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Preamble (UPDATED)

It is important that the medical profession play a significant role in critically evaluating the use of diagnostic procedures and therapies as they are introduced and tested in the detection, management, or prevention of disease states. Rigorous and expert analysis of the available data documenting absolute and relative benefits and risks of those procedures and therapies can produce helpful guidelines that improve the effectiveness of care, optimize patient outcomes, and favorably affect the overall cost of care by focusing resources on the most effective strategies.

The American College of Cardiology Foundation (ACCF) and the American Heart Association (AHA) have jointly engaged in the production of such guidelines in the area of cardiovascular disease since 1980. The ACCF/AHA Task Force on Practice Guidelines (Task Force), whose charge is to develop, update, or revise practice guidelines for important cardiovascular diseases and procedures, directs this effort. Writing committees are charged with the task of performing an assessment of the evidence and acting as an independent group of authors to develop, update, or revise written recommendations for clinical practice.

Experts in the subject under consideration have been selected from both organizations to examine subject-specific data and write guidelines. The process includes additional representatives from other medical practitioner and specialty groups when appropriate. Writing committees are specifically charged to perform a literature review, weigh the strength of evidence for or against a particular treatment or procedure, and include estimates of expected health outcomes where data exist. Patient-specific modifiers and comorbidities and issues of patient preference that may influence the choice of particular tests or therapies are considered, as well as frequency of follow-up and cost-effectiveness. When available, information from studies on cost will be considered; however, review of data on efficacy and clinical outcomes will constitute the primary basis for preparing recommendations in these guidelines.

The guidelines will be reviewed annually by the Task Force and will be considered current unless they are updated, revised, or sunsetted and withdrawn from distribution. Keeping pace with the stream of new data and evolving evidence on which guideline recommendations are based is an ongoing challenge to timely development of clinical practice guidelines. In an effort to respond promptly to new evidence, the Task Force has created a “focused update” process to revise the existing guideline recommendations that are affected by evolving data or opinion. New evidence is reviewed in an ongoing fashion to more efficiently respond to important science and treatment trends that could have a major impact on patient outcomes and quality of care.

For the 2012 focused update, the standing guideline writing committee along with the parent Task Force identified trials and other key data through October 2011 that may impact guideline recommendations, specifically in response to the approval of new oral antplatelets, and to provide guidance on how to incorporate these agents into daily practice (Section 1.1, “Methodology and Evidence”). Now that multiple agents are available, a comparison of their use in various
settings within clinical practice is provided. This iteration replaces the sections in the 2007 ACC/AHA Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Unstable Angina/Non–ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction that were updated by the 2011 ACCF/AHA Focused Update of the Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Unstable Angina/Non–ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction. The focused update is not intended to be based on a complete literature review from the date of the previous guideline publication but rather to include pivotal new evidence that may affect changes to current recommendations. See the 2012 focused update for the complete preamble and evidence review period.

In analyzing the data and developing recommendations and supporting text, the writing group uses evidence-based methodologies developed by the Task Force. The Class of Recommendation (COR) is an estimate of the size of the treatment effect, with consideration given to risks versus benefits, as well as evidence and/or agreement that a given treatment or procedure is or is not useful/effective and in some situations may cause harm. The Level of Evidence (LOE) is an estimate of the certainty or precision of the treatment effect. The writing group reviews and ranks evidence supporting each recommendation, with the weight of evidence ranked as LOE A, B, or C, according to specific definitions that are included in Table 1. Studies are identified as observational, retrospective, prospective, or randomized, as appropriate. For certain conditions for which inadequate data are available, recommendations are based on expert consensus and clinical experience.

### Table 1. Applying Classification of Recommendations and Level of Evidence

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LEVEL A</th>
<th>Recommendation that procedure or treatment is useful/effective</th>
<th>Sufficient evidence from multiple randomized trials or meta-analyses</th>
<th>Recommendation in favor of treatment or procedure being useful/effective</th>
<th>Some conflicting evidence from multiple randomized trials or meta-analyses</th>
<th>Recommendation's usefulness/efficacy less well established</th>
<th>Greater conflicting evidence from multiple randomized trials or meta-analyses</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL B</td>
<td>Recommendation that procedure or treatment is useful/effective</td>
<td>Evidence from single randomized trial or nonrandomized studies</td>
<td>Recommendation in favor of treatment or procedure being useful/effective</td>
<td>Some conflicting evidence from single randomized trial or nonrandomized studies</td>
<td>Recommendation's usefulness/efficacy less well established</td>
<td>Greater conflicting evidence from single randomized trial or nonrandomized studies</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEVEL C</td>
<td>Recommendation that procedure or treatment is useful/effective</td>
<td>Only expert opinion, case studies, or standard of care</td>
<td>Recommendation in favor of treatment or procedure being useful/effective</td>
<td>Only diverging expert opinion, case studies, or standard of care</td>
<td>Recommendation's usefulness/efficacy less well established</td>
<td>Only diverging expert opinion, case studies, or standard of care</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A recommendation with Level of Evidence B or C does not imply that the recommendation is weak. Many important clinical questions addressed in the guidelines do not lend themselves to clinical trials. Although randomized trials are unavailable, there may be a very clear clinical consensus that a particular test or therapy is useful or effective.

*Data available from clinical trials or registries about the usefulness/efficacy in different subpopulations, such as sex, age, history of diabetes, history of prior myocardial infarction, history of heart failure, and prior aspirin use.

†For comparative effectiveness recommendations (Class I and IIa; Level of Evidence A and B only), studies that support the use of comparator verbs should involve direct comparisons of the treatments or strategies being evaluated.
experience and are ranked as LOE C. When recommendations at LOE C are supported by historical clinical data, appropriate references (including clinical reviews) are cited if available. For issues for which sparse data are available, a survey of current practice among the clinicians on the writing group is the basis for LOE C recommendations, and no references are cited. The schema for COR and LOE is summarized in Table 1, which also provides suggested phrases for writing recommendations within each COR. A new addition to this methodology for the 2012 focused update is separation of the Class III recommendations to delineate whether the recommendation is determined to be of “no benefit” or is associated with “harm” to the patient. In addition, in view of the increasing number of comparative effectiveness studies, comparator verbs and suggested phrases for writing recommendations for the comparative effectiveness of one treatment or strategy versus another have been added for COR I and IIa, LOE A or B only.

In view of the advances in medical therapy across the spectrum of cardiovascular diseases, the Task Force has designated the term guideline-directed medical therapy (GDMT) to represent optimal medical therapy as defined by ACCF/AHA guideline (primarily Class I)–recommended therapies. This new term, GDMT, is incorporated into the 2012 focused update and will be used throughout all future guidelines.

Because the ACCF/AHA practice guidelines address patient populations (and healthcare providers) residing in North America, drugs that are not currently available in North America are discussed in the text without a specific COR. For studies performed in large numbers of subjects outside North America, each writing group reviews the potential impact of different practice patterns and patient populations on the treatment effect and relevance to the ACCF/AHA target population to determine whether the findings should inform a specific recommendation.

The ACCF/AHA practice guidelines are intended to assist healthcare providers in clinical decision making by describing a range of generally acceptable approaches to the diagnosis, management, and prevention of specific diseases or conditions. The guidelines attempt to define practices that meet the needs of most patients in most circumstances. The ultimate judgment about care of a particular patient must be made by the healthcare provider and patient in light of all the circumstances presented by that patient. As a result, situations may arise in which deviations from these guidelines may be appropriate. Clinical decision making should consider the quality and availability of expertise in the area where care is provided. When these guidelines are used as the basis for regulatory or payer decisions, the goal should be improvement in quality of care. The Task Force recognizes that situations arise in which additional data are needed to inform patient care more effectively; these areas will be identified within each respective guideline when appropriate.

Prescribed courses of treatment in accordance with these recommendations are effective only if they are followed. Because lack of patient understanding and adherence may adversely affect outcomes, physicians and other healthcare providers should make every effort to engage the patient’s active participation in prescribed medical regimens and lifestyles. In addition, patients should be informed of the risks, benefits, and alternatives to a particular treatment and should be involved in shared decision making whenever feasible, particularly for COR IIa and IIb, for which the benefit-to-risk ratio may be lower.

The Task Force makes every effort to avoid actual, potential, or perceived conflicts of interest that may arise as a result of industry relationships or personal interests among the members of the writing group. All writing group members and peer reviewers of the guideline are required to disclose all current healthcare–related relationships, including those existing 12 months before initiation of the writing effort.

For the 2007 guidelines, all members of the writing committee, as well as peer reviewers of the document, were asked to provide disclosure statements of all such relationships that may be perceived as real or potential conflicts of interest. Writing committee members are also strongly encouraged to declare a previous relationship with industry that may be perceived as relevant to guideline development.

In December 2009, the ACCF and AHA implemented a new policy for relationships with industry and other entities (RWI) that requires the writing group chair plus a minimum of 50% of the writing group to have no relevant RWI (Appendix 4 includes the ACCF/AHA definition of relevance). These statements are reviewed by the Task Force and all members during each conference call and/or meeting of the writing group and are updated as changes occur. All guideline recommendations require a confidential vote by the writing group and must be approved by a consensus of the voting members. Members are not permitted to draft or vote on any text or recommendations pertaining to their RWI. The 2012 members who recused themselves from voting are indicated in the list of writing group members, and specific section recusals are noted in Appendix 4. 2007 and 2012 authors’ and peer reviewers’ RWI pertinent to this guideline are disclosed in Appendixes 1, 2, 4, and 5, respectively. Additionally, to ensure complete transparency, writing group members’ comprehensive disclosure information including RWI not pertinent to this document is available as an online supplement. Comprehensive disclosure information for the Task Force is also available online at www.cardiosource.org/ACC/About-ACC/Leadership/Guidelines-and-Documents-Task-Forces.aspx. The work of the 2012 writing group is supported exclusively by the ACCF, and AHA, without commercial support. Writing group members volunteered their time for this activity.

In April 2011, the Institute of Medicine released 2 reports: Finding What Works in Health Care: Standards for Systematic Reviews and Clinical Practice Guidelines We Can Trust. It is noteworthy that the ACCF/AHA practice guidelines were cited as being compliant with many of the standards that were proposed. A thorough review of these reports and our current methodology is under way, with further enhancements anticipated.

The 2007 executive summary and recommendations are published in the August 7, 2007, issue of the Journal of the American College of Cardiology and August 7, 2007, issue of Circulation. The full-text guidelines are e-published in the same issue of
the journals noted above, as well as posted on the ACC (http://www.cardiosource.org) and AHA (my.americanheart.org) Web sites. Guidelines are official policy of both the ACCF and AHA.

The current document is a re-publication of the “ACCF/AHA 2007 Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Unstable Angina/Non–ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction,” revised to incorporate updated recommendations and text from the 2012 Focused Update. For easy reference, this online-only version denotes sections that have been updated. The sections that have not been updated could contain text or references that are not current, as these sections have not been modified.

Jeffrey L. Anderson, MD, FACC, FAHA
Chair, ACCF/AHA Task Force on Practice Guidelines

1. Introduction (UPDATED)

1.1. Organization of Committee and Evidence Review (UPDATED)

The ACC/AHA Task Force on Practice Guidelines was formed to make recommendations regarding the diagnosis and treatment of patients with known or suspected cardiovascular disease (CVD). Coronary artery disease (CAD) is the leading cause of death in the United States. Unstable angina (UA) and the closely related condition of non–ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction (NSTEMI) are very common manifestations of this disease.

The 2007 guideline committee members reviewed and compiled published reports through a series of computerized literature searches of the English-language literature since 2002 and a final manual search of selected articles. Details of the specific searches conducted for particular sections are provided when appropriate. Detailed evidence tables were developed whenever necessary with the specific criteria outlined in the individual sections. The recommendations made were based primarily on these published data. The weight of the evidence was ranked highest (A) to lowest (C). The final recommendations for indications for a diagnostic procedure, a particular therapy, or an intervention in patients with UA/NSTEMI summarize both clinical evidence and expert opinion.

The 2007 committee consisted of acknowledged experts in general internal medicine representing the American College of Physicians (ACP), family medicine from the American Academy of Family Physicians (AAFP), emergency medicine from the American College of Emergency Physicians (ACEP), thoracic surgery from the Society of Thoracic Surgeons (STS), interventional cardiology from the Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions (SCAI), and general and critical care cardiology, as well as individuals with recognized expertise in more specialized areas, including noninvasive testing, preventive cardiology, coronary intervention, and cardiovascular surgery. Both the academic and private practice sectors were represented.


For the 2012 focused update, members of the 2011 Unstable Angina/Non–ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction (UA/NSTEMI) focused update writing group were invited and all agreed to participate (referred to as the 2012 focused update writing group). Members were required to disclose all RWI relevant to the data under consideration. The 2012 writing group included representatives from the ACCF, AHA, American Academy of Family Physicians, American College of Emergency Physicians, American College of Physicians, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, and Society of Thoracic Surgeons.

For the 2012 focused update, late-breaking clinical trials presented at the 2008, 2009, and 2010 annual scientific meetings of the ACC, AHA, and European Society of Cardiology, as well as selected other data through October 2011, were reviewed by the standing guideline writing committee along with the parent Task Force to identify those trials and other key data that may impact guideline recommendations. On the basis of the criteria/considerations noted above, and the approval of new oral antplatelets, the 2012 focused update was initiated to provide guidance on how to incorporate these agents into daily practice. Now that multiple agents are available, a comparison is provided on their use in various settings within clinical practice.

1.2. Document Review and Approval (UPDATED)

The 2007 document was reviewed by 2 outside reviewers nominated by each of the ACC and AHA and by 49 peer reviewers.

The 2012 focused update was reviewed by 2 official reviewers each nominated by the ACCF and the AHA, as well as 1 or 2 reviewers each from the American College of Emergency Physicians, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, and Society of Thoracic Surgeons, and 29 individual content reviewers, including members of the ACCF Interventional Scientific Council. The information on reviewers’ RWI was distributed to the writing group and is published in this document (Appendix 5).

This document was approved for publication by the governing bodies of the ACCF and the AHA and endorsed by the American College of Emergency Physicians, Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions, and Society of Thoracic Surgeons.

1.3. Purpose of These Guidelines

These guidelines address the diagnosis and management of patients with UA and the closely related condition of NSTEMI. These life-threatening disorders are a major cause of emergency medical care and hospitalization in the United States. In 2004, the National Center for Health Statistics reported 1,565,000 hospitalizations for primary or secondary diagnosis of an acute coronary syndrome (ACS), 669,000 for UA and 896,000 for myocardial infarction (MI). The average age of a person having a first heart attack is 65.8 years for men and 70.4 years for women, and 43% of ACS
patients of all ages are women. In 2003, there were 4,497,000 visits to US emergency departments (EDs) for primary diagnosis of CVD.\textsuperscript{12} The prevalence of this presentation of CVD ensures that many health care providers who are not cardiovascular specialists will encounter patients with UA/NSTEMI in the course of the treatment of other diseases, especially in outpatient and ED settings. These guidelines are intended to assist both cardiovascular specialists and nonspecialists in the proper evaluation and management of patients with an acute onset of symptoms suggestive of these conditions. These clinical practice guidelines also provide recommendations and supporting evidence for the continued management of patients with these conditions in both inpatient and outpatient settings. The diagnostic and therapeutic strategies that are recommended are supported by the best available evidence and expert opinion. The application of these principles with carefully reasoned clinical judgment reduces but does not eliminate the risk of cardiac damage and death in patients who present with symptoms suggestive of UA/NSTEMI. Appendix 3 lists the abbreviations found in this document.

### 1.4. Overview of the Acute Coronary Syndromes

#### 1.4.1. Definition of Terms

Unstable angina/NSTEMI constitutes a clinical syndrome subset of the ACS that is usually, but not always, caused by atherosclerotic CAD and is associated with an increased risk of cardiac death and subsequent MI. In the spectrum of ACS, UA/NSTEMI is defined by electrocardiographic (ECG) ST-segment depression or prominent T-wave inversion and/or positive biomarkers of necrosis (eg, troponin) in the absence of ST-segment elevation and in an appropriate clinical setting (chest discomfort or anginal equivalent) (Table 2, Figure 1). The results of angiographic and angioscopic studies suggest that UA/NSTEMI often results from the disruption or erosion of an atherosclerotic plaque and a subsequent cascade of pathological processes that decrease coronary blood flow. Most patients who die during UA/NSTEMI do so because

| Table 2. Guidelines for the Identification of ACS Patients by ED Registration Clerks or Triage Nurses |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Registration/clerical staff</th>
<th>Patients with the following chief complaints require immediate assessment by the triage nurse and should be referred for further evaluation:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chest pain, pressure, tightness, or heaviness; pain that radiates to neck, jaw, shoulders, back, or 1 or both arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Indigestion or “heartburn”; nausea and/or vomiting associated with chest discomfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Persistent shortness of breath</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Weakness, dizziness, lightheadedness, loss of consciousness</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Triage nurse</th>
<th>Patients with the following symptoms and signs require immediate assessment by the triage nurse for the initiation of the ACS protocol:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Chest pain or severe epigastric pain, nontraumatic in origin, with components typical of myocardial ischemia or MI:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Central/substernal compression or crushing chest pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pressure, tightness, heaviness, cramping, burning, aching sensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Unexplained indigestion, belching, epigastric pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Radiating pain in neck, jaw, shoulders, back, or 1 or both arms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Associated dyspnea</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Associated nausea and/or vomiting</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Associated diaphoresis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>If these symptoms are present, obtain stat ECG.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Medical history</th>
<th>The triage nurse should take a brief, targeted, initial history with an assessment of current or past history of:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• CABG, PCI, CAD, angina on effort, or MI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• NTG use to relieve chest discomfort</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Risk factors, including smoking, hyperlipidemia, hypertension, diabetes mellitus, family history, and cocaine or methamphetamine use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Regular and recent medication use</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The brief history must not delay entry into the ACS protocol.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Special considerations</th>
<th>Women may present more frequently than men with atypical chest pain and symptoms.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Diabetic patients may have atypical presentations due to autonomic dysfunction.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Elderly patients may have atypical symptoms such as generalized weakness, stroke, syncope, or a change in mental status.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


ACS = acute coronary syndrome; CABG = coronary artery bypass graft surgery; CAD = coronary artery disease; ECG = electrocardiogram; ED = emergency department; MI = myocardial infarction; NTG = nitroglycerin; PCI = percutaneous coronary intervention.
Figure 1. Acute Coronary Syndromes. The top half of the figure illustrates the chronology of the interface between the patient and the clinician through the progression of plaque formation, onset, and complications of UA/NSTEMI, along with relevant management considerations at each stage. The longitudinal section of an artery depicts the “timeline” of atherogenesis from (1) a normal artery to (2) lesion initiation and accumulation of extracellular lipid in the intima, to (3) the evolution to the fibrofatty stage, to (4) lesion progression with procoagulant expression and weakening of the fibrous cap. An acute coronary syndrome (ACS) develops when the vulnerable or high-risk plaque undergoes disruption of the fibrous cap (5); disruption of the plaque is the stimulus for thrombogenesis. Thrombus resorption may be followed by collagen accumulation and smooth muscle cell growth (6). After disruption of a vulnerable or high-risk plaque, patients experience ischemic discomfort that results from a reduction of flow through the affected epicardial coronary artery. The flow reduction may be caused by a completely occlusive thrombus (bottom half, right side) or subtotally occlusive thrombus (bottom half, left side). Patients with ischemic discomfort may present with or without ST-segment elevation on the ECG. Among patients with ST-segment elevation, most (thick white arrow in bottom panel) ultimately develop a Q-wave MI (QwMI), although a few (thin white arrow) develop a non-Q-wave MI (NQMI). Patients who present without ST-segment elevation are suffering from either unstable angina (UA) or a non–ST-segment elevation MI (NSTEMI) (thick red arrows), a distinction that is ultimately made on the basis of the presence or absence of a serum cardiac marker such as CK-MB or a cardiac troponin detected in the blood. Most patients presenting with NSTEMI ultimately develop a NQMI on the ECG; a few may develop a QwMI. The spectrum of clinical presentations ranging from UA through NSTEMI and STEMI is referred to as the acute coronary syndromes. This UA/NSTEMI guideline, as diagrammed in the upper panel, includes sections on initial management before UA/NSTEMI, at the onset of UA/NSTEMI, and during the hospital phase. Secondary prevention and plans for long-term management begin early during the hospital phase of treatment. *Positive serum cardiac marker. Modified with permission from Libby P. Current concepts of the pathogenesis of the acute coronary syndromes. Circulation 2001;104:365;7 © 2001 Lippincott, Williams & Wilkins; The Lancet, 358, Hamm CW, Bertrand M, Braunwald E. Acute coronary syndrome without ST elevation: implementation of new guidelines, 1553–8. Copyright 2001, with permission from Elsevier;8 and Davies MJ. The pathophysiology of acute coronary syndromes. Heart 2000;83:361–6.9 © 2000 Lippincott, Williams & Wilkins. CK-MB = MB fraction of creatine kinase; Dx = diagnosis; ECG = electrocardiogram.
of sudden death or the development (or recurrence) of acute MI. The efficient diagnosis and optimal management of these patients must derive from information readily available at the time of the initial clinical presentation. The clinical presentation of patients with a life-threatening ACS often overlaps that of patients subsequently found not to have CAD. Moreover, some forms of MI cannot always be differentiated from UA at the time of initial presentation.

“Acute coronary syndrome” has evolved as a useful operational term to refer to any constellation of clinical symptoms that are compatible with acute myocardial ischemia (Figure 1). It encompasses MI (ST-segment elevation and depression, Q wave and non-Q wave) and UA. These guidelines focus on 2 components of this syndrome: UA and NSTEMI. In practice, the term “possible ACS” is often assigned first by ancillary personnel, such as emergency medical technicians and triage nurses, early in the evaluation process. A guideline of the National Heart Attack Alert Program summarizes the clinical information needed to make the diagnosis of possible ACS at the earliest phase of clinical evaluation (Table 2). The implication of this early diagnosis for clinical management is that a patient who is considered to have an ACS should be placed in an environment with continuous ECG monitoring and defibrillation capability, where a 12-lead ECG can be obtained expeditiously and definitively interpreted, ideally within 10 min of arrival in the ED. The most urgent priority of early evaluation is to identify patients with ST-elevation MI (STEMI) who should be considered for immediate reperfusion therapy and to recognize other potentially catastrophic causes of patient symptoms, such as aortic dissection.

Patients diagnosed as having STEMI are excluded from management according to these guidelines and should be managed as indicated according to the ACC/AHA Guidelines for the Management of Patients With ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction. Similarly, management of electrocardiographic true posterior MI, which can masquerade as NSTEMI, is covered in the STEMI guidelines. The management of patients who experience peri-procedural myocardial damage, as reflected in the release of biomarkers of necrosis, such as the MB isoenzyme of creatine kinase (CK-MB) or troponin, also is not considered here.

Patients with MI and with definite ischemic ECG changes for whom acute reperfusion therapy is not suitable should be diagnosed and managed as patients with UA. The residual group of patients with an initial diagnosis of ACS will include many patients who will ultimately be proven to have a noncardiac cause for the initial clinical presentation that was suggestive of ACS. Therefore, at the conclusion of the initial evaluation, which is frequently performed in the ED but sometimes occurs during the initial hours of inpatient hospitalization, each patient should have a provisional diagnosis of 1) ACS (Figure 1), which in turn is classified as a) STEMI, a condition for which immediate reperfusion therapy (thrombolysis or percutaneous coronary intervention [PCI]) should be considered, b) NSTEMI, or c) UA (definite, probable, or possible); 2) a non-ACS cardiovascular condition (eg, acute pericarditis); 3) a noncardiac condition with another specific disease (eg, chest pain secondary to esophageal spasm); or 4) a noncardiac condition that is undefined. In addition, the initial evaluation should be used to determine risk and to treat life-threatening events.

In these guidelines, UA and NSTEMI are considered to be closely related conditions whose pathogenesis and clinical presentations are similar but of differing severity; that is, they differ primarily in whether the ischemia is severe enough to cause sufficient myocardial damage to release detectable quantities of a marker of myocardial injury, most commonly troponin I (TnI), troponin T (TnT), or CK-MB. Once it has been established that no biomarker of myocardial necrosis has been released (based on 2 or more samples collected at least 6 h apart, with a reference limit of the 99th percentile of the normal population), the patient with ACS may be considered to have experienced UA, whereas the diagnosis of NSTEMI is established if a biomarker has been released. Markers of myocardial injury can be detected in the bloodstream with a delay of up to several hours after the onset of ischemic chest pain, which then allows the differentiation between UA (ie, no biomarkers in circulation; usually transient, if any, ECG changes of ischemia) and NSTEMI (ie, elevated biomarkers). Thus, at the time of presentation, patients with UA and NSTEMI can be indistinguishable and therefore are considered together in these guidelines.

1.4.2. Pathogenesis of UA/NSTEMI

These conditions are characterized by an imbalance between myocardial oxygen supply and demand. They are not a specific disease, such as pneumococcal pneumonia, but rather a syndrome, analogous to hypertension. A relatively few nonexclusive causes are recognized (Table 3).

The most common mechanisms involve an imbalance that is caused primarily by a reduction in oxygen supply to the myocardium, whereas with the fifth mechanism noted below, the imbalance is principally due to increased myocardial oxygen requirements, usually in the presence of a fixed, restricted oxygen supply:

Table 3. Causes of UA/NSTEMI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cause</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Thrombus or thromboembolism, usually arising on disrupted or eroded plaque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1. Occlusive thrombus, usually with collateral vessels†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Subtotally occlusive thrombus on pre-existing plaque</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Distal microvascular thromboembolism from plaque-associated thrombus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Thromboembolism from plaque erosion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Non-plaque-associated coronary thromboembolism</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dynamic obstruction (coronary spasm‡ or vasoconstriction) of epicardial and/ or microvascular vessels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Progressive mechanical obstruction to coronary flow</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronary arterial inflammation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Secondary UA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coronary artery dissection§</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The most common cause of UA/NSTEMI is reduced myocardial perfusion that results from coronary artery narrowing caused by a thrombus that developed on a disrupted atherosclerotic plaque and is usually nonocclusive. Microembolization of platelet aggregates and components of the disrupted plaque are believed to be responsible for the release of myocardial markers in many of these patients. An occlusive thrombus/plaque also can cause this syndrome in the presence of an extensive collateral blood supply.

The most common underlying molecular and cellular pathophysiology of disrupted atherosclerotic plaque is arterial inflammation, caused by noninfectious (eg, oxidized lipids) and, possibly, infectious stimuli, which can lead to plaque expansion and destabilization, rupture or erosion, and thrombogenesis. Activated macrophages and T lymphocytes located at the shoulder of a plaque increase the expression of enzymes such as metalloproteinases that cause thinning and disruption of the plaque, which in turn can lead to UA/NSTEMI.

A less common cause is dynamic obstruction, which may be triggered by intense focal spasm of a segment of an epicardial coronary artery (Prinzmetal’s angina) (see Section 6.7). This local spasm is caused by hypercontractility of vascular smooth muscle and/or by endothelial dysfunction. Large-vessel spasm can occur on top of obstructive or destabilized plaque, resulting in angina of “mixed” origin or UA/NSTEMI. Dynamic coronary obstruction can also be caused by diffuse microvascular dysfunction; for example, due to endothelial dysfunction or the abnormal constriction of small intramural resistance vessels. Coronary spasm also is the presumed mechanism underlying cocaine-induced UA/NSTEMI.

A third cause of UA/NSTEMI is severe narrowing without spasm or thrombus. This occurs in some patients with progressive atherosclerosis or with restenosis after a PCI.

A fourth cause of UA/NSTEMI is coronary artery dissection (eg, as a cause of ACS in peripartum women).

The fifth mechanism is secondary UA, in which the precipitating condition is extrinsic to the coronary arterial bed. Patients with secondary UA usually, but not always, have underlying coronary atherosclerotic narrowing that limits myocardial perfusion, and they often have chronic stable angina. Secondary UA is precipitated by conditions that 1) increase myocardial oxygen requirements, such as fever, tachycardia, or thyrotoxicosis; 2) reduce coronary blood flow, such as hypotension; or 3) reduce myocardial oxygen delivery, such as anemia or hypoxemia. These causes of UA/NSTEMI are not mutually exclusive.

1.4.3. Presentations of UA and NSTEMI

There are 3 principal presentations of UA: 1) rest angina (angina commencing when the patient is at rest), 2) new-onset (less than 2 months) severe angina, and 3) increasing angina (increasing in intensity, duration, and/or frequency) (Table 4). Criteria for the diagnosis of UA are based on the duration and intensity of angina as graded according to the Canadian Cardiovascular Society classification (Table 5).

Non–ST-elevation MI generally presents as prolonged, more intense rest angina or angina equivalent.

1.5. Management Before UA/NSTEMI and Onset of UA/NSTEMI

The ACS spectrum (UA/MI) has a variable but potentially serious prognosis. The major risk factors for development of coronary heart disease (CHD) and UA/NSTEMI are well established. Clinical trials have demonstrated that modification of those risk factors can prevent the development of CHD (primary prevention) or reduce the risk of experiencing UA/NSTEMI in patients who have CHD (secondary prevention). All practitioners should emphasize prevention and refer patients to primary care providers for appropriate long-term preventive care. In addition to internists and family physicians, cardiologists have an important leadership role in primary (and secondary) prevention efforts.

1.5.1. Identification of Patients at Risk of UA/NSTEMI

Class I

1. Primary care providers should evaluate the presence and status of control of major risk factors for CHD for all patients at regular intervals (approximately every 3 to 5 years). (Level of Evidence: C)

2. Ten-year risk (National Cholesterol Education Program [NCEP] global risk) of developing symptomatic CHD should be calculated for all patients who have 2 or more

Table 5. Grading of Angina Pectoris According to CCS Classification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Description of Stage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>“Ordinary physical activity does not cause... angina,” such as walking or climbing stairs. Angina occurs with strenuous, rapid, or prolonged exertion at work or recreation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>“Slight limitation of ordinary activity.” Angina occurs on walking or climbing stairs rapidly; walking uphill; walking or stair climbing after meals; in cold, in wind, or under emotional stress; or only during the few hours after awakening. Angina occurs on walking more than 2 blocks on the level and climbing more than 1 flight of ordinary stairs at a normal pace and under normal conditions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>III</td>
<td>“Marked limitations of ordinary physical activity.” Angina occurs on walking 1 to 2 blocks on the level and climbing 1 flight of stairs under normal conditions and at a normal pace.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>“Inability to carry on any physical activity without discomfort—anginal symptoms may be present at rest.”</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted with permission from Campeau L. Grading of angina pectoris (letter). Circulation 1976;54:522–3.21

CCS = Canadian Cardiovascular Society classification; UA = unstable angina.

Table 4. Three Principal Presentations of UA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Class</th>
<th>Presentation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rest angina*</td>
<td>Angina occurring at rest and prolonged, usually greater than 20 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New-onset angina</td>
<td>New-onset angina of at least CCS class III severity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increasing angina</td>
<td>Previously diagnosed angina that has become distinctly more frequent, longer in duration, or lower in threshold (ie, increased by 1 or more CCS class to at least CCS class III severity)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

major risk factors to assess the need for primary prevention strategies. (Level of Evidence: B) 21,24

3. Patients with established CHD should be identified for secondary prevention efforts, and patients with a CHD risk equivalent (eg, atherosclerosis in other vascular beds, diabetes mellitus, chronic kidney disease, or 10-year risk greater than 20% as calculated by Framingham equations) should receive equally intensive risk factor intervention as those with clinically apparent CHD. (Level of Evidence: A)

Major risk factors for developing CHD (ie, smoking, family history, adverse lipid profiles, diabetes mellitus, and elevated blood pressure) have been established from large, long-term epidemiological studies.25,26 These risk factors are predictive for most populations in the United States. Primary and secondary prevention interventions aimed at these risk factors are effective when used properly. They can also be costly in terms of primary care provider time, diversion of attention from other competing and important health care needs, and expense, and they may not be effective unless targeted at higher-risk patients.27 It is therefore important for primary care providers to make the identification of patients at risk, who are most likely to benefit from primary prevention, a routine part of everyone’s health care. The Third Report of the NCEP provides guidance on identifying such patients.25 Furthermore, the Writing Committee supports public health efforts to reach all adults at risk, not just those under the care of a primary care physician.

Patients with 2 or more risk factors who are at increased 10-year and lifetime risk will have the greatest benefit from primary prevention, but any individual with a single elevated risk factor is a candidate for primary prevention.28 Waiting until the patient develops multiple risk factors and increased 10-year risk contributes to the high prevalence of CHD in the United States.25,28 Such patients should have their risk specifically calculated by any of the several valid prognostic tools available in print,25,29 on the Internet,30 or for use on a personal computer or personal digital assistant (PDA).25 Patients’ specific risk levels determine the absolute risk reductions they can obtain from preventive interventions and guide selection and prioritization of those interventions. For example, target levels for lipid lowering and for antihypertensive therapy vary by patients’ baseline risk. A specific risk number can also serve as a powerful educational intervention to motivate lifestyle changes.31

The detection of subclinical atherosclerosis by noninvasive imaging represents a new, evolving approach for refining individual risk in asymptomatic individuals beyond traditional risk factor assessment alone. A recent AHA scientific statement indicates that it may be reasonable to measure atherosclerosis burden using electron-beam or multidetector computed tomography (CT) in clinically selected intermediate-CAD-risk individuals (eg, those with a 10% to 20% Framingham 10-year risk estimate) to refine clinical risk prediction and to select patients for aggressive target values for lipid-lowering therapies (Class IIb, Level of Evidence: B).32

1.5.2. Interventions to Reduce Risk of UA/NSTEMI

The benefits of prevention of UA/NSTEMI in patients with CHD are well documented and of large magnitude.10,28,33–35 Patients with established CHD should be identified for secondary prevention efforts, and patients with a CHD risk equivalent should receive equally intensive risk factor intervention for high-risk primary prevention regardless of sex.36 Patients with diabetes mellitus and peripheral vascular disease have baseline risks of UA/NSTEMI similar to patients with known CHD, as do patients with multiple risk factors that predict a calculated risk of greater than 20% over 10 years as estimated by the Framingham equations.25 Such patients should be considered to have the risk equivalents of CHD, and they can be expected to have an absolute benefit similar to those with established CHD.

All patients who use tobacco should be encouraged to quit and should be provided with help in quitting at every opportunity.37 Recommendations by a clinician to avoid tobacco can have a meaningful impact on the rate of cessation of tobacco use. The most effective strategies for encouraging quitting are those that identify the patient’s level or stage of readiness and provide information, support, and, if necessary, pharmacotherapy targeted at the individual’s readiness and specific needs.33,38 Pharmacotherapy may include nicotine replacement or withdrawal-relieving medication such as bupropion. Varenicline, a nicotine acetylcholine receptor partial antagonist, is a newly approved nonnicotine replacement therapy for tobacco avoidance.39–42 Many patients require several attempts before they succeed in quitting permanently.33,44 Additional discussion in this area can be found in other contemporary documents (eg, the ACC/AHA 2002 Guideline Update for the Management of Patients With Chronic Stable Angina).45

All patients should be instructed in and encouraged to maintain appropriate low-saturated-fat, low-trans-fat, and low-cholesterol diets high in soluble (viscous) fiber and rich in vegetables, fruits, and whole grains. All patients also should be encouraged to be involved with a regular aerobic exercise program, including 30 to 60 min of moderate-intensity physical activity (such as brisk walking) on most and preferably all days of the week.10,45 For those who need to weigh less, an appropriate balance of increased physical activity (ie, 60 to 90 min daily), caloric restriction, and formal behavioral programs is encouraged to achieve and maintain a body mass index between 18.5 and 24.9 kg/m2 and a waist circumference of less than or equal to 35 inches in women and less than or equal to 40 inches in men. For those who need lipid lowering beyond lifestyle measures, the statin drugs have the best outcome evidence supporting their use and should be the mainstay of pharmacological intervention.28 The appropriate levels for lipid management are dependent on baseline risk; the reader is referred to the NCEP report (http://www.nhlbi.nih.gov/guidelines/cholesterol/index.htm) for details.24,25,46–48

Primary prevention patients with high blood pressure should be treated according to the recommendations of the Seventh Joint National Committee on High Blood Pressure (JNC 7).49,50 Specific treatment recommendations are based on the level of hypertension and the patient’s other risk factors. A diet low in salt and rich in vegetables, fruits, and low-fat dairy products should be encouraged for all hypertensive patients, as should a regular aerobic exercise program.51–54 Most patients
patients commonly hold a preexisting expectation that a heart attack would present dramatically with severe, crushing chest pain, such that there would be no doubt that one was occurring. This was in contrast to their actual reported symptom experience of a gradual onset of discomfort involving midsternal chest pressure or tightness, with other associated symptoms often increasing in intensity. The ambiguity of these symptoms, due to this disconnect between prior expectations and actual experience, resulted in uncertainty about the origin of symptoms and thus a “wait-and-see” posture by patients and those around them. Other reported reasons for delay were that patients thought the symptoms were self-limited and would go away or were not serious72–74; that they attributed symptoms to other preexisting chronic conditions, especially among older adults with multiple chronic conditions (eg, arthritis), or sometimes to a common illness such as influenza; that they were afraid of being embarrassed if symptoms turned out to be a “false alarm”; that they were reluctant to trouble others (eg, health care providers, Emergency Medical Services [EMS]) unless they were “really sick”72–74; that they held stereotypes of who is at risk for a heart attack; and that they lacked awareness of the importance of rapid action, knowledge of reperfusion treatment, or knowledge of the benefits of calling EMS/9-1-1 to ensure earlier treatment.69 Notably, women did not perceive themselves to be at risk.73

1.6.2. Silent and Unrecognized Events

Patients experiencing UA/NSTEMI do not always present with chest discomfort.66 The Framingham Study was the first to show that as many as half of all MIIs may be clinically silent and unrecognized by the patient.77 Canto et al78 found that one third of the 434 877 patients with confirmed MI in the National Registry of Myocardial Infarction presented to the hospital with symptoms other than chest discomfort. Compared with MI patients with chest discomfort, MI patients without chest discomfort were more likely to be older, to be women, to have diabetes, and/or to have prior heart failure [HF]. Myocardial infarction patients without chest discomfort delayed longer before they went to the hospital (mean 7.9 h) and were less likely to be diagnosed as having an MI when admitted (22.2% vs 50.3%). They also were less likely to receive fibrinolysis or primary PCI, ASA, beta blockers, or heparin. Silent MI patients were 2.2 times more likely to die during the hospitalization (in-hospital mortality rate 23.3% vs 9.3%). Unexplained dyspnea, even without angina, is a particularly worrisome symptom, with more than twice the risk of death than for typical angina in patients undergoing cardiovascular evaluation.63 Recently, the prognostic significance of dyspnea has been emphasized in patients undergoing cardiac evaluation. Self-reported dyspnea alone among 17 991 patients undergoing stress perfusion testing was an independent predictor of cardiac and total mortality and increased the risk of sudden cardiac death 4-fold even in those with no prior history of CAD.63

Health care providers should maintain a high index of suspicion for UA/NSTEMI when evaluating women, patients with diabetes mellitus, older patients, those with unexplained dyspnea, and those with a history of HF or stroke, as well as those patients who complain of chest discomfort but who have a permanent pacemaker that may confound recognition of UA/NSTEMI on their 12-lead ECG.79

2. Initial Evaluation and Management

2.1. Clinical Assessment

Because symptoms are similar and the differentiation of UA/NSTEMI and STEMI requires medical evaluation, we will
refer to prediagnostic clinical presentation as ACS, defined as UA or MI (NSTEMI or STEMI) (Figure 2).

Recommendations

Class I

1. Patients with symptoms that may represent ACS (Table 2) should not be evaluated solely over the telephone but should be referred to a facility that allows evaluation by a physician and the recording of a 12-lead ECG and biomarker determination (eg, an ED or other acute care facility). (Level of Evidence: C)

2. Patients with symptoms of ACS (chest discomfort with or without radiation to the arm[s], back, neck, jaw or epigastrium; shortness of breath; weakness; diaphoresis; nausea; lightheadedness) should be instructed to call 9-1-1 and should be transported to the hospital by ambulance rather than by friends or relatives. (Level of Evidence: B)

3. Health care providers should actively address the following issues regarding ACS with patients with or at risk for CHD and their families or other responsible caregivers:
   a. The patient's heart attack risk; (Level of Evidence: C)
   b. How to recognize symptoms of ACS; (Level of Evidence: C)
   c. The advisability of calling 9-1-1 if symptoms are unimproved or worsening after 5 min, despite feelings of uncertainty about the symptoms and fear of potential embarrassment; (Level of Evidence: C)
   d. A plan for appropriate recognition and response to a potential acute cardiac event, including the phone number to access EMS, generally 9-1-1. (Level of Evidence: C)

4. Prehospital EMS providers should administer 162 to 325 mg of ASA (chewed) to chest pain patients suspected of having ACS unless contraindicated or already taken by the patient. Although some trials have used enteric-coated ASA for initial dosing, more rapid buccal absorption occurs with non-enteric-coated formulations. (Level of Evidence: C)

5. Health care providers should instruct patients with suspected ACS for whom nitroglycerin [NTG] has been prescribed previously to take not more than 1 dose of NTG sublingually in response to chest discomfort/pain. If chest discomfort/pain is unimproved or is worsening 5 min after 1 NTG dose has been taken, it is recommended that the patient or family member/friend/caregiver call 9-1-1 immediately to access EMS before taking additional NTG. In patients with chronic stable angina, if symptoms are significantly improved by 1 dose of NTG, it is appropriate to instruct the patient or family member/friend/caregiver to repeat NTG every 5 min for a maximum of 3 doses and call 9-1-1 if symptoms have not resolved completely. (Level of Evidence: C)

Figure 2. Algorithm for Evaluation and Management of Patients Suspected of Having ACS. To facilitate interpretation of this algorithm and a more detailed discussion in the text, each box is assigned a letter code that reflects its level in the algorithm and a number that is allocated from left to right across the diagram on a given level. ACC/AHA = American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association; ACS = acute coronary syndrome; ECG = electrocardiogram; LV = left ventricular.
6. Patients with a suspected ACS with chest discomfort or other ischemic symptoms at rest for greater than 20 min, hemodynamic instability, or recent syncope or presyncope should be referred immediately to an ED. Other patients with suspected ACS who are experiencing less severe symptoms and who have none of the above high-risk features, including those who respond to an NTG dose, may be seen initially in an ED or an outpatient facility able to provide an acute evaluation. (Level of Evidence: C)

Class IIa

1. It is reasonable for health care providers and 9-1-1 dispatchers to advise patients without a history of ASA allergy who have symptoms of ACS to chew ASA (162 to 325 mg) while awaiting arrival of prehospital EMS providers. Although some trials have used enteric-coated ASA for initial dosing, more rapid buccal absorption occurs with non-enteric-coated formulations. (Level of Evidence: B)

2. It is reasonable for health care providers and 9-1-1 dispatchers to advise patients who tolerate NTG to repeat NTG every 5 min for a maximum of 3 doses while awaiting ambulance arrival. (Level of Evidence: C)

3. It is reasonable that all prehospital EMS providers perform and evaluate 12-lead ECGs in the field (if available) on chest pain patients suspected of ACS to assist in triage decisions. Electrocardiographs with validated computer-generated interpretation algorithms are recommended for this purpose. (Level of Evidence: B)

4. If the 12-lead ECG shows evidence of acute injury or ischemia, it is reasonable that prehospital ACS providers relay the ECG to a predetermined medical control facility and/or receiving hospital. (Level of Evidence: B)

Patients with suspected ACS must be evaluated rapidly. Decisions made on the basis of the initial evaluation have substantial clinical and economic consequences. The first triage decision is made by the patient, who must decide whether to access the health care system. Media campaigns such as “Act in Time,” sponsored by the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute (NHLBI), provide patient education regarding this triage decision (www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health/public/heart/acttime). The campaign urges both men and women who feel heart attack symptoms or observe the signs in others to wait no more than a few minutes, 5 min at most, before calling 9-1-1. Campaign materials point out that patients can increase their chance of surviving a heart attack by learning the symptoms and filling out a survival plan. They also are advised to talk with their doctor about heart attacks and how to reduce their risk of having one. The patient materials include a free brochure about symptoms and recommended actions for survival, in English and Spanish, as well as a free wallet card that can be filled in with emergency medical information. Materials geared directly to providers include a Patient Action Plan Tablet, which contains the heart attack warning symptoms and steps for developing a survival plan, individualized with the patient’s name; a quick reference card for addressing common patient questions about seeking early treatment to survive a heart attack, including a PDA version; and a warning signs wall chart. These materials and others are available on the “Act in Time” Web page (www.nhlbi.nih.gov/health/public/heart/acttime/). When the patient first makes contact with the medical care system, a critical decision must be made about where the evaluation will take place. The health care provider then must place the evaluation in the context of 2 critical questions: Are the symptoms a manifestation of an ACS? If so, what is the prognosis? The answers to these 2 questions lead logically to a series of decisions about where the patient will be best managed, what medications will be prescribed, and whether an angiographic evaluation will be required.

Given the large number of patients with symptoms compatible with ACS, the heterogeneity of the population, and a clustering of events shortly after the onset of symptoms, a strategy for the initial evaluation and management is essential. Health care providers may be informed about signs and symptoms of ACS over the telephone or in person by the patient or family members. The objectives of the initial evaluation are first to identify signs of immediate life-threatening instability and then to ensure that the patient is moved rapidly to the most appropriate environment for the level of care needed based on diagnostic criteria and an estimation of the underlying risk of specific negative outcomes.

Health practitioners frequently receive telephone calls from patients or family members/friends/caregivers who are concerned that their symptoms could reflect heart disease. Most such calls regarding chest discomfort of possible cardiac origin in patients without known CAD do not represent an emergency; rather, these patients usually seek reassurance that they do not have heart disease or that there is little risk due to their symptoms. Despite the frequent inclination to dismiss such symptoms over the telephone, health care providers, EMS dispatchers, and staff positioned to receive these calls should advise patients with possible accelerating angina or angina at rest for greater than 20 min, chest pain, or other ischemic symptoms at rest for greater than 20 min, hemodynamic instability, or recent syncope or presyncope should be referred immediately to an ED. Other patients with suspected ACS who are experiencing less severe symptoms and who have none of the above high-risk features, including those who respond to an NTG dose, may be seen initially in an ED or an outpatient facility able to provide an acute evaluation. (Level of Evidence: C)
transported to the ED via ambulance, one third had a final diagnosis of MI, one third had a final diagnosis of UA, and one third had a final diagnosis of a noncardiac cause; 1.5% of these patients developed cardiopulmonary arrest before arrival at the hospital or in the ED.82

Every community should have a written protocol that guides EMS system personnel in determining where to take patients with suspected or confirmed ACS. Active involvement of local health care providers, particularly cardiologists and emergency physicians, is needed to formulate local EMS destination protocols for these patients. In general, patients with suspected ACS should be taken to the nearest appropriate hospital; however, patients with known STEMI and/or cardiogenic shock should be sent as directly as possible to hospitals with interventional and surgical capability.8

The advent of highly effective, time-dependent treatment for ACS, coupled with the need to reduce health care costs, adds further incentive for clinicians to get the right answer quickly and to reduce unnecessary admissions and length of hospital stay. Investigators have tried various diagnostic tools, such as clinical decision algorithms, cardiac biomarkers, serial ECGs, echocardiography, myocardial perfusion imaging, and multidetector (eg, 64-slice) coronary CT angiography (CCTA), in an attempt to avoid missing patients with MI or UA. The most successful strategies to emerge thus far are designed to identify MI patients and, when clinically appropriate, screen for UA and underlying CAD. Most strategies use a combination of cardiac biomarkers, short-term observation, diagnostic imaging, and provocative stress testing. An increasing number of high-quality centers now use structured protocols, checklists, or critical pathways to screen patients with suspected MI or UA.93-105 It does not appear to matter whether the institution designates itself a chest pain center; rather, it is the multifaceted, multidisciplinary, standardized, and structured approach to the problem that appears to provide clinical, cost-effective benefit.106,107 One randomized trial has confirmed the safety, efficacy, and cost-effectiveness of the structured decision-making approach compared with standard, unstructured care.108

Regardless of the approach used, all patients presenting to the ED with chest discomfort or other symptoms suggestive of MI or UA should be considered high-priority triage cases and should be evaluated and treated on the basis of a predetermined, institution-specific chest pain protocol. The protocol should include several diagnostic possibilities (Figure 2).109 The patient should be placed on a cardiac monitor immediately, with emergency resuscitation equipment, including a defibrillator, nearby. An ECG also should be performed immediately and evaluated by an experienced emergency medicine physician, with a goal of within 10 min of ED arrival. If STEMI is present, the decision as to whether the patient will be treated with fibrinolytic therapy or primary PCI should be made within the next 10 min.8 For cases in which the initial diagnosis and treatment plan are unclear to the emergency medicine physician or are not covered directly by an institutionally agreed-upon protocol, immediate cardiology consultation is advisable.

Morbidity and mortality from ACS can be reduced significantly if patients and bystanders recognize symptoms early, activate the EMS system, and thereby shorten the time to definitive treatment. Patients with possible symptoms of MI should be transported to the hospital by ambulance rather than by friends or relatives, because there is a significant association between arrival at the ED by ambulance and early reperfusion therapy in STEMI patients.110-113 In addition, emergency medical technicians and paramedics can provide life-saving interventions (eg, early cardiopulmonary resuscitation [CPR] and defibrillation) if the patient develops cardiac arrest. Approximately 1 in every 300 patients with chest pain transported to the ED by private vehicle goes into cardiac arrest en route.114

Several studies have confirmed that patients with ACS frequently do not call 9-1-1 and are not transported to the hospital by ambulance. A follow-up survey of chest pain patients presenting to participating EDs in 20 US communities who were either released or admitted to the hospital with a confirmed coronary event revealed that the average proportion of patients who used EMS was 23%, with significant geographic difference (range 10% to 48%). Most patients were driven by someone else (60%) or drove themselves to the hospital (16%).112 In the National Registry of Myocardial Infarction 2, just over half (53%) of all patients with MI were transported to the hospital by ambulance.111

Even in areas of the country that have undertaken substantial public education campaigns about the warning signs of ACS and the need to activate the EMS system rapidly, either there were no increases in EMS use65,116-119 or EMS use increased (as a secondary outcome measure) but was still suboptimal, with a 20% increase from a baseline of 33% in all 20 communities in the REACT study70 and an increase from 27% to 41% in southern Minnesota after a community campaign.120 Given the importance of patients using EMS for possible acute cardiac symptoms, communities, including medical providers, EMS systems, health care insurers, hospitals, and policy makers at the state and local level, need to have agreed-upon emergency protocols to ensure patients with possible heart attack symptoms will be able to access 9-1-1 without barriers, to secure their timely evaluation and treatment.121

As part of making a plan with the patient for timely recognition and response to an acute event, providers should review instructions for taking NTG in response to chest discomfort/pain (Figure 3). If a patient has previously been prescribed NTG, it is recommended that the patient be advised to take 1 NTG dose sublingually promptly for chest discomfort/pain. If symptoms are unimproved or worsening 5 min after 1 NTG dose has been taken, it also is recommended that the patient be instructed to call 9-1-1 immediately to access EMS. Although the traditional recommendation is for patients to take 1 NTG dose sublingually, 5 min apart, for up to 3 doses before calling for emergency evaluation, this recommendation has been modified by the UA/NSTEMI Writing Committee to encourage earlier contacting of EMS by patients with symptoms suggestive of ACS. While awaiting ambulance arrival, patients tolerating NTG can be instructed by health care providers or 9-1-1 dispatchers to take additional NTG every 5 min up to 3 doses. Self-treatment with prescription medication, including nitrates, and with nonprescription medication (eg, antacids) has been documented as a frequent cause of delay among
patients with ACS, including those with a history of MI or angina. Both the rate of use of these medications and the number of doses taken were positively correlated with delay time to hospital arrival.72

Family members, close friends, caregivers, or advocates should be included in these discussions and enlisted as reinforcement for rapid action when the patient experiences symptoms of a possible ACS80,124,125 (Figure 3). For patients known to their providers to have frequent angina, physicians may consider a selected, more tailored message that takes into account the frequency and character of the patient’s angina and their typical time course of response to NTG. In many of these patients with chronic stable angina, if chest pain is significantly improved by 1 NTG, it is still appropriate to instruct the patient or family member/friend/caregiver to repeat NTG every 5 min for a maximum of 3 doses and call 9-1-1 if symptoms have not totally resolved. If patients are not previously prescribed NTG (left side of algorithm), it is recommended that they call 9-1-1 if chest discomfort/pain is unimproved or worsening 5 min after it starts. If the symptoms subside within 5 min of when they began, patients should notify their physician of the episode. (For those patients with newonset chest discomfort who have not been prescribed NTG, it is appropriate to discourage them from seeking someone else’s NTG [eg, from a neighbor, friend, or relative].) Although some trials have used enteric-coated aspirin for initial dosing, more rapid buccal absorption occurs with non-enteric-coated formulations. EMS = emergency medical services; NTG = nitroglycerin.

Figure 3. Patient (Advance) Instructions for NTG Use and EMS Contact in the Setting of Non–Trauma-Related Chest Discomfort/Pain. If patients experience chest discomfort/pain and have been previously prescribed NTG and have it available (right side of algorithm), it is recommended that they be instructed (in advance) to take 1 dose of NTG immediately in response to symptoms. If chest discomfort/pain is unimproved or worsening 5 min after taking 1 NTG sublingually, it is recommended that the patient call 9-1-1 immediately to access EMS. In patients with chronic stable angina, if the symptoms are significantly improved after taking 1 NTG, it is appropriate to instruct the patient or family member/friend/caregiver to repeat NTG every 5 min for a maximum of 3 doses and call 9-1-1 if symptoms have not totally resolved. If patients are not previously prescribed NTG (left side of algorithm), it is recommended that they call 9-1-1 if chest discomfort/pain is unimproved or worsening 5 min after it starts. If the symptoms subside within 5 min of when they began, patients should notify their physician of the episode. (For those patients with newonset chest discomfort who have not been prescribed NTG, it is appropriate to discourage them from seeking someone else’s NTG [eg, from a neighbor, friend, or relative].) Although some trials have used enteric-coated aspirin for initial dosing, more rapid buccal absorption occurs with non-enteric-coated formulations. EMS = emergency medical services; NTG = nitroglycerin.

providers should target those patients at increased risk for ACS, focusing on patients with known CHD, peripheral vascular disease, or cerebral vascular disease, those with diabetes, and patients with a 10-year Framingham risk of CHD of more than 20%. They should stress that the chest discomfort will usually not be dramatic, such as is commonly misrepresented on television or in the movies as a “Hollywood heart attack.” Providers also should describe anginal equivalents and the commonly associated symptoms of ACS (eg, shortness of breath, a cold sweat, nausea, or lightheadedness) in both men and women, as well as the increased frequency of atypical symptoms in elderly patients.78

2.1.1. Emergency Department or Outpatient Facility Presentation

It is recommended that patients with a suspected ACS with chest discomfort or other ischemic symptoms at rest for more than 20 min, hemodynamic instability, or recent syncope or presyncope to be referred immediately to an ED or a specialized chest pain unit. For other patients with a suspected ACS who are experiencing less severe symptoms and are having none of the above high-risk features, the recommendation is to be seen initially in an ED, a chest pain unit, or an appropriate outpatient facility.
Table 6. Likelihood That Signs and Symptoms Represent an ACS Secondary to CAD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>High Likelihood</th>
<th>Intermediate Likelihood</th>
<th>Low Likelihood</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Chest or left arm pain or discomfort as chief symptom reproducing prior documented angina</td>
<td>Chest or left arm pain or discomfort as chief symptom</td>
<td>Probable ischemic symptoms in absence of any of the intermediate likelihood features but may have:</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Known history of CAD, including MI</td>
<td>Age greater than 70 years</td>
<td>Recent cocaine use</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Male sex</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Diabetes mellitus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Examination</td>
<td>Transient MR murmur, hypotension, diaphoresis, pulmonary edema, or rales</td>
<td>Extracardiac vascular disease</td>
<td>Chest discomfort reproduced by palpation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECG</td>
<td>New, or presumably new, transient ST-segment deviation (1 mm or greater) or T-wave inversion in multiple precordial leads</td>
<td>Fixed waves</td>
<td>T-wave flattening or inversion less than 1 mm in leads with dominant waves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac markers</td>
<td>Elevated cardiac TnI, TnT, or CK-MB</td>
<td>Normal</td>
<td>Normal ECG</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


ACS = acute coronary syndrome; CAD = coronary artery disease; CK-MB = MB fraction of creatine kinase; ECG = electrocardiogram; MI = myocardial infarction; MR = mitral regurgitation; NTG = nitroglycerin; TnI = troponin I; TnT = troponin T.

Outcomes data that firmly support these recommendations are not available; however, these recommendations are of practical importance because differing ACS presentations require differing levels of emergent medical interventions, such as fibrinolytics or emergency coronary angiography leading to PCI or surgery, or sophisticated diagnostic evaluation such as nuclear stress testing or CCTA. When symptoms have been unrelenting for more than 20 min, the possibility of MI must be considered. Given the strong evidence for a relationship between delay in treatment and death,128–130 an immediate assessment

Table 7. Short-Term Risk of Death or Nonfatal MI in Patients With UA/NSTEMI*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>High Risk</th>
<th>Intermediate Risk</th>
<th>Low Risk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>History</td>
<td>Accelerating tempo of ischemic symptoms in preceding 48 h</td>
<td>Prior MI, peripheral or cerebrovascular disease, or CABG; prior aspirin use</td>
<td>Increased angina frequency, severity, or duration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Character of pain</td>
<td>Prolonged ongoing (greater than 20 min) rest pain</td>
<td>Prolonged (greater than 20 min) rest angina, now resolved, with moderate or high likelihood of CAD</td>
<td>Angina provoked at a lower threshold</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinical findings</td>
<td>Pulmonary edema, most likely due to ischemia</td>
<td>Prior MI, peripheral or cerebrovascular disease, or CABG; prior aspirin use</td>
<td>New onset angina with onset 2 weeks to 2 months prior to presentation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECG</td>
<td>Angina at rest with transient ST-segment changes greater than 0.5 mm</td>
<td>T-wave changes</td>
<td>Normal or unchanged ECG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac markers</td>
<td>Elevated cardiac TnI, TnT, or CK-MB (eg, TnT or TnI greater than 0.1 ng per ml)</td>
<td>Slightly elevated cardiac TnI, TnT, or CK-MB (eg, TnT greater than 0.01 but less than 0.1 ng per ml)</td>
<td>Normal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Estimation of the short-term risks of death and nonfatal cardiac ischemic events in UA (or NSTEMI) is complex multivariable problem that cannot be fully specified in table such as this; therefore, this table is meant to offer general guidance and illustration rather than rigid algorithms. Adapted from AHCPR Clinical Practice Guidelines No. 10, Unstable Angina: Diagnosis and Management, May 1994.124

CABG = coronary artery bypass graft surgery; CAD = coronary artery disease; CCS = Canadian Cardiovascular Society; CK-MB = creatine kinase, MB fraction; ECG = electrocardiogram; MI = myocardial infarction; MR = mitral regurgitation; NTG = nitroglycerin; TnI = troponin I; TnT = troponin T; UA/NSTEMI = unstable angina/non–ST-elevation myocardial infarction.
that includes a 12-lead ECG is essential. Patients who present with hemodynamic instability require an environment in which therapeutic interventions can be provided, and for those with presyncope or syncope, the major concern is the risk of sudden death. Such patients should be encouraged to seek emergency transportation when it is available. Transport as a passenger in a private vehicle is an acceptable alternative only if the wait for an emergency vehicle would impose a delay of greater than 20 to 30 min.

2.1.2. Questions to Be Addressed at the Initial Evaluation

The initial evaluation should be used to provide information about the diagnosis and prognosis. The attempt should be made to simultaneously answer 2 questions:

What is the likelihood that the signs and symptoms represent ACS secondary to obstructive CAD (Table 6)?

What is the likelihood of an adverse clinical outcome (Table 7)? Outcomes of concern include death, MI (or recurrent MI), stroke, HF; recurrent symptomatic ischemia, and serious arrhythmia.

For the most part, the answers to these questions form a sequence of contingent probabilities. Thus, the likelihood that the signs and symptoms represent ACS is contingent on the likelihood that the patient has underlying CAD. Similarly, the prognosis is contingent on the likelihood that the symptoms represent acute ischemia. However, in patients with symptoms of possible ACS, traditional risk factors for CAD are less important than are symptoms, ECG findings, and cardiac biomarkers. Therefore, the presence or absence of these traditional risk factors ordinarily should not be heavily weighed in determining whether an individual patient should be admitted or treated for ACS.

2.2. Early Risk Stratification

Recommendations for Early Risk Stratification

Class I

1. A rapid clinical determination of the likelihood risk of obstructive CAD (ie, high, intermediate, or low) should be made in all patients with chest discomfort or other symptoms suggestive of an ACS and considered in patient management. (Level of Evidence: C)

2. Patients who present with chest discomfort or other ischemic symptoms should undergo early risk stratification for the risk of cardiovascular events (eg, death or [re]MI) that focuses on history, including anginal symptoms, physical findings, ECG findings, and biomarkers of cardiac injury, and results should be considered in patient management. (Level of Evidence: C)

3. A 12-lead ECG should be performed and shown to an experienced emergency physician as soon as possible after ED arrival, with a goal of within 10 min of ED arrival for all patients with chest discomfort (or anginal equivalent) or other symptoms suggestive of ACS. (Level of Evidence: B)

4. If the initial ECG is not diagnostic but the patient remains symptomatic and there is high clinical suspicion for ACS, serial ECGs, initially at 15- to 30-min intervals, should be performed to detect the potential for development of ST-segment elevation or depression. (Level of Evidence: B)

5. Cardiac biomarkers should be measured in all patients who present with chest discomfort consistent with ACS. (Level of Evidence: B)

6. A cardiac-specific troponin is the preferred marker, and if available, it should be measured in all patients who present with chest discomfort consistent with ACS. (Level of Evidence: B)

7. Patients with negative cardiac biomarkers within 6 h of the onset of symptoms consistent with ACS should have biomarkers remeasured in the time frame of 8 to 12 h after symptom onset. (The exact timing of serum marker measurement should take into account the uncertainties often present with the exact timing of onset of pain and the sensitivity, precision, and institutional norms of the assay being utilized as well as the release kinetics of the marker being measured.) (Level of Evidence: B)

8. The initial evaluation of the patient with suspected ACS should include the consideration of noncoronary causes for the development of unexplained symptoms. (Level of Evidence: C)

Class IIa

1. Use of risk-stratification models, such as the Thrombolysis In Myocardial Infarction (TIMI) or Global Registry of Acute Coronary Events (GRACE) risk score or the Platelet Glycoprotein IIb/IIIa in Unstable Angina: Receptor Suppression Using Integrilin Therapy (PURSUIT) risk model, can be useful to assist in decision making with regard to treatment options in patients with suspected ACS. (Level of Evidence: B)

2. It is reasonable to remeasure positive biomarkers at 6- to 8-h intervals 2 to 3 times or until levels have peaked, as an index of infarct size and dynamics of necrosis. (Level of Evidence: B)

3. It is reasonable to obtain supplemental ECG leads V3 through V6 in patients whose initial ECG is nondiagnostic to rule out MI due to left circumflex occlusion. (Level of Evidence: B)

4. Continuous 12-lead ECG monitoring is a reasonable alternative to serial 12-lead recordings in patients whose initial ECG is nondiagnostic. (Level of Evidence: B)

Class IIb

1. For patients who present within 6 h of the onset of symptoms consistent with ACS, assessment of an early marker of cardiac injury (eg, myoglobin) in conjunction with a late marker (eg, troponin) may be considered. (Level of Evidence: B)

2. For patients who present within 6 h of symptoms suggestive of ACS, a 2-h delta CK-MB mass in conjunction with 2-h delta troponin may be considered. (Level of Evidence: B)

3. For patients who present within 6 h of symptoms suggestive of ACS, myoglobin in conjunction with CK-MB mass or troponin when measured at baseline and 90 min may be considered. (Level of Evidence: B)
4. Measurement of B-type natriuretic peptide (BNP) or NT-pro-BNP may be considered to supplement assessment of global risk in patients with suspected ACS. (Level of Evidence: B)

Class III

1. Total CK (without MB), aspartate aminotransferase (AST, SGOT), alanine transaminase, beta-hydroxybutyric dehydrogenase, and/or lactate dehydrogenase should not be utilized as primary tests for the detection of myocardial injury in patients with chest discomfort suggestive of ACS. (Level of Evidence: C)

2.2.1. Estimation of the Level of Risk

The medical history, physical examination, ECG, assessment of renal function, and cardiac biomarker measurements in patients with symptoms suggestive of ACS at the time of the initial presentation can be integrated into an estimation of the risk of death and nonfatal cardiac ischemic events. The latter include new or recurrent MI, recurrent UA, disabling angina that requires hospitalization, and urgent coronary revascularization. Estimation of the level of risk is a multivariable problem that cannot be accurately quantified with a simple table; therefore, Tables 6 and 7 are meant to be illustrative of the general relationships between history, clinical and ECG findings, and the categorization of patients into those at low, intermediate, or high risk of the presence of obstructive CAD and the short-term risk of cardiovascular events, respectively. Optimal risk stratification requires accounting for multiple prognostic factors simultaneously by a multivariable approach (eg, the TIMI and GRACE risk score algorithms [see below]).

2.2.2. Rationale for Risk Stratification

Because patients with ischemic discomfort at rest as a group are heterogeneous in terms of risk of cardiac death and nonfatal ischemic events, an assessment of the prognosis guides the initial evaluation and treatment. An estimation of risk is useful in 1) selection of the site of care (coronary care unit, monitored step-down unit, or outpatient setting) and 2) selection of therapy, including platelet glycoprotein (GP) IIb/IIIa inhibitors (see Section 3.2) and invasive management strategy (see Section 3.3). For all modes of presentation of an ACS, a strong relationship exists between indicators of the likelihood of ischemia due to CAD and prognosis (Tables 6 and 7). Patients with a high likelihood of ischemia due to CAD are at a greater risk of an untoward cardiac event than are patients with a lower likelihood of CAD. Therefore, an assessment of the likelihood of CAD is the starting point for the determination of prognosis in patients who present with symptoms suggestive of ACS. Other important elements for prognostic assessment are the tempo of the patient’s clinical course, which relates to the short-term risk of future cardiac events, principally MI, and the patient’s likelihood of survival should an MI occur.

Patients can present with ischemic discomfort but without ST-segment deviation on the 12-lead ECG in a variety of clinical scenarios, including no known prior history of CAD, a prior history of stable CAD, soon after MI, and after myocardial revascularization with CABG or PCI.19,132,133 As a clinical syndrome, ischemic discomfort without ST-segment elevation (UA and NSTEMI) shares ill-defined borders with severe chronic stable angina, a condition associated with lower immediate risk, and STEMI, a presentation with a higher risk of early death and cardiac ischemic events. The risk is highest at the time of presentation and subsequently declines. Yet, the risk remains high past the acute phase. By 6 months, UA/NSTEMI mortality rates higher than that after STEMI can be seen145; and by 12 months, the rates of death, MI, and recurrent instability in contemporary randomized controlled trials and registry studies exceed 10% and are often related to specific risk factors such as age, diabetes mellitus, renal failure, and impairment of left ventricular (LV) function. Whereas the early events are related to the activity of 1 culprit coronary plaque that has ruptured and is the site of thrombus formation, events that occur later are more related to the underlying pathophysiological mechanisms that trigger plaque activity and that mark active atherosclerosis.153-155

A few risk scores have been developed that regroup markers of the acute thrombotic process and other markers of high risk to identify high-risk patients with UA/NSTEMI. The TIMI, GRACE, and PURSUIT risk scores are discussed in detail in Section 2.2.6.

2.2.3. History

Patients with suspected UA/NSTEMI may be divided into those with and those without a history of documented CAD. Particularly when the patient does not have a known history of CAD, the physician must determine whether the patient’s presentation, with its constellation of specific symptoms and signs, is most consistent with chronic ischemia, acute ischemia, or an alternative disease process. The 5 most important factors derived from the initial history that relate to the likelihood of ischemia due to CAD, ranked in the order of importance, are 1) the nature of the anginal symptoms, 2) prior history of CAD, 3) sex, 4) age, and 5) the number of traditional risk factors present.142-146 In patients with suspected ACS but without preexisting clinical CHD, older age appears to be the most important factor. One study found that for males, age younger than 40 years, 40 to 55 years, and older than 55 years and for females, age younger than 50 years, 50 to 65 years, and older than 65 years was correlated with low, intermediate, and high risk for CAD, respectively.145 Another study found that the risk of CAD increased in an incremental fashion for each decade above age 40 years, with male sex being assigned an additional risk point.146 In these studies, being a male older than 55 years or a female older than 65 years outweighed the importance of all historical factors, including the nature of the chest pain.145,146

2.2.4. Anginal Symptoms and Anginal Equivalents

The characteristics of angina, which are thoroughly described in the ACC/AHA 2002 Guideline Update for the Management of Patients With Chronic Stable Angina,11 include deep, poorly localized chest or arm discomfort that is reproducingly associated with physical exertion or emotional stress and is relieved promptly (ie, in less than 5 min) with rest and/or the use of sublingual NTG. Patients with UA/NSTEMI may have discomfort that has all of the qualities of typical angina except that the episodes are more severe and prolonged, may occur
at rest, or may be precipitated by less exertion than in the past. Although it is traditional to use the simple term “chest pain” to refer to the discomfort of ACS, patients often do not perceive these symptoms to be true pain, especially when they are mild or atypical. Terms such as “ischemic-type chest discomfort” or “symptoms suggestive of ACS” have been proposed to more precisely capture the character of ischemic symptoms. Although “chest discomfort” or “chest press” is frequently used in these guidelines for uniformity and brevity, the following caveats should be kept clearly in mind. Some patients may have no chest discomfort but present solely with jaw, neck, ear, arm, shoulder, back, or epigastric discomfort or with unexplained dyspnea without discomfort. If these symptoms have a clear relationship to exertion or stress or are relieved promptly with NTG, they should be considered equivalent to angina. Occasionally, such “anginal equivalents” that occur at rest are the mode of presentation of a patient with UA/NSTEMI, but without the exertional history or known prior history of CAD, it may be difficult to recognize their cardiac origin. Other difficult presentations of the patient with UA/NSTEMI include those without any chest (or equivalent) discomfort. Isolated unexplained new-onset or worsened exertional dyspnea is the most common anginal equivalent symptom, especially in older patients; less common isolated presentations, primarily in older adults, include nausea and vomiting, diaphoresis, and unexplained fatigue. Indeed, older adults and women with ACS not infrequently present with atypical angina or nonanginal symptoms. Rarely do patients with ACS present with syncope as the primary symptom or with other nonanginal symptoms.

Features that are not characteristic of myocardial ischemia include the following:

- Pleuritic pain (ie, sharp or knife-like pain brought on by respiratory movements or cough)
- Primary or sole location of discomfort in the middle or lower abdominal region
- Pain that may be localized at the tip of 1 finger, particularly over the left ventricular apex or a costochondral junction
- Pain reproduced with movement or palpation of the chest wall or arms
- Very brief episodes of pain that last a few seconds or less
- Pain that radiates into the lower extremities

Documentation of the evaluation of a patient with suspected UA/NSTEMI should include the physician’s opinion of whether the discomfort is in 1 of 3 categories: high, intermediate, or low likelihood of acute ischemia caused by CAD (Table 6).

Although typical characteristics substantially increase the probability of CAD, features not characteristic of typical angina, such as sharp stabbing pain or reproduction of pain on palpation, do not entirely exclude the possibility of ACS. In the Multicenter Chest Pain Study, acute ischemia was diagnosed in 22% of patients who presented to the ED with sharp or stabbing pain and in 13% of patients with pain with pleuritic qualities. Furthermore, 7% of patients whose pain was fully reproduced with palpation were ultimately recognized to have ACS. The Acute Cardiac Ischemia Time-Insensitive Predictive Instrument (ACI-TIPI) project found that older age, male sex, the presence of chest or left arm pain, and the identification of chest pain or pressure as the most important presenting symptom all increased the likelihood that the patient was experiencing acute ischemia.

The relief of chest pain by administration of sublingual NTG in the ED setting is not always predictive of ACS. One study reported that sublingual NTG relieved symptoms in 35% of patients with active CAD (defined as elevated cardiac biomarkers, coronary vessel with at least 70% stenosis on coronary angiography, or positive stress test) compared with 41% of patients without active CAD. Furthermore, the relief of chest pain by the administration of a “GI cocktail” (eg, a mixture of liquid antacid, viscous lidocaine, and anticholinergic agent) does not predict the absence of ACS.

2.2.5. Demographics and History in Diagnosis and Risk Stratification

In most studies of ACS, a prior history of MI has been associated not only with a high risk of obstructive CAD but also with an increased risk of multivessel CAD. There are differences in the presentations of men and women with ACS (see Section 6.1). A smaller percentage of women than men present with STEMI, and of the patients who present without ST-segment elevation, fewer women than men have MIs. Women with suspected ACS are less likely to have obstructive CAD than are men with a similar clinical presentation, and when CAD is present in women, it tends to be less severe. On the other hand, when STEMI is present, the outcome in women tends to be worse even when adjustment is made for the older age and greater comorbidity of women. However, the outcome for women with UA is significantly better than the outcome for men, and the outcomes are similar for men and women with NSTEMI.

Older adults (see Section 6.4) have increased risks of both underlying CAD and multivessel CAD; furthermore, they are at higher risk for an adverse outcome than are younger patients. The slope of the increased risk is steepest beyond age 70 years. This increased risk is related in part to the greater extent and severity of underlying CAD and the more severe LV dysfunction in older patients; however, age itself exerts a strong, independent prognostic risk as well, perhaps at least in part because of comorbidities. Older adults also are more likely to have atypical symptoms on presentation.

In patients with symptoms of possible ACS, some of the traditional risk factors for CAD (eg, hypertension, hypercholesterolemia, and cigarette smoking) are only weakly predictive of the likelihood of acute ischemia and are far less important than are symptoms, ECG findings, and cardiac biomarkers. Therefore, the presence or absence of these traditional risk factors ordinarily should not be used to determine whether an individual patient should be admitted or treated for ACS. However, the presence of these risk factors does appear to relate to poor outcomes in patients with established ACS. Although not as well investigated as the traditional risk factors, a family history of premature CAD has been demonstrated to be associated with increased coronary artery calcium scores greater than the 75th age percentile in asymptomatic individuals and increased risk of 30-d cardiac events in patients
admitted for UA/NSTEMI. Of special interest is that sibling history of premature CAD has a stronger relationship than parental history. However, several of these risk factors have important prognostic and therapeutic implications. Diabetes and the presence of extracardiac (carotid, aortic, or peripheral) vascular disease are major risk factors for poor outcome in patients with ACS (see Section 6.2). For both STEMI and UA/NSTEMI, patients with these conditions have a significantly higher mortality rate and risk of acute HF. For the most part, this increase in risk is due to a greater extent of underlying CAD and LV dysfunction, but in many studies, diabetes carries prognostic significance over and above these findings. Similarly, a history of hypertension is associated with an increased risk of a poor outcome.

The current or prior use of ASA at the time and presentation of ACS has been associated in 1 database with increased cardiovascular event risk. The rationale is not fully elucidated, it appears those taking prior ASA therapy have more multivessel CAD, are more likely to present with thrombus present, may present later in the evolution of ACS, or may be ASA resistant. Surprisingly, current smoking is associated with a lower risk of death in the setting of ACS, primarily because of the younger age of smokers with ACS and less severe underlying CAD. This “smokers’ paradox” seems to represent a tendency for smokers to develop thrombi on less severe plaques and at an earlier age than nonsmokers.

Being overweight and/or obese at the time of ACS presentation is associated with lower short-term risk of death; however, this “obesity paradox” is primarily a function of younger age at time of presentation, referral for angiography at an earlier stage of disease, and more aggressive ACS management. Although short-term risk may be lower for overweight/obese individuals, these patients have a higher long-term total mortality risk. Increased long-term cardiovascular risk appears to be primarily limited to severe obesity.

