Use of the SAMe-TT2R2 score to predict anticoagulation control in atrial fibrillation and venous thromboembolism patients treated with vitamin K antagonists: A review

Zulkifly, Hanis; Lip, Gregory; Lane, Deirdre

Link to publication on Research at Birmingham portal

1 **Use of the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score to predict anticoagulation control in atrial fibrillation and venous**

2 **thromboembolism patients treated with vitamin K antagonists: A review**

3

4 **Running head:** The SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score: a review

5

6 Hanis Zulkifly, MPharm[a]

7 Gregory Y.H. Lip, MD[a, b]

8 Deirdre A. Lane, PhD[a, b]

9

10 [a]Institute of Cardiovascular Sciences, University of Birmingham, Birmingham, United Kingdom

11 [b]Aalborg Thrombosis Research Unit, Department of Clinical Medicine, Aalborg University, Aalborg,

12 Denmark

13

14 HHZ523@student.bham.ac.uk

15 g.y.h.lip@bham.ac.uk

16 deirdrelane@nhs.net

17 **Corresponding Author:** Dr Deirdre A Lane

18 Tel: +44 121-507-5080   Email: deirdrelane@nhs.net

19 Mailing address: University of Birmingham Institute of Cardiovascular Sciences, City Hospital,

20 Dudley Road, Birmingham, B18 7QH, UK

21 **Word count: 5957**

22 **Article type**: Review article

Abstract

Identifying patients who are likely to achieve and maintain a therapeutic INR when prescribed a vitamin K antagonist (VKA) for stroke prevention in atrial fibrillation (AF) and venous thromboembolism (VTE) is challenging. The SAMe-TT_2R_2 score was developed based on common clinical factors that can highlight patients who may be unable to achieve and maintain good anticoagulation control and for whom a 'trial of warfarin' would be inadvisable. This review summarises the main published prospective and retrospective studies that have validated the SAMe-TT_2R_2 score in AF and VTE patients treated with a VKA and how the SAMe-TT_2R_2 score could aid clinical decision-making; 19 studies were included. Taken together validation studies suggest that the SAMe-TT_2R_2 score is able to predict good or poor anticoagulation control among AF and VTE patients, although data on VTE patients are limited (3 studies). The available evidence suggests that the SAMe-TT_2R_2 score may be a useful tool to aid clinical decision-making for oral anticoagulants (OAC) in AF and VTE patients.

Keywords: SAMe-TT_2R_2 score; atrial fibrillation; venous thromboembolism; vitamin K antagonist; decision-making; oral anticoagulation

Introduction

For decades, vitamin K antagonists (VKA, e.g., warfarin) have been the cornerstone of stroke prevention in atrial fibrillation (AF) and prevention of venous thromboembolism (VTE).[1] However, VKA efficacy and safety requires achievement of an international normalised ratio (INR) between 2.0-3.0. Achieving this target INR alone is an inadequate measure of the therapeutic efficacy of VKA.[1]

Time in therapeutic range (TTR) is one measure that summarises INR control over time. TTR is an important and independent predictor of thromboembolic and bleeding outcomes in AF patients on VKA.[2, 3] An average individual TTR≥65% is recommended by NICE guidelines,[1] while European guidelines[4] recommend TTR≥70% to maximize effectiveness and safety of VKAs.

However, identifying patients who are likely to achieve and maintain a therapeutic INR is more difficult. Based on common clinical factors that influence INR and anticoagulation control in everyday clinical practice, a clinical scoring system, the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score[5] (**Table 1**) was developed in 2013 to identify risk factors highlighting those patients who may be unable to achieve/maintain good anticoagulation control and for whom a 'trial of warfarin' would be inadvisable. The frequency of INR measurements are not factored-in (or intended to be). This score assigns 1 point each to female sex, age <60 years, history of ≥2 co-morbidities (hypertension, diabetes mellitus, coronary artery disease or myocardial infarction, peripheral artery disease, congestive heart failure, previous stroke, pulmonary, hepatic, or renal disease) and treatment with drugs interacting with VKA (e.g., amiodarone) and 2 points each for current/recent tobacco use (within 2-years) and non-white ethnicity[5] (**Table 1**). The score can be used to aid decision-making by identifying those patients who would probably do well on VKA (achieving a high TTR, ≥65%) or conversely, those would need additional interventions to achieve good INR control or to be started on/switched to a non-VKA oral anticoagulant (NOAC). The current review summarises studies which have assessed and/or validated the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score in patients treated with VKA for AF or VTE.

Methods

A comprehensive structured literature search was performed using MEDLINE and EMBASE from 2013 until February 2017; the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score was first published in 2013. The search strategy included keywords and MeSH terms relating to AF, deep vein thrombosis, VTE, stroke prevention, warfarin, VKAs, oral anticoagulant, inception cohort, adverse effect, poor control, INR and SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score (without MeSH term) individually and in combination. Primary published research articles and abstracts on prospective or retrospective studies validating the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score were included. Studies that did not provide comparative outcomes, information on follow-up time, or were not published in English language were excluded. Manual search of citations was also performed, and discussion with content experts was undertaken to identify any other relevant studies (**Figure 1**).

Results

Searches identified 166 citations. After removal of duplicates and screening of titles and abstracts, 24 full-text articles were assessed for eligibility and 19 studies were included (**see Figure 1**). Current studies assessing the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score are summarised in **Table 2** and baseline patient characteristics of these cohorts in **Table 3**. With the exception of three[6-8] all were performed in AF patients.[2,5,9-22] Most studies (n=11)[5-7,11,14,17,19-22] were performed prospectively, with follow-up duration ranging from six-months[17] to 4.7 years.[15] The number of participants included in VTE cohorts ranged from 135[6] to 1943[8] and between 104[14] to 8120[21] in studies on AF patients.

