

American Society of Hematology 2018 guidelines for management of venous thromboembolism: prophylaxis for hospitalized and nonhospitalized medical patients

Holger J. Schünemann,^{1,2,*} Mary Cushman,^{3,4,*} Allison E. Burnett,⁵ Susan R. Kahn,⁶ Jan Beyer-Westendorf,^{7,8} Frederick A. Spencer,¹ Suely M. Rezende,⁹ Neil A. Zakai,^{3,4} Kenneth A. Bauer,¹⁰ Francesco Dentali,¹¹ Jill Lansing,¹² Sara Balduzzi,¹³ Andrea Darzi,² Gian Paolo Morgano,² Ignacio Neumann,^{2,14} Robby Nieuwlaet,² Juan J. Yepes-Nuñez,² Yuan Zhang,² and Wojtek Wiercioch²

¹Department of Medicine and ²Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence and Impact, McMaster University, Hamilton, ON, Canada; ³Department of Medicine and ⁴Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of Vermont Larner College of Medicine and University of Vermont Medical Center, Burlington, VT; ⁵Inpatient Antithrombosis Service, University of New Mexico Health Sciences Center, Albuquerque, NM; ⁶Department of Medicine, McGill University and Lady Davis Institute, Montreal, QC, Canada; ⁷Thrombosis Research Unit, Division of Hematology, Department of Medicine I, University Hospital "Carl Gustav Carus," Dresden, Germany; ⁸Kings Thrombosis Service, Department of Hematology, Kings College London, United Kingdom; ⁹Department of Internal Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil; ¹⁰Department of Medicine, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA; ¹¹Department of Medicine and Surgery, Insubria University, Varese, Italy; ¹²State University of New York, Albany, NY; ¹³Cochrane Italy, Department of Diagnostic, Clinical and Public Health Medicine, University of Modena and Reggio Emilia, Modena, Italy; and ¹⁴Department of Internal Medicine, School of Medicine, Pontificia Universidad Católica de Chile, Santiago, Chile

Background: Venous thromboembolism (VTE) is the third most common vascular disease. Medical inpatients, long-term care residents, persons with minor injuries, and long-distance travelers are at increased risk.

Objective: These evidence-based guidelines from the American Society of Hematology (ASH) intend to support patients, clinicians, and others in decisions about preventing VTE in these groups.

Methods: ASH formed a multidisciplinary guideline panel balanced to minimize potential bias from conflicts of interest. The McMaster University GRADE Centre supported the guideline-development process, including updating or performing systematic evidence reviews. The panel prioritized clinical questions and outcomes according to their importance for clinicians and adult patients. The Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation approach was used to assess evidence and make recommendations, which were subject to public comment.

Results: The panel agreed on 19 recommendations for acutely ill and critically ill medical inpatients, people in long-term care facilities, outpatients with minor injuries, and long-distance travelers.

Conclusions: Strong recommendations included provision of pharmacological VTE prophylaxis in acutely or critically ill inpatients at acceptable bleeding risk, use of mechanical prophylaxis when bleeding risk is unacceptable, against the use of direct oral anticoagulants during hospitalization, and against extending pharmacological prophylaxis after hospital discharge. Conditional recommendations included not to use VTE prophylaxis routinely in long-term care patients or outpatients with minor VTE risk factors. The panel conditionally recommended use of graduated compression stockings or low-molecular-weight heparin in long-distance travelers only if they are at high risk for VTE.

Summary of recommendations

Background

Venous thromboembolism (VTE) is the third most common cardiovascular diagnosis, with an incidence rate of ~1 in 1000 annually in middle age and increasing to nearly 1% annually in nonagenarians.¹ About 50% of all VTE events occur as a result of a current or recent hospital admission for surgery or acute medical illness.^{2,3} Hospital-acquired VTE is preventable, with interventions including anticoagulants and mechanical measures, including compression stockings and intermittent pneumatic compression.

Other nonhospitalized medical populations that are at increased risk for VTE include long-term care residents, frail persons, those with minor injuries, and long-distance travelers, particularly those with preexisting VTE risk factors.²⁻⁷ These guidelines addressed methods to prevent VTE in these adult in-hospital and outpatient medical populations who are not on chronic anticoagulants for other indications.

These guidelines are based on updated and original systematic reviews of evidence conducted under the direction of the McMaster University GRADE Centre with international collaborators. The panel followed best practices for guideline development recommended by the Institute of Medicine and the Guidelines International Network (GIN).⁸⁻¹¹ The panel used the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) approach¹²⁻¹⁸ to assess the certainty in the evidence and formulate recommendations.

Interpretation of Strong and Conditional Recommendations

The strength of a recommendation is expressed as strong (“the guideline panel recommends...”) or conditional (“the guideline panel suggests...”) and has the following interpretation:

Strong recommendation

- For patients: most individuals in this situation would want the recommended course of action, and only a small proportion would not.
- For clinicians: most individuals should follow the recommended course of action. Formal decision aids are not likely to be needed to help individual patients make decisions consistent with their values and preferences.
- For policy makers: the recommendation can be adopted as policy in most situations. Adherence to this recommendation according to the guideline could be used as a quality criterion or performance indicator.
- For researchers: the recommendation is supported by credible research or other convincing judgments that make additional research unlikely to alter the recommendation. On occasion, a strong recommendation is based on low or very low certainty in the evidence. In such instances, further research may provide important information that alters the recommendations.

Conditional recommendation

- For patients: the majority of individuals in this situation would want the suggested course of action, but many would not. Decision aids may be useful in helping patients to make decisions consistent with their individual risks, values, and preferences.
- For clinicians: different choices will be appropriate for individual patients, and clinicians must help each patient arrive at a management decision consistent with the patient’s values and preferences. Decision aids may be useful in helping individuals to make decisions consistent with their individual risks, values, and preferences.
- For policy makers: policy making will require substantial debate and involvement of various stakeholders. Performance measures about the suggested course of action should focus on whether an appropriate decision-making process is duly documented.
- For researchers: this recommendation is likely to be strengthened (for future updates or adaptation) by additional research.

An evaluation of the conditions and criteria (and the related judgments, research evidence, and additional considerations) that determined the conditional (rather than strong) recommendation will help to identify possible research gaps.

We defined acutely ill medical patients as patients hospitalized for a medical illness. Critically ill patients were defined as suffering from an immediately life-threatening condition admitted to an intensive or critical care unit. Chronically ill medical patients were defined as those with medical conditions who may be cared for in long-term care facilities. Interventions evaluated include anticoagulants (“parenterals,” defined as unfractionated heparin [UFH], low-molecular-weight heparin [LMWH] or fondaparinux, and direct oral anticoagulants [DOACs]), aspirin, and mechanical methods.

Recommendations

Acutely ill medical patients: pharmacological VTE prophylaxis

Recommendations 1, 2, and 3. In acutely ill medical patients, the American Society of Hematology (ASH) guideline panel *suggests* using UFH, LMWH, or fondaparinux rather than no parenteral anticoagulant (conditional recommendation, low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕⊕○○). Among these anticoagulants, the panel *suggests* using LMWH (low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕⊕○○) or fondaparinux (very low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕⊕○○) rather than UFH (conditional recommendation). **Remark:** These recommendations also apply to patients with stroke who receive VTE prophylaxis.

Critically ill medical patients: pharmacological VTE prophylaxis

Recommendations 4 and 5. In critically ill medical patients, the ASH guideline panel *recommends* using UFH or LMWH over no UFH or LMWH (strong recommendation, moderate certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕⊕⊕○) and *suggests* using LMWH over UFH (conditional recommendation, moderate certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕⊕⊕○).

Acutely or critically ill medical patients: mechanical VTE prophylaxis vs a combination of pharmacological and mechanical or pharmacological VTE prophylaxis alone

Recommendation 6. In acutely or critically ill medical patients, the ASH guideline panel *suggests* using pharmacological VTE prophylaxis over mechanical VTE prophylaxis (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕○○○).

Recommendation 7. In acutely or critically ill medical patients who do not receive pharmacological VTE prophylaxis, the ASH guideline panel *suggests* using mechanical VTE prophylaxis over no VTE prophylaxis (conditional recommendation, moderate certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕⊕⊕○).

Recommendation 8 and 9. In acutely or critically ill medical patients, the ASH guideline panel *suggests* pharmacological or mechanical VTE prophylaxis alone over mechanical combined with pharmacological VTE prophylaxis (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕○○○).

Recommendation 10. In acutely or critically ill medical patients who are receiving mechanical VTE prophylaxis, the ASH guideline panel *suggests* using pneumatic compression devices or graduated compression stockings for VTE prophylaxis (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕○○○).

DOAC vs LMWH in acutely ill medical patients

Recommendation 11. In acutely ill hospitalized medical patients, the ASH guideline panel *recommends* using LMWH over DOACs for VTE prophylaxis (strong recommendation, moderate certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕⊕⊕○).

Recommendation 12. In acutely ill hospitalized medical patients, the ASH guideline panel *recommends* inpatient VTE prophylaxis with LMWH only, rather than inpatient and extended-duration outpatient VTE prophylaxis with DOACs (strong recommendation, moderate certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕⊕⊕○).

Remark: If patients are on a DOAC for other reasons, this recommendation may not apply.

Extended-duration outpatient prophylaxis vs inpatient-only prophylaxis

Recommendation 13. In acutely ill medical patients, the ASH guideline panel *recommends* inpatient over inpatient plus extended-duration outpatient VTE prophylaxis (strong recommendation, moderate certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕⊕⊕○).

Extended-duration outpatient prophylaxis vs inpatient-only UFH or LMWH

Recommendation 14. In critically ill medical patients, the ASH guideline panel *recommends* inpatient over inpatient plus extended-duration outpatient VTE prophylaxis (strong recommendation, moderate certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕⊕⊕○).

Chronically ill medical patients or nursing home patients

Recommendation 15. In chronically ill medical patients, including nursing home patients, the ASH guideline panel *suggests* not using VTE prophylaxis compared with using any VTE prophylaxis (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕○○○). **Remark:** If a patient's status changes to acute, other recommendations would apply.

Introduction

Aim of these guidelines and specific objectives

The purpose of these guidelines is to provide evidence-based recommendations about prevention of VTE in hospitalized and nonhospitalized medical patients and long-distance travelers. The target audience includes patients, hematologists, general practitioners, internists, hospitalists, other clinicians, pharmacists, and decision makers. Policy makers interested in these guidelines include those involved in developing local, national, or international programs aiming to reduce the incidence of VTE or to evaluate direct and indirect harms and costs related to VTE. This document may also serve as the basis for adaptation by local, regional, or national guideline panels.

Medical outpatients with minor provoking risk factors for VTE

Recommendation 16. In medical outpatients with minor provoking risk factors for VTE (eg, immobility, minor injury, illness, infection), the ASH guideline panel *suggests* not using VTE prophylaxis (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕○○○).

Long-distance travelers

Recommendation 17. In long-distance (>4 hours) travelers without risk factors for VTE, the ASH guideline panel *suggests* not using graduated compression stockings, LMWH, or aspirin for VTE prophylaxis (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕○○○).

Recommendation 18. In people who are at substantially increased VTE risk (eg, recent surgery, prior history of VTE, postpartum women, active malignancy, or ≥2 risk factors, including combinations of the above with hormone replacement therapy, obesity, or pregnancy), the ASH guideline panel *suggests* using graduated compression stockings or prophylactic LMWH for long-distance (>4 hours) travel (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕○○○).

Recommendation 19. In people who are at substantially increased VTE risk (eg, recent surgery, prior history of VTE, postpartum women, active malignancy, or ≥2 risk factors, including combinations of the above with hormone replacement therapy, obesity, or pregnancy), and in whom LMWH or graduated compression stockings is not feasible (eg, resource-constrained setting or aversion to other indicated anticoagulants), the ASH guideline panel *suggests* using aspirin rather than no VTE prophylaxis (conditional recommendations, very low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕○○○).

Values and preferences

The guideline panel rated mortality, pulmonary embolism (PE), moderate to severe deep venous thrombosis (DVT), and major bleeding as critical for decision making and placed a high value on these outcomes and avoiding them with the interventions that were evaluated.

Explanations and other considerations

These recommendations take into consideration cost and cost-effectiveness, impact on health equity, acceptability, and feasibility.

Table 1. RAMs used in medical inpatients

| RAM | Points |
|---|--------|
| Padua VTE RAM: score ≥4 indicates high VTE risk* | |
| Reduced mobility | 3 |
| Active cancer | 3 |
| Previous VTE (excluding superficial thrombophlebitis) | 3 |
| Known thrombophilic condition | 3 |
| Recent trauma and/or surgery (<1 mo) | 2 |
| Elderly age (ie, >70 y) | 1 |
| Heart and/or respiratory failure | 1 |
| Acute myocardial infarction or ischemic stroke | 1 |
| Ongoing hormonal treatment | 1 |
| Obesity (body mass index >30) | 1 |
| Acute infection and/or rheumatologic disorder | 1 |
| IMPROVE VTE RAM: score ≥2 indicates increased VTE risk† | |
| Previous VTE | 3 |
| Known thrombophilia‡ | 2 |
| Lower limb paralysis§ | 2 |
| Active cancer | 2 |
| Immobilization ≥7 d | 1 |
| ICU/CCU stay | 1 |
| Age >60 y | 1 |
| IMPROVE bleeding RAM: score ≥7 indicates high bleeding risk¶ | |
| Renal failure (GFR 30-59 vs ≥60 mL/min per m ²) | 1 |
| Male vs female | 1 |
| Age 40-80 vs <40 y | 1.5 |
| Current cancer | 2 |
| Rheumatic disease | 2 |
| Central venous catheter | 2 |
| ICU/Critical Care Unit stay | 2.5 |
| Renal failure (GFR <30 vs ≥60 mL/min per square meter) | 2.5 |
| Hepatic failure (INR > 1.5) | 2.5 |
| Age ≥85 vs <40 y | 3.5 |
| Platelet count <50 × 10 ⁹ /L | 4 |
| Bleeding in 3 mo before admission | 4 |
| Active gastroduodenal ulcer | 4.5 |

CI, confidence interval; CCU, Coronary Care Unit; GFR, glomerular filtration rate; ICU, Intensive Care Unit; INR, international normalized ratio.

*A total of 60.3% of patients in this study were low risk (Padua score 0-3). VTE prophylaxis was administered by provider choice from among several medications and with or without concomitant compression stockings.³⁶

VTE incidence without VTE prophylaxis:

Padua score 0 to 3: 0.3%

Padua score ≥ 4: 11%

Among at-risk patients (Padua score ≥ 4)

Overall VTE hazard ratio (HR), 32 (95% CI, 4.1-251)

Incidence of VTE

No prophylaxis: 11%

With prophylaxis: 2.2%

VTE HR with prophylaxis, 0.13 (95% CI, 0.04-0.4)

Incidence of major or clinically relevant nonmajor bleeding with prophylaxis = 1.6% (95% CI, 0.5-4.6)

Interpretation: among at-risk patients (Padua score ≥ 4), the reduction in VTE appears to outweigh the increased risk of bleeding with pharmacologic prophylaxis.

†Risk level: score of 0 or 1 = low risk, score of 2 or 3 = moderate risk; score ≥ 4 = high risk. For scores ≥ 2, VTE prophylaxis is indicated.

A total of 69% of patients in this study³⁷ were low risk for VTE (score 0 or 1).

Three-month rate of symptomatic VTE:

IMPROVE VTE score 0 or 1: 0.5%

IMPROVE VTE score 2 or 3: 1.5%

IMPROVE VTE score ≥ 4: 5.7%.

‡Congenital or acquired thrombophilic condition (eg, factor V Leiden, lupus anticoagulant, protein C, or protein S deficiency).

§Leg falls to bed by 5 seconds but has some effort against gravity using the National Institutes of Health stroke scale.

¶About 90% of patients in this study⁴⁰ were low risk for bleeding (score < 7).

Incidence of major bleeding/any bleeding:

IMPROVE bleeding score < 7: 0.4%/1.5%

IMPROVE bleeding score ≥ 7: 4.1%/7.9%.

risk factor for VTE, and ~40% have ≥3 risk factors.²⁰ In a United States population-based study, hospital-acquired DVT and PE occurred in 1.3% and 0.4% of hospital admissions, respectively.²¹ The increased risk of VTE persists for 45 to 60 days after hospital discharge.²² Other medical populations that may be at increased risk for VTE include long-term care residents, frail persons, those with minor injuries, and long-distance travelers, particularly those with preexisting VTE risk factors.²⁻⁷

Description of the target populations

The panel discussed which acutely ill medical inpatients should be considered in these guidelines. Medical inpatients are a heterogeneous population in terms of VTE risk, but these patients have conventionally been subject to universal, or group-based, VTE-prevention strategies.^{20,23-25} We defined acutely ill medical patients as patients hospitalized for a medical illness. Critically ill patients were defined as suffering from an immediately life-threatening condition requiring hospitalization in an intensive or critical care unit. Chronically ill medical patients were defined as those with medical conditions who may be cared for in long-term care facilities. We also considered long-distance travelers, as those traveling by air for >4 hours, and outpatients with minor provoking risk factors for VTE.

Recent studies among hospitalized medically ill patients suggest that a universal approach to prevention has minimal impact on reducing VTE.^{26,27} This may be due, in part, to (1) shorter lengths of stay and truncated thromboprophylaxis regimens compared with older studies that showed significant reductions in thromboembolic events with prophylaxis or insufficient duration of follow-up in research studies²⁸⁻³⁰; (2) overprophylaxis of low-risk patients and underprophylaxis of high-risk patients, resulting in an unfavorable risk-harm balance for these patients; or (3) underutilization of appropriate prophylaxis in hospitalized medical patients due to clinician concern for bleeding or perception that patients are not at sufficiently high risk for VTE to warrant prophylaxis.³¹

Based on enhanced understanding of these issues, a paradigm shift in VTE risk assessment and prevention is underway that prompts clinicians to strive for individualized prophylaxis based on VTE and bleeding risk. Over the last decade, several quantitative VTE risk-assessment models (RAMs) were developed for medical inpatients.³²⁻³⁴ The 2 most extensively studied are the empirically derived Padua score³⁵ and the database-derived IMPROVE score³⁶ (Table 1). Both have been externally validated and showed fair discrimination in identifying medical inpatients who are and are not at increased risk for VTE.^{32,37,38} The IMPROVE investigators also developed an externally validated bleeding risk RAM (Table 1) that may aid in identifying acutely ill medical inpatients at increased risk for bleeding.³⁹⁻⁴¹ The footnote of Table 1 provides data on how these RAMs may be applied for clinical decision making.

