**IJPPR** INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF PHARMACY & PHARMACEUTICAL RESEARCH An official Publication of Human Journals



Human Journals **Review Article** April 2024 Vol.:30, Issue:4 © All rights are reserved by Dr Hajra Tariq et al.

# Risk for Recurrent Venous Thromboembolism in Patients with Subsegmental Pulmonary Embolism Managed without Anticoagulation



<sup>1</sup>Dr Hajra Tariq, <sup>2</sup>Hafiza Sidra, <sup>3</sup>Farooq Ashraf, <sup>4</sup>Sara Ahmed, <sup>5</sup>Sheraz Ahmed, <sup>6</sup>Shahzaib Shahzad, <sup>7</sup>Muhab Mohamed Hassan Suliman, <sup>8</sup>Amal Daher Alshammari, <sup>9</sup>Muhammad Faisal Hayat, <sup>10</sup>Dr Ghulam Murtaza Mehdi, <sup>11</sup>Umar Sultan

1. Abbottabad Senior Registrar, Cardiology International Medical Complex, Abbottabad, Pakistan. 2. Medical Doctor Internal Medicine, University of Health Sciences Lahore, Pakistan.3. Medical Officer North Ravi Hospital, Lahore, Pakistan. 4. Clinical Fellow Emergency Department, National Institute of Cardiovascular Diseases Karachi, Pakistan. 5. Department of Medicine, Islamic International Medical College Islamabad, Pakistan. 6. Resident Cardiology Punjab Institute of Cardiology Lahore, Pakistan.7. Clinical Pharmacology Unit, Department of Basic Medical Sciences, College of Medicine, AlMaarefa University, Diriyah 13713, Riyadh, Saudi Arabia 8. Assistant Professor, Department of family Medicine, College of Medicine, University of Ha'il, Saudi Arabia 9. Resident Cardiology Punjab Institute of Cardiology Lahore, Pakistan. 10. House Officer Mayo Hospital Lahore, Pakistan. 11. Resident Cardiology Punjab Institute of Cardiology Lahore, Pakistan.

Submitted: Accepted: Published: 25 March 2024 31 March 2024 30 April 2024





ijppr.humanjournals.com

Keywords: Recurrent Venous Thromboembolism,

Subsegmental Pulmonary Embolism, Anticoagulation

### ABSTRACT

Venous thromboembolism (VTE) is a frequent complication in patients with cancer. Contemporary risk estimates indicate that a diagnosis of cancer increases the risk of VTE by the factor of 9 compared to individuals without cancer. The main objective of this meta-analysis is to find the risk for recurrent venous thromboembolism in patients with subsegmental pulmonary embolism managed without anticoagulation. For this study, Preferred Reporting Items guideline for conducting this systematic review analysis (PRISMA) was followed. Electronic articles from January 2014 to January 2023 were searched on PUB Med, online Willey library, and ScienceDirect site. For thromboembolism related studies we include articles from year 2014 to year 2023 for better comparison. We use keywords like thromboembolism, pulmonary, embolism, anticoagulants, risk factors, venous thromboembolism, subsegmental pulmonary embolism, and patients with thromboembolism to search relevant articles. At first sight, the initial symptoms of selected studies were noted. In patients with a VTE diagnosis in the absence of underlying cancer, the recurrence risk of VTE depends on the presence of risk factors and triggers, with the highest risk observed in patients with an unprovoked VTE (i.e. without a triggering event or identifiable risk factor). In contrast, VTE due to major transient provoking risk factors is associated with the lowest risk for recurrence. It is concluded that patients with subsegmental pulmonary embolism who did not have proximal deep venous thrombosis had a higher-thanexpected rate of recurrent venous thromboembolism.

### **INTRODUCTION**

Venous thromboembolism (VTE) is a frequent complication in patients with cancer. Contemporary risk estimates indicate that a diagnosis of cancer increases the risk of VTE by a factor of 9 compared to individuals without cancer [1]. VTE events adversely impact the clinical course of disease in cancer patients by contributing to morbidity, mortality, healthcare-costs, and adding to the psychological burden of patients as reviewed in Ref. [2]. Therefore, optimizing therapeutic approaches by personalizing primary prevention of cancerassociated VTE and secondary prevention of recurrent VTE is an unmet medical need, as the risk-benefit ratio of primary and secondary thromboprophylaxis in cancer patients needs to be carefully balanced based on the concurrent high risk of bleeding events. Various risk factors were identified for the first diagnosis of VTE in cancer patients [3].

