

Title: Efficacy and Safety of Direct Oral Anticoagulants Versus Warfarin in Patients with Non-valvular Atrial Fibrillation and Liver Cirrhosis

3

4 Tien-Shin Chou, MD^{1,5}, Yuan Lin, MD^{2,5}, Ming-Lung Tsai, MD⁴, Chin-Ju Tseng,
5 MD³, Jhih-Wei Dai, MD³, Ning-I Yang, MBChB³, Chih-Lang Lin, MD¹, Li-Wei
6 Chen, MD¹, Ming-Jui Hung, MD, PhD³, Tien-Hsing Chen, MD^{3,5,6}

7

8

9 1. Division of Gastroenterology, Department of Internal Medicine, Keelung Chang
10 Gung Memorial Hospital, Keelung Taiwan

11 2. Department of Emergency Medicine, Keelung Chang Gung Memorial Hospital,
12 Keelung, Taiwan

13 3. Division of Cardiology, Department of Internal Medicine, Keelung Chang Gung
14 Memorial Hospital, Keelung Taiwan

15 4. Division of Cardiology, Department of Internal Medicine, New Taipei Municipal
16 TuCheng Hospital, Taiwan

17 5. Chang Gung University College of Medicine, Taoyuan, Taiwan

18 6. Center of data science and Biostatistics, Keelung Chang Gung Memorial Hospital,
19 Taiwan

20

21 Short title: DOAC in AF and cirrhosis

22

23 Address for Co-Correspondence:

24 Tien-Hsing Chen, MD

25 Department of Cardiology, Chang Gung Memorial Hospital, Keelung, Taiwan

26 222, Maijin Road, Keelung, Taiwan, R.O.C

27 Tel: +886-2-24313131; Fax: + 886-2-24313161

28 E-mail: skyheart0826@gmail.com

29

30 **Words count:** 3534 (Text not include the title page, abstract, references, tables, and
31 figure legends.)

32 **Words count:** 7596 (including title page, abstract, text, references, tables and figures
33 legends)

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract

Background: Evidence of the pharmacodynamics of direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs) is limited in patients with atrial fibrillation (AF) and liver cirrhosis (LC). This study aimed to compare the efficacy and safety of DOACs versus warfarin in patients with non-valvular AF and LC.

Methods: We conducted a new-user, retrospective cohort study involving patients with AF and LC from the Chang Gung Hospital System for the years 2012–2021. LC was categorized per the Child–Pugh classification system. We divided the included patients into two cohorts, namely a DOAC cohort and a warfarin cohort. The measured outcomes were thromboembolic events (ischemic stroke [IS], transient ischemic attack [TIA], and systemic embolism [SE]), intracranial hemorrhage [ICH], gastrointestinal (GI) and major bleeding, and all-cause mortality.

Results: In total, 478 DOAC users and 247 warfarin users were included in the analysis. DOACs and warfarin exhibited comparable efficacy in preventing thromboembolic events, namely IS (adjusted hazard ratio [aHR], 1.05; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.42–2.61), TIA (aHR, 1.36; 95% CI, 0.18–10.31), and SE (aHR, 0.49; 95% CI, 0.14–1.70). DOAC use was associated with a similar risk of ICH (aHR, 0.65; 95% CI, 0.26–1.59) and GI bleeding (aHR, 0.64; 95% CI, 0.39–1.03), a decreased risk of major bleeding (aHR, 0.64; 95% CI, 0.42–0.99), and a reduction in all-cause mortality (aHR, 0.73; 95% CI, 0.54–0.99). Patients with Child–Pugh class A classification exhibited a significant reduction in major bleeding risk in DOAC users (aHR, 0.48; 95% CI, 0.33–0.70); however, this reduction was nonsignificant for patients with class B or C classification (aHR, 0.77; 95% CI, 0.54–1.08).

Conclusion: Relative to warfarin, DOACs provide comparable efficacy but greater safety for patients with non-valvular AF and LC. Specifically, DOAC use leads to a lower risk of major bleeding and a lower all-cause mortality.

Clinical Perspective

What is New?

- This study reveals that direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs) and warfarin have similar effectiveness in preventing thromboembolic events in patients with non-valvular atrial fibrillation (AF) and liver cirrhosis (LC).
- DOACs demonstrate a lower risk of major bleeding and reduced all-cause mortality compared to warfarin, especially in patients with Child–Pugh class A LC.
- The safety profile of DOACs in reducing gastrointestinal bleeding is comparable to that of warfarin, with a trend towards lower risk.

What are the Clinical Implications?

- For patients with non-valvular AF and LC, particularly those with Child–Pugh class A classification, DOACs may be a safer alternative to warfarin due to their lower risk of major bleeding.
- Clinicians can consider DOACs as a comparable alternative to warfarin for stroke prevention in this patient group, given their similar efficacy in preventing thromboembolic events.
- The reduced all-cause mortality associated with DOACs highlights their potential benefit in improving overall patient outcomes in the context of AF and LC.

Introduction

Liver cirrhosis (LC) is a risk factor for atrial fibrillation (AF), and the prevalence rate of AF increases with the severity of liver disease.(1, 2). In AF management, anticoagulation therapy is a crucial component. However, when AF and LC coexist, a key challenge for implementing anticoagulation therapy is balancing the benefits of stroke prevention against the increased risk of bleeding; this challenge is related to the multifaceted hemostatic changes and altered drug metabolism induced by liver disease (3, 4).

In the general AF population, direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs) have been demonstrated to be effective for stroke prevention, and they pose a lower risk of bleeding compared with warfarin (5). However, the efficacy and safety of DOACs in patients with both AF and LC are less clear. DOACs provide several advantages, including simplified dosing adjustments based on renal function, limited drug–diet interactions, and minimal coagulation monitoring requirements (6). Because DOACs are less dependent on liver clearance relative to warfarin, they can be advantageous for patients with LC (7). However, evidence of the pharmacodynamics of DOACs in patients with LC is limited because most clinical trials exclude patients with severe liver disease (8-11).

On the basis of the Child–Pugh classification system, current guidelines advocate the administration of oral anticoagulants for patients with LC (12-14). For patients with class A LC, all four currently available DOACs are regarded as appropriate. For those with class B LC, dabigatran, apixaban, and edoxaban should be administered with caution, whereas the use of rivaroxaban is discouraged. For patients with class C LC, DOACs are not recommended (12-14). Nonetheless, most of the data supporting these guidelines were derived from small-scale clinical studies (15, 16) or extrapolated from noncirrhotic populations(17-20). That is, these data were not based on comprehensive clinical and laboratory information with accurate definitions of liver disease severity (17-20). Furthermore, real-world studies have yielded inconclusive and inconsistent data regarding the effectiveness and safety of DOACs in patients with liver disease (17-19). Lee SR et al. reported that the clinical outcomes of DOAC and warfarin use in patients with LC were not significantly different (17). By contrast, Lee HF et al. reported a lower risk of gastrointestinal (GI) bleeding in DOAC users than in warfarin users (18), and Lawal et al. observed that

relative to warfarin users, DOAC users were exposed to a comparable risk of major GI bleeding but to lower risks of all-cause mortality and major bleeding (19). These inconsistent findings and the limited event data pertaining to this topic highlight the necessity of conducting more focused and rigorous research in this area.

Thus, we enrolled cohorts of patients with both AF and LC who were treated with either DOACs or warfarin. Our objective was to investigate the comparative efficacy and safety of DOACs versus warfarin in patients with AF across the spectrum of LC severity.

Methods

Data source

The data were retrieved from the Chang Gung Research Database (21). Due to retrospective nature of the database study, the hospital identification number of each patient was encrypted and de-identified to protect their privacy. Therefore, informed consent was waived for this study. The institutional review board of Chang Gung Memorial Hospital approved the study protocol (IRB No. :202200625B0).

