

Cost of warfarin versus direct oral anticoagulants

In Dr Wohlgemut's commentary "The 'direct' dilemma. Oral anticoagulants and the parameters of public prescribing," published in the November issue of *Canadian Family Physician*, his point about being fiscally responsible and recognizing the responsibility of physicians to help politicians be good stewards of the public purse is well taken¹; however, we as physicians and as a society have to be very careful about not being penny-wise and pound-foolish. The Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health report cited in Wohlgemut's article showed that outpatient treatment of atrial fibrillation with warfarin is cheaper than use of direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs).² This is not surprising given that DOACs are many times more expensive. However, we do have to recognize that effective primary care, as well as interventions that potentially improve outcomes in chronic diseases such as atrial fibrillation, ultimately save the health care system money in the long run by reducing use of acute care. The Canadian Institute for Health Information reported that in 2019, 26.6% of health spending would go toward hospitals, which is also the single biggest cost.³ In fact, the combined cost of physicians and drugs is 30.4% of health care spending, while hospitals account for 26.6% alone. It is also worth noting that the cost of physician services increases for hospitalized patients versus patients seen on an outpatient basis. It is a complicated scenario, but others have more recently attempted to answer this question vis-à-vis DOACs: Ortiz-Cartagena and colleagues⁴ conducted a study of patients enrolled in anticoagulation clinics who had hospital admissions related to anticoagulation treatment. Their findings reflected those of the earlier mentioned Canadian Institute for Health Information review,³ in that for outpatient care alone, cost was less for warfarin, but when inpatient treatment was factored in as well, warfarin was actually less cost effective, as length of stay for the warfarin patients was substantially longer.

While the results of one study are by no means conclusive proof of superior cost efficacy in the Canadian system, it is worth noting these results. Ultimately it also raises another problem with these discussions: our health care system tends to be "siloe" in Canada. We talk about costs of primary care, or costs of acute care, but we don't always look at those systems together and the way they interact with each other. In order to

provide the best care to our patients and be the best possible stewards of health care resources, we can no longer continue to do that.

—Marco G. Mannarino MD CCFP
Edmonton, Alta

Competing interests
None declared

References

1. Wohlgemut J. The "direct" dilemma. Oral anticoagulants and the parameters of public prescribing. *Can Fam Physician* 2019;65:775-6 (Eng), 780-2 (Fr).
2. Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health. *New oral anticoagulants for the prevention of thromboembolic events in patients with atrial fibrillation*. Ottawa, ON: Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health; 2012.
3. Canadian Institute for Health Information [website]. *Where is most of the money being spent in 2019?* Ottawa, ON: Canadian Institute for Health Information; 2019. Available from: <http://cihi.ca/en/where-is-most-of-the-money-being-spent-in-2019>. Accessed 2019 Dec 6.
4. Ortiz-Cartagena I, Orraca Gotay A, Acevedo J. Cost effectiveness of oral anticoagulation therapy for non-valvular atrial fibrillation patients; warfarin versus the new oral anticoagulants rivaroxaban, dabigatran, and apixaban. *J Am Coll Cardiol* 2018;71(Suppl 11):A490.

Decreasing our carbon and environmental footprint at conferences

Thank you, Dr Ladouceur, for appealing to Canadian family physicians for strategies to fight climate change and preserve our planet in your November editorial, "Our fight against climate change."¹

One idea is for the College of Family Physicians of Canada (CFPC) and its provincial and territorial counterparts to demonstrate leadership at conferences, starting immediately. Serving predominantly plant-based meals, avoiding single-use plastics, and offering and accrediting telepresence at conferences could all be done routinely. This would substantially decrease our carbon and environmental footprint as a group of health professionals.²⁻⁴ These efforts could be publicized to set an example.

Regrettably, at the Wednesday lunch of the 2019 Family Medicine Forum in Vancouver, BC, in October, for every 3 rows of plant-based offerings, there were 10 rows of meat (roast beef or chicken). This is in line with neither Canada's Food Guide⁵ nor the EAT-Lancet Commission.⁶ Thankfully, the packaging and utensils were mostly compostable. A large number of physicians flew across the country to attend the conference and it is unclear (after having inquired at the CFPC) whether there were options for participating remotely.

In line with our CanMEDS-Family Medicine roles of leadership and advocacy, the Canadian public should view family physicians as exemplars in matters of health. We call on the CFPC and its provincial and territorial

Top 5 recent articles read online at cfp.ca

1. **Praxis:** Quick and painless. *2018 Updates on guideline recommendations* (November 2019)
2. **RxFiles:** Navigating cannabinoid choices for chronic neuropathic pain in older adults. *Potholes and highlights* (November 2019)
3. **Prevention in Practice:** Measuring what really matters. *Screening in primary care* (November 2019)
4. **Tools for Practice:** Topical treatments for rosacea (November 2019)
5. **Commentary:** Cannabis legislation provides an opportunity to strengthen primary care substance use counseling (November 2019)