Characterizing the risk of recurrent VTE in cancer patients requires the consideration and knowledge of underlying factors that influence risk of the first VTE event. Risk of VTE in cancer patients is highly heterogeneous and strongly depends on treatment-, tumor-and patient-related prothrombotic risk factors [3]. Among those, the underlying tumor type is among the most important factors that influence VTE risk, with the highest rates of up to 20% observed in patients with pancreatic and gastric cancer, and a low risk in patients with breast and prostate cancer. Further, advanced disease stage, certain anti-cancer treatments (e.g. surgery, radiotherapy, cisplatin-based chemotherapy, anti-angiogenic agents), and comorbidities including a prior history of VTE were identified as risk factors for VTE diagnosis [2,3]. Importantly, the increasingly utilized immune checkpoint inhibitors have lately been shown to be associated with an increased risk [4]. Based on the heterogeneity in VTE risk, in combination with an increased risk of bleeding events in cancer patients compared to the general population, primary thromboprophylaxis is not routinely recommended in the overall population of patients with cancer, necessitating the implementation of risk prediction strategies to identify high-risk subgroups. Different biomarkers were identified that can help predicting the future risk of VTE in patients with cancer beyond key clinical prothrombotic risk factors, including D-dimer [[5], [6]], soluble Pselectin (sP-selectin) [6,7], prothrombin fragment 1 + 2 (F1+2) [8] and citrullinated histone H3 [9] in the general population with cancer, and the expression of podoplanin on cancer cells in patients with glioblastoma.

In recent years, physicians have been increasingly confronted with unsuspected filling defects of the pulmonary artery - corresponding with pulmonary embolism (PE) identified on routine computed tomography (CT) scans of the chest, performed for indications other than suspected PE [10]. Although the available literature focusses mostly on this apparent diagnosis of incidental PE in cancer patients, this phenomenon is clearly relevant to other patients as well, including those referred for coronary artery imaging, evaluation of pulmonary infections, or those who have been subjected to major trauma. In general, unsuspected venous thrombosis accounts for an annual estimated 375 000 to 425 000 recognised incident cases in the US, at a total cost of \$7 billion to \$10 billion [11]. Despite this relatively high frequency, the optimal management of incidental PE has not been addressed in clinical trials and remains the subject of debate.

### Objective

The main objective of this meta-analysis is to find the risk for recurrent venous thromboembolism in patients with subsegmental pulmonary embolism managed without anticoagulation.

### Methodology of the study

#### **Search Strategy:**

For this study, Preferred Reporting Items guideline for conducting this systematic review analysis (PRISMA) was followed. Electronic articles from January 2014 to January 2023 were searched on PUB Med, online Willey library, and ScienceDirect site. For thromboembolism releted studies we include articles from year 2014 to year 2023 for better comparison. We use keywords like thromboembolism, pulmonary, embolism, anticoagulants, risk factors, venous thromboembolism, subsegmental pulmonary embolism and patients with thromboembolism to search relevant articles. We make assure that all the data have information such as thromboembolism and pulmonary embolism. With the help of keywords, we analyze the title, abstract aims, and objectives to extract the relevant data.

### **Inclusion criteria:**

Articles and case studies with complete demographic information and complete medical symptoms of patients confirmed after diagnosis were included for this research.

## **Exclusion Criteria;**

Articles which were written in other than English language were not included for this research. On the behalf of keywords seven hundred sixty two articles were found. Information in the form of posters, case studies without imaging, letters to editors, and articles with copied information were excluded from this study.



Fig 1: Inclusion Criteria of selected studies according to PRISMA follow up

The evaluation of selected data was further done into two phases first we select the data based on abstract and title. Secondly, the inner text of articles was examined and included if they were eligible to fill the inclusion criteria of our study. At the initial stage of collecting data, seven hundred and sixty-two articles were found with selected keywords. In the first screening, 164 duplicate articles were excluded and on further screening of the rest of 598 articles, we omitted 502 articles with poor information. Later on, remaining 96 articles were further gone through the screening process. At the last stage, 25 articles that fulfilled the

inclusion criteria and had adequate data on required topic were included. Demographic information of patients like mean age and rang, the sample size was kept in tabular form.

