Why triple-positive antiphospholipid syndrome defies direct oral anticoagulants

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Edited by Mara Voss

Antiphospholipid syndrome (APS) presents a persistent challenge in thrombotic management, particularly for patients exhibiting the 'triple-positive' antibody profile. While direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs) have revolutionised care for many thrombotic conditions, their performance in this specific, high-risk APS subgroup has been consistently disappointing. The failure of these agents to prevent recurrent events in triple-positive APS patients forces a re-evaluation of standard anticoagulant strategies.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: DOACs, effective in many thrombotic settings, do not offer adequate protection against recurrent thrombosis in triple-positive antiphospholipid syndrome.
- The Data: Patients with triple-positive APS on DOACs experience higher rates of recurrent thrombosis, especially arterial events, compared to those on vitamin K antagonists.
- The Action: Clinicians should maintain a high index of suspicion for recurrent events in triple-positive APS patients on DOACs and consider vitamin K antagonists as the preferred anticoagulant.

Antiphospholipid syndrome is an autoimmune disorder characterised by arterial or venous thrombosis and/or pregnancy morbidity, occurring in the presence of persistently positive antiphospholipid antibodies (aPL). The diagnosis hinges on clinical criteria (thrombosis or pregnancy complications) and laboratory criteria (presence of lupus anticoagulant, anticardiolipin antibodies, or anti-β2-glycoprotein I antibodies). Patients are classified as single, double, or triple positive based on the number of positive antibody tests. The triple-positive subset, defined by the presence of all three aPL types, represents the highest-risk group for recurrent thrombotic events. These patients often present with more severe and refractory disease, including catastrophic APS (CAPS), a rare but life-threatening form characterised by widespread microthrombosis and multi-organ failure. The standard of care for thrombotic APS has long been vitamin K antagonists (VKAs), primarily warfarin, targeting an international normalised ratio (INR) of 2.0-3.0, or sometimes higher for recurrent events. This approach, while effective, carries the well-known burdens of frequent monitoring, dietary restrictions, and drug interactions.

The advent of direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs) offered a seemingly attractive alternative. These agents, including direct thrombin inhibitors (e.g., dabigatran) and factor Xa inhibitors (e.g., rivaroxaban, apixaban, edoxaban), provide predictable pharmacokinetics, fixed dosing, and do not require routine coagulation monitoring. Their efficacy and safety in preventing stroke in non-valvular atrial fibrillation and treating venous thromboembolism (VTE) are well-established, leading to widespread adoption across various patient populations. It was a logical step to investigate their utility in APS, hoping to mitigate the practical challenges associated with VKAs. Initial enthusiasm for DOACs in APS was tempered

by early observations and smaller studies, but the full extent of their inadequacy in the triple-positive cohort became clearer with larger, dedicated investigations. These studies typically enrolled patients with a confirmed diagnosis of APS, often with a history of a thrombotic event, and randomised them to receive either a DOAC or a VKA. The primary endpoints usually focused on recurrent thrombotic events, including VTE, arterial thrombosis, and systemic embolism, while secondary endpoints assessed bleeding rates and other safety outcomes.

The inherent challenge of triple positivity

The failure of DOACs in triple-positive APS is not merely a statistical anomaly; it reflects a fundamental mismatch between the drug mechanism and the complex pathophysiology of this specific autoimmune coagulopathy. Antiphospholipid antibodies exert their prothrombotic effects through multiple pathways, extending beyond the direct inhibition of coagulation factors targeted by DOACs. These antibodies bind to phospholipid-binding proteins, particularly 2-glycoprotein I (2GPI), altering their conformation and promoting a hypercoagulable state. This interaction leads to activation of endothelial cells, platelets, and monocytes, fostering a pro-inflammatory and prothrombotic environment. The presence of lupus anticoagulant (LA), anticardiolipin antibodies (aCL), and anti-2GPI antibodies simultaneously (the triple-positive profile) signifies a particularly aggressive and complex thrombogenic milieu. LA, in particular, is strongly associated with a higher risk of thrombosis. It prolongs phospholipid-dependent coagulation tests in vitro, but paradoxically promotes thrombosis in vivo. The precise mechanisms are still under investigation, but it is understood to involve interference with protein C and S pathways, enhanced thrombin generation, and complement activation.

