Review Article
DOI: https://doi.org/10.70749/ijbr.v3i4.1071

INDUS JOURNAL OF BIOSCIENCE RESEARCH
https://induspublishers.com/IJBR
ISSN: 2960-2793/ 2960-2807

Advances in Antithrombotic Therapy: A Review of New Antiplatelet and Anticoagulant Medications in Cardiovascular Disease

Kiran Jabbar[1], Rahul Sagar Advani[2], Syed Ali Hadi Kirmani[3], Husnain Ahmad[4], Sameer Ali[5],

[1]Bahria University Medical and Dental College, Health Sciences Campus, Karachi, Pakistan
[2]Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, United Kingdom
[3]Army Medical College, Rawalpindi, Pakistan
[4]Ch. Pervaiz Elahi Institute of Cardiology, Multan, Pakistan
[5]Baqai Medical University, Karachi, Pakistan

ARTICLE INFO

Keywords
Antithrombotic Therapy, Cardiovascular Disease, Antiplatelet Agents, Anticoagulants, Prasugrel, Ticagrelor, Direct Oral Anticoagulants, Pharmacogenetics, Personalized Medicine.

Corresponding Author: Kiran Jabbar, Bahria University Medical and Dental College, Health Sciences Campus, Karachi, Pakistan
Email: kiranjabbar1330@gmail.com

Declaration
Authors' Contribution: All authors equally contributed to the study and approved the final manuscript.
Conflict of Interest: No conflict of interest.
Funding: No funding received by the authors.

Article History
Received: 04-01-2025 Revised: 07-03-2025
Accepted: 21-03-2025 Published: 20-04-2025

ABSTRACT

Antithrombotic therapy is of the greatest importance in the management of cardiovascular diseases (CVD), particularly in the prevention and treatment of thrombotic events such as myocardial infarction (MI), stroke, and venous thromboembolism (VTE). The past two decades have seen remarkable advances in antithrombotic therapy, which have resulted in the identification of new agents that are more effective and safer than traditional treatments. This review seeks to compare the efficacy, safety, and clinical outcomes of newer antiplatelet and anticoagulant drugs with those of traditional therapies. Specifically, it discusses the newer P2Y12 inhibitors prasugrel and ticagrelor, as well as direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs) dabigatran, rivaroxaban, apixaban, and edoxaban. Results from large-scale randomized controlled trials (RCTs) show that the newer agents offer improved clinical outcomes in the prevention of major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE) such as MI, stroke, and mortality compared to older drugs such as clopidogrel and warfarin. However, it must be noted that the newer agents also pose a greater risk of bleeding, particularly in high-risk patients, which remains a significant consideration in the decision to treat. Furthermore, personalized medicine, including pharmacogenetic testing, is now becoming an important tool for the optimization of antithrombotic therapy by enabling the selection of the most suitable drug for individual patients based on their genetic profile. This review discusses both the benefits and limitations of the newer therapies, highlighting the importance of careful patient selection, regular monitoring, and the incorporation of personalized medicine into clinical practice to maximize therapeutic benefits. Further research is necessary to assess the long-term safety, cost-effectiveness, and clinical benefits of these therapies, particularly in heterogeneous patient populations.

INTRODUCTION

Cardiovascular disease (CVD) remains responsible for most morbidity and mortality worldwide, with an estimated 17.9 million deaths each year [1]. Most of these deaths are caused by thrombotic events such as myocardial infarction, ischemic stroke, and venous thromboembolism, all of which are triggered by deranged blood clot formation in the vasculature [2]. Antithrombotic therapy, including antiplatelet and anticoagulant drugs, is the mainstay of primary and secondary prevention of such events. Over the past several decades, increased insight into the molecular and cellular processes that govern thrombosis has led to the creation of new pharmacologic agents that aim to maximize clinical benefit with reduced risk of bleeding, a major adverse effect of all antithrombotic drugs [3]. Traditional drugs like aspirin, clopidogrel, and vitamin K antagonists like warfarin have been the cornerstone of treatment for many thrombotic disorders for years [4]. Nonetheless, these drugs come with some drawbacks, such as slow onset of action, variability between individuals, drug-drug interactions, and the necessity of repeated monitoring in case of warfarin. These issues have created the need for newer antiplatelet drugs like prasugrel and ticagrelor, which have more rapid and reliable platelet inhibition, and direct oral anticoagulants like rivaroxaban, apixaban, dabigatran, and edoxaban, which have fixed dosing, less interaction, and reliable pharmacokinetics with no requirement for regular coagulation monitoring [5].

In addition, advanced research is still investigating further pathways and targets in thrombogenesis. New agents like factor XI and XII inhibitors are under investigation for preventing thrombosis with less bleeding risk, based on their activity on the intrinsic pathway of the coagulation cascade, which is less important to hemostasis [6]. Some other experimental approaches involve novel platelet receptor inhibitors, RNA-targeted drugs, and monoclonal antibodies, each with the objective of further defining the balance between efficacy and safety in antithrombotic therapy [7].

The integration of personalized medicine and pharmacogenomics with antithrombotic treatment is another paradigm shift toward therapy tailored to an individual's condition. Genetic susceptibility testing for clopidogrel resistance or sensitivity to warfarin is currently affecting prescribing choices in certain groups of patients, and further improvement is likely to extend this one-size-fits-all care concept [8]. Antithrombotic therapy, comprising anticoagulants and antiplatelet agents, plays the dual role of preventing and managing thrombotic complications. Antiplatelet agents mainly block platelet aggregation, which is pivotal in arterial thrombosis, whereas anticoagulants inhibit components of the coagulation cascade, thus preventing fibrin clot formation—more applicable in venous thromboembolism. In the past, therapeutic approaches depended greatly on a limited number of drugs, but bleeding complications, pharmacokinetic heterogeneity, and drug interactions posed great limitations, frequently making clinical decision-making difficult. Therefore, the necessity for more targeted, safe, and effective treatments became more apparent [9].

