FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH DELAYING OF FIBRINOLYTIC THERAPY ADMINISTRATION IN PATIENTS WITH ACUTE MYOCARDIAL INFARCTION

Jabar Ali¹, Iftikhar Ahmad¹, Mohammad Faheem¹, Muhammad Irfan¹, Adnan Mahmood Gul¹, Mohammad Hafizullah¹

ABSTRACT

Objective: To evaluate the door-to-needle time for fibrinolytic therapy for acute myocardial infarction (AMI) and to identify factors associated with a prolonged door-to-needle time.

Methodology: This cross-sectional study was conducted at Cardiology Department, Lady Reading Hospital, Peshawar between 1st July and 15th September 2010. All patients having AMI, eligible for thrombolysis were included in the study. The time of onset of chest pain and arrival in the hospital and any reason for delay was determined by asking the patients, the relatives and/or the attending nurse.

Results: Out of 140 patients recruited, 60% (n=84) were males and mean age was 57.96 ± 13.55 years. The mean door to needle time was 72.47±50.85 minutes (range 25 – 305). Door to needle time of < 30 minutes was achieved in 7.1% (10) patients, < 40 minutes in 21.4% (30) and < 50 minutes in 41.4% (58) patients. The main reason for delay in starting thrombolysis was logistic reasons in 42.9% (n=60) patients i.e. transfer from another hospital, non-availability of transfer staff from the casualty, unavailability of monitoring beds or non-availability of streptokinase in pharmacy. Other reasons were subtle ECG changes in 17.8% (n=25) cases, misinterpretation of symptoms in 21.5% (n=30), complete heart block needing pacemaker in 4.3% (n=6), raised blood pressure in 4.3% (n=6) and arrival in odd timing in 9.2% (n=13) cases.

Conclusion: Door to needle time of < 30 minutes was achieved in only a small minority of our patients. The main reason for delay was logistics.

Keywords: Acute myocardial infarction, Door to needle time, Fibrinolytic therapy.

This article may be cited as: Ali J, Ahmad I, Faheem M, Irfan M, Gul AM, Hafizullah M. Factors associated with delaying of fibrinolytic therapy administration in patients with acute myocardial infarction. Khyber Med Univ J 2012; 4(3): 129-132.

INTRODUCTION

It has been well established that early intervention with thrombolytic therapy can reduce mortality and morbidity after acute myocardial infarction (AMI)¹. Thrombolysis within the first hour can save an additional 65 lives per 1000 patients and a delay of four hours will reduce this to 25 lives per 1000^{1.3}. The delay between the onset of symptoms and arrival in the emergency department may be many hours, with causes for delay being complex and multifactorial⁴.

Once in hospital, thrombolysis can further be delayed because of delay in assessment, re-assesment

1 Department of Cardiology, Postgraduate Medical Institute, Lady Reading Hospital, Peshawar, Pakistan

Address for Correspondence:

Dr. Jabar Ali

Department of Cardiology, Postgraduate Medical Institute, Lady Reading Hospital, Peshawar, Pakistan Phone No:(+92) 03339343310 E mail: jabar77@hotmail.com Date Submitted: July 10, 2012 Date Revised: September 22, 2012 Date Accepted: September 25, 2012

KMUJ 2012; Vol. 4, No. 3: 129-132 -

by a second doctor, or intrahospital transfer if the administration of thrombolysis is confined to a special area outside the emergency department⁵. Time to reperfusion plays an important role in myocardial salvage, and the concept of the "golden hour", i.e. the optimal window for initiation of treatment (within 1 hour from the onset of pain), now appears to be applicable to all patients, including those treated by pharmacological reperfusion therapy⁶. Guidelines on STEMI recommend door-toneedle time of <30 min for fibrinolysis and door-to-balloon time of <90 min for primary angioplasty⁶. Analysis of the real-life context reveals that time to myocardial reperfusion often exceed recommendations7. A study conducted in Punjab Institute of Cardiology Lahore also evaluated the factors associated with delaying the administration of fibrinolytics therapy8. Since no such study has been conducted in our province so the rationale was to determine the factors associated with prolonging door-to-needle time. This study was conducted to evaluate the door-to-needle time for fibrinolytic therapy for AMI and to identify factors associated with a prolonged door-to-needle time.