Cocaine use has been implicated as a cause of ACS, presumably owing to the ability of this drug to cause coronary vasospasm and thrombosis in addition to its direct effects on heart rate and arterial pressure and its myocardial toxic properties (see Section 6.6). Recently, the use of methamphetamine has grown, and its association with ACS also should be considered. It is important to inquire about the use of cocaine and methamphetamine in patients with suspected ACS, especially in younger patients (age less than 40 years) and others with few risk factors for CAD. Urine toxicology should be considered when substance abuse is suspected as a cause of or contributor to ACS.

### 2.2.6. Estimation of Early Risk at Presentation

A number of risk assessment tools have been developed to assist in assessing risk of death and ischemic events in patients with UA/NSTEMI, thereby providing a basis for therapeutic decision making (Table 8, Figure 4). It should be recognized that the predictive ability of these commonly used risk assessment scores for nonfatal CHD risk is only moderate.

Antman et al developed the TIMI risk score, a simple tool composed of 7 (1-point) risk indicators rated on presentation (Table 8). The composite end points (all-cause mortality, new or recurrent MI, or severe recurrent ischemia prompting urgent revascularization within 14 d) increase as the TIMI risk score increases. The TIMI risk score has been validated internally within the TIMI 11B trial and 2 separate cohorts of patients from the Efficacy and Safety of Subcutaneous Enoxaparin in Unstable Angina and Non-Q-Wave Myocardial Infarction (ESSENCE) trial. The model remained a significant predictor of events and appeared relatively insensitive to missing information, such as knowledge of previously documented coronary stenosis of 50% or more. The model's predictive ability remained intact with a cutoff of 65 years of age. The TIMI risk score was recently studied in an unselected ED population with chest pain syndrome; its performance was similar to that in the ACS population in which it was derived and validated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>TIMI Risk Score</th>
<th>All-Cause Mortality, New or Recurrent MI, or Severe Recurrent Ischemia Requiring Urgent Revascularization Through 14 d After Randomization, %</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0–1</td>
<td>4.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>8.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>19.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>26.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6–7</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The TIMI risk score is determined by the sum of the presence of 7 variables at admission; 1 point is given for each of the following variables: age 65 y or older; at least 3 risk factors for CAD; prior coronary stenosis of 50% or more; ST-segment deviation on ECG presentation; at least 2 anginal events in prior 24 h; use of aspirin in prior 7 d; elevated serum cardiac biomarkers. Prior coronary stenosis of 50% or more remained relatively insensitive to missing information and remained significant predictor of events. Reprinted with permission from Antman EM, Cohen M, Bernink PJ, et al. The TIMI risk score for unstable angina/non–ST-elevation MI: method for prognostication and therapeutic decision making. JAMA 2000;284:835–42. Copyright © 2000 American Medical Association.

| CAD = coronary artery disease; ECG = electrocardiogram; MI = myocardial infarction; Y = year. |
or UA (C statistic = 0.83). The 8 variables used in the GRACE risk model are older age (odds ratio [OR] 1.7 per 10 years), Killip class (OR 2.0 per class), systolic blood pressure (OR 1.4 per 20 mmHg decrease), ST-segment deviation (OR 2.4), cardiac arrest during presentation (OR 4.3), serum creatinine level (OR 1.2 per 1-mg per dL increase), positive initial cardiac biomarkers (OR 1.6), and heart rate (OR 1.3 per 30-beat per min increase). The sum of scores is applied to a reference monogram to determine the corresponding all-cause mortality from hospital discharge to 6 mo. The GRACE clinical application tool can be downloaded to a handheld PDA to be used at the bedside and is available at www.outcomesumassmed.org/grace (Figure 4). An analysis comparing the 3 risk scores (TIMI, GRACE, and PURSUIT) concluded that all 3 demonstrated good predictive accuracy for death and MI at 1 year, thus identifying patients who might be likely to benefit from aggressive therapy, including early myocardial revascularization.

The ECG provides unique and important diagnostic and prognostic information (see also Section 2.2.6.1 below).
Accordingly, ECG changes have been incorporated into quantitative decision aids for the triage of patients presenting with chest discomfort. Although ST elevation carries the highest early risk of death, ST depression on the presenting ECG portends the highest risk of death at 6 months, with the degree of ST depression showing a strong relationship to outcome. Dynamic risk modeling is a new frontier in modeling that accounts for the common observation that levels and predictors of risk constantly evolve as patients pass through their disease process. Excellent models have been developed based on presenting features, but information the next day about clinical (eg, complications), laboratory (eg, biomarker evolution), and ECG (eg, ST resolution for STEMI) changes provides additional data relevant to decisions at key “decision-node” points in care. Dynamic modeling concepts promise more sophisticated, adaptive, and individually predictive modeling of risk in the future.

Renal impairment has been recognized as an additional high-risk feature in patients with ACS. Mild to moderate renal dysfunction is associated with moderately increased short- and long-term risks, and severe renal dysfunction is associated with severely increased short- and long-term mortality risks. Patients with renal dysfunction experience increased bleeding risks, have higher rates of HF and arrhythmias, have been underrepresented in cardiovascular trials, and may not enjoy the same magnitude of benefit with some therapies observed in patients with normal renal function. (see also Section 6.5).

Among patients with UA/NSTEMI, there is a progressively greater benefit from newer, more aggressive therapies such as low-molecular-weight heparin (LMWH), platelet GP IIb/IIIa inhibition, and an invasive strategy with increasing risk score.

2.2.6.1. Electrocardiogram

The ECG is critical not only to add support to the clinical suspicion of CAD but also to provide prognostic information based on the pattern and magnitude of the abnormalities. A recording made during an episode of the presenting symptoms is particularly valuable. Importantly, transient ST-segment changes (greater than or equal to 0.05 mV [ie, 0.5 mm]) that develop during a symptomatic episode at rest and that resolve when the patient becomes asymptomatic strongly suggest acute ischemia and a very high likelihood of underlying severe CAD. Patients whose current ECG suggests ischemia can be assessed with greater diagnostic accuracy if a prior ECG is available for comparison (Table 6).

Although it is imperfect, the 12-lead ECG lies at the center of the decision pathway for the evaluation and management of patients with acute ischemic discomfort (Figure 1, Table 6). The diagnosis of MI is confirmed with serial cardiac biomarkers in more than 90% of patients who present with ST-segment elevation of greater than or equal to 1 mm (0.1 mV) in at least 2 contiguous leads, and such patients should be considered candidates for acute reperfusion therapy. Patients who present with ST-segment depression are initially considered to have either UA or NSTEMI; the distinction between the 2 diagnoses is ultimately based on the detection of markers of myocardial necrosis in the blood. Up to 25% of patients with NSTEMI and elevated CK-MB go on to develop Q-wave MI during their hospital stay, whereas the remaining 75% have non-Q-wave MI. Acute fibrinolytic therapy is contraindicated for ACS patients without ST-segment elevation, except for those with electrocardiographic true posterior MI manifested as ST-segment depression in 2 contiguous anterior precordial leads and/or isolated ST-segment elevation in posterior chest leads. Inverted T waves may also indicate UA/NSTEMI. In patients suspected of having ACS on clinical grounds, marked (greater than or equal to 2 mm [0.2 mV]) symmetrical precordial T-wave inversion strongly suggests acute ischemia, particularly that due to a critical stenosis of the left anterior descending coronary artery (LAD). Patients with this ECG finding often exhibit hypokinesis of the anterior wall and are at high risk if given medical treatment alone. Revascularization will often reverse both the T-wave inversion and wall-motion disorder. Nonspecific ST-segment and T-wave changes, usually defined as ST-segment deviation of less than 0.5 mm (0.05 mV) or T-wave inversion of less than or equal to 2 mm (0.2 mV), are less diagnostically helpful than the foregoing findings. Established Q waves greater than or equal to 0.04 s are also less helpful in the diagnosis of UA, although by suggesting prior MI, they do indicate a high likelihood of significant CAD. Isolated Q waves in lead III may be a normal finding, especially in the absence of repolarization abnormalities in any of the inferior leads. A completely normal ECG in a patient with chest pain does not exclude the possibility of ACS, because 1% to 6% of such patients eventually are proved to have had an MI (by definition, an NSTEMI), and at least 4% will be found to have UA.

The common alternative causes of ST-segment and T-wave changes must be considered. In patients with ST-segment elevation, the diagnoses of LV aneurysm, pericarditis, myocarditis, Prinzmetal’s angina, early repolarization (eg, in young black males), apical LV ballooning syndrome (Takotsubo cardiomyopathy; see Section 6.9), and Wolff-Parkinson-White syndrome represent several examples to be considered. Central nervous system events and drug therapy with tricyclic antidepressants or phenothiazines can cause deep T-wave inversion.

Acute MI due to occlusion of the left circumflex coronary artery can present with a nondiagnostic 12-lead ECG. Approximately 4% of acute MI patients show the presence ST elevation isolated to the posterior chest leads V₇ through V₉ and “hidden” from the standard 12 leads. The presence of posterior ST elevation is diagnostically important because it qualifies the patient for acute reperfusion therapy as an acute STEMI. The presence or absence of ST-segment elevation in the right ventricular (V₉ through V₁₃) or posterior chest leads (V₇ through V₉) also adds prognostic information in the presence of inferior ST-segment elevation, predicting high and low rates of in-hospital life-threatening complications, respectively.

With reference to electrocardiographic true posterior MI, new terminology recently has been proposed based on the standard of cardiac magnetic resonance (CMR) imaging localization. CMR studies indicate that abnormally increased R waves, the Q-wave equivalent in leads V₇ and V₉, indicate an MI localized to the lateral LV wall and that abnormal Q waves in I and VL (but not V₉) indicate a mid-anterior wall MI. Thus,
the electrocardiographic terms “posterior” and “high lateral MI” refer to anatomic “lateral wall MI” and “mid-anterior wall MI.” The impact of these findings and recommendations for standard electrocardiographic terminology are unresolved as of this writing.

Several investigators have shown that a gradient of risk of death and cardiac ischemic events can be established based on the nature of the ECG abnormality. Patients with ACS and confounding ECG patterns such as bundle-branch block, paced rhythm, or LV hypertrophy are at the highest risk for death, followed by patients with ST-segment deviation (ST-segment elevation or depression); at the lowest risk are patients with isolated T-wave inversion or normal ECG patterns. Importantly, the prognostic information contained within the ECG pattern remains an independent predictor of death even after adjustment for clinical findings and cardiac biomarker measurements.

In addition to the presence or absence of ST-segment deviation or T-wave inversion patterns as noted earlier, there is evidence that the magnitude of the ECG abnormality provides important prognostic information. Thus, Lloyd-Jones et al reported that the diagnosis of acute non–Q-wave MI was 3 to 4 times more likely in patients with ischemic discomfort who had at least 3 ECG leads that showed ST-segment depression and maximal ST depression of greater than or equal to 0.2 mV. Investigators from the TIMI III Registry reported that the 1-year incidence of death or new MI in patients with at least 0.5 mm (0.05 mV) of ST-segment deviation was 16.3% compared with 6.8% for patients with isolated T-wave changes and 8.2% for patients with no ECG changes.

Physicians frequently seek out a previous ECG for comparison in patients with suspected ACS. Studies have demonstrated that patients with an unchanged ECG have a reduced risk of MI and a very low risk of in-hospital life-threatening complications even in the presence of confounding ECG patterns such as LV hypertrophy.

Because a single 12-lead ECG recording provides only a snapshot view of a dynamic process, the usefulness of obtaining serial ECG tracings or performing continuous ST-segment monitoring has been studied. Although serial ECGs increase the ability to diagnose UA and MI, the yield is higher with serial cardiac biomarker measurements. However, identification of new injury on serial 12-lead ECG (and not elevated cardiac biomarkers) has a reduced risk of MI and a very low risk of in-hospital life-threatening complications even in the presence of confounding ECG patterns such as LV hypertrophy.

Because a single 12-lead ECG recording provides only a snapshot view of a dynamic process, the usefulness of obtaining serial ECG tracings or performing continuous ST-segment monitoring has been studied.

Information from the initial history, physical examination, and ECG (Table 6) can enable the physician to classify and exclude from further assessment patients “not having ischemic discomfort.” This includes patients with noncardiac pain (eg, pulmonary embolism, musculoskeletal pain, or esophageal discomfort) or cardiac pain not caused by myocardial ischemia (eg, acute pericarditis). The remaining patients should undergo a more complete evaluation of the secondary causes of UA that might alter management. This evaluation should include a physical examination for evidence of other cardiac disease, an ECG to screen for arrhythmias, measurement of body temperature and blood pressure, and determination of hemoglobin or hematocrit. Cardiac disorders other than CAD that can cause myocardial ischemia include aortic stenosis and hypertrophic cardiomyopathy. Factors that increase myocardial oxygen demand or decrease oxygen delivery to the heart can provoke or exacerbate ischemia in the presence of significant underlying CAD or secondary angina; previously unrecognized gastrointestinal bleeding that causes anemia is a common secondary cause of worsening angina.
or the development of symptoms of ACS. Acute worsening of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease (with or without superimposed infection) can lower oxygen saturation levels sufficiently to intensify ischemic symptoms in patients with CAD. Evidence of increased cardiac oxygen demand can be suspected in the presence of fever, signs of hyperthyroidism, sustained tachyarrhythmias, or markedly elevated blood pressure. Another cause of increased myocardial oxygen demand is arteriovenous fistula in patients receiving dialysis.

The majority of patients seen in the ED with symptoms of possible ACS will be judged after their workup not to have a cardiac problem. One clinical trial of a predictive instrument evaluated 10,689 patients with suspected ACS. To participate, patients were required to be greater than 30 years of age with a chief symptom of chest, left arm, jaw, or epigastric pain or discomfort; shortness of breath; dizziness; palpitations; or other symptoms suggestive of acute ischemia. After evaluation, 7,996 patients (75%) were deemed not to have acute ischemia.

2.2.8. Cardiac Biomarkers of Necrosis and the Redefinition of AMI

Cardiac biomarkers have proliferated over recent years to address various facets of the complex pathophysiology of ACS. Some, like the cardiac troponins, have become essential for risk stratification of patients with UA/NSTEMI and for the diagnosis of MI. Others, such as the inflammatory markers, are opening new perspectives on pathophysiology and risk stratification, and the use in clinical practice of selected new markers may be recommended for clinical use in the near future. Still other promising markers are being developed as part of translational research and await prospective validation in various populations. New developments are expected in the fields of proteomic and genomics, cell markers and circulation microfluidics, and microtechnology and nanotechnology imaging.

Current markers of necrosis leak from cardiomyocytes after the loss of membrane integrity and diffuse into the cardiac interstitium, then into the lymphatics and cardiac microvasculature. Eventually, these macromolecules, collectively referred to as cardiac biomarkers, are detectable in the peripheral circulation. Features that favor their diagnostic performance are high concentrations in the myocardium and absence in nonmyocardial tissue, release into the blood within a convenient diagnostic time window and in proportion to the extent of myocardial injury, and quantification with reproducible, inexpensive, and rapid and easily applied assays. The cardiac troponins possess many of these features and have gained wide acceptance as the biomarkers of choice in the evaluation of patients with ACS for diagnosis, risk stratification, and treatment selection.

The traditional definitions of MI were revisited in 2000 in a consensus document of a joint committee of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) and ACC and at the time of publication is being updated by an expanded joint task force of the ESC, ACC, AHA, World Heart Federation (WHF), and World Health Organization. The new definitions are inspired by the emergence of new highly sensitive and specific diagnostic methods that allow the detection of areas of cell necrosis as small as 1 g. Myocardial necrosis in the task force document is defined by an elevation of troponin above the 99th percentile of normal. Myocardial infarction, which is necrosis related to ischemia, is further defined by the addition to the troponin elevation of at least 1 of the following criteria: ischemic ST and T-wave changes, new left bundle-branch block, new Q waves, PCI-related marker elevation, or positive imaging for a new loss of viable myocardium. Myocardial infarction can still be diagnosed in the absence of measurement of troponin when there is evidence of a new loss of viable myocardium, ST-segment elevation, or new left bundle-branch block with sudden cardiac death within 1 h of symptoms, or a postmortem pathological diagnosis. Coronary artery bypass graft-related MI is diagnosed by an increase of cardiac biomarkers to more than 5- to 10-fold the 99th percentile of normal, new Q waves or new left bundle-branch block on the ECG, or a positive imaging test. The task force further recommended further defining MI by the circumstances that cause it (spontaneous or in the setting of a diagnostic or therapeutic procedure), by the amount of cell loss (infarct size), and by the timing of MI (evolving, healed, or healed). Providing fold-elevations above normal for diagnostic biomarkers, to allow for meaningful comparisons among clinical trials, is also endorsed.

At the present time, the implications of using the new ESC/ACC redefinition of MI have not been fully explored; much of the present database for UA/NSTEMI derives from CK/CK-MB–based definitions of MI. Moreover, troponin assays have rapidly evolved through several generations over the past decade, becoming increasingly more sensitive and specific. Thus, it is important to recognize that the recommendations in this section are formulated from studies that frequently utilize modified World Health Organization criteria or definitions of MI based on earlier-generation troponin assays.

2.2.8.1. Creatine Kinase-MB

Creatine kinase-MB, a cytosolic carrier protein for high-energy phosphates, has long been the standard marker for the diagnosis of MI. Creatine kinase-MB, however, is less sensitive and less specific for MI than the cardiac troponins. Low levels of CK-MB can be found in the blood of healthy persons, and elevated levels occur with damage to skeletal muscle.

When a cardiac troponin is available, the determination of CK-MB remains useful in a few specific clinical situations. One is the diagnosis of early infarct extension (reinfarction), because the short half-life of CK-MB compared with troponin permits the detection of a diagnostic new increase after initial peak. Although routine determination of CK-MB has been suggested for the diagnosis of an eventual infarct extension, a single CK-MB determination obtained when symptoms recur may serve as the baseline value for comparison with samples obtained 6 to 12 h later. Another situation is the diagnosis of a periprocedural MI, because the diagnostic and prognostic value of CK-MB in these situations has been extensively validated. When assessed, CK-MB should be measured by mass immunoassays and not by other methods previously used.

The use of other, older biochemistry assays of nonspecific markers such as alanine transaminase, aspartate transaminase, and lactate dehydrogenase should generally be avoided in contemporary practice.
2.2.8.2. Cardiac Troponins

The troponin complex consists of 3 subunits: T (TnT), I (TnI), and C (TnC).229 The latter is expressed by both cardiac and skeletal muscle, whereas TnT and TnI are derived from heart-specific genes. Therefore, the term “cardiac troponins” (cTn) in these guidelines refers specifically to either cTnT or cTnI. Cardiac troponin as a biomarker provides robust results that are highly sensitive and specific in detecting cell necrosis; an early release is attributable to a cytosolic pool and a late release to the structural pool.225,230

Because cTnT and cTnI generally are not detected in the blood of healthy persons, the cutoff value for elevated cTnT and cTnI levels may be set to slightly above the upper limit of the performance characteristics of the assay for a normal healthy population. High-quality analytic methods are needed to achieve these high standards.231 One issue with the use of cTnI is the multiplicity of existing assays that have different analytical sensitivities, some being unable to detect the lower values with a reasonable precision.232 Physicians therefore need to know the sensitivity of the tests used for TnI in their hospitals at the cutoff concentrations used for clinical decisions. Such heterogeneity does not exist for cTnT, which exists as a single test; this test is now a third-generation immunoassay that uses recombinant monoclonal human antibodies.230 Rare patients may have blocking antibodies to part of the troponin molecule, which would result in false-negative results.233

2.2.8.2.1. Clinical Use. Although troponins can be detected in blood as early as 2 to 4 h after the onset of symptoms, elevation can be delayed for up to 8 to 12 h. This timing of elevation is similar to that of CK-MB but persists longer, for up to 5 to 14 d (Figure 5). An increasing pattern in serial levels best helps determine whether the event is acute, distinct from a previous event, subacute, or chronic.

The proportion of patients showing a positive cTn value depends on the population of patients under evaluation. Approximately 30% of patients with typical rest chest discomfort without ST-segment elevation who would be diagnosed as having UA because of a lack of CK-MB elevation actually have NSTEMI when assessed with cardiac-specific troponin assays. The diagnosis of MI in the community at large when cTn is used results in a large increase in the incidence of MIs, by as much as 41% compared with use of only CK-MB alone, and a change in the case mix, with a survival rate that is better than that of MI identified by the previous criteria.234 Troponin elevation conveys prognostic information beyond that supplied by the clinical characteristics of the patient, the ECG at presentation, and the predischarge exercise test.206,207,215–217 Furthermore, a quantitative relationship exists between the amount of elevation of cTn and the risk of death.206,207 (Figure 6). The incremental risk of death or MI in troponin-positive versus troponin-negative patients is summarized in Table 9. It should be cautioned, however, that cTn should not be used as the sole marker of risk, because

---

**Figure 5.** Timing of Release of Various Biomarkers After Acute Myocardial Infarction. The biomarkers are plotted showing the multiples of the cutoff for acute myocardial infarction (AMI) over time. The dashed horizontal line shows the upper limit of normal (ULN), defined as the 99th percentile from a normal reference population without myocardial necrosis; the coefficient of variation of the assay should be 10% or less). The earliest rising biomarkers are myoglobin and CK isoenzymes (leftmost curve). CKMB (dashed curve) rises to a peak of 2 to 5 times the ULN and typically returns to the normal range within 2 to 3 d after AMI. The cardiac-specific troponins show small elevations above the ULN in small infarctions (eg, as is often the case with NSTEMI) but rise to 20 to 50 times the ULN in the setting of large infarctions (eg, as is typically the case in STEMI). The troponin levels may stay elevated above the ULN for 7 d or more after AMI. Modified from Shapiro BP, Jaffe AS. Cardiac biomarkers. In: Murphy JG, Lloyd MA, editors. Mayo Clinic Cardiology: Concise Textbook. 3rd ed. Rochester, MN: Mayo Clinic Scientific Press and New York: Informa Healthcare USA, 2007:773–80.23 Used with permission from Mayo Foundation for Medical Education and Research. CK = creatine kinase; CKMB = MB fraction of creatine kinase; CV = coefficient of variation; MI = myocardial infarction; NSTEMI = non–ST-elevation myocardial infarction; UA/NSTEMI = unstable angina/non–ST-elevation myocardial infarction.

**Figure 6.** Troponin I Levels to Predict the Risk of Mortality in Acute Coronary Syndromes. Mortality rates are at 42 d (without adjustment for baseline characteristics) in patients with acute coronary syndrome. The numbers at the bottom of each bar are the numbers of patients with cardiac troponin I levels in each range, and the numbers above the bars are percentages. P less than 0.001 for the increase in the mortality rate (and the risk ratio for mortality) with increasing levels of cardiac troponin I at enrollment. Reprinted with permission from Antman EM, Tana-sijevic MJ, Thompson B, et al. Cardiac-specific troponin I levels to predict the risk of mortality in patients with acute coronary syndromes. N Engl J Med 1996;335:1342–9.25 Copyright © 1996 Massachusetts Medical Society. All rights reserved.
patients without troponin elevations can still have a substantial risk of an adverse outcome.

Although cTn accurately identifies myocardial necrosis, it does not inform us as to the cause or causes of necrosis; these can be multiple and include noncoronary causes such as tachyarrhythmia, cardiac trauma by interventions, chest trauma from motor vehicle accidents, HF, LV hypertrophy, myocarditis, and pericarditis, as well as severe noncardiac conditions such as sepsis, burns, respiratory failure, acute neurological diseases, pulmonary embolism, pulmonary hypertension, drug toxicity, cancer chemotherapy, and renal insufficiency. Therefore, in making the diagnosis of NSTEMI, cTn should be used in conjunction with other criteria of MI, including characteristics of the ischemic symptoms and the ECG.

In all of these situations, equivalent information is generally obtained with cTnI and cTnT, except in patients with renal dysfunction, in whom cTnI assessment appears to have a specific role. Among patients with end-stage renal disease and no clinical evidence of acute myocardial necrosis, 15% to 53% show increased cTnT, but fewer than 10% have increased cTnI; dialysis generally increases cTnT but decreases cTnI.

Troponin elevation has important therapeutic implications. It permits the identification of high-risk patients and of subsets of patients who will benefit from specific therapies. Thus, among patients with UA/NSTEMI, those with elevated cTn benefit from treatment with platelet GP IIb/IIIa inhibitors, whereas those without such elevation may not benefit or may even experience a deleterious effect. For example, in the c7E3 Fab Antiplatelet Therapy in Unstable angina to prevent Recurrent ischemic Events (CAPTURE) trial, the rates of death or nonfatal MI with cTnT elevation were 23.9% with placebo versus 9.5% with abciximab (P=0.002). Similar results have been reported for cTnI and cTnT with use of tirofiban. The benefit of LMWH was also greater in UA/NSTEMI patients with positive cTn. In the Fragmin During Instability in Coronary Artery Disease (FRISC) trial, the rates of death or nonfatal MI through 40 d increased progressively in the placebo group from 5.7% in the lowest tertile to 12.6% and 15.7% in the second and third tertiles, respectively, compared with rates of 4.7%, 5.7%, and 8.9%, respectively, in the dalteparin group, which represents risk reductions in events by increasing tertiles of 17.5%, 43%, and 55% 248. Similar differential benefits were observed with enoxaparin versus unfractionated heparin (UFH) in the ESSENCE trial. By contrast and of interest, patients with UA/NSTEMI but without elevated cTnT in the Clopidogrel in Unstable angina to prevent Recurrent ischemic Events
therapy (13.1% vs 18.3%) in patients with elevated levels.250

The reasons for the differential benefit could pertain to a benefit that does not emerge in the low-risk patient, or that is overshadowed by complications related to treatment.

Such also appears to be the case with the GP IIb/IIIa antagonists and with an invasive management strategy that includes application of interventional procedures. Indeed, in 2 trials that compared an early routine invasive strategy to a routine noninvasive strategy, the FRISC-II and Treat Angina with Aggrastat and determine Cost of Therapy with Invasive or Conservative Strategy (TACTICS) TIMI-18 trials, patients who profited from the early invasive treatment strategy were those at high risk as determined by cTnT levels and the admission ECG. In the FRISC study, the invasive strategy reduced the 12-month risk of death or MI by 40% (13.2% vs 22.1%, P=0.001) in the cohort with both ST depression and a cTnT level of 0.03 mcg per liter or greater, but the absolute gain of the invasive strategy was insignificant in the cohorts with either ST depression, cTnT level elevation, or neither of these findings.251 In the TACTICS TIMI-28 study, subgroups of patients with no ECG changes, a low TIMI score, and no cTn elevation showed no benefit from the invasive strategy, whereas those with positive cTn, independent of the presence of elevated CK-MB levels, showed markedly reduced odds of adverse clinical events of 0.13 at 30 d (95% confidence interval [CI] = 0.04 to 0.39) and 0.29 at 180 d (95% CI = 0.16 to 0.52).252

2.2.8.1.1. Clinical Use of Marker Change Scores. A newer method to both identify and exclude MI within 6 h of symptoms is to rely on changes in serum marker levels (delta values) over an abbreviated time interval (eg, 2 h) as opposed to the traditional approach of performing serial measurements over 6 to 8 h.218,220,253–256 Because assays are becoming more sensitive and precise, this method permits the identification of increasing values while they are still in the normal or indeterminate range of the assay. By relying on delta values for the identification or exclusion of MI, higher-risk patients with positive delta values can be selected earlier for more aggressive anti-ischemic therapy (eg, GP IIb/IIIa inhibitors), and lower-risk patients with negative delta values can be considered for early stress testing.218,220,255–257 One study of 1042 patients found the addition of a 3-h delta CK-MB to result in a sensitivity of 93% and a specificity of 94% for MI.254 In another study of 2074 consecutive ED chest pain patients, a 2-h delta CK-MB in conjunction with a 2-h delta troponin I measurement had a sensitivity for acute MI of 93% and specificity of 94% in patients whose initial ECG was nondiagnostic for injury. When combined with physician judgment and selective nuclear stress testing, the sensitivity for MI was 100% with specificity of 82%, and the sensitivity for 30-d ACS was 99.1% with specificity of 87%.220 Because there are no manufacturer-recommended delta cutoff values, the appropriate delta values for identification and exclusion of MI should take into account the sensitivity and precision of the specific assay utilized and should be confirmed by in-house studies. It also is important for delta values to be measured on the same instrument owing to subtle variations in calibration among individual instruments, even of the same model.

Another method to exclude MI within 6 h of symptom onset is the multimarker approach, which utilizes the serial measurement of myoglobin (ie, a very early marker) in combination with the serial measurements of cTn and/or CK-MB (ie, a later marker).258–262 Studies have reported that multimarker measurements at baseline and 90 min have a sensitivity for MI of approximately 95% with a high negative predictive value, thus allowing for the early exclusion of MI when combined with clinical judgment.260,261 However, because of the low specificity of the multimarker strategy (mainly due to the lower specificity of myoglobin), a positive multimarker test is inadequate to diagnose MI and requires confirmation with a later-appearing definitive marker.260,263

2.2.8.2.1.2. Bedside Testing for Cardiac Markers. Cardiac markers can be measured in the central chemistry laboratory or with point-of-care instruments in the ED with desktop devices or handheld bedside rapid qualitative assays.239 When a central laboratory is used, results should be available as soon as possible, with a goal of within 60 min. Point-of-care systems, if implemented at the bedside, have the advantage of reducing delays due to transportation and processing in a central laboratory and can eliminate delays due to the lack of availability of central laboratory assays at all hours. Certain portable devices can simultaneously measure myoglobin, CK-MB, and troponin I.255 These advantages of point-of-care systems must be weighed against the need for stringent quality control and appropriate training of ED personnel in assay performance and the higher costs of point-of-care testing devices relative to determinations in the central laboratory. In addition, these point-of-care assays at present are qualitative or, at best, semiquantitative. To date, bedside testing has not succeeded in becoming widely accepted or applied.

2.2.8.3. Myoglobin and CK-MB Subforms Compared With Troponins

Myoglobin, a low-molecular-weight heme protein found in both cardiac and skeletal muscle, is not cardiac specific, but it is released more rapidly from infarcted myocardium than are CK-MB and cTn and can be detected as early as 2 h after the onset of myocardial necrosis. However, the clinical value of serial determinations of myoglobin for the diagnosis of MI is limited by its brief duration of elevation of less than 24 h. Thus, an isolated early elevation in patients with a nondiagnostic ECG should not be relied on to make the diagnosis of MI but should be supplemented by a more cardiac-specific marker.260 Creatine kinase-MB subforms are also efficient for the early diagnosis of MI and have a similar specificity to that of CK-MB but require special expertise.
with no real advantage over better standardized and more easily applied cTn testing.

2.2.8.4. Summary Comparison of Biomarkers of Necrosis: Singly and in Combination

Table 10 compares the advantages and disadvantages of cardiac biomarkers of necrosis that are currently used for the evaluation and management of patients with suspected ACS but without ST-segment elevation on the 12-lead ECG. Given the overlapping time frame of the release pattern of cardiac biomarkers, it is important that clinicians incorporate the time from the onset of the patient’s symptoms into their assessment of the results of biomarker measurements.18,25,26,266 (Figure 5).

Many patients with suspected ACS have combined assessments of troponin and CK-MB. When baseline troponin and CK-MB were used together for diagnostic and risk assessment across the spectrum of chest pain syndromes in a large database that consisted of several clinical trials, those with positive results for both markers were at highest short-term (24 h and 30 d) risk of death or MI.267 However, those with baseline troponin elevation without CK-MB elevation also were at increased 30-d risk, whereas risk with isolated CK-MB elevation was lower and not significantly different than if both markers were negative.267

In summary, the cTns are currently the markers of choice for the diagnosis of MI. They have a sensitivity and specificity as yet unsurpassed, which allows for the recognition of very small amounts of myocardial necrosis. These small areas of infarction are the consequence of severe ischemia and/or distal microembolization of debris from an unstable thrombogenic plaque. The unstable plaques are likely responsible for the high-risk situation. Thus, cTns as biomarkers are not only markers of cell necrosis but also of an active thrombogenic plaque, and hence, they indicate prognosis and are useful in guiding therapies. Although not quite as sensitive or specific as the cTns, CK-MB by mass assay is a second-choice marker that remains useful for the diagnosis of MI extension and of periprocedural MI. Routine use of myoglobin and other markers is not generally recommended.

Because many methods exist, many with multiple test generations, for cardiac biomarker testing in practice and in published reports, physicians should work with their clinical laboratories to ensure use of and familiarity with contemporary test technology, with appropriate, accurate ranges of normal and diagnostic cutoffs, specific to the assay used.

2.2.9. Other Markers and Multimarker Approaches

Besides markers of myocardial necrosis, markers of pathophysiological mechanisms implicated in ACS are under investigation and could become useful to determine pathophysiology, individualize treatment, and evaluate therapeutic effects. In considering the clinical application of new biomarkers, it is important to determine that they provide

Table 10. Biochemical Cardiac Markers for the Evaluation and Management of Patients With Suspected ACS But Without ST-Segment Elevation on 12-Lead ECG

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Marker</th>
<th>Advantages</th>
<th>Disadvantages</th>
<th>Point-of-Care Test Available?</th>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>Clinical Recommendation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Cardiac troponins</td>
<td>1. Powerful tool for risk stratification</td>
<td>1. Low sensitivity in very early phase of MI (less than 6 h after symptom onset) and requires repeat measurement at 8 to 12 h, if negative</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Data on diagnostic performance and potential therapeutic implications increasingly available from clinical trials</td>
<td>Useful as a single test to efficiently diagnose NSTEMI (including minor myocardial damage), with serial measurements. Clinicians should familiarize themselves with diagnostic “cutoffs” used in their local hospital laboratory</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Greater sensitivity and specificity than CK-MB</td>
<td>2. Limited ability to detect late minor infarction</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Detection of recent MI up to 2 weeks after onset</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Useful for selection of therapy</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5. Detection of reperfusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CK-MB</td>
<td>1. Rapid, cost-efficient, accurate assays</td>
<td>1. Loss of specificity in setting of skeletal muscle disease or injury, including surgery</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Familiar to majority of clinicians</td>
<td>Prior standard and still acceptable diagnostic test in most clinical circumstances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Ability to detect early reinfarction</td>
<td>2. Low sensitivity during very early MI (less than 6 h after symptom onset) or later after symptom onset (more than 36 h) and for minor myocardial damage (detectable with troponins)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Myoglobin</td>
<td>1. High sensitivity</td>
<td>1. Very low specificity in setting of skeletal muscle injury or disease</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>More convenient early marker than CK-MB isoforms because of greater availability of assays for myoglobin; rapid-release kinetics make myoglobin useful for noninvasive monitoring of reperfusion in patients with established MI</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2. Useful in early detection of MI</td>
<td>2. Rapid return to normal range limits sensitivity for later presentations</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3. Detection of reperfusion</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4. Most useful in ruling out MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACS = acute coronary syndrome; CK-MB = MB fraction of creatine kinase; ECG = electrocardiogram; h = hours; MI = myocardial infarction; NSTEMI = non–ST-elevation MI.
incremental value over existing biomarkers. A multimarker approach to risk stratification of UA/NSTEMI (eg, simultaneous assessment of cTnI, C-reactive protein [CRP], and BNP) has been advocated as a potential advance over single biomarker assessment. Further evaluation of a multimarker approach will be of interest.

2.2.9.1. Ischemia

Other new biochemical markers for the detection of myocardial necrosis are either less useful or have been less well studied than those mentioned above. An example is ischemia-modified albumin found soon after transient coronary occlusion and preceding any significant elevations in myoglobin, CK-MB, or cTnI. This modified albumin depends on a reduced capacity of human albumin to bind exogenous cobalt during ischemia. Choline is released upon the cleavage of phospholipids and could also serve as a marker of ischemia. Growth-differentiation factor-15 (GDF-15), a member of the transforming growth factor-β cytokine superfamily that is induced after ischemia-and-reperfusion injury, is a new biomarker that has been reported to be of incremental prognostic value for death in patients with UA/NSTEMI.

2.2.9.2. Coagulation

Markers of activity of the coagulation cascade, including elevated plasma levels of fibrinogen, the prothrombin fragments, fibrinopeptide, and ß-dimers, are elevated in ACS but have little discriminative ability for a specific pathophysiology, diagnosis, or treatment assessments. In experimental studies, markers of thrombin generation are blocked by anticoagulants and reactivate after their discontinuation and are not affected by clopidogrel.

2.2.9.3. Platelets

Platelet activation currently is difficult to assess directly in vivo. New methods, however, are emerging that should allow a better and more efficient appraisal of their state of activation and of drug effects. Alternative markers of platelet activity are also being studied, including CD40L, platelet-neutrophil coaggregates, P-selectin, and platelet microparticles.

2.2.9.4. Inflammation

Systemic markers of inflammation are being widely studied and show promise for providing additional insights into pathophysiological mechanisms proximal to and triggering thrombosis, as well as suggesting novel therapeutic approaches. White blood cell counts are elevated in patients with MI, and this elevation has prognostic implications. Patients without biochemical evidence of myocardial necrosis but who have elevated CRP levels on admission or during hospital stay have higher short- and long-term mortality rates; at 1 year, mortality rates with increasing quartiles were 1.8%, 3.9%, 7.7%, and 19.2%, respectively (P less than 0.001) in the GUSTO-IV trial of 6809 patients. This prognostic value was independent of conventional risk factors for mortality in patients with stable and unstable CAD. A review of available studies in ACS showed that when measured at first patient contact or during the hospital stay, the natriuretic peptides are strong predictors of both short- and long-term mortality in patients with STEMI and UA/NSTEMI. Increasing levels of NT-proBNP are associated with proportionally higher short- and long-term mortality rates: at 1 year, mortality rates with increasing quartiles were 1.8%, 3.9%, 7.7%, and 19.2%, respectively (P less than 0.001) in the GUSTO-IV trial of 6809 patients. This prognostic value was independent of a previous history of HF and of clinical or laboratory signs of LV dysfunction on admission or during hospital stay. B-type natriuretic peptide and NT-proBNP levels can now be measured easily and rapidly in most hospital laboratories.

2.3. Immediate Management

Recommendations

Class I

1. The history, physical examination, 12-lead ECG, and initial cardiac biomarker tests should be integrated to assign patients with chest pain into 1 of 4 categories: a noncardiac diagnosis, chronic stable angina, possible ACS, and definite ACS. (Level of Evidence: C)

2. Patients with probable or possible ACS but whose initial 12-lead ECG and cardiac biomarker levels are normal should be observed in a facility with cardiac monitoring (eg, chest pain unit or hospital telemetry ward), and repeat ECG (or continuous 12-lead ECG monitoring) and repeat cardiac biomarker measurement(s) should be obtained at predetermined, specified time intervals (see Section 2.2.8). (Level of Evidence: B)

3. In patients with suspected ACS in whom ischemic heart disease is present or suspected, if the follow-up 12-lead ECG and cardiac biomarkers measurements are normal, a stress test (exercise or pharmacological) to provoke ischemia should be performed in the ED, in a chest pain unit, or on an outpatient basis in a timely fashion (within 72 h) as an alternative to inpatient admission. Low-risk patients with a negative diagnostic test can be managed as outpatients. (Level of Evidence: C)
4. In low-risk patients who are referred for outpatient stress testing (see above), precautionary appropriate pharmacotherapy (eg, ASA, sublingual NTG, and/or beta blockers) should be given while awaiting results of the stress test. (Level of Evidence: C)

5. Patients with definite ACS and ongoing ischemic symptoms, positive cardiac biomarkers, new ST-segment deviations, new deep T-wave inversions, hemodynamic abnormalities, or a positive stress test should be admitted to the hospital for further management. Admission to the critical care unit is recommended for those with active, ongoing ischemia/injury or hemodynamic or electrical instability. Otherwise, a telemetry step-down unit is reasonable. (Level of Evidence: C)

6. Patients with possible ACS and negative cardiac biomarkers who are unable to exercise or who have an abnormal resting ECG should undergo a pharmacological stress test. (Level of Evidence: B)

7. Patients with definite ACS and ST-segment elevation in leads V₁ to V₄ due to left circumflex occlusion should be evaluated for immediate reperfusion therapy. (Level of Evidence: A)

8. Patients discharged from the ED or chest pain unit should be given specific instructions for activity, medications, additional testing, and follow-up with a personal physician. (Level of Evidence: C)

Class IIa

1. In patients with suspected ACS with a low or intermediate probability of CAD, in whom the follow-up 12-lead ECG and cardiac biomarkers measurements are normal, performance of a noninvasive coronary imaging test (ie, CCTA) is reasonable as an alternative to stress testing. (Level of Evidence: B)

By integrating information from the history, physical examination, 12-lead ECG, and initial cardiac biomarker tests, clinicians can assign patients to 1 of 4 categories: noncardiac diagnosis, chronic stable angina, possible ACS, and definite ACS (Figure 2).

Patients who arrive at a medical facility in a pain-free state, have unchanged or normal ECGs, are hemodynamically stable, and do not have elevated cardiac biomarkers represent more of a diagnostic than an urgent therapeutic challenge. Evaluation begins in these patients by obtaining information from the history, physical examination, and ECG (Tables 6 and 7) to be used to confirm or reject the diagnosis of UA/NSTEMI.

Patients with a low likelihood of CAD should be evaluated for other causes of the noncardiac presentation, including musculoskeletal pain; gastrointestinal disorders, such as esophageal spasm, gastritis, peptic ulcer disease, or cholecystitis; intrathoracic disease, such as musculoskeletal disorders; and neuropsychiatric disease, such as hyperventilation syndrome, panic disorder (Figure 2, B1). Patients who are found to have evidence of 1 of these alternative diagnoses should be excluded from management with these guidelines and referred for appropriate follow-up care (Figure 2, C1). Reassurance should be balanced with instructions to return for further evaluation if symptoms worsen or if the patient fails to respond to symptomatic treatment. Chronic stable angina may also be diagnosed in this setting (Figure 2, B2), and patients with this diagnosis should be managed according to the ACC/AHA 2002 Guideline Update for the Management of Patients With Chronic Stable Angina.11

Patients with possible ACS (Figure 2, B3 and D1) are candidates for additional observation in a specialized facility (eg, chest pain unit) (Figure 2, E1). Patients with definite ACS (Figure 2, B4) are triaged on the basis of the pattern of the 12-lead ECG. Patients with ST-segment elevation (Figure 2, C3) are evaluated for immediate reperfusion therapy (Figure 2, D3) and managed according to the ACC/AHA Guidelines for the Management of Patients With ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction,8 whereas those without ST-segment elevation (Figure 2, C2) are either managed by additional observation (Figure 2, E1) or admitted to the hospital (Figure 2, H3). Patients with low-risk ACS (Table 6) without transient ST-segment depressions greater than or equal to 0.05 mV (0.5 mm) or T-wave inversions greater than or equal to 0.2 mV (2 mm), without positive cardiac biomarkers, and with a negative stress test or CCTA (Figure 2, H1) may be discharged and treated as outpatients (Figure 2, I1). Low-risk patients may have a stress test within 3 d of discharge.

2.3.1. Chest Pain Units

To facilitate a more definitive evaluation while avoiding the unnecessary hospital admission of patients with possible ACS (Figure 2, B3) and low-risk ACS (Figure 2, F1), as well as the inappropriate discharge of patients with active myocardial ischemia without ST-segment elevation (Figure 2, C2), special units have been established that are variously referred to as “chest pain units” and “short-stay ED coronary care units.” Personnel in these units use critical pathways or protocols designed to arrive at a decision about the presence or absence of myocardial ischemia and, if present, to characterize it further as UA or NSTEMI and to define the optimal next step in the care of the patient (eg, admission, acute intervention).9,20,292,293 The goal is to arrive at such a decision after a finite amount of time, which usually is between 6 and 12 h but may extend up to 24 h depending on the policies in individual hospitals. Typically, the patient undergoes a predetermined observation period with serial cardiac biomarkers and ECGs. At the end of the observation period, the patient is reevaluated and then generally undergoes functional cardiac testing (eg, resting nuclear scan or echocardiography) and/or stress testing (eg, treadmill, stress echocardiography, or stress nuclear testing) or noninvasive coronary imaging study (ie, CCTA) (see Section 2.3.2). Those patients who have a recurrence of chest pain strongly suggestive of ACS, a positive biomarker value, a significant ECG change, or a positive functional/stress test or CCTA are generally admitted for inpatient evaluation and treatment. Although chest pain units are useful, other appropriate observation areas in which patients with chest pain can be evaluated may be used as well, such as a section of the hospital’s cardiology telemetry ward.

The physical location of the chest pain unit or the site where patients with chest pain are observed is variable, ranging from...
a specifically designated area of the ED to a separate hospital unit with the appropriate equipment to observational status (24-h admission) on a regular hospital telemetry ward.\textsuperscript{294} Similarly, the chest pain unit may be administratively a part of the ED and staffed by emergency physicians or may be administered and staffed separately or as part of the hospital cardiovascular service. Capability of chest pain units generally includes continuous monitoring of the patient's ECG, ready availability of cardiac resuscitation equipment and medications, and appropriate staffing with nurses and physicians. The ACEP has published guidelines that recommend a program for the continuous monitoring of outcomes of patients evaluated in such units and the impact on hospital resources.\textsuperscript{295} A consensus panel statement from ACEP emphasized that chest pain units should be considered as part of a multifaceted program that includes efforts to minimize patient delays in seeking medical care and delays in the ED itself.\textsuperscript{295}

It has been reported, both from studies with historical controls and from randomized trials, that the use of chest pain units is cost-saving compared with an in-hospital evaluation to "rule out MI."\textsuperscript{296,297} The potential cost savings of a chest pain unit varies depending on the practice pattern for the disposition of chest pain patients at individual hospitals.\textsuperscript{296} Hospitals with a high admission rate of low-risk patients to rule out MI (70\% to 80\%) will experience the largest cost savings by implementing a chest pain unit approach but will have the smallest impact on the number of missed MI patients. In contrast, hospitals with relatively low admission rates of such patients (30\% to 40\%) will experience greater improvements in the quality of care because fewer MI patients will be missed but will experience a smaller impact on costs because of the low baseline admission rate.

Farkouh et al\textsuperscript{108} extended the use of a chest pain unit in a separate portion of the ED to include patients at an intermediate risk of adverse clinical outcome on the basis of the previously published Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality guidelines for the management of UA\textsuperscript{131} (Table 7). They reported a 46\% reduction in the ultimate need for hospital admission in intermediate-risk patients after a median stay of 9.2 h in the chest pain unit. Extension of the use of chest pain units to intermediate-risk patients in an effort to reduce inpatient costs is facilitated by making available diagnostic testing modalities such as treadmill testing and stress imaging (echocardiographic, nuclear, or magnetic resonance) or CCTA within 72 h. The exact nature of the test may vary depending on the patient's ability to exercise on either a treadmill or bicycle and/or T-wave changes, positive cardiac biomarkers, or hemodynamic instability; Figure 2, D2) should be admitted to the hospital (Figure 2, H3).

2.3.2. Discharge From ED or Chest Pain Unit

The initial assessment of whether a patient has UA/NSTEMI and which triage option is most suitable generally should be made immediately on the patient's arrival at a medical facility. Rapid assessment of a patient's candidacy for additional observation can be accomplished based on the status of the symptoms, ECG findings, and initial serum cardiac biomarker measurement.

Patients who experience recurrent ischemic discomfort, evolve abnormalities on a follow-up 12-lead ECG or on cardiac biomarker measurements, or develop hemodynamic abnormalities such as new or worsening HF (Figure 2, D2) should be admitted to the hospital (Figure 2, H3) and managed as described in Section 3.

Patients who are pain free, have either a normal or nondiagnostic ECG or one that is unchanged from previous tracings, and have a normal set of initial cardiac biomarker measurements are candidates for further evaluation to screen for nonischemic discomfort (Figure 2, B1) versus a low-risk ACS (Figure 2, D1). If the patient is low risk (Table 7) and does not experience any further ischemic discomfort and a follow-up 12-lead ECG and cardiac biomarker measurements after 6 to 8 h of observation are normal (Figure 2, F1), the patient may be considered for an early stress test to provoke ischemia or CCTA to assess for obstructive CAD (Figure 2, G1). This test can be performed before the discharge and should be supervised by an experienced physician. Alternatively, the patient may be discharged and return for stress testing as an outpatient within 72 h. The exact nature of the test may vary depending on the patient's ability to exercise on either a treadmill or bicycle and the local expertise in a given hospital setting (eg, availability of different testing modalities at different times of the day or different days of the week).\textsuperscript{299} Patients who are capable of exercise and who are free of confounding features on the baseline ECG, such as bundle-branch block, LV hypertrophy, or paced rhythms, can be evaluated with routine symptom-limited conventional exercise stress testing. Patients who are incapable of exercise or who have an interpretable baseline ECG should be considered for pharmacological stress testing with either nuclear perfusion imaging or 2-dimensional echocardiography, or magnetic resonance.\textsuperscript{181,293,301} Alternatively,
it is reasonable to perform a non-invasive coronary imaging test (ie, CCTA). An imaging-enhanced test also may be more predictive in women than conventional ECG exercise stress testing (see Section 6.1).

Two imaging modalities, CMR and multidetector computed tomography for coronary calcification and CCTA, are increasingly becoming clinically validated and applied and hold promise as alternative or supplementary imaging modalities for assessing patients who present with chest pain syndromes. Cardiac magnetic resonance has the capability of assessing cardiac function, perfusion, and viability in the same setting. Its advantages are excellent resolution (approximately 1 mm) of cardiac structures and avoidance of exposure to radiation and iodinated contrast. Disadvantages include long study time, confined space (claustrophobia), and (current) contraindication to the presence of pacemakers/defibrillators. To evaluate for ischemic heart disease, an adenosine first-pass gadolinium perfusion study is combined with assessment of regional and global function and viability (gadolinium delayed study). Direct coronary artery imaging is better assessed by CCTA (see below). One study indicated a sensitivity of 89% and specificity of 87% for combined adenosine stress and gadolinium delayed enhancement (viability) CMR testing for CAD. Dobutamine CMR stress testing can be used as an alternative to adenosine perfusion CMR (eg, in asthmatic patients).

Coronary CT angiography with current multidetector technology (ie, 64 slices beginning in 2005) has been reported to give 90% to 95% or greater sensitivity and specificity for occlusive CAD in early clinical trial experience. Because continuity of care is important in the overall management of patients with a chest pain syndrome, the patient's primary physician (if not involved in the care of the patient during the initial episode) should be notified of the results of the evaluation and should receive a copy of the relevant test results. Patients with a noncardiac diagnosis and those with low risk or possible ACS with a negative stress test should be counseled to make an appointment with their primary physician as outpatients for further investigation into the cause of their symptoms (Figure 2, I1). They should be seen by a physician as soon after discharge from the ED or chest pain unit as practical and appropriate, that is, usually within 72 h.

Patients with possible ACS (Figure 5, B3) and those with a definite ACS but a nondiagnostic ECG and normal cardiac biomarkers when they are initially seen (Figure 2, D1) at institutions without a chest pain unit (or equivalent facility) should be admitted to an inpatient unit. The inpatient unit to which such patients are to be admitted should have the same provisions for continuous ECG monitoring, availability of resuscitation equipment, and staffing arrangements as described above for the design of chest pain units.

3. Early Hospital Care

Patients with UA/NSTEMI, recurrent symptoms suggestive of ACS and/or ECG ST-segment deviations, or positive cardiac biomarkers who are stable hemodynamically should be admitted to an inpatient unit for bed rest with continuous rhythm monitoring and careful observation for recurrent ischemia (a step-down unit) and managed with either an

[301] Because LV function is so integrally related to prognosis and greatly affects therapeutic options, strong consideration should be given to the assessment of LV function with echocardiography or another modality (ie, CMR, radionuclide, CCTA, or contrast angiography) in patients with documented ischemia. In sites at which stress tests are not available, low-risk patients may be discharged and referred for outpatient stress testing in a timely fashion. Prescription of precautionary anti-ischemic treatment (eg, ASA, sublingual NTG, and beta blockers) should be considered in these patients while awaiting results of stress testing. Specific instructions also should be given on whether or not to take these medications (eg, beta blockers) before testing, which may vary depending on the test ordered and patient-specific factors. These patients also should be given specific instructions on what to do and how to seek emergency care for recurrence or worsening of symptoms while awaiting the stress test.

Patients who develop recurrent symptoms during observation suggestive of ACS or in whom the follow-up studies (12-lead ECG, cardiac biomarkers) show new abnormalities (Figure 2, F2) should be admitted to the hospital (Figure 2, H3). Patients in whom ACS has been excluded should be reassessed for need for further evaluation of other potentially serious medical conditions that may mimic ACS symptomatology (eg, pulmonary embolism and aortic dissection).
invasive or conservative strategy (Appendix 6 has replaced Table 11). Patients with continuing discomfort and/or hemodynamic instability should be hospitalized for at least 24 h in a coronary care unit characterized by a nursing-to-patient ratio sufficient to provide 1) continuous rhythm monitoring, 2) frequent assessment of vital signs and mental status, 3) documented ability to perform defibrillation quickly after the onset of ventricular fibrillation, and 4) adequate staff to perform these functions. Patients should be maintained at that level of care until they have been observed for an adequate period of time, generally at least 24 h, without any of the following major complications: sustained ventricular tachycardia or fibrillation, sinus tachycardia, high-degree atrioventricular (AV) block, sustained hypotension, recurrent ischemia documented by symptoms or ST-segment change, new mechanical defect (ventricular septal defect or mitral regurgitation), or HF. Shorter periods of monitoring might be appropriate for selected patients who are successfully reperfused and who have normal LV function and minimal or no necrosis.

Once a patient with documented high-risk ACS is admitted, standard medical therapy is indicated as discussed later. Unless a contraindication exists, these patients generally should be treated with ASA, a beta blocker, anticoagulant therapy, a GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor, and a thienopyridine (ie, clopidogrel; initiation may be deferred until a revascularization decision is made). Critical decisions are required regarding the angiographic (invasive) strategy. One option is a routine angiographic approach in which coronary angiography and revascularization are performed unless a contraindication exists. Within this approach, a common past strategy has called for a period of medical stabilization. Increasingly, physicians are taking a more aggressive approach, with coronary angiography and revascularization performed within 24 h of admission; the rationale for the more aggressive approach is the protective effect of carefully administered anticoagulant and antiplatelet therapy on procedural outcome. The alternative approach, commonly referred to as the “initial conservative strategy” (see Section 3.3), is guided by ischemia, with angiography reserved for patients with recurrent ischemia or a high-risk stress test despite medical therapy. Regardless of the angiographic strategy, an assessment of LV function is recommended in patients with documented ischemia because of the imperative to treat patients who have impaired LV function with ACE inhibitors, beta blockers, and, when HF or diabetes mellitus is present, aldosterone antagonists; when the coronary anatomy is appropriate (eg, 3-vessel coronary disease), CABG is appropriate (see Section 4). When the coronary angiogram is obtained, a left ventriculogram may be obtained at the same time. When coronary angiography is not scheduled, echocardiography, nuclear ventriculography, or magnetic resonance imaging or CT angiography can be used to evaluate LV function.

### Table 11. Selection of Initial Treatment Strategy: Invasive Versus Conservative Strategy

Deleted. Replaced by Appendix 6.

#### 3.1. Anti-Ischemic and Analgesic Therapy

**Recommendations for Anti-Ischemic Therapy**

**Class I**

1. Bed/chair rest with continuous ECG monitoring is recommended for all UA/NSTEMI patients during the early hospital phase. *(Level of Evidence: C)*

2. Supplemental oxygen should be administered to patients with UA/NSTEMI with an arterial saturation less than 90%, respiratory distress, or other high-risk features for hypoxemia. *(Pulse oximetry is useful for continuous measurement of SaO₂)* *(Level of Evidence: B)*

3. Patients with UA/NSTEMI with ongoing ischemic discomfort should receive sublingual NTG (0.4 mg) every 5 min for a total of 3 doses, after which assessment should be made about the need for intravenous NTG, if not contraindicated. *(Level of Evidence: C)*

4. Intravenous NTG is indicated in the first 48 h after UA/NSTEMI for treatment of persistent ischemia, HF, or hypertension. The decision to administer intravenous NTG and the dose used should not preclude therapy with other proven mortality-reducing interventions such as beta blockers or ACE inhibitors. *(Level of Evidence: B)*

5. Oral beta-blocker therapy should be initiated within the first 24 h for patients who do not have 1 or more of the following: 1) signs of HF, 2) evidence of a low-output state, 3) increased risk* for cardiogenic shock, or 4) other relative contraindications to beta blockade (PR interval greater than 0.24 s, second or third degree heart block, active asthma, or reactive airway disease). *(Level of Evidence: B)*

6. In UA/NSTEMI patients with continuing or frequently recurring ischemia and in whom beta blockers are contraindicated, a nondihydropyridine calcium channel blocker (eg, verapamil or diltiazem) should be given as initial therapy in the absence of clinically significant LV dysfunction or other contraindications. *(Level of Evidence: B)*

7. An ACE inhibitor should be administered orally within the first 24 h to UA/NSTEMI patients with pulmonary congestion or LV ejection fraction (LVEF) less than or equal to 0.40, in the absence of hypotension (systolic blood pressure less than 100 mm Hg or less than 30 mm Hg below baseline) or known contraindications to that class of medications. *(Level of Evidence: A)*

8. An angiotensin receptor blocker should be administered to UA/NSTEMI patients who are intolerant of ACE inhibitors and have either clinical or radiological signs of HF or LVEF less than or equal to 0.40. *(Level of Evidence: A)*

*Risk factors for cardiogenic shock (the greater the number of risk factors present, the higher the risk of developing cardiogenic shock): age greater than 70 years, systolic blood pressure less than 120 mm Hg, sinus tachycardia greater than 110 or heart rate less than 60, increased time since onset of symptoms of UA/NSTEMI.*
9. Because of the increased risks of mortality, reinfarction, hypertension, HF, and myocardial rupture associated with their use, nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (NSAIDs), except for ASA, whether nonselective or cyclooxygenase (COX)-2–selective agents, should be discontinued at the time a patient presents with UA/NSTEMI. (Level of Evidence: C)

Class IIa

1. It is reasonable to administer supplemental oxygen to all patients with UA/NSTEMI during the first 6 h after presentation. (Level of Evidence: C)

2. In the absence of contradictions to its use, it is reasonable to administer morphine sulfate intravenously to UA/NSTEMI patients if there is uncontrolled ischemic chest discomfort despite NTG, provided that additional therapy is used to manage the underlying ischemia. (Level of Evidence: B)

3. It is reasonable to administer intravenous (IV) beta blockers at the time of presentation for hypertension to UA/NSTEMI patients who do not have 1 or more of the following: 1) signs of HF, 2) evidence of low-output state, 3) increased risk* for cardiogenic shock, or 4) other relative contraindications to beta blockade (PR interval greater than 0.24 s, second or third degree heart block, active asthma, or reactive airway disease). (Level of Evidence: B)

4. Oral long-acting nondihydropyridine calcium channel blockers are reasonable for use in UA/NSTEMI patients for recurrent ischemia in the absence of contraindications after beta blockers and nitrates have been fully used. (Level of Evidence: C)

5. An ACE inhibitor administered orally within the first 24 h of UA/NSTEMI can be useful in patients without pulmonary congestion or LVEF less than or equal to 0.40 in the absence of hypotension (systolic blood pressure less than 100 mm Hg or less than 30 mm Hg below baseline) or known contraindications to that class of medications. (Level of Evidence: B)

6. Intra-aortic balloon pump (IABP) counterpulsation is reasonable in UA/NSTEMI patients for severe ischemia that is continuing or recurs frequently despite intensive medical therapy, for hemodynamic instability in patients before or after coronary angiography, and for mechanical complications of MI. (Level of Evidence: C)

Class IIb

1. The use of extended-release forms of nondihydropyridine calcium channel blockers instead of a beta blocker may be considered in patients with UA/NSTEMI. (Level of Evidence: B)

2. Immediate-release dihydropyridine calcium channel blockers in the presence of adequate beta blockade may be considered in patients with UA/NSTEMI with ongoing ischemic symptoms or hypertension. (Level of Evidence: B)

Class III

1. Nitrates should not be administered to UA/NSTEMI patients with systolic blood pressure less than 90 mm Hg or greater than or equal to 30 mm Hg below baseline, severe bradycardia (less than 50 beats per minute), tachycardia (more than 100 beats per minute) in the absence of symptomatic HF, or right ventricular infarction. (Level of Evidence: C)

2. Nitroglycerin or other nitrates should not be administered to patients with UA/NSTEMI who had received a phosphodiesterase inhibitor for erectile dysfunction within 24 h of sildenafil or 48 h of tadalafil use. The suitable time for the administration of nitrates after vardenafil has not been determined. (Level of Evidence: C)

3. Immediate-release dihydropyridine calcium channel blockers should not be administered to patients with UA/NSTEMI in the absence of a beta blocker. (Level of Evidence: A)

4. An intravenous ACE inhibitor should not be given to patients within the first 24 h of UA/NSTEMI because of

*Risk factors for cardiogenic shock (the greater the number of risk factors prese higher the risk of developing cardiogenic shock): age greater than 70 years, systolic blood pressure less than 120 mm Hg, sinus tachycardia greater than 110 or heart rate less than 60, increased time since onset of symptoms of UA/NSTEMI.

**Table 12. Class I Recommendations for Anti–Ischemic Therapy: Continuing Ischemia/Other Clinical High-Risk Features Present**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature Present*</th>
<th>Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bed/chair rest with continuous ECG monitoring</td>
<td>Supplemental oxygen with an arterial saturation less than 90% respiratory distress, or other high-risk features for hypoxemia. Pulse oximetry can be useful for continuous measurement of SaO2.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTG 0.4 mg sublingually every min for total of doses; afterward, assess need for IV NTG</td>
<td>NTG IV for first 48 h after UA/NSTEMI for treatment of persistent ischemia, HF, or hypertension</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision to administer NTG IV and dose should not preclude therapy with other mortality-reducing interventions such as beta blockers or ACE inhibitors</td>
<td>Beta blockers (via oral route) within 24 h without a contraindication (eg, HF) irrespective of concomitant performance of PCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When beta blockers are contraindicated, nondihydropyridine calcium channel blocker (eg, verapamil or diltiazem) should be given as initial therapy in the absence of severe LV dysfunction or other contraindications</td>
<td>ACE inhibitor (via oral route) within first 24 h with pulmonary congestion, or LVEF less than or equal to 0.40, in the absence of hypotension (systolic blood pressure less than 100 mm Hg or less than 30 mm Hg below baseline) or known contraindications to that class of medications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARB should be administered to UA/NSTEMI patients who are intolerant of ACE inhibitors and have either clinical or radiological signs of heart failure or LVEF less than or equal to 0.40.</td>
<td>*Recurrent angina and/or ischemia-related ECG changes (0.05 mV or greater ST-segment depression or bundle-branch block) at rest or with low-level activity; or ischemia associated with HF symptoms, S gallop, or new or worsening mitral regurgitation; or hemodynamic instability or depressed LV function (LVEF less than 0.40 on noninvasive study); or serious ventricular arrhythmia.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ACE = angiotensin-converting enzyme; ARB = angiotensin receptor blocker; HF = heart failure; IV = intravenous; LV = left ventricular; LVEF = left ventricular ejection fraction; NTG = nitroglycerin; MI = myocardial infarction; PCI = percutaneous coronary intervention; UA/NSTEMI = unstable angina/non–ST-elevation myocardial infarction.
the increased risk of hypotension. (A possible exception may be patients with refractory hypertension.) (Level of Evidence: B)

5. It may be harmful to administer intravenous beta blockers to UA/NSTEMI patients who have contraindications to beta blockade, signs of HF or low-output state, or other risk factors* for cardiogenic shock. (Level of Evidence: A)

6. Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs (except for ASA), whether nonselective or COX-2–selective agents, should not be administered during hospitalization for UA/NSTEMI because of the increased risks of mortality, reinfarction, hypertension, HF, and myocardial rupture associated with their use. (Level of Evidence: C)

The optimal management of UA/NSTEMI has the twin goals of the immediate relief of ischemia and the prevention of serious adverse outcomes (ie, death or myocardial [re] infarction). This is best accomplished with an approach that includes anti-ischemic therapy (Table 12), antithrombotic therapy, ongoing risk stratification, and the use of invasive procedures. Patients who are at intermediate or high risk for adverse outcomes, including those with ongoing ischemia refractory to initial medical therapy and those with evidence of hemodynamic instability, should be admitted whenever possible to a critical care environment with ready access to invasive cardiovascular diagnosis and therapeutic procedures. Ready access is defined as ensured, timely access to a cardiac catheterization laboratory with personnel who have appropriate credentials and experience in invasive coronary procedures, as well as to emergency or urgent cardiovascular surgery and cardiac anesthesia.

The approach to the achievement of the twin goals described here includes the initiation of pharmacological management and planning of a definitive treatment strategy for the underlying disease process. Most patients are stable at presentation and planning of a definitive treatment strategy for the underlying disease process. Most patients are stable at presentation and planning of a definitive treatment strategy for UA/NSTEMI because of the increased risks of mortality, reinfarction, hypertension, HF, and myocardial rupture associated with their use. (Level of Evidence: C)

The severity of symptoms dictates some of the general care that should be given during the initial treatment. Patients should be placed on bed rest while ischemia is ongoing but can be mobilized to a chair and use a bedside commode when symptom free. Subsequent activity should not be inappropriately

*Risk factors for cardiogenic shock (the greater the number of risk factors present, the higher the risk of developing cardiogenic shock): age greater than 70 years, systolic blood pressure less than 120 mm Hg, sinus tachycardia greater than 110 or heart rate less than 60, increased time since onset of symptoms of UA/NSTEMI.

### Table 13. Dosing Table for Antiplatelet and Anticoagulant Therapy in Patients With UA/NSTEMI

Deleted. See Appendixes 7 and 8.
NTG tablets taken 5 min apart (Tables 12 and 14; Table 13 is deleted in this document because it is no longer current; refer instead to Appendixes 7 and 8.) and with the initiation of an oral or intravenous beta blocker (when there are no contraindications), as well as those with HF or hypertension. Note that NTG is contraindicated after the use of sildenafil within the previous 24 h or tadalafl within 48 h or with hypertension.\textsuperscript{308–310} The suitable delay before nitrate administration after the use of vardenafil has not been determined, although blood pressure had generally returned to baseline by 24 h.\textsuperscript{311} These drugs inhibit the phosphodiesterase that degrades cyclic guanosine monophosphate, and cyclic guanosine monophosphate mediates vascular smooth muscle relaxation by nitric oxide. Thus, NTG-mediated vasodilatation is markedly exaggerated and prolonged in the presence of phosphodiesterase inhibitors. Nitrate use within 24 h after sildenafil or the administration of sildenafil in a patient who has received a nitrate becomes important after 24 h of continuous therapy with any formulation. Patients who require continued intravenous NTG beyond 24 h may require periodic increases in infusion rate to maintain efficacy. An effort must be made to use non–tolerance-producing nitrate regimens (lower doses and intermittent dosing). When patients have been free of ischemic discomfort and other manifestations of ischemia for 12 to 24 h, an attempt should be made to reduce the dose of intravenous NTG and to switch to oral or topical nitrates. It is not appropriate to continue intravenous NTG in patients who remain free of signs and symptoms of ischemia. When ischemia recurs during continuous intravenous NTG therapy, responsiveness to nitrates can often be restored by increasing the dose and, after symptoms have been controlled for several hours, attempting to add a nitrate-free interval. This strategy should be pursued as long as symptoms are not adequately controlled. In stabilized patients, intravenous NTG should generally be converted within 24 h to a nonparenteral alternative (Table 14) administered in a non–tolerance-producing regimen to avoid the potential reactivation of symptoms. A practical method for converting intravenous to topical NTG has been published.\textsuperscript{313}

Topical or oral nitrates are acceptable alternatives for patients who require antianginal therapy but who do not have ongoing refractory ischemic symptoms. Tolerance to the hemodynamic effects of nitrates is dose and duration dependent and typically becomes important after 24 h of continuous therapy with any formulation. Patients who require continued intravenous NTG beyond 24 h may require periodic increases in infusion rate to maintain efficacy. An effort must be made to use non–tolerance-producing nitrate regimens (lower doses and intermittent dosing). When patients have been free of ischemic discomfort and other manifestations of ischemia for 12 to 24 h, an attempt should be made to reduce the dose of intravenous NTG and to switch to oral or topical nitrates. It is not appropriate to continue intravenous NTG in patients who remain free of signs and symptoms of ischemia. When ischemia recurs during continuous intravenous NTG therapy, responsiveness to nitrates can often be restored by increasing the dose and, after symptoms have been controlled for several hours, attempting to add a nitrate-free interval. This strategy should be pursued as long as symptoms are not adequately controlled. In stabilized patients, intravenous NTG should generally be converted within 24 h to a nonparenteral alternative (Table 14) administered in a non–tolerance-producing regimen to avoid the potential reactivation of symptoms. A practical method for converting intravenous to topical NTG has been published.\textsuperscript{313}

Most studies of nitrate treatment in UA/NSTEMI have been small and uncontrolled, and there are no randomized, placebo-controlled trials that address either symptom relief or reduction in cardiac events. One small randomized trial compared intravenous NTG with buccal NTG and found no significant difference in the control of ischemia.\textsuperscript{314} An overview of small studies of NTG in MI from the prefibrinolytic era suggested a 35% reduction in mortality rates;\textsuperscript{315} in contrast, both the Fourth International Study of Infarct Survival (ISIS-4)\textsuperscript{316} and Gruppo Italiano per lo Studio della Sopravvivenza nell’infarto Miocardico (GISSI-3)\textsuperscript{317} trials formally tested this hypothesis.

### Table 14. NTG and Nitrates in Angina

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Compound</th>
<th>Route</th>
<th>Dose/Dosage</th>
<th>Duration of Effect</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NTG</td>
<td>Sublingual tablets</td>
<td>0.3 to 0.6 mg up to 1.5 mg</td>
<td>1 to 7 min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Spray</td>
<td>0.4 mg as needed</td>
<td>Similar to sublingual tablets</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Transdermal</td>
<td>0.2 to 0.8 mg per h every 12 h</td>
<td>8 to 12 h during intermittent therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Intravenous</td>
<td>5 to 200 mcg per min</td>
<td>Tolerance in 7 to 8 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isosorbide dinitrate</td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>5 to 80 mg, 2 or 3 times daily</td>
<td>Up to 8 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral, slow release</td>
<td>40 mg 1 or 2 times daily</td>
<td>Up to 8 h</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Isosorbide mononitrate</td>
<td>Oral 20 mg twice daily</td>
<td>12 to 24 h</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral, slow release</td>
<td>60 to 240 mg once daily</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pentaerythritol tetrani trate</td>
<td>Sublingual</td>
<td>10 mg as needed</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erythritol tetrani trate</td>
<td>Sublingual</td>
<td>5 to 10 mg as needed</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Oral</td>
<td>10 to 30 mg 3 times daily</td>
<td>Not known</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

in patients with suspected MI in the reperfusion era and failed to confirm this magnitude of benefit. However, these large trials are confounded by frequent prehospital and hospital use of NTG in the “control” groups. Nevertheless, a strategy of routine as opposed to selective use of nitrates did not reduce mortality. The abrupt cessation of intravenous NTG has been associated with exacerbation of ischemic changes on the ECG, and a graded reduction in the dose of intravenous NTG is advisable. Thus, the rationale for NTG use in UA/NSTEMI is extrapolated from pathophysiological principles and extensive, although uncontrolled, clinical observations.

3.1.2.3. Beta-Adrenergic Blockers

Beta blockers competitively block the effects of catecholamines on cell membrane beta receptors. Beta-1 adrenergic receptors are located primarily in the myocardium; inhibition of catecholamine action at these sites reduces myocardial contractility, sinus node rate, and AV node conduction velocity. Through these actions, they blunt the heart rate and contractility responses to chest pain, exertion, and other stimuli. They also decrease systolic blood pressure. All of these effects reduce MVO2. Beta-2 adrenergic receptors are located primarily in vascular and bronchial smooth muscle; the inhibition of catecholamine action at these sites produces vasoconstriction and bronchoconstriction. In UA/NSTEMI, the primary benefits of beta blockers are due to inhibition of beta-1 adrenergic receptors, which results in a decrease in cardiac work and myocardial oxygen demand. Slowing of the heart rate also has a favorable effect, acting not only to reduce MVO2 but also to increase the duration of diastole and diastolic pressure-time, a determinant of forward coronary flow and collateral flow.

Beta blockers, administered orally, should be started early in the absence of contraindications. Intravenous administration may be warranted in patients with ongoing rest pain, especially with tachycardia or hypertension, in the absence of contraindications (see below) (Table 12).

The benefits of routine early intravenous use of beta blockers in the fibrinolytic era have been challenged by 2 later randomized trials of intravenous beta blockade and by a post hoc analysis of the use of atenolol in the GUSTO-I trial. A subsequent systematic review of early beta-blocker therapy in STEMI found no significant reduction in mortality. Most recently, the utility of early intravenous followed by oral beta blockade (metoprolol) was tested in 45,852 patients with MI (93% had STEMI, 7% had NSTEMI) in the COMMIT study. Neither the composite of death, reinfarction, or cardiac arrest nor death alone was reduced for up to 28 d in the hospital. Overall, a modest reduction in reinfarction and ventricular fibrillation (which was seen after day 1) was counterbalanced by an increase in cardiogenic shock, which occurred early (first day) and primarily in those who were hemodynamically compromised or in HF or who were stable but at high risk of development of shock. Thus, early aggressive beta blockade poses a substantial net hazard in hemodynamically unstable patients and should be avoided. Risk factors for shock were older age, female sex, time delay, higher Killip class, lower blood pressure, higher heart rate, ECG abnormality, and previous hypertension. There was a moderate net benefit for those who were relatively stable and at low risk of shock. Whether to start beta blockade intravenously or orally in these latter stable patients is unclear, and patterns of use vary. In an attempt to balance the evidence base overall for UA/NSTEMI patients, beta blockers are recommended in these guidelines to be initiated orally, in the absence of contraindications (eg, HF), within the first 24 h. Greater caution is now suggested in the early use of intravenous beta blockers, which should be targeted to specific indications and should be avoided with HF, hypotension, and hemodynamic instability.

The choice of beta blocker for an individual patient is based primarily on pharmacokinetic and side effect criteria, as well as on physician familiarity (Table 15). There are no comparative studies between members of this class in the acute setting. Beta blockers without intrinsic sympathomimetic activity are preferred, however. Agents studied in the acute setting include metoprolol, propranolol, and atenolol. Carvedilol may be added...
Table 15. Properties of Beta Blockers in Clinical Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drugs</th>
<th>Selectivity</th>
<th>Partial Agonist Activity</th>
<th>Usual Dose for Angina</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Propranolol</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>20 to 80 mg twice daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metoprolol</td>
<td>Beta&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>50 to 200 mg twice daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Atenolol</td>
<td>Beta&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>50 to 200 mg per d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nadolol</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>40 to 80 mg per d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timolol</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10 mg twice daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Acebutolol</td>
<td>Beta&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>200 to 600 mg twice daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Betaxolol</td>
<td>Beta&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10 to 20 mg per d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bisoprolol</td>
<td>Beta&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>10 mg per d</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Esmolol (intravenous)</td>
<td>Beta&lt;sub&gt;1&lt;/sub&gt;</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>50 to 300 mcg per kg per min</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labetalol&lt;sup&gt;+&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>200 to 600 mg twice daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pindolol</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>2.5 to 7.5 mg times daily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carvedilol</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>6.25 mg twice daily, uptitrated to a maximum of 25 mg twice daily</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>+</sup>Labetalol and carvedilol are combined alpha and beta blockers. Adapted from Table 25, of Gibbons RJ, Abrams J, Chatterjee K, et al. ACC/AHA 2002 guideline update for the management of patients with chronic stable angina. Available at: http://www.acc.org/qualityandscience.4

Patients with marked first-degree AV block (ie, ECG PR interval greater than 0.24 s), any form of second- or third-degree AV block in the absence of a functioning implanted pacemaker, a history of asthma, severe LV dysfunction or HF (eg, rales or S<sub>3</sub> gallop) or at high risk for shock (see above) should not receive beta blockers on an acute basis. In patients with hypertension, the relative cardiovascular benefit of atenolol has been questioned on the basis of recent clinical trial analyses. However, beta blockers are strongly recommended before discharge in those with compensated HF or LV systolic dysfunction for secondary prevention. However, beta blockers are strongly recommended before discharge in those with compensated HF or LV systolic dysfunction for secondary prevention. Patients with significant chronic obstructive pulmonary disease who may have a component of reactive airway disease should be given beta blockers very cautiously; initially, low doses of a beta-1-selective agent should be used. If there are concerns about possible intolerance to beta blockers, initial selection should favor a short-acting beta-1–specific drug such as metoprolol or esmolol. Mild wheezing or a history of chronic obstructive pulmonary disease mandates a short-acting cardioselective agent at a reduced dose (eg, 12.5 mg of metoprolol orally) rather than the complete avoidance of a beta blocker.