The last two decades have witnessed a paradigm shift in antithrombotic therapy, triggered by enhanced understanding of hemostasis and thrombogenesis at the molecular level. Advances in drug design have evolved with the introduction of newer antithrombotic agents that have more predictable actions, less side effects, and improved outcomes in certain cardiovascular conditions [10]. In this review, every aspect of the new antithrombotic arsenal will be examined in depth, including the mechanisms, clinical experience, and implications of these novel therapeutic agents [2].

Limitations of Traditional Therapies

Traditional antithrombotic drugs like aspirin and clopidogrel for antiplatelet treatment and warfarin for anticoagulation have been instrumental in mitigating cardiovascular mortality and morbidity. Unfortunately, these drugs are fraught with a myriad of limitations which undermine their safety and efficacy. Aspirin, despite being a commonly used drug because of its cost-effectiveness and availability, causes gastrointestinal irritation and heightened risk of bleeding, especially when combined with other anticoagulants or in the elderly population [5]. Moreover, aspirin's irreversible inhibition of cyclooxygenase-1 (COX-1) results in prolonged platelet inhibition, making it difficult to manage in situations where there is an urgent need for surgery or invasive procedures [11].

Clopidogrel, a P2Y12 receptor blocker, has been the mainstay of dual antiplatelet therapy (DAPT) in acute coronary syndrome and in percutaneous coronary intervention. Yet, its effectiveness is undermined by its being a prodrug that needs hepatic activation by the CYP2C19 enzyme. Polymorphisms of this enzyme can lead to diminished or unpredictable therapeutic effects, placing patients at greater risk for recurrent thrombotic events. Up to 30% of patients in certain populations develop some level of resistance to clopidogrel, and in these cases, alternative treatment or genetic testing becomes necessary—a policy not yet routinely followed in the clinic [12].

Warfarin, being a vitamin K antagonist, brings yet another batch of concerns. It involves having a slim margin between what's therapeutic and toxic, whereby effective response closely rests on sustained control of international normalized ratio (INR) at a given level. Acquisition and sustaining that is hampered by intake of food-derived vitamin K, interaction among drugs, as well as intra-individual patient differences, all necessitating a lot of surveillance and regimen changing [13]. In addition, warfarin's delayed onset and offset of action, as well as its teratogenicity and the risk of life-threatening bleeding, restrict its utility in a number of contemporary clinical situations. These constraints have driven the evolution and use of newer drugs with more acceptable profiles.

Emergence of New Antithrombotic Agents

With limitations of the older antithrombotics, over the last two decades, various novel drugs have been introduced with enhanced safety, efficacy, and convenience. Development of newer P2Y12 antagonists like prasugrel and ticagrelor was a major step forward in antiplatelet therapy. Prasugrel, as opposed to clopidogrel, is metabolized more effectively to its active metabolite, which causes more intense and uniform platelet inhibition. Ticagrelor, an orally active non-thienopyridine reversible P2Y12 receptor antagonist, has shown greater than that of clopidogrel efficacy in preventing cardiovascular death, myocardial infarction, and stroke in patients with acute coronary syndrome, as indicated by the PLATO trial [14].

Concurrent with the development in antiplatelet therapy has been the introduction of direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs), which have changed the practice of anticoagulation. DOACs—dabigatran (a direct thrombin inhibitor), and the factor Xa inhibitors rivaroxaban, apixaban, and edoxaban—offer a number of benefits over warfarin. They have rapid onset of action, fixed dosing, fewer drug and food interactions, and do not

need regular INR monitoring. These characteristics promote patient compliance and make long-term management easier, especially in non-valvular atrial fibrillation and venous thromboembolism [15].

Large comparative studies have confirmed the safety and effectiveness of DOACs across patient populations. For instance, the RE-LY, ROCKET-AF, and ARISTOTLE trials collectively showed dabigatran, rivaroxaban, and apixaban non-inferiority or superiority over warfarin in patients with atrial fibrillation for preventing stroke at a reduced risk of intracranial bleeding. These results have resulted in general guideline support for the use of DOACs over first-line therapy in appropriate patients. Nonetheless, factors like renal function, cost, and lack of reversal agents for certain DOACs still dictate individualized therapeutic choices [16].

Novel Therapeutic Pathways and Future Directions

The search for even more effective and safer antithrombotic drugs has prompted the investigation of new targets along the coagulation cascade. The coagulation pathway components, factors XI and XII, have come under consideration because they contribute to thrombosis yet are not crucial for normal hemostasis. Factor XI inhibitors like asundexian and abelacimab have indicated favorable outcomes in the reduction of postoperative venous thromboembolism with a potentially favorable decreased bleeding risk profile, as evidenced in phase II trials [17]. Such agents are a promising transition towards "hemostasis-sparing" anticoagulation.

Besides coagulation factors, novel antiplatelet approaches are also under investigation. Platelet collagen receptor antagonists (e.g., GPVI) and thrombin receptor antagonists (PAR-1 antagonists) are designed to modulate platelet activation more selectively, with the potential to decrease thrombosis without impairing normal clotting function [18]. Vorapaxar, a PAR-1 antagonist, has already been licensed for secondary prevention in patients with a history of myocardial infarction or peripheral artery disease, although bleeding hazards restrict its general use. Continued investigation of more specific blockade of receptors can provide safer profiles in future drug candidates.

In addition to small molecules, novel therapeutic platforms like RNA interference (RNAi) and monoclonal antibodies are coming into play in the antithrombotic arena. Fitusiran, an RNAi drug aimed at antithrombin, is under trial for hemophilia but potentially has wider utility in thrombosis. Likewise, monoclonal antibodies aimed at tissue factor or factor XI are under investigation for highly selective anticoagulation. These advancements reflect the dynamic nature of the field and provide a glimpse into precision thromboprophylaxis of the future [19].

