

Title:

Clinical Outcomes, Management, Healthcare Resource Utilization, and Cost

According to the CHA₂DS₂-VASc Scores in Asian Patients with Nonvalvular Atrial
Fibrillation

Running title:

Clinical Outcomes by CHA₂DS₂-VASc Scores

List of authors:

Keye Fan¹, BS, Yue Xiao¹, BS, Aoming Xue¹, BS, Jifang Zhou¹, M.D., Ph.D..

Author affiliations:

¹ School of International Pharmaceutical Business, China Pharmaceutical University,
Jiangsu, China

Corresponding author:

Jifang Zhou, M.D., Ph.D.

School of International Pharmaceutical Business

China Pharmaceutical University, Jiangsu, China

Email: 1020202613@cpu.edu.cn; Phone: +86-25-86185555; Fax: +86-25-86185279

Word count:

6153 words

Abstract

Background: The prognosis among non-valvular atrial fibrillation (NVAF) patients with different CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores in the contemporary Asian population remains unclear. Additionally, there is a lack of research examining the disparities in management patterns, healthcare resource utilization (HCRU), and cost among these patients. Therefore, this study aims to assess the incidence of clinical outcomes in NVAF patients with different CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores and explore their management patterns, HCRU, and cost.

Methods and Results: This retrospective cohort study assessed patients diagnosed with NVAF between January 2018 and July 2022, utilizing a merged dataset from China. Patients were stratified into 3 cohorts by CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores: low-risk (0 for males, 1 for females), intermediate-risk (1 for males, 2 for females), and high-risk (≥ 2 for males, ≥ 3 for females). One-year incidence rates of clinical outcomes (including ischemic stroke, transient ischemic attack, arterial embolism, and major bleeding) were calculated as events per 100 person-years. Cumulative incidence and crude and adjusted hazard ratios (aHRs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs) were calculated using the Fine and Gray models. Management patterns, HCRU, and cost were analyzed descriptively. Among 419,490 NVAF patients (mean age: 75.2 years, 45.1% female), 16,541 (3.9%) were classified as low-risk, 38,494 (9.2%) as intermediate-risk, and 364,455 (86.9%) as high-risk. The mean (SD) age-adjusted Charlson comorbidity index score was 4.7 (2.0), increasing with CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores. The one-year cumulative incidence of ischemic stroke was 3.2% (95% CI,

2.9%–3.5%) for low-risk, 4.9% (95% CI, 4.7%–5.2%) for intermediate-risk (aHR, 1.3, 95% CI, 1.2–1.4), and 12.2% (95% CI, 12.1%–12.3%) for high-risk (aHR, 2.5, 95% CI, 2.3–2.8). Meanwhile, the incidence of transient ischemic attack, arterial embolism, and major bleeding showed a similar increasing trend from low-risk to high-risk. Within one year after the index date, 16.4% of patients in the low-risk cohort received oral anticoagulants (OACs), while 11.1% of patients in the high-risk cohort received OACs. The mean (SD) number of all-cause hospitalizations was 0.1 (0.1), 0.1 (0.2), and 0.1 (0.3) per-patient-per-month (PPPM) for low-risk, intermediate-risk, and high-risk, respectively. The mean (SD) length of stay increased from 0.9 (1.1) days PPPM for the low-risk to 1.2 (1.8) days PPPM for the high-risk.

Conclusion: This study demonstrates that contemporary Asian NVAf patients with higher CHA₂DS₂-VAsC scores experience higher incidence of adverse outcomes and increased hospital resource consumption. There is insufficient utilization of OACs and other AF management measures across all CHA₂DS₂-VAsC scores groups. These findings provide new evidence for improving patient management and guiding resource allocation in healthcare.

Keywords: Atrial fibrillation; CHA₂DS₂-VAsC score; Cardiovascular disease; Anticoagulant therapy; Healthcare resource utilization.

Non-standard Abbreviations and Acronyms

AF = Atrial fibrillation

OAC = Oral anticoagulant

NVAF = Nonvalvular atrial fibrillation

HCRU = Healthcare resource utilization

ICD = International Classification of Diseases

CCI = Charlson comorbidity index

ACCI = Age-adjusted Charlson comorbidity index

IS = Ischemic stroke

TIA = Transient ischemic attack

AE = Arterial embolism

MB = Major bleeding

LAAC = Left atrial appendage closure

LOS = Length of stay

PPPM = Per patient per month

PY = Person-year

CI = Confidence interval

HR = Hazard ratio

NOAC = Non-vitamin K oral anticoagulant

Clinical Perspective:

What Is New?

- This large-scale study assessed the incidence of adverse clinical outcomes among contemporary Asian atrial fibrillation patients by CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores.
- This study demonstrated suboptimal management across all CHA₂DS₂-VASc score groups, with higher hospital resource utilization observed in groups with higher CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores.

What Are the Clinical Implications?

- This study indicated that AF patients with elevated CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores face a greater risk of adverse clinical outcomes.
- Our findings informed decision-making on healthcare resource allocation and AF management.

Introduction

Atrial fibrillation (AF) is the most common sustained cardiac arrhythmia worldwide.

