

The Impacts of Oral Anticoagulants on Clinical Outcomes in Patients with Atrial Fibrillation Across Five Stages of Renal Function

Jo-Nan Liao, M.D.^{1,2*}; Yi-Hsin Chan, M.D.^{3,4,5*}; Hsin-Fu Lee, M.D.^{3,4,6}; Yung-Hsin Yeh, M.D.^{3,4}; Shang-Hung Chang, M.D., PhD^{3,4,7}; Shih-Ann Chen, M.D.^{1,2,8}; Tze-Fan Chao, M.D.^{1,2}

¹Division of Cardiology, Department of Medicine, Taipei Veterans General Hospital, Taipei, Taiwan. ²Institute of Clinical Medicine, and Cardiovascular Research Center, National Yang Ming Chiao Tung University, Taipei, Taiwan. ³The Cardiovascular Department, Chang Gung Memorial Hospital, Linkou, Taoyuan 33305, Taiwan. ⁴College of Medicine, Chang Gung University, Taoyuan 33302, Taiwan. ⁵Microscopy Core Laboratory, Chang Gung Memorial Hospital, Linkou, Taoyuan 33305, Taiwan. ⁶Graduate Institute of Clinical Medical Sciences, College of Medicine, Chang Gung University, Taoyuan, Taiwan. ⁷Center for Big Data Analytics and Statistics, Chang Gung Memorial Hospital, Taoyuan, Taiwan. ⁸Cardiovascular Center, Taichung Veterans General Hospital, Taichung, Taiwan.

***Drs. Jo-Nan Liao and Yi-Hsin Chan contributed equally to this manuscript and are joint first authors**

Running title: OACs in AF across different renal function stages

Address for correspondence

Tze-Fan Chao, M.D.

Division of Cardiology, Department of Medicine, Taipei Veterans General Hospital,

No. 201, Sec. 2, Shih-Pai Road, Taipei, Taiwan.

Tel: 886-2-2875-7156; Fax: 886-2-2873-5656

E-Mail: eyckeyck@gmail.com

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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: To analyze the impact of using different renal function equations and stroke prevention strategy in atrial fibrillation (AF) across all chronic kidney disease (CKD) stages.

Methods: We used the Cockcroft-Gault (CG), Modified Diet in Renal Disease (MDRD), and Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemiology Collaboration (CKD-EPI) equations to classify 39,217 patients into stage 1 to 5 CKD during July 1st, 2001, and September 30st, 2018. The endpoint is a composite outcome including ischemic stroke or major bleeding or mortality.

Results: More patients belonged to stage 1 and 2 CKD using the MDRD and CKD-EPI equations. In subgroups of patients with eGFR-MDRD or eGFR-CKD-EPI ≥ 60 mL/min, a 17-18% increase of event was observed in patients with eGFR-CG < 60 mL/min compared to those ≥ 60 mL/min. Compared to no oral anticoagulant (OAC), OAC use was associated with a significantly lower risk of event across stage 1 to 4 CKD but not in stage 5 CKD. Both warfarin and NOACs exhibited better outcome compared to no OAC across stage 1 to 4 CKD while NOACs was associated with more risk reduction compared to warfarin. Among patients on OACs, there was a trend toward better outcome with NOAC than warfarin across stage 2-4 CKD but not in stage 1 and 5 CKD.

Conclusions: OAC should be used in stage 1 to 4 CKD with NOAC exhibiting the trend of better outcome through stage 2 to 4 CKD than warfarin. For stage 5 CKD, optimal strategy remains undetermined.

Key words: atrial fibrillation, chronic kidney disease, Cockcroft-Gault (CG) equation, oral anticoagulant, non-vitamin K antagonist oral anticoagulant

Clinical Perspective

- **What Is New?** The stages of renal function of AF patients varied significantly with different renal equations, and the CG equation remained effective in differentiating clinical outcomes for patients with $\text{eGFR-MDRD} \geq 60$ mL/min or $\text{eGFR-CKD-EPI} \geq 60$ mL/min
- **What Are the Clinical Implications?** OAC should be used in stage 1 to 4 CKD with NOAC exhibiting the trend of better outcome through stage 2 to 4 CKD than warfarin.