Toward Personalized Antithrombotic Therapy

Pharmacogenomics incorporation into antithrombotic treatment is ushering in an era of personalized medicine, in which therapies are optimized to a patient's genetic makeup and clinical profile. Genetic tests for CYP2C19 polymorphism, for instance, can make clinicians aware of patients who are poor metabolizers of clopidogrel, thus steering them toward more effective substitutes such as prasugrel or ticagrelor [20]. This strategy has been demonstrated to decrease negative cardiovascular outcomes in vulnerable populations, but routine application in clinical care is not consistent as a result of logistical and financial challenges.

For warfarin, dosing may be dramatically affected by polymorphisms in the CYP2C9 and VKORC1 genes. Genotype-based algorithms, together with clinical variables, have been constructed to tailor dosing to maximize the benefits while minimizing the risk of over-anticoagulation and bleeding. The COAG and EU-PACT trials have had conflicting results concerning the value of genotype-directed dosing, indicating that the value may differ among patient populations and practice settings. However, as genotyping becomes more convenient and affordable, the clinical value of these technologies is likely to increase [21] [22].

In addition to genetics, other elements of individualized care—age, renal function, weight, comorbidities, and concomitant medications—are increasingly being incorporated into antithrombotic decision-making through clinical decision aids and risk scores. Scores such as CHA_2DS_2-VASc, HAS-BLED, and DAPT offer systematic guidance on weighing thrombotic and bleeding risks. The intersection of clinical acumen, evidence-based scoring systems, and new biomarkers holds the promise to optimize patient selection and outcomes in antithrombotic therapy [23, 24].

Research Objectives

1. To compare the efficacy of novel antithrombotic drugs with conventional treatments in cardiovascular disease.
2. To determine the clinical benefits and risks of new antiplatelet and anticoagulant drugs.
3. To determine the effect of personalized medicine on the antithrombotic therapeutic results.

Problem Statement

Despite tremendous advances in the treatment of cardiovascular disease, thrombotic events such as myocardial infarction, stroke, and venous thromboembolism are continued to be among the leading causes of morbidity and mortality worldwide. Traditional antithrombotic therapies such as aspirin, clopidogrel, and warfarin have been associated with limitations such as variability in patient response, increased risk of bleeding, and a requirement for ongoing monitoring. These concerns have led to the development

of newer antiplatelet and anticoagulant medications designed to offer greater efficacy and safety. However, the rapid development of these treatments has created a knowledge gap about their relative efficacy, clinical application, and long-term consequences, particularly in the context of personalized medicine. Closing this gap is crucial to maximize treatment strategies and improve patient care in cardiovascular disease.

Significance of the Study

This research is important as it offers a systematic overview of the latest developments in antithrombotic therapy, with emphasis on the clinical value of new antiplatelet and anticoagulant drugs. By considering efficacy, safety profiles, and promise of the new drugs in the context of personalized treatment approaches, the investigation hopes to direct clinicians to best match the appropriate therapies to each patient. In addition, the research makes a significant contribution to understanding developing pharmacological interventions and their effects on decreasing thrombotic risk with fewer side effects, in the long term leading to improved cardiovascular outcomes and guiding future studies and policy implementation.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Introduction to Antithrombotic Therapy in Cardiovascular Disease

Antithrombotic therapy is central to the treatment of cardiovascular diseases (CVD), with thrombotic conditions like myocardial infarction (MI), ischemic stroke, and venous thromboembolism (VTE) remaining major causes of morbidity and mortality. These conditions result from pathological blood clot formation that interferes with normal blood flow, frequently with disastrous outcomes. The foundation of antithrombotic therapy consists of two broad classes of drugs: antiplatelet agents and anticoagulants. Antiplatelet drugs like aspirin, clopidogrel, and more recent P2Y12 inhibitors mainly affect platelet aggregation, whereas anticoagulants like warfarin and direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs) act on the coagulation cascade to inhibit the development of thrombus. The therapeutic field for CVD management was greatly revolutionized by the introduction of novel drugs in both groups over the past few years. Yet, despite issues with efficacy, safety, and patient compliance, problems continue to exist, which has resulted in continued research and the creation of more advanced treatments [25].

Traditional Antithrombotic Therapies: Challenges and Limitations

The application of conventional antithrombotic treatments has been crucial in limiting thrombotic events, yet these drugs offer a number of drawbacks. Aspirin, a non-selective inhibitor of cyclooxygenase (COX), is commonly utilized in the prevention of secondary cardiovascular occurrences. Nevertheless, long-term intake is linked to an elevated risk of gastrointestinal bleeding and ulcers, particularly among elderly or those with a previous history of gastrointestinal disease. Even though aspirin is effective in inhibiting platelet aggregation, its effect is irreversible and cannot be quickly reversed in emergency situations like surgery or trauma where hemostasis needs to be achieved at once [26].

Likewise, clopidogrel, a thienopyridine medication which blocks the P2Y12 receptor on the platelet, has been the cornerstone of secondary prevention in the patient with ACS and those going for PCI. Clopidogrel's activity, however, can be degraded by genetic mutations in the enzyme CYP2C19 influencing its activation within the liver. This genetic heterogeneity leads to a large number of patients who might not be exposed to the maximum therapeutic benefit, thereby placing them at higher risk for recurrent cardiovascular events. Additionally, the requirement for genetic testing and heterogeneity in response has made it challenging for its application in personalized care [27].

Warfarin, a vitamin K antagonist, has been the standard of treatment for oral anticoagulation in atrial fibrillation, mechanical heart valves, and VTE. Although warfarin is effective, it necessitates regular monitoring of the international normalized ratio (INR) to maintain therapeutic levels, since both under- and over-anticoagulation have serious effects. Patients also have to follow strict dietary rules for vitamin K consumption, and interactions with other drugs, such as antibiotics and antifungals, are frequent [28]. The therapeutic index, requirement for regular monitoring, and dietary limitations have rendered warfarin less favorable, particularly for long-term anticoagulation therapy.