D-dimer, a by-product of fibrin degradation, is a biomarker for increased VTE risk in medical inpatients.^{42,43} A modified version of the IMPROVE VTE risk score, IMPROVEDD, showed improved risk assessment in the APEX clinical trial population.⁴⁴

Although optimal strategies for VTE risk assessment and decision making on prophylaxis are yet to be identified, when clinicians and health care systems use these ASH VTE guidelines, they should integrate VTE and bleeding risk assessments into clinical decision-making processes. Importantly, none of the existing validated quantitative RAMs proposed for clinical use in this setting have undergone extensive impact analyses that shows their use leads to a reduction in clinical outcomes.

Methods

The guideline panel developed and graded the recommendations and assessed the certainty in the supporting evidence following the GRADE approach.¹²⁻¹⁸ The overall guideline-development process, including funding of the work, panel formation, management of conflicts of interest, internal and external review, and organizational approval, was guided by ASH policies and procedures derived from the GIN–McMaster Guideline Development Checklist (<http://cebgrade.mcmaster.ca/guidecheck.html>) and was intended to meet recommendations for trustworthy guidelines by the Institute of Medicine and GIN.⁸⁻¹¹ An article detailing the methods used to develop these guidelines is forthcoming.

Organization, panel composition, planning, and coordination

The work of this panel was coordinated with 9 other guideline panels (addressing other aspects of VTE) by ASH and the McMaster GRADE Centre (funded by ASH under a paid agreement). Project oversight was provided initially by a coordination panel, which reported to the ASH Committee on Quality, and then by the coordination panel chair (Dr. Adam Cuker) and vice-chair (H.J.S.). ASH vetted and appointed individuals to the guideline panel. The McMaster GRADE Centre vetted and retained researchers to conduct systematic reviews of evidence and coordinate the guideline-development process, including the use of the GRADE approach. The membership of the panel and the GRADE Centre team is described in Supplement 1.

The panel included hematologists, internists, other physicians, and a pharmacist who all had clinical and research expertise on the guideline topic; methodologists with expertise in evidence appraisal and guideline development; and 1 patient representative. The panel chair was a content expert. The vice-chair was an internist and expert in guideline-development methodology.

In addition to synthesizing evidence systematically, the McMaster GRADE Centre supported the guideline-development process, including determining methods, preparing agendas and meeting materials, and facilitating panel discussions. The panel's work was done using Web-based tools (<https://www.surveymonkey.com> and <https://grade.pro>) and face-to-face and online meetings.

Guideline funding and management of conflicts of interest

Development of these guidelines was wholly funded by ASH, a nonprofit medical specialty society that represents hematologists. Most members of the guideline panel were members of ASH. ASH staff supported panel appointments and coordinated meetings but

had no role in choosing the guideline questions or determining the recommendations.

Members of the guideline panel received travel reimbursement for attendance at in-person meetings, and the patient representative was offered, but declined, an honorarium of \$200. The panelists received no other payments. Some researchers who contributed to the systematic evidence reviews received salary or grant support through the McMaster GRADE Centre. Other researchers participated to fulfill requirements of an academic degree or program.

Conflicts of interest of all participants were managed according to ASH policies based on recommendations of the Institute of Medicine⁴⁵ and GIN.¹¹ At the time of appointment, a majority of the guideline panel, including the chair and the vice-chair, had no conflicts of interest as defined and judged by ASH (ie, no current material interest in any commercial entity with a product that could be affected by the guidelines). Some panelists disclosed new interests or relationships during the development process, but the balance of the majority was maintained.

Before appointment to the panel, individuals disclosed financial and nonfinancial interests. Members of the VTE Guideline Coordination Panel reviewed the disclosures and judged which interests were conflicts and should be managed. Supplement 2 provides the complete “Disclosure of Interests” forms of all panel members. In Part A of the forms, individuals disclosed material interests for 2 years prior to appointment. In Part B, they disclosed interests that were not mainly financial. Part C summarizes ASH decisions about which interests were judged to be conflicts. Part D describes new interests disclosed by individuals after appointment.

Recusal was also used to manage conflicts of interest. During all deliberations, panel members with a current direct financial interest in a commercial entity with any product that could be affected by the guidelines were recused from making judgments about relevant recommendations.^{11,46-48} The Evidence-to-Decision framework for each recommendation describes which individuals were recused from making judgments about each recommendation.

None of the McMaster University–affiliated researchers who contributed to the systematic evidence reviews or who supported the guideline-development process had any current material interest in a commercial entity with any product that could be affected by the guidelines. Supplement 3 provides the complete “Disclosure of Interest” forms of researchers who contributed to these guidelines.

Formulating specific clinical questions and determining outcomes of interest

The panel used the GRADEpro Guideline Development Tool (<https://grade.pro>)⁴⁹ and SurveyMonkey (<https://www.surveymonkey.com>) to brainstorm and then prioritize the questions described in Table 2.

The panel selected outcomes of interest for each question a priori, following the approach described in detail elsewhere.⁵⁰ In brief, the panel brainstormed all possible outcomes before rating their relative importance for decision making following the GRADE approach.⁵⁰ During this rating process, the panel used definitions of the outcomes (“marker states”) that were developed for these guidelines. Rating outcomes by their relative importance can help to focus attention on those outcomes that are considered most important for clinicians and patients and help to resolve or clarify potential disagreements. The outcomes rated highly by the panel

Table 2. Patient populations and interventions for the prevention of VTE and the corresponding recommendations

| |
|--|
| Acutely ill patients: pharmacological prophylaxis addressing the following comparisons |
| 1. Parenteral anticoagulant vs no parenteral anticoagulant |
| 2. LMWH vs unfractionated heparin |
| 3. Fondaparinux vs low molecular weight heparin or unfractionated heparin |
| Critically ill patients: pharmacological prophylaxis addressing the following comparisons |
| 4. Any heparin vs no heparin |
| 5. LMWH vs unfractionated heparin |
| Acutely or critically ill patients: mechanical prophylaxis addressing the following comparisons |
| 6. Mechanical vs pharmacological prophylaxis |
| 7. Mechanical vs no prophylaxis |
| 8. Mechanical combined with pharmacological vs mechanical alone |
| 9. Mechanical combined with pharmacological vs pharmacological alone |
| 10. Intermittent pneumatic compression stockings vs graduated compression stockings |
| DOACs in acutely ill medical patients |
| 11. DOACs vs prophylactic LMWH |
| 12. Extended-duration DOACs vs shorter-duration non-DOAC prophylaxis |
| Extended-duration outpatient prophylaxis vs inpatient-only prophylaxis |
| 13. Acutely ill medical patients |
| 14. Critically ill medical patients |
| Chronically ill patients or nursing home patients |
| 15. Pharmacological prophylaxis vs no prophylaxis |
| Medical outpatients with minor provoking factors for VTE (eg, immobility, minor injury, illness, infection) |
| 16. Prophylaxis vs no prophylaxis |
| Long-distance travelers: prophylaxis addressing the following comparisons |
| 17. Graduated compression stockings |
| 18. LMWH |
| 19. Aspirin vs no prophylaxis |

and those identified as important based on the literature reviews were further refined. The panel rated the following outcomes as critical for clinical decision making across questions: mortality, PE, proximal DVT, distal DVT, major bleeding including gastrointestinal bleeding, and heparin-induced thrombocytopenia (HIT). For several outcomes, the studies reported outcomes differently from what the panel determined to be critical or important for decision making. Typically, outcomes were reported as “any VTE,” “any PE,” “any DVT,” “any proximal DVT,” or “any distal DVT,” sometimes preceded by “asymptomatic” or “symptomatic,” but reporting was inconsistent across studies. This affected the degree of certainty that panel members had in making recommendations, so they made explicit assumptions about the meaning of the outcomes to patients through the use of marker states, rather than leaving them implicit.

Evidence review and development of recommendations

For each guideline question, the McMaster GRADE Centre prepared a GRADE Evidence-to-Decision (EtD) framework, using the GRADEpro Guideline Development Tool (<https://gradepr.org>).^{12,13,18} The EtD table summarized the results of systematic reviews of the literature that were updated or performed for these guidelines. The EtD table addressed effects of interventions, resource utilization

(cost-effectiveness), values and preferences (relative importance of outcomes), equity, acceptability, and feasibility. The guideline panel reviewed draft EtD tables before, during, or after the guideline panel meeting and made suggestions for corrections and identified missing evidence. To ensure that recent studies were not missed, searches (presented in Supplement 4) were updated during October and November of 2016, and panel members were asked to suggest any studies that may have been considered missed and fulfilled the inclusion criteria for the individual questions.

Under the direction of the McMaster GRADE Centre, researchers followed the general methods outlined in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions (<https://training.cochrane.org/handbook>) for conducting updated or new systematic reviews of intervention effects. When existing reviews were used, judgments of the original authors about risk for bias were either randomly checked for accuracy and accepted or conducted de novo if they were not available or not reproducible. For new reviews, risk for bias was assessed at the health outcome level using the Cochrane Collaboration’s risk for bias tool for randomized trials or nonrandomized studies. In addition to conducting systematic reviews of intervention effects, the researchers searched for evidence related to baseline risks, values, preferences and costs, and summarized findings within the EtD frameworks.^{12,13,18} Subsequently, the certainty in the body of evidence (also known as

quality of the evidence or confidence in the estimated effects) was assessed for each effect estimate of the outcomes of interest following the GRADE approach based on the following domains: risk for bias, precision, consistency and magnitude of the estimates of effects, directness of the evidence, risk for publication bias, presence of large effects, dose–response relationship, and an assessment of the effect of plausible residual and opposing confounding. The certainty was categorized into 4 levels ranging from very low to high.^{14–16}

During a 2-day in-person meeting, followed by online communication and conference calls, the panel developed clinical recommendations based on the evidence summarized in the EtD tables. For each recommendation, the panel took a population perspective and came to consensus on the following: the certainty in the evidence, the balance of benefits and harms of the compared management options, and the assumptions about the values and preferences associated with the decision. The guideline panel also explicitly took into account the extent of resource use associated with alternative management options. The panel agreed on the recommendations (including direction and strength), remarks, and qualifications by consensus or, in rare instances, by voting (an 80% majority was required for a strong recommendation), based on the balance of all desirable and undesirable consequences. The final guidelines, including recommendations, were reviewed and approved by all members of the panel.

Interpretation of strong and conditional recommendations

The recommendations are labeled as “strong” or “conditional” according to the GRADE approach. The words “the guideline panel recommends” are used for strong recommendations, and “the guideline panel suggests” for conditional recommendations. Table 3 provides GRADE’s interpretation of strong and conditional recommendations by patients, clinicians, health care policy makers, and researchers.

Document review

Draft recommendations were reviewed by all members of the panel, revised, and then made available online on 17 July 2017 for external review by stakeholders, including allied organizations, other medical professionals, patients, and the public. Thirty-three individuals or organizations submitted comments. The document was revised to address pertinent comments, but no changes were made to the recommendations. On 30 April 2018, the ASH Guideline Oversight Subcommittee and the ASH Committee on Quality approved that the defined guideline-development process was followed; on 4 May 2018, the officers of the ASH Executive Committee approved submission of the guidelines for publication under the imprimatur of ASH. The guidelines were then subjected to peer review by *Blood Advances*.

How to use these guidelines

ASH guidelines are primarily intended to help clinicians make decisions about diagnostic and treatment alternatives. Other purposes are to inform policy, education, and advocacy and to state future research needs. They may also be used by patients. These guidelines are not intended to serve or be construed as a standard of care. Clinicians must make decisions on the basis of the clinical presentation of each individual patient, ideally through a shared process that considers the patient’s values and preferences with respect to the anticipated outcomes of the chosen option. Decisions may be constrained by the realities of a specific clinical setting and local resources, including, but not limited to, institutional policies, time

limitations, and availability of treatments. These guidelines may not include all appropriate methods of care for the clinical scenarios described. As science advances and new evidence becomes available, recommendations may become outdated. Following these guidelines cannot guarantee successful outcomes. ASH does not warrant or guarantee any products described in these guidelines.

Statements about the underlying values and preferences, as well as qualifying remarks accompanying each recommendation, are its integral parts and serve to facilitate more accurate interpretation. They should never be omitted when recommendations from these guidelines are quoted or translated. Implementation of the guidelines will be facilitated by the related interactive forthcoming decision aids. The use of these guidelines is also facilitated by the links to the EtD frameworks and interactive summary of findings tables in each section.

Recommendations

Acutely ill medical patients: pharmacological prophylaxis

Question: Should any parenteral anticoagulant (UFH, LMWH or fondaparinux) vs no parenteral anticoagulant be used in acutely ill medical patients for VTE prophylaxis?

Question: If pharmacologic prophylaxis is used, should LMWH vs UFH be used?

Question: If pharmacologic prophylaxis is used, should fondaparinux vs LMWH or UFH be used?

Recommendation 1, 2, and 3

In acutely ill medical patients, the ASH guideline panel *suggests* using UFH, LMWH, or fondaparinux rather than no parenteral anticoagulant (conditional recommendation, low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕⊕○○). Among these anticoagulants, the panel *suggests* using LMWH (low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕⊕○○) or fondaparinux (very low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕○○○) rather than UFH (conditional recommendation). **Remark:** These 3 recommendations also apply to anticoagulant choices when VTE prophylaxis is considered for patients with stroke.

Parenteral anticoagulant vs no parenteral anticoagulant in acutely ill medical patients

Summary of the evidence. We found 17 systematic reviews that addressed this question,^{51–67} with 25 studies^{29,30,68–89} (H. Vissinger and S. Husted, unpublished data, 1995) in these reviews evaluating outcomes relevant to this question. All studies included acutely ill medical inpatients, with 16 of the trials specifically including stroke patients.^{68–82} The panel also considered the randomized controlled trial (RCT) by Cohen et al²⁸ that compared fondaparinux against no parenteral anticoagulation and felt that the results were similar enough to include fondaparinux with UFH and LMWH. The EtD framework is shown online at <https://dbep.gradeapro.org/profile/54B577E9-7F80-3A78-B3EA-3850E9A1D432>.

Benefits. Parenteral anticoagulants (UFH, LMWH, or fondaparinux) had no impact on mortality based on a meta-analysis of 21

Table 3. Interpretation of strong and conditional recommendations

| Implications for: | Strong recommendation | Conditional recommendation |
|-------------------|---|---|
| Patients | Most individuals in this situation would want the recommended course of action, and only a small proportion would not. | The majority of individuals in this situation would want the suggested course of action, but many would not. Decision aids may be useful in helping patients to make decisions consistent with their individual risks, values, and preferences. |
| Clinicians | Most individuals should follow the recommended course of action. Formal decision aids are not likely to be needed to help individual patients make decisions consistent with their values and preferences. | Different choices will be appropriate for individual patients, and clinicians must help each patient arrive at a management decision consistent with the patient's values and preferences. Decision aids may be useful in helping individuals to make decisions consistent with their individual risks, values, and preferences. |
| Policy makers | The recommendation can be adopted as policy in most situations. Adherence to this recommendation according to the guideline could be used as a quality criterion or performance indicator. | Policy-making will require substantial debate and involvement of various stakeholders. Performance measures should assess whether decision making is appropriate. |
| Researchers | The recommendation is supported by credible research or other convincing judgments that make additional research unlikely to alter the recommendation. On occasion, a strong recommendation is based on low or very low certainty in the evidence. In such instances, further research may provide important information that alters the recommendations. | The recommendation is likely to be strengthened (for future updates or adaptation) by additional research. An evaluation of the conditions and criteria (and the related judgments, research evidence, and additional considerations) that determined the conditional (rather than strong) recommendation will help to identify possible research gaps. |

RCTs (relative risk [RR], 0.97; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.91-1.04; absolute risk reduction [ARR], 2 fewer per 1000; 95% CI, from 6 fewer to 3 more per 1000), but we estimated that heparins reduced the risk for developing PE (RR, 0.59; 95% CI, 0.45-0.78; ARR, 4 fewer per 1000; 95% CI, from 6-2 fewer per 1000), symptomatic proximal DVT (RR, 0.28; 95% CI, 0.06-1.37; ARR, 3 fewer per 1000; 95% CI, from 4 fewer to 1 more per 1000), and symptomatic distal DVT (RR, 0.75; 95% CI, 0.17-3.34; ARR, 1 fewer per 1000; 95% CI, from 2 fewer to 5 more per 1000).

Harms and burden. Sixteen RCTs reported on major bleeding (RR, 1.48; 95% CI, 0.81-2.71; ARR, 3 more per 1000; 95% CI, from 1 fewer to 12 more per 1000). Two RCTs reported an increase in gastrointestinal bleeding (RR, 2.61; 95% CI, 0.36-18.86; ARR, 50 more per 1000; 95% CI, from 20 fewer to 558 more per 1000), and 3 reported little impact on thrombocytopenia (RR, 0.95; 95% CI, 0.47-1.92; ARR, 0 per 1000; 95% CI, from 1 fewer to 2 more per 1000), with 1 of the studies specifically reporting no HIT in either group.

Certainty in the evidence of effects. The certainty in these estimated effects was judged as low owing to the risk of bias and imprecision of the estimates.

Other EtD criteria and considerations. The panel assumed that avoidance of PE, DVT, and bleeding events was critical or important for decision making to patients. Three reports compared the cost-effectiveness of LMWH compared with no heparin in medical patients and showed favorable cost-effectiveness of enoxaparin.⁹⁰⁻⁹² Although the panel assumed no impact on health equity, the use of any parenteral anticoagulant (UFH, LMWH, and fondaparinux) was considered acceptable and feasible.

Conclusions and research needs for this recommendation. The panel determined that there is low certainty in the evidence for a net health benefit from using any parenteral anticoagulant in acutely ill medical patients. Other EtD criteria were generally in favor of using any parenteral anticoagulant for VTE prevention so that the desirable consequences were greater than the undesirable consequences.

The panel identified the following additional research questions:

- Better information on baseline risk assessment of thrombosis and bleeding in medical inpatients is needed, in particular whether risk varies over the course of admission; and
- More information on the optimal dosing of parenteral anticoagulation to prevent VTE in medical inpatients is needed. In particular, can lower or higher doses be used in different settings (perhaps dependent on baseline risk), and should dosing be adjusted in obese patients, underweight patients, and patients with renal disease?

LMWH vs UFH in acutely ill medical patients

Summary of the evidence. We found 8 systematic reviews^{51,52,54,58,59,63,65,67} that addressed this question and included 11 RCTs.⁹³⁻¹⁰³ We identified 1 additional study⁹⁹ published after the search for the systematic reviews was completed. All studies included acutely ill medical patients, with 5 studies in stroke patients.⁹³⁻⁹⁷ The EtD framework is shown at <https://dbep.grade-pro.org/profile/FA048403-345D-A41B-8147-6657D26C1399>.

Benefits, harms, and burden. LMWH compared with UFH had little impact on mortality (RR, 0.99; 95% CI, 0.82-1.19; ARR, 1 fewer per 1000; 95% CI, 9 fewer to 10 more per 1000). LMWH showed reductions in PE, symptomatic DVT, major bleeding, and HIT compared with UFH, but the estimates were imprecise, with small ARRs (see evidence profile in the online EtD framework).

