



THE UNIVERSITY *of* EDINBURGH

Edinburgh Research Explorer

Pulmonary embolism management in the emergency department

Citation for published version:

Serebriakoff, P, Cafferkey, J, de Wit, K, Horner, DE & Reed, MJ 2022, 'Pulmonary embolism management in the emergency department', *Emergency Medicine Journal*. <https://doi.org/10.1136/ememed-2021-212001>

Digital Object Identifier (DOI):

[10.1136/ememed-2021-212001](https://doi.org/10.1136/ememed-2021-212001)

Link:

[Link to publication record in Edinburgh Research Explorer](#)

Document Version:

Peer reviewed version

Published In:

Emergency Medicine Journal

General rights

Copyright for the publications made accessible via the Edinburgh Research Explorer is retained by the author(s) and / or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing these publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

Take down policy

The University of Edinburgh has made every reasonable effort to ensure that Edinburgh Research Explorer content complies with UK legislation. If you believe that the public display of this file breaches copyright please contact openaccess@ed.ac.uk providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



1 Pulmonary Embolism Management 2 in the Emergency Department

3 Authors

Philippa Serebriakoff	https://orcid.org/0000-0002-5764-8604	¹ Emergency Medicine Research Group Edinburgh (EMERGE), Department of Emergency Medicine, Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, 51 Little France Crescent, Edinburgh EH16 4SA, UK.
John Cafferkey	https://orcid.org/0000-0001-6926-9508	¹ Emergency Medicine Research Group Edinburgh (EMERGE), Department of Emergency Medicine, Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, 51 Little France Crescent, Edinburgh EH16 4SA, UK.
Kerstin de Wit	https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2763-6474	² Department of Emergency Medicine, Queen's University, Kingston, Ontario, Canada and Department of Medicine, McMaster University, Ontario, Canada
Daniel Horner	https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0400-2017	³ Emergency Department, Salford Royal NHS Foundation Trust, Salford, UK ⁴ Division of Infection, Immunity and Respiratory Medicine, University of Manchester, Manchester, UK.
Matthew J Reed *	https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1308-4824	¹ Emergency Medicine Research Group Edinburgh (EMERGE), Department of Emergency Medicine, Royal Infirmary of Edinburgh, 51 Little France Crescent, Edinburgh EH16 4SA, UK. ⁵ Acute Care Group, Usher Institute of Population Health Sciences and Informatics, College of Medicine and Veterinary Medicine, University of Edinburgh, Nine Edinburgh BioQuarter, 9 Little France Road, Edinburgh EH16 4UX, UK.

4 Article details

Article Type	Practice review
Word limit	3697 excluding title page, abstract, references, figures and tables

5

6 * Corresponding author: Matthew J Reed

7

8 Corresponding author's email address: mattreed@ed.ac.uk

9

10 Keywords

11 Pulmonary embolism; thromboembolic disease, management; emergency care systems;
12 thrombolysis;

13 Abstract

14 Pulmonary embolism (PE) can present with a range of severity. Prognostic risk stratification
15 is important for efficacious and safe management. This review article discusses the
16 management of high, intermediate, and low risk PE. We discuss strategies to identify patients
17 suitable for urgent outpatient care in addition to identification of patients who would benefit
18 from thrombolysis. We discuss specific subgroups of patients where optimal treatment differs
19 from the usual approach and identify emerging management paradigms exploring new
20 therapies and subgroups.
21

22 Manuscript Text

23

24 INTRODUCTION

25 Combined with deep vein thrombosis (DVT), pulmonary embolism (PE) is the third most
26 common acute cardiovascular syndrome. The condition has an estimated incidence of 39 to
27 115 per 100,000 population per year – a rate which increases annually [1]. In the context of
28 improved disease awareness and greater access to diagnostic tests, the balance of early
29 diagnosis and intervention versus over-investigation is challenging. Most PE cases presenting
30 to the Emergency Department (ED) are low risk, and the estimated mortality for missed or
31 untreated disease at less than 5% [2].
32

33 Management of PE is focussed on arresting clot growth, providing physiological support and
34 preventing recurrence. However, treatment comes with a risk of serious adverse events. The
35 narrative of progress in PE management is less about the application of new therapeutic
36 agents and more about improvements in detecting which patients may benefit from existing
37 interventions.
38

39 **DEFINING RISK**

40 The clinical presentation and prognosis of acute PE is variable. Even with treatment, high
 41 risk PE has a mortality rate as high as 65%, while low risk PE has a mortality rate less than
 42 1% [3]. Severity assessment is crucial to determine correct treatment. Risk stratification tools
 43 can reliably predict 30-day mortality risk.

44
 45 Historically, PE was divided into massive, sub-massive and non-massive PE. This division
 46 was initially based on anatomy and clot burden, but later encompassed physiological
 47 parameters [4]. These definitions were vague and inconsistently applied. More practical
 48 classifications have now been issued from several international bodies, but these vary. The
 49 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) dichotomises PE into those with or
 50 without cardiovascular instability [5]; the European Society of Cardiology (ESC) divides
 51 patients with PE into low, moderate and high risk; and the American College of Chest
 52 Physicians (ACCP) uses screening tools to identify low risk patients safe for outpatient
 53 management, and high risk patients for thrombolysis [**Table 1**]. All guidelines agree that high
 54 risk is defined primarily by refractory hypotension.

55

56 **Table 1:**

	ESC [1]	ACCP [6,7]	NICE [8]
High risk	Shock, RV dysfunction and myocardial injury Tx: emergency thrombolysis, embolectomy, admission	Hypotension (systolic blood pressure <90 mmHg) Tx: thrombolysis	Haemodynamic instability Tx: UFH infusion and consider thrombolysis
Intermediate risk	RV dysfunction, or myocardial injury, or both. No shock or hypotension. Tx: anticoagulation and admission	No specific definition of intermediate risk, but strongly recommend against thrombolysis in PE not associated with hypotension Tx: anticoagulation	No haemodynamic instability Tx: anticoagulation, consider early discharge or ambulation
Low risk	No shock, hypotension, RV dysfunction or myocardial injury Tx: anticoagulation, early	Clinically low risk patients Tx: anticoagulation, consider treatment at	

57

58 ACCP: American College of Chest Physicians; CT: computer tomography; ESC: European
59 Society of Cardiology; NICE: National Institute for Health and Care Excellence; PESI:
60 Pulmonary Embolism Severity Index; RV: right ventricular; sPESI: simplified Pulmonary
61 Embolism Severity Index; Tx: Treatment; UFH: Unfractionated Heparin

62

63 **Assessing right ventricular dysfunction**

64 Moderate risk PE is defined by the presence of right ventricular (RV) dysfunction. RV
65 dilatation can be directly correlated with mortality risk and is used by the ESC as a tool for
66 risk stratification [9]. Increasing RV:LV ratio on CT imaging is associated with higher
67 mortality, even in patients otherwise assessed as low risk by other clinical markers [10]. CT
68 can also identify other indicators of severity such as contrast reflux into the IVC and
69 abnormal volumetric analysis of the heart chambers [1]. Point of care ultrasound (POCUS)
70 may identify RV dysfunction (particularly dilatation) in the hands of trained emergency
71 clinicians.