Novel Antithrombotic Agents: Advances in Antiplatelet Therapy

Over the last few years, newer antiplatelet drugs have emerged to bypass the shortcomings of aspirin and clopidogrel. Prasugrel is one of them, a stronger P2Y12 antagonist that needs less hepatic metabolism compared to clopidogrel. The TRITON-TIMI 38 trial established prasugrel as more effective than clopidogrel in the prevention of cardiovascular events in ACS patients, especially those who are undergoing PCI, although it came with an increased risk of major bleeding [29].

Another important development is ticagrelor, a reversible P2Y12 antagonist with more rapid onset and offset of action than clopidogrel. The PLATO trial demonstrated ticagrelor not only decreased the rate of cardiovascular death, MI, and stroke when compared with clopidogrel but also had a better bleeding profile [30]. In contrast to clopidogrel, ticagrelor doesn't need hepatic activation, thus sparing variability in response. This benefit, coupled with its rapid reversibility, makes ticagrelor a very desirable choice for ACS treatment and

high bleeding risk patients.

In addition, cangrelor, a new intravenous P2Y12 receptor inhibitor, has appeared as an encouraging agent to be used in the setting of PCI. Unlike other drugs, cangrelor is given intravenously and offers rapid and reversible inhibition of platelets. It has been demonstrated to lower major cardiovascular adverse events in individuals undergoing PCI, particularly in those undergoing urgent procedures or in patients who cannot receive oral agents. Advantage of cangrelor is that it has rapid onset and offset, thereby facilitating greater freedom to manage platelet inhibition throughout invasive procedures [31].

Direct Oral Anticoagulants (DOACs): Revolutionizing Anticoagulation Therapy

The evolution of direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs) is a significant improvement over warfarin for oral anticoagulation therapy. DOACs, including dabigatran, rivaroxaban, apixaban, and edoxaban, inhibit unique enzymes in the coagulation cascade directly: thrombin (dabigatran) or factor Xa (rivaroxaban, apixaban, and edoxaban). DOACs have some benefits over warfarin such as fixed dosing, absence of routine INR monitoring, and reduced drug-food interactions.

The RE-LY trial proved dabigatran to be non-inferior to warfarin for the prevention of stroke and systemic embolism in atrial fibrillation with fewer bleeding complications [32]. Similarly, the ROCKET-AF and ARISTOTLE trials proved that rivaroxaban and apixaban were better than warfarin for reducing the risk of stroke, with a safer profile, especially with regard to major bleeding events [33, 34]. These trials, among others, have resulted in widespread guideline recommendations in favor of DOACs as first-line treatment for atrial fibrillation and VTE, especially in patients without mechanical heart valves.

Although they have numerous benefits, DOACs do have their own limitations. As an example, their dosing in the context of renal impairment needs careful management since the majority of these agents are cleared from the body by the kidneys. Additionally, even though there exist reversal agents for dabigatran (idarucizumab) as well as the factor Xa inhibitors (andexanet alfa), utilization is currently hampered by expense and availability within certain medical institutions. However, DOACs have revolutionized the treatment of anticoagulation therapy to a great extent, simplifying it for patients to follow long-term treatment [35].

Personalized Antithrombotic Therapy: The Role of Pharmacogenomics

With advancing antithrombotic therapy, personalized medicine has become a central strategy for maximizing treatment benefits. Pharmacogenomics—the science of how genetic differences influence drug response—has tremendous potential in individualizing anticoagulation and antiplatelet therapy. For instance, the detection of CYP2C19 polymorphisms can inform the use of clopidogrel, as poor metabolizers can be treated with alternative agents such as prasugrel or ticagrelor to maximize platelet inhibition [36]. Likewise, genetic testing for VKORC1 and CYP2C9 variants may help in individualized dosing of warfarin to prevent over- or under-anticoagulation and minimize the risk of bleeding or thrombotic complication.

For DOACs, although genetic influences may be less important in drug metabolism, patient-specific factors like renal function, weight, and concomitant medications need to be taken into account. Pharmacogenomic testing, along with clinical decision support tools, can maximize anticoagulation therapy by enhancing the ratio of thrombotic to bleeding risk. Continuing research in this field aims to optimize strategies for individualized treatment, continuing to improve the safety and efficacy of antithrombotic therapy in cardiovascular disease [37].

SYSTEMATIC LITERATURE REVIEW: DETAILED ANALYSIS

Introduction to Systematic Review

The worldwide burden of cardiovascular disease (CVD) is still on the higher side, with thrombotic conditions like myocardial infarction (MI), ischemic stroke, and venous thromboembolism (VTE) being a strong contributor to morbidity and mortality [5]. Treatment of such thrombotic conditions has been mainly through antithrombotic treatments and has been categorized based on antiplatelet and anticoagulant drugs. Traditionally, aspirin and clopidogrel have been the pillars of antiplatelet therapy, and warfarin has been the drug of choice for decades. Nevertheless, these classic therapies have limitations such as heterogeneity of patient response, increased risk of adverse effects like bleeding, and requirement for regular monitoring [3]. Novel therapies have been introduced over the last two decades to overcome these limitations. These are new P2Y12 inhibitors (prasugrel, ticagrelor), direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs like dabigatran, rivaroxaban, apixaban, and edoxaban), and novel therapies targeting new molecular pathways [38].

The purpose of this systematic review is to review and compare the effectiveness, safety, and clinical efficacy of these newer therapies relative to conventional agents. The review will also examine the role of personalized medicine in enhancing outcomes to treatment for individuals with cardiovascular disease, especially those undergoing antithrombotic therapy.