Fourteen studies were performed in European populations,[5-7,9-12,14,17-22] two in Asian populations,[15, 16] (with one reporting a target INR 2.0-3.0[15]) and two in North American populations.[8, 13] Proietti et al[11] studied a mixed indication clinical trial cohort including patients from Europe, Asia and Australasia.

Most studies were performed in elderly (mean/median age ranging from 61-76 years) white-Western populations, mainly using warfarin (13 studies)[5-11,13,15,16,19-21] as the OAC of choice. Most patients had multiple comorbidities with hypertension the most common, except for the study by Lip et al[21] where congestive heart failure was most prevalent. All studies reported a low prevalence of

105   smoking status and use of amiodarone for rhythm-control, with the exception of the original

106   derivation study; 35% of patients used amiodarone.[21] As the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score categories increase,

107   the mean TTR of their study population decreases, except for one study by Domelo-Rodriguez[6] which

108   showed the opposite relationship (Figure 2).

109   Five studies[8,12,13,15,18] investigated the relationship between components included in the

110   SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score and TTR. Three studies[12,13,18] showed that female sex was associated with poor

111   anticoagulation control; one[18] showed that having ≥2 comorbidities was related to poor TTR and one[13]

112   showed that black ethnicity (as well as NYHA IV) was associated with poorer anticoagulation control.

113   Chan et al[15] also reported that having heart failure and diabetes mellitus independently predicts poor

114   anticoagulation control.

115   Eight studies[2,5,7-9,12,18, 21] reported the predictive ability of the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score using c-

116   statistics **(Figure 3)**. Taken together these validation studies suggest that the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score is

117   able to predict good or poor anticoagulation control among AF patients better than chance, with c-

118   statistics ranging from 0.56[12] to 0.72;[5] the evidence is less robust in VTE patients (c-statistic 0.52-

119   0.65).[7,8]

120   Eight studies[11,15,18,20-22] also examined if the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score could discriminate AF

121   patients with clinical events. Five[11,15,18,21,22] demonstrated some positive associations for SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$

122   score predicting clinical events, with c-statistics ranging from 0.55[21] to 0.62[22] (**Table 4**).   Another

123   study,[8] also examined if the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score was associated with clinical outcomes, in particular

124   recurrent VTE and International Society on Thrombosis and Haemostasis (ISTH) major bleeding rates

125   in a VTE cohort; patients with a score>2 had more overall adverse event rates (composite of recurrent

126   VTE and ISTH major bleeding) than those with a score of 0-2 (7.9 vs. 4.5 overall adverse event

127   rates/100 patient-years respectively).[8]

128

129   **Discussion**

130   This review of studies assessing and validating the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score extends and updates a previous

131   narrative review[23] with the addition of validation studies in VTE populations[6, 7] and validations in

132   Asian AF populations.[15,16] Overall, eight studies[2,5,7-9,12,18,21] suggest that the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score is able

133 to modestly predict quality of anticoagulation control in AF patients receiving VKA therapy, with c-

134 statistics ranging from 0.56^{12} to $0.72.^5$ Many risk scores based on clinical factors such as CHADS$_2$,

135 CHA$_2$DS$_2$-VASc, Killip and TIMI scores show broadly similar modest c-indexes (approx. 0.6) when

136 used to predict patients categorised at 'high risk' who actually sustain clinical events.[24,25]

137   The original purpose of developing the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score was to produce a simple clinical

138 schema which could be used routinely in everyday practice to help assess the likelihood of an AF

139 patient being able to achieve and maintain good anticoagulation control on VKA therapy, using

140 patient-related clinical parameters which are readily available. The availability of NOACs worldwide

141 has resulted in increased usage due to their advantages. These include faster onset-of-action (average

142 maximum effect approximately three hours after intake[26] compared to VKA (onset 36-72 hours)),

143 greater reduction in stroke/systemic embolism (+19% compared to VKA[4]), avoidance of INR

144 monitoring with NOACs,[27] and absence of achieving/maintaining adequate TTR (as with warfarin).

145 Achieving a therapeutic INR can take 2-4 weeks and often longer.[3]After termination of study drug in

146 the NOAC trials, of those patients switching to warfarin, <40% achieved a therapeutic INR within 15

147 days, and <80% after 30 days;[28] more strokes occurred during that period in the patients who went

148 from study drug to VKA than from VKA to VKA.[28,29] This strongly argues for using NOACs over

149 VKAs where possible, however, VKAs are still widely used globally and will not disappear from use

150 especially for AF patients with severe renal impairment, moderate to severe mitral stenosis or

151 mechanical heart valves.[4]

152   In addition, in low- and middle-income countries where cost plays an important role in

153 options available for OAC treatment VKA is still the first-line antithrombotic agent of choice,

154 therefore the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score will remain an important decision-making tool, currently and in the

155 future, to guide physicians choice of anticoagulant treatment.[30] Most validation studies included in

156 this review demonstrated good predictive ability except two[6,19] which demonstrate that the SAME-

157 TT$_2$R$_2$ score was unable to predict anticoagulation control well in their populations. Although both

158 studies were prospective, results should be interpreted with care as both included small numbers of

159 participants (135[6] and 180[19] respectively) and thus may not be adequately powered to test the

160 predictive ability of the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score in regard to anticoagulation control.