72

73 Biomarkers also allow identification of RV dysfunction in the setting of acute PE, usually
74 through indication of myocardial injury. Elevated troponin is significantly associated with
75 short term mortality (odds ratio [OR] 5.24; 95% CI, 3.28 to 8.38) and is predictive of higher
76 mortality even in haemodynamically stable patients [11]. Raised B-natriuretic peptide (BNP)
77 is also correlated with early PE related mortality, with an OR of 3.71 (95% CI, 0.81– 17.02)
78 [12]. Although the association between a raised troponin or BNP with RV dysfunction and
79 worse prognosis is clear, the role of these biomarkers in the acute setting is not yet
80 established. The ESC include troponin as part of their risk adjusted management strategy
81 flow chart in non high-risk PE whilst natriuretic peptides are only mentioned as a potential
82 consideration as part of 3-6 month follow up. There is not sufficient evidence to dictate
83 treatment. However, in a deteriorating patient these markers may enable individualised
84 decision making to thrombolyse or admit to higher level care. Equally, normal biomarkers in
85 a stable patient, may support CTPA or echocardiography evidence of normal RV function,
86 and aid a decision not to thrombolyse or admit to higher level care an intermediate-high risk
87 patient.

88

89 Outpatient therapy

90 Around 95% of patients diagnosed with PE can be categorized as non-high risk who may be
 91 eligible for outpatient treatment [13]. Managing patients at home may reduce hospital costs
 92 and result in improved patient satisfaction [14,15]. Three validated decision-making tools are
 93 available for the emergency physician: the Pulmonary Embolism Severity Index (PESI),
 94 simplified PESI (sPESI), and HESTIA scores [16] [Table 2]. All three scores accurately
 95 identify patients with < 2.5% risk of death in the coming 30 days. [16,17] The ESC
 96 recommends using sPESI or HESTIA to stratify patients and determine suitability of
 97 outpatient management, ACCP suggests using a computerised clinical decision-support
 98 system based on the PE Severity Index (PESI) score and pragmatic exclusion criteria [18]
 99 while NICE guidelines do not recommend any specific decision tool.

100 Table 2:

	PESI [19]	sPESI [20]	HESTIA [21]
Role	Predicts risk of 30-day all-cause mortality for patients presenting with acute PE, using variables identified from a large retrospective cohort	Predicts risk of 30-day all-cause mortality using a selection of variables from PESI	A set of exclusion criteria to identify whether patients are unsuitable for treatment at home for acute PE
Components	Age (in years) Male sex (+10) History of cancer (+30) History of heart failure (+30) History of chronic lung disease (+10) Heart rate ≥ 110 (+20) Systolic BP <100mmHg (+30) Respiratory rate ≥ 30 (+20) Temperature <36°C (+20) Altered mental status (+60) O ₂ saturations <90% (+20)	Age >80 years History of cancer History of chronic cardiopulmonary disease Heart rate ≥ 110 Systolic BP <100 O ₂ saturations <90%	Haemodynamic instability Thrombolysis or embolectomy Active or high risk of bleeding PE diagnosed during anticoagulation treatment > 24 hours supplemental oxygen to maintain saturations > 90% Severe pain requiring intravenous analgesia Medical or social reason for admission for over 24 hours Creatinine clearances of < 30mL/min Severe liver impairment Pregnancy History of HIT
Interpretation	Total score assigns patients to specific risk categories: ≤ 65 Very low risk 66-85 Low risk 86-105 Intermediate risk 106-125 High risk >125 Very high risk Widely validated, including	Score one for each variable met. 0 Low risk ≥ 1 High risk Good agreement with PESI and validated in prospective	If any criteria present, the patient should be admitted for treatment. Otherwise, they can be treated at home. Validated in prospective studies [22].

	in a randomised trial.	studies.	
--	------------------------	----------	--

101
102
103
104
105
106
107
108
109
110
111
112
113
114
115
116
117
118
119
120
121
122
123
124
125
126
127
128
129
130
131
132

PESI: Pulmonary Embolism Severity Index; sPESI: Simplified Pulmonary Embolism Severity Index

Derived from a retrospective database and the most widely validated tool [16], the Pulmonary Embolism Severity Index (PESI) predicts 30-day all-cause mortality for patients with acute PE and is based on 11 clinical criteria with weighted score. The simplified tool (sPESI) is an equally weighted 6-question tool which has been demonstrated to be as accurate as PESI, [22] and provides a binary outcome. This and the fact that it incorporates many of the factors which are immediately relevant to the emergency physician such as the bleeding risk, the need for supplemental oxygen, intravenous analgesia, the social situation, and renal impairment, makes it of particular utility in ED.

Although initially designed to stratify risk in hospitalised patients, these tools are now commonly used to indicate suitability for outpatient treatment [23]. The Hestia criterion also identifies low-risk PE patients suitable for outpatient PE treatment. Patients with no Hestia criteria have low all-cause mortality, and the Hestia score has been used to reliably identify patients safe for discharge [24]. Comparisons between the sPESI and Hestia scores suggest that the Hestia score allows for safe discharge in a greater portion of patients than the sPESI [25].

It is important to note that PESI and sPESI were developed to predict 30 days all-cause mortality and do not differentiate between patients whose mortality risk is related to their PE and those whose mortality risk reflects their underlying comorbidities. Whatever the risk score, the clinician must first ask the question of whether inpatient admission will improve overall prognosis or comfort. Many patients will wish to participate in the decision to be admitted or discharged and shared-decision making can be important. Patients with a higher risk of 30-day mortality based on comorbidities such as cancer may still choose outpatient care if they are fully informed and have the required home supports. Rapid, reliable follow up will be important in this instance. Others at low risk of mortality may not feel comfortable being discharged directly home.

133 **ANTICOAGULATION**

134 Most patients with acute PE require therapeutic anticoagulation as the primary treatment
135 strategy. The choice of anticoagulant is determined by a range of factors such as bleeding
136 risk, comorbidities, co-prescribed medications, and patient preference as listed in **Table 3**.
137 Patients diagnosed with PE are often started on either direct oral anticoagulants (DOACs) or
138 subcutaneous low molecular weight heparin (LMWH) to ensure effective early
139 anticoagulation.

