Background

Oral anticoagulants (OACs) are a group of medications that reduce the risk of thrombosis. These include warfarin, dabigatran, rivaroxaban, dabigatran and apixaban. Anticoagulant therapy is complex and can be difficult for patients to understand. Identifying patients’ knowledge gaps is the first step towards improving patient education strategies. To date, there are no systematic reviews of patients’ knowledge gaps surrounding OACs.

Methods

Following PRISMA guidelines, we systematically searched PubMed, CINAHL, and PSYCHINFO for qualitative and quantitative studies that measured patients’ knowledge about their anticoagulants. Keywords included knowledge gap, medications, and closely related terms.

Results

We identified 290 studies from our initial search. Title and abstract screening led to 134 studies whose full-text was reviewed for eligibility. Majority of the full texts were excluded for having irrelevant focus (n=70) or being editorials, opinion papers, letters to editors, or conference proceedings (n=12). Finally, 41 studies were included in this review (n=11220 patients), which were mostly published after 2010. Of the 41 studies, 14 were conducted in North America, 23 Europe, 3 Asia, and 6 in Australia. Majority of the studies assessed patient knowledge on warfarin (n=27) with very few focusing on the newer OACs (dabigatran:7, aspirin:3, apixaban:4, rivaroxaban:4). Over half of the included studies (71%) had utilized validated tools to assess patients’ knowledge.

Conclusion

Our results highlight the need for more studies on this topic particularly in Africa and South America and on the newer medications.
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