

Reevaluating Pretreatment with P2Y12 Inhibitors in Non-ST Elevation Myocardial Infarction (NSTEMI): A Paradigm Shift in Antiplatelet Therapy

Donaldo Emiliano Silva Lopez¹, Sergio Emmanuel Vargas López², Raúl II Barajas Navarro², Jesus Castañeda Dadda², Juan Manuel García Huerta², Ximena Flores Navarro²

¹Tecnologico de Monterrey, Campus Monterrey, Monterrey, Nuevo Leon, México

²Universidad Autónoma de Guadalajara, Zapopan, Jalisco, México

ABSTRACT

The management of acute coronary syndromes (ACS), particularly non-ST elevation myocardial infarction (NSTEMI), has evolved significantly over the past decade. Pretreatment with P2Y12 inhibitors, once a cornerstone in the therapeutic strategy for NSTEMI, is now being critically reassessed. Emerging evidence suggests that the routine use of P2Y12 inhibitors prior to coronary angiography may not confer the anticipated benefits and could potentially increase the risk of bleeding complications without a corresponding reduction in ischemic events. This article reviews the current literature, clinical trials, and guidelines to elucidate the rationale behind the declining recommendation for P2Y12 inhibitor pretreatment in NSTEMI patients. We explore the pathophysiological mechanisms, the balance between ischemic and bleeding risks, and the implications for clinical practice. The shift towards a more individualized approach, guided by risk stratification and the timing of invasive strategies, is discussed in detail. This review aims to provide clinicians with a comprehensive understanding of the evolving landscape of antiplatelet therapy in NSTEMI, emphasizing the importance of evidence-based decision-making in optimizing patient outcomes.

KEYWORDS: Non-ST Elevation Myocardial Infarction (NSTEMI), P2Y12 Inhibitors, Pretreatment, Antiplatelet Therapy, Bleeding Risk, Ischemic Risk, Coronary Angiography, Acute Coronary Syndrome (ACS), Evidence-Based Medicine, Clinical Guidelines.

ARTICLE DETAILS

Published On:
21 April 2025

Available on:
<https://ijmscrs.com/>

INTRODUCTION

Non-ST elevation myocardial infarction (NSTEMI) represents a significant proportion of acute coronary syndromes (ACS) and is associated with considerable morbidity and mortality. The management of NSTEMI has traditionally involved a combination of antiplatelet and anticoagulant therapies aimed at reducing ischemic events. Among these, P2Y12 inhibitors, such as clopidogrel, prasugrel, and ticagrelor, have played a pivotal role in inhibiting platelet aggregation and preventing thrombotic complications. Historically, pretreatment with P2Y12 inhibitors prior to coronary angiography was widely recommended, based on the premise that early and potent platelet inhibition would reduce ischemic events, particularly in patients undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI).^{1,2}

However, recent clinical trials and meta-analyses have challenged this paradigm, suggesting that the benefits of P2Y12 inhibitor pretreatment may be offset by an increased risk of bleeding, particularly in patients who do not proceed to PCI or who require coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG). The 2020 European Society of Cardiology (ESC) guidelines for the management of ACS in patients presenting without persistent ST-segment elevation have notably downgraded the recommendation for routine pretreatment with P2Y12 inhibitors, advocating instead for a more tailored approach based on individual patient risk profiles and the timing of invasive strategies.^{1,2}

This shift in clinical practice is underpinned by a growing body of evidence highlighting the importance of balancing ischemic and bleeding risks. The introduction of more potent P2Y12 inhibitors, such as ticagrelor and prasugrel, has further complicated this balance, as these agents are associated with

Reevaluating Pretreatment with P2Y12 Inhibitors in Non-ST Elevation Myocardial Infarction (NSTEMI): A Paradigm Shift in Antiplatelet Therapy

a higher bleeding risk compared to clopidogrel. Additionally, the widespread adoption of radial access for coronary angiography and PCI has reduced access-site bleeding complications, potentially altering the risk-benefit calculus for P2Y12 inhibitor pretreatment.^{1,2}