Certainty in the evidence of effects. Overall, the certainty in these estimated effects was rated as very low owing to risk of bias and imprecision of the estimates (see evidence profile in the online EtD framework).

Other EtD criteria and considerations. The panel assumed that avoidance of PE, DVT, and bleeding events was critical or important for decision-making to patients. Eleven reports^{91,104-113} compared the cost-effectiveness of LMWH with UFH in hospitalized patients; 1 was a trial-based analysis that the panel considered most informative.¹⁰⁶ All reports concluded that

LMWH was cost-effective for thromboprophylaxis compared with UFH, with 4 reports suggesting that LMWH was more effective and provided net savings compared with UFH.^{91,104,105,111} The panel recognized that cost may change or differ widely across settings. In addition, the panel expressed caution about existing cost-effectiveness analyses that differed in their assumptions and input parameters from that used by the panel in the EtD. Although the panel assumed no impact on health equity, the fewer injections required with once-daily LMWH made it feasible and acceptable compared with UFH, which is administered more than once daily.

Conclusions and research needs for this recommendation.

The guideline panel determined that there is low certainty in the evidence for a net health benefit from using LMWH over UFH in acutely ill medical patients. Other EtD criteria were generally in favor of using LMWH so that the desirable consequences were greater than the undesirable consequences. This recommendation includes stroke patients, despite a slightly higher bleeding risk with LMWH compared with UFH among stroke patients in our systematic review. The panel judged that the consequences from using LMWH were favorable compared with the consequences of using UFH.

There were no future research needs prioritized by the panel.

Fondaparinux vs LMWH or UFH in acutely ill medical patients

Summary of the evidence. We did not identify trials that directly addressed this question. One trial,²⁸ which was included in 9 identified systematic reviews,^{55,56,58-61,63,66,67} addressed the use of fondaparinux compared with no prophylaxis in acutely ill medical patients. This trial was used to indirectly compare the effect of fondaparinux with LMWH and UFH through a calculation of the ratio of risk ratios based on the 25 identified RCTs that compared these agents vs no prophylaxis. The EtD framework is shown at <https://dbep.gradepro.org/profile/4F45952B-32AD-43CA-8839-6CB829E4BF3D>.

Benefits, harms, and burden. Fondaparinux may reduce several outcomes when indirectly compared with the meta-analysis of RCTs using LMWH or UFH, including mortality (RR, 0.56; 95% CI, 0.30-1.06; ARR, 30 fewer per 1000; 95% CI, from 47 fewer to 4 more per 1000), PE (RR, 0.59; 95% CI, 0.18-1.94; ARR, 3 fewer per 1000; 95% CI, from 5 fewer to 6 more per 1000), distal DVT (RR, 0.82; 95% CI, 0.26-2.55; ARR, 10 fewer per 1000; 95% CI, from 42 fewer to 87 more per 1000), and major bleeding (RR, 0.66; 95% CI, 0.04-11.32; ARR, 7 fewer per 1000; 95% CI, from 19 fewer to 202 more per 1000). However, proximal DVT was increased (RR, 1.75; 95% CI, 0.50-6.12; ARR, 14 more per 1000; 95% CI, from 9 fewer to 93 more per 1000).

Certainty in the evidence of effects. Overall, the certainty in these estimated effects was very low owing to the risk of bias, the indirect comparison, and imprecision of the estimates.

Other EtD criteria and considerations. The panel assumed that avoidance of PE, DVT, and bleeding events was critical or important for decision making to patients. There were no published cost-effectiveness analyses, and no cost differences between fondaparinux and LMWH were assumed. The panel assumed no impact on health equity and that the use of fondaparinux was acceptable and probably feasible.

Conclusions and research needs for this recommendation.

The panel judged that the desirable and undesirable consequences did not favor fondaparinux over LMWH but favored fondaparinux over UFH for similar considerations as for LMWH over UFH. However, this judgment was based on very low certainty in the evidence for the comparison of the health effects exerted by fondaparinux compared with UFH or LMWH in acutely ill medical patients. No specific research needs related to fondaparinux were recommended by the panel.

Critically ill medical patients: pharmacological prophylaxis

Any heparin vs no heparin

Question: Should any heparin (UFH or LMWH) vs no UFH or LMWH be used for venous thrombosis prophylaxis in critically ill patients?

Recommendation 4

In critically ill medical patients, the ASH guideline panel *recommends* using UFH or LMWH over no UFH or LMWH (strong recommendation, moderate certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕⊕⊕○).

Five of 6 panelists without conflicts voted in favor of a strong recommendation over a conditional recommendation.

Summary of the evidence. We identified 1 systematic review that addressed this question in critically ill medical patients.¹¹⁴ Three RCTs in this review fulfilled our inclusion criteria and measured outcomes relevant to this context (eg, mortality, PE, DVT, major bleeding, and thrombocytopenia).¹¹⁵⁻¹¹⁷ Our update of this systematic review did not identify any additional studies that fulfilled the inclusion criteria. All studies included critically ill medical inpatients. We excluded studies that addressed this question in critically ill patients who underwent surgery or those with trauma.

Of the 3 included studies, 2 of them^{115,117} assessed the effect of LMWH, whereas 1 study¹¹⁷ assessed the effect of UFH. Two studies reported the effect of treatment on mortality,^{115,117} and all 3 studies reported outcomes of any PE and any DVT (it was not specified whether symptomatic or asymptomatic DVT or whether proximal or distal DVT). One study¹¹⁷ reported on development of DVT assessed as symptomatic DVT, which was used to extrapolate data for proximal DVT and distal DVT representing the moderate marker state. Two studies^{115,117} assessed the risk of major bleeding, and 1 study assessed the risk of thrombocytopenia.¹¹⁵ No studies reported the outcome of HIT specifically. The EtD framework is shown at <https://dbep.gradepro.org/profile/783DCF1B-50FC-72D0-A1E1-3C31011E9471>.

Benefits. In absolute and relative terms, pharmacological prophylaxis probably reduces mortality, PE, and DVT. The mortality RR was 0.89 (95% CI, 0.78-1.02), and ARR was 32 fewer per 1000 (95% CI, from 64 fewer to 6 more per 1000). The PE RR was 0.53 (95% CI, 0.28-0.98), and ARR was 2 fewer per 1000 (95% CI, 0-3 fewer per 1000). The DVT RR was 0.86 (95% CI, 0.59-1.25), and ARR was 1 fewer per 1000 (95% CI, 8 fewer to 5 more per 1000) for distal DVT, for a baseline risk of 2.0%.

Harms and burden. Major bleeding is probably not increased with UFH or LMWH (RR, 1.01; 95% CI, 0.40-2.54), and absolute risk increase (ARI) was 7 more per 1000 (95% CI, 30 fewer to 76 more per 1000). Although no studies reported on HIT, 1 study reported an increased risk for thrombocytopenia with heparin

use, with an RR of 1.49 (95% CI, 0.59-3.78) and an ARI of 30 more per 1000 (95% CI, 25 fewer to 171 more per 1000). However, the panel considered thrombocytopenia an important, but not critical, outcome for decision making.

Certainty in the evidence of effects. Overall, the panel judged the certainty in these estimated effects as moderate owing to serious imprecision of the estimates for the critical outcomes (see evidence profile and online EtD framework).

Other EtD criteria and considerations. The panel assumed that avoidance of death, PE, DVT, and major bleeding was critical to patients and judged that the benefits clearly favored prophylaxis. The panel judged that costs were negligible, and heparin prophylaxis was acceptable and feasible.

Conclusions and research needs for this recommendation. The guideline panel determined that there was moderate certainty in the evidence that the desirable effects of heparin (UFH or LMWH) outweigh the undesirable effects in critically ill medical patients. The panel made a strong recommendation for using pharmacological prophylaxis, although the exact magnitude of the mortality benefit is still in question. The panel did not identify high-priority future research questions.

LMWH vs UFH

Question. Should LMWH vs UFH be used for VTE prophylaxis in critically ill patients?

Recommendation 5

In critically ill medical patients, the ASH guideline suggests using LMWH over UFH (conditional recommendation, moderate certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕⊕⊕○).

Of 6 panelists without conflicts, 4 (67%) favored a conditional recommendation and 2 (33%) favored a strong recommendation for LMWH over UFH. Considering the ASH criterion for strong recommendations (80% majority required), the panel made a conditional recommendation.

Summary of the evidence. We identified 1 systematic review that addressed this question in critically ill medical patients.¹¹⁴ Three RCTs in this review fulfilled the inclusion criteria and measured relevant outcomes (eg, mortality, PE, DVT, major bleeding, and thrombocytopenia).¹¹⁷⁻¹¹⁹ Our update of this systematic review did not identify any additional studies. All studies included critically ill medical inpatients. We excluded studies that addressed this question in critically ill patients who underwent surgery or had trauma.

All 3 studies¹¹⁷⁻¹¹⁹ reported the effect of LMWH compared with UFH on mortality. Two studies^{117,118} reported on the development of any PE, and 1 of these studies¹¹⁸ reported on development of symptomatic PE specifically, which was used to extrapolate data for the outcome of PE representing the moderate marker state. All 3 studies reported on the development of any DVT, and 2 studies^{117,118} reported on the development of symptomatic DVT, which was used to extrapolate data for proximal DVT and distal DVT representing the moderate marker state. All 3 studies assessed the risk of major bleeding, and 1 study¹¹⁸ assessed the risk of HIT. No studies reported on the risk of gastrointestinal bleeding specifically. The EtD framework is shown at <https://dbep.gradepro.org/profile/FDD22673-C5BB-8A63-A715-5D225B808EA2>.

Benefits. In absolute and relative terms, LMWH compared with UFH appeared to have a moderate impact on mortality and VTE. The mortality RR was 0.90 (95% CI, 0.75-1.08), and ARR was 24 fewer per 1000 (95% CI, from 61 fewer to 19 more per 1000). For PE, the RR was 0.80 (95% CI, 0.44-1.46). With a baseline risk of 0.4%, the ARR for PE was 1 fewer per 1000 (95% CI, from 2 fewer to 2 more per 1000). For DVT, the RR was 0.87 (95% CI, 0.60-1.25). With a baseline risk of 0.5% for proximal DVT, this translated to an ARR of 1 fewer per 1000 (95% CI, 1 fewer to 2 more per 1000). For distal DVT with a baseline risk of 1.4%, the ARR was 2 fewer per 1000 (95% CI, 6 fewer to 4 more per 1000).

Harms and burden. Major bleeding did not appear to differ between LMWH and UFH (RR, 0.98; 95% CI, 0.76-1.27; RR, 1 fewer per 1000; 95% CI, 13 fewer to 14 more per 1000). HIT was probably decreased with LMWH vs UFH, with an RR of 0.42 (95% CI, 0.15-1.18) and an ARR of 3 fewer per 1000 (95% CI, 5 fewer to 1 more per 1000).

Certainty in the evidence of effects. Overall, the panel judged the certainty in these estimated effects as moderate owing to serious imprecision of the estimates, although the certainty was judged as low for mortality and PE. However, the effect estimates all favored LMWH and, thus, the overall certainty was moderate for the critical outcomes.¹²⁰

Other EtD criteria and considerations. The panel assumed that avoidance of death, PE, and DVT was critical or important for decision making to patients. The panel judged that the cost or savings were negligible, and LMWH was probably acceptable and feasible given that fewer injections would be required compared with UFH.

Conclusions and research needs for this recommendation. The guideline panel determined that there was moderate certainty in the evidence that the desirable consequences of LMWH outweigh the undesirable consequences compared with UFH in critically ill medical patients. The panel made a conditional recommendation because of remaining uncertainty about the exact magnitude of the effect and because critically ill medical patients with renal failure and hepatic failure may require alternative options. The panel did not prioritize the comparison of fondaparinux against LMWH or UFH in critically ill patients. Future research should address:

- Tools for quantitative risk assessment for VTE and bleeding in critically ill medical patients; and
- Determination of the acceptable balance between bleeding and thrombosis risk in the context of selecting the optimal thromboprophylaxis in critically ill medical patients.

Acutely or critically ill medical patients: mechanical VTE prophylaxis vs a combination of pharmacological and mechanical or pharmacological VTE prophylaxis alone

Question: Should mechanical VTE prophylaxis vs pharmacological VTE prophylaxis be used in acutely or critically ill medical patients?

Question: Should mechanical VTE prophylaxis vs no VTE prophylaxis be used in acutely or critically ill medical patients?

Question: Should mechanical combined with pharmacological vs mechanical VTE prophylaxis alone be used in acutely or critically ill medical patients?

Question: Should mechanical combined with pharmacological vs pharmacological VTE prophylaxis alone be used in acutely or critically ill medical patients?

Question: Should pneumatic compression devices vs graduated compression stockings be used for VTE prophylaxis in acutely or critically ill medical patients?

Recommendation 6

In acutely or critically ill medical patients, the ASH guideline panel suggests using pharmacological VTE prophylaxis over mechanical VTE prophylaxis (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕○○○).

Recommendation 7

In acutely or critically ill medical patients who do not receive pharmacological VTE prophylaxis, the ASH guideline panel suggests using mechanical VTE prophylaxis over no VTE prophylaxis (conditional recommendation, moderate certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕⊕○○).

Recommendations 8 and 9

In acutely or critically ill medical patients, the ASH guideline panel suggests pharmacological or mechanical VTE prophylaxis alone over mechanical combined with pharmacological VTE prophylaxis (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕○○○).

Recommendation 10

In acutely or critically ill medical patients who are receiving mechanical VTE prophylaxis, the ASH guideline panel suggests using pneumatic compression devices or graduated compression stockings for VTE prophylaxis (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕○○○).

For questions addressing mechanical approaches to VTE prophylaxis, we defined mechanical prophylaxis broadly as including pneumatic compression devices or graduated compression stockings. Pneumatic compression devices included intermittent pneumatic compression or sequential pneumatic compression. We used the collective term “mechanical prophylaxis” when mechanical prophylaxis modalities are compared with, or combined with, pharmacological prophylaxis.

Mechanical vs pharmacological prophylaxis

Question: Should mechanical VTE prophylaxis vs pharmacological VTE prophylaxis be used in acutely or critically ill medical patients?

Recommendation 6

In acutely or critically ill medical patients, the ASH guideline panel suggests using pharmacological VTE prophylaxis over mechanical VTE prophylaxis (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕○○○).

Summary of the evidence. We did not identify any systematic review that addressed this question, but our comprehensive search for RCTs identified 2 studies^{121,122} in acutely or critically ill medical patients that provided limited evidence for this question. Therefore, the guideline panel decided to include indirect evidence from RCTs in trauma patients, for which we identified a systematic review.¹²³ Our update of that systematic review did not identify any eligible additional studies.

Seven studies reported the effect of mechanical prophylaxis vs pharmacological prophylaxis on risk of mortality.^{122,124-129} Seven studies reported the effect of mechanical prophylaxis vs pharmacological prophylaxis on development of symptomatic PE.^{121,122,124-127,129} Three studies reported the effect of mechanical prophylaxis vs pharmacological prophylaxis on development of symptomatic DVT.^{121,126,127} Seven studies reported the effect of mechanical prophylaxis vs pharmacological prophylaxis on risk of major bleeding.^{121,124-128,130} The EtD framework is shown at <https://dbep.gradepro.org/profile/95794127-BD67-D33B-BCDA-3FF49A76A6F2>.

Benefits. In absolute and relative terms, mechanical prophylaxis compared with pharmacological prophylaxis appeared to have little or no impact on mortality (RR, 0.95; 95% CI, 0.42-1.13; ARR, 1 fewer per 1000; 95% CI, from 11 fewer to 21 more per 1000). For PE, the RR was 1.54 (95% CI, 0.48-4.93), and the ARI was 1 more per 1000 (95% CI, from 1 fewer to 4 more per 1000), for a baseline risk of 0.1%. For symptomatic DVT, the RR was 2.20 (95% CI, 0.22-22.1). Using a baseline risk of 0.2% for proximal DVT, the ARI was 2 more per 1000 (95% CI, 1 fewer to 38 more per 1000), and with a baseline risk of 0.7% for distal DVT, this extrapolated to an ARI of 9 more per 1000 (95% CI, 6 fewer to 152 more per 1000).

Harms and burden. Major bleeding appeared reduced with mechanical vs pharmacological prophylaxis, with a RR of 0.87 (95% CI, 0.25-3.08) and an ARR of 4 fewer per 1000 (95% CI, 21 fewer to 58 more per 1000) (very low certainty in the evidence). No quantitative estimates were available on the risk of falls, ischemia, and limb ulceration.

Certainty in the evidence of effects. Overall, the certainty in these estimated effects was very low owing to very serious imprecision and serious indirectness of the estimates (see evidence profile and online EtD framework).

Other EtD criteria and considerations. The panel assumed that avoidance of death, PE, and DVT was critical for decision making for patients. Given the efficacy of pharmacological prophylaxis compared with no prophylaxis, as well as uncertainty about the difference in effects and cost between pharmacological and mechanical prophylaxis, the panel judged that acceptability and feasibility would vary importantly across settings.

Conclusions and research needs for this recommendation. The guideline panel determined that there is very low certainty in the evidence that there are net desirable consequences from pharmacological prophylaxis compared with mechanical prophylaxis in acutely or critically ill medical patients. The panel made a conditional recommendation for using pharmacological prophylaxis over mechanical prophylaxis and determined that the recommendation would not apply to groups in whom the risk of VTE would be too small to justify the downsides or burden of any prophylaxis. The panel felt that the very low certainty about the effect estimates suggests that there is a research gap with regard to effectiveness. Research question identified:

- Better information on bleeding risk in medical inpatients to inform decisions about use of mechanical compared with pharmacological VTE prophylaxis.

Mechanical vs no prophylaxis

Question: Should mechanical VTE prophylaxis vs no VTE prophylaxis be used in acutely or critically ill medical patients?

Recommendation 7

In acutely or critically ill medical patients who do not receive pharmacological VTE prophylaxis, the ASH guideline panel suggests using mechanical VTE prophylaxis over no VTE prophylaxis (conditional recommendation, moderate certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕⊕⊕○).

Summary of the evidence. We did not identify any systematic review that addressed this question. Our systematic search for RCTs identified 1 study¹³¹ conducted in critically ill medical patients, which provided limited evidence. Due to the scarcity of direct evidence, the guideline panel decided to consider indirect evidence available from systematic reviews of RCTs conducted in trauma and stroke patients. We found 1 systematic review that provided evidence from trauma patients¹²³ and 1 systematic review that provided evidence from stroke patients.¹³² Our update of the systematic reviews identified 1 additional study in stroke patients¹³³ that fulfilled our inclusion criteria.

