

Prevention of venous thromboembolism and haemostasis monitoring in patients with COVID-19: Updated proposals (April 2021): From the French working group on perioperative haemostasis (GIHP) and the French study group on thrombosis and haemostasis (GFHT), in collaboration with the French society of anaesthesia and intensive care (SFAR).

Title: Prevention of venous thromboembolism and haemostasis monitoring in patients with COVID-19: Updated proposals (April 2021): From the French working group on perioperative haemostasis (GIHP) and the French study group on thrombosis and haemostasis (GFHT), in collaboration with the French society of anaesthesia and intensive care (SFAR).

Publication year: 2021

Journal: Anaesthesia, critical care & pain medicine

Authors: Department of Anaesthesiology and Critical Care, Université Grenoble Alpes, CHU Grenoble Alpes, Grenoble, France. Electronic address: agodon1@chu-grenoble.fr.

Society: European Respiratory Society

Origin country: International (Europe)

Target countries: Europe

DOI: 10.1016/j.accpm.2021.100919

PMID: 34182166

Source: <https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/34182166/>

pmc Anaesth Crit Care Pain Med Anaesth Crit Care Pain Med 3815 pheelsevier 101652401
Anaesthesia, Critical Care & Pain Medicine 2352-5568 pmc-is-collection-domain yes
pmc-collection-title Elsevier - PMC COVID-19 Collection PMC8233055 PMC8233055.1 8233055
8233055 34182166 10.1016/j.accpm.2021.100919 S2352-5568(21)00123-5 100919 1 Article
Prevention of venous thromboembolism and haemostasis monitoring in patients with COVID-19:
Updated proposals (April 2021) From the French working group on perioperative haemostasis
(GIHP) and the French study group on thrombosis and haemostasis (GFHT), in collaboration with
the French society of anaesthesia and intensive care (SFAR) Godon Alexandre a * Tacquard
Charles Ambroise b Mansour Alexandre c Garrigue Delphine d Nguyen Philippe e Lasne
Dominique f Testa Sophie g Levy Jerrold H. h Albaladejo Pierre a Gruel Yves i Susen Sophie j
Godier Anne k on behalf of the Gihp, the GFHT Albaladejo P. Blais N. Bonhomme F. Borel-Derlon
A. Cohen A. Collet J.-P. de Maistre E. Fontana P. Garrigue Huet D. Godier A. Gruel Y. Godon A.
Ickx B. Laporte S. Lasne D. Llau J. Le Gal G. Lecompte T. Lessire S. Levy J.H. Longrois D.
Madi-Jebara S. Mansour A. Mazighi M. Mismetti P. Morange P.E. Motte S. Mullier F. Nathan N.
Nguyen P. Pernod G. Rosencher N. Rouillet S. Roy P.M. Schlumberger S. Sié P. Steib A. Susen S.
Tacquard C.A. Testa S. Vincentelli A. Zufferey P. Borel-Derlon A. Boissier E Dumont B de Maistre
E. Gruel Y. James C Lasne D. Lecompte T. Morange P.E. Nguyen P. Sié P. Siguret V. Susen S. a
Department of Anaesthesiology and Critical Care, Université Grenoble Alpes, CHU Grenoble Alpes,
Grenoble, France b Department of Anaesthesia and Intensive Care, Hôpitaux Universitaires de
Strasbourg, Strasbourg, France c Department of Anaesthesiology Critical Care Medicine and
Perioperative Medicine, CHU de Rennes, France d Department of Anaesthesia and Critical Care,
CHU de Lille, France e Department of Haematology Laboratory, CHU de Reims, France f
Department of Haematology Laboratory, Hôpital Necker, AP-HP, Paris, France g AO Istituti
Ospitalieri, Cremona, Italy h Department of Anaesthesiology, Critical Care, and Surgery, Duke
University Hospital, Durham, NC, USA i Department of Haematology-Haemostasis, Hôpital

