Screening strategies for atrial fibrillation: a systematic review and cost-effectiveness analysis

Nicky J Welton, 1* Alexandra McAleenan, 1 Howard HZ Thom, 1 Philippa Davies, 1 Will Hollingworth, 1 Julian PT Higgins, 1 George Okoli, 1 Jonathan AC Sterne, 1 Gene Feder, 1 Diane Eaton, 2 Aroon Hingorani, 3 Christopher Fawsitt, 1 Trudie Lobban, 4,5 Peter Bryden, 1 Alison Richards 1 and Reecha Sofat 6

Declared competing interests of authors: Nicky J Welton reports that she is principal investigator on a research project funded by the Medical Research Council (MRC) Methodology Research Council Programme in collaboration with Pfizer Ltd. Pfizer Ltd part fund a junior researcher on a project that is purely methodological using historical data in an unrelated area (pain relief). Howard HZ Thom reports personal fees from Novartis Pharma AG, personal fees from Roche Pharma, personal fees from ICON plc and personal fees from Eli Lilly, outside the submitted work.

Published May 2017 DOI: 10.3310/hta21290

¹School of Social and Community Medicine, Faculty of Health Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol, UK

²AntiCoagulation Europe, Bromley, UK

³Institute of Cardiovascular Science, Faculty of Population Health Sciences, University College London, London, UK

⁴Atrial Fibrillation Association, Shipston on Stour, UK

⁵Arrythmia Alliance, Shipston on Stour, UK

⁶Division of Medicine, Faculty of Medical Science, University College London, London, UK

^{*}Corresponding author Nicky.Welton@bristol.ac.uk

Plain English summary

Screening strategies for atrial fibrillation

Health Technology Assessment 2017; Vol. 21: No. 29

DOI: 10.3310/hta21290

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Plain English summary

A trial fibrillation (AF) is the most common heart rhythm disorder. AF is a major cause of stroke and subsequent disability and mortality. Many AF patients benefit from blood-thinning drugs (anticoagulation therapies), which have been shown to reduce the risk of an AF-related stroke. AF is often diagnosed only after an AF-related stroke. Earlier detection could prevent AF-related strokes, disability and mortality. This study aimed to assess whether or not a national screening programme for AF would represent good value for money. To do this, we reviewed studies looking at how well screening tests identify individuals with AF and also studies that compare different methods of screening. We found that a national screening programme in which older individuals (aged 65–70 years) are invited to be screened during a routine appointment with their doctor is likely to be cost-effective. There was also evidence that repeated screening every 5 years until age 80 years would prove to be of value. The screening test most likely to be cost-effective involves either a nurse taking a pulse rhythm check or a specific blood pressure monitor that is also able to detect AF. Whichever screening test is used, patients with a positive result would need to have their diagnosis confirmed by a trained doctor using an electrocardiogram machine before discussing treatment options.

New studies on (1) how to implement screening in general practice, (2) the performance of new tests (patches, smartphone/watch devices, iPads, hand-held devices) and (3) the effectiveness of screening with regard to the long-term risks of AF-related stroke and mortality would be useful.

HTA/HTA TAR

Health Technology Assessment

ISSN 1366-5278 (Print)

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

Impact factor: 4.058

Health Technology Assessment is indexed in MEDLINE, CINAHL, EMBASE, The Cochrane Library and the ISI Science Citation Index.

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk

The full HTA archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta. Print-on-demand copies can be purchased from the report pages of the NIHR Journals Library website: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

Criteria for inclusion in the Health Technology Assessment journal

Reports are published in *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HTA programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

Reviews in *Health Technology Assessment* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

HTA programme

The HTA programme, part of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), was set up in 1993. It produces high-quality research information on the effectiveness, costs and broader impact of health technologies for those who use, manage and provide care in the NHS. 'Health technologies' are broadly defined as all interventions used to promote health, prevent and treat disease, and improve rehabilitation and long-term care.

The journal is indexed in NHS Evidence via its abstracts included in MEDLINE and its Technology Assessment Reports inform National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. HTA research is also an important source of evidence for National Screening Committee (NSC) policy decisions.

For more information about the HTA programme please visit the website: http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/programmes/hta

This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HTA programme as project number 14/141/01. The contractual start date was in October 2014. The draft report began editorial review in June 2016 and was accepted for publication in December 2016. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HTA editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the draft document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2017. This work was produced by Welton et al. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland (www.prepress-projects.co.uk).

Health Technology Assessment Editor-in-Chief

Professor Hywel Williams Director, HTA Programme, UK and Foundation Professor and Co-Director of the Centre of Evidence-Based Dermatology, University of Nottingham, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editor-in-Chief

Professor Tom Walley Director, NIHR Evaluation, Trials and Studies and Director of the EME Programme, UK

NIHR Journals Library Editors

Professor Ken Stein Chair of HTA Editorial Board and Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

Professor Andree Le May Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (EME, HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals)

Dr Martin Ashton-Key Consultant in Public Health Medicine/Consultant Advisor, NETSCC, UK

Professor Matthias Beck Chair in Public Sector Management and Subject Leader (Management Group), Queen's University Management School, Queen's University Belfast, UK

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Eugenia Cronin Senior Scientific Advisor, Wessex Institute, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Scientific Advisor, NETSCC, UK

Dr Catriona McDaid Senior Research Fellow, York Trials Unit, Department of Health Sciences, University of York, UK

Professor William McGuire Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

Professor Geoffrey Meads Professor of Health Sciences Research, Health and Wellbeing Research Group, University of Winchester, UK

Professor John Norrie Chair in Medical Statistics, University of Edinburgh, UK

Professor John Powell Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK

Professor James Raftery Professor of Health Technology Assessment, Wessex Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsma Reviews Manager, Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, UK

Professor Helen Roberts Professor of Child Health Research, UCL Institute of Child Health, UK

Professor Jonathan Ross Professor of Sexual Health and HIV, University Hospital Birmingham, UK

Professor Helen Snooks Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

Professor Jim Thornton Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK

Professor Martin Underwood Director, Warwick Clinical Trials Unit, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

Please visit the website for a list of members of the NIHR Journals Library Board: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: journals.library@nihr.ac.uk