

## Reply

*to comment on "Indirect comparisons of new oral anticoagulant drugs for efficacy and safety when used for stroke prevention in atrial fibrillation" AND "Lack of stroke subtype information may hinder indirect comparison between the ROCKET-AF and other trials of new oral anticoagulants"*

Lip, Gregory Y H; Larsen, Torben Bjerregaard; Skjøth, Flemming; Rasmussen, Lars Hvilsted

*Published in:*  
Journal of the American College of Cardiology

*DOI (link to publication from Publisher):*  
[10.1016/j.jacc.2012.10.034](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2012.10.034)

*Publication date:*  
2013

*Document Version*  
Publisher's PDF, also known as Version of record

[Link to publication from Aalborg University](#)

### *Citation for published version (APA):*

Lip, G. Y. H., Larsen, T. B., Skjøth, F., & Rasmussen, L. H. (2013). Reply: to comment on "Indirect comparisons of new oral anticoagulant drugs for efficacy and safety when used for stroke prevention in atrial fibrillation" AND "Lack of stroke subtype information may hinder indirect comparison between the ROCKET-AF and other trials of new oral anticoagulants". *Journal of the American College of Cardiology*, 61(5), 596.  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2012.10.034>

### General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal -

**Take down policy**

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us at [vbn@aub.aau.dk](mailto:vbn@aub.aau.dk) providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

Downloaded from [vbn.aau.dk](http://vbn.aau.dk) on: August 23, 2025

\*Affiliated Hospital of Medical College  
Qingdao University  
Neurology  
No. 16 Jiangsu Road  
Qingdao, Shandong 266003  
China  
E-mail: drlhf@163.com

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2012.08.1028>

## REFERENCES

1. Lip GY, Larsen TB, Skjøth F, Rasmussen LH. Indirect comparisons of new oral anticoagulant drugs for efficacy and safety when used for stroke prevention in atrial fibrillation. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2012;60:738–46.
2. Mantha S, Ansell J. An indirect comparison of dabigatran, rivaroxaban and apixaban for atrial fibrillation. *Thromb Haemost* 2012;108:476–84.
3. Schneeweiss S, Gagne JJ, Patrick AR, Choudhry NK, Avorn J. Comparative efficacy and safety of new oral anticoagulants in patients with atrial fibrillation. *Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes* 2012;5:480–6.
4. Rothwell PM, Algra A, Amarenco P. Medical treatment in acute and long-term secondary prevention after transient ischaemic attack and ischaemic stroke. *Lancet* 2011;377:1681–92.
5. Kirshner HS. Differentiating ischemic stroke subtypes: risk factors and secondary prevention. *J Neurol Sci* 2009;279:1–8.
6. Hankey GJ, Patel MR, Stevens SR, et al., for the ROCKET-AF Steering Committee Investigators. Rivaroxaban compared with warfarin in patients with atrial fibrillation and previous stroke or transient ischaemic attack: a subgroup analysis of ROCKET AF. *Lancet Neurol* 2012;11:315–22.

## Reply

We thank Drs. Li and Zhao for their interest in our paper (1). They are correct that indirect comparisons cannot address all the heterogeneity between trials, as well as the underlying pathogenic mechanisms that they allude to. However, it is not very likely that there would be major differences in stroke subtypes among the 3 studies. Also, the inclusion and exclusion criteria are broadly the same in the 3 trials, except for the 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) trial, wherein more patients may possibly have a different stroke type than thromboembolism-related, because of the higher-risk profile.

The only way to definitively address this issue would be to perform a large head-to-head randomized trial, and with the current agents, this would need to be a 4-arm noninferiority randomized trial of dabigatran (2 doses), apixaban, and rivaroxaban, which would probably require a massive number of atrial fibrillation patients (probably >50,000) and require >5 years of follow-up.

In the absence of head-to-head comparisons, indirect comparisons allow the opportunity to have some insight into how these novel anticoagulants would perform against each other for the main efficacy and safety endpoints (2). To that end, our analysis (1) concludes that there are no profound differences in the major efficacy and safety endpoints between the novel oral anticoagulants. This is consistent with other recent papers on the same topic (3,4), although 1 analysis by Kansal et al. (5) did highlight some differences with fewer incidents of ischaemic stroke and intracranial hemorrhage, as well as cost effectiveness, when dabigatran was compared against rivaroxaban.

\*Gregory Y. H. Lip, MD  
Torben Bjerregaard Larsen, MD, PhD  
Flemming Skjøth, PhD  
Lars Hvilsted Rasmussen, MD, PhD

\*City Hospital NHS Trust/University Department of Medicine  
City Hospital  
Dudley Road  
Birmingham B18 7QH  
United Kingdom  
E-mail: g.y.h.lip@bham.ac.uk

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2012.10.034>

Please note: Dr. Lip has served as a consultant for Bayer, Astellas, Merck, AstraZeneca, Sanofi, BMS/Pfizer, and Boehringer Ingelheim and has served on the Speakers' Bureau for Bayer, BMS/Pfizer, Boehringer Ingelheim, and Sanofi. Dr. Larsen and Dr. Rasmussen have served on the Speakers' Bureau for BMS/Pfizer and Boehringer Ingelheim. Dr. Skjøth has reported that he has no relationships relevant to the contents of this paper to disclose.

## REFERENCES

1. Lip GY, Larsen TB, Skjøth F, Rasmussen LH. Indirect comparisons of new oral anticoagulant drugs for efficacy and safety when used for stroke prevention in atrial fibrillation. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2012;60:738–46.
2. Skjøth F, Larsen TB, Rasmussen LH. Indirect comparison studies—are they useful? Insights from the novel oral anticoagulants for stroke prevention in atrial fibrillation. *Thromb Haemost* 2012;108:405–6.
3. Mantha S, Ansell J. An indirect comparison of dabigatran, rivaroxaban and apixaban for atrial fibrillation. *Thromb Haemost* 2012;108:476–84.
4. Harenberg J, Marx S, Diener HC, et al. Comparison of efficacy and safety of dabigatran, rivaroxaban and apixaban in patients with atrial fibrillation using network meta-analysis. *Int Angiol* 2012;31:33–9.
5. Kansal AR, Sharma M, Bradley-Kennedy C, et al. Dabigatran versus rivaroxaban for the prevention of stroke and systemic embolism in atrial fibrillation in Canada: comparative efficacy and cost-effectiveness. *Thromb Haemost* 2012;108:672–82.

## Not All Fat Is Equal

We read with interest the paper by Gupta et al. (1). Adipose tissue is a major source of hormones and cytokines implicated in systemic inflammatory reactions, metabolic abnormalities, hypertension, and insulin resistance (2,3). The investigators use body mass index (BMI) to classify adiposity status. However, it is useful to re-evaluate how body fat is determined. Numerous studies have produced evidence that BMI has limited ability to accurately predict body composition.

So how fat is fat? BMI is the most commonly used measure to determine adiposity status in everyday clinical practice. It is a safe, convenient, and popular method. However, the index is an indirect surrogate of body fat, which is not able to distinguish lean body mass from fat mass. There is growing body of evidence that BMI may misclassify weight status in many patients (4–6). It tends to overestimate normal weight and underestimate overweight or obesity.

Dual-energy X-ray (DXA) absorptiometry is considered by many to be a gold standard for assessing body composition (direct measurement of total body fat and lean soft tissue mass). It provides a more accurate indication of body fat percentage, which is one of the fundamental links between obesity and its associated disease risk.