161

Importance of good anticoagulation control

Achieving good anticoagulation control (TTR≥65-70%) as recommended by guidelines[1,4] is essential for managing AF and VTE patients treated with VKA. Numerous studies have demonstrated that a high TTR translates into lower risk of stroke and bleeding.[31-35] A systematic review demonstrated that a 7% and 12% improvement in TTR can lead to a reduction in major bleeding and thromboembolic events, respectively, by 1 event per 100 patient years.[34] A real-world study[32] of 27,458 warfarin-treated AF patients (≥3 INR measurements), showed that in patients with good anticoagulation control (TTR ≥70%), stroke risk was reduced to 79% compared to patients with poor INR control (TTR ≤30%). However, achieving and maintaining a therapeutic INR can be difficult to accomplish and therefore, NOACs are preferred to VKA in the majority of patients requiring OAC initiation.[4]

SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score and clinical events

Evident in most studies included in this review,[2,5,7,9-18,20-22] increasing SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score demonstrated poorer TTR values which might also translate into poorer clinical outcomes. This can be evidenced by studies that showed the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score relating to severe bleeding[22] and major bleeding (defined by the Bleeding Academic Research Consortium),[21] stroke/TE,[21] adverse cardiovascular events[22] and death[21, 22] during follow-up. In an observational study performed in 911 Spanish AF patients, the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score also successfully predicted the composite outcome of major bleeding, TE complications and death.[18] A Chinese study also demonstrated that a SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score of ≤2 vs. SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ of 3 vs. SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ ≥4 is associated with lower annual stroke risk (3.49%/year vs. 4.56% per year vs. 6.41%/year, respectively).[15]

Impact of different methods of calculating TTR

188   Fauchier and colleagues[36] have raised concern about the different methods used to calculate

189   TTR, whether to use TTR based on the Rosendaal method, percentage of INRs in range (PINRR)

190   (traditional method) or percentage of visits in range on a given date (cross-sectional method), as these

191   methods are not interchangeable. In this review, 17 studies[2,5-17,19,20,22] reported TTR using the

192   Rosendaal method, only one[18] calculated time in therapeutic range according to PINRR, while the

193   other reported 'labile INR' as their measure of anticoagulation control.[21] Currently there is no

194   evidence on the optimal method of calculating percentage of INR in range, as each method has its

195   own unique strengths and weaknesses.[37] While TTR via the Rosendaal method calculates the exact

196   percentage of days the INR falls within range, its calculation is more complex than the others and is

197   based on linear extrapolation. In contrast, calculating TTR via the PINRR method is simpler as it only

198   looks at the number of INRs that fall within the therapeutic range divided by the total number of INR

199   tests undertaken. However, the PINNR method does not take into account the actual number of days

200   of anticoagulant treatment and thus might underestimate control in patients with inconsistent INR

201   monitoring, patients who have temporarily discontinued therapy and patients with a long gaps

202   between each INR test, in contrast to the Rosendaal method where these factors will be accounted for,

203   resulting in a lower TTR.

204

205 **Factors affecting anticoagulation control**

206   In this review, only 5 studies[8,12,13,15,18] investigated the relationship of individual components

207   of the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score with the quality of anticoagulation control. Among these female sex[12,13,18],

208   >2 comorbidities,[18] heart failure and diabetes mellitus[15] (individually) and black ethnicity[5] were

209   associated with poor TTR control, however no studies found any association between age <60 years

210   and smoking with poor TTR.

211   It is interesting to speculate how some elements of the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score could influence

212   anticoagulation control. Some studies[38,39] investigating predictors of TTR have demonstrated that

213   women have poorer anticoagulation control compared to men (translating into poorer outcomes),

214   although the precise mechanism remains unclear.[5] Similarly, women are known to be at higher risk of

215   AF-related stroke irrespective of warfarin use.[40,41] Tobacco use within 2 years scores 2-points in the

216 SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score, however most validation studies reported low prevalence of smoking (6.3%-30%)

217 except in the external validation study by Apostolakis et al[5] (49% reported as smoker/ex-smoker

218 (within 2 years)). How smoking can influence anticoagulation control is unclear but it may reflect less

219 interest in maintaining good health which may translate into poorer adherence to oral anticoagulants,

220 thus resulting in poor TTR.[5]

221   The original SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score publication suggested that patients who are younger and

222 have more comorbidities probably have adherence issues with VKA therapy which are reflected by

223 poor TTR[3]. In terms of non-white ethnicity, some studies have shown that African-Americans and

224 Hispanics have poorer anticoagulation control compared to whites and suggest that this may be due to

225 various reasons including socioeconomic status, poor understanding of therapy, adherence issues,

226 genetic predisposition, etc.[42,43] However, these aspects need to be further investigated as studies in

227 these areas are lacking.

228   Another editorial[44] suggests that other factors, not currently within the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score,

229 could be included in the assessment of anticoagulation control, such as distance from home to

230 anticoagulation clinic, which could be the main reason preventing patients attending for regular

231 follow-up. There is clearly the need for a large prospective randomised trial to evaluate the impact of

232 SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score-guided therapy with VKA or NOAC not only in relation to anticoagulation

233 control (TTR) but also towards clinical outcomes (stroke and bleeding), which would formalise its

234 utility in clinical practice. Hence, where patients have chosen VKA over a NOAC for stroke

235 prevention or treatment of VTE or where NOACs are contraindicated but a high SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score

236 (>2) is present, perhaps more frequent follow-up visits and reviews, educational interventions and

237 counselling[45] may be required to ensure that INRs are within the therapeutic range in order to achieve

238 the best outcomes and minimise treatment complications.

239

240 **Limitations**

241 The main limitation of the included studies is study design; none utilised a randomised controlled trial

242 design and most were performed in white populations. Given that one of the risk factors for poorer

243 anticoagulation control is ethnicity, SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score in these populations is automatically worse

244 compared to non-whites; thus a lower score predicts better control of VKA therapy. Thus, future

245 studies need to ascertain whether the threshold of the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score used to indicate probability

246 of poorer anticoagulation control (SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score ≥2) needs to be modified in non-white

247 populations so that the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score is applicable globally. In addition, only three studies have

248 validated the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score in VTE cohorts to date, hence more studies are needed specifically

249 in VTE cohorts to enhance its applicability in these patients. Lastly, only 8 studies reported the c-

250 statistic to quantify the predictive ability of the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score.

251

252 **Conclusions**

253 Making decisions when choosing OAC therapy can be challenging. The available evidence suggests

254 that the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score is a useful tool to aid decision-making for OAC in AF (and VTE) patients

255 and adequately predicts those who are likely to be able/unable to achieve and maintain good INR

256 control.