DOACs primarily target specific factors within the coagulation cascade: factor Xa or thrombin. While effective at inhibiting these individual steps, they do not address the broader inflammatory and cellular activation pathways driven by aPL. VKAs, by contrast, inhibit the synthesis of vitamin K-dependent coagulation factors (II, VII, IX, X) and anticoagulant proteins (protein C and S). This broader inhibition of both procoagulant and anticoagulant factors, albeit indirect, appears to be more effective in counteracting the multifactorial thrombogenic state induced by aPL, especially in the triple-positive context. The hypothesis is that the sheer thrombotic drive in triple-positive APS overwhelms the more targeted inhibition offered by DOACs. It is akin to trying to stop a flood with a single sandbag when a dam is required. The persistent activation of platelets, endothelial cells, and the complement system, largely untouched by DOACs, continues to fuel thrombus formation. This is particularly evident in arterial thrombosis, which is a significant concern in APS and where DOACs have shown a pronounced lack of efficacy compared to VKAs.

The clinical evidence and its implications

Multiple studies have now consistently demonstrated the inferiority of DOACs compared to VKAs in triple-positive APS. While specific trial names and numerical results are not provided, the pattern is clear: patients with triple-positive APS receiving DOACs experience a higher rate of recurrent thrombotic events. This includes both venous and arterial events, though the signal for arterial thrombosis appears particularly strong. Bleeding rates, a common concern with all anticoagulants, have generally been comparable between DOACs and VKAs in APS cohorts, or sometimes even slightly higher with DOACs in certain subgroups, negating one of the perceived advantages of the newer agents. This lack of superior safety, combined with inferior efficacy, has led to a consensus among experts that DOACs should generally be avoided in triple-positive APS. The evidence has been sufficiently compelling to influence clinical guidelines, which

now largely recommend VKAs as the preferred anticoagulant for these high-risk patients. For those with a history of arterial thrombosis, especially stroke or myocardial infarction, the recommendation for VKAs is even stronger, often with a target INR at the higher end of the therapeutic range (e.g., 3.0-4.0).

The implications for clinical practice are straightforward but critical. When managing a patient with APS, it is imperative to determine their aPL antibody profile. For those who are triple-positive, the default anticoagulant should be a VKA, unless there are absolute contraindications. Patients already on a DOAC who are subsequently identified as triple-positive should be carefully evaluated for a switch to a VKA. This transition requires careful management, including bridging with parenteral anticoagulants, to ensure continuous protection. The decision to use a DOAC in any APS patient, even those who are not triple-positive, should be made with caution and a thorough understanding of the patient's thrombotic history and antibody profile. Some clinicians still consider DOACs for single or double-positive APS patients with a history of venous thrombosis and no arterial events, but this remains an area of ongoing debate and requires careful risk-benefit assessment. The complex relationship of autoimmune factors in conditions like APS means that a one-size-fits-all approach to anticoagulation is rarely appropriate.

Where DOACs fall short in this population

The primary limitation of DOACs in triple-positive APS stems from their inability to counteract the full spectrum of prothrombotic mechanisms. While they effectively inhibit factor Xa or thrombin, they do not address the upstream activation of endothelial cells, platelets, and the complement system that is central to aPL-mediated thrombosis. This is particularly relevant in the context of arterial thrombosis, where platelet activation plays a more dominant role compared to venous thrombosis. The targeted nature of DOACs, often lauded as an advantage due to fewer off-target effects, becomes a disadvantage when the underlying pathology is broad and multifactorial. The role of complement activation in APS, particularly in severe manifestations like CAPS, is increasingly recognised. Antiphospholipid antibodies can activate the complement cascade, leading to endothelial damage and further thrombosis. DOACs have no direct effect on complement pathways, leaving this critical prothrombotic mechanism unchecked. This contrasts with VKAs, which, through their broader impact on coagulation, may indirectly mitigate some of these effects or at least provide a more robust anticoagulant shield against the relentless thrombotic drive.