The global prevalence of AF was reported at 4,977 cases per million people in 2017, and it was higher in men than in women.¹ In China, the estimated prevalence of AF ranged from 0.69% to 2.31% and increased with age.^{2–4} As a chronic cardiovascular disease, AF is associated with other conditions, including hypertension, diabetes, myocardial infarction, congestive heart failure, coronary artery disease, and sleep apnea.^{5,6} Meanwhile, AF is associated with a spectrum of adverse clinical outcomes, most notably a fivefold escalation in the risk of stroke, imposing an escalating disease burden.^{7,8} Effective anticoagulation management, particularly the use of oral anticoagulants (OACs), has been shown to significantly reduce the risk of stroke in patients with AF.⁹

The CHA₂DS₂-VASc score, including congestive heart failure, hypertension, age 75 years or older, diabetes, stroke, vascular disease, age 65 to 74 years, and sex category, is a commonly used tool for assessing the risk of stroke in patients with AF. This scoring system has been recommended by guidelines for preventing stroke and is considered a crucial factor in deciding whether to prescribe OACs to individuals with AF.^{7,10} Previous studies have shown a higher incidence of adverse clinical outcomes among nonvalvular atrial fibrillation (NVAf) patients with higher levels of CHA₂DS₂-VASc risk scores.^{11–16} However, these studies were primarily based on Western populations or relied on limited sample sizes or data from years past. Considering the differences in ethnicity and the evolving spectrum of diseases, the

incidence of adverse outcomes among contemporary Asian NVAF patients with different CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores remains unclear.^{17,18} Additionally, research suggests that Asian populations experience suboptimal AF management and exhibit greater disparities in healthcare burden between AF and non-AF individuals.^{19,20} However, to our knowledge, there is currently no study that granulates the differences in management patterns, healthcare resource utilization (HCRU), and cost by CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores, which could potentially offer insights for medical decision-making and resource allocation.

Therefore, the main objective of this study is to assess the incidence of major clinical outcomes in contemporary Asian NVAF patients with different CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores using a combined dataset, as well as to describe the treatment patterns, HCRU, and cost among these patients.

Method

Data source

The dataset utilized in this study was extracted from the Jiangsu Population Health Records Big Data Platform in China. Established in 2012 by the Provincial Health Commission, this information platform encompasses 218 tertiary hospitals province-wide, offering comprehensive medical and health data, including inpatient and outpatient records, prescription records, and surgical records, primarily coded using the International Classification of Diseases, 9th Revision (ICD-9) or 10th Revision (ICD-10). Additionally, unstructured medical orders and mortality information are also integrated. Data availability determined the study period from 2018 to 2022.

Study design

This study employed a retrospective cohort design and adhered to the Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) reporting guidelines. The cohort of AF cases was identified by having at least one inpatient admission or two outpatient visits with a gap exceeding 30 days with a diagnosis of AF during the study period (from January 1, 2018 to July 31, 2022). AF was defined by the diagnosis code (ICD-9, 427.31; ICD-10, I48), or medical terms in Chinese. The AF index date was defined as the earliest date of diagnosis during the study period (the diagnosis date was defined as the discharge date for hospital discharge records and the outpatient date for outpatient records). The duration preceding the AF index date was defined as the baseline period. Patients who had invalid demographic information or were aged < 18 years at the AF index date were excluded. Patients

who had a valvular AF diagnosis from hospital discharge records, outpatient records, or surgery records during the baseline period were also excluded.

NVAF patients were further categorized into 3 cohorts by CHA₂DS₂-VASc risk scores: low-risk (0 for males, 1 for females), intermediate-risk (1 for males, 2 for females), and high-risk (≥ 2 for males, ≥ 3 for females), which were captured and assessed from hospital discharge records and outpatient records using the ICD-10 codes or medical terms during the baseline period (Table S1).

Baseline patient characteristics

Patient demographic characteristics, including age, gender, and year of index date, were obtained at the index date. Common comorbidities, including coronary artery disease, heart failure, myocardial infarction, atherosclerosis, cerebrovascular disease, hypertension, diabetes, dyslipidemias, chronic pulmonary diseases, chronic liver disease, renal disease, pneumonia, malignancy, autoimmune disease, anemia, depression, dementia, frailty, and sleep apnea during the baseline period, were extracted from hospital discharge records and outpatient records for each patient using the ICD-10 codes or medical terms (Table S2). Both the Charlson comorbidity index (CCI) scores and the age-adjusted Charlson comorbidity index (ACCI) scores (plus 1 point for every decade aged 50 and over, up to a maximum of 4 points) were calculated (Table S3).

Follow-up clinical outcomes

The follow-up period for each patient ranged from the AF index date up to one year, the date of death, or the end of the study (July 31, 2022), whichever came first. The

observation period was limited to a maximum of one year due to the dynamic nature of stroke risk factors.²¹ We investigated four main clinical outcomes: ischemic stroke (IS), transient ischemic attack (TIA), arterial embolism (AE), and major bleeding (MB). All outcomes were identified from hospital discharge records and outpatient records using the ICD-10 codes or medical terms (Table S4).

Patient management, HCRU, and cost

Medication information (including warfarin, rivaroxaban, dabigatran, apixaban, and edoxaban) was captured from prescription records using the generic name of each drug. Patients with an AF index date after May 31, 2022, were excluded from the analysis of medication usage due to the unavailability of prescription records. Nonpharmacological strategies (including left atrial appendage closure [LAAC], catheter ablation, surgical ablation, and pacemaker implantation) relevant to AF management were captured from surgical records using the ICD-9 codes or medical terms (Table S5).

HCRU included outpatient visits, inpatient admissions, and inpatient length of stay (LOS). The cost was the total cost of one hospitalization and was converted to 2022 US dollars from the Chinese yuan (CNY). All HCRU and cost were evaluated from the hospital discharge records or outpatient records and presented as per patient per month (PPPM).

Statistical analysis

Patient baseline characteristics, management, HCRU, and cost were analyzed descriptively. Means (SD) or medians (IQR) were calculated for continuous variables.