Study Population and Exposure

The study cohort comprised patients with both nonvalvular AF and LC who were exposed to DOACs (apixaban, dabigatran, rivaroxaban, or edoxaban) or warfarin between January 1, 2012, and December 31, 2021. The index day was defined as the first day on which a DOAC or warfarin was prescribed. Patients with LC were included if they met two criteria. First, they were required to be clinically diagnosed with LC. Second, this diagnosis was required to be validated through a manual review of reports of abdominal ultrasound or transient elastography (FibroScan, liver stiffness > 12 kPa) conducted 3 years before or 6 months after the index day (22, 23). Patients were excluded if they lacked abdominal ultrasound or transient elastography data, their abdominal ultrasound or transient elastography results did not provide any evidence of LC, they had a history of liver transplantation, their demographic (age and sex) or Child–Pugh score data were incomplete, they were aged <20 years, they had valvular AF, they had prior venous thromboembolism, they were undergoing dialysis for end-stage renal disease, or they were lost to follow-up. Furthermore, we divided the included patients into a DOAC group and a warfarin group (**Figure 1**).

179

180 *Clinical outcomes*

181 The primary outcomes were efficacy and safety outcomes. The efficacy
182 outcomes were ischemic stroke (IS), transient ischemic attack (TIA), systemic
183 embolism (SE), and a composite measure of IS, TIA, and SE (IS/TIA/SE). The safety
184 outcomes were intracranial hemorrhage (ICH), GI bleeding, and major bleeding. The
185 secondary outcomes were all-cause mortality, myocardial infarction (MI), and liver
186 decompensation outcomes. The liver decompensation outcomes were hepatic
187 encephalopathy, ascites, spontaneous bacterial infection, hepatorenal syndrome,
188 esophageal variceal bleeding, hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC), and liver related
189 death. Comorbidities and diseases were detected by referencing International
190 Classification of Diseases, 9th and 10th Revision, Clinical Modification (ICD-9-CM
191 and ICD-10-CM) codes (**Supplemental Table S1**). Most of the clinical events were
192 identified through inpatient diagnoses, with the exceptions being ascites, and all-
193 cause mortality. Information on the date and cause of death was retrieved from the
194 Taiwan Death Registry database. Ascites was defined as newly detectable ascites that
195 were clinically confirmed by ultrasound findings. The end of the study period was the
196 date of death, December 31, 2021, the final clinical visit, or the fifth year of follow-
197 up, whichever occurred first.

198

199 *Covariate measurement*

200 The covariates examined in the present study were demographics (i.e., age, sex,
201 smoking habit, alcohol drinking habit, and body mass index), duration of LC, LC-
202 related diseases (e.g., primary biliary cholangitis), LC complications (e.g., ascites),
203 comorbidities (i.e., diabetes mellitus, hypertension, and four others), historical events
204 requiring hospitalization (i.e., ischemic stroke, major bleeding, and six others),
205 medications concurrently prescribed at outpatient clinics (i.e., aspirin, beta-blockers,
206 and 16 other medications), risk scores (i.e., Child–Pugh score, CHA2DS2-VASc
207 score, HAS-BLED score, and Charlson comorbidity index score), liver function test
208 (i.e., serum aspartate aminotransferase and alanine aminotransferase, platelet count,
209 prothrombin time, bilirubin level, and albumin level), and various laboratory data
210 (e.g., international normalized ratio [INR]). A comorbidity was included in this study
211 if two outpatient diagnoses or one discharge diagnosis was made for the comorbidity
212 prior to the index date. Laboratory data within 3 months prior to the index date were

retrieved. Liver function test results and esophagogastroduodenoscopy results were retrieved from records dating to 3 years prior to and 6 months after the index date. Concurrent medication use was determined using records dating to 3 months before or after the index date. Portal hypertension was defined as the presence of ascites, varices, or splenomegaly (24). The classification of liver disease severity based on Child–Pugh scores is described in **Supplemental Table S2**.

Statistical analysis

Because substantial differences in baseline demographics and clinical characteristics were identified between the DOAC and warfarin groups, inverse probability of treatment weighting (IPTW), which is based with on the average treatment effect and propensity scores, was performed to ensure comparability between the two groups. We estimated the propensity score using a generalized boosted model (GBM), which was constructed using 50,000 regression trees. All the covariates (**Table 1**) were included in the estimation of propensity scores; the follow-up year was replaced by the index date. The balance of baseline data between the two groups before and after GBM-IPTW was evaluated by calculating standardized difference (STD), where an absolute STD value of <0.2 indicated a non-substantial group difference. Because of the substantial amount of missing values in the continuous laboratory data, the missing data were imputed using an expectation-maximization algorithm. We compared outcomes in both the imputed and IPTW-adjusted cohorts.

We employed the Cox proportional hazard model to compare the risk of fatal time-to-event outcomes (e.g., liver-related death) between the DOAC and warfarin groups. The Fine–Gray sub-distribution hazard model was used to compare the incidence of nonfatal time-to-event outcomes (e.g., ischemic stroke and major bleeding) between the two groups; all-cause mortality during follow-up was considered as a competing risk in this model. Given the potential covariate imbalances between the two groups, even after thorough GBM-IPTW, including imbalances pertaining to age, age groups, esophageal/gastric varice–related complications, portal hypertension, radiofrequency ablation, P2Y12, other beta-blockers, CHA₂DS₂-VASc score, INR value, and INR status (absolute STD > 0.2), the aforementioned survival regression models were further adjusted for these covariates. Finally, a subgroup analysis of the primary safety outcome (i.e., major

bleeding) was performed, and the results were stratified by clinical variables in the IPTW-adjusted cohort. SAS (version 9.4, SAS Institute) was used for statistical analyses. A two-sided *P* value of <0.05 was regarded as statistically significant.

Results

Baseline characteristics

From the Chang Gung Research Database, we identified 1,932 patients with AF and LC who were treated with oral anticoagulants between January 1, 2012, and December 31, 2021. Among them, 725 patients met the eligibility criteria for inclusion in the present study (**Figure 1**). **Table 1** presents the baseline characteristics of the study population, and the patients treated with DOACs (*n* = 478) were compared with those treated with warfarin (*n* = 247). After IPTW adjustment, the distribution of Child–Pugh classes was comparable between the DOAC group and the warfarin group (Child–Pugh A, 53.9% vs. 45.3%; STD = −0.17; Child–Pugh B, 40.5% vs. 47.4%; STD = −0.14; Child–Pugh C, 5.6% vs. 7.3%; STD = −0.07). However, the DOAC group had higher CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores (DOAC vs. warfarin, 3.5 vs. 3.1) and HAS-BLED scores (DOAC vs. warfarin, 3.9 vs. 3.6) relative to the warfarin group. Additionally, the DOAC group had a lower prevalence of portal hypertension (DOAC vs. warfarin, 74.3% vs. 85.2%), higher mean age (DOAC vs. warfarin, 72.2 years vs. 67.8 years), and lower INR level (DOAC vs. warfarin, 1.2 vs. 1.4) relative to the warfarin group. The average follow-up durations for the DOAC and warfarin groups were 2.6 and 3.2 years, respectively.

Clinical outcomes

For the maximum 5-year follow-up period, the results revealed that DOACs were as effective as warfarin in reducing the incidence of the composite outcome (IS/TIA/SE; adjusted hazard ratio [aHR], 0.76; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.38–1.53) (**Table 2** and **Figure 2A**). The primary efficacy outcomes did not differ significantly between the two groups. Regarding safety outcomes, while there was no significant difference in intracranial hemorrhage (ICH) between the two groups, DOACs demonstrated a non-significant trend toward a lower risk of GI bleeding (aHR, 0.64; 95% CI, 0.39–1.03) and a significantly lower risk of major bleeding (aHR, 0.64; 95% CI, 0.42–0.99) relative to the warfarin group (**Figure 2B**).

Furthermore, the DOAC group exhibited a significantly lower risk of all-cause mortality (aHR, 0.73; 95% CI, 0.54–0.99) (**Figure 2C**). The DOAC and warfarin groups exhibited similar levels of MI risk (aHR, 1.20; 95% CI, 0.26–5.61; $P = 0.815$). Regarding liver decompensation outcomes, no significant differences were observed between the two groups (**Table 2**). **Supplemental Figure S1** provides details on the causes of death.

