Correspondence and evidence supporting both contentions is available and used by investi-
ANA-positive women. We reiterate that investigating a broader spectrum more interesting aPL subgroups without interference from the inclusion of
trective tissue disease may be important, as it is emerging that in patients
with primary antiphospholipid syndrome (APS), there may be an inflam-
intuitive, therefore, if, in the absence of an identifiable etiology, there is no differ-
ence in subsequent pregnancy outcome and if there is no difference in
the distribution of known etiologies of loss between women with 2 versus 3
losses, it is acceptable to include both groups without stratifying by num-
ier of losses. Indeed, our analysis supported this inference, as we found no
difference in outcome when comparing women with 2 versus 3 previous losses. As Dr. Carp noted, and as supported by Brigham’s large prospective study, maternal age has a profound influence on future pregnancy
success, and appears to be the most significant factor in predicting subse-
quent pregnancy outcome in women with RPL. Age was not a discriminat-
ing factor in our trial, as there was no significant difference between the 2
treatment groups (33.8 vs 34.6 yrs). The issues of number of losses and age
have already been thoroughly addressed with regard to this population. Our
trial design incorporated 2 of the strata that have not yet been adequately
investigated with regard to the treatment efficacy of heparin and aspirin
(ASA) for RPL: the effect of aPL positivity and a history of early versus
late losses.

Regarding the inclusion of women positive for antinuclear antibodies
(ANA) as well as aPL in our trial, we discussed the controversial status of the
decision in our report. However, as we stratified the 2 treatment groups on the presence of aPL positivity, we were able to analyze the (apparently
more interesting) aPL subgroups without interference from the inclusion of
ANA-positive women. We reiterate that investigating a broader spectrum of autoantibodies than just aPL for women with RPL in the absence of connective tissue disease may be important, as it is emerging that in patients
with primary antiphospholipid syndrome (APS), there may be an inflammatory component to the RPL with an etiology that remains to be elucidated.

Dr. Carp mentions 3 reports that have evaluated heparin and ASA versus ASA alone, and cites them as a “more closely defined group of women with antiphospholipid syndrome and 3 or more miscarriages.” Unfortunately, this is not the case. Kutteh, et al specifically excluded women with the lupus anticoagulant (a classification criterion for APS) and studies by both Rai, et al and Farquharson, et al included women with such low levels of anticardiolipin antibodies (IgG > 5 and IgM > 3; and
IgG > 9 and IgM > 5) that they would not have fulfilled classification criteria for APS regardless of the number of miscarriages. As discussed in our report, Rai and Kutteh’s studies, both completed and published more than
10 years ago, have the lowest birthrates in their ASA-only treatment groups in the literature, and they are the only studies that found a significant dif-
ference in pregnancy outcome with the addition of heparin. Because they were the earliest trials reported for this population, the results became the
basis for clinical decision-making that has not assimilated new data published over the intervening decade. Subsequent trials that have reported much higher success rates in their ASA-only treatment arms and detected
no significant improvement in pregnancy outcome with anticoagulant ther-
apy have been largely disregarded or misconstrued. For example, in his let-
ter, Dr. Carp cites Farquharson, et al’s report as evidence supporting the continued use of heparin and ASA despite their conclusion to the contrary — that no benefit was conferred by the addition of heparin to ASA treatment.

Regardless of treatment regimen, number of prior losses, history of early versus late losses, or aPL positivity, almost 80% of our patients had a live birth. While we clearly conceded the weaknesses in our trial, we stand
by our contention that for women with RPL, aPL, and no history of throm-
Bosis, there is insufficient evidence for recommendations for thromboprop-
phyaxis in pregnancy. Unfortunately, this treatment has become entrenched and continues as an example of eminence- rather than evi-
dence-based medicine.

References

CHRISTINE A. CLARK, Research Associate; KAREN A. SPITZER, MSc. CARL A. LASKIN, MD, University of Toronto and LifeQuest Centre for Reproductive Medicine, Suite 1800, 655 Bay Street, Toronto, Ontario, Canada. Address correspondence to C. Clark; E-mail: cclarksolo@aol.com


J Rheumatol 2010;37:1; doi:10.3899/jrheum.090404

E-mail: cclarksolo@aol.com

Personal non-commercial use only. The Journal of Rheumatology Copyright © 2010. All rights reserved.