Counts and frequencies were calculated for categorical variables. A Kruskal-Wallis test was used as appropriate for group comparisons. The one-year incidence rates for different outcomes were determined by computing the number of events per 100 person-years (PYs) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs). The cumulative incidences of clinical outcomes were computed utilizing the Fine and Gray model, which accounted for death as a competing risk. Additionally, to conduct further comparisons among cohorts, hazard ratios (HRs) with corresponding 95% CIs were calculated employing both a crude model and an adjusted model, adjusting for age, sex, year of diagnosis, and CCI scores. A two-sided P-value of <0.05 was considered statistically significant. Analyses were performed using R version 4.2.1.

Supplementary analysis

In light of the lower age threshold for increased stroke risk among Asian AF patients, the latest Chinese AF management guidelines have proposed the CHA₂DS₂-VASc-60 stroke risk scoring system.²² Within this framework, patients aged 60 to 64 years are assigned 1 point, while those aged 65 years or older receive 2 points. Therefore, we conducted a supplementary analysis to assess the incidence of clinical outcomes among NVAf patients stratified by CHA₂DS₂-VASc-60 scores.

Results

Baseline characteristics

A total of 419,490 NVAf patients were included in the final study cohort. According to the CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores, 16,541 (3.9%) individuals were classified as low-risk, 38,494 (9.2%) as intermediate-risk, and 364,455 (86.9%) as high-risk (Figure 1). The baseline characteristics of the patients were presented in Table 1. The mean (SD) age of the overall population was 75.2 (11.0) years. The proportion of female patients increased with the CHA₂DS₂-VASc risk scores, ranging from 37.0% in the low-risk group to 46.3% in the high-risk group. Hypertension was the most prevalent comorbidity, followed by heart failure, atherosclerosis, and cerebrovascular disease, accounting for 57.1%, 46.2%, 37.1%, and 36.3%, respectively. The mean (SD) CCI scores and ACCI scores were 1.7 (1.5) and 4.7 (2.0), respectively, both increasing with the CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores.

Clinical outcomes within one year after AF index date

The one-year incidence rates for IS, TIA, AE, and MB among the overall population were 12.4 (95% CI, 12.3–12.5), 1.1 (95% CI, 1.0–1.1), 0.5 (95% CI, 0.5–0.5), and 3.1 per 100 PYs (95% CI, 3.1–3.2), respectively. Meanwhile, the incidence rates for the four investigated clinical outcomes showed an increasing trend from the low-risk group to the high-risk group, namely from 3.4 (95% CI, 3.1–3.7) to 13.7 per 100 PYs (95% CI, 13.5–13.8) for IS, from 0.5 (95% CI, 0.4–0.6) to 1.1 per 100 PYs (95% CI, 1.1–1.2) for TIA, from 0.2 (95% CI, 0.1–0.3) to 0.5 per 100 PYs (95% CI, 0.5–0.6) for AE, and from 1.6 (95% CI, 1.4–1.8) to 3.3 per 100 PYs (95% CI, 3.2–3.3) for MB.

(Table 2).

The one-year cumulative incidence of all four clinical outcomes exhibited a trend similar to their respective incidence rates. (Table 2, Figure 2). When further comparing the differences among different CHA₂DS₂-VASc risk groups, except for the non-significantly higher incidence of TIA (aHR, 1.0, 95% CI, 0.8–1.3) and AE (aHR, 1.3, 95% CI, 0.9–2.0) in the intermediate-risk group compared to the low-risk group, all other results indicated a significant association between higher CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores and an increased incidence of clinical outcomes (Table 2).

Supplementary analysis

The estimated incidence of clinical outcomes among various risk groups based on the CHA₂DS₂-VASc-60 scores closely approximated those based on the CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores (Table 2, Table S6). However, the risk of AE in the intermediate-risk group was significantly higher than that in the low-risk group (aHR = 2.4, 95% CI, 1.3–4.4) based on the CHA₂DS₂-VASc-60 scores (Table S6).

Patient management within one year after AF index date

In total, 11.7% of patients were prescribed OACs, and 8.6% were prescribed non-vitamin K oral anticoagulants (NOACs, namely rivaroxaban, dabigatran, apixaban, and edoxaban). The most commonly used OAC in AF patients was rivaroxaban, with a prescription rate of 6.6% during the follow-up period (Figure 3, Table S7). The group with higher CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores demonstrated a lower prescription rate of OACs, from 16.4% for the low-risk group to 11.1% for the high-risk group. In addition, in terms of nonpharmacological strategies, 1.4% of patients

underwent catheter ablation, with a higher proportion in the low-risk group compared to the high-risk group (5.7% vs. 0.9%), and 0.4% underwent pacemaker implantation (Figure 3, Table S7).

HCRU and cost within one year after AF index date

Table 3 illustrates a comprehensive overview of HCRU and cost, both aggregated and stratified by CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores. The mean (SD) number of all-cause hospitalizations and all-cause outpatient visits were 0.1 (0.3) PPPM and 0.2 (0.5) PPPM, respectively. The mean (SD) LOS was 1.1 (1.7) days PPPM, and an increasing trend was observed with higher CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores, from 0.9 (1.1) days PPPM for the low-risk group to 1.2 (1.8) days PPPM for the high-risk group. The mean (SD) healthcare cost in the overall study population was \$341.9 (\$1630.7) PPPM, with \$454.2 (\$783.6) for the low-risk cohort, \$383.9 (\$1218.7) for the intermediate-risk cohort, and \$334.2 (\$1683.8) for the high-risk cohort.