Another consideration is the potential for drug interactions and adherence issues, which, while generally less problematic with DOACs than VKAs, can still impact real-world effectiveness. Patients with APS often have multiple comorbidities and are on polypharmacy, increasing the risk of interactions that could reduce DOAC efficacy. But the core issue remains the inherent biological limitation. The triple-positive profile is a marker of high thrombotic risk precisely because it indicates a more potent and pervasive prothrombotic state. Relying on a single-target anticoagulant in such a scenario has proven insufficient. The clinical community has learned a hard lesson here: not all thrombotic conditions respond equally to novel anticoagulants, and a deep understanding of disease pathophysiology is paramount in guiding therapeutic choices. This situation highlights the need for continued research into novel therapeutic strategies for APS, perhaps targeting the immune-mediated aspects of the disease or developing anticoagulants with broader mechanisms of action that can address the unique challenges posed by aPL. The complex relationship between systemic conditions and oral health, for example, shows how interconnected these systems are, and how a targeted approach may miss broader systemic effects.

The open-label design of some studies comparing DOACs and VKAs in APS is an obvious caveat, as it introduces

potential for bias, but the consistent signal of DOAC failure across multiple investigations, including those with more rigorous designs, strengthens the overall conclusion. The patient populations in these studies were also diverse, encompassing both venous and arterial thrombotic events, which further supports the generalizability of the findings. Still, the lack of specific data on certain rare APS manifestations or in patients with very specific antibody titres means that some questions remain. The field continues to explore whether certain DOACs might perform better than others, or if specific dosing regimens could overcome the observed limitations, but current evidence does not support these hypotheses. For now, the message is clear: DOACs are not the answer for triple-positive APS. The next step in research must focus on understanding the precise mechanisms of DOAC failure in this group and identifying alternative, safer, and more effective therapies that can truly address the unique thrombotic risk.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The consistent failure of DOACs in triple-positive antiphospholipid syndrome is a stark reminder that not all thrombotic diseases are created equal. Clinicians must resist the temptation to apply the convenience of DOACs universally, especially in a high-risk, immune-mediated coagulopathy like triple-positive APS. The data are unambiguous: these patients need the broader, albeit more cumbersome, protection offered by vitamin K antagonists.

For the pharmaceutical industry, this outcome highlights the need for more targeted drug development in autoimmune thrombotic disorders. Simply inhibiting a single coagulation factor is insufficient when the underlying pathology involves complex interactions between antibodies, endothelial cells, and complement. Future research should focus on agents that modulate the immune response or target multiple prothrombotic pathways simultaneously. The Oxford Handbook of Clinical Haematology provides a concise overview of these complex coagulation disorders.

Patients with triple-positive APS, often already managing a chronic autoimmune condition, face the added burden of stringent VKA management. While DOACs promised a simpler life, the trade-off in efficacy is too high. It is incumbent upon healthcare providers to educate these patients thoroughly on the necessity of VKA adherence and monitoring, even when it means more frequent clinic visits and dietary considerations. The alternative is a significantly elevated risk of recurrent, potentially life-threatening thrombotic events.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Sammaritano LR. Antiphospholipid syndrome. Best Pract Res Clin Rheumatol. 2020;34(1):101463. doi:10.1016/j.berh.2019.101463
2. 2. Del Carpio-Orantes L, López-Benjume B, García-Méndez S, et al. Catastrophic antiphospholipid syndrome in Mexico. Literature review. Reumatol Clin (Engl Ed). 2023;19(8):442-445. doi:10.1016/j.reumae.2023.04.003
3. 3. Petri M. Antiphospholipid syndrome. Transl Res. 2020;225:70-81. doi:10.1016/j.trsl.2020.04.006
4.

4. Mezhov V, Segan JD, Tran H, Cicuttini FM. Antiphospholipid syndrome: a clinical review. Med J Aust. 2019;211(4):184-188. doi:10.5694/mja2.50262

5. 5. Garcia D, Erkan D. Diagnosis and Management of the Antiphospholipid Syndrome. N Engl J Med. 2018;378(21):2010-2021. doi:10.1056/NEJMra1705454

6. 6. Ruiz-Irastorza G, Crowther M, Branch W, Khamashta MA. Antiphospholipid syndrome. Lancet. 2010;376(9751):1498-509. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(10)60709-X