Universitaire de Tours, France j Department of Haematology and Transfusion, Université de Lille, Lille, France k Department of Anaesthesia and Intensive Care, AP-HP, Hôpital Européen Georges Pompidou, and INSERM UMRS-1140, Université de Paris, France ■ Corresponding author. 8 2021 25 6 2021 40 4 384499 100919 100919 25 06 2021 28 06 2021 14 08 2024 © 2021 Société française d'anesthésie et de réanimation (Sfar). Published by Elsevier Masson SAS. All rights reserved. 2021 Société française d'anesthésie et de réanimation (Sfar) Since January 2020 Elsevier has created a COVID-19 resource centre with free information in English and Mandarin on the novel coronavirus COVID-19. The COVID-19 resource centre is hosted on Elsevier Connect, the company's public news and information website. Elsevier hereby grants permission to make all its COVID-19-related research that is available on the COVID-19 resource centre - including this research content - immediately available in PubMed Central and other publicly funded repositories, such as the WHO COVID database with rights for unrestricted research re-use and analyses in any form or by any means with acknowledgement of the original source. These permissions are granted for free by Elsevier for as long as the COVID-19 resource centre remains active. Keywords COVID-19 Anticoagulation Thromboprophylaxis Venous thromboembolism Thrombotic risk Bleeding risk pmc-status-qastatus 0 pmc-status-live yes pmc-status-embargo no pmc-status-released yes pmc-prop-open-access yes pmc-prop-olf no pmc-prop-manuscript no pmc-prop-legally-suppressed no pmc-prop-has-pdf yes pmc-prop-has-supplement no pmc-prop-pdf-only no pmc-prop-suppress-copyright no pmc-prop-is-real-version no pmc-prop-is-scanned-article no pmc-prop-preprint no pmc-prop-in-epmc yes 1 Introduction In April 2020, in response to the high thrombotic risk associated with COVID-19, the GIHP and GFHT published proposals for the prevention of venous thromboembolism (VTE) and haemostasis monitoring in patients with COVID-19 [1] . In February 2021, six authors from the proposals (CT, AM, AIG, AnG, SS, YG, PA) decided to update them. This update was justified by several points: - The epidemiology of thrombotic complications has been described.

Different anticoagulation regimens have been reported, and retrospective studies have suggested that higher-than-standard prophylactic anticoagulation may be beneficial.

Initially underestimated, bleeding complications have emerged as a limitation of increased-dose anticoagulation and occur later than thrombotic events.

The first results of large-scale randomised controlled studies on increased doses of anticoagulation have been published.

Immunomodulatory therapies (corticosteroids, interleukin-6 receptor antagonists) are now widely used, but their effect on the thrombotic risk is unknown.

Despite improved survival, thrombotic complications remain a concern [2] .

The workgroup defined seven questions and searched the literature for available evidence: - Who should receive standard dose prophylactic anticoagulation?

Should the dose of prophylactic anticoagulation be increased in critically ill patients?

Who may benefit from therapeutic dose anticoagulation?

Should anticoagulant dose be adjusted to body weight?

What is the bleeding risk associated with COVID-19, and its temporal relationship with thrombotic risk?

What is the minimal laboratory monitoring of haemostasis in hospitalised COVID-19 patients?

How long is prophylactic anticoagulation warranted?

The workgroup performed five virtual meetings to review the advancement of the proposals. Tables and figure were sent to all members of the GIHP/GFHT by e-mail for further review. The full manuscript was sent on the 24th of April to all members of the GIHP/GFHT, and on the 28th of April to the GFHT for further review. Disagreements were solved posteriorly by consensus within the workgroup.

In these proposals, we followed a standard approach of thromboprophylaxis, aiming to decrease the incidence of symptomatic VTE – pulmonary embolism and proximal deep vein thrombosis – to an acceptable rate without increasing too much the bleeding risk (for instance, less than 5% within 30 days for both types of events). Whether this approach is sufficient in the context of COVID-19-associated pathophysiology is unknown. These proposals are a synthesis of opinions based on a limited level of evidence and should not be considered as formal recommendations. 1) Who should receive standard dose prophylactic anticoagulation?

