DOACs for AFib: Are intermediate-risk patients getting the protection they need?

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 4 September 2026 · Edited by William Lopes

Atrial fibrillation (AFib) management often focuses on patients at high risk of stroke, where the benefits of anticoagulation are clear. But for those at intermediate risk, the decision to initiate direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs) has been less straightforward, often leading to under-treatment.

New insights suggest that DOACs cut the risk of major clinical events in this intermediate-risk population, providing a clearer path for clinicians navigating this common dilemma. This re-evaluation of risk stratification and treatment thresholds could alter prescribing patterns for a significant cohort of AFib patients.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: DOACs demonstrate a benefit in reducing clinical events for AFib patients previously considered intermediate stroke risk, expanding the population for whom these therapies are clearly indicated.
- The Data: DOACs consistently reduce stroke and systemic embolism, as well as all-cause mortality, across various intermediate-risk subgroups.
- The Action: Clinicians should consider DOAC initiation for AFib patients with intermediate stroke risk, moving beyond a conservative approach that may have previously withheld effective prevention.

Atrial fibrillation remains a leading cause of stroke, and effective anticoagulation is paramount for prevention. Current guidelines recommend oral anticoagulation for most patients with AFib and a CHA2DS2-VASc score of 2 or greater for men, or 3 or greater for women. But the intermediate-risk group, typically those with a CHA2DS2-VASc score of 1 for men or 2 for women, has presented a persistent challenge, with clinicians often weighing bleeding risk against a perceived lower stroke risk.

This patient population, often characterised by a single non-sex-related risk factor such as hypertension, diabetes, or vascular disease, represents a substantial proportion of individuals with AFib. The question has always been whether the absolute risk reduction from anticoagulation outweighs the inherent bleeding risk in these patients, a balance that has led to considerable variability in clinical practice. For a deeper dive into how guidelines are evolving, consider new ESC guidelines streamlining AFib management.

Re-evaluating the Risk-Benefit Equation

The conventional wisdom for intermediate-risk AFib patients has often leaned towards a more conservative approach, sometimes deferring anticoagulation in the absence of additional risk factors. This stance was largely based on older data and a cautious interpretation of bleeding risk, particularly with vitamin K antagonists. But DOACs offer a more favourable safety profile compared to warfarin, prompting a re-evaluation of their utility across the full spectrum of

stroke risk.

DOACs, including dabigatran, rivaroxaban, apixaban, and edoxaban, have consistently demonstrated superiority or non-inferiority to warfarin in reducing stroke and systemic embolism, with a lower incidence of intracranial haemorrhage. This improved safety profile is important when considering patients at intermediate risk, where the net clinical benefit must be carefully assessed. The availability of these agents has broadened the scope of patients who can safely receive effective anticoagulation, pushing the field to reconsider where the treatment threshold truly lies.

The Case for Broader DOAC Use

Evidence now supports that DOACs significantly reduce the incidence of stroke and systemic embolism in AFib patients with intermediate stroke risk. This benefit extends beyond just stroke prevention, encompassing a reduction in other major adverse cardiovascular events and all-cause mortality. The argument that these patients might not benefit enough to justify anticoagulation is increasingly difficult to sustain.

The underlying mechanism for this benefit is straightforward: preventing thrombus formation in the left atrial appendage, the primary source of emboli in AFib. Even with a single additional risk factor, the cumulative risk over time is substantial enough to warrant intervention. For clinicians seeking a comprehensive resource on cardiovascular practice, the Oxford Handbook of Cardiology provides an excellent guide.

But the decision to initiate a DOAC still requires careful individual assessment, considering factors such as patient adherence, renal function, and concomitant medications. The improved safety profile of DOACs does not eliminate bleeding risk entirely, and patients with a high risk of bleeding, regardless of their stroke risk, still require an individualized approach. Still, for the vast majority of intermediate-risk patients, the data now clearly support the use of DOACs.

Addressing Clinical Inertia

One of the persistent challenges in AFib management is clinical inertia, where established practices or perceived ambiguities delay the adoption of evidence-based treatments. The intermediate-risk group has been particularly susceptible to this, with many patients remaining untreated or undertreated. This often stems from a lack of clear, unambiguous guidance for this specific cohort, leading to a default conservative stance.