140

141

142

144 Table 3:

Therapeutic option	Advantages	Considerations	Patient Group	Contraindications	Pregnancy
Apixaban 10 mg twice daily for 7 days followed by 5 mg twice daily for a minimum of 3 months	Fixed dosing		Most patients	Severe renal impairment (creatinine clearance < 15 ml/min) Pregnancy and breast feeding Co-prescription of strong inhibitors or inducers of P-glycoprotein and CYP 3A4*. In-situ gastrointestinal tumour. Recent gastrointestinal bleeding. Relative contra-indication: urothelial cancer.	Passed by placenta and breast milk
Rivaroxaban 15 mg twice and day for 21 days followed by 20 mg daily for a minimum of 3 months	Fixed dosing	Manufacturer suggests consideration of dose reduction in renal impairment	Most patients	Severe renal impairment (creatinine clearance < 15 ml/min) Pregnancy and breast feeding Co-prescription of strong inhibitors or inducers of P-glycoprotein and CYP 3A4* In-situ gastrointestinal tumour. Recent gastrointestinal bleeding. Relative contra-indication: urothelial cancer.	Low level evidence, possible increased rate of miscarriage and foetal abnormality [23]
Tinzaparin, Enoxaparin Dalteparin		Injected once or twice daily by the patient	In-situ gastrointestinal cancer Recent gastrointestinal bleeding Urothelial cancer Pregnant or breast feeding Intermediate risk patients (signs of right heart strain) during initial treatment phase	Severe renal function creatinine clearance < 30 ml/min	Safe in pregnancy and breastfeeding
Edoxaban 60 mg daily or dabigatran 150 mg twice daily with initial LMWH lead in (5 days)		Edoxaban dose is reduced to 30 mg daily in patients who meet any of the following criteria: creatinine clearance 15-50 mL/min, ≤ 60 kg or concomitant use of potent P-glycoprotein inhibitors (such as erythromycin, cyclosporine, dronedarone, quinidine, or ketoconazole).	Most patients	Edoxaban is not contraindicated in patients with creatinine clearance < 15 mL/min, whereas dabigatran is contraindicated in patients with creatinine clearance < 30 mL/min. Pregnancy and breast feeding Co-prescription of strong inhibitors or inducers of P-glycoprotein and CYP 3A4* for dabigatran and CYP 3A4 for edoxaban In-situ gastrointestinal tumour Recent gastrointestinal bleeding Relative contra-indication: urothelial cancer	Both edoxaban and dabigatran have showed toxicity in animal studies

Warfarin dosed according to the INR with initial concurrent LMWH until target INR ≥ 2.0		Requires regular INR blood tests	On medications interacting with DOACs Renal impairment precluding DOAC prescription Antiphospholipid antibody syndrome	In severe renal dysfunction, LMWH is contraindicated Pregnancy or breast feeding	Passed by placenta and breast milk, teratogenic
IV Unfractionated Heparin (UFH)	Short half life	Given IV so patient must be admitted into hospital May be long delays until therapeutic anticoagulation achieved	Initial treatment in patients with a very high bleeding risk or renal failure	Heparin induced thrombocytopenia	Safe in pregnancy and breastfeeding.

145

146 GI: gastro-intestinal; INR: international normalised ration; IV: intravenous; VTE: venous thromboembolism. * Examples of are phenytoin,
147 carbamazepine, phenobarbital, primidone, eslicarbazepine, rifampicin, ‘azole antifungals (such as ketoconazole, voriconazole), HIV protease
148 inhibitors (such as ritonavir).

149
150
151
152
153
154
155
156
157
158
159
160
161
162
163
164
165
166
167
168
169
170
171
172
173
174
175
176
177
178
179

DOACs are the treatment of choice for most patients on discharge. They are simpler to take than warfarin with fixed dosing, no food restrictions and minimal monitoring requirements (usually 6-12 monthly assessments of renal function). Although all DOACs are effective treatment for PE, apixaban and rivaroxaban have the added advantage of requiring no LMWH lead in treatment, making either well suited to prescribing in the ED. In contrast, warfarin is challenging to initiate in the ED due to the need for serial monitoring and dose titration. Warfarin must be started with a minimum of five days of LMWH (continued until the INR \geq 2.0). Important DOAC contraindications include in-situ gastrointestinal tumours, bladder tumours, and a number of interacting medications [24].

Obesity

Patients weighing more than 120kg present a further challenge to achieve effective anticoagulation. In such cases, NICE guidelines recommend using an anticoagulant which can be monitored for efficacy, such as warfarin or LMWH. However, emerging evidence suggests both apixaban and rivaroxaban may be safe and effective in obese patients [25,26] at the standard dose [27].

Pregnancy

For pregnant patients, prevention of iatrogenic harm to the foetus and breast-feeding infant is paramount (see **Table 3**). LMWH is a safe anticoagulant for pregnant patients and should be given in doses titrated against the woman’s booking or early pregnancy weight [28]. There is no evidence to suggest superiority between once daily and twice daily LMWH dosing regimens. Treatment should continue throughout pregnancy until 6 weeks post-partum and 3 months total of treatment has been given. These patients tend to be induced with their LMWH held for 24 hours pre-delivery. When a patient is diagnosed with PE within two weeks of delivery, they are often changed to unfractionated heparin (UFH) in the days prior to delivering. This reduces the period of time when their anticoagulant therapy is held and in the context of significant haemorrhage, can be held because of its short half-life.

180 **Renal Impairment**

181 Apixaban, rivaroxaban and edoxaban can be prescribed for patients with renal impairment as
182 long as the creatinine clearance is > 15 ml/min. The dose of edoxaban should be reduced with
183 a creatinine clearance < 50 ml/min. PE patients with a creatinine clearance of < 15 ml/min
184 should be commenced on IV heparin followed by warfarin anticoagulation [29].

185

186 **MANAGEMENT OF SUBSEGMENTAL PE**

187 Subsegmental PE (SSPE) affects the 4th division and more distal pulmonary arterial
188 branches. Increasing use of computer tomography pulmonary angiography (CTPA) and
189 improved sensitivity of diagnostic imaging have resulted in higher rates of SSPE diagnosis.
190 There is also more subjectivity in diagnosis; higher inter observer variability is seen on
191 CTPA for diagnosis of subsegmental than for proximal PE [30].

192

193 A prospective cohort study [31] enrolling 292 patients diagnosed with SSPE (without cancer)
194 found 28 (9.6%) had DVT at baseline or on repeat ultrasound a week later. Among 266
195 patients (without DVT at baseline or one week) managed without anticoagulation, 3.1%
196 (95% CI 1.6-6.1) were diagnosed with recurrent VTE within 90 days [32]. This first
197 prospective study only supports withholding anticoagulation for all patients with SSPE with
198 normal serial bilateral leg ultrasounds, although shared decision making with the patient
199 would be necessary to withhold anticoagulation. Further research is ongoing including a
200 randomised controlled trial (NCT04727437).

201

202 **MANAGEMENT OF PE IN HIGH-RISK CASES**

203 Overall mortality for high-risk PE patients with cardiovascular instability is estimated to
204 range from 18% to 30%[3]. When progression to cardiac arrest occurs mortality can be as
205 high as 65% [3,33]. Whilst the evidence for thrombolysis improving outcomes is relatively
206 weak, outcomes in high-risk patients with cardiovascular instability are so poor that most
207 international guidelines recommend systemic thrombolysis [1,7,8]. For intermediate risk
208 patients, there is little evidence that systemic thrombolysis improves overall mortality or
209 longer term outcomes while increasing the risk of major bleeding including hemorrhagic
210 stroke. [34,35]. In this situation, guidelines suggest deferring systemic thrombolysis unless
211 the patient develops cardiovascular decompensation [6].