Introduction

Atrial fibrillation (AF) is the most common cardiac arrhythmia worldwide and increases the risk of ischemic stroke, cardiovascular events, and all-cause mortality.¹ Hypercoagulability and the irregular hemodynamic status of AF place patients vulnerable to renal function impairment,² so chronic kidney disease (CKD) is common in patients with AF.^{3,4} On the other hand, renal function impairment increases the risk of ischemic stroke and major bleeding in AF.⁵⁻⁷ For example, stroke rates increased from 1.4% per year in stage 1 CKD to 3.72% in stage 4-5 CKD, and so did the rates of mortality and bleeding.⁸

Oral anticoagulants (OACs) are indicated in AF patients at high risk of ischemic stroke after weighing the risk and benefit of OACs.^{1,9} Non-vitamin K antagonist (NOAC) is the mainstream OACs in stroke prevention in current guidelines because of better safety and comparable or even better efficacy compared to warfarin.^{1,9-13} However, because different types of NOACs undergo certain degree of renal clearance, patients with severe CKD were mostly excluded from landmark randomized controlled trials (RCTs).¹⁴⁻¹⁷ Besides, there are conflicting results for the use of NOACs and warfarin in patients with end-stage CKD and calciphylaxis is a major concern with the use of warfarin in end-stage CKD.^{18,19} Therefore, the use of OAC in AF patients with CKD remains challenging. Although there were real-world cohort studies specifically analyzed OAC use in subgroups of patients with advanced CKD,²⁰⁻²⁶ a simultaneous comparison of OAC strategies across all CKD stages is lacking. Therefore, the aim of the present study is to use a large-scale real-world cohort to simultaneously analyze the effect of OAC use and OAC types in AF patients across all stages of CKD. Furthermore, how different renal function equations affect the classification of CKD stage and its role in differentiating prognosis will also be studied.

Methods

Database

This is a retrospective study using the data from the Chang Gung Research Database provided by Chang Gung Memorial Hospital (CGMH) Medical system. The CGMH Medical system included 3 major teaching hospitals and 4 tertiary care medical centers with a total of 10,050 beds and about 280,000 admissions per year.²⁷ There were around 500,000 emergent department visits and 8,500,000 outpatient department visits to CGMH Medical system in 2015, accounting for approximately 1/10 of the annual Taiwanese medical service.²⁷ In this database, the personal information and identification number of each patient are encrypted and a consistent encrypting procedure was used to de-identify detailed medical information of each patient.²⁸ Therefore, informed consent was waived for this study. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Chang Gung Medical Foundation (201802075B0).

Study cohort and study design

Patients ≥ 20 years with newly diagnosed AF during July 1st, 2001, and September 30st, 2018, were identified from the CGMH medical database ($n = 70,408$) and we excluded patients without body weight (BW) and serum creatinine (sCr) data within 6 months before AF being diagnosed. A total of 39,217 patients were ultimately included for the present study.

Renal function determination

The estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) was calculated for renal function evaluation using the Cockcroft-Gault (CG), Modified Diet in Renal Disease (MDRD), and Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemiology Collaboration (CKD-EPI) equations as the following:²⁹⁻³¹

$$\text{CG (mL/min)} = (140 - \text{Age}) * \text{BW} / (72 * \text{sCr}) * (0.85 \text{ if female})$$

$$\text{MDRD (mL/min)} = 175 * \text{sCr}^{-1.154} * \text{Age}^{-0.203} * (0.742 \text{ if female}) * (1.210 \text{ if African-American})$$

$$\text{CKD-EPI (mL/min)} = 141 * \min(\text{sCr} / (0.7 \text{ if female; } 0.9 \text{ if male}), 1)^{(-0.329 \text{ if female; } -0.411 \text{ if male})} * \max(\text{sCr} / (0.7 \text{ if female; } 0.9 \text{ if male}), 1)^{-1.209} * 0.993 * \text{Age} * (1.018 \text{ if female}) * (1.159 \text{ if black})$$

Patients were classified as stage 1 CKD (eGFR > 90 mL/min), stage 2 CKD (eGFR of 60 to 89 mL/min), stage 3 CKD (eGFR of 30 to 59 mL/min), stage 4 CKD (eGFR of 15 to 29 mL/min), and stage 5 CKD (eGFR < 15 mL/min).

Clinical endpoints

The clinical endpoint is a composite outcome including the occurrence of ischemic stroke or major bleeding or all-cause mortality. A stratified analysis comparing OAC strategy and OAC types across all CKD stages was performed. All study endpoints were defined based on the first discharge diagnosis to avoid misclassification. Major bleeding was defined as hospitalization of intracranial hemorrhage, gastrointestinal bleeding, and other sites of critical bleeding. The follow-up period was defined as the duration from the date when AF was diagnosed until the occurrence of clinical outcomes, or until the end date of the study period (September 30, 2018), whichever came first.