257

258 **References**

259 **1.** National Institute for Care Excellence (2014) Atrial Fibrillation: Management. NICE
260   Guideline (CG180)2014.

261 **2.** Ruiz-Ortiz M, Bertomeu V, Cequier A, Marin F, Anguita M. Validation of the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$
262   score in a nationwide population of nonvalvular atrial fibrillation patients on vitamin K
263   antagonists. Thromb Haemost 2015;114:695-701.

264 **3.** De Caterina R, Husted S, Wallentin L, et al. Vitamin K antagonists in heart disease: Current
265   status and perspectives (Section III). Position Paper of the ESC Working Group on
266   Thrombosis – Task Force on Anticoagulants in Heart Disease. Thromb Haemost
267   2013;110:1087-1107.

268 **4.** Kirchhof P, Benussi S, Kotecha D, et al. 2016 ESC Guidelines for the management of atrial
269   fibrillation developed in collaboration with EACTS. Eur Heart J 2016;37:2893-2962.

270 **5.** Apostolakis S, Sullivan RM, Olshansky B, Lip GYH. Factors affecting quality of
271   anticoagulation control among patients with atrial fibrillation on warfarin: The same-tt2r2
272   score. Chest 2013;144:1555-1563.

273 **6.** Demelo-Rodríguez P, Postigo-Esteban A, García-Fernández-Bravo I, Agud M, Calpena S,
274   Camacho M, del Toro-Cervera J. Evaluation of the SAMe-TT2R2 score to predict the quality
275   of anticoagulation control in a cohort of patients with venous thromboembolism treated with
276   vitamin K antagonists. Thromb Res 2016;147:58-60.

277 **7.** Palareti G, Antonucci E, Lip GYH, Testa S, Guazzaloca G, Falanga A, Pengo V, Poli D. The
278   SAME-TT2R2 score predicts the quality of anticoagulation control in patients with acute
279   VTE. A real-life inception cohort study. Thromb Haemost 2016;115:1101-1108.

280 **8.** Kataruka A, Kong X, Haymart B, Kline-Rogers E, Almany S, Kozlowski J, Krol GD, Kaatz
281   S, McNamara MW, Froehlich JB. SAMe-TT2R2 predicts quality of anticoagulation in
282   patients with acute venous thromboembolism: The MAQI2 experience. Vasc Med
283   2017;22:197-203.

284   **9.**   Pivatto Júnior F, Scheffel R, Ries l, Wolkind R, Marobin R, Barkan S, Amon L, Biolo A.

285   SAMe-TT2R2 Score in the Outpatient Anticoagulation Clinic to Predict Time in Therapeutic

286   Range and Adverse Events. Arq Bras Cardiol 2017;108:290-296.

287   **10.**   Szymanski FM, Lip GYH, Filipiak KJ, Platek AE, Karpinski G. Usefulness of the SAME-

288   TT2R2 score to predict anticoagulation control on VKA in patients with atrial fibrillation and

289   obstructive sleep apnea. Int J Cardiol 2016;204:200-205.

290   **11.**   Proietti M, Lane DA, Lip GYH. Relation of the SAMe-TT2R2 score to quality of

291   anticoagulation control and thromboembolic events in atrial fibrillation patients: Observations

292   from the SPORTIF trials. Int J Cardiol 2016;216:168-172.

293   **12.**   Lobos-Bejarano JM, Barrios V, Polo-García J, Escobar C, Vargas-Ortega D, Marín-Montañés

294   N, Prieto-Valiente L, Fuentes S, Prieto MA, García-Ortiz L. Evaluation of SAMe-TT2R2

295   score and other clinical factors influencing the quality of anticoagulation therapy in non-

296   valvular atrial fibrillation: a nationwide study in Spain. Curr Med Res Opin 2016;32:1-7.

297   **13.**   Lip GY, Waldo AL, Ip J, Martin DT, Bersohn MM, Choucair WK, Akar JG, Wathen M,

298   Halperin JL. Determinants of Time in Therapeutic Range in Patients Receiving Oral

299   Anticoagulants (A Substudy of IMPACT). Am J Cardiol 2016;118:1680-1684.

300   **14.**   Gorzelak-Pabis P, Zyzak S, Krewko L, Broncel M. Assessment of the mean time in the

301   therapeutic INR range and the SAME-TT2R2 score in patients with atrial fibrillation and

302   cognitive impairment. Pol Arch Med Wewn 2016;126:494-501.

303   **15.**   Chan PH, Hai JJ, Chan EW, Li WH, Tse HF, Wong ICK, Lip GYH, Siu CW. Use of the

304   SAMe-TT(2)R(2) Score to Predict Good Anticoagulation Control with Warfarin in Chinese

305   Patients with Atrial Fibrillation: Relationship to Ischemic Stroke Incidence. PLoS One

306   2016;11:e0150674.

307   **16.**   Bernaitis N, Ching CK, Chen L, Hon JS, Teo SC, Davey AK, Anoopkumar-Dukie S. The

308   Sex, Age, Medical History, Treatment, Tobacco Use, Race Risk (SAMe TT2R2) Score

309   Predicts Warfarin Control in a Singaporean Population. J Stroke Cerebrovasc Dis 2016;26:64-

310   69.

311   **17.**   Roldan V, Cancio S, Galvez J, Valdes M, Vicente V, Marin F, Lip GY. The SAMe-TTR

312   Score Predicts Poor Anticoagulation Control in AF Patients: A Prospective 'Real-world'

313   Inception Cohort Study. Am J Med 2015;128:1237-1243.

314   **18.**   Abumuaileq RR, Abu-Assi E, Raposeiras-Roubin S, Lopez-Lopez A, Redondo-Dieguez A,

315   Alvarez-Iglesias D, Rodriguez-Manero M, Pena-Gil C, Gonzalez-Juanatey JR. Evaluation of

316   SAMe-TT2R2 risk score for predicting the quality of anticoagulation control in a real-world

317   cohort of patients with non-valvular atrial fibrillation on vitamin-K antagonists. Europace

318   2015;17:711-717.