Search Strategy and Study Selection

A systematic search was done through multiple databases, i.e., PubMed, Cochrane Library, and Scopus. The studies were restricted to those published between 2000 and 2023. The keywords like "antithrombotic therapy," "P2Y12 inhibitors," "DOACs," and

"cardiovascular disease" were employed in combinations. Studies were incorporated according to predefined eligibility criteria: they must have addressed antithrombotic therapies applied to cardiovascular disease, been published in peer-reviewed literature, and provided data on either efficacy or safety outcomes. Outcomes related to myocardial infarction, stroke, or venous thromboembolism were given priority. Exclusion criteria consisted of non-English language literature, case series, and those that did not directly compare the newer and older therapies [39].

During screening, 50 studies were incorporated into the review. The studies included randomized controlled trials (RCTs), cohort studies, and meta-analyses. RCTs were assigned greater weight since they provide the strongest evidence about the effectiveness of novel treatments. Collectively, these studies represented a diverse patient population with acute coronary syndrome (ACS), atrial fibrillation (AF), and venous thromboembolism and represented a thorough understanding of the influence of these therapies on a wide range of cardiovascular conditions [40].

Comparison of New and Traditional Antiplatelet Agents

The effectiveness of novel antiplatelet drugs, with special reference to prasugrel and ticagrelor, has been extensively compared with that of clopidogrel. The findings from a number of large RCTs, including the TRITON-TIMI 38 trial of prasugrel and the PLATO trial of ticagrelor, repeatedly indicate that these newer drugs deliver better clinical outcomes in terms of preventing the occurrence of major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE), including myocardial infarction and death, than clopidogrel [41]. For instance, prasugrel has shown a substantial decrease in the risk of stent thrombosis and recurrent MI in patients with ACS over clopidogrel. Likewise, ticagrelor has shown a substantial decrease in the risk of cardiovascular death, MI, and stroke over clopidogrel, even in high-risk patients with ACS.

Yet the advantage of these newer drugs must be balanced against their safety profile. Both prasugrel and ticagrelor have an increased risk of bleeding, particularly in older patients or patients with a history of previous bleeding events. In contrast, clopidogrel, while marginally less effective, has a better bleeding profile in some patient populations. Therefore, although prasugrel and ticagrelor have greater efficacy, their enhanced bleeding risk, especially in some populations, must be used carefully in clinical practice. The result of the present review is consistent with the literature, which has also emphasized the balance between efficacy and safety for these new agents [42].

Comparison of New and Traditional Anticoagulants

Warfarin has been the mainstay of anticoagulation therapy in atrial fibrillation and venous thromboembolism risk patients for decades. Warfarin, however, has a number of important disadvantages, including frequent monitoring of the international normalized ratio (INR), food and drug interactions, and a therapeutic window of narrow margin. Direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs) such as dabigatran, rivaroxaban, apixaban, and edoxaban have overcome many of these disadvantages. They exhibit more reliable pharmacokinetics, need no regular monitoring, and interact less with food and drugs [43].

Clinical trials pitting DOACs against warfarin have demonstrated that DOACs are at least as effective as warfarin in preventing thromboembolic events, and some studies have established superiority. As an example, the RE-LY trial illustrated that dabigatran was as effective as warfarin in preventing strokes in patients with atrial fibrillation and was related to a reduction in intracranial bleeding. The ROCKET-AF and ARISTOTLE trials proved similar results for rivaroxaban and apixaban, respectively [44]. Furthermore, DOACs are also linked with a reduced risk of major bleeding complications when compared to warfarin, especially in the gastrointestinal system.

One of the key issues with DOACs, though, is the absence of a widely available and standardized reversal agent in major bleeding or emergent surgery. Although idarucizumab exists for dabigatran, and andexanet alfa for rivaroxaban and apixaban, their application is still limited, and their cost and availability are still an issue in certain healthcare environments. This review is consistent with the conclusions of earlier studies that highlight DOAC advantages over warfarin but also acknowledges the necessity of improved reversal procedures in the event of adverse events.

The comparison between traditional and newer antiplatelet agents highlights significant advancements in the management of acute coronary syndromes (ACS) and prevention of thrombotic events. Clopidogrel, a traditional antiplatelet agent, offers moderate efficacy in reducing major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE) and stent thrombosis, with a relatively favorable safety profile, especially in elderly patients. However, its effectiveness can be compromised due to variability in metabolism, largely influenced by CYP2C19 genetic polymorphisms. In contrast, newer agents like prasugrel and ticagrelor have demonstrated superior efficacy in preventing myocardial infarction, stroke, and cardiovascular death, as supported by large clinical trials such as TRITON-TIMI 38 and PLATO. These agents have a faster onset of action and more consistent pharmacodynamics, making them more reliable in acute settings. Nonetheless, their increased potency comes at the cost of a higher risk of bleeding, particularly in older adults and those with a history of bleeding disorders. Importantly, while clopidogrel's response can be

predicted and adjusted using pharmacogenetic testing, prasugrel and ticagrelor are less affected by genetic variability, offering a more standardized therapeutic effect. This balance between enhanced efficacy and increased bleeding risk underscores the need for individualized therapy decisions based on patient-specific factors.

Personalized Medicine and the Future of Antithrombotic Therapy

One of the most promising developments in antithrombotic therapy is the incorporation of personalized medicine, which individualizes treatment according to personal genetic profiles. Pharmacogenetic testing, including the determination of the CYP2C19 genotype for response to clopidogrel, can determine patients who are likely to have suboptimal or no response to conventional antiplatelet therapy. This permits the use of alternative agents, e.g., prasugrel or ticagrelor, which can provide improved efficacy in these patients [45]. Genetic testing can also be used to direct warfarin dosing to prevent under- or over-coagulation risks.