In the absence of these concerns, previously studied regimens may be used. Intravenous metoprolol may be given in 5-mg increments by slow intravenous administration (5 mg over 1 to 2 min), repeated every 5 min for a total initial dose of 15 mg. In patients who tolerate the total 15-mg IV dose, oral therapy can be initiated 15 min after the last intravenous dose at 25 to 50 mg every 6 h for 48 h. Thereafter, patients should receive a maintenance dose of up to 100 mg twice daily. Alternatively, intravenous propranolol may be administered as an initial dose of 0.5 to 1.0 mg, followed in 1 to 2 h by 40 to 80 mg by mouth every 6 to 8 h. Monitoring during intravenous beta-blocker therapy should include frequent checks of heart rate and blood pressure and continuous ECG monitoring, as well as auscultation for rales and bronchospasm. Beta-blockade also may be started orally, in smaller initial doses if appropriate, within the first 24 h, in cases in which a specific clinical indication for intravenous initiation is absent or the safety of aggressive early beta blockade is a concern. Carvedilol, 6.25 mg by mouth twice daily, uptitrated individually at 3- to 10-d intervals to a maximum of 25 mg twice daily, can reduce mortality and reinfarction when given to patients with recent (3 to 21 d) MI and LV dysfunction. After the initial intravenous load, if given, patients without limiting side effects may be converted to an oral regimen. The desired resting heart rate is 50 to 60 beats per minute unless a limiting side effect is reached. Selection of the oral agent should include the clinician’s familiarity with the agent. Maintenance doses are given in Table 15.

Initial studies of beta-blocker benefits in ACS were small and uncontrolled. An overview of double-blind, randomized trials in patients with threatening or evolving MI suggests an approximately 13% reduction in the risk of progression to MI. These trials were conducted prior to the routine use of ASA, heparin, clopidogrel, GP IIb/IIIa inhibitors, and revascularization. These trials lack sufficient power to assess the effects of these drugs on mortality rates for UA. Pooled results from the Evaluation of c7E3 for the Prevention of Ischemic Complications (EPIC), Evaluation of PTCA and Improve Long-term Outcome by c7E3 GP IIb/IIIa receptor blockade (EPiLOG), Evaluation of Platelet IIb/IIIa Inhibitor for STENTing (EPISTENT), CAPTURE, and ReoPro in Acute myocardial infarction and Primary PTCA Organization...
and Randomization Trial (RAPPORT) studies were used to evaluate the efficacy of beta-blocker therapy in patients with ACS who were undergoing PCI. At 30 d, death occurred in 0.6% of patients receiving beta-blocker therapy versus 2.0% of patients not receiving such therapy (P less than 0.001). At 6 months, death occurred in 1.7% of patients receiving beta-blocker therapy versus 3.7% not receiving this therapy (P less than 0.001). Thus, patients receiving beta-blocker therapy who undergo PCI for UA or MI have a lower short-term mortality.329

Overall, the rationale for beta-blocker use in all forms of CAD, including UA, is generally favorable, with the exception of initial HF. In the absence of contraindications, the new evidence appears sufficient to make beta blockers a routine part of care. A related group shown to benefit are high- or intermediate-risk patients who are scheduled to undergo cardiac or noncardiac surgery.330 A recent exception to beta-blocker benefit was COMMIT, a large trial of mostly STEMI patients, which showed no overall mortality effect. Subgroup analysis suggested this to be due to an increased risk in those with initial HF or risk factors for cardiogenic shock.323 In contrast to this adverse experience with early, aggressive beta blockade, carvedilol, begun in low doses 3 to 10 d after MI in patients with LV dysfunction (ejection fraction of 0.40 or less) and gradually uptitrated, decreased subsequent death or nonfatal recurrent MI when given in conjunction with modern ACS therapies in the most contemporary oral beta blocker post-MI trial, CAPRICORN (Carvedilol Post-Infarct Survival Control in LV Dysfunction).327

In conclusion, evidence for the beneficial effects of the use of beta blockers in patients with UA is based on limited randomized trial data along with pathophysiological considerations and extrapolation from experience with CAD patients who have other types of ischemic syndromes (stable angina or compensated chronic HF). The duration of benefit with long-term oral therapy is uncertain and likely varies with the extent of revascularization.

### 3.1.2.4. Calcium Channel Blockers

Calcium channel blockers (CCBs) reduce cell transmembrane inward calcium flux, which inhibits both myocardial and vascular smooth muscle contraction; some also slow AV conduction and depress sinus node impulse formation. Agents in this class vary in the degree to which they produce vasodilation, decreased myocardial contractility, AV block, and sinus node slowing. Nifedipine and amlodipine have the most peripheral arterial dilatory effects but few or no AV or sinus node effects, whereas verapamil and diltiazem have prominent AV and sinus node effects and some peripheral arterial dilatory effects as well. All 4 of these agents, as well as other approved agents, have coronary dilatory properties that appear to be similar. Although different CCBs are structurally and, potentially, therapeutically diverse, superiority of 1 agent over another in UA/NSTEMI has not been demonstrated, except for the increased risks posed by rapid-release, short-acting dihydropyridines such as nifedipine (Table 16).

In conclusion, evidence for the beneficial effects of use of beta blockers in patients with UA is based on limited randomized trial data along with pathophysiological considerations and extrapolation from experience with CAD patients who have other types of ischemic syndromes (stable angina or compensated chronic HF). The duration of benefit with long-term oral therapy is uncertain and likely varies with the extent of revascularization.
Amlodipine and felodipine are reasonably well tolerated by patients with mild LV dysfunction, although their use in UA/NSTEMI has not been studied. The CCB evidence base in UA/NSTEMI is greatest for verapamil and diltiazem. Several randomized trials during the 1980s tested CCBs in UA/NSTEMI and found that they relieve or prevent signs and symptoms of ischemia to a degree similar to the beta blockers. The Danish Study Group on Verapamil in Myocardial Infarction (DAVIT) studied 3447 patients with suspected UA/NSTEMI. A benefit was not proved, but death or nonfatal MI tended to be reduced. The Diltiazem Reinfarction Study (DRS) studied 576 patients with UA/NSTEMI. Diltiazem reduced reinfarction and refractory angina at 14 d without an increase in mortality rates. Retrospective analysis of the Q-wave MI subset of patients in the Multicenter Diltiazem Postinfarction Trial (MDPIT) suggested similar findings. The Holland Interuniversity Nifedipine/metoprolol Trial (HINT), tested nifedipine and metoprolol in a 2 × 2 factorial design in 515 patients. The study was stopped early because of concern for harm with the use of nifedipine alone. In contrast, patients already taking a beta blocker appeared to benefit from the addition of nifedipine (risk ratio (RR) 0.68). Meta-analyses combining UA/NSTEMI studies of all CCBs have suggested no overall benefit, whereas those excluding nifedipine (eg, for verapamil alone) have reported favorable effects on outcomes. Retrospective analyses of DAVIT and MDPIT suggested that verapamil and diltiazem can have a detrimental effect on mortality rates in patients with LV dysfunction. In contrast, verapamil reduced diuretic use in DAVIT-2. Furthermore, subsequent prospective trials with verapamil administered to MI patients with HF who were receiving an ACE inhibitor suggested a benefit. The Diltiazem as Adjunctive Therapy to Activase (DATA) trial also suggested that intravenous diltiazem in MI patients can be safe; death, MI, and recurrent ischemia were decreased at 35 d and 6 months.

In summary, definitive evidence for a benefit of CCBs in UA/NSTEMI is predominantly limited to symptom control. For immediate-release nifedipine, an increase in serious events is suggested when administered early without a beta blocker. Heart rate–slowing CCB drugs (verapamil and diltiazem) can be administered early to patients with UA/NSTEMI without HF without overall harm and with trends toward a benefit. Therefore, when beta blockers cannot be used, and in the absence of clinically significant LV dysfunction, heart rate–slowing CCBs are preferred. Greater caution is indicated when combining a beta blocker and CCB for refractory ischemic symptoms, because they may act in synergy to depress LV function and sinus and AV node conduction. The risks and benefits in UA/NSTEMI of newer CCBs, such as the dihydropyridines amlodipine and felodipine, relative to the older agents in this class that have been reviewed here, remain undefined, which suggests a cautious approach, especially in the absence of beta blockade.

3.1.2.5. Inhibitors of the Renin-Angiotensin-Aldosterone System
Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors have been shown to reduce mortality rates in patients with MI or who recently had an MI and have LV systolic dysfunction, in patients with diabetes mellitus with LV dysfunction, and in a broad spectrum of patients with high-risk chronic CAD, including patients with normal LV function. Follow-up of patients with LV dysfunction after MI in the TRACE (TRAndolapril Cardiac Evaluation) trial showed that the beneficial effect of trandolapril on mortality and hospitalization rate was maintained for at least 10 to 12 years. A systematic review assessing potential ASA–ACE inhibitor interactions showed clinically important benefits with ACE inhibitor therapy, irrespective of whether concomitant ASA was used, and only weak evidence of a reduction in the benefit of ACE inhibitor therapy added to ASA, these data did not solely involve patients with MI. Accordingly, ACE inhibitors should be used in patients receiving ASA and in those with hypertension that is not controlled with beta blockers. Recent data on ACE inhibitor patients with stable CAD are summarized in the section on long-term medical therapy (see Section 5.2.3).

In patients with MI complicated by LV systolic dysfunction, HF, or both, the angiotensin receptor blocker valsartan was as effective as captopril in patients at high risk for cardiovascular events after MI. The combination of valsartan and captopril increased adverse events and did not improve survival. Although not in the acute care setting, treatment of patients with chronic HF and diabetes mellitus (at least half of whom had an MI) in the CHARM (Candesartan in Heart failure Assessment in Reduction of Mortality)-Overall program showed a reduction in cardiovascular deaths and hospital admissions for HF, independent of ejection fraction or baseline treatment. The selective aldosterone receptor blocker eplerenone, used in patients with MI complicated by LV dysfunction and either HF or diabetes mellitus, reduced morbidity and mortality in the Eplerenone Post-acute myocardial infarction Heart failure Efficacy and Survival Study (EPHESUS). This complements data from the earlier Randomized Aldactone Evaluation Study (RALES), in which aldosterone receptor blockade with spironolactone decreased morbidity and death in patients with severe HF, half of whom had an ischemic origin. Indications for long-term use of aldosterone receptor blockers are given in Section 5.2.3.

3.1.2.6. Other Anti-ischemic Therapies
Other less extensively studied therapies for the relief of ischemia, such as spinal cord stimulation and prolonged external counterpulsion, are under evaluation. Most experience has been gathered with spinal cord stimulation in “intractable angina,” in which anginal relief has been described. They have not been applied in the acute setting for UA/NSTEMI. The channel openers have hemodynamic and cardioprotective effects that could be useful in UA/NSTEMI. Nicorandil is such an agent that has been approved in a number of countries but not in the United States. In a pilot double-blind, placebo-controlled study of 245 patients with UA, the addition of this drug to conventional treatment significantly reduced the number of episodes of transient myocardial ischemia (mostly silent) and of ventricular and supraventricular tachycardia. Further evaluation of this class of agents is underway. Ranolazine is a newly approved (January 2006) agent that exerts antianginal effects without reducing heart rate or blood...
pressure. Currently, ranolazine is indicated alone or in combination with amiodipine, beta-blockers, or nitrates for the treatment of chronic angina that has failed to respond to standard antianginal therapy. The recommended initial dose is 500 mg orally twice daily, which can be escalated as needed to a maximum of 1000 mg twice daily. The mechanism of action of ranolazine has not been fully characterized but appears to depend on membrane ion-channel effects (similar to those after chronic amiodarone). It is contraindicated in patients with QT-prolonging conditions. Preliminary results of a large (N=6560) patient trial of ranolazine, begun within 48 h of UA/NSTEMI, suggested safety and symptom relief (reduction in the composite of cardiovascular death, MI, or recurrent ischemia) (hazard ratio [HR] 0.92, 95% CI 0.83 to 1.02). Thus, ranolazine may be safely administered for symptom relief after UA/NSTEMI, but it does not appear to significantly improve the underlying disease substrate.

3.1.2.7. Intra-aortic Balloon Pump Counterpulsation

Experience with IABP for refractory ischemia dates back more than 30 years. In a prospective registry of 22 patients, 5495 of whom had acute MI, placement of an IABP in MI patients primarily was performed for cardiogenic shock, for hemodynamic support during catheterization and/or angioplasty, before high-risk surgery, for mechanical complications of MI, or for refractory post-MI UA. Balloon insertions were successful in 97.7% of patients, and major complications occurred in 2.7% of patients during a median use of 3 d. The placement of an IABP could be useful in patients with recurrent ischemia despite maximal medical management and in those with hemodynamic instability until coronary angiography and revascularization can be completed.

3.1.2.8. Analgesic Therapy

Because of the known increased risk of cardiovascular events among patients taking COX-2 inhibitors and NSAIDs, patients who are taking them at the time of UA/NSTEMI should discontinue them immediately (see Section 5.2.16 for additional discussion). A secondary analysis of the Enoxaparin and Thrombolysis Reperfusion for Acute Myocardial Infarction Treatment (EXTRACT)-TIMI-25 data demonstrated an increased risk of death, reinfarction, HF, or shock among patients who were taking NSAIDs within 7 d of enrollment. Longer term management is considered in Section 5.2.16.

3.2. Recommendations for Antiplatelet/Anticoagulant Therapy in Patients for Whom Diagnosis of UA/NSTEMI Is Likely or Definite (UPDATED)

3.2.1. Antiplatelet Therapy: Recommendations (UPDATED)

(see Appendixes 7, 8, 9, and the Online Data Supplement)

Class I

1. Aspirin should be administered to UA/NSTEMI patients as soon as possible after hospital presentation and continued indefinitely in patients who tolerate it. (Level of Evidence: A)

2. A loading dose followed by daily maintenance dose of either clopidogrel (Level of Evidence: B), or ticagrelor† (in PCI-treated patients) (Level of Evidence: C), or prasugrel† (in PCI-treated patients) (Level of Evidence: B) should be administered to UA/NSTEMI patients who are unable to take aspirin because of hypersensitivity or major GI intolerance.

3. Patients with definite UA/NSTEMI at medium or high risk and in whom an initial invasive strategy is selected (Appendix 6) should receive dual antiplatelet therapy on presentation. (Level of Evidence: A)

At the time of PCI:

a. Clopidogrel (Level of Evidence: B)

b. Prasugrel† (Level of Evidence: B)

c. An IV GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor. (Level of Evidence: A)

IV eptifibatide and tirofiban are the preferred GP IIb/IIIa inhibitors. (Level of Evidence: B)

4. For UA/NSTEMI patients in whom an initial conservative (ie, noninvasive) strategy is selected, clopidogrel or ticagrelor (loading dose followed by daily maintenance dose) should be added to aspirin and anticoagulant therapy as soon as possible after admission and administered for up to 12 months. (Level of Evidence: B)

‡ Patients weighing <60 kg have an increased exposure to the active metabolite of prasugrel and an increased risk of bleeding on a 10-mg once-daily maintenance dose. Consideration should be given to lowering the maintenance dose to 5 mg in patients who weigh <60 kg, although the effectiveness and safety of the 5-mg dose have not been studied prospectively. For post-PCI patients, a daily maintenance dose should be given for at least 12 months for patients receiving DES and up to 12 months for patients receiving BMS unless the risk of bleeding outweighs the anticipated net benefit afforded by a P2Y12 receptor inhibitor. Do not use prasugrel in patients with active pathological bleeding or a history of TIA or stroke. In patients age ≥75 years, prasugrel is generally not recommended because of the increased risk of fatal and intracranial bleeding and uncertain benefit except in high-risk situations (patients with diabetes or a history of prior myocardial infarction), in which its effect appears to be greater and its use may be considered. Do not start prasugrel in patients likely to undergo urgent CABG. When possible, discontinue prasugrel at least 7 days before any surgery. Additional risk factors for bleeding include body weight <60 kg, propensity to bleed, and concomitant use of medications that increase the risk of bleeding (eg, warfarin, heparin, fibrinolytic therapy, or chronic use of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

† The recommended maintenance dose of aspirin to be used with ticagrelor is 81 mg daily. Ticagrelor’s benefits were observed irrespective of prior therapy with clopidogrel. When possible, discontinue ticagrelor at least 5 days before any surgery. Issues of patient compliance may be especially important. Consideration should be given to the potential and as yet undetermined risk of intracranial hemorrhage in patients with prior stroke or TIA.
5. For UA/NSTEMI patients in whom an initial conservative strategy is selected, if recurrent symptoms/ischemia, heart failure, or serious arrhythmias subsequently appear, then diagnostic angiography should be performed. (Level of Evidence: A)\textsuperscript{188,251} Either an IV GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor (epifibatide or tirofiban, [Level of Evidence: A]),\textsuperscript{135,137,387} clopidogrel (loading dose followed by daily maintenance dose [Level of Evidence: B]),\textsuperscript{349} or ticagrelor\textsuperscript{‡} (loading dose followed by daily maintenance dose [Level of Evidence: B])\textsuperscript{381} should be added to aspirin and anticoagulant therapy before diagnostic angiography (upstream). (Level of Evidence: C)

6. A loading dose of P2Y\textsubscript{12} receptor inhibitor therapy is recommended for UA/NSTEMI patients for whom PCI is planned.\textsuperscript{§} One of the following regimens should be used:

a. Clopidogrel 600 mg should be given as early as possible before or at the time of PCI (Level of Evidence: B)\textsuperscript{389–391} or

b. Prasugrel\textsuperscript{†} 60 mg should be given promptly and no later than 1 hour after PCI once coronary anatomy is defined and a decision is made to proceed with PCI (Level of Evidence: B)\textsuperscript{380} or

c. Ticagrelor\textsuperscript{‡} 180 mg should be given as early as possible before or at the time of PCI. (Level of Evidence: B)\textsuperscript{381}

7. The duration and maintenance dose of P2Y\textsubscript{12} receptor inhibitor therapy should be as follows:

a. In UA/NSTEMI patients undergoing PCI, either clopidogrel 75 mg daily,\textsuperscript{20,38,381} prasugrel\textsuperscript{†} 10 mg daily,\textsuperscript{380} or ticagrelor\textsuperscript{‡} 90 mg twice daily\textsuperscript{381} should be given for at least 12 months. (Level of Evidence: B)

b. If the risk of morbidity because of bleeding outweighs the anticipated benefits afforded by P2Y\textsubscript{12} receptor inhibitor therapy, earlier discontinuation should be considered. (Level of Evidence: C)

Class IIa

1. For UA/NSTEMI patients in whom an initial conservative strategy is selected and who have recurrent ischemic discomfort with aspirin, a P2Y\textsubscript{12} receptor inhibitor (clopidogrel or ticagrelor), and anticoagulant therapy, it is reasonable to add a GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor before diagnostic angiography. (Level of Evidence: C)

Class IIb

1. For UA/NSTEMI patients in whom an initial invasive strategy is selected, it is reasonable to omit administration of an IV GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor if bivalirudin is selected as the anticoagulant and at least 300 mg of clopidogrel was administered at least 6 hours earlier than planned catheterization or PCI. (Level of Evidence: B)\textsuperscript{392–394}

Class III: No Benefit

1. Abciximab should not be administered to patients in whom PCI is not planned. (Level of Evidence: A)\textsuperscript{586,587}

2. In UA/NSTEMI patients who are at low risk for ischemic events (eg, TIMI risk score ≤2) or at high risk of bleeding and who are already receiving aspirin and a P2Y\textsubscript{12} receptor inhibitor, upstream GP IIb/IIIa inhibitors are not recommended. (Level of Evidence: B)\textsuperscript{392,396,397}

Class III: Harm

1. In UA/NSTEMI patients with a prior history of stroke and/or TIA for whom PCI is planned, prasugrel\textsuperscript{†} is
potentially harmful as part of a dual antiplatelet therapy regimen. (Level of Evidence: B) (Figure 8; Box C1)

Class IIa

1. For UA/NSTEMI patients in whom an initial conservative strategy is selected, enoxaparin or fondaparinux is preferable to UFH as anticoagulant therapy, unless CABG is planned within 24 h. (Level of Evidence: B)

3.2.3. Additional Management Considerations for Antiplatelet and Anticoagulant Therapy: Recommendations (UPDATED) (see Appendixes 7, 8, 9, and the Online Data Supplement)

Class I

1. For UA/NSTEMI patients in whom an initial conservative strategy is selected and no subsequent features appear that would necessitate diagnostic angiography (recurrent symptoms/ischemia, heart failure, or serious arrhythmias), a stress test should be performed. (Level of Evidence: B) 251

a. If, after stress testing, the patient is classified as not at low risk, diagnostic angiography should be performed. (Level of Evidence: A) 198,251

b. If, after stress testing, the patient is classified as being at low risk, the instructions noted below should be followed in preparation for discharge 198,251.
i. Continue aspirin indefinitely. *(Level of Evidence: A)* \(^{372,374,375}\)

ii. Continue clopidogrel or ticagrelor‡ for up to 12 months. *(Level of Evidence: B)* \(^{249,381,388}\)

iii. Discontinue IV GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor if started previously. *(Level of Evidence: A)* \(^{135,137}\)

iv. Continue UFH for 48 hours *(Level of Evidence: A)* \(^{377,407}\) or administer enoxaparin *(Level of Evidence: A)* \(^{398}\) or fondaparinux *(Level of Evidence: B)* \(^{409}\) for the duration of hospitalization, up to 8 days, and then discontinue anticoagulant therapy.

**Evidence:** A\(^{175,186,408}\) or fondaparinux *(Level of Evidence: B)* \(^{409}\) for the duration of hospitalization, up to 8 days, and then discontinue anticoagulant therapy.

2. For UA/NSTEMI patients in whom CABG is selected as a postangiography management strategy, the instructions noted below should be followed.

a. Continue aspirin. *(Level of Evidence: A)* \(^{410-416}\)

b. See Class I, #3, in this section.

c. Discontinue IV GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor (eptifibatide or tirofiban) 4 hours before CABG. *(Level of Evidence: B)* \(^{410,414,417}\)

d. Anticoagulant therapy should be managed as follows:

i. Continue UFH. *(Level of Evidence: B)* \(^{175,418-420}\)
ii. Discontinue enoxaparin 12 to 24 hours before CABG and dose with UFH per institutional practice. (Level of Evidence: B)\(^{249,383,384}\)

iii. Discontinue fondaparinux 24 hours before CABG and dose with UFH per institutional practice. (Level of Evidence: B)\(^{249,422}\)

iv. Discontinue bivalirudin 3 hours before CABG and dose with UFH per institutional practice. (Level of Evidence: B)\(^{249,424}\)

3. In patients taking a P2Y\(_{12}\) receptor inhibitor in whom CABG is planned and can be delayed, it is recommended that the drug be discontinued to allow for dissipation of the antiplatelet effect (Level of Evidence: B).\(^{249,383,384}\) The period of withdrawal should be at least 5 days in patients receiving clopidogrel (Level of Evidence: B)\(^{249,383,384}\) or ticagrelor\(\dagger\) if not started before diagnostic angiography. (Level of Evidence: C)\(^{399}\) and at least 7 days in patients receiving prasugrel\(\ddagger\) (Level of Evidence: C)\(^{399}\) unless the need for revascularization and/or the net benefit of the P2Y\(_{12}\) receptor inhibitor therapy outweighs the potential risks of excess bleeding. (Level of Evidence: C)\(^{426}\)

4. For UA/NSTEMI patients in whom PCI has been selected as a postangiography management strategy, the instructions noted below should be followed:

a. Continue aspirin. (Level of Evidence: A)\(^{372,375}\)

b. Administer a loading dose of a P2Y\(_{12}\) receptor inhibitor if not started before diagnostic angiography. (Level of Evidence: A)\(^{379,381,391,427–429}\)

c. Discontinue anticoagulant therapy after PCI for uncomplicated cases. (Level of Evidence: B)\(^{175,186,400,470,421}\)

5. For UA/NSTEMI patients in whom medical therapy is selected as a management strategy and in whom no significant obstructive coronary artery disease on angiography was found, antiplatelet and anticoagulant therapy should be administered at the discretion of the clinician (Level of Evidence: C). For patients in whom evidence of coronary atherosclerosis is present (eg, luminal irregularities or intravascular ultrasound-demonstrated lesions), albeit without flow-limiting stenoses, long-term treatment with aspirin and other secondary prevention measures should be prescribed. (Level of Evidence: C)

6. For UA/NSTEMI patients in whom medical therapy is selected as a management strategy and in whom coronary artery disease was found on angiography, the following approach is recommended:

a. Continue aspirin. (Level of Evidence: A)\(^{372,374,375}\)

b. Administer a loading dose of clopidogrel or ticagrelor\(\dagger\) if not given before diagnostic angiography. (Level of Evidence: B)\(^{249,381}\)

c. Discontinue IV GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor if started previously. (Level of Evidence: B)\(^{135,137,392,432}\)

d. Anticoagulant therapy should be managed as follows:

i. Continue IV UFH for at least 48 hours or until discharge if given before diagnostic angiography. (Level of Evidence: A)\(^{75,377,407}\)

ii. Continue enoxaparin for duration of hospitalization, up to 8 days, if given before diagnostic angiography. (Level of Evidence: A)\(^{175,186,400,422}\)

iii. Continue fondaparinux for duration of hospitalization, up to 8 days, if given before diagnostic angiography. (Level of Evidence: B)\(^{409}\)

iv. Either discontinue bivalirudin or continue at a dose of 0.25 mg/kg per hour for up to 72 hours at the physician's discretion if given before diagnostic angiography. (Level of Evidence: B)\(^{399,433,434}\)

7. For UA/NSTEMI patients in whom a conservative strategy is selected and who do not undergo angiography or stress testing, the instructions noted below should be followed:

a. Continue aspirin indefinitely. (Level of Evidence: A)\(^{372,374,375}\)

b. Continue clopidogrel or ticagrelor\(\dagger\) for up to 12 months. (Level of Evidence: B)\(^{249,378,381,435}\)

c. Discontinue IV GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor if started previously. (Level of Evidence: A)\(^{135,137}\)

d. Continue UFH for 48 hours (Level of Evidence: A)\(^{377,407}\)

or administer enoxaparin (Level of Evidence: A)\(^{75,186,400}\) or fondaparinux (Level of Evidence: B)\(^{409}\) for the duration of hospitalization, up to 8 days, and then discontinue anticoagulant therapy.

8. For UA/NSTEMI patients in whom an initial conservative strategy is selected and in whom no subsequent features appear that would necessitate diagnostic angiography (recurrent symptoms/ischemia, heart failure, or serious arrhythmias), LVEF should be measured. (Level of Evidence: B)\(^{436–439}\)

Class IIa

1. For UA/NSTEMI patients in whom PCI has been selected as a postangiography management strategy, it is reasonable to administer an IV GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor (abciximab, eptifibatide, or tirofiban) if not started
before diagnostic angiography, particularly for troponin-positive and/or other high-risk patients. (Level of Evidence: A)\textsuperscript{188,250}

2. For UA/NSTEMI patients in whom PCI is selected as a management strategy, it is reasonable to omit administration of an IV GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor if bivalirudin was selected as the anticoagulant and at least 300 mg of clopidogrel was administered at least 6 hours earlier. (Level of Evidence: B)\textsuperscript{436–439}

3. If LVEF is less than or equal to 0.40, it is reasonable to perform a stress test. (Level of Evidence: B)\textsuperscript{436}

4. If LVEF is greater than 0.40, it is reasonable to perform a stress test. (Level of Evidence: B)\textsuperscript{436}

Class IIb

1. Platelet function testing to determine platelet inhibitory response in patients with UA/NSTEMI (or, after ACS and PCI) on P2Y\textsubscript{12} receptor inhibitor therapy may be considered if results of testing may alter management. (Level of Evidence: B)\textsuperscript{440–444}

2. Genotyping for a CYP2C19 loss of function variant in patients with UA/NSTEMI (or, after ACS and with PCI) on P2Y\textsubscript{12} receptor inhibitor therapy might be considered if results of testing may alter management. (Level of Evidence: C)\textsuperscript{445–451}

Class III: No Benefit

1. IV fibrinolytic therapy is not indicated in patients without acute ST-segment elevation, a true posterior MI, or a presumed new left bundle-branch block. (Level of Evidence: A)\textsuperscript{452}

Antithrombotic therapy is essential to modify the disease process and its progression to death, MI, or recurrent MI in the majority of patients who have ACS due to thrombosis on a plaque. A combination of ASA, an anticoagulant, and additional antiplatelet therapy represents the most effective therapy. The intensity of treatment is tailored to individual risk, and triple-antithrombotic treatment is used in patients with continuing ischemia or with other high-risk features and in patients oriented to an early invasive strategy (Appendices 6 and 9; Figures 7, 8, and 9). Appendices 7 and 8 show the recommended doses of the various agents. A problematic group of patients are those who present with UA/NSTEMI but who are therapeutically anticoagulated with warfarin. In such patients, clinical judgment is needed with respect to initiation of the antiplatelet and anticoagulant therapy recommended in this section. A general guide is not to initiate anticoagulant therapy until the international normalized ratio (INR) is less than 2.0. However, antiplatelet therapy should be initiated even in patients therapeutically anticoagulated with warfarin, especially if an invasive strategy is planned and implantation of a stent is anticipated. In situations where the INR is supratherapeutic, the bleeding risk is unacceptably high, or urgent surgical treatment is necessary, reversal of the anticoagulant effect of warfarin may be considered with either vitamin K or fresh-frozen plasma as deemed clinically appropriate on the basis of physician judgment.

3.2.3.1. Antiplatelet/Anticoagulant Therapy in Patients for Whom Diagnosis of UA/NSTEMI Is Likely or Definite (NEW SECTION)

3.2.3.1.1. Newer P2Y\textsubscript{12} Receptor Inhibitors. P2Y\textsubscript{12} receptor inhibitor therapy is an important component of antithromplatelet therapy in patients with UA/NSTEMI and has been tested in several large trial populations with UA/NSTEMI. The last version of the guideline recommended the use of clopidogrel in patients with UA/NSTEMI because it was the only US Food and Drug Administration (FDA)–approved P2Y\textsubscript{12} receptor inhibitor in this patient population at that time.\textsuperscript{1} Since the publication of the last guideline,\textsuperscript{1} the FDA has approved 2 additional P2Y\textsubscript{12} receptor inhibitors for use in patients with UA/NSTEMI. The FDA approved the use of prasugrel and ticagrelor based on data from head-to-head comparison trials with clopidogrel, in which prasugrel and ticagrelor were respectively superior to clopidogrel in reducing clinical events but at the expense of an increased risk of bleeding.

The pivotal trial for prasugrel, TRITON–TIMI 38 (Trial to Assess Improvement in Therapeutic Outcomes by Optimizing Platelet Inhibition with Prasugrel–Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction),\textsuperscript{380} focused on patients with acute coronary syndrome (ACS) who were referred for percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI). TRITON–TIMI 38 randomly assigned 13,608 patients with moderate- to high-risk ACS, of whom 10,074 (74%) had UA/NSTEMI, to receive prasugrel (a 60-mg loading dose and a 10-mg daily maintenance dose) or clopidogrel (a 300-mg loading dose and a 75-mg daily maintenance dose) for a median follow-up of 14.5 months. Acetylsalicylic acid (aspirin) was prescribed within 24 hours of PCI. Clinical endpoints were assessed at 30 and 90 days and then at 3-month intervals for 6 to 15 months. Among patients with UA/NSTEMI undergoing PCI, a prasugrel loading dose was administered before, during, or within 1 hour after PCI but only after coronary anatomy had been defined. Patients taking any thienopyridine within 5 days of randomization were excluded.

Prasugrel was associated with a significant 2.2% absolute reduction and a 19% relative reduction in the primary efficacy endpoint, a composite of the rate of death due to cardiovascular causes (including arrhythmia, congestive heart failure, shock, and sudden or witnessed death), nonfatal myocardial infarction (MI), or nonfatal stroke during the follow-up period (see Online Data Supplement). The primary efficacy endpoint occurred in 9.9% of patients receiving prasugrel and 12.1% of patients receiving clopidogrel (HR for prasugrel versus clopidogrel: 0.81; 95% CI: 0.73 to 0.90; P<0.001).\textsuperscript{380} Prasugrel decreased cardiovascular death, MI, and stroke by 138 events (number needed to treat=46). The difference in the primary endpoint was largely related to the difference in rates of nonfatal MI (7.3% for prasugrel versus 9.5% for clopidogrel; HR: 0.76; 95% CI: 0.67 to 0.85; P<0.001). Rates of cardiovascular death (2.1% versus 2.4%; P=0.31) and nonfatal stroke (1.0% versus 1.0%; P=0.93) were not reduced by prasugrel relative to clopidogrel. Rates of stent thrombosis were significantly reduced from 2.4% to 1.1% (P<0.001) by prasugrel.

Prasugrel was associated with a significant increase in the rate of bleeding, notably TIMI (Thrombolysis In Myocardial
Infarction) major hemorrhage, which was observed in 2.4% of patients taking prasugrel and in 1.8% of patients taking clopidogrel (HR for prasugrel versus clopidogrel: 1.32; 95% CI: 1.03 to 1.68; \(P=0.03\)). Prasugrel was associated with a significant increase in fatal bleeding compared with clopidogrel (0.4% versus 0.1%; \(P=0.002\)). From the standpoint of safety, prasugrel was associated with an increase of 35 TIMI major and non–coronary artery graft bypass (CABG) bleeds (number needed to harm=167). Also, greater rates of life-threatening bleeding were evident in the prasugrel group than in the clopidogrel group: 1.4% versus 0.9%, respectively (HR for prasugrel: 1.52; 95% CI: 1.08 to 2.13; \(P=0.01\)). From the standpoint of safety, prasugrel was associated with an increase of 35 TIMI major and non–coronary artery graft bypass (CABG) bleeds (number needed to harm=167). Also, greater rates of life-threatening bleeding were evident in the prasugrel group than in the clopidogrel group: 1.4% versus 0.9%, respectively (HR for prasugrel: 1.52; 95% CI: 1.08 to 2.13; \(P=0.01\)). In the few patients who underwent CABG, TIMI major bleeding through 15 months was also greater with prasugrel than with clopidogrel (13.4% versus 3.2%, respectively; HR for prasugrel: 4.73; 95% CI: 1.90 to 11.82; \(P<0.001\)). The net clinical benefit in the TRITON–TIMI 38 study demonstrated a primary efficacy and safety endpoint rate of 13.9% in the clopidogrel group versus 12.2% in the prasugrel group (HR: 0.87; 95% CI: 0.79 to 0.95; \(P=0.004\)).

A post hoc analysis suggested there were 3 subgroups of ACS patients who did not have a favorable net clinical benefit (defined as the rate of death due to any cause, nonfatal MI, nonfatal stroke, or non–CABG-related nonfatal TIMI major bleeding) from the use of prasugrel or who had net harm: Patients with a history of stroke or transient ischemic attack before enrollment had net harm from prasugrel (HR: 1.54; 95% CI: 1.02 to 2.32; \(P=0.04\)); patients age \(\geq 75\) years had no net benefit from prasugrel (HR: 0.99; 95% CI: 0.81 to 1.21; \(P=0.92\)); and patients with a body weight of <60 kg had no net benefit from prasugrel (HR: 1.03; 95% CI: 0.69 to 1.53; \(P=0.89\)). In both treatment groups, patients with at least 1 of these risk factors had higher rates of bleeding than those without them.

The FDA approved prasugrel on July 10, 2009, and cited a contraindication against its use in patients with a history of transient ischemic attack or stroke or with active pathological bleeding. The FDA labeling information includes a general warning against the use of prasugrel in patients age \(\geq 75\) years because of concerns of an increased risk of fatal and intracranial bleeding and uncertain benefit except in high-risk situations (patients with diabetes or a history of prior MI), in which case the net benefit appears to be greater and its use may be considered. In focusing specifically on patients with UA/NSTEMI, the rate of the primary efficacy endpoint was significantly reduced in favor of prasugrel (9.9% versus 12.1%; adjusted HR: 0.82; 95% CI: 0.73 to 0.93; \(P=0.002\)).

The pivotal trial for ticagrelor, PLATO (Study of Platelet Inhibition and Patient Outcomes), was a multicenter, international, randomized controlled trial comparing ticagrelor with clopidogrel (on a background of aspirin therapy) to determine whether ticagrelor is superior to clopidogrel for the prevention of vascular events and death in a broad population of patients with ACS (see Online Data Supplement). A total of 18624 patients hospitalized with an ACS were randomized...
at 862 centers (from 2006 through 2008). Of those, 11,598 patients had UA/NSTEMI (patients with UA and NSTEMI made up 16.7% and 42.7% of the overall population, respectively), whereas 7026 patients had STEMI.

The primary efficacy endpoint was the time to first occurrence of the composite of vascular death, MI, or stroke. The primary safety endpoint was the first occurrence of any major bleeding event. The randomized treatment was scheduled to continue for 12 months; however, patients were allowed to leave the trial at 6 to 9 months if the event-driven study achieved its targeted number of primary events. Overall, the median duration of study drug administration was 277 days. Using a double-blind, double-dummy design, ticagrelor (180-mg loading dose followed by 90 mg twice daily) was compared with clopidogrel (300- to 600-mg loading dose followed by 75 mg daily). At 24 hours after randomization, 79% of patients treated with clopidogrel received at least 300 mg, and nearly 20% received at least 600 mg. Overall, 64.3% of patients underwent PCI during the index hospitalization and 60.6% had stent implantation. Median times from the start of hospitalization to initiation of study treatment were 4.9 and 5.3 hours for ticagrelor and clopidogrel, respectively.

At 12 months, ticagrelor was associated with a 1.9% absolute reduction and 16% relative reduction in the primary composite outcome compared with clopidogrel (9.8% versus 11.7%; HR: 0.84; 95% CI: 0.77 to 0.92), which was driven by lower rates of MI (5.8% versus 6.9%; HR: 0.84; 95% CI: 0.75 to 0.95) and vascular death (4.0% versus 5.1%; HR: 0.79; 95% CI: 0.69 to 0.91). The benefits of ticagrelor appeared consistent across most subgroups studied, with no significant interaction being observed between the treatment effect and type of ACS. In focusing specifically on patients with UA/NSTEMI, ticagrelor was associated with a significant reduction in the primary efficacy endpoint among NSTEMI patients (n=7955 patients; 11.4% versus 13.9%; HR: 0.83; 95% CI: 0.73 to 0.94) but not among UA patients (n=3112 patients; 8.6% versus 9.1%; HR: 0.96; 95% CI: 0.75 to 1.22), although caution is urged against overinterpreting subgroup analyses. The benefits of ticagrelor in PLATO appeared within the first 30 days, persisted for up to 360 days, and were evident irrespective of clopidogrel pretreatment and whether patients had invasive or medical management planned. Notably, ticagrelor was associated with a 1.4% absolute reduction in all-cause mortality (4.5% versus 5.9%; HR: 0.78; 95% CI: 0.69 to 0.89) and with lower rates of definite stent thrombosis (1.3% versus 1.90%; HR: 0.67; 95% CI: 0.50 to 0.91).

There were no significant differences between the ticagrelor and clopidogrel groups in rates of major bleeding (the primary safety endpoint: composite of major life-threatening and other major bleeding events, PLATO study criteria; 11.6% versus 11.2%; HR: 1.04; 95% CI: 0.95 to 1.13), TIMI major bleeding (7.9% versus 7.7%; HR: 1.03; 95% CI: 0.93 to 1.15), or fatal bleeding (0.3% versus 0.3%; HR: 0.87; 95% CI: 0.48 to 1.59). There were also no differences in major bleeding in patients undergoing CABG, in whom clopidogrel and ticagrelor were discontinued before the procedure for 5 days and 24 to 72 hours, respectively, per study protocol. Ticagrelor, however, was associated with a higher rate of non-CABG-related major bleeding (4.5% versus 3.8%, P=0.03). In addition, ticagrelor caused a higher incidence of dyspnea (13.8% versus 7.8%; HR: 1.84; 95% CI: 1.68 to 2.02; although not necessitating drug discontinuation except in a few cases), mild increases in creatinine and uric acid levels, and a higher rate of ventricular pauses ≥3 seconds in the first week (5.8% versus 3.6%, P=0.01; but without causing differences in syncope or pacemaker implantation). Overall, discontinuation of the study drug due to adverse events occurred more frequently with ticagrelor than with clopidogrel (7.4% versus 6.0%; P<0.001). Patients with a history of bleeding were excluded in PLATO, and <4% of patients had a prior history of nonhemorrhagic stroke. The efficacy and safety of ticagrelor in patients with prior transient ischemic attack or stroke were not reported in PLATO, and the balance of risks and benefits of ticagrelor in this patient population remains unclear.

A separate analysis was performed for the 5216 patients in PLATO admitted with ACS and prespecified as planned for noninvasive management (constituting 28% of the overall PLATO study population). Compared with clopidogrel, ticagrelor was associated with a lower incidence of the primary endpoint (12.0% versus 14.3%; HR: 0.85; 95% CI: 0.73 to 1.00; P=0.04) and overall mortality without increasing major bleeding. These results indicate the benefits of intensified P2Y12 inhibition with ticagrelor applied broadly for patients regardless of the intended or actualized management strategy.

The benefits of ticagrelor in PLATO appeared to be attenuated in patients weighing less than the median weight for their sex and those not taking lipid-lowering therapies at randomization. There was a significant interaction between treatment and geographic region, with patients enrolled in North America having no statistically significant differences between ticagrelor and clopidogrel with respect to the primary efficacy endpoint. Extensive additional analyses were conducted to explore potential explanations for this interaction between treatment effect in PLATO and geographic region and whether this could be explained by specific patient characteristics or concomitant therapies. Mahaffey and colleagues noted that a significantly higher proportion of patients in the United States received a median aspirin dose of ≥300 mg daily compared with the rest of the world (53.6% versus 1.7%). Indeed, of all 37 baseline and postrandomization variables explored, only aspirin maintenance dose appeared to explain a substantial fraction of the regional interaction. Of note, subgroup analysis consistently showed the same aspirin-dose effect outside the United States. Without being able to fully rule out the play of chance or other factors related to clinical care in North America as explanations for the regional interaction, PLATO concluded that a low aspirin maintenance dose (≤100 mg daily) is likely to be associated with the most favorable outcomes when using the potent P2Y12 inhibitor ticagrelor in patients with ACS.

Because of its reversible inhibition of the P2Y12 receptor, ticagrelor is associated with more rapid functional recovery of circulating platelets and, consequently, a faster offset of effect than clopidogrel. Although this may represent a potential advantage for patients with ACS undergoing early CABG, it
may theoretically pose a problem for noncompliant patients (especially given its twice-daily dosing regimen).

The FDA approved ticagrelor on July 20, 2011.399 The FDA also issued a “Boxed Warning” indicating that aspirin daily maintenance doses of more than 100 mg decrease the effectiveness of ticagrelor, cautioned against its use in patients with active bleeding or a history of intracranial hemorrhage, and advocated a Risk Evaluation and Mitigation Strategy, a plan to help ensure that the benefits of ticagrelor outweigh its risks. As part of that plan, the manufacturer is mandated to conduct educational outreach programs to alert physicians about the risk of using higher doses of aspirin.

Dual antiplatelet therapy with aspirin and either clopidogrel or prasugrel has increased the risk of intracranial hemorrhage in several clinical trials and patient populations (especially in those with prior stroke).380,453–456 In PLATO, the number of patients with prior stroke was small, limiting the power to detect treatment differences in intracranial bleeding in this subgroup.456 Patients with prior stroke or TIA have been excluded from PEGASUS (Prevention of Cardiovascular Events in Patients With Prior Heart Attack Using Ticagrelor Compared to Placebo on a Background of Aspirin),457 an ongoing trial of ticagrelor versus placebo in addition to aspirin in patients with stable coronary artery disease. Until further data become available, it seems prudent to weigh the possible increased risk of intracranial bleeding when considering the addition of ticagrelor to aspirin in patients with prior stroke or TIA.458

3.2.3.1.2. Choice of P2Y12 Receptor Inhibitors for PCI in UA/NSTEMI. The 2012 writing group cautions that data on the use of prasugrel and ticagrelor come solely from the TRITON–TIMI 38 and PLATO trials, respectively, and their use in clinical practice should carefully follow how they were tested in these studies.382,384 Prasugrel was administered only after a decision to proceed to PCI was made, whereas ticagrelor was studied in “all-comer” patients with UA/NSTEMI, including invasively and medically managed patients. The 2012 writing group does not recommend that prasugrel be administered routinely to patients with UA/NSTEMI before angiography, such as in an emergency department, or used in patients with UA/NSTEMI who have not undergone PCI. The FDA package label suggests that it is reasonable to consider selective use of prasugrel before catheterization in subgroups of patients for whom a decision to proceed to angiography and PCI has already been established for any reason.399 The 2012 writing group acknowledges this flexibility, but it is not its intention to make more specific recommendations about which subgroups of patients might benefit from prasugrel or ticagrelor instead of clopidogrel. The 2012 writing group does wish to caution clinicians about the potential increased bleeding risks associated with prasugrel and ticagrelor compared with clopidogrel in specific settings and especially among the subgroups identified in the package insert and clinical trials.380,384,395,399 This guideline explicitly does not endorse one of the P2Y12 receptor inhibitors over the other. There were several reasons for this decision. Although the composite efficacy endpoint in TRITON–TIMI 38 favored prasugrel, driven predominantly by a difference in nonfatal MIs (mostly asymptomatic), with deaths and nonfatal strokes being similar, bleeding was increased in the prasugrel group.380 On the other hand, the composite efficacy endpoint in PLATO favoring ticagrelor over clopidogrel was driven by differences in both vascular death and nonfatal MIs, with stroke rates being similar. Ticagrelor was also associated with a notable reduction in all-cause mortality in PLATO. Compared with clopidogrel, ticagrelor was associated with a higher rate of non–CABG-related major bleeding and slightly more frequent discontinuation of the study drug due to adverse events.381 On the other hand, prasugrel was associated with a significant increase in the rate of TIMI major hemorrhage, TIMI major and non-CABG bleeding, as well as higher fatal and life-threatening bleeding. There was a significant interaction between the treatment effect in PLATO and the geographic region, with lack of benefit in the United States for ticagrelor versus clopidogrel (with the explanation depending on a post hoc analysis of aspirin maintenance dose, as noted in the preceding text)398 (see Online Data Supplement).

It must be recognized, however, that the 2 newer P2Y12 receptor inhibitors were studied in different patient populations and that there is no head-to-head comparative trial of these agents. Also, the loading dose of clopidogrel in TRITON–TIMI 38 was lower than is currently recommended in this guideline.380 Furthermore, some emerging studies suggest there may be some patients who are resistant to clopidogrel, but there is little information about the use of strategies to select patients who might do better with newer P2Y12 receptor inhibitors. Considerations of efficacy in the prevention of thrombosis and risk of an adverse effect related to bleeding and experience with a given medication may best guide decisions about the choice of P2Y12 receptor inhibitor for individual patients.459 (Appendix 8).

3.2.3.1.2.1. Timing of Discontinuation of P2Y12 Receptor Inhibitor Therapy for Surgical Procedures. The 2012 writing group weighed the current data on the use of P2Y12 receptor inhibitor therapy in patients who remain hospitalized after UA/NSTEMI and are candidates for CABG and retained the 2007 recommendation7 of empirical discontinuation of clopidogrel therapy for at least 5 days380 and advocated a period of at least 7 days in patients receiving prasugrel and a period of at least 5 days in patients receiving ticagrelor for their respective discontinuation before planned CABG.395,399 Ultimately, the patient’s clinical status will determine the risk-to-benefit ratio of CABG compared with awaiting restoration of platelet function.

It is the opinion of the 2012 writing group that physicians and patients should be cautioned against early discontinuation of P2Y12 receptor inhibitors for elective noncardiac procedures. Given the increased hazard of recurrent cardiovascular events from premature discontinuation of P2Y12 inhibitors and the increased bleeding risk in patients undergoing procedures on therapy (eg, colonoscopy with biopsy, dental procedures), it is advisable to consult a cardiologist and preferably defer elective noncardiac procedures until the patient finishes the appropriate course of P2Y12 receptor inhibition therapy, especially in UA/NSTEMI patients who received less than
12 months of treatment with dual antiplatelet therapy after deployment of a drug-eluting stent (DES). 460

3.2.3.1.3. Interindividual Variability in Responsiveness to Clopidogrel. Although clopidogrel in combination with aspirin has been shown to reduce recurrent coronary events in the posthospitalized ACS population, 249,382 the response to clopidogrel varies among patients, and diminished responsiveness to clopidogrel has been observed. 461–462 Clopidogrel is a prodrug and requires conversion to R130964, its active metabolite, through a 2-step process in the liver that involves several CYP450 isoenzymes 446; of these, the CYP2C19 isoenzyme is responsible for almost half of the first step formation. 446 At least 3 major genetic polymorphisms of the CYP2C19 isoenzyme are associated with loss of function: CYP2C19*1, *2, and *3. 446–448 The CYP2C19*2 and *3 variants account for 85% and 99% of the loss-of-function alleles in Caucasians and Asians, respectively. 446 There are racial and ethnic differences in the prevalence of these loss-of-function alleles among Caucasians, African Americans, Asians, and Latinos, but all of these groups have some expression of them.

Data from a number of observational studies have demonstrated an association between an increased risk of adverse cardiovascular events and the presence of more than or equal to 1 of the nonfunctioning alleles 446,447,449,450,461–465 and are well delineated in the ACCF/AHA Clopidogrel Clinical Alert. 446 Prasugrel, the second FDA-approved P2Y<sub>12</sub> receptor inhibitor for use in ACS, is also a prodrug that requires conversion to its active metabolite. Prasugrel requires a single CYP-dependent step for its oxidation to the active metabolite, and at least 2 observational studies have demonstrated no significant decrease in plasma concentrations or platelet inhibition activity in carriers of at least 1 loss-of-function allele of the CYP2C19 isoenzyme. 466–468 On the other hand, ticagrelor, the latest FDA-approved P2Y<sub>12</sub> receptor inhibitor, is a nonthienopyridine, reversible, direct-acting oral antagonist of the P2Y<sub>12</sub> receptor that does not require transformation to an active metabolite. 468

Since the FDA announced a “Boxed Warning” on March 12, 2010, about the diminished effectiveness of clopidogrel in patients with an impaired ability to convert the drug into its active form, 489 there has been much interest in whether clinicians should perform routine testing in patients being treated with clopidogrel. The routine testing could be for genetic variants of the CYP2C19 allele and/or for overall effectiveness for inhibition of platelet activity. The ACCF/AHA Clopidogrel Clinical Alert expertly summarizes the issues surrounding clopidogrel and the use of genotype testing, as well as the potential for routine platelet function testing. 446

The FDA label revision does not mandate testing for CYP2C19 genotypes or overall platelet function. 446 The revision serves to warn clinicians that certain patient subgroups may exhibit reduced clopidogrel-mediated platelet inhibition and emphasizes that clinicians should be aware of alternative treatment strategies to tailor alternative therapies when appropriate.

A number of commercially available genetic test kits will identify the presence of more than or equal to 1 of the loss-of-function CYP2C19 alleles, but these tests are expensive and not routinely covered by most insurance policies. Additionally, there are no prospective studies that demonstrate that the routine use of these tests coupled with modification of antiplatelet therapy improves clinical outcomes or reduces subsequent clinical events. A recent meta-analysis demonstrated an association between the CYP2C19 genotype and clopidogrel responsiveness but no significant association of genotype with cardiovascular events. 469 Several ongoing studies are examining whether genotype assessment with attendant alteration in antiplatelet therapy for those with loss-of-function alleles can improve clinical outcomes. On the basis of the current evidence, it is difficult to strongly recommend genotype testing routinely in patients with ACS, but it might be considered on a case-by-case basis, especially in patients who experience recurrent ACS events despite ongoing therapy with clopidogrel.

Some argue that clinicians should consider routine testing of platelet function, especially in patients undergoing high-risk PCI, 446 to maximize efficacy while maintaining safety. Again, no completed prospective studies have examined such an approach to guide such a sweeping change in clinical management. At least 4 randomized clinical evaluation studies being conducted now are testing the hypothesis that routine platelet function testing should be used to tailor antiplatelet therapy, and any strong recommendation regarding more widespread use of such testing must await the results of these trials. The lack of evidence does not mean lack of efficacy or potential benefit, but the prudent physician should maintain an open yet critical mind-set about the concept until data are available from ≥1 of the ongoing randomized clinical trials examining this strategy.

Our recommendations for the use of genotype testing and platelet function testing seek to strike a balance between not imposing an undue burden on clinicians, insurers, and society to implement these strategies in patients with UA/NSTEMI and that of acknowledging the importance of these issues to patients with UA/NSTEMI. Our recommendations that the use of either strategy may have some benefit should be taken in the context of the remarks in this update, as well as the more comprehensive analysis in the ACCF/AHA Clopidogrel Clinical Alert. 446 The Class IIb recommendation of these strategies suggests that a selective, limited approach to platelet genotype assessment and platelet function testing is the more prudent course until better clinical evidence exists for us to provide a more scientifically derived recommendation.

3.2.3.1.4. Optimal Loading and Maintenance Dosages of Clopidogrel. Some have suggested that the loading and maintenance doses of clopidogrel should be altered to account for potential reduced responsiveness to clopidogrel therapy or that some subgroups of high-risk patients should be treated preferentially with prasugrel. 446 Accordingly, the optimal loading and short-term maintenance dosing for clopidogrel in patients with UA/NSTEMI undergoing PCI is uncertain.

Loading and short-term maintenance doses of clopidogrel were studied in CURRENT–OASIS 7 (Clopidogrel optimal loading dose Usage to Reduce Recurrent Events–Organization to Assess Strategies in Ischemic Syndromes), with published data demonstrating a potential benefit of higher-dose
clopidogrel in patients with definite UA/NSTEMI undergoing an invasive management strategy.\textsuperscript{389, 470} The CURRENT–OASIS 7 trial randomized 25,086 patients with ACS who were intended for PCI and who were not considered to be at high risk for bleeding to receive higher-dose clopidogrel (600 mg loading, 150 mg daily for 6 days, 75 mg daily thereafter) versus standard-dose clopidogrel (300 mg loading, 75 mg daily) as part of a 2×2 design that also compared maintenance higher-dose aspirin (300 to 325 mg daily) with low-dose aspirin (75 to 100 mg daily). All patients received more than or equal to 300 mg of aspirin on Day 1 regardless of randomization after Day 1. The primary endpoint of the trial was the combination of cardiovascular death, myocardial (re)infarction, or stroke at 30 days. Although the overall trial\textsuperscript{470} failed to demonstrate a significant difference in the primary endpoint between the clopidogrel and aspirin groups (4.2% versus 4.4%), the PCI subset (n=17,263) did show significant differences in the clopidogrel group.\textsuperscript{389} The primary outcome was reduced in the PCI subgroup randomized to higher-dose clopidogrel (3.9% versus 4.5%; \(P=0.035\)), and this was largely driven by a reduction in myocardial (re)infarction (2.0% versus 2.6%; \(P=0.017\)). Definite stent thrombosis was reduced in the higher-dose clopidogrel group (0.7% versus 1.3%; \(P=0.0001\)), with consistent results across DES versus non-DES subtypes.

Higher-dose clopidogrel therapy increased major bleeding in the entire group (2.5% versus 2.0%; \(P=0.017\)) and PCI subgroup (1.1% versus 0.7%; \(P=0.008\)). The benefit of higher-dose clopidogrel loading was offset by an increase in major bleeding.\textsuperscript{389} The findings from the prespecified PCI subgroup analysis\textsuperscript{389} should be interpreted with caution and considered hypothesis generating, because the primary endpoint of the CURRENT–OASIS 7 trial was not met and given that the \(P\) value for interaction (\(P=0.026\)) between treatment effect and PCI was of borderline statistical significance.

As noted in the dosing table (Appendix 7), the current recommended loading dose for clopidogrel is uncertain. In addition, several hours are required to metabolize clopidogrel to its active metabolite, leaving a window of time where there is a reduced level of effectiveness even in patients who respond to clopidogrel.

### 3.2.3.1.5. Proton Pump Inhibitors and Dual Antiplatelet Therapy for ACS

Proton pump inhibitor (PPI) medications have been found to interfere with the metabolism of clopidogrel. When clopidogrel is started, PPIs are often prescribed to clopidogrel.\textsuperscript{461} Coupled with concern about the GI precautions, there has been increased emphasis on the prevention of premature discontinuation of dual antiplatelet therapy, particularly in patients who have received a DES for whom 12 months of antiplatelet therapy is recommended.\textsuperscript{460}

There have been retrospective reports of adverse cardiovascular outcomes (eg, readmission for ACS) when the antiplatelet regimen of clopidogrel and aspirin is accompanied by PPIs assessed as a group compared with use of this regimen without a PPI.\textsuperscript{461, 472, 473} In a retrospective cohort study from the Veterans Affairs’ medical records and pharmacy database, concomitant clopidogrel and PPI therapy (with omeprazole, rabeprazole, lansoprazole, or pantoprazole) at any time during follow-up of 8,205 patients discharged for ACS was associated with an increased risk of death or rehospitalization for ACS.\textsuperscript{461} Other post hoc study analyses\textsuperscript{469} and a retrospective data analysis from the National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute Dynamic Registry, in which PPIs were assessed as a class in combination with a clopidogrel and an aspirin regimen, have not found an effect of PPI therapy on the clinical effect of clopidogrel in ACS patients, post-ACS patients, and a general post-PCI population, respectively.\textsuperscript{449}

Some studies have suggested that adverse cardiovascular outcomes with the combination of clopidogrel and a PPI are explained by the individual PPI, in particular, the use of a PPI that inhibits\textsuperscript{CYP450 2C19}, including omeprazole, lan- soprazole, or rabeprazole. Notably, the PPI omeprazole has been reported to significantly decrease the inhibitory effect of clopidogrel on platelet aggregation.\textsuperscript{474, 475} One study reported that the PPI pantoprazole was not associated with recurrent MI among patients receiving clopidogrel, possibly due to pantoprazole’s lack of inhibition of\textsuperscript{CYP450 2C19}.\textsuperscript{472}

Other studies have examined the P2Y\textsubscript{12} receptor inhibitor prescribed with the PPI. One open-label drug study evaluated the effects of the PPI lansoprazole on the pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of prasugrel and clopidogrel in healthy subjects given single doses of prasugrel 60 mg and clopidogrel 300 mg with and without concurrent lansoprazole 30 mg per day. The data suggest that inhibition of platelet aggregation was reduced in patients who took the combination of clopidogrel and lansoprazole, whereas platelet aggregation was unaffected after a prasugrel dose.\textsuperscript{476}

Another study\textsuperscript{473} assessed the association of PPIs with the pharmacodynamics and clinical efficacy of clopidogrel and prasugrel, based on populations from 2 randomized trials, the PRINCIPLE (Prasugrel In Comparison to Clopidogrel for Inhibition of Platelet Activation and Aggregation) TIMI-44 trial\textsuperscript{477} and the TRIOUT–TIMI 38 trial.\textsuperscript{380} The findings indicated that first, PPI treatment attenuated the pharmacodynamic effects of clopidogrel and, to a lesser extent, those of prasugrel. Second, PPI treatment did not affect the clinical outcome of patients given clopidogrel or prasugrel. This finding was true for all PPIs that were studied, including omeprazole and pantoprazole.

Observational trials may be confounded by selection bias. In the COGENT (Clopidogrel and the Optimization of Gastrointestinal Events) study,\textsuperscript{278} omeprazole was compared with placebo in 3,627 patients starting dual antiplatelet therapy with aspirin and clopidogrel. No difference was found in the primary composite cardiovascular endpoint between clopidogrel plus omeprazole and clopidogrel plus placebo (HR: 1.02), but GI bleeding complications were reduced.\textsuperscript{478} COGENT had several shortcomings (see Online Data Supplement), and more controlled, randomized clinical trial data are needed to address the clinical impact of conjunctive therapy with clopidogrel and PPIs.

The FDA communication on an ongoing safety review of clopidogrel bisulfate\textsuperscript{479} advises that healthcare providers should reevaluate the need for starting or continuing treatment with a PPI, including omeprazole, in patients taking clopidogrel. The FDA notes there is no evidence that
other drugs that reduce stomach acid, such as H2 blockers or antacids, interfere with the antiplatelet activity of clopidogrel. Healthcare providers should continue to prescribe and patients should continue to take clopidogrel as directed, because clopidogrel has demonstrated benefits in preventing blood clots that could lead to a heart attack or stroke. Healthcare providers should reevaluate the need for starting or continuing treatment with a PPI, including omeprazole (over the counter), in patients taking clopidogrel. Patients taking clopidogrel should consult their healthcare provider if they are currently taking or considering taking a PPI, including omeprazole. The ACCF has released a statement on the use of PPI agents in appropriate clinical settings, yet highlights the potential risks and benefits from use of PPI agents in combination with clopidogrel.

3.2.3.1.6. Glycoprotein IIb/IIIa Receptor Antagonists (Updated to Incorporate Newer Trials and Evidence). The efficacy of glycoprotein (GP) IIb/IIIa inhibitor therapy has been well established during PCI procedures and in patients with UA/NSTEMI, particularly among high-risk patients such as those with elevated troponin biomarkers, those with diabetes, and those undergoing revascularization. These studies supported the upstream use of a GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor as a second agent in combination with aspirin for routine angioplasty in patients with UA/NSTEMI, especially in high-risk subsets such as those with an initial elevation in cardiac troponins, those with diabetes, and those undergoing revascularization. These studies did not directly test in a randomized fashion the selection of an oral thienopyridine versus an intravenous (IV) GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor as the second antiplatelet agent in UA/NSTEMI.

Contemporary clinical trials have therefore been needed to define the optimal timing of initiation of GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor therapy in patients with UA/NSTEMI, whether “upstream” (at presentation and before angiography) or “deferred” (at the time of angiography/PCI), and its optimal application (whether routine, selective, or provisional) and to clarify the relative benefit and risk of GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor therapy as a third antiplatelet agent in combination with aspirin and a thienopyridine.

The EARLY ACS (Early Glycoprotein IIb/IIIa Inhibition in Patients With Non–ST-Segment Elevation Acute Coronary Syndrome) trial examined in part the optimal strategy for the use of GP IIb/IIIa inhibitors in moderate- and high-risk ACS patients undergoing early invasive therapy. A total of 9207 patients were randomized to 1 of 3 antithrombin regimens: unfractionated heparin (UFH) or enoxaparin plus GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor therapy; bivalirudin plus GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor therapy; or bivalirudin alone. Patients assigned to the heparin (UFH or enoxaparin) plus GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor therapy; or to the bivalirudin plus GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor therapy were randomized to immediate upstream routine GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor therapy or deferred selective use of GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor therapy at the time of PCI. A clopidogrel loading dose of ≥300 mg was required in all cases no later than 2 hours before surgery for those undergoing CABG. Early clopidogrel was allowed at the investigators’ discretion (75% intended early use), and if used, a loading dose of 300 mg was recommended. For patients beginning clopidogrel during PCI (intended in 25% of study subjects, but actually implemented in 11%), a dose of 600 mg was permitted. Randomization to 1 of 3 antithrombotic regimens was stratified according to the intention of the investigator to administer early clopidogrel (ie, at or before randomization). The primary endpoint (a 30-day composite of all-cause death, MI, recurrent ischemia requiring urgent revascularization, or thrombotic bailout at 96 hours) occurred in 9.3% of patients in the early therapy arm versus 10.0% of patients in the provisional GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor therapy arm (OR: 0.92; 95% CI: 0.80 to 1.06; P=0.23). Secondary endpoint (all-cause death or MI within 30 days) event rates were 11.2% versus 12.3% (OR: 0.89; 95% CI: 0.79 to 1.01; P=0.08). Early routine epitibatide administration was associated with a greater risk of TIMI major hemorrhage (2.6% versus 1.8%; P=0.02). Severe or moderate bleeding, as defined by the GUSTO (Global Utilization of Streptokinase and t-PA for Occluded Coronary Arteries) criteria, also occurred more commonly in the early epitibatide group (7.6% versus 5.1%; P=0.001). Rates of red blood cell transfusion were 8.6% and 6.7% in the early-epitibatide and delayed-epitibatide groups, respectively (P=0.001). There were no significant interactions with respect to prespecified baseline characteristics, including early clopidogrel administration, and the primary or secondary efficacy endpoints. In a subgroup analysis, early administration of epitibatide in patients who underwent PCI was associated with numerically fewer ischemic events.
hours after PCI, and provisional GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor use was permitted before angiography in the deferred group for severe breakthrough ischemia. The composite ischemic endpoint occurred in 7.1% of the patients assigned to upstream administration and in 7.9% of patients assigned to deferred selective administration (RR: 1.12; 95% CI: 0.97 to 1.29; \( P = 0.13 \)),

and thus the noninferiority hypothesis was not achieved. Major bleeding was lower in the deferred-use group versus the upstream group (4.9% to 6.1%; \( P < 0.001 \) for noninferiority and \( P = 0.009 \) for superiority).

Although early GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor therapy as dual antiplatelet therapy also reduced complications after PCI, supporting its continued role in patients undergoing PCI,

these 2 most recent studies\(^{392,397} \) more strongly support a strategy of selective rather than routine upstream use of GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor therapy as part of triple antiplatelet therapy. Data from EARLY ACS\(^{397} \) highlight the potential bleeding risks of upstream use of a GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor as part of triple antiplatelet therapy. The use of a GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor should be undertaken when the risk-benefit ratio suggests a potential benefit for the patient. The use of these agents as part of triple antiplatelet therapy may therefore not be supported when there is a concern for increased bleeding risk or in non–high-risk subsets such as those with a normal baseline troponin level, those without diabetes, and those aged 275 years, in whom the potential benefit may be significantly offset by the potential risk of bleeding (Refer to Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.3).

### 3.2.4. Older Antiplatelet Agents and Trials (Aspirin, Ticlopidine, Clopidogrel)

**3.2.4.1. Aspirin**

(Refer to Updated Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.3, and New Section 3.2.3.1)

Some of the strongest evidence available about the long-term prognostic effects of therapy in patients with coronary disease pertains to ASA.\(^{370} \) By irreversibly inhibiting COX-1 within platelets, ASA prevents the formation of thromboxane A2, thereby diminishing platelet aggregation promoted by this pathway but not by others. This platelet inhibition is the plausible mechanism for the clinical benefit of ASA, both because it is fully present with low doses of ASA and because platelets represent one of the principal participants in thrombus formation after plaque disruption. Alternative or additional mechanisms of action for ASA are possible, such as an anti-inflammatory effect,\(^{370} \) but they are unlikely to be important at the low doses of ASA that are effective in UA/NSTEMI.

Among all clinical investigations with ASA, trials in UA/NSTEMI have consistently documented a striking benefit of ASA compared with placebo independent of the differences in study design, such as time of entry after the acute phase, duration of follow-up, and dose used\(^{372,374,376,377} \) (Figure 10).

No trial has directly compared the efficacy of different doses of ASA in patients who present with UA/NSTEMI; however, information can be gleaned from a collaborative meta-analysis of randomized trials of antiplatelet therapy for prevention of death, MI, and stroke in high-risk patients (ie, acute or previous vascular disease or other predisposing conditions).\(^{410} \) This collaborative meta-analysis pooled data from 195 trials involving more than 143,000 patients and demonstrated a 22% reduction in the odds of vascular death, MI, or stroke with antiplatelet therapy across a broad spectrum of clinical presentations that included patients presenting with UA/NSTEMI. Indirect comparisons of the proportional effects of different doses of ASA ranging from less than 75 mg to up to 1500 mg daily showed similar reductions in the odds of vascular events with doses between 75 and 1500 mg daily; when less than 75 mg was administered daily, the proportional benefit of ASA was reduced by at least one half compared with the higher doses. An analysis from the CURE trial suggested that there was no difference in the rate of thrombotic events according to ASA dose, but there was a dose-dependent increase in bleeding in patients receiving ASA (plus placebo): the major bleeding rate was 2.0% in patients taking less than 100 mg of ASA, 2.3% with 100 to 200 mg, and 4.0% with greater than 200 mg per d.\(^{409,408} \)

The prompt action of ASA and its ability to reduce mortality rates in patients with suspected MI enrolled in the Second International Study of Infarct Survival (ISIS-2) trial led to the recommendation that ASA be initiated immediately in the ED once the diagnosis of ACS is made or suspected. Aspirin therapy also can be started in the prehospital setting when ACS is suspected. On the basis of prior randomized trial protocols and clinical experience, the initial dose of ASA should be between 162 and 325 mg. Although some trials have used enteric-coated ASA for initial dosing, more rapid buccal absorption occurs with non–enteric-coated formulations.\(^{409} \)

After stenting, a higher initial maintenance dose of ASA of 325 mg per d has been recommended for 1 month after bare-metal stent implantation and 3 to 6 months after drug-eluting stent (DES) implantation.\(^{4} \) This was based primarily on clinical trials that led to approval of these stents, which used the higher doses initially. However, after PCI a daily aspirin dose of 81 mg per day is an accepted regimen in preference to higher maintenance doses based on risk of excess bleeding and an update of current evidence for ASA dosing (Appendixes 7 and 8).

In patients who are already receiving ASA, it should be continued. The protective effect of ASA has been sustained for at least 1 to 2 years in clinical trials in UA/NSTEMI.

Longer term follow-up data in this population are lacking. Long-term efficacy can be extrapolated from other studies of ASA therapy in CAD. Studies in patients with prior MI, stroke, or transient ischemic attack have shown statistically significant benefit during the first 2 years and some additional but not statistically significant benefit during the third year.\(^{370} \) In the absence of large comparison trials of different durations of antiplatelet treatment in patients with CVD or in primary prevention, it seems prudent to continue ASA indefinitely unless side effects are present.\(^{4,11,374} \) Thus, patients should be informed of the evidence that supports the use of ASA in UA/NSTEMI and CAD in general and instructed to continue the drug indefinitely, unless a contraindication develops. It is important to emphasize to patients that there is a sound rationale for concomitant use of ASA even if other antithrombotic drugs, such as clopidogrel, prasugrel, ticagrelor or warfarin, are administered concurrently and that withdrawal or discontinuation of ASA or P2Y\(_{12} \) receptor inhibition therapy has been associated with recurrent episodes of ACS, including stent thrombosis (Figure 11 deleted).\(^{490-492} \)
Finally, because of a drug interaction between ibuprofen and ASA, patients should be advised to use an alternative NSAID or to take their ibuprofen dose at least 30 min after ingestion of immediate-release ASA or at least 8 h before ASA ingestion to avoid any potential diminution of the protective effects of ASA. No recommendations about the concomitant use of ibuprofen and enteric-coated low-dose ASA can be made on the basis of available data.493

Contraindications to ASA include intolerance and allergy (primarily manifested as asthma with nasal polyps), active bleeding, hemophilia, active retinal bleeding, severe untreated hypertension, an active peptic ulcer, or another serious source of gastrointestinal or genitourinary bleeding. Gastrointestinal side effects such as dyspepsia and nausea are infrequent with the low doses. Primary prevention trials have reported a small excess in intracranial bleeding, which is offset in secondary prevention trials by the prevention of ischemic stroke. It has been proposed that there is a negative interaction between ACE inhibitors and ASA, with a reduction in the vasodilatory effects of ACE inhibitors, presumably because ASA inhibits ACE inhibitor–induced prostaglandin synthesis. This interaction does not appear to interfere importantly with the clinical benefits of therapy with either agent.494 Therefore, unless there are specific contraindications, ASA should be administered to all patients with UA/NSTEMI.

### 3.2.4.2. Adenosine Diphosphate Receptor Antagonists and Other Antiplatelet Agents

(Refer to Updated Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.3, and New Section 3.2.3.1)

Several P2Y12 receptor inhibitors are approved for antiplatelet therapy in patients with UA/NSTEMI.380,381,495 Detailed discussion of the newer P2Y12 receptor inhibitors (prasugrel and ticagrelor) and trials is available in Section 3.2.3.1. The older ADP receptor antagonists (ticlopidine and clopidogrel), which are discussed in the current section, exert irreversible antiplatelet effects but take several days to achieve maximal effect in the absence of a loading dose. The administration of a loading dose can shorten the time to achievement of effective levels of antiplatelet therapy. Because the mechanisms of the antiplatelet effects of ASA and P2Y12 receptor...
inhibitors differ, a potential exists for additive benefit with the combination.

Ticlopidine has been used successfully for the secondary prevention of stroke and MI and for the prevention of stent closure and graft occlusion. The adverse effects of ticlopidine limit its usefulness: gastrointestinal problems (diarrhea, abdominal pain, nausea, and vomiting), neutropenia in approximately 2.4% of patients, severe neutropenia in 0.8% of patients, and, rarely, thrombotic thrombocytopenia purpura. Neutropenia usually resolves within 1 to 3 weeks of discontinuation of therapy but very rarely may be fatal. Thrombotic thrombocytopenia purpura, which is a very uncommon, life-threatening complication, requires immediate plasma exchange. Monitoring of ticlopidine therapy requires a complete blood count that includes a differential count every 2 weeks for the first 3 months of therapy.

Extensive clinical experience with clopidogrel is derived in part from the Clopidogrel versus Aspirin in Patients at Risk of Ischemic Events (CAPRIE) trial. A total of 19,185 patients were randomized to receive ASA 325 mg per d or clopidogrel 75 mg per d. Entry criteria consisted of atherosclerotic vascular disease manifested as recent ischemic stroke, recent MI, or symptomatic peripheral arterial disease. Follow-up extended for 1 to 3 years. The RR of ischemic stroke, MI, or vascular death was reduced by 8.7% in favor of clopidogrel from 5.8% to 5.3% (P = 0.04). The benefit was greatest for patients with peripheral arterial disease. This group had a 24% relative risk reduction (P = 0.03). There was a slightly increased, but minimal, incidence of rash and diarrhea with clopidogrel treatment and slightly more bleeding with ASA. There was no excess neutropenia with clopidogrel, which contrasts with ticlopidine. The results provide evidence that clopidogrel is at least as effective as ASA and appears to be modestly more effective. In 1 report, 11 severe cases of thrombotic thrombocytopenia purpura were described as occurring within 14 d after the initiation of clopidogrel; plasma exchange was required in 10 of the patients, and 1 patient died. These cases occurred among more than 3 million patients treated with clopidogrel.

Clopidogrel is reasonable antiplatelet therapy for secondary prevention, with an efficacy at least similar to that of ASA. Clopidogrel is indicated in patients with UA/NSTEMI who are unable to tolerate ASA due to either hypersensitivity or major gastrointestinal contraindications, principally recent significant bleeding from a peptic ulcer or gastritis. When treatment with thienopyridines is considered during the acute phase, it should be recognized that there is a delay before attainment of the full antiplatelet effect. Clopidogrel is preferred to ticlopidine because it more rapidly inhibits platelets and appears to have a more favorable safety profile.