212

213 **Management of cardiac arrest due to PE**

214 PE represents between 2% to 5% of out of hospital cardiac arrests [36], and at least 6% of in-
215 hospital cardiac arrests [37]. In cases of known or suspected PE, systemic thrombolysis
216 during CPR increases 30-day survival [38] [39]. Thrombolysis must be given as soon as
217 possible to increase the likelihood of a positive outcome. When the cause of cardiac arrest is
218 unknown, empiric thrombolysis does not appear to improve clinical outcomes [40].

219
220 A key challenge often lies in identifying patients for whom PE is the most likely cause of
221 arrest, particularly where no collateral history is available. Whilst 25 to 50% of first time PE
222 patients have no risk factors [41], recent medical history (recent hospitalisation, abdominal or
223 pelvic surgery) and family history may influence differential diagnosis. Identification of DVT
224 on POCUS may provide evidence of acute VTE, making PE as a cause of arrest more likely
225 [42]. The most common PE arrest rhythm is PEA [43] and PE can be associated with low end
226 tidal CO₂ readings due to increased dead space, although this finding is non-specific [44].
227 Prognosis following cardiac arrest is likely to be poor, even with thrombolysis [45].

228
229 Thrombolysis is achieved using a tissue plasminogen activator (TPA) agent, such as alteplase
230 or tenecteplase. Treatment harms are significant with 10% of intermediate risk PE patients
231 experiencing a major bleeding event after thrombolysis and 1.5% having haemorrhagic
232 stroke. These risks increase with age [34].

233

234 **Extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO)**

235 Patients identified as likely to benefit from ECMO use following massive PE can see up to a
236 65% rate of survival to decannulation, but outcomes are worse for PE patients who progress
237 to cardiac arrest [46]. Delay to initiation of ECMO for more than 30 minutes during PE
238 related arrest is associated with a less than 10% survival rate [47].

239

240 **Management of unstable high-risk PE**

241 **Systemic thrombolysis versus alternatives**

242 International guidelines (ESC, ACCP, CHEST) recommend systemic thrombolysis for high-
243 risk PE patients with cardiovascular instability, to rapidly reperfuse pulmonary arteries and
244 reduce RV dysfunction. A meta-analysis has demonstrated effectiveness of systemic
245 thrombolysis for high-risk patient groups, with a reduction in mortality or recurrence from
246 19% to 9.4% compared to treatment with heparin alone [48]. Many contraindications exist

247 and there is a statistically significant increase in major and clinically relevant non major
248 bleeding events compared to treatment with heparin alone, with a NNT of 10 and NNH of 8
249 [48].
250 Departments with immediate access to interventional radiology and relevant techniques such
251 as catheter directed thrombolysis and/or clot retrieval, may consider their use in high risk
252 patients [49]. Patients who undergo direct intra-arterial thrombolysis receive lower doses of
253 thrombolytic agent with a theoretical reduced bleeding risk [50]. There are no clear
254 contraindications to catheter directed thrombolysis and for patients with recent surgery,
255 trauma, or pregnant women, such techniques may be lifesaving. Intravascular therapy is only
256 effective for proximal pulmonary artery thromboses. Such services must be set up through
257 the development of intradepartmental protocols and require an on-call rota of interventional
258 radiologists with expertise who can be rapidly mobilised. In a highly functioning system, one
259 study reports a pooled estimate for clinical success of catheter directed thrombolysis of
260 81.3% and a 30-day mortality estimate was 8.0%. The incidence of major bleeding was 6.7%
261 [51]. There is insufficient evidence to recommend catheter directed therapies over systemic
262 thrombolysis at present [52]. Surgical embolectomy may be considered in patients with
263 haemodynamic instability despite anticoagulation treatment, as an alternative to “rescue
264 thrombolysis” [1]. Surgical embolectomy is highly unlikely to be first choice therapy and
265 there is insufficient evidence to recommend embolectomy over catheter directed therapy or
266 systemic thrombolysis.

267

268 Management of intermediate-risk PE

269 The PEITHO trial found no significant difference in mortality at 7 days and 30 days with
270 systemic thrombolysis in intermediate risk PE, and a significant increased bleeding risk with
271 systemic thrombolysis [34]. Guidelines suggest against use of systemic thrombolysis for
272 intermediate risk PE, but promote use of systemic thrombolysis for patients who deteriorate
273 to become high risk [6]. Unlike myocardial infarction, there is no evidence to suggest benefit
274 of short door-to-needle times, so systemic thrombolysis can be reserved over the entire phase
275 of acute admission for those patients who deteriorate.

276

277 Intravascular thrombolysis and therapy may also be effective for intermediate risk PE
278 patients, however there is insufficient evidence supporting catheter directed therapy over
279 standard treatment of therapeutic anticoagulation. Low molecular weight heparin is a

280 common treatment of choice for intermediate risk PE and there are no trials comparing its
281 efficacy to the DOACs.

282

283 Systemic thrombolysis in pregnant patients

284 For pregnant patients with life threatening PE and haemodynamic compromise, the Royal
285 College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists (RCOG) suggest initial therapy with UFH,
286 noting the importance of individual case assessment. They advocate consideration of
287 systemic thrombolysis or surgical thrombectomy for deteriorating patients. Catheter directed
288 therapies may be a future option, but benefit has not yet been established [53]. The evidence
289 is low quality [54,55] and individual patient decisions have to be made balancing therapeutic
290 availability, time to treatment, haemodynamic stability, and individualised risk.

291

292 **SPECIAL CIRCUMSTANCES**

293 **Cancer patients**

294 In cancer associated thrombosis, guidelines support DOAC therapy [7,8]. These agents
295 demonstrate potential benefits such as reduced bleeding risk and comparable safety and
296 efficacy profile compared to LMWH, and lower lifestyle burden [56]. However, in
297 gastrointestinal or bladder malignancy where bleeding risk is greater, guidelines advise
298 avoiding DOACs which are associated with a greater risk of gastrointestinal bleeding and
299 haematuria.

300

301 **Recurrent PEs**

302 VTE recurrence following a provoked clot is approximately 3% per patient-year after
303 stopping anticoagulant therapy [57]. This risk is higher (at least 8%) in patient groups such as
304 those with cancer or antiphospholipid syndrome, and in those with no provoking cause for
305 their PE [58].

306 True ‘anticoagulation failure’ is rare, occurring in 2.0% of patients on DOACs and 2.2% of
307 patients on warfarin for VTE [59]. An ED safe approach to patients who are diagnosed with
308 PE while being prescribed an anticoagulant is to change them onto full dose LMWH. Early
309 discussion with specialists is sensible, as there is little evidence to guide management.