319   **19.**   Skov J, Bladbjerg E-M, Bor MV, Gram J. SAmett2r2 does not predict time in therapeutic

320   range of the international normalized ratio in patients attending a high-quality anticoagulation

321   clinic. Chest 2014;145:187-188.

322   **20.**   Poli D, Antonucci E, Testa S, Lip GY. A prospective validation of the SAME-TT2R 2 score:

323   how to identify atrial fibrillation patients who will have good anticoagulation control on

324   warfarin. Intern Emerg Med 2014;9:443-447.

325   **21.**   Lip GYH, Haguenoer K, Saint-Etienne C, Fauchier L. RElationship of the same-tt2r2 score to

326   poor-quality anticoagulation, stroke, clinically relevant bleeding, and mortality in patients

327   with atrial fibrillation. Chest 2014;146:719-726.

328   **22.**   Gallego P, Roldan V, Marin F, Galvez J, Valdes M, Vicente V, Lip GY. SAMe-TT2R2 score,

329   time in therapeutic range, and outcomes in anticoagulated patients with atrial fibrillation. Am

330   J Med 2014;127:1083-1088.

331   **23.**   Esteve-Pastor MA, Roldan V, Valdes M, Lip GY, Marin F. The SAMe-TTR score and

332   decision making between a Vitamin K Antagonist or a Non-Vitamin K Antagonist Oral

333   Anticoagulant in patients with atrial fibrillation. Expert Rev Cardiovasc Ther 2015;14:177-

334   187.

335   **24.**   Senoo K, Lip GY. Predictive abilities of the HAS-BLED and ORBIT bleeding risk scores in

336   non-warfarin anticoagulated atrial fibrillation patients: An ancillary analysis from the

337   AMADEUS trial. Int J Cardiol 2016;221:379-382.

338   **25.**   Lip GY, Lane DA. Bleeding risk assessment in atrial fibrillation: observations on the use and

339   misuse of bleeding risk scores. J Thromb Haemost 2016;14:1711-1714.

340   **26.**   Heidbuchel H, Verhamme P, Alings M, et al. Updated European Heart Rhythm Association

341   practical guide on the use of non-vitamin-K antagonist anticoagulants in patients with non-

342   valvular atrial fibrillation: Executive summary. Eur Heart J 2017;38:2137-2149.

343   **27.**   Mekaj YH, Mekaj AY, Duci SB, Miftari EI. New oral anticoagulants: their advantages and

344   disadvantages compared with vitamin K antagonists in the prevention and treatment of

345   patients with thromboembolic events. Ther Clin Risk Manag 2015;11:967-977.

346   **28.**   Mahaffey KW, Hellkamp AS, Patel MR, et al. End of Study Transition From Study Drug to

347   Open-Label Vitamin K Antagonist Therapy. Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes 2013;6:470.

348   **29.**   Ruff CT, Giugliano RP, Braunwald E, Mercuri M, Curt V, Betcher J, Grip L, Cange AL,

349   Crompton AE, Murphy SA, Deenadayalu N, Antman EM. Transition of Patients From

350   Blinded Study Drug to Open-Label Anticoagulation: The ENGAGE AF–TIMI 48 Trial. J Am

351   Coll Cardiol 2014;64:576-584.

352   **30.**   Bista D, Chalmers L, Bereznicki L, Peterson G. Potential use of NOACs in developing

353   countries: pros and cons. Eur J Clin Pharmacol 2014;70:817-828.

354   **31.**   Gallego P, Roldan V, Marín F, Romera M, Valdés M, Vicente V, Lip GYH. Cessation of oral

355   anticoagulation in relation to mortality and the risk of thrombotic events in patients with atrial

356   fibrillation. Thromb Haemost 2013;110:1189-1198.

357   **32.**   Gallagher AM, Setakis E, Plumb JM, Clemens A, van Staa T-P. Risks of stroke and mortality

358   associated with suboptimal anticoagulation in atrial fibrillation patients. Thromb Haemost

359   2011;106:968.

360   **33.**   Morgan CL, McEwan P, Tukiendorf A, Robinson PA, Clemens A, Plumb JM. Warfarin

361   treatment in patients with atrial fibrillation: Observing outcomes associated with varying

362   levels of INR control. Thromb Res 2009;124:37-41.

363   **34.**   Wan Y, Heneghan C, Perera R, Roberts N, Hollowell J, Glasziou P, Bankhead C, Xu Y.

364   Anticoagulation Control and Prediction of Adverse Events in Patients With Atrial

365   FibrillationCLINICAL PERSPECTIVE. Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes 2008;1:84-91.

366 **35.** White HD, Gruber M, Feyzi J, et al. Comparison of outcomes among patients randomized to

367   warfarin therapy according to anticoagulant control: Results from sportif iii and v. Arch

368   Intern Med 2007;167:239-245.

369 **36.** Fauchier L, Poli D, Olshansky B. The SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score and quality of anticoagulation in

370   AF: Can we predict which patient benefits from anticoagulation? Thromb Haemost

371   2015;114:657-659.

372 **37.** Schmitt L, Speckman J, Ansell J. Quality Assessment of Anticoagulation Dose Management:

373   Comparative Evaluation of Measures of Time-in-Therapeutic Range. J Thromb Thrombolysis

374   2003;15:213-216.