In total, 7 studies each reported on the effect of mechanical methods vs no intervention on mortality^{126,131,133-137} and on the development of PE.^{126,131,133-135,137,138} Five studies reported the effect of mechanical methods vs no intervention on the development of proximal DVT: 2 for symptomatic proximal DVT^{133,134} and 3 for any proximal DVT.^{131,135,137} Four studies reported the effect of mechanical methods vs no intervention on the development of distal DVT: 2 for symptomatic distal DVT^{133,134} and 2 for any distal DVT.^{131,137} The EtD framework is shown at <https://dbep.gradeopro.org/profile/01137182-5DA7-ADF7-B58C-BBAF33FD4DCD>.

Benefits. In absolute and relative terms, mechanical prophylaxis appeared to have little or no impact on mortality and VTE (RR, 0.93; 95% CI, 0.77-1.13; ARR, 7 fewer per 1000; 95% CI, from 24 fewer to 14 more per 1000). For PE, the RR was 0.73 (95% CI, 0.51-1.04), translating to an ARR of 0 fewer per 1000 (95% CI, from 0 fewer to 0 fewer per 1000) using a baseline risk of 0.1% per admission for PE; for proximal or distal DVT, the RR was 0.82 (95% CI, 0.61-1.10), translating to an ARR of 0 fewer per 1000 (95% CI, 0-1 fewer per 1000) using a baseline risk of 0.2%.

Harms and burden. The panel rated adverse effects of mechanical prophylaxis, such as risk of falls, ischemia, and limb ulceration, as important, but not critical, for decision making. A study¹³⁴ showed 2 events of lower limb ischemia or amputation in 1438 patients receiving pneumatic compression devices compared with 0 events in 1438 patients not receiving pneumatic compression devices. The panel also suggested that pneumatic compression devices might reduce mobility and cause falls in patients who ambulate, although the panel did not review specific evidence for these outcomes, and some evidence suggests no increased risk of falls with pneumatic compression devices.¹³⁹

Certainty in the evidence of effects. Overall, the certainty in the estimated effects was moderate owing to imprecision of the

estimates when the small possible benefits are weighed against the less important potential harms or burden (see evidence profile and online EtD framework).

Other EtD criteria and considerations. The panel assumed that avoidance of death, PE, and DVT was critical or important for decision making to patients. Mechanical prophylaxis, including pneumatic compression devices, appeared to be cost-effective. For example, 1 study¹³⁴ comparing pneumatic compression devices with no devices for immobile stroke patients suggested an additional cost of US \$2171 to prevent 1 DVT of any type. In general, mechanical prophylaxis was considered acceptable, and, among options, graduated compression stockings were considered more feasible than pneumatic compression devices.

Conclusions and research needs for this recommendation.

The guideline panel determined that there is moderate certainty in the evidence that the desirable consequences of mechanical prophylaxis outweigh the undesirable consequences in acutely or critically ill medical patients. The panel made a conditional recommendation because, prior to applying the intervention to all patients, clinicians should carefully evaluate suitability based on risk factors. For example, patients given mechanical prophylaxis must be observed to reduce the risk of falls and other complications. Patients with peripheral vascular disease may experience higher rates of adverse events, including leg ulceration, ischemia, and amputations. The absolute risk reduction in VTE may be higher in high-risk VTE patients, and the benefits may outweigh the harms among patients at increased risk of bleeding. Some patient groups (eg, those with lower extremity injuries or open wounds) may not be able to use pneumatic compression devices. The cost of the devices for large hospitals may be considerable, and devices require storage space. The panel also felt that more research should be conducted to elucidate:

- Net health benefit of mechanical prophylaxis in a lower-risk medical inpatient population;
- Utility of outpatient use of mechanical prophylaxis in those at risk of VTE;
- Direct comparisons between graduated compression stockings and pneumatic compression devices in medical inpatients; and
- Impact of use of pneumatic compression devices in medical inpatients at high bleeding risk or with active bleeding

Mechanical combined with pharmacological vs mechanical prophylaxis alone

Question: Should mechanical combined with pharmacological VTE prophylaxis vs mechanical VTE prophylaxis alone be used in acutely or critically ill medical patients?

Recommendation 8

In acutely or critically ill medical patients, the ASH guideline panel suggests using mechanical alone over mechanical combined with pharmacological VTE prophylaxis (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕○○○).

Summary of the evidence. No existing systematic review addressed this question, and our systematic search for RCTs

identified 1 study providing direct evidence for this question.⁸⁸ This trial reported any confirmed VTE as an outcome. Therefore, we extrapolated the effects to representative baseline risks for PE and proximal and distal VTE to estimate the potential benefits and harms but rated down for indirectness because information for symptomatic VTE was not available.

The EtD framework is shown at <https://dbep.gradepro.org/profile/01137182-5DA7-ADF7-B58C-BBAF33FD4DCD>.

Benefits. In absolute and relative terms, combined mechanical and pharmacological prophylaxis compared with mechanical prophylaxis alone appeared to have no impact on mortality (RR, 1.0; 95% CI, 0.8-1.2; ARR, 0 fewer per 1000; 95% CI, from 10 fewer to 10 more per 1000). For VTE, the RR was 1.98 (95% CI, 0.60-6.58). For PE, this resulted in an ARI of 1 more per 1000 (95% CI, 0-6 more per 1000) using a baseline risk of 0.1%. For proximal DVT, the ARI was 2 more per 1000 (95% CI, 1 fewer to 10 more per 1000) using a baseline risk of 0.2%. For distal DVT, this extrapolated to an ARI of 7 more per 1000 (95% CI, 3 fewer to 40 more per 1000) using a baseline risk of 0.7%.

Harms and burden. Major bleeding was increased, with an RR of 1.48 (95% CI, 0.7-3.1) and an ARI of 1 more per 1000 (95% CI, from 1 fewer to 6 more per 1000). The panel considered the risk of falls, ischemia, and limb ulceration as important outcomes (as discussed for recommendation 7), but no quantitative estimates were available.

Certainty in the evidence of effects. The panel considered the certainty in these estimated effects as very low owing to very serious imprecision and indirectness (see evidence profile and online EtD framework).

Other EtD criteria and considerations. The panel assumed that avoidance of death, PE, and DVT was critical or important to patients for decision making.

Conclusions and research needs for this recommendation. The guideline panel determined that there is very low certainty in the balance between desirable and undesirable health effects of combined mechanical and pharmacological prophylaxis compared with mechanical prophylaxis alone in acutely or critically ill medical patients. The panel felt that applying combined prophylaxis to all patients would mean that the undesirable consequences would likely outweigh the desirable consequences. The panel felt that more research should be conducted to:

- Provide more direct evidence on combined mechanical and pharmacological prophylaxis compared with mechanical prophylaxis alone via clinical trials on efficacy, harms, and adherence to the intervention, particularly in high-risk medical inpatients in whom the balance of potential benefits vs harms might be more favorable than among lower-risk patients;
- Obtain patient preferences for mechanical or pharmacological prophylaxis by studying feasibility, equity, and acceptability;
- Determine current utilization rate of combined mechanical and pharmacological prophylaxis in practice; and
- Compare combined mechanical and pharmacological prophylaxis with mechanical prophylaxis alone utilizing comparative effectiveness research studies.

Mechanical combined with pharmacological vs pharmacological prophylaxis alone

Question: Should mechanical combined with pharmacological VTE prophylaxis vs pharmacological VTE prophylaxis alone be used in acutely or critically ill medical patients?

Recommendation 9

In acutely or critically ill medical patients, the ASH guideline panel *suggests* pharmacological VTE prophylaxis alone over mechanical combined with pharmacological VTE prophylaxis (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕○○○).

Summary of the evidence. We did not identify any systematic review that addressed this question or any RCT addressing this question in acutely or critically ill medical patients. Because of the lack of direct evidence to answer this question, the guideline panel decided to include indirect evidence available from RCTs in trauma and stroke patients. We used 1 systematic review summarizing evidence for patients with trauma¹²³ and 1 systematic review in patients with stroke.¹³² Our update of these systematic reviews did not identify any additional eligible studies. The EtD framework is shown at <https://dbep.gradepro.org/profile/DBB3AAE6-C0E9-1F2D-947D-4ED4A2B15E33>.

Benefits. In absolute and relative terms, mechanical prophylaxis may reduce mortality, PE, and DVT, but the estimates are very uncertain (for mortality the RR was 0.50; 95% CI, 0.05-5.30; ARR, 4 fewer per 1000; 95% CI, from 8 fewer to 34 more per 1000; for PE the RR was 0.35; 95% CI, 0.05-2.22; ARR, 1 fewer per 1000; 95% CI, from 1 fewer to 1 more per 1000; for proximal DVT the RR was 0.13; 95% CI, 0.04-0.40; ARR, 2 fewer per 1000; 95% CI, 1-2 fewer per 1000; for distal DVT the RR was 0.21; 95% CI, 0.02-1.76; ARR, 6 fewer per 1000; 95% CI, from 7 fewer to 5 more per 1000).

Harms and burden. Major bleeding with mechanical plus pharmacological prophylaxis compared with pharmacological prophylaxis alone may be increased, with an RR of 2.83 (95% CI, 0.30-26.7) and an ARR of 51 more major bleeding events per 1000 (95% CI, 20 fewer to 720 more per 1000). The panel considered risk of falls, ischemia, and limb ulceration with mechanical prophylaxis as important outcomes (as discussed for recommendation 7).

Certainty in the evidence of effects. Overall, the certainty in the estimated effects was very low owing to very serious imprecision and serious indirectness of the estimates (see evidence profile and online EtD framework).

Other EtD criteria and considerations. The panel assumed that avoidance of death, PE, DVT, and major bleeding was critical to patients. The panel judged that cost was moderate and cost-effectiveness favored pharmacological prophylaxis alone, but combined prophylaxis was deemed acceptable and feasible (see recommendation 7).

Conclusions and research needs for this recommendation. The guideline panel determined that, in acutely or critically ill medical patients, there is very low certainty in the evidence that, compared with pharmacological prophylaxis the undesirable consequences of mechanical combined with pharmacological

prophylaxis outweigh the desirable consequences of the 2 approaches combined. Thus, the panel made a conditional recommendation for using pharmacological prophylaxis alone. Priorities for research include conducting trials of combined mechanical and pharmacological prophylaxis compared with pharmacological prophylaxis alone among very high risk patient groups. Other research needs are outlined in recommendation 8.

Pneumatic compression devices vs graduated compression stockings

Question: Should pneumatic compression devices vs graduated compression stockings be used for VTE prophylaxis in acutely or critically ill medical patients?

Recommendation 10

In acutely or critically ill medical patients who are not receiving pharmacological VTE prophylaxis, the ASH guideline panel *suggests* using pneumatic compression devices or graduated compression stockings for VTE prophylaxis (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕○○○).

Summary of the evidence. We did not identify any systematic review that addressed this question, but our systematic search for RCTs identified 1 RCT¹²² in acutely ill medical patients that provided limited evidence for this question. This study compared intermittent pneumatic compression with graduated compression stockings. The EtD framework is shown at <https://dbep.gradeopro.org/profile/481D40D6-31CD-153A-BB3F-1CF50F1A7B23>.

Benefits, harms, and burden. For this recommendation, there was only 1 RCT with 43 participants and very few events (1 death, 1 PE, 3 DVTs). In comparing these 1 alternatives the panel believed it could not judge the balance of health effects based on this RCT.

Certainty in the evidence of effects. The panel rated the certainty in these estimated effects as very low owing to very serious imprecision and serious indirectness of the estimates (see evidence profile and online EtD framework).

Other EtD criteria and considerations. The panel assumed that avoidance of death, PE, and DVT was critical or important for decision making to patients.

Conclusions and research needs for this recommendation. The guideline panel determined that there was a paucity of evidence, as well as very low certainty in the evidence. The panel decided to not make a final judgment about which 1 of the 2 options led to more desirable than undesirable consequences. Thus, deducting from other recommendations, the panel made a conditional recommendation for using either option if mechanical prophylaxis is chosen.

With regard to research, the panel felt that:

- A systematic review of observational studies and a large comparative RCT are needed to increase the evidence available comparing pneumatic compression devices to graduated compression stockings in acutely or critically ill medical patients.
- Studies of pneumatic compression devices compared with graduated compression stockings are needed in acutely or critically ill medical patients with contraindications to pharmacological prophylaxis or those at high bleeding risk.

DOACs in acutely ill medical patients

Question: Should any DOAC vs LMWH be used for VTE prophylaxis in acutely ill hospitalized medical patients?

Question: Should any DOAC extended beyond hospital discharge vs standard duration non-DOAC VTE prophylaxis administered in hospital only be used in acutely ill medical patients?

Recommendation 11

In acutely ill hospitalized medical patients, the ASH guideline panel *recommends* using LMWH over DOACs as VTE prophylaxis (strong recommendation, moderate certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕⊕⊕○).

Recommendation 12

In acutely ill hospitalized medical patients, the ASH guideline panel *recommends* inpatient VTE prophylaxis with LMWH only, rather than inpatient and extended duration outpatient VTE prophylaxis with DOACs (strong recommendation, moderate certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕⊕⊕○). **Remark:** If patients are on a DOAC for other reasons, this recommendation may not apply.

Summary of the evidence. We did not find any systematic reviews addressing the questions and, thus, conducted a new systematic review. We made decisions a priori regarding search methods, eligibility criteria, data collection, and data analysis. We included 3 RCTs comparing a standard course inpatient treatment of 6 to 14 days of the LMWH enoxaparin with an extended treatment of 30 to 42 days of the DOAC rivaroxaban,¹⁴⁰ apixaban,¹⁴¹ or betrixaban.⁴² The studies had similar designs. We evaluated outcomes in 2 phases: first, we focused on outcomes at the end of the standard-course inpatient treatment with enoxaparin or oral DOAC (ie, enoxaparin and DOAC for the same period of time), and then we evaluated outcomes separately at the end of the prophylaxis period (ie, standard inpatient duration for enoxaparin vs extended-duration DOAC). Following our public comment period, we received data from the APEX trial investigators to allow us to conduct analyses focusing on the relevant time periods, as described above, and all outcomes. Specifically, we invited the APEX trial investigators to provide information about outcomes including all-cause mortality, PE, symptomatic DVT, and major bleeding at the end of short-term treatment with enoxaparin or oral DOAC. In response, the APEX investigators provided this additional information (Supplement 5).

The 3 RCTs reported the effects of DOAC vs LMWH on mortality, VTE-related mortality, PE, symptomatic DVT, and major bleeding. None of the studies reported whether the symptomatic DVTs were proximal or distal; therefore, we estimated the absolute effect on proximal and distal DVT by applying results to a representative baseline risk. Gastrointestinal bleeding was not reported separately in all trials, but the APEX investigators provided us with information about these events. In our analyses, none of the DOACs had effects that differed importantly or statistically from the others. Therefore, following our prespecified analysis approach, we used the combined analyses of the 3 RCTs to formulate recommendations. The EtD frameworks are shown at <https://dbep.gradeopro.org/profile/684ECAB2-2D90-B610-94A8-00BED6FC63FE> (for Recommendation 11) and

<https://dbep.gradepro.org/profile/200AE04A-D3F5-16AC-BEFE-A9E99C2A3900> (for Recommendation 12).

Any DOAC vs LMWH

Question: Should any DOAC vs LMWH be used for VTE prophylaxis in acutely ill hospitalized medical patients?

Benefits. In absolute terms, use of a DOAC compared with LMWH probably had no impact on VTE-related mortality (RR, 0.64; 95% CI, 0.21-1.98; ARR, 0 fewer deaths per 1000; 95% CI, 1 fewer to 1 more per 1000) and little impact on VTE (for nonfatal PE: RR, 1.01; 95% CI, 0.29-3.53; ARR, 0 fewer per 1000; 95% CI, 1 fewer to 3 more per 1000; for symptomatic DVT: RR, 1.03; 95% CI, 0.34-3.08; ARR, 0 fewer per 1000; 95% CI, 1 fewer to 2 more per 1000). We extrapolated these estimates for symptomatic proximal and distal DVT because trials did not report DVT location. For symptomatic proximal DVT, the ARR was 0 fewer per 1000 (95% CI, 1 fewer to 4 more per 1000) estimated for a baseline risk of 0.2%, and for symptomatic distal DVT, the ARR was 0 fewer per 1000 (95% CI, 4 fewer to 12 more per 1000) estimated for a baseline risk of 0.6%.

Harms and burden. In the 3 included trials, use of a DOAC compared with LMWH led to an increased risk for major bleeding (RR, 1.70; 95% CI, 1.02-2.82; ARI, 2 or 8 more hemorrhages per 1000 for 2 representative baseline risks of bleeding [low and high]). The 95% CIs for these absolute effects using baseline risks from Spencer et al were 0 to 4 more per 1000 and 2 to 22 more per 1000, respectively.¹⁴²

Certainty in the evidence of effects. The overall certainty in these estimated effects was moderate owing to imprecision of the estimates for the VTE outcomes (see evidence profile in the online EtD framework).

Other EtD criteria and considerations. The panel assumed that avoidance of death, VTE-related death, PE, DVT, and bleeding was critical or important to patients for decision making. The panel judged that DOACs would lead to cost savings in hospital because of lower DOAC drug cost compared with LMWH. Compared with LMWH, DOACs are probably acceptable and definitely feasible.

Any DOAC extended beyond hospital discharge vs non-DOAC in hospital only

Question: Should any DOAC extended beyond hospital discharge vs non-DOAC VTE prophylaxis administered in hospital only be used in acutely ill medical patients?

Benefits. In absolute terms, extended use of DOACs appeared to have no impact on mortality (RR, 1.01; 95% CI, 0.89-1.14), with an ARR of 0 fewer per 1000 treated (95% CI, 5 fewer to 7 more per 1000). The relative risk for PE was reduced (RR, 0.67; 95% CI, 0.41-1.09), with an ARR of 1 fewer per 1000 treated (95% CI, 0-2 fewer per 1000). For proximal and distal symptomatic DVT, we applied an RR of 0.62 (95% CI, 0.36-1.05), which was the RR for any symptomatic DVT in the studies. The resulting ARR for symptomatic proximal DVT was 0 fewer per 1000 (95% CI, 0-1 fewer per 1000) for a baseline risk of 0.2%, and the ARR for symptomatic distal DVT was 2 fewer per 1000 (95% CI, 0-4 fewer per 1000) for a baseline risk of 0.6%.

Harms and burden. In the 3 trials, extended use of a DOAC led to an increased risk for major bleeding (RR, 1.99; 95% CI, 1.08-3.65). The ARI for 2 baseline risks based on Spencer et al¹⁴² were 4 or 12 more hemorrhages per 1000 treated (95% CI, 0-10 more and 1-32 more per 1000, respectively).

Certainty in the evidence of effects. The certainty in these estimated effects was moderate owing to imprecision of the estimates when the small possible benefits are balanced against the harms.

