

Mechanical prophylaxis for venous thromboembolism prevention in obese individuals

Phlebology

2021, Vol. 36(10) 768–770

© The Author(s) 2021



Article reuse guidelines:

sagepub.com/journals-permissions

DOI: 10.1177/0268355211031147

journals.sagepub.com/home/phl

Amulya Khatri^{1,2} , Alun H Davies^{1,2}  and Joseph Shalhoub^{1,2} 

Obesity represents a significant risk factor for venous thromboembolism (VTE), with a relative risk increase of 2.5 for the development of deep vein thrombosis (DVT).¹ Given the rise in rates of obesity,² targeted efforts are necessary to refine and optimise VTE prophylaxis regimens for obese individuals.

Mechanical and pharmacological prophylaxis remain the mainstay in VTE prevention. Current mechanical strategies to reduce venous stasis include graduated compression stockings (GCS) and active devices, such as intermittent pneumatic compression (IPC).³ Whilst mechanical prophylaxis is effective in preventing VTE compared to no intervention, its clinical utility has been cast into doubt, particularly as an adjunct to other strategies. Recently the PREVENT and GAPS trials, published in 2019 and 2020, respectively, showed no added benefit of mechanical prophylaxis when pharmacological prophylaxis was in place.^{4,5}

The addition of pharmacological to mechanical prophylaxis with IPC, and vice versa, was the subject of a 2016 Cochrane Review.⁶ The meta-analysis performed showed that the addition of IPC to pharmacological prophylaxis reduced episodes of PE, with no difference in DVT or bleeding. However, the addition of pharmacological prophylaxis to IPC reduced the incidence of DVT at a cost of increased risk of bleeding, without impacting upon rates of pulmonary embolism (PE).⁶ A subsequent trial by Kamachi et al., which compared IPC with IPC plus pharmacological prophylaxis, found the addition of pharmacological prophylaxis yielded no difference in rates of either DVT or PE;⁷ it being noteworthy that all VTE episodes in this study were asymptomatic and detected on screening CT imaging. These findings in this recent trial may be driven, at least in part, by the wide-reaching advances in patient care that have been observed to drive down VTE rates, such as early mobilisation and enhanced recovery after surgery protocols, which may have contributed to underpowering in this study.⁸

Importantly, obese patients have been relatively underrepresented in past trials⁹ with, for example,

obese patients' inclusion ranging between 2.9% and 42% in the above trials.^{7,10} Impaired venous return worsened by increased intra-abdominal pressure, longer hospital admission and reduced mobility are proposed mechanisms for the increased risk of VTE in the obese patient group.¹¹ Co-morbidities associated with obesity, such as varicose veins or impaired cardiac function, may further worsen venous return. As such, it is plausible that obese patients may particularly benefit from mechanical prophylaxis to counteract these contributors to venous stasis. Indeed, counteracting the immobility in stroke patients with IPC significantly reduced VTE incidence in the CLOTS 3 trial.¹²

Despite obesity being a VTE risk factor and the theoretical benefit of mechanical prophylaxis, there remains a lack of evidence in this area. This paucity of data was highlighted almost a decade ago by Freeman and colleagues yet, to the best of our knowledge, no trials have been initiated focusing on obese patients.¹³

A systematic database search performed by the authors of this editorial, combining relevant free text and MeSH terms relating to VTE, mechanical prophylaxis and obesity, found no studies investigating mechanical prophylaxis in obese patients outside of bariatric surgery, despite the number of trials investigating VTE prophylaxis in general. The use of mechanical prophylaxis in bariatric surgery was the subject of a recent systematic review.¹⁴

Limited evidence may be extrapolated from two observational studies investigating bariatric surgical patients, comparing IPC against the combination of

¹Academic Section of Vascular Surgery, Department of Surgery & Cancer, Imperial College London, London, UK

²Imperial Vascular Unit, Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust, London, UK

Corresponding author:

Joseph Shalhoub, Department of Surgery & Cancer, Academic Section of Vascular Surgery, Imperial College London, London SW7 2AZ, UK.