An oral loading dose (300 mg) of clopidogrel is typically used to achieve more rapid platelet inhibition. The optimal loading dose with clopidogrel has not been rigorously established. The greatest amount of general clinical experience and randomized trial data exist for a clopidogrel loading dose of 300 mg, which is the approved loading dose. Higher loading doses (600 to 900 mg) have been evaluated. They appear to be safe and more rapidly acting; however, it must be recognized that the database for such higher loading doses is not sufficiently robust to formulate definitive recommendations. Most studies to date with higher loading doses of clopidogrel have examined surrogates for clinical outcomes, such as measurements of 1 or more markers of platelet aggregation or function. When groups of patients are studied, a general dose response is observed with increasing magnitude and speed of onset of inhibition of platelet aggregation in response to agonists such as ADP as the loading dose increases. However, considerable interindividual variation in antiplatelet effect also is observed with all loading doses of clopidogrel, which makes it difficult to predict the impact of different loading doses of clopidogrel in a specific patient. Small to moderate-sized trials have reported favorable outcomes with a 600-mg versus a 300-mg loading dose in patients undergoing PCI (Appendixes 7 and 8).

Two randomized trials compared clopidogrel with ticlopidine. In 1 study, 700 patients who successfully received a stent were randomized to receive 500 mg of ticlopidine or 75 mg of clopidogrel, in addition to 100 mg of ASA, for 4 weeks. Cardiac death, urgent target-vessel revascularization, angiographically documented thrombotic stent occlusion, or nonfatal MI within 30 d occurred in 3.1% of patients who received clopidogrel and 1.7% of patients who received ticlopidine (P = 0.24), and noncardiac death, stroke, severe peripheral vascular hemorrhagic events, or any adverse event that resulted in the discontinuation of the study medication occurred in 4.5% and 9.6% of patients, respectively (P = 0.01). The Clopidogrel ASpirin Stent International Cooperative Study (CLASSICS) was conducted in 1020 patients. A loading dose of 300 mg of clopidogrel followed by 75 mg per d was compared to a daily dose of 75 mg without a loading dose and with a loading dose of 150 mg of ticlopidine followed by 150 mg twice per day (patients in each of the 3 arms also received ASA). The first dose was administered 1 to 6 h after stent implantation; the treatment duration was 28 d. The trial showed better tolerance to clopidogrel with or without a loading dose than to ticlopidine. Stent thrombosis or major complications occurred at the same frequency in the 3 groups.

The CURE trial randomized 12,562 patients with UA and NSTEMI presenting within 24 h to placebo or clopidogrel (loading dose of 300 mg followed by 75 mg daily) and followed them for 3 to 12 months. All patients received ASA. Cardiovascular death, MI, or stroke occurred in 11.5% of patients assigned to placebo and 9.3% assigned to clopidogrel (RR = 0.80, P = 0.001). In addition, clopidogrel was associated with significant reductions in the rate of in-hospital severe ischemia and revascularization, as well as the need for fibrinolytic therapy or intravenous GP IIb/IIIa receptor antagonists. These results were observed across a wide variety of subgroups. A reduction in recurrent ischemia was noted within the first few hours after randomization.

There was an excess of major bleeding (2.7% in the placebo group vs 3.7% in the clopidogrel group, P = 0.003) and of minor bleeding but not of life-threatening bleeding. The risk of bleeding was increased in patients undergoing CABG surgery within the first 5 d of stopping clopidogrel. The CURE study was conducted at centers in which there was no routine
policy regarding early invasive procedures; revascularization was performed during the initial admission in only 23% of the patients. Although the addition of a platelet GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor in patients receiving ASA, clopidogrel, and heparin in CURE was well tolerated, fewer than 10% of patients received this combination. Therefore, additional information on the safety of an anticoagulant and a GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor in patients already receiving ASA and clopidogrel should be obtained. Accurate estimates of the treatment benefit of clopidogrel in patients who received GP IIb/IIIa antagonists remain ill-defined.

The CURE trial also provides strong evidence for the addition of clopidogrel to ASA on admission in the management of patients with UA and NSTEMI in whom a noninterventional approach is intended, an especially useful approach in hospitals that do not have a routine policy about early invasive procedures. The event curves for the 2 groups separate early. The optimal duration of therapy with clopidogrel in patients who have been managed exclusively medically has not been determined, but the favorable results in CURE were observed over a period averaging 9 months and for up to 1 year.

The PCI-CURE study was an observational substudy of the patients undergoing PCI within the larger CURE trial. In the PCI-CURE study, 2658 patients had previously been randomly assigned to double-blind treatment with clopidogrel (n = 1313) as per the CURE protocol or placebo (n=1345). Patients were pretreated with ASA and the study drug for a median of 10 d. After PCI, most patients received open-label clopidogrel for approximately 4 weeks, after which the blinded study drug was restarted for a mean of 8 months. Fifty-nine patients (4.5%) in the clopidogrel group had the primary event end point (a composite of cardiovascular death, MI, or urgent target-vessel revascularization) within 30 d of PCI compared with 86 (6.4%) in the placebo group (RR = 0.70, 95% CI 0.50 to 0.97, P=0.03). Overall, including events before and after PCI, there was a 31% reduction in cardiovascular death or MI (P=0.002). Thus, in patients with UA and NSTEMI receiving ASA and undergoing PCI, a strategy of clopidogrel pretreatment followed by up to 1 year of clopidogrel use (and probably at least 1 year in those with DES; see below) is beneficial in reducing major cardiovascular events compared with placebo and appears to be cost-effective (the incremental cost-effectiveness ratio for clopidogrel plus ASA compared with ASA alone was $15400 per quality-adjusted life-year). Therefore, clopidogrel (or the newer P2Y₁₂ receptor inhibitors) should be used routinely in patients who undergo PCI on top of background ASA therapy.

Pathological and clinical evidence particularly highlights the need for longer-term P2Y₁₂ receptor blockade in patients who receive DES. DESs consistently have been shown to reduce stent restenosis. However, this same antiproliferative action can delay endothelialization, predisposing to stent thrombosis including late (beyond 3 to 6 months) or very late (after 1 year) thrombosis after stent placement. These concerns have raised questions about the ideal duration of dual antiplatelet therapy (DAT) and the overall balance of benefit/risk of DES compared with bare-metal stents. A number of comparisons of outcomes up to 4 years after DES and bare-metal stent implantation, including the initial FDA approval trials, have been published. These confirm a marked reduction in restenosis and consequent repeat revascularization procedures with DES. However, although results have varied, they also suggest a small incremental risk (of about 0.5%) of stent thrombosis. Reassuringly, they have not shown an overall increase in death or MI after DES versus bare-metal stents, suggesting offsetting advantages of improved revascularization versus increased stent thrombosis risk. These observations also emphasize the need for a continued search for more biocompatible stents that minimize restenosis without increasing the risks of thrombosis.

In the ISAR-REACT-2 trial, patients undergoing PCI were assigned to receive either abciximab (bolus of 0.25 mg per kg of body weight, followed by a 0.125-mg per kg per min [maximum, 10 mg per min] infusion for 12 h, plus heparin 70 U per kg of body weight) or placebo (placebo bolus and infusion of 12 h, plus heparin bolus, 140 U per kg). All patients received 600 mg of clopidogrel at least 2 h before the procedure, as well as 500 mg of oral or intravenous ASA. Of 2022 patients enrolled, 1012 were assigned to abciximab and 1010 to placebo. The primary end point was reached in 90 patients (8.9%) assigned to abciximab versus 120 patients (11.9%) assigned to placebo, a 25% reduction in risk with abciximab (RR = 0.75, 95% CI 0.58 to 0.97, P=0.03). Among patients without an elevated cTn level, there was no difference in the incidence of primary end-point events between the abciximab group (23 [4.6%] of 499 patients) and the placebo group (22 [4.6%] of 474 patients; RR = 0.99, 95% CI 0.56 to 1.76, P=0.98), whereas among patients with an elevated cTn level, the incidence of events was significantly lower in the abciximab group (67 [13.1%] of 513 patients) than in the placebo group (98 [18.3%] of 536 patients), which corresponds to an RR of 0.71 (95% CI 0.54 to 0.95, P=0.02; P=0.07 for interaction). There were no significant differences between the 2 groups with regard to the risk of major or minor bleeding or the need for transfusion. Thus, it appears beneficial to add an intravenous GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor to clopidogrel treatment if an invasive strategy is planned in patients with high-risk features (eg, elevated cTn level) (Figures 7, 8, and 9; and Appendix 9 for updated algorithm incorporating newer P2Y₁₂ receptor inhibitors).

The optimal timing of administration of the loading dose of clopidogrel for those who are managed with an early invasive strategy cannot be determined with certainty from PCI-CURE because there was no comparison of administration of the loading dose before diagnostic angiography (“upstream treatment”) versus at the time of PCI (“in-lab treatment”). However, based on the early separation of the curves, when there is delay to coronary angiography, patients should receive clopidogrel (or ticagrelor; refer to updated Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.3) as initial therapy (Figures 7, 8, and 9; and Appendix 9 for updated algorithm incorporating newer P2Y₁₂ receptor inhibitors). The Clopidogrel for the Reduction of Events During Observation (CREDO) trial, albeit not designed specifically to study UA/NSTEMI patients, provides partially relevant information on the question of timing of the loading dose. Patients with symptomatic CAD and evidence of ischemia who were referred for PCI and those who were thought to be highly likely to require PCI were randomized.
to receive clopidogrel (300 mg) or matching placebo 3 to 24 h before PCI. All subjects received a maintenance dose of clopidogrel (75 mg daily) for 28 d. Thus, CREDO is really a comparison of the administration of a loading dose before PCI versus not administering a loading dose at all. There is no explicit comparison within CREDO of a pre-PCI loading dose versus a loading dose in the catheterization laboratory. In CREDO, the relative risk for the composite end point of death/MI/urgent target-vessel revascularization was 0.82, in favor of the group who received a loading dose before PCI compared with the opposite arm that did not receive a loading dose, but this did not reach statistical significance ($P=0.23$). Subgroup analyses within CREDO suggest that if the loading dose is given at least 6 or preferably 15 h before PCI, fewer events occur compared with no loading dose being administered.515 One study from the Netherlands that compared pretreatment with clopidogrel before PCI versus administration of a loading dose at the time of PCI in patients undergoing elective PCI showed no difference in biomarker release or clinical end points.516

Thus, there now appears to be an important role for clopidogrel in patients with UA/NSTEMI, both in those who are managed conservatively and in those who undergo PCI, especially stenting, or who ultimately undergo CABG surgery.517 However, it is not entirely clear how long therapy should be maintained.518,519 Whereas increased hazard is clearly associated with premature discontinuation of dual antiplatelet therapy after DES, the benefit of extended therapy beyond 1 year is uncertain.505,512,513 Hence, the minimum requirements for DAT duration should be vigorously applied for each DES type. However, 1 year of DAT may be ideal for all UA/NSTEMI patients who are not at high risk of bleeding given the secondary preventive effects of DAT, perhaps especially after DES. On the other hand, the limited database at this point in time does not support a recommendation for DAT beyond 1 year for all DES-treated patients.505,512,513 For patients with clinical features associated with an increased risk of stent thrombosis, such as diabetes or renal insufficiency or procedural characteristics such as multiple stents or a treated bifurcation lesion, extended DAT may be reasonable. Data on the relative merits of DES versus bare-metal stents in “off-label” patients (such as multivessel disease or MI), who are at higher risk and experience higher event rates, and of the ideal duration of DAT in these patients, are limited and are currently insufficient to draw separate conclusions.505,512,513

Because of the importance of dual-antiplatelet therapy with ASA and a P2Y$_{12}$ receptor inhibitor after implantation of a stent, especially if a DES is being considered, clinicians should ascertain whether the patient can comply with 1 year of dual-antiplatelet therapy. Patients should also be instructed to contact their treating cardiologist before stopping any antiplatelet therapy, because abrupt discontinuation of antiplatelet therapy can put the patient at risk of stent thrombosis, an event that may result in MI or even death.460 Health care providers should postpone elective surgical procedures until beyond 12 months after DES implantation.460 If a surgical procedure must be performed sooner than 12 months, an effort should be made to maintain the patient on ASA and minimize the period of time of discontinuation of a P2Y$_{12}$ receptor inhibitor.460

In the CURE study, which predominantly involved medical management of patients with UA/NSTEMI, the relative risk reduction in events was of a similar magnitude (approximately 20%) during the first 30 d after randomization as during the ensuing cumulative 8 months.521 In contrast, clopidogrel was not beneficial in a large trial of high-risk primary prevention patients.435

Because clopidogrel, when added to ASA, increases the risk of bleeding during major surgery, it has been recommended that clopidogrel be withheld for at least 5 d$^{240}$ and up to 7 d before surgery in patients who are scheduled for elective CABG.$^{488,522}$ In many hospitals in which patients with UA/NSTEMI undergo rapid diagnostic catheterization within 24 h of admission, clopidogrel is not started until it is clear that CABG will not be scheduled within the next several days. However, unstable patients should receive clopidogrel (or ticagrelor; refer to updated Sections 3.2.1 and 3.2.3) or be taken for immediate angiography (Figures 7, 8, and 9; and Appendix 9 for updated algorithm incorporating newer P2Y$_{12}$ receptor inhibitors). A loading dose of clopidogrel (or one of the newer P2Y$_{12}$ receptor inhibitors, ticagrelor or prasugrel) can be given to a patient on the catheterization table if a PCI is to be performed immediately. If PCI is not performed, clopidogrel or ticagrelor can be given after the catheterization. However, when clopidogrel is given before catheterization and urgent surgical intervention is indicated, some experience suggests that “early” bypass surgery may be undertaken by experienced surgeons at acceptable incremental bleeding risk. Among 2858 UA/NSTEMI patients in the CRUSADE (Can Rapid Risk Stratification of Unstable Angina Patients Suppress Adverse Outcomes With Early Implementation of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Guidelines) Registry undergoing CABG, 30% received acute clopidogrel therapy, the majority of these (87%) within 5 d of surgery. “Early” CABG after clopidogrel was associated with a significant increase in any blood transfusion (OR 1.36, 95% CI 1.10 to 1.68) and the need for 4 or more units of blood (OR 1.70, 95% CI 1.32 to 2.1). In-hospital rates of death were low (3% to 4%), and no difference was noted in rates of death, reinfarction, or stroke with “early” CABG in patients treated with versus without acute clopidogrel.$^{523}$ The Writing Committee believes that more data on the overall relative benefits versus risks of proceeding with early bypass surgery in the presence of clopidogrel therapy (or one of the newer P2Y$_{12}$ receptor inhibitors, ticagrelor or prasugrel) are desirable and necessary in order to formulate better-informed recommendations for the timing of surgery in the UA/NSTEMI patient.

Sulfinpyrazone, dipyridamole, prostacyclin, and prostacyclin analogs have not been demonstrated to be of benefit in UA or NSTEMI and are not recommended. The thromboxane synthase blockers and thromboxane A2 receptor antagonists have been evaluated in ACS and have not shown any advantage over ASA. A number of other antiplatelet drugs are currently available (Appendix 8), and still others are under active investigation.

Evidence has emerged that there is considerable interpatient variability in the response to clopidogrel, with a wide range of inhibition of platelet aggregation after a given dose.$^{524}$
Patients with diminished responsiveness to clopidogrel appear to be at increased risk of ischemic events. The reasons for the large interpatient variability in responsiveness to clopidogrel are under investigation, but variation in absorption, generation of the active metabolite, and drug interactions are leading possibilities. Maneuvers to overcome poor responsiveness to clopidogrel may involve an increase in the dose. However, techniques for monitoring for poor response to clopidogrel and the appropriate dosing strategy when it is uncovered remain to be established.

3.2.5. Anticoagulant Agents and Trials

(Refer to Updated Sections 3.2.2 and 3.2.3)

A number of drugs are available to clinicians for management of patients with UA/NSTEMI. Although the medical literature sometimes refers to such drugs as “antithrombins,” the 2007 Writing Committee has chosen to refer to them as anticoagulants because they often inhibit 1 or more proteins in the coagulation cascade before thrombin. Evaluation of anticoagulant strategies is an active area of investigation. It is difficult to draw conclusions that 1 anticoagulant strategy is to be preferred over another given the uncertainty of whether equipotent doses were administered, the different durations of treatment studied across the trials, and the fact that many patients were already receiving 1 open-label anticoagulant before they were randomized in a trial to another anticoagulant (which makes it uncertain what residual effect the open-label anticoagulant had in the trial). Other aspects of the data set that confound interpretation of the impact of specific anticoagulant strategies include a range of antiplatelet strategies administered concomitantly with the anticoagulant and the addition of a second anticoagulant, either because of clinician preference or as part of protocol design, as patients moved from the medical management phase to the interventional management phase of treatment for UA/NSTEMI.

The 2007 Writing Committee also wishes to draw attention to the fact that active-control noninferiority trials are being performed with increasing frequency as it becomes ethically increasingly difficult to perform placebo-controlled trials. In this update, for example, noninferiority (“equivalence”) comparisons on primary or major secondary end points were important in the Acute Catheterization and Urgent Intervention Triage strategy (ACUITY), Organization to Assess Strategies for Ischaemic Syndromes (OASIS-5), and Randomized Evaluation of PCI Linking Angiomax to reduced Clinical Events (REPLACE-2) studies. Although practically useful, noninferiority analyses depend on assumptions not inherent in classic superiority analytical designs and thus present additional limitations and interpretative challenges. Noninferiority trials require an a priori choice of a “noninferiority margin,” typically defined in terms of a fraction of standard treatment effect to be preserved compared with a putative placebo (eg, 0.5) and which rests on clinical judgment and statistical issues. Because noninferiority trials do not have a placebo control, these assumptions cannot be easily verified. Thus, whether the new therapy indeed is therapeutically “equivalent” is less certain than in a superiority trial. Hence, additional caution in weighing and applying the results of noninferiority trials is appropriate.

The 2007 Writing Committee believes that a number of acceptable anticoagulant strategies can be recommended with a Class I status but emphasizes the fact that a preference for a particular strategy is far from clear (Figures 7, 8, and 9; and Appendix 9 for updated algorithm incorporating newer P2Y12 receptor inhibitors). It is suggested that each institution agree on a consistent approach to minimize the chance of medication errors and double anticoagulation when personal preferences are superimposed on an already-initiated treatment plan. Factors that should be weighed when one considers an anticoagulant strategy (or set of strategies to cover the range of patient scenarios) include established efficacy, risk of bleeding in a given patient, cost, local familiarity with dosing regimens (particularly if PCI is planned), anticipated need for surgery, and the desire to promptly reverse the anticoagulant effect if bleeding occurs.

Unfractionated heparin exerts its anticoagulant effect by accelerating the action of circulating antithrombin, a proteolytic enzyme that inactivates factor IIa (thrombin), factor IXa, and factor Xa. It prevents thrombus propagation but does not lyse existing thrombi. Unfractionated heparin is a heterogeneous mixture of polysaccharide chains of molecular weights that range from 5000 to 30000 Daltons and have varying effects on anticoagulant activity. Unfractionated heparin binds to a number of plasma proteins, blood cells, and endothelial cells. The LMWHs are obtained through chemical or enzymatic depolymerization of the polysaccharide chains of heparin to provide chains with different molecular weight distributions. Approximately 25% to 50% of the pentasaccharide-containing chains of LMWH preparations contain more than 18 saccharide units, and these are able to inactivate both thrombin and factor Xa. Low-molecular-weight heparin chains that are fewer than 18 saccharide units retain their ability to inactivate factor Xa but not thrombin. Therefore, LMWHs are relatively more potent in facilitating inhibition of factor Xa than in the inactivation of thrombin. Distinct advantages of LMWH over UFH include decreased binding to plasma proteins and endothelial cells and dose-independent clearance, with a longer half-life that results in more predictable and sustained anticoagulation with once- or twice-a-day subcutaneous administration. An advantage of LMWHs is that they do not usually require laboratory monitoring of activity. The pharmacodynamic and pharmacokinetic profiles of the different commercial preparations of LMWHs vary, with their mean molecular weights ranging from 4200 to 6000 Daltons. Accordingly, their ratios of anti–factor IIa to anti–factor IIa vary, ranging from 1.9 to 3.8. By contrast, the direct thrombin inhibitors specifically block thrombin without the need for a cofactor. Hirudin binds directly to the anion binding site and the catalytic sites of thrombin to produce potent and predictable anticoagulation.

Bivalirudin is a synthetic analog of hirudin that binds reversibly to thrombin and inhibits clot-bound thrombin. More upstream in the coagulation cascade are factor Xa inhibitors, such as the synthetic pentasaccharide fondaparinux, that act proximally to inhibit the multiplicity effects of the downstream coagulation reactions and thereby reduce the amount of
thrombin that is generated. Advantages of fondaparinux compared with UFH include decreased binding to plasma proteins and endothelial cells and dose-independent clearance, with a longer half-life that results in more predictable and sustained anticoagulation with fixed-dose, once-a-day subcutaneous administration. An advantage of these agents over UFH is that like the LMWHs, fondaparinux does not require laboratory monitoring of activity. Fondaparinux is cleared readily, as is the anti–Xa activity of enoxaparin. The factor Xa inhibitors do not have any action against thrombin that is already formed or that is generated despite their administration, which possibly contributes to the observation of an increased rate of catheter thrombosis when factor Xa inhibitors such as fondaparinux are used alone to support PCI procedures. In the case of both the direct thrombin inhibitors and fondaparinux, it is not possible to reverse the effect with protamine because they lack a protamine-binding domain; reversal of their action in the event of bleeding requires discontinuation of their administration and, if needed, transfusion of coagulation factors (eg, fresh-frozen plasma).

In summary, whereas anticoagulant therapy forms a basic element of UA/NSTEMI therapy, recommendation of an anticoagulant regimen has become more complicated by a number of new choices suggested by contemporary trials, some of which do not provide adequate comparative information for common practice settings. The 2007 Writing Committee believes that inadequate unconfounded comparative information is available to recommend a preferred regimen when an early, invasive strategy is used for UA/NSTEMI, and physician and health care system preference, together with individualized patient application, is advised. Additional experience may change this viewpoint in the future. On the other hand, these available trials are less confounded for the large number of patients treated with an initial noninvasive or delayed invasive strategy: they suggest an anticoagulant preference for these patients treated with a noninvasive strategy in the order of fondaparinux, enoxaparin, and UFH (least preferred), using the specific regimens tested in these trials. Bivalirudin has not been tested in a noninvasive strategy and hence cannot be recommended currently. Even in this group, the order of preference often depends on a single, albeit large, trial, so that additional clinical trial information will be welcomed.

The optimal duration of anticoagulation therapy remains undefined. Evidence for recurrence of events after cessation of short-duration intravenous UFH and results of studies in STEMI patients demonstrating superiority of anticoagulant agents that are administered for the duration of the hospital stay suggest that anticoagulation duration of more than 2 d for those who are managed with a conservative strategy may be beneficial, but this requires further study.

3.2.5.1. Unfractionated Heparin
Six relatively small randomized, placebo-controlled trials with UFH have been reported.536–541 The results of studies that compared the combination of ASA and heparin with ASA alone are shown in Figure 10. In the trials that used UFH, the reduction in the rate of death or MI during the first week was 54% (P=0.016), and in the trials that used either UFH or LMWH, the reduction was 63%. Two published meta-analyses have included different studies. In 1 meta-analysis, which involved 3 randomized trials and an early end point (less than 5 d),539 the risk of death or MI with the combination of ASA and heparin was reduced by 56% (P=0.03). In the second meta-analysis, which involved 6 trials and end points that ranged from 2 to 12 weeks, the RR was reduced by 33% (P=0.06).542 Most of the benefits of the various anticoagulants are short term, however, and are not maintained on a long-term basis. Reactivation of the disease process after the discontinuation of anticoagulants may contribute to this loss of early gain among medically treated patients that has been described with UFH,543 dalteparin,406 and hirudin.544,545 The combination of UFH and ASA appears to mitigate this reactivation in part,543,546 although there is hematologic evidence of increased thrombin activity after the cessation of intravenous UFH (“rebound”) even in the presence of ASA.547 Uncontrolled observations suggested a reduction in the “heparin rebound” by switching from intravenous to subcutaneous UFH for several days before the drug is stopped.

Unfractionated heparin has important pharmacokinetic limitations that are related to its nonspecific binding to proteins and cells. These pharmacokinetic limitations of UFH translate into poor bioavailability, especially at low doses, and marked variability in anticoagulant response among patients.548 As a consequence of these pharmacokinetic limitations, the anticoagulant effect of heparin requires monitoring with the activated partial thromboplastin time (aPTT), a test that is sensitive to the inhibitory effects of UFH on thrombin (factor IIa), factor Xa, and factor IXa. Many clinicians have traditionally prescribed a fixed initial dose of UFH (eg, 5000 U bolus, 1000 U per h initial infusion); clinical trials have indicated that a weight-adjusted dosing regimen can provide more predictable anticoagulation than the fixed-dose regimen.549,550 The weight-adjusted regimen recommended is an initial bolus of 60 U per kg (maximum 4000 U) and an initial infusion of 12 U per kg per h (maximum 1000 U per h). The therapeutic range of the various nomograms differs due to variation in the laboratory methods used to determine aPTT. The American College of Chest Physicians consensus conference552 has therefore recommended dosage adjustments of the nomograms to correspond to a therapeutic range equivalent to heparin levels of 0.3 to 0.7 U per mL by anti–factor Xa determinations, which correlates with aPTT values between 60 and 80 s. In addition to body weight, other clinical factors that affect the response to UFH include age and sex, which are associated with higher aPTT values, and smoking history and diabetes mellitus, which are associated with lower aPTT values.548,551 At high doses, heparin is cleared renally.552

Even though weight-based UFH dosing regimens are used, the aPTT should be monitored for adjustment of UFH dosing. Because of variation among hospitals in the control aPTT values, nomograms should be established at each institution that are designed to achieve aPTT values in the target range (eg, for a control aPTT of 30 s, the target range [1.5 to 2.5 times control] would be 45 to 75 s). Delays in laboratory turnaround time for aPTT results also can be a source of variability in care, resulting in over- or under-anticoagulation for prolonged time periods, and should be avoided. Measurements should be made 6 h after any dosage change.
and used to adjust UFH infusion until the aPTT exhibits a therapeutic level. When 2 consecutive aPTT values are therapeutic, the measurements may be made every 24 h and, if necessary, dose adjustment performed. In addition, a significant change in the patient’s clinical condition (eg, recurrent ischemia, bleeding, or hypotension) should prompt an immediate aPTT determination, followed by dose adjustment, if necessary.

Serial hemoglobin/hematocrit and platelet measurements are recommended at least daily during UFH therapy. In addition, any clinically significant bleeding, recurrent symptoms, or hemodynamic instability should prompt their immediate determination. Serial platelet counts are necessary to monitor for heparin-induced thrombocytopenia. Mild thrombocytopenia may occur in 10% to 20% of patients who are receiving heparin, whereas significant thrombocytopenia (platelet count less than 100 000) occurs in 1% to 5% of patients and typically appears after 4 to 14 d of therapy. A rare but dangerous complication (less than 0.2% incidence) is autoimmune UFH-induced thrombocytopenia with thrombosis, which can occur both shortly after initiation of UFH or, rarely, in a delayed (ie, after 5 to 19 d or more), often unrecognized form.558–560 A high clinical suspicion mandates the immediate cessation of all heparin therapy (including that used to flush intravenous lines).

Most of the trials that evaluated the use of UFH in UA/NSTEMI have continued therapy for 2 to 5 d. The optimal duration of therapy remains undefined.

### 3.2.5.2. Low-Molecular-Weight Heparin

In a pilot open-label study, 219 patients with UA were randomized to receive ASA (200 mg per d), ASA plus UFH, or ASA plus nadroparin (an LMWH).486 The combination of ASA and LMWH significantly reduced the total ischemic event rate, the rate of recurrent angina, and the number of patients requiring interventional procedures.

The FRISC study496 randomized 1506 patients with UA or non–Q-wave MI to receive subcutaneous administration of the LMWH dalteparin (120 IU per kg twice daily) or placebo for 6 d and then once a day for the next 35 to 45 d. Dalteparin was associated with a 63% risk reduction in death or MI during the first 6 d (4.8% vs 1.8%, P<0.001), which matched the favorable experience observed with UFH. Although an excess of events was observed after the dose reduction to once daily after 6 d, a significant decrease was observed at 40 d with dalteparin in the composite outcome of death, MI, or revascularization (23.7% vs 18.0%, P=0.005), and a trend was noted toward a reduction in rates of death or MI (10.7% vs 8.0%, P=0.07).

Because the level of anticoagulant activity cannot be easily measured in patients receiving LMWH (eg, aPTT or activated clotting time [ACT]), interventional cardiologists have expressed concern about the substitution of LMWH for UFH in patients scheduled for catheterization with possible PCI. However, in a study involving 293 patients with UA/NSTEMI who received the usual dose of enoxaparin, Collett et al561 showed that PCI can be performed safely.

An alternative approach is to use LMWH during the period of initial stabilization. The dose can be withheld on the morning of the procedure, and if an intervention is required and more than 8 h has elapsed since the last dose of LMWH, UFH can be used for PCI according to usual practice patterns. Because the anticoagulant effect of UFH can be more readily reversed than that of LMWH, UFH is preferred in patients likely to undergo CABG within 24 h.

### 3.2.5.3. LMWH Versus UFH

Nine randomized trials have directly compared LMWH with UFH (Table 17). Two trials evaluated dalteparin, another evaluated nadroparin, and 6 evaluated enoxaparin. Heterogeneity of trial results has been observed. Trials with dalteparin and nadroparin reported similar rates of death or nonfatal MI compared with UFH, whereas 5 of 6 trials of enoxaparin found point estimates for death or nonfatal MI that favored enoxaparin over UFH; the pooled OR was 0.91 (95% CI 0.83 to 0.99). The benefit of enoxaparin appeared to be driven largely by a reduction in nonfatal MI, especially in the cohort of patients who had not received any open-label anticoagulant therapy before randomization.

There are few data to assess whether the heterogeneous results are explained by different populations, study designs, various heparin dose regimens, properties of the various LMWHs (more specifically, different molecular weights and anti–factor Xa/anti–factor IIa ratios), concomitant therapies, or other unrecognized influences. Although it is tempting to compare the relative treatment effects of the different LMWH compounds, the limitations of such indirect comparisons must be recognized. The only reliable method of comparing 2 treatments is through a direct comparison in a well-designed clinical trial or series of trials. The comparison of different therapies (eg, different LMWHs) with a common therapy (eg, UFH) in different trials does not allow a conclusion to be made about the relative effectiveness of the different LMWHs because of the variability in both control group and experimental group event rates due to protocol differences, differences in concomitant therapies due to geographic and time variability, and the play of chance. Similar considerations apply to comparisons among platelet GP IIb/IIIa inhibitors.

In the Enoxaparin Versus Tinzaparin (EVET) trial, 2 LMWHs, enoxaparin and tinzaparin, administered for 7 d, were compared in 436 patients with UA/NSTEMI. Enoxaparin was associated with a lower rate of death/MI/recurrent angina at 7 and 30 d compared with tinzaparin.562,563 Bleeding rates were similar with the 2 LMWHs.

The advantages of LMWH preparations are the ease of subcutaneous administration and the absence of a need for monitoring. Furthermore, the LMWHs stimulate platelets less than UFH646 and are less frequently associated with heparin-induced thrombocytopenia.559–561 In the ESSENCE trial, minor bleeding occurred in 11.9% of enoxaparin patients and 7.2% of UFH patients (P<0.001), and major bleeding occurred in 6.5% and 7.0%, respectively.175 In TIMI 11B, the rates of minor bleeding in hospital were 9.1% and 2.5%, respectively (P<0.001), and the rates of major bleeding were 1.5% and 1.0% (P=0.14).186 In the FRISC study, major bleeding occurred in 0.8% of patients given dalteparin and in 0.5% of patients given placebo, and minor bleeding occurred
### Trials of LMWH Versus UFH in UA/NSTEMI

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial</th>
<th>(Reference)</th>
<th>LMWH/Dose</th>
<th>UFH</th>
<th>End Point/Drug Effect</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Major Bleeding (P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRISC (371)</strong></td>
<td>1506</td>
<td>(a) 6 d: dalteparin 120 IU per kg† SC twice daily (maximum 10,000 IU) (b) During first 40 d: dalteparin 7500 IU SC once per day</td>
<td>(a) 6 d: placebo (b) During first 40 d: placebo</td>
<td>(a) Death or new MI (6 d): LMWH 1.8%, placebo 4.8% (b) Death or new MI (during first 40 d): LMWH 8%, placebo 10.7%</td>
<td>(a) RR 0.37 ARR 3% (b) RR 0.75 ARR 2.7%</td>
<td>(a) 0.20 to 0.68 (b) 0.54 to 1.03</td>
<td>(a) 0.001 (b) 0.07</td>
<td>(a) LMWH 0.8%, placebo 0.5%; ARR –0.3% (P=NR) (b) During first 40 d: LMWH 0.3%, placebo 0.3%; ARR 0% (P=NR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ESSENCE (169)</strong></td>
<td>3171</td>
<td>Enoxaparin 1 mg per kg SC twice daily (minimum 48 h, maximum 8 d)</td>
<td>UFH IV bolus (usually 5000 units) and continued IV infusion</td>
<td>(a) Death, MI, or recurrent angina at 14 d: LMWH 16.6%, UFH 19.8% (b) Death, MI, or recurrent angina at 30 d: LMWH 19.8%, UFH 23.3%</td>
<td>(a) OR at 14 d = 0.80 ARR 3.2% (b) OR at 30 d = 0.81 ARR 3.5%</td>
<td>(a) 0.67 to 0.96 (b) 0.68 to 0.96</td>
<td>(a) 0.019 (b) 0.016</td>
<td>At 30 d: LMWH 6.5%, UFH 7%; ARR 0.5% (P = 0.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRIC (462)</strong></td>
<td>1482</td>
<td>(a) Days 1 to 6: dalteparin 120 IU per kg SC twice daily (b) Days 6 to 45: dalteparin 7500 IU SC once per day</td>
<td>(a) Days 1 to 6: UFH 5000 units IV bolus and IV infusion of 1000 units per h for 48 h (b) Days 6 to 45: placebo SC once daily</td>
<td>(a) Death, MI, or recurrence of angina (Days 1 to 6): LMWH 9.3%, UFH 7.6% (b) Death, MI, or recurrence of angina (Days 6 to 45): 12.3% in both the LMWH and UFH groups</td>
<td>(a) RR 1.18 ARR –1.7% (b) RR 1.01 ARR 0% (a) RR 1.07 ARR –0.3% (b) RR 0.92 ARR 0.4%</td>
<td>(a) 0.84 to 1.66 (b) 0.74 to 1.38 (a) 0.63 to 1.80 (b) 0.54 to 1.57</td>
<td>(a) 0.33 (b) 0.76</td>
<td>(a) Days 1 to 6: LMWH 11.1%, UFH 1.0%; ARR –0.1% (P=NR) (b) Days 6 to 45: LMWH 0.5%, placebo 0.4%; ARR –0.1% (P=NR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>FRAX I.S. (463)</strong></td>
<td>3468</td>
<td>(a) Nadroparin 6 d: nadroparin 86 anti-Xa IU per kg IV bolus, followed by nadroparin 86 anti-Xa IU per kg SC twice daily for 6 d (b) Nadroparin 14 d: nadroparin 86 anti-Xa IU per kg IV bolus, followed by nadroparin 86 anti-Xa IU per kg SC twice daily for 14 d</td>
<td>(a) + (b) UFH 5000 units IV bolus and UFH infusion at 1250 units per h IV for 6 d (plus or minus 2 d)</td>
<td>Cardiac death, MI, refractory angina, recurrence of UA at Day 14: LMWH 17.8%, LMWH 14 20.0%, UFH 18.1%</td>
<td>(a) ARR 0.3% (b) ARR –1.9%</td>
<td>(a) –2.8 to 3.4 (b) –5.1 to 1.3</td>
<td>(a) 0.85 (b) 0.24</td>
<td>At 6 d: UFH 1.6%, LMWH 1.5%; ARR 0.1% At 14 d: UFH 1.6% LMWH 3.5%, ARR –1.9% (P = 0.0035)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TIMI 11B (180)</strong></td>
<td>3910</td>
<td>(a) Inpatient: enoxaparin 30 mg IV bolus immediately followed by 1 mg per kg SC every 12 h (b) Outpatient: enoxaparin 40 mg SC twice per day (patients weighing less than 65 kg) or 60 mg SC twice per day (patients weighing at least 65 kg)</td>
<td>(a) Inpatient: UFH 70 units per kg bolus and infusion at 15 units per h titrated to aPTT (treatment maintained for a minimum of 3 and maximum of 8 d at physician’s discretion) (b) Outpatient: placebo SC twice per day</td>
<td>Death, MI, urgent revascularization (a) At 48 h: LMWH 5.5%, UFH 7.3% (b) 8 d: LMWH 12.4%, UFH 14.5% (c) 14 d: LMWH 14.2%, UFH 16.7% (d) 43 d: LMWH 17.3%, UFH 19.7%</td>
<td>(a) OR 0.75 ARR 1.8% (b) OR 0.83 ARR 2.1% (c) OR 0.82 ARR 2.5% (d) OR 0.85 ARR 2.4%</td>
<td>(a) 0.58 to 0.97 (b) 0.69 to 1.00 (c) 0.69 to 0.98 (d) 0.72 to 1.00</td>
<td>(a) 0.026 (b) 0.048 (c) 0.029 (d) 0.048</td>
<td>At 48 h: LMWH 0.8% UFH 0.7% ARR –0.1% (P = 0.14) End of initial hospitalization: LMWH 1.5%, UFH 1%; ARR –0.5% (P = 0.143) Between Day 8 and Day 43: LMWH 2.9%, placebo 2.9%; ARR 0% (P = 0.021) (Continued)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 17. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial (Reference)</th>
<th>LMWH/Dose</th>
<th>UFH</th>
<th>End Point/Drug Effect</th>
<th>Analysis</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P</th>
<th>Major Bleeding (P)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACUTE II †† ‡‡ (464)</td>
<td>Enoxaparin 1 mg per kg SC every 12 h</td>
<td>UFH 5000 units IV bolus and maintenance infusion at 1000 units per h IV adjusted to aPTT</td>
<td>(a) Death or (b) MI at 30 d</td>
<td>(a) RR = –1.3</td>
<td>0.06 to 3.93</td>
<td>(a) 0.77</td>
<td>LMWH 0.3%; UFH 1%; ARR 0.7% (P = 0.57)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INTERACT, †† ‡‡ (465)</td>
<td>Enoxaparin 1 mg per kg SC every 12 h</td>
<td>UFH 70 units per kg IV bolus followed by continuous infusion at 15 units per kg per h</td>
<td>Death or MI at 30 d: LWMH 5.0%, UFH 9.0%</td>
<td>RR 0.55</td>
<td>ARR 4%</td>
<td>0.30 to 0.96</td>
<td>0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A to Z** (466)</td>
<td>Enoxaparin 1 mg per kg SC every 12 h</td>
<td>UFH 4000 units IV bolus followed by 900 units per h IV infusion for patients weighing equal to or greater than 70 kg</td>
<td>All-cause death, MI, or refractory ischemia within 7 d of tirofiban initiation: LWMH 8.4%, UFH 9.4%</td>
<td>HR 0.88</td>
<td>ARR 1%</td>
<td>0.71 to 1.08</td>
<td>NR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYNERGY†† ‡‡ (423)</td>
<td>Enoxaparin 1 mg per kg SC every 12 h</td>
<td>UFH 60 units per kg (maximum 4000 units) IV bolus followed by 12 units per kg per h for IV infusion for patients weighing less than 70 kg</td>
<td>Death or nonfatal MI during first 30 d after randomization: LWMH 14.0%, UFH 14.5%</td>
<td>HR 0.96</td>
<td>ARR 0.5%</td>
<td>0.86 to 1.06</td>
<td>0.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For specific interventions and additional medications during the study, see individual study references. Major bleeding was classified as follows in the various trials: A to Z: decrease in hemoglobin of more than 5 mg per dL or intracranial or pericardial bleeding. ESSENCE: Major hemorrhage was defined as bleeding resulting in death, transfusion of at least 2 U of blood, a fall in hemoglobin of 30 g per liter or more, or a retroperitoneal, intracranial, or intracocular hemorrhage. TIMI 11B: Overt bleed resulting in death; a bleed in a retroperitoneal, intracranial, or intracocular location; a hemoglobin drop of greater than or equal to 3 g per dL; or the requirement of transfusion of at least 2 U of blood. SYNERGY: TIMI and GUSTO criteria. ACUTE II: Severity was recorded on the basis of the TIMI trial bleeding criteria. TIMI major bleeding involved a hemoglobin drop greater than 5 g per dL (with or without an identified site, not associated with coronary artery bypass grafting) or intracranial hemorrhage or cardiac tamponade. INTERACT: Major bleeding included bleeding resulting in death, or retroperitoneal hemorrhage, or bleeding at a specific site accompanied by a drop in hemoglobin greater than or equal to 3 g per dL. FRIC: A bleeding event was classified as major if it led to a fall in the hemoglobin level of at least 20 g per liter, required transfusion, was intracranial, or caused death or cessation of the study treatment. "Primary study end point was first 6 d.‡Follow-up incomplete in 13 patients (8 dalteparin, 5 placebo) at their request. §Primary study outcome was Days 6 to 45. †All patients in ACUTE II received a tirofiban loading dose of 0.4 mcg per kg per min over 30 min, followed by a maintenance infusion at 0.1 mcg per kg per min. ¶All patients in INTERACT received eptifibatide 180 mcg per kg bolus followed by a 2.0 mcg per kg per min infusion for 48 h. **All patients enrolled in the A to Z trial received aspirin and tirofiban. ††Patients also received glycoprotein IIb/IIIa inhibitors, aspirin, clopidogrel; patients eligible for enrollment even if LMWH or UFH given before enrollment, adjustments made to enoxaparin and UFH during percutaneous coronary intervention.

A to Z = Aggrastat to Zocor study; ACUTE II = Antithrombotic Combination Using Tirofiban and Enoxaparin; aPTT = activated partial thromboplastin time; ARR = absolute risk reduction; CI = confidence interval; ESSENCE = Efficacy and Safety of Subcutaneous Enoxaparin in Unstable Angina and Non-Q-Wave Myocardial Infarction; FRIC = FRagmin In unstable Coronary disease; HR = hazard ratio; INTERACT = Integriplin and Enoxaparin Randomized Assessment of Acute Coronary Syndrome Treatment; IU = international units; IV = intravenous; LD = loading dose; MD = maintenance dose; N = number of patients; LMWH = low-molecular-weight heparin; MI = myocardial infarction; NR = not reported; RR = relative risk; SC = subcutaneous; SYNERGY = Superior Yield of the New strategy of Enoxaparin, Revascularization and Glycoprotein IIb/IIIa Inhibitors; TIMI 11B = Thrombolysis In Myocardial Infarction 11B; U = unit; UA = unstable angina; UFH = unfractionated heparin.
in 61 (8.2%) of 746 patients and 2 (0.3%) of 760 patients, respectively.

The anticoagulant effect of LMWH is less effectively reversed with protamine than that of UFH. In addition, LMWH administered during PCI does not permit monitoring of the ACT to titrate the level of anticoagulation. In the ESSENCE and TIMI 11B trials, special rules were set to discontinue enoxaparin before PCI and CABG. Because of limited experience with enoxaparin at the time the ESSENCE and TIMI 11B trials were conducted, UFH was administered during PCI to achieve ACT values of greater than 350 s. In the Superior Yield of the New Strategy of Enoxaparin, Revascularization and Glycoprotein IIb/IIIa Inhibitors (SYNERGY) trial, enoxaparin was compared to UFH during PCI in patients with high-risk UA/NSTEMI400 (Figure 12). More bleeding was observed with enoxaparin, with a statistically significant increase in TIMI-defined major bleeding (9.1% vs 7.6%, \( P=0.008 \)) but a nonsignificant excess in GUSTO-defined severe bleeding (2.7% vs 2.2%, \( P=0.08 \)) and transfusions (17.0% vs 16.0%, \( P=0.16 \)). A post hoc analysis from SYNERGY suggested that some of the excess bleeding seen with enoxaparin could be explained by crossover to UFH at the time of PCI.431 This remains to be validated prospectively, but at the present time, it appears reasonable to minimize the risk of excessive anticoagulation during PCI by avoiding crossover of anticoagulants (ie, maintain consistent anticoagulant therapy from the pre-PCI phase throughout the procedure itself).

An economic analysis of the ESSENCE trial suggested cost savings with enoxaparin.565 For patients who are receiving subcutaneous LMWH and in whom CABG is planned, it is recommended that LMWH be discontinued and UFH be used during the operation. Additional experience with regard to the safety and efficacy of the concomitant administration of LMWHs with GP IIb/IIIa antagonists and fibrinolytic agents is currently being acquired.

### 3.2.5.3.1. Extended Therapy with LMWHs

The FRISC, Fragmin in unstable coronary artery disease study (FRIC), TIMI 11B, and Fast Revascularization during InStability in Coronary artery disease-II (FRISC-II) trials evaluated the potential benefit of the prolonged administration of LMWH after hospital discharge (Table 17). In the FRISC trial, doses of dalteparin were administered between 6 d and 35 to 45 d; in FRIC, patients were rerandomized after the initial 6-d treatment period to receive dalteparin for an additional 40 d, and the outpatient treatment period lasted 5 to 6 weeks in TIMI 11B and 1 week in the FRAXiparine in Ischaemic Syndromes (FRAXIS) trial. The FRISC-II trial used a different study design. Dalteparin was administered to all patients for a minimum of 5 d.464 Patients were subsequently randomized to receive placebo or the continued administration of dalteparin twice per day for up to 90 d. Analysis of the results from the time of randomization showed a significant reduction with dalteparin in the composite end point of death or MI at 30 d (3.1% vs 5.9%, \( P=0.002 \)) but not at 3 months (6.7% vs 8.0%, \( P=0.17 \)). The composite of death, MI, or revascularization during the total treatment period was reduced at 3 months (29.1% vs 33.4%, \( P=0.031 \)). The benefits of prolonged dalteparin administration were limited to patients who were managed medically and to those with elevated TnT levels at baseline. Although these results make a case for the prolonged use of an LMWH in selected patients who are managed medically or in whom angiography is delayed, their relevance to contemporary practice is less clear now that clopidogrel is used more frequently and there is a much greater tendency to proceed to an early invasive strategy.

### 3.2.5.4. Direct Thrombin Inhibitors

Hirudin, the prototype of the direct thrombin inhibitors, has been extensively studied but with mixed results. The GUSTO-IIb trial randomly assigned 12142 patients with suspected MI

Figure 12. SYNERGY Primary Outcomes at 30 d. CI = confidence interval; MI = myocardial infarction; SYNERGY = Superior Yield of the New strategy of Enoxaparin, Revascularization and Glycoprotein IIb/IIIa Inhibitors; UFH unfractionated heparin.
to 72 h of therapy with either intravenous hirudin or UFH. Patients were stratified according to the presence of ST-segment elevation on the baseline ECG (4131 patients) or its absence (8011 patients). The primary end point of death, nonfatal MI, or reinfarction at 30 d occurred in 9.8% of the UFH group versus 8.9% of the hirudin group (OR 0.89, \( P=0.058 \)). For patients without ST-segment elevation, the rates were 9.1% and 8.3%, respectively (OR 0.90, \( P=0.22 \)). At 24 h, the risk of death or MI was significantly lower in the patients who received hirudin than in those who received UFH (2.1% vs 1.3%, \( P=0.001 \)). However, the Thrombolysis and Thrombin Inhibition in Myocardial Infarction (TIMI) 9B trial of hirudin as adjunctive therapy to thrombolytic therapy in patients with STEMI showed no benefit of the drug over UFH either during study drug infusion or later.\(^6\) The GUSTO-IIb and TIMI 9B trials used hirudin doses of 0.1 mg per kg bolus and 0.1 mg per kg per h infusion for 3 to 5 d after the documentation of excess bleeding with higher doses used in the GUSTO-IIA and TIMI 9A trials (0.6 mg per kg bolus and 0.2 mg per kg per h infusion).\(^6\) The OASIS program evaluated hirudin in patients with UA/NSTEMI. OASIS 1\(^57\) was a pilot trial of 909 patients that compared the low hirudin dose of 0.1 mg per kg per h infusion and the medium hirudin dose of 0.15 mg per kg h infusion with UFH. The latter dose provided the best results, with a reduction in the rate of death, MI, or refractory angina at 7 d (6.5% with UFH vs 3.3% with hirudin, \( P=0.047 \)). This medium dose was used in the large OASIS 2\(^7\) trial that consisted of 10141 patients with UA/NSTEMI who were randomized to receive UFH (5000 IU bolus plus 15 U per kg per h) or recombinant hirudin (0.4 mg per kg bolus and 0.15 mg per kg per h) infusion for 72 h. The primary end point of cardiovascular death or new MI at 7 d occurred in 4.2% in the UFH group versus 3.6% patients in the hirudin group (RR 0.84, \( P=0.064 \)). A secondary end point of cardiovascular death, new MI, or refractory angina at 7 d was significantly reduced with hirudin (6.7% vs 5.6%, RR 0.83, \( P=0.011 \)). There was an excess of major bleeding incidents that required transfusion with hirudin (1.2% vs 0.7% with heparin, \( P=0.014 \)) but no excess in life-threatening bleeding incidents or strokes. A meta-analysis of the GUSTO-IIb, TIMI 9B, OASIS 1, and OASIS 2 trials showed a relative risk of death or MI of 0.90 (\( P=0.015 \)) with hirudin compared with UFH at 35 d after randomization; RR values were similar for patients receiving thrombolytic agents (0.88) and not receiving thrombolytic agents (0.90).\(^7\)

The relative benefits of hirudin versus UFH in ACS patients undergoing PCI were evaluated in the 1410-patient subset in GUSTO-IIb who underwent PCI during the initial drug infusion. A reduction in nonfatal MI and the composite of death and MI was observed with hirudin that was associated with a slightly higher bleeding rate.\(^8\) Hirudin (lepirudin) is presently indicated by the US Food and Drug Administration only for anticoagulation in patients with heparin-induced thrombocytopenia\(^9\) and for the prophylaxis of deep vein thrombosis in patients undergoing hip replacement surgery. It should be administered as a 0.4 mg per kg IV bolus over 15 to 20 s followed by a continuous intravenous infusion of 0.15 mg per kg per h, with adjustment of the infusion to a target range of 1.5 to 2.5 times the control aPTT values. Argatroban is another direct thrombin inhibitor that is approved for the management of patients with heparin-induced thrombocytopenia.\(^7\) However, in ACS, the monovalent direct thrombin inhibitors (including argatroban) are ineffective antithrombotic agents compared with UFH, and thus, argatroban should generally not be used in management of ACS.\(^7\) The recommended initial dose of argatroban is an intravenous infusion of 2 mcg per kg per min, with subsequent adjustments to be guided by the aPTT (medical management) or ACT (interventional management).

The REPLACE 2 investigators compared bivalirudin (bolus 0.75 mg per kg followed by infusion of 1.75 mg per kg per h with provisional GP IIb/IIIa inhibition) with UFH 65 U per kg bolus with planned GP IIb/IIIa inhibition in patients undergoing urgent or elective PCI.\(^6\) Only 14% had been treated for UA within 48 h before enrollment. Prespecified definitions of noninferiority were satisfied for bivalirudin, with the benefits of a significantly lower bleeding rate.\(^6\) Follow-up through 1 year also suggested similar mortality for the 2 approaches.\(^6\)

Bivalirudin was investigated further in the ACUITY trial\(^6\) (Figures 13 and 14). The ACUITY trial used a 2 × 2 factorial design to compare a heparin (UFH or enoxaparin) with or without upstream GP IIb/IIIa inhibition versus bivalirudin with or without upstream GP IIb/IIIa inhibition; a third arm tested bivalirudin alone and provisional GP IIb/IIIa inhibition. The study was randomized but open-label (unblinded). The main comparisons in the ACUITY trial were of heparin with GP IIb/IIIa inhibition versus bivalirudin with GP IIb/IIIa inhibition versus bivalirudin with provisional GP IIb/IIIa inhibition. Three primary 30-d end points were prespecified: composite ischemia, major bleeding, and net clinical outcomes (composite ischemia or major bleeding). Bivalirudin plus GP IIb/IIIa inhibitors compared with heparin plus GP IIb/IIIa inhibitors resulted in noninferior 30-d rates of composite ischemia (7.7% vs 7.3%), major bleeding (5.3% vs 5.7%), and net clinical outcomes (11.8% vs 11.7%) (Figure 13). Bivalirudin alone compared with heparin GB plus IIb/IIIa inhibitors resulted in noninferior rates of composite ischemia (7.8% vs 7.3%, \( P=0.32 \), RR 1.08, 95% CI 0.93 to 1.42), significantly reduced major bleeding (3.0% vs 5.7%, \( P<0.001 \), RR 0.53, 95% CI 0.43 to 0.65), and superior 30-d net clinical outcomes (10.1% vs 11.7%, \( P=0.015 \), RR 0.86, 95% CI 0.77 to 0.97). For the subgroup of 5753 patients who did receive clopidogrel before angiography or PCI, the composite ischemic end point occurred in 7.0% in the bivalirudin-alone group versus 7.3% in the group that received heparin plus GP IIb/IIIa inhibition (RR 0.97, 95% CI 0.80 to 1.17), whereas in the 3304 patients who did not receive clopidogrel before angiography or PCI, the composite ischemic event rate was 9.1% in the bivalirudin-alone group versus 7.1% in the heparin plus GP IIb/IIIa inhibition group (RR 1.29, 95% CI 1.03 to 1.63; \( P \) for interaction 0.054) (Figure 14).\(^6\) The 2007 Writing Committee believes that this observation introduces a note of caution about the use of bivalirudin alone, especially when there is a delay to angiography when high-risk patients who may not be represented by the ACUITY trial population are being managed, or if early ischemic discomfort occurs after the initial antithrombotic strategy has been implemented (Figures 7, 8, and 9; and Appendix 9 for updated algorithm incorporating newer P2Y \(_12\)
receptor inhibitors). The 2007 Writing Committee therefore recommends that patients meeting these criteria be treated with concomitant GP IIb/IIIa inhibitors or clopidogrel, administered before angiography to optimize outcomes whether a bivalirudin-based or heparin-based anticoagulant strategy is used. This approach is also supported by the findings of the ACUITY timing study that showed a trend toward higher rates of ischemic events, which did not meet inferiority criteria, in the deferred GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor group compared with the upstream GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor. Death/MI/unplanned revascularization for ischemia occurred in 7.1% of routine upstream GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor group versus 7.9% of deferred selective inhibitor group; RR 1.12 (95% CI 0.97 to 1.29).392,575 Similarly, in the ACUITY PCI substudy,394,576 subjects who did not receive clopidogrel pre-PCI had higher rates of the composite ischemic end point in the bivalirudin-alone group compared with the heparin plus GP IIb/IIIa group. In both the REPLACE 2 and ACUITY trials, bivalirudin with provisional GP IIb/IIIa blockade was associated with a lower risk of bleeding, whereas this was not the case in ACUITY with the combination of bivalirudin and planned GP IIb/IIIa blockade, suggesting that dosing regimens and concomitant GP IIb/IIIa blockade plays an important role in bleeding risk.433 The impact of switching anticoagulants after randomization, which has been associated with excess bleeding,430,577 is unclear for bivalirudin. It should be noted that the ACUITY protocol called for angiography...
within 24 to 48 h of randomization and that the median time to
catheterization (from the time the study drug was started) was
approximately 4 h; thus, the study results of this trial cannot be
extrapolated beyond the group of patients treated in an early
invasive fashion.

3.2.5.5. Factor Xa Inhibitors

The OASIS 5 investigators evaluated the use of fondaparinux
in UA/NSTEMI422 (Figure 15). OASIS 5 compared 2
anticoagulant strategies given for a mean of 6 d; one of which
was amended during the conduct of the trial. In OASIS 5,
patients with UA/NSTEMI were randomized to a control
strategy of enoxaparin 1.0 mg per kg SC twice daily (reduced
to 1.0 mg per kg once daily for patients with an estimated
creatinine clearance less than 30 ml per min) coupled with
UFH when PCI was performed (no additional UFH if the
last dose of enoxaparin was less than 6 h before). If the last
dose of enoxaparin was given more than 6 h before, the
recommendation was that an intravenous bolus of UFH 65 U
per kg be administered if a GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor was to be used
and 100 U per kg if no GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor was to be used. The
opposite arm was a strategy of fondaparinux 2.5 mg SC once
daily to be supplemented as follows if PCI was performed:
within 6 h of the last subcutaneous dose of fondaparinux, no
additional study drug was given if a GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor was
used, and 2.5 mg of fondaparinux was given intravenously if
no GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor was used; more than 6 h since the
last dose of fondaparinux, an additional intravenous dose of
fondaparinux 2.5 mg was recommended if a GP IIb/IIIa
inhibitor was used or 5.0 mg IV if no GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor was
used. As explained by the OASIS 5 investigators, the rationale
for the recommendation to use UFH during PCI in the
enoxaparin arm was based on lack of approval for enoxaparin
for PCI in the US by the Food and Drug Administration,
lack of available trial data on the use of enoxaparin
during PCI when OASIS 5 was designed, and lack of any
recommendations about the use of enoxaparin in the available

ACC/AHA or ESC PCI guidelines (personal communication,
OASIS 5 Investigators, July 7, 2006). The UFH dosing
recommendation in the enoxaparin arm was formulated
in consultation with the maker of enoxaparin and was not
altered when the SYNERGY trial did not show superiority
of enoxaparin over UFH.400 Of note, during the conduct of the
trial, catheter-associated thrombus was reported 3 times more
frequently with the fondaparinux strategy (0.9% vs 0.3%).

The number of patients with primary outcome events
at 9 d (death, MI, or refractory ischemia) was similar in
the 2 groups (579 with fondaparinux [5.8%] vs 573 with
enoxaparin [5.7%]; HR in the fondaparinux group 1.01; 95%
CI 0.90 to 1.13), which satisfied prespecified noninferiority
criteria. The number of events that met this combined
primary efficacy outcome showed a nonsignificant trend
among a lower value in the fondaparinux group at 30 d (805
vs 864, P=0.13) and at the end of the study (180 d; 1222 vs
1308, P=0.06; Figure 12). The rate of major bleeding at 9
d was lower with fondaparinux than with enoxaparin (217
events [2.2%] vs 412 events [4.1%]; HR 0.52; P<0.001). The
composite of the primary outcome and major bleeding at 9
d favored fondaparinux (737 events [7.3%] vs 905 events
[9.0%]; HR 0.81; P<0.001) (Figure 15). Fondaparinux was
associated with a significantly reduced number of deaths at
30 d (295 vs 352, P=0.02) and at 180 d (574 vs 638, P=0.05).
Fondaparinux also was associated with significant reductions
in death, MI, and stroke (P=0.007) at 180 d.
Thus, fondaparinux is another anticoagulant that has been given a Class I recommendation in the management of UA/NSTEMI, as noted in Figures 7, 8, and 9 (see Appendix 9 for updated algorithm incorporating newer P2Y₁₂ receptor inhibitors). As tested in OASIS 5, the fondaparinux (plus UFH) strategy was associated with lower bleeding rates, clearly an attractive feature given the relationship between bleeding events and increased risk of death and ischemic events.⁷⁷⁹ The excess bleeding in the enoxaparin arm may have been in part a result of the combination of enoxaparin and UFH during PCI.

At present, based on experience in both OASIS 5 and OASIS 6,⁷¹⁴ it appears that patients receiving fondaparinux before PCI should receive an additional anticoagulant with anti–IIa activity to support PCI (see Appendixes 7 and 8). To date, the only anticoagulant that has been evaluated with fondaparinux during PCI is UFH, and based on limited experience, the OASIS investigators recommend an UFH dose of 50 to 60 U per kg IV when fondaparinux-treated patients are taken to PCI (personal communication, OASIS 5 Investigators, July 7, 2006).

However, a cautionary note is that this UFH recommendation is not fully evidence-based, given its inconsistent and uncontrolled use in OASIS 5. Hence, additional clinical trial information is needed to establish more rigorously the safety of intravenous UFH at the time of PCI in patients receiving fondaparinux as initial medical treatment. Because the anticoagulant effect of UFH can be more readily reversed than that of fondaparinux, UFH is preferred over fondaparinux as initial medical treatment. Because the anti-coagulant effect of UFH can be more readily reversed than that of fondaparinux, UFH is preferred over fondaparinux in patients likely to undergo CABG within 24 h.

### 3.2.5.6. Long-Term Anticoagulation
(Refer to Updated Section 5.2.6)

The long-term administration of warfarin has been evaluated in a few, mostly small studies. Williams et al.⁷⁸⁰ randomized 102 patients with UA to UFH for 48 h followed by open-label warfarin for 6 months and reported a 65% risk reduction in the rate of MI or recurrent UA. The Antithrombotic Therapy in Acute Coronary Syndromes (ATACS) trial⁷⁷¹ randomized 214 patients with UA/NSTEMI to ASA alone or to the combination of ASA plus UFH followed by warfarin. At 14 d, there was a reduction in the composite end point of death, MI, and recurrent ischemia with the combination therapy (27.0% vs 10.5%, P=0.004). In a small randomized pilot study of 57 patients allocated to warfarin or placebo in addition to ASA, less evidence was noted of angiographic progression in the culprit lesion after 10 weeks of treatment with warfarin (33% for placebo vs 4% for warfarin) and more regression was observed.⁷⁷⁹ The OASIS pilot study⁷⁸⁰ compared a fixed dosage of warfarin 3 mg per d or a moderate dose titrated to an INR of 2.0 to 2.5 in 197 patients and given for 7 months after the acute phase. Low-intensity warfarin had no benefit, whereas the moderate-intensity regimen reduced the risk of death, MI, or refractory angina by 58% and the need for rehospitalization for UA by 58%. However, these results were not reproduced in the larger OASIS 2 trial⁷⁸¹ of 3712 patients randomized to the moderate-intensity regimen of warfarin or standard therapy, with all patients receiving ASA. The rate of cardiovascular death, MI, or stroke after 5 months was 7.7% with the anticoagulant and 8.4% without (P=0.37).⁷⁸¹ Thus, the role, if any, of long-term warfarin in patients with UA/NSTEMI remains to be defined.

The Coumadin Aspirin Reinfarction Study (CARS) conducted in post-MI patients was discontinued prematurely owing to a lack of evidence of a benefit of reduced-dose ASA (80 mg per d) combined with either 1 or 3 mg of warfarin daily compared with 160 mg per d of ASA alone.⁷⁸² The Combination Hemotherapy And Mortality Prevention study found no benefit to the use of warfarin (to an INR of 1.5 to 2.5) plus 81 mg per d of ASA versus 162 mg per d of ASA alone with respect to total mortality (the primary end point), cardiovascular mortality, stroke, or nonfatal MI (mean follow-up of 2.7 years) after an index MI.⁷⁸³ Low- or moderate-intensity anticoagulation with fixed-dose warfarin thus is not recommended for routine use after hospitalization for UA/NSTEMI. Warfarin should be prescribed, however, for UA/NSTEMI patients with established indications for warfarin, such as atrial fibrillation, left ventricular thrombus, and mechanical prosthetic heart valves.

The Antithrombatics in the Secondary Prevention of Events in Coronary Thrombosis-2 (ASPECT-2) open-label trial randomized 999 patients after ACS to low-dose ASA, high-intensity oral anticoagulation (INR 3.0 to 4.0), or combined low-dose ASA and moderate intensity oral anticoagulation (INR 2.0 to 2.5).⁷⁸⁴ After a median of 12 months, the primary end point of MI, stroke, or death was reached in 9% receiving ASA, 5% given anticoagulants (P=0.048), and 5% receiving combination therapy (P=0.03). Major and minor bleeding events occurred in 1% and 5%, 1% and 8%, and 2% and 15% of patients, respectively.

Similarly, a large (n = 3630) Norwegian open-label study (WARIS-2) compared ASA (160 mg per d), high-intensity warfarin (INR target 2.8 to 4.2), or ASA (75 mg per d) combined with moderate-intensity warfarin (INR 2.0 to 2.5) over a mean of 4 years after MI (41% with non-Q-wave MI).⁷⁸⁵ One third of patients underwent an intervention over the study period. The primary outcome of death, nonfatal MI, or thromboembolic stroke occurred in 20% of ASA patients, 16.7% of warfarin patients, and 15% of combination therapy patients (P=0.03). The annual major bleeding rate was 0.62% in both warfarin arms and 0.17% with ASA alone (P less than 0.001). Thus, moderate-intensity warfarin with low-dose ASA appears to be more effective than ASA alone when applied to MI patients treated primarily with a noninterventional approach, but it is associated with a higher bleeding risk.

An indication for warfarin (eg, for atrial fibrillation, mechanical prosthetic valve, or left ventricular thrombus) in addition to ASA and P2Y₁₂ receptor inhibitor therapy, which are indicated for most high-risk patients, arises occasionally after UA/NSTEMI. There are no prospective trials and few observational data to establish the benefit and risk of such “triple antithrombotic” therapy.⁷⁸⁶,⁷⁸⁷ In the 2004 STEMI guidelines,⁷ a Class IIb, Level of Evidence: C recommendation was given for the use of warfarin (INR 2.0 to 3.0) in combination with ASA (75 to 162 mg) and clopidogrel (75 mg per d) for patients with a stent implanted and concomitant indications for anticoagulation. Similarly, the 2005 PCI guidelines⁷ stated that warfarin in combination with clopidogrel and low-dose ASA should be used with great caution and only when INR
is carefully regulated (2.0 to 3.0). Despite a limited amount of subsequent observational data, the evidence base remains small, which leaves this as a Class IIb recommendation. When triple-combination therapy is selected for clear indications and is based on clinical judgment that benefit will outweigh the incremental risk of bleeding, then therapy should be given for the minimum time and at the minimally effective doses necessary to achieve protection. An expanded evidence base on this issue is strongly needed.

3.2.6. Platelet GP IIb/IIIa Receptor Antagonists
(Refer to Updated Sections 3.2.1, 3.2.3, and 3.2.3.1.6)

The GP IIb/IIIa receptor is abundant on the platelet surface. When platelets are activated, this receptor undergoes a change in conformation that increases its affinity for binding to fibrinogen and other ligands. The binding of molecules of fibrinogen to receptors on different platelets results in platelet aggregation. This mechanism is independent of the stimulus for platelet aggregation and represents the final and obligatory pathway for platelet aggregation.\(^{586}\) The platelet GP IIb/IIIa receptor antagonists act by occupying the receptors, preventing fibrinogen from binding, and thereby preventing platelet aggregation. Experimental and clinical studies have suggested that occupancy of at least 80% of the receptor population and inhibition of platelet aggregation to ADP (5 to 20 micromoles per liter) by at least 80% results in potent antithrombotic effects.\(^{589}\) The various GP IIb/IIIa antagonists, however, possess significantly different pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic properties.\(^{586}\)

Abciximab is a Fab fragment of a humanized murine antibody that has a short plasma half-life but strong affinity for the receptor, which results in some receptor occupancy that persists for weeks. Platelet aggregation gradually returns to normal 24 to 48 h after discontinuation of the drug. Abciximab also inhibits the vitronectin receptor (alpha beta, on endothelial cells and the MAC-1 receptor on leukocytes.\(^{591,592}\) The clinical relevance of occupancy of these receptors is unknown.

Eptifibatide is a cyclic heptapeptide that contains the KGD (Lys-Gly-Asp) sequence; tirofiban is a nonpeptide mimetic of the RGD (Arg-Gly-Asp) sequence of fibrinogen.\(^{590,593-595}\) Receptor occupancy with these 2 synthetic antagonists is, in general, equivalent with plasma levels. They have half-lives of 2 to 3 h and are highly specific for the GP IIb/IIIa receptor. Platelet aggregation returns to normal in 4 to 8 h after discontinuation of these drugs, a finding that is consistent with their relatively short half-lives.\(^{596}\) Glycoprotein IIb/IIIa antagonists can bind to different sites on the receptor, which results in somewhat different binding properties that can modify their platelet effects and, potentially and paradoxically, activate the receptor.\(^{597}\) Oral antagonists to the receptor, previously under investigation, have been abandoned because of negative results of 5 large trials of 4 of these compounds.\(^{598-601}\)

The efficacy of GP IIb/IIIa antagonists in prevention of the complications associated with percutaneous interventions has been documented in numerous trials, many of them composed totally or largely of patients with UA.\(^{387,483,484,602}\) (Table 18). Two trials with tirofiban and 1 trial with epifibatide have also documented their efficacy in UA/NSTEMI patients, only some of whom underwent interventions.\(^{135,137}\) Two trials were completed with the experimental drug lamifiban and 1 with abciximab.\(^{585}\) Few direct comparative data are available for these various antiplatelet agents. The TARGET study (Do Tirofiban and ReoPro Give Similar Efficacy Trial) assessed differences in safety and efficacy of tirofiban and abciximab in 4809 patients undergoing PCI with intended stenting.\(^{580}\) The composite of death, nonfatal MI, or urgent target-vessel revascularization at 30 d occurred more frequently in the tirofiban group (7.6% vs 6.0%). The advantage of abciximab was observed exclusively among patients presenting with UA/NSTEMI (63% of the population).\(^{589}\) A possible explanation for the inferior performance of in-laboratory initiation of tirofiban for PCI in the setting of ACS was an insufficient loading dose of tirofiban to achieve optimal early (periprocedural) antiplatelet effect.\(^{586}\)

Abciximab has been studied primarily in PCI trials, in which its administration consistently resulted in reductions in rates of MI and the need for urgent revascularization (Table 18). In subgroups of patients within those trials who had ACS, the risk of ischemic complications within the first 30 d after PCI was reduced by 60% to 80% with abciximab therapy. Two trials with abciximab specifically studied patients with acute ischemic syndromes. The CAPTURE trial enrolled patients with refractory UA.\(^{387}\) After angiographic identification of a culprit lesion suitable for angioplasty, patients were randomized to either abciximab or placebo administered for 20 to 24 h before angioplasty and for 1 h thereafter. The rate of death, MI, or urgent revascularization within 30 d (primary outcome) was reduced from 15.9% with placebo to 11.3% with abciximab (RR 0.71, \(P=0.012\)). At 6 months, death or MI had occurred in 10.6% of the placebo-treated patients versus 9.0% of the abciximab-treated patients (\(P=0.19\)). Abciximab is approved for the treatment of UA/NSTEMI as an adjunct to PCI or when PCI is planned within 24 h.

The GUSTO IV-ACS trial\(^{385}\) enrolled 7800 patients with UA/NSTEMI who were admitted to the hospital with more than 5 min of chest pain and either ST-segment depression and/or elevated TnT or TnI concentration. All received ASA and either UFH or LMWH. They were randomized to an abciximab bolus and a 24-h infusion, an abciximab bolus and a 48-h infusion, or placebo. In contrast to other trials with GP IIb/IIIa antagonists, GUSTO IV-ACS enrolled patients in whom early (less than 48 h) revascularization was not intended. At 30 d, death or MI occurred in 8.0% of patients taking placebo, 8.2% of patients taking 24-h abciximab, and 9.1% of patients taking 48-h abciximab, differences that were not statistically significant. At 48 h, death occurred in 0.3%, 0.7%, and 0.9% of patients in these groups, respectively (placebo vs abciximab 48 h, \(P=0.008\)). The lack of benefit of abciximab was observed in most subgroups, including patients with elevated concentrations of troponin who were at higher risk. Although the explanation for these results is not clear, they indicate that abciximab at the dosing regimen used in GUSTO IV-ACS is not indicated in the management of patients with UA or NSTEMI in whom an early invasive management strategy is not planned.
### Table 18. UA/NSTEMI Outcome of Death or Myocardial Infarction in Clinical Trials of GP IIb/IIIa Antagonists Involving More Than 1000 Patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trial (Year)</th>
<th>Study Population</th>
<th>Drugs</th>
<th>Placebo</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Results</th>
<th>GP IIb/IIIa</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>ARR, %</th>
<th>RR</th>
<th>95% CI</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>PCI trials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPIC (1994) (510)</td>
<td>High-risk PTCA</td>
<td>Abciximab</td>
<td>72/7696</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>49/708</td>
<td>6.9*</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td>0.47 to 0.95</td>
<td>0.022</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPILOG (1997) (511)</td>
<td>All PTCA</td>
<td>Abciximab</td>
<td>85/939</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>35/935</td>
<td>3.7*</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.41</td>
<td>0.28 to 0.61</td>
<td>Less than 0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPTURE (1997) (372)</td>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Abciximab</td>
<td>57/635</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>30/630</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.35 to 0.81</td>
<td>0.003</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IMPACT II (1997) (517)</td>
<td>All PTCA</td>
<td>Eptifibatide</td>
<td>112/1328</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>93/1349</td>
<td>6.9*</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.83</td>
<td>0.63 to 1.06</td>
<td>0.134</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESTORE (1997) (518)</td>
<td>UA</td>
<td>Ticlopidine</td>
<td>69/1670</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>54/1071</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.78</td>
<td>0.55 to 1.10</td>
<td>0.162</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPISTENT (1998) (512)</td>
<td>Elective stenting</td>
<td>Abciximab</td>
<td>83/829</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>38/794</td>
<td>4.8*</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.32 to 0.68</td>
<td>Less than 0.001</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESPRIT (2000) (519)</td>
<td>Elective stenting</td>
<td>Eptifibatide</td>
<td>104/1024</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>66/1040</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>0.46 to 0.84</td>
<td>0.0016</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAR-REACT (2004) (520)</td>
<td>Elective stenting with clopidogrel pretreatment</td>
<td>Abciximab</td>
<td>42/1080</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>43/1079</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.02</td>
<td>0.68 to 1.55</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ACS trials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRISM-PLUS (1996) (130)</td>
<td>UA/NQWMI</td>
<td>Ticlopidine</td>
<td>95/797</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>67/733*</td>
<td>9.1*</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.70</td>
<td>0.51 to 0.96</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRISM (1998) (374)</td>
<td>UA/NQWMI</td>
<td>Ticlopidine</td>
<td>115/1616</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>94/1616</td>
<td>5.8†</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>0.61 to 1.05</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURSUIT (1998) (128)</td>
<td>UA/NQWMI</td>
<td>Eptifibatide</td>
<td>744/4739</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>670/4722</td>
<td>14.2*</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.82 to 1.00</td>
<td>0.04</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARAGON A (1998) (373)</td>
<td>UA/NQWMI</td>
<td>Lamifibine</td>
<td>89/758</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>80/755</td>
<td>10.6*†</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>0.90</td>
<td>0.68 to 1.20</td>
<td>0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUSTO IV ACS (2001) (514)</td>
<td>UA/NQWMI</td>
<td>Abciximab</td>
<td>209/2598</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>450/5202‡</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.08</td>
<td>0.92 to 1.26</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PARAGON B (2002) (521)</td>
<td>UA/NQWMI</td>
<td>Lamifibine</td>
<td>296/2597</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>278/2628</td>
<td>10.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>0.94</td>
<td>0.77 to 1.09</td>
<td>0.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAR-REACT (2006) (244)</td>
<td>UA/NSTEMI§</td>
<td>Abciximab</td>
<td>116/1010</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>87/1012</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0.75</td>
<td>0.57 to 0.97</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All PCI trials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All PCI trials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All ACS trials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All ACS trials</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>All PCI and ACS trials</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Best treatment group selected for analysis. †Platelet GP IIb/IIIa antagonist without heparin. ‡Pooled results for 24- and 48-h infusion arms. §Used an invasive (PCI) strategy; all patients received clopidogrel.

