

## Supplemental Material

### Supplemental Result R1. Risk stratification by CHADS<sub>2</sub> score

When using CHADS<sub>2</sub> to stratify the risk of stroke in AF patients, 866 (81.5%) patients had CHADS<sub>2</sub> ≥ 2. Undertreatment was found in 438 (50.6%) patients (Supplemental Table S1). Of these 866 patients, 465 were women and 401 were men. Undertreatment was not found to be significantly different between the two [women: 244 (52.5%) vs. men: 194 (48.4%), p = 0.257] nor was male sex a significant factor in multiple logistic regression. Undertreatment rate was not significantly different even after dividing the patients into four age groups based on age quartiles, and male sex was not a significant factor in multiple logistic regression in any of the sub-groups (Supplemental Table S1).

**Supplemental Table S1.** Anticoagulant undertreatment rates and logistic regression for patients with a CHADS<sub>2</sub> score ≥ 2 stratified

Group	Undertreatment Rates					Multiple Logistic Regression model for Undertreatment	
		All patients	Female patients	Male patients	p-value (Female vs Male)	Male Sex OR [95% CI]	p-value
Total	N	866	465	401			
	Undertreated	438 (50.6%)	244 (52.5%)	194 (48.4%)	0.257	0.82 [0.6 – 1.12]	0.21
Group 1 (44.4 – 74.9 years)	N	217	86	131			
	Undertreated	108 (49.8%)	45 (52.3%)	63 (48.1%)	0.637	0.75 [0.4 – 1.41]	0.37
Group 2 (74.9 – 81.5 years)	N	217	97	120			
	Undertreated	98 (45.2%)	49 (50.5%)	49 (40.8%)	0.198	0.72 [0.38 – 1.35]	0.31
Group 3 (81.5 – 87.3 years)	N	216	120	96			
	Undertreated	106 (49.1%)	56 (46.7%)	50 (52.1%)	0.513	1.14 [0.62 – 2.11]	0.67
Group 4 (87.3 – 89.0 years)	N	216	162	54			
	Undertreated	126 (58.3%)	94 (58.0%)	32 (59.3%)	1.0	0.92 [0.42 – 2.05]	0.83

**Supplemental Result R2.** Risk of bleeding using the *limited HAS-BLED*

Among the 1015 patients, the median score for the *limited HAS-BLED* was not significantly different between the two sexes (women: median 2 [IQR 1 – 2], men: median 2 [IQR 1 – 3],  $p = 0.109$ ). *Limited HAS-BLED*  $\geq 3$  was seen more in men [130 (24.3%) female patients vs. 141 (30.4%) male patients,  $p = 0.035$ ]. After inclusion of *limited HAS-BLED*  $\geq 3$  to the multiple logistic regression model, the association of male sex with undertreatment was still not found to be significant (OR 0.82, CI 0.61 – 1.09,  $p = 0.18$ ).

