


Response to Commentary and Critique to “VTE Prophylaxis Therapy: Clinical Practice vs Clinical Guidelines” by Abukhalil et al [Response to Letter]

Abdallah Damin Abukhalil 

Pharmacy Department, Faculty of Pharmacy, Nursing and Health Professions, Birzeit University, Birzeit, West Bank, Palestine

Correspondence: Abdallah Damin Abukhalil, Email adkhalil@birzeit.edu

Dear editor

We thank Dr. Güven for his knowledgeable comments regarding our article “VTE Prophylaxis Therapy: Clinical Practice vs Clinical Guidelines” and for agreeing that we found similar results requiring adherence to clinical guidelines in healthcare institutions, even though the methodology in both studies was slightly different.

First, we understand the concern about BMI limitation, which we have listed as a limitation of the study; however, in the sample calculation for the Padua score in the study sample, only a small number of patients had a PADUA score of 3. Furthermore, they had a normal BMI, constituting approximately 7% of the patients; even adding 1 to their Padua score will not have a statistically significant effect on the study results, as suggested in the comment provided in the letter.

In the second comment, the Padua and IMPROVE models helped stratify hospitalized patients based on VTE and bleeding risk and have been externally validated.^{1–3} The overuse of anticoagulants in the study was mainly seen in patients with low Padua scores. Furthermore, similar overutilization of anticoagulants was recently reported in a regional study.⁴ In our study, a Padua total score of 4 was considered the cutoff point for initiating prophylaxis in certain patients, indicating a high risk of developing VTE. For the IMPROVE bleeding score, a total score of 7 was considered a cut-off point for the risk of bleeding. Patients with a Padua score ≥ 4 and a bleeding score < 7 were candidates for VTE pharmacotherapy prophylaxis if no other contraindications were present.^{5,6} According to the American College of Chest Physicians Evidence-Based Clinical Practice Guidelines, For acutely ill hospitalized medical patients at increased risk of thrombosis who are bleeding or are at high risk for major bleeding, mechanical thromboprophylaxis with graduated compression stockings or intermittent pneumatic compression is recommended over pharmacological prophylaxis. Furthermore, for critically ill patients who are bleeding or are at high risk for major bleeding mechanical thromboprophylaxis with GCS and/or IPC, at least until the bleeding risk decreases.⁷

Disclosure

The author reports no conflicts of interest in this communication.

References

1. 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. doi:10.1160/TH13-05-0427
2. 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. doi:10.1160/TH16-01-0003
3. Greene MT, Spyropoulos AC, Chopra V, et al. Validation of risk assessment models of venous thromboembolism in hospitalized medical patients. *Am J Med.* 2016;129(9):1001.e1009–1001.e1018. doi:10.1016/j.amjmed.2016.03.031
4. Hajj I, Al-Masri M, Bashaireh K, et al. A cross-sectional, multicenter, observational study to assess the prophylaxis of venous thromboembolism in Lebanese and Jordanian hospitals. *Thromb J.* 2021;19(1). doi:10.1186/s12959-021-00261-2

5. Abukhalil AD, Nasser A, Khader H, et al. VTE Prophylaxis therapy: clinical practice vs clinical guidelines. *Vasc Health Risk Manag.* 2022;18:701–710. doi:10.2147/VHRM.S382050
6. Skeik N, Westergard E. Recommendations for VTE prophylaxis in medically ill patients. *Ann Vasc Dis.* 2020;13(1):38–44. doi:10.3400/avd.ra.19-00115
7. Kahn SR, Lim W, Dunn AS, et al. Prevention of VTE in nonsurgical patients. *Chest.* 2012;141(2):e195S–e226S. doi:10.1378/chest.11-2296

Dove Medical Press encourages responsible, free and frank academic debate. The content of the Vascular Health and Risk Management 'letters to the editor' section does not necessarily represent the views of Dove Medical Press, its officers, agents, employees, related entities or the Vascular Health and Risk Management editors. While all reasonable steps have been taken to confirm the content of each letter, Dove Medical Press accepts no liability in respect of the content of any letter, nor is it responsible for the content and accuracy of any letter to the editor.

Vascular Health and Risk Management

Dovepress

Publish your work in this journal

Vascular Health and Risk Management is an international, peer-reviewed journal of therapeutics and risk management, focusing on concise rapid reporting of clinical studies on the processes involved in the maintenance of vascular health; the monitoring, prevention and treatment of vascular disease and its sequelae; and the involvement of metabolic disorders, particularly diabetes. This journal is indexed on PubMed Central and MedLine. The manuscript management system is completely online and includes a very quick and fair peer-review system, which is all easy to use. Visit <http://www.dovepress.com/testimonials.php> to read real quotes from published authors.

Submit your manuscript here: <https://www.dovepress.com/vascular-health-and-risk-management-journal>

<https://doi.org/10.2147/VHRM.S392327>