Email: j.shalhoub@imperial.ac.uk

IPC and pharmacological prophylaxis. Whilst Gagner et al. found no significant difference between these two regimens, suggesting IPC may be sufficient for VTE prophylaxis, the study was limited by a low number of participants in the IPC only arm, lack of randomisation and relatively low rates of VTE compared to those reported in the literature.¹⁵ Frantizides et al. found that IPC combined with early mobilisation and emphasis on hydration reduced the incidence of VTE compared to IPC with routine pharmacological prophylaxis, with an increased rate of bleeding in the latter group.¹⁶ Amongst this study's limitations were higher BMIs and longer operating times in the group receiving the combination of IPC and pharmacological prophylaxis.¹⁶

The use of IPC with early ambulation was able to achieve low rates of DVT occurrence (3/957, 0.31%) without the use of pharmacological prophylaxis, suggesting IPC to be an effective method in obese patients. Despite the promising results, the single regimen impairs our ability to assess the impact of mechanical prophylaxis in the context of other interventions, such as early ambulation on the first post-operative day.¹⁷

Current European Society of Anaesthesiology guidelines on VTE prophylaxis in obese patients relies on the above discussed literature, resulting in limited recommendations due to the lack of high-quality evidence.¹⁸

Outside of bariatric surgery, there continues to be a dearth of data. In 2007, Turpie and colleagues conducted a randomised controlled trial showing the addition of pharmacological prophylaxis to IPC reduced VTE events, but found no significant difference within obese patients in sub-group analysis.¹⁰ However, the large confidence intervals point to the limited power of this sub-group analysis and, in turn, restrict the conclusions which can be drawn.

Therefore, further research is required to investigate whether differential effects of mechanical prophylaxis in obese patients exist, extending beyond patients undergoing surgery for weight loss. Sub-group analysis from existing trials may provide initial data, providing preliminary evidence to inform and facilitate the design of further studies. Future studies, if not specifically focused on obese patients, should consider including obese patients as an appropriately powered *a priori* subgroup.

The assumption that all mechanical prophylaxis produces a homogenous effect may impair any conclusions drawn from these studies. Whereas GCS provides continuous compression, IPC employs active intermittent compression more comparable to 'muscle pump' physiology. This appears to translate into clinical utility, with the CLOTS 3 trial finding a benefit of IPC in newly admitted stroke patients, whilst the CLOTS 1 trial found GCS to have no benefit in VTE prophylaxis.^{12,19} Previous meta-analyses of hospitalized and of

critically ill patients have also suggested IPC to have greater efficacy than GCS.^{3,20}

The location of IPC device placement also appears to impact the prevention of DVT, and haemodynamic studies have shown variation in venous blood flow depending on the method and brand of IPC system in place.²¹⁻²³ Thus, comparing the efficacy of various aspects of GCS and IPC use in obese patients will also be required to truly assess the role of mechanical prophylaxis in this population. Consideration must also be given to the difficulties in applying mechanical prophylaxis to obese legs and the associated financial and personnel resources, impacting adherence with and effectiveness of compression in clinical practice.

Finally, the optimal regimen for pharmacological prophylaxis in obese patients is yet to be determined and has been reviewed elsewhere.²⁴ The authors again note that obese patients are underrepresented within these clinical trials, resulting in an unclear optimal regimen for various heparins and direct oral anticoagulants.

There remains a lack of evidence to determine the optimal VTE prophylaxis regimen in obese individuals, calling for appropriately designed and powered clinical studies specifically aimed at this important group.

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The author(s) declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Funding

The author(s) received no financial support for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

Ethical approval

Not required.

Guarantor

AHD.

Contributorship


All authors researched the literature and contributed to the design of the work. AK wrote the first draft of the manuscript. All authors reviewed and edited the manuscript and approved the final version of the manuscript.


Acknowledgements

The authors thank Department of Vascular Surgery, Imperial College Healthcare Trust.

ORCID iDs

Amulya Khatri  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3675-5304>

Alun H Davies  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-5261-6913>

Joseph Shalhoub  <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-1011-7440>

