

Available online at www.sciencedirect.com

SciVerse ScienceDirect

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ihj

Editorial

Glycoprotein IIb-IIIa inhibitors – Do we still need them?

Vijayakumar Subban^{a,*}, K. Sarat Chandra^b

^a Section Editor, *Indian Heart Journal*

^b Honorary Editor, *Indian Heart Journal*

Platelets play central role in thrombotic events in acute coronary syndromes (ACS) and during percutaneous coronary interventions (PCI). Platelet activation occurs through various mechanisms and all culminate in expression of the surface GP IIb-IIIa receptors which mediate their aggregation and thrombosis. Glycoprotein IIb-IIIa inhibitors (GPI) remain the most powerful antiplatelet agents by inhibiting this final common pathway of platelet activation. The role of GPI in the treatment of coronary ischemic events has evolved through the past 20 years. Given their potent antiplatelet activity and consistent anti-ischemic benefit in major trials, they were an integral part of antiplatelet – antithrombin portfolio in the treatment of ACS and during PCI over a decade. However, the advent of stents and thienopyridine ticlopidine and later clopidogrel made periprocedural ischemic complications less common and GPI had slowly lost its importance in routine low-risk PCI. Though GPI reduced periprocedural ischemic complications, increased bleeding events continued to be a major problem. In the recent years, bleeding has increasingly been recognized as a major determinant of clinical outcomes both with ACS and PCI. Recently, the availability of bivalirudin as an equally effective and safer periprocedural anticoagulant, heparin and GPI have slowly been pushed to second place over the entire spectrum of coronary interventions. The newer antiplatelets which provide rapid and more consistent antiplatelet action further reduced the role of GPI to a very small subset of patients where ischemic risk far exceeds the thrombotic risk.^{1–3} This editorial briefly evaluates the current role of GPI in the background of recent major studies with newer antiplatelets and bivalirudin.

1. Elective PCI

GPI ruled the era of plain balloon angioplasty where acute closure was the main threat to the interventionist. The

paradigm shift happened when stents and thienopyridines were introduced into the interventional practice. Though this brought down GPI usage substantially, they continued to be an important part of periprocedural antithrombin-antiplatelet treatment. Two major trials in the last decade questioned the practice of routine periprocedural use of GPI in non-acute PCI where effective platelet inhibition can be achieved with optimal clopidogrel loading. The ISAR-REACT trial tested the role of abciximab in 2159 patients undergoing elective low-risk PCI after preloading with 600 mg of clopidogrel. Abciximab failed to show any reduction in the primary end point of 30-day incidence of major adverse cardiac events compared with placebo. Further, it increased the incidence of thrombocytopenia and blood transfusions.⁴ The ISAR-SWEET trial examined the same strategy in 701 diabetic patients. Again abciximab did not improve outcomes in the setting of clopidogrel loading at least 2 h prior to the procedure.⁵ In contrast, a recent meta-analysis of 22 studies involving 10,123 patients showed significant reduction in non-fatal myocardial infarction at the expense of significant increase in minor bleeding events with GPI over and above dual antiplatelets.⁶ With the available evidence, the current guidelines do not recommend routine use of GPI in elective low and intermediate risk PCI if the patients are optimally preloaded with clopidogrel.⁷

2. Unstable angina and non-ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction

GPI had consistently been shown to be beneficial in patients with unstable angina (UA) and non-ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction (NSTEMI). This led to wide spread use of these agents both in medically treated patients and upstream to the planned procedure. However, a meta-analysis of 29,570 patients by Roffi et al,⁸ in 2002 showed that the utility of GPI

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: drkumarvijay@gmail.com (V. Subban).

0019-4832/\$ – see front matter Copyright © 2013, Cardiological Society of India. All rights reserved.