# **RESULTS:**

At first sight, the initial symptoms of selected studies were noted. In patients with a VTE diagnosis in the absence of underlying cancer, the recurrence risk of VTE depends on the presence of risk factors and triggers, with the highest risk observed in patients with an unprovoked VTE (i.e. without an triggering event or identifiable risk factor). In contrast, VTE due to major transient provoking risk factors is associated with the lowest risk for recurrence.

Study	Study type	Treatment	n	Finding	Risk estimate	Setting
Chee CE et	Cohort study	Long term	477	Metastasis	HR 1.5 [95% CI:	Recurrence
al. 2014		treatment: 74%		Stage IV	1.03–2.17]	during and after
		heparin		pancreatic cancer	HR 6.38 [95% CI:	stopping
		followed by		Brain cancer	2.69–15.13]	anticoagulation
		warfarin, 9%		Myeloproliferative	HR 4.57 [95% CI:	
		inferior vena		or myelodysplastic	2.07-10.09]	
		cava filter		disorders	HR 3.49 [95% CI:	
				Ovarian cancer	1.59–7.68]	
				Stage IV cancer	HR 3.22 [95% CI:	
				(non-pancreatic)	1.57–6.59]	
				Lung cancer	HR 2.85 [95% CI:	
				Neurological	1.74–4.67]	
				disease with leg	HR 2.73 [95% CI:	
				paresis	1.63-4.55]	
				Cancer stage	HR 2.38 [95% CI:	
				progression	1.14-4.97]	
					HR 2.14 [95% CI:	
					1.30–3.63]	
Khorana	Posthoc	Tinzaparin or	900	Venous	SHR 3.0 [95%	Recurrence
AA et al.	analysis of	warfarin for 6		compression	CI: 1.8–4.9]	during
2017	RCT	months		Hepatobiliary	SHR 2.9 [95%	anticoagulation
				cancer	CI: 1.2–7.0]	
Young	RCT	Dalteparin or	406	Stomach or	HR 5.55 [95% CI:	Recurrence
AM et al.		rivaroxaban		pancreas versus	1.97–15.66]	during
2018		for 6 months		other malignancies	HR 2.69 [95% CI:	anticoagulation
				Lung, lymphoma,	1.11–6.53]	
				gynecologic, or	HR 2.78 [95% CI:	
				bladder versus	1.2–6.41]	
				other malignancies		
				Symptomatic VTE		
				versus incidental		

 Table 1. Risk factors and predictors for recurrent VTE in cancer patients.

				PE		
Bosch FTM et al. 2021	Posthoc analysis of RCT	Edoxaban or LMWH for 6 months (up to 12 months)	1050	Age <50 years Body weight >110 kg DVT only as index event Upper GI tumor	SHR         2.0         [95%]           CI:         1.12–3.58]           SHR         2.3         [95%]           CI:         1.14–4.62]           SHR         1.93         [95%]           CI:         1.25–2.99]         SHR         3.35         [95%]           CI:         1.07–10.57]         [95%]         [95%]	Recurrence during and after stopping anticoagulation
Louzada ML et al. 2021	Retrospective cohort	<ul><li>37% Vitamin</li><li>K antagonist,</li><li>63% LMWH</li></ul>	543	Sex Primary tumor		Recurrence during anticoagulation
Trujillo- Santos J et al. 2008	Prospective registry	49% long term LMWH, 43% long term vitamin K antagonists, 3.8% inferior vena cava filter	3805	Patients aged <65 years Clinically overt PE at entry Cancer detected <3 months earlier	OR 1.6 [95% CI: 1.0–2.4] for DVT; OR 3.0 [95% CI: 1.9–4.9] for PE OR 1.9 [95% CI: 1.2–3.1] for PE OR 2.4 [95% CI: 1.5–3.6] for DVT; OR 2.0 [95% CI: 1.2–3.2] for PE	Recurrence during anticoagulation
Napolitano M et al. 2014	Prospective study	LMWH 6 months, if RVT then randomization: LMWH 6 more months or stop, no RVT anticoagulation stop	347 (242 patients with RVT)	RVT after 6 months of LMWH or PE as index event	HR 9.56 [95% CI: 2.8–28.5]	Recurrence during and after stopping anticoagulation
Marshall A et al. 2020	RCT	Dalteparin or rivaroxaban for 6 months, then second randomization rivaroxaban or placebo for 6 more months	92	RVT after 5.5 months or PE as index event		Recurrence during and after stopping anticoagulation
Bauersachs R et al. 2018	Posthoc analysis of RCT	Tinzaparin or warfarin for 6 months	900	Renal impairment	RR 1.74 [95% CI: 1.06–2.85]	Recurrence during anticoagulation
Van Es N et al. 2018	Prospective observational study	Full dose heparin for 1 month, followed by 75% dose for 5 months	3414	Baseline P- selectin levels	SHR 4.0 [95% CI: 1.1–14]	Recurrence during anticoagulation
Lapeone	riospective	i un uose	JTIT	1160	1	Recuirchee