Statistical analysis

Data are presented as the mean value \pm standard deviation for continuous variables and proportions for categorical variables. Differences between continuous values were assessed using the unpaired two-tailed *t*-test or one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA). Differences between nominal variables were compared by the chi-squared test. The incidences of clinical

endpoint were calculated from dividing the number of events by person-time at risk. The risk of clinical endpoint was assessed using the Cox regression analysis. The proportional hazards assumption was tested using Schoenfeld residual test which showed no non-proportionality. The Kaplan-Meier method was used to plot the cumulative incidence curves of clinical endpoints for different renal function groups, with statistical significance examined by the log-rank test. All statistical significances were set at a $p < 0.05$.

Results

Baseline characteristics of all AF patients

Table 1 shows the baseline characteristics of the study population. The mean age of the 39,217 patients with AF was 71.09 ± 12.76 years and 57.1% of them were males. The mean CHA₂DS₂-VASc and HAS-BLED scores were 2.58 ± 1.65 and 1.94 ± 1.33 , respectively. Hypertension was the most common comorbidity with 47.8% of patients having hypertension. The mean and median sCr levels were 1.62 ± 1.91 mg/dL and 1.03 mg/dL (interquartile range 0.80-1.45 mg/dL), respectively. The mean eGFRs were 56.75 mL/min calculated by CG equation, 69.75 mL/min by MDRD equation and 62.12 mL/min by CKD-EPI equation. Among all 39,217 patients, 12,791 patients were treated with OAC, including 6,381 patients on warfarin and 6,410 patients on NOACs.

Varied renal function classification based on different equations and its relationship with clinical endpoint

Patient classifications based on renal function status were dissimilar based on different equations. The CG equation classified patients into 14.7% of stage 1 CKD, 25.9% of stage 2 CKD, 37.2% of stage 3 CKD, 12.7% of stage 4 CKD, and 9.4% of stage 5 CKD, respectively. With MDRD equation, there were 24.5% of stage 1 CKD, 35.5% of stage 2 CKD, 25.3% of

stage 3 CKD, 6.7% of stage 4 CKD, and 8.1% of stage 5 CKD. Based on the CKD-EPI equation, the distribution of renal function stages was as follows: 18.0% of stage 1 CKD, 37.8% of stage 2 CKD, 27.7% of stage 3 CKD, 7.6% of stage 4 CKD, and 8.9% of stage 5 CKD. In brief, part of patients with $eGFR < 60$ mL/min based on the CG equation might have been classified as stage 1 or 2 CKD using MDRD or CKD-EPI equations. **(Figure 1)** In subgroup of patients with $eGFRs\text{-MDRD}$ or $eGFRs\text{-CKD-EPI} \geq 60$ mL/min, patients with $eGFR\text{-CG} < 60$ mL/min was significantly associated with 17% and 18% increase of clinical endpoint compared to those with $eGFR\text{-CG} \geq 60$ mL/min. **(Figure 2)**

The impact of OAC use on clinical endpoint in each CKD stage.

Among all study population, the use of OAC was associated with 29.7% decrease of clinical endpoint compared to those without OACs, and more risk reduction was observed on NOACs than warfarin (NOACs: adjusted hazard rate [aHR]: 0.497, 95% confidence interval [CI]: 0.456-0.543; warfarin: aHR 0.863, 95% CI 0.810-0.919; interaction $P < 0.001$). This was also evident through stage 1 to 4 CKD but not in stage 5 CKD. **(Figure 3)** There was no significant difference of risk between OAC and no OAC groups in patients with stage 5 CKD.

Subgroup analysis in patients on OAC in each CKD stage was performed. **(Figure 4)** In patients with stage 1 and 5 CKD, there was no significant difference of the risk of clinical endpoint between NOAC and warfarin (stage 1 CKD: aHR 0.937, 95% CI 0.607-1.447, $P = 0.768$; stage 5 CKD: aHR 1.168, 95% CI 0.711-1.919, $P = 0.539$). In patients with stage 2 and stage 3 CKD, multivariate Cox regression analysis demonstrated significantly lower risk with NOAC compared to warfarin. (stage 2 CKD: aHR 0.630; 95% CI 0.504-0.792; stage 3 CKD: aHR 0.712, 95% CI 0.610-0.832; both $P < 0.001$). In stage 4 CKD, NOAC was associated with a trend toward lower risk, although a marginal P value of 0.052 was observed. **(Figure 4)**

Discussion

Main findings

In the present study, a large Asian AF cohort was used to investigate the risk of clinical outcomes in relation to the evaluation of renal function status and OAC strategy. The main findings are as follows: (i) patient grouping varied depending on the renal function equations used, and the CG equation was effective in differentiating clinical outcomes for patients with $eGFR\text{-MDRD} \geq 60$ mL/min or $eGFR\text{-CKD-EPI} \geq 60$ mL/min; (ii) compared to no OAC, OAC use was associated with significantly lower risk of clinical events through stage 1 to 4 CKD but not in stage 5 CKD; and (iii) among patients with stage 2 to 4 CKD, NOAC was associated with better outcomes than warfarin, while there was no significant difference between NOAC and warfarin in patients with stage 1 and 5 CKD.