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ihj.2013.04.032>

was mainly for patients who had invasive strategy. Again, this practice was re-evaluated in two recent trials, ACUITY – timing⁹ and EARLY ACS¹⁰; they did show any advantage with routine upstream therapy with GPI compared to selective administration in the catheterization laboratory in the background of optimal dual antiplatelet preloading. In addition, upstream therapy was associated with increased bleeding events. Further, ISAR-REACT-2 trial investigated the utility of abciximab given in catheterization laboratory in patients optimally loaded with dual antiplatelets. There was a 25% statistically significant relative reduction in the primary endpoint of death, myocardial infarction or urgent revascularization and this benefit was confined to only patients with elevated troponin levels.¹¹ The current guidelines recommends GPI only in patients with high risk features such as elevated troponin and angiographically visible thrombus and those not pre-treated with thienopyridines. Upstream therapy may be considered only in patients with on-going ischemia and the risk of bleeding is low.^{12,13}

3. ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction

The trials of ‘pre dual antiplatelet’ era showed clinical benefit of routine GPI, both upstream and periprocedural, in the setting of primary PCI. However, recent data does not support this practice. The upstream administration of GPI was evaluated in two trials. In the On-TIME 2 trial, the patients were pre-treated with a loading dose of clopidogrel and randomized to prehospital administration of tirofiban infusion vs placebo. Tirofiban infusion improved ST-segment resolution at 1 h after PCI. Though it fails to demonstrate improvement in survival or rate of reinfarction, there was reduction in the incidence of early stent thrombosis and urgent PCI.¹⁴ In the BRAVE-3 trial, upstream administration of abciximab was evaluated against placebo in patients pre-treated with 600 mg of clopidogrel loading and heparin. There was no difference in the primary endpoint of reduction in infarct size or in the secondary end point of 30-day incidence of death, myocardial infarction or urgent revascularization.¹⁵ In addition, there was increased incidence of thrombocytopenia and minor bleeding in the abciximab arm. With this background, the current guidelines recommended GPI for selected patients with high risk angiographic features and those not optimally loaded with dual antiplatelets.^{16,17}

4. Bivalirudin vs heparin + GPI

Bivalirudin is a synthetic, direct thrombin inhibitor that binds specifically and reversibly to both clot-bound and free thrombin. It has been evaluated as an alternative to heparin + GPI in patients undergoing both urgent and elective PCI. In the REPLACE-2 trial, bivalirudin with provisional use of GPI (abciximab) was tested against low-dose unfractionated heparin (UFH) plus planned GPI in both stable and acute coronary syndromes. At 30-day follow-up, bivalirudin with provisional GPI not only met the non-inferiority primary

composite endpoint but was also associated with significantly lower rate of bleeding.¹⁸ The ACUITY trial evaluated bivalirudin in 13,819 patients with NSTEMI–ACS. It enrolled patients into three arms: unfractionated or low molecular weight heparin + GPI (UFH/LMWH + GPI), bivalirudin + GPI and bivalirudin alone. The composite ischemic endpoint was not different among the three arms. However, the bivalirudin alone arm was associated lower rate of bleeding and significantly better net clinical outcome compared to UFH/LMWH + GPI arm.¹⁹ The ISAR-REACT 4 trial, compared bivalirudin alone with UFH + GPI in 1721 NSTEMI patients in the background of optimal dual antiplatelet loading. The UFH + abciximab arm failed to reduce the primary endpoint and in addition, was associated with increased bleeding.²⁰ The 3602 patient HORIZONS-AMI trial evaluated bivalirudin with provisional GPI against UFH and planned GPI in the setting of primary PCI.²¹ The bivalirudin arm was associated with reduced rate of primary endpoint of net clinical outcome, primarily linked to lower incidence of bleeding. In addition bivalirudin arm was associated with lower mortality that remained significant at 3-year follow-up. Bivalirudin arm was associated with increased incidence of acute stent thrombosis, especially in patients who did not receive clopidogrel loading.²² However, at the end of three years, the incidence was similar between both the arms. With this superior clinical outcomes, bivalirudin has been given Class I (Level of evidence – B) recommendation during PCI.^{7,13,16,17}