Discussion

This study was a large-scale retrospective cohort analysis encompassing a total of 419,490 NVAF patients recorded using the regional Population Health Big Data Platform. This study demonstrated an increased incidence of adverse clinical outcomes in contemporary Asian NVAF patients with higher CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores. Meanwhile, we observed that the proportion of patients who had utilized medications or nonpharmacological strategies for AF management was remarkably low. Furthermore, we investigated the HCRU and cost among NVAF patients stratified by CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores and found that patients in the high-risk group had higher inpatient resource consumption. The findings of this study emphasized the importance of focusing on NVAF patients with higher CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores and informed decision-making on healthcare resource allocation and AF management. The majority of patients in the study exhibited high CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores, with 86.9% of individuals being classified as high-risk. This result was consistent with a previous study based on five large health claims databases in the United States, where 89.0% of patients were estimated to have a high-risk of stroke.¹² Similar demographic characteristics, including an average age of over 70 years old and a higher proportion of males, were observed in comparable investigations.^{14,23} This study revealed a higher incidence of adverse clinical outcomes compared to previous studies and an increasing trend with higher CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores. The incidence of IS in Asian patients included in this study was notably higher across different CHA₂DS₂-VASc score categories compared to Western populations.^{11,12}

Additionally, the estimated incidence of IS in our study was higher than those reported in most prior studies involving Asian populations, highlighting a greater disease burden for the Chinese population.^{13–16} We observed that the incidence of TIA and AE also increased with the CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores. However, there was no significant difference in the risk of TIA and AE between the intermediate-risk and low-risk groups, suggesting a limited utility of CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores in predicting the risk of TIA and AE in Asian patients with lower scores. Moreover, consistent with a study from Japan, a significant increase in the incidence of MB was observed from the low-risk group to the high-risk group.¹³

Given that Asian AF patients have a lower stroke age threshold, modified versions of the CHA₂DS₂-VASc score have been proposed. For instance, Taiwan introduced the MCHA₂DS₂-VASc score, which has been incorporated into international guidelines and considered a potentially advantageous alternative.^{10,24} In the latest Chinese AF management guidelines, the CHA₂DS₂-VASc-60 score was proposed for assessing stroke risk in Chinese AF patients.²² Therefore, we explored the clinical outcomes of AF patients with different CHA₂DS₂-VASc-60 scores in the supplementary analysis.

The results revealed that the incidence among patients stratified by CHA₂DS₂-VASc-60 scores was comparable to those stratified by CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores. Notably, compared to the CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores, the intermediate-risk (aHR, 1.4 vs. 1.3) and high-risk groups (aHR, 3.0 vs. 2.5) stratified by the CHA₂DS₂-VASc-60 scores exhibited higher risks of IS. Additionally, the intermediate-risk group based on the CHA₂DS₂-VASc-60 scores showed a

significantly higher risk of AE compared to the low-risk group (aHR, 2.4, 95% CI: 1.3–4.4). Therefore, the CHA₂DS₂-VASc-60 scores may serve as a more suitable stroke risk assessment tool for the Chinese population, although further validation is required.

The findings of this study indicate suboptimal management of Asian NVAf patients across all CHA₂DS₂-VASc score strata. This study revealed a significant underutilization of OACs among NVAf patients. Throughout the follow-up period, only approximately 12% of patients received prescriptions for any OACs, and those who received prescriptions for any NOACs accounted for merely around 9%. The low utilization rate of OACs is widespread in China.^{20,25} This is primarily attributed to doctors' concerns about the bleeding risk associated with OACs as well as suboptimal medication adherence among patients. Another reason for the low prescription rate may be the exclusion of data from retail pharmacies or non-tertiary hospitals, which may also partially account for the lower OAC utilization observed in the high-risk group compared to the low-risk group. Certain patients might acquire medications directly from retail pharmacies or non-tertiary hospitals, resulting in their prescription data being absent from this study's records. In addition to assessing the use of OACs, this study examined other management strategies. The proportion of patients undergoing LAAC remained far less than 1%, with comparable results observed across all three cohorts. Notably, this study found a significantly higher proportion of patients in the low-risk group undergoing catheter ablation compared to the high-risk group (5.7% vs. 0.9%), indicating that younger patients are more likely to

opt for catheter ablation for rhythm control. This is in line with the current understanding of rhythm control, namely that early implementation of catheter ablation leads to greater clinical benefits for patients.^{10,26}

Moreover, this study offers the latest estimates of HCRU and cost for modern Asian NVAf patients, both collectively and categorized by CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores, potentially providing valuable evidence for healthcare resource allocation decisions. Approximately one-third of Asian patients included in this study experienced at least one hospitalization within one year after diagnosis, a proportion similar to that of the European (37.2%) and North American (37.5%) populations.²⁷ Furthermore, our study indicated that patients with higher CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores have higher hospitalization resource needs. Compared to the low-risk group, patients in the high-risk group had higher hospitalization rates and longer LOS. Conversely, patients in the high-risk group exhibited lower outpatient visit rates compared to those in the low-risk group. This might be due to the increased consultation costs and reduced accessibility of tertiary hospitals. Consequently, older patients more likely classified into the high-risk group may prefer seeking outpatient care for common illnesses at primary healthcare facilities not covered in this study. Additionally, this study revealed an average inpatient cost of \$341.9 PPM, which is lower than observed in Western populations.^{28,29} This disparity is largely attributed to differences in socioeconomic determinants of health, such as financial resources, social support, and access to healthcare among different racial groups.³⁰ Meanwhile, we noted that the average inpatient costs for patients in the low-risk group appeared to be higher than those in

the high-risk group. A plausible explanation is the smaller sample size in the low-risk group, resulting in a more skewed distribution of cost (IQR for low-risk group, \$83.8–\$591.1 vs. high-risk group, \$88.7–\$280.1).