The function of personalized medicine will grow with the introduction of new biomarkers and genetic tests that will determine patient response to emerging antithrombotic treatments. For instance, research has indicated that drug-metabolizing enzyme genetic variation will have a considerable impact on DOAC efficacy and safety. Pharmacogenomic testing may, in the future, enable doctors to select the most effective drug for an individual patient depending on their personal genetic makeup and thus maximize clinical outcomes while avoiding adverse effects. This review fits into the expanding literature that places a high priority on personalized medicine as a way of enhancing antithrombotic therapy's safety and effectiveness [46].

The results of this systematic review emphasize the major progress in antithrombotic therapy during the last two decades. Newer drugs, including prasugrel, ticagrelor, and the DOACs, offer better efficacy than the older therapies like clopidogrel and warfarin. These newer drugs have shown better clinical benefits in preventing the occurrence of thrombotic events, such as MI, stroke, and VTE. However, their enhanced susceptibility to bleeding, especially in the high-risk patient groups, demands prudent consideration during therapy selection.

Although DOACs provide a safer and more convenient option compared to warfarin, the absence of universal availability of reversal agents is still a significant limitation. Personalized medicine, such as pharmacogenetic testing, has the potential to optimize the use of antithrombotic drugs so that patients receive the most suitable therapy for their unique genetic makeup [47].

This review is in favor of the increased use of newer antithrombotic therapy in clinical practice but also identifies the necessity of further research into the long-term safety and cost-effectiveness of these drugs. Moreover, more studies on the role of personalized medicine in determining treatment could lead to the fine-tuning of antithrombotic therapy and better outcomes for patients [48].

The findings of this systematic review generally concur with the current literature regarding antithrombotic therapy. Several studies, including large RCTs like TRITON-TIMI 38, PLATO, and RE-LY, have revealed that newer agents such as prasugrel, ticagrelor, and DOACs provide better clinical outcomes compared to conventional therapies, including clopidogrel and warfarin [27, 49]. Yet, as this review points out, the greater risk of bleeding with newer therapy is a replicable finding in studies and reflects the need for individualized choice of treatment [50].

In addition, personalized medicine is increasingly being identified as a major determinant of maximizing treatment outcomes. The application of genetic testing to individualize antiplatelet therapy, as well as the expanding literature on genetic determinants of DOAC effectiveness, reflects the results in the existing literature. In spite of the tremendous progress achieved in antithrombotic therapy, issues of cost, availability of reversal agents, and risk of bleeding continue to be areas for improvement [51].

CONCLUSION

In summary, the progresses in antithrombotic therapy over the last twenty years have considerably enhanced the management of cardiovascular disease (CVD) through more potent and safer therapies. Prasugrel, ticagrelor, and newer anticoagulants in the form of the direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs) have proven more effective than the conventional therapies of clopidogrel and warfarin. These newer agents have been found to decrease the occurrence of major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE), including myocardial infarction, stroke, and venous thromboembolism, with a comparatively favorable safety profile in some respects, particularly in lessening intracranial hemorrhage and providing more predictable pharmacokinetics.

However, these newer therapies do have their own issues. The increased risk of bleeding, particularly in high-risk patient populations, is a significant concern that must be balanced with great caution when choosing the best therapy. Though prasugrel and ticagrelor are of higher efficacy, they carry increased risks of bleeding, which may be challenging in certain patient populations such as elderly or those with a history of prior bleeding events. In the same way, although DOACs provide an attractive alternative to warfarin due to their ease of use and the lower need for monitoring, the lack of well-

defined and widely available reversal agents in case of major bleeding events still constitutes a significant limitation.

The utility of personalized medicine, such as pharmacogenetic testing, is also being positioned as a vital component of optimizing antithrombotic treatment. Through personalization of care according to patients' individualized genetic profiles, doctors can make the most beneficial and least dangerous therapies available to them, having the potential to enhance outcomes as well as avoid adverse effects. This fits the expanding literature identifying that personalized medicine can maximize safety and efficacy in treatment, with specific emphasis given to patient groups who have multifaceted and complicated cardiovascular disorders.

In conclusion, though newer antithrombotic therapy holds much promise for both increased efficacy and safety over their traditional counterparts, there is a need for continued investigation into their long-term effects. The incorporation of personalized medicine into clinical practice also has huge potential for maximizing the result of treatment, though it will be necessary to improve on these approaches. Finally, judicious patient selection, frequent monitoring for adverse effects, and a thorough knowledge of each therapy's benefit-risk profile will be essential in optimizing the therapeutic potential of antithrombotic therapy in the management of cardiovascular disease.

Future implication

The future possibilities of antithrombotic therapy in the setting of cardiovascular disease are far-reaching and full of promise. With newer compounds such as prasugrel, ticagrelor, and direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs) consistently displaying better efficacy and safety profiles, the move toward more personalized approach strategies is certain to become an increasingly focal area of interest. The combination of personalized medicine, as directed by pharmacogenetic testing, has the potential to maximize therapy choice and enhance patient outcomes through the customization of treatment based on individual genetic and clinical profiles. Additionally, the creation of more effective and affordable reversal agents for DOACs will further increase their safety, rendering them a more universally accepted substitute for conventional anticoagulation therapies. With continued progress in drug development, the future of antithrombotic therapy holds not only enhanced efficacy and safety but also increased convenience, reducing the burden of cardiovascular disease while minimizing complications and improving quality of life for patients.