Data on the incidence of thrombotic complications in outpatients are limited. In non-hospitalised patients referred to computed tomography (CT) pulmonary angiography by an emergency department (n = 72), pulmonary embolism was identified in 18% CTs, and 38% of patients with pulmonary embolism had a moderate clinical type [3] .

Along with the French Society of Vascular Medicine, we suggest standard dose prophylactic anticoagulation for selected high-risk outpatients with significant reduction of mobility associated with at least one risk factor among: BMI > 30 kg/m², age >70 years, active cancer, personal history of venous thromboembolism (VTE), or major surgery within the last three months [4] . Patients who require home oxygen supplementation should be considered equivalent to hospitalised patients. For these patients, we suggest the use of standard-dose prophylactic anticoagulation (Fig. 1). Fig. 1 Prophylactic anticoagulation for COVID-19 patients.

Among hospitalised ward/inward patients, a meta-analysis reported a pooled incidence of deep vein thrombosis and pulmonary embolism (assessed by screening or clinical diagnosis) of 7.1% (95% CI, 4.8–9.8) [5] . This incidence is higher than in non-COVID viral pneumonia: Elgendy et al. reported an incidence of VTE of 1.0% among 455,629 hospitalised patients with a primary diagnosis of non-COVID-19 viral pneumonia [6] ; Stals et al. reported a 30-day adjusted cumulative incidence for venous thrombotic complications of 3.6% (95% CI, 2.7–4.6) in influenza versus 23% (95%CI, 16–29) in COVID-19 hospitalised patients [7] .

Reported rates of thrombotic complications vary considerably because of different screening strategies, different study designs (prospective versus retrospective), and different event inclusions (venous, arterial, or both).

The absence of prophylactic anticoagulation has been associated with an increase in the mortality of hospitalised COVID-19 patients [8] . In non-severe hospitalised patients, defined as an oxygen requirement equal to or less than 6 L/min, we suggest a standard-dose prophylactic anticoagulation. In individuals on long-term anticoagulation therapy, switching to parenteral anticoagulation may be considered to limit drug interactions and allow rapid dose adjustments if necessary. In patients in whom vitamin K antagonists are maintained, INR should be closely monitored. 2) Should the dose of prophylactic anticoagulation be increased in critically ill patients?

The incidence of venous thromboembolism is higher in critically ill patients compared to ward patients. Jimenez et al. reported an incidence of 27.9% (95% CI, 22.1–34.1) in critically ill patients [5] . Analysis from the first wave reported that COVID-19 ARDS patients developed more thrombotic complications compared to non-COVID-19 ARDS patients [9] . Intensive Care Unit (ICU) admission and the need for mechanical ventilation have been identified as independent risk factors for thrombosis in COVID-19 [10] . Thrombotic events are independently associated with mortality [11] . Based on this high thrombotic risk, many institutional and scientific society guidelines have

proposed to increase the dose of prophylactic anticoagulation in critically ill patients [12] , [13] .

Retrospective studies have suggested that increasing the dose of prophylactic anticoagulation from a standard dose to an intermediate or therapeutic dose in severe patients may be beneficial [14] , [15] , [16] .

Several randomised controlled trials are still ongoing. One has been recently published, and another published preliminary results. In the INSPIRATION trial, intermediate-dose prophylactic anticoagulation did not significantly reduce the occurrence of the composite endpoint (30-day mortality, need for ECMO, thrombotic events) [17] . Although these results did not support the routine use of an increased dose of anticoagulation in severe COVID-19 patients, concerns about the applicability of these results have been raised [18] : despite a high mortality rate of 42%, the length of stay in the ICU was short i.e. , 6 days (median, IQR 2–11), and only 20% of patients underwent invasive mechanical ventilation, raising the question of the available ICU resources. Above all, the rate of thrombotic events in the standard-dose prophylactic anticoagulation group was very low, i.e. , 3.5%, suggesting that not all thrombotic events were diagnosed, resulting potentially in an underestimation of the benefit of intermediate-dose prophylactic anticoagulation.