C K

METHODOLOGY

This was a cross-sectional descriptive study of the patients who were thrombolyzed with streptokinase for AMI at Cardiology Department, Govt Lady Reading Hospital, Peshawar between 1st July and 15th September 2010. All patients who were eligible for thrombolysis after AMI were included in the study regardless of the outcome. The time of onset of chest pain and the time delay till the arrival in the hospital was determined by asking the patient or/and attending relatives. The door to needle time was calculated from the first medical contact till the initiation of thrombolytic therapy. The reason for delay in the door to needle time was determined by asking the attending nurse, patients and/or relatives. Data was recorded on a proforma and expressed as percentages and mean \pm SD. SPSS version 15 was used to analyze the data.

RESULTS

A total 140 patients who underwent thrombolysis with streptokinase for AMI were included. Males were 60% (84) and females were 40% (56). The mean age was 57.96 \pm 13.55 years, the mean age for males was 58.19 \pm 13.72 years and for females it was 57.61 \pm 13.41 years. The baseline characteristics are shown in Table I. As shown in Table II, Inferior MI was seen 42.9% (60), anterior MI in 37.1% (52), anterolateral in 14.2% (20), Inferior plus RV infarction in 2.9% (4).

The mean door to needle time was 72.47 ± 50.85 minutes with minimal being 25 minutes and maximum as high as 305 minutes. Door to needle time of < 30 minutes was achieved in 7.1% (10) patients and door to needle time of < 40 minutes was achieved in 21.4% (30) and door to needle time of < 50 minutes was achieved in 41.4% (58) patients.

The main reason for delay in starting thrombolysis is grouped under the heading as logistic reasons in 42.9% (60) i.e. transfer from another hospital, non-availability of transfer staff from the casualty in off timings, unavailability of monitoring beds in CCU and non-availability of streptokinase in the hospital pharmacy. Another important reason for delay was misinterpretation of symptoms by 21.5% (30) patients. Another reason for delay was subtle ECG-changes, not typical of AMI which included those patients who cannot be thrombolyzed straight away and had to be monitored with serial ECG and cardiac biomarkers before thrombolysis, this group had 17.8% (25) patients. Arrival of patients in off timings (after 2 pm), complete heart block needing pacemaker and raised blood pressure were also responsible for prolonging door to needle time (Figure 1).

There was also a decreasing trend in door to needle time seen when patients were attended in on-timings i.e. from 8am to 2 pm than in off-timings i.e. 2pm onwards. The mean door to needle time was 57.64 ± 23.12 minutes in the on timings and 79.34 ± 54.32 minutes in the off timings.

BASELINE CHARACTERISTICS

Characteristics	N = 140
Age (years) mean \pm SD	58.17 ± 13.7
Males	60% (84)
Female	40% (56)
Hypertension	44.3% (62)
Diabetes	30% (42)
Dyslipidemia	22.14% (31)
Smoking	19.3% (27)

Table I

TYPES OF MYOCARDIAL INFARCTION

Type of Myocardial Infarction (MI)	Frequency (n=140)
Inferior MI	42.9% (60)
Anterior MI	37.1% (52)
Anterior lateral MI	14.2% (20)
Inferior plus RV infarction	2.9% (4)
Antero-Septal MI	1.4% (1)
New onset Left Bundle Branch (LBBB)	1.4% (1)

Table II

REASONS FOR DELAY IN THROMBOLYSIS

Reasons for delay



DISCUSSION

Although the medical and technological revolution in the last 3 decades has improved clinical outcomes in patients presenting with acute STEMI, residual morbidity and mortality are still high. Randomized controlled trials of fibrinolytic therapy have demonstrated the benefit of initiating treatment as early as possible after the onset of STEMI symptoms^{9,10}. The time to treatment is a pivotal parameter in reperfusion. Patients treated within the 1st hour have the highest absolute and relative mortality benefit¹¹. By a team-based approach, significant improvement was seen in the measured time variables, with a mean door-to-needle time of 30 min. The time required for patient evaluation and ECG acquisition can delay the management of STEMI¹². In-hospital delay has been shortened to 20-30 min by establishing special systems, such as emergency departments with special equipment and specifically trained personnel, and by allowing emergency physicians to administer thrombolytic therapy¹³.