375 **38.** Senoo K, Lip GYH. Female Sex, Time in Therapeutic Range, and Clinical Outcomes in Atrial

376   Fibrillation Patients Taking Warfarin. Stroke 2016;47:1665.

377 **39.** Rose AJ, Hylek EM, Ozonoff A, Ash AS, Reisman JI, Berlowitz DR. Patient characteristics

378   associated with oral anticoagulation control: results of the Veterans AffaiRs Study to Improve

379   Anticoagulation (VARIA). J Thromb Haemost 2010;8:2182-2191.

380 **40.** Fang MC, Singer DE, Chang Y, Hylek EM, Henault LE, Jensvold NG, Go AS. Gender

381   Differences in the Risk of Ischemic Stroke and Peripheral Embolism in Atrial Fibrillation.

382   Circulation 2005;112:1687.

383 **41.** Tsadok M, Jackevicius CA, Rahme E, Humphries KH, Behlouli H, Pilote L. Sex differences

384   in stroke risk among older patients with recently diagnosed atrial fibrillation. JAMA

385   2012;307:1952-1958.

386 **42.** Yong C, Azarbal F, Abnousi F, et al. Racial Differences in Quality of Anticoagulation

387   Therapy for Atrial Fibrillation (from the TREAT-AF Study). Am J Cardiol 2016;117:61-68.

388 **43.** Golwala H, Jackson LR, 2nd, Simon DN, et al. Racial/ethnic differences in atrial fibrillation

389   symptoms, treatment patterns, and outcomes: Insights from Outcomes Registry for Better

390   Informed Treatment for Atrial Fibrillation Registry. Am Heart J 2016;174:29-36.

391 **44.** Roldan V, Marin F. The importance of excellence in the quality of anticoagulation control

392   whilst taking vitamin K antagonists. Thromb Haemost 2015;113:671-673.

393   **45.**   Clarkesmith DE, Pattison HM, Lip GYH, Lane DA. Educational intervention improves

394   anticoagulation control in atrial fibrillation patients: the TREAT randomised trial. PLoS One

395   2013;8:e74037.

396

397

398

399 **Table 1:** The SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score

400

	Component	Score
S	Sex (female)	1
A	Age (<60 years)	1
Me	Medical history†	1
T	Treatment (interacting drugs, e.g., amiodarone)	1
T	Tobacco use (within 2-years)	2
R	Race (non-white ethnicity)	2
	Maximum total score	**8**

408

409 †≥2 of the following: hypertension, diabetes mellitus, coronary artery disease/myocardial infarction, peripheral arterial disease, congestive

410 heart failure, previous stroke, pulmonary, hepatic, or renal disease.

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

Table 2: Studies assessing the SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score in atrial fibrillation and venous thromboembolism cohorts

	a. Study design b. Mean follow-up c. Method INR monitoring	Population a. Number b. Mean (SD)/median (IQR) age (range, years) c. Race/ethnicity d. OAC used	SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score distribution (%); mean TTR (%) ± SD	Percentage of patients with dichotomised TTR (%)
Pivatto Junior[9] **2017** **Brazil**	a. Retrospective b. 1 year c. Hospital OAC clinic	a. 263 AF b. 71.2 (64.1-78.5) c. White d. 97.3% Warfarin	0-1: 138 (52.5); 69.2 ≥2: 125 (47.5); 56.3	-
Kataruka[8] **2017** **USA**	a. Retrospective b. Median 0.56 years ± 1.13 c. Hospital OAC clinic	a. 1943 VTE b. 61.8 (15.7) c. White d. Warfarin	0-1: 665; 57±21 2: 432; 55±22 >2: 846; 50±23	TTR<60:57.6
Bernaitis[16] **2016** **Singapore**	a. Retrospective b. - c. Hospital	a. 1137 AF b. 71 (63-77) c. Asian d. Warfarin	0-1:0 2: 339; 63.2±34.1 >2:798; 55.8±34.1	-
Chan[15] **2016** **Hong Kong**	a. Retrospective b. 4.7 ± 3.6 years c. Hospital	a. 1428 NVAF b. 76.2 (8.7) c. Chinese d. Warfarin	2: 22(14.3); 70[†] 3: 80 (51.9); 70 4: 41 (26.6); 70 5: 7 (4.5); 70 6: 4 (2.6); 70	TTR≥70: 11 TTR<70: 89
Demelo-Rodriguez[6] **2016** **Spain**	a. Prospective b. 72,668 patient-years c. Primary care	a. 135 VTE b. Median 66[#] c. White d. Warfarin	0-1:91; 64.7±19.5 ≥2: 44; 66 ±20.5	-
Gorzelak-Pabis[14] **2016** **Poland**	a. Prospective b. - c. Hospital	a. 104 AF with cognitive impairment b. 75 (10) c. White d. 61% Acenocoumarol	0-1: 64±26 ≥2: 50±28	-

Lip[13] **2016** **USA**	a. Prospective b. 438 days c. Trial setting	a. 229 AF b. 66.7 (11) c. 80.3% White d. Warfarin	0-1:0.571±0.22 ≥2: 0.498±0.24	-
Lobos-Bejarano[12] **2016** **Spain**	a. Retrospective b. >12 months c. Primary care	a. 1524 NVAF b. 77.4 (8.7) c. White d. 94.8% Acenocoumarol	0-1: 69.6% ± 17.4 ≥2: 66.6% ± 18.5	TTR≥65: 60.6 TTR<65: 39.4
Palareti[7] **2016** **Spain**	a. Prospective b. 998 patient-years c. Hospital OAC clinic	a. 1308 VTE b. 68(51-78) c. White d. Warfarin	0-1: 916 (70); 61±22 ≥2: 392 (30); 56±23	TTR≥65: 50.4 TTR<65: 49.6
Proietti[11] **2016** **Europe, Asia, Australasia**	a. Prospective b. Median 563 days c. Trial setting	a. 3665 AF b. 72(66-77) c. Mixed‡ d. Warfarin	0-2: 2914 (80.4); 69.05 (55.63-79.89) >2: 710 (19.6); 66.55 (52.83-77.46)	TTR>70: 46.9 TTR≤70: 53.1
Szymanski [10] **2016** **Poland**	a. Retrospective b. - c. Hospital	a. 211 AF b. 57.1 (10.2) c. White d. 75.4% warfarin	0-1: 114 (54); 52.3 ≥2: 97 (46); 51.3	TTR>70: 25.2 TTR≤70: 74.8
Abumuaileq[18] **2015** **Spain**	a. Retrospective b. 10 months c. Hospital OAC clinic	a. 911 NVAF b. 73 (11) c. White d. 93% Acenocoumarol	0-1:672 (74); 59±18¶ ≥2: 239 (26); 54±19¶	PINRR>65:39 PINRR≤65:61
Roldán[44] **2015** **Spain**	a. Prospective b. 6 months c. Hospital OAC clinic	a. 459 NVAF b. 76 (70-82) c. White d. Acenocoumarol	<2: 253 (55); 67±18 ≥2: 206 (44.8); 61±16	TTR>65:54 TTR≤65:46
Ruiz-Ortiz[2] **2015** **Spain**	a. Retrospective b. Median 27 months c. Cardiology clinic	a. 1056 NVAF b. 73.6 (9.8) c. White d. Acenocoumarol	0-1:613 (58); 65.6±26.2 ≥2: 443 (42); 61.3±25.3	TTR≥65:52.7 TTR≥65:47.3

