Atrial Fibrillation and Shared Decision Making
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Like what you saw?

Atrial Fibrillation by the Numbers

Top Guideline Organizations Recommend Shared Decision Making for the Treatment of Atrial Fibrillation

Atrial Fibrillation Shared Decision Making in Action with Option Grid™ Decision Aids

An estimated 2.7-6.1 million Americans have atrial fibrillation. Each year, atrial fibrillation results in over 750,000 hospitalizations and about 130,000 deaths. Atrial fibrillation costs the United States approximately $6 billion each year.

“In patients with AF, antithrombotic therapy should be individualized based on shared decision making after discussion of the absolute and relative risks of stroke and bleeding and the patient’s values and preferences.”

- 2014 AHA/ACC/HRS Guideline for the Management of Patients with Atrial Fibrillation, American Journal of Cardiology

Research Supports That the Use of Patient Decision Aids Results in...

Team Talk
Work with the patient to gather insights into their preference, and goals for treatment. Populate the Options Grid decision aid “Atrial Fibrillation - Treatment Options to Lower Stroke Risk” with the patient’s age, sex, and risk factors. Then select options to compare and discuss with the patient based on their unique preferences and goals.

Option Talk
Describe the customized Options Grid decision aid and discuss the evidence-based treatment options that align with the patient’s preferences. The information will be laid out in a user-friendly format that translates the latest clinical evidence on the treatment options into terms the patient can easily digest.

Decision Talk
Gather informed preferences and together make the best preference-based evidence-supported decision for the patient’s unique needs.

Document the Encounter
With Options Grid decision aids you can email or print the customized grid for your patient. Additionally, you can attach it to the patient’s medical record in your EMR.

Increased Knowledge
More Accurate Risk Perceptions
More Conservative Decisions
Reduced Costs
Congruence Between Informed Values and Choice
Improved Adherence
Better Communication
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