In our study the mean door to needle time was 72.47 \pm 50.85 minutes. A study conducted by Zed et al at the Vancouver General Hospital showed that a door-toneedle time of <30 min was achieved in only 24.3%¹⁴. A study conducted in Punjab institute of cardiology showed a minimum time of 5 minute, while the maximum was 420 minute with mean time of 55.13 (\pm 71.04) minutes⁸. Thus our time was comparable with study conducted in India and middle east^{15,16}. In our study we achieved Door to needle time of < 30 minutes in 7.1% (10). The number of patient's thrombolysed within 30 minutes was lower than other contemporary studies, although some of them had smaller sample sizes^{8,14-18}.

In our study the main reason for delay in starting thrombolysis was logistic-reasons (42.9%). Another reason is subtle ECG changes, which include patients who cannot be thrombolyzed straight away and had to be monitored with serial ECG and cardiac biomarkers before thrombolysis (17.8%). These findings are favouring the results of Jahengir W et al which showed that subtle ST-segment changes in initial ECG was seen in 25% cases and delay in decision making and starting fibrinolytic therapy in 12% cases⁶. A study conducted in India by Masurkar et al noted the delay in taking or interpreting ECG and transfer to ICU were responsible for causing delay in getting the patients with acute myocardial infarction to be thrombolysed¹⁵.

There was also a decreasing trend in door to needle time seen when patients were attended in on-timings (57.64 \pm 23.12 minutes) than in off timings (79.34 \pm 54.32 minutes). This may be because of non accessibility of transport or unavailability of trained health care provider especially in rural area at late hours. In fact, some have demonstrated that provider delay accounts for more time lost than patient delay in the pre-hospital period.¹⁹ Other studies have also shown similar results^{20,21}.

CONCLUSION

Door to needle time of < 30 minutes was achieved in only a small minority of our patients. The main reason for the delay was logistics.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We acknowledge the efforts of Dr. Cheragh Hussain, Dr. Sher Bahadar Khan and Dr. Sayed Farhat Abass for their guidance and valuable suggestions during the study project.

REFERENCES

- Ohman EM, Harrington RA, Cannon CP, Agnelli G, Cairns JA, Kennedy JW. Intravenous thrombolysis in acute myocardial infarction. Chest 2001; 119: 253-77S.
- Boersma E, Maas ACP, Deckers JW, Simoons ML. Early thrombolytic treatment of acute myocardial infarction: reappraisal of the golden hour. Lancet 1996; 348: 771-5.
- Fibrinolytic Therapy Trialists' (FTT) Collaborative Group. Indications for fibrinolytic therapy in suspected acute myocardial infarction: collaborative overview of early mortality and major morbidity results from all randomised trials of more than 1000 patients. Lancet 1994; 343: 311-22.
- Goldberg RJ, Steg PG, Sadiq I,Granger CB, Jackson EA, Budaj A, et al. Extent of, and factors associated with, delay to hospital presentation in patients with acute coronary disease (the GRACE registry) Am J Cardiol 2002; 89:791-6.
- Weston CFM, Penny WJ, Julian DG, on behalf of the British Heart Foundation Working Group. Guidelines for the early management of patients with myocardial infarction. Br Med J 1994; 308: 767-71.
- Antman EM, Anbe DT, Armstrong PW, Bates ER, Green LA, Hand M, et al. ACC/AHA guidelines for the management of patients with ST-elevation myocardial infarction-executive summary: A report of the American College of Cardiology/American Heart Association Task Force on Practice Guidelines (Writing Committee to Revise the 1999 Guidelines for the Management of Patients With Acute Myocardial Infarction). Circulation 2004; 110: 588-636.
- Arós F, Cuñat J, Loma-Osorio A, Torrado E, Bosch X, Rodríguez J, et al. Manejo del infarto en España en el año 2000. Estudio PRIAMHO II. Rev Esp Cardiol 2003; 56: 1165-73.
- Jahengir W, Daood MS, Khan M, Malik N H. Evaluation of Door-to needle time in patient undergoing fibrinolytic therapy after acute myocardial infarction. Pak J Physiol 2009; 5(2): 38-9.
- Moyer P, Ornato JP, Brady WJ Jr, Davis LL, Ghaemmaghami CA, Gibler WB, et al. Development of systems of care for ST-elevation myocardial infarction patients: The emergency medical services and emergency department perspective. Circulation 2007; 116: e43-8.
- Huber K, De Caterina R, Kristensen SD, Verheugt FW, Montalescot G, Maestro LB. Pre-hospital reperfusion therapy: A strategy to improve therapeutic outcome in patients with ST-elevation myocardial infarction. Eur Heart J 2005; 26: 2063-74.
- Lincoff AM, Topol EJ. The illusion of reperfusion. Does anyone achieve optimal myocardial reperfusion? Circulation 1993; 88: 1361-74.
- 12. Pinto DS, Kirtane AJ, Nallamothu BK, Murphy SA, Cohen DJ, Laham RJ, et al. Hospital delays in