In this article, we delve into the pathophysiological rationale for antiplatelet therapy in NSTEMI, review the key clinical trials that have shaped current guidelines, and discuss the implications for clinical practice. We also explore the role of risk stratification tools, such as the CRUSADE and PRECISE-DAPT scores, in guiding the timing and choice of antiplatelet therapy. By synthesizing the latest evidence, this review aims to provide clinicians with a nuanced understanding of the evolving recommendations regarding P2Y12 inhibitor pretreatment in NSTEMI, ultimately supporting informed decision-making to optimize patient outcomes.^{1,2}

BACKGROUND

The management of non-ST elevation myocardial infarction (NSTEMI) has undergone significant transformation over the past two decades, driven by advances in pharmacological therapies, interventional cardiology, and a deeper understanding of the pathophysiological mechanisms underlying acute coronary syndromes (ACS). Central to this evolution has been the role of antiplatelet therapy, particularly the use of P2Y12 receptor inhibitors, which target the P2Y12 adenosine diphosphate (ADP) receptor on platelets, thereby inhibiting platelet activation and aggregation. Historically, pretreatment with P2Y12 inhibitors prior to coronary angiography was considered a standard of care in NSTEMI, based on the rationale that early and potent platelet inhibition would reduce thrombotic complications, particularly in patients undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI). However, contemporary evidence has prompted a reevaluation of this approach, leading to a paradigm shift in clinical guidelines and practice.^{3,4}

The concept of P2Y12 inhibitor pretreatment emerged from early studies demonstrating the benefits of early antiplatelet therapy in ACS. Clopidogrel, a first-generation thienopyridine, was the first P2Y12 inhibitor to gain widespread use, supported by the CURE (Clopidogrel in Unstable Angina to Prevent Recurrent Events) trial, which showed a significant reduction in cardiovascular events when clopidogrel was added to aspirin in patients with non-ST elevation ACS. This led to the adoption of pretreatment strategies, with the aim of achieving adequate platelet inhibition before PCI. However, the CURE trial included a heterogeneous population, and the benefits of pretreatment were not specifically evaluated in patients undergoing invasive management.^{3,4}

The introduction of more potent P2Y12 inhibitors, such as prasugrel and ticagrelor, further complicated the landscape. While these agents demonstrated superior efficacy in

reducing ischemic events compared to clopidogrel, they were also associated with an increased risk of bleeding. The TRITON-TIMI 38 trial, which evaluated prasugrel in ACS patients scheduled for PCI, showed a significant reduction in ischemic events but at the cost of higher rates of major bleeding, including fatal bleeding. Similarly, the PLATO trial, which compared ticagrelor to clopidogrel in ACS patients, demonstrated a reduction in cardiovascular death, myocardial infarction, and stroke, but also an increased risk of non-CABG-related bleeding. These findings raised concerns about the safety of routine pretreatment, particularly in patients who might not proceed to PCI or who might require CABG surgery.⁴

The ACCOAST (A Comparison of Prasugrel at the Time of Percutaneous Coronary Intervention or as Pretreatment at the Time of Diagnosis in Patients with Non-ST Elevation Myocardial Infarction) trial was a pivotal study that directly challenged the pretreatment paradigm. This randomized controlled trial compared pretreatment with prasugrel at the time of diagnosis to administration at the time of PCI in NSTEMI patients. The results showed no reduction in ischemic events with pretreatment but a significant increase in major bleeding complications. These findings were corroborated by subsequent meta-analyses, which consistently demonstrated that pretreatment with P2Y12 inhibitors did not reduce ischemic events but was associated with a higher risk of bleeding, particularly in patients who did not undergo PCI or who required CABG.⁵

In addition to the clinical trial data, the changing landscape of interventional cardiology has influenced the reconsideration of pretreatment strategies. The widespread adoption of radial access for coronary angiography and PCI has significantly reduced access-site bleeding complications, altering the risk-benefit balance of early antiplatelet therapy. Furthermore, advances in risk stratification tools, such as the CRUSADE (Can Rapid Risk Stratification of Unstable Angina Patients Suppress Adverse Outcomes with Early Implementation of the ACC/AHA Guidelines) and PRECISE-DAPT (Predicting Bleeding Complications in Patients Undergoing Stent Implantation and Subsequent Dual Antiplatelet Therapy) scores, have enabled more individualized decision-making, allowing clinicians to identify patients at high risk of bleeding who may not benefit from pretreatment.⁵