Limitations

The study encountered several limitations that warrant acknowledgment. Firstly, its retrospective nature, relying on administrative databases not primarily intended for research, poses inherent constraints. The reliance on coded variables raises the possibility of coding errors and disease misclassifications, potentially introducing selection bias. Secondly, the absence of certain detailed patient information, such as electrocardiograms and specific subtypes of atrial fibrillation, could not be accessed, which might have provided valuable insights into the study outcomes. Thirdly, the study's scope was confined to AF patients seeking treatment at tertiary medical institutions, limiting the generalizability of the findings to broader populations. Additionally, unmeasured confounders may have influenced the observed associations, as factors not accounted for in the study could potentially impact the outcomes under investigation. Furthermore, limited follow-up durations may have restricted the ability to capture long-term effects or changes in patient outcomes over time, potentially affecting the comprehensiveness of the study's findings.

Conclusions

Utilizing a dataset comprising more than 400,000 NVAF individuals, we conducted a comprehensive analysis of adverse clinical outcomes, management patterns, HCRU, and cost among contemporary Asian NVAF patients overall and stratified by CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores. Our study found that individuals with higher CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores had a higher incidence of adverse clinical outcomes and increased hospital resource consumption. Moreover, inadequate anticoagulation therapy and other management strategies were observed across all CHA₂DS₂-VASc score groups. With the exacerbation of population aging, an increase in the proportion of AF patients with higher CHA₂DS₂-VASc scores is foreseeable. Therefore, to alleviate the burden on both patients and society, more effective AF management strategies and the appropriate allocation of healthcare resources are warranted.

Acknowledgments

We thank our colleagues for providing consolidated help in accomplishing this study.

All authors participated in the study's design. AX and YX undertook data cleaning duties. KF and JZ were responsible for the analysis of the data, the interpretation of the results, and the drafting of the manuscript.

Sources of Funding

This research did not receive any specific grants from funding agencies in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Disclosures

None.

Supplemental Material

Tables S1–S7

Reference

1. Lippi G, Sanchis-Gomar F, Cervellin G. Global epidemiology of atrial fibrillation: An increasing epidemic and public health challenge. *Int. J. Stroke Off. J. Int. Stroke Soc.* 2021;16:217–221.
2. Wang X, Fu Q, Song F, Li W, Yin X, Yue W, Yan F, Zhang H, Zhang H, Teng Z, et al. Prevalence of atrial fibrillation in different socioeconomic regions of China and its association with stroke: Results from a national stroke screening survey. *Int. J. Cardiol.* 2018;271:92–97.
3. Chen M, Li C, Liao P, Cui X, Tian W, Wang Q, Sun J, Yang M, Luo L, Wu H, et al. Epidemiology, management, and outcomes of atrial fibrillation among 30 million citizens in Shanghai, China from 2015 to 2020: A medical insurance database study. *Lancet Reg. Health West. Pac.* 2022;23:100470.
4. Shi S, Tang Y, Zhao Q, Yan H, Yu B, Zheng Q, Li Y, Zheng L, Yuan Y, Zhong J, et al. Prevalence and risk of atrial fibrillation in China: A national cross-sectional epidemiological study. *Lancet Reg. Health - West. Pac.* 2022;23:100439.
5. Benjamin EJ, Levy D, Vaziri SM, D'Agostino RB, Belanger AJ, Wolf PA. Independent risk factors for atrial fibrillation in a population-based cohort. The Framingham Heart Study. *JAMA.* 1994;271:840–844.
6. Lau DH, Nattel S, Kalman JM, Sanders P. Modifiable Risk Factors and Atrial Fibrillation. *Circulation.* 2017;136:583–596.
7. Hindricks G, Potpara T, Dagres N, Arbelo E, Bax JJ, Blomström-Lundqvist C, Boriani G, Castella M, Dan G-A, Dilaveris PE, et al. 2020 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of atrial fibrillation developed in collaboration with the European Association for Cardio-Thoracic Surgery (EACTS): The Task Force for the diagnosis and management of atrial fibrillation of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) Developed with the special contribution of the European Heart Rhythm Association (EHRA) of the ESC. *Eur. Heart J.* 2021;42:373–498.
8. Lip GY, Tse HF, Lane DA. Atrial fibrillation. *The Lancet.* 2012;379:648–661.
9. Hart RG, Pearce LA, Aguilar MI. Meta-analysis: Antithrombotic Therapy to Prevent Stroke in Patients Who Have Nonvalvular Atrial Fibrillation. *Ann. Intern. Med.* 2007;146:857–867.
10. Joglar JA, Chung MK, Armbruster AL, Benjamin EJ, Chyou JY, Cronin EM, Deswal A, Eckhardt LL, Goldberger ZD, Gopinathannair R, et al. 2023 ACC/AHA/ACCP/HRS Guideline for the Diagnosis and Management of Atrial Fibrillation: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart

Association Joint Committee on Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Circulation*. 2024;149:e1–e156.