310

311 **PE FOLLOW UP**

312 Patients diagnosed with PE should be reviewed in a specialist clinic as soon as practical.
313 Patients should be given important information about PE and anticoagulation treatment. This
314 is also an opportunity to perform a limited cancer screen. Previously routine, thrombophilia
315 testing is not longer performed in most cases. PE is treated for a minimum of three months
316 and in cases with persistent symptoms, long term medication may be required. All patients
317 are assessed for their risk of recurrent VTE [1]. In general, patients with a strong, transient
318 provoking factor for their PE (such as hip replacement surgery, hospitalisation for acute
319 illness, trauma) can discontinue their anticoagulation at 3 months. Patients with a weak
320 provoking factor or no provoking factor have a higher risk of recurrence. A decision rule
321 such as the HERDOO2 rule can individualize the estimated risk of recurrent VTE which
322 helps with shared decision making [60]. For example, men remain at high risk of recurrence
323 following unprovoked PE and are usually offered long term anticoagulation. Patients with
324 active cancer and antiphospholipid syndrome have the highest risk for recurrence and are
325 recommended to continue long term.

326

327 **EMERGING MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES AND CONTROVERSY**

328 **Multidisciplinary hospital PE teams**

329 Multidisciplinary PE response teams (PERT) aim to bring clinicians from several different
330 specialties, including cardiology, respiratory, haematology, vascular and cardiothoracic
331 surgery together to provide emergency evaluation and rapidly determine optimal
332 management. An important aspect of this team is availability 24 hours a day with remote
333 access to patient details and the ability to meet immediately. Most examples are seen in the
334 United States, and tend to focus on intermediate, high risk and complex patients.
335 Retrospective data have signalled improved outcomes associated with implementation of
336 these teams [61].

337

338 **Reduced-dose thrombolysis**

339 The use of reduced-dose systemic thrombolysis (0.5 to 0.6 mg/kg alteplase) might reduce the
340 risk of major bleeding or intracranial bleeding. A recent network meta-analysis suggests no
341 difference in efficacy between full dose and reduced-dose thrombolysis, and reduced-dose
342 thrombolysis may have a net benefit with a reduced bleeding risk [62]. A trial is currently

343 underway to prospectively evaluate low dose thrombolysis in the setting of intermediate risk
344 PE (NCT04430569).

345

346 **PE in SARS-CoV-2 Patients**

347 As many as 35% of hospitalised SARS-CoV-2 patients are diagnosed with VTE and 60%
348 have VTE at autopsy [63,64]. VTE risk correlates with disease severity with 21% in
349 intensive care units (ICU) having VTE. This compares to 8% of influenza ICU patients [65].
350 The exact pathophysiological process is not yet fully understood but growing consensus
351 indicates a direct effect of SARS-CoV-2 on vascular endothelium along with predisposing
352 prothrombotic factors like hypoxia, severe inflammation, and immobilization [66]. An
353 elevated D-dimer and thrombocytopenia correlate with increasing VTE risk, disease severity
354 and mortality [67,68]. VTE diagnosis, risk assessment and treatment in COVID-19 patients is
355 currently the same as with standard protocols, with no current evidence supporting alternative
356 management [69].

357

358 Prophylactic treatment of hospitalised SARS-CoV-2 patients with anticoagulation (using
359 treatment or prophylactic dose LMWH [75]) improves survival, although VTE risk remains
360 despite anticoagulation particularly in the critically unwell [70,71]. An enhanced
361 anticoagulation regime with close monitoring has demonstrated survival benefit in critically
362 unwell patients [72]. However, in level two or three patients, NICE suggests the LMWH
363 dose should be reduced to a locally agreed intermediate or standard dose as treatment dose
364 has not been shown to prevent deaths or reduce duration of intensive care but is associated
365 with an increased risk of bleeding [75].

366

367 Even greater uncertainty exists for VTE risk management in non-hospitalised patients. The
368 IMPROVE VTE study suggests an individualised risk assessment to determine if extended
369 treatment is required on discharge [73]. The ACA and CHEST guidance concurs with patient
370 specific risk assessment, while National Institute of Health (NIH) suggests against routine
371 screening for VTE in SARS-CoV-2 patients [72]. NICE guidance also recognises lack of
372 evidence here, and suggests assessment of both VTE and bleeding risks and to consider
373 pharmacological prophylaxis if the risk of VTE outweighs the risk of bleeding [74].

374

375 **Patient Centred Care**

376 Patient involvement is increasingly recognised as central to providing good care for patients
377 with PE. The Canadian Venous Thromboembolism Clinical Trials and Outcomes Research
378 Network, in conjunction with the James Lind Alliance, is undertaking a priority setting
379 partnership for VTE and is set to chart the direction of future research in this area towards
380 questions important to patients and the public [75]. Shared decision making in the ED is
381 particularly important in areas of uncertainty around PE management, for example decisions
382 around admission, choice of anticoagulant and long term anticoagulation. Successful shared
383 decision making in PE is grounded in a good understanding of the evidence behind treatment
384 strategies, acknowledgement and communication of uncertainty, and use of plain language
385 summaries like those produced by Thrombosis UK [76].

386 **SUMMARY**

387 The approach to managing PE starts with risk stratification and use of validated scoring
388 systems. High risk patients should receive systemic thrombolysis when suitable and low risk
389 patients should be assessed for home management. Most PE patients are suitable for
390 outpatient treatment. Emergency physicians should be familiar with anticoagulant prescribing
391 tailored to individual patient need and aware of the relevant contraindications for specific
392 anticoagulants.

393

394 **Competing interests**

395 JC, PS, KdW and MR have no conflicts of interest to declare.

396 DH was a topic expert for NICE NG158 and QS201, regarding the diagnosis and
397 management of venous thromboembolic disease and venous thromboembolism in adults,
398 respectively. DH was also a co-author on the BTS guidelines for the outpatient management
399 of pulmonary embolism and the accompanying national quality standards.

400

401 **Funding**

402 No funding was used for the preparation of this manuscript.

403 DH is currently appointed as professor of the Royal College of Emergency Medicine and has
404 specific NIHR funding relevant to a thrombosis research project (NIHR127454).

405 MJR is supported by an NHS Research Scotland Career Researcher Clinician award.

406

407 **Table legends**

408 **Table 1:** Comparison of commonly used national and international classification tools for PE
409 with associated treatment guidance.

410 **Table 2:** Commonly used scoring tools to identify low risk PEs

411 **Table 3:** comparison of various anticoagulation choices

412

413 **Contributorship statement**

414 PS, JC and MR devised the concept and planned the review. PS and JC drafted the
415 manuscript. KdW, DH and MR provided critical review and redrafted the work. MR is
416 guarantor.