Subgroup analysis

In the subgroup analysis of major bleeding, the beneficial effect of DOACs in reducing major bleeding risk did not significantly differ across various factors, namely age, gender, portal hypertension, diabetes mellitus, malignancy, HAS-BLED score, albumin level, total bilirubin level, and INR status (**Supplemental Table S3**). However, the beneficial effect of DOACs was more in patients with HCC than in those without HCC (aHR, 0.38 vs. 0.72; P for interaction = 0.02). We further stratified our results by Child–Pugh class and discovered that patients with Child–Pugh class A classification exhibited a significant reduction in major bleeding risk in DOAC users (aHR, 0.48; 95% CI, 0.33–0.70); however, this reduction was nonsignificant for patients with class B or C classification (aHR, 0.77; 95% CI, 0.54–1.08) (**Figure 3A and 3B**).

Discussion

In the present cohort study, we evaluated the efficacy and safety of DOACs versus warfarin among 725 patients with non-valvular AF and LC of varying severity. Our findings indicated that DOACs and warfarin were similarly effective in preventing thromboembolic events, namely IS, TIA, and SE. Compared with warfarin users, DOAC users exhibited similar ICH risk and a non-significantly lower risk of GI bleeding. DOAC use was associated with a lower risk of major bleeding, especially in patients with Child–Pugh class A LC. DOAC use was associated with lower all-cause mortality. Regarding liver decompensation outcomes, no significant differences were observed between the DOAC and warfarin groups. Overall, DOAC and warfarin users exhibited similar efficacy and safety with respect to ICH and GI bleeding. However, relative to warfarin, DOACs exhibited superior safety in reducing major bleeding events; this finding provides essential guidance when deciding whether to administer anticoagulation therapy for patients with AF and LC.

315

316 For patients with LC, DOACs and warfarin have been reported to lead to similar
317 outcomes with respect to stroke and SE (17-19). In our study, patients with LC who
318 used DOACs exhibited similar levels of IS and SE risk relative to those who used
319 warfarin. The pathophysiological mechanism underlying the association between LC
320 and stroke is complex and multifactorial. Clinical evidence has debunked the
321 misconception that natural anticoagulation occurs in patients with LC (25). Notably,
322 the risk of ischemic stroke has been reported to be higher in patients with AF and LC
323 than in patients with AF alone (26). Chronic liver disease, particularly LC, increases
324 thrombosis risk because of the impaired synthesis of endogenous anticoagulants such
325 as protein C, protein S, and antithrombin (25). This risk is intensified because of the
326 combined effects of several factors in patients with LC, namely the release of factor
327 VIII and von Willebrand factor stimulated by lipopolysaccharides from bacterial
328 translocation; the reduction in ADAMTS13 levels, which modulates von Willebrand
329 factor activity; and hypofibrinolysis due to low plasminogen levels (27, 28).
330 Furthermore, in patients with LC, interleukin-6, which is frequently elevated in
331 response to endotoxemia (29, 30), increases tissue factor expression on activated
332 monocytes and endothelial cells (31). This cascade amplifies systemic inflammation,
333 impairs the coagulation pathway, and potentially increases the risk of stroke in
334 patients with LC (32, 33). In our study cohort, these LC-related factors could have
335 precipitated stroke and reduced the protective effect of DOACs, possibly explaining
336 the absence of a significant effect on stroke outcomes.

337

338 Compared with warfarin use, DOAC use was reported to be associated with a
339 lower risk of ICH in several key randomized controlled trials (8-11). In the present
340 study, a similar level ICH risk was also observed among DOAC users. A proposed
341 hypothesis is that DOACs, by not interfering with the formation of tissue factor and
342 factor VIIa complexes, may support cerebral hemostatic mechanisms (34).
343 Additionally, the interactions of DOACs with the P-glycoprotein transport system and
344 their potential ability to limit endothelial cell damage within the blood-brain barrier
345 (mediated by the thrombin/Protease-Activated Receptor-1 pathway) may contribute to
346 their superior safety profile in preventing ICH (34-36). Another plausible hypothesis
347 is that anticoagulants disrupt the coagulation pathway, which promotes the
348 accelerated extravasation of red blood cells, the accumulation of cerebral

microhemorrhages (CMBs), and, eventually, leads to the development of symptomatic ICH (37). This hypothesis is supported by a study that reported a lower incidence of new CMB among DOAC users than among warfarin users in a population treated for AF (38). However, findings have been inconsistent regarding the association of ICH risk with DOAC use in the context of liver disease (17, 18). Increased liver fibrosis may be independently associated with an increased burden of CMB, but the mechanism underlying this association remains unclear (39). Furthermore, patients with LC exhibit an increased risk of hemorrhagic stroke (40). Although DOACs can marginally reduce the risk of ICH in patients without LC, the complex nature of ICH development may diminish this protective effect in patients with LC. This supports our finding that DOAC and warfarin users exhibit similar levels of ICH risk.

The present study revealed that relative to warfarin users, DOAC users tended to exhibit a reduced risk of GI bleeding and had a decreased risk of major bleeding. The superior safety profiles of DOACs relative to warfarin may be attributed to their more predictable pharmacokinetics, lower dependence on liver clearance, and fewer interactions with various drugs and foods. Furthermore, bacterial overgrowth in the small intestine, which is commonly observed in patients with LC, particularly those with advanced liver disease and portal hypertension, may alter gut microbiota (41, 42). This change can lead to a net decrease in vitamin K availability, which may amplify the anticoagulant effect of warfarin, thereby increasing the risks of over-anticoagulation and bleeding (43). The aforementioned factors may have collectively contributed to the observed reduction in the risks of major and GI bleeding. Compared with the cohorts of other studies, our cohort exhibited several distinct differences. First, our cohort had a lower HAS-BLED score relative to that of a nationwide U.S. study that included not only patients with LC but also those with less severe liver diseases (19). Despite the lower HAS-BLED score, our study revealed higher risks of both major and GI bleeding. This finding indicates that the HAS-BLED score should be further validated to more accurately predict the bleeding risk associated with anticoagulant use in patients with LC. Second, Lawal et al. categorized patients with LC into those with compensated or decompensated LC, and they did not identify any differences in clinical outcomes (including major and GI bleeding) between DOAC and warfarin users (19). Conversely, our analysis

highlighted the safety benefits of DOAC, particularly with respect to major bleeding, for patients with Child–Pugh class A LC. Additionally, DOACs demonstrated a trend towards a reduction in GI bleeding risk in our cohort, although this trend did not reach statistical significance.

In our study, the risk of all-cause mortality was lower among DOAC users than among warfarin users, and this trend was most pronounced for liver-related deaths (Supplemental Figure S1). While a study found that the mortality benefit of DOAC may be related to the reduced risk in ICH (44), our study observed a comparable risk of ICH with DOAC use. This suggests that the advantage of DOAC in reducing all-cause mortality may be partly due to a decrease in liver-associated complications, though the underlying biological mechanisms for this effect remain to be elucidated. A study highlighted the mortality-reducing effects of vitamin K1 in patients with LC (45), providing a backdrop for exploring the interplay between anticoagulants and vitamin K. Additionally, a meta-analysis revealed that patients experiencing ICH while on DOACs had smaller hematoma sizes and lower mortality rates at discharge compared to those on vitamin K antagonists (46). This indicates that DOACs are associated with less severe outcomes in the event of ICH, potentially contributing to their overall mortality benefit. Furthermore, nearly half of our study participants were diagnosed with diabetes mellitus. The benefits of vitamin K in enhancing insulin sensitivity and mitigating inflammation raises questions about whether warfarin’s inhibition of vitamin K may exacerbate glucose control and inflammatory responses (47). A supporting study reported lower mortality rates among DOAC users than among warfarin users in patients with AF and diabetes mellitus (48). Nevertheless, the aforementioned hypotheses represent preliminary interpretations, and more rigorous research is required to confirm them.