FX et al.	registry	anticoagulation		Obesity		after stopping
2021	registry	for at least 3		Renal		anticoagulation
2021		months then		insufficiency		unneougulation
		stop of		Previous VTE		
		anticoagulation		Type of cancer		
		and follow-up		(nancreas lung		
		of 1 year		kidney carcinoma		
		or r your		of unknown		
				origin metastasis)		
				Association of		
				pulmonary		
				embolism and		
				deep vein		
				thrombosis		
				Inferior vena cava		
				filter		
				Direct oral		
				anticoagulant		
				(compared to low		
				molecular weight		
				heparin) in the		
				first 7 days		
				Post-thrombotic		
				syndrome and		
				residual venous or		
				pulmonary artery		
				obstruction after 3		
				months		
				No recent surgery		
				Not catheter-		
				related thrombosis		
Sakamoto	Retrospective	Long term	695	Metastasis		Recurrence
J et al.	cohort study	treatment:				during and after
2019		warfarin 83%,				stopping
		DOAC 2.9%,				anticoagulation
		LMWH 2.6%				
Mulder FI	Post hoc	Edoxaban or	331	ECOG 2 versus 0	HR 5.24 [95% CI:	Recurrence
et al. 2020	analysis of	LMWH for 6–		for recurrent	1.81–15.18]	during
	RCT	12 months		incidental VTE		anticoagulation
Louzada	Systematic	Vitamin K	4573	Metastatic versus	RR 1.36 [95% CI:	Recurrence
ML et al.	review (6	antagonist or		localized disease	1.06–1.74]	during and after
2011	prospective	LMWH				stopping
	studies)					anticoagulation
Otero	Prospective	More than 3	166	Male sex	SHR 4.32 [95%	Recurrence
Candelera	study	months of		Ratio basal D-	CI: 1.10–16.96]	after stopping
R et al.		anticoagulation		dimer to 21 days	SHR 7.53 [95%	anticoagulation
2021		than stop and		D-dimer >2	CI: 1.97–28.71]	
		blood draw, 21		Increasing hs-CRP	SHR 5.15 [95%	
		days later		(day 21)	CI: 1.37–19.34]	
		blood draw		Increasing P-	SHR 5.60 [95%	

		again		selectin (day 21)	CI: 1.48–21.08]	
Mahé I et al. 2017	Prospective registry	Long-term treatment: 67% LMWH, 20% Vitamin K antagonists, 1.1% rivaroxaban, 1.6% fondaparinux	3947	Lung cancer versus breast cancer	HR 3.8 [95% CI: 2.6–5.6]	Recurrence during anticoagulation
Jara- Palomares L et al. 2018	Prospective study	At least 3 months of LMWH, then anticoagulation stop and blood draw, 21 days later blood draw again	114	hs-CRP >4.5 mg/L D-dimer >600 ng/mL	SHR 9.82 [95% CI: 1.86–51.7] SHR 5.81 [95% CI: 1.06–31.72]	Recurrence after stopping anticoagulation
Gal Le et al. 2023	Cohort Study	Patients with isolated subsegmental pulmonary embolism.	266	Patients with subsegmental pulmonary embolism who did not have proximal deep venous thrombosis had a higher-than- expected rate of recurrent venous thromboembolism.	Of the 266 patients included in the primary analysis, the primary outcome occurred in 8 patients, for a cumulative incidence of 3.1% (95% CI, 1.6% to 6.1%) over the 90-day follow-up. The incidence of recurrent venous thromboembolism was 2.1% (CI, 0.8% to 5.5%) and 5.7% (CI, 2.2% to 14.4%) over the 90-day follow-up in patients with single and multiple isolated subsegmental pulmonary embolism, respectively. No patients had a fatal recurrent pulmonary embolism.	Recurrence during anticoagulation