ACS = acute coronary syndrome; CAPTURE = c7E3 Fab Antiplatelet Therapy in Unstable Refractory Angina; CI = confidence interval; EPIC = Evaluation of c7E3 for the Prevention of Ischemic Complications; EPILOG = Evaluation of PTCA and Improve Long-term Outcome by c7E3 GP IIb/IIIa receptor blockade; EPISTENT = Evaluation of Platelet IIb/IIIa Inhibitor for STENTing; ESPRIT = Enhanced Suppression of Platelet Receptor GP IIb/IIIa using Integrillin Therapy; GUSTO IV ACS = Global Use of Strategies to Open Occluded Coronary Arteries IV: IMPACT II = Integration of Minimize Platelet Aggregation and Coronary Thrombosis II; ISAR-REACT = Intracoronary Stenting and Antithrombotic Regimen-Rapid Early Action for Coronary Treatment; NQWMI = non-Q-wave myocardial infarction; PARAGON = Platelet IIb/IIIa Antagonist for the Reduction of Acute coronary syndrome events in a Global Organization Network; PCI = percutaneous coronary intervention; PRISM = Platelet Receptor Inhibition in Ischemic Syndrome Management; PRISM-PLUS = Platelet Receptor Inhibition in Ischemic Syndrome Management in Patients Limited by Unstable Signs and Symptoms; PTCA = percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty; PURSUIT = Platelet Glycoprotein IIb/IIIa in Unstable 16 Angina: Receptor Suppression Using Integrillin Therapy; RESTORE = Randomized Efficacy Study of Ticlopidine for Outcomes and Restenosis; RR = risk ratio; UA = unstable angina; UA/NSTEMI = unstable angina/non–ST-elevation myocardial infarction.
Tirofiban was studied in the Platelet Receptor Inhibition in Ischemic Syndrome Management (PRISM) study and Platelet Receptor Inhibition in Ischemic Syndrome Management in Patients Limited by Unstable Signs and Symptoms (PRISM-PLUS) trials. PRISM directly compared tirofiban with heparin in 3232 patients with accelerating angina or angina at rest and ST-segment or T-wave changes and with cardiac marker elevation, a previous MI, or a positive stress test or angiographically documented coronary disease. The primary composite outcome (death, MI, or refractory ischemia at the end of a 48-h infusion period) was reduced from 5.6% with UFH to 3.8% with tirofiban (RR 0.67, P = 0.01). At 30 d, the frequency of the composite outcome was similar in the 2 groups (17.1% for UFH vs 15.9% for tirofiban, P = 0.34), but a trend toward reduction in the rate of death or MI was present with tirofiban (7.1% vs 5.8%, P = 0.11), and a significant reduction in mortality rates was observed (3.6% vs 2.3%, P = 0.02). The benefit of tirofiban was mainly present in patients with an elevated TnI or TnT concentration at baseline.

The PRISM-PLUS trial enrolled 1915 patients with clinical features of UA/NSTEMI within the previous 12 h and the presence of ischemic ST-T changes or CK and CK-MB elevation. Patients were randomized to tirofiban alone, UFH alone, or the combination for a period varying from 48 to 108 h. The tirofiban-alone arm was dropped during the trial because of an excess mortality rate. The combination of tirofiban and UFH compared with UFH alone reduced the primary composite end point of death, MI, or refractory ischemia at 7 d from 17.9% to 12.9% (RR 0.68, P = 0.004). This composite outcome also was significantly reduced at 30 d (22%, P = 0.03) and at 6 months (19%, P = 0.02). The end point of death or nonfatal MI was reduced at 7 d (4%, P = 0.006), at 30 d (30%, P = 0.03), and at 6 months (22%, P = 0.06). A high rate of angiography in this trial could have contributed to the important reduction in event rates. Computer-assisted analysis of coronary angiograms obtained after 48 h of treatment in PRISM-PLUS also showed a reduction in the thrombus load at the site of the culprit lesion and improved coronary flow in patients who received the combination of tirofiban and UFH.

Tirofiban, in combination with heparin, has been approved for the treatment of patients with ACS, including patients who are managed medically and those undergoing PCI.

Eptifibatide was studied in the PURSUIT trial, which enrolled 402 patients who had chest pain at rest within the previous 24 h and ST-T changes or CK-MB elevation. The study drug was added to standard management until hospital discharge or for 72 h, although patients with normal coronary arteries or other mitigating circumstances had shorter infusions. The infusion could be continued for an additional 24 h if an intervention was performed near the end of the 72-h infusion period. The primary outcome rate of death or nonfatal MI at 30 d was reduced from 15.7% to 14.2% with eptifibatide (RR 0.91, P = 0.042). Within the first 96 h, a substantial treatment effect was seen (9.1% vs 7.6%, P = 0.01). The benefits were maintained at 6-month follow-up. Eptifibatide has been approved for the treatment of patients with ACS (UA/NSTEMI) who are treated medically or with PCI. It is usually administered with ASA and heparin.

The cumulative event rates observed during the phase of medical management and at the time of PCI in the CAPTURE, PRISM-PLUS, and PURSUIT trials are shown in Figure 16. By protocol design, almost all patients underwent PCI in CAPTURE. In PRISM-PLUS, angiography was recommended. A percutaneous revascularization was performed in 31% of patients in PRISM-PLUS and in 13% of patients in PURSUIT. Each trial showed a statistically significant reduction in the rate of death or MI during the phase of medical management; the reduction in event rates was magnified at the time of the intervention.

Although it is tempting to evaluate the drug effect by comparing patients who had intervention with those who did not, such an analysis is inappropriate. Patients who do not undergo intervention include many low-risk patients, patients who died before having the opportunity for intervention, patients with contraindications, and patients with uncomplicated courses in countries and practices that use the ischemia-guided approach; there is no way to adjust for these imbalances. Accordingly, the analysis in Figure 16 includes the event rates for all patients during the time when they were treated medically. It then begins the analysis anew in patients who underwent PCI at the time of angiography while taking drug or placebo. In the PRISM-PLUS trial, 1069 patients did not undergo early PCI. Although tirofiban treatment was associated with a lower incidence of death, MI or death, or MI or refractory ischemia at 30 d, these reductions were not statistically significant.

In a high-risk subgroup of these patients not undergoing PCI (TIMI risk score greater than or equal to 4), tirofiban appeared to be beneficial whether patients underwent PCI (OR 0.60, 95% CI 0.35 to 1.01) or not (OR 0.69, 95% CI 0.49 to 0.99); however, no benefit was observed in patients at lower risk. In the PURSUIT trial, the impact of eptifibatide on the incidence of death or MI in the subgroup of patients who did not undergo revascularization within the first 72 h was modest and consistent with the overall trial result, although not individually significant (15.6% vs 14.5%, P = 0.23).

Boersma et al performed a meta-analysis of GP IIb/IIIa antagonists of all 6 large, randomized, placebo-controlled trials (including GUSTO IV) involving 31402 patients with UA/NSTEMI not routinely scheduled to undergo coronary revascularization. In the overall population, the risk of death or MI by 30 d was modestly reduced in the active treatment arms (11.8% vs 10.8%, OR 0.91, 95% CI 0.84 to 0.98, P = 0.015). Treatment effect appeared to be greater among higher-risk patients with troponin elevations or ECG ST-segment depressions. Unexpectedly, no benefit was observed in women, but there was no evidence of a sex difference in treatment effect once patients were stratified by troponin concentrations (a risk reduction was seen in both men and women with elevated cTn levels). These and other data have elevated troponin level to a major factor in decision making for the use of these agents in UA/NSTEMI. Major bleeding complications were increased in the GP IIb/IIIa antagonist-treated group compared with those who received placebo (2.4% vs 1.4%, P less than 0.0001). For special considerations about the use of GP IIb/IIIa antagonists in women, see Section 6.1.2.1.

A relationship was observed between revascularization procedures and the apparent treatment effect of GP IIb/IIIa blockade in the meta-analysis by Boersma et al.
Revascularization strategies were not specified by trial protocols or randomized, but 5847 (19%) of the 31 402 patients underwent PCI or CABG within 5 d, and 11 965 patients (38%) did so within 30 d. Significant reductions in the risk of death or MI with GP IIb/IIIa blockade were observed in these subgroups (OR 0.79, 95% CI 0.68 to 0.91 for patients revascularized within 5 d; OR = 0.89, 95% CI 0.80 to 0.98 for patients revascularized within 30 d), whereas no significant treatment effect was present in the other 19 416 patients who did not undergo coronary revascularization within 30 d (OR for death or MI 0.95, 95% CI 0.86 to 1.05). The authors concluded that the benefit of GP IIb/IIIa blockade in patients with UA/NSTEMI was “clinically most meaningful in patients at high risk of thrombotic complications.” The findings of this meta-analysis in the context of other trials of GP IIb/IIIa blockade during PCI suggest that GP IIb/IIIa inhibitors are of substantial benefit in patients with UA/NSTEMI who undergo PCI, are of modest benefit in patients who are not routinely scheduled to undergo revascularization (but who may do so), and are of questionable benefit in patients who do not undergo revascularization.

Although there is a temptation to use the comparison of each of these GP IIb/IIIa inhibitors with placebo to draw conclusions about relative efficacy, such an exercise could be misleading. Each trial had different entry criteria, different approaches to angiographic evaluation, and different criteria for end-point measurement and took place in different locations in different time periods. The effects of these differences cannot be accounted for in an indirect comparison. Head-to-head (direct) comparisons are required to draw reliable conclusions about the relative efficacy of these different molecules. As noted earlier, 1 trial (TARGET) demonstrated an advantage to in-laboratory initiation of abciximab over tirofiban for UA/NSTEMI patients undergoing PCI with stenting. An explanation offered for this difference was an insufficient loading dose of tirofiban to achieve optimal periprocedural antiplatelet effect.

Treatment with a GP IIb/IIIa antagonist increases the risk of bleeding, which is typically mucocutaneous or involves the access site of vascular intervention. Unfortunately, each trial also used a different definition of bleeding and reported bleeding related to CABG differently. In the PRISM trial, with no interventions (including CABG) on treatment, major bleeding (excluding CABG) occurred in 0.4% of patients who received tirofiban and 0.4% of patients who received UFH. In the PRISM-PLUS trial, major bleeding according to the TIMI criteria was reported in 1.4% of patients who received tirofiban and 0.8% of patients who received placebo (P = 0.23), whereas PURSUIT reported major bleeding in 10.6% of patients who received eptifibatide and 9.1% of patients who received placebo (P = 0.02). In the PURSUIT trial, with the exclusion of patients who underwent CABG, the rates were 3.0% with eptifibatide and 1.3% with placebo (P = 0.001). No trials have shown an excess of intracranial bleeding with a GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor. As with the efficacy data, the temptation to make indirect comparisons should be tempered by the variability in protocol, circumstances, and definitions of the trial.

Aspirin has been used with the intravenous GP IIb/IIIa receptor blockers in all trials. A strong case also can be made for the concomitant use of heparin with GP IIb/IIIa receptor blockers. The tirofiban arm without UFH in the PRISM-PLUS trial was discontinued early because of an excess of deaths. In addition, the PURSUIT trial reported a higher event rate in the 11% of patients who were not treated with concomitant heparin. In a randomized comparison, a lower-dose regimen of the GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor lamifiban gave a more favorable outcome trend when combined with heparin than when administered without heparin. Current recommendations call for the concomitant use of heparin with GP IIb/IIIa inhibitors. Glycoprotein IIb/IIIa inhibitors can increase the ACT when combined with heparin, which means that lower doses of heparin are required to achieve a target level of anticoagulation. Moreover, trial data indicate that lower heparin doses diminish the bleeding risk associated with GP IIb/IIIa blockade in the setting of PCI, findings that likely can be extrapolated to the medical phase of management in patients with UA/NSTEMI.

Blood hemoglobin and platelet counts should be monitored and patient surveillance for bleeding should be performed daily during the administration of GP IIb/IIIa receptor blockers. Thrombocytopenia is an unusual complication of this class of agents. Severe thrombocytopenia, defined by nadir platelet counts of less than 50 000 per mL, is observed in 0.5% of patients, and profound thrombocytopenia, defined by nadir platelet counts of less than 20 000 per mL, is observed in 0.2% of patients. Although reversible, thrombocytopenia is associated with an increased risk of bleeding.

Several trials have demonstrated that GP IIb/IIIa inhibitors can be used with LMWH among patients with unstable ischemic syndromes. In the Antithrombotic Combination Using Tirofiban and Enoxaparin (ACUTE II) study, UFH and enoxaparin were compared in patients with UA/NSTEMI receiving tirofiban. The incidence of major and minor bleeding was similar, and there was a trend to fewer adverse events in patients receiving enoxaparin. More recently, 2 large-scale, randomized trials have examined the relative efficacy of enoxaparin versus UFH among patients with ACS. One of these, the A to Z Trial (Aggrastat to Zocor), randomized 3987 patients who were treated with concomitant ASA and tirofiban. Coronary angiography was performed in 60% of patients. Nonsignificant trends toward fewer ischemic end points but more frequent bleeding events were observed with enoxaparin than with UFH therapy. In the larger SYNERGY trial, 10 027 patients with high-risk ACS were randomized to receive either UFH or enoxaparin (Figure 12). Glycoprotein IIb/IIIa antagonists were administered to 57% of patients, and 92% underwent coronary angiography. No advantage of enoxaparin over heparin was observed for the primary end point of death or myocardial infarction by 30 d (14.0% vs 14.5%), but the 2 randomized therapies offered similar protection against ischemic events during PCI. Enoxaparin was associated, however, with an excess risk of TIMI major bleeding (9.1% vs 7.6%, P = 0.008).

The ACUITY trial investigated the combination of a GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor with bivalirudin, a direct thrombin inhibitor (see Section 3.2.2.4 and Figure 13). Glycoprotein IIb/IIIa inhibitors with bivalirudin resulted in similar (noninferior) clinical outcomes compared with GP IIb/IIIa inhibition with UFH or enoxaparin.
A challenge for the current guidelines is integrating the GP IIb/IIIa studies from the 1990s with more recent studies using preangiography clopidogrel loading, newer anticoagulants, and varying degrees of patient acuity and risk/benefit. The current evidence base and expert opinion suggest that for UA/NSTEMI patients in whom an initial invasive strategy is selected, either an intravenous GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor or an appropriate P2Y₁₂ receptor inhibitor should be added to ASA and anticoagulant therapy before diagnostic angiography (upstream) and that both may be considered before angiography for high-risk patients. For UA/NSTEMI patients in whom an initial conservative (ie, noninvasive) strategy is selected, the evidence for benefit is less.

3.2.7. Fibrinolysis

The failure of intravenous fibrinolytic therapy to improve clinical outcomes in the absence of MI with ST-segment elevation or bundle-branch block was clearly demonstrated in the TIMI 11B, ISIS-2, and GISSI 1 trials. A meta-analysis of fibrinolytic therapy in UA/NSTEMI patients showed no benefit of fibrinolysis versus standard therapy. Consequently, such therapy is not recommended for the management of patients with an ACS without ST-segment elevation, a posterior-wall MI, or a presumably new left bundle-branch block (see ACC/AHA
Guidelines for the Management of Patients With ST-Elevation Myocardial Infarction.

3.3. Initial Conservative Versus Initial Invasive Strategies (UPDATED)
(Refer to Appendixes 6 and 9 for Supplemental Information)

Class I

1. An early invasive strategy (ie, diagnostic angiography with intent to perform revascularization) is indicated in UA/NSTEMI patients who have refractory angina or hemodynamic or electrical instability (without serious comorbidities or contraindications to such procedures). (Level of Evidence: B)\textsuperscript{118,618}

2. An early invasive strategy (ie, diagnostic angiography with intent to perform revascularization) is indicated in initially stabilized UA/NSTEMI patients (without serious comorbidities or contraindications to such procedures) who have an elevated risk for clinical events (see Appendix 6 and Sections 2.2.6 and 3.4.3). (Level of Evidence: A)\textsuperscript{118,251,436}

Class IIa

3. It is reasonable to choose an early invasive strategy (within 12 to 24 hours of admission) over a delayed invasive strategy for initially stabilized high-risk patients with UA/NSTEMI. For patients not at high risk, a delayed invasive approach is also reasonable. (Level of Evidence: B)\textsuperscript{432}

Class IIb

1. In initially stabilized patients, an initially conservative (ie, a selectively invasive) strategy may be considered as a treatment strategy for UA/NSTEMI patients (without serious comorbidities or contraindications to such procedures) who have an elevated risk for clinical events (see Appendix 6 and Sections 2.2.6 and 3.4.3), including those who are troponin positive. (Level of Evidence: B)\textsuperscript{436,419} The decision to implement an initial conservative (vs initial invasive) strategy in these patients may be made by considering physician and patient preference. (Level of Evidence: C)

Class III: No Benefit

1. An early invasive strategy (ie, diagnostic angiography with intent to perform revascularization) is not recommended in patients with extensive comorbidities (eg, liver or pulmonary failure, cancer), in whom the risks of revascularization and comorbid conditions are likely to outweigh the benefits of revascularization. (Level of Evidence: C)

2. An early invasive strategy (ie, diagnostic angiography with intent to perform revascularization) is not recommended in patients with acute chest pain and a low likelihood of ACS. (Level of Evidence: C)

3. An early invasive strategy (ie, diagnostic angiography with intent to perform revascularization) should not be performed in patients who will not consent to revascularization regardless of the findings. (Level of Evidence: C)

3.3.1. General Principles

In addition to aggressive medical therapy, 2 treatment pathways have emerged for treating ACS patients. The “initial” or “early” invasive strategy, now known simply as the “invasive” strategy, triages patients to undergo an invasive diagnostic evaluation without first getting a noninvasive stress test or without failing medical treatment (ie, an initial conservative diagnostic strategy, or sometimes now known as the “selective invasive strategy”; see below and de Winter et al.\textsuperscript{436} Patients treated with an invasive strategy generally will undergo coronary angiography within 4 to 24 h of admission; however, these patients also are treated with the usual UA/NSTEMI medications, including appropriate anti-ischemic, antiplatelet, and anticoagulant therapy, as outlined in Sections 3.1 and 3.2. These drugs generally are not withheld until after angiography.

Within the invasive strategy, there is a subgroup of patients presenting to the ED who require urgent catheterization and revascularization in the absence of ST deviation because of ongoing ischemic symptoms or hemodynamic or rhythm instability. These patients are often rushed off to the catheterization laboratory within minutes to a few hours of arrival and are not considered appropriate candidates for a conservative strategy. Even here, appropriate medical therapy is considered; however, with these patients, the administration of GP IIb/IIIa inhibitors or P2Y\textsubscript{12} receptor inhibitor therapy may be delayed until the time of angiography, at a physician’s discretion (Figures 7, 8, and 9; and Appendix 9 for updated algorithm incorporating newer P2Y\textsubscript{12} receptor inhibitors). On the other hand, the longer the interval between presentation and angiography in patients, the greater the incremental benefit of “upstream” antiplatelet therapy. In summary, the invasive strategy can be subdivided into: 1) those patients requiring urgent angiography/revascularization very soon after arrival at the ED, and 2) those with a UA/NSTEMI presentation who are designated either by patient/physician discretion or after risk assessment to benefit from “early” but nonurgent angiography/intervention.

In contrast, the “initial conservative strategy” (also referred to as “selective invasive management”) calls for proceeding with an invasive evaluation only for those patients who fail medical therapy (refractory angina or angina at rest or with minimal activity despite vigorous medical therapy) or in whom objective evidence of ischemia (dynamic ECG changes, high-risk stress test) is identified. Estimating the risk for an adverse outcome is paramount for determining which strategy is best applied to an individual ACS patient. Several risk tools have been validated that are useful in guiding the type and intensity of therapy by identifying patients most likely to benefit from aggressive treatment.

One such valuable tool for risk determination is based on data from the TIMI 11B and ESSENCE trials\textsuperscript{436} and is discussed in Section 2.2.6 and Table 8. The TIMI risk calculator is available at http://www.timi.org/.

\textsuperscript{1}Immediate catheterization/angiography is recommended for unstable patients.
Another simple risk-prediction tool has been validated by data from GRACE\textsuperscript{122} (Figure 4; Section 2.2.6). The GRACE calculator can estimate short and intermediate mortality and is useful when making diagnostic and treatment decisions for ACS patients. The GRACE clinical application tool can be downloaded to a handheld PDA to be used at the bedside and is available at http://www.outcomes-umassmed.org/grace.

The PURSUIT, TIMI, and GRACE risk scores demonstrate good predictive accuracy for death and MI. They provide valuable information that can be used to identify patients likely to benefit from early, aggressive therapy, including intravenous GP platelet inhibitors and early coronary revascularization.\textsuperscript{180}

### 3.3.2. Rationale for the Initial Conservative Strategy

A few multicenter trials have shown similar outcomes with initial conservative and invasive therapeutic strategies.\textsuperscript{136,620,621} Some trials\textsuperscript{623,624} have emphasized the early risk associated with revascularization procedures. The conservative strategy seeks to avoid the routine early use of invasive procedures unless patients experience refractory or recurrent ischemic symptoms or develop hemodynamic instability. When the conservative strategy is chosen, a plan for noninvasive evaluation is required to detect severe ischemia that occurs spontaneously or at a low threshold of stress and to promptly refer these patients for coronary angiography and revascularization when possible. In addition, as in STEMI,\textsuperscript{149} an early echocardiogram should be considered to identify patients with significant LV dysfunction (eg, LVEF less than 0.40). Such a finding prompts consideration for angiography to identify left main or multivessel CAD, because patients with multivessel disease and LV dysfunction are at high risk and could accrue a survival benefit from CABG.\textsuperscript{417,625} In addition, a stress test (eg, exercise or pharmacological stress) for the assessment of ischemia is recommended before discharge or shortly thereafter to identify patients who may also benefit from revascularization. The use of aggressive anticoagulant and antiplatelet agents has reduced the incidence of adverse outcomes in patients managed conservatively (see Section 3.3).\textsuperscript{135,141,175,186,387,408,485,611} An advantage offered by the conservative strategy is that many patients stabilize on medical therapy and will not require coronary angiography. Consequently, the conservative strategy limits the use of in-hospital cardiac catheterization and may avoid costly and possibly unnecessary invasive procedures.

### 3.3.3. Rationale for the Invasive Strategy

For patients with UA/NSTEMI without recurrent ischemia in the first 24 h, the use of angiography provides an invasive approach to risk stratification. It can identify the 10% to 20% of patients with no significant coronary stenoses and the approximately 20% with 3-vessel disease with LV dysfunction or left main CAD. This latter group can derive a survival benefit from CABG (see Section 4). In addition, PCI of the culprit lesion has the potential to reduce the risk for subsequent hospitalization and the need for multiple antianginal drugs compared with the early conservative strategy (TIMI IIIIB).\textsuperscript{139} Just as the use of improved anticoagulant therapy and/or a platelet GP IIb/IIIa receptor blocker has improved the outcome in patients managed according to the conservative strategy, the availability of these agents also makes the invasive approach more attractive, particularly because the early hazard of PCI is lessened. The availability of GP IIb/IIIa receptor blockers also has led to 2 alternatives for the routine invasive approach: immediate angiography or deferred angiography.

#### 3.3.3.1. Timing of Invasive Therapy (NEW SECTION)

Among initially stabilized patients with UA/NSTEMI for whom an early invasive strategy of coronary angiography is chosen, optimal timing of angiography has not been well defined. Early or immediate catheterization with revascularization of unstable coronary lesions may prevent ischemic events that would otherwise occur during medical therapy. Conversely, pretreatment with intensive antithrombotic therapy may diminish thrombus burden and “passivate” unstable plaques, improving the safety of percutaneous revascularization and reducing the risk of perioperative ischemic complications. Three trials have compared different strategies of “early” versus “delayed” intervention in patients with UA/NSTEMI and form the basis of the updated recommendations in this guideline.

The ISAR-COOL (Intracoronary Stenting with Antithrombotic Regimen Cooling-Off) trial\textsuperscript{624} carried out at 2 hospitals between 2000 and 2002 randomized 410 patients with unstable chest pain and either electrocardiographic ST-segment depression or elevated troponin levels to undergo coronary angiography within 6 hours of presentation (median 2.4 hours) or after 3 to 5 days (median 86 hours) of antithrombotic pretreatment.\textsuperscript{624} Patients with “large MI,” defined by ST-segment elevation or creatine kinase–myocardial band isoenzyme activity $>3$ times normal, were excluded. Underlying medical therapy in both treatment arms included aspirin, clopidogrel, UFH, and tirofiban. By 30 days’ follow-up, the primary endpoint of death or large MI (defined by new electrocardiographic Q waves, left bundle-branch block, or creatine kinase–myocardial band elevation $>5$ times normal) occurred in 11.6% of patients randomized to delayed catheterization versus 5.9% of those in the early angiography group ($P=0.04$). Differences between treatment groups were observed exclusively in the period before catheterization, with identical event rates in the 2 arms after angiography. Although providing evidence that a strategy of “cooling-off” for 3 to 5 days before angiography does not improve outcome in this setting, the findings of this trial were limited because of the small sample size and the prolonged delay before angiography in the medical pretreatment arm.

Information more relevant to contemporary practice patterns was provided in the 2009 publication of the large-scale multicenter TIMACS (Timing of Intervention in Acute Coronary Syndromes) trial,\textsuperscript{432} which compared early versus delayed angiography and intervention in patients with non–ST-segment elevation ACS. Patients were included if they presented within 24 hours of onset of unstable ischemic symptoms with advanced age (260 years), elevated cardiac biomarkers, or ischemic electrocardiographic changes, and were randomized to undergo angiography as rapidly as possible and within 24 hours of randomization (median 14 hours) versus after a minimum delay of 36 hours (median 50 hours). Anticoagulation included aspirin, clopidogrel in $>80$% of patients, heparin or fondaparinux, and GP IIb/IIIa inhibitors in 23% of patients. Although the trial was initially powered for enrollment of 4000 patients to
detect a 25% reduction in the primary endpoint of death, new MI, or stroke at 6 months, the steering committee chose to terminate enrollment at 3031 patients because of recruitment challenges. Among the overall trial population, there was only a nonsignificant trend toward a reduced incidence of the primary clinical endpoint, from 11.3% in the delayed intervention group to 9.6% in the early intervention arm (HR for early intervention: 0.85; 95% CI: 0.68 to 1.06; P=0.15). However, a prospectively defined secondary endpoint of death, MI, or refractory ischemia was significantly reduced by early intervention from 12.9% to 9.5% (HR: 0.72; 95% CI: 0.58 to 0.89; P=0.003), mainly because of a difference in the incidence of refractory ischemia (3.3% versus 1.0% in the delayed versus early intervention arms, respectively; P<0.001). The occurrence of refractory ischemia was associated with a more than 4-fold increase in risk of subsequent MI. Moreover, significant heterogeneity was observed in the primary endpoint when stratified according to a prespecified estimation of baseline risk according to the GRACE (Global Registry of Acute Coronary Events) score. Patients in the highest tertile of the GRACE risk score (>140) experienced a sizeable and significant reduction in the incidence of the primary ischemic endpoint, from 21.0% to 13.9% (HR: 0.65; 95% CI: 0.48 to 0.89; P=0.006), whereas no difference in outcome (6.7% versus 7.6% in the delayed and early groups, respectively; HR: 1.12; 95% CI: 0.81 to 1.56; P=0.48) was observed among patients in the lower 2 risk tertiles (GRACE score ≤140).432

Results of the TIMACS trial suggested superior outcome among patients managed by early rather than delayed intervention in the setting of UA/NSTEMI, although the reduction in the primary endpoint did not reach statistical significance for the overall trial population. Nevertheless, refractory ischemia was reduced by an early approach, as were the risks of death, MI, and stroke among patients at the highest tertile of ischemic risk as defined by the GRACE risk score.432

To assess whether a more aggressive strategy of very early intervention, analogous to the standard of primary PCI for STEMI, would lead to improved outcomes with patients with non–ST-elevation ACS, the ABOARD (Angioplasty to Blunt the Rise of Troponin in Acute Coronary Syndromes) study investigators425 compared angiography and intervention performed immediately on presentation with intervention carried out on the next working day. A total of 352 patients with unstable ischemic symptoms, ECG changes, or troponin elevation were randomized at 13 hospitals to immediate (at a median 70 minutes after enrollment) versus delayed (at a median 21 hours) angiography and revascularization. Background antithrombotic therapy consisted of aspirin, clopidogrel with a loading dose of more than or equal to 300 mg, abciximab during PCI, and the anticoagulant of the investigator’s choice. The primary trial endpoint was peak troponin I value during the hospitalization period. Immediate intervention conferred no advantage with regard to the primary endpoint (median troponin I value 2.1 versus 1.7 ng/mL in the immediate and delayed intervention groups, respectively), nor was there even a trend toward improved outcome in the prespecified clinical secondary endpoint of death, MI, or urgent revascularization by 1 month (13.7% versus 10.2% in the immediate and delayed intervention groups, respectively; P=0.31).425

These 3 trials,432,624,625 taken together with earlier studies, do provide support for a strategy of early angiography and intervention to reduce ischemic complications in patients who have been selected for an initial invasive strategy, particularly among those at high risk (defined by a GRACE score >140), whereas a more delayed approach is reasonable in low- to intermediate-risk patients. The “early” time period in this context is considered to be within the first 24 hours after hospital presentation, although there is no evidence that incremental benefit is derived by angiography and intervention performed within the first few hours of hospital admission. The advantage of early intervention was achieved in the context of intensive background antithrombotic therapy.

3.3.4. Immediate Angiography

Excluding those in need of urgent intervention, 2 alternatives for the invasive approach have emerged: early (“immediate”) or deferred angiography (ie, with respect to a 12- to 48-h window). Some may argue that proceeding immediately to angiography is an efficient approach for the ACS patient. Patients found not to have CAD may be discharged rapidly or shifted to a different management strategy. Patients with obvious culprit lesions amenable to PCI can have a procedure performed immediately, hastening discharge. Patients with left main CAD and those with multivessel disease and LV dysfunction can be sent expeditiously to undergo bypass surgery, thereby avoiding a risky waiting period. Earlier support for immediate angiography came from the Intracoronary Stenting with Antithrombotic Regimen Cooling-off Study (ISAR-COOL).626 All ACS patients were treated with intensive medical therapy (including oral and intravenous antiplatelet therapy). They were randomized to immediate angiography (median time 2.4 h) or a prolonged “cooling off” period for a median of 86 h before undergoing catheterization. Patients randomized to immediate angiography had significantly fewer deaths or MIs at 30 d. Importantly, this difference in outcome was attributed to events that occurred before catheterization in the “cooling off” group, which supports the rationale for intensive medical therapy and very early angiography. However, the more contemporary ABOARD study,625 which compared angiography and intervention performed immediately on presentation with intervention carried out on the next working day, found no evidence of incremental benefit derived by a strategy of immediate angiography and intervention for UA/NSTEMI (see Section 3.3.3.1).

3.3.5. Deferred Angiography

(Refer to New Section 3.3.3.1.)

In most reports that involve use of the invasive strategy, angiography has been deferred for 12 to 48 h while antithrombotic and anti-ischemic therapies are intensified. Several observational studies, as summarized in Smith et al626 have found a lower rate of complications in patients undergoing PCI more than 48 h after admission, during which heparin and ASA were administered, than with early intervention; however, the value of prolonged medical stabilization before angiography has not proven in the contemporary era. The TIMACS trial432 compared early versus delayed angiography and intervention in patients with UA/NSTEMI (see Section 3.3.3.1), and demonstrated that a strategy of early angiography and intervention
reduced ischemic complications, particularly among patients at high risk (defined by a GRACE score >140).

3.3.6. Comparison of Early Invasive and Initial Conservative Strategies
(Refer to New Section 3.3.3.1.)

Prior meta-analyses have concluded that routine invasive therapy is better than an initial conservative or selectively invasive approach. Mehta et al concluded that the routine invasive strategy resulted in an 18% relative reduction in death or MI, including a significant reduction in MI alone. The routine invasive arm was associated with higher in-hospital mortality (1.8% vs 1.1%), but this disadvantage was more than compensated for by a significant reduction in mortality between discharge and the end of follow-up (3.8% vs 4.9%). The invasive strategy also was associated with less angina and fewer rehospitalizations than with the conservative pathway. Patients undergoing routine invasive treatment also had improved quality of life.

In contrast to these findings, other studies, most recently ICTUS (Invasive versus Conservative Treatment in Unstable coronary Syndromes), have favorably highlighted a strategy of selective invasive therapy. In ICTUS, 1200 high-risk ACS patients were randomized to routine invasive versus selective invasive management and followed up for 1 year with respect to the combined incidence of death, MI, and ischemic rehospitalization. All patients were treated with optimal medical therapy that included ASA, clopidogrel, LMWH, and lipid-lowering therapy; abciximab was given to those undergoing revascularization. At the end of 1 year, there was no significant difference in the composite end point between groups. This study suggests that a selective invasive strategy could be reasonable in ACS patients. A possible explanation for the lack of benefit of the invasive approach in this trial (and other trials) could be related to the relatively high rate of revascularization actually performed in patients treated in the selective invasive arm (47%), thereby reducing observed differences between treatment strategies, and to the lower event rate (lower-risk population) than in other studies. Results were unchanged during longer term follow-up. Nevertheless, ICTUS required troponin positivity for entry. Thus troponin alone might no longer be an adequate criterion for strategy selection, especially with increasingly sensitive troponin assays. The degree of troponin elevation and other high-risk clinical factors taken together should be considered in selecting a treatment strategy.

Other criticisms of ICTUS have included that it was relatively underpowered for hard end points and that it used a controversial definition for postprocedural MI (ie even minimal, asymptomatic CK-MB elevation). Nevertheless, ICTUS required troponin positivity for entry. Thus troponin alone might no longer be an adequate criterion for strategy selection, especially with increasingly sensitive troponin assays. The degree of troponin elevation and other high-risk clinical factors taken together should be considered in selecting a treatment strategy.

Additional, 1-year follow-up may be inadequate to fully realize the long-term impact and benefit of the routine invasive strategy. In the RITA-3 trial (Third Randomized Intervention Treatment of Angina), 5-year but not 1-year event rates favored the early invasive arm (see Figure 17 and text below). In ICTUS, however, results were maintained during a 3-year follow-up.

Thus, these guidelines recommend that in initially stabilized UA/NSTEMI patients, an initial conservative (selective invasive) strategy may be considered as a treatment option. The 2007 Writing Committee also believes that additional comparative trials of the selective invasive with the routine initial invasive strategies are indicated using aggressive contemporary medical therapies in both arms, including routine dual antiplatelet therapy in medically treated patients (as recommended in Section 5.2.1) as well as aggressive lipid lowering and other updated secondary prevention measures (as summarized in Section 5.2). Further study could provide a stronger evidence base for an initial conservative/selective invasive strategy in initially stabilized patients, as it has for stable angina patients.

Nevertheless, a meta-analysis of contemporary randomized trials in NSTEMI, including ICTUS, currently supports a long-term mortality and morbidity benefit of an early invasive as compared with an initial conservative strategy. Nonfatal MI at 2 years (7.6% vs 9.1%, respectively; RR 0.83, 95% CI 0.72 to 0.96, P=0.012) and hospitalization (at 13 months; RR = 0.69, 95% CI 0.65 to 0.74, P<0.0001) also were reduced by an early invasive strategy (Figure 18). A separate review of contemporary randomized trials in the stent era using the Cochrane database arrived at similar conclusions. Details of selected contemporary trials of invasive versus conservative strategies follow.
Figure 18. Relative Risk of Outcomes With Early Invasive Versus Conservative Therapy in UA/NSTEMI. 

A: Relative risk of all-cause mortality for early invasive therapy compared with conservative therapy at a mean follow-up of 2 years. B: Relative risk of recurrent nonfatal myocardial infarction for early invasive therapy compared with conservative therapy at a mean follow-up of 2 years. C: Relative risk of recurrent unstable angina resulting in rehospitalization for early invasive therapy compared with conservative therapy at a mean follow-up of 13 months. Modified from the Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 48, Bavry AA, Kumbhani DJ, Rassi AN, Bhatt DL, Askari AT. Benefit of early invasive therapy in acute coronary syndromes a meta-analysis of contemporary randomized clinical trials, 1319–25. Copyright 2006, with permission from Elsevier. CI = confidence interval; FRISC-II = FRagmin and fast Revascularization during InStability in Coronary artery disease; ICTUS = Invasive versus Conservative Treatment in Unstable coronary Syndromes; ISAR-COOL = Intracoronary Stenting with Antithrombotic Regimen COOLing-off study; RITA-3 = Third Randomized Intervention Treatment of Angina trial; RR = relative risk; TIMI-18 = Thrombolysis In Myocardial Infarction-18; TRUCS = Treatment of Refractory Unstable angina in geographically isolated areas without Cardiac Surgery; UA/NSTEMI = unstable angina/non–ST-elevation myocardial infarction; VINO = Value of first day angiography/angioplasty In evolving Non–ST segment elevation myocardial infarction: Open multicenter randomized trial.
In the FRISC-II study, 3048 ACS patients were treated with dalteparin for 5 to 7 d.251 Of these patients, 2457 who qualified were then randomized (2 × 2 factorial design) to continue to receive dalteparin or placebo (double blind) and to receive either a noninvasive or an invasive treatment strategy, with coronary angiography and revascularization, if appropriate, performed within 7 d of admission. At 6 months, there were no differences between continued dalteparin compared with placebo. However, death or MI occurred in 9.4% of patients assigned to the invasive strategy versus 12.1% of those assigned to the noninvasive strategy (P < 0.03). At 1 year, the mortality rate in the invasive strategy group was 2.2% compared with 3.9% in the noninvasive strategy group (P = 0.016).637 It may be concluded from FRISC-II that patients with UA/NSTEMI who are not at very high risk for revascularization and who first receive an average of 6 d of treatment with LMWH, ASA, nitrates, and beta blockers have a better outcome at 6 months with a (delayed) routine invasive approach than with a routine conservative approach, with very low revascularization rates. Long-term outcomes of the FRISC-II trial have been published recently.638 At 5 years, the invasive strategy was favored for the primary end point of death or nonfatal MI (HR 0.81, P = 0.009). Benefit was confined to men, nonsmokers, and patients with 2 or more risk factors.

In the TACTICS-TIMI 18 trial,188 2220 patients with UA or NSTEMI were treated with ASA, heparin, and the GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor tirofiban. They were randomized to an early invasive strategy with routine coronary angiography within 48 h followed by revascularization if the coronary anatomy was deemed suitable or to a more conservative strategy. In the latter group, catheterization was performed only if the patient had recurrent ischemia or a positive stress test. Death, MI, or rehospitalization for ACS at 6 months occurred in 15.9% of patients assigned to the invasive strategy versus 19.4% assigned to the more conservative strategy (P = 0.025). Death or MI188 was also reduced at 6 months (7.3% vs 9.5%, P < 0.05). The beneficial effects on outcome were observed in medium- and high-risk patients, as defined by an elevation of TnT greater than 0.01 ng per mL, the presence of ST-segment deviation, or a TIMI risk score greater than 3.166 In the absence of eptifibatide was associated with a reduced need for transfer to tertiary referral centers and improved outcomes.639

The RITA-3 trial633 compared early and conservative therapy in 1810 moderate-risk patients with ACS. Patients with positive cardiac biomarkers (CK-MB greater than 2 times the upper limit of normal at randomization) were excluded from randomization, as were those with new Q waves, MI within 1 month, PCI within 1 year, and any prior CABG. The combined end point of death, nonfatal MI, and refractory angina was reduced from 14.5% to 9.6% by early invasive treatment. The benefit was driven primarily by a reduction in refractory angina. There was a late divergence of the curves, with reduced 5-year death and MI in the early invasive arm (Figure 17).

In the VINO trial (Value of first day angiography/angioplasty In evolving Non–ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction: Open multicenter randomized trial).640 131 patients with NSTEMI were randomized to cardiac catheterization on the day of admission versus conservative therapy. Despite the fact that 40% of the conservatively treated patients crossed over to revascularization by the time of the 6-month follow-up, there was a significant reduction in death or reinfarction for patients assigned to early angiography and revascularization (6% vs 22%).

The ISAR-COOL trial624 randomized 410 intermediate-to-high-risk patients to very early angiography and revascularization versus a delayed invasive strategy. All patients were treated with intensive medical therapy that included ASA, heparin, clopidogrel (600-mg loading dose), and the intravenous GP IIb/IIIa receptor inhibitor tirofiban. In the very early arm, patients underwent cardiac catheterization at a mean time of 2.4 h versus 86 h in the delayed invasive arm. The very early invasive strategy was associated with significantly better outcome at 30 d, measured by reduction in death and large MI (5.9% vs 11.6%). More importantly, the benefit seen was attributable to a reduction in events before cardiac catheterization, which raises the possibility that there is a hazard associated with a “cooling-down” period.

3.3.7. Subgroups

TACTICS-TIMI 18 demonstrated a reduction in the 6-month end point of death or MI in older adult ACS patients. With respect to gender, controversy exists over revascularization treatment differences between men and women with ACS. The FRISC-II trial showed a benefit of early revascularization in men for death or MI that was not observed for women.641 In contrast, death, MI, or rehospitalization rates were reduced for both men and women in TACTICS-TIMI 18.188 Furthermore, an observational study reported that women actually did better than men with early interventional therapy for UA/NSTEMI.642 Finally, RITA-3633 showed that the routine strategy of invasive evaluation resulted in a beneficial effect in men that was not seen in women. Additional research is required to further clarify these diverse observations.643
3.3.8. Care Objectives

The objective is to provide a strategy that has the most potential to yield the best clinical outcome and improve long-term prognosis. The purpose of coronary angiography is to provide detailed information about the size and distribution of coronary vessels, the location and extent of atherosclerotic obstruction, and the suitability for revascularization. The LV angiogram, which is usually performed along with coronary angiography, provides an assessment of the extent of focal and global LV dysfunction and of the presence and severity of coexisting disorders (eg, valvular or congenital lesions). A detailed discussion of revascularization is presented in Section 4 of these guidelines, as well as in the ACC/AHA Guidelines for Percutaneous Coronary Intervention\(^6\) and the ACC/AHA Guideline Update for Coronary Artery Bypass Graft Surgery.\(^6\) Although general guidelines can be offered, the selection of appropriate procedures and the decision to refer patients for revascularization require both clinical judgment and counseling with the patient and the patient’s family regarding expected risks and benefits.

Although not conducted in patients with UA/NSTEMI, the following studies have addressed the value of stress testing in guiding therapy. The DANISH trial in Acute Myocardial Infarction (DANAMI) studied 503 patients with inducible ischemia (ie, a positive exercise stress test) after fibrinolytic therapy for first MI and compared an ischemia-guided invasive strategy with a conservative strategy.\(^6\) The invasive strategy in the post-MI patients with inducible ischemia resulted in a reduction in the incidence of reinfarction, hospitalizations for UA, and stable angina. Similarly, in the Asymptomatic Cardiac Ischemia Pilot (ACIP) study,\(^6\) 558 clinically stable patients with ischemia on stress testing and during daily life (ST-segment depression on exercise treadmill testing or perfusion abnormality on radionuclide pharmacological stress test if unable to exercise, in addition to ST-segment depression on ambulatory ECG monitoring), most of whom had angina in the previous 6 weeks, were randomized to 1 of 3 initial strategies: symptom-guided medical care, ischemia-guided medical care, or revascularization. More than one third of these patients had “complex” stenoses on angiography. Those randomized to early revascularization experienced less ambulatory ischemia at 6 weeks, were randomized to 1 of 3 initial treatment strategies: symptom-guided medical care, ischemia-guided medical care, or revascularization. More than one third of these patients had “complex” stenoses on angiography. Those randomized to early revascularization experienced less ambulatory ischemia at 12 weeks than did those randomized to initial medical care in whom revascularization was delayed and symptom driven.

After either STEMI or NSTEMI, the SWIISSII (Swiss Interventional Study of Silent Ischemia Type II) study, which randomized 201 patients with silent ischemia, demonstrated by stress imaging, to either revascularization with PCI or anti-ischemic drug therapy and followed them for an average of 10 years. Survival free of cardiac death, nonfatal MI, or symptom-driven revascularization was significantly reduced in the PCI group. Though relatively small, the study supports the use of stress testing after UA/NSTEMI for guiding the selection of invasive evaluation in UA/NSTEMI patients treated with an initial conservative strategy.\(^6\)

In ACS patients with UA/NSTEMI, the purpose of noninvasive testing is both to identify ischemia and to identify candidates at high risk for adverse outcomes and to direct them to coronary angiography and revascularization when possible. However, neither randomized trials\(^3,6,16,25,61,62,621\) nor observational data\(^5\) uniformly support an inherent superiority for the routine use of coronary angiography and revascularization (see Section 4). Accordingly, the decision regarding which strategy to pursue for a given patient should be based on the patient’s estimated outcome risk assisted by clinical and noninvasive test results, available facilities, previous outcome of revascularization by the team available in the institution in which the patient is hospitalized, and patient preference.

Coronary angiography can enhance prognostic stratification. This information can be used to guide medical therapy and to plan revascularization therapy, but it is important to emphasize that an adverse outcome in ACS is very time dependent and that after 1 to 2 months, the risk for adverse outcome is essentially the same as that for low-risk chronic stable angina (Figure 17). Several older studies in patients with stable angina, including the Second Randomized Intervention Treatment of Angina (RITA-2) trial,\(^6,22\) have found a higher early risk of death or MI with an interventional strategy than with medical management alone. Thus, the timing of coronary angiography and revascularization is critically important if patients at high risk are to benefit. Unfortunately, the total number of operative complications is increased when revascularization procedures are performed routinely, because some patients who are not in need of revascularization will be exposed to its hazards. However, contemporary use of aggressive medical therapy in UA/NSTEMI, including oral and intravenous antithrombotic agents and antiplatelet agents, has lessened the early hazard and risk for ischemic complications in patients undergoing early invasive procedures.

Patients with UA/NSTEMI often can be divided into different risk groups on the basis of their initial clinical presentation. The TIMI, PURSUIT, and GRACE scores are useful clinical tools for assigning risk to patients presenting with UA/NSTEMI (Table 8; Figure 4; see Section 2.2.6).

Risk stratification in turn identifies patients who are most likely to benefit from subsequent revascularization. For example, patients with left main disease or multivessel CAD with reduced LV function are at high risk for adverse outcomes and are likely to benefit from surgical bypass. Clinical evaluation and noninvasive testing will aid in the identification of most patients in the high-risk subset, because they often have 1 or more of the following high-risk features: advanced age (greater than 70 years), prior MI, revascularization, ST-segment deviation, HF or depressed resting LV function (ie, LVEF less than or equal to 0.40) on noninvasive study, or noninvasive stress test findings. The presence of any of these risk factors or of diabetes mellitus aids in the identification of high-risk patients who could benefit from an invasive strategy.

The majority of patients presenting with UA/NSTEMI, however, do not fall into the very high-risk group and do not have findings that typically portend a high risk for adverse outcomes. Accordingly, they are not likely to receive the same degree of benefit from routine revascularization afforded to high-risk patients, and an invasive study is optional for those at lower risk and can be safely deferred pending further clinical developments. Decisions regarding coronary angiography in patients who are not high risk according to findings on clinical examination and noninvasive testing can be individualized on the basis of patient preferences and the degree to which they are affected by clinical symptoms.
The data on which recommendations for invasive or conservative strategy recommendations are based come from several randomized trials. Older trials included TIMI IIIB, Veterans Affairs Non-Q-Wave Infarction Strategies in Hospital (VANQWISH), and Medicine versus Angiography in Thrombolytic Exclusion (MATE). More recent trials, relevant to contemporary practice, include FRISC-II, TACTICS-TIMI 18, VINO, RITA-3, ISAR-COOL, ICTUS, a large, prospective, multinational registry, the OASIS registry, and several meta-analyses. See Section 3.3.1.5 for a detailed description of these trials and the more recent meta-analyses. See Section 3.3.3.1 for updated trials on the timing of invasive angiography.

Some selected areas require additional comment. In a patient with UA, a history of prior PCI within the past 6 months suggests the presence of restenosis, which often can be treated effectively with repeat PCI. Coronary angiography without preceding functional testing is generally indicated. Patients with prior CABG represent another subgroup for whom a strategy of early coronary angiography is usually indicated. The complex interplay between the progression of native coronary disease and the development of graft atherosclerosis with ulceration and embolization is difficult to untangle noninvasively; these considerations argue for early coronary angiography. In addition, patients with known or suspected reduced LV systolic function, including patients with prior anterior Q-wave MIs, those with known depressed LV function, and those who present with HF, have sufficient risk that the possibility of benefit from revascularization procedures merits early coronary angiography without preceding functional testing.

In patients with UA/NSTEMI, coronary angiography typically shows the following profile: 1) no severe epicardial stenosis in 10% to 20% with a sex differential, 2) 1-vessel stenosis in 30% to 35%, 3) multivessel stenosis in 40% to 50%, and 4) significant (greater than 50%) left main stenosis in 4% to 10%. In the early invasive strategy in TIMI IIIB, no critical obstruction (less than 60% diameter stenosis) was found in 19% of patients, 1-vessel stenosis in 30% to 35%, 3-vessel stenosis in 15%, and left main stenosis (greater than 50%) in 4%. Complex plaques are usually believed to be responsible for the culprit lesions. These usually are eccentric and sometimes have irregular borders and correlate with intracoronary thrombi and an increased risk of recurrent ischemia at rest, MI, and cardiac death. Similar findings were noted in more than 80% of the patients in the VANQWISH trial, and more than 1 complex lesion was found in most patients. Interestingly, in TIMI IIIB, many of the patients without severe stenosis had reduced contrast clearance, which suggests microvascular dysfunction, which can contribute to impaired myocardial perfusion.

Appropriate treatment for women presenting with ACS might be different from that in men (see also Section 6.1). In FRISC-II and RITA-3, an improved outcome in the early invasive arm was seen only in men, whereas the benefit of early revascularization was equivalent in men and women in the TACTICS-TIMI 18 trial provided that the troponin level was elevated. In contrast, low-risk women tended to have worse outcomes, including a higher risk of major bleeding, with early revascularization therapy, whereas low-risk men were neither harmed nor benefited by this strategy. Most studies showed that women were more likely than men to have either normal vessels or noncritical stenoses. High-risk women also were more likely to have elevation of CRP and BNP and less often had elevated troponin. Women with any positive biomarker benefited from invasive therapy, whereas those without elevated CRP, BNP, or troponin did better with a conservative approach (see Section 6.1).

Patients with severe 3-vessel stenosis and reduced LV function and those with left main stenosis should be considered for early CABG (see Section 4). In low-risk patients, quality of life and patient preferences should be given considerable weight in the selection of a treatment strategy. Low-risk patients whose symptoms do not respond well to maximal medical therapy and who experience poor quality of life and functional status and are prepared to accept the risks of revascularization should be considered for revascularization.

The discovery that a patient does not have significant obstructive CAD should prompt consideration of whether the symptoms represent another cause of cardiac ischemia (eg, syndrome X, coronary spasm, coronary embolism, or coronary artery dissection; see Section 6) or pericarditis/myocarditis or are noncardiac in origin. There is a distinction between normal coronaries and vessels with less than 50% stenoses but with atherosclerotic plaque present, which might be demonstrated to be extensive on coronary intravascular ultrasound. The latter can include visualization of a culprit ulcerated plaque.

Noncardiac syndromes should prompt a search for the true cause of symptoms. Unfortunately, many such patients continue to have recurrent symptoms, are readmitted to the hospital, can become disabled, and continue to consume health care resources even with repeated coronary angiography. It is not presently possible to define the extent of comorbidity that would, in every case, make referral for coronary angiography and revascularization inappropriate. The high-risk patient with significant comorbidities requires thoughtful discussion among the physician, patient, and family and/or patient advocate. A decision for or against revascularization must be made on a case-by-case basis.

Examples of extensive comorbidity that usually preclude revascularization include 1) advanced or metastatic malignancy with a projected life expectancy of 1 year or less, 2) intracranial pathology that contraindicates the use of systemic anticoagulation or causes severe cognitive disturbance (eg, Alzheimer’s disease) or advanced physical limitations, 3) end-stage cirrhosis with symptomatic portal hypertension (eg, encephalopathy, visceral bleeding), and 4) CAD that is known from previous angiography not to be amenable to revascularization. This list is not meant to be all-inclusive. More difficult decisions involve patients with significant comorbidities that are not as serious as those listed here; examples include patients who have moderate or severe renal failure but are stable with dialysis.

Consultation with an interventional cardiologist and a cardiac surgeon before coronary angiography is advised to define technical options and likely risks and benefits. The operators who perform coronary angiography and revascularization and the facility in which these procedures are performed are important considerations, because the availability of interventional cardiologists and cardiac surgeons who are experienced in high-risk and complex patients is essential. As a general
principle, the potential benefits of coronary angiography and revascularization must be carefully weighed against the risks and the conflicting results of the clinical trials and registries. The 2007 Writing Committee endorses further research into techniques that could reduce bleeding (eg, radial access and smaller sheath sizes) and the proper selection and dosing of drugs to minimize bleeding in patients with UA/NSTEMI.

3.4. Risk Stratification Before Discharge

**Recommendations**

**Class I**

1. Noninvasive stress testing is recommended in low-risk patients (Table 7) who have been free of ischemia at rest or with low-level activity and of HF for a minimum of 12 to 24 h. ([Level of Evidence: C](#))

2. Noninvasive stress testing is recommended in patients at intermediate risk (Table 7) who have been free of ischemia at rest or with low-level activity and of HF for a minimum of 12 to 24 h. ([Level of Evidence: C](#))

3. Choice of stress test is based on the resting ECG, ability to perform exercise, local expertise, and technologies available. Treadmill exercise is useful in patients able to exercise in whom the ECG is free of baseline ST-segment abnormalities, bundle-branch block, LV hypertrophy, intraventricular conduction defect, paced rhythm, preexcitation, and digoxin effect. ([Level of Evidence: C](#))

4. An imaging modality should be added in patients with resting ST-segment depression (greater than or equal to 0.10 mV), LV hypertrophy, bundle-branch block, intraventricular conduction defect, preexcitation, or digoxin who are able to exercise. In patients undergoing a low-level exercise test, an imaging modality can add sensitivity. ([Level of Evidence: B](#))

5. Pharmacological stress testing with imaging is recommended when physical limitations (eg, arthritis, amputation, severe peripheral vascular disease, severe chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, or general debility) preclude adequate exercise stress. ([Level of Evidence: B](#))

6. Prompt angiography without noninvasive risk stratification should be performed for failure of stabilization with intensive medical treatment. ([Level of Evidence: B](#))

7. A noninvasive test (echocardiogram or radionuclide angiogram) is recommended to evaluate LV function in patients with definite ACS who are not scheduled for coronary angiography and left ventriculography. ([Level of Evidence: B](#))

The management of ACS patients requires continuous risk stratification. Important prognostic information is derived from careful initial assessment, the patient’s course during the first few days of management, and the patient’s response to anti-ischemic and antithrombotic therapy. The Braunwald classification has been validated prospectively and represents an appropriate clinical instrument to help predict outcome. Angina at rest, within 48 h in the absence of an extracardiac condition (primary UA; Braunwald Class III), and UA in the early postinfarction period (Braunwald class C), along with age, male sex, hypertension, and maximal intravenous antianginal/anti-ischemic therapy, were independent predictors for death or nonfatal MI. The baseline ECG on presentation was also found to be extremely useful for risk stratification in the TIMI III registry, as discussed in Section 2.2.6.2, and in the RISC (Research on InStability in Coronary artery disease) study group. In a more recent database of 12,142 patients presenting within 12 h of the onset of ischemic symptoms, the ECG at presentation allowed individualized risk stratification across the spectrum of ACS ([Figure 19](#)). In many cases, noninvasive stress testing provides a very useful supplement to such clinically based risk assessment. In addition, as pointed out previously, troponins are very helpful in risk assessment. Some patients, however, are at such high risk for an adverse outcome that noninvasive risk stratification would not be likely to identify a subgroup with sufficiently low risk to avoid coronary angiography to determine whether revascularization is possible. These patients include those who, despite intensive medical therapy, manifest recurrent rest angina, hemodynamic compromise, or severe LV dysfunction. Such patients should be considered directly for early coronary angiography without noninvasive stress testing; however, referral for coronary angiography is not reasonable if they are unwilling to consider revascularization or have severe complicating illnesses that preclude revascularization. Other patients may have such a low likelihood of CAD after initial clinical evaluation that even an abnormal test finding is unlikely to prompt additional therapy that would further reduce risk (eg, a 35-year-old woman without CAD risk factors). Such patients would ordinarily not be considered for coronary angiography and revascularization unless the diagnosis of UA/NSTEMI is unclear. The majority of patients presenting with UA/NSTEMI do not fall into these categories and are accordingly reasonable candidates for risk stratification with noninvasive testing.

**3.4.1. Care Objectives**

The goals of noninvasive testing are to 1) determine the presence or absence of ischemia in patients with a low or intermediate likelihood of CAD and 2) estimate prognosis. This information is key for the development of further diagnostic steps and therapeutic measures.

A detailed discussion of noninvasive stress testing in CAD is presented in the ACC/AHA Guidelines for Exercise Testing, ACC/AHA Guidelines for the Clinical Use of Cardiac Radionuclide Imaging, and ACC/AHA Guidelines for the Clinical Application of Echocardiography ([Tables 19, 20, and 21](#)). Briefly, the provocation of ischemia at a low workload or a high-risk treadmill score (ie, greater than or equal to 11) implies severe limitation in the ability to increase coronary blood flow. This is usually the result of severe coronary artery obstruction and is associated with a high risk for an adverse outcome and/or severe angina after discharge. Unless there are contraindications to revascularization, such patients generally merit referral for early coronary angiography to direct a revascularization procedure, if appropriate. On the other hand, the attainment of a higher workload (eg, greater...
than 6.5 metabolic equivalents [METS]) without evidence of ischemia (low-risk treadmill score greater than or equal to 5) is associated with functionally less severe coronary artery obstruction. Such patients have a better prognosis and can often be safely managed conservatively. Ischemia that develops at greater than 6.5 METS can be associated with severe coronary artery obstruction, but unless other high-risk markers are present (greater than 0.2-mV ST-segment depression or elevation, fall in blood pressure, ST-segment shifts in multiple leads reflecting multiple coronary regions, or prolonged ST-segment shifts [greater than 6 min] in recovery), these patients also may be safely managed conservatively (Table 20).

Stress radionuclide ventriculography or stress echocardiography (Table 20) provides an important alternative to exercise electrocardiography testing. Myocardial perfusion imaging with pharmacological stress (Table 21) is particularly useful in patients who are unable to exercise. The prognostic value of pharmacological stress testing appears similar to that of exercise testing with imaging, although there are few direct comparisons.

As noted earlier (Section 2.3.2.), CMR is a newer imaging modality that can effectively assess cardiac function, perfusion (eg, with adenosine stress), and viability at the same study. The combination of these features has been reported to yield excellent predictive information in suspected CAD/ACS patients.

3.4.2. Noninvasive Test Selection

There are no conclusive data that either LV function or myocardial perfusion at rest and during exercise or pharmacological stress is superior in the assessment of prognosis. Both the extent of CAD and the degree of LV dysfunction are important in the selection of the appropriate therapy. Studies that directly compare prognostic information from multiple noninvasive tests for ischemia in patients after the stabilization of UA/NSTEMI are hampered by small sample size. Dobutamine stress echocardiography measures both resting LV function and the functional consequences of a coronary stenosis. An ischemic response is characterized by initially improved LV function at low-stress doses, followed by deterioration with increasing dobutamine doses. However, UA and MI are listed as contraindications for dobutamine stress echocardiography.

The RISC study evaluated predischarge symptom-limited bicycle exercise testing in 740 men with UA/NSTEMI. Multivariate analysis showed that the extent of ST-segment depression, expressed as the number of leads with ischemic changes at a low maximal workload, was negatively correlated independently with infarct-free survival rates at 1 year. This and other smaller studies permit a comparison of the effectiveness of exercise ECG with exercise or dipyridamole thallium-201 study for risk stratification. All of these noninvasive tests show similar accuracy in dichotomization of the total population into low- and high-risk subgroups.

Selection of the noninvasive stress test should be based primarily on patient characteristics, local availability, and expertise in interpretation. Because of simplicity, lower cost, and widespread familiarity with performance and interpretation, the standard low-level exercise ECG stress test remains the most reasonable test in patients who are able to exercise and who have a resting ECG that is interpretable for ST-segment shifts. Patients with an ECG pattern that would interfere with interpretation of the ST segment should have an exercise test with imaging. Patients who are unable to exercise should have a pharmacological stress test with imaging. Low- and intermediate-risk patients admitted with ACS may undergo symptom-limited stress testing provided they have been asymptomatic and clinically stable for 12 to 24 h.

The optimal testing strategy in women is less well defined than in men (see Section 6.1), but there is evidence that imaging studies are superior to exercise ECG evaluation in women. Exercise testing has been reported to be less accurate for diagnosis in women. At least a portion of the lower reported accuracy derives from a lower pretest likelihood of...
and prognostic values of the tests were similar, but the earlier test identified patients who developed adverse events during the first month, and this represented approximately one half of all events that occurred during the first year. These data illustrate the importance of early noninvasive testing for risk stratification.

The VANQWISH trial used symptom-limited thallium exercise treadmill testing at 3 to 5 d to direct the need for angiography in the 442 non–Q-wave MI patients randomized to an early conservative strategy. Among subjects in the conservative arm meeting VANQWISH stress test criteria to cross over to coronary angiography, 51% were found to have surgical CAD and showed favorable outcomes after revascularization. These findings support the concept that noninvasive stress testing can be used successfully to identify a high-risk subset of patients who can be directed to coronary angiography. It is unlikely that any angiographically directed early revascularization strategy could alter the very low early event rates observed in patients without a high-risk stress test.

Noninvasive tests are most useful for management decisions when risk can be stated in terms of events over time. A large population of patients must be studied to derive and test the equations needed to accurately predict individual patient risk. No noninvasive study has been reported in a sufficient number of patients after the stabilization of UA/NSTEMI to develop and test the accuracy of a multivariable equation to report test results in terms of absolute risk. Therefore, data from studies of stable angina patients must be used for risk, reported as events over time. Although the pathological process that evokes ischemia may be different in the 2 forms of angina, it is likely that the use of prognostic nomograms derived from patients with stable angina also are predictive of risk in patients with recent UA/NSTEMI after stabilization. With this untested assumption, the much larger literature derived from populations that include patients with both stable angina and UA/NSTEMI provides equations for risk stratification that convert physiological changes observed during noninvasive testing into statements of risk expressed as events over time.

### 3.4.3. Selection for Coronary Angiography

In contrast to the noninvasive tests, coronary angiography provides detailed structural information to allow an assessment of prognosis and to provide direction for appropriate

---

**Table 19. Noninvasive Risk Stratification**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Level</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Low risk (less than 1% annual mortality rate)</td>
<td>Mild/moderate resting LV dysfunction (LVEF = 0.35 to 0.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermediate-risk treadmill score (–11 to 5)</td>
<td>Moderate resting LV dysfunction (LVEF = 0.35 to 0.49)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low-risk treadmill score (score 5 or greater)</td>
<td>Normal or small myocardial perfusion defect at rest or with stress*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Although the published data are limited, patients with these findings will probably not be at low risk in the presence of either a high-risk treadmill score or severe resting LV dysfunction (LVEF less than 0.35). Reproduced from Table 23 in Gibbons RJ, Abrams J, Chatterjee K, et al. ACC/AHA 2002 guideline update for the management of patients with chronic stable angina: a report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines (Committee to Update the 1999 Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Chronic Stable Angina). 2002. Available at: www.acc.org/qualityandscience/clinical/statements.htm.

**Table 20. Noninvasive Test Results That Predict High Risk for Adverse Outcome (Left Ventricular Imaging)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Method</th>
<th>Criterion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stress Radionuclide Ventriculography</td>
<td>Exercise EF 0.50 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rest EF 0.35 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Rest EF 0.35 or less</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Wall-motion score index greater than 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fall in EF 0.10 or greater</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The acute phase of UA/NSTEMI is usually over within 2 months. The risk of progression to MI or death is highest during that period. At 1 to 3 months after the acute phase, most patients resume a clinical course similar to that in patients with chronic stable coronary disease.

The broad goals during the hospital discharge phase are 2-fold: 1) to prepare the patient for normal activities to the extent possible and 2) to use the acute event as an opportunity to reevaluate the plan of care, particularly lifestyle and risk factor modification. Aggressive risk factor modifications that can prolong survival should be the main goals of long-term management of stable CAD. Patients who have undergone successful PCI with an uncomplicated course are usually discharged the next day, and patients who undergo uncomplicated CABG are generally discharged 4 to 7 days after CABG. Medical management of low-risk patients after noninvasive stress testing and coronary angiography can typically be accomplished rapidly, with discharge soon after testing. Medical management of a high-risk group of patients who are unsuitable for or unwilling to undergo revascularization could require vigilant inpatient monitoring in order to achieve adequate ischemic symptom control with medical therapy that will minimize future morbidity and mortality and improve quality of life.

5. Late Hospital Care, Hospital Discharge, and Post-Hospital Discharge Care

The acute phase of UA/NSTEMI is usually over within 2 months. The risk of progression to MI or the development of recurrent MI or death is highest during that period. At 1 to 3 months after the acute phase, most patients resume a clinical course similar to that in patients with chronic stable coronary disease.

The broad goals during the hospital discharge phase are 2-fold: 1) to prepare the patient for normal activities to the extent possible and 2) to use the acute event as an opportunity to reevaluate the plan of care, particularly lifestyle and risk factor modification. Aggressive risk factor modifications that can prolong survival should be the main goals of long-term management of stable CAD. Patients who have undergone successful PCI with an uncomplicated course are usually discharged the next day, and patients who undergo uncomplicated CABG are generally discharged 4 to 7 days after CABG. Medical management of low-risk patients after noninvasive stress testing and coronary angiography can typically be accomplished rapidly, with discharge soon after testing. Medical management of a high-risk group of patients who are unsuitable for or unwilling to undergo revascularization could require vigilant inpatient monitoring in order to achieve adequate ischemic symptom control with medical therapy that will minimize future morbidity and mortality and improve quality of life.

5.1. Medical Regimen and Use of Medications

**Recommendations**

**Class I**

1. Medications required in the hospital to control ischemia should be continued after hospital discharge in patients with UA/NSTEMI who do not undergo coronary revascularization, patients with unsuccessful revascularization, and patients with recurrent symptoms after revascularization. Upward or downward titration of the doses may be required. *(Level of Evidence: C)*

2. All post-UA/NSTEMI patients should be given sublingual or spray NTG and instructed in its use. *(Level of Evidence: C)*

3. Before hospital discharge, patients with UA/NSTEMI should be informed about symptoms of worsening myocardial ischemia and MI and should be instructed in how and when to seek emergency care and assistance if such symptoms occur. *(Level of Evidence: C)*

4. Before hospital discharge, post-UA/NSTEMI patients and/or designated responsible caregivers should be provided with portable, easily understood, and culturally sensitive instructions with respect to medication type, purpose, dose, frequency, and pertinent side effects. *(Level of Evidence: C)*

5. In post-UA/NSTEMI patients, anginal discomfort lasting more than 2 or 3 minutes should prompt the patient to discontinue physical activity or remove himself or herself from any stressful event. If pain does not subside immediately, the patient should be instructed to take 1 dose of NTG sublingually. If the chest discomfort/pain is unimproved or worsening 5 minutes after 1 NTG dose has been taken, it is recommended that the patient or a family member/friend call 9-1-1 immediately to access EMS. While activating EMS access, additional NTG (at 5-min intervals 2 times) may be taken while lying down or sitting. *(Level of Evidence: C)*
Table A. Revascularization to Improve Survival Compared With Medical Therapy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anatomic Setting</th>
<th>COR</th>
<th>LOE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>UPLM or complex CAD</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABG and PCI</td>
<td>I—Heart Team approach recommended</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABG and PCI</td>
<td>IIa—Calculation of STS and SYNTAX scores</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>UPLM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABG</td>
<td>IIa—For SIHD when both of the following are present:</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Anatomic conditions associated with a low risk of PCI procedural complications and a high likelihood of good long-term outcome (eg, a low SYNTAX score of &lt;22, ostial or trunk left main CAD)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clinical characteristics that predict a significantly increased risk of adverse surgical outcomes (eg, STS-predicted risk of operative mortality &gt;5%)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI</td>
<td>IIa—For SIHD when both of the following are present:</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Anatomic conditions associated with a low to intermediate risk of PCI procedural complications and an intermediate to high likelihood of good long-term outcome (eg, low-intermediate SYNTAX score of &lt;33, bifurcation left main CAD)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Clinical characteristics that predict an increased risk of adverse surgical outcomes (eg, moderate-severe COPD, disability from prior stroke, or prior cardiac surgery; STS-predicted risk of operative mortality &gt;2%)</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>III: Harm—For SIHD in patients (versus performing CABG) with unfavorable anatomy for PCI and who are good candidates for CABG</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>3-vessel disease with or without proximal LAD artery disease</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABG</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IIa—It is reasonable to choose CABG over PCI in patients with complex 3-vessel CAD (eg, SYNTAX score &gt;22) who are good candidates for CABG.</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI</td>
<td>IIb—Of uncertain benefit</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-vessel disease with proximal LAD artery disease</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABG</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IIb—Of uncertain benefit</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>2-vessel disease without proximal LAD artery disease</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABG</td>
<td>IIa—With extensive ischemia</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IIb—Of uncertain benefit without extensive ischemia</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI</td>
<td>IIb—Of uncertain benefit</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-vessel proximal LAD artery disease</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABG</td>
<td>IIa—With LIMA for long-term benefit</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IIb—Of uncertain benefit</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI</td>
<td>III: Harm</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1-vessel disease without proximal LAD artery involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABG</td>
<td>III: Harm</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>IIa—EF 35% to 50%</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABG</td>
<td>IIb—EF&lt;35% without significant left main CAD</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI</td>
<td>Insufficient data</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Survivors of sudden cardiac death with presumed ischemia-mediated VT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABG</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI</td>
<td>I</td>
<td>C</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>No anatomic or physiologic criteria for revascularization</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABG</td>
<td>III: Harm</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI</td>
<td>III: Harm</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*In patients with multivessel disease who also have diabetes, it is reasonable to choose CABG (with LIMA) over PCI (Class of recommendation IIa; Level of evidence: B). CABG indicates coronary artery bypass graft; CAD, coronary artery disease; COPD, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; COR, class of recommendation; EF, ejection fraction; LAD, left anterior descending; LIMA, left internal mammary artery; LOE, level of evidence; LV, left ventricular; N/A, not applicable; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention; SIHD, stable ischemic heart disease; STEMI, ST-elevation myocardial infarction; STS, Society of Thoracic Surgeons; SYNTAX, Synergy between Percutaneous Coronary Intervention with TAXUS and Cardiac Surgery; TIMI, Thrombolysis In Myocardial Infarction; UA/NSTEMI, unstable angina/non-ST-elevation myocardial infarction; UPLM, unprotected left main disease; and VT, ventricular tachycardia.
The health care team should establish a follow-up system in which personnel specially trained to support and assist clinicians in CAD management call patients on the telephone. For example, calls might occur weekly for the first 4 weeks after discharge. This structured program can gauge the progress of the patient's recovery, reinforce the CAD education taught in the hospital, address patient questions and concerns, and monitor progress in meeting risk factor modification goals.

5.2. Long-Term Medical Therapy and Secondary Prevention

For the non-updated subsections on long-term medical therapy and secondary prevention, please refer to the more contemporary 2011 Secondary Prevention Guideline721 or the 2012 Stable Ischemic Heart Disease Guideline.722 Patients with UA/NSTEMI require secondary prevention for CAD at discharge. The management of the patient with stable CAD is of relevance, as detailed in the ACC/AHA/ACP Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Chronic Stable Angina,11 as are the secondary prevention guidelines9 outlined in the more recent ACC/AHA Guidelines for the Management of Patients With ST-Elevation MI and Secondary Prevention.10,45

A health care team with expertise in aggressively managing CAD risk factors should work with patients and their families to educate them in detail regarding specific targets for LDL-C and high-density lipoprotein cholesterol (HDL-C), blood pressure, body mass index (BMI), physical activity, and other appropriate lifestyle modifications.51 These health care teams can be hospital-, office-, or community-based and may include chronic disease management or cardiac rehabilitation/secondary prevention programs. The family should be instructed on how best to further support the patient by encouraging reasonable changes in risk behavior (eg, cooking AHA, Mediterranean, or DASH [Dietary Approach to Stop Hypertension] diet meals for the entire family; exercising together). This is particularly important when screening of family members reveals common risk factors, such as dyslipidemia, hypertension, secondhand smoke, and obesity. Of recent concern is the national trend to obesity, which has increased over the past decade in all 50 states,
and its risk consequences. The combination of evidence-based therapies provides complementary, added morbidity and mortality reduction, prescription of and compliance with these combination therapies should be stressed.

5.2.1. Convalescent and Long-Term Antiplatelet Therapy (UPDATED)

Class I

1. For UA/NSTEMI patients treated medically without stenting, aspirin# should be prescribed indefinitely (Level of Evidence: A). Clodipogrel (75 mg per day) or ticagrelor‡ (90 mg twice daily) should be prescribed for up to 12 months. (Level of Evidence: B)268,384,459
2. For UA/NSTEMI patients treated with a stent (BMS or DES), aspirin should be continued indefinitely. (Level of Evidence: A) The duration and maintenance dose of P2Y12 receptor inhibitor therapy should be as follows: a. Clodipogrel 75 mg daily,48,280 prasugrel† 10 mg daily, or ticagrelor‡ 90 mg twice daily should be given for at least 12 months in patients receiving DES and up to 12 months for patients receiving BMS. (Level of Evidence: B)249,381,382 b. If the risk of morbidity because of bleeding outweighs the anticipated benefits afforded by P2Y12 receptor inhibitor therapy, earlier discontinuation should be considered. (Level of Evidence: C)
3. Clopidogrel 75 mg daily (Level of Evidence: B).249,378 Prasugrel† 10 mg daily (in PCI-treated patients) (Level of Evidence: C).280 or ticagrelor‡ 90 mg twice daily (Level of Evidence: C)48 should be given to patients recovering from UA/NSTEMI when aspirin is contraindicated or not tolerated because of hypersensitivity or GI intolerance (despite use of gastroprotective agents such as PPIs).378,478

#For aspirin-allergic patients, use either clopidogrel or ticagrelor alone (individually) or try aspirin desensitization. Note that there are no data for therapy with 2 concurrent P2Y12 receptor inhibitors, and this is not recommended in the case of aspirin allergy.

‡The recommended maintenance dose of aspirin to be used with ticagrelor is 81 mg daily. Ticagrelor’s benefits were observed irrespective of prior therapy with clopidogrel. When possible, discontinue ticagrelor at least 5 d before any surgery. Issues of patient compliance may be especially important. Consideration should be given to the potential and as yet undetermined risk of intracranial hemorrhage in patients with prior stroke or TIA.