Limitations

Our study has several limitations: 1. **Patient Cohort:** Our cohort consists mostly of patients with milder forms of LC, which limits our findings’ applicability to advanced LC (Child–Pugh classes B and C). However, the relevance of stroke prevention for patients with Child–Pugh class B and C LC, who often have a limited life expectancy, may be reduced. Thus, the long-term effects of DOACs in these classes may be less crucial. 2. **Differential Effects of DOACs:** Although each DOAC has a distinct pharmacological profile, our study did not separately examine the safety

and efficacy of each DOAC in this cohort. Notably, a study reported a higher bleeding risk in rivaroxaban users than in apixaban users (49). Because of the limited number of participants in each DOAC class, our study did not have adequate statistical power for the further analysis of each DOAC. 3. **Methodological Limitation:** We employed IPTW to mitigate biases when comparing DOACs and warfarin. However, retrospective studies inherently harbor confounders, which hinder the confirmation of causality between DOAC use and outcomes, and only randomized controlled trials or prospective studies can yield conclusive evidence. 4. **Generalizability:** The present study's geographical context and predominant LC etiology restrict its general applicability. Specifically, it was conducted within the context of an East Asian health-care system where viral hepatitis and alcohol are the primary causes of LC. Therefore, our results may not be generalized to patients with liver diseases resulting from nonalcoholic steatohepatitis, although literature findings suggest that the pharmacokinetics of apixaban are unaffected by nonalcoholic steatohepatitis (50).

Conclusion

In the present study, DOACs and warfarin demonstrated comparable effectiveness in preventing thromboembolic events, namely IS, TIA, and SE. However, compared to warfarin, DOAC use resulted in lower rates of major bleeding, particularly in patients with Child–Pugh class A LC, while demonstrating comparable effects on the risks of ICH and GI bleeding. DOACs were associated with reduced all-cause mortality. Our research provides a real-world perspective that can help to guide clinicians in anticoagulation decision-making for patients with AF and LC.

451

452

453

454

455

456

457

458 **Acknowledgments**

459 The authors thank the statistical assistance and wish to acknowledge the support of

460 the Maintenance Project of the Center of data science and Biostatistics (Grant

461 CGRPG2F0011, CLRPG2C0021, CLRPG2C0022, CLRPG2C0023, CLRPG2C0024,

462 CLRPG2G0081, CLRPG2G0082, CLRPG2G0083, CLRPG2L0021, CLRPG2L0022,

463 and CMRPG2N0041) at Keelung Chang Gung Memorial Hospital for study design

464 and monitor, data analysis and interpretation.

465

466 **Sources of Funding:**

467 This work was supported by grants from the Chang Gung Memorial Hospital, Taiwan

468 (CMRPG2N0041).

469

470 **Disclosures:**

471 None.

472

473

474

475

476

477

478

479

480

481

482

483

484

485 **Reference:**

- 486 1. Lee H, Choi EK, Rhee TM, Lee SR, Lim WH, Kang SH, et al. Cirrhosis is a risk
487 factor for atrial fibrillation: A nationwide, population-based study. *Liver Int.*
488 2017;37(11):1660-7.
- 489 2. Huang WA, Dunipace EA, Sorg JM, Vaseghi M. Liver Disease as a Predictor of
490 New-Onset Atrial Fibrillation. *J Am Heart Assoc.* 2018;7(15):e008703.
- 491 3. Chokesuwattanaskul R, Thongprayoon C, Bathini T, Torres-Ortiz A,
492 O'Corragain OA, Watthanasuntorn K, et al. Efficacy and safety of anticoagulation for
493 atrial fibrillation in patients with cirrhosis: A systematic review and meta-analysis.
494 *Dig Liver Dis.* 2019;51(4):489-95.
- 495 4. Lewis JH, Stine JG. Review article: prescribing medications in patients with
496 cirrhosis - a practical guide. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther.* 2013;37(12):1132-56.
- 497 5. Chiang CE, Chao TF, Choi EK, Lim TW, Krittayaphong R, Li M, et al. Stroke
498 Prevention in Atrial Fibrillation: A Scientific Statement of JACC: Asia (Part 1). *JACC*
499 *Asia.* 2022;2(4):395-411.
- 500 6. Turco L, de Raucourt E, Valla DC, Villa E. Anticoagulation in the cirrhotic
501 patient. *JHEP Rep.* 2019;1(3):227-39.
- 502 7. Qamar A, Vaduganathan M, Greenberger NJ, Giugliano RP. Oral
503 Anticoagulation in Patients With Liver Disease. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2018;71(19):2162-
504 75.
- 505 8. Connolly SJ, Ezekowitz MD, Yusuf S, Eikelboom J, Oldgren J, Parekh A, et al.
506 Dabigatran versus warfarin in patients with atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med.*
507 2009;361(12):1139-51.
- 508 9. Patel MR, Mahaffey KW, Garg J, Pan G, Singer DE, Hacke W, et al.
509 Rivaroxaban versus warfarin in nonvalvular atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med.*
510 2011;365(10):883-91.
- 511 10. Giugliano RP, Ruff CT, Braunwald E, Murphy SA, Wiviott SD, Halperin JL, et al.
512 Edoxaban versus warfarin in patients with atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med.*
513 2013;369(22):2093-104.
- 514 11. Granger CB, Alexander JH, McMurray JJ, Lopes RD, Hylek EM, Hanna M, et al.
515 Apixaban versus warfarin in patients with atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med.*
516 2011;365(11):981-92.
- 517 12. Chiang CE, Chao TF, Choi EK, Lim TW, Krittayaphong R, Li M, et al. Stroke
518 Prevention in Atrial Fibrillation: A Scientific Statement of JACC: Asia (Part 2). *JACC*
519 *Asia.* 2022;2(5):519-37.
- 520 13. O'Shea RS, Davitkov P, Ko CW, Rajasekhar A, Su GL, Sultan S, et al. AGA

521 Clinical Practice Guideline on the Management of Coagulation Disorders in Patients
522 With Cirrhosis. *Gastroenterology*. 2021;161(5):1615-27 e1.

523 14. Steffel J, Collins R, Antz M, Cornu P, Desteghe L, Haeusler KG, et al. 2021
524 European Heart Rhythm Association Practical Guide on the Use of Non-Vitamin K
525 Antagonist Oral Anticoagulants in Patients with Atrial Fibrillation. *Europace*.
526 2021;23(10):1612-76.

527 15. Intagliata NM, Henry ZH, Maitland H, Shah NL, Argo CK, Northup PG, et al.
528 Direct Oral Anticoagulants in Cirrhosis Patients Pose Similar Risks of Bleeding When
529 Compared to Traditional Anticoagulation. *Dig Dis Sci*. 2016;61(6):1721-7.

530 16. Hum J, Shatzel JJ, Jou JH, Deloughery TG. The efficacy and safety of direct
531 oral anticoagulants vs traditional anticoagulants in cirrhosis. *Eur J Haematol*.
532 2017;98(4):393-7.

533 17. Lee SR, Lee HJ, Choi EK, Han KD, Jung JH, Cha MJ, et al. Direct Oral
534 Anticoagulants in Patients With Atrial Fibrillation and Liver Disease. *J Am Coll Cardiol*.
535 2019;73(25):3295-308.

536 18. Lee HF, Chan YH, Chang SH, Tu HT, Chen SW, Yeh YH, et al. Effectiveness and
537 Safety of Non-Vitamin K Antagonist Oral Anticoagulant and Warfarin in Cirrhotic
538 Patients With Nonvalvular Atrial Fibrillation. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2019;8(5):e011112.

539 19. Lawal OD, Aronow HD, Shobayo F, Hume AL, Taveira TH, Matson KL, et al.
540 Comparative Effectiveness and Safety of Direct Oral Anticoagulants and Warfarin in
541 Patients With Atrial Fibrillation and Chronic Liver Disease: A Nationwide Cohort
542 Study. *Circulation*. 2023;147(10):782-94.

543 20. Pastori D, Lip GYH, Farcomeni A, Del Sole F, Sciacqua A, Perticone F, et al.
544 Incidence of bleeding in patients with atrial fibrillation and advanced liver fibrosis on
545 treatment with vitamin K or non-vitamin K antagonist oral anticoagulants. *Int J*
546 *Cardiol*. 2018;264:58-63.

547 21. Shao SC, Chan YY, Kao Yang YH, Lin SJ, Hung MJ, Chien RN, et al. The Chang
548 Gung Research Database-A multi-institutional electronic medical records database
549 for real-world epidemiological studies in Taiwan. *Pharmacoepidemiol Drug Saf*.
550 2019;28(5):593-600.

551 22. Hung CH, Lu SN, Wang JH, Lee CM, Chen TM, Tung HD, et al. Correlation
552 between ultrasonographic and pathologic diagnoses of hepatitis B and C virus-
553 related cirrhosis. *J Gastroenterol*. 2003;38(2):153-7.