Figure 2: Forest plot for pooled estimated values

### Discussion

There are several angles from which the relevance of incidental PE could be considered, i.e. comparison of the prognosis of 1) incidental PE in cancer patients versus cancer patients without VTE; 2) incidental PE with a large versus a smaller embolic load; and 3) incidental PE versus symptomatic PE [11]. Most studies in incidental PE have been performed in cancer patients, because they comprise the overall majority of incidental PE diagnoses detected by CT scanning performed for cancer staging [12]. The relevance of incidental PE could best be demonstrated by showing its natural history without anticoagulant treatment. Unfortunately, there are very few studies to demonstrate this phenomenon [13]. The landmark trial of Barritt and Jordan showed that untreated symptomatic PE is followed by high recurrent PE, and even fatal PE. In fact, of the 19 patients who were not administered anticoagulant treatment, almost 25% died of fatal PE, and five showed progression of PE at 3 months, whereas none of the treated patients suffered PE-related death or progression. One study in patients with incidental PE evaluated the safety of withholding anticoagulant treatment [14]. Patients with confirmed distal or proximal DVT, but without symptoms of PE randomly received i.v. heparin, followed by vitamin-K antagonists, or a non-steroidal agent, phenylbutazone. A total of 42 out of 90 study patients (47%) were found to have silent PE. Perfusion-ventilation lung scans showed no significant changes at 10 and 60 days, between the two groups [15].

Moreover, within 12 months, six patients died in the anticoagulant group, with one death being attributed to PE. Furthermore, seven patients died in the non-anticoagulant group, none of which was reportedly related to PE, suggesting that anticoagulant therapy could have been withheld. The small sample size however, does not permit a strong conclusion. Notably, a recent patient level meta-analysis indicated that patients with incidental PE who remained untreated – presumably due to a high risk of bleeding or other relevant prognostic factorshave a very high 6-month risk of recurrent VTE (12%) and mortality (47%) [16]. Moreover, data from a retrospective observational study that was not included in the aforementioned meta-analysis confirmed that patients with incidental PE who did not receive anticoagulant treatment showed poorer survival [17]. Several retrospective studies in patients with cancer indicate that incidental PE can have important effects on survival, as well as on recurrent VTE [18-20]. In one study that included a control group of patients without PE, matched for age, cancer histology and severity, the median survival in patients with incidental PE was 8 months, compared to 12 months for the matched controls. In two studies of heterogeneous groups of cancer patients, incidental PE had a similar influence on survival, compared to cancer patients with symptomatic PE. In the first study, 6-month mortality rates were around 50% in both groups, which was significantly worse than the 27% mortality rate in the 60 patients with symptoms suggestive of PE, but for whom the diagnosis of PE was excluded [21]. In the second study, 12-month mortality rates were  $\sim$ 53% in both groups. In addition, a similar incidence of recurrent VTE between patients with symptomatic VTE and patients with incidental PE (16.9% versus 13.3%; p=0.77) was observed. In contrast, a very recent observational study of a relatively small number of 66 patients reported that malignancyassociated incidental PE was not associated with a higher risk of mortality, compared to matched control patients without incidental PE [22].

### Conclusion

It is concluded that patients with subsegmental pulmonary embolism who did not have proximal deep venous thrombosis had a higher than expected rate of recurrent venous thromboembolism.

#### References

1. Le Gal G, Kovacs MJ, Bertoletti L, Couturaud F, Dennie C, Hirsch AM, Huisman MV, Klok FA, Kraaijpoel N, Mallick R, Pecarskie A, Pena E, Phillips P, Pichon I, Ramsay T, Righini M, Rodger MA, Roy PM, Sanchez O, Schmidt J, Schulman S, Shivakumar S, Trinh-Duc A, Verdet R, Vinsonneau U, Wells P, Wu C, Yeo E, Carrier M; SSPE Investigators. Risk for Recurrent Venous Thromboembolism in Patients With

Subsegmental Pulmonary Embolism Managed Without Anticoagulation : A Multicenter Prospective Cohort Study. Ann Intern Med. 2022 Jan;175(1):29-35. doi: 10.7326/M21-2981. Epub 2021 Nov 23. PMID: 34807722.