5. GPI and newer antiplatelets

Clopidogrel is limited by its slow onset and less potent platelet inhibition. Even with 600 mg of loading dose, it takes at least a few hours to achieve adequate platelet inhibition which is associated with increased periprocedural ischemic complications. This led to the introduction of three newer P₂Y₁₂ inhibitors: prasugrel, ticagrelor and cangrelor.²³ Prasugrel and ticagrelor are thienopyridines and administered orally. The additional benefit of GPI in the background of these drugs is largely unknown. In TRITON–TIMI 38 trial, a 55% of patients received GPI. GPI usage over all increased the rates of TIMI major and minor non-CABG bleeding and however this did not influence both clinical benefit and the risk of bleeding with prasugrel compared with clopidogrel.²⁴ In the PLATO trial, 27% of patients received GPI. Similar to prasugrel, ticagrelor also reduced rates of death, MI, or stroke independent of GPI use.²⁵ Cangrelor is a non-thienopyridine reversible P₂Y₁₂ inhibitor, administered intravenously and provides instant protection against ischemic events. It also has the advantage of disappearance of antiplatelet activity at cessation of infusion. This is advantageous in case of major bleeding or emergency surgery. This might further reduce the need for adjunctive GPI use. However, in the major CHAMPION – PHOENIX trial, none of the patients received GPI.²⁶ It remains to be seen whether it gives the same level of protection against ischemic events in the acute setting. As there have been no randomized studies specifically evaluating the role of GPI in the background of newer drugs, current guidelines do not give any definite recommendations.

6. Alternative protocols of GPI administration

6.1. Bolus only and abbreviated infusion

The recommendation of long duration infusion of GPI (12–24 h) was based on trial data predating the era of stents and dual antiplatelets. As thienopyridine loading is expected to achieve adequate antiplatelet activity within 30 min to few hours particularly with the newer and potent antiplatelets, it may be reasonable to limit the use GP IIb-IIIa inhibitor in the bolus only or bolus and short duration infusion. Two studies have evaluated bolus only treatment and another study infusion for less than 2 h^{27–29} However, the studies included fewer patients with ACS. Though this approach appears to be reasonable, currently there are no recommendations on these protocols.

6.2. Intracoronary infusion

Intracoronary infusion (IC) of GPI resulted in higher receptor occupancy rates and better thrombus resolution in experimental models.³⁰ Smaller studies have shown improved epicardial and myocardial perfusion and were also associated with less adverse events. In the major AIDA-STEMI trial, 2065 STEMI patients undergoing PCI were randomly assigned to receive abciximab by an IV infusion or directly into the infarct related coronary artery through guiding catheter. The primary composite outcome of death, new MI, new heart failure at 90 days, was not different between two groups. However, the IC administration was associated with reduced incidence of heart failure.³¹ In the MRI sub study, there was no significant difference in the infarct size between the groups.³² In the INFUSE AMI study, the selective infusion of IC abciximab through a specialized perfusion catheter was associated with statistically significant 2% reduction in the infarct size by MRI.³³ Further, in a registry of 104 patients evaluated by IC administration of GPI was associated with reduction thrombus burden and improved flow following PCI.³⁴ The current study by Sengottuvelu and Ravi Sekar also has shown similar outcomes in STEMI patients undergoing primary PCI.³⁵ The current guidelines have given a Class II b recommendation for IC - GPI in the setting of PCI during STEMI.

7. Do we need them anymore?

From the negative outcomes from multiple trials, it appears that GPI have little role to play as an adjunct in the current era of optimal oral antiplatelet loading, newer P₂Y₁₂ receptor antagonists and direct thrombin inhibitors. However, it is important to remember that significant number of patients in the test arm of most of the trials have received GPI. This indirectly means that a subgroup of patients still needed GPI for their periprocedural ischemic events. How many of us would be comfortable in leaving a residual thrombus without GPI? Is there any catheterization laboratory that does not have GPI in house? However, they have to be used judiciously with specific attention to their bleeding risk. In the current era, GPI still has a role particularly in patients with high thrombotic

burden in the setting of ACS, elective PCI complicated by thrombotic events and in patients who are not adequately preloaded with dual antiplatelets. Though evidence is not strong enough, strategies like bolus only, bolus + abbreviated infusion or IC infusion might be equally effective with less bleeding. Thus these drugs though two decades older, are here to stay till some more effective and safer alternative is available.