The role of renal function equations in differentiating clinical outcomes

The CG equation, which considers patient's age, gender, and body weight, was mostly used to estimate patient's renal function in all landmark NOAC trials and international guidelines,³²⁻³⁴ whereas the MDRD and CKD-EPI equations are frequently used in real-world practice. There were studies demonstrating inconsistency of renal function estimation using different equations in AF patients.³⁵⁻³⁸ Misclassification of renal function status in AF patients using the MDRD and CKD-EPI equations was mostly observed,^{37, 38} and may have harmful effect on prognosis because of potential off-label dosing of NOACs.³⁷ Therefore, the CG equation is recommended for correct dosing of NOACs.^{38, 39} Our present study also observed disagreement of renal function classification according to different equations. In subgroup of patients with preserved renal function as presented with $eGFR\text{-MDRD} \geq 60$ mL/min or $eGFR\text{-CKD-EPI} \geq 60$ mL/min, a cut-off value of $eGFR\text{-CG}$ of 60 mL/min still

differentiated patients into different outcomes. Therefore, our study again reinforces that CG equation is preferred over MDRD and CKD-EPI equations for renal function estimation and determining NOAC doses in AF patients.

The effect of OAC on clinical outcomes in each renal function stage

To the best of our knowledge, there is no study simultaneously analyzing the stroke prevention strategy in each CKD stage in AF patients. Only scattered cohort studies or subgroup analysis aiming at certain OAC or particular CKD stages were available. Sub-analysis in patients with stage 3 to 4 CKD from large-scale RCTs showed that NOACs were non-inferior to warfarin in stroke prevention with comparable or less risk of bleeding.²⁰⁻²⁴ A meta-analysis including 15 studies in patients with mild, moderate, and severe CKD observed no difference between NOAC and warfarin in the risk of stroke or systemic embolism in any subgroups of CKD. NOAC further reduced the risk of mortality in moderate-severe or severe CKD and major bleeding in moderate and moderate-severe CKD.⁴⁰ A retrospective study including 21,733 AF patients with CKD reported NOAC being associated with lower mortality, less bleeding, and a non-significant trend toward lower embolic stroke compared to warfarin in all renal function groups.⁴¹ In the present study, we displayed the analysis in an organized manner covering all CKD stages, and clearly demonstrated the benefit of OAC through stage 1-4 CKD but not stage 5 CKD. NOACs especially showed less risk through stage 2-4 CKD but not in stage 1 and 5 CKD. We suppose that the prognosis of stage 1 CKD might be too good to tell the differences of prognosis between NOAC and warfarin. As to stage 5 CKD which was universally excluded from large-scale RCTs,⁴²⁻⁴⁵ we found no difference of risk between OAC use or not and between NOAC and warfarin in stage 5 CKD, which further highlights the dilemma of stroke prevention in AF patients with end-stage CKD.

In brief, although there is a long way to go before more robust data are available, our findings are in line with a review from a nephrological perspective in which they proposed NOACs to be the first line therapy for AF patients with mild and moderate renal dysfunction and may be adopted for those with severe CKD not on dialysis.⁴⁶ For stage 5 CKD, limited studies suggested apixaban use, but overall, the benefit of OAC or NOACs in AF patients with stage 5 CKD remain an uncharted territory.

Limitations

There are several limitations of the present study. First, this was a retrospective study of the electronic medical record database, so the decision of OAC was not per pre-specified algorithm and depended on the physicians who were in charge of those patients. Therefore, conditions precluding or preferring/inclining a certain strategy may be present. Second, although we used multivariable Cox regression analysis to adjust baseline differences, some unmeasured confounders may still exist. Third, the estimation of renal function stages were based on the data and BW at enrollment. We can not exclude the possibility of fluctuation of renal function during the follow-up period and its impact on prognosis. Fourth, the time in therapeutic range of warfarin use was not available in the present study, which might influence the effect of warfarin. Last, individual NOAC use and its dosing in different renal function status were not included in the analysis. So it is unknown whether one NOAC is superior than the other in distinct renal function stages.