The evolving evidence has been reflected in changes to clinical guidelines. The 2020 European Society of Cardiology (ESC) guidelines for the management of ACS in patients presenting without persistent ST-segment elevation downgraded the recommendation for routine pretreatment with P2Y12 inhibitors, suggesting that it should be considered only in selected high-risk patients and after careful evaluation of the timing of invasive management. Similarly, the American College of Cardiology (ACC) and American Heart Association (AHA) guidelines have emphasized the importance of individualized decision-

Reevaluating Pretreatment with P2Y12 Inhibitors in Non-ST Elevation Myocardial Infarction (NSTEMI): A Paradigm Shift in Antiplatelet Therapy

making, taking into account the balance between ischemic and bleeding risks.⁶

In summary, the historical rationale for P2Y12 inhibitor pretreatment in NSTEMI was based on the premise that early platelet inhibition would reduce ischemic events. However, contemporary evidence has demonstrated that this approach does not provide significant ischemic benefits and is associated with an increased risk of bleeding. The shift towards a more individualized strategy, guided by risk stratification and the timing of invasive management, represents a significant advancement in the care of NSTEMI patients. This background sets the stage for a detailed exploration of the current evidence and clinical implications of avoiding routine pretreatment with P2Y12 inhibitors in NSTEMI.⁶

Current Paradigms

The management of non-ST elevation myocardial infarction (NSTEMI) has entered a new era, marked by a departure from the once widely accepted practice of routine pretreatment with P2Y12 inhibitors. This paradigm shift is rooted in a growing body of evidence that challenges the efficacy and safety of early antiplatelet therapy in this patient population. Contemporary guidelines and clinical practice now emphasize a more nuanced, individualized approach to antiplatelet therapy, guided by risk stratification, the timing of invasive strategies, and a careful balance between ischemic and bleeding risks. Below, we explore the key paradigms that underpin this evolving landscape.⁶

Individualized Risk Stratification: Balancing Ischemia and Bleeding

One of the most significant advancements in the management of NSTEMI has been the development and integration of risk stratification tools into clinical decision-making. The CRUSADE (Can Rapid Risk Stratification of Unstable Angina Patients Suppress Adverse Outcomes with Early Implementation of the ACC/AHA Guidelines) and PRECISE-DAPT (Predicting Bleeding Complications in Patients Undergoing Stent Implantation and Subsequent Dual Antiplatelet Therapy) scores have become indispensable in identifying patients at high risk of bleeding or ischemic events. These tools enable clinicians to tailor antiplatelet therapy to the individual patient, rather than adhering to a one-size-fits-all approach. For example, patients with a high bleeding risk may benefit from deferred P2Y12 inhibitor administration until coronary anatomy is defined, whereas those with a high ischemic burden may still derive benefit from early therapy. This personalized approach represents a fundamental shift from the historical practice of routine pretreatment.⁶

Timing of Invasive Strategy: The Role of Coronary Angiography

The timing of coronary angiography and subsequent revascularization plays a pivotal role in determining the

appropriateness of P2Y12 inhibitor pretreatment. Current guidelines recommend an early invasive strategy (within 24 hours) for high-risk NSTEMI patients, such as those with dynamic ST-T wave changes, hemodynamic instability, or refractory angina. In such cases, the benefits of early antiplatelet therapy may outweigh the risks. However, for patients in whom the timing of angiography is uncertain or delayed, pretreatment with P2Y12 inhibitors may expose them to unnecessary bleeding risks, particularly if they do not proceed to percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) or require coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG). This paradigm underscores the importance of aligning antiplatelet therapy with the planned invasive strategy.⁷

The Bleeding-Ischemia Trade-Off: Lessons from Clinical Trials

The ACCOAST (A Comparison of Prasugrel at the Time of Percutaneous Coronary Intervention or as Pretreatment at the Time of Diagnosis in Patients with Non-ST Elevation Myocardial Infarction) trial was a landmark study that reshaped the understanding of P2Y12 inhibitor pretreatment. This trial demonstrated that pretreatment with prasugrel did not reduce ischemic events but significantly increased the risk of major bleeding. These findings were corroborated by subsequent meta-analyses, which consistently showed that routine pretreatment does not provide a net clinical benefit. The introduction of more potent P2Y12 inhibitors, such as ticagrelor and prasugrel, has further complicated this balance, as these agents are associated with higher bleeding risks compared to clopidogrel. As a result, the current paradigm prioritizes the avoidance of unnecessary bleeding complications, particularly in patients who may not require PCI.⁸