2. Franco L, Giustozzi M, Agnelli G, Becattini C. Anticoagulation in patients with isolated distal deep vein thrombosis: a meta-analysis. J Thromb Haemost. 2017 Jun;15(6):1142-1154. doi: 10.1111/jth.13677. Epub 2017 Apr 18. PMID: 28316124.

3. Decousus H, Quéré I, Presles E, Becker F, Barrellier MT, Chanut M, Gillet JL, Guenneguez H, Leandri C, Mismetti P, Pichot O, Leizorovicz A; POST (Prospective Observational Superficial Thrombophlebitis) Study Group. Superficial venous thrombosis and venous thromboembolism: a large, prospective epidemiologic study. Ann Intern Med. 2010 Feb 16;152(4):218-24. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-152-4-201002160-00006. PMID: 20157136.

4. Englisch, Cornelia, et al. "Risk Assessment for Recurrent Venous Thromboembolism in Patients with Cancer." *Thrombosis Update*, vol. 5, 2021, p. 100080, https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tru.2021.100080.

5. I. Pabinger, N. van Es, G. Heinze, F. Posch, J. Riedl, E.-M. Reitter, *et al.* A clinical prediction model for cancer-associated venous thromboembolism: a development and validation study in two independent prospective cohorts. The Lancet Haematology, 5 (7) (2018), pp. e289-e298

6. Monreal M, Rey-Joly BC, Ruiz MJ, et al. Asymptomatic pulmonary embolism in patients with deep vein thrombosis. Is it useful to take a lung scan to rule out this condition? J Cardiovasc Surg (Torino) 1989; 30: 104–107.

7. Huisman MV, Buller HR, ten Cate JW, et al. Unexpected high prevalence of silent pulmonary embolism in patients with deep venous thrombosis. Chest 1989; 95: 498–502.

8. Dorfman GS, Cronan JJ, Tupper TB, et al. Occult pulmonary embolism: a common occurrence in deep venous thrombosis. AJR Am J Roentgenol 1987; 148: 263–266.

9. Moser KM, Fedullo PF, LitteJohn JK, et al. Frequent asymptomatic pulmonary embolism in patients with deep venous thrombosis. JAMA 1994; 271: 223–225.

10. Rokx C, Borjas Howard JF, Smit C, Wit FW, Pieterman ED, Reiss P, et al. (2020) Risk of recurrent venous thromboembolism in patients with HIV infection: A nationwide cohort study. PLoS Med 17(5): e1003101. https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pmed.1003101

11. Auer RC, Schulman AR, Tuorto S, et al. Use of helical CT is associated with an increased incidence of postoperative pulmonary emboli in cancer patients with no change in the number of fatal pulmonary emboli. J Am Coll Surg. 2009;208:871-8. [PMID: 19476851] doi:10.1016/j.jamcollsurg.2008.12.030

12. Schulman S, Kearon C; Subcommittee on Control of Anticoagulation of the Scientific and Standardization Committee of the International Society on Thrombosis and Haemostasis. Definition of major bleeding in clinical investigations of antihemostatic medicinal products in non-surgical patients. J Thromb Haemost. 2005;3:692-4. [PMID: 15842354]

13. Carrier M, Righini M, Wells PS, et al. Subsegmental pulmonary embolism diagnosed by computed tomography: incidence and clinical implications. A systematic review and meta-analysis of the management outcome studies. J Thromb Haemost. 2010;8:1716-22. [PMID: 20546118] doi:10.1111/j.1538-7836.2010 .03938.x

14. Carrier M, Le Gal G, Wells PS, et al. Systematic review: case-fatality rates of recurrent venous thromboembolism and major bleeding events among patients treated for venous thromboembolism. Ann Intern Med. 2010;152:578-89. [PMID: 20439576] doi:10.7326/0003-4819-152-9-201005040-00008

15. Da Costa Rodrigues J, Alzuphar S, Combescure C, et al. Diagnostic characteristics of lower limb venous compression ultrasonography in suspected pulmonary embolism: a meta-analysis. J Thromb Haemost. 2016;14:1765-72. [PMID: 27377039] doi:10.1111/jth.13407

