RATE OR RHYTHM CONTROL FOR RECURRENT ATRIAL FIBRILLATION

A summary of best available evidence and information on current clinical practice
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Why this is important

Atrial fibrillation (AF) is a common condition\(^{11,12}\) that accounts for 1 to 4 per cent of adult emergency department presentations. It is one of the top 50 reasons for presentation to emergency departments in Australia.\(^{3}\) Of those people with AF treated in emergency departments around 65 per cent have persistent or permanent AF, most of whom are in older age groups (>65 years).\(^{14}\) In general practice, up to 4 per cent of patients older than 30 years have past or present AF.\(^{15}\)

Treatment of AF aims to reduce the risk of potentially severe complications including systemic thromboembolism, and possible stroke and death. Treatment is also important to relieve symptoms such as palpitations, shortness of breath, chest pain, poor exercise tolerance, fatigue and light-headedness, and to improve quality of life.

A rate control strategy is acceptable as initial therapy for older people with atrial fibrillation at risk of recurrence, rather than routine use of electrical or pharmacological rhythm control. (Level 1 evidence)

In addition to anticoagulant therapy, there are two main treatment strategies for AF: rhythm control and rate control. **Rhythm control** aims to revert AF to normal sinus rhythm using electrical direct-current defibrillation, anti-arrhythmic drugs, or a combination of both. **Rate control** focuses on controlling the ventricular rate while leaving the heart in AF rhythm by using rate-slowing medication.

Both strategies have limitations. Rate control medications carry some risk of excessive slowing of heart rate. Not all attempts at attaining rhythm control are successful, and drugs to control rhythm may precipitate new or more frequent arrhythmias.\(^{10}\)

Between 2000 and 2003, a number of trials were published comparing outcomes of these treatment strategies.\(^{7\\text{-}11}\) The results challenged theoretical assumptions about the advantages of rhythm control,\(^{12}\) and led to updates of AF clinical practice guidelines.\(^{6,13,14}\)

Best available evidence

A Cochrane systematic review of these trials comparing pharmacological rhythm control and rate control\(^{15}\) found no difference in mortality or quality of life. However, it identified that people treated with rhythm control were more likely to require hospitalisation and to suffer adverse events.

A second Cochrane review comparing electrical rhythm control and rate control\(^{16} \) also found no difference in mortality, but a trend towards higher stroke rate in the rhythm control treatment group. Strokes that occurred in the trials were mostly in people who had stopped or were receiving sub-therapeutic, anticoagulant therapy. Some measures of quality of life were, however, better for those in this rhythm control group. The review’s conclusion recommends against routine use of electrical cardioversion for all people with AF.

Another systematic review that combined the results of electrical and pharmacological trials found no significant difference between rate and rhythm control in all-cause mortality.\(^{17}\)

Studies in these reviews included people with persistent AF or at high risk of recurrent AF who were within an average age range of 61 to 70 years.
These three reviews’ conclusions suggest that rate control is an acceptable primary strategy for this patient group. The reviews also draw attention to the importance of appropriate anticoagulation therapy, regardless of the strategy used.

There is little evidence available comparing rate and rhythm control for patient groups not well represented in these trials. These include people with new onset AF, aged under 65 years, at low risk of AF recurrence, and with severe heart failure or myocardial infarction.

Table 1 summarises the recommendations from the guideline commissioned by the National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence in the United Kingdom, based on the available evidence and consensus, for choosing between rate and rhythm control for people with persistent AF.

**Table 1. Indications for rate or rhythm control in persistent AF**

Adapted from Atrial Fibrillation. National clinical guideline for management in primary and secondary care(13)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate-control strategy</th>
<th>Preferred initial option for:</th>
<th>Rhythm-control strategy</th>
<th>Preferred initial option for:</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• older people (&gt;65)</td>
<td>• younger people (&lt;65)</td>
<td>• people with unacceptable arrhythmia-related symptoms</td>
<td>• people presenting for the first time with lone AF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• people with coronary artery disease</td>
<td>• people with contraindications to anti-arrhythmic drugs</td>
<td>• people presenting for the first time with lone AF</td>
<td>• AF secondary to a treated/corrected precipitant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• people with contraindications to anti-arrhythmic drugs</td>
<td>• people with contraindications to anti-arrhythmic drugs</td>
<td>• people presenting for the first time with lone AF</td>
<td>• people with congestive heart failure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• those unsuitable for cardioversion</td>
<td>• people with congestive heart failure</td>
<td>• people with congestive heart failure</td>
<td>• people without congestive heart failure</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Current practice**

Patterns of practice in AF management have changed considerably over time as concerns over the side effects of treatments have emerged and new drugs have become available. While many studies have examined anticoagulant use for AF, there are relatively few studies examining the choice of rate or rhythm strategy in practice.

In non-emergency settings, an American study of office-based practice in the 10 years before release of the rate versus rhythm control trials identified a trend of decreasing use of rate control medications. A European study of cardiologist practice in 2003-04 found that a rhythm control strategy was applied in many cases where rate control was likely to have been sufficient.

European studies of emergency department AF care have identified variation in choice of agents and preferred treatment protocols, both within and between different countries. However, these studies do not provide sufficient information to compare care delivered with current recommendations in rate and rhythm control. There is limited information available about Australian emergency care practice for choice of rate or rhythm control for recurrent or chronic AF.

**Implications for practice**

- Rate control is a suitable strategy for the majority of older people with atrial fibrillation who are at risk of recurrence. (Level I evidence)

- Appropriate ongoing anticoagulant therapy should be used, regardless of whether a rate control or rhythm control strategy is adopted.
Levels of evidence

I   Evidence obtained from a systematic review of all relevant randomised controlled trials
II   Evidence obtained from at least one properly-designed randomised controlled trial
III-1 Evidence obtained from well-designed pseudorandomised controlled trials
III-2 Evidence obtained from comparative studies
III-3 Evidence obtained from comparative studies with historical control, two or more single arm studies, or interrupted time series without a parallel control group
IV   Evidence obtained from case series, either post-test or pre-test/post-test
CPP  Recommended best practice based on clinical experience and expert opinion