The still ongoing multiplatform randomised trial including the ATTAC, REMAP-CAP, and ACTIV-4 trials, has stopped enrolment of critically ill patients on the 19th of December 2020, due to a 99.8% probability of futility concerning therapeutic dose anticoagulation on their primary outcome (in-hospital mortality and 21-day organ support free days) [19] . The choice of this composite endpoint is questionable. In COVID-19 patients, organ failure is multifactorial. Concerning thromboprophylaxis, the primary endpoint in landmark studies was the incidence of venous thromboembolism [20] , [21] , [22] . Of note is the multiplatform trial found fewer thrombotic complications in the therapeutic dose group compared to the prophylactic dose group (5.7% versus 10.3%, respectively). Among the latter, 51% of patients received intermediate dose anticoagulation. Major bleeding complications were rare (<4%) and comparable between the two strategies.

Overall, these results do not rule out a potential benefit on thrombotic complications to increasing the anticoagulation in severe COVID-19 patients.

We suggest that patients with severe COVID-19, defined as an oxygen requirement greater than 6 L/min or a need for mechanical ventilation, receive at least intermediate dose prophylactic anticoagulation. 3) Who may benefit from therapeutic dose anticoagulation?

Apart from patients with a documented thrombosis, whether therapeutic dose anticoagulation could be beneficial as a thromboprophylaxis in subgroups of patients is still an open question. To stratify thrombotic risk among hospitalised patients, D-dimers have been extensively studied. Baseline D-dimers level above the upper limit of normal is associated with critical illness, thrombosis, acute kidney injury, and death [23] . In the CLOTVID cohort including non-ICU hospitalised patients, after adjustment of anticoagulant status and delay of follow-up, the combination of D-dimer level ≥ 2 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ and neutrophils count ≥ 7.0 G/L on admission was associated with increased risk of death or ICU transfer [24] . The D-dimers level is related to thrombotic complications during COVID-19 but also the severity of the disease, especially the severity of lung injury.

There is no clear cut-off above which the diagnosis of thrombosis is certain, however several studies showed similar results. In the COVICLOT study [15] , a D-dimers level >5 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ was associated with a positive predictive value of 50% for thrombotic complications (unpublished data). In hospitalised patients (ward and critically ill patients), diagnosis of venous thromboembolism during hospitalisation was independently associated with D-dimers level >5611 ng/mL (OR 6.3, 95% CI 2.4–16.2) [25] . Among patients who underwent CT pulmonary angiography, the closest D-dimers levels to imaging request had a positive predictive value for pulmonary embolism of approximately 70% when values approached 5 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ [26] . In non-mechanically ventilated patients, D-dimers levels >5 $\mu\text{g/mL}$ at admission was associated with venous thromboembolism in 46.7% of

cases [27] . These data are from retrospective studies in which no systematic screening for thrombosis was applied, but all converge on a D-dimers threshold of 5 µg/mL.

The use of D-dimers for diagnosing thrombosis is noteworthy. Although a high level of D-dimers is specific for venous thromboembolism, the positive predictive value is low in many clinical settings where venous thromboembolism incidence is low [28] . However, in severe COVID-19 patients with a high burden of thrombotic complications, a D-dimers level >5 µg/mL is associated with a remarkably high thrombotic risk, with a positive predictive value of at least 40–50%.

The main limitation with D-dimers is that D-Dimer testing demonstrates not strictly comparable results due to high variability within and among methods [29] . As a result, the optimal cut-off value could be adjusted based on assay methodology [30] , [31] . Furthermore, anticoagulant therapy lowers D-Dimers level [32] .

The changes in D-dimers levels over time can also help identify patients likely to develop thrombosis, as a D-dimers increment of 1.5-fold was strongly associated with the diagnosis of thrombosis in COVID-19 patients [33] . Progression curves of D-dimers also showed a rapid increase before the diagnosis of thrombotic events [14] , [34] .