Conclusion

The stages of renal function of AF patients varied significantly with different renal equations. OAC use was associated with better prognosis than no OACs through stage 1 to 4 CKD, whereas NOACs was better or at least non-inferior to warfarin through stage 2 to 4

CKD. For stage 5 CKD, optimal strategy of stroke prevention, including the use of OAC or not and OAC types, remains unknown, and more studies are warranted.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank the statistical assistance and wish to acknowledge the support of the Maintenance Project of the Center for Big Data Analytics and Statistics (Grant CLRPG3D0045) at Chang Gung Memorial Hospital for study design and monitor, data analysis and interpretation.

Sources of Funding

This study was supported by grants 105-2628-B-182A-003-MY3 from the Ministry of Science and Technology (MOST 110-2314-B-075-059, MOST 111-2314-B-075-004-MY2) and grants CMRPG3E1681, CMRPG3E1682, CMRPG3E1683, and CORPG3G0351 from Chang Gung Memorial Hospital, Linkou, Taiwan.

Disclosures

The authors report no relationships that could be construed as a conflict of interest

References

1. Hindricks G, Potpara T, Dagres N, Arbelo E, Bax JJ, Blomstrom-Lundqvist C, 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.
2. Ding WY, Gupta D, Wong CF and Lip GYH. Pathophysiology of atrial fibrillation and chronic kidney disease. *Cardiovasc Res*. 2021;117:1046-1059.
3. Hart RG, Eikelboom JW, Brimble KS, McMurry MS and Ingram AJ. Stroke prevention in atrial fibrillation patients with chronic kidney disease. *Can J Cardiol*. 2013;29:S71-8.
4. Baber U, Howard VJ, Halperin JL, Soliman EZ, Zhang X, McClellan W, et al. Association of chronic kidney disease with atrial fibrillation among adults in the United States: REasons for Geographic and Racial Differences in Stroke (REGARDS) Study. *Circ Arrhythm Electrophysiol*. 2011;4:26-32.
5. Vazquez E, Sanchez-Perales C, Lozano C, Garcia-Cortes MJ, Borrego F, Guzman M, et al. Comparison of prognostic value of atrial fibrillation versus sinus rhythm in patients on long-term hemodialysis. *Am J Cardiol*. 2003;92:868-71.
6. Wang HH, Hung SY, Sung JM, Hung KY and Wang JD. Risk of stroke in long-term dialysis patients compared with the general population. *Am J Kidney Dis*. 2014;63:604-11.
7. Sood MM, Bota SE, McArthur E, Kapral MK, Tangri N, Knoll G, et al. The three-year incidence of major hemorrhage among older adults initiating chronic dialysis. *Can J Kidney Health Dis*. 2014;1:21.

8. Arnon Y, Hoshen M, Berliner-Sendrey A, Reges O, Balicer R, Leibowitz M, et al. Risk of Stroke, Bleeding, and Death in Patients with Nonvalvular Atrial Fibrillation and Chronic Kidney Disease. *Cardiology*. 2020;145:178-186.
9. January CT, Wann LS, Calkins H, Chen LY, Cigarroa JE, Cleveland JC, Jr., et al. 2019 AHA/ACC/HRS Focused Update of the 2014 AHA/ACC/HRS Guideline for the Management of Patients With Atrial Fibrillation: A Report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Clinical Practice Guidelines and the Heart Rhythm Society in Collaboration With the Society of Thoracic Surgeons. *Circulation*. 2019;140:e125-e151.
10. Ruff CT, Giugliano RP, Braunwald E, Hoffman EB, Deenadayalu N, Ezekowitz MD, et al. Comparison of the efficacy and safety of new oral anticoagulants with warfarin in patients with atrial fibrillation: a meta-analysis of randomised trials. *Lancet*. 2014;383:955-62.
11. Chao TF, Chiang CE, Lin YJ, Chang SL, Lo LW, Hu YF, et al. Evolving Changes of the Use of Oral Anticoagulants and Outcomes in Patients With Newly Diagnosed Atrial Fibrillation in Taiwan. *Circulation*. 2018;138:1485-1487.
12. Chao TF, Joung B, Takahashi Y, Lim TW, Choi EK, Chan YH, et al. 2021 Focused Update Consensus Guidelines of the Asia Pacific Heart Rhythm Society on Stroke Prevention in Atrial Fibrillation: Executive Summary. *Thromb Haemost*. 2022;122:20-47.
13. Chao TF, Joung B, Takahashi Y, Lim TW, Choi EK, Chan YH, et al. 2021 Focused update of the 2017 consensus guidelines of the Asia Pacific Heart Rhythm Society (APHRS) on stroke prevention in atrial fibrillation. *J Arrhythm*. 2021;37:1389-1426.
14. Granger CB, Alexander JH, McMurray JJ, Lopes RD, Hylek EM, Hanna M, et al. Apixaban versus warfarin in patients with atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med*. 2011;365:981-92.