The Role of Radial Access and Procedural Advances

The widespread adoption of radial access for coronary angiography and PCI has significantly reduced access-site bleeding complications, altering the risk-benefit calculus for P2Y12 inhibitor pretreatment. Radial access is now the preferred approach in many centers, supported by robust evidence demonstrating its superiority over femoral access in reducing bleeding and vascular complications. This procedural advancement has diminished the relative benefit of early antiplatelet therapy, as the risk of access-site bleeding is no longer a major driver of adverse outcomes. Consequently, the focus has shifted towards optimizing procedural safety and minimizing bleeding risks through technical advancements rather than relying solely on pharmacological strategies.⁸

Deferred Administration of P2Y12 Inhibitors: A Safer Alternative

Deferred administration of P2Y12 inhibitors, defined as initiating therapy after coronary angiography and only in patients proceeding to PCI, has emerged as a safer and more effective strategy in many cases. This approach allows

Reevaluating Pretreatment with P2Y12 Inhibitors in Non-ST Elevation Myocardial Infarction (NSTEMI): A Paradigm Shift in Antiplatelet Therapy

clinicians to make informed decisions based on the patient's coronary anatomy and revascularization plan, thereby avoiding unnecessary exposure to antiplatelet agents in patients who may not benefit. Studies have shown that deferred administration does not compromise ischemic outcomes while significantly reducing bleeding complications. This paradigm aligns with the broader trend towards precision medicine, where therapeutic decisions are guided by individual patient characteristics and real-time diagnostic information.⁸

Guideline Recommendations: Reflecting the Evidence

The 2020 European Society of Cardiology (ESC) guidelines for the management of NSTEMI represent a significant departure from previous recommendations, explicitly advising against routine pretreatment with P2Y12 inhibitors. Instead, the guidelines advocate for a selective approach, reserving pretreatment for high-risk patients in whom the benefits clearly outweigh the risks. Similarly, the American College of Cardiology (ACC) and American Heart Association (AHA) guidelines emphasize the importance of individualized decision-making, taking into account the timing of invasive management and the patient's bleeding risk. These guideline updates reflect the growing consensus that routine pretreatment is no longer justified in the majority of NSTEMI patients.⁸

The Evolving Role of Dual Antiplatelet Therapy (DAPT)

The duration and intensity of dual antiplatelet therapy (DAPT) in NSTEMI patients have also evolved, with a greater emphasis on balancing ischemic and bleeding risks. Short-duration DAPT regimens, guided by risk scores and the type of stent used, have gained traction as a means of reducing bleeding complications without compromising efficacy. This shift further supports the move away from routine pretreatment, as the focus has shifted towards optimizing the timing and duration of antiplatelet therapy rather than initiating it indiscriminately.⁸

The current paradigms in the management of NSTEMI reflect a profound shift in the understanding of antiplatelet therapy. The move away from routine P2Y12 inhibitor pretreatment is grounded in robust clinical evidence, which highlights the importance of individualized risk stratification, the timing of invasive strategies, and the avoidance of unnecessary bleeding complications. As the field continues to evolve, the emphasis on precision medicine and patient-centered care will likely drive further refinements in the management of NSTEMI, ensuring that therapeutic decisions are both evidence-based and tailored to the unique needs of each patient.⁸

Clinical Considerations in the Avoidance of P2Y12 Inhibitor Pretreatment in Non-ST Elevation Myocardial Infarction (NSTEMI)

The decision to avoid routine pretreatment with P2Y12 inhibitors in patients with non-ST elevation myocardial

infarction (NSTEMI) is supported by a multitude of clinical considerations. These considerations are grounded in evidence from clinical trials, pathophysiological insights, and practical aspects of patient management. Below, we explore the key clinical factors that inform this paradigm shift, emphasizing the importance of individualized care, risk stratification, and the balance between ischemic and bleeding risks.⁹