Other EtD criteria and considerations. The panel assumed that avoidance of PE, DVT, and bleeding events was critical or important for decision making to patients. Although the panel judged that extending prophylaxis with a DOAC was probably acceptable and feasible, it could increase inequity because of access to and cost of extended out-of-hospital use.

Conclusions and research needs for these recommendations

The guideline panel determined that there is moderate certainty in the evidence for net health harm given the increased bleeding risk from using a DOAC compared with LMWH in acutely ill medical inpatients, both for inpatient use and extended use. Other EtD criteria generally favored LMWH use in hospital only because the undesirable effects of DOACs were greater than the desirable consequences. The panel considered that the EtDs were formulated using RCTs that tested 3 DOACs, but there was no heterogeneity observed in the systematic review, and the drugs have the same mechanism of action. The panel prioritized symptomatic over asymptomatic VTE, and the latter were included in the trial end points. However, inclusion of asymptomatic VTE in our analysis would not have changed interpretation of the relative effects of treatment. A strong recommendation was warranted given the overall moderate certainty in the evidence and minimal absolute effects on mortality and VTE compared with the increased bleeding risk from DOACs.

The panel suggested that future research should address:

- DOAC use among medical inpatients or for extended prophylaxis after discharge in larger trials assessing symptomatic VTE and bleeding end points, and in more selected patients based on predicted risk of VTE and of bleeding; and
- Evaluation of lower-dose DOAC regimens in medical inpatients or for extended use after discharge, to determine whether this might mitigate bleeding risk while preventing VTE.¹⁴³

Extended-duration outpatient prophylaxis vs inpatient-only prophylaxis in acutely ill medical patients

Question: Should extended-duration pharmacological VTE prophylaxis after discharge (ie, up to 30 or 40 days) vs in-hospital-only pharmacological VTE prophylaxis be used in acutely ill hospitalized medical patients?

Recommendation 13

In acutely ill medical patients, the ASH guideline panel *recommends* inpatient over inpatient plus extended-duration outpatient VTE prophylaxis (strong recommendation, moderate certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕⊕⊕○). **Remark:** This recommendation applies to heparin and DOACs.

Summary of the evidence. We identified 1 systematic review that provided evidence to address this question.¹⁴⁵ Our

update of the systematic review identified 1 additional study.⁴² All studies included acutely and critically ill medical patients.

Four studies utilizing enoxaparin (1 study) or a DOAC (3 studies) for extended prophylaxis reported the effect of extended vs in-hospital-only pharmacological prophylaxis on the development of nonfatal PE, symptomatic proximal DVT, major bleeding, and mortality^{42,140,141,145}; 3 studies reported the development of symptomatic distal DVT,^{42,140,141} and 1 study¹⁴⁵ assessed the risk of developing HIT. These studies also provided evidence for Recommendation 14, addressing extended-duration prophylaxis with DOACs.

The EtD framework is shown at <https://dbep.gradepro.org/profile/B7E7908E-FFD0-19C4-862E-16561BEC51FE>.

Benefits. Extended duration of pharmacological prophylaxis (LMWH or DOAC) appeared to have no effect on mortality (RR, 1.00; 95% CI, 0.89-1.12; ARR, 0 per 1000; 95% CI, 5 fewer to 5 more per 1000). For VTE, there were important relative effects but small absolute effects. Specifically, for PE the RR was 0.63 (95% CI, 0.39-1.03), and ARR was 1 fewer per 1000 (95% CI, 0-3 fewer per 1000). For proximal DVT, the RR was 0.54 (95% CI, 0.32-0.91), and ARR was 3 fewer per 1000 (95% CI, 1-4 fewer per 1000 based on representative baseline risks).

Harms and burden. In the 4 trials, extended use of pharmacological prophylaxis led to an increased risk for major bleeding (RR, 2.09; 95% CI, 1.33-3.27; ARI, 4-13 more bleeds per 1000; 95% CI, 1-8 more and 4-27 more per 1000 for baseline risks of 0.4% and 1.2%, respectively, based on the trials and Decousus et al³⁹).

Certainty in the evidence of effects. Overall, the certainty in these estimated effects was low owing to imprecision of the estimates and indirect comparisons (see evidence profile in the online EtD framework).

Other EtD criteria and considerations. The panel assumed that avoidance of PE, DVT, and bleeding events was critical or important to patients for decision making but that using extended prophylaxis could cause inequity because of concerns about cost and the ability to self-inject. A relevant trial was published after the guideline panel finalized this recommendation and during revision of this manuscript.¹⁴⁶ The study did not find that rivaroxaban was superior to placebo when given to medical patients at increased predicted VTE risk for 45 days after hospital discharge.¹⁴⁶ This finding is consistent with the conclusions of the systematic review conducted for this recommendation. Although this trial adds important information to the body of evidence for this recommendation, the guideline panel agreed that the trial results should not change the recommendation.

Conclusions and research needs for this recommendation. The guideline panel determined that there is low certainty in the evidence for net health harm from using extended compared with in-hospital prophylaxis. Other EtD criteria were generally in favor of using in-hospital prophylaxis only, because the undesirable consequences were greater than the desirable consequences in acutely ill medical patients, leading to a recommendation for shorter prophylaxis.

With regard to future research, the panel suggests:

- Studies of risk assessment tools for guidance on defining high-risk status for VTE and bleeding at discharge;

- Trials of pharmacological or nonpharmacological interventions in selected high-risk medical patients for VTE at discharge¹⁴³; and
- Studies that evaluate dose adjustments or lower doses of anticoagulants that might maximize benefit while minimizing harm when used for extended treatment to prevent VTE after hospital discharge.

Extended-duration outpatient prophylaxis vs inpatient-only UFH or LMWH in critically ill medical patients

Question: Should extended-duration (ie, up to 30 or 40 days) vs in-hospital-only UFH or LMWH be used for the thromboprophylaxis of VTE in critically ill hospitalized medical patients?

Recommendation 14

In critically ill medical patients, the ASH guideline panel *recommends* inpatient over inpatient plus extended-duration outpatient VTE prophylaxis (strong recommendation, moderate certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕⊕⊕○).

Because we did not find evidence addressing this question directly in critically ill hospitalized medical patients, the panel extrapolated the information found in acutely ill patients from recommendation 13 to critically ill patients. The EtD framework that combined acutely and critically ill patients is shown at <https://dbep.gradepro.org/profile/627ca9c1-1a6f-4155-bb21-44ffdf6cc197>.

Conclusions and research needs for this recommendation.

The guideline panel determined that there is low certainty in the evidence for net health harm from using extended compared with in-hospital prophylaxis in critically ill patients and that the other EtD criteria were generally in favor of using in-hospital-only prophylaxis so that the undesirable consequences were greater than the desirable consequences in critically ill medical patients. Given that this recommendation was based on indirect data and extrapolation from acutely ill medical patients, further research in critically ill medical patients is required. Research questions are listed in under recommendation 13.

Chronically ill medical patients or nursing home patients

Question: Should pharmacological VTE prophylaxis be used in chronically ill medical patients or nursing home patients?

Recommendation 15

In chronically ill medical patients, including nursing home patients, the ASH guideline panel *suggests* not using VTE prophylaxis compared with using any VTE prophylaxis (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕○○○). **Remark:** If a patient's status changes to acute, other recommendations would apply.

Summary of the evidence. We did not identify any systematic review that addressed this question. We identified

1 randomized trial of LMWH vs placebo with 87 patients¹⁴⁷ that fulfilled our inclusion criteria and measured outcomes relevant to this question (mortality, PE, proximal and distal DVT). The study included outpatients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease requiring home oxygen and who also had restricted physical activity. The study did not report the risk of major bleeding, gastrointestinal bleeding, or HIT specifically. The EtD framework is shown at <https://dbep.gradepro.org/profile/92523320-6D45-1BCA-9311-C750EB428BCB>.

Benefits. In absolute and relative terms, LMWH appeared to have a moderate impact on mortality and no impact on VTE, but these effects were considered very uncertain. For mortality, the RR was 0.43 (95% CI, 0.14-1.31), and the ARR was 119 fewer per 1000 (180 fewer to 65 more per 1000). For PE, the RR could not be calculated, because there were no events in the intervention and control groups. For proximal DVT, the RR was 0.98 (95% CI, 0.06-15.1), with an ARR of 0 fewer per 1000 (95% CI, 22 fewer to 329 more per 1000 using the study baseline risk of 2.3%). Reardon et al reported an incidence of 3.7% per year of any VTE in 2144 nursing home residents,¹⁴⁹ which was the basis of modeling of assumptions of a 3% VTE risk in a high-risk population, as well as a 1% VTE risk in a low-risk population. Based on the modeling of low- and high-risk populations, the ARR for proximal DVT was 0 fewer per 1000 (95% CI, 0 fewer to 5 more per 1000) and 0 fewer per 1000 (95% CI, 1 fewer to 15 more per 1000), respectively. The same RR was used for distal DVT, resulting in an ARR of 0 fewer per 1000 (95% CI, 1 fewer to 20 more per 1000) for a low-risk population and 0 fewer per 1000 (95% CI, 4 fewer to 61 more per 1000) for a high-risk population.

Harms and burden. The study did not report on major bleeding. The study reported an increase in thrombocytopenia (RR, 4.89; 95% CI, 0.24-98.96), but this increase was very imprecise, and the panel considered thrombocytopenia an important, but not critical, outcome for decision making.

Certainty in the evidence of effects. Overall, the certainty in these estimated effects is very low owing to very serious imprecision and serious indirectness of the estimates (see evidence profile and online EtD framework).

Other EtD criteria and considerations. The panel assumed that avoidance of death, PE, DVT, and major bleeding was critical to patients. The panel judged that the cost of pharmacological prophylaxis for this patient group would be moderate, and it could lead to inequity, because not all patient groups would be likely to receive pharmacological prophylaxis as the result of challenges with widespread implementation in nursing homes. Pharmacological prophylaxis was otherwise judged as probably not acceptable to all patients and stakeholders but probably feasible (see equity considerations above).

Conclusions and research needs for this recommendation. The guideline panel determined that there is very low certainty in the evidence that the undesirable consequences of pharmacological thromboprophylaxis in chronically ill medical patients outweigh the desirable consequences. The evidence suggested no important reduction in VTE but increased bleeding with use of LMWH in 1 study. Pharmacological

thromboprophylaxis was deemed to be of high cost and probably not acceptable to stakeholders. The panel suggested future research:

- Studies on identification of high-risk subgroups of chronically ill medical patients who could benefit from VTE prophylaxis, with consideration given to those who are immobilized;
- Studies of low-dose anticoagulant approaches, including use of DOACs or aspirin in chronically ill medical patients; and
- Research on current clinical practices for VTE prevention and patient preferences for VTE prevention in chronically ill medical inpatients or nursing home residents.

Medical outpatients with minor provoking risk factors for VTE

Question: Should VTE prophylaxis be used in medical outpatients with minor provoking factors for VTE (eg, immobility, minor injury, illness/infection)?

Recommendation 16

In medical outpatients with minor provoking factors for VTE (eg, immobility, minor injury, illness, infection), the ASH guideline panel *suggests* not using VTE prophylaxis (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕○○○).

Because we did not find evidence addressing this question, the panel decided to extrapolate the information found in acutely ill medical inpatients in recommendation 13. Evidence for outpatients with cancer is addressed in a separate ASH guideline. The EtD framework is shown at <https://dbep.gradepro.org/profile/0F91C482-0EC7-18AC-8738-817C23635ED2>.

Conclusions and research needs for this recommendation.

The guideline panel used indirect evidence from acutely ill medical patients that evaluated extended outpatient prophylaxis and determined that there is low certainty in the evidence for net health harm from that evidence in medical outpatients with minor provoking factors for VTE. Through extrapolation, the other EtD criteria were generally not in favor of using prophylaxis, because the undesirable consequences were greater than the desirable consequences in these patients. Given that this recommendation was based on indirect data and extrapolation, further research is required. The recommendation against thromboprophylaxis in medical outpatients with minor provoking factors for VTE, cost of treatment in this population, probable inequity of a recommendation, and lack of general acceptability were additional undesirable consequences.

The panel felt that the following research areas would be helpful:

- Development of risk-assessment methods to determine absolute risk of VTE in outpatients with minor provoking VTE risk factors and
- Trials of interventions (pharmacological or nonpharmacological) in a high-risk population of outpatients with minor provoking VTE risk factors.

Long-distance travelers

Question: Should graduated compression stockings, LMWH, or aspirin vs no VTE prophylaxis be used by long-distance (>4 hours) travelers?

Recommendation 17

In long-distance (>4 hours) travelers without risk factors for VTE, the ASH guideline panel *suggests* not using graduated compression stockings, LMWH, or aspirin for VTE prophylaxis (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕○○○). **Remark:** People without known risk factors who place a high value on prevention of VTE may choose to use graduated compression stockings (also reduces edema).

Recommendation 18

In people who are at substantially increased VTE risk (eg, recent surgery, history of VTE, postpartum women, active malignancy, or ≥2 risk factors, including combinations of the above with hormone replacement therapy, obesity, or pregnancy), the ASH guideline panel *suggests* using graduated compression stockings or prophylactic LMWH for long-distance (>4 hours) travel (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕○○○).

Recommendation 19

In people who are at substantially increased VTE risk (eg, recent surgery, history of VTE, postpartum women, active malignancy, or ≥2 risk factors, including combinations of the above with hormone replacement therapy, obesity, or pregnancy) and in whom LMWH or graduated compression stockings is not feasible (eg, resource-constrained setting or aversion to other indicated anticoagulants), the ASH guideline panel *suggests* using aspirin rather than no VTE prophylaxis (conditional recommendation, very low certainty in the evidence of effects ⊕○○○).

Air travel and VTE

Summary of the evidence for baseline risk.

Worldwide, 3.4 billion passengers traveled by air in 2015 (<http://data.worldbank.org/indicator/IS.AIR.PSGR>). We identified 1 systematic review evaluating the risk of a symptomatic DVT event within 4 weeks of flights longer than 4 hours. Air travel is associated with a 2.8-fold increased risk for DVT or PE (95% CI, 2.1-4.2).¹⁴⁹ The estimated absolute risk for symptomatic DVT with air travel is ~0.05% (95% CI, 0.01-0.19) and for asymptomatic DVT is 2.6% for a 4-hour flight and 3.6% for a ≥7-hour flight.¹⁵⁰ The risk was deemed to be 1 per 4600 flights taken,¹⁵¹ and it suggested that the risk for a severe PE occurring immediately after air travel increases with the duration of travel, to up to 4.8 per million for flights longer than 12 hours. Our update of the review identified 11 additional relevant studies.¹⁵²⁻¹⁶² We did not consider studies addressing biomarkers as predictors of travel-related VTE. These associations were no longer evident by 12 weeks after travel. If symptomatic DVT develops, the potential impact is high. In ambulatory population-based cohorts, the estimated 28-day mortality for a first episode of symptomatic VTE is 11%.¹⁶³

It is not clear that patients with prior VTE are particularly susceptible to air travel-related VTE. A case-control study did not show a higher risk for VTE with air travel or long-duration travel by car, bus, or train among patients with prior VTE compared with those without prior VTE.¹⁶⁰ This lack of increased risk was not explained by preventive measures taken during travel, because these were equally distributed between cases and controls. Two available studies assessed the risk of VTE in total joint arthroplasty patients, finding no association between preoperative or postoperative air travel and VTE risk.^{154,156} However, findings might be biased if travelers took precautions to reduce their risk of VTE, and studies might have been underpowered to detect associations.

Several VTE risk factors (eg, cancer, plaster casts, hormone replacement therapy, oral contraceptives, and pregnancy) multiplicatively increase the risk of air travel-related VTE.¹⁶² For example, pregnant women who traveled by air had an odds ratio (OR) for VTE of 14.3 (95% CI, 1.7-121.0) compared with an OR of 4.3 (95% CI, 0.9-19.8) associated with pregnancy alone.¹⁶⁴ Women who traveled by air while using oral contraceptives had an 8.2-fold (95% CI, 2.3-28.7) elevated risk for VTE compared with nontravelers who were not on contraceptives, whereas the risk with oral contraceptives alone was increased 2.5-fold (95% CI, 0.9-7.0).¹⁶²

To interpret research for these questions, we used a baseline risk for symptomatic VTE of 215 per million trips for symptomatic VTE after travel longer than 4 hours (based on 1 in 4600 flights).¹⁵¹ The shape of the relationship between duration of air travel and VTE risk is not well known, and these recommendations may require extrapolation to shorter or longer duration of travel.

Graduated compression stockings for long-distance travelers

Summary of the evidence for effects. We found 1 systematic review of 9 RCTs that addressed the impact of graduated compression stockings compared with not using stockings in long-distance travelers.¹⁶⁵ We did not find additional studies addressing this question. The EtD framework is shown at <https://dbep.gradepro.org/profile/C18330E4-93EB-5807-ABAB-5F926CD54CCF>.

Benefits. In absolute terms and on a population level, graduated compression stockings appeared to have very small and very uncertain effects on VTE, with an RR of 0.10 (95% CI, 0.04-0.25) extrapolated to all VTE events. For PE, the ARR was 11 fewer per 1 000 000 (95% CI, 9-12 fewer per 1 000 000), for proximal DVT, the ARR was 540 fewer per 1 000 000 (95% CI, 450-576 fewer per 1 000 000), and for distal DVT, the ARR was 2112 fewer per 1 000 000 (95% CI, 1760-2253 fewer per 1 000 000). Death did not occur in any of the studies.

Harms and burden. The panel did not consider any of the possible harms as critical. The tolerability of graduated compression stockings was described as very good, with no reported side effects in 4 RCTs. None of the 5 trials reported serious adverse effects of wearing the stockings, but in 1 trial, 4 patients developed varicose vein thrombosis, possibly as a result of the stockings.¹⁶⁵ The panel was concerned about potential allergy to the stocking material, but this adverse effect was not reported in the trials.

Certainty in the evidence of effects. Overall, the certainty in these estimated effects is very low owing to very serious

indirectness and serious risk of bias for the estimates (see evidence profile and online EtD framework).

Other EtD criteria and considerations. The panel assumed that avoidance of PE, DVT, and bleeding was critical or important for decision making to patients. Graduated compression stockings were considered to not be cost-effective, to be acceptable to some but not to other stakeholders, and probably feasible.

LMWH and aspirin for long-distance travelers

Summary of the evidence for effects. We found several narrative and systematic reviews that addressed the impact of LMWH or aspirin compared with no prophylaxis in long-distance travelers.^{150,166,167} Our updated search for studies did not identify eligible RCTs. Only 1 small RCT evaluated the impact of LMWH, aspirin, or no prophylaxis on VTE.¹⁶⁸ The EtD frameworks are shown at <https://dbep.gradepro.org/profile/916AAFBA-F72C-2CBE-BD33-8EA86A031824> and <https://dbep.gradepro.org/profile/7E083128-12E4-1EB2-9567-2E37334ECB8D>.