11. Ding WY, Blomström-Lundqvist C, Fauchier L, Marin F, Potpara TS, Boriani G, Lip GYH. Contemporary management of atrial fibrillation and the predicted vs. absolute risk of ischaemic stroke despite treatment: a report from ESC-EHRA EORP-AF Long-Term General Registry. *Eur. Eur. Pacing Arrhythm. Card. Electrophysiol. J. Work. Groups Card. Pacing Arrhythm. Card. Cell. Electrophysiol. Eur. Soc. Cardiol.* 2023;25:277–282.
12. Lip GYH, Murphy RR, Sahiar F, Ingall TJ, Dhamane AD, Ferri M, Hlavacek P, Preib MT, Keshishian A, Russ C, et al. Risk Levels and Adverse Clinical Outcomes Among Patients With Nonvalvular Atrial Fibrillation Receiving Oral Anticoagulants. *JAMA Netw. Open.* 2022;5:e2229333.
13. Maeda T, Nishi T, Funakoshi S, Tada K, Tsuji M, Satoh A, Kawazoe M, Yoshimura C, Arima H. Risks of Bleeding and Stroke Based on CHA2DS2-VASc Scores in Japanese Patients With Atrial Fibrillation: A Large-Scale Observational Study Using Real-World Data. *J. Am. Heart Assoc.* 2020;9:e014574.
14. Lin Y-S, Chen Y-L, Chen T-H, Lin M-S, Liu C-H, Yang T-Y, Chung C-M, Chen M-C. Comparison of Clinical Outcomes Among Patients With Atrial Fibrillation or Atrial Flutter Stratified by CHA2DS2-VASc Score. *JAMA Netw. Open.* 2018;1:e180941.
15. Kim T-H, Yang P-S, Uhm J-S, Kim J-Y, Pak H-N, Lee M-H, Joung B, Lip GYH. CHA2DS2-VASc Score (Congestive Heart Failure, Hypertension, Age ≥ 75 [Doubled], Diabetes Mellitus, Prior Stroke or Transient Ischemic Attack [Doubled], Vascular Disease, Age 65-74, Female) for Stroke in Asian Patients With Atrial Fibrillation: A Korean Nationwide Sample Cohort Study. *Stroke*. 2017;48:1524–1530.
16. Guo Y, Wang H, Tian Y, Wang Y, Lip GYH. Multiple risk factors and ischaemic stroke in the elderly Asian population with and without atrial fibrillation. An analysis of 425,600 Chinese individuals without prior stroke. *Thromb. Haemost.* 2016;115:184–192.
17. Tsai C-F, Anderson N, Thomas B, Sudlow CLM. Risk factors for ischemic stroke and its subtypes in Chinese vs. Caucasians: Systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int. J. Stroke Off. J. Int. Stroke Soc.* 2015;10:485–493.
18. Elliott AD, Middeldorp ME, Van Gelder IC, Albert CM, Sanders P. Epidemiology and modifiable risk factors for atrial fibrillation. *Nat. Rev. Cardiol.* 2023;20:404–417.
19. Deshmukh A, Iglesias M, Khanna R, Beaulieu T. Healthcare utilization and costs

associated with a diagnosis of incident atrial fibrillation. *Heart Rhythm* 02. 2022;3:577–586.

20. Romiti GF, Corica B, Proietti M, Mei DA, Frydenlund J, Bisson A, Boriani G, Olshansky B, Chan Y-H, Huisman MV, et al. Patterns of oral anticoagulant use and outcomes in Asian patients with atrial fibrillation: a post-hoc analysis from the GLORIA-AF Registry. *EClinicalMedicine*. 2023;63:102039.
21. Østergaard L, Olesen JB, Petersen JK, Nielsen LS, Kristensen SL, Schou M, Køber L, Fosbøl E. Arterial Thromboembolism in Patients With Atrial Fibrillation and CHA2DS2-VASc 1: A Nationwide Study. *Circulation*. 2023;
22. Chinese Society of Cardiology, Chinese Medical Association, Heart Rhythm Committee of Chinese Society of Biomedical Engineering. [Chinese guidelines on diagnosis and management of atrial fibrillation]. *Zhonghua Xin Xue Guan Bing Za Zhi*. 2023;51:572–618.
23. Lahad K, Maor E, Klempfner R, Grossman C, Druyan A, Ben-Zvi I. CHA2DS2-VASC Score Predicts the Risk of Stroke in Patients Hospitalized to the Internal Medicine Department Without Known Atrial Fibrillation. *J. Gen. Intern. Med*. 2022;37:3355–3360.
24. Chao T-F, Lip GYH, Liu C-J, Tuan T-C, Chen S-J, Wang K-L, Lin Y-J, Chang S-L, Lo L-W, Hu Y-F, et al. Validation of a Modified CHA2DS2-VASc Score for Stroke Risk Stratification in Asian Patients With Atrial Fibrillation: A Nationwide Cohort Study. *Stroke*. 2016;47:2462–2469.
25. Gu H-Q, Yang X, Wang C-J, Zhao X-Q, Wang Y-L, Liu L-P, Meng X, Jiang Y, Li H, Liu C, et al. Assessment of Trends in Guideline-Based Oral Anticoagulant Prescription for Patients With Ischemic Stroke and Atrial Fibrillation in China. *JAMA Netw. Open*. 2021;4:e2118816.
26. Bahnson TD, Giczewska A, Mark DB, Russo AM, Monahan KH, Al-Khalidi HR, Silverstein AP, Poole JE, Lee KL, Packer DL, et al. Association Between Age and Outcomes of Catheter Ablation Versus Medical Therapy for Atrial Fibrillation: Results From the CABANA Trial. *Circulation*. 2022;145:796–804.
27. Mantovani LG, Cozzolino P, Ferrara P, Virdone S, Camm AJ, Verheugt FWA, Bassand J-P, Turpie AGG, Hacke W, Kayani G, et al. Healthcare Resource Utilization in Patients with Newly Diagnosed Atrial Fibrillation: A Global Analysis from the GARFIELD-AF Registry. *Healthc. Basel Switz*. 2023;11:638.
28. Jain R, Fu A-C, Lim J, Wang C, Elder J, Sander SD, Tan H. Health Care Resource Utilization and Costs Among Newly Diagnosed and Oral Anticoagulant-Naive Nonvalvular Atrial Fibrillation Patients Treated with Dabigatran or Warfarin in the United States. *J. Manag. Care Spec. Pharm*.