†Patients weighing <60 kg have an increased exposure to the active metabolite of prasugrel and an increased risk of bleeding on a 10-mg once-daily maintenance dose. Consideration should be given to lowering the maintenance dose to 5 mg in patients who weigh <60 kg, although the effectiveness and safety of the 5-mg dose have not been studied prospectively. For post-PCI patients, a daily maintenance dose should be given for at least 12 months for patients receiving DES and up to 12 months for patients receiving BMS unless the risk of bleeding outweighs the anticipated net benefit afforded by a P2Y12 receptor inhibitor. Do not use prasugrel in patients with active pathological bleeding or a history of TIA or stroke. In patients age 75 years, prasugrel is generally not recommended because of the increased risk of fatal and intracranial bleeding and uncertain benefit except in high-risk situations (patients with diabetes or a history of prior myocardial infarction), in which its effect appears to be greater and its use may be considered. Do not start prasugrel in patients likely to undergo urgent CABG. When possible, discontinue prasugrel at least 7 days before any surgery. Additional risk factors for bleeding include body weight <60 kg, propensity to bleed, and concomitant use of medications that increase the risk of bleeding (eg, warfarin, heparin, fibrinolytic therapy, or chronic use of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).378

Class IIa

1. After PCI, it is reasonable to use 81 mg per day of aspirin in preference to higher maintenance doses. (Level of Evidence: B)389,416,470,724,727

Class IIb

1. For UA/NSTEMI patients who have an indication for anticoagulation, the addition of warfarin** may be reasonable to maintain an INR of 2.0 to 3.0.†† (Level of Evidence: B)728–737
2. Continuation of a P2Y12 receptor inhibitor beyond 12 months may be considered in patients following DES placement. (Level of Evidence: C)

Class III: No Benefit

1. Dipyridamole is not recommended as an antiplatelet agent in post-UA/NSTEMI patients because it has not been shown to be effective. (Level of Evidence: B)416,738,739

5.2.2. Beta Blockers

Class I

1. Beta blockers are indicated for all patients recovering from UA/NSTEMI unless contraindicated. (For those at low risk, see Class IIa recommendation below). Treatment should begin within a few days of the event, if not initiated acutely, and should be continued indefinitely. (Level of Evidence: B)
2. Patients recovering from UA/NSTEMI with moderate or severe LV failure should receive beta-blocker therapy with a gradual titration scheme. (Level of Evidence: B)

Class IIa

1. It is reasonable to prescribe beta blockers to low-risk patients (ie, normal LV function, revascularized, no high-risk features) recovering from UA/NSTEMI in the absence of absolute contraindications. (Level of Evidence: B)

5.2.3. Inhibition of the Renin-Angiotensin-Aldosterone System

Class I

1. Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors should be given and continued indefinitely for patients recovering from UA/NSTEMI with HF, LV dysfunction (LVEF less than 0.40), hypertension, or diabetes mellitus, unless contraindicated. (Level of Evidence: A)
2. An angiotensin receptor blocker should be prescribed at discharge to those UA/NSTEMI patients who are intolerant of an ACE inhibitor and who have either

**Continue aspirin indefinitely and warfarin longer term as indicated for specific conditions such as atrial fibrillation; LV thrombus; or cerebral, venous, or pulmonary emboli.

††An INR of 2.0 to 2.5 is preferable while given with aspirin and a P2Y12 receptor inhibitor, especially in older patients and those with other risk factors for bleeding. For UA/NSTEMI patients who have mechanical heart valves, the INR should be at least 2.5 (based on type of prosthesis).
clinical or radiological signs of HF and LVEF less than 0.40. (Level of Evidence: A)

3. Long-term aldosterone receptor blockade should be prescribed for UA/NSTEMI patients without significant renal dysfunction (estimated creatinine clearance should be greater than 30 mL per min) or hyperkalemia (potassium should be less than or equal to 4 mEq per liter) who are already receiving therapeutic doses of an ACE inhibitor, have an LVEF less than or equal to 0.40, and have either symptomatic HF or diabetes mellitus. (Level of Evidence: A)

Class IIa

1. Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors are reasonable for patients recovering from UA/NSTEMI in the absence of LV dysfunction, hypertension, or diabetes mellitus unless contraindicated. (Level of Evidence: A)

2. Angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitors are reasonable for patients with HF and LVEF greater than 0.40. (Level of Evidence: A)

3. In UA/NSTEMI patients who do not tolerate ACE inhibitors, an angiotensin receptor blocker can be useful as an alternative to ACE inhibitors in long-term management provided there are either clinical or radiological signs of HF and LVEF less than 0.40. (Level of Evidence: B)

Class IIb

1. The combination of an ACE inhibitor and an angiotensin receptor blocker may be considered in the long-term management of patients recovering from UA/NSTEMI with persistent symptomatic HF and LVEF less than 0.40 despite conventional therapy including an ACE inhibitor or an angiotensin receptor blocker alone. (Level of Evidence: B)

Data on the utility of ACE inhibitors in stable CAD in the presence of HF and LV dysfunction have been compelling, whereas data in their absence have been conflicting. A reduction in the rates of mortality and vascular events was reported in the Heart Outcomes Prevention Evaluation (HOPE) Study with the long-term use of an ACE inhibitor (ramipril) in moderate-risk patients with CAD, many of whom had preserved LV function, as well as patients at high risk of developing CAD. Similar but smaller benefits were reported in the EUROPA study (EUropean trial on Reduction

Table 22. Medications Used for Stabilized UA/NSTEMI Patients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Anti-ischemic and Antiplatelet/Antiplatelet Agents</th>
<th>Drug Action</th>
<th>Class/Level of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Aspirin</td>
<td>Antiplatelet</td>
<td>I/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clopidogrel or prasugrel (in PCI-treated patients) or ticagrelor</td>
<td>Antiplatelet</td>
<td>I/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beta blockers</td>
<td>Anti-ischemic</td>
<td>I/B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACEI</td>
<td>EF less than 0.40 or HF EF greater than 0.40</td>
<td>I/A IIa/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nitrates</td>
<td>Antianginal</td>
<td>I/C for ischemic symptoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calcium channel blockers (short-acting dihydropyridine antagonists should be avoided)</td>
<td>Antianginal</td>
<td>I for ischemic symptoms; when beta blockers are not successful (B) or contraindicated, or cause unacceptable side effects (C)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dipyridamole</td>
<td>Antiplatelet</td>
<td>III/A</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Agents for Secondary Prevention and Other Indications

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk Factor</th>
<th>Class/Level of Evidence</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>HMG-CoA reductase inhibitors</td>
<td>LDL cholesterol greater than 70 mg per dL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fibrates</td>
<td>HDL cholesterol less than 40 mg per dL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niacin</td>
<td>HDL cholesterol less than 40 mg per dL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Niacin or fibrates</td>
<td>Triglycerides 200 mg per dL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antidepressant</td>
<td>Treatment of depression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of hypertension</td>
<td>Blood pressure greater than 140/90 mm Hg or greater than 130/80 mm Hg if kidney disease or diabetes present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hormone therapy (initiation)*</td>
<td>Postmenopausal state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment of diabetes</td>
<td>HbA1c greater than 7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hormone therapy (continuation)*</td>
<td>Postmenopausal state</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COX-2 inhibitor or NSAID</td>
<td>Chronic pain</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vitamins C, E, beta-carotene, folic acid, B6, B12</td>
<td>Antioxidant effect; homocysteine lowering</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*For risk reduction of coronary artery disease.

ACEI = angiotensin-converting enzyme inhibitor; CHF = congestive heart failure; COX-2 = cyclooxygenase 2; EF = ejection fraction; HDL = high-density lipoprotein; HMG-CoA = hydroxymethyl glutaryl coenzyme A; INR = international normalized ratio; LDL = low-density lipoprotein; NSAID = nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drug; NSTEMI = non–ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction; UA = unstable angina.

‡‡The safety of this combination has not been proven in patients also receiving aldosterone antagonist and is not recommended.
Of cardiac events with Perindopril in patients with stable coronary Artery disease), which observed a significant reduction in incidence of cardiovascular death, MI, or cardiac arrest among moderate-risk patients with known coronary disease without apparent HF randomized to perindopril versus placebo.\textsuperscript{740} Conflicting results, however, were observed in the Prevention of Events with Angiotensin Converting Enzyme Inhibition (PEACE) trial, which found no significant difference in the risk of cardiovascular death, MI, or coronary revascularization among low-risk patients with stable CAD and preserved LV function when an ACE inhibitor (trandolapril) was added to modern conventional therapy\textsuperscript{741}; however, a subsequent meta-analysis of these 3 major trials supported benefit across the risk spectrum studied.\textsuperscript{742} These and other data may be harmonized by postulating that ACE inhibitors provide general benefit in stable CAD but that the absolute benefit is proportional to disease-related risk, with those at lowest risk benefiting least.\textsuperscript{742,743} These and other agents that provide general benefit in stable CAD but that the absolute benefit can be harmonized by postulating that ACE inhibitors provide general benefit in stable CAD but that the absolute benefit is proportional to disease-related risk, with those at lowest risk benefiting least.\textsuperscript{742,743} These and other agents that may be used in patients with chronic CAD are listed in Table 22 and are discussed in detail in the ACC/AHA Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Chronic Stable Angina.\textsuperscript{11}

### 5.2.4. Nitroglycerin

Class I

1. Nitroglycerin to treat ischemic symptoms is recommended. (Level of Evidence: C)

### 5.2.5. Calcium Channel Blockers

Class I

1. Calcium channel blockers\textsuperscript{§§} are recommended for ischemic symptoms when beta blockers are not successful. (Level of Evidence: B)

2. Calcium channel blockers\textsuperscript{§§} are recommended for ischemic symptoms when beta blockers are contraindicated or cause unacceptable side effects. (Level of Evidence: C)

### 5.2.6. Warfarin Therapy (UPDATED)

Class I

1. Use of warfarin in conjunction with aspirin and/or P2Y\textsubscript{12} receptor inhibitor therapy is associated with an increased risk of bleeding, and patients and clinicians should watch for bleeding, especially GI, and seek medical evaluation for evidence of bleeding. (Level of Evidence: A)\textsuperscript{249,250,280,301,409,500–503,585,744}

Class IIb

1. Warfarin either without (INR 2.5 to 3.5) or with low-dose aspirin (81 mg per day; INR 2.0 to 2.5) may be reasonable for patients at high coronary artery disease risk and low bleeding risk who do not require or are intolerant of P2Y\textsubscript{12} receptor inhibitor therapy. (Level of Evidence: B)\textsuperscript{745,746}

2. Targeting oral anticoagulant therapy to a lower INR (eg, 2.0 to 2.5) might be reasonable in patients with UA/NSTEMI managed with aspirin and a P2Y\textsubscript{12} inhibitor. (Level of Evidence: C)

### 5.2.7. Lipid Management

#### Class I

1. The following lipid recommendations are beneficial:
   a. Lipid management should include assessment of a fasting lipid profile for all patients, within 24 h of hospitalization. (Level of Evidence: C)
   b. Hydroxymethyl glutaryl-coenzyme A reductase inhibitors (statins), in the absence of contraindications, regardless of baseline LDL-C and diet modification, should be given to post-UA/NSTEMI patients, including postrevascularization patients. (Level of Evidence: A)
   c. For hospitalized patients, lipid-lowering medications should be initiated before discharge. (Level of Evidence: A)
   d. For UA/NSTEMI patients with elevated LDL-C (greater than or equal to 100 mg per dL), cholesterol-lowering therapy should be initiated or intensified to achieve an LDL-C of less than 100 mg per dL. (Level of Evidence: A) Further titration to less than 70 mg per dL is reasonable. (Class IIa, Level of Evidence: A)
   e. Therapeutic options to reduce non–HDL-C are recommended, including more intense LDL-C–lowering therapy. (Level of Evidence: B)
   f. Dietary therapy for all patients should include reduced intake of saturated fats (to less than 7% of total calories), cholesterol (to less than 200 mg per dL), and trans fat (to less than 1% of energy). (Level of Evidence: B)
   g. Promoting daily physical activity and weight management are recommended. (Level of Evidence: B)

2. Treatment of triglycerides and non–HDL-C is useful, including the following:
   a. If triglycerides are 200 to 499 mg per dL, non–HDL-C should be less than 130 mg per dL. (Level of Evidence: B)
   b. If triglycerides are greater than or equal to 500 mg per dL,\textsuperscript{¶¶} therapeutic options to prevent pancreatitis are fibrate\textsuperscript{##} or niacin\textsuperscript{##} before LDL-lowering therapy is recommended. It is also recommended that LDL-C be treated to goal after triglyceride-lowering therapy. Achievement of a non–HDL-C target less than 130 mg per dL (ie, 30 mg per dL greater than LDL-C target) if possible is recommended. (Level of Evidence: C)

---

\textsuperscript{11}Non–HDL-C = total cholesterol minus HDL-C.
\textsuperscript{§§}Short-acting dihydropyridine calcium channel antagonists should be avoided.
\textsuperscript{¶¶}Patients with very high triglycerides should not consume alcohol.
\textsuperscript{##}Use of bile acid sequestrants is relatively contraindicated when triglycerides are greater than 200 mg per dL.
\textsuperscript{##}The combination of high-dose statin plus fibrate can increase risk for severe myopathy. Statin doses should be kept relatively low with this combination. Dietary supplement niacin must not be used as a substitute for prescription niacin.
Moreover, recent trials have provided mounting evidence that cholesterol-lowering therapy for patients with CAD and hypercholesterolemia or with mild cholesterol elevation (mean 209 to 218 mg per dL) after MI and UA reduces vascular events and death. 748,749 The use of bile acid sequestrants is relatively contraindicated when triglycerides are greater than 200 mg per dL. Compared with placebo, the aggressive, high-dose atorvastatin group showed a 16% reduction in the HR for the primary composite end point of all-cause cardiovascular death, MI, UA requiring rehospitalization, revascularization (performed at least 30 d after randomization), and stroke was observed in favor of the high-dose regimen. The second trial, phase Z of the A to Z Trial compared early initiation of an intensive statin regimen (simvastatin 40 mg per d for 1 month followed by 80 mg per d thereafter) with a delayed initiation of a less-intensive regimen (placebo for 4 months followed by simvastatin 20 mg per d) in patients with ACS. No difference was observed between the groups during the first 4 months of follow-up for the primary end point (composite of cardiovascular death, nonfatal MI, readmission for ACS, and stroke). However, from 4 months through the end of the study, the primary end point was significantly reduced in the aggressive treatment arm, which represented a favorable trend toward a reduction of major cardiovascular events with the early, aggressive statin regimen. The incidence of myopathy

1. The following lipid management strategies can be beneficial:
   a. Further reduction of LDL-C to less than 70 mg per dL is reasonable. (Level of Evidence: A)
   b. If baseline LDL cholesterol is 70 to 100 mg per dL, it is reasonable to treat LDL-C to less than 70 mg per dL. (Level of Evidence: B)
   c. Further reduction of non–HDL-C to less than 100 mg per dL is reasonable; if triglycerides are 200 to 499 mg per dL, non–HDL-C target is less than 130 mg per dL. (Level of Evidence: B)
   d. Therapeutic options to reduce non–HDL-C (after LDL-C lowering) include niacin## or fibrate¶¶ therapy.
   e. Nicotinic acid (niacin)## and fibric acid derivatives (fenofibrate, gemfibrozil)¶¶ can be useful as therapeutic options (after LDL-C-lowering therapy) for HDL-C less than 40 mg per dL. (Level of Evidence: B)
   f. Nicotinic acid (niacin)## and fibric acid derivatives (fenofibrate, gemfibrozil)¶¶ can be useful as therapeutic options (after LDL-C-lowering therapy) for triglycerides greater than 200 mg per dL. (Level of Evidence: B)
   g. The addition of plant stanol/sterols (2 g per d) and viscous fiber (more than 10 g per d) is reasonable to further lower LDL-C. (Level of Evidence: A)

2. Encouraging consumption of omega-3 fatty acids in the form of fish*** or in capsule form (1 g per d) for risk reduction may be reasonable. For treatment of elevated triglycerides, higher doses (2 to 4 g per d) may be used for risk reduction. (Level of Evidence: B)

There is a wealth of evidence that cholesterol-lowering therapy for patients with CAD and hypercholesterolemia or with mild cholesterol elevation (mean 209 to 218 mg per dL) after MI and UA reduces vascular events and death. Moreover, recent trials have provided mounting evidence that statin therapy is beneficial regardless of whether the baseline LDL-C level is elevated. More aggressive therapy has resulted in suppression or reversal of coronary atherosclerosis progression and lower cardiovascular event rates, although the impact on total mortality remains to be clearly established. These data are discussed more fully elsewhere.

For patients with CHD or CHD equivalents (i.e., atherosclerosis in other vascular territories, diabetes mellitus, or 10-year estimated cardiovascular risk greater than 20%), the NCEP Adult Treatment Panel III recommended a target LDL-C level less than 100 mg per dL. Therapeutic lifestyle changes are recommended as well. Therapeutic lifestyle changes include diet, weight management, and increased physical activity. Specific diet recommendations include restriction of calories from saturated fat to less than 7% of total caloric intake and of cholesterol to less than 200 mg per d. Additionally, increased soluble fiber (10 to 25 g per d) and plant stanol/sterols (2 g per d) are noted as therapeutic lifestyle change dietary options to enhance LDL-C lowering. Reduction in trans fat (to less than 1% of caloric intake) subsequently has been added to prevention guidelines. These guidelines also recommend consideration of drug therapy if LDL-C is above goal range, either simultaneously with therapeutic lifestyle changes or sequentially, after 3 months of therapeutic lifestyle changes.

An update to the Adult Treatment Panel III guidelines was published in mid 2004. The major change recommended in this update is an LDL-C treatment goal of less than 70 mg per dL as a reasonable option in very-high-risk patients (such as after UA/NSTEMI). Furthermore, if a high-risk patient has high triglycerides (greater than 200 mg per dL) or low HDL-C (less than 40 mg per dL), consideration can be given to combining a fibrate or nicotinic acid with an LDL-lowering drug. For moderately high-risk patients (2 or more risk factors and 10-year risk of 10% to 20%), the recommended LDL-C goal is less than 130 mg per dL, but an LDL-C goal of less than 100 mg per dL is a reasonable option. When drug therapy is utilized in moderate- to high-risk patients, it is advised that the intensity of the treatment be sufficient to achieve a reduction in LDL-C levels of at least 30% to 40%. Therapeutic lifestyle changes to modify existing lifestyle-based risk factors are strongly urged regardless of LDL-C levels.

Two trials further support early intensive lipid lowering after ACS. In the PROVE-IT TIMI 22 study (PRavastatin Or atorVastatin Evaluation and Infection Therapy-Thrombolysis In Myocardial Infarction 22), 4162 patients within 10 d of ACS were randomized to 40 mg of pravastatin or 80 mg of atorvastatin daily. The median LDL-C achieved in the moderately intensive (standard-dose) pravastatin group was 95 mg per dL compared with a median of 62 mg per dL in the aggressive, high-dose atorvastatin group. A 16% reduction in the HR for the primary composite end point of all-cause death, MI, UA requiring rehospitalization, revascularization (performed at least 30 d after randomization), and stroke was observed in favor of the high-dose regimen. The second trial, phase Z of the A to Z Trial compared early initiation of an intensive statin regimen (simvastatin 40 mg per d for 1 month followed by 80 mg per d thereafter) with a delayed initiation of a less-intensive regimen (placebo for 4 months followed by simvastatin 20 mg per d) in patients with ACS. No difference was observed between the groups during the first 4 months of follow-up for the primary end point (composite of cardiovascular death, nonfatal MI, readmission for ACS, and stroke). However, from 4 months through the end of the study, the primary end point was significantly reduced in the aggressive treatment arm, which represented a favorable trend toward a reduction of major cardiovascular events with the early, aggressive statin regimen. The incidence of myopathy

---

1Non–HDL-C = total cholesterol minus HDL-C.
2The combination of high-dose statin plus fibrate can increase risk for severe myopathy. Statin doses should be kept relatively low with this combination. Dietary supplement niacin must not be used as a substitute for prescription niacin.
3Patients with very high triglycerides should not consume alcohol. The use of bile acid sequestrants is relatively contraindicated when triglycerides are greater than 200 mg per dL.
4Pregnant and lactating women should limit their intake of fish to minimize exposure to methylmercury.
Observational studies have generally supported initiation of lipid-lowering therapy before discharge after ACS both for safety and for early efficacy (event reduction). In contrast, a meta-analysis of randomized trials of early (less than 14 d) initiation of lipid lowering after ACS, although supporting its safety, suggests that efficacy is generally delayed beyond 4 months.

Short- and long-term compliance is a clear benefit of in-hospital initiation of lipid lowering. In a demonstration project, the Cardiovascular Hospitalization Atherosclerosis Management Program, the in-hospital initiation of lipid-lowering therapy increased the percentage of patients treated with statins 1 year later from 10% to 91%, and for those with an LDL-C less than 100 mg per dL, the percentage increased from 6% to 58%, which suggests that predischARGE initiation of lipid-lowering therapy enhances long-term compliance. Thus, there appear to be no adverse effects and substantial advantages to the initiation of lipid-lowering therapy before hospital discharge. Such early initiation of therapy also has been recommended in the update of the third report of the NCEP. Adherence to statin therapy also has been shown to be associated with improved survival in a large, population-based longitudinal observational study.

5.2.8. Blood Pressure Control

Class I

1. Blood pressure control according to JNC 7 guidelines is recommended (ie, blood pressure less than 140/90 mm Hg or less than 130/80 mm Hg if the patient has diabetes mellitus or chronic kidney disease). (Level of Evidence: A)

Additional measures recommended to treat and control blood pressure include the following:

a. Patients should initiate and/or maintain lifestyle modifications, including weight control, increased physical activity, alcohol moderation, sodium reduction, and emphasis on increased consumption of fresh fruits, vegetables, and low-fat dairy products. (Level of Evidence: B)

b. For patients with blood pressure greater than or equal to 140/90 mm Hg (or greater than or equal to 130/80 mm Hg for individuals with chronic kidney disease or diabetes mellitus), it is useful to add blood pressure medication as tolerated, treating initially with beta blockers and/or ACE inhibitors, with addition of other drugs such as thiazides as needed to achieve target blood pressure. (Level of Evidence: A)

All patients with elevated systolic or diastolic blood pressures should be educated and motivated to achieve targeted hypertensive control according to JNC 7 guidelines adapted to patients with ischemic heart disease.

5.2.9. Diabetes Mellitus

Class I

1. Diabetes management should include lifestyle and pharmacotherapy measures to achieve a near-normal HbA1c level of less than 7%. (Level of Evidence: B)

Diabetes management should also include the following:

a. Vigorous modification of other risk factors (eg, physical activity, weight management, blood pressure control, and cholesterol management) as recommended should be initiated and maintained. (Level of Evidence: B)

b. It is useful to coordinate the patient’s diabetic care with the patient’s primary care physician or endocrinologist. (Level of Evidence: C)

Glycemic control during and after ACS is discussed in Section 6.2.1.

Overweight patients should be instructed in a weight loss regimen, with emphasis on the importance of regular exercise and a lifelong prudent diet to maintain ideal body mass index. Patients should be informed and encouraged that even small reductions in weight can have positive benefits. This can be reassuring to severely obese patients. In the Diabetes Prevention Program study, 3234 overweight subjects with elevated fasting and postload plasma glucose concentrations were randomized to treatment with metformin or a lifestyle modification program. The goals of the lifestyle modification program were targeted to at least a 7% weight loss and at least 150 min of physical activity per week. The incidence of diabetes mellitus was reduced by 58% in the lifestyle modification group and 31% in the metformin group compared with placebo. The study supports the substantial positive effects of even modest changes in weight and physical activity on the development of diabetes, a major risk factor for cardiovascular events.

5.2.10. Smoking Cessation

Class I

1. Smoking cessation and avoidance of exposure to environmental tobacco smoke at work and home are recommended. Follow-up, referral to special programs, or pharmacotherapy (including nicotine replacement) is useful, as is adopting a stepwise strategy aimed at smoking cessation (the 5 A’s are: Ask, Advise, Assess, Assist, and Arrange). (Level of Evidence: B)

For patients who smoke, persistent smoking cessation counseling is often successful and has substantial potential to improve survival. Daly et al quantified the long-term effects of smoking on patients with ACS. Men less than 60 years old who continued to smoke had a risk of death due to all causes that was 5.4 times that of men who stopped smoking (P less than 0.05). Referral to a smoking cessation program and the use of pharmacological agents including nicotine patches or gum are recommended.
Bupropion, an anxiolytic agent and weak inhibitor of neuronal uptake of neurotransmitters, has been effective when added to brief regular counseling sessions in helping patients to quit smoking. The treatment of 615 study subjects for 7 weeks resulted in smoking cessation rates of 28.8% for the 100 mg per d dosage and 44.2% for 300 mg per d compared with 19.6% for placebo-assigned patients (P less than 0.001). The abstinence rate at 1 year was 23.0% for those treated with bupropion 300 mg per d versus 12.4% for those receiving placebo.

Recently, another nonnicotine replacement therapy, varenicline, was approved to assist in smoking cessation. Varenicline is a first-in-class nicotine acetylcholine receptor partial agonist, designed to provide some nicotine effects (easing withdrawal symptoms) and to block the effects of nicotine from cigarettes, discouraging smoking. Approval was based on demonstrated effectiveness in 6 clinical trials involving a total of 3659 chronic cigarette smokers. In 2 of the 5 placebo-controlled trials, varenicline also was compared to bupropion and found to be more effective. Varenicline is given for an initial 12-week course. Successfully treated patients may continue treatment for an additional 12 weeks to improve the chances of long-term abstinence. Family members who live in the same household should also be encouraged to quit smoking to help reinforce the patient's effort and to decrease the risk of secondhand smoke for everyone.

5.2.11. Weight Management

Class I

1. Weight management, as measured by body mass index and/or waist circumference, should be assessed on each visit. A body mass index of 18.5 to 24.9 kg per m2 and a waist circumference (measured horizontally at the iliac crest) of less than 40 inches for men and less than 35 inches for women is recommended. (Level of Evidence: B) Additional weight management practices recommended include the following:
   a. On each patient visit, it is useful to consistently encourage weight maintenance/reduction through an appropriate balance of physical activity, caloric intake, and formal behavioral programs when indicated to maintain/achieve a body mass index between 18.5 and 24.9 kg per m2. (Level of Evidence: B)
   b. If waist circumference is 35 inches or more in women or 40 inches or more in men, it is beneficial to initiate lifestyle changes and consider treatment strategies for metabolic syndrome as indicated. (Level of Evidence: B)
   c. The initial goal of weight loss therapy should be to reduce body weight by approximately 10% from baseline. With success, further weight loss can be attempted if indicated through further assessment. (Level of Evidence: B)

5.2.12. Physical Activity

Class I

1. The patient’s risk after UA/NSTEMI should be assessed on the basis of an in-hospital determination of risk. A physical activity history or an exercise test to guide initial prescription is beneficial. (Level of Evidence: B)

2. Guided/modified by an individualized exercise prescription, patients recovering from UA/NSTEMI generally should be encouraged to achieve physical activity duration of 30 to 60 min per d, preferably 7 (but at least 5) d per week of moderate aerobic activity, such as brisk walking, supplemented by an increase in daily lifestyle activities (eg, walking breaks at work, gardening, and household work). (Level of Evidence: B)

3. Cardiac rehabilitation/secondary prevention programs are recommended for patients with UA/NSTEMI, particularly those with multiple modifiable risk factors and/or those moderate- to high-risk patients in whom supervised exercise training is particularly warranted. (Level of Evidence: B)

Class IIb

1. The expansion of physical activity to include resistance training on 2 d per week may be reasonable. (Level of Evidence: C)

Federal and ACC/AHA guidelines recommend that all Americans strive for at least 30 to 60 min of moderate physical activity most days of the week, preferably daily. The 30 to 60 min can be spread out over 2 or 3 segments during the day. For post-UA/NSTEMI patients, daily walking can be encouraged immediately after discharge. Excellent resource publications on exercise prescription in cardiovascular patients are available. Physical activity is important in efforts to lose weight because it increases energy expenditure and plays an integral role in weight maintenance. Regular physical activity reduces symptoms in patients with CVD, improves functional capacity, and improves other cardiovascular risk factors such as insulin resistance and glucose intolerance. Beyond the instructions for daily exercise, patients require specific instruction on those strenuous activities (eg, heavy lifting, climbing stairs, yard work, and household activities) that are permissible and those they should avoid. Several activity questionnaires or nomograms, specific to the cardiac population and general population, have been developed to help guide the patient’s exercise prescription if an exercise test is not available. As emphasized by the US Public Health Service, comprehensive cardiac rehabilitation services include long-term programs involving medical evaluation, prescribed exercise, cardiac risk factor modification, education, and counseling. These programs are designed to limit the physiological and psychological effects of cardiac illness, reduce the risk for sudden death or reinfarction, control cardiac symptoms, and enhance the psychosocial and vocational status of selected patients. Enrollment in a cardiac rehabilitation program after discharge can enhance patient education and compliance with the medical regimen and assist with the implementation of a regular exercise program. In addition to aerobic training, mild- to moderate-resistance training may be considered. This can be started 2 to 4 weeks after aerobic training has begun. Expanded physical activity is an important treatment component for the metabolic syndrome, which is becoming increasingly prevalent.

Exercise training can generally begin within 1 to 2 weeks after UA/NSTEMI treated with PCI or CABG to relieve ischemia. Unsupervised exercise may target a heart rate range of 60% to 75% of maximum predicted; supervised
training (see Section 5.4) may target a somewhat higher heart rate (70% to 85% of maximum predicted). Additional restrictions apply when residual ischemia is present.

5.2.13. Patient Education

Class I

1. Beyond the detailed instructions for daily exercise, patients should be given specific instruction on activities (eg, heavy lifting, climbing stairs, yard work, and household activities) that are permissible and those that should be avoided. Specific mention should be made regarding resumption of driving, return to work, and sexual activity. (Level of Evidence: C) Specific recommendations for physical activity follow in Section 5.4.

Patients should be educated and motivated to achieve appropriate target LDL-C and HDL-C goals. Patients who have undergone PCI or CABG derive benefit from cholesterol lowering and deserve special counseling lest they mistakenly believe that revascularization obviates the need for significant lifestyle changes. The NHLBI “Your Guide to Better Health” series provides useful educational tools for patients (http://hp2010.nhlbihin.net/yourguide/).

5.2.14. Influenza

Class I

1. An annual influenza vaccination is recommended for patients with cardiovascular disease. (Level of Evidence: B)

5.2.15. Depression

Class IIa

1. It is reasonable to consider screening UA/NSTEMI patients for depression and refer/treat when indicated. (Level of Evidence: B)

5.2.16. Nonsteroidal Anti-inflammatory Drugs

Class I

1. At the time of preparation for hospital discharge, the patient's need for treatment of chronic musculoskeletal discomfort should be assessed, and a stepped-care approach to treatment should be used for selection of treatments (Figure 20). Pain relief should begin with acetaminophen, small doses of narcotics, or nonacetylated salicylates. (Level of Evidence: C)

Class IIa

1. It is reasonable to use nonselective NSAIDs, such as naproxen, if initial therapy with acetaminophen, small doses of narcotics, or nonacetylated salicylates is insufficient. (Level of Evidence: C)

Class IIb

1. Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs with increasing degrees of relative COX-2 selectivity may be considered for pain relief only for situations in which intolerable discomfort persists despite attempts at stepped-care therapy with acetaminophen, small doses of narcotics, nonacetylated salicylates, or nonselective NSAIDs. In all cases, the lowest effective doses should be used for the shortest possible time. (Level of Evidence: C)

Class III

1. Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs with increasing degrees of relative COX-2 selectivity should not be administered to UA/NSTEMI patients with chronic musculoskeletal discomfort when therapy with acetaminophen, small doses of narcotics, nonacetylated salicylates, or nonselective NSAIDs provides acceptable levels of pain relief. (Level of Evidence: C)
The selective COX-2 inhibitors and other nonselective NSAIDs have been associated with increased cardiovascular risk. The risk appears to be amplified in patients with established CVD.\textsuperscript{3,366–369} In a large Danish observational study of first-time MI patients (n = 58,432), the HRs and 95% CIs for death were 2.80 (2.41 to 3.25) for rofecoxib, 2.57 (2.15 to 3.08) for celecoxib, 1.50 (1.36 to 1.67) for ibuprofen, 2.40 (2.09 to 2.80) for diclofenac, and 1.29 (1.16 to 1.43) for other NSAIDS.\textsuperscript{368} There were dose-related increases in risk of death and non–dose-dependent trends for rehospitalization for MI for all drugs.\textsuperscript{367,368} An AHA scientific statement on the use of NSAIDS concluded that the risk of cardiovascular events is proportional to COX-2 selectivity and the underlying risk in the patient.\textsuperscript{778} Nonpharmacological approaches were recommended as the first line of treatment, followed by the stepped-care approach to pharmacological therapy, as shown in Figure 20.

5.2.17. Hormone Therapy

Class III

1. Hormone therapy with estrogen plus progestin, or estrogen alone, should not be given de novo to postmenopausal women after UA/NSTEMI for secondary prevention of coronary events. \textit{(Level of Evidence: A)}

2. Postmenopausal women who are already taking estrogen plus progestin, or estrogen alone, at the time of UA/NSTEMI in general should not continue hormone therapy. However, women who are more than 1 to 2 years past the initiation of hormone therapy who wish to continue such therapy for another compelling indication should weigh the risks and benefits, recognizing the greater risk of cardiovascular events and breast cancer (combination therapy) or stroke (estrogen). Hormone therapy should not be continued while patients are on bedrest in the hospital. \textit{(Level of Evidence: B)}

Although prior observational data suggested a protective effect of hormone therapy for coronary events, a randomized trial of hormone therapy for secondary prevention of death and MI (Heart and Estrogen/progestin Replacement Study [HERS]) failed to demonstrate a beneficial effect.\textsuperscript{779} Disturbingly, there was an excess risk for death and MI (Heart and Estrogen/progestin Replacement Study [HERS]) failed to demonstrate a beneficial effect.\textsuperscript{779}

5.2.18. Antioxidant Vitamins and Folic Acid

Class III

1. Antioxidant vitamin supplements (eg, vitamins E, C, or beta carotene) should not be used for secondary prevention in UA/NSTEMI patients. \textit{(Level of Evidence: A)}

2. Folic acid, with or without B6 and B12, should not be used for secondary prevention in UA/NSTEMI patients. \textit{(Level of Evidence: A)}

Although there is an association of elevated homocysteine blood levels and CAD, a reduction in homocysteine levels with routine folate supplementation was not demonstrated to reduce the risk of CAD events in 2 trials (Norwegian Vitamin Trial [NORVIT] and HOPE) that included post-MI or high risk, stable patients.\textsuperscript{783–786} Similarly, a large clinical trials experience with antioxidant vitamins has failed to demonstrate benefit for primary or secondary prevention.\textsuperscript{45,787}

5.3. Postdischarge Follow-Up

Recommendations

Class I

1. Detailed discharge instructions for post-UA/NSTEMI patients should include education on medications, diet, exercise, and smoking cessation counseling (if appropriate), referral to a cardiac rehabilitation/secondary prevention program (when appropriate), and the scheduling of a timely follow-up appointment. Low-risk medically treated patients and revascularized patients should return in 2 to 6 weeks, and higher risk patients should return within 14 d. \textit{(Level of Evidence: C)}

2. Patients with UA/NSTEMI managed initially with a conservative strategy who experience recurrent signs or symptoms of UA or severe (Canadian Cardiovascular Society class III) chronic stable angina despite medical management who are suitable for revascularization should undergo timely coronary angiography. \textit{(Level of Evidence: B)}

3. Patients with UA/NSTEMI who have tolerable stable angina or no anginal symptoms at follow-up visits should be managed with long-term medical therapy for stable CAD. \textit{(Level of Evidence: B)}

4. Care should be taken to establish effective communication between the post-UA/NSTEMI patient and health care team members to enhance long-term compliance with prescribed therapies and recommended lifestyle changes. \textit{(Level of Evidence: B)}

The risk of death within 1 year can be predicted on the basis of clinical information and the ECG (see also Section 3.3). In a study of 515 survivors of hospitalization for NSTEMI, risk factors included persistent ST-segment depression, HF, advanced age, and ST-segment elevation at discharge.\textsuperscript{788} Patients with all high-risk markers present had a 14-fold greater mortality rate than did patients with all markers absent. Elevated cardiac TnT levels have also been demonstrated to provide independent prognostic information for cardiac events at 1 to 2 years. For patients with ACS in a GUSTO-IIa substudy, age, ST-segment elevation on admission, prior CABG, TnT, renal
insufficiency, and severe chronic obstructive pulmonary disease were independently associated with risk of death at 1 year.\textsuperscript{789,790} For UA/NSTEMI patients, prior MI, ToT positivity, accelerated angina before admission, and recurrent pain or ECG changes were independently associated with risk of death at 2 years. Patients managed with an initial conservative strategy (see Section 3) should be reassessed at the time of return visits for the need for cardiac catheterization and revascularization. Specifically, the presence and severity of angina should be ascertained. Rates of revascularization during the first year have been reported to be high.\textsuperscript{791} Long-term (7 years) follow-up of 282 patients with UA demonstrated high event rates during the first year (MI 11%, death 6%, PTCA 30%, and CABG 27%); however, after the first year, event rates were low.\textsuperscript{791} Independent risk factors for death/MI were age greater than 70 years, diabetes, and male sex. A predictive model for the risk of death from discharge to 6 months after an ACS has been developed and validated using the 17,142-patient GRACE registry database.\textsuperscript{152} Mortality averaged 4.8%. Nine predictive variables were identified: older age, history of MI, history of HF, increased pulse rate at presentation, lower systolic blood pressure at presentation, elevated initial serum creatinine level, elevated initial serum cardiac biomarker levels, ST-segment depression on presenting ECG, and not having a PCI performed in the hospital. The C statistic for the validation cohort was 0.75. The GRACE tool was suggested to be a simple, robust tool for clinical use.

Certain patients at high risk of ventricular tachyarrhythmia after UA/NSTEMI may be candidates for an implantable cardioverter defibrillator. Indications and timing of an implantable cardioverter defibrillator in this setting are presented in the STEMI guidelines\textsuperscript{4} and more recently the Ventricular Arrhythmias and Sudden Cardiac Death guidelines.\textsuperscript{992} Indications for testing for atherosclerotic disease in other vascular beds (ie, carotid, peripheral arterial) are also covered elsewhere in recent guidelines.\textsuperscript{793}

Major depression has also been reported to be an independent risk factor for cardiac events after MI and occurs in up to 25% of such patients.\textsuperscript{794} Antidepressant therapy (with sertraline) was safe and effective for relief of depressive symptoms in a controlled trial in 369 depressed patients with ACS, but it did not conclusively demonstrate a beneficial effect on cardiovascular end points, perhaps because of limited sample size.\textsuperscript{795} Cognitive therapy and, in some cases, sertraline did not affect late survival after MI in another randomized study (Enhancing Recovery in Coronary Heart Disease [ENRICHD]), but those whose depression did not improve were at higher risk of late mortality.\textsuperscript{796} The CREATE trial evaluated interpersonal psychotherapy (IPT) compared with clinical management and the selective serotonin reuptake inhibitor citalopram compared with placebo in a 2 × 2 factorial design among patients with CAD and major depression.\textsuperscript{797} The primary end point of Hamilton Depression Rating Scale score was improved in the citalopram group versus placebo (mean reduction 14.9 vs 11.6, \textit{P}=0.005) but did not differ for IPT versus clinical management (mean reduction 12.1 vs 14.4, \textit{P}=0.06). Likewise, the secondary end point of reduction in mean Beck Depression Inventory score was improved in the citalopram group but did not differ for IPT.

Patients recognized to be at high risk for a cardiac event after discharge for any of the above reasons should be seen for follow-up earlier and more frequently than lower-risk patients.

The overall long-term risk for death or MI 2 months after an episode of UA/NSTEMI is similar to that of other CAD patients with similar characteristics. Van Domburg et al\textsuperscript{791} reported a good long-term outcome even after a complicated early course. Based on a median follow-up of almost 8 years, mortality in the first year was 6%, then 2% to 3% annually in the following years.\textsuperscript{791} When the patient has returned to the baseline level, typically 6 to 8 weeks after hospitalization, arrangements should be made for long-term regular follow-up visits, as for stable CAD. Cardiac catheterization with coronary angiography is recommended for any of the following situations: 1) significant increase in anginal symptoms, including recurrent UA; 2) high-risk pattern (eg, at least 2 mm of ST-segment depression, systolic blood pressure decline of at least 10 mm Hg) on exercise test (see Section 3.4); 3) HF; 4) angina with mild exertion (inability to complete stage 2 of the Bruce protocol for angina); and 5) survivors of sudden cardiac death. Revascularization is recommended based on the coronary anatomy and ventricular function (see Section 4, ACC/AHA Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Chronic Stable Angina,\textsuperscript{11} and ACC/AHA 2004 Guideline Update for Coronary Artery Bypass Graft Surgery\textsuperscript{844}).

Minimizing the risk of recurrent cardiovascular events requires optimizing patients' compliance with prescribed therapies and recommended lifestyle modifications. Many studies exploring predictors of compliance have failed to find predictive value in simple demographic or socioeconomic variables. More reliable predictors are the patients' beliefs and perceptions about their vulnerability to disease and the efficacy of the prescribed treatments and, importantly, various aspects of the relationship with their health care provider.\textsuperscript{789–800} Development of a therapeutic relationship with the patient and family is likely to enhance compliance. Care should be taken to ensure that there is adequate time spent with the family focused on explanation of the disease and proposed treatments, the importance of adhering to the prescribed treatment plan, and exploration of patient-specific barriers to compliance. Participation in cardiac rehabilitation/secondary prevention programs can help reinforce patient-specific secondary prevention issues and can address barriers to compliance. Close communication between the treating physician and the cardiac rehabilitation team is important to maximize effectiveness.\textsuperscript{10,54,801,802}

### 5.4. Cardiac Rehabilitation

#### Class I

1. Cardiac rehabilitation/secondary prevention programs, when available, are recommended for patients with UA/NSTEMI, particularly those with multiple modifiable risk factors and those moderate- to high-risk patients in whom supervised or monitored exercise training is warranted. (Level of Evidence: B)

Cardiac rehabilitation programs are designed to limit the physiological and psychological effects of cardiac illness, reduce the risk for sudden death or reinfarction, control cardiac symptoms,
stabilize or reverse the atherosclerotic process, and enhance the psychosocial and vocational status of selected patients.773,801,803 Cardiac rehabilitation is a comprehensive long-term program that involves medical evaluation, prescribed exercise, cardiac risk factor modification, education, and counseling.773,804 Cardiac rehabilitation may occur in a variety of settings, including medically supervised groups in a hospital, physician’s office, or community facility.804 Exercise may involve a stationary bicycle, treadmill, calisthenics, walking, or jogging, and monitoring may include ECG telemetry, depending on a patient’s risk status and the intensity of exercise training. Education and counseling concerning risk factor modification are individualized, and close communication between the treating physician and cardiac rehabilitation team may promote long-term behavioral change.801,802 Alternative delivery approaches, including home exercise, internet-based, and transtelephonic monitoring/supervision, can be implemented effectively and safely for carefully selected clinically stable patients.773,805

Witt et al806 examined the association of participation in cardiac rehabilitation with survival in Olmstead County, Minnesota, and found that participants had a lower risk of death and recurrent MI at 3 years (P < 0.001 and P = 0.049, respectively). The survival benefit associated with participation was stronger in more recent years.806 In this study, half of the eligible patients participated in cardiac rehabilitation after MI, although women and older adult patients were less likely to participate, independent of other characteristics.

A pooled-effect estimate for total mortality for the exercise-only intervention demonstrated a reduction in all-cause mortality (random effects model OR 0.73 [95% CI 0.54 to 0.98]) compared with usual care. Comprehensive cardiac rehabilitation reduced all-cause mortality, although to a lesser degree (OR 0.87 [95% CI 0.71 to 1.05]). Neither of the interventions had an effect on the occurrence of nonfatal MI. The authors concluded that exercise-based cardiac rehabilitation appeared to be effective in reducing cardiac deaths but that it was still unclear whether an exercise-only or a comprehensive cardiac rehabilitation intervention was more beneficial. The population studied was predominantly male, middle-aged, and low risk. The authors suggested that those who could have benefited from the intervention might have been excluded owing to age, gender, or comorbidity. The authors cautioned that the results were of limited reliability because the quality of reporting in the studies was generally poor, and there were high losses to follow-up.804

Cardiac rehabilitation comprising exercise training and education, counseling, and behavioral interventions yielded improvements in exercise tolerance with no significant cardiovascular complications, improvements in symptoms (decreased anginal pain and improved symptoms of HF such as shortness of breath and fatigue), and improvements in blood lipid levels; reduced cigarette smoking in conjunction with a smoking cessation program; decreased stress; and improved psychosocial well-being.773 In addition to reductions in total cholesterol and LDL-C, increases in HDL-C levels occur.807

Cardiac rehabilitation has been reported to improve prognosis after MI in a cost-effective manner.808,809 In current practice, referrals for cardiac rehabilitation are more frequent after bypass surgery and less frequent after PCI for UA/NSTEMI.810 Benefits of rehabilitation after uncomplicated UA/NSTEMI with revascularization and modern medical therapy are less clear in comparison with STEMI or complicated NSTEMI.

Existing community studies reveal that fewer than one third of patients with MI receive information or counseling about cardiac rehabilitation before being discharged from the hospital.773,811 Only 16% of patients in a study of 5 hospitals in 2 Michigan communities were referred to a cardiac rehabilitation program at discharge, and only 26% of the patients later interviewed in the community reported actual participation in such a program; however, 54% of the patients referred at discharge did participate at the time of their follow-up interview.811 Physician referral was the most powerful predictor of patient participation in a cardiac rehabilitation program. In a longitudinal study of the use of inpatient cardiac rehabilitation in 5204 Worcester, Mass, residents hospitalized with MI in seven 1-year periods between 1986 and 1997, patients not referred to inpatient cardiac rehabilitation were less likely to be prescribed effective cardiac medications and to undergo risk factor modification counseling before discharge.812

Patient reasons for nonparticipation and noncompliance include affordability of service, insurance coverage/noncoverage, social support from a spouse or other caregiver, gender-specific attitudes, patient-specific internal factors such as anxiety or poor motivation, and logistical and financial constraints, or a combination of these factors.813-816 Women and the elderly are referred less frequently to cardiac rehabilitation programs, even though they derive benefit from them.45,813-816 Health care systems should consider instituting processes that encourage referral of appropriate patients to cardiac rehabilitation/secondary prevention programs (for example, the use of standardized order sets that facilitate this, such as the AHA “Get with the Guidelines” tools). In addition, it is important that referring health care practitioners and cardiac rehabilitation teams communicate in ways that promote patient participation. Of note, Medicare coverage for rehabilitation recently was expanded beyond post-MI, post-CABG, and stable angina to include PCI.817

5.5. Return to Work and Disability
Return-to-work rates after MI, which currently range from 63%818 to 94%,819 are difficult to influence because they are confounded by factors such as job satisfaction, financial stability, and company policies.820 In PAMI (Primary Angioplasty in Myocardial Infarction)-II, a study of primary PTCA in low-risk patients with MI (ie, age less than 70 years, ejection fraction greater than 0.45, 1- or 2-vessel disease, and good PTCA result), patients were encouraged to return to work at 2 weeks.821 The actual timing of return to work was not reported, but no adverse events occurred as a result of this strategy.

Cardiac rehabilitation programs after MI can contribute to reductions of mortality and improved physical and emotional well-being (see Section 5.4). Patients whose expectations for return to work were addressed in rehabilitation returned to work at a significantly faster rate than the control group in a prospective study.822

Lower or absent levels of depressive symptoms before MI increases the odds of recovery of functional status.823 Patients with high pre-event functional independence measurement have a shorter length of stay and a greater likelihood of discharge to home.824 Pre-event peak aerobic capacity and depression score
are the best independent predictors of postevent physical function. Women tend to have lower physical function scores than men of similar age, depression score, and comorbidity. Resting LVEF is not a predictor of physical function score.

Patients' cardiac functional states are not a strong predictor of their probability of returning to work. Diabetes, older age, Q-wave MI, and preinfarction angina are associated with failure to resume full employment. However, psychological variables such as trust, job security, patient feelings about disability, expectations of recovery by both physician and patient, and degree of somatizing are more predictive. Physical requirements of the job play a role as well.

To aid occupational physicians in making return-to-work decisions, Froom et al studied the incidence of post-MI events at 1, 2, 4, 6, 9, and 12 months. Events included cardiac death, recurrent infarction, CHF, and UA. They found that the incidence of events reached a low steady state at 10 weeks.

Return to work can be determined by employer regulations rather than by the patient's medical condition. It behooves the physician to provide data to prove that the patient's job does not impose a prohibitive risk for a cardiac event. An example is the case of Canadian bus drivers reported by Kavanagh et al. These patients were evaluated with a stress test. The physician and technologist studied the drivers at work and showed that the cardiac stress values during driving were only half of the average values obtained in the stress laboratory. The calculated risk of sudden cardiovascular incidents causing injury or death to passengers, other road users, and the drivers themselves in the first year after recovery from an MI was 1 in 50,000 driving-years. The bus drivers were allowed to return to work after they satisfied the Canadian Cardiovascular Society guidelines.

Covinsky et al performed a mail survey study of patients with MIs. Three months after discharge, women reported worse physical and mental health and were more likely to work less than before the MI. Similarly, women were less likely to return to work than men. Contemporary information specific to UA/NSTEMI on return to work by gender is needed.

The current aggressive interventional treatment of ACS will have an impact on mortality, morbidity, and hospital length of stay. It remains to be determined whether earlier improvement in cardiac condition after ACS will have an effect on the rate of return to work because of the multiple noncardiac factors that influence disability and return to work.

5.6. Other Activities

In patients who desire to return to physically demanding activities early, the safety of the activity can be determined by comparing performance on a graded exercise test with the MET level required for the desired activity. Table 23 presents energy levels, expressed in METS, required to perform a variety of common activities. This and similar tables can be helpful in translating a patient's performance on a graded exercise test into daily activities that can be undertaken with reasonable safety.

The health care provider should provide explicit advice about when to return to previous levels of physical activity, sexual activity, and employment. Daily walking can be encouraged immediately. In stable patients without complications (Class I), sexual activity with the usual partner can be resumed within 1 week to 10 d. Driving can begin 1 week after discharge if the patient is judged to be in compliance with individual state laws. Each state's Department of Motor Vehicles or its equivalent has mandated certain criteria, which vary from state to state and must be met before operation of a motor vehicle after serious illness. These include such caveats as the need to be accompanied and to avoid stressful circumstances such as rush hour, inclement weather, night driving, heavy traffic, and high speeds. For patients who have experienced a complicated MI (one that required CPR or was accompanied by hypotension, serious arrhythmias, high-degree block, or CHF), driving should be delayed 2 to 3 weeks after symptoms have resolved.

Most commercial aircraft are pressurized to 7500 to 8000 feet and therefore could cause hypoxia due to the reduced alveolar oxygen tension. The maximum level of pressurization is limited to 8000 feet (2440 m) by Federal Aviation Administration regulation. Therefore, air travel within the first 2 weeks of MI should be undertaken only if there is no angina, dyspnea, or hypoxemia at rest or fear of flying. The individual must have a companion, must carry NTG, and must request airport transportation to avoid rushing and increased cardiac demands. Availability of an emergency medical kit and automated external defibrillator has been mandated as of April 12, 2004, in all aircraft that carry at least approximately 30 passengers and have at least 1 flight attendant.

Patients with UA (ie, without infarction) who are revascularized and otherwise stable may accelerate return to work, driving, flying, and other normal activities (often, within a few days).

5.7. Patient Records and Other Information Systems

Effective medical record systems that document the course and plan of care should be established or enhanced. Both paper-based and electronic systems that incorporate evidence-based guidelines of care, tools for developing customized patient care plans and educational materials, and capture of data for appropriate standardized quality measurements should be implemented and used routinely. Examples of such tools are the ACC’s “Guidelines Applied in Practice” and the AHA’s “Get With the Guidelines.” All computerized provider order entry (CPOE) systems should incorporate these attributes as well. In some settings, the regular and consistent use of such systems and tools has been shown to significantly improve quality of care and patient safety. The patient's medical record from the time of hospital discharge should indicate the discharge medical regimen, the major instructions about postdischarge activities and rehabilitation, and the patient's understanding and plan for adherence to the recommendations. After resolution of the acute phase of UA/NSTEMI, the medical record should summarize cardiac events, current symptoms, and medication changes since hospital discharge or the last outpatient visit and should document the plan for future care. Processes for effective and timely transfer of relevant prehospital and postdischarge patient information between all participating caregivers should be continuously enhanced in accordance with existing regulatory standards. This should include providing all patients with the tools to facilitate access.
Table 23. Energy Levels Required to Perform Some Common Activities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Less Than 3 METS</th>
<th>3–5 METS</th>
<th>5–7 METS</th>
<th>7–9 METS</th>
<th>More Than 9 METS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-Care</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing</td>
<td>Cleaning windows</td>
<td>Easy digging in garden</td>
<td>Sawing wood</td>
<td>Carrying loads upstairs (objects more than 90 lb)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shaving</td>
<td>Raking</td>
<td>Level hand lawn mowing</td>
<td>Heavy shoveling</td>
<td>Climbing stairs (quickly)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dressing</td>
<td>Power lawn mowing</td>
<td>Climbing stairs (slowly)</td>
<td>Carrying stairs (moderate speed)</td>
<td>Climbing stairs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk work</td>
<td>Bed making/stripping</td>
<td>Carrying objects (30 to 60 lb)</td>
<td>Carrying objects (60 to 90 lb)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washing dishes</td>
<td>Carrying objects (15 to 30 lb)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Digging vigorously</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Driving auto</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light housekeeping</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Occupational</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sitting (clerical/assembly)</td>
<td>Stocking shelves (light objects)</td>
<td>Carpentering (exterior)</td>
<td>Digging ditches (pick and shovel)</td>
<td>Lumber jack</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typing</td>
<td>Auto repair</td>
<td>Shoveling dirt</td>
<td>Shoveling (heavily)</td>
<td>Heavy laborer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Desk work</td>
<td>Light welding/carpentry</td>
<td>Sawing wood</td>
<td>Forestry</td>
<td>Shoveling (heavy)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standing (store clerk)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Operating pneumatic tools</td>
<td>Farming</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Recreational</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf (cart)</td>
<td>Dancing (social)</td>
<td>Badminton (competitive)</td>
<td>Canoeing</td>
<td>Handball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knitting</td>
<td>Golf (walking)</td>
<td>Tennis (singles)</td>
<td>Mountain climbing</td>
<td>Football (competitive)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hand sewing</td>
<td>Sailing</td>
<td>Snow skiing (downhill)</td>
<td>Paddle ball</td>
<td>Squash</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tennis (doubles)</td>
<td>Light backpacking</td>
<td>Walking (5 mph)</td>
<td>Ski touring</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Volleyball (6 persons)</td>
<td>Basketball</td>
<td>Running (12 min. mile)</td>
<td>Vigorous basketball</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Table tennis</td>
<td>Football</td>
<td>Mountain or rock climbing</td>
<td>(game)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Marital sex</td>
<td>Stream Fishing</td>
<td>Soccer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Physical Conditioning</strong></td>
<td>Level walking (3–4 mph)</td>
<td>Level walking (4.5–5.0 mph)</td>
<td>Level jogging (5 mph)</td>
<td>Running (more than 6 mph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walking (2 mph)</td>
<td>Level biking (6–8 mph)</td>
<td>Level biking (9–10 mph)</td>
<td>Swimming (crawl stroke)</td>
<td>Bicycling (more than 13 mph)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very light calisthenics</td>
<td>Light calisthenics</td>
<td>Swimming, breast stroke</td>
<td>Rowing machine</td>
<td>Rope jumping</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bicycling (12 mph)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


METS = metabolic equivalents; mph = miles per hour.

6. Special Groups

6.1. Women

Recommendations

Class I

1. Women with UA/NSTEMI should be managed with the same pharmacological therapy as men both in the hospital and for secondary prevention, with attention to antiplatelet and anticoagulant doses based on weight and renal function; doses of renally cleared medications should be based on estimated creatinine clearance. (Level of Evidence: B)

2. Recommended indications for noninvasive testing in women with UA/NSTEMI are similar to those for men. (Level of Evidence: B)

3. For women with high-risk features, recommendations for invasive strategy are similar to those of men. See Section 3.3. (Level of Evidence: B)

4. In women with low-risk features, a conservative strategy is recommended. (Level of Evidence: B)

Although at any age, women have a lower incidence of CAD than men, they account for a considerable proportion of UA/NSTEMI patients, and UA/NSTEMI is a serious and common condition among women. It is important to overcome long-held notions that severe coronary manifestations are uncommon in this population; however, women can manifest CAD somewhat differently than men. Women who present with chest discomfort are more likely than men to have non-cardiac causes and cardiac causes other than fixed obstructive coronary artery stenosis. Other cardiac causes include coronary vasospasm, abnormal vasodilator reserve, and other mechanisms. Women with CAD are, on average, older than men and are more likely to have comorbidities such as hypertension, diabetes mellitus, and HF with preserved systolic function; to manifest angina rather than MI; and, among angina and MI patients, to have atypical symptoms.
6.1.1. Profile of UA/NSTEMI in Women

Considerable clinical information about UA/NSTEMI in women has emerged from many randomized trials and registries. As in other forms of CAD, women are older and have more comorbidities (diabetes mellitus and hypertension) and stronger family histories than men. Women are less likely to have had a previous MI or cardiac procedures, more likely to have a history of HF, and less likely to have LV systolic dysfunction. Women present with symptoms of similar frequency, duration, and pattern, but more often than men, they have anginal-equivalent symptoms such as dyspnea or atypical symptoms. The frequency of ST-segment changes is similar to that for men, but women more often have T-wave inversion. There are notable differences in the profiles of cardiac biomarkers for women and men, with a consistent finding in trials and registries that women less often have elevated levels of troponin. In an analysis of TACTICS-TIMI 18, women also less often had elevation of CK-MB; however, women more often had increased levels of high-sensitivity CRP or BNP than men. Importantly, the prognostic value of elevated biomarkers is similar in both men and women. Coronary angiograms in both trials and registries revealed less extensive CAD in women, as well as a higher proportion with nonobstructive CAD. The rate of nonobstructive CAD can be as high as 37% despite selection of women according to strict inclusion criteria in clinical trials.

A differing symptom pattern in women than men, the lower frequency of positive cardiac biomarkers despite high rates of ST-T abnormalities on the ECG, and the higher frequency of nonobstructive CAD in women make it challenging to confirm the diagnosis of UA/NSTEMI. This is a likely cause of underutilization of several therapies in women compared with men. There are important mechanisms of ischemic chest pain other than platelet/thrombus aggregates on plaque erosion or ulceration in women (see Section 6.8). Although some studies report that female sex is a risk factor for poor outcome in UA/NSTEMI on the basis of unadjusted event rates, multivariate models have not found female sex to be an independent risk factor for death, reinfarction, or recurrent ischemia. This is in contrast to an apparent independent risk of death for women compared with men with STEMI, particularly for younger women.

6.1.2. Management

6.1.2.1. Pharmacological Therapy

In studies that span the spectrum of CAD, women tend to receive less intensive pharmacological treatment than men, perhaps in part because of a general perception of lower frequency and severity of CAD in women. Although the specifics vary regarding beta blockers and other drugs, a consistent (and disturbing) pattern is that women are prescribed ASA and other antithrombotic agents less frequently than men. Women derive the same treatment benefit as men from ASA, clopidogrel, antiocoagulants, beta blockers, ACE inhibitors, and statins. A meta-analysis of GP IIb/IIIa antagonists in ACS demonstrated an interaction between sex and treatment effect, with an apparent lack of efficacy in women, however, women with elevated troponin levels received the same beneficial effect as men treated with GP IIb/IIIa antagonists. The findings of a beneficial effect of a direct invasive strategy in women treated with a GP IIb/IIIa antagonist in TACTICS-TIMI 18 (see Section 6.1.2.3) further supports the similar efficacy of these agents in this cohort of women and men.

Despite the clear benefit of antiplatelet and anticoagulant therapy for women with ACS, women are at increased risk of bleeding. A low maintenance dose of ASA (75 to 162 mg) should be used to reduce the excess bleeding risk, especially in combination with clopidogrel. Estimated creatinine clearance instead of serum creatinine levels should guide decisions about dosing and the use of agents that are renally cleared, eg, LMWHs and the small-molecule GP IIb/IIIa antagonists. In a large community-based registry study, 42% of patients with UA/NSTEMI received excessive initial dosing of at least 1 antiplatelet or anticoagulant agent (UFH, LMWH, or GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor). Female sex, older age, renal insufficiency, low body weight, and diabetes were predictors of excessive dosing. Dosing errors predicted an increased risk of major bleeding. The formula used to estimate creatinine clearance for dose adjustment in clinical studies and labeling that defines adjustments for several medications has been based on the Cockroft-Gault formula for estimating creatinine clearance, which is not identical to the Modification of Diet and Renal Disease (MDRD) formula recently recommended for screening for renal disease. Other units or cut points for adjustment. Weight-based adjustment of medication doses also should be applied carefully where recommended.

The use of hormone therapy in postmenopausal women is discussed in Section 5.2.17.

6.1.2.2. Coronary Artery Revascularization

Contemporary studies have cast doubt on the widely held belief that women fare worse with PCI and CABG than do men because of technical factors (eg, smaller artery size, greater age, and more comorbidities). In the case of PCI, it has been suggested that angiographic success and late outcomes are similar in women and men, although in some series, early complications occurred more frequently in women. However, the outlook for women undergoing PCI appears to have improved, as evidenced by the NHLBI PTCA registry. Earlier studies of women undergoing CABG showed that women were less likely to receive internal mammary arteries or complete revascularization and had a higher mortality rate (RR 1.4 to 4.4) than men. However, more recent studies of CABG in patients with ACS show a more favorable outlook for women than previously thought (see Section 6.3).

A Mayo Clinic review of 3014 patients (941 women) with UA who underwent PCI reported that women had similar early and late results as men. The BARI trial of 1829 patients compared PTCA and CABG, primarily in patients with UA, and showed that the results of revascularization were, if anything, better in women than men when corrected for other factors. At an average 5.4-year follow-up, mortality rates for men and women were 12% and 13%, respectively, but when adjusted for baseline differences (eg, age, diabetes, and other comorbidities), there was a lower risk of death (RR 0.60, 95% CI 0.43 to 0.84, P=0.003) but a similar risk.
of death or MI (RR 0.84, 95% CI 0.66 to 1.07, P=0.16) in women compared with men.\textsuperscript{459} The NHLBI Dynamic Registry has reported improved outcomes for women who underwent PCI in 1997 to 1998 compared with 1985 to 1986. Compared with men, women had similar procedural success, in-hospital death, MI, and CABG.\textsuperscript{460} Although the 1-year event rate was higher for women, female sex was not independently associated with death or MI because women tended to be older and had more comorbidities. A prospective study of 1450 patients with UA/NSTEMI who underwent an indirect or direct invasive strategy with coronary stenting reported that female sex was independently associated with a lower rate of death and MI (HR 0.51, 95% CI 0.28 to 0.95).\textsuperscript{462}

6.1.2.3. Initial Invasive Versus Initial Conservative Strategy

In the modern era, clinical trials assessing a direct invasive strategy compared with an initial conservative strategy for the management of UA/NSTEMI have consistently demonstrated a benefit for men.\textsuperscript{463,464,465} Approximately one third of the cohorts in these trials were women (n = 2179), and the results on the efficacy and safety of a direct invasive strategy in women have been conflicting. Each trial was underpowered to evaluate the subgroup of women, and there were substantial differences among the trials (Table 24). A meta-analysis of trials in the era of stents and GP IIb/IIIa antagonists has failed to show a survival benefit of a direct invasive strategy in women at 6 to 12 months (OR for women 1.07, 95% CI 0.82 to 1.41; OR for men 0.68, 95% CI 0.57 to 0.81).\textsuperscript{467}

In TACTICS-TIMI 18, there was a significant reduction in the primary end point of death, nonfatal MI, or rehospitalization for an ACS with a direct invasive strategy (OR 0.45, 95% CI 0.24 to 0.88, P=0.02).\textsuperscript{188} All subjects in this trial (n = 754) were treated with an early GP IIb/IIIa antagonist (tirofiban). A similar overall reduction in the primary composite end point of death, MI, or rehospitalization for ACS at 6 months was observed for women and men (adjusted OR 0.72, 95% CI 0.47 to 1.11 and adjusted OR 0.64, 95% CI 0.47 to 0.88, respectively). Women were older, more frequently had hypertension, and less frequently had previous MI, CABG, and elevated cardiac biomarkers (P less than 0.001 for all), but there was no significant difference in TIMI risk score distribution by sex (P=0.76).\textsuperscript{465} A similar reduction in composite risk was observed in women with intermediate (3 to 4) or high (5 to 7) TIMI risk scores as in men. However, in contrast to men with a low TIMI risk score who had similar outcomes with an invasive and conservative strategy, low-risk women had an OR for events of 1.59 (95% CI 0.69 to 3.67) for the invasive compared with the conservative strategy.\textsuperscript{465} However, the number of events was small (n = 26 events), and the P value for interaction between strategy, TIMI risk score, and sex on outcome did not achieve significance (P=0.09). An elevated biomarker, including BNP, CRP, CK-MB, and troponin, also identified women (and men) who benefited differentially from a direct invasive strategy. The reduction in risk was enhanced in women with elevated TnT levels (adjusted OR 0.47, 95% CI 0.26 to 0.83), with a similar reduction in the primary end point noted for women and men with elevated troponin. However, in contrast to the similar outcome for the invasive versus conservative strategy in men with a negative TnT marker (OR 1.02, 95% CI 0.64 to 1.62, P=0.04), the primary end point of death, MI, and rehospitalization occurred significantly more frequently in women with negative troponin randomized to an invasive strategy (OR 1.46, 95% CI 0.78 to 2.72).\textsuperscript{653}

The RITA-3 trial enrolled 682 women (38% of 1810 patients).\textsuperscript{463} There was a significant interaction between sex and treatment strategy (invasive versus conservative) on outcome in RITA-3 (P=0.042). In contrast to a reduction in death or MI for men assigned to an invasive strategy, the HR for women was 1.09. Women assigned to an initial conservative strategy had a lower rate of death and MI (5.1%) at 1 year than the women enrolled in TACTICS-TIMI 18 (9.7% at 6 months). Consistent with this difference, 37% of women in RITA-3 had no significant obstructive CAD, compared with 17% of women in TACTICS-TIMI 18.\textsuperscript{188} Other notable differences between RITA-3 and TACTICS-TIMI 18 include routine use of GP IIb/IIIa antagonist in TACTICS-TIMI 18 and different criteria for the MI end point in both the conservative and the invasive treatment groups. The RITA-3 investigators have reported that the rates of death and MI for women are 11.1% and 12.7% in the conservative versus invasive strategy, respectively, that is, not significantly different, when there was a lower threshold for cardiac marker diagnosis of MI among the conservatively treated group.\textsuperscript{464}

In the only trial that showed an overall survival benefit for an invasive strategy, FRISC-II, there was a significant interaction in outcome between treatment strategy, which included a systematic but delayed interventional approach within 7 d of symptom onset, and sex.\textsuperscript{464,467} Thirty percent of the 2457 enrolled patients were women, and the death and MI rate at 1 year was nonsignificantly higher for invasively treated versus conservatively treated women, in contrast to a large reduction in death and MI for men. Female sex was independently associated with events in the invasively assigned patients. However, the poor outcome of women was largely driven by a 9.9% death rate at 1 year in women who underwent CABG. In contrast, the death rate for women who underwent PCI in the invasive strategy group was similar to that of men (1.5% vs 1.0%; RR 1.50, 95% CI 0.27 to 8.28; P = nonsignificant [NS]).

In summary, women with UA/NSTEMI and high-risk features, including elevated cardiac biomarkers, appear to benefit from an invasive strategy with early intervention and adjunctive GP IIb/IIIa antagonist use. There is no benefit of a direct invasive strategy for low-risk women, and the weight of evidence from the recent randomized clinical trials suggests that there may be excess risk associated with a direct invasive strategy in this group. The challenges in the diagnosis of UA/NSTEMI and the varied pathophysiology of ischemic pain in women who present with rest discomfort suggest that perhaps the excess risk of a direct invasive strategy observed in low-risk women could be due to intervention on a stable incidental coronary lesion in a woman with another mechanism for rest pain.

6.1.3. Stress Testing

In general, ECG exercise testing is less predictive in women than in men, primarily because of the lower pretest probability of CAD\textsuperscript{669,684–686} Perfusion studies using sestamibi have good sensitivity and specificity in women.\textsuperscript{467} Breast attenuation is less of a problem than previously with thallium-201 stress testing with new tissue software. Stress echocardiography (dobutamine or exercise) is therefore an accurate and cost-effective
### Table 24. Invasive Versus Conservative Strategy Results for UA/NSTEMI by Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study (Reference)</th>
<th>Timing</th>
<th>End Point</th>
<th>Overall Result</th>
<th>Results in Men</th>
<th>Results in Women</th>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>TACTICS-TIMI 18 (182,565)</strong> 2002</td>
<td>Angiography 4 to 48 h</td>
<td>Death, MI</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>6 months</td>
<td>Benefit greater in women with high cTnT; OR = 0.47 (95% CI 0.26 to 0.83) for death, MI, and rehospitalization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n= 2220</td>
<td>34% female</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inv: 4.7%</td>
<td>Inv: 7.6%</td>
<td>Inv: 6.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cons: 7.0%,</td>
<td>Cons: 9.4%</td>
<td>Cons: 9.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( P = 0.02 )</td>
<td>OR = 0.68 (95% CI 0.43 to 1.05)</td>
<td>OR = 0.45 (95% CI 0.24 to 0.88)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARR = 2.3%</td>
<td>ARR = 1.8%</td>
<td>ARR = 3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>RITA-(758) 2002</strong></td>
<td>Angiography within 48 h</td>
<td>Death, MI, refractory angina</td>
<td>4 months</td>
<td>4 months</td>
<td>4 months</td>
<td>Angina reduced with invasive strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n = 1810</td>
<td>38% female</td>
<td></td>
<td>Inv: 9.6%</td>
<td>Inv: 8.8%</td>
<td>Inv: 10.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cons: 14.5%,</td>
<td>Cons: 17.3%</td>
<td>Cons: 5.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>( P = 0.001 )</td>
<td>ARR = 8.5%</td>
<td>ARR = 3.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>RR = 0.66 (95% CI 0.51 to 0.85)</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ARR = 4.9%</td>
<td>Inv: 7.0%</td>
<td>Inv: 8.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 year</td>
<td>Cons: 10.1%</td>
<td>Cons: 5.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Inv: 7.0%</td>
<td>( p = 0.58 )</td>
<td>ARR = 2.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Cons: 8.3%</td>
<td>RR = 0.91 (95% CI 0.67 to 1.23)</td>
<td>ARR = 0.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| **FRISC II (245,549,552) 1999** | Revascularization within 7d | Death, MI | 6 months | 1 year | 6 months | Mortality benefit at 1 year (2.2% vs. 3.9%)
| n = 2457 | 30% female | | Inv: 9.4% | Inv: 9.6% | Inv: 10.5% | |
| | | | Cons: 12.1%, | Cons: 15.8% \( p < 0.001 \) | Cons: 8.3%, RR = 1.26 (95% CI 0.80 to 1.97) | |
| | | | \( P = 0.3 \) | ARR = 6.2% | ARR = 1.9% | |
| | | | 1 year | ARR = 2.7% | 1 year | |
| | | | Inv: 10.4% | Inv: 12.4% | Inv: 12.4% | |
| | | | Cons: 14.1% | Cons: 10.5%, \( p = NS \) | Cons: 10.5%, \( p = NS \) | |
| | | | \( P = 0.005 \) | ARR = 3.7% | ARR = 3.7% | |
| **TIMI-IIIb (150) 1997** | Angiography 1 to 48 h | Death, MI | 1 year | 1 year | 1 year | Invasively treated patients had less angina and fewer rehospitalizations for ischemia |
| n = 1423 | 34% female | | Death at 6 weeks | Death at 6 weeks | Death at 6 weeks | |
| | | | Inv: 10.8% | Inv: 2.6% | Inv: 2% | |
| | | | Cons: 12.2%, | Cons: 1.4% | Cons: 4.4% | |
| | | | \( P = 0.42 \) | ARR = 1.2% | ARR = 2.4% | |
| | | | ARR = 1.4% | MI at 6 weeks | MI at 6 weeks | |
| | | | Inv: 5.5% | Inv: 4.4% | Inv: 4.4% | |
| | | | Cons: 6.0% | Cons: 5.2% | Cons: 5.2% | |
| | | | ARR = 0.5% | ARR = 0.8% | ARR = 0.8% | |

Reproduced with permission from Percutaneous Coronary Intervention and Adjunctive Pharmacotherapy in Women: A Statement for Healthcare professionals from the American Heart Association © 2005, American Heart Association, Inc. [125]

ACS = acute coronary syndrome; ARR = absolute risk reduction; CI = confidence interval; Cons = conservative; cTnT = cardiac troponin T; FRISC II = Fast Revascularization during InStability in Coronary artery disease-II; Inv = invasive; MI = myocardial infarction; n = number of patients; NS = nonsignificant; NSTEMI = non–ST-segment elevation MI; OR = odds ratio; PTCA = percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty; RITA-3 = Third Randomized Intervention Treatment of Angina; RR = risk ratio; TACTICS-TIMI 18 = Treat Angina with Aggrastat and determine Cost of Therapy with Invasive or Conservative Strategy–Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction 18; TIMI IIIb = Thrombolysis In Myocardial Infarction IIIb; UA = unstable angina.
technique for CAD detection in women.569 Newer perfusion methods such as adenosine-stress CMR also appear to be promising in women. Cardiac magnetic resonance imaging (for function, perfusion, and viability) and multislice CCTA are 2 new diagnostic modalities that could prove particularly useful in women because of their promise of both greater sensitivity and specificity (improved diagnostic accuracy). Evidence of ischemia by objective measures without obstructive CAD carries an adverse prognosis.11,868 and is suggestive of vascular dysfunction (coronary endothelial or microvascular dysfunction) as an etiological mechanism.

Recommendations for noninvasive testing in women are the same as in men (see Section 3.4).838,868 A report of 976 women who underwent treadmill exercise suggests that the Duke Treadmill Score provides accurate diagnostic and prognostic estimates in both women and men.669 The Duke Treadmill Score actually performed better for women than for men in the exclusion of CAD. There were fewer low-risk women than men with any significant CAD (at least 1 vessel with greater than 75% stenosis; 20% in women vs 47% in men, P less than 0.001).

Regarding dobutamine stress echocardiography, pilot phase data from the Women’s Ischemia Syndrome Evaluation (WISE) indicated that in women, the test reliably detects multivessel disease (sensitivity 81.8%, similar to that in men) but not 1-vessel disease.870 Several studies have indicated that women with positive stress tests tend not to be evaluated as aggressively as men,846 which is inappropriate given the adverse prognosis of ischemia as demonstrated in WISE and other studies.838,871-878

In the TIMI IIIB registry, women underwent exercise testing in a similar proportion as men.157,839 The frequencies of stress test positivity were also similar, although women were less likely to have a high-risk stress test result. Moreover, women were less likely to undergo angiography (RR 0.71, P less than 0.001), perhaps because of the lower percentage with high-risk test results on noninvasive testing.

6.1.4. Conclusions
Women with UA/NSTEMI are older and more frequently have comorbidities compared with men but have more atypical presentations and appear to have less severe and less extensive obstructive CAD. Women receive ASA less frequently than do men, but patients with UA/NSTEMI of either sex benefit from and should receive this agent, as well as other Class I recommended agents. Doses should be adjusted on the basis of weight and estimated creatinine clearance for renally cleared drugs for all recommended agents when appropriate. Image-enhanced stress testing has similar prognostic value in women as in men.

6.2. Diabetes Mellitus (UPDATED)

Class I

1. Medical treatment in the acute phase of UA/NSTEMI and decisions on whether to perform stress testing, angiography, and revascularization should be similar in patients with and without diabetes mellitus. (Level of Evidence: A)188,251,489,579

Class IIa

1. For patients with UA/NSTEMI and multivessel disease, CABG with use of the internal mammary arteries can be beneficial over PCI in patients being treated for diabetes mellitus. (Level of Evidence: B)880

2. PCI is reasonable for UA/NSTEMI patients with diabetes mellitus with single-vessel disease and inducible ischemia. (Level of Evidence: B)888

3. It is reasonable to use an insulin-based regimen to achieve and maintain glucose levels less than 180 mg/dL while avoiding hypoglycemia for hospitalized patients with UA/NSTEMI with either a complicated or uncomplicated course. (Level of Evidence: B)891-894

6.2.1. Profile and Initial Management of Diabetic and Hyperglycemic Patients With UA/NSTEMI
Coronary artery disease accounts for 75% of all deaths in patients with diabetes mellitus,57,59 and approximately 20% to 25% of all patients with UA/NSTEMI have diabetes.697,839,885-888

Patients with UA/NSTEMI and diabetes have more severe CAD.868,869,901 and diabetes is an important independent predictor for adverse outcomes (death, MI, or readmission with UA at 1 year; RR 4.9)891-894 In addition, many patients with diabetes who present with UA/NSTEMI have already undergone CABG.895

Patients with diabetes tend to have more extensive noncoronary vascular comorbidities, hypertension, LV hypertrophy, cardiomyopathy, and HF. In addition, autonomic dysfunction, which occurs in approximately one third of patients with diabetes, influences heart rate and blood pressure, raises the threshold for the perception of angina, and may be accompanied by LV dysfunction.896-898 On coronary angiography, patients with diabetes and UA have a greater proportion of ulcerated plaques (94% vs 60%, P=0.01) and intracoronary thrombi (94% vs 55%, P=0.004) than patients without diabetes.899 These findings suggest a higher risk of plaque instability.