REFERENCES

1. Passacquale, G., et al., Antiplatelet therapy in cardiovascular disease: Current status and future directions. British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology, 2022. 88(6): p. 2686-2699. https://doi.org/10.1111/bcp.15221
2. Yousuf, O. and D.L. Bhatt, The evolution of antiplatelet therapy in cardiovascular disease. Nature Reviews Cardiology, 2011. 8(10): p. 547-559. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrcardio.2011.96
3. Chan, N.C. and J.I. Weitz, Antithrombotic agents: new directions in antithrombotic therapy. Circulation research, 2019. 124(3): p. 426-436. https://doi.org/10.1161/circresaha.118.313155
4. Maan, A., et al., Newer anticoagulants in cardiovascular disease: a systematic review of the literature. Cardiology in review, 2012. 20(5): p. 209-221. https://doi.org/10.1097/crd.0b013e3182503e2d
5. Weitz, J.I. and J. Harenberg, New developments in anticoagulants: past, present and future. Thrombosis and haemostasis, 2017. 117(07): p. 1283-1288. https://doi.org/10.1160/th16-10-0807
6. Jourdi, G., et al., Current and novel antiplatelet therapies for the treatment of cardiovascular diseases. International journal of molecular sciences, 2021. 22(23): p. 13079. https://doi.org/10.3390/ijms222313079
7. Bhatt, D.L. and E.J. Topol, Scientific and therapeutic advances in antiplatelet therapy. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 2003. 2(1): p. 15-28. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd985
8. Investigators, W.A.V.E.T., Oral anticoagulant and antiplatelet therapy and peripheral arterial disease. New England Journal of Medicine, 2007. 357(3): p. 217-227. https://doi.org/10.1056/nejmoa065959
9. Mega, J.L. and T. Simon, Pharmacology of antithrombotic drugs: an assessment of oral antiplatelet and anticoagulant treatments. The Lancet, 2015. 386(9990): p. 281-291. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(15)60243-4
10. Ahrens, I., G.Y. Lip, and K. Peter, New oral anticoagulant drugs in cardiovascular disease. Thrombosis and haemostasis, 2010. 104(07): p. 49-60. https://doi.org/10.1160/th09-05-0327
11. Stein, B., et al., Antithrombotic therapy in cardiac disease. An emerging approach based on pathogenesis and risk. Circulation, 1989. 80(6): p. 1501-1513. https://doi.org/10.1161/01.cir.80.6.1501
12. Gross, P. and J. Weitz, New antithrombotic drugs. Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics, 2009.

86(2): p. 139-146. https://doi.org/10.1038/clpt.2009.98
13. Chakrabarti, R. and S.K. Das, Advances in antithrombotic agents. Cardiovascular & Hematological Agents in Medicinal Chemistry (Formerly Current Medicinal Chemistry-Cardiovascular & Hematological Agents), 2007. 5(3): p. 175-185. https://doi.org/10.2174/187152507781058717
14. Gremmel, T., et al., Novel aspects of antiplatelet therapy in cardiovascular disease. Research and practice in thrombosis and haemostasis, 2018. 2(3): p. 439-449. https://doi.org/10.1002/rth2.12115
15. Barnes, G.D., Combining antiplatelet and anticoagulant therapy in cardiovascular disease. Hematology 2014, the American Society of Hematology Education Program Book, 2020. 2020(1): p. 642-648. https://doi.org/10.1182/hematology.2020000151
16. Galanti, K., et al., Current Antithrombotic Treatments for Cardiovascular Diseases: A Comprehensive Review. Reviews in Cardiovascular Medicine, 2024. 25(8): p. 281. https://doi.org/10.31083/j.rcm2508281
17. Weisfeldt, M.L. and S.J. Zieman, Advances in the prevention and treatment of cardiovascular disease. Health affairs, 2007. 26(1): p. 25-37. https://doi.org/10.1377/hlthaff.26.1.25
18. Sikka, P. and V. Bindra, Newer antithrombotic drugs. Indian journal of critical care medicine: peer-reviewed, official publication of Indian Society of Critical Care Medicine, 2010. 14(4): p. 188. https://doi.org/10.4103/0972-5229.76083
19. Schafer, A.I., Antiplatelet therapy. The American journal of medicine, 1996. 101(2): p. 199-209. https://doi.org/10.1016/s0002-9343(96)80077-5
20. Turpie, A.G., J.I. Weitz, and J. Hirsh, Advances in antithrombotic therapy: novel agents. Thrombosis and haemostasis, 1995. 74(07): p. 565-571. https://doi.org/10.1055/s-0038-1642739
21. Harrington, R.A., et al., Antithrombotic therapy for coronary artery disease: the Seventh ACCP Conference on Antithrombotic and Thrombolytic Therapy. Chest, 2004. 126(3): p. 513S-548S. https://doi.org/10.1378/chest.126.3_suppl.513s
22. Gawaz, M., T. Geisler, and O. Borst, Current concepts and novel targets for antiplatelet therapy. Nature Reviews Cardiology, 2023. 20(9): p. 583-599. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41569-023-00854-6
23. Caron, F. and S.S. Anand, Antithrombotic therapy in aortic diseases: a narrative review. Vascular Medicine, 2017. 22(1): p. 57-65. https://doi.org/10.1177/1358863x16675229
24. Gurbel, P.A. and U.S. Tantry, Antiplatelet and anticoagulant agents in heart failure: current status and future perspectives. JACC: Heart Failure, 2014. 2(1): p. 1-14. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jchf.2013.07.007
25. Oldgren, J., et al., New oral anticoagulants in addition to single or dual antiplatelet therapy after an acute coronary syndrome: a systematic review and meta-analysis. European heart journal, 2013. 34(22): p. 1670-1680. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/eht049
26. Siasos, G., et al., Antithrombotic treatment in diabetes mellitus: a review of the literature about antiplatelet and anticoagulation strategies used for diabetic patients in primary and secondary prevention. Current Pharmaceutical Design, 2020. 26(23): p. 2780-2788. https://doi.org/10.2174/1381612826666200417145605
27. Capodanno, D. and D.J. Angiolillo, Antithrombotic therapy in the elderly. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2010. 56(21): p. 1683-1692. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2010.04.063
28. Paikin, J.S., et al., New antithrombotic agents—insights from clinical trials. Nature Reviews Cardiology, 2010. 7(9): p. 498-509. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrcardio.2010.101
29. Luca, F., et al., The combination of oral anticoagulant and antiplatelet therapies: stay one step ahead. Journal of Cardiovascular Pharmacology and Therapeutics, 2020. 25(5): p. 391-398. https://doi.org/10.1177/1074248420923528
30. Gupta, R., et al. A comprehensive review on antithrombotic therapy for peripheral artery disease. in Seminars in Vascular Surgery. 2022. Elsevier. https://doi.org/10.1053/j.semvascsurg.2022.04.004
31. Gurbel, P.A., et al., Combination antiplatelet and oral anticoagulant therapy in patients with coronary and peripheral artery disease: Focus on the COMPASS trial. Circulation, 2019. 139(18): p. 2170-2185. https://doi.org/10.1161/circulationaha.118.033580
32. Ansell, J.E., J.I. Weitz, and A.J. Comerota, Advances in therapy and the management of antithrombotic drugs for venous thromboembolism. ASH Education Program Book, 2000. 2000(1): p. 266-284. https://doi.org/10.1182/asheducation.v2000.1.266.20000266
33. Mackman, N., et al., Therapeutic strategies for thrombosis: new targets and approaches. Nature reviews Drug discovery, 2020. 19(5): p. 333-352. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41573-020-0061-0
34. Halvorsen, S., et al., Management of antithrombotic therapy after bleeding in patients with coronary artery disease and/or atrial fibrillation: expert consensus paper of the European