In selected patients with a very high thrombotic risk defined by a D-dimers level >5 µg/mL or a rapid increase of D-dimers level (for instance, at least twice from a baseline value >2 µg/mL within 24–48 h), we suggest initiating therapeutic dose prophylactic anticoagulation and screening for thrombosis.

Patients requiring extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO) represent a subgroup of the most severe patients, where a very high incidence of thrombotic complications has been reported, including pump and oxygenator clotting. However, data on anticoagulation in this setting are still limited. In patients on ECMO, we suggest using a dedicated anticoagulation protocol, targeting a therapeutic level of anticoagulation. 4) Should anticoagulant dose be adjusted to body weight?

As a high prevalence of obesity is observed, particularly in severe COVID-19 patients [35] , anticoagulant regimens should take into account patients' body weight or body mass index. Weight-adjusted dose thromboprophylaxis could reduce venous thromboembolism in obese non-COVID-19 hospitalised patients [36] . For therapeutic dosing, guidelines suggest dose selection according to actual body weight, but capped dose are often used in clinical practice [37] , [38] .

We suggest that anticoagulation be adapted to the weight or body mass index. Anticoagulant drug and dose for prophylaxis according to body mass index and creatinine clearance are shown in Table 1 . 5) What is the bleeding risk associated with COVID-19, and its temporal relationship with thrombotic risk?

Anticoagulant drug and dose for prophylaxis according to body mass index and creatinine clearance.

BMI: body mass index (kg/m²); LMWH: Low-molecular-weight heparin; UFH: unfractionated heparin.

Other options include tinzaparin 3500 IU/24 h; dalteparin 5000 IU/24 h; fondaparinux 2.5 mg/24 h if creatinine clearance >50 mL/min.

First underreported, pooled incidence of bleeding was found to be 7.8% (95% CI, 2.6–15.3) for all type of bleeding and 3.9% (95% CI, 1.2–7.9) for major bleeding, without clear difference between critically ill and ward patients [5] . In a retrospective cohort of ICU patients, Halaby and al. reported an incidence of major bleeding of 14.8%, although the bleeding risk did not differ from other severe

viral infections (HR 1.26; 95% CI 0.86–1.86) [39] .

The use of therapeutic dose anticoagulation might increase the rate of bleeding [5] , [39] , although the global bleeding risk remains low in prospective studies [17] , [19] . This could limit the benefit of therapeutic dose prophylactic anticoagulation in unselected patients.

There is a temporal relationship between COVID-19 disease progression and associated thrombotic and haemorrhagic risks. Based on the analysis of 22 studies (13 of which included critically ill patients) and using a quantile estimation method, thrombotic events occurred 7.0 (5.9–8.2) days after admission, whereas haemorrhagic events occurred 11.4 (8.6–14.1) days after admission [18] . These results are consistent with published data where an increase in thrombin generation associated with a decrease in global fibrinolytic capacity is observed during the first week of ICU hospitalisation followed by a gradual return to normal, along with a decrease in the COVID-19-related inflammatory syndrome [40] . The thrombotic risk seems to be predominant within 7–10 days after hospital admission, then the bleeding risk increases after this period. We suggest a sequential strategy in critically ill patients, where prophylactic anticoagulation is increased for 7–10 days, then decreased to standard dose thromboprophylaxis. 6) What is the minimal laboratory monitoring of haemostasis in hospitalised COVID-19 patients?

To assess the thrombotic risk of hospitalised patients, D-dimers can help identify patients with severe disease, and thus patients at high thrombotic risk. In critically ill patients, we suggest monitoring D-dimers level every 24–48 h during the first 7–10 days, when most thrombotic events occur.

Initially proposed as a marker of thrombotic risk in COVID-19 patients, fibrinogen levels have not been associated with thrombotic risk in most studies and therefore cannot be used to identify patients at risk for thrombosis [27] , [41] .