Bleeding Risk: A Paramount Concern

One of the most compelling reasons to avoid routine P2Y12 inhibitor pretreatment in NSTEMI is the heightened risk of bleeding complications. Bleeding is not merely a procedural inconvenience but a significant predictor of morbidity and mortality in ACS patients. The ACCOAST trial demonstrated that pretreatment with prasugrel increased the risk of major bleeding without reducing ischemic events. This finding is particularly relevant in NSTEMI, where a substantial proportion of patients may not proceed to percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI) or may require coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG). In such cases, pretreatment can lead to excessive bleeding during surgery, necessitating platelet transfusions or delaying revascularization. Tools like the CRUSADE and PRECISE-DAPT scores help identify patients at high bleeding risk, reinforcing the need to defer P2Y12 inhibitor administration until coronary anatomy is defined.⁹

Uncertainty in Coronary Anatomy and Revascularization Strategy

In NSTEMI, the coronary anatomy is often unknown at the time of initial presentation, and the decision to proceed with PCI, CABG, or medical management depends on angiographic findings. Pretreatment with P2Y12 inhibitors commits the patient to a potent antiplatelet state, which may be unnecessary or even harmful if CABG is required. For example, prasugrel and ticagrelor have prolonged antiplatelet effects, and their use prior to angiography can complicate surgical management. Deferring P2Y12 inhibitor administration until after angiography allows clinicians to tailor therapy based on the patient's specific coronary anatomy and revascularization plan, minimizing unnecessary risks.⁹

Lack of Ischemic Benefit with Pretreatment

Clinical trials have consistently failed to demonstrate a significant reduction in ischemic events with P2Y12 inhibitor pretreatment in NSTEMI. The ACCOAST trial, which compared pretreatment with prasugrel to administration at the time of PCI, found no difference in the primary composite endpoint of cardiovascular death, myocardial infarction, stroke, urgent revascularization, or glycoprotein IIb/IIIa inhibitor rescue therapy. Similarly, meta-analyses of earlier studies, including those involving clopidogrel, have shown that pretreatment does not reduce the incidence of major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE). These findings

Reevaluating Pretreatment with P2Y12 Inhibitors in Non-ST Elevation Myocardial Infarction (NSTEMI): A Paradigm Shift in Antiplatelet Therapy

challenge the historical rationale for early antiplatelet therapy and support the current guideline recommendations against routine pretreatment.⁹

The Role of Potent P2Y12 Inhibitors

The introduction of more potent P2Y12 inhibitors, such as ticagrelor and prasugrel, has further complicated the decision to pretreat. While these agents are more effective than clopidogrel in reducing ischemic events, they are also associated with a higher risk of bleeding. For example, ticagrelor is contraindicated in patients with a history of intracranial hemorrhage, and prasugrel is not recommended for patients over 75 years of age or those with a history of stroke or transient ischemic attack (TIA). The use of these agents prior to angiography can expose patients to unnecessary bleeding risks, particularly if they are not candidates for PCI or require CABG. This underscores the importance of deferring P2Y12 inhibitor administration until the revascularization strategy is clear.⁹

Timing of Invasive Management

The timing of coronary angiography and revascularization is a critical factor in determining the appropriateness of P2Y12 inhibitor pretreatment. Current guidelines recommend an early invasive strategy (within 24 hours) for high-risk NSTEMI patients, such as those with dynamic ST-T wave changes, hemodynamic instability, or refractory angina. In such cases, the benefits of early antiplatelet therapy may outweigh the risks. However, for patients in whom the timing of angiography is delayed or uncertain, pretreatment may expose them to unnecessary bleeding risks without providing significant ischemic benefit. This highlights the importance of aligning antiplatelet therapy with the planned invasive strategy.⁹

Radial Access and Procedural Safety

The widespread adoption of radial access for coronary angiography and PCI has significantly reduced access-site bleeding complications, altering the risk-benefit balance of early antiplatelet therapy. Radial access is now the preferred approach in many centers, supported by robust evidence demonstrating its superiority over femoral access in reducing bleeding and vascular complications. This procedural advancement has diminished the relative benefit of early antiplatelet therapy, as the risk of access-site bleeding is no longer a major driver of adverse outcomes. Consequently, the focus has shifted towards optimizing procedural safety through technical advancements rather than relying solely on pharmacological strategies.⁹