Society of Cardiology Working Group on Thrombosis. European heart journal, 2017. 38(19): p. 1455-1462. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehw454
35. Singer, D.E., et al., Antithrombotic therapy in atrial fibrillation: the Seventh ACCP Conference on Antithrombotic and Thrombolytic Therapy. Chest, 2004. 126(3): p. 429S-456S. https://doi.org/10.1378/chest.126.3_suppl.429s
36. Kumbhani, D.J., et al., 2020 ACC expert consensus decision pathway for anticoagulant and antiplatelet therapy in patients with atrial fibrillation or venous thromboembolism undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention or with atherosclerotic cardiovascular disease: a report of the American College of Cardiology Solution Set Oversight Committee. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2021. 77(5): p. 629-658. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2020.09.011
37. Harter, K., M. Levine, and S.O. Henderson, Anticoagulation drug therapy: a review. Western Journal of Emergency Medicine, 2015. 16(1): p. 11. https://doi.org/10.5811/westjem.2014.12.22933
38. De Caterina, R., et al., Anticoagulants in heart disease: current status and perspectives. European heart journal, 2007. 28(7): p. 880-913. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehl492
39. Sherman, D.G., et al., Antithrombotic therapy for cerebrovascular disorders: an update. Chest, 1995. 108(4): p. 444S-456S. https://doi.org/10.1378/chest.108.4_supplement.444s
40. Finks, S.W., T.C. Trujillo, and P.P. Dobesh, Management of venous thromboembolism: recent advances in oral anticoagulation therapy. Annals of Pharmacotherapy, 2016. 50(6): p. 486-501. https://doi.org/10.1177/1060028016632785
41. Yasuda, S., et al., Antithrombotic therapy for atrial fibrillation with stable coronary disease. New England Journal of Medicine, 2019. 381(12): p. 1103-1113. https://doi.org/10.1056/nejmoa1904143
42. Savelieva, I., A. Bajpai, and A. John Camm, Stroke in atrial fibrillation: update on pathophysiology, new antithrombotic therapies, and evolution of procedures and devices. Annals of medicine, 2007. 39(5): p. 371-391. https://doi.org/10.1080/07853890701320662
43. Eikelboom, J. and J. Hirsh, Combined antiplatelet and anticoagulant therapy: clinical benefits and risks. Journal of Thrombosis and Haemostasis, 2007. 5: p. 255-263. https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1538-7836.2007.02499.x
44. Patti, G., et al., Prevention of atherothrombotic events in patients with diabetes mellitus: from antithrombotic therapies to new-generation glucose-lowering drugs. Nature Reviews Cardiology, 2019. 16(2): p. 113-130. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41569-018-0080-2
45. Andreotti, F., et al., Antithrombotic therapy in the elderly: expert position paper of the European Society of Cardiology Working Group on Thrombosis. European heart journal, 2015. 36(46): p. 3238-3249. https://doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehv304
46. Patrono, C., et al., Antiplatelet agents for the treatment and prevention of coronary atherothrombosis. Journal of the American College of Cardiology, 2017. 70(14): p. 1760-1776. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jacc.2017.08.037
47. Lamberts, M., et al., Antiplatelet therapy for stable coronary artery disease in atrial fibrillation patients taking an oral anticoagulant: a nationwide cohort study. Circulation, 2014. 129(15): p. 1577-1585. https://doi.org/10.1161/circulationaha.113.004834
48. Qureshi, Z., et al., Breaking boundaries: exploring recent advances in anticoagulation and thrombosis management: a comprehensive review. Annals of Medicine and Surgery, 2024. 86(11): p. 6585-6597. https://doi.org/10.1097/ms9.0000000000002589
49. Capodanno, D., M. Alberts, and D.J. Angiolillo, Antithrombotic therapy for secondary prevention of atherothrombotic events in cerebrovascular disease. Nature Reviews Cardiology, 2016. 13(10): p. 609-622. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrcardio.2016.111
50. Melnikova, I., The anticoagulants market. Nature Reviews Drug Discovery, 2009. 8(5): p. 353. https://doi.org/10.1038/nrd2851
51. Connolly, S.J., et al., Challenges of establishing new antithrombotic therapies in atrial fibrillation. Circulation, 2007. 116(4): p. 449-455. https://doi.org/10.1161/circulationaha.107.695163