2018;24:73–82.

29. Reynolds SL, Ghatte SR, Sheer R, Gandhi PK, Moretz C, Wang C, Sander S, Costantino ME, Annavarapu S, Andrews G. Healthcare utilization and costs for patients initiating Dabigatran or Warfarin. *Health Qual. Life Outcomes*. 2017;15:128.
30. Chelak K, Chakole S. The Role of Social Determinants of Health in Promoting Health Equality: A Narrative Review. *Cureus*. 2023;15:e33425.

List of tables

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of atrial fibrillation patients

Table 2. Prognosis within one year after the diagnosis of atrial fibrillation

Table 3. Health care resource utilization and cost stratified by CHA₂DS₂-VASc score

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of atrial fibrillation patients

Characteristics	Overall (n=419490)	Low risk* (n=16541)	Intermediate risk* (n=38494)	High risk* (n=364455)
Age, years				
Mean (SD)	75.2 (11.0)	54.2 (8.7)	62.3 (8.9)	77.5 (9.2)
18-44	4733 (1.1)	2200 (13.3)	1544 (4.0)	989 (0.3)
45-64	59645 (14.2)	14341 (86.7)	18990 (49.3)	26314 (7.2)
65-74	115422 (27.5)	0	17960 (46.7)	97462 (26.7)
75-84	154606 (36.9)	0	0	154606 (42.4)
≥85	85084 (20.3)	0	0	85084 (23.3)
Sex				
Male	230338 (54.9)	10421 (63.0)	24107 (62.6)	195810 (53.7)
Female	189152 (45.1)	6120 (37.0)	14387 (37.4)	168645 (46.3)
Year of diagnosis				
2018	106591 (25.4)	3880 (23.5)	9694 (25.2)	93017 (25.5)
2019	95193 (22.7)	3585 (21.7)	8730 (22.7)	82878 (22.7)
2020	81744 (19.5)	3018 (18.2)	7381 (19.2)	71345 (19.6)
2021	98906 (23.6)	4669 (28.2)	9719 (25.2)	84518 (23.2)
2022	37056 (8.8)	1389 (8.4)	2970 (7.7)	32697 (9.0)
Baseline comorbidities				

Hypertension	239376 (57.1)	0	8068 (21.0)	231308 (63.5)
Heart failure	193881 (46.2)	0	8793 (22.8)	185088 (50.8)
Atherosclerosis	155774 (37.1)	0	1999 (5.2)	153775 (42.2)
Cerebrovascular disease	152147 (36.3)	1051 (6.4)	4334 (11.3)	146762 (40.3)
Diabetes	83501 (19.9)	0	1495 (3.9)	82006 (22.5)
Chronic pulmonary disease	66716 (15.9)	817 (4.9)	3367 (8.7)	62532 (17.2)
Chronic liver disease	39044 (9.3)	1343 (8.1)	3682 (9.6)	34019 (9.3)
Malignancy	31957 (7.6)	1257 (7.6)	3892 (10.1)	26808 (7.4)
Renal disease	28581 (6.8)	174 (1.1)	1016 (2.6)	27391 (7.5)
Pneumonia	24264 (5.8)	443 (2.7)	1472 (3.8)	22349 (6.1)
Anemia	22994 (5.5)	456 (2.8)	1237 (3.2)	21301 (5.8)
Myocardial infarction	18452 (4.4)	0	222 (0.6)	18230 (5.0)
Dyslipidemias	15677 (3.7)	692 (4.2)	1339 (3.5)	13646 (3.7)
Coronary artery disease	11341 (2.7)	157 (0.9)	514 (1.3)	10670 (2.9)
Dementia	4547 (1.1)	13 (0.1)	54 (0.1)	4480 (1.2)
Autoimmune	3735 (0.9)	122 (0.7)	363 (0.9)	3250 (0.9)

disease				
Frailty	2022 (0.5)	34 (0.2)	93 (0.2)	1895 (0.5)
Depression	1668 (0.4)	50 (0.3)	125 (0.3)	1493 (0.4)
Sleep apnea	1340 (0.3)	53 (0.3)	156 (0.4)	1131 (0.3)
CCI score				
Mean (SD)	1.7 (1.5)	0.5 (1.2)	1.0 (1.4)	1.8 (1.5)
0-1	233381 (55.6)	14681 (88.8)	30498 (79.2)	188202 (51.6)
2-4	166090 (39.6)	1598 (9.7)	7012 (18.2)	157480 (43.2)
≥5	20019 (4.8)	262 (1.6)	984 (2.6)	18773 (5.2)
ACCI score				
Mean (SD)	4.7 (2.0)	1.6 (1.5)	2.8 (1.6)	5.0 (1.8)
0-1	18177 (4.3)	9324 (56.4)	6101 (15.8)	2752 (0.8)
2-4	177578 (42.3)	6697 (40.5)	28427 (73.8)	145455 (39.9)
≥5	223735 (53.3)	520 (3.1)	3966 (10.3)	216248 (59.3)

Data are presented as number (%) unless otherwise specified.

Abbreviations: CCI, Charlson comorbidity index; ACCI, Age-adjusted Charlson comorbidity index.

*Patients were stratified by CHA₂DS₂-VASc score on index: Low risk (0 for males, 1 for females), Intermediate risk (1 for males, 2 for females), High risk (≥2 for males, ≥3 for females).