Deferred Administration: A Safer Alternative

Deferred administration of P2Y12 inhibitors, defined as initiating therapy after coronary angiography and only in patients proceeding to PCI, has emerged as a safer and more effective strategy in many cases. This approach allows clinicians to make informed decisions based on the patient's

coronary anatomy and revascularization plan, thereby avoiding unnecessary exposure to antiplatelet agents in patients who may not benefit. Studies have shown that deferred administration does not compromise ischemic outcomes while significantly reducing bleeding complications. This strategy aligns with the broader trend towards precision medicine, where therapeutic decisions are guided by individual patient characteristics and real-time diagnostic information.⁹

Guideline Recommendations and Clinical Practice

The 2020 European Society of Cardiology (ESC) guidelines for the management of NSTEMI explicitly advise against routine pretreatment with P2Y12 inhibitors, reflecting the growing consensus that this approach does not provide a net clinical benefit. Similarly, the American College of Cardiology (ACC) and American Heart Association (AHA) guidelines emphasize the importance of individualized decision-making, taking into account the timing of invasive management and the patient's bleeding risk. These guideline updates have been widely adopted in clinical practice, leading to a significant reduction in the use of pretreatment strategies.¹⁰

Patient-Specific Factors

Finally, patient-specific factors must be considered when deciding whether to pretreat with P2Y12 inhibitors. These include age, renal function, history of bleeding, and comorbidities such as diabetes or cerebrovascular disease. For example, elderly patients and those with chronic kidney disease are at higher risk of bleeding and may not benefit from pretreatment. Similarly, patients with a history of gastrointestinal bleeding or peptic ulcer disease may require prophylactic proton pump inhibitor therapy if P2Y12 inhibitors are used. These considerations highlight the importance of a personalized approach to antiplatelet therapy in NSTEMI.¹⁰

The avoidance of routine P2Y12 inhibitor pretreatment in NSTEMI is supported by a robust body of evidence and a multitude of clinical considerations. These include the heightened risk of bleeding, the lack of ischemic benefit, the uncertainty of coronary anatomy, and the importance of aligning antiplatelet therapy with the planned invasive strategy. By adopting a more individualized approach, clinicians can optimize outcomes in NSTEMI patients, minimizing bleeding complications while ensuring effective antiplatelet therapy for those who stand to benefit. This paradigm shift reflects the evolving understanding of ACS management and underscores the importance of evidence-based, patient-centered care.¹⁰

CONCLUSIONS

The management of non-ST elevation myocardial infarction (NSTEMI) has undergone a significant transformation in recent years, driven by advances in pharmacological

Reevaluating Pretreatment with P2Y12 Inhibitors in Non-ST Elevation Myocardial Infarction (NSTEMI): A Paradigm Shift in Antiplatelet Therapy

therapies, interventional techniques, and a deeper understanding of the pathophysiological mechanisms underlying acute coronary syndromes (ACS). Central to this evolution has been the reevaluation of the role of P2Y12 inhibitor pretreatment, a practice that was once considered a cornerstone of NSTEMI management but is now increasingly discouraged in contemporary clinical guidelines. The conclusions drawn from the current body of evidence, clinical trials, and expert consensus can be summarized as follows:

Lack of Ischemic Benefit with Routine Pretreatment

The primary rationale for P2Y12 inhibitor pretreatment in NSTEMI was the theoretical benefit of early and potent platelet inhibition in reducing thrombotic complications, particularly in patients undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention (PCI). However, robust clinical trials, such as the ACCOAST study, have demonstrated that pretreatment does not significantly reduce the incidence of major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE), including cardiovascular death, myocardial infarction, or stroke. This lack of ischemic benefit challenges the historical justification for routine pretreatment and supports the shift towards a more selective approach.