Benefits. In absolute terms and on a population level, LMWH appeared to have a very small and very uncertain effect on VTE compared with no treatment (RR, 0.10; 95% CI, 0.10-2.11 extrapolated to all VTE events; ARR, 3 fewer per 1 000 000; 95% CI, from 3 fewer to 4 more per 1 000 000 for PE; ARR, 176 fewer per 1 000 000; 95% CI, from 194 fewer to 217 more per 1 000 000 for proximal DVT; ARR, 702 fewer per 1 000 000; 95% CI, from 772 fewer to 866 more per 1 000 000 for distal DVT; death did not occur in this trial). In absolute terms and on a population level, aspirin appeared to have an even smaller and very uncertain effect on VTE compared with no treatment (RR, 0.75; 95% CI, 0.13-4.32 extrapolated to all VTE events; ARR, 1 fewer per 1 000 000; 95% CI, from 3 fewer to 12 more per 1 000 000 for PE; ARR for proximal DVT, 49 fewer per 1 000 000; 95% CI, from 170 fewer to 650 more per 1 000 000; ARR for distal DVT, 195 fewer per 1 000 000; 95% CI, from 679 fewer to 2590 more per 1 000 000; death did not occur in this trial).

Harms and burden. Bleeding did not occur with LMWH or aspirin in the 1 available RCT.

Certainty in the evidence of effects. Overall, the certainty in these estimated effects is very low owing to very serious indirectness and serious risk of bias for the estimates (see evidence profile in the online EtD framework).

Other EtD criteria and considerations. The panel assumed that avoidance of PE, DVT, and bleeding events was critical or important to patients for decision making. Given the panel's judgment that LMWH and aspirin showed no net health benefit, they were not cost-effective. Although the panel assumed no impact on health equity for aspirin, it felt that equity would be reduced if LMWH were recommended, given challenges with access. The use of LMWH was considered acceptable to some but not to other stakeholders and probably not feasible for all travelers, but use of aspirin was considered acceptable and feasible.

Conclusions and research needs for recommendations for long-distance travelers

The guideline panel determined that, although the health effects may suggest net benefit for the use of graduated compression stockings, cost would be moderate, and use of stockings would not be cost-effective. Equity would probably be reduced because graduated

compression stockings would likely be an out-of-pocket cost, and acceptability would vary because insurance companies may not be willing to cover the cost. Proper use of graduated compression stockings might require support in the elderly and people with disabilities, but stockings on a population level were considered probably feasible. Overall, the panel judged that, for all interventions, the undesirable consequences were greater than the desirable consequences and made recommendations against their use, with the exception of patients with VTE risk factors. People without known VTE risk factors who place a high value on prevention of VTE may choose to use graduated compression stockings. For LMWH and aspirin, people with substantially increased risk for VTE (eg, recent surgery, history of VTE, hormone replacement therapy, pregnant or postpartum women, active malignancy, or ≥ 2 VTE risk factors) may experience more health benefits than harms.

With regard to research needs, the panel identified:

- Risk-assessment methods to define travelers at sufficiently high VTE risk to warrant VTE prophylaxis intervention; and
- Large pragmatic trials of interventions to prevent VTE in travelers, particularly those at high VTE risk; and
- Evidence on effectiveness and safety of DOACs to prevent VTE in travelers at risk of VTE.

What are others saying and what is new in these ASH guidelines?

There are 5 other recent guidelines available on the prevention of VTE in medical patients: the 2011 American College of Physicians guidelines,¹⁶⁹ the 2012 American College of Chest Physicians (ACCP) guidelines,¹⁷⁰ the 2013 update from the International Union of Angiology (IUA),²⁴ the 2017 update from the Asian Venous Thrombosis Forum,¹⁷¹ and the 2018 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence guidelines.¹⁷² The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality in the United States also provides a guide for implementing effective quality improvement in this area.¹⁷³ Two major differences between the ASH guidelines and many of the others is the consistent use of systematic reviews and EtDs, which increases transparency, and the use of marker states to estimate the relative importance of key outcomes of treatment to patients.

All guidelines advocated assessing the risk of VTE and bleeding in admitted medical patients. The American College of Physicians issued 2 additional recommendations: for the use of heparin or a related drug, unless patients were at high bleeding risk, and against use of graduated compression stockings. The ACCP guidelines were most similar to the ASH guideline in scope and methods. The ACCP advised not to use prophylaxis in medical patients at low risk of VTE, based on the Padua Prediction Score, or at high risk of bleeding. For at-risk medical or critically ill patients, LMWH, UFH twice daily or thrice daily, and fondaparinux were all recommended, with selection among these based on patient preference, compliance, and local factors related to formularies. The ASH panel recommended LMWH or fondaparinux over UFH. For patients at risk of bleeding, the ACCP recommended mechanical prophylaxis with graduated compression stockings or intermittent pneumatic compression, with consideration of pharmacologic prophylaxis if the bleeding risk resolved. This is similar to the ASH guidelines, although the recommendations were not specifically keyed to bleeding risk but to persons at risk who are not receiving pharmacological prophylaxis. Unlike ACCP, the ASH panel

Table 4. Research priorities identified by patient population

| | |
|---|---|
| Acutely or critically ill medical inpatients | <p>Better information on baseline risk assessment of thrombosis and bleeding in acutely or critically ill medical inpatients is needed, in particular whether risk varies over the course of admission</p> <p>More information on the optimal dosing of parenteral anticoagulation to prevent VTE in acutely or critically ill medical inpatients is needed. In particular, can lower or higher doses be used in different settings (perhaps dependent on baseline risk), and should dosing be adjusted in obese patients, underweight patients, and patients with renal disease?</p> <p>Determination of the acceptable balance between bleeding and thrombosis risk in the context of selecting the optimal VTE prophylaxis in critically ill medical patients</p> <p>Net health benefit of mechanical prophylaxis in a lower risk medical inpatient population</p> <p>Utility of outpatient use of mechanical prophylaxis in medical outpatients at risk of VTE</p> <p>Direct comparisons between graduated compression stockings and pneumatic compression devices in acutely or critically ill medical inpatients</p> <p>Impact of use of pneumatic compression devices in acutely or critically ill medical inpatients at high bleeding risk or with active bleeding</p> <p>Better information on bleeding risk in acutely or critically ill medical inpatients to inform decisions about use of mechanical or pharmacological VTE prophylaxis</p> <p>More direct evidence on combined mechanical and pharmacological prophylaxis compared with mechanical prophylaxis alone via clinical trials on efficacy, harms, and adherence to the intervention, particularly in high-risk medical inpatients in whom the balance of potential benefits vs harms might be more favorable than among lower-risk patients</p> <p>Obtain patient preferences for mechanical or pharmacological prophylaxis in the hospital setting by studying feasibility, equity, and acceptability</p> <p>Determine current utilization rate of combined mechanical and pharmacological prophylaxis in practice among acutely or critically ill medical inpatients</p> <p>Provide more direct evidence on combined mechanical and pharmacological prophylaxis compared with mechanical prophylaxis alone via clinical trials on efficacy, harms and adherence to the intervention, particularly in high-risk medical inpatients in whom the balance of potential benefits vs harms might be more favorable than among lower-risk patients</p> <p>Comparative effectiveness research on combined mechanical and pharmacological prophylaxis compared with mechanical prophylaxis alone in acutely or critically ill medical inpatients</p> <p>Conduct trials of combined mechanical and pharmacological prophylaxis compared with pharmacological prophylaxis alone among very high risk patient groups</p> <p>A systematic review of observational studies and a large comparative RCT are needed to increase the evidence available comparing pneumatic compression devices with graduated compression stockings in acutely or critically ill medical patients</p> <p>Studies of pneumatic compression devices compared with graduated compression stockings in acutely or critically ill medical patients with contraindications to pharmacological prophylaxis or those at high bleeding risk</p> <p>Study DOAC use among medical inpatients or for extended prophylaxis after discharge in larger trials assessing symptomatic VTE and bleeding end points in more selected patients based on predicted risk of VTE and of bleeding</p> <p>Evaluation of lower-dose DOAC regimens in acutely ill medical inpatients or for extended use after discharge, to determine whether this might mitigate bleeding risk while preventing VTE</p> <p>Trials of pharmacological or nonpharmacological interventions in selected high-risk medical patients at discharge</p> <p>Studies that evaluate dose adjustments or lower doses of anticoagulants that might maximize benefit while minimizing harm when used for extended treatment to prevent VTE after hospital discharge among acutely or critically ill medical inpatients</p> |
| Chronically ill medical inpatients or nursing home residents | <p>Studies on identification of high-risk subgroups of chronically ill medical patients who could benefit from VTE prophylaxis, with consideration given to those who are immobilized</p> <p>Studies of low-dose anticoagulant approaches, including use of DOACs or aspirin in chronically ill medical patients</p> <p>Research on current clinical practices for VTE prevention and patient preferences for VTE prevention in chronically ill medical inpatients or nursing home residents</p> <p>Studies on identification of high-risk subgroups of chronically ill medical patients who could benefit from VTE prophylaxis, with consideration given to those who are immobilized</p> |
| Outpatients with minor provoking VTE risk factors | <p>Development of risk-assessment methods to determine absolute risk of VTE in outpatients with minor provoking VTE risk factors</p> <p>Trials of interventions (pharmacological or nonpharmacological) in a high-risk population of outpatients with minor provoking VTE risk factors</p> |
| Travelers | <p>Risk-assessment methods to define travelers at sufficiently high VTE risk to warrant VTE prophylaxis intervention</p> <p>Large pragmatic trials of interventions to prevent VTE in travelers, particularly those at high VTE risk</p> <p>Evidence on effectiveness and safety of DOACs to prevent VTE in travelers at risk of VTE</p> |

addressed combination mechanical and pharmacological prophylaxis over either alone and suggested against the combination.

The ASH panel and ACCP recommended against prophylaxis in chronically immobilized outpatients or nursing home residents. The ASH panel also specifically recommended against prophylaxis in outpatients with minor provoking factors for VTE. The ACCP and the ASH panel considered long-distance travelers and advised against prophylaxis for persons without risk factors. For long-distance travelers at increased risk for VTE, the ACCP recommended 15- to 30-mm Hg below-knee graduated compression stockings, frequent ambulation, calf muscle exercise, or sitting in an aisle seat. They recommended against the use of aspirin or anticoagulants. The ASH panel recommended LMWH or graduated compression stockings and the use of aspirin if these were not feasible or available.

In the 2013 IUA updated guidelines, risk assessment of medically ill patients and treatment with LMWH or fondaparinux was recommended, as was consideration of postdischarge treatment of women, patients older than 75 years, or those with severe immobility. They also recommended, with moderate certainty, the use of graduated compression stockings plus intermittent pneumatic compression in ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke patients in whom risks of anticoagulant prophylaxis were deemed unacceptable.

The 2017 Asian Venous Thrombosis Forum updated guidelines for medically ill patients concluded that, if prophylaxis was used, pharmacological prophylaxis was preferred in the absence of bleeding risk; otherwise, intermittent pneumatic compression, but not graduated compression stockings, were recommended.¹⁷¹

The National Institute for Health and Care Excellence guidelines released in 2018 addressed VTE prevention in all hospitalized patients.¹⁷² For medical patients, they addressed specific subgroups separately: acute coronary syndrome, stroke, medical, renal impairment, cancer, palliative care, critically ill, and psychiatry patients. Differences from the ASH guidelines include:

- No prophylaxis generally for patients with acute coronary syndrome;
- Consider prophylaxis in those on long-term anticoagulation if this is interrupted;
- Use intermittent pneumatic compression in acute stroke patients for 30 days or until the patient is mobile or discharged;
- Use pharmacological prophylaxis in acutely ill medical patients for 7 days minimally, with LMWH preferentially;
- Use LMWH or UFH, with lower doses of each if desired, for medical patients with renal impairment;
- Use prophylaxis with LMWH in those receiving palliative care if desired, but not in the last days of life;
- Use mechanical prophylaxis in critically ill patients if pharmacological prophylaxis is contraindicated;
- Use daily, or more frequent, VTE and bleeding risk assessments in critically ill patients;
- For acute psychiatric patients, perform VTE risk assessment, and if prophylaxis is used, use fondaparinux or LMWH; and
- Recommendation for education of patients/caregivers on VTE and VTE prevention at admission and discharge.

The ASH panel addressed use of DOACs for inpatient and postdischarge prophylaxis in medical patients using data not

available to other guideline groups and recommended against the use of DOACs over other treatments in the hospital. Like the ACCP and unlike the IUA, the ASH panel recommended against extending prophylaxis after discharge with a DOAC or other agent (with only enoxaparin being evaluated by the ACCP and the IUA). The other guidelines that we describe here did not address extended postdischarge prophylaxis.

Limitations of these guidelines

The limitations of these guidelines are inherent in the low or very low certainty in the evidence we identified for many of the questions. The necessary inclusion of results from older trials might pose difficulty in interpretation of findings given secular trends in characteristics of acutely or critically ill medical inpatients over the past 2 decades (eg, length of stay, illness severity, duration of administered VTE prophylaxis). We did not address whether twice or thrice daily unfractionated heparin should be used when unfractionated heparin is chosen, because we did not develop a guideline question for this, there are little data, and there are no recent data.

Revision or adaptation of the guidelines

Plans for updating these guidelines

After publication of these guidelines, ASH will maintain them through surveillance for new evidence, ongoing review by experts, and regular revisions.

Updating or adapting recommendations locally

Adaptation of these guidelines will be necessary in many circumstances. These adaptations should be based on the associated EtD frameworks.¹⁷⁴ The Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality in the United States provides a guide for implementing effective quality improvement in this patient population.¹⁷⁵

Priorities for research

On the basis of gaps in evidence identified during the guideline-development process, the panel identified 29 areas for further research, which are summarized in Table 4.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Itziar Etxeandia, Arnav Agarwal, Samantha Craigie, Rana Qadeer, Farid Foroutan, Housne Ara, Federico Popoff, Maram Hakoum, Tejan Baldeh, Stephanie Ross, Luis Colunga, John Riva, and Rohan Kehar for supporting the systematic reviews. A template of the guidelines for all panels (prepared by H.J.S.) was critically reviewed by Adam Cuker, Rob Kunkle, the ASH Guideline Oversight Subcommittee, the Methods Group supporting the guidelines, and *Blood Advances* editors.

Authorship

Contribution: H.J.S. wrote the first draft of the manuscript and revised the manuscript based on authors' suggestions; M.C. contributed to drafting and critical revisions of the manuscript and contributed to further drafts; guideline panel members (H.J.S., M. C., J.B.-W., A.E.B., F.A.S., F.D., S.R.K., J.L., S.M.R., N.A.Z., K.A.B.) critically reviewed the manuscript and provided suggestions for improvement; members of the knowledge synthesis team (H.J.S., S.B., A.D., G.P.M., I.N., R.N., W.W., J.J.Y.-N., Y.Z.) contributed evidence summaries to the guidelines; and W.W. checked the

manuscript accuracy and coordinated the systematic review team with R.N. and H.J.S. All authors approved the content. M.C. and H.J.S. were the chair and vice-chair of the panel and led the panel meetings.

Conflict-of-interest disclosure: All authors were members of the guideline panel, members of the systematic review team, or both. As

such, they completed a disclosure of interest form, which was reviewed by ASH and is available as Supplements 2 and 3.

Correspondence: Holger J. Schünemann, Department of Health Research Methods, Evidence and Impact, McMaster University, HSC-2C16, 1280 Main St West; Hamilton, ON L8N 3Z5, Canada; e-mail: schuneh@mcmaster.ca.

References

1. Benjamin EJ, Virani SS, Callaway CW, et al; American Heart Association Council on Epidemiology and Prevention Statistics Committee and Stroke Statistics Subcommittee. Heart disease and stroke statistics-2018 update: a report from the American Heart Association [published correction appears in *Circulation*. 2018;137(12):e493]. *Circulation*. 2018;137(12):e67-e492.
2. Heit JA. Venous thromboembolism epidemiology: implications for prevention and management. *Semin Thromb Hemost*. 2002;28(suppl 2):3-13.
3. Heit JA, O'Fallon WM, Petterson TM, et al. Relative impact of risk factors for deep vein thrombosis and pulmonary embolism: a population-based study. *Arch Intern Med*. 2002;162(11):1245-1248.
4. Zarowitz BJ, Tangalos E, Lefkowitz A, et al. Thrombotic risk and immobility in residents of long-term care facilities. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*. 2010;11(3):211-221.
5. Cannegieter SC. Travel-related thrombosis. *Best Pract Res Clin Haematol*. 2012;25(3):345-350.
6. Folsom AR, Boland LL, Cushman M, Heckbert SR, Rosamond WD, Walston JD. Frailty and risk of venous thromboembolism in older adults. *J Gerontol A Biol Sci Med Sci*. 2007;62(1):79-82.
7. van Stralen KJ, Rosendaal FR, Doggen CJ. Minor injuries as a risk factor for venous thrombosis. *Arch Intern Med*. 2008;168(1):21-26.
8. Schünemann HJ, Wiercioch W, Etzeandia I, et al. Guidelines 2.0: systematic development of a comprehensive checklist for a successful guideline enterprise. *CMAJ*. 2014;186(3):E123-E142.
9. Committee on Standards for Developing Trustworthy Clinical Practice Guidelines, Board on Health Care Services; Graham R, Mancher M, Wolman DM, Greenfield S, Steinberg E, eds. *Clinical Practice Guidelines We Can Trust*. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2011.
10. Qaseem A, Forland F, Macbeth F, Ollenschläger G, Phillips S, van der Wees P; Board of Trustees of the Guidelines International Network. Guidelines International Network: toward international standards for clinical practice guidelines. *Ann Intern Med*. 2012;156(7):525-531.
11. Schünemann HJ, Al-Ansary LA, Forland F, et al; Board of Trustees of the Guidelines International Network. Guidelines International Network: principles for disclosure of interests and management of conflicts in guidelines. *Ann Intern Med*. 2015;163(7):548-553.
12. Alonso-Coello P, Oxman AD, Moberg J, et al; GRADE Working Group. GRADE Evidence to Decision (EtD) frameworks: a systematic and transparent approach to making well informed healthcare choices. 2: Clinical practice guidelines. *BMJ*. 2016;353:i2089.
13. Alonso-Coello P, Schünemann HJ, Moberg J, et al; GRADE Working Group. GRADE Evidence to Decision (EtD) frameworks: a systematic and transparent approach to making well informed healthcare choices. 1: Introduction. *BMJ*. 2016;353:i2016.
14. Atkins D, Eccles M, Flottorp S, et al; GRADE Working Group. Systems for grading the quality of evidence and the strength of recommendations I: critical appraisal of existing approaches The GRADE Working Group. *BMC Health Serv Res*. 2004;4(1):38.
15. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Akl EA, et al. GRADE guidelines: 1. Introduction-Grade evidence profiles and summary of findings tables. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2011;64(4):383-394.
16. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Vist GE, et al; GRADE Working Group. GRADE: an emerging consensus on rating quality of evidence and strength of recommendations. *BMJ*. 2008;336(7650):924-926.
17. Schünemann HJ, Best D, Vist G, Oxman AD, GRADE Working Group. Letters, numbers, symbols and words: how to communicate grades of evidence and recommendations. *CMAJ*. 2003;169(7):677-680.
18. Schünemann HJ, Mustafa R, Brozek J, et al; GRADE Working Group. GRADE Guidelines: 16. GRADE evidence to decision frameworks for tests in clinical practice and public health. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2016;76:89-98.
19. Barbar S, Prandoni P. Scoring systems for estimating risk of venous thromboembolism in hospitalized medical patients. *Semin Thromb Hemost*. 2017;43(5):460-468.
20. National Institute for Health and Clinical Excellence. NICE clinical guideline 92: Venous thromboembolism: reducing the risk. <http://www.1000livesplus.wales.nhs.uk/sitesplus/documents/1011/CG92NICEGuidelinePDF.pdf>. Accessed 15 April 2018.
21. Stein PD, Beemath A, Olson RE. Trends in the incidence of pulmonary embolism and deep venous thrombosis in hospitalized patients. *Am J Cardiol*. 2005;95(12):1525-1526.
22. Hull RD, Merali T, Mills A, Stevenson AL, Liang J. Venous thromboembolism in elderly high-risk medical patients: time course of events and influence of risk factors. *Clin Appl Thromb Hemost*. 2013;19(4):357-362.
23. Geerts WH, Bergqvist D, Pineo GF, et al. Prevention of venous thromboembolism: American College of Chest Physicians Evidence-Based Clinical Practice Guidelines (8th Edition). *Chest*. 2008;133(6 suppl):381S-453S.
24. Nicolaidis AN, Fareed J, Kakkar AK, et al. Prevention and treatment of venous thromboembolism--International Consensus Statement. *Int Angiol*. 2013;32(2):111-260.

25. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Preventing hospital-acquired venous thromboembolism: a guide for effective quality improvement. <https://www.mnhospitals.org/Portals/0/Documents/ptsafety/vte/vtguide.pdf>. Accessed 14 December 2017.
26. Flanders SA, Greene MT, Grant P, et al. Hospital performance for pharmacologic venous thromboembolism prophylaxis and rate of venous thromboembolism: a cohort study. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2014;174(10):1577-1584.
27. Mahan CE, Fisher MD, Mills RM, et al. Thromboprophylaxis patterns, risk factors, and outcomes of care in the medically ill patient population. *Thromb Res*. 2013;132(5):520-526.
28. Cohen AT, Davidson BL, Gallus AS, et al; ARTEMIS Investigators. Efficacy and safety of fondaparinux for the prevention of venous thromboembolism in older acute medical patients: randomised placebo controlled trial. *BMJ*. 2006;332(7537):325-329.
29. Leizorovicz A, Cohen AT, Turpie AG, Olsson CG, Vaitkus PT, Goldhaber SZ; PREVENT Medical Thromboprophylaxis Study Group. Randomized, placebo-controlled trial of dalteparin for the prevention of venous thromboembolism in acutely ill medical patients. *Circulation*. 2004;110(7):874-879.
30. Samama MM, Cohen AT, Darmon JY, et al; Prophylaxis in Medical Patients with Enoxaparin Study Group. A comparison of enoxaparin with placebo for the prevention of venous thromboembolism in acutely ill medical patients. *N Engl J Med*. 1999;341(11):793-800.
31. Cohen AT, Tapson VF, Bergmann JF, et al; ENDORSE Investigators. Venous thromboembolism risk and prophylaxis in the acute hospital care setting (ENDORSE study): a multinational cross-sectional study. *Lancet*. 2008;371(9610):387-394.
32. Greene MT, Spyropoulos AC, et al. Validation of risk assessment models of venous thromboembolism in hospitalized medical patients. *Am J Med*. 2016;129(9):1001.e9-1001.e18.
33. Stuck AK, Spirk D, Schaudt J, Kucher N. Risk assessment models for venous thromboembolism in acutely ill medical patients. A systematic review. *Thromb Haemost*. 2017;117(4):801-808.
34. Zakai NA, Callas PW, Repp AB, Cushman M. Venous thrombosis risk assessment in medical inpatients: the medical inpatients and thrombosis (MITH) study. *J Thromb Haemost*. 2013;11(4):634-641.
35. Barbar S, Noventa F, Rossetto V, et al. A risk assessment model for the identification of hospitalized medical patients at risk for venous thromboembolism: the Padua Prediction Score. *J Thromb Haemost*. 2010;8(11):2450-2457.
36. Spyropoulos AC, Anderson FA Jr, FitzGerald G, et al; IMPROVE Investigators. Predictive and associative models to identify hospitalized medical patients at risk for VTE. *Chest*. 2011;140(3):706-714.
37. Nendaz M, Spirk D, Kucher N, et al. Multicentre validation of the Geneva Risk Score for hospitalised medical patients at risk of venous thromboembolism. Explicit ASsessment of Thromboembolic Risk and Prophylaxis for Medical PATients in SwitzErland (ESTIMATE). *Thromb Haemost*. 2014;111(3):531-538.
38. Rosenberg D, Eichorn A, Alarcon M, McCullagh L, McGinn T, Spyropoulos AC. External validation of the risk assessment model of the International Medical Prevention Registry on Venous Thromboembolism (IMPROVE) for medical patients in a tertiary health system. *J Am Heart Assoc*. 2014;3(6):e001152.
39. Decousus H, Tapson VF, Bergmann JF, et al; IMPROVE Investigators. Factors at admission associated with bleeding risk in medical patients: findings from the IMPROVE investigators. *Chest*. 2011;139(1):69-79.
40. Hostler DC, Marx ES, Moores LK, et al. Validation of the International Medical Prevention Registry on Venous Thromboembolism bleeding risk score. *Chest*. 2016;149(2):372-379.
41. Rosenberg DJ, Press A, Fishbein J, et al. External validation of the IMPROVE bleeding risk assessment model in medical patients. *Thromb Haemost*. 2016;116(3):530-536.
42. Cohen AT, Harrington RA, Goldhaber SZ, et al; APEX Investigators. Extended thromboprophylaxis with betrixaban in acutely ill medical patients. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;375(6):534-544.
43. Cohen AT, Spiro TE, Spyropoulos AC, et al; MAGELLAN Study Group. D-dimer as a predictor of venous thromboembolism in acutely ill, hospitalized patients: a subanalysis of the randomized controlled MAGELLAN trial. *J Thromb Haemost*. 2014;12(4):479-487.
44. Gibson CM, Spyropoulos AC, Cohen AT, et al. The IMPROVEDD VTE risk score: incorporation of D-Dimer into the IMPROVE score to improve venous thromboembolism risk stratification. Available at: <http://www.thieme-connect.de/DOI/DOI?10.1055/s-0037-1603929>. Accessed 6 August 2017.
45. Lo B, Field MJ, eds. Conflict of Interest in Medical Research, Education, and Practice. Washington, DC: National Academies Press; 2009.
46. Akl EA, El-Hachem P, Abou-Haidar H, Neumann I, Schünemann HJ, Guyatt GH. Considering intellectual, in addition to financial, conflicts of interest proved important in a clinical practice guideline: a descriptive study. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2014;67(11):1222-1228.
47. Guyatt G, Akl EA, Hirsh J, et al. The vexing problem of guidelines and conflict of interest: a potential solution. *Ann Intern Med*. 2010;152(11):738-741.
48. Schünemann HJ, Osborne M, Moss J, et al; ATS Ethics and Conflict of Interest Committee and the Documents Development and Implementation Committee. An official American Thoracic Society Policy statement: managing conflict of interest in professional societies. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2009;180(6):564-580.
49. Brożek J, Nowak A, Kunstman P, Schünemann HJ. GRADEpro Guideline Development Tool (computer program). Available at: www.guidelinedevelopment.org. Accessed 5 July 2018.
50. Guyatt GH, Oxman AD, Kunz R, et al. GRADE guidelines: 2. Framing the question and deciding on important outcomes. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2011;64(4):395-400.
51. Ageno W, Bosch J, Cucherat M, Eikelboom JW. Nadroparin for the prevention of venous thromboembolism in nonsurgical patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Thromb Thrombolysis*. 2016;42(1):90-98.

52. Alikhan R, Bedenis R, Cohen Alexander T. Heparin for the prevention of venous thromboembolism in acutely ill medical patients (excluding stroke and myocardial infarction). *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2014;(5):CD003747.
53. André C, de Freitas GR, Fukujima MM. Prevention of deep venous thrombosis and pulmonary embolism following stroke: a systematic review of published articles. *Eur J Neurol*. 2007;14(1):21-32.
54. Bump GM, Dandu M, Kaufman SR, Shojania KG, Flanders SA. How complete is the evidence for thromboembolism prophylaxis in general medicine patients? A meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *J Hosp Med*. 2009;4(5):289-297.
55. Dentali F, Douketis JD, Gianni M, Lim W, Crowther MA. Meta-analysis: anticoagulant prophylaxis to prevent symptomatic venous thromboembolism in hospitalized medical patients. *Ann Intern Med*. 2007;146(4):278-288.
56. Eikelboom JW. Effect of fondaparinux 2.5 mg once daily on mortality: A meta-analysis of phase III randomized trials of venous thromboembolism prevention. *Eur Heart J Suppl*. 2008;10(suppl C):C8-C13.
57. Kamphuisen PW, Agnelli G. What is the optimal pharmacological prophylaxis for the prevention of deep-vein thrombosis and pulmonary embolism in patients with acute ischemic stroke? *Thromb Res*. 2007;119(3):265-274.
58. Kanaan AO, Silva MA, Donovan JL, Roy T, Al-Homsi AS. Meta-analysis of venous thromboembolism prophylaxis in medically ill patients. *Clin Ther*. 2007;29(11):2395-2405.
59. Lederle FA, Zylla D, MacDonald R, Wilt TJ. Venous thromboembolism prophylaxis in hospitalized medical patients and those with stroke: a background review for an American College of Physicians Clinical Practice Guideline. *Ann Intern Med*. 2011;155(9):602-615.
60. Lloyd NS, Douketis JD, Moinuddin I, Lim W, Crowther MA. Anticoagulant prophylaxis to prevent asymptomatic deep vein thrombosis in hospitalized medical patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Thromb Haemost*. 2008;6(3):405-414.
61. Loffredo L, Perri L, Catasca E, Del Ben M, Angelico F, Violi F. Antithrombotic drugs in acutely ill medical patients: Review and meta-analysis of interventional trials with low-molecular-weight heparin and fondaparinux. *Clin Pract*. 2013;10(5):615-627.
62. Paciaroni M, Agnelli G, Venti M, Alberti A, Acciarresi M, Caso V. Efficacy and safety of anticoagulants in the prevention of venous thromboembolism in patients with acute cerebral hemorrhage: a meta-analysis of controlled studies. *J Thromb Haemost*. 2011;9(5):893-898.
63. Saigal S, Sharma JP, Joshi R, Singh DK. Thrombo-prophylaxis in acutely ill medical and critically ill patients. *Indian J Crit Care Med*. 2014;18(6):382-391.
64. Sandercock PA, Counsell C, Kane EJ. Anticoagulants for acute ischaemic stroke. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2015;(3):CD000024.
65. Sandercock PAG, Counsell C, Tseng MC. Low-molecular-weight heparins or heparinoids versus standard unfractionated heparin for acute ischaemic stroke. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2008;(3)CD000119.
66. Själander A, Jansson JH, Bergqvist D, Eriksson H, Carlberg B, Svensson P. Efficacy and safety of anticoagulant prophylaxis to prevent venous thromboembolism in acutely ill medical inpatients: a meta-analysis. *J Intern Med*. 2008;263(1):52-60.
67. Wein L, Wein S, Haas SJ, Shaw J, Krum H. Pharmacological venous thromboembolism prophylaxis in hospitalized medical patients: a meta-analysis of randomized controlled trials. *Arch Intern Med*. 2007;167(14):1476-1486.
68. International Stroke Trial Collaborative Group. The International Stroke Trial (IST): a randomised trial of aspirin, subcutaneous heparin, both, or neither among 19435 patients with acute ischaemic stroke. *Lancet*. 1997;349(9065):1569-1581.
69. Chaudhry HRAH, Yadav K, Dubey S, Gupta R, Jain R. Low molecular weight heparin in acute ischemic stroke. *Antiseptic*. 2002;99:31-32.
70. Dickmann U, Voth E, Schicha H, Henze T, Prange H, Emrich D. Heparin therapy, deep-vein thrombosis and pulmonary embolism after intracerebral hemorrhage. *Klin Wochenschr*. 1988;66(23):1182-1183.
71. Duke RJ, Bloch RF, Turpie AG, Trebilcock R, Bayer N. Intravenous heparin for the prevention of stroke progression in acute partial stable stroke. *Ann Intern Med*. 1986;105(6):825-828.
72. Duke RJ, Turpie AJ, Bloch RF, Trebilcock RG. Clinical trial of low-dose subcutaneous heparin for the prevention of stroke progression: natural history of acute partial stroke and stroke-in-evolution [abstract]. *J Cereb Blood Flow Metabol*. 1982;2(2):267.
73. Elias A, Milandre L, Lagrange G, et al. Prevention of deep venous thrombosis of the leg by a very low molecular weight heparin fraction (CY 222) in patients with hemiplegia following cerebral infarction: a randomized pilot study (30 patients) [in French]. *Rev Med Intern*. 1990;11(1):95-98.
74. Hommel M. Fraxiparine in ischaemic stroke study (FISS bis). *Cerebrovasc Dis*. 1998;8(suppl 4):19.
75. Kay R, Wong KS, Yu YL, et al. Low-molecular-weight heparin for the treatment of acute ischemic stroke. *N Engl J Med*. 1995;333(24):1588-1593.
76. Kwiecinski HPJ, Kaminska A, Szylyk B. A randomized trial of fraxiparine in acute ischaemic stroke. *Cerebrovasc Dis*. 1995;5:234.
77. McCarthy ST, Turner J. Low-dose subcutaneous heparin in the prevention of deep-vein thrombosis and pulmonary emboli following acute stroke. *Age Ageing*. 1986;15(2):84-88.
78. McCarthy ST, Turner JJ, Robertson D, Hawkey CJ, Macey DJ. Low-dose heparin as a prophylaxis against deep-vein thrombosis after acute stroke. *Lancet*. 1977;2(8042):800-801.
79. Pambianco G, Orchard T, Landau P. Deep vein thrombosis: prevention in stroke patients during rehabilitation. *Arch Phys Med Rehabil*. 1995;76(4):324-330.
80. Pince J. *Thromboses veineuses des membres inferieurs et embolies pulmonaires au cours des accidents vasculaires cerebraux. A propos d'un essai comparatif de traitement preventif* [doctoral dissertation]. Toulouse, France: Université Paul Sabatier; 1981.
81. Prins MH, Gelsema R, Sing AK, van Heerde LR, den Ottolander GJ. Prophylaxis of deep venous thrombosis with a low-molecular-weight heparin (Kabi 2165/Fragmin) in stroke patients. *Haemostasis*. 1989;19(5):245-250.

82. Sandset PM, Dahl T, Stiris M, Rostad B, Scheel B, Abildgaard U. A double-blind and randomized placebo-controlled trial of low molecular weight heparin once daily to prevent deep-vein thrombosis in acute ischemic stroke. *Semin Thromb Hemost.* 1990;16(suppl):25-33.
83. Belch JJ, Lowe GD, Ward AG, Forbes CD, Prentice CR. Prevention of deep vein thrombosis in medical patients by low-dose heparin. *Scott Med J.* 1981;26(2):115-117.
84. Dahan R, Houlbert D, Caulin C, et al. Prevention of deep vein thrombosis in elderly medical in-patients by a low molecular weight heparin: a randomized double-blind trial. *Haemostasis.* 1986;16(2):159-164.
85. Gallus AS, Hirsh J, Tuttle RJ, et al. Small subcutaneous doses of heparin in prevention of venous thrombosis. *N Engl J Med.* 1973;288:545-551.
86. Gärdlund B; The Heparin Prophylaxis Study Group. Randomised, controlled trial of low-dose heparin for prevention of fatal pulmonary embolism in patients with infectious diseases. *Lancet.* 1996;347(9012):1357-1361.
87. Ibarra-Pérez C, Lau-Cortés E, Colmenero-Zubiarte S, et al. Prevalence and prevention of deep venous thrombosis of the lower extremities in high-risk pulmonary patients. *Angiology.* 1988;39(6):505-513.
88. Kakkar AK, Cimminiello C, Goldhaber SZ, Parakh R, Wang C, Bergmann JF; LIFENOX Investigators. Low-molecular-weight heparin and mortality in acutely ill medical patients. *N Engl J Med.* 2011;365(26):2463-2472.
89. Mahé I, Bergmann JF, d'Azémar P, Vaissie JJ, Caulin C. Lack of effect of a low-molecular-weight heparin (nadroparin) on mortality in bedridden medical in-patients: a prospective randomised double-blind study. *Eur J Clin Pharmacol.* 2005;61(5-6):347-351.
90. Lamy A, Wang X, Kent R, Smith KM, Gafni A. Economic evaluation of the MEDENOX trial: a Canadian perspective. *Medical Patients with Enoxaparin. Can Respir J.* 2002;9(3):169-177.
91. Offord R, Lloyd AC, Anderson P, Bearne A. Economic evaluation of enoxaparin for the prevention of venous thromboembolism in acutely ill medical patients. *Pharm World Sci.* 2004;26(4):214-220.
92. Pechevis M, Detournay B, Pribil C, Fagnani F, Chalanson G. Economic evaluation of enoxaparin vs. placebo for the prevention of venous thromboembolism in acutely ill medical patients. *Value Health.* 2000;3(6):389-396.
93. Diener HC, Ringelstein EB, von Kummer R, et al; PROTECT Trial Group. Prophylaxis of thrombotic and embolic events in acute ischemic stroke with the low-molecular-weight heparin certoparin: results of the PROTECT Trial. *Stroke.* 2006;37(1):139-144.
94. Dumas R, Woitinas F, Kutnowski M, et al. A multicentre, double-blind, randomized study to compare the safety and efficacy of once-daily ORG 10172 and twice-daily low-dose heparin in preventing deep-vein thrombosis in patients with acute ischaemic stroke. *Age Ageing.* 1994;23(6):512-516.
95. Hillbom M, Eriälä T, Sotaniemi K, Tatlisumak T, Sarna S, Kaste M. Enoxaparin vs heparin for prevention of deep-vein thrombosis in acute ischaemic stroke: a randomized, double-blind study. *Acta Neurol Scand.* 2002;106(2):84-92.
96. Sherman DG, Albers GW, Bladin C, et al; PREVAIL Investigators. The efficacy and safety of enoxaparin versus unfractionated heparin for the prevention of venous thromboembolism after acute ischaemic stroke (PREVAIL Study): an open-label randomised comparison. *Lancet.* 2007;369(9570):1347-1355.
97. Turpie AG, Gent M, Côte R, et al. A low-molecular-weight heparinoid compared with unfractionated heparin in the prevention of deep vein thrombosis in patients with acute ischemic stroke. A randomized, double-blind study. *Ann Intern Med.* 1992;117(5):353-357.
98. Bergmann JF, Neuhart E; The Enoxaparin in Medicine Study Group. A multicenter randomized double-blind study of enoxaparin compared with unfractionated heparin in the prevention of venous thromboembolic disease in elderly in-patients bedridden for an acute medical illness. *Thromb Haemost.* 1996;76(4):529-534.
99. Ishi SV, Lakshmi M, Kakde ST, et al. Randomised controlled trial for efficacy of unfractionated heparin (UFH) versus low molecular weight heparin (LMWH) in thrombo-prophylaxis. *J Assoc Physicians India.* 2013;61(12):882-886.
100. Kleber FX, Witt C, Vogel G, Koppenhagen K, Schomaker U, Flosbach CW; THE-PRINCE Study Group. Randomized comparison of enoxaparin with unfractionated heparin for the prevention of venous thromboembolism in medical patients with heart failure or severe respiratory disease. *Am Heart J.* 2003;145(4):614-621.
101. Lechler E, Schramm W, Flosbach CW; The Prime Study Group. The venous thrombotic risk in non-surgical patients: epidemiological data and efficacy/safety profile of a low-molecular-weight heparin (enoxaparin). *Haemostasis.* 1996;26(suppl 2):49-56.
102. Riess H, Haas S, Tebbe U, et al. A randomized, double-blind study of certoparin vs. unfractionated heparin to prevent venous thromboembolic events in acutely ill, non-surgical patients: CERTIFY Study. *J Thromb Haemost.* 2010;8(6):1209-1215.
103. Schellong SM, Haas S, Greinacher A, et al. An open-label comparison of the efficacy and safety of certoparin versus unfractionated heparin for the prevention of thromboembolic complications in acutely ill medical patients: CERTAIN. *Expert Opin Pharmacother.* 2010;11(18):2953-2961.
104. Amin AN, Lin J, Lenhart G, Schulman KL. Clinical and economic outcomes in patients at risk of venous thromboembolism receiving appropriate enoxaparin or unfractionated heparin prophylaxis. *Thromb Haemost.* 2009;102(2):321-326.
105. Deitelzweig SB, Becker R, Lin J, Benner J. Comparison of the two-year outcomes and costs of prophylaxis in medical patients at risk of venous thromboembolism. *Thromb Haemost.* 2008;100(5):810-820.
106. Fowler RA, Mittmann N, Geerts W, et al; Australia and New Zealand Intensive Care Society Clinical Trials Group. Cost-effectiveness of dalteparin vs unfractionated heparin for the prevention of venous thromboembolism in critically ill patients. *JAMA.* 2014;312(20):2135-2145.
107. Leykum L, Pugh J, Diuguid D, Papadopoulos K. Cost utility of substituting enoxaparin for unfractionated heparin for prophylaxis of venous thrombosis in the hospitalized medical patient. *J Hosp Med.* 2006;1(3):168-176.
108. Lloyd AC, Anderson PM, Quinlan DJ, Bearne A. Economic evaluation of the use of enoxaparin for thromboprophylaxis in acutely ill medical patients. *J Med Econ.* 2001;4(1-4):99-113.