15. Patel MR, Mahaffey KW, Garg J, Pan G, Singer DE, Hacke W, et al. Rivaroxaban versus warfarin in nonvalvular atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med*. 2011;365:883-91.
16. Connolly SJ, Ezekowitz MD, Yusuf S, Eikelboom J, Oldgren J, Parekh A, et al. Dabigatran versus warfarin in patients with atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med*. 2009;361:1139-51.
17. Giugliano RP, Ruff CT, Braunwald E, Murphy SA, Wiviott SD, Halperin JL, et al. Edoxaban versus warfarin in patients with atrial fibrillation. *N Engl J Med*. 2013;369:2093-104.
18. Steffel J, Collins R, Antz M, Cornu P, Desteghe L, Haesler KG, et al. 2021 European Heart Rhythm Association Practical Guide on the Use of Non-Vitamin K Antagonist Oral Anticoagulants in Patients with Atrial Fibrillation. *Europace*. 2021;23:1612-1676.
19. Chiang CE, Chao TF, Choi EK, Lim TW, Krittayaphong R, Li M, et al. Stroke Prevention in Atrial Fibrillation: A Scientific Statement of JACC: Asia (Part 2). *JACC Asia*. 2022;2:519-537.
20. Hohnloser SH, Hijazi Z, Thomas L, Alexander JH, Amerena J, Hanna M, et al. Efficacy of apixaban when compared with warfarin in relation to renal function in patients with atrial fibrillation: insights from the ARISTOTLE trial. *Eur Heart J*. 2012;33:2821-30.
21. Stanifer JW, Pokorney SD, Chertow GM, Hohnloser SH, Wojdyla DM, Garonzik S, et al. Apixaban Versus Warfarin in Patients With Atrial Fibrillation and Advanced Chronic Kidney Disease. *Circulation*. 2020;141:1384-1392.
22. Lindner SM, Fordyce CB, Hellkamp AS, Lokhnygina Y, Piccini JP, Breithardt G, et al. Treatment Consistency Across Levels of Baseline Renal Function With Rivaroxaban or Warfarin: A ROCKET AF (Rivaroxaban Once-Daily, Oral, Direct Factor Xa Inhibition

Compared With Vitamin K Antagonism for Prevention of Stroke and Embolism Trial in Atrial Fibrillation) Analysis. *Circulation*. 2017;135:1001-1003.

23. Bohula EA, Giugliano RP, Ruff CT, Kuder JF, Murphy SA, Antman EM, et al.

Impact of Renal Function on Outcomes With Edoxaban in the ENGAGE AF-TIMI 48 Trial. *Circulation*. 2016;134:24-36.

24. Hijazi Z, Hohnloser SH, Oldgren J, Andersson U, Connolly SJ, Eikelboom JW, et al.

Efficacy and safety of dabigatran compared with warfarin in relation to baseline renal function in patients with atrial fibrillation: a RE-LY (Randomized Evaluation of Long-term Anticoagulation Therapy) trial analysis. *Circulation*. 2014;129:961-70.

25. Yu HT, Yang PS, Kim TH, Jang E, Kim D, Uhm JS, et al. Impact of Renal Function on Outcomes With Edoxaban in Real-World Patients With Atrial Fibrillation. *Stroke*. 2018;49:2421-2429.

26. Hanni C, Petrovitch E, Ali M, Gibson W, Giuliano C, Holzhausen J, et al. Outcomes associated with apixaban vs warfarin in patients with renal dysfunction. *Blood Adv*. 2020;4:2366-2371.

27. Wang CL, Wu VC, Kuo CF, Chu PH, Tseng HJ, Wen MS, et al. Efficacy and Safety of Non-Vitamin K Antagonist Oral Anticoagulants in Atrial Fibrillation Patients With Impaired Liver Function: A Retrospective Cohort Study. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2018;7:e009263.

28. Wang CL, Wu VC, Lee CH, Kuo CF, Chen YL, Chu PH, et al. Effectiveness and safety of non-vitamin-K antagonist oral anticoagulants versus warfarin in atrial fibrillation patients with thrombocytopenia. *J Thromb Thrombolysis*. 2019;47:512-519.

29. Cockcroft DW and Gault MH. Prediction of creatinine clearance from serum creatinine. *Nephron*. 1976;16:31-41.

30. Levey AS, Bosch JP, Lewis JB, Greene T, Rogers N and Roth D. A more accurate method to estimate glomerular filtration rate from serum creatinine: a new prediction

equation. Modification of Diet in Renal Disease Study Group. *Ann Intern Med*.