REFERENCES

- Hanna EB, Rao SV, Manoukian SV, Saucedo JF. The evolving role of glycoprotein IIb/IIIa inhibitors in the setting of percutaneous coronary intervention strategies to minimize bleeding risk and optimize outcomes. *JACC Cardiovasc Interv.* 2010;3:1209–1219.
- Centurión OA. Actual role of platelet glycoprotein IIb/IIIa receptor inhibitors as adjunctive pharmacological therapy to primary angioplasty in acute myocardial infarction: in the light of recent randomized trials and observational studies with bivalirudin. *Open Cardiovasc Med J.* 2010;4:135–145.
- Kaluski E. The role of glycoprotein IIb/IIIa inhibitors – a promise not kept? *Curr Cardiol Rev.* 2008;4:84–91.
- Kastrati A, Mehilli J, Schuhlen H, et al. A clinical trial of abciximab in elective percutaneous coronary intervention after pretreatment with clopidogrel. *N Engl J Med.* 2004;350:232–238.
- Mehilli J, Kastrati A, Schuhlen H, et al. Randomized clinical trial of abciximab in diabetic patients undergoing elective percutaneous coronary interventions after treatment with a high loading dose of clopidogrel. *Circulation.* 2004;110:3627–3635.
- Winchester DE, Wen X, Brearley WD, et al. Efficacy and safety of glycoprotein IIb/IIIa inhibitors during elective coronary revascularization a meta-analysis of randomized trials performed in the era of stents and thienopyridines. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2011;57:1190–1199.
- Levine GN, Bates ER, Blankenship JC, et al. 2011 ACCF/AHA/SCAI guideline for percutaneous coronary intervention A report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines and the Society for Cardiovascular Angiography and Interventions. *J Am Coll Cardiol.* 2011;58:e44–122.
- Roffi M, Chew DP, Mukherjee D, et al. Platelet glycoprotein IIb/IIIa inhibition in acute coronary syndromes. Gradient of benefit related to the revascularisation strategy. *Eur Heart J.* 2002;23:1441–1448.
- Stone GW, Bertrand ME, Moses JW, et al. Routine upstream initiation vs deferred selective use of glycoprotein IIb/IIIa inhibitors in acute coronary syndromes: the ACUITY timing trial. *JAMA.* 2007;297:591–602.
- Giugliano RP, White JA, Bode C, et al, for the EARLY ACS Investigators. Early versus delayed, provisional eptifibatid in acute coronary syndromes. *N Engl J Med.* 2009;360:2176–2190.
- Kastrati A, Mehilli J, Neumann F-J, et al, for the Intracoronary Stenting, Antithrombotic Regimen: Rapid Early Action for Coronary Treatment 2 Trial I. Abciximab in patients with acute coronary syndromes undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention after clopidogrel pretreatment: the ISAR-REACT 2 randomized trial. *JAMA.* 2006;295:1531–1538.
- Hamm CW, Bassand JP, Agewall S, et al. ESC guidelines for the management of acute coronary syndromes in patients presenting without persistent ST-segment elevation: the task force for the management of acute coronary syndromes (ACS) in patients presenting without persistent ST-segment