554 23. Foucher J, Chanteloup E, Vergniol J, Castera L, Le Bail B, Adhoute X, et al.
555 Diagnosis of cirrhosis by transient elastography (FibroScan): a prospective study. *Gut*.
556 2006;55(3):403-8.

557 24. Nehra MS, Ma Y, Clark C, Amarasingham R, Rockey DC, Singal AG. Use of
558 administrative claims data for identifying patients with cirrhosis. *J Clin Gastroenterol*.
559 2013;47(5):e50-4.

560 25. Tripodi A, Mannucci PM. The coagulopathy of chronic liver disease. *N Engl J*
561 *Med*. 2011;365(2):147-56.

562 26. Kuo L, Chao TF, Liu CJ, Lin YJ, Chang SL, Lo LW, et al. Liver Cirrhosis in Patients
563 With Atrial Fibrillation: Would Oral Anticoagulation Have a Net Clinical Benefit for
564 Stroke Prevention? *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2017;6(6).

565 27. Carnevale R, Raparelli V, Nocella C, Bartimoccia S, Novo M, Severino A, et al.
566 Gut-derived endotoxin stimulates factor VIII secretion from endothelial cells.
567 Implications for hypercoagulability in cirrhosis. *J Hepatol*. 2017;67(5):950-6.

- 568 28. Ding WY, Gupta D, Lip GYH. Atrial fibrillation and the prothrombotic state:
569 revisiting Virchow's triad in 2020. *Heart*. 2020;106(19):1463-8.
- 570 29. Lee FY, Lu RH, Tsai YT, Lin HC, Hou MC, Li CP, et al. Plasma interleukin-6 levels
571 in patients with cirrhosis. Relationship to endotoxemia, tumor necrosis factor-alpha,
572 and hyperdynamic circulation. *Scand J Gastroenterol*. 1996;31(5):500-5.
- 573 30. Arroyo V, Angeli P, Moreau R, Jalan R, Claria J, Trebicka J, et al. The systemic
574 inflammation hypothesis: Towards a new paradigm of acute decompensation and
575 multiorgan failure in cirrhosis. *J Hepatol*. 2021;74(3):670-85.
- 576 31. Levi M, van der Poll T, Schultz M. Systemic versus localized coagulation
577 activation contributing to organ failure in critically ill patients. *Semin Immunopathol*.
578 2012;34(1):167-79.
- 579 32. Esenwa CC, Elkind MS. Inflammatory risk factors, biomarkers and associated
580 therapy in ischaemic stroke. *Nat Rev Neurol*. 2016;12(10):594-604.
- 581 33. Arroyo V, Garcia-Martinez R, Salvatella X. Human serum albumin, systemic
582 inflammation, and cirrhosis. *J Hepatol*. 2014;61(2):396-407.
- 583 34. Eikelboom JW, Wallentin L, Connolly SJ, Ezekowitz M, Healey JS, Oldgren J, et
584 al. Risk of bleeding with 2 doses of dabigatran compared with warfarin in older and
585 younger patients with atrial fibrillation: an analysis of the randomized evaluation of
586 long-term anticoagulant therapy (RE-LY) trial. *Circulation*. 2011;123(21):2363-72.
- 587 35. Eyal S, Hsiao P, Unadkat JD. Drug interactions at the blood-brain barrier: fact
588 or fantasy? *Pharmacol Ther*. 2009;123(1):80-104.
- 589 36. Puech C, Delavenne X, He Z, Forest V, Mismetti P, Perek N. Direct oral
590 anticoagulants are associated with limited damage of endothelial cells of the blood-
591 brain barrier mediated by the thrombin/PAR-1 pathway. *Brain Res*. 2019;1719:57-63.
- 592 37. Wilson D, Werring DJ. Antithrombotic therapy in patients with cerebral
593 microbleeds. *Curr Opin Neurol*. 2017;30(1):38-47.
- 594 38. Zhuang L, Zhai L, Qiao S, Hu X, Lai Q, Fu F, et al. New cerebral microbleeds in
595 AF patients on non-vitamin K oral anticoagulants or warfarin: One-year follow-up.
596 *Medicine (Baltimore)*. 2022;101(7):e25836.
- 597 39. Kim YD, Song D, Heo JH, Kim SU, Kim BK, Park JY, et al. Relationship between
598 Cerebral Microbleeds and Liver Stiffness Determined by Transient Elastography.
599 *PLoS One*. 2015;10(9):e0139227.
- 600 40. Parikh NS, Navi BB, Schneider Y, Jesudian A, Kamel H. Association Between
601 Cirrhosis and Stroke in a Nationally Representative Cohort. *JAMA Neurol*.
602 2017;74(8):927-32.
- 603 41. Ghosh G, Jesudian AB. Small Intestinal Bacterial Overgrowth in Patients With
604 Cirrhosis. *J Clin Exp Hepatol*. 2019;9(2):257-67.
- 605 42. Maslennikov R, Pavlov C, Ivashkin V. Small intestinal bacterial overgrowth in
606 cirrhosis: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Hepatol Int*. 2018;12(6):567-76.
- 607 43. Scarpellini E, Gabrielli M, Za T, Lauritano EC, Santoliquido A, Rossi E, et al. The
608 interaction between small intestinal bacterial overgrowth and warfarin treatment.
609 *Am J Gastroenterol*. 2009;104(9):2364-5.
- 610 44. Liew A, O'Donnell M, Douketis J. Comparing mortality in patients with atrial
611 fibrillation who are receiving a direct-acting oral anticoagulant or warfarin: a meta-
612 analysis of randomized trials. *J Thromb Haemost*. 2014;12(9):1419-24.
- 613 45. Xiong Z, Liu Y, Chang T, Xu X, Huo S, Deng H, et al. Effect of vitamin K1 on
614 survival of patients with chronic liver failure: A retrospective cohort study. *Medicine*

615 (Baltimore). 2020;99(13):e19619.
616 46. Ahmed A, Ahmed R, Ali SS, Patel U, Shahid I, Zafar M, et al. Intracerebral
617 hemorrhage outcomes in patients using direct oral anticoagulants versus vitamin K
618 antagonists: a meta-analysis. Clin Neurol Neurosurg. 2020;198:106146.
619 47. Karamzad N, Maleki V, Carson-Chahhoud K, Azizi S, Sahebkar A, Gargari BP. A
620 systematic review on the mechanisms of vitamin K effects on the complications of
621 diabetes and pre-diabetes. Biofactors. 2020;46(1):21-37.
622 48. Huang HK, Liu PP, Lin SM, Hsu JY, Yeh JJ, Lai EC, et al. Diabetes-Related
623 Complications and Mortality in Patients With Atrial Fibrillation Receiving Different
624 Oral Anticoagulants : A Nationwide Analysis. Ann Intern Med. 2022;175(4):490-8.
625 49. Ray WA, Chung CP, Stein CM, Smalley W, Zimmerman E, Dupont WD, et al.
626 Association of Rivaroxaban vs Apixaban With Major Ischemic or Hemorrhagic Events
627 in Patients With Atrial Fibrillation. JAMA. 2021;326(23):2395-404.
628 50. Tirona RG, Kassam Z, Strapp R, Ramu M, Zhu C, Liu M, et al. Apixaban and
629 Rosuvas--tatin Pharmacokinetics in Nonalcoholic Fatty Liver Disease. Drug Metab
630 Dispos. 2018;46(5):485-92.
631

Figure legends

Figure 1. Flow chart for selecting and excluding patients.

Figure 2. Cumulative event rates for primary efficacy outcome (A), major bleeding (B), and all-cause mortality (C) during 5-year follow-up period for patients with atrial fibrillation and liver cirrhosis who were administered DOACs or warfarin in IPTW-adjusted cohort.

Abbreviations: DOAC, direct oral anticoagulant; IPTW, inverse probability of treatment weighting.

Figure 3. Cumulative event rates for primary safety outcome (major bleeding) during 5-year follow-up period for patients with atrial fibrillation and liver cirrhosis who were administered DOACs or warfarin in IPTW-adjusted cohort; results are classified under Child–Pugh class A (A) and Child–Pugh class B or C (B).