1999;130:461-70.

31. Levey AS, Stevens LA, Schmid CH, Zhang YL, Castro AF, 3rd, Feldman HI, et al. A new equation to estimate glomerular filtration rate. *Ann Intern Med*. 2009;150:604-12.

32. Steffel J, Verhamme P, Potpara TS, Albaladejo P, Antz M, Desteghe L, et al. The 2018 European Heart Rhythm Association Practical Guide on the use of non-vitamin K antagonist oral anticoagulants in patients with atrial fibrillation. *Eur Heart J*. 2018;39:1330-1393.

33. Chiang CE, Okumura K, Zhang S, Chao TF, Siu CW, Wei Lim T, et al. 2017 consensus of the Asia Pacific Heart Rhythm Society on stroke prevention in atrial fibrillation. *J Arrhythm*. 2017;33:345-367.

34. Chiang CE, Wu TJ, Ueng KC, Chao TF, Chang KC, Wang CC, et al. 2016 Guidelines of the Taiwan Heart Rhythm Society and the Taiwan Society of Cardiology for the management of atrial fibrillation. *J Formos Med Assoc*. 2016;115:893-952.

35. Perez Cabeza AI, Chinchurreta Capote PA, Gonzalez Correa JA, Ruiz Mateas F, Rosas Cervantes G, Rivas Ruiz F, et al. Discrepancies between the use of MDRD-4 IDMS and CKD-EPI equations, instead of the Cockcroft-Gault equation, in the determination of the dosage of direct oral anticoagulants in patients with non-valvular atrial fibrillation. *Med Clin (Barc)*. 2018;150:85-91.

36. Malavasi VL, Pettorelli D, Fantecchi E, Zoccali C, Laronga G, Trenti T, et al. Variations in clinical management of non-vitamin K antagonist oral anticoagulants in patients with atrial fibrillation according to different equations for estimating renal function : Post hoc analysis of a prospective cohort. *Intern Emerg Med*. 2018;13:1059-1067.

37. Andrade JG, Hawkins NM, Fordyce CB, Deyell MW, Er L, Djurdjev O, et al. Variability in Non-Vitamin K Antagonist Oral Anticoagulants Dose Adjustment in Atrial

Fibrillation Patients With Renal Dysfunction: The Influence of Renal Function Estimation Formulae. *Can J Cardiol.* 2018;34:1010-1018.

38. Chan YH, Chao TF, Lee HF, Yeh YH, Chang SH, Kuo CT, et al. Different Renal Function Equations and Dosing of Direct Oral Anticoagulants in Atrial Fibrillation. *JACC Asia.* 2022;2:46-58.

39. Chan YH, Chao TF, Lee HF, Yeh YH, Yeh CH, Huang YC, et al. Impacts of Different Renal Function Estimation Formulas on Dosing of DOACs and Clinical Outcomes. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2020;76:1808-1810.

40. Xu R, Wu F, Lan J and Duan P. Real-world comparison of direct-acting oral anticoagulants and vitamin K antagonists in chronic kidney disease: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Expert Rev Hematol.* 2021;14:493-502.

41. Makani A, Saba S, Jain SK, Bhonsale A, Sharbaugh MS, Thoma F, et al. Safety and Efficacy of Direct Oral Anticoagulants Versus Warfarin in Patients With Chronic Kidney Disease and Atrial Fibrillation. *Am J Cardiol.* 2020;125:210-214.

42. Investigators RAS. Rivaroxaban-once daily, oral, direct factor Xa inhibition compared with vitamin K antagonism for prevention of stroke and Embolism Trial in Atrial Fibrillation: rationale and design of the ROCKET AF study. *Am Heart J.* 2010;159:340-347 e1.

43. Ezekowitz MD, Connolly S, Parekh A, Reilly PA, Varrone J, Wang S, et al. Rationale and design of RE-LY: randomized evaluation of long-term anticoagulant therapy, warfarin, compared with dabigatran. *Am Heart J.* 2009;157:805-10, 810 e1-2.

44. Ruff CT, Giugliano RP, Antman EM, Crugnale SE, Bocanegra T, Mercuri M, et al. Evaluation of the novel factor Xa inhibitor edoxaban compared with warfarin in patients with atrial fibrillation: design and rationale for the Effective aNticoaGulation with factor xA next

Generation in Atrial Fibrillation-Thrombolysis In Myocardial Infarction study 48 (ENGAGE AF-TIMI 48). *Am Heart J.* 2010;160:635-41.