417 References

- 418 1 Konstantinides SV, Meyer G, Becattini C, *et al.* 2019 ESC Guidelines for the diagnosis
419 and management of acute pulmonary embolism developed in collaboration with the
420 European Respiratory Society (ERS). *Eur Heart J* 2020;**41**:543–603.
421 doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehz405
- 422 2 Calder KK, Herbert M, Henderson SO. The Mortality of Untreated Pulmonary Embolism
423 in Emergency Department Patients. *Ann Emerg Med* 2005;**45**:302–10.
424 doi:10.1016/j.annemergmed.2004.10.001
- 425 3 Bělohávek J, Dytrych V, Linhart A. Pulmonary embolism, part I: Epidemiology, risk
426 factors and risk stratification, pathophysiology, clinical presentation, diagnosis and
427 nonthrombotic pulmonary embolism. *Exp Clin Cardiol* 2013;**18**:129–38.
- 428 4 Jaff MR, McMurtry MS, Archer SL, *et al.* Management of Massive and Submassive
429 Pulmonary Embolism, Iliofemoral Deep Vein Thrombosis, and Chronic Thromboembolic
430 Pulmonary Hypertension: A Scientific Statement From the American Heart Association.
431 *Circulation* 2011;**123**:1788–830. doi:10.1161/CIR.0b013e318214914f
- 432 5 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (Great Britain). Scenario: Suspected
433 pulmonary embolism. London: 2020. [https://cks.nice.org.uk/topics/pulmonary-
434 embolism/management/confirmed-pulmonary-embolism/](https://cks.nice.org.uk/topics/pulmonary-embolism/management/confirmed-pulmonary-embolism/) (accessed 14 Feb 2021).
- 435 6 Kearon C, Akl EA, Ornelas J, *et al.* Antithrombotic Therapy for VTE Disease. *Chest*
436 2016;**149**:315–52. doi:10.1016/j.chest.2015.11.026
- 437 7 Stevens SM, Woller SC, Baumann Kreuziger L, *et al.* Antithrombotic Therapy for VTE
438 Disease: Second Update of the CHEST Guideline and Expert Panel Report – Executive
439 Summary. *Chest* 2021;:S0012369221015075. doi:10.1016/j.chest.2021.07.056
- 440 8 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (Great Britain). *Venous*
441 *thromboembolic diseases: diagnosis, management and thrombophilia testing*. 2020.
- 442 9 Schoepf UJ, Kucher N, Kipfmueller F, *et al.* Right ventricular enlargement on chest
443 computed tomography: a predictor of early death in acute pulmonary embolism.
444 *Circulation* 2004;**110**:3276–80. doi:10.1161/01.CIR.0000147612.59751.4C
- 445 10 Meinel FG, Nance JW, Schoepf UJ, *et al.* Predictive Value of Computed Tomography in
446 Acute Pulmonary Embolism: Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Am J Med*
447 2015;**128**:747-759.e2. doi:10.1016/j.amjmed.2015.01.023
- 448 11 Becattini C, Vedovati MC, Agnelli G. Prognostic Value of Troponins in Acute
449 Pulmonary Embolism: A Meta-Analysis. *Circulation* 2007;**116**:427–33.
450 doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.106.680421
- 451 12 Barco S, Mahmoudpour SH, Planquette B, *et al.* Prognostic value of right ventricular
452 dysfunction or elevated cardiac biomarkers in patients with low-risk pulmonary
453 embolism: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur Heart J* 2019;**40**:902–10.
454 doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehy873

- 455 13 Yoo HH, Nunes-Nogueira VS, Fortes Villas Boas PJ, *et al.* Outpatient versus inpatient
456 treatment for acute pulmonary embolism. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*
457 2019;**3**:CD010019. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD010019.pub3
- 458 14 Malik A, Aronow W. Safety, efficacy, length of stay and patient satisfaction with
459 outpatient management of low-risk pulmonary embolism patients – a meta-analysis. *Arch*
460 *Med Sci* 2021;**17**:245–51. doi:10.5114/aoms/99206
- 461 15 Roy P-M, Moumneh T, Penalzoza A, *et al.* Outpatient management of pulmonary
462 embolism. *Thromb Res* 2017;**155**:92–100. doi:10.1016/j.thromres.2017.05.001
- 463 16 Elias A, Mallett S, Daoud-Elias M, *et al.* Prognostic models in acute pulmonary
464 embolism: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMJ Open* 2016;**6**:e010324.
465 doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2015-010324
- 466 17 Quezada CA, Bikdeli B, Villén T, *et al.* Accuracy and Interobserver Reliability of the
467 Simplified Pulmonary Embolism Severity Index Versus the Hestia Criteria for Patients
468 With Pulmonary Embolism. *Acad Emerg Med* 2019;**26**:394–401.
469 doi:10.1111/acem.13561
- 470 18 Vinson DR, Mark DG, Chettipally UK, *et al.* Increasing Safe Outpatient Management of
471 Emergency Department Patients With Pulmonary Embolism: A Controlled Pragmatic
472 Trial. *Ann Intern Med* 2018;**169**:855. doi:10.7326/M18-1206
- 473 19 Aujesky D, Obrosky DS, Stone RA, *et al.* Derivation and Validation of a Prognostic
474 Model for Pulmonary Embolism. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2005;**172**:1041–6.
475 doi:10.1164/rccm.200506-862OC
- 476 20 Jiménez D, Aujesky D, Moores L, *et al.* Simplification of the pulmonary embolism
477 severity index for prognostication in patients with acute symptomatic pulmonary
478 embolism. *Arch Intern Med* 2010;**170**:1383–9. doi:10.1001/archinternmed.2010.199
- 479 21 Zondag W, Mos ICM, Creemers-Schild D, *et al.* Outpatient treatment in patients with
480 acute pulmonary embolism: the Hestia Study. *J Thromb Haemost* 2011;**9**:1500–7.
481 doi:https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1538-7836.2011.04388.x
- 482 22 Zondag W, Hiddinga BI, Crobach MJT, *et al.* Hestia criteria can discriminate high- from
483 low-risk patients with pulmonary embolism. *Eur Respir J* 2013;**41**:588–92.
484 doi:10.1183/09031936.00030412
- 485 23 Lameijer H, Aalberts JJJ, van Veldhuisen DJ, *et al.* Efficacy and safety of direct oral
486 anticoagulants during pregnancy; a systematic literature review. *Thromb Res*
487 2018;**169**:123–7. doi:10.1016/j.thromres.2018.07.022
- 488 24 Sabatino J, De RS, Polimeni A, *et al.* Direct Oral Anticoagulants in Patients With Active
489 Cancer. *JACC CardioOncology* 2020;**2**:428–40. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2020.06.001
- 490 25 Cardinal RM, D’Amico F, D’Addezio A, *et al.* Safety and efficacy of direct oral
491 anticoagulants across body mass index groups in patients with venous thromboembolism:
492 a retrospective cohort design. *J Thromb Thrombolysis* Published Online First: 2 January
493 2021. doi:10.1007/s11239-020-02361-8