Abbreviations: DOAC, direct oral anticoagulant; IPTW, inverse probability of treatment weighting.

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of patients with atrial fibrillation and liver cirrhosis who were administered DOAC or warfarin.

| Variable | Before IPTW and imputation# | | | | After IPTW and imputation\$ | | |
|------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|--------------------|-------|-----------------------------|--------------|-------|
| | Available number | DOAC (n = 478) | Warfarin (n = 247) | STD | DOAC | Warfarin | STD |
| Age, years | 725 | 73.2 ± 10.9 | 65.2 ± 12.6 | 0.68 | 72.2 ± 11.3 | 67.8 ± 12.4 | 0.37 |
| Age group | 725 | | | | | | |
| <65 years | | 103 (21.5) | 122 (49.4) | -0.61 | 24.8% | 39.3% | -0.31 |
| 65–74 years | | 147 (30.8) | 64 (25.9) | 0.11 | 30.6% | 30.2% | 0.01 |
| ≥75 years | | 228 (47.7) | 61 (24.7) | 0.49 | 44.6% | 30.5% | 0.29 |
| Female | 725 | 181 (37.9) | 82 (33.2) | 0.10 | 37.6% | 33.0% | 0.10 |
| Smoking | 725 | 133 (27.8) | 80 (32.4) | -0.10 | 29.0% | 29.1% | <0.01 |
| Alcohol drinking | 725 | 112 (23.4) | 63 (25.5) | -0.05 | 25.1% | 23.8% | 0.03 |
| Body mass index, kg/m ² | 615 | 26.1 ± 4.9 | 25.5 ± 4.9 | 0.12 | 26.2 ± 4.6 | 25.6 ± 4.5 | 0.12 |
| Vital signs | | | | | | | |
| Systolic blood pressure, mmHg | 669 | 131.2 ± 21.9 | 130.7 ± 22.3 | 0.03 | 131.0 ± 21.2 | 132.2 ± 22.9 | -0.05 |
| Diastolic blood pressure, mmHg | 669 | 75.2 ± 13.2 | 73.3 ± 13.4 | 0.14 | 75.2 ± 12.7 | 73.7 ± 13.4 | 0.11 |
| Heart rate, beats/min | 667 | 83.5 ± 18.0 | 81.2 ± 18.2 | 0.13 | 83.5 ± 17.2 | 80.3 ± 17.2 | 0.19 |
| Duration of liver cirrhosis, years | 725 | 4.3 ± 5.2 | 3.5 ± 4.1 | 0.19 | 4.1 ± 5.0 | 3.8 ± 4.6 | 0.07 |
| Liver cirrhosis related disease | | | | | | | |
| Alcoholism | 725 | 79 (16.5) | 39 (15.8) | 0.02 | 17.6% | 13.2% | 0.12 |
| HBV infection | 725 | 153 (32.0) | 75 (30.4) | 0.04 | 32.0% | 33.6% | -0.04 |
| HCV infection | 725 | 152 (31.8) | 78 (31.6) | <0.01 | 30.4% | 31.1% | -0.02 |
| Nonalcoholic fatty liver disease | 725 | 46 (9.6) | 16 (6.5) | 0.12 | 9.3% | 6.5% | 0.10 |
| Autoimmune hepatitis | 725 | 5 (1.0) | 0 (0.0) | 0.15 | 1.0% | 0.0% | 0.14 |
| Primary biliary cholangitis | 725 | 6 (1.3) | 1 (0.4) | 0.09 | 1.3% | 0.5% | 0.08 |
| Liver cirrhosis complications | | | | | | | |
| Ascites | 725 | 147 (30.8) | 99 (40.1) | -0.20 | 32.5% | 36.8% | -0.09 |
| EV or GV | 725 | 62 (13.0) | 56 (22.7) | -0.26 | 13.7% | 21.9% | -0.22 |
| Hepatic encephalopathy | 725 | 10 (2.1) | 15 (6.1) | -0.20 | 2.3% | 5.0% | -0.14 |
| Spontaneous bacterial peritonitis | 725 | 2 (0.4) | 1 (0.4) | <0.01 | 0.4% | 1.1% | -0.08 |

| Variable | Before IPTW and imputation# | | | | After IPTW and imputation\$ | | |
|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|--------------------|-------|-----------------------------|----------|-------|
| | Available number | DOAC (n = 478) | Warfarin (n = 247) | STD | DOAC | Warfarin | STD |
| HCC | 725 | 123 (25.7) | 56 (22.7) | 0.07 | 24.3% | 23.6% | 0.02 |
| Hepatorenal syndrome | 725 | 4 (0.8) | 1 (0.4) | 0.06 | 0.8% | 0.4% | 0.06 |
| Portal hypertension | 725 | 350 (73.2) | 216 (87.4) | -0.36 | 74.3% | 85.2% | -0.27 |
| Treatment for HCC | | | | | | | |
| Systemic therapy | 725 | 66 (13.8) | 37 (15.0) | -0.03 | 13.0% | 16.3% | -0.09 |
| Liver resection | 725 | 5 (1.0) | 6 (2.4) | -0.11 | 0.9% | 2.8% | -0.14 |
| Radiofrequency ablation | 725 | 75 (15.7) | 21 (8.5) | 0.22 | 15.1% | 8.2% | 0.21 |
| Transarterial chemoembolisation | 725 | 8 (1.7) | 0 (0.0) | 0.18 | 1.5% | 0.0% | 0.17 |
| Percutaneous injection therapy | 725 | 11 (2.3) | 8 (3.2) | -0.06 | 2.1% | 3.1% | -0.06 |
| Comorbidities | | | | | | | |
| Diabetes mellitus | 725 | 219 (45.8) | 110 (44.5) | 0.03 | 46.3% | 48.0% | -0.03 |
| Hypertension | 725 | 368 (77.0) | 152 (61.5) | 0.34 | 75.9% | 68.1% | 0.18 |
| Hyperlipidemia | 725 | 147 (30.8) | 61 (24.7) | 0.14 | 30.2% | 26.1% | 0.09 |
| Peripheral artery disease | 725 | 45 (9.4) | 34 (13.8) | -0.14 | 9.1% | 13.0% | -0.12 |
| Peptic ulcer disease | 725 | 242 (50.6) | 123 (49.8) | 0.02 | 50.7% | 51.4% | -0.01 |
| Malignancy | 725 | 222 (46.4) | 101 (40.9) | 0.11 | 45.0% | 43.4% | 0.03 |
| History of events requiring hospitalization | | | | | | | |
| Systemic thromboembolism | 725 | 11 (2.3) | 13 (5.3) | -0.16 | 2.3% | 4.5% | -0.12 |
| Ischemic stroke | 725 | 71 (14.9) | 31 (12.6) | 0.07 | 15.6% | 10.1% | 0.17 |
| Transient ischemic attack | 725 | 8 (1.7) | 10 (4.0) | -0.14 | 1.5% | 2.7% | -0.09 |
| Intracranial hemorrhage | 725 | 31 (6.5) | 7 (2.8) | 0.17 | 5.8% | 2.4% | 0.18 |
| Myocardial infarction | 725 | 26 (5.4) | 9 (3.6) | 0.09 | 5.3% | 3.5% | 0.09 |
| Coronary revascularization | 725 | 32 (6.7) | 11 (4.5) | 0.10 | 6.4% | 3.2% | 0.15 |
| Heart failure | 725 | 122 (25.5) | 71 (28.7) | -0.07 | 26.1% | 27.9% | -0.04 |
| Major bleeding | 725 | 122 (25.5) | 48 (19.4) | 0.15 | 24.6% | 20.9% | 0.09 |
| Medications | | | | | | | |
| Aspirin | 725 | 126 (26.4) | 54 (21.9) | 0.11 | 27.4% | 21.0% | 0.15 |