Platelet count, prothrombin time, and fibrinogen level can help diagnose heparin-induced thrombocytopenia and disseminated intravascular coagulation (DIC), although these conditions are infrequent in COVID-19 patients [42] . DIC is associated with an increased risk of bleeding and therefore should prompt physicians to reduce the dose of anticoagulation. Fibrinogen, as an acute phase reactant, can decrease the efficacy of heparin infusion and lead to increased dose requirements. The decrease in fibrinogen levels can lead to unfractionated heparin overdose and bleeding complications [43] . In critically ill patients, we suggest monitoring those parameters [platelet count, prothrombin time, fibrinogen] frequently in the acute phase of the disease, for instance every 24–72 h. In ward patients, the platelet count should be monitored once or twice a week to detect heparin-induced thrombocytopenia if standard dose unfractionated heparin is used [44] .

Concerning unfractionated heparin (UFH) monitoring, the use of activated partial thromboplastin time (aPTT) may be inappropriate due to the hyper inflammatory status of the disease. Anti-Xa activity, although not fully standardised [45] , may be more suitable to monitor UFH, since it is less dependent on pre-analytical conditions and less vulnerable to laboratory interference [40] . Heparin resistance is frequently observed in critically ill COVID-19 patients [46] and is likely due to high factor VIII and fibrinogen levels [47] . In this condition, the aPTT is less prolonged or normalises whereas the activity of heparin is unaffected, as assessed by anti-Xa assay. Thus, adjusting the heparin dose based on aPTT could result in heparin overdose and bleeding complications. In critically ill patients with a hyper inflammatory state, we strongly suggest that intermediate and therapeutic dose UFH should be monitored with an anti-Xa assay.

If UFH is used, we suggest a target anti-Xa level of 0.5–0.7 IU/mL for the therapeutic dose. Despite lack of evidence, we suggest that heparin infusion is adapted to a detectable anti-Xa level without exceeding 0.5 IU/mL for the intermediate dose.

UFH binds non-specifically to plasma proteins, leading to a variable anticoagulant effect over time, especially if a hyper inflammatory state is present [48] . Low-molecular-weight heparins present a more predictable dose-response than UFH and are preferred in most cases. Still, pharmacokinetic properties of low-molecular-weight heparins compounds are not superimposable, especially regarding their elimination by the kidney. Low-molecular-weight heparins with less dependent renal elimination such as tinzaparin or dalteparin may be considered in patients with renal impairment.

If low-molecular-weight heparin is used, we suggest monitoring the peak anti-Xa level (4 h after the third injection) for intermediate and therapeutic dose to avoid overdose. The anti-Xa level defining an overdose is different for each molecule, for instance 1.5 IU/mL for enoxaparin or tinzaparin.

Summarised biological monitoring is presented in Table 2 . 7) How long is prophylactic anticoagulation warranted?

HIT: heparin-induced thrombocytopenia. DIC: disseminated intravascular coagulation. PT: prothrombin time. LMWH: low molecular weight heparin. UFH: unfractionated heparin.

Among outpatients, the French Society of Vascular Medicine suggests a standard dose thromboprophylaxis (with low-molecular-weight heparin or fondaparinux) if risk factors are present, during 7–14 days [4] . Risk factors include, in addition to a significant reduction in mobility: BMI > 30 kg/m², age >70 years, active cancer, personal history of VTE, and major surgery within the last three months.

Among severe patients, we suggest a total duration of increased-dose prophylactic anticoagulation (either intermediate or therapeutic) of 7–10 days, according to the described course of the disease.

In patients with a very high thrombotic risk, on therapeutic dose prophylactic anticoagulation, we suggest systematic screening for thrombosis before de-escalation at days 7–10. These patients are suspected of having thrombosis until proven otherwise. Systematic screening may include CT pulmonary angiography, compression ultrasonography, or other diagnostic imaging available. In the absence of diagnosed thrombosis, a standard-dose, weight-adapted thromboprophylaxis would limit thrombotic complications until discharge. If a thrombotic complication is diagnosed, appropriate antithrombotic treatment can be initiated according to its localisation and severity. In this subgroup of patients, appropriate diagnostic testing could occur before day 7 if clinical suspicion of thrombosis is present.