FACTORS ASSOCIATED WITH DELAYING OF FIBRINOLYTIC THERAPY ADMINISTRATION.....

C K

reperfusion for ST-elevation myocardial infarction: implications when selecting a reperfusion strategy. Circulation 2006; 114: 2019-25.

- MacCallum AG, Stafford PJ, Jones C, Vincent R, Perez-Avila C, Chamberlain DA. Reduction in hospital time to thrombolytic therapy by audit of policy guidelines. Eur Heart J 1990; 11(Suppl F): 48-52.
- Zed PJ, Abu-Laban RB, Cadieu TM, Purssell RA. Fibrinolytic administration for acute myocardial infarction in a tertiary ED: Factors associated with an increased door-to-needle time. Am J Emerg Med 2004; 22: 192-96.
- Masurkar VA, Kapadia FN, Shirwadkar CG, Shukla U, Sood V. Evaluation of the door-to-needle time for fibrinolytic administration for acute myocardial infarction. Indian J Critical Care Med 2005; 9(3): 137-140.
- Abba AA, Wanni BA, Rahmatullah RA, Khalil MZ, Kumo AM, GhonaimM A. Door-to-needle time in administering thrombolytic therapy for acute myocardial infarction. Saudi Med J 2003; 24(4): 361-364.
- Huynh T, O'Loughlin J, Joseph L, Schampaert E, Rinfret S, Afilalo M. for the AMI-QUEBEC Study Investigators. Delays to reperfusion therapy in acute STsegment elevation myocardial infarction: results from the AMI-QUEBEC Study. Canadian Med Assoc J 2006; 175(12): 1527-32.
- Tsai CL, David J, Magid MD, Sullivan AF, Gordon JA, Kaushal R, Michael Ho P, et al. Quality of Care for acute myocardial infarction in 58 U.S. emergency departments. Acad Emerg Med 2010; 17: 940-50.
- Pattenden J, Watt I, Lewin RJ, Stanford N. Decision making processes in people with symptoms of acute myocardial infarction: qualitative study. Br Med J 2002; 324: 1006-9.

- Hedges JR, Feldman HA, Bittner V, Goldberg RJ, Zapka J, Osganian SK, et al. Impact of community intervention to reduce patient delay time on use of reperfusion therapy for acute myocardial infarction: rapid early action for coronary treatment (REACT) trial. REACT Study Group. Acad Emerg Med 2000; 7: 862-72.
- 21. Hutchings CB, Mann NC, Daya M, Jui J, Goldberg R, Cooper L, et al. Patients with chest pain calling 9-1-1 or self-transporting to reach definitive care: which mode is quicker? Am Heart J 2004; 147: 35-41.

AUTHOR'S CONTRIBUTION

Following authors have made substantial contributions to the manuscript as under

- JI: Conception and design, Acquisition of data, Drafting the manuscript,
- IH: Acquisition of data
- MF: Drafting the manuscript,
- MI: Analysis and interpretation of data,
- AMG: Critical revision,
- MH: Final Approval of the manuscript

CONFLICT OF INTEREST Authors declare no conflict of interest GRANT SUPPORT AND FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE NONE DECLARED

KMUJ web address: www.kmuj.kmu.edu.pk Email address: kmuj@kmu.edu.pk