- elevation of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). *Eur Heart J*. 2011;32:2999–3054.
13. Jneid H, Anderson JL, Wright RS, et al. 2012 ACCF/AHA focused update of the guideline for the management of patients with unstable angina/non-ST-elevation myocardial infarction (updating the 2007 guideline and replacing the 2011 focused update): a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2012;60:645–681.
 14. Heestermans AA, van Werkum JW, Hamm C, et al. Marked reduction of early stent thrombosis with pre-hospital initiation of high-dose tirofiban in ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction. *J Thromb Haemost*. 2009;7:1612–1618.
 15. Mehilli J, Kastrati A, Schulz S, et al. Abciximab in patients with acute ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction undergoing primary percutaneous coronary intervention after clopidogrel loading: a randomized double-blind trial. *Circulation*. 2009;119:1933–1940.
 16. Steg PG, James SK, Atar D, et al. ESC guidelines for the management of acute myocardial infarction in patients presenting with ST-segment elevation. *Eur Heart J*. 2012;33:2569–2619.
 17. O’Gara PT, Kushner FG, Ascheim DD, et al. 2013 ACCF/AHA guideline for the management of ST-elevation myocardial infarction: a report of the American College of Cardiology Foundation/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2013;61:e78–140.
 18. Lincoff AM, Bittl JA, Harrington RA, et al, for the REPLACE 2 Investigators. Bivalirudin and provisional glycoprotein IIb/IIIa blockade compared with heparin and planned glycoprotein IIb/IIIa blockade during percutaneous coronary intervention: the REPLACE-2 randomized trial. *JAMA*. 2003;289:853–863.
 19. Stone GW, McLaurin BT, Cox DA, et al, for the ACUITY Investigators. Bivalirudin for patients with acute coronary syndromes. *N Engl J Med*. 2006;355:2203–2216.
 20. Kastrati A, Neumann FJ, Schulz S, et al, for ISAR-REACT 4 Trial Investigators. Abciximab and heparin versus bivalirudin for non-ST-elevation myocardial infarction. *N Engl J Med*. 2011;365:1980–1989.
 21. Stone GW, Witzenbichler B, Guagliumi G, et al, for the HORIZONS-AMI Trial Investigators. Bivalirudin during primary PCI in acute myocardial infarction. *N Engl J Med*. 2008;358:2218–2230.
 22. Stone GW, Witzenbichler B, Guagliumi G, et al. Heparin plus a glycoprotein IIb/IIIa inhibitor versus bivalirudin monotherapy and paclitaxel-eluting stents versus bare-metal stents in acute myocardial infarction (HORIZONS-AMI): final 3-year results from a multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2011;378:643–645.
 23. Angiolillo DJ, Fernandez-Ortiz A, Bernardo E, et al. Variability in individual responsiveness to clopidogrel: clinical implications, management, and future perspectives. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2007;49:1505–1516.
 24. O’Donoghue M, Antman EM, Braunwald E, et al. The efficacy and safety of prasugrel with and without a glycoprotein IIb/IIIa inhibitor in patients with acute coronary syndromes undergoing percutaneous intervention: a TRITON-TIMI 38 (Trial to assess improvement in therapeutic outcomes by optimizing platelet inhibition with prasugrel-thrombolysis in myocardial infarction 38) analysis. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2009;54:678–685.
 25. Wallentin L, Becker RC, Budaj A, et al. Ticagrelor versus clopidogrel in patients with acute coronary syndromes. *N Engl J Med*. 2009;361:1045–1057.
 26. Bhatt DL, Stone GW, Mahaffey KW, et al. Effect of platelet inhibition with cangrelor during PCI on ischemic events. *N Engl J Med*. 2013;368:1303–1313.
 27. Fung AY, Saw J, Starovoytov A, et al. Abbreviated infusion of eptifibatid after successful coronary intervention: the BRIEF PCI (brief infusion of eptifibatid following percutaneous coronary intervention) randomized trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2009;53:837–845.
 28. Bertrand OF, De Larochelliere R, Rodes-Cabau J, et al, for the Early Discharge After Transradial Stenting of Coronary Arteries Study Investigators. A randomized study comparing same-day home discharge and abciximab bolus only to overnight hospitalization and abciximab bolus and infusion after transradial coronary stent implantation. *Circulation*. 2006;114:2636–2643.
 29. Kini AS, Chen VHT, Krishnan P, et al. Bolus-only versus bolus-infusion of glycoprotein IIb/IIIa inhibitors during percutaneous coronary intervention. *Am Heart J*. 2008;156:513–519.
 30. Romagnoli E, Burzotta F, Trani C, Biondi-Zoccai GG, Giannico F, Crea F. Rationale for intracoronary administration of abciximab. *J Thromb Thrombolysis*. 2007;23:57–63.
 31. Thiele H, Wöhrle J, Hambrecht R, et al. Intracoronary versus intravenous bolus abciximab during primary percutaneous coronary intervention in patients with acute ST-elevation myocardial infarction: a randomised trial. *Lancet*. 2012;379:923–931.
 32. Eitel I, Wöhrle J, Suenkel H, et al. Intracoronary compared with intravenous bolus abciximab application during primary percutaneous coronary intervention in ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction: cardiac magnetic resonance substudy of the AIDA-STEMI trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2013;61:1447–1454.
 33. Stone GW, Maehara A, Witzenbichler B, et al. Intracoronary abciximab and aspiration thrombectomy in patients with large anterior myocardial infarction: the INFUSE-AMI randomized trial. *JAMA*. 2012;307:1817–1826.
 34. Maluenda G, Sizemore BC, Revtyak G, et al. Intracoronary glycoprotein IIb/IIIa inhibitor infusion via a perfusion coronary catheter to decrease thrombus burden: results from the ClearWay™ multicenter registry. *Cardiovasc Revasc Med*. 2013. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.carrev.2012.12.006>.
 35. Sengottuvelu G, Ravi Sekar V. Intra coronary abciximab in STEMI using local drug delivery catheter-single centre experience. *Indian Heart J*. 2013;65:256–259.