



DDW 2016: Controversies in GIB

Neena S. Abraham MD, MSc (EPID), FASGE, FACG, AGAF

Professor of Medicine, Mayo Clinic

Arizona Site Director, Mayo Clinic Robert D. and Patricia E. Kern Center for the Science of Health Care Delivery

Division of Gastroenterology and Hepatology, Mayo Clinic, Scottsdale, AZ

Division of Health Care Policy & Research, Department of Health Sciences Research, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN

Hot Topics

- Acute Management Strategies
 - Hemospray
 - Early vs. Late resumption of ASA
 - Platelet transfusion
- DOACs
 - Head to head risk study
 - Idarucizumab interim analysis
 - GPA and edoxaban bleeding rates
- LVADs
 - Target INR post bleed

Hemospray vs. Combined Conventional Technique for Bleeding PUD (Kwok et al)

- Adsorbs water and clotting factors to create a mechanical tamponnade
- Randomized, parallel group trial of N=20 (Forrest 1A, 1B, 2A and 2B)
 - Injection + heater probe vs. hemospray
 - Second-look EGD to assess re-bleed
- Outcomes
 - Immediate hemostasis 19/20
 - Re-bleed (2nd look EGD) 33% hemospray vs. 10% conventional
- **Take-Home Message**
 - Not ready for prime time
 - Washes off in 12 hours
 - Use as an adjunct only or temporizing measure until definitive therapy occurs (within 12 hours)
 - Bad choice for patient with a high risk stigmata (1A and 1B lesions)

Early and Late Resumption of ASA after endoscopic therapy for bleeding peptic ulcers (Lin et al)

- Hong Kong group: RCT post ulcer bleed ASA vs. place– NNH 13 for mortality
- Cohort study to assess risk associated with early (w/in 7 day) vs. late (>7 days) resumption of ASA following bleeding peptic ulcer treatment
- Outcomes: re-bleeding, CV events, 30 day mortality
- Results: n=327 patients (105 early; 156 late)
 - No difference in re-bleed rate
 - Higher risk of CVA in late group (4.5% vs. 1.9%)
 - 65 patients no resumption of ASA- higher mortality (26% vs. 4%)

MUST resume ASA within 7 days of endoscopy!

Platelet transfusion for acute GIB in patients taking antiplatelet agent: is there benefit or harm? (Zakko et al).

- GIB patients on clopidogrel, aspirin at Yale (2009-2014)
- Case-control study; 1:1 matching (age,sex, GIB location)
- Outcomes: recurrent GIB, major adverse CV events, mortality, RBC transfusion and LOS
- Results: 204 cases/204 controls
 - Cases had more severe GIB (hemodynamics) and more DAPT use (30% vs. 24%)
 - Controls – higher pre-GIB PPI use (30% vs. 21%)
 - Platelet transfusion without thrombocytopenia did NOT reduce rebleeding or need for RBC transfusion
 - Platelet transfusion associated with increased mortality (OR 5.57; 1.52-27.1) after adjustment for stents, hemodynamics initial Hg <7 mg/dL, initial ICU admission status
- **Take-Home Message: No role unless thrombocytopenia (<50,000)**
- CardioGI Pearl: only with prasugrel and ticagrelor
 - reversible P2Y12 agent ticagrelor and PAR-1 inhibitor vorapaxar will re-distribute on transfused platelets, so not helpful.

Gastrointestinal Safety of Direct Oral Anticoagulants: A Head-to-Head Study (Abraham)

- No prior head-to-head DOAC safety trials. Indirect comparisons are of limited clinical utility for risk-prediction. Ascertain which DOAC has the most favorable GI safety profile.
- Methods:
 - Propensity-matched cohort study
 - New users of DOACs
 - Atrial fibrillation patients
 - Optum Labs Data Warehouse: large administrative data source which includes >120 million geographically diverse, non-elderly and elderly individuals, privately insured or enrolled in Medicare Advantage.
 - Cox proportional Hazards Models, incidence rates, absolute risk reduction and age-stratified analysis
- Outcomes of interest:
 - Stroke/SE, major bleeding, GIB

- N= 43,303
 - Apixaban 6,576
 - Dabigatran 17,426
 - Rivaroxaban 19,301
- 1:1 Propensity Matched* Sub-cohorts
 - API vs. DABI (N=13,084)
 - API vs. RIVA (N= 13,130)
 - RIVA vs. DABI (N=31,574)