| Variable | Before IPTW and imputation# | | | | After IPTW and imputation\$ | | |
|----------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|--------------------|-------|-----------------------------|-----------|-------|
| | Available number | DOAC (n = 478) | Warfarin (n = 247) | STD | DOAC | Warfarin | STD |
| P2Y12 | 725 | 75 (15.7) | 17 (6.9) | 0.28 | 15.6% | 7.6% | 0.25 |
| Amiodarone/dronedarone | 725 | 72 (15.1) | 30 (12.1) | 0.09 | 14.9% | 12.7% | 0.06 |
| Digoxin | 725 | 47 (9.8) | 51 (20.6) | -0.30 | 10.3% | 17.1% | -0.20 |
| ACEi/ARBs | 725 | 244 (51.0) | 104 (42.1) | 0.18 | 50.9% | 44.1% | 0.14 |
| Beta-blockers | | | | | | | |
| Propranolol | 725 | 33 (6.9) | 29 (11.7) | -0.17 | 7.0% | 11.2% | -0.15 |
| Carvedilol | 725 | 29 (6.1) | 21 (8.5) | -0.09 | 6.2% | 6.6% | -0.02 |
| Other beta-blockers | 725 | 191 (40.0) | 50 (20.2) | 0.44 | 38.2% | 23.5% | 0.32 |
| Calcium channel blockers | 725 | 175 (36.6) | 91 (36.8) | <0.01 | 36.0% | 35.3% | 0.01 |
| MRAs | 725 | 126 (26.4) | 88 (35.6) | -0.20 | 27.6% | 35.1% | -0.16 |
| Loop diuretics | 725 | 235 (49.2) | 129 (52.2) | -0.06 | 49.7% | 51.2% | -0.03 |
| Thiazide | 725 | 17 (3.6) | 14 (5.7) | -0.10 | 3.8% | 4.4% | -0.03 |
| Antiviral treatment for HBV or HCV | 725 | 91 (19.0) | 33 (13.4) | 0.15 | 19.1% | 12.7% | 0.18 |
| PPIs | 725 | 148 (31.0) | 86 (34.8) | -0.08 | 32.1% | 35.2% | -0.07 |
| Ursodeoxycholic acid | 725 | 14 (2.9) | 4 (1.6) | 0.09 | 2.7% | 1.3% | 0.10 |
| NSAIDs | 725 | 129 (27.0) | 71 (28.7) | -0.04 | 27.1% | 25.4% | 0.04 |
| Hypoglycemic agent | | | | | | | |
| SGLT2i | 725 | 11 (2.3) | 1 (0.4) | 0.16 | 2.1% | 0.4% | 0.15 |
| GLP1RA | 725 | 3 (0.6) | 0 (0.0) | 0.11 | 0.5% | 0.0% | 0.10 |
| Other oral hypoglycemic agents | 725 | 144 (30.1) | 61 (24.7) | 0.12 | 31.0% | 26.7% | 0.10 |
| Insulin | 725 | 58 (12.1) | 35 (14.2) | -0.06 | 13.1% | 14.3% | -0.04 |
| Risk score | | | | | | | |
| CHA ₂ DS ₂ -VASc | 725 | 3.6 ± 1.7 | 2.9 ± 1.9 | 0.39 | 3.5 ± 1.7 | 3.1 ± 1.8 | 0.26 |
| HAS-BLED | 725 | 3.9 ± 1.3 | 3.6 ± 1.5 | 0.17 | 3.9 ± 1.3 | 3.6 ± 1.4 | 0.20 |
| Charlson comorbidity index | 725 | 6.0 ± 3.3 | 5.6 ± 3.2 | 0.10 | 5.9 ± 3.3 | 5.8 ± 3.1 | 0.01 |
| Child–Pugh score | 725 | | | | | | |
| Class A: 5 or 6 | | 265 (55.4) | 94 (38.1) | 0.35 | 53.9% | 45.3% | 0.17 |

| Variable | Before IPTW and imputation# | | | | After IPTW and imputation\$ | | |
|--------------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------|--------------------|-------|-----------------------------|---------------|-------|
| | Available number | DOAC (n = 478) | Warfarin (n = 247) | STD | DOAC | Warfarin | STD |
| Class B: 7–9 | | 190 (39.7) | 135 (54.7) | -0.30 | 40.5% | 47.4% | -0.14 |
| Class C: ≥10 | | 23 (4.8) | 18 (7.3) | -0.10 | 5.6% | 7.3% | -0.07 |
| Baseline laboratory data | | | | | | | |
| eGFR, mL/min/1.73 m ² | 709 | 73.3 ± 33.3 | 79.4 ± 45.4 | -0.15 | 74.0 ± 33.7 | 78.9 ± 41.7 | -0.13 |
| eGFR status | 709 | | | | | | |
| >60 | | 306 (64.6) | 155 (66.0) | -0.03 | 64.7% | 67.6% | -0.06 |
| 30–60 | | 139 (29.3) | 54 (23.0) | 0.14 | 29.2% | 23.7% | 0.13 |
| <30 | | 29 (6.1) | 26 (11.1) | -0.18 | 6.1% | 8.7% | -0.10 |
| Serum creatinine, µmol/L | 709 | 106.1 ± 79.6 | 132.6 ± 150.3 | -0.19 | 106.1 ± 79.6 | 123.8 ± 123.8 | -0.13 |
| Blood urea nitrogen, mmol/L | 610 | 8.2 ± 5.5 | 9.2 ± 7.8 | -0.15 | 7.9 ± 5.3 | 8.7 ± 6.5 | -0.13 |
| AST, U/L | 668 | 43.8 ± 36.7 | 50.5 ± 38.2 | -0.18 | 44.0 ± 37.7 | 46.4 ± 33.8 | -0.07 |
| ALT, U/L | 715 | 31.5 ± 27.5 | 39.9 ± 46.9 | -0.22 | 32.5 ± 29.0 | 37.0 ± 38.8 | -0.13 |
| ALK-P, U/L | 484 | 104.2 ± 78.6 | 106.1 ± 58.3 | -0.03 | 99.4 ± 68.1 | 107.4 ± 58.3 | -0.13 |
| Albumin level, g/L | 725 | 35.9 ± 6.6 | 35.8 ± 6.3 | 0.02 | 35.7 ± 6.6 | 35.5 ± 6.1 | 0.03 |
| Total bilirubin level, µmol/L | 725 | 20.4 ± 17.8 | 23.2 ± 36.0 | -0.10 | 21.3 ± 21.3 | 22.5 ± 30.6 | -0.04 |
| Total bilirubin status, µmol/L | 725 | | | | | | |
| <34.2 | | 432 (90.4) | 217 (87.9) | 0.08 | 89.5% | 87.0% | 0.08 |
| ≥34.2 | | 46 (9.6) | 30 (12.1) | -0.08 | 10.5% | 13.0% | -0.08 |
| International normalized ratio (INR) | 725 | 1.2 ± 0.3 | 1.5 ± 0.6 | -0.63 | 1.2 ± 0.3 | 1.4 ± 0.5 | -0.35 |
| INR status | 725 | | | | | | |
| <1.7 | | 455 (95.2) | 180 (72.9) | 0.64 | 93.6% | 80.8% | 0.39 |
| 1.7–2.3 | | 20 (4.2) | 36 (14.6) | -0.36 | 5.3% | 11.6% | -0.23 |
| ≥2.3 | | 3 (0.6) | 31 (12.6) | -0.50 | 1.1% | 7.6% | -0.33 |
| Hemoglobin, g/L | 678 | 120.0 ± 23.8 | 117.6 ± 24.1 | 0.10 | 120.3 ± 23.6 | 119.5 ± 23.6 | 0.03 |
| Platelet, count ×10 ³ | 669 | 161.8 ± 79.7 | 157.0 ± 114.7 | 0.05 | 162.6 ± 77.2 | 161.3 ± 103.0 | 0.01 |
| Fasting glucose, mmol/L | 312 | 6.6 ± 2.1 | 6.9 ± 3.1 | -0.13 | 6.6 ± 2.0 | 6.6 ± 2.9 | <0.01 |
| Glycated hemoglobin, % | 426 | 6.4 ± 1.3 | 6.7 ± 1.4 | -0.23 | 6.2 ± 1.2 | 6.3 ± 1.3 | -0.07 |

| Variable | Before IPTW and imputation [#] | | | | After IPTW and imputation ^{\$} | | |
|----------------------------------|-----------------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|-------|-----------------------------------------|-----------|-------|
| | Available number | DOAC (n = 478) | Warfarin (n = 247) | STD | DOAC | Warfarin | STD |
| Triglyceride, mmol/L | 449 | 1.1 ± 0.7 | 1.2 ± 0.8 | -0.15 | 1.1 ± 0.6 | 1.1 ± 0.6 | <0.01 |
| Total cholesterol, mmol/L | 474 | 3.9 ± 1.0 | 4.1 ± 1.3 | -0.16 | 3.9 ± 1.0 | 4.1 ± 1.1 | -0.14 |
| High-density lipoprotein, mmol/L | 420 | 1.1 ± 0.4 | 1.1 ± 0.5 | -0.05 | 1.1 ± 0.4 | 1.2 ± 0.4 | -0.15 |
| Low-density lipoprotein, mmol/L | 454 | 2.3 ± 0.9 | 2.4 ± 1.1 | -0.08 | 2.3 ± 0.8 | 2.4 ± 0.9 | -0.11 |
| Follow-up years | 725 | 2.4 ± 2.0 | 3.6 ± 2.9 | -0.48 | 2.6 ± 2.2 | 3.2 ± 2.6 | -0.25 |

