The mid-term follow-up results are even more interesting. At the 3.8-year follow-up, the patients of the PROTECT AF experienced a significant benefit in the composite primary endpoint (8.4% vs 19.9%; hazard ratio = 0.61; 95% confidence interval, 0.38-0.97; \( P = .04 \)) compared to the control group with warfarin. Actually, even all-cause mortality improved in the LAAO group (12.3% vs 18%; hazard ratio = 0.66; 95% confidence interval, 0.45-0.98; \( P = .04 \)).

Also, the third large randomized clinical trial, the PRAGUE-17,\(^\text{[10]}\) that compared LAAO with direct-acting oral anticoagulants in 400 patients, proved the non-inferiority of this procedure compared to new anticoagulants to prevent cardiovascular, neurological or hemorrhagic events associated with atrial fibrillation.

A meta-analysis of these randomized clinical trials proved that LAAO has similar cerebral infarction rates to those of oral anticoagulation (warfarin or new anticoagulants) with significant reductions of cerebral hemorrhages and cardiac and non-cardiac death.\(^\text{[11]}\)

Added to this, large scale multicenter registries have proven the efficacy and safety of this intervention in patients with contraindications to oral anticoagulation. The EWOLUTION registry of 1021 patients reported a 62% rate of contraindication to oral anticoagulation, a 98.5% success rate, and a 2.7% rate of complications.\(^\text{[12]}\) At the 2-year follow-up, cerebral infarction rates of 1.3/100 patients-year (a 83% reduction compared to the historic series) and hemorrhage rates of 2.7/100 patients-year (a 46% reduction compared to the historic series) were reported.\(^\text{[13]}\) In line with this, the multicenter registry of the Amulet device (Abbott, United States) that included 1088 patients of whom 83% had contraindications to oral anticoagulation revealed a 99% success rate and a 3.2% rate of complications.\(^\text{[14]}\) These results are consistent with almost all the studies published over the last decade.

In our setting we have registries like the one published in this issue of REC: Interventional Cardiology, where Ruiz-Salmerón et al.\(^\text{[5]}\) analyze 260 consecutive cases of LAAO in a population of high embolic \([\text{CHA}_2\text{DS}_2\text{-VASc of 4.3} \pm 1.6]\) and hemorrhagic risk [HAS-BLED of 3.7 \pm 1.2]. They confirmed a 75.5% reduction of embolic risk and a 58.5% reduction of hemorrhagic risk with respect to the risk predicted by both scales. Also, patients with longer follow-up periods (> 4 years in this case) showed a progressive benefit derived from the intervention [rate of events per 100 patients-year: 0.7 vs 2.0; \( P = .17 \) for embolisms; and 1.7 vs 4.0, \( P = .09 \) for major hemorrhages] compared to those with shorter follow-up periods.

Studies like this are necessary since we don’t have too many studies on long-term experiences with LAAO with mean follow-up periods...
> 2.5 years. It is only from this long-term follow-up perspective that we will be able to understand the impact of an intervention largely, based on the prophylaxis of the thromboembolic complications that may occur during a patient’s lifetime.

Finally, we should mention that scientific societies like the European Heart Rhythm Association and the European Association of Percutaneous Cardiovascular Interventions support the benefits of LAOO in situations of contraindication to oral anticoagulation, high risk of bleeding, cerebral infarction under anticoagulation or even in patients who, after being properly informed, reject oral anticoagulation. However, the current clinical practice guidelines published by the European Society of Cardiology still assign a low level of recommendation (IIb-B) for patients with atrial fibrillation contraindicated to long-term courses with oral anticoagulants (eg, patients with intracranial hemorrhages without reversible cause). In any case, the results of 2 ongoing large scale randomized clinical trials of LAOO vs direct-acting oral anticoagulants, the CHAMPION-AF (NCT04394546) and the CATALYST (NCT04226547) will conclusively establish the level of recommendation of this technique in patients without contraindications to oral anticoagulation.

In conclusion, we should assert that the LAOO is an effective and safe technique. With the cumulative data obtained over the last decade, its utility is undeniable in patients with atrial fibrillation who cannot take oral anticoagulation to prevent the occurrence of strokes. Also, clinical trials have proven its advantages vs warfarin, and even the long-term follow-up of these patients has offered significant positive results, even reducing mortality rate compared to oral anticoagulation. The results of the new clinical trials vs direct-acting oral anticoagulants will determine the large-scale future of this procedure.
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