109. McGarry LJ, Stokes ME, Thompson D. Outcomes of thromboprophylaxis with enoxaparin vs. unfractionated heparin in medical inpatients. *Thromb J*. 2006;4(1):17.
110. McGarry LJ, Thompson D, Weinstein MC, Goldhaber SZ. Cost effectiveness of thromboprophylaxis with a low-molecular-weight heparin versus unfractionated heparin in acutely ill medical inpatients. *Am J Manag Care*. 2004;10(9):632-642.
111. Schädlich PK, Kentsch M, Weber M, et al. Cost effectiveness of enoxaparin as prophylaxis against venous thromboembolic complications in acutely ill medical inpatients: modelling study from the hospital perspective in Germany. *Pharmacoeconomics*. 2006;24(6):571-591.
112. Shorr AF, Jackson WL, Weiss BM, Moores LK. Low-molecular weight heparin for deep vein thrombosis prophylaxis in hospitalized medical patients: results from a cost-effectiveness analysis. *Blood Coagul Fibrinolysis*. 2007;18(4):309-316.
113. Wilbur K, Lynd LD, Sadatsafavi M. Low-molecular-weight heparin versus unfractionated heparin for prophylaxis of venous thromboembolism in medicine patients—a pharmacoeconomic analysis. *Clin Appl Thromb Hemost*. 2011;17(5):454-465.
114. Alhazzani W, Lim W, Jaeschke RZ, Murad MH, Cade J, Cook DJ. Heparin thromboprophylaxis in medical-surgical critically ill patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis of randomized trials. *Crit Care Med*. 2013;41(9):2088-2098.
115. Fraisse F, Holzapfel L, Couland JM, et al; The Association of Non-University Affiliated Intensive Care Specialist Physicians of France. Nadroparin in the prevention of deep vein thrombosis in acute decompensated COPD. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med*. 2000;161(4 pt 1):1109-1114.
116. Kapoor M, Kupfer YY, Tessler S. Subcutaneous heparin prophylaxis significantly reduces the incidence of venous thromboembolic events in the critically ill [abstract]. *Crit Care Med*. 1999;27(12):A69.
117. Shorr AF, Williams MD. Venous thromboembolism in critically ill patients. Observations from a randomized trial in sepsis. *Thromb Haemost*. 2009;101(1):139-144.
118. Cook D, Meade M, Guyatt G, et al; PROTECT Investigators for the Canadian Critical Care Trials Group and the Australian and New Zealand Intensive Care Society Clinical Trials Group. Dalteparin versus unfractionated heparin in critically ill patients. *N Engl J Med*. 2011;364(14):1305-1314.
119. Goldhaber SZ, Kett DH, Cusumano CJ, Kuroki CA. Low molecular weight heparin versus minidose unfractionated heparin for prophylaxis against venous thromboembolism in medical intensive care unit patients: a randomized controlled trial. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 2000;35(2):325A.
120. Guyatt G, Oxman AD, Sultan S, et al. GRADE guidelines: 11. Making an overall rating of confidence in effect estimates for a single outcome and for all outcomes. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2013;66(2):151-157.
121. Orken DN, Kenangil G, Ozkurt H, et al. Prevention of deep venous thrombosis and pulmonary embolism in patients with acute intracerebral hemorrhage. *Neurologist*. 2009;15(6):329-331.
122. Salzman EW, Sobel M, Lewis J, Sweeney J, Hussey S, Kurland G. Prevention of venous thromboembolism in unstable angina pectoris. *N Engl J Med*. 1982;306(16):991.
123. Barrera LM, Perel P, Ker K, Cirocchi R, Farinella E, Morales Uribe CH. Thromboprophylaxis for trauma patients. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2013; (3): CD008303.
124. Ginzburg E, Cohn SM, Lopez J, Jackowski J, Brown M, Hameed SM; Miami Deep Vein Thrombosis Study Group. Randomized clinical trial of intermittent pneumatic compression and low molecular weight heparin in trauma. *Br J Surg*. 2003;90(11):1338-1344.
125. Knudson MM, Collins JA, Goodman SB, McCrory DW. Thromboembolism following multiple trauma. *J Trauma*. 1992;32(1):2-11.
126. Knudson MM, Lewis FR, Clinton A, Atkinson K, Megerman J. Prevention of venous thromboembolism in trauma patients. *J Trauma*. 1994;37(3):480-487.
127. Knudson MM, Morabito D, Paiement GD, Shackelford S. Use of low molecular weight heparin in preventing thromboembolism in trauma patients. *J Trauma*. 1996;41(3):446-459.
128. Kurtoglu M, Yanar H, Bilsel Y, et al. Venous thromboembolism prophylaxis after head and spinal trauma: intermittent pneumatic compression devices versus low molecular weight heparin. *World J Surg*. 2004;28(8):807-811.
129. Yanar H, Kurtoglu M, Taviloglu K, Guloglu R, Ertekin C. Is intermittent pneumatic compression make low molecular weight heparin more efficient in the prophylaxis of venous thromboembolism in trauma patients. *Eur J Trauma Emerg Surg*. 2007;33(suppl II):79-80.
130. Kurtoglu M, Serin K, Yanar H, Ozdenkaya Y. Venous thromboembolism prophylaxis methods in the trauma and emergency surgery intensive care unit patients. *J Thromb Haemost*. 2009;7(S2):692-693.
131. Zhang C, Zeng W, Zhou H, et al. The efficacy of intermittent pneumatic compression in the prevention of venous thromboembolism in medical critically ill patients [in Chinese]. *Zhongguo Wei Zhong Bing Ji Jiu Yi Xue*. 2011;23(9):563-565.
132. Naccarato M, Chiodo Grandi F, Dennis M, Sandercock PA. Physical methods for preventing deep vein thrombosis in stroke. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2010;(8):CD001922.
133. Dennis M, Sandercock P, Graham C, Forbes J, CLOTS (Clots in Legs Or sTockings after Stroke) Trials Collaboration. The Clots in Legs Or sTockings after Stroke (CLOTS) 3 trial: a randomised controlled trial to determine whether or not intermittent pneumatic compression reduces the risk of post-stroke deep vein thrombosis and to estimate its cost-effectiveness. *Health Technol Assess*. 2015;19(76):1-90.
134. The CLOTS Trials Collaboration, Dennis M, Sandercock PA, Reid J, et al; Effectiveness of high-length graduated compression stockings to reduce the risk of deep vein thrombosis after stroke (CLOTS trial 1): a multicentre, randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 2009;373(9679):1958-1965.
135. Fisher CG, Blachut PA, Salvian AJ, Meek RN, O'Brien PJ. Effectiveness of pneumatic leg compression devices for the prevention of thromboembolic disease in orthopaedic trauma patients: a prospective, randomized study of compression alone versus no prophylaxis. *J Orthop Trauma*. 1995;9(1):1-7.
136. Prasad BK, Banerjee AK, Howard H. Incidence of deep vein thrombosis and the effect of pneumatic compression of the calf in elderly hemiplegics. *Age Ageing*. 1982;11(1):42-44.

137. Velmahos GC, Petrone P, Chan LS, Hanks SE, Brown CV, Demetriades D. Electrostimulation for the prevention of deep venous thrombosis in patients with major trauma: a prospective randomized study. *Surgery*. 2005;137(5):493-498.
138. Dennis JW, Menawat S, Von Thron J, et al. Efficacy of deep venous thrombosis prophylaxis in trauma patients and identification of high-risk groups. *J Trauma*. 1993;35(1):132-138, discussion 138-139.
139. Boelig MM, Streiff MB, Hobson DB, Kraus PS, Pronovost PJ, Haut ER. Are sequential compression devices commonly associated with in-hospital falls? A myth-busters review using the patient safety net database. *J Patient Saf*. 2011;7(2):77-79.
140. Cohen AT, Spiro TE, Büller HR, et al; MAGELLAN Investigators. Rivaroxaban for thromboprophylaxis in acutely ill medical patients. *N Engl J Med*. 2013;368(6):513-523.
141. Goldhaber SZ, Leizorovicz A, Kakkar AK, et al; ADOPT Trial Investigators. Apixaban versus enoxaparin for thromboprophylaxis in medically ill patients. *N Engl J Med*. 2011;365(23):2167-2177.
142. Spencer FA, Gurwitz JH, Schulman S, et al. Venous thromboembolism in older adults: A community-based study. *Am J Med*. 2014;127(6):530-537.e3.
143. Raskob GE, Spyropoulos AC, Zrubek J, et al. The MARINER trial of rivaroxaban after hospital discharge for medical patients at high risk of VTE. Design, rationale, and clinical implications. *Thromb Haemost*. 2016;115(6):1240-1248.
144. Sharma A, Chatterjee S, Lichstein E, Mukherjee D. Extended thromboprophylaxis for medically ill patients with decreased mobility: does it improve outcomes? *J Thromb Haemost*. 2012;10(10):2053-2060.
145. Hull RD, Schellong SM, Tapson VF, et al; EXCLAIM (Extended Prophylaxis for Venous ThromboEmbolic in Acutely Ill Medical Patients With Prolonged Immobilization) study. Extended-duration venous thromboembolism prophylaxis in acutely ill medical patients with recently reduced mobility: a randomized trial. *Ann Intern Med*. 2010;153(1):8-18.
146. Spyropoulos AC, Ageno W, Albers GW, et al; MARINER Investigators. Rivaroxaban for thromboprophylaxis after hospitalization for medical illness. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;379(12):1118-1127.
147. Modesto-Alapont M, Nauffal-Manzur D, Ansótegui-Barrera E, et al. Can home prophylaxis for venous thromboembolism reduce mortality rates in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease? [in Spanish]. *Arch Bronconeumol*. 2006;42(3):130-134.
148. Reardon G, Pandya N, Nutescu EA, et al. Incidence of venous thromboembolism in nursing home residents. *J Am Med Dir Assoc*. 2013;14(8):578-584.
149. Chandra D, Parisini E, Mozaffarian D. Meta-analysis: travel and risk for venous thromboembolism. *Ann Intern Med*. 2009;151(3):180-190.
150. Philbrick JT, Shumate R, Siadaty MS, Becker DM. Air travel and venous thromboembolism: a systematic review. *J Gen Intern Med*. 2007;22(1):107-114.
151. Kuipers S, Schreijer AJ, Cannegieter SC, Büller HR, Rosendaal FR, Middeldorp S. Travel and venous thrombosis: a systematic review. *J Intern Med*. 2007;262(6):615-634.
152. Beam DM, Courtney DM, Kabrhel C, Moore CL, Richman PB, Kline JA. Risk of thromboembolism varies, depending on category of immobility in outpatients. *Ann Emerg Med*. 2009;54(2):147-152.
153. MacCallum PK, Mt-Isa S, Whyte K, et al. Air travel and risk of venous thromboembolism: a community-based study. *J Thromb Haemost*. 2009;7(S2):162.
154. Chua CC, Lim HY, Sleeman M, Ho P. Provoked venous thromboembolism in non-cancer patients: are they the same? *Haematologica*. 2015;100(suppl 1):308-309.
155. Citak M, Klatte TO, Suero EM, Lenhart J, Gehrke T, Kendoff D. Are patients with preoperative air travel at higher risk for venous thromboembolism following primary total hip and knee arthroplasty? *Technol Health Care*. 2015;23(3):307-311.
156. Cooper HJ, Sanders SA, Berger RA. Risk of symptomatic venous thromboembolism associated with flying in the early postoperative period following elective total hip and knee arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty*. 2014;29(6):1119-1122.
157. Kuipers S, Cannegieter SC, Doggen CJ, Rosendaal FR. Effect of elevated levels of coagulation factors on the risk of venous thrombosis in long-distance travelers. *Blood*. 2009;113(9):2064-2069.
158. Kuipers S, Venemans-Jellema A, Cannegieter SC, et al. The incidence of venous thromboembolism in commercial airline pilots: a cohort study of 2630 pilots. *J Thromb Haemost*. 2014;12(8):1260-1265.
159. Lapostolle F, Le Toumelin P, Chassery C, et al. Gender as a risk factor for pulmonary embolism after air travel. *Thromb Haemost*. 2009;102(6):1165-1168.
160. Timp J, Le Cessie S, Van Hylckama Vlieg A, Rosendaal FR, Cannegieter SC. Long-haul travel and the risk of recurrent venous thrombosis. *J Thromb Haemost*. 2015;13(suppl 2):725.
161. Tsoran I, Saharov G, Brenner B, et al. Prolonged travel and venous thromboembolism findings from the RIETE registry. *Thromb Res*. 2010;126(4):287-291.
162. Kuipers S, Venemans A, Middeldorp S, Büller HR, Cannegieter SC, Rosendaal FR. The risk of venous thrombosis after air travel: contribution of clinical risk factors. *Br J Haematol*. 2014;165(3):412-413.
163. Cushman M, Tsai AW, White RH, et al. Deep vein thrombosis and pulmonary embolism in two cohorts: the longitudinal investigation of thromboembolism etiology. *Am J Med*. 2004;117(1):19-25.
164. Cannegieter SC, Rosendaal FR. Pregnancy and travel-related thromboembolism. *Thromb Res*. 2013;131(suppl 1):S55-S58.
165. Clarke MJ, Broderick C, Hopewell S, Juszczak E, Eisinga A. Compression stockings for preventing deep vein thrombosis in airline passengers. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2016;9:CD004002.

166. World Health Organization. International Travel and Health. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization; 2012.
167. World Health Organization. WHO Research Into Global Hazards of Travel (WRIGHT) Project: final report of phase I. Geneva, Switzerland: World Health Organization; 2007.
168. Cesarone MR, Belcaro G, Nicolaidis AN, et al. Venous thrombosis from air travel: the LONFLIT3 study--prevention with aspirin vs low-molecular-weight heparin (LMWH) in high-risk subjects: a randomized trial. *Angiology*. 2002;53(1):1-6.
169. Qaseem A, Chou R, Humphrey LL, Starkey M, Shekelle P; Clinical Guidelines Committee of the American College of Physicians. Venous thromboembolism prophylaxis in hospitalized patients: a clinical practice guideline from the American College of Physicians. *Ann Intern Med*. 2011; 155(9):625-632.
170. Kahn SR, Lim W, Dunn AS, et al. Prevention of VTE in nonsurgical patients: antithrombotic therapy and prevention of thrombosis, 9th ed: American College of Chest Physicians Evidence-Based Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Chest*. 2012;141(2 suppl):e195S-e226S.
171. Liew NC, Alemany GV, Angchaisuksiri P, et al. Asian venous thromboembolism guidelines: updated recommendations for the prevention of venous thromboembolism. *Int Angiol*. 2017;36(1):1-20.
172. National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Venous thromboembolism in over 16s: reducing the risk of hospital-acquired deep vein thrombosis or pulmonary embolism. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng89>. Accessed 15 April 2018.
173. Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality. Preventing hospital-associated venous thromboembolism: a guide for effective quality improvement. <http://www.ahrq.gov/professionals/quality-patient-safety/patient-safety-resources/resources/vtguide/index.html>. Accessed 15 April 2018.
174. Schünemann HJ, Wiercioch W, Brozek J, et al. GRADE Evidence to Decision (EtD) frameworks for adoption, adaptation, and de novo development of trustworthy recommendations: GRADE-ADOLOPMENT. *J Clin Epidemiol*. 2017;81:101-110.