Abbreviation: GBM, generalized boosted model; IPTW, inverse probability of treatment weighting; DOAC, direct oral anticoagulant; STD, standardized difference; EGD, esophagogastroduodenoscopy; EV, esophageal varices; GV, gastric varices; HBV, hepatitis B virus; HCV, hepatitis C virus; HCC, hepatocellular carcinoma; ACEi, angiotensin converting enzyme inhibitor; ARB, angiotensin receptor blockers; MRAs, mineralocorticoid receptor antagonists; PPIs, proton pump inhibitors; NSAIDs, nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs; SGLT2i, sodium–glucose cotransporter 2 inhibitors; GLP1RA, glucagon-like peptide 1 receptor agonists; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; AST, aspartate aminotransferase; ALT, alanine aminotransferase; ALK-P, alkaline phosphatase.

[#] Data are presented as frequencies (percentages) and means ± standard deviations or medians [25th, 75th percentiles].

^{\$} Data are presented as numbers (percentages) and means ± standard deviations or medians [25th, 75th percentiles].

Table 2. Follow-up outcomes during 5-year follow-up of patients with atrial fibrillation and liver cirrhosis who were administered DOACs or warfarin in IPTW-adjusted cohort.

| Outcome | DOAC | | Warfarin | | aHR (95% CI) for DOAC† | <i>P</i> value |
|------------------------------|------------|------------------------|------------|------------------------|---------------------------|-------------------|
| | Event rate | Incidence (95% CI)* | Event rate | Incidence (95% CI)* | | |
| Primary efficacy outcome | | | | | | |
| Ischemic stroke | 4.3% | 2.0 (1.2–2.7) | 4.7% | 2.2 (1.3–3.1) | 1.05 (0.42–2.61) | 0.921 |
| Transient ischemic attack | 0.7% | 0.3 (0.0–0.6) | 0.4% | 0.2 (–0.1–0.4) | 1.36 (0.18–10.3) | 0.764 |
| Systemic embolism | 1.9% | 0.8 (0.4–1.3) | 3.9% | 1.8 (1.0–2.6) | 0.49 (0.14–1.70) | 0.258 |
| Composite outcome | 6.7% | 3.1 (2.2–4.1) | 8.6% | 4.1 (2.9–5.4) | 0.76 (0.38–1.53) | 0.445 |
| Primary safety outcome | | | | | | |
| Intracranial hemorrhage | 3.3% | 1.5 (0.8–2.1) | 4.3% | 2.0 (1.1–2.8) | 0.65 (0.26–1.59) | 0.339 |
| Gastrointestinal bleeding | 13.1% | 6.4 (5.0–7.8) | 21.4% | 10.8 (8.8–12.9) | 0.64 (0.39–1.03) | 0.067 |
| Major bleeding | 16.9% | 8.4 (6.8–10.0) | 25.8% | 13.7 (11.3–16.1) | 0.64 (0.42–0.99) | 0.046 |
| Secondary outcomes | | | | | | |
| All-cause mortality | 42.9% | 19.4 (17.0–21.7) | 46.3% | 20.8 (18.1–23.5) | 0.73 (0.54–0.99) | 0.047 |
| Myocardial infarction | 1.9% | 0.9 (0.4–1.4) | 1.5% | 0.7 (0.2–1.1) | 1.20 (0.26–5.61) | 0.815 |
| Liver decompensation | | | | | | |
| Hepatic encephalopathy | 2.5% | 1.2 (0.6–1.8) | 4.9% | 2.2 (1.3–3.1) | NA | NA |
| New-onset ascites | 8.3% | 3.8 (2.8–4.9) | 10.9% | 5.1 (3.7–6.5) | 0.65 (0.34–1.23) | 0.183 |
| SBP | 2.2% | 1.0 (0.5–1.5) | 4.0% | 1.8 (1.0–2.6) | 0.69 (0.28–1.74) | 0.437 |
| Hepatorenal syndrome | 1.6% | 0.7 (0.3–1.2) | 4.6% | 2.1 (1.2–2.9) | NA | NA |
| Esophageal variceal bleeding | 3.4% | 1.6 (0.9–2.3) | 7.3% | 3.4 (2.3–4.6) | 0.65 (0.27–1.57) | 0.341 |
| New-onset HCC | 8.5% | 4.1 (3.0–5.2) | 6.2% | 3.0 (1.9–4.0) | 1.70 (0.77–3.78) | 0.192 |
| Liver-related death | 15.2% | 6.9 (5.5–8.3) | 21.3% | 9.6 (7.7–11.4) | 0.66 (0.38–1.15) | 0.143 |

Abbreviations: IPTW, inverse probability of treatment weighting; DOAC, direct oral anticoagulant; HR, hazard ratio; CI, confidence interval; NA, not acceptable; SBP, spontaneous bacterial infection; HCC, hepatocellular carcinoma.

† Additional adjustments were made for age, age group, esophageal/gastric varices–related complications, portal hypertension, radiofrequency ablation, P2Y12, other beta-blockers, CHA₂DS₂-VASc score, international normalized ratio, and INR status.

* Number of events per 100 person-years.

Figure 1. Flow chart for selecting and excluding patients.

Figure 1




Figure 2. Cumulative event rates for primary efficacy outcome (A), major bleeding (B), and all-cause mortality (C) during 5-year follow-up period for patients with atrial fibrillation and liver cirrhosis who were administered DOACs or warfarin in IPTW-adjusted cohort.

Abbreviations: DOAC, direct oral anticoagulant; IPTW, inverse probability of treatment weighting.

Figure 2A




Figure 2. Cumulative event rates for primary efficacy outcome (A), major bleeding (B), and all-cause mortality (C) during 5-year follow-up period for patients with atrial fibrillation and liver cirrhosis who were administered DOACs or warfarin in IPTW-adjusted cohort.

Abbreviations: DOAC, direct oral anticoagulant; IPTW, inverse probability of treatment weighting.

Figure 2B




Figure 2. Cumulative event rates for primary efficacy outcome (A), major bleeding (B), and all-cause mortality (C) during 5-year follow-up period for patients with atrial fibrillation and liver cirrhosis who were administered DOACs or warfarin in IPTW-adjusted cohort.

Abbreviations: DOAC, direct oral anticoagulant; IPTW, inverse probability of treatment weighting.

Figure 2C




Figure 3. Cumulative event rates for primary safety outcome (major bleeding) during 5-year follow-up period for patients with atrial fibrillation and liver cirrhosis who were administered DOACs or warfarin in IPTW-adjusted cohort; results are classified under Child–Pugh class A (A) and Child–Pugh class B or C (B).

Abbreviations: DOAC, direct oral anticoagulant; IPTW, inverse probability of treatment weighting.

Figure 3A




Figure 3. Cumulative event rates for primary safety outcome (major bleeding) during 5-year follow-up period for patients with atrial fibrillation and liver cirrhosis who were administered DOACs or warfarin in IPTW-adjusted cohort; results are classified under Child–Pugh class A (A) and Child–Pugh class B or C (B).

Abbreviations: DOAC, direct oral anticoagulant; IPTW, inverse probability of treatment weighting.

Figure 3B