According to American Diabetes Association standards of care,66 the relationship of controlled blood glucose levels and reduced mortality in the setting of MI has been demonstrated. The American College of Endocrinology has also emphasized the importance of careful control of blood glucose targets in the range of 110 mg per dL preprandially to a maximum of 180 mg per dL. In 1 study,901 admission blood glucose values were analyzed in consecutive patients with MI. Analysis revealed an independent association of admission blood glucose and mortality. The 1-year mortality rate was significantly lower in subjects with admission plasma glucose less than 101 mg per dL (5.6 mmol per liter) than in those with plasma glucose 200 mg per dL (11 mmol per liter). In the first Diabetes and Insulin-Glucose Infusion in Acute Myocardial Infarction (DIGAMI) study,902,903 insulin-glucose infusion followed by subcutaneous insulin treatment in diabetic patients with MI was examined. Mean blood glucose in the intensive insulin intervention arm was 172.8 mg per dL (9.5 mmol per liter) compared with 211 mg per dL (11.6 mmol per liter) in the “conventional” group. Overall, the intensive approach reduced long-term relative mortality (at 3.4 years of follow-up) by 25% in the insulin-treated group. The broad range of blood...
glucose levels within each arm limits the ability to define specific blood glucose target thresholds.

In the second DIGAMI study, 3 treatment strategies were compared in a randomized trial among 1253 patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus and suspected MI: acute insulin-glucose infusion followed by insulin-based long-term glucose control, insulin-glucose infusion followed by standard glucose control, and routine metabolic management according to local practice. Blood glucose was reduced more at 24 h in those receiving insulin-glucose infusions, but long-term glucose control, assessed by HbA1C, did not differ between the groups, and the fasting glucose in group 1 (8.0 mmol per liter) did not reach target (5 to 7 mmol per liter). The primary end point of all-cause mortality between groups 1 and 2 did not differ significantly (23.4% vs 22.6%) at a median of 2.1 years of follow-up. Morbidity also did not differ among the 3 groups. Although the DIGAMI-2 regimen of acutely introduced, long-term insulin treatment in the setting of suspected acute MI was not demonstrated to improve survival were linearly associated with ICU glucose levels, with the lowest mortality in patients with blood glucose less than or equal to 150 mg per dL (8.3 mmol per liter).

A mixed group of patients with and without diabetes admitted to a surgical intensive care unit (ICU) were randomized to receive intensive insulin therapy (target blood glucose 80 to 110 mg per dL [4.4 to 6.1 mmol per liter]). Achievement of a mean blood glucose of 103 mg per dL (5.7 mmol per liter) reduced mortality during the ICU stay and decreased overall in-hospital mortality. Subsequent analysis demonstrated that for each 20-mg per dL (1.1-mmol per liter) glucose elevation above 100 mg per dL (5.5 mmol per liter), the risk of death during the ICU stay increased. Hospital and ICU survival were linearly associated with ICU glucose levels, with the highest survival rates occurring in patients achieving an average blood glucose less than or equal to 110 mg per dL (6.1 mmol per liter).

Although beta blockers can mask the symptoms of hypoglycemia or lead to it by blunting the hypoglycemic response, they nevertheless should be used with appropriate caution in patients with diabetes mellitus and UA/NSTEMI. Diuretics that cause hypokalemia can inhibit insulin release and thereby worsen glucose intolerance.

Elevated blood glucose among critically ill patients even in the absence of clinical diabetes mellitus has received recent attention as an important risk factor for mortality. A randomized trial in the surgical ICU setting found that strict glycemic control with insulin reduced both morbidity and in-hospital mortality. More recently, the role of intensive insulin therapy in the medical ICU setting has been studied in 1200 medical ICU patients (some with CVD) randomized to conventional therapy (insulin administered when glucose exceeded 215 mg per dL, tapering infusion when glucose fell below 180 mg per dL) or to intensive insulin therapy (targeting a glucose of 80 to 110 mg per dL). Overall, intensive insulin did not significantly reduce in-hospital mortality, the primary end point (37.3% in the intensive therapy arm, 40% in the conventional arm, \( P = 0.33 \)), but secondary outcomes of acquired kidney injury, time to ventilator weaning, and ICU and hospital discharge stays were reduced. Hypoglycemia was more common but often consisted of a single, asymptomatic episode. However, when analysis was restricted to the intended population of 767 patients whose ICU stay was at least 3 d, in-hospital death was reduced from 52.5% to 43% (\( P = 0.009 \)) and ICU death from 38.1% to 31.3% (\( P = 0.005 \)). In addition, secondary outcomes of time to ventilator weaning, days to ICU discharge and to hospital discharge, acquired kidney injury, hyperbilirubinemia, and CRP levels were reduced. Newer evidence has emerged which led the 2012 writing group to recommend treatment for hyperglycemia >180 mg/dL while avoiding hypoglycemia (see Section 6.2.1.1).

### 6.2.1.1. Intensive Glucose Control (NEW SECTION)

As detailed in the 2004 STEMI guideline, 2007 UA/NSTEMI guideline revision, and 2009 STEMI and PCI focused update, randomized trial evidence supported use of insulin infusion to control hyperglycemia. A clinical trial of intensive versus conventional glucose control in critically ill patients raised uncertainty about the optimal level to target when achieving glucose control. NICE-SUGAR (Normoglycaemia in Intensive Care Evaluation—Survival Using Glucose Algorithm Regulation), a large international randomized trial (n=6104) of adults admitted to the intensive care unit with either medical or surgical conditions, compared intensive glucose control (target glucose range, 81 to 108 mg/dL) with conventional glucose control (to achieve a glucose level of <180 mg/dL, with reduction and discontinuation of insulin if the blood glucose level dropped below 144 mg/dL). Time-weighted glucose levels achieved were 115±18 mg/dL in the intensive group versus 144±23 mg/dL in the conventional group. The risk of death was increased at 90 days in the intensive group by 2.6% (27.5% versus 24.9%; OR: 1.14; 95% CI: 1.02 to 1.08; \( P = 0.02 \); number needed to harm=38). The result remained the same after adjusting for potential confounders. There were significantly more episodes of treatment-related hypoglycemia in the intensely managed group (6.8% versus 0.5%; \( P = 0.001 \)), although the contribution of hypoglycemia to excess mortality is uncertain. Overall, the hospital course and proximate causes of death were similar in the 2 groups. Excess deaths in the intensive management group were predominantly of cardiovascular causes (absolute difference: 5.8%; \( P = 0.02 \)). More patients in the intensive group than in the conventional group were treated with corticosteroids. Because NICE-SUGAR enrolled critically ill medical and surgical patients, the degree to which its results can be extrapolated to the management of patients with UA/NSTEMI is unclear. Although recent data from a small, mechanistic clinical trial suggest that glucose control may reduce inflammation and improve left ventricular ejection fraction.
in patients with acute MI, it remains uncertain whether acute glucose control will improve patient outcomes.

A consensus statement by the American Association of Clinical Endocrinologists and the American Diabetes Association\(^7\) summarized that “although hyperglycemia is associated with adverse outcomes after acute MI, reduction of glycemia per se and not necessarily the use of insulin is associated with improved outcomes. It remains unclear, however, whether hyperglycemia is a marker of underlying health status or is a mediator of complications after acute MI. Nonisoglycopenic hypoglycemia has also been associated with adverse outcomes and is a predictor of higher mortality.”

There is a clear need for a well-designed, definitive randomized trial of target-driven glucose control in UA/NSTEMI patients with meaningful clinical endpoints so that glucose treatment thresholds and glucose targets can be determined. Until such a trial is completed, and on the basis of the balance of current evidence,\(^9\) the 2012 writing group concluded that it was prudent to change the recommendation for the use of insulin to control blood glucose in UA/NSTEMI from a more stringent to a more moderate target range in keeping with the recent 2009 STEMI and PCI focused update (Class IIa, LOE: B)\(^1\) and recommend treatment for hyperglycemia more than 180 mg/dL while avoiding hypoglycemia. The 2012 writing group believed that the 2007 recommendation regarding long-term glycemic control targets failed to reflect recent data casting doubt on a specific ideal goal for the management of diabetes in patients with UA/NSTEMI.

Diabetes is another characteristic associated with high risk for adverse outcomes after UA/NSTEMI. The 2007 UA/NSTEMI guidelines\(^7\) state that patients with diabetes are at high risk and in general should be treated similarly to patients with other high-risk features. However, the 2012 writing group noted that diabetes was not listed as a high-risk feature for which an invasive strategy was specifically preferred, in contrast to the inclusion of chronic kidney disease (CKD) and diabetes mellitus as characteristics favoring an invasive approach in the 2007 European Society of Cardiology guidelines for management of UA/NSTEMI.\(^8\) To revisit this question for diabetes, the 2012 writing group reviewed results of the published analysis of patients with diabetes in the FRISC-II (FRagmin and Fast Revascularization during Instability in Coronary artery disease) trial.\(^2\) Overall, the FRISC-II trial demonstrated a benefit with invasive management compared with conservative management in patients with UA/NSTEMI. There were similar reductions in the risk of MI/death at 1 year in the diabetic subgroup randomized to an invasive strategy (OR: 0.61; 95% CI: 0.36 to 1.04) compared with patients who did not have diabetes randomized to an invasive strategy (OR: 0.72; 95% CI: 0.54 to 0.95). The risk of death was also reduced by randomization to an invasive strategy among patients with diabetes (OR: 0.59; 95% CI: 0.27 to 1.27) and without diabetes (OR: 0.50; 95% CI: 0.27 to 0.94). Subgroup analysis of the TACTICS–TIMI-18 (Treat Angina with Aggrastat and determine Cost of Therapy with Invasive or Conservative Strategy–Thrombolysis In Myocardial Infarction 18) study in patients with diabetes, available in abstract form, was consistent with this finding.\(^9\) Thus, diabetes, as well as the often concurrent comorbidity of CKD (Section 6.5, Chronic Kidney Disease: Recommendations), is not only a high-risk factor but also benefits from an invasive approach. Accordingly, diabetes has been added to the list of characteristics for which an early invasive strategy is generally preferred (Appendix 6).

### 6.2.2. Coronary Revascularization

Approximately 20% of all patients who undergo CABG\(^1\) and PCI\(^2\) have diabetes mellitus. Data regarding outcomes are complex. In the Coronary Artery Surgery Study (CASS) of CABG, patients with diabetes had a 57% higher mortality rate than patients without diabetes. A striking advantage for CABG over PCI was found in treated patients with diabetes in the BARI trial,\(^3\) a randomized trial of PCI versus CABG in 1829 stable patients with multivessel disease, of whom 19% were patients with diabetes (see Section 4). As in other studies, patients with diabetes mellitus had increased comorbidity rates. Five years after randomization, patients who required treatment for diabetes had a lower survival rate than patients without diabetes (73.1% vs 91.3%, P less than 0.0001), whereas survival rates in patients without and with diabetes who did not require hypoglycemic treatment were similar (93.3% vs 91.1%, P=NS). Outcomes for CABG in treated patients with diabetes were far better than those for PCI (80.6% vs 65.5% survival, P=0.0003). An interesting finding was that the mortality rate during the 5.4 years of the study in patients with diabetes who received SVGs (18.2%) was similar to that of patients who underwent PCI (20.6%); whereas the mortality rate in patients who received internal mammary arteries was much lower (2.9%). Results of the Emory Angioplasty versus Surgery Trial (EAST) at 8 years showed a similar trend but were less conclusive.\(^4\) The increased mortality rate noted in randomized trials in patients with diabetes treated with PTCA has been confirmed in a registry study from Emory University.\(^5\) Uncorrected, there was little difference in long-term mortality rates. The CABG patients had more severe disease, and with correction for baseline differences, there was an improved survival rate in insulin-requiring patients with multivessel disease who were revascularized with CABG rather than with PCI. That the more severely diseased patients, in a nonrandomized registry, were selectively sent more often for CABG than for PCI probably represents good clinical decision making.

A 9-year follow-up of the NHLBI registry showed a similar disturbing pattern for patients with diabetes undergoing PCI.\(^6\) Immediate angiographic success and completeness of revascularization were similar, but compared with patients without diabetes, patients with diabetes (who, again, had more severe CAD and comorbidities) had increased rates of hospital mortality (3.2% vs 0.5%), nonfatal MI (7.0% vs 4.1%), death and MI (10.0% vs 4.5%), and the combined end point of death, MI, and CABG (11% vs 6.7%; P less than 0.01 for all). At 9 years, rates of mortality (35.9% vs 17.9%), MI (29% vs 18.5%), repeat PCI (43.0% vs 36.5%), and CABG (37.6% vs 27.4%) were all higher in patients with diabetes than in those without.\(^7\)

However, other data point to a lesser differential effect of PCI in patients with diabetes. For example, data from the BARI registry varied from those of the BARI trial. In the registry, there was no significant difference in cardiac survival for patients with diabetes undergoing PCI (92.5%) and CABG.
(94%; \(P=\text{NS}\)). In the Duke University registry, patients with diabetes and PCI or CABG were matched with the BARI population. The outcome in patients with diabetes was worse than that without diabetes with either CABG or PCI, but there was no differential effect by therapy. The 5-year survival rate for PCI and CABG adjusted for baseline characteristics was 86% and 89% in patients with diabetes and 92% and 93% without diabetes, respectively.\(^921\)

Stents could improve the outcome of patients with diabetes who undergo PCI. In a study with historical controls, the outcome after coronary stenting was superior to that after PTCA in patients with diabetes, and the restenosis rate after stenting was reduced (63% vs 36%; diabetes vs no diabetes with balloon PTCA at 6 months, \(P=0.0002\), compared with 25% and 27% with stents, \(P=\text{NS}\)).\(^919\) On the other hand, patients with diabetes who underwent atherectomy had the same substantial restenosis rate (60% over 6 months).\(^922\) Using data derived from the Northern New England registries, a contemporary BARI-like comparison of long-term survival after PCI (64% with at least 1 stent) versus CAGB found significantly better risk-adjusted long-term survival in CAGB patients with 3-vessel disease (HR = 0.60, \(P<0.01\)). Similar benefits of CAGB over PCI were demonstrated for patients with diabetes.

Three trials have shown that abciximab considerably improved the outcome of PCI in patients with diabetes. In the EPILOG trial, abciximab resulted in a greater decline in death/MI over 6 months after PCI in patients with diabetes (HR 0.36, 95% CI 0.21 to 0.61) than in those without diabetes (HR 0.60, 95% CI 0.44 to 0.83).\(^924\) Similar results have been reported for tirofiban in the PRISM-PLUS trial.\(^925\) EPISTENT was a randomized trial that compared stent plus placebo with stent plus abciximab and balloon plus abciximab in 2399 patients, of whom 20.5% had diabetes and 20.3% had UA.\(^926\) The 30-d event rate (death, MI, and urgent revascularization) in patients with diabetes declined from 12.1% (stent plus placebo) to 5.6% (stent plus abciximab; \(P=0.040\)). At 6 months, the drug reduced revascularization of target arteries in patients with diabetes (16.6% vs 8.1%, \(P=0.02\)). Death or MI was reduced to a similar degree in patients with diabetes as that in patients without diabetes. These benefits were maintained at 1 year.\(^926\) Thus, in the 6-month data, initial GP IIb/IIIa therapy, as well as stenting, considerably improved the safety of PCI in patients with diabetes. In a comparative trial of abiciximab and tirofiban (TARGET), both agents were associated with comparable event rates, including similar rates of 6-month target-vessel revascularization and 1-year mortality.\(^927\)

### 6.2.3. Conclusions

Diabetes occurs in approximately one fifth of patients with UA/NSTEMI and is an independent predictor of adverse outcomes. It is associated with more extensive CAD, unstable lesions, frequent comorbidities, and less favorable long-term outcomes with coronary revascularization, especially with PTCA. It is unclear whether these differences are due to more frequent restenosis and/or severe progression of the underlying disease.\(^889\) The use of stents, particularly with abciximab, appears to provide more favorable results in patients with diabetes, although more data are needed, including with DES. Coronary artery bypass grafting, especially with 1 or both internal mammary arteries, leads to more complete revascularization and a decreased need for reintervention than PCI, even when bare-metal stents are used in diabetic patients with multivessel disease. Given the diffuse nature of diabetic coronary disease, the relative benefits of CAGB over PCI may well persist for diabetic patients, even in the era of DES.

### 6.3. Post-CABG Patients

#### Recommendations

**Class I**

1. **Medical treatment for UA/NSTEMI patients after CABG** should follow the same guidelines as for non-post-CABG patients with UA/NSTEMI. \((\text{Level of Evidence: } C)\)

2. **Because of the many anatomic possibilities that might be responsible for recurrent ischemia, there should be a low threshold for angiography in post-CABG patients with UA/NSTEMI.** \((\text{Level of Evidence: } C)\)

**Class IIa**

1. **Repeat CABG is reasonable for UA/NSTEMI patients with multiple SVG stenoses, especially when there is significant stenosis of a graft that supplies the LAD.** Percutaneous coronary intervention is reasonable for focal saphenous vein stenosis. \((\text{Level of Evidence: } C)\) \(\text{(Note that an intervention on a native vessel is generally preferable to that on a vein graft that supplies the same territory, if possible.)}\)

2. **Stress testing with imaging in UA/NSTEMI post-CABG patients is reasonable.** \((\text{Level of Evidence: } C)\)

Overall, up to 20% of patients presenting with UA/NSTEMI have previously undergone CABG.\(^925\) Conversely, approximately 20% of post-CABG patients develop UA/NSTEMI during an interval of 7.5 years,\(^928\) with a highly variable postoperative time of occurrence.\(^929\) Post-CABG patients who present with UA/NSTEMI are at higher risk, with more extensive CAD and LV dysfunction than those patients who have not previously undergone surgery.

#### 6.3.1. Pathological Findings

Pathologically, intimal hyperplasia or atherosclerosis may develop in SVGs, and there is a particular tendency for thrombotic lesions to develop in these vessels (in 72% of grafts resected in 1 study).\(^930\)-\(^933\) In addition, post-CABG patients may develop atherosclerosis in their native vessels, and this can lead to UA/NSTEMI.\(^933\),\(^934\) However, obstructive lesions are more likely to occur in SVGs (53% within 5 years, 76% at 5 to 10 years, and 92% at greater than 10 years),\(^935\) and there is a high rate of early graft failure in current practice (occlusion in up to one third at 1 year).\(^836\) In grafts in native vessels\(^936\),\(^937\) and technical complications may also play a role in the development of UA/NSTEMI during the early postoperative period.\(^928\),\(^938\) Both angioscopic and angiographic findings indicate that SVG disease is a serious and unstable process. Angioscopically, friable plaques occur uniquely in
SVGs (44% vs 0% in native coronary arteries), whereas rough and white plaques occur in both SVGs and native coronary arteries. Angiographically, the SVGs more frequently have complex lesions (ie, overhanging edges, irregular borders, ulcerations, or thrombosis), thrombi (37% vs 12%, \( P=0.04 \)), and total occlusions (49% vs 24%, \( P=0.02 \)).

### 6.3.2. Clinical Findings and Approach

Compared with UA/NSTEMI patients without prior CABG, post-CABG patients are more often male (presumably because more men than women have undergone CABG), older, and more likely to have diabetes. They have more extensive native-vessel CAD and more previous MIs and LV dysfunction. Symptomatically, these patients have more prolonged chest pain than ACS patients without prior CABG. More than 30% of post-CABG patients have resting ECG abnormalities, and ECG stress tests are therefore less conclusive; however, a test that becomes positive after having been negative is helpful in the diagnosis of ischemia. Myocardial stress perfusion imaging and dobutamine echocardiography are often helpful diagnostically. Furthermore, a positive imaging test can help to define the area of ischemia in post-CABG patients with complex disease.

The outcomes of UA/NSTEMI in post-CABG patients are less favorable than those in patients who have not undergone CABG. There is a high rate of embolization of atherosclerotic material from friable grafts at the time of intervention, which makes these procedures more difficult and which is associated with higher rates of complications. In one matched case-control study of UA, the initial course was similar, but post-CABG patients had twice the incidence of adverse events (death, MI, or recurrent UA) during the first year. This was attributed to a lower rate of complete revascularization, which was possible in only 9 of 42 post-CABG patients compared with 39 of 52 patients who had not previously undergone CABG \( (P=0.001) \). Results were directionally similar in the TIMI III registry of ACS, in which 16% of patients were post-CABG. Here again, early outcomes in post-CABG patients and others were equivalent, but at 1 year, the rate of adverse events (death, MI, or recurrent ischemia) was 39.3% for those who had previously undergone CABG versus 30.2% for those who had not \( (P=0.002) \).

Revascularization with either PCI or reoperation often is indicated and is possible in post-CABG patients with UA/NSTEMI. In a randomized controlled trial that compared stents with PTCA of obstructed SVGs, there was no statistically significant difference in restenosis during a 6-month period, although a trend favored stents \( (34\% \text{ vs } 46\%) \).

### 6.3.3. Conclusions

Post-CABG patients, especially those with only SVGs, are at high risk of UA/NSTEMI. There is a higher likelihood of disease in SVGs than in native arteries, and this difference increases with postoperative time. Pathologically and angiographically, disease in SVGs has characteristics associated with instability. There also are difficulties with treadmill ECG testing and less favorable outcomes with repeat revascularization than in patients who have not undergone previous CABG.

### 6.4. Older Adults

#### Recommendations

**Class I**

1. Older patients withUA/NSTEMI should be evaluated for appropriate acute and long-term therapeutic interventions in a similar manner as younger patients with UA/NSTEMI. *(Level of Evidence: A)*

2. Decisions on management of older patients with UA/NSTEMI should not be based solely on chronologic age but should be patient-centered, with consideration given to general health, functional and cognitive status, comorbidities, life expectancy, and patient preferences and goals. *(Level of Evidence: B)*

3. Attention should be given to appropriate dosing (ie, adjusted by weight and estimated creatinine clearance) of pharmacological agents in older patients with UA/NSTEMI, because they often have altered pharmacokinetics (due to reduced muscle mass, renal and/or hepatic dysfunction, and reduced volume of distribution) and pharmacodynamics (increased risks of hypotension and bleeding). *(Level of Evidence: B)*

4. Older UA/NSTEMI patients face increased early procedural risks with revascularization relative to younger patients, yet the overall benefits from invasive strategies

---

**Table 25. Impact of Age on Outcomes of Acute Coronary Syndrome: GRACE Risk Model**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>No. of Deaths (Hospital Mortality Rate)</th>
<th>Crude OR (95% CI)</th>
<th>Adjusted OR (95% CI)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 45 y</td>
<td>20 (1.3)</td>
<td>Reference</td>
<td>Reference</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45 to 54 y</td>
<td>79 (2.0)</td>
<td>1.47 (0.90 to 2.41)</td>
<td>1.95 (1.06 to 3.61)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>55 to 64 y</td>
<td>171 (3.1)</td>
<td>2.35 (1.47 to 3.74)</td>
<td>2.77 (1.53 to 4.99)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>65 to 74 y</td>
<td>373 (5.5)</td>
<td>4.34 (2.76 to 6.83)</td>
<td>4.95 (2.78 to 8.79)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75 to 84 y</td>
<td>439 (9.3)</td>
<td>7.54 (4.80 to 11.8)</td>
<td>8.04 (4.53 to 14.3)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>85 y or more</td>
<td>260 (18.4)</td>
<td>16.7 (10.5 to 26.4)</td>
<td>15.7 (8.77 to 28.3)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*All \( P \) less than 0.0001. The GRACE risk model includes systolic blood pressure, initial serum creatinine, heart rate, initial cardiac enzyme, Killip class, ST-segment deviation, and cardiac arrest at hospital arrival. Modified with permission from Avezum A, Makdisse M, Spencer F, et al. Impact of age on management and outcome of acute coronary syndrome: observations from the Global Registry of Acute Coronary Events (GRACE). Am Heart J 2005; 149:67–73.*

CI = confidence interval; GRACE = Global Registry of Acute Coronary Events; OR = odds ratio.
are equal to or perhaps greater in older adults and are recommended. \(\textit{Level of Evidence: B}\)

5. Consideration should be given to patient and family preferences, quality-of-life issues, end-of-life preferences, and sociocultural differences in older patients with UA/NSTEMI. \(\textit{Level of Evidence: C}\)

Older adults represent a group of patients in whom baseline risk is higher (Table 25) and who have more comorbidities but who derive equivalent or greater benefit (eg, invasive vs conservative strategy) compared to younger patients. Although a precise definition of “older patients” or “elderly” has not been established in the medical literature, many studies have used this term to refer to those who are 75 years and older. On the basis of a large national ACS registry, older patients make up a substantial portion of those presenting with UA/NSTEMI, with 35% older than 75 years and 11% aged more than 85 years.\(^946\) Older persons also present with a number of special and complex challenges. First, older persons who develop UA/NSTEMI are more likely to present with atypical symptoms, including dyspnea and confusion, rather than with the chest pain typically experienced by younger patients with acute myocardial ischemia.\(^947\) Conversely, noncardiac comorbidities such as chronic obstructive lung disease, gastrolesophageal reflux disease, upper-body musculoskeletal symptoms, pulmonary embolism, and pneumonia also are more frequent and may be associated with chest pain at rest that can mimic classic symptoms of UA/NSTEMI. Hence, successful recognition of true myocardial ischemia in the elderly is often more difficult than in younger patients. Second, they are more likely than younger patients to have altered or abnormal cardiovascular anatomy and physiology, including a diminished beta-sympathetic response, increased cardiac afterload due to decreased arterial compliance and arterial hypertension, orthostatic hypotension, cardiac hypertrophy, and ventricular dysfunction, especially diastolic dysfunction.\(^948\) Third, older patients typically have developed significant cardiac comorbidities and risk factors, such as hypertension, prior MI, HF, cardiac conduction abnormalities, prior CABG, peripheral and cerebrovascular disease, diabetes mellitus, renal insufficiency, and stroke. Fourth, because of this larger burden of comorbid disease, older patients tend to be treated with a greater number of medications and are at higher risk for drug interactions and polypharmacy. Hence, among an already high-risk population, older age is associated with higher disease severity and higher disease and treatment risk at presentation.\(^946\)

6.4.1. Pharmacological Management

Overall, although the elderly have been generally underrepresented in randomized controlled trials, when examined, older subgroups appear to have relatively similar relative risk reductions and similar or greater absolute risk reductions in many end points as younger patients for commonly used treatments in the management of UA/NSTEMI. In spite of an increasing number of possible relative contraindications associated with older age, the rates of serious adverse events for most older patients generally remain low when evidence-based treatment for UA/NSTEMI is provided. Despite generally similar benefits, recent studies such as CRUSADE,\(^946\) TACTICS-TIMI 18,\(^188\) and GRACE\(^942\) have documented significantly lower use of evidence-based therapies in the elderly, including less use of an aggressive, early invasive strategy and of key pharmacotherapies, including anticoagulants, beta blockers, clopidogrel, and GP IIb/IIIa inhibitors.

With this said, precautions need to be taken to personalize these therapies (ie, beginning with lower doses than in younger patients, whenever appropriate, and providing careful observation for toxicity). Older persons are particularly vulnerable to adverse events from cardiovascular drugs due to altered drug metabolism and distribution, as well as to exaggerated drug effects. Reductions in cardiac output and in renal and hepatic perfusion and function decrease the rate of elimination of drugs in the elderly. Additionally, older patients typically have lower drug distribution volumes (due to a lower body mass). As a result, drugs need to be carefully selected and individually adjusted. Current evidence demonstrates that older adults are frequently excessively dosed. In a community-based registry, among treated patients aged 75 years or older, 38% received an excessive dose of UFH, 17% received excessive LMWH, and 65% received an excessive dose of a GP IIb/IIIa antagonist.\(^946\) A subsequent study from the same registry found that 15% of major bleeding in UA/NSTEMI patients could be attributed to excessive dosing.\(^738\) Mortality and length of stay also were higher in patients receiving excessive dosing.

In the elderly, drugs such as beta blockers that undergo first-pass hepatic metabolism exhibit increased bioavailability.\(^949\) Exaggerated pharmacodynamic responses to drugs often resulted from lower cardiac output, plasma volume, and vasomotor tone, as well as blunted baroreceptor and beta-adrenergic responses.

6.4.2. Functional Studies

Older persons can have difficulty performing standardized exercise tolerance tests because of age-related medical problems, such as general deconditioning, decreased lung capacity, chronic pain, sensory neuropathy, osteoarthritis, and muscle weakness. Furthermore, the higher prevalence of preexisting resting ECG abnormalities,\(^942\) arrhythmias,\(^147,950\) and cardiac hypertrophy often make the interpretation of a standard stress ECG inconclusive or impossible. In such patients, alternative methods for evoking evidence of acute myocardial ischemia, such as pharmacological stress testing with dynamic cardiac imaging, may be substituted (see also Section 3.4).

6.4.3. Percutaneous Coronary Intervention in Older Patients

Recent evidence from several major interventional trials has demonstrated a clear benefit for older patients. A collaborative meta-analysis of several more recently published PCI trials (FRISC-II, TACTICS, RITA-3, VINO, and MATE) have suggested that the majority of the benefit from an invasive strategy in the elderly has accrued from contemporary strategies used in trials published after 1999 and in patients with positive troponins or their cardiac biomarkers.\(^628\) These trials indicated that compared with younger patients, the elderly gain important absolute benefits from an early invasive strategy but at a cost of increased bleeding. Specifically, a significant benefit was seen in reduction of the combined...
end point of death and recurrent MI, but only a trend to reduction in death was noted. A recent observational analysis in a community population failed to show an early benefit on in-hospital survival with an invasive strategy in the older subgroup (75 years or older), which highlights the need for continued caution in applying trial results uniformly in older patients. Thus, selection of older patients for an early invasive strategy is complex, including risk from disease and risk from intervention, but given the absolute benefits observed in these trials, age should not preclude consideration.

Despite these potential benefits, older patients are also far less likely to undergo angiography (RR 0.65, \( P < 0.001 \) at 6 weeks) and coronary revascularization (RR 0.79, \( P = 0.002 \) at 6 weeks) after a UA/NSTEMI episode than younger patients. This apparent underuse of potentially beneficial interventions might be due in part to practitioner concerns about the increased risk of complications. Finding the appropriate balance between benefit and risk of aggressive therapies to maximize net clinical outcome remains a challenge in the elderly.

### 6.4.4. Contemporary Revascularization Strategies in Older Patients

Several studies of PCI in patients aged 65 to 75 years have shown that success rates with experienced medical professionals are similar to those in younger patients, but with even older patients, success rates decline and complication rates rise. On the other hand, a Mayo Clinic review of PCI in patients greater than 65 years old (of whom 75% had UA) revealed an overall success rate of 93.5%, an immediate in-hospital mortality rate of 1.4%, and a need for emergency CABG rate of only 0.7%. Angiographic outcome changed little between the 65-69-year-old group and the greater than 75-year-old group, and the 1-year event rate (death, MI, CABG, repeat PCI, or severe angina) was 45.1% in all patients greater than 65 years old. Predictors of outcomes (ie, extent and severity of CAD and comorbidities) after PCI in older patients were the same as those in younger patients. Similarly, a review of coronary stenting in the elderly reported that procedural success rates were high (95% to 98%) and periprocedural complication rates were low (MI 1.2% to 2.8%, urgent CABG 0.9% to 1.8%, repeat PCI 0% to 0.6%) in the elderly, with little difference between those greater than 75 years old and those less than 65 years old. Subgroup analyses in both TIMI IIB136 and FRISC-II251 showed a greater advantage of the invasive strategy in patients older than 65 years of age. More contemporary studies have confirmed this advantage, including TACTICS-TIMI 18. Among patients older than 75 years of age, the early invasive strategy conferred an absolute reduction of 10.8 percentage points (to 10.8% from 21.6%; \( P = 0.016 \)) and a relative reduction of 56% in death or MI at 6 months; however, benefits came with an increased risk of major bleeding events (16.6% vs 6.5%; \( P = 0.009 \)).

A review of 15,679 CABG procedures performed in patients greater than 70 years old from the Toronto Hospital956 reported encouraging results. Operative mortality rates declined from 7.2% in 1982 to 1986, to 4.4% in 1987 to 1991 (and from 17.2% to 9.1% for high-risk patients) but showed little further change in the period of 1992 to 1996. Predictors of operative death (LV dysfunction, previous CABG, peripheral vascular disease, and diabetes) were similar to those in younger patients.

Operative morbidity and mortality rates increase for CABG with advanced age, but outcomes have been favorable compared with medical therapy, and quality of life improves. A recent retrospective review of 662,033 patients who underwent cardiac surgical procedures performed using the STS National Cardiac Database962 found a CABG operative mortality of 2.8% for patients 50 to 79 years of age, 7.1% for patients 80 to 89 years of age, and 11.8% for patients aged 90 years or more. This study included more than 1000 patients over 90 years of age and 5 centenarians and documented that the 57% of nonagenarians without certain risk factors (renal failure, IABP, emergency surgery, or peripheral or cerebrovascular disease) constituted a relatively low-risk group with an operative mortality of only 7.2%, similar to the overall risk in octogenarians. Thus, with appropriate selection, CABG surgery can be an appropriate revascularization strategy in even the oldest patient subgroups.

### 6.4.5. Conclusions

Older patients with UA/NSTEMI tend to have atypical presentations of disease, substantial comorbidity, ECG stress tests that are more difficult to interpret, and different physiological responses to pharmacological agents compared with younger patients. Although they are at highest risk, guideline-recommended therapies are used less frequently. Even though their outcomes with interventions and surgery are not as favorable as those of younger patients, coronary revascularization should be recommended when the same group of prognostic risk factors that play a role in the younger age group are taken into account. The approach to these patients also must consider general medical and cognitive status, bleeding risk and other risk of interventions, anticipated life expectancy, and patient or family preferences.

### 6.5. Chronic Kidney Disease (UPDATED)

#### Class I

1. Creatinine clearance should be estimated in UA/NSTEMI patients and the doses of renally cleared medications should be adjusted according to the pharmacokinetic data for specific medications. (Level of Evidence: B)

2. Patients undergoing cardiac catheterization with receipt of contrast media should receive adequate preparatory hydration. (Level of Evidence: B)

3. Calculation of the contrast volume to creatinine clearance ratio is useful to predict the maximum volume of contrast media that can be given without significantly increasing the risk of contrast-associated nephropathy. (Level of Evidence: B)

#### Class IIa

1. An invasive strategy is reasonable in patients with mild (stage 2) and moderate (stage 3) CKD. (Level of Evidence: B) (There are insufficient data on...
Chronic kidney disease (CKD) is not only a coronary risk equivalent for ascertainment of coronary risk but also a risk factor for the development and progression of CVD. Chronic kidney disease constitutes a risk factor for adverse outcomes after MI, including NSTEMI and other coronary patient subsets. In the highly validated GRACE risk score, serum creatinine is 1 of the 8 independent predictors of death. In recent study, even early CKD constituted a significant risk factor for cardiovascular events and death. Chronic kidney disease also predicts an increase in recurrent cardiovascular events. Cardiovascular death is 10 to 30 times higher in dialysis patients than in the general population. The underrepresentation of patients with renal disease in randomized controlled trials of CVD is of concern. Most of the limited evidence available and current opinion suggest that when appropriately monitored, cardiovascular medications and interventional strategies can be applied safely in those with renal impairment and provide therapeutic benefit. However, not all recent evidence is consistent with this premise: atorvastatin did not significantly reduce the primary end point of cardiovascular death, nonfatal MI, or stroke in a prospective randomized trial of patients with diabetes and end-stage CKD who were undergoing hemodialysis. The preference for primary PCI has also been questioned.

Particularly in the setting of ACS, bleeding complications are higher in this patient subgroup because of platelet dysfunction and dosing errors; benefits of fibrinolytic therapy, antiplatelet agents, and anticoagulants can be negated or outweighed by bleeding complications; and renin-angiotensin-aldosterone inhibitors can impose a greater risk because of the complications of hyperkalemia and worsening renal function in the CKD patient. Angiography carries an increased risk of contrast-induced nephropathy; the usual benefits of percutaneous interventions can be lessened or abolished; and PCI in patients with CKD is associated with a higher rate of early and late complications of bleeding, restenosis, and death. Thus, the identification of CKD is important in that it represents an ACS subgroup with a far more adverse prognosis but for whom interventions have less certain benefit.

Coronary arteriography is a frequent component of the care of ACS patients. As such, contrast-induced nephropathy can constitute a serious complication of diagnostic and interventional procedures (see Section 6.5.1). Identification of CKD patients as recommended in the AHA science advisory on detection of chronic kidney disease in patients with or at increased risk of cardiovascular disease should guide the use of isosmolar contrast agents.

The advisory recommendations are that all patients with CVD be screened for evidence of kidney disease by estimating glomerular filtration rate, testing for microalbuminuria, and measuring the albumin-to-creatinine ratio (Class IIa, Level of Evidence: C). A glomerular filtration rate less than 60 mL per min per 1.73 square meters of body surface should be regarded as abnormal (Class I, Level of Evidence: B). Furthermore, the albumin-to-creatinine ratio should be used to screen for the presence of kidney damage in adult patients with CVD, with values greater than 30 mg of albumin per 1 g of creatinine regarded as abnormal (Class IIa, Level of Evidence: B).

A diagnosis of renal dysfunction is critical to proper medical therapy of UA/NSTEMI. Many cardiovascular drugs used in UA/NSTEMI patients are renally cleared; their doses should be adjusted for estimated creatinine clearance (see also Section 3). In a large community-based registry study, 42% of patients with UA/NSTEMI received excessive initial dosing of at least 1 antiplatelet or antithrombin agent (UFH, LMWH, or GP IIIb/IIIa inhibitor). Renal insufficiency was an independent predictor of excessive dosing. Dosing errors predicted an increased risk of major bleeding. Clinical studies and labeling that defines adjustments for several of these drugs have been based on the Cockroft-Gault formula for estimating creatinine clearance, which is not identical to the MDRD formula. Use of the Cockroft-Gault formula to generate dose adjustments is recommended. The impact of renal dysfunction on biomarkers of necrosis (ie, troponin) is discussed in Section 2.2.8.2.1.

To increase the meager evidence base and to optimize care for this growing high-risk population, the recognition of CKD patients with or at risk of CVD and the inclusion and reporting of renal disease in large CVD trials must be increased in the future.

6.5.1. Angiography in Patients With CKD (NEW SECTION)

Since the 2007 UA/NSTEMI Guidelines were published, several larger randomized trials have been published that reported no difference in contrast-induced nephropathy (CIN) when iodixanol was compared with various other low-osmolar contrast media (LOCM). These and other randomized trials comparing isosmolar iodixanol with LOCM have been summarized in 2 mutually supportive and complementary meta-analyses involving 16 trials in 2763 patients and 25 trials in 3260 patients, respectively. When more recent trials were combined with the older studies, the data supporting a reduction in CIN favoring iodixanol were no longer significant (summary RR: 0.79; 95% CI: 0.56 to 1.12; \( P=0.29 \)) or ioversol, the only ionic LOCM (RR: 0.58; 95% CI: 0.37 to 0.92; \( P=0.022 \)). However, subanalyses showed variations in relative renal safety by specific LOCM: A reduction in CIN was observed when iodixanol was compared to ioxaglate, the only ionic LOCM (RR: 0.58; 95% CI: 0.37 to 0.92; \( P=0.022 \)), and to iohexol, a nonionic LOCM (RR: 0.19; 95% CI: 0.07 to 0.56; \( P=0.0002 \)), but no difference was noted in comparisons of iodixanol with iopamidol, iopromide, or ioversol, and a single trial favored iomeprol. A pooled comparison of iodixanol with all nonionic LOCM other than iohexol indicated equivalent safety (RR: 0.97; 95% CI: 0.72 to 1.32; \( P=0.86 \)). Results were consistent regardless of ancillary preventive therapies (hydration, acetylcytysteine), route of administration (IV or intra-arterial), age, sex, dose, or preexisting CKD or diabetes. Of further interest, findings were similar in the 8 studies (n=1793 patients) performed in the setting of coronary angiography. A more recent study comparing iodixanol versus iopamidol provides additional supportive evidence. However, even these clinical inferences must be tempered by the relative paucity of...
head-to-head trials comparing CIN rates among the various contrast media and the variability in results (eg, for iohexol versus other low-osmolar comparators).981–984 Furthermore, the assumption that a transient rise in serum creatinine after 24 to 48 hours is a reliable predictor of the more serious but somewhat delayed development of renal failure requiring hospitalization or dialysis has been challenged. A nationwide Swedish survey965 of hospitalizations for renal failure after coronary procedures in 57 925 patients found that this risk was paradoxically higher with iodoxanol (1.7%) than ioxaglate (0.8%) or iohexol (0.9%; P < 0.001). Although the result was observational, hence subject to selection bias, it persisted in analyses of high-risk patient subsets (patients with diabetes, prior history of renal failure), in multivariable analysis, and in hospitals crossing over from ioxaglate to iodoxanol. Iodoxanol’s greater viscosity was speculated but not demonstrated to be a possible mechanism for the observed effect. Thus, an overall summary of the current database, updated since previous guideline recommendations in 2007,7 is that strength and consistency of relationships between specific isosmolar or low-osmolar agents and CIN or renal failure are not sufficient to enable a guideline statement on selection among commonly used low-osmolar and isosmolar media. Instead, the 2012 writing group recommends focusing on operator conduct issues shown to be important to protect patients, that is, 1) proper patient preparation with hydration, and 2) adjustment of maximal contrast dose to each patient’s renal function and other clinical characteristics.

With respect to patient preparation, the 2012 writing group reviewed several trials addressing the optimal preparatory regimen of hydration and pharmacotherapy. The basic principle of hydration follows from experimental studies and clinical experience, with isotonic or half-normal saline alone being the historical gold standards.963,966,986–988 More recently, sodium bicarbonate has been tested as the hydrating solution. Some trials have reported superiority of sodium bicarbonate over saline in preventing CIN.989–992 Similarly, some have reported a benefit of N-acetylcysteine administration as adjunctive therapy to hydration,993,994 whereas others have not.994,995 Thus, although the 2012 writing group found the evidence compelling for adequate hydration preparatory to angiography with contrast media, it found the evidence insufficient to recommend a specific regimen.

With respect to limitation of contrast dose by renal function, mounting evidence points to renal-function–specific limits on maximal contrast volumes that can be given without significantly increasing the baseline risk of provoking CIN. In a contemporary study, Laskey et al studied 3179 consecutive patients undergoing PCI and found that a contrast volume to creatinine clearance ratio > 3.7 was a significant and independent predictor of an early and abnormal increase in serum creatinine.967 In an earlier trial, administration of a contrast volume of 5 mL×body weight (kg)/serum creatinine (mg/dL), applied to 16 592 patients undergoing cardiac catheterization, was associated with a 6-fold increase in the likelihood of patients developing CIN requiring dialysis.968

Patients with CKD are consistently underrepresented in randomized controlled trials of cardiovascular disease.180 The impact of an invasive strategy has been uncertain in this group. The SWEDHEART (Swedish Web-System for Enhancement and Development of Evidence-Based Care in Heart Disease Evaluated According to Recommended Therapies) study included a cohort of 23 262 patients hospitalized for NSTEMI in Sweden between 2003 and 2006 who were age ≤ 80 years.970 This contemporary nationwide registry of nearly all consecutive patients examined the distribution of CKD and the use of early revascularization after NSTEMI and evaluated whether early revascularization (by either PCI or CABG) within 14 days of admission for NSTEMI altered outcomes at all stages of kidney function.

In SWEDHEART, all-cause mortality was assessed at 1 year and was available in > 99% of patients. Moderate or more advanced CKD (estimated glomerular filtration rate [eGFR] < 60 mL/min per 1.73 m2) was present in 56 89 patients (24.4%). After multivariable adjustment, the 1-year mortality in the overall cohort was 36% lower with early revascularization (HR: 0.64; 95% CI: 0.56 to 0.73; P < 0.001).970 The magnitude of the difference in 1-year mortality was similar in patients with normal eGFR (early revascularization versus medically treated: 1.9% versus 10%; HR: 0.58; 95% CI: 0.42 to 0.80; P = 0.001), mild CKD [eGFR 60 to 89 mL/min per 1.73 m2] (2.4% versus 10%; HR: 0.64; 95% CI: 0.52 to 0.80; P = 0.001), and moderate CKD [eGFR 30 to 59 mL/min per 1.73 m2] (7% versus 22%; HR: 0.68; 95% CI: 0.54 to 0.86; P = 0.001). The benefit of an invasive therapy was not evident in patients with severe CKD stage 4 [eGFR 15 to 29 mL/min per 1.73 m2] (22% versus 41%; HR: 0.91; 95% CI: 0.51 to 1.61; P = 0.780) or in those with CKD stage 5 kidney failure [eGFR < 15 mL/min per 1.73 m2 or receiving dialysis] (44% versus 53%; HR: 1.61; 95% CI: 0.84 to 3.09; P = 0.150). Early revascularization was associated with increased 1-year survival in UA/NSTEMI patients with mild to moderate CKD, but no association was observed in those with severe or end-stage kidney disease.970

The findings from SWEDHEART are limited by their nonrandomized nature and the potential for selection bias despite the intricate multivariable adjustment.970 On the other hand, SWEDHEART captured unselected patients with more comorbidities and is therefore more reflective of real-world patients.

Recently, a collaborative meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials that compared invasive and conservative treatments in UA/NSTEMI was conducted to estimate the effectiveness of early angiography in patients with CKD.969 The meta-analysis demonstrated that an invasive strategy was associated with a significant reduction in rehospitalization (RR: 0.76; 95% CI: 0.66 to 0.87; P < 0.001) at 1 year compared with conservative strategy. The meta-analysis did not show any significant differences with regard to all-cause mortality (RR: 0.76; 95% CI: 0.49 to 1.17; P = 0.21), nonfatal MI (RR: 0.78; 95% CI: 0.52 to 1.16; P = 0.22), and the composite of death/nonfatal MI (RR: 0.79; 95% CI: 0.53 to 1.18; P = 0.24).969

Our recommendation is that an early invasive strategy (ie, diagnostic angiography with intent to perform revascularization) is a reasonable strategy in patients with mild and moderate CKD. Clinicians should exercise judgment in all populations with impaired kidney function when considering
whether to implement an invasive strategy. Such implementation should be considered only after careful assessment of the risks, benefits, and alternatives for each individual patient.

The observational data with regard to patients with mild to severe CKD also support the recognition that CKD is an underappreciated high-risk characteristic in the UA/NSTEMI population. The increased risk of mortality associated with mild, moderate, and severe CKD remains evident across studies.963,964,969,996 Indeed, the risks of short- and long-term mortality are increased as the gradient of renal dysfunction worsens.963,969,996 The optimal role of early revascularization in this heterogeneous population of patients remains an important topic of research and investigation as discussed earlier in this update.997

6.6. Cocaine and Methamphetamine Users

Recommendations

Class I

1. Administration of sublingual or intravenous NTG and intravenous or oral calcium channel blockers is recommended for patients with ST-segment elevation or depression that accompanies ischemic chest discomfort after cocaine use. (Level of Evidence: C)

2. Immediate coronary angiography, if possible, should be performed in patients with ischemic chest discomfort after cocaine use whose ST segments remain elevated after NTG and calcium channel blockers; PCI is recommended if occlusive thrombus is detected. (Level of Evidence: C)

3. Fibrinolytic therapy is useful in patients with ischemic chest discomfort after cocaine use if ST segments remain elevated despite NTG and calcium channel blockers, if there are no contraindications, and if coronary angiography is not possible. (Level of Evidence: C)

Class IIa

1. Administration of NTG or oral calcium channel blockers can be beneficial for patients with normal ECGs or minimal ST-segment deviation suggestive of ischemia after cocaine use. (Level of Evidence: C)

2. Coronary angiography, if available, is probably recommended for patients with ischemic chest discomfort after cocaine use with ST-segment depression or isolated T-wave changes not known to be previously present and who are unresponsive to NTG and calcium channel blockers. (Level of Evidence: C)

3. Management of UA/NSTEMI patients with methamphetamine use similar to that of patients with cocaine use is reasonable. (Level of Evidence: C)

Class IIb

1. Administration of combined alpha- and beta-blocking agents (eg, labetalol) may be reasonable for patients after cocaine use with hypertension (systolic blood pressure greater than 150 mm Hg) or those with sinus tachycardia (pulse greater than 100 beats per min) provided that the patient has received a vasodilator, such as NTG or a calcium channel blocker, within close temporal proximity (ie, within the previous hour). (Level of Evidence: C)

Class III

1. Coronary angiography is not recommended in patients with chest pain after cocaine use without ST-segment or T-wave changes and with a negative stress test and cardiac biomarkers. (Level of Evidence: C)

The use of cocaine can produce myocardial ischemia, thereby leading to UA/NSTEMI.998–1001 The widespread use of cocaine makes it mandatory to consider this cause, because its recognition mandates special management. Specifically, initial management recommendations for cocaine-induced ACS include NTG and calcium channel antagonists. Assessment for resolution of chest discomfort and ECG changes is then undertaken before fibrinolytic therapy is initiated or angiography is considered. The use of beta blockers in close proximity (ie, within 4 to 6 h) of cocaine exposure is controversial, with some evidence for harm; thus, when used, the guidelines recommend combination alpha and beta blockade in addition to a vasodilator. There are no data to guide recommendations for beta blockade later after exposure, after cocaine elimination.

The action of cocaine is to block presynaptic reuptake of neurotransmitters such as norepinephrine and dopamine, which produces excess concentrations at the postsynaptic receptors that lead to sympathetic activation and the stimulation of dopaminergic neurons.1002 There may also be a direct contractile effect on vascular smooth muscle.1009 Detoxification is accomplished with plasma and liver cholinesterases, which form metabolic products that are excreted in the urine. Infants, elderly patients, and patients with hepatic dysfunction lack sufficient plasma cholinesterase to metabolize the drug1007 and therefore are at high risk of adverse effects with cocaine use.

6.6.1. Coronary Artery Spasm With Cocaine Use

The basis for coronary spasm has been demonstrated in both in vitro1003 and in vivo999,1004–1008 experiments in animals and humans. Reversible vasoconstriction of rabbit aortic rings has been demonstrated with cocaine in concentrations of 10−3 to 10−4 mol per liter. Pretreatment with calcium channel blockers markedly inhibits cocaine-induced vasoconstriction. Coronary injection of cocaine produces vasoconstriction in miniswine with experimentally induced nonocclusive atherosclerotic lesions.1009

Nademanee et al1010 performed 24-h ECG monitoring in 21 male cocaine users after admission to a substance abuse treatment center and found that 8 had frequent episodes of ST-segment elevation, most during the first 2 weeks of withdrawal. In cocaine users with prolonged myocardial ischemia, coronary arteriography can reveal coronary artery spasm with otherwise normal-appearing coronary arteries or with underlying minimally obstructive coronary atherosclerosis.999,1001,1004 The cocaine-induced increase in coronary vascular resistance is reversed with calcium channel blockers.1005,1011 Cocaine increases the response of platelets to arachidonic acid, thus
increasing thromboxane A2 production and platelet aggregation.1012 In addition, reversible combined reduction in protein C and antithrombin III has been observed in patients with cocaine-related arterial thrombosis.1013 All of these effects favor coronary thrombosis.999,1006,1014 Coronary thrombosis can also develop as a consequence of coronary spasm.

Cocaine users can develop ischemic chest discomfort that is indistinguishable from the UA/NSTEMI secondary to coronary atherosclerosis. The patient who presents with prolonged myocardial ischemia should be questioned about the use of cocaine. In a study by Hollander et al,1015 the presence or absence of cocaine use was assessed in only 13% of patients who presented to the ED with chest pain. Table 26 lists the clinical characteristics of a typical patient with cocaine-related chest pain or MI.1001

Most patients who present to the ED with cocaine-associated chest pain do not develop MI.1016 MI development has been reported to occur only in 6% of such patients.1001

Accelerated coronary atherosclerosis has been reported in chronic users of cocaine1017,1018, a coronary artery spasm is more readily precipitated at sites of atherosclerotic plaques.1014 Cocaine causes sinus tachycardia, as well as an increase in blood pressure and myocardial contractility, thereby increasing myocardial oxygen demand.1005 These increases can precipitate myocardial ischemia and UA/NSTEMI in both the presence and absence of obstructive coronary atherosclerosis and coronary spasm. Aortic dissection1019 and coronary artery dissection1999,1019 have been reported as consequences of cocaine use. Other reported cardiac complications are myocarditis1018 and cardiomyopathy.1020,1021

### 6.6.2. Treatment

When a patient with or suspected of cocaine use is seen in the ED with chest pain compatible with myocardial ischemia and ST-segment elevation, sublingual NTG or a calcium channel blocker (eg, diltiazem 20 mg IV) should be administered.999,1008 If there is no response, immediate coronary angiography should be performed, if possible. Fibrinolytic therapy has been successfully employed in patients with MI after cocaine use, although these patients frequently have contraindications to fibrinolysis, including hypertension, seizures, or aortic dissection. Thus, PCI may be a preferred method of revascularization in this setting. However, even this therapeutic strategy is problematic in subjects with cocaine-related MI; those in whom stents are deployed are at substantial risk of subsequent in-stent thrombosis unless double-antiplatelet therapy (ASA and clopidogrel) is ingested regularly and predictably for several months afterward, and those who take part in substance abuse often are unreliable in adhering to such a regimen. Thus, bare-metal stents, which require a shorter duration of dual-antiplatelet therapy, generally are preferred to DES in cocaine abusers. If thrombus is present and PCI is unavailable or ineffective, fibrinolytic agents may be administered if there are no contraindications.1022,1023 If catheterization is not available, intravenous fibrinolytic therapy may be considered in patients with ST-segment elevation and clinical symptoms consistent with MI.

If the ECG is normal or shows only minimal T-wave changes and there is a history of chest pain compatible with acute myocardial ischemia, the patient should receive sublingual NTG or an oral calcium channel blocker and be observed. After cocaine use, increased motor activity, skeletal muscle injury, and rhabdomyolysis can occur, causing CK and even CK-MB elevation in the absence of MI.1024 Troponin I and TnT are more specific for myocardial injury and therefore are preferred. Blood should be drawn twice for serum markers of myocardial necrosis at 6-h intervals. If the ECG shows ST-segment changes and the cardiac biochemical markers are normal, the patient should be observed in the hospital in a monitored bed for 24 h; most complications will occur within 24 h.1025 If the patient's clinical condition is unchanged and the ECG remains unchanged after 24 h, the patient can be discharged.1026 A shorter observation period of 9 to 12 h, with measurement of troponin levels at 3, 6, and 9 h after presentation, also has been validated.1026

Many observers believe that beta blockers are contraindicated in cocaine-induced coronary spasm because there is evidence from a single double-blind, randomized, placebo-controlled trial that beta-adrenergic blockade augments cocaine-induced coronary artery vasoconstriction.1027 Others believe that if the patient has a high sympathetic state with sinus tachycardia and hypertension, beta blockers should be used.1999 Labetalol, an alpha and beta blocker, has been advocated, because it has been shown not to induce coronary artery vasoconstriction even though its beta-adrenergic–blocking action predominates over its alpha-adrenergic–blocking activity in the doses that are commonly used.1028 Therefore, in cocaine-induced myocardial ischemia and vasoconstriction, NTG and calcium channel blockers are the preferred drugs. Both NTG and verapamil have been shown to reverse cocaine-induced hypertension, coronary arterial vasoconstriction,1008,1027 and tachycardia (verapamil).
the frequency of other potentially life-threatening arrhythmias is not negligible. Clinical presentation resembles that of cocaine-associated ACS. On the basis of the similarities in pathophysiology and these few clinical observations, therapy similar to that of cocaine-induced UA/NSTEMI is recommended pending information more specific to methamphetamine.

6.7. Variant (Prinzmetal’s) Angina

Recommendations

Class I

1. Diagnostic investigation is indicated in patients with a clinical picture suggestive of coronary spasm, with investigation for the presence of transient myocardial ischemia and ST-segment elevation during chest pain. (Level of Evidence: A)

2. Coronary angiography is recommended in patients with episodic chest pain accompanied by transient ST-segment elevation. (Level of Evidence: B)

3. Treatment with nitrates and calcium channel blockers is recommended in patients with variant angina whose coronary angiogram shows no or nonobstructive coronary artery lesions. Risk factor modification is recommended, with patients with atherosclerotic lesions considered to be at higher risk. (Level of Evidence: B)

Class IIb

1. Percutaneous coronary intervention may be considered in patients with chest pain and transient ST-segment elevation and a significant coronary artery stenosis. (Level of Evidence: B)

2. Provocative testing may be considered in patients with no significant angiographic CAD and no documentation of transient ST-segment elevation when clinically relevant symptoms possibly explained by coronary artery spasm are present. (Level of Evidence: C)

Class III

1. Provocative testing is not recommended in patients with variant angina and high-grade obstructive stenosis on coronary angiography. (Level of Evidence: B)

Variant angina (Prinzmetal’s angina, periodic angina) is a form of UA that usually occurs spontaneously and is characterized by transient ST-segment elevation that spontaneously resolves or resolves with NTG use without progression to MI. The earliest stages of MI can also be associated with cyclic ST-segment elevations, but MI does not possess the nature of periodic angina. The spasm is most commonly focal and can occur simultaneously at more than 1 site. Even coronary segments that are apparently normal on coronary angiography often have evidence of mural atherosclerosis on intravascular ultrasound. This can result in localized endothelial dysfunction and coronary spasm.

Patients with Prinzmetal’s angina frequently have coronary artery plaques that can be either nonobstructive or obstructive. Walling et al reported that coronary arteriography showed 1-vessel disease in 81 (39%) of 217 patients and multivessel disease in 40 (19%). Rovai et al found a similar high prevalence of obstructive disease in 162 patients with variant angina.

6.7.1. Clinical Picture

Although chest discomfort in the patient with variant angina can be precipitated by exercise, it usually occurs without any preceding increase in myocardial oxygen demand; the majority of patients have normal exercise tolerance, and stress testing may be negative. Because the anginal discomfort usually occurs at rest without a precipitating cause, it may simulate UA/NSTEMI secondary to coronary atherosclerosis. Episodes of Prinzmetal’s angina often occur in clusters, with prolonged asymptomatic periods of weeks to months. Attacks can be precipitated by an emotional stress, hyperventilation, exercise, or exposure to cold. A circadian variation in the episodes of angina is most often present, with most attacks occurring in the early morning. Compared with patients with chronic stable angina, patients with variant angina are younger and, except for smoking, have fewer coronary risk factors. Some studies have shown an association of variant angina with other vasospastic disorders, such as migraine headache and Raynaud’s phenomenon. The presence of syncope during an episode of chest pain suggests severe ischemia related to an acute occlusion, often due to focal spasm.

Most often, the attacks of angina resolve spontaneously without evidence of MI. However, a prolonged vasospasm may result in complications such as MI, a high degree of AV block, life-threatening ventricular tachycardia, or sudden death.

6.7.2. Pathogenesis

The pathogenesis of focal coronary spasm in this condition is not well understood. The probable underlying defect is the presence of dysfunctional endothelium that exposes the medial smooth muscle to vasoconstrictors such as catecholamines, thromboxane A2, serotonin, histamine, and endothelin. Endothelial dysfunction also can impair coronary flow-dependent vasodilation owing to the decreased production and release of nitric oxide and enhanced phosphorylation of myosin light chains, an important step in smooth muscle contraction. There can be an imbalance between endothelium-produced vasodilator factors (ie, prostacyclin, nitric oxide) and vasoconstrictr factors (ie, endothelin, angiotensin II) that favors the latter. There also is evidence of involvement of the autonomic nervous system, with reduced parasympathetic tone and enhanced reactivity of the alpha-adrenergic vascular receptors. Regardless of the mechanism, the risk for focal spasm is transient but recurrent.

6.7.3. Diagnosis

The key to the diagnosis of variant angina is the documentation of ST-segment elevation in a patient during transient chest discomfort (which usually occurs at rest, typically in the early morning hours, and nonreproducibly during exercise) and that resolves when the chest discomfort abates. Typically, NTG
is exquisitely effective in relieving the spasm. ST-segment elevation implies transmural focal ischemia associated with complete or near-complete coronary occlusion of an epicardial coronary artery in the absence of collateral circulation. In variant angina, the dynamic obstruction can be superimposed on severe or nonsevere coronary stenosis or supervene in an angiographically normal coronary artery segment. Hence, coronary angiography is usually part of the workup of these patients and can help orient treatment.

It is noteworthy that spasm often develops spontaneously during angiography, which aids the diagnosis in patients with no previously documented ST-segment elevation; catheter-induced spasm is not, however, an indicator of vasospastic disease. Diagnostic tests for Prinzmetal’s angina are based on the recording of transient ST-segment elevation during an episode of chest pain. Continuous 12-lead ECG monitoring can be performed for this purpose in-hospital or as an outpatient; recording during numerous episodes of pain improves diagnostic sensitivity. A treadmill exercise test is also useful; one third of patients will show ST-segment elevation, another third ST-segment depression, and one third no ST-segment change. Interestingly, the results may not be reproducible within the same patients and are more often positive when the test is performed in the early morning hours. A 2-dimensional echocardiogram or the injection of a nuclear marker at the time of chest pain may help document the presence of transmural ischemia. A number of other provocative tests can be used to precipitate coronary artery spasm when the diagnosis is suspected but not objectively documented. Nitrates and calcium channel blockers should be withdrawn well before provocative testing. These tests are more often used during coronary angiography; the spasm can then be visualized before the appearance of chest pain and promptly relieved by the intracoronary injection of NTG. The test can also be performed in a coronary care unit setting while the patient is monitored for ST-segment elevation, but this is recommended only if the coronary anatomy is known. Such nonpharmacological tests include the cold pressor test and hyperventilation performed for 6 min in the morning, alone or after exercise.1059 Pharmacological tests in general provide a better diagnostic yield. Ergonovine, methylergonovine, and ergometrine have been most widely studied and used in the past, but methylergonovine and ergometrine are no longer generally available, and the use of ergonovine is limited. Acetylcholine and methacholine are now predominantly used for this diagnostic purpose. Although the spasm is usually promptly relieved with NTG administered intracoronarily or intravenously, it may at times be refractory to therapy with NTG and other vasodilators and may be recurrent in the same segment or in other coronary artery segments, resulting in prolonged ischemia, MI, or occasionally, death.1055 For these reasons, provocative tests are now rarely used and are limited to a few indications, such as patients with suggestive symptoms that could be helped by an appropriate diagnosis not otherwise reached, patients in whom treatment with nitrates and calcium channel blockers has failed, and patients with a life-threatening disease in whom the physician wants to verify the efficacy of the treatment. Thus, patients with a positive hyperventilation test are more likely to have a higher frequency of attacks, multivessel spasm, or high degree of AV block or ventricular tachycardia than are patients with a negative hyperventilation test,1054 and high-risk patients whose tests become negative with treatment are more likely to have a favorable long-term course. The investigation of coronary spasm in patients with coronary artery lesions of borderline significance can be complemented by other diagnostic procedures such as intravascular ultrasound, functional flow reverse, and other functional testing to assess more accurately the significance of the obstruction.

6.7.4. Treatment
Coronary spasm is usually very responsive to NTG, long-acting nitrates, and calcium channel blockers,1056–1058 which are considered first-line therapies. (Beta-blockers have theoretical adverse potential, and their clinical effect is controversial.) Smoking should be discontinued. Usually, a calcium channel blocker in a moderate to high dose (eg, verapamil 240 to 480 mg per d, diltiazem 180 to 360 mg per d, or nifedipine 60 to 120 mg per d) is started; patients with very active disease can require a combination of nitrates and 2 calcium channel blockers of different classes (ie, a dihydropyridine with verapamil or diltiazem). Alpha-receptor blockers have been reported to be of benefit, especially in patients who are not responding completely to calcium channel blockers and nitrates.1050 In patients who develop coronary spasm (with or without provocation) during coronary angiography; 0.5 mg of NTG should be infused directly into the coronary artery that is involved.

6.7.5. Prognosis
The prognosis of variant angina is usually excellent in patients with variant angina who receive medical therapy, especially in patients with normal or near-normal coronary arteries. Yasue et al1059 reported an 89% to 97% overall 5-year survival rate. In a 7-year follow-up in approximately 300 patients, the incidence of sudden death was 3.6% and the incidence of MI was 6.5%.1059 Patients with coronary artery vasospasm superimposed on a fixed obstructive CAD have a worse prognosis. In a study of 162 patients with variant angina by Rovai et al,1038 patients with normal coronary arteries and single-vessel disease had a 5-year survival rate of 95% compared with a rate of 80% for those with multivessel disease. Almost identical survival rates were reported in an earlier study by Waller et al.1017 Occasional patients may require instrumentation with a pacemaker to prevent transient AV block associated with ischemia or with a defibrillator to prevent sudden death associated with ischemia-induced ventricular fibrillation. Treatment can at times be very frustrating in the occasional patient refractory to standard medication. Cardiac denervation has been used in these patients with marginal benefit.

6.8. Cardiovascular “Syndrome X”

Recommendations

Class I

1. Medical therapy with nitrates, beta blockers, and calcium channel blockers, alone or in combination, is recommended in patients with cardiovascular syndrome X. (Level of Evidence: B)
2. Risk factor reduction is recommended in patients with cardiovascular syndrome X. *(Level of Evidence: B)*

**Class IIb**

1. Intracoronary ultrasound to assess the extent of atherosclerosis and rule out missed obstructive lesions may be considered in patients with syndrome X. *(Level of Evidence: B)*

2. If no ECGs during chest pain are available and coronary spasm cannot be ruled out, coronary angiography and provocative testing with acetylcholine, adenosine, or methacholine and 24-h ambulatory ECG may be considered. *(Level of Evidence: C)*

3. If coronary angiography is performed and does not reveal a cause of chest discomfort, and if syndrome X is suspected, invasive physiological assessment (ie, coronary flow reserve measurement) may be considered. *(Level of Evidence: C)*

4. Imipramine or aminophylline may be considered in patients with syndrome X for continued pain despite implementation of Class I measures. *(Level of Evidence: C)*

5. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation and spinal cord stimulation for continued pain despite the implementation of Class I measures may be considered for patients with syndrome X. *(Level of Evidence: B)*

**Class III**

1. Medical therapy with nitrates, beta blockers, and calcium channel blockers for patients with noncardiac chest pain is not recommended. *(Level of Evidence: C)*

6.8.1. Definition and Clinical Picture

Cardiovascular "syndrome X" refers to patients with angina or angina-like discomfort with exercise, ST-segment depression on exercise testing, and normal or nonobstructed coronary arteries on arteriography.1060 This entity should be differentiated from the metabolic syndrome X (metabolic syndrome), which describes patients with insulin resistance, hyperinsulinemia, dyslipidemia, hypertension, and abdominal obesity. It also should be differentiated from noncardiac chest pain. Syndrome X is more common in women than in men.784,1060–1062 Chest pain can vary from that of typical angina pectoris to chest pain with atypical features to chest pain that simulates UA secondary to CAD.1061 Other atypical features can be prolonged chest pain at rest and chest pain that is unresponsive to NTG.1061 Most often, the chest pain occurs with activity and simulates angina pectoris due to stable CAD. However, because chest pain can accelerate in frequency or intensity or may occur at rest, the patient can present with the clinical picture of UA. Therefore, this syndrome is discussed in this guideline.

The cause of the discomfort and ST-segment depression in patients with syndrome X is not well understood. The most frequently proposed causes are impaired endothelium-dependent arterial vasodilation with decreased nitric oxide production, impaired microvascular dilation (non–endothelium-dependent), increased sensitivity to sympathetic stimulation, or coronary vasoconstriction in response to exercise.836,1064,1065 Increased levels of plasma endothelin correlate with impaired coronary microvascular dilation.1066 There is increasing evidence that these patients frequently also have an increased responsiveness to pain and an abnormality in pain perception.

The diagnosis of syndrome X is suggested by the triad of anginal-type chest discomfort, objective evidence of ischemia, and absence of obstructive CAD. The diagnosis can be confirmed by provocative coronary angiographic testing with acetylcholine for coronary endothelium-dependent function and adenosine for non–endothelium-dependent microvascular function. Other causes of angina-like chest discomfort not associated with cardiac disease, such as esophageal dysmotility, fibromyalgia, and costochondritis, must also be eliminated. In addition, in patients with a clinical presentation consistent with variant angina, coronary spasm must be ruled out by the absence of ST-segment elevation with the anginal discomfort or by provocative testing. Myocardial perfusion scanning may be abnormal owing to a patchy abnormal response to exercise of the microvasculature that can lead to reduced coronary flow to different regions of the myocardium.836 Magnetic resonance imaging studies also may suggest myocardial ischemia.1067,1068

The intermediate-term prognosis of patients with syndrome X has been reported to be excellent in older studies.1061,1063,1069 The CASS registry reported a 96% 7-year survival rate in patients with anginal-type chest pain, normal coronary arteriograms, and an LVEF greater than 0.50.1070 However, testing for ischemia was not performed in CASS. More recent data from WISE indicate that the prognosis in syndrome X, validated by ischemia testing, is not entirely benign with respect to risk of cardiac death and nonfatal MI.1062,1063,1067 The WISE data demonstrate that the prognosis is related to the extent of angiographic disease across the range of 20% stenosis to obstructive lesions.1062 Long-term follow-up shows that ventricular function usually remains normal,1063 although there have been reports of progressive LV dysfunction, and many patients continue to have chest pain that requires medication.1071

Additional data from WISE838,871–878 suggest adverse outcomes in some women with myocardial ischemia on noninvasive testing and nonobstructive CAD. A number of variables may be contributory. Intramural lesions, evidence of an atherosclerotic burden, are evident on intravascular ultrasound. A decrease in coronary flow reserve appears to independently predict major coronary events. In addition, there is important coronary endothelial dysfunction that may be related to hormonal influences, inflammatory markers, or oxidative stress and possibly to a clustering of risk factors as is seen in the metabolic syndrome. Other microvascular dysfunction may be present. Although half of the WISE women with myocardial ischemia documented on noninvasive testing had no flow-limiting coronary obstructive disease at angiography, not only were there persisting symptoms, but there was a subsequent significant occurrence of coronary events. Evaluation of the 4-year risk-adjusted freedom from death or MI showed that women with no or minimal obstructive disease had a total rate of occurrence of these end points of 9.4% by 4 years. Pending additional data, aggressive coronary risk factor reduction appears to be appropriate.
6.8.2. Treatment
Persistence of symptoms is common, and many patients do not return to work. The demonstration of normal coronary arteries on angiography can be reassuring. In 1 study, after a normal coronary arteriogram, there was a reduced need for hospitalization and a reduction in the number of hospital days for cardiac reasons. However, even minimal atherosclerotic disease on angiography warrants risk factor modification.

Both beta blockers and calcium channel blockers have been found to be effective in reducing the number of episodes of chest discomfort. Beneficial effects with nitrates are seen in approximately one half of patients. The use of alpha-adrenergic blockers would appear to be a rational therapy, but the results of small trials are inconsistent. Imipramine 50 mg daily has been successful in some chronic pain syndromes, including syndrome X, reducing the frequency of chest pain by 50%. Transcutaneous electrical nerve stimulation and spinal cord stimulation can offer good pain control. Estrogen in postmenopausal women with angina and normal coronary arteriograms has been shown to reverse the acetylcholine-induced coronary arterial vasoconstriction, presumably by improving endothelium-dependent coronary vasomotion, and to reduce the frequency of chest pain episodes by 50%. However, because of increased cardiovascular and other risks documented in randomized controlled trials of primary and secondary coronary prevention, hormone therapy is not recommended for chronic conditions.

Statin therapy and exercise training have improved exercise capacity, endothelial function, and symptoms. It is recommended that patients be reassured of the excellent intermediate-term prognosis and treated with long-acting nitrates. If the patient continues to have episodes of chest pain, a calcium channel blocker or beta blocker can be started. Finally, 50 mg of imipramine daily has been successful in reducing the frequency of chest pain episodes. Cognitive behavioral therapy can be beneficial. If symptoms persist, other causes of chest pain, especially esophageal dysmotility, should be ruled out.

6.9. Takotsubo Cardiomyopathy
A disorder, or group of disorders, with several names (stress-induced cardiomyopathy, transient LV apical ballooning, Takotsubo cardiomyopathy, and broken heart syndrome) is an uncommon but increasingly reported cause of ACS. Takotsubo cardiomyopathy is noteworthy for the absence of obstructive coronary artery disease, typical precipitation by intense psychological or emotional stress, and predominant occurrence in postmenopausal women. The characteristic finding of apical LV ballooning is seen on left ventriculography or echocardiography, with transient ST elevation or deep T-wave inversions on the surface ECG. Despite the presence of positive cardiac biomarkers and frequent hemodynamic compromise or even cardiogenic shock, almost all patients recover completely, typically with normal wall motion within 1 to 4 weeks.

7. Conclusions and Future Directions
The last quarter century has witnessed enormous strides in the understanding of ACS pathophysiology and its management. These have included the critical role of coronary thrombosis, the novel concept and suggestion of a therapeutic benefit of reperfusion therapy, and finally, the demonstration of mortality reductions with fibrinolysis in large, multicenter trials. However, these trials also uncovered the paradox that fibrinolysis did not benefit or even harmed NSTEMI patients. This central management dichotomy, together with other differences between STEMI and UA/NSTEMI, has been reflected since 2000 in separate practice guidelines. Despite these differences, more remains in common than distinct, including the discovery that atherothrombosis is an active, inflammatory process. Further inquiry has led to the concept of the vulnerable plaque and the vulnerable patient.

Whereas the incidence and risk of STEMI have decreased over the past 25 years, the relative frequency of UA/NSTEMI has increased, and its risk has remained relatively high (now comparable to that of STEMI). Hence, improving UA/NSTEMI outcomes remains a challenge for the future.

A contemporary multinational observational study has emphasized the benefits of applying evidence-based guidelines in clinical practice. Between 1999 and 2006, 27,558 patients with UA/NSTEMI in 14 countries were enrolled and followed for 6 months after discharge. Increases over the 7 years of enrollment were observed in the use of interventional therapy and of major pharmacological therapies, including beta blockers, statins, ACE inhibitors (or ARBs), low molecular weight heparin, GP IIb/IIa inhibitors, and thienopyridines. These changes were accompanied by marked declines (by one half) in in-hospital rates of heart failure or cardiogenic shock and recurrent MI and in 6-month rates of death (from 4.9% to 3.3%) and stroke (1.4% to 0.7%). Improved outcomes occurred despite an increase in patient risk profile. The future should emphasize further improvements in evidence-based guideline applications.

Improving prehospital and ED assessment should aim at more efficient entry into the health care system (eg, limiting delays for NTG-refractory angina before calling 9-1-1), diagnosis and risk stratification (eg, using marker changes while they are still in the normal range; in the future, with the aid of nontraditional biomarkers), and initiation of therapy. The future will see the increasing use of new imaging tests to assess the chest pain patient. By simultaneously assessing cardiac function, perfusion, and viability, CMR can yield a high sensitivity and specificity for diagnosis of CAD/ACS. Multislice cardiac computed tomography, which combines coronary calcium scoring with noninvasive coronary angiography (current resolution 0.5 mm), has undergone favorable initial evaluation for assessment of the low- to intermediate-risk chest pain patient. The current status and appropriate application of CMR and cardiac CT are addressed in recent AACC/AHA documents.

The concept of a network of “heart attack centers” has been proposed as a way to improve MI care in the future. These heart attack centers would be organized and certified to provide the highest levels of care and would be geographically readily accessible to virtually all patients.