45. Lopes RD, Alexander JH, Al-Khatib SM, Ansell J, Diaz R, Easton JD, et al. Apixaban for reduction in stroke and other Thromboembolic events in atrial fibrillation (ARISTOTLE) trial: design and rationale. *Am Heart J.* 2010;159:331-9.

46. Ravera M, Bussalino E, Fusaro M, Di Lullo L, Aucella F and Paoletti E. Systematic DOACs oral anticoagulation in patients with atrial fibrillation and chronic kidney disease: the nephrologist's perspective. *J Nephrol.* 2020;33:483-495.

Table 1. Baseline characteristic of all AF patients

	All (n=39,217)
Age (years), mean (SD)	71.09 (12.76)
Age\geq75 years, n (%)	10545 (26.9)
Age 65-74 years, n (%)	17634 (45.0)
Sex (male), n (%)	22374 (57.1)
Body weight, kg	63.15 (13.76)
CHA₂DS₂-VASc score, mean (SD)	2.58 (1.65)
HAS-BLED score, mean (SD)	1.94 (1.33)
Comorbidities, n (%)	
Hypertension	18755 (47.8)
Diabetes mellitus	9918 (25.3)
Heart failure	1340 (3.4)
Prior stroke/TIA	2592 (6.6)
Vascular diseases	2953 (7.5)
COPD	9082 (23.2)
Hyperlipidemia	9396 (24.0)
Serum Creatinine level (mg/dL), mean (SD)	1.62 (1.92)
Serum Creatinine level (mg/dL), median (IQR)	1.03 (0.80 – 1.45)
eGFR by CG equation (mL/min)	56.75 (34.68)
eGFR by MDRD equation (mL/min)	69.75 (39.94)
eGFR by CKD-EPI equation (mL/min)	62.12 (29.36)
Stroke prevention strategy, n (%)	
Non-OACs	26426 (67.4)
Warfarin	6381 (16.3)
NOACs	6410 (16.3)

AF = atrial fibrillation; COPD = chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; eGFR = estimated glomerular filtration rate; IQR = interquartile range; NOACs = non-vitamin K antagonist oral anticoagulant; SD = standard deviation; TIA = transient ischemic attack

Figure Legends

Figure 1 The distribution of renal function stages using different equations. These pie charts illustrated the distribution of renal function stages using the CG, MDRD, and CKD-EPI equations. More patients were classified as stage 1 and 2 CKD using the MDRD and CKD-EPI equations than the CG equation, which highlighted the discrepancy of renal function classification between different equations.

Figure 2 Cumulative incidence of clinical events in patients with eGFR-MDRD and eGFR-CKD-EPI ≥ 60 mL/min. The Kaplan-Meier method disclosed that even in patients with eGFR above 60 mL/min using the MDRD or CKD-EPI method, the CG equation with a cut-off value of 60 mL/min still differentiated patients into different prognosis. Those with eGFR-CG < 60 mL/min was associated with worse outcome compared to patients with eGFR-CG ≥ 60 mL/min.

aHR = adjusted hazard ratio; eGFR = estimated glomerular filtration rate


Figure 3 Risk of clinical events across all stages of CKD. Compared to no OAC, OAC use was associated with better outcomes in stage 1-4 CKD whereas NOACs exhibited more risk reduction than warfarin compared to no OAC. In stage 5 CKD, there was no differences between OAC use or not.

aHR = adjusted hazard ratio; CI = confidence interval; CKD = chronic kidney disease; NOACs = non-vitamin K antagonist oral anticoagulants; OACs = oral anticoagulants


Figure 4 Subgroup analysis comparing warfarin with NOACs in patients receiving oral anticoagulants. Compared to warfarin, NOAC was associated with significantly lower risk of clinical events in stage 2-3 CKD while there was a marginal benefit toward NOAC use in

stage 4 CKD. In patients with stage 1 and 5 CKD, however, there was no significant differences between warfarin and NOACs. aHR = adjusted hazard ratio; CI = confidence interval; CKD = chronic kidney disease; NOACs = non-vitamin K antagonist oral anticoagulants


CG




MDRD



CKD-EPI




eGFR-MDRD ≥ 60 mL/min



Number at risk

eGFR-CG < 60	15,323	8,219	5,047	2,871	1,425	623	272	62	6
eGFR-CG ≥ 60	8,175	3,366	1,792	913	391	190	65	9	1

eGFR-CKD-EPI ≥ 60 mL/min



Number at risk

eGFR-CG < 60	15,232	8,176	5,024	2,857	1,419	622	273	62	6
eGFR-CG ≥ 60	6,649	2,758	1,467	760	338	165	59	8	1