- 494 26 Doucette K, Latif H, Vakiti A, *et al.* Efficacy and Safety of Direct-Acting Oral
495 Anticoagulants (DOACs) in the Overweight and Obese. *Adv Hematol* 2020;**2020**:1–7.
496 doi:10.1155/2020/3890706
- 497 27 Upreti VV, Wang J, Barrett YC, *et al.* Effect of extremes of body weight on the
498 pharmacokinetics, pharmacodynamics, safety and tolerability of apixaban in healthy
499 subjects. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 2013;**76**:908–16. doi:10.1111/bcp.12114
- 500 28 Royal College of Obstetricians and Gynaecologists. Thromboembolic Disease in
501 Pregnancy and the Puerperium: Acute Management. Royal College of Obstetricians and
502 Gynaecologists 2015. [https://www.rcog.org.uk/en/guidelines-research-](https://www.rcog.org.uk/en/guidelines-research-services/guidelines/gtg37b/)
503 [services/guidelines/gtg37b/](https://www.rcog.org.uk/en/guidelines-research-services/guidelines/gtg37b/) (accessed 17 Jan 2021).
- 504 29 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Clinical Knowledge Summaries:
505 Apixaban. 2021. [https://cks.nice.org.uk/topics/anticoagulation-](https://cks.nice.org.uk/topics/anticoagulation-oral/management/apixaban/)
506 [oral/management/apixaban/](https://cks.nice.org.uk/topics/anticoagulation-oral/management/apixaban/) (accessed 19 Jan 2022).
- 507 30 Ghanima W, Nielssen BE, Holmen LO, *et al.* Multidetector computed tomography
508 (MDCT) in the diagnosis of pulmonary embolism: interobserver agreement among
509 radiologists with varied levels of experience. *Acta Radiol Stockh Swed* 1987
510 2007;**48**:165–70. doi:10.1080/02841850601100859
- 511 31 Ottawa Hospital Research Institute. A Multicenter Prospective Cohort Management
512 Study to Evaluate the Safety of Withholding Anticoagulation in Patients With
513 Subsegmental PE Who Have a Negative Serial Bilateral Lower Extremity Ultrasound.
514 clinicaltrials.gov 2021. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT01455818> (accessed 5 Aug
515 2021).
- 516 32 Le Gal G, Kovacs MJ, Bertolotti L, *et al.* Risk for Recurrent Venous Thromboembolism
517 in Patients With Subsegmental Pulmonary Embolism Managed Without Anticoagulation.
518 *Ann Intern Med* Published Online First: 23 November 2021. doi:10.7326/M21-2981
- 519 33 Chatterjee S, Chakraborty A, Weinberg I, *et al.* Thrombolysis for Pulmonary Embolism
520 and Risk of All-Cause Mortality, Major Bleeding, and Intracranial Hemorrhage: A Meta-
521 analysis. *JAMA* 2014;**311**:2414. doi:10.1001/jama.2014.5990
- 522 34 Meyer G, Vicaut E, Danays T, *et al.* Fibrinolysis for Patients with Intermediate-Risk
523 Pulmonary Embolism. *N Engl J Med* 2014;**370**:1402–11. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1302097
- 524 35 Konstantinides SV, Vicaut E, Danays T, *et al.* Impact of Thrombolytic Therapy
525 on the Long-Term Outcome of Intermediate-Risk Pulmonary Embolism. *J Am Coll*
526 *Cardiol* 2017;**69**:1536–44. doi:10.1016/j.jacc.2016.12.039
- 527 36 Javaudin F, Lascarrou J-B, Le Bastard Q, *et al.* Thrombolysis During Resuscitation for
528 Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest Caused by Pulmonary Embolism Increases 30-Day
529 Survival. *Chest* 2019;**156**:1167–75. doi:10.1016/j.chest.2019.07.015
- 530 37 Bergum D, Nordseth T, Mjølstad OC, *et al.* Causes of in-hospital cardiac arrest –
531 Incidences and rate of recognition. *Resuscitation* 2015;**87**:63–8.
532 doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2014.11.007

- 533 38 Li X, Fu Q, Jing X, *et al.* A meta-analysis of cardiopulmonary resuscitation with and
534 without the administration of thrombolytic agents. *Resuscitation* 2006;**70**:31–6.
535 doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2005.11.016
- 536 39 Truhlář A, Deakin CD, Soar J, *et al.* European Resuscitation Council Guidelines for
537 Resuscitation 2015. *Resuscitation* 2015;**95**:148–201.
538 doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2015.07.017
- 539 40 Abu-Laban RB, Christenson JM, Innes GD, *et al.* Tissue plasminogen activator in cardiac
540 arrest with pulseless electrical activity. *N Engl J Med* 2002;**346**:1522–8.
541 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa012885
- 542 41 White RH. The Epidemiology of Venous Thromboembolism. *Circulation* 2003;**107**:4I--
543 8. doi:10.1161/01.CIR.0000078468.11849.66
- 544 42 Ahn JH, Jeon J, Toh H-C, *et al.* SEARCH 8Es: A novel point of care ultrasound protocol
545 for patients with chest pain, dyspnea or symptomatic hypotension in the emergency
546 department. *PLOS ONE* 2017;**12**:e0174581. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0174581
- 547 43 Kürkciyan I, Meron G, Sterz F, *et al.* Pulmonary Embolism as Cause of Cardiac Arrest:
548 Presentation and Outcome. *Arch Intern Med* 2000;**160**:1529.
549 doi:10.1001/archinte.160.10.1529
- 550 44 Heradstveit BE, Sunde K, Sunde G-A, *et al.* Factors complicating interpretation of
551 capnography during advanced life support in cardiac arrest—A clinical retrospective
552 study in 575 patients. *Resuscitation* 2012;**83**:813–8.
553 doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2012.02.021
- 554 45 Böttiger BW, Arntz H-R, Chamberlain DA, *et al.* Thrombolysis during Resuscitation for
555 Out-of-Hospital Cardiac Arrest. *N Engl J Med* 2008;**359**:2651–62.
556 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa070570
- 557 46 George B, Parazino M, Omar HR, *et al.* A retrospective comparison of survivors and
558 non-survivors of massive pulmonary embolism receiving veno-arterial extracorporeal
559 membrane oxygenation support. *Resuscitation* 2018;**122**:1–5.
560 doi:10.1016/j.resuscitation.2017.11.034
- 561 47 Bazan VM, Rodgers-Fischl P, Zwischenberger JB. Supportive Therapy: Extracorporeal
562 membrane oxygenation. *Crit Care Clin* 2020;**36**:517–29. doi:10.1016/j.ccc.2020.02.007
- 563 48 Wan S, Quinlan DJ, Agnelli G, *et al.* Thrombolysis Compared With Heparin for the
564 Initial Treatment of Pulmonary Embolism. *Circulation* 2004;**110**:744–9.
565 doi:10.1161/01.CIR.0000137826.09715.9C
- 566 49 Lewis JE, Pilcher DV. The management of pulmonary embolism. *Anaesth Intensive Care*
567 *Med* 2017;**18**:126–32. doi:10.1016/j.mpaic.2016.12.001
- 568 50 Tan CW, Balla S, Ghanta RK, *et al.* Contemporary Management of Acute Pulmonary
569 Embolism. *Semin Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2020;**32**:396–403.
570 doi:10.1053/j.semtevs.2020.04.002