For high-risk patients, the concept of establishing and maintaining normal levels of myocardial perfusion mechanically continues to gain support, with evidence favoring intervention.
at even shorter (eg, less than 6 to 24 h) rather than longer (ie, greater than 48 to 96 h) intervals.624 The future should bring additional important information on this issue.

In contrast, for low-risk patients, evidence is growing that an initially noninvasive approach may be preferred (eg, PCI shows benefit in high-risk women, as in men, but carries adverse risk potential in low-risk women).498,505 This dependence of therapeutic benefit on disease risk has also been shown for antiplatelet and anticoagulant therapies. Hence, there is an increasing need to optimally stratify risk; some progress has been made (eg, with the use of biomarkers integrated into an overall clinical risk score; see Section 2.2), but further development of risk assessment algorithms will be welcome in the future.

Platelets play a critical role UA/NSTEMI, and antiplatelet therapy continues to undergo testing. Higher (eg, 600 mg or more of clopidogrel) and earlier loading doses of clopidogrel, in addition to new P2Y12 receptor inhibitor (prasugrel and ticagrelor) have been tested since the previous guidelines were published (see Section 3.2), with evidence of earlier and more potent antiplatelet activity. However, an incremental benefit of triple-antiplatelet therapy (ASA, GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor, and clopidogrel) over double therapy with clopidogrel plus ASA (without GP IIb/IIIa inhibition) was recently shown for PCI in the setting of UA/NSTEMI.500

Late thrombosis of DES,504,506,507,100 associated with delayed endothelialization,502,503 recently has emerged as a therapeutic issue.508 Thus, longer periods of dual-antiplatelet therapy (ie, at least 1 year) increasingly are advocated after PCI (see Section 3.2). More choices in antiplatelet therapy can be expected, including intravenously administered and rapidly acting P2Y12 receptor inhibitor. Biocompatible stents can also be expected looking forward, including biodegradable stents.

Triple-anticoagulant therapy (eg, ASA, a P2Y12 receptor inhibitor, and warfarin) increasingly has a potential indication (eg, PCI plus atrial fibrillation, cardiac or vascular thrombosis, or mechanical heart valve). Its current Class IIb recommendation (to be used “with caution” is in need of a firmer evidence base.4,59

Anticoagulant choices have proliferated since the last guidelines were published. Although LMWH (eg, enoxaparin) gained recognition as an alternative or preferred anticoagulant in the previous guidelines, subsequent study in the setting of an early PCI strategy has suggested that either UFH or LMWH is acceptable.400 Meanwhile, agents from 2 newer classes have been tested favorably (see Section 3.2).422,424 Fondaparinux, a synthetic factor Xa inhibitor, was noninferior to enoxaparin at 9 d, with a lower bleeding risk. However, catheter-related thrombosis with fondaparinux raises concerns about its use with PCI, a concern amplified by its failure with PCI in STEMI.534 In contrast, fondaparinux is an appealing choice with a noninvasive approach to UA/NSTEMI, especially in those at higher risk of bleeding.

The ACUITY study, which tested bivalirudin for UA/NSTEMI, has led to a guidelines change to allow bivalirudin as an anticoagulant option.424 Bivalirudin was found to be noninferior to UFH/LMWH when given with a GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor. When given without a GP inhibitor, bleeding rates were lower but ischemic risk was higher unless clopidogrel therapy had been given before the procedure. Bivalirudin use was not tested with a conservative strategy. These guidelines present several options for anticoagulant/antiplatelet regimens, but whether there are clear preferences must await additional analysis and an enriched evidence base and could vary depending on the health care setting, the preferred treatment strategy (eg, invasive vs conservative), and individual patient factors.

This guideline revision recognizes ongoing developments in prevention (see Section 5.1.1). More aggressive LDL-C lowering (ie, to the optimal LDL-C goal of less than 70 mg per dL) further reduces cardiovascular events, although an incremental mortality benefit remains to be shown.1101 An additional tool for smoking cessation has appeared (varenicline), and others are in testing (see Section 5.2). High compliance with recommended secondary prevention measures has been shown to improve outcomes, but optimal compliance is still lacking, including at hospitals peer-rated as top tier.1102 The evidence base for therapeutic lifestyle change continues to grow; the challenge for the future is more successful implementation (see Section 5.2).

Primary prevention remains a major challenge. Risk is currently assessed by traditional factors (eg, Framingham risk score) and the intensity of treatment by risk score-determined goals. The majority of coronary events occur in a large segment of the population whose risk is intermediate (neither very low nor very high). Routine individual screening for asymptomatic disease is widely accepted for common cancers (eg, colon and breast cancer) but not for atherosclerosis. Application of an “atherosclerosis test” (eg, coronary artery calcium scoring or carotid intima-media thickness assessment) to middle-aged adults at intermediate risk has been proposed.32,301,1091,1092 The future will determine how broadly extended primary screening will be accepted to identify the “ACS-vulnerable” patient.

Progress in UA/NSTEMI remains uneven, with rapid evolution in some areas but slow progress in others. Our hope is that guidelines increasingly become based on levels of evidence A (or B). Writing these guidelines has highlighted the many holes in the fabric of the current evidence base. Academia, regulatory agencies, practicing physicians, professional organizations, and patient advocacy groups, as well as industry, must cooperate to achieve the universal goal of a fully evidence-based management strategy for UA/NSTEMI in the future. Strategies must include not only innovations in diagnosis and treatment but also fresh approaches to motivating lifestyle changes, leading to improved diet, weight control, physical activity, and tobacco avoidance, as well as to better compliance with evidence-based medical therapies.492

7.1. Recommendations for Quality of Care and Outcomes for UA/NSTEMI (NEW SECTION)

Class IIa

1. It is reasonable for clinicians and hospitals that provide care to patients with UA/NSTEMI to participate in a standardized quality-of-care data registry designed to
track and measure outcomes, complications, and adherence to evidence-based processes of care and quality improvement for UA/NSTEMI. (Level of Evidence: B)1108-1113

7.1.1. Quality Care and Outcomes (NEW SECTION)
The development of regional systems of UA/NSTEMI care is a matter of utmost importance.1103,1107,1108 This includes encouraging the participation of key stakeholders in collaborative efforts to evaluate care using standardized performance and quality-improvement measures, such as those endorsed by the ACC and the AHA for UN/NSTEMI.1109 Standardized quality-of-care data registries designed to track and measure outcomes, complications, and adherence to evidence-based processes of care for UA/NSTEMI are also critical: programs such as the NCDR (National Cardiovascular Data Registry) ACTION Registry-GWTG, the AHA's Get With The Guidelines (GWTG) quality-improvement program, and those performance-measurement systems required by The Joint Commission and the Centers for Medicare and Medicaid Services.1103,1110-1112 More recently, the AHA has promoted its Mission: Lifeline initiative, which was developed to encourage closer cooperation and trust among prehospital emergency services personnel and cardiac care professionals.1113 The evaluation of UA/NSTEMI care delivery across traditional care-delivery boundaries with these tools and other resources is imperative to identify systems problems and enable the application of modern quality-improvement methods, such as Six Sigma, to make necessary improvements.1104,1108,1109,1111 The quality-improvement data coming from registries like the ACTION-GTWG may prove pivotal in addressing opportunities for quality improvement at the local, regional, and national level, including the elimination of healthcare disparities and conduct of comparative effectiveness research.
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</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>• Atherogenics*</td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Biosite*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Centocor*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Converge Medical*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td>• Cordis*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Dr. Reddy’s Laboratory*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Eli Lilly*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• GlaxoSmithKline*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Glaxo Wellcome*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Guilford*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Medtronic*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Novartis*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pfizer*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Pharmacia Upjohn*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Philips*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Orphan Therapeutic*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sankyo*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sanofi*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Scios*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Takeda America*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• The Medicines Company*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Vasogenix*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric D. Peterson</td>
<td>• Bristol-Myers Squibb/Sanofi</td>
<td>• Millennium Pharmaceuticals</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Millennium Pharmaceuticals</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Schering-Plough</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pierre Theroux</td>
<td>• AstraZeneca</td>
<td>• AstraZeneca</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>• Sanofi-Aventis</td>
<td>• Boston Scientific</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Medtronic</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Merck</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Proctor &amp; Gamble</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sanofi-Aventis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td>Nanette Kass Wenger</td>
<td>• Pfizer</td>
<td>• Bristol-Myers Squibb</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>• Abbott</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• CV Therapeutics</td>
<td></td>
<td>• AstraZeneca AB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Eli Lilly</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Bristol-Myers Squibb</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Merck</td>
<td></td>
<td>• CV Therapeutics*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• NitroMed</td>
<td></td>
<td>• GlaxoSmithKline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Novartis</td>
<td></td>
<td>• NitroMed Heart Failure Advisory Board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>• Pfizer</td>
<td></td>
<td>• Sanofi-Aventis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R. Scott Wright</td>
<td>Centocor*</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

This table represents the actual or potential relationships with industry that were reported as of February 13, 2007. This table was updated in conjunction with all meetings and conference calls of the writing committee. *Indicates significant (greater than $10,000) relationship.
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<tbody>
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<td></td>
<td>AstraZeneca†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Bristol-Myers Squibb†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CV Therapeutics†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Eli Lilly†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td>Inotek Pharmaceuticals†</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td>Merck and Co.†</td>
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<tr>
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<td></td>
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<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Novartis†</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nuacid†</td>
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<td></td>
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<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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<td></td>
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<td>Proctor &amp; Gamble†</td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scios†</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
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<td>• Official–AHA</td>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
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</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Genentech†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GlaxoSmithKline†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Novartis†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Proctor &amp; Gamble†</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Scios†</td>
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</tr>
<tr>
<td>David Holmes</td>
<td>• Official–ACC Board of Trustees</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kristen Newby</td>
<td>• Official–AHA</td>
<td>• Biosite • CV Therapeutics • Eli Lilly • Inverness Medical • Proctor &amp; Gamble</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>Bristol-Myers Squibb/Sanofi</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rick Nishimura</td>
<td>• Official–ACC Lead Task Force Reviewer</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eugene Sherman</td>
<td>• Official–ACC Board of Governors</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>• Abbott • GlaxoSmithKline • Novartis • Sanofi-Aventis • Takeba</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>• General Electric†</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>William Brady</td>
<td>• Organizational–American College of Emergency Physicians</td>
<td>• Heartscape • Medicolegal Review</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<td>Robert Higgins</td>
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<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
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<td>None</td>
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<tr>
<td>Morton Kern</td>
<td>Organizational– Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions and ACC/ AHA/ SCACCI PCI Guidelines Writing Committee‡</td>
<td>Merritt Medical</td>
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<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marjorie King</td>
<td>Organizational– American Association of Cardiovascular and Pulmonary Rehabilitation‡</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Michael Lim</td>
<td>Organizational– Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions‡</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>• Bristol-Myers Squibb</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Walter Merrill</td>
<td>Organizational– Society of Thoracic Surgeons‡</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Pollack</td>
<td>Organizational– Society for Academic Emergency Medicine</td>
<td>• Bristol-Myers Squibb</td>
<td>• Sanofi-Aventis</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>• GlaxoSmithKline†</td>
<td>• Spouse employed by The Medicines Company†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mazen Abu-Fadel</td>
<td>Content–ACCF Cardiac Catheterization and Intervention Committee</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Paul Armstrong</td>
<td>Content–ACC/ AHA STEMI Guidelines Writing Committee</td>
<td>• Abbott Laboratories</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>• Boehringer Ingelheim</td>
<td>• Medicure†</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eric Bates</td>
<td>Content–ACC/ AHA STEMI Guidelines Writing Committee</td>
<td>• AstraZeneca</td>
<td>• Eli Lilly</td>
<td>None</td>
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<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander Battler</td>
<td>Content–ACC/ AHA Acute Syndromes Data Standards Writing Committee</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
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</tr>
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<td>• AstraZeneca† • BGB New York • Bristol-Myers Squibb† • DIME • GlaxoSmithKline† • Merck† • NCME • Pfizer† • Sanofi-Aventis† • Schering-Plough†</td>
<td>None</td>
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<td>• Accumetrics† • AstraZeneca† • Bristol-Myers Squibb† • Merck† • Pfizer† • Sanofi-Aventis† • Schering-Plough†</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
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<td>• CV Therapeutics†</td>
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<td>• Content–ACCF Cardiac Catheterization and Intervention Committee</td>
<td>• Sanofi-Aventis</td>
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<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
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<td>• Content–ACC/ AHA Acute Coronary Syndromes Data Standards Writing Committee</td>
<td>• Abbott • Boston Scientific • Cordis • Viacor</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>• Centocor</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>James Ferguson</td>
<td>• Content–ACCF Cardiac Catheterization and Intervention Committee</td>
<td>• Bristol-Myers Squibb • Eisai† • GlaxoSmithKline • Prism • Sanofi-Aventis† • Schering-Plough • Takeda • The Medicus Co. • Terox</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>• Eisai • The Medicus Co. • Vitatron/Medtronic</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gregg Fonarow</td>
<td>• Content–ACCF Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease Committee</td>
<td>• AstraZeneca • Bristol-Myers Squibb/Sanofi† • GlaxoSmithKline† • Guidant • Medtronic† • Merck/Schering-Plough† • Pfizer† • St. Jude</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>• Guidant • Medtronic† • Pfizer† • St. Judes</td>
<td>None</td>
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<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
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<td>• CV Therapeutics • McKesson</td>
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<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
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<td>Harlan Krumholz</td>
<td>• Content–ACC/ AHA STEMI Guidelines Writing Committee, ACC/AHA Acute Coronary Syndromes Data Standards Writing Committee</td>
<td>• CV Therapeutics • United Healthcare†</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Janet Long</td>
<td>• Content–ACCF Prevention of Cardiovascular Disease Committee</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>• AstraZeneca</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Noel Bairey Merz</td>
<td>• Content</td>
<td>• AstraZeneca • Bayer† • KOS • Merck • Pfizer</td>
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<td>• Eli Lilly† • Johnson &amp; Johnson† • Medtronic†</td>
<td>None</td>
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<td>• Content–ACCF Cardiac Catheterization and Intervention Committee</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charles Mullany</td>
<td>• Content–ACC/ AHA STEMI Guidelines Writing Committee</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>None</td>
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</table>
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### Appendix 3. Abbreviations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AAFP</td>
<td>American Academy of Family Physicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACC</td>
<td>American College of Cardiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACCF</td>
<td>American College of Cardiology Foundation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACE</td>
<td>angiotensin converting enzyme</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACEP</td>
<td>American College of Emergency Physicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACP</td>
<td>American College of Physicians</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACS</td>
<td>acute coronary syndrome</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACT</td>
<td>activated clotting time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ACUTY</td>
<td>Acute Catheterization and Urgent Intervention Triage strategy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AHA</td>
<td>American Heart Association</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AMI</td>
<td>acute myocardial infarction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>aPTT</td>
<td>activated partial thromboplastin time</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ARTS</td>
<td>Arterial Revascularization Therapy Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ASA</td>
<td>aspirin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AST, SGOT</td>
<td>aspartate aminotransferase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AV</td>
<td>atrioventricular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BARI</td>
<td>Bypass Angioplasty Revascularization Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BNP</td>
<td>B-type natriuretic peptide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABB</td>
<td>coronary artery bypass graft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CABRI</td>
<td>Coronary Angioplasty versus Bypass Revascularization Investigation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAD</td>
<td>coronary artery disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CAPTURE</td>
<td>c7E3 Fab Antiplatelet Therapy in Unstable Refractory Angina trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CASS</td>
<td>Coronary Artery Surgery Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCB</td>
<td>calcium channel blocker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CCTA</td>
<td>coronary computed tomographic angiogram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CHD</td>
<td>coronary heart disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CI</td>
<td>confidence interval</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CKD</td>
<td>chronic kidney disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CK-MB</td>
<td>creatine kinase-myocardial band</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CMR</td>
<td>cardiac magnetic resonance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMMIT</td>
<td>Clopidogrel and Metopolol in Myocardial Infarction Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COX</td>
<td>cyclooxygenase</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CPR</td>
<td>cardiopulmonary resuscitation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CREDO</td>
<td>Clopidogrel for the Reduction of Events During Observation trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CRP</td>
<td>C-reactive protein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CT</td>
<td>computed tomography</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cTn</td>
<td>cardiac troponin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURE</td>
<td>Clopidogrel in Unstable Angina to Prevent Recurrent Events trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CVD</td>
<td>cardiovascular disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d</td>
<td>day</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DAVIT</td>
<td>Danish Study Group on Verapamil in Myocardial Infarction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DES</td>
<td>drug-eluting stent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIGAMI</td>
<td>Diabetes and Insulin-Glucose Infusion in Acute Myocardial Infarction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ECG</td>
<td>electrocardiogram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ED</td>
<td>emergency department</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>emergency medical services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPIC</td>
<td>Evaluation of c7E3 for the Prevention of Ischemic Complications</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EPIL0G</td>
<td>Evaluation of PTCA and Improve Long-term Outcome by c7E3 GP IIb/IIIa receptor blockade</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abbreviation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EPISTENT</td>
<td>Evaluation of Platelet IIb/IIIa Inhibitor for STENTing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ERACI-II</td>
<td>Estudio Randomizado Argentino de Angioplastia vs. Clrugia-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESC</td>
<td>European Society of Cardiology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ESSENCE</td>
<td>Efficacy and Safety of Subcutaneous Enoxaparin in Unstable Angina and Non-Q Wave Myocardial Infarction trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRIC</td>
<td>FRagmin In unstable Coronary artery disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRISC</td>
<td>Fast Revascularization During Instability in Coronary Artery Disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FRISC-II</td>
<td>Fast Revascularization During Instability in Coronary Artery Disease-II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GISSI</td>
<td>Gruppo Italiano per lo Studio della Sopravvivenza nell’Infarto-1 1 trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GISSI-3</td>
<td>Gruppo Italiano per lo Studio della Sopravvivenza nell’infarto Miocardico</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GP</td>
<td>glycoprotein</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRACE</td>
<td>Global Registry of Acute Coronary Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUSTO</td>
<td>Global Utilization of Streptokinase and t-PA for Occluded Arteries</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GUSTO-II</td>
<td>Global Use of Strategies to Open Occluded Coronary Arteries II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>h</td>
<td>hour</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hb</td>
<td>hemoglobin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HDL-C</td>
<td>high-density lipoprotein cholesterol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HF</td>
<td>heart failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HOPE</td>
<td>Heart Outcomes Prevention Evaluation Study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HR</td>
<td>hazard ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IABP</td>
<td>intra-aortic balloon pump</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICTUS</td>
<td>Invasive versus Conservative Treatment in Unstable coronary Syndromes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ICU</td>
<td>intensive care unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IPT</td>
<td>interpersonal psychotherapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INR</td>
<td>international normalized ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISAR-REACT</td>
<td>Intracoronary stenting and Antithrombotic Regimen- Rapid Early Action for Coronary Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISIS-2</td>
<td>Second International Study of Infarct Survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ISIS-4</td>
<td>Fourth International Study of Infarct Survival</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IU</td>
<td>international unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IV</td>
<td>intravenous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JNC 7</td>
<td>Seventh Joint National Committee on High Blood Pressure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>kg</td>
<td>kilogram</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LAD</td>
<td>left anterior descending coronary artery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDL-C</td>
<td>low-density lipoprotein cholesterol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMWH</td>
<td>low-molecular-weight heparin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LV</td>
<td>left ventricular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LVEF</td>
<td>left ventricular ejection fraction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MASS II</td>
<td>Multicenter Anti Atherosclerotic Study II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATE</td>
<td>Medicine versus Angiography in Thrombolytic Exclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDPIT</td>
<td>Multicenter Diltiazem Postinfarction Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MDRD</td>
<td>Modification of Diet and Renal Disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>METS</td>
<td>metabolic equivalents</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MI</td>
<td>myocardial infarction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MV2</td>
<td>myocardial oxygen demand</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NCEP</td>
<td>National Cholesterol Education Program</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NHLBI</td>
<td>National Heart, Lung, and Blood Institute</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NS</td>
<td>nonsignificant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NSTEMI</td>
<td>non–ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NTG</td>
<td>nitroglycerin</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Acronym</th>
<th>Term</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NT-proBNP</td>
<td>N-terminal B-type natriuretic peptide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OASIS</td>
<td>Organization to Assess Strategies for Ischemic Syndromes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OR</td>
<td>odds ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PCI</td>
<td>percutaneous coronary intervention</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PDA</td>
<td>personal digital assistant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRISM</td>
<td>Platelet Receptor Inhibition in Ischemic Syndrome Management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PRISM-PLUS</td>
<td>Platelet Receptor Inhibition in Ischemic Syndrome Management in Patients Limited by Unstable Signs and Symptoms</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PTCA</td>
<td>percutaneous transluminal coronary angioplasty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PURSUIT</td>
<td>Platelet Glycoprotein IIb/IIIa in Unstable 16 Angina: Receptor Suppression Using Integrilin Therapy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REACT</td>
<td>Rapid Early Action for Coronary Treatment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REPLACE-2</td>
<td>Randomized Evaluation of PCI Linking Angiomax to reduced Clinical Events</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RITA</td>
<td>Research Group in Instability in Coronary Artery Disease trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RR</td>
<td>risk ratio</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SaO\textsubscript{2}</td>
<td>arterial oxygen saturation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SC</td>
<td>subcutaneous</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCAI</td>
<td>Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SHOCK</td>
<td>Should we emergently revascularize Occluded Coronaries for cardiogenic shock study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SoS</td>
<td>Stent or Surgery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STEMI</td>
<td>ST-elevation myocardial infarction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>STS</td>
<td>Society of Thoracic Surgeons</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVG</td>
<td>saphenous vein graft</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYNERGY</td>
<td>Superior Yield of the New Strategy of Enoxaparin, Revascularization and Glycoprotein IIb/IIIa Inhibitors trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TACTICS-TIMI 18</td>
<td>Treat Angina with Aggrastat and determine Cost of therapy with Invasive or Conservative Strategy (TACTICS) TIMI-18 trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TARGET</td>
<td>Do Tirofiban and ReoPro Give Similar Efficacy Outcomes Trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMI</td>
<td>Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TnI</td>
<td>troponin I</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TnT</td>
<td>troponin T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>U</td>
<td>units</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA</td>
<td>unstable angina</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UA/NSTEMI</td>
<td>unstable angina/non–ST-elevation myocardial infarction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFH</td>
<td>unfractionated heparin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VANQWISH</td>
<td>Veterans Affairs Non–Q-Wave Infarction Strategies in Hospital</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VINO</td>
<td>Value of first day angiography/angioplasty In evolving Non-ST-Segment elevation myocardial infarction: Open randomized trial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WISE</td>
<td>Women's Ischemia Syndrome Evaluation</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Appendix 6. Selection of Initial Treatment Strategy: Invasive Versus Conservative Strategy
(NEW—Replaces Table 11 in 2007 Guideline)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Generally Preferred Strategy</th>
<th>Patient Characteristics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Invasive                     | Recurrent angina or ischemia at rest or with low-level activities despite intensive medical therapy  
                                 Elevated cardiac biomarkers (TnT or TnI)  
                                 New or presumably new ST-segment depression  
                                 Signs or symptoms of HF or new or worsening mitral regurgitation  
                                 High-risk findings from noninvasive testing  
                                 Hemodynamic instability  
                                 Sustained ventricular tachycardia  
                                 PCI within 6 mo  
                                 Prior CABG  
                                 High-risk score (eg, TIMI, GRACE)  
                                 Mild to moderate renal dysfunction  
                                 Diabetes mellitus  
                                 Reduced LV function (LVEF <40%) |
| Conservative                 | Low-risk score (eg, TIMI, GRACE)  
                                 Patient or physician preference in the absence of high-risk features |

CABG indicates coronary artery bypass graft; GRACE, Global Registry of Acute Coronary Events; HF, heart failure; LV, left ventricular; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention; TIMI, Thrombolysis In Myocardial Infarction; TnI, troponin I; and TnT, troponin T. Reprinted from Anderson et al.⁷


### Appendix 7. Dosing Table for Antiplatelet and Anticoagulant Therapy to Support PCI in UA/NSTEMI (NEW)

#### Glycoprotein IIb/IIIa Receptor Antagonists

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>Patient Received Initial Medical Treatment (With a P2Y&lt;sub&gt;12&lt;/sub&gt; Receptor Inhibitor)</th>
<th>Patient Did Not Receive Initial Medical Treatment (With a P2Y&lt;sub&gt;12&lt;/sub&gt; Receptor Inhibitor)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abciximab</td>
<td>LD of 0.25 mg/kg IV bolus</td>
<td>MD of 0.125 mcg/kg per min (maximum 10 mcg/min) (Class I, LOE: A)</td>
<td>Continue for up to 12 h at the discretion of the physician.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eptifibatide</td>
<td>LD of 180 mcg/kg IV bolus followed 10 min later by second IV bolus of 180 mcg/kg</td>
<td>MD of 2.0 mcg/kg per min, started after first bolus; reduce infusion by 50% in patients with estimated creatinine clearance &lt;50 mL/min (Class I, LOE: A)</td>
<td>Double bolus is recommended to support PCI in STEMI as the recommended adult dosage of eptifibatide in patients with normal renal function. Infusion should be continued for 12 to 18 h at the discretion of the physician.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tirofiban</td>
<td>LD of 25 mcg/kg IV bolus</td>
<td>MD of IV infusion of 0.15 mcg/kg per min; reduce rate of infusion by 50% in patients with estimated creatinine clearance &lt;30 mL/min (Class I, LOE: B)</td>
<td>Increased dosing over previous recommendation. Continue for up to 18 h at the discretion of the physician. A lower-dose regimen for tirofiban is FDA approved and has been shown to be effective when used to treat UA/NSTEMI patients who are started on medical therapy and when there is a substantial delay to angiography/PCI (eg, 48 h); MD of 50 mcg/mL administered at an initial rate of 0.4 mcg/kg per min for 30 min.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### P2Y<sub>12</sub> Receptor Inhibitors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug</th>
<th>During PCI</th>
<th>Patient Did Not Receive Initial Medical Treatment (With a P2Y&lt;sub&gt;12&lt;/sub&gt; Receptor Inhibitor)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Clopidogrel†</td>
<td>If 600 mg given orally, then no additional treatmentA second LD of 300 mg may be given orally to supplement a prior LD of 300 mg (Class I, LOE: C)</td>
<td>LD of 300–600 mg orally (Class I, LOE: A) MD of 75 mg orally per d (Class I, LOE: A) MD of 150 mg orally per d for initial 6 d may be considered (Class IIb, LOE: B)</td>
<td>Optimum LD requires clinical consideration. Dose for patients ≥75 y of age has not been established. There is a recommended duration of therapy for all post-PCI patients receiving a BMS or DES. Caution should be exercised for use with a PPI. Period of withdrawal before surgery should be at least 5 d. (For full explanations, see footnote.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prasugrel‡</td>
<td>No data are available to guide decision making</td>
<td>LD of 60 mg orally (Class I, LOE: B) MD of 10 mg orally per d (Class I, LOE: B)</td>
<td>There are no data for treatment with prasugrel before PCI. MD of 5 mg orally per d in special circumstances. Special dosing for patients &lt;60 kg or &gt;75 y of age. There is a recommended duration of therapy for all post-PCI patients receiving a DES. Contraindicated for use in patients with prior history of TIA or stroke. Period of withdrawal before surgery should be at least 7 d. (For full explanations, see footnote.)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticagrelor</td>
<td>Patients who are already receiving clopidogrel should receive a loading dose of ticagrelor</td>
<td>LD of 180 mg orally (Class I, LOE: B) MD of 90 mg orally twice daily (Class I, LOE: B)</td>
<td>The recommended maintenance dose of ASA to be used with ticagrelor is 81 mg daily. Ticagrelor’s benefits were observed irrespective of prior therapy with clopidogrel (47% of patients in PLATO received clopidogrel at the time of randomization). Period of withdrawal before surgery should be at least 5 d. Issues of patient compliance may be especially important with twice-daily dosing regimen. Ticagrelor increases the risk of fatal ICH compared with clopidogrel and should be avoided in those with a prior history of ICH. Until further data become available, it seems prudent to weigh the possible increased risk of intracranial bleeding when considering the addition of ticagrelor to aspirin in patients with prior stroke or TIA.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

(continued)
### Appendix 7. Continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Drug*</th>
<th>Patient Received Initial Medical Treatment (With a P2Y12 Receptor Inhibitor)</th>
<th>Patient Did Not Receive Initial Medical Treatment (With a P2Y12 Receptor Inhibitor)</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bivalirudin</td>
<td>For patients who have received UFH, wait 30 min, then give 0.75 mg/kg bolus, then 1.75 mg/kg per h infusion (Class I, LOE: B)</td>
<td>0.75 mg/kg bolus, 1.75 mg/kg per h infusion</td>
<td>▶ Bivalirudin may be used to support PCI and UA/NSTEMI with or without previously administered UFH with the addition of 600 mg of clopidogrel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UFH</td>
<td>IV GP ilb/illa planned: target ACT 200–250 s</td>
<td>IV GP ilb/illa planned: 50–70 units/kg bolus to achieve an ACT of 200–250 s</td>
<td>▶ In UA/NSTEMI patients undergoing PCI who are at high risk of bleeding, bivalirudin anticoagulation is reasonable.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>No IV GP ilb/illa planned: target ACT 250–300 s for HemoTec, 300–350 s for Hemochron (Class I, LOE: B)</td>
<td>No IV GP ilb/illa planned: 70–100 units/kg bolus to achieve target ACT of 250–300 s for HemoTec, 300–350 s for Hemochron (Class I, LOE: B)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This list is in alphabetical order and is not meant to indicate a particular therapy preference. This drug table does not make recommendations for combinations of listed drugs. It is only meant to indicate an approved or recommended dosage if a drug is chosen for a given situation.

†The optimum LD of clopidogrel has not been established. Randomized trials establishing its efficacy and providing data on bleeding risks used an LD of 300 mg orally followed by a daily oral dose of 75 mg. Higher oral LDs such as 600 mg or more than 900 mg of clopidogrel more rapidly inhibit platelet aggregation and achieve a higher absolute level of inhibition of platelet aggregation, but the additive clinical efficacy and safety of higher oral LD have not been rigorously established. For post-PCI patients receiving a DES, a daily MD should be given for at least 12 mo unless the risk of bleeding outweighs the anticipated net benefit afforded by a P2Y12 receptor inhibitor. For post-PCI patients receiving a BMS, an MD should be given for up to 12 mo (unless the risk of bleeding outweighs the anticipated net benefit afforded by a P2Y12 receptor inhibitor; then it should be given for a minimum of 2 wk). The necessity for giving an LD of clopidogrel before PCI is driven by the pharmacokinetics of clopidogrel, for which a period of several hours is required to achieve desired levels of platelet inhibition. Patients who have a reduced-function CYP2C19 allele have significantly lower levels of the active metabolite of clopidogrel, diminished platelet inhibition, and a higher rate of MACE, including stent thrombosis. In UA/NSTEMI patients taking clopidogrel for whom CABG is planned and can be delayed, it is reasonable to discontinue the clopidogrel to allow for dissipation of the antiplatelet effect unless the urgency for revascularization and/or the net benefit of clopidogrel outweigh the potential risks of excess bleeding. The period of withdrawal should be at least 5 d in patients receiving clopidogrel.

‡Patients weighing <60 kg have an increased exposure to the active metabolite of prasugrel and an increased risk of bleeding on a 10-mg once-daily MD. Consider lowering the MD to 5 mg in patients who weigh <60 kg. The effectiveness and safety of the 5-mg dose have not been studied prospectively. For post-PCI patients receiving DES, a daily MD should be given for at least 12 mo unless the risk of bleeding outweighs the anticipated net benefit afforded by a P2Y12 receptor inhibitor. Do not use prasugrel in patients with active pathological bleeding or a history of TIA or stroke. In patients age >75 y, prasugrel is generally not recommended because of the increased risk of fatal and intracranial bleeding and uncertain benefit, except in high-risk situations (patients with diabetes or a history of prior myocardial infarction), for which its effect appears to be greater and its use may be considered. Do not start prasugrel in patients likely to undergo urgent CABG. When possible, discontinue prasugrel at least 7 d before any surgery. Additional risk factors for bleeding include body weight <60 kg, propensity to bleed, and concomitant use of medications that increase the risk of bleeding (eg, warfarin, heparin, fibrinolytic therapy, or long-term use of nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs).

§Enoxaparin and fondaparinux can be used as alternative anticoagulant drugs during PCI. When enoxaparin is initiated during PCI for UA/NSTEMI, it should be administered as a 0.5- to 0.75-mg/kg IV bolus. In UA/NSTEMI patients who were treated with SC enoxaparin before PCI (and who achieved steady state levels), additional dosing of enoxaparin depends on the timing from the last SC dose administered: (a) if the last SC dose was administered <8 h, no additional therapy with enoxaparin is recommended; (b) if the last SC dose was administered >8 h, additional therapy with 0.3 mg/kg IV bolus is recommended. Fondaparinux can be initiated as soon as possible after presentation with UA/NSTEMI as a 2.5-mg once-daily SC dose. During PCI, a 50- to 60-U/kg IV bolus of UFH is recommended to be added to fondaparinux by the OASIS 5 Investigators (however, this regimen has not been rigorously tested in prospective randomized trials). Fondaparinux should be avoided for creatinine clearance <30 mL/min.

ACT indicates activated clotting time; ASA, aspirin; BMS, bare-metal stent; CABG, coronary artery bypass graft; DES, drug-eluting stent; GP, glycoprotein; FDA, Food and Drug Administration; ICH, intracranial hemorrhage; IV, intravenous; LD, loading dose; LOE, level of evidence; MACE, major adverse cardiac events; MD, maintenance dose; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention; PLATO, PLATelet inhibition and patient Outcomes trial; PPI, proton pump inhibitor; STEMI, ST-elevation myocardial infarction; TIA, transient ischemic attack; UA/NSTEMI, unstable angina/non–ST-elevation myocardial infarction; and UFH, unfractionated heparin.

Modified from Wright et al.1

---

**Parenteral Anticoagulants**

**Bivalirudin**

For patients who have received UFH, wait 30 min, then give 0.75 mg/kg bolus, then 1.75 mg/kg per h infusion (Class I, LOE: B).

**UFH**

- IV GP ilb/illa planned: target ACT 200–250 s
- No IV GP ilb/illa planned: target ACT 250–300 s for HemoTec, 300–350 s for Hemochron (Class I, LOE: B).

**Comments**

- No IV GP ilb/illa planned: target ACT 250–300 s for HemoTec, 300–350 s for Hemochron (Class I, LOE: B).
### Appendix 8. Comparisons Among Orally Effective P2Y₁₂ Inhibitors (NEW)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Pharmacology</th>
<th>Clopidogrel</th>
<th>Prasugrel</th>
<th>Ticagrelor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prodrug</td>
<td>Prodrug—requires conversion to active metabolite that irreversibly blocks P2Y₁₂ receptor</td>
<td>Prodrug—requires conversion to active metabolite that irreversibly blocks P2Y₁₂ receptor</td>
<td>Parent compound is active and no biotransformation is required for reversible inhibition of P2Y₁₂ receptor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effect on platelet aggregation</td>
<td>There is a delay of several hours before maximal antiplatelet effect is seen</td>
<td>Onset of antiplatelet effect is faster and extent of inhibition of aggregation is greater than with clopidogrel (a significant antiplatelet effect was observed within 30 min of loading)</td>
<td>Onset of antiplatelet effect is faster and extent of inhibition of aggregation is greater than with clopidogrel (a significant antiplatelet effect was observed within 30 min of loading)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management strategy</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
<td>Invasive</td>
<td>Conservative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loading dose</td>
<td>300 mg</td>
<td>600 mg</td>
<td>Generally not recommended for precatetherization use in UA/NSTEMI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing</td>
<td>Initiate on presentation</td>
<td>Initiate as soon as possible before or at the time of PCI</td>
<td>Initiate as soon as possible before or at the time of PCI</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maintenance dose</td>
<td>75 mg</td>
<td>75 mg</td>
<td>10 mg</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Duration</td>
<td>Ideally up to 12 mo</td>
<td>At least 12 mo for patients receiving DESUp to 12 mo for patients receiving BMS</td>
<td>At least 12 mo for patients receiving DESUp to 12 mo for patients receiving BMS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional considerations</td>
<td>Variability of response: Greater than with prasugrel or ticagrelor. Factors impacting on response in some patients may include genetic predisposition to convert parent compound to active metabolite and drug interactions (eg, PPIs)</td>
<td>Less than with clopidogrel. Impact of genotype and concomitant medications appears less than with clopidogrel.</td>
<td>Less compared with clopidogrel. Impact of genotype and concomitant medications appears less than with clopidogrel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Platelet function testing</td>
<td>Clinical utility not rigorously established. May be useful in selected patients with ischemic/thrombotic events while compliant with a clopidogrel regimen</td>
<td>Clinical utility not rigorously established but less likely to be necessary given lesser degree of variation in response</td>
<td>Clinical utility not rigorously established but less likely to be necessary given lesser degree of variation in response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Genotyping</td>
<td>Identifies patients with a diminished (CYP2C19 *2, *3 alleles) or enhanced (CYP2C17 allele) to form active metabolite. Role of genotyping in clinical management not rigorously established.</td>
<td>Clinical utility not rigorously established but less likely to be necessary given lesser degree of variation in response</td>
<td>Clinical utility not rigorously established but less likely to be necessary given lesser degree of variation in response</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Risk of bleeding</td>
<td>Standard dosing with clopidogrel is associated with less bleeding than with prasugrel and ticagrelor. Higher doses of clopidogrel are associated with greater risk of bleeding than standard dose clopidogrel.</td>
<td>Risk of spontaneous, instrumented, and fatal bleeds higher with prasugrel compared with standard dose clopidogrel</td>
<td>Risk of non-CABG bleeds higher with ticagrelor compared with standard dose clopidogrel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transition to surgery</td>
<td>Wait 5 d after last dose</td>
<td>Wait 7 d after last dose</td>
<td>Wait 5 d after last dose</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ASA indicates aspirin; BMS, bare-metal stent; DES, drug-eluting stent; CABG, coronary artery bypass graft; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention; PPI, proton pump inhibitor; TIA, transient ischemic attack; and UA/NSTEMI, unstable angina/non-ST-elevation myocardial infarction.
Appendix 9. Flowchart for Class I and Class IIa Recommendations for Initial Management of UA/NSTEMI (NEW)

*A loading dose followed by a daily maintenance dose of either clopidogrel (LOE: B), prasugrel (in PCI-treated patients), or ticagrelor (LOE: C) should be administered to UA/NSTEMI patients who are unable to take ASA because of hypersensitivity or major GI intolerance.

††If fondaparinux is used during PCI (Class I, LOE: B), it must be coadministered with another anticoagulant with Factor IIa activity (ie, UFH).

‡Timing of invasive strategy generally is assumed to be 4 to 48 h. If immediate angiography is selected, see STEMI guidelines.

§Precatheterization triple antiplatelet therapy (ASA, clopidogrel or ticagrelor, GP inhibitors) is a Class IIb, LOE: B recommendation for selected high-risk patients. Also, note that there are no data for therapy with 2 concurrent P2Y₁₂ receptor inhibitors, and this is not recommended in the case of aspirin allergy.

ASA indicates aspirin; CABG, coronary artery bypass graft; D/C, discontinue; GI, gastrointestinal; GP, glycoprotein; IV, intravenous; LOE, level of evidence; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention; STEMI, ST-elevation myocardial infarction; UA/NSTEMI, unstable angina/non–ST-elevation myocardial infarction; and UFH, unfractionated heparin.

Modified from Wright et al.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis Reported</th>
<th>P (95% CI)</th>
<th>OR/HR/RR</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PLATO Ticagrelor vs. Clopidogrel in Patients with Acute Coronary Syndromes, Wallentin L, 2009. (1)</td>
<td>To compare ticagrelor (180 mg LD, 90 mg bid thereafter) and clopidogrel (300-600 mg LD, 75 mg daily thereafter) in the prevention of cardiovascular events among ACS pts.</td>
<td>18,624 patients (of whom 11,598 pts had UA/NSTEMI)</td>
<td><strong>Inclusion:</strong> ACS w/out ST-segment elevation during previous 24 h and at least 2 of 3 criteria: ST-segment changes on ECG, positive biomarker, or 1 of several risk factors (age ≥60 y, previous MI or CABG; CAD ≥50% in at 2 v: previous ischemic stroke, TIA, carotid stenosis at least 50%, or cerebral revascularization; DM; PAD; or chronic renal dysfunction (CrCl &lt;60 ml per min. per 1.73 m² of BSA). ACS with ST-segment elevation during previous 24 h, 2 criteria needed: persistent ST-segment elevation of at least 0.1 mV in at least 2 contiguous leads or a new LBBB, and, primary PCI.</td>
<td><strong>Primary efficacy endpoint:</strong> 12 mo composite of death from vascular causes, MI*, or stroke. <strong>Primary safety endpoint:</strong> any major bleeding event at 12 mo†.</td>
<td>Primary efficacy endpoint: 9.8% ticagrelor vs. 11.7% clopidogrel</td>
<td>&lt;0.001 (0.77 to 0.92)</td>
<td>HR: 0.84</td>
<td>Ticagrelor Reduced primary and secondary endpoints in pts taking ticagrelor compared to clopidogrel. Ticagrelor was associated with an increase in the rate of non–procedure-related bleeding, but no increase in the rate of overall major bleeding compared to clopidogrel.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Exclusion:</strong> Contraindication against clopidogrel use, fibrinolytic therapy w/in 24 h prior to randomization, need for oral anticoagulation Rx, increased risk of</td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary endpoints: Death from any cause, MI*, or stroke=10.2% ticagrelor vs. 12.3% clopidogrel</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Death from vascular causes, MI, stroke, severe recurrent ischemia, recurrent ischemia, TIA, or other arterial thrombotic event =14.6% ticagrelor vs. 16.7% clopidogrel</td>
<td></td>
<td>Death from any cause (4.5% ticagrelor vs. 5.9% clopidogrel)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Subgroups (primary efficacy endpoint): NSTEMI: (n=7,955 pts: 11.4% ticagrelor vs. 13.9% clopidogrel)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>(0.37 to 0.94)</td>
<td>HR: 0.78</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>UA: (n=3,112 pts; 8.6% ticagrelor vs. 9.1% clopidogrel)</td>
<td></td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>(0.75 to 0.96)</td>
<td>HR: 0.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Aim of Study</td>
<td>Study Size</td>
<td>Patient Population Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Endpoints</td>
<td>Statistical Analysis Reported</td>
<td>( P ) (95% CI)</td>
<td>OR/HR/RR</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticagrelor Compared With Clopidogrel by Geographic Region in the Platelet Inhibition and Patient Outcomes (PLATO) Trial, Mahaffey KW, 2011. (2)</td>
<td>To investigate potential explanations for the observed region-by-treatment interaction in the PLATO study using Cox regression analyses.</td>
<td>U.S.=141 3; rest of world =17,211</td>
<td>Bradycardia, concomitant therapy w/ strong cytochrome P-450 3A inhibitor or inducer and clinically important anaemia or thrombocytopenia, and dialysis requirement (per PLATO study paper. James S, Akerblom A, Cannon CP, et al. Am Heart J. 2009;157:599-605.</td>
<td>Primary safety end point: any major bleeding event at 12 mo.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Secondary safety end point</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary safety endpoint (rates of major bleeding): 11.6% ticagrelor vs. 11.2% clopidogrel</td>
<td>1.22)</td>
<td></td>
<td>HR: 1.04</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-CABG related major bleeding (4.5% ticagrelor vs. 3.8% clopidogrel</td>
<td>0.03 (1.02 to 1.38)</td>
<td></td>
<td>HR: 1.19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CV death/MI*/stroke in U.S. =11.9% ticagrelor vs. 9.5% clopidogrel</td>
<td>0.1459 (0.92 to 1.75)</td>
<td></td>
<td>HR: 1.27</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CV death/MI*/stroke in rest of the world = 9% ticagrelor vs. 11% clopidogrel</td>
<td>&lt;0.0001 (0.74 to 0.90)</td>
<td></td>
<td>HR: 0.81</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CV death in U.S. = 3.4% vs. 2.7% clopidogrel</td>
<td>0.4468 (0.69 to 2.31)</td>
<td></td>
<td>HR: 1.26</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CV death in rest of the world = 3.8% ticagrelor vs. 4.9% clopidogrel</td>
<td>0.0005 (0.67 to 0.89)</td>
<td></td>
<td>HR: 0.77</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MI (excluding silent) in U.S. = 9.1% ticagrelor vs. 6.7% clopidogrel</td>
<td>0.0956</td>
<td></td>
<td>HR: 1.38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Using an ASA dose >100 mg is a possible explanation for the outcome differences between the U.S. and the rest of the world.

Higher doses of ASA were used at landmark points. More U.S. pts were treated with a high-dose ASA after day 2 compared with the rest of the world pts (61% vs. 4%).

However, play of...
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis Reported</th>
<th>P (95% CI)</th>
<th>OR/HR/RR</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>explain the treatment-by-region interaction, statistical evaluations indicate the observed regional interaction and pattern of results seen across regions and countries were consistent with what might be expected by chance alone in a large, multiregional clinical trial with multiple exploratory analyses.</td>
<td>MI (excluding silent) in rest of the world = 5.1% ticagrelor vs. 6.4% clopidogrel</td>
<td>(0.95 to 2.01)</td>
<td>0.0004 (0.70 to 0.90)</td>
<td>HR: 0.80</td>
<td>chance could not be excluded.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stroke in U.S. = 1.0% ticagrelor vs. 0.6% clopidogrel</td>
<td>0.3730 (0.51 to 5.97)</td>
<td>HR: 1.75</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Stroke in rest of the world = 1.49% ticagrelor vs. 1.2% clopidogrel</td>
<td>0.2964 (0.88 to 1.50)</td>
<td>HR: 1.15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. ASA dose ≥300 mg: ticagrelor 40 events vs. clopidogrel 27 events</td>
<td>Not stated (0.99 to 2.64)</td>
<td>HR: 1.62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. ASA dose &gt;100 to &lt;300 mg: ticagrelor 2 events vs. clopidogrel 2 events (HR: not calculated)</td>
<td>Not stated (not stated)</td>
<td>HR:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>U.S. ASA dose ≤100 mg: ticagrelor 19 events vs. clopidogrel 24 events</td>
<td>Not stated (0.40 to 1.33)</td>
<td>HR: 0.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-U.S. ASA dose ≥300 mg: ticagrelor 28 events vs. clopidogrel 23 events</td>
<td>Not stated (0.71 to 2.14)</td>
<td>HR: 1.23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Non-U.S. ASA dose</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Aim of Study</td>
<td>Study Size</td>
<td>Patient Population Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Endpoints</td>
<td>Statistical Analysis Reported</td>
<td>P (95% CI)</td>
<td>OR/HR/RR</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ticagrelor vs. clopidogrel in patients with acute coronary syndromes intended for noninvasive management: substudy from prospective randomized PLATelet inhibition and patient Outcomes (PLATO) trial, James SK, 2011. (3)</td>
<td>To evaluate efficacy and safety outcomes in pts in PLATO (treating physician designated pts as planned for initial invasive management or initial conservatory management).</td>
<td>5216 pts specified for planned non-invasive management (n=2601 ticagrelor; n=2615 clopidogrel) (28% of 18,624 PLATO participants)</td>
<td>See main PLATO study (1)</td>
<td>Primary composite end point of cardiovascular death, MI, and stroke; their individual components; PLATO defined major bleeding at 1 yr.</td>
<td>Primary endpoint of CV death, MI*, stroke: 12% ticagrelor vs. 14.3% clopidogrel</td>
<td>HR: 0.85</td>
<td>PLATO pts with ACS managed w/ planned noninvasive strategy treated with ticagrelor compared to clopidogrel had a reduction in ischaemic events and mortality, without increasing major bleeding.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Aim of Study</td>
<td>Study Size</td>
<td>Patient Population Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Endpoints</td>
<td>Statistical Analysis Reported</td>
<td>P (95% CI)</td>
<td>OR/HR/RR</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT- OASIS 7</td>
<td>To evaluate whether doubling the dose of loading and initial maintenance doses of clopidogrel is superior to the standard-dose clopidogrel regimen and to investigate if higher-dose ASA is superior to lower-dose ASA. Pts were assigned in a 2 × 2 factorial design to 600 mg clopidogrel loading on Day 1, followed by 150 mg/d for 6 d, then 75 mg thereafter vs. 300 mg clopidogrel loading on Day 1, followed by 75 mg/d thereafter and either ASA 300-325 mg/d vs. lower-dose ASA.</td>
<td>25,086</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Age ≥18 y with non–ST-segment ACS or STEMI. Requirements included ECG changes compatible with ischemia or elevated cardiac biomarkers and coronary angiographic assessment, with plan to perform PCI as early as possible, but no later than 72 h after randomization. Exclusion criteria: Increased risk of or known bleeding and allergy to clopidogrel or ASA.</td>
<td>Primary outcome was CV death, MI, or stroke, whichever occurred first, at 30 d. Prespecified secondary endpoint was definite or probable stent thrombosis (by ARC definition) in pts who underwent PCI. Main safety outcome was major bleeding according to trial criteria‡.</td>
<td>11.9% ticagrelor vs. 10.3% clopidogrel</td>
<td>0.30 (0.83 to 1.06)</td>
<td>HR: 0.94</td>
<td>This analysis of the overall trial in 25,086 pts failed to demonstrate a significant difference in the primary endpoint of CV death, MI, or stroke at 30 d between the double-dose clopidogrel for 7 d vs. standard-dose clopidogrel and between the higher-dose vs. lower-dose aspirin subgroups. The secondary endpoint of definite stent thrombosis in those undergoing PCI was reduced in the clopidogrel higher-dose group for both DES vs. non-DES subtypes, but this benefit was offset by increased major bleeding in the higher-dose clopidogrel group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary outcome for clopidogrel dose comparison: 4.2% in double-dose clopidogrel group vs. 4.4% in standard-dose clopidogrel group.</td>
<td>Major bleeding for clopidogrel dose comparison: 2.5% in double-dose clopidogrel group vs. 2.0% in standard-dose clopidogrel group.</td>
<td>0.01 (1.05 to 1.46)</td>
<td>HR: 1.24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary outcome for ASA dose comparison: 4.2% in higher-dose ASA group vs. 4.4% in lower-dose ASA group.</td>
<td>Major bleeding for ASA comparison: 2.3% in higher-dose ASA group vs. 2.3% in lower-dose ASA group.</td>
<td>0.47 (0.86 to 1.09)</td>
<td>HR: 0.97</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Clopidogrel and ASA dose interaction—primary outcome for pts on higher-dose ASA: 3.8% in double-dose clopidogrel vs.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.90 (0.84 to 1.17)</td>
<td>HR: 0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.03 (0.69 to 0.98)</td>
<td>HR: 0.82</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Aim of Study</td>
<td>Study Size</td>
<td>Patient Population Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Endpoints</td>
<td>Statistical Analysis Reported</td>
<td>P (95% CI)</td>
<td>OR/HR/RR</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>75-100 mg/d.</td>
<td>The goal of this prespecified subgroup analysis of CURRENT-OASIS 7(4) was to examine efficacy and safety outcomes</td>
<td>17,263</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Pts with ACS (with or without ST-segment elevation) and either ECG evidence of ischemia or elevated biomarkers. Pts were required to have coronary angioplasty with intent to undergo PCI as</td>
<td>Primary outcome was composite of CV death, MI, or stroke from randomization to Day 30. Secondary outcomes included primary outcome plus recurrent ischemia, individual components</td>
<td>Primary outcome in clopidogrel dose comparison reduced with double-dose clopidogrel: 3.9% in double-dose clopidogrel group vs. 4.5% in standard-dose clopidogrel group.</td>
<td>0.039 (0.74 to 0.99)</td>
<td>Adjusted HR: 0.86</td>
<td>This sub-study of CURRENT-OASIS-7 analyzed the 69% of pts (n=17,263) who underwent PCI, a prespecified analysis in a postrandomization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Aim of Study</td>
<td>Study Size</td>
<td>Patient Population Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Endpoints</td>
<td>Statistical Analysis Reported</td>
<td>P (95% CI)</td>
<td>OR/HR/RR</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CURRENT-OASIS 7</td>
<td>Study undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention for acute coronary syndromes (CURRENT-OASIS 7): a randomised factorial trial, Mehta SR, 2010. (5)</td>
<td>in pts who underwent PCI.</td>
<td>early as possible, but not later than 72 h after randomization. Exclusion criteria: Increased risk of bleeding or active bleeding. Additional information on study eligibility criteria in study Web appendix.</td>
<td>of composite outcomes, and stent thrombosis per ARC criteria.</td>
<td>Secondary outcome (CV death, MI, stroke, or recurrent ischemia) in clopidogrel dose comparison was reduced with double-dose clopidogrel: 4.2% in double-dose clopidogrel vs. 5.0% in standard-dose clopidogrel.</td>
<td>Rates of definite stent thrombosis were lower with double-dose clopidogrel (0.7%) vs. standard-dose clopidogrel (1.3%).</td>
<td>CURRENT-defined major bleed was more common with double-dose (0.1%) than standard-dose clopidogrel (0.04%); however, no difference in TIMI-defined severe or major bleeding.</td>
<td>0.025 (0.74 to 0.98)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TIMACS</td>
<td>Early vs. delayed invasive intervention in acute coronary syndromes, Mehta</td>
<td>To study efficacy of an early invasive strategy (within 24 h of presentation) compared with</td>
<td>3031</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Presentation to a hospital with UA or MI without ST-segment elevation within 24 h after onset of symptoms and if 2 of the following 3 criteria for</td>
<td>Composite of death, MI, or stroke at 6 mo.</td>
<td>At 6 mo the primary outcome occurred in 9.6% of pts in early-intervention group vs. 11.3% of delayed-intervention group.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.15 (0.68 to 1.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Aim of Study</td>
<td>Study Size</td>
<td>Patient Population Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Endpoints</td>
<td>Statistical Analysis Reported</td>
<td>P (95% CI)</td>
<td>OR/HR/RR</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SR, 2009, (6)</td>
<td>delayed invasive strategy (any time &gt;36 h after presentation).</td>
<td>increased risk are present: age ≥60 y, cardiac biomarkers above ULN, or results on ECG compatible with ischemia (i.e., ST-segment depression ≥1 mm or transient ST-segment elevation or T-wave inversion &gt;3 mm). Exclusion criteria: Patient who is not a suitable candidate for revascularization.</td>
<td>28% risk reduction in secondary outcome of death, MI, or refractory ischemia in early-intervention group (9.5%) vs. delayed-intervention group (12.9%).</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.003 (0.58 to 0.89)</td>
<td>HR: 0.72</td>
<td>challenges, limiting its power. For the overall trial population, there was only a non-significant trend to a reduction in the primary ischemic endpoint in the early compared to delayed intervention groups. The prospectively-defined secondary endpoint of death, MI, or refractory ischemia was reduced by early intervention, mainly because of a reduction in refractory ischemia. Heterogeneity was observed in the primary ischemic endpoint by a pre-specified estimate of baseline risk according to the GRACE score, with pts in the highest tertile experiencing a sizeable risk reduction and suggesting a potential advantage.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prespecified analyses indicated early intervention improved the primary outcome in the third of pts at highest risk.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.006 (0.48 to 0.89)</td>
<td>HR: 0.65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Prespecified analyses did not show that early intervention improved primary outcome in the two thirds at low to intermediate risk.</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.48 (0.81 to 1.56)</td>
<td>HR: 1.12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Aim of Study</td>
<td>Study Size</td>
<td>Patient Population Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Endpoints</td>
<td>Statistical Analysis Reported</td>
<td>P (95% CI)</td>
<td>OR/HR/RR</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CARE</td>
<td>Cardiac Angiography in Renally Impaired Patients (CARE) study: a randomized double-blind trial of contrast-induced nephropathy in patients with chronic kidney disease, Solomon RJ, 2007. (7)</td>
<td>To compare iopamidol and iodixanol in pts with CKD (eGFR 20-59 mL/min) who underwent cardiac angiography or PCI. Exclusion criteria: Pregnancy, lactation, administration of any investigational drug within the previous 30 d, intra-arterial or IV administration of iodinated CM from 7 d before to 72 h after administration of the study agents, medical conditions or circumstances that would have substantially decreased chance to obtain reliable data (NYHA class IV CHF, hypersensitivity to iodine-containing compounds, hyperthyroidism or thyroid malignancies, uncontrolled DM, unstable renal drug dependence, psychiatric</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Men and women (≥18 y) with moderate to severe CKD scheduled for diagnostic cardiac angiography or PCI. Exclusion criteria: Pregnancy, lactation, administration of any investigational drug within the previous 30 d, intra-arterial or IV administration of iodinated CM from 7 d before to 72 h after administration of the study agents, medical conditions or circumstances that would have substantially decreased chance to obtain reliable data (NYHA class IV CHF, hypersensitivity to iodine-containing compounds, hyperthyroidism or thyroid malignancies, uncontrolled DM, unstable renal drug dependence, psychiatric</td>
<td>Primary endpoint was postdose SCr increase of 0.5 mg/dL (44.2 mol/L) over baseline. Secondary outcome was postdose SCr increase ≥25%, a postdose estimated GFR decrease ≥25%, and mean peak change in SCr.</td>
<td>Reported</td>
<td>0.39 (–6.7 to 2.1)</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td>In this randomized trial of moderate size, the rate of CIN in higher-risk pts with moderate CKD was not significantly different between the low-osmolar contrast medium iopamidol and the iso-osmolar contrast medium iodixanol.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Aim of Study</td>
<td>Study Size</td>
<td>Patient Population Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Endpoints</td>
<td>Statistical Analysis Reported</td>
<td>P (95% CI)</td>
<td>OR/HR/RR</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The relative renal safety of iodixanol compared with low-osmolar contrast media: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials, Reed M, 2009. (8)</td>
<td>Meta-analysis to compare nephrotoxicity of the iso-osmolar contrast medium iodixanol with LOCM.</td>
<td>16 trials (2,763 subjects)</td>
<td>Pts enrolled in RCTs that compared incidence of CI-AKI with either iodixanol or LOCM.</td>
<td>Primary endpoint was incidence of CI-AKI. Secondary endpoints were need for renal replacement therapy and mortality.</td>
<td>No significant difference in incidence of CI-AKI in iodixanol group than in LOCM group (overall summary).</td>
<td>0.19 (0.56 to 1.12)</td>
<td>Summary RR 0.79</td>
<td>In this updated meta-analysis of 16 CIN trials, data supporting a reduction in CIN favoring the iso-osmolar medium iodixanol compared to LOCM were no longer significant. Sub-analyses suggested potential variations in relative renal safety by specific LOCM with reductions in CIN for iodixanol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Disorders, dementia), administration of any medication to prevent CIN other than N-acetylcysteine, or intake of nephrotoxic medications from 24 h before to 24 h after administration of the study agent.</td>
<td>Mean post-SCr increases were significantly less with iopamidol (all pts: 0.07 mg/dL with iopamidol vs. 0.12 mg/dL with iodixanol).</td>
<td>0.03</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>In pts with DM, SCr change from baseline was 0.07 mg/dL with iopamidol vs. 0.16 mg/dL with iodixanol.</td>
<td>0.013</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Decreases in eGFR ≥25% were recorded in 5.9% (12 pts) with iopamidol and 10% (21 pts) with iodixanol.</td>
<td>0.15 (–9.3 to 1.1)</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Aim of Study</td>
<td>Study Size</td>
<td>Patient Population Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Endpoints</td>
<td>Statistical Analysis Reported</td>
<td>P (95% CI)</td>
<td>OR/HR/RR</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nephrotoxicity of iso-osmolar iodixanol compared with nonionic low-osmolar contrast media: meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials, Heinrich MC, 2009. (9)</td>
<td>Meta-analysis of RCTs to compare nephrotoxicity of iso-osmolar iodixanol with nonionic LOCM.</td>
<td>25 trials (3270 subjects)</td>
<td>Incidence criteria: RCTs analyzing SCr levels before and after intravascular application of iodixanol or LOCM.</td>
<td>Incidence of CIN and change in SCr levels.</td>
<td>Iodixanol did not significantly reduce risk of CIN (or risk of SCr increase) compared with LOCM overall. However, risk of intra-arterial iohexol was greater than that of iodixanol.</td>
<td>0.10 (0.61 to 1.04)</td>
<td>RR 0.80</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- iodixanol was compared with iopromide, 0.84 (0.47 to 1.85) RR 0.93 compared with the ionic LOCM ioxaglate and with iohexol, a nonionic LOCM, but not with 4 other LOCM.
- or iodixanol compared with ioversol. 0.68 (0.60 to 1.39) RR 0.92
- No significant difference between iodixanol and LOCM noted in rates of postprocedure hemodialysis. 0.20 (0.08 to 1.68) RR 0.37
- No significant difference between iodixanol and LOCM in rates of death. 0.663 (0.33 to 5.79) RR 1.38
- No significant risk reduction after IV administration of CM. 0.79 (0.62 to 1.89) RR 1.08
- In pts with intra-arterial administration and renal insufficiency, risk of CIN was greater for iohexol than for iodixanol. <0.01 (0.21 to 0.68) RR 0.38
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis Reported</th>
<th>P (95% CI)</th>
<th>OR/HR/RR</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EARLY-ACS</td>
<td>To evaluate upstream use of GP IIb/IIIa inhibitor eptifibatide vs. provisional eptifibatide administration in the catheterization lab in high-risk pts with NSTE ACS.</td>
<td>9492</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Pts at least 18 y of age were randomized within 8-12 h after presentation and assigned to an invasive treatment strategy no sooner than the next calendar day. To qualify as having a high-risk UA/NSTEMI, pts were required to have at least 2 of the following: ST-segment depression or transient ST elevation, elevated biomarker levels (CK-MB or troponin), and age ≥60 y. The study protocol was later amended to permit enrollment of pts age 50-59 y with elevated cardiac biomarker levels and documented vascular disease and clarified the timing of angiography as ≥12 h after randomization. Exclusion criteria: Increased risk of bleeding, allergy to heparin or eptifibatide, pregnancy, renal dialysis within previous 30 d, intention of investigator</td>
<td>The primary efficacy composite endpoint was death from any cause, MI, recurrent ischemia requiring urgent revascularization, or thrombotic bailout at 96 h. The secondary efficacy endpoint was composite of death from any cause or MI within the first 30 d. Safety endpoints included rates of hemorrhage, transfusion, surgical reexploration, stroke, thrombocytopenia, and serious adverse events at 120 h after randomization.</td>
<td>No difference between iodixanol and the other (noniohexol) LOCM.</td>
<td>0.86 (0.50 to 1.78)</td>
<td>RR 0.95</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Aim of Study</td>
<td>Study Size</td>
<td>Patient Population</td>
<td>Endpoints</td>
<td>Statistical Analysis Reported</td>
<td>P (95% CI)</td>
<td>OR/HR/RR</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ABOARD</td>
<td>Immediate vs delayed intervention for acute coronary syndromes: a randomized clinical trial, Montalescot G, 2009. (11)</td>
<td>To determine if immediate intervention on admission can result in reduction of MI vs. delayed intervention.</td>
<td>252</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Presence of at least 2 of the following: ischemic symptoms, ECG abnormalities in at least 2 contiguous leads, or positive troponin, TIMI risk score ≥3. Exclusion criteria: Hemodynamic or arrhythmic instability requiring urgent catheterization, chronic oral anticoagulation, or thrombolytic therapy in the preceding 24 h.</td>
<td>Primary endpoint was peak troponin value during hospitalization. Secondary endpoints were composite of death, MI, or urgent revascularization at 1-mo follow-up.</td>
<td>No difference was found in peak troponin-I between groups (median 2.1 ng/dL [0.3 to 7.1 ng/mL] vs. 1.7 mg/mL [0.3 to 7.2 ng/mL] in immediate- and delayed-intervention groups, respectively).</td>
<td>0.70 (Not stated)</td>
<td>Not stated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TRITON-TIMI 38</td>
<td>To evaluate treatment with prasugrel compared with clopidogrel among pts undergoing</td>
<td>13,608</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Scheduled PCI for ACS. For UA/NSTEMI pts, ischemic symptoms ≥10 min within 72 h of randomization, TIMI risk score ≥3, and either ST-</td>
<td>Primary endpoints were death from CV causes, nonfatal MI, or nonfatal stroke. Key safety endpoint was major bleeding§.</td>
<td>Primary endpoint was significantly lower in prasugrel group compared with clopidogrel group (9.9% vs. 12.1%, respectively).</td>
<td>&lt;0.001 (0.73 to 0.90)</td>
<td>HR: 0.81</td>
<td>TRITON-TIMI-38 compared the new thienopyridine prasugrel to clopidogrel in 13,608 moderate-to-high risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Aim of Study</td>
<td>Study Size</td>
<td>Patient Population Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Endpoints</td>
<td>Statistical Analysis Reported</td>
<td>P (95% CI)</td>
<td>OR/HR/RR</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>syndromes, Wiviott SD, 2007. (12)</td>
<td>planned PCI for ACS.</td>
<td>segment deviation ≥1 mm or elevated cardiac biomarker of necrosis. For STEMI pts, symptom onset within 12 h of randomization if primary PCI was scheduled or within 14 d if medically treated for STEMI. Exclusion criteria: Included increased bleeding risk, anemia, thrombocytopenia, intracranial pathology, or use of any thienopyridine within 5 d.</td>
<td>Primary endpoint was consistent in UA/NSTEMI cohort (9.9% with prasugrel vs. 12.1% with clopidogrel; 18% RR).</td>
<td>0.002 (0.73 to 0.93)</td>
<td>HR: 0.82</td>
<td>STEMI and NSTEMI pts scheduled to undergo PCI. Prasugrel was associated with a reduction in the composite ischemic event rate over 15 mo of follow-up, including stent thrombosis, but it was associated with a significantly increased rate of bleeding. In subgroup analyses, those with prior stroke/TIA fared worse on prasugrel, and no advantage was seen in those age ≥75 y or &lt;60 kg in weight.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Primary endpoint in STEMI cohort (10% in prasugrel vs. 12.4% in clopidogrel; 21% RR).</td>
<td>0.02 (0.65 to 0.97)</td>
<td>HR: 0.79</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Efficacy benefit evident by 3 d (4.7% in prasugrel group vs. 5.6% in clopidogrel group).</td>
<td>0.01 (0.71 to 0.96)</td>
<td>HR: 0.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Efficacy benefit evident from Day 3 to end of follow-up (5.6% in pts receiving prasugrel vs. 6.9% of pts receiving clopidogrel).</td>
<td>0.003 (0.70 to 0.93)</td>
<td>HR: 0.80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Definite or probable stent thrombosis occurred less frequently in prasugrel group than in clopidogrel group (1.1% vs. 2.4%, respectively).</td>
<td>&lt;0.001 (0.36 to 0.64)</td>
<td>HR: 0.48</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety endpoint of TIMI major non-CABG bleeding was higher with prasugrel compared with clopidogrel (2.4% vs. 1.8%, respectively).</td>
<td>0.03 (1.03 to 1.68)</td>
<td>HR: 1.32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Aim of Study</td>
<td>Study Size</td>
<td>Patient Population Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Endpoints</td>
<td>Statistical Analysis Reported</td>
<td>P (95% CI)</td>
<td>OR/HR/RR</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------</td>
<td>-------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Increase in bleeding consistent for different categories of TIMI major bleeding, including life-threatening bleeding (1.4% in prasugrel vs. 0.9% in clopidogrel. Fatal bleeding (0.4% in prasugrel vs. 0.1% in clopidogrel. And nonfatal bleeding (1.1% in prasugrel vs. 0.9% in clopidogrel.</td>
<td>0.01 (1.08 to 2.13)</td>
<td>HR: 1.52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>CABG-related TIMI major bleeding increased with prasugrel compared with clopidogrel (13.4% vs. 3.2%, respectively).</td>
<td>&lt;0.001 (1.90 to 11.82)</td>
<td>HR: 4.73</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>No difference in mortality (death from any cause) between groups (3.0% in prasugrel group vs. 3.2% in clopidogrel group).</td>
<td>0.64 (0.78 to 1.16)</td>
<td>HR: 0.95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Net clinical benefit endpoint (composite of death, MI, stroke or TIMI major bleeding) favored prasugrel over clopidogrel (12.2% vs. 13.9%, respectively).</td>
<td>0.004 (0.79 to 0.95)</td>
<td>HR: 0.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study</td>
<td>Aim of Study</td>
<td>Study Size</td>
<td>Patient Population Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria</td>
<td>Endpoints</td>
<td>Statistical Analysis Reported</td>
<td>P (95% CI)</td>
<td>OR/HR/RR</td>
<td>Conclusion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SWEDEHEART</td>
<td>Influence of renal function on the effects of early revascularization in non-ST-elevation myocardial infarction: data from the Swedish Web-System for Enhancement and Development of Evidence-Based Care in Heart Disease Evaluated According to Recommended Therapies (SWEDEHEART), Szummer K, 2009. (13)</td>
<td>23, 262</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: NSTEMI pts ≤80 y of age from nationwide CCU register (2003 and 2006).</td>
<td>Description of 1-y survival according to renal function stage.</td>
<td>Pts treated with early revascularization had overall improved survival rate at 1 y.</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
<td>HR: 0.64</td>
<td>A contemporary nationwide Swedish registry, evaluated the use of early revascularization after NSTEMI across all stages of CKD, and stratified outcomes by stage of CKD. Early revascularization was associated with improved adjusted 1-y survival in UA/NSTEMI pts with mild-to-moderate CKD, but no association was observed in those with severe and end-stage disease. SWEDEHEART is limited by its observational nature, but by capturing unselected pts, it may be quite reflective of real-world experience.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-y mortality for pts with eGFR ≥90: 1.9% for invasive treatment vs. 10% for medical treatment</td>
<td>0.001 (0.42 to 0.80)</td>
<td>HR: 0.58</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-y mortality for pts with eGFR 60 to 89: 2.4% for invasive treatment vs. 10% for medical treatment.</td>
<td>&lt;0.001 (0.52 to 0.80)</td>
<td>HR: 0.64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-y mortality for pts with eGFR 30 to 59: 7% for invasive treatment vs. 22% for medical treatment.</td>
<td>0.001 (0.54 to 0.81)</td>
<td>HR: 0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-y mortality for pts with eGFR 15 to 29: 22% for invasive treatment vs. 41% for medical treatment.</td>
<td>0.740 (0.51 to 1.61)</td>
<td>HR: 0.91</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1-y mortality for pts with eGFR &lt;15/dialysis: 44% for invasive treatment vs. 53% for medical treatment.</td>
<td>0.150 (0.84 to 3.09)</td>
<td>HR: 1.61</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study</th>
<th>Aim of Study</th>
<th>Study Size</th>
<th>Patient Population Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria</th>
<th>Endpoints</th>
<th>Statistical Analysis Reported</th>
<th>P (95% CI)</th>
<th>OR/HR/RR</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>COGENT</td>
<td>To investigate efficacy and safety of concomitant clopidogrel and PPI administration in pts with CAD receiving clopidogrel and ASA.</td>
<td>3761</td>
<td>Inclusion criteria: Age ≥21 y, clopidogrel therapy with concomitant ASA anticipated for at least next 12 mo, including pts with ACS or coronary stent placement. Exclusion criteria: Hospitalized pts for whom discharge not anticipated within 48 h of randomization; need for current/long-term use of PPI, H2-receptor antagonist, sucralfate, or misoprostol; erosive esophagitis or esophageal or gastric variceal disease or previous nonendoscopic gastric surgery; clopidogrel or other thienopyridine ≥21 d before randomization; receipt of oral anticoagulant unable to be discontinued safely; recent fibrinolytic therapy.</td>
<td>Primary GI safety endpoint: composite of GI overt or occult bleeding, symptomatic gastroduodenal ulcers or erosions, obstructions, or perforation. Primary CV safety endpoint: composite of death from CV causes, nonfatal MI, coronary revascularization, or ischemic stroke.</td>
<td>Total GI event rate: 1.1% with omeprazole vs. 2.9% with placebo</td>
<td>&lt;0.001 (0.18 to 0.63)</td>
<td>HR: 0.34</td>
<td>In this randomized, placebo controlled comparison in 3,873 pts with an indication for dual-antiplatelet therapy, no difference was found in the primary composite CV endpoint between clopidogrel plus omeprazole and clopidogrel plus placebo at 180 d. The rate of GI bleeding and associated complications were reduced with omeprazole. Study limitations include premature termination of planned enrollment, limited follow-up and power to discern small to moderate differences between therapies, inadequate ascertainment of all end points, and the use of a single-pill formulation, which might differ in release kinetics.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Overt upper GI bleeding rate: 0.1% with omeprazole vs. 0.6% with placebo</td>
<td>0.001 (0.03 to 0.56)</td>
<td>HR: 0.13</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total CV event rate: 4.9% with omeprazole vs. 5.7% with placebo</td>
<td>0.96 (0.68 to 1.44)</td>
<td>HR: 0.99</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Study Aim of Study Study Size Patient Population Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria Endpoints Statistical Analysis Reported P (95% CI) OR/HR/RR Conclusion

*These events excluded silent MI (which accounted for 0.1% in each treatment group in PLATO).

†PLATO major bleeding was defined as major life-threatening bleeding (fatal bleeding, intracranial bleeding, intrapericardial bleeding with cardiac tamponade, hypovolemic shock or severe hypotension due to bleeding and requiring pressors or surgery, a decline in the hemoglobin level of ≥5 g/dL, or the need for transfusion of ≥4 units of red cells) or other major bleeding (e.g., bleeding that led to clinically-significant disability (e.g., intraocular bleeding with permanent vision loss) or bleeding either associated with a drop in the hemoglobin level of ≥3 g/dL but <5/dL or requiring transfusion of 2-3 units of red cells.

‡The primary safety outcome is major bleeding (i.e., severe bleeding plus other major bleeding). Severe bleeding was defined as: Fatal or leading to a drop in hemoglobin of ≥5 g/dL, or significant hypotension with the need for inotropes, or requiring surgery (other than vascular site repair), or symptomatic intracranial hemorrhage, or requiring transfusion of ≥4 units of red blood cells or equivalent whole blood. Other major bleeding was defined as: significantly disabling, intraocular bleeding leading to significant loss of vision or bleeding requiring transfusion of 2 or 3 units of red blood cells or equivalent whole blood.

§Key safety endpoint was non–CABG-related TIMI major bleeding (Intracranial hemorrhage ≥5 g/dL decrease in the hemoglobin concentration, ≥15% absolute decrease in hematocrit.

ACS indicates acute coronary syndrome; ARC, academic research consortium; ASA, aspirin; CABG, coronary artery bypass graft; CAD, coronary artery disease; CCU, coronary care unit; CHF, congestive heart failure; CI-AKI, contrast-induced acute kidney injury; CI, confidence interval; CIN, contrast-induced nephropathy; CKD, chronic kidney disease; CK-MB, creatine kinase-MB; CM, contrast media; CURRENT, Clopidogrel optimal loading dose Usage to Reduce Recurrent EveNTs; CV, cardiovascular; DES, drug-eluting stent; DM, diabetes mellitus; ECG, electrocardiograph; eGFR, estimated glomerular filtration rate; GI, gastrointestinal; GP, glycoprotein; GRACE, Global Registry of Acute Coronary Events; GUSTO, Global Utilization of Streptokinase and Tissue Plasminogen Activator for Occluded Coronary Arteries trial; HR, hazard ratio; IV, intravenous; LD, loading dose; LOC, low-osmolar contrast media; MACCE, major adverse cardiac and cerebrovascular events; MI, myocardial infarction; NSTEMI, non–ST-elevation myocardial infarction; NYHA, New York Heart Association; OR, odds ratio; patients, pts; PCI, percutaneous coronary intervention; PPI, proton pump inhibitor; RCT, randomized controlled trial; RR, relative risk; SCr, serum creatinine; STEMI, ST-elevation myocardial infarction; TIMI, Thrombolysis in Myocardial Infarction; TnI, troponin I; UA, unstable angina; and ULN, upper limit of normal
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