References

1. Stein PD, Beemath A and Olson RE. Obesity as a risk factor in venous thromboembolism. *Am J Med* 2005; 118: 978–980.
2. Keaver L, Xu B, Jaccard A, et al. Morbid obesity in the UK: a modelling projection study to 2035. *Scand J Public Health* 2020; 48: 422–427.
3. Ho KM and Tan JA. Stratified meta-analysis of intermittent pneumatic compression of the lower limbs to prevent venous thromboembolism in hospitalized patients. *Circulation* 2013; 128: 1003–1020.
4. Shalhoub J, Lawton R, Hudson J, et al. Graduated compression stockings as adjuvant to pharmacothromboprophylaxis in elective surgical patients (GAPS study): randomised controlled trial. *Br Med J* 2020; 369: m1309.
5. Arabi YM, Al-Hameed F, Burns KEA, et al. Adjunctive intermittent pneumatic compression for venous thromboprophylaxis. *N Engl J Med* 2019; 380: 1305–1315.
6. Kakkos SK, Caprini JA, Geroulakos G, et al. Combined intermittent pneumatic leg compression and pharmacological prophylaxis for prevention of venous thromboembolism. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. Epub ahead of print 2016. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD005258.pub3.
7. Kamachi H, Homma S, Kawamura H, et al. Intermittent pneumatic compression versus additional prophylaxis with enoxaparin for prevention of venous thromboembolism after laparoscopic surgery for gastric and colorectal malignancies: multicentre randomized clinical trial. *BJS Open* 2020; 4: 804–810.
8. Hunt BJ. Preventing hospital associated venous thromboembolism. *Br Med J* 2019; 365: 14239.
9. Brenner B, Arya R, Beyer-Westendorf J, et al. Evaluation of unmet clinical needs in prophylaxis and treatment of venous thromboembolism in at-risk patient groups: pregnancy, elderly and obese patients. *Thromb J* 2019; 17: 24.
10. Turpie AGG, Bauer KA, Caprini JA, et al. Fondaparinux combined with intermittent pneumatic compression vs. intermittent pneumatic compression alone for prevention of venous thromboembolism after abdominal surgery: a randomized, double-blind comparison. *J Thromb Haemostas* 2007; 5: 1854–1861.
11. Willenberg T, Schumacher A, Amann-Vesti B, et al. Impact of obesity on venous hemodynamics of the lower limbs. *J Vasc Surg* 2010; 52: 664–668.
12. CLOTS Trial Collaboration. Effectiveness of intermittent pneumatic compression in reduction of risk of deep vein thrombosis in patients who have had a stroke (CLOTS 3): a multicentre randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2013; 382: 516–524.
13. Freeman AL, Pendleton RC and Rondina MT. Prevention of venous thromboembolism in obesity. *Expert Rev Cardiovasc Ther* 2010; 8: 1711–1721.
14. Bartlett MA, Mauck KF and Daniels PR. Prevention of venous thromboembolism in patients undergoing bariatric surgery. *Vasc Health Risk Manag* 2015; 11: 461–477.
15. Gagner M, Selzer F, Belle SH, et al. Adding chemoprophylaxis to sequential compression might not reduce risk of venous thromboembolism in bariatric surgery patients. *Surg Obes Relat Dis* 2012; 8: 663–670.
16. Frantzides CT, Welle SN, Ruff TM, et al. Routine anticoagulation for venous thromboembolism prevention following laparoscopic gastric bypass. *J Soc Laparosc Robot Surg* 2012; 16: 33–37.
17. Clements RH, Yellumhanthi K, Ballem N, et al. Pharmacologic prophylaxis against venous thromboembolic complications is not mandatory for all laparoscopic Roux-en-Y gastric bypass procedures. *J Am Coll Surg* 2009; 208: 917–921; discussion 921–913.
18. Venclauskas L, Maleckas A and Arcelus JI. European guidelines on perioperative venous thromboembolism prophylaxis: surgery in the obese patient. *Eur J Anaesthesiol* 2018; 35: 147–153.
19. CLOTS Trials Collaboration. Effectiveness of thigh-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: 1958–1965.
20. Wang Y, Huang D, Wang M, et al. Can intermittent pneumatic compression reduce the incidence of venous thrombosis in critically ill patients: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Clin Appl Thromb Hemost* 2020; 26: 1076029620913942.
21. Elliott CG, Dudney TM, Egger M, et al. Calf-thigh sequential pneumatic compression compared with plantar venous pneumatic compression to prevent deep-vein thrombosis after non-lower extremity trauma. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg* 1999; 47: 25–32.
22. Whitelaw GP, Oladipo OJ, Shah BP, et al. Evaluation of intermittent pneumatic compression devices. *Orthopedics* 2001; 24: 257–261.
23. Kakkos SK, Nicolaidis AN, Griffin M, et al. Comparison of two intermittent pneumatic compression systems. A hemodynamic study. *Int Angiol* 2005; 24: 330–335.
24. Ihaddadene R and Carrier M. The use of anticoagulants for the treatment and prevention of venous thromboembolism in obese patients: implications for safety. *Expert Opin Drug Saf* 2016; 15: 65–74.