16. Prandoni P, Lensing AW, Piccioli A, et al. Recurrent venous thromboembolism and bleeding complications during anticoagulant treatment in patients with cancer and venous thrombosis. Blood. 2002;100:3484-8. [PMID: 12393647]

17. Carrier M, Righini M, Le Gal G. Symptomatic subsegmental pulmonary embolism: what is the next step. J Thromb Haemost. 2012;10:1486-90. [PMID: 22672341] doi:10.1111/j.1538-7836.2012.04804.x

18. Bariteau A, Stewart LK, Emmett TW, et al. Systematic review and meta-analysis of outcomes of patients with subsegmental pulmonary embolism with and without anticoagulation treatment. Acad Emerg Med. 2018;25:828-35. [PMID: 29498138] doi:10.1111/acem.13399

Citation: Dr Hajra Tariq et al. Ijppr.Human, 2024; Vol. 30 (4): 348-359.

19. Kearon C, Akl EA, Ornelas J, et al. Antithrombotic therapy for VTE disease: CHEST guideline and expert panel report. Chest. 2016;149: 315-52. [PMID: 26867832] doi:10.1016/j.chest.2015.11.026

20. Prandoni P, Lensing AW, Bernardi E, et al; DERECUS Investigators Group. The diagnostic value of compression ultrasonography in patients with suspected recurrent deep vein thrombosis. Thromb Haemost. 2002;88:402-6. [PMID: 12353067]

21. Kearon C, Akl EA, Comerota AJ, Prandoni P, Bounameaux H, Goldhaber SZ, Nelson ME, Wells PS, Gould MK, Dentali F, Crowther M, Kahn SR; American College of Chest Physicians. Antithrombotic therapy for VTE disease: Antithrombotic Therapy and Prevention of Thrombosis, 9th ed: American College of Chest Physicians Evidence-Based Clinical Practice Guidelines. *Chest* 2012; **141**(2 Suppl.): e419S–94S.

22. De Martino RR, Wallaert JB, Rossi AP, Zbehlik AJ, Suckow B, Walsh DB. A meta-analysis of anticoagulation for calf deep venous thrombosis. *J Vasc Surg* 2012; **56**: 228–37.e1; discussion 236–7.

23. Schwarz T, Buschmann L, Beyer J, Halbritter K, Rastan A, Schellong S. Therapy of isolated calf muscle vein thrombosis: a randomized, controlled study. *J Vasc Surg* 2010; **52**: 1246–50.

24. Garry J, Duke A, Labropoulos N. Systematic review of the complications following isolated calf deep vein thrombosis. *Br J Surg* 2016; **103**: 789–96.

25. Ferrara F, Meli F, Amato C, Cospite V, Raimondi F, Novo G, Novo S. Optimal duration of treatment in surgical patients with calf venous thrombosis involving one or more veins. *Angiology* 2006; **57**: 418–23.

26. Jadad AR, Moore RA, Carroll D, Jenkinson C, Reynolds DJ, Gavaghan DJ, McQuay HJ. Assessing the quality of reports of randomized clinical trials: is blinding necessary? *Control Clin Trials* 1996; **17**: 1–12.

27. Bax L, Ikeda N, Fukui N, Yaju Y, Tsuruta H, Moons KG. More than numbers: the power of graphs in metaanalysis. *Am J Epidemiol* 2009; **169**: 249–55.

28. Horner D, Hogg K, Body R, Nash MJ, Baglin T, Mackway-Jones K. The anticoagulation of calf thrombosis (ACT) project: results from the randomized controlled external pilot trial. *Chest* 2014; **146**: 1468–77.

29. Bell LN, Berg RL, Schmelzer JR, Liang H, Mazza JJ, Kanth R, Bray CL, Zaldivar CB, Yale SH. Thromboembolic complications following a first isolated episode of superficial vein thrombosis: a cross-sectional retrospective study. J Thromb Thrombolysis. 2017 Jan;43(1):31-37. doi: 10.1007/s11239-016-1414-8. PMID: 27565478.

30. Marchiori A, Mosena L, Prandoni P. Superficial vein thrombosis: risk factors, diagnosis, and treatment. Semin Thromb Hemost. 2006 Oct;32(7):737-43. doi: 10.1055/s-2006-951459. PMID: 17024602.