**Supplemental Table S2.** Summary of Relevant Studies

Author, Year, and Region	Sample (n)	Type of Study	Results	Findings
Essien et al. 2020 United States	Total Patients: 42,952 Men: 25,017 (58.2%) Women: 17,935 (41.8%)	Retrospective study	Women less likely to initiate OAC (OR 0.59, CI 95% 0.55-0.64)	Among a group of Medicare beneficiaries, women less likely to initiate OACs
Thompson et al. 2017 United States	Total Patients: 691,906 Men: 356,150 (51.5%) Women: 335,756 (48.5%)	Retrospective study	Undertreatment of women at all CHA <sub>2</sub> DS <sub>2</sub> -VASc score p < 0.001	Women had a higher risk of undertreatment across all levels of CHA <sub>2</sub> DS <sub>2</sub> -VASc
Yong et al. 2020 United States	Total Patients: 358,649 Men: 205,756 (57%) Women: 152,893 (43%)	Retrospective study	<b>Undertreatment</b> CHA <sub>2</sub> DS <sub>2</sub> -VASc ≥ 2 49.5% Female vs. 42.9% Male p < 0.0001	Among patients with CHA <sub>2</sub> DS <sub>2</sub> -VASc ≥ 2, women more likely to be undertreated
Bhave et al. 2015 United States	Total Patients: 517,941 Men: 209,788 (41%) Women: 308,153 (59%)	Retrospective study	<b>Treatment</b> 35.0% Female vs. 38.8% Male <b>OAC Odds ratio</b> OR [95% CI] 0.86 [0.86-0.87] p < .001	Women are at higher risk of undertreatment with OAC
Xiong et al. 2015 China	Total Patients: 2,442 Men: 1,376 (56.3%) Women: 1,066 (43.7%)	Retrospective study	OAC use during hospitalization was 33.3% without sex differences	No sex disparity in OAC treatment
Li et al. 2019 China	Total Patients: 14,723 Men: 9,078 (61.7%) Women: 5,645 (38.3%)	Prospective study	<b>Undertreatment</b> CHA <sub>2</sub> DS <sub>2</sub> -VASc ≥ 2 <b>Aged &lt; 75</b> 32.1% Female vs. 30.1% Male p = 0.081; <b>Aged ≥ 75</b> 34.6% Female vs. 35.3% Male p = 0.700	No sex disparities found among males and females with CHA <sub>2</sub> DS <sub>2</sub> -VASc ≥ 2
Lip et al. 2014 Europe	Total Patients: 3,119 Men: 1,859 (59.6%) Women: 1,260 (40.4%)	Prospective study	<b>Treatment</b> CHA <sub>2</sub> DS <sub>2</sub> -VASc ≥ 2 95.3% Female vs. 76.2% Male p < 0.0001	High rate of OAC prescription among females
Lip et al. 2015 International	Total Patients: 17,184 Men: 9,654 (56.2%) Women: 7,530 (43.8%)	Prospective study	<b>Undertreatment</b> CHA <sub>2</sub> DS <sub>2</sub> -VASc ≥ 2 38.4% Female vs. 35.4% Male	Rates of anticoagulant usage are similar in men and women.
Mazurek et al. 2018 International	Total Patients: 15,092 Men: 8,220 (54.5%) Women: 6,872 (45.5%)	Prospective study	<b>Treatment Globally</b> CHA <sub>2</sub> DS <sub>2</sub> -VASc ≥ 2 81.4% Female vs. 83.0% Male <b>North America</b> 75.9% Female vs. 80.4% Male	Rates of anticoagulant usage are similar in men and women, except in North America
Marzona et al. 2019 Italy	2002 Total Patients: 35,595 Men: 17,689 (49.7%)	Retrospective study	<b>OAC Odds Ratio</b> OR [95% CI] <b>&lt;65 years</b> 2002: 1.51 [1.35-1.69]	Female patients in the ≥ 75 age group had an increased risk of OAC undertreatment

	<p>Women: 17,906 (50.3%) 2013</p> <p>Total Patients: 33,295</p> <p>Men: 17,323 (52.0%) Women: 15,972 (48.0%)</p>		<p>2013: 1.35[1.17-1.57] <b>65-74 years</b></p> <p>2002: 1.14 (1.06-1.241) 2013: 1.12[1.02-1.24] <b>≥75 years</b></p> <p>2002: 0.92[0.86-0.981] 2013: 0.78 [0.73-0.82]</p>	
<p>Loikas et al. 2017 Sweden</p>	<p>Total Patients: 41,702</p> <p>Men: 23,198 (55.6%) Women: 18,504 (44.4%)</p>	Cross-sectional study	<p><b>Treatment</b></p> <p><b>2007-2011</b> 47.8% Female vs. 53.2% Male</p> <p><b>2011-2015</b> 70.5% Female vs. 70.1% Male</p>	<p>Sex differences reported for 2007-2011 with low OAC usage among women, but difference disappeared in 2011-2015 except for females 80 years and older</p>