The data on DOACs in intermediate-risk AFib patients should serve as a catalyst for change. It highlights the importance of proactive risk assessment and timely initiation of anticoagulation. The long-term consequences of untreated AFib, even in those with seemingly lower initial risk, are severe and preventable. This includes not only stroke but also heart failure and cognitive decline. Clinicians should also be aware of how other interventions, like the flu jab, can impact AFib outcomes.

The open-label nature of many real-world studies is an obvious caveat, but the consistency of findings across diverse populations strengthens the argument. The trial was not powered to detect differences in specific, rare bleeding events, and that gap matters for some patients. But the overall picture is clear: DOACs offer a net clinical benefit. The next step will be to see how quickly these insights translate into updated guideline recommendations and, more importantly, into routine clinical practice.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The notion that intermediate-risk AFib patients can safely forgo anticoagulation is increasingly untenable. The evidence for DOACs in this population is compelling, demonstrating a clear reduction in stroke, systemic embolism, and all-cause mortality. Clinicians who have been hesitant to prescribe DOACs for patients with a CHA2DS2-VASc score of 1 (men) or 2 (women) should reconsider their approach.

This shift means moving away from a 'wait and see' strategy. The cumulative risk of stroke, even with a single non-sex-related risk factor, is too high to ignore. The improved safety profile of DOACs compared to warfarin makes this decision easier, but vigilance for bleeding risk remains essential. Patient education on adherence and potential side effects is paramount.

The industry, particularly manufacturers of DOACs, now has a stronger case to advocate for broader guideline inclusion for this patient group. This could lead to a significant expansion of the eligible treatment population, but it also places a greater responsibility on primary care to identify and manage these patients effectively. The cost-effectiveness of preventing strokes in a larger cohort will be a key consideration for health systems.

For patients, this means a greater chance of receiving effective stroke prevention, potentially avoiding life-altering events. But it also requires a clear understanding of the need for daily medication and the associated risks. Shared decision-making, with a frank discussion of benefits and risks, will be essential for ensuring adherence and optimal outcomes.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used solely to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. No AI-generated conclusions appear in The Life Science Feed without editor verification against the primary source.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Bizhanov KA, bzaliyev KB, Baimbetov AK, Sarsenbayeva AB, Lyan E. Atrial fibrillation: Epidemiology, pathophysiology, and clinical complications (literature review). J Cardiovasc Electrophysiol. 2023;34(1):153-165. doi:10.1111/jce.15759
2. 2. Saleh K, Haldar S. Atrial fibrillation: a contemporary update. Clin Med (Lond). 2023;23(5):437-441. doi:10.7861/clinmed.2023-23.5.Cardio2
3. 3. Bidaoui G, Assaf A, Marrouche N. Atrial Fibrillation in Heart Failure: Novel Insights, Challenges, and Treatment Opportunities. Curr Heart Fail Rep. 2024;22(1):3. doi:10.1007/s11897-024-00691-9
4. 4. Zimetbaum P. Atrial Fibrillation. Ann Intern Med. 2017;166(5):ITC33-ITC48. doi:10.7326/AITC201703070
5. 5. Tomaiko-Clark E, Husain F, Su W. Weight loss and atrial fibrillation: a review. Curr Opin Cardiol. 2023;38(1):6-10. doi:10.1097/HCO.0000000000001004
6. 6. Baroni M, Albaba D, Ngo A, Livingston RK. Atrial Fibrillation Following Electroconvulsive Therapy: A Systematic Review and Case Report. J ECT. 2024;40(4):240-244. doi:10.1097/YCT.0000000000001029

LICENCE & RIGHTS

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER

This content is intended for healthcare professionals only and does not constitute medical advice. Clinical decisions must be made by qualified practitioners based on individual patient circumstances.

FOLLOW THE LIFE SCIENCE FEED

Instagram @lifesciencefeed **LinkedIn** linkedin.com/company/thelifesciencefeed

thelifesciencefeed.com