Gallego[22] **2014** **Spain**	a. Prospective b. Median 952 days c. Hospital OAC clinic	a. 972 NVAF b. 76 (70-82) c. White d. Acenocoumarol	0-1:431 (44); 79.67 ±19.46 ≥2: 332 (34); 78.4 ± 20.28 >2:208 (21); 74.25 ± 20.24	-
Lip[21] **2014** **France**	a. Prospective b. 1016±1018 days c. Clinicians -hospital	a. 8120 AF b. 70 (15) c. White d. Warfarin	0-1: 4504 (55); 77(1.7)§ ≥2: 2252 (28); 52(2.3)§ >2:1364 (17); 43(3.2)§	-
Poli[20] **2014** **Italy**	a. Prospective b. 4.6 years c. Hospital OAC clinic	a. 1089 AF b. 75 (30-94) c. White d. Warfarin	0-1:624 (57); 72.3 ± 15.3 2: 288 (26); 72.0 ± 15.6 >2:177 (16); 68.2 ±16.4	-
Skov[19] **2014** **Denmark**	a. Prospective b. 1 year c. Hospital OAC clinic	a. 182 AF b. 70.2# c. White d. Warfarin	0-1:105 (58); 76 ≥2: 77 (42); 76	-
Apostolakis[5] **2013** **United Kingdom**	a. Retrospective and prospective b. 3.5 years c. Clinical trial (internal-validation)/Hospital OAC clinic (external-validation)	a. 1305 AF b. 69(8)/74(10) c. 8.7%, 19.3 % non-white (internal/external-validation) d. Warfarin	(Internal/External validation) 0: 242 (19); 0.66±0.16/0.7±0.13 1: 413 (32); 0.65±0.18/0.66±0.17 2: 303 (23); 0.63±0.17/0.66±0.16 3:185 (14); 0.59±0.22/0.65±0.17	**Internal validation** TTR>70:35.7 TTR≤70:64.3 **External validation** TTR>70:44.1 TTR≤70:55.9

AF: atrial fibrillation; CV: cardiovascular; INR: international normalised ratio; IQR: interquartile range; Max: maximum; MI: myocardial infarction; NVAF: non-valvular atrial fibrillation; OAC: oral anticoagulant/anticoagulation; ROC: area under curve; SD: standard deviation; SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score: sex (female), age (<60 years, medical history (≥2 of the following: hypertension, diabetes, coronary artery disease or myocardial infarction, peripheral arterial disease, congestive heart failure, previous stroke, pulmonary, hepatic, or renal disease), treatment with interacting drugs (e.g. amiodarone[all 1 point], current tobacco use and race (non-white) [2 points]; TTR: time to therapeutic; TE: thromboembolism; VTE: venous thromboembolism

†TTR presented as ≥70% and <70% not mean TTR; ‡mixed population: White, Black, Asian, other; §number of patients with labile INR, (%); ¶PINRR % (mean ± SD); #no SD or IQR reported; - not reported

Table 3: Baseline characteristics of studies assessing SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ score in AF and VTE cohorts

