



Effective Health Care

Mechanical Thrombectomy Devices in Acute Coronary Syndromes

Nomination Summary Document

Results of Topic Selection Process & Next Steps

- Mechanical thrombectomy devices in acute coronary syndromes will go forward for refinement as a comparative effectiveness or effectiveness review. The scope of this topic, including populations, interventions, comparators, and outcomes, will be further developed in the refinement phase.
- When key questions have been drafted, they will be posted on the AHRQ Web site and open for public comment. To sign up for notification when this and other Effective Health Care (EHC) Program topics are posted for public comment, please go to <http://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/index.cfm/join-the-email-list/>.

Topic Description

Nominator: Government agency

Nomination Summary: The nominator questions what mechanical thrombectomy devices are used in patients with acute coronary syndromes (ACSs), their indications for use, and their advantages and disadvantages compared to cardiac catheterization without these devices.

Population(s): Patients with acute myocardial infarction or unstable angina undergoing cardiac catheterization

Intervention(s): Mechanical thrombectomy devices

Comparator(s): Thrombolytics, catheterization with stent placement (with or without glycoprotein IIb/IIIa inhibitors)

Outcome(s): Improved patient morbidity and mortality

Key Questions from Nominator:

1. What are the various mechanical thrombectomy devices used in patients with acute coronary syndromes?
2. What are the indications for their use?
3. What are the advantages and disadvantages of such devices compared to cardiac catheterization without use of these devices?
4. What are the associated harms?

Considerations

- The topic meets all EHC Program selection criteria. (For more information, see <http://effectivehealthcare.ahrq.gov/index.cfm/submit-a-suggestion-for-research/how-are-research-topics-chosen/>.)
- No trials were found comparing thrombolytics to mechanical thrombectomy devices, which may limit the ability of a review to examine comparative effectiveness. An effectiveness review on this topic may be useful because there may be an issue of harms related to the use of these devices, because of identified studies that have not been included in previous meta-analyses, and because a review could examine current gaps in the evidence.