Table 2. Prognosis within one year after the diagnosis of atrial fibrillation

Risk	Events	PYs	Incidence rate (95% CI), per 100 PYs	Cumulative incidence (95% CI), %	Crude HR (95% CI)	Adjusted HR* (95% CI)
Ischemic stroke						
Overall	44576	358807	12.4 (12.3-12.5)	11.2 (11.1-11.3)	-	-
Low risk	506	14925	3.4 (3.1-3.7)	3.2 (2.9-3.5)	1 [Reference]	1 [Reference]
Intermediate risk	1803	34621	5.2 (5.0-5.5)	4.9 (4.7-5.2)	1.5 (1.4-1.7)	1.3 (1.2-1.4)
High risk	42267	309261	13.7 (13.5-13.8)	12.2 (12.1-12.3)	4.0 (3.6-4.3)	2.5 (2.3-2.8)
Transient ischemic attack						
Overall	4060	383127	1.1 (1.0-1.1)	1.0 (1.0-1.1)	-	-
Low risk	76	15188	0.5 (0.4-0.6)	0.5 (0.4-0.6)	1 [Reference]	1 [Reference]
Intermediate risk	191	35571	0.5 (0.5-0.6)	0.5 (0.5-0.6)	1.1 (0.8-1.4)	1.0 (0.8-1.3)

High risk	3793	332368	1.1 (1.1-1.2)	1.1 (1.1-1.2)	2.3 (1.8-2.8)	2.0 (1.5-2.5)
Arterial embolism						
Overall	1874	384129	0.5 (0.5-0.5)	0.5 (0.4-0.5)	-	-
Low risk	32	15208	0.2 (0.1-0.3)	0.2 (0.1-0.3)	1 [Reference]	1 [Reference]
Intermediate risk	98	35602	0.3 (0.2-0.3)	0.3 (0.2-0.3)	1.3 (0.9-2.0)	1.3 (0.9-2.0)
High risk	1744	333319	0.5 (0.5-0.6)	0.5 (0.5-0.5)	2.5 (1.8-3.5)	2.4 (1.6-3.6)
Major bleeding						
Overall	11802	378545	3.1 (3.1-3.2)	3.0 (2.9-3.0)	-	-
Low risk	243	15095	1.6 (1.4-1.8)	1.6 (1.4-1.8)	1 [Reference]	1 [Reference]
Intermediate risk	838	35177	2.4 (2.2-2.6)	2.3 (2.1-2.4)	1.5 (1.3-1.7)	1.3 (1.1-1.5)
High risk	10721	328273	3.3 (3.2-3.3)	3.1 (3.0-3.2)	2.0 (1.8-2.3)	1.3 (1.1-1.5)

Abbreviations: PY, person-year; HR, hazard ratio.

*Adjusted for age, sex, year of diagnosis, and Charlson comorbidity index score.

Table 3. Health care resource utilization and cost stratified by CHA₂DS₂-VASc score

	Overall	Low risk	Intermediate risk	High risk	p value*
	(n = 419490)	(n = 16541)	(n = 38494)	(n = 364455)	
Hospitalization					
Number of patients hospitalized, N (%)	150779 (35.9)	4475 (27.1)	12386 (32.2)	133918 (36.7)	-
All cause hospitalizations, N	316258	9340	27385	279533	-
Mean (SD) [†]	0.1 (0.3)	0.1 (0.1)	0.1 (0.2)	0.1 (0.3)	< 0.001
Median (IQR) [†]	0.0 (0.0-0.1)	0.0 (0.0-0.1)	0.0 (0.0-0.1)	0.0 (0.0-0.1)	
Length of stay					
Mean (SD) ^{†‡} , days	1.1 (1.7)	0.9 (1.1)	1.0 (1.3)	1.2 (1.8)	< 0.001
Median (IQR) [†]	0.8 (0.6-1.2)	0.7 (0.5-1.1)	0.7 (0.5-1.1)	0.8 (0.6-1.2)	

Cost of Hospitalization					
Mean (SD) ^{†‡} , \$	341.9 (1630.7)	454.2 (783.6)	383.9 (1218.7)	334.2 (1683.8)	< 0.001
Median (IQR) [†]	144.5 (88.2-288.1)	170.9 (83.8-591.1)	145.9 (83.9-352.5)	143.8 (88.7-280.1)	
Outpatient visits					
Number of patients with an outpatient visit, N (%)	119912 (28.6)	6587 (39.8)	13410 (34.8)	99915 (27.4)	-
All cause outpatient visits, N	745458	37976	83492	623990	-
Mean (SD) [†]	0.2 (0.5)	0.2 (0.6)	0.2 (0.5)	0.2 (0.5)	< 0.001
Median (IQR) [†]	0.0 (0.0-0.1)	0.0 (0.0-0.2)	0.0 (0.0-0.2)	0.0 (0.0-0.1)	

**P* values calculated using a Kruskal-Wallis test.

[†]Results were calculated as per patient per month (PPPM).

[‡]Only patients with medical records within one year after atrial fibrillation diagnosis were included in the calculation.

List of figures

Figure 1. Flow chart of study cohort

Figure 2. Cumulative incidence of clinical outcomes

Figure 3. Management pattern of atrial fibrillation patients

Figure 1. Flow chart of study cohort

Abbreviations: AF, atrial fibrillation.

Figure 2. Cumulative incidence of clinical outcomes

Figure 3. Management pattern of atrial fibrillation patients

Abbreviations: OAC, oral anticoagulant; NOAC, non-vitamin K oral anticoagulant; LAAC, left atrial appendage closure.