Patient characteristic, N (%)	Sex (female)	Age <60 y	Hyperten-sion	Diabetes mellitus	Heart failure	Prior stroke/TIA	Peripheral arterial disease	Renal disease	Coronary artery disease	COPD	Current smoking habit	Previous bleeding	Treatment: Amiodarone
PivattoJunior[9]	113 (43.0)	41 (15.6)	231 (87.8)	108 (41.1)	149 (56.7)	96 (36.5)	25 (9.5)	7 (2.7)	76 (28.9)	36 (13.7)	37 (14.1)	24 (9.1)	26 (9.9)
Kataruka[8]	1017 (52.3)	1060 (54.6)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	575 (29.6)	-	22 (1.1)
Bernaitis[16]	448 (39.4)	172 (15.1)	677 (59.5)	343 (30.2)	88 (7.7)	45 (4.0)	-	156 (13.7)	271 (23.8)	-	84 (7.4)	-	78 (6.9)
Chan[15]	671 (52.5)	48.0 (3.4)	922 (64.6)	387 (27.1)	367 (25.7)	496 (34.7)	102 (7.1)	2.9 (2.0)	407 (28.5)	-	71.0 (5.0)	-	94 (6.6)
Demelo-Rodriguez[6]	(50.4)	-	(51.9)	(18.5)	(3.7)	(5.2)	(3.0)	(15.6)	-	(17.0)	(18.5)	-	-
Gorzelak-Pabis[14]	63 (60.6)	-	92 (88.5)	30 (28.8)	72 (69.2)	15 (14.0)					20 (19.2)		8 (7.7)
Lip[13]	47 (20.5)	57 (24.9)	206 (90.0)	106 (46.3)	126 (55.0)	26 (11.4)/ 14 (6.1)	31 (13.5)	-	178 (77.7)		-	-	46 (20.1)[#]
L-Bejarano[12]	741 (48.6)	66 (4.3)	1223 (80.2)	473 (31.0)	392.0 (25.7)	209.0 (13.7)	99 (6.5)	92 (6.0)	286 (18.8)	-	100 (6.6)	134 (8.8)	100 (6.6)
Palareti[7]	698.0 (53.4)	446 (34.1)	678 (51.8)	107 (8.2)	36.0 (2.8)	66 (5.0)	54 (4.1)	73 (5.6)	99.0 (7.6)	-	134 (10.0)	-	15 (1.1)
Proietti[11]	1116 (30.5)	72[§] (66-77)	2812 (76.7)	860 (23.5)	1372 (37.4)	753 (20.5)	-	-	1619 (44.2)	-	334 (9.1)	208 (5.7)	-
Szymanski[10]	79 (37.4)	108 (51.2)		27 (12.8)	8.0 (3.8)	16 (7.6)	-	-	-	-	31.0 (14.7)	-	17 (8.1)
Abumuaileq[18]	306 (33.6)	-	678 (74.4)	220 (24.1)	343 (37.7)	103 (11.3)	92 (10.1)	36[¶] (4)	127 (13.9)	183 (20.1)	77 (8.5)	115 (12.6)	-
Roldán[17]	237 (53.0)	38 (8.0)	368 (80.0)	141 (31.0)	87 (19.0)	67 (15.0)	-	51 (11.0)	70 (15.0)	50 (11.0)	38 (8.0)	37 (8.0)	72 (16.0)
Ruiz-Ortiz[2]	443 (42.0)	-	884 (83.7)	321 (30.4)	235 (22.2)	150 (14.2)	-	153 (14.5)	215 (20.3)	176 (16.7)	76 (7.2)	56 (5.3)[††]	102 (9.7)

Study													
Gallego[22]	494 (51.0)	66 (7.0)	796 (82.0)	249 (26.0)	350 (36.0)	182 (19.0)	-	94 (10.0)	182 (19.0)	-	136 (14.0)	79 (8.0)	-
Lip[21]	3,129 (39)	-	3,405 (42.0)	1,244 (15.0)	4,466 (55.0)	674 (8.0)	-	734 (9.0)	2,434 (30.0)	870 (11.0)	1,053 (13.0)	-	1,670 (35.0)
Poli[20]	412 (37.8)	61 (5.6)	745 (68.7)	216 (19.9)	268 (24.7)	313 (28.8)	143 (13.2)	-	239 (22.1)	-	181 (16.6)	-	200 (18.4)
Skov[19]	54 (29.6)	23 (12.6)	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	41 (22.5)	-	27 (14.8)
Apostolakis[5†]	382 (37.5)	147 (14.4)	692 (67.9)	200 (19.6)	197 (19.3)	130 (12.8)	57 (5.6)	53 (5.2)‡‡	173 (17.0)§§	-	64.0 (6.3)	-	129 (12.7)
Apostolakis[5‡]	157 (67.1)	30.0 (10.5)	234 (81.8)	64 (22.4)	45 (15.7)	30.0 (12.8)	8 (2.8)	2.0 (0.7)‡‡	44 (15.4)§§	-	140 (49.0)	-	26 (9.1)

COPD: chronic obstructive pulmonary disease; eGFR: estimated glomerular filtration rate; MI: myocardial infarction; TIA: transient ischemic attack

†Internal validation; ‡external validation; §median age (IQR); ¶eGFR 30 ml/min/1.73m2; # antiarrhythmic; ††Major bleed; ‡‡ hepatic/renal disease; §§ history of MI

Table 4: Predictive ability (c-statistics) of SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ for anticoagulation control and clinical events

	Anticoagulation control, c-statistics (95% CI)	Clinical events, c-statistics (95% CI)
PivattoJunior[9]	TTR≥65: 0.612 (0.544-0.681; p=0.002)	-
Kataruka[8]	TTR<60: 0.61(-) TTR<65: 0.65(-) TTR<70: 0.65 (-)	-
Chan[15]	-	Stroke: 0.54 (0.52-0.57)
Lobos-Bejarano[12]	TTR≥65: 0.562 (0.533-0.592; p<0.001)	-
Palareti[7]	TTR<65: 0.52 (0.48-0.55; p:0.35)	-
Abumuaileq[18]	PINRR ≤70: 0.60 (0.56-0.64; p<0.001)	Composite major bleeding, thromboembolic complication or death: 0.57 (0.51-0.62)
Ruiz-Ortiz[2]	TTR≥65: 0.57 (0.53-0.60; p<0.0005)	-
Gallego[22]	-	Adverse CV event: 0.62 (0.57-0.68; p<0.001) Bleeding: 0.55 (0.49-0.62; p=0.117) All-cause mortality: 0.62 (0.55-0.68; p<0.001)
Lip[21]	Labile INR: 0.589 (0.574-0.603)	Stroke/TE: 0.561 (0.547-0.575) Severe bleeding: 0.552 (0.537-0.566) Major BARC bleeding:0. 574 (0.560-0.589) Death: 0.544 (0.530-0.559)
Apostolakis[5]	TTR 31% internal 0.72 (0.64-0.795) TTR 36% external 0.70 (0.57-0.82)	-

BARC: Bleeding Academic Research Consortium; CV: cardiovascular; INR: international normalised ratio; PINRR: percentage of INR in range; TE: thromboembolism; TTR: time in therapeutic range; - not reported

Figure legends:

Figure 1: Selection of studies for inclusion – PRISMA flowchart

Figure 2: Mean TTR vs. SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ categories in validation studies

Legend: SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ categories: black= score 0-1; grey= score of 2; white= score >2

Figure 3: Predictive ability (c-statistics and 95% confidence intervals) of SAMe-TT$_2$R$_2$ and anticoagulation control in validation studies