Increased Bleeding Risk: A Critical Consideration

One of the most compelling reasons to avoid routine pretreatment is the heightened risk of bleeding complications. Bleeding is not only a procedural complication but also an independent predictor of morbidity and mortality in ACS patients. The ACCOAST trial highlighted that pretreatment with prasugrel significantly increased the risk of major bleeding without providing a corresponding reduction in ischemic events. This risk is particularly relevant in NSTEMI, where a substantial proportion of patients may not proceed to PCI or may require coronary artery bypass grafting (CABG). In such cases, pretreatment can lead to excessive perioperative bleeding, necessitating platelet transfusions or delaying revascularization. The availability of risk stratification tools, such as the CRUSADE and PRECISE-DAPT scores, further underscores the importance of identifying patients at high bleeding risk and deferring P2Y12 inhibitor administration until coronary anatomy is defined.

Uncertainty in Coronary Anatomy and Revascularization Strategy

In NSTEMI, the coronary anatomy is often unknown at the time of initial presentation, and the decision to proceed with PCI, CABG, or medical management depends on angiographic findings. Pretreatment with P2Y12 inhibitors commits the patient to a potent antiplatelet state, which may be unnecessary or even harmful if CABG is required. Deferring P2Y12 inhibitor administration until after angiography allows clinicians to tailor therapy based on the patient's specific coronary anatomy and revascularization plan, minimizing unnecessary risks and optimizing outcomes.

The Role of Potent P2Y12 Inhibitors and Their Limitations

The introduction of more potent P2Y12 inhibitors, such as ticagrelor and prasugrel, has further complicated the decision to pretreat. While these agents are more effective than clopidogrel in reducing ischemic events, they are also associated with a higher risk of bleeding. For example, ticagrelor is contraindicated in patients with a history of intracranial hemorrhage, and prasugrel is not recommended for patients over 75 years of age or those with a history of stroke or transient ischemic attack (TIA). The use of these agents prior to angiography can expose patients to unnecessary bleeding risks, particularly if they are not candidates for PCI or require CABG. This underscores the importance of deferring P2Y12 inhibitor administration until the revascularization strategy is clear.

Timing of Invasive Management and Procedural Advances

The timing of coronary angiography and revascularization is a critical factor in determining the appropriateness of P2Y12 inhibitor pretreatment. Current guidelines recommend an early invasive strategy (within 24 hours) for high-risk NSTEMI patients, such as those with dynamic ST-T wave changes, hemodynamic instability, or refractory angina. In such cases, the benefits of early antiplatelet therapy may outweigh the risks. However, for patients in whom the timing of angiography is delayed or uncertain, pretreatment may expose them to unnecessary bleeding risks without providing significant ischemic benefit. Additionally, the widespread adoption of radial access for coronary angiography and PCI has significantly reduced access-site bleeding complications, altering the risk-benefit balance of early antiplatelet therapy.

Deferred Administration: A Safer and More Effective Strategy

Deferred administration of P2Y12 inhibitors, defined as initiating therapy after coronary angiography and only in patients proceeding to PCI, has emerged as a safer and more effective strategy in many cases. This approach allows clinicians to make informed decisions based on the patient's coronary anatomy and revascularization plan, thereby avoiding unnecessary exposure to antiplatelet agents in patients who may not benefit. Studies have shown that deferred administration does not compromise ischemic outcomes while significantly reducing bleeding complications. This strategy aligns with the broader trend towards precision medicine, where therapeutic decisions are guided by individual patient characteristics and real-time diagnostic information.

Guideline Recommendations and Clinical Practice

The 2020 European Society of Cardiology (ESC) guidelines for the management of NSTEMI explicitly advise against routine pretreatment with P2Y12 inhibitors, reflecting the growing consensus that this approach does not provide a net

Reevaluating Pretreatment with P2Y12 Inhibitors in Non-ST Elevation Myocardial Infarction (NSTEMI): A Paradigm Shift in Antiplatelet Therapy

clinical benefit. Similarly, the American College of Cardiology (ACC) and American Heart Association (AHA) guidelines emphasize the importance of individualized decision-making, taking into account the timing of invasive management and the patient's bleeding risk. These guideline updates have been widely adopted in clinical practice, leading to a significant reduction in the use of pretreatment strategies.