**PS Model: baseline characteristics, prior warfarin use, socio-demographic factors*

Results: Comparative Risks

	RIVA vs. DABI		ARR	API vs. DABI		ARR	API vs. RIVA		ARR
Stroke or Emboli	1.4	1.4	0.02 (0.21, 0.25)	1.4	1.5	-0.13 (0.57, 0.30)	1.4	1.3	0.10 (0.37, 0.57)
Major Bleeding	3.8	2.6	1.20 (0.67, 1.72)	2.1	3.3	-1.20** (-1.99, -0.41)	2.0	4.6	-2.54*** (-3.47, -1.61)
GIB	2.7	2.0	0.72 (0.27, 1.17)	1.4	2.7	-1.35*** (-2.03,- 0.67)	1.3	3.5	-2.20*** (-3.00, -1.40)

*p<0.05, **p<0.01, ***p<0.001

Conclusions

- DOACs similar with regard to cardiac benefit
- Apixaban has most favorable bleeding profile
 - 35% safer than DABI
 - 2.2 X safer than RIVA
- DABI was 28% safer (GIB) and 20% safer (major bleed) than RIVA
- All DOACs: GIB risk highest in patients ≥ 75 yrs
 - >2X higher risk with each comparison
 - API appears safer in the very elderly

Idarucizumab for Emergent Reversal of Dabigatran Anticoagulation during Gastrointestinal Hemorrhage: Interim Results of the Reverse-AD study (Aisenberg)

- Ongoing Reverse-AD Study enrollees presenting with severe GIB
- Interim analysis cohort (n=123)
- Results:
 - 66 patients had severe bleeding; 27 GIB
 - Mean age GIB 77.5 yrs (60-93); 56% male; renal impairment in 22/23 of those with CrCl measured
 - Afib indication for use in 93%; 74% took last dose <24 hours prior to presentation
 - 10/27 had UGIB (37%); 8/27 (30%) LGIB
 - 24/27 received >1 unit PRBC (mean 4.5 units); 9 received FFP and platelets transfused in 1 patient
 - Time to cessation of GIB after IDA use was 4.5 hours (0-645 hours)
 - Serum assays to confirm above-therapy levels not shown
 - 20/27 patients had resumption of antithrombotic post bleed (74%)

Concurrent GPA and Edoxaban-GIB Rates: Engage-AF TIMI 48 trial (Aisenberg)

- Engage-AF TIMI 48 trial: high vs. low dose EDX (60 mg vs. 30 mg/day) vs. warfarin for stroke prevention n=21,105
 - Major GIB (MGIB) captured as a safety outcome
- Post-Hoc analysis of patients with MGIB
 - 579 patients with MGIB (2.75%)
 - 1,691 patients (8%) daily PPI; 91/579 had MGIB (15.7% of GIB)
 - High-EDX > warfarin > low-EDX (Dose dependent MGIB)
 - PPI use increased MGIB bleed rates in all arms
 - LGIB increased in all arms
 - UGIB increased in high and low dose EDX
 - Take-home message: Confounding by indication

The Role of Goal INR and Re-Bleeding for the LVAD patient (Storm)

- Retrospective review of LVAD bleeding experience 2012-2014 (Brigham and Women's)
- Aim to identify a threshold INR level which increased GIB re-bleed risk
- 24 patients with LVADs had GIB
 - 64 admissions (2.7 times/patient)
 - 77 GI procedures ; source found in 25%; AVM most common
 - **INR >2.5 had earlier re-bleed ($p=0.03$); HR 2.03 (1.04, 4.14)**
 - Concomitant ASA and AP increased re-bleed risk ($p=0.09$); NS on MVA
 - Endoscopic therapy did not reduce re-bleed; low risk of finding a bleeding lesion
- **Take Home Message: Goal INR should be 2.5 or less to decrease re-bleed**
 - My approach:
 - 1st decrease ASA to 81 mg or, no AP if possible
 - 2nd decrease INR to 2.0-2.5

Take Home Messages from DDW 16 Abstracts

- Hemospray should not be your “go-to method”
 - High-risk of rebleed when compared to conventional therapy
- Must resume cardiac ASA within 7 days following urgent GIB management
 - Increased death without it! No increased re-bleed
 - Higher CVA risk with delay
- Platelet transfusion increases mortality unless patient is thrombocytopenic
- Time to cessation of GIB after IDA use was 4.5 hours
 - Assays to confirm above-therapy levels not shown; ?C/E
- ALL DOACs increase risk of GIB in patients ≥ 75 yr
 - Apixaban has the safest GIB profile
- LVAD re-bleed prevention— lower goal INR to 2.5