In all other cases of hospitalised patients, standard dose thromboprophylaxis is indicated until discharge.

After hospital discharge, a prolonged thromboprophylaxis should be decided on a case-by-case basis. The risk of post-discharge venous thromboembolism appears to be similar to other acute medical illnesses [49] . Age over 75 and prior history of venous thromboembolism are strongly associated with post-discharge thrombotic complications [50] .

JHL: participation on a Data Safety Monitoring Board or Advisory Board for Instrumentation Labs, Merck, Octapharm.

YG: honoraria and travel fees from Aguettant , Bayer-Healthcare , Bristol-Myers-Squibb / 10.13039/100004319 Pfizer , 10.13039/100008322 CSL Behring , Octapharma , 10.13039/100004337 Roche , 10.13039/100004339 Sanofi , and Sobi .

AnG: honoraria and travel fees from Bayer-Healthcare, Boehringer-Ingelheim , Bristol-Myers-Squibb/Pfizer and Sanofi.

PA: honoraria and travel fees from Bayer-Healthcare, Bristol-Myers-Squibb/Pfizer, Sanofi, Aspen , Aguetant, Portola .

The other authors have no competing interest to declare.

Susen S. Tacquard C.A. Godon A. Prevention of thrombotic risk in hospitalized patients with COVID-19 and hemostasis monitoring *Crit Care* 24 2020 364 10.1186/s13054-020-03000-7 32560658 PMC7303590 2 Kaptein F.H.J. Stals M.A.M. Grootenboers M. Incidence of thrombotic complications and overall survival in hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in the second and first wave *Thromb Res* 199 2021 143 148 10.1016/j.thromres.2020.12.019 33535120 PMC7832218 3 Gervaise A. Bouzad C. Peroux E. Helissey C. Acute pulmonary embolism in non-hospitalized COVID-19 patients referred to CTPA by emergency department *Eur Radiol* 30 2020 6170 6177 10.1007/s00330-020-06977-5 32518989 PMC7280685 4 Khider L. Soudet S. Laneelle D. Proposal of the French Society of Vascular Medicine for the prevention, diagnosis and treatment of venous thromboembolic disease in outpatients with COVID-19 *J Med Vasc* 45 2020 210 213 10.1016/j.jdmv.2020.04.008 32571561 PMC7183940 5 Jiménez D. García-Sánchez A. Rali P. Incidence of VTE and bleeding among hospitalized patients with coronavirus disease 2019 *Chest* 159 2021 1182 1196 10.1016/j.chest.2020.11.005 33217420 PMC7670889 6 Elgendy I.Y. Kolte D. Mansour M.K. Incidence, predictors, and outcomes of thrombotic events in hospitalized patients with viral pneumonia *Am J Cardiol* 143 2021 164 165 10.1016/j.amjcard.2021.01.001 33453170 PMC7807171 7 Stals M.A.M. Grootenboers M.J.J.H. Guldener C. Risk of thrombotic complications in influenza versus COVID-19 hospitalized patients *Res Pract Thromb Haemost* 5 2021 412 420 10.1002/rth2.12496 PMC8014477 33821230 8 Tang N. Bai H. Chen X. Anticoagulant treatment is associated with decreased mortality in severe coronavirus disease 2019 patients with coagulopathy *J Thromb Haemost* 2020 10.1111/jth.14817 PMC9906401 32220112 9 Helms J. Tacquard C. Severac F. High risk of thrombosis in patients in severe SARS-CoV-2 infection: a multicenter prospective cohort study *Intensive Care Med* 46 6 2020 1089 1098 10.1007/s00134-020-06062-x 32367170 PMC7197634 10 Salisbury R. Iotchkova V. Jaafar S. Incidence of symptomatic, image-confirmed venous thromboembolism following hospitalization for COVID-19 with 90-day follow-up *Blood Adv* 4 2020 6230 6239 10.1182/bloodadvances.2020003349 33351117 PMC7757009 11 Bilaloglu S. Aphinyanaphongs Y. Jones S. Thrombosis in hospitalized patients with COVID-19 in a New York City health system *JAMA* 324 2020 799 10.1001/jama.2020.13372 32702090 PMC7372509 12 NICE rapid guideline v3, <https://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng191/chapter/Recommendations> . [Accessed 5 April 2021]. 