- 571 51 Avgerinos ED, Saadeddin Z, Ali ANA, *et al.* A meta-analysis of outcomes of catheter-
572 directed thrombolysis for high- and intermediate-risk pulmonary embolism. *J Vasc Surg*
573 *Venous Lymphat Disord* 2018;**6**:530–40. doi:10.1016/j.jvsv.2018.03.010
- 574 52 Moore K, Kunin J, Alnijoumi M, *et al.* Current Endovascular Treatment Options in Acute
575 Pulmonary Embolism. *J Clin Imaging Sci* 2021;**11**. doi:10.25259/JCIS_229_2020
- 576 53 Wiegers HMG, Middeldorp S. Contemporary best practice in the management of
577 pulmonary embolism during pregnancy. *Ther Adv Respir Dis*
578 2020;**14**:175346662091422. doi:10.1177/1753466620914222
- 579 54 Sousa Gomes M, Guimarães M, Montenegro N. Thrombolysis in pregnancy: a literature
580 review. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med* 2019;**32**:2418–28.
581 doi:10.1080/14767058.2018.1434141
- 582 55 Martillotti G, Boehlen F, Robert-Ebadi H, *et al.* Treatment options for severe pulmonary
583 embolism during pregnancy and the postpartum period: a systematic review. *J Thromb*
584 *Haemost* 2017;**15**:1942–50. doi:10.1111/jth.13802
- 585 56 Wang T, Li A, Garcia D. Managing thrombosis in cancer patients. *Res Pract Thromb*
586 *Haemost* 2018;**2**:429–38. doi:10.1002/rth2.12102
- 587 57 Iorio A, Kearon C, Filippucci E, *et al.* Risk of recurrence after a first episode of
588 symptomatic venous thromboembolism provoked by a transient risk factor: a systematic
589 review. *Arch Intern Med* 2010;**170**:1710–6. doi:10.1001/archinternmed.2010.367
- 590 58 Áinle FN, Kevane B. Which patients are at high risk of recurrent venous
591 thromboembolism (deep vein thrombosis and pulmonary embolism)? *Blood Adv*
592 2020;**4**:5595–606. doi:10.1182/bloodadvances.2020002268
- 593 59 van Es N, Coppens M, Schulman S, *et al.* Direct oral anticoagulants compared with
594 vitamin K antagonists for acute venous thromboembolism: evidence from phase 3 trials.
595 *Blood* 2014;**124**:1968–75. doi:10.1182/blood-2014-04-571232
- 596 60 Rodger MA, Le Gal G, Anderson DR, *et al.* Validating the HERDOO2 rule to guide
597 treatment duration for women with unprovoked venous thrombosis: multinational
598 prospective cohort management study. *BMJ* 2017;**j1065**. doi:10.1136/bmj.j1065
- 599 61 Myc LA, Solanki JN, Barros AJ, *et al.* Adoption of a dedicated multidisciplinary team is
600 associated with improved survival in acute pulmonary embolism. *Respir Res*
601 2020;**21**:159. doi:10.1186/s12931-020-01422-z
- 602 62 Jimenez D, Martin-Saborido C, Muriel A, *et al.* Efficacy and safety outcomes of
603 recanalisation procedures in patients with acute symptomatic pulmonary embolism:
604 systematic review and network meta-analysis. *Thorax* 2018;**73**:464–71.
605 doi:10.1136/thoraxjnl-2017-210040
- 606 63 Jiménez D, García-Sánchez A, Rali P, *et al.* Incidence of VTE and Bleeding Among
607 Hospitalized Patients With Coronavirus Disease 2019: A Systematic Review and Meta-
608 analysis. *Chest* 2021;**159**:1182–96. doi:10.1016/j.chest.2020.11.005

- 609 64 Wichmann D, Sperhake J-P, Lütgehetmann M, *et al.* Autopsy Findings and Venous
610 Thromboembolism in Patients With COVID-19: A Prospective Cohort Study. *Ann Intern*
611 *Med* 2020;**173**:268–77. doi:10.7326/M20-2003
- 612 65 Poissy J, Goutay J, Caplan M, *et al.* Pulmonary Embolism in Patients With COVID-19:
613 Awareness of an Increased Prevalence. *Circulation* 2020;**142**:184–6.
614 doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.120.047430
- 615 66 Khandelwal G, Ray A, Sethi S, *et al.* COVID-19 and thrombotic complications—the role
616 of anticoagulants, antiplatelets and thrombolytics. *J Fam Med Prim Care* 2021;**10**:3561–
617 7. doi:10.4103/jfmprc.jfmprc_1297_20
- 618 67 van Blydenstein SA, Menezes CN, Miller N, *et al.* Prevalence and Trajectory of COVID-
619 19-Associated Hypercoagulability Using Serial Thromboelastography in a South African
620 Population. *Crit Care Res Pract* 2021;**2021**:3935098. doi:10.1155/2021/3935098
- 621 68 Salabei JK, Fishman TJ, Asnake ZT, *et al.* COVID-19 Coagulopathy: Current knowledge
622 and guidelines on anticoagulation. *Heart Lung* 2021;**50**:357–60.
623 doi:10.1016/j.hrtlng.2021.01.011
- 624 69 Chandra A, Chakraborty U, Ghosh S, *et al.* Anticoagulation in COVID-19: current
625 concepts and controversies. *Postgrad Med J* 2021;:postgradmedj-2021-139923.
626 doi:10.1136/postgradmedj-2021-139923
- 627 70 Ge J, Ma Y, Wu Z, *et al.* Anticoagulation treatment for patients with coronavirus disease
628 2019 (COVID-19) and its clinical effectiveness in 2020. *Medicine (Baltimore)*
629 2021;**100**:e27861. doi:10.1097/MD.00000000000027861
- 630 71 Bradbury CA, McQuilten Z. Anticoagulation in COVID-19. *The Lancet* 2022;**399**:5–7.
631 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(21)02503-4
- 632 72 Skeik N, Smith JE, Patel L, *et al.* Risk and Management of Venous Thromboembolism in
633 Patients with COVID-19. *Ann Vasc Surg* 2021;**73**:78–85. doi:10.1016/j.avsg.2020.11.007
- 634 73 Spyropoulos AC, Lipardi C, Xu J, *et al.* Modified IMPROVE VTE Risk Score and
635 Elevated D-Dimer Identify a High Venous Thromboembolism Risk in Acutely Ill
636 Medical Population for Extended Thromboprophylaxis. *TH Open Companion J Thromb*
637 *Haemost* 2020;**4**:e59–65. doi:10.1055/s-0040-1705137
- 638 74 National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. *COVID-19 rapid guideline: managing*
639 *COVID-19*. 2021. <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng191> (accessed 19 Jan 2022).
- 640 75 Canadian Venous Thromboembolism Clinical Trials and Outcomes Research. Venous
641 Thromboembolism (Canada) PSP Protocol. James Lind Alliance.
642 2020.[https://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/documents/venous-thromboembolism-canada-psp-](https://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/documents/venous-thromboembolism-canada-psp-protocol/24525)
643 [protocol/24525](https://www.jla.nihr.ac.uk/documents/venous-thromboembolism-canada-psp-protocol/24525) (accessed 30 Dec 2021).
- 644 76 Thrombosis UK. Information Sheets & Booklets. [https://thrombosisuk.org/information-](https://thrombosisuk.org/information-fact-sheets.php)
645 [fact-sheets.php](https://thrombosisuk.org/information-fact-sheets.php) (accessed 30 Dec 2021).

646