Patient-Centered Care and Individualized Therapy

The shift away from routine pretreatment reflects a broader trend towards patient-centered care and individualized therapy. By incorporating risk stratification tools, considering patient-specific factors, and aligning antiplatelet therapy with the planned invasive strategy, clinicians can optimize outcomes in NSTEMI patients. This approach minimizes bleeding complications while ensuring effective antiplatelet therapy for those who stand to benefit, ultimately improving the quality of care and patient outcomes.

In conclusion, the avoidance of routine P2Y12 inhibitor pretreatment in NSTEMI is supported by a robust body of evidence and a multitude of clinical considerations. The lack of ischemic benefit, the heightened risk of bleeding, the uncertainty of coronary anatomy, and the importance of aligning antiplatelet therapy with the planned invasive strategy all contribute to this paradigm shift. By adopting a more individualized approach, clinicians can optimize outcomes in NSTEMI patients, minimizing bleeding complications while ensuring effective antiplatelet therapy for those who stand to benefit. This evolution in clinical practice reflects the growing emphasis on precision medicine and patient-centered care, ultimately leading to better outcomes for patients with NSTEMI.

REFERENCES

- I. P.G. Melo de Barros e Silva, H.B. Ribeiro, A.C. do Amaral Baruzzi, *et al.* When is the best time for the second antiplatelet agent in non-ST elevation acute coronary syndrome?. *Arq Bras Cardiol*, 106 (2016), pp. 236-246
<http://dx.doi.org/10.5935/abc.20160042> | Medline
- II. R. Nairouz, M. Valgimigli, Y. Rochlani, *et al.* Meta-analysis of clopidogrel pretreatment in acute coronary syndrome patients undergoing invasive strategy. *Int J Cardiol*, 229 (2017), pp. 82-89
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ijcard.2016.11.226> | Medline
- III. A. Bellemain-Appaix, S.A. O'Connor, J. Silvain, *et al.* for the ACTION group. Association of clopidogrel pretreatment with mortality, cardiovascular events and major bleeding among patients undergoing percutaneous coronary intervention: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *JAMA*, 308 (2012), pp. 2507-2517
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1001/jama.2012.50788> | Medline
- IV. P. Adamski, K. Buszko, J. Sikora, *et al.* Metabolism of ticagrelor in patients with acute coronary syndromes. *Sci Rep*, 8 (2018), pp. 11746
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1038/s41598-018-29619-9> | Medline
- V. G. Montalescot, A.W. van't Hof, F. Lapostolle, *et al.* ATLANTIC Investigators. Prehospital ticagrelor in ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction. *N Engl J Med*, 371 (2014), pp. 1016-1027
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa1407024> | Medline
- VI. B. Redfors, C. Dworeck, I. Haraldsson, *et al.* Pretreatment with P2Y12 receptor antagonists in ST-elevation myocardial infarction: a report from the Swedish Coronary Angiography and Angioplasty Registry. *Eur Heart J*, 40 (2019), pp. 1202-1210
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehz069> | Medline
- VII. J. Abtan, P.G. Steg. Pre-treatment with a P2Y12 antagonist before PCI in STEMI: why should we wait?. *Eur Heart J*, 40 (2019), pp. 1211-1213
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehz058> | Medline
- VIII. J.P.M. Guedes, N. Marques, Azevedo, *et al.* Dose de carga do inibidor P2Y12 antes do laboratório de hemodinâmica no enfarte agudo do miocárdio com supradesnívelamento do segmento ST – Será mesmo a melhor estratégia?. *Rev Port Cardiol*, 39 (2020),
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.repc.2020.03.001> | Medline
- IX. D. Sibbing, A. Kastrati, P.B. Berger. Pre-treatment with P2Y12 inhibitors in ACS patients: who, when, why and which agent?. *Eur Heart J*, 37 (2016), pp. 1284-1295
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1093/eurheartj/ehv717> | Medline
- X. B. Ibanez, S. James, S. Agewall, *et al.* ESC Scientific Document Group 2017 ESC Guidelines for the management of acute myocardial infarction in patients presenting with ST-segment elevation: the Task Force for the management of acute myocardial infarction in patients presenting with ST-segment elevation of the European Society of Cardiology (ESC). *Eur Heart J*, 39 (2018), pp. 119-177