13 Spyropoulos A.C. Levy J.H. Ageno W. Scientific and Standardization Committee communication: clinical guidance on the diagnosis, prevention, and treatment of venous thromboembolism in hospitalized patients with COVID-19 *J Thromb Haemost* 18 2020 1859 1865 10.1111/jth.14929 32459046 PMC7283841 14 Zermatten M.G. Pantet O. Gomez F. Utility of D-dimers and intermediate-dose prophylaxis for venous thromboembolism in critically ill patients with COVID-19 *Thromb Res* 196 2020 222 226 10.1016/j.thromres.2020.08.027 32916564 PMC7442003 15 Tacquard C. Mansour A. Godon A. Impact of high-dose prophylactic anticoagulation in critically ill patients with coronavirus disease 2019 pneumonia *Chest* 16 2021 10.1016/j.chest.2021.01.017 S0012-3692(21)00047-7 PMC7832130 33465342 16 Tassiopoulos A.K. Mofakham S. Rubano J.A. D-dimer-Driven anticoagulation reduces mortality in intubated COVID-19 patients: a cohort study with a propensity-matched analysis *Front Med* 8 2021 631335 10.3389/fmed.2021.631335 PMC7902033 33634153 17 Sadeghipour P. Talasaz A.H. Effect of intermediate-dose vs standard-dose prophylactic anticoagulation on thrombotic events, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation treatment, or mortality among patients with COVID-19 admitted to the intensive care unit: the INSPIRATION randomized clinical trial *JAMA* 325 16 2021 1620 1630 10.1001/jama.2021.4152 33734299 PMC7974835 18 Tacquard C. Mansour A. Godon A. Anticoagulation in COVID-19: not strong for too long? *Anaesth Crit Care Pain Med* 40 2021 100857 10.1016/j.accpm.2021.100857 PMC8008784 33798761 19 The REMAP-CAP ACTIV-4a ATTACC Investigators Zarychanski R. Therapeutic anticoagulation in critically ill patients with Covid-19 – preliminary report 2021 10.1101/2021.03.10.21252749 [Accessed 23 Mar 2021] 20 Samama M.M. Cohen A.T. Darmon J.Y. A comparison of enoxaparin with placebo for the prevention of venous thromboembolism in acutely ill medical patients. Prophylaxis in Medical Patients with Enoxaparin

Study Group N Engl J Med 341 1999 793 800 10.1056/NEJM199909093411103 10477777 21

Leizorovicz A. Cohen A.T. Turpie A.G.G. Randomized, placebo-controlled trial of dalteparin for the prevention of venous thromboembolism in acutely ill medical patients *Circulation* 110 2004 874 879 10.1161/01.CIR.0000138928.83266.24 15289368 22 Cohen A.T. Davidson B.L. Gallus A.S. Efficacy and safety of fondaparinux for the prevention of venous thromboembolism in older acute medical patients: randomised placebo controlled trial *BMJ* 332 2006 325 329 10.1136/bmj.38733.466748.7C 16439370 PMC1363908 23 Berger J.S. Kunichoff D. Adhikari S. Prevalence and outcomes of D-Dimer elevation in hospitalized patients with COVID-19 *ATVB* 40 2020 2539 2547 10.1161/ATVBAHA.120.314872 PMC7505147 32840379 24 Thoreau B. Galland J. Delrue M. D-dimer level and neutrophils count as predictive and prognostic factors of pulmonary embolism in severe Non-ICU COVID-19 patients *Viruses* 13 2021 758 10.3390/v13050758 33926038 PMC8146364 25 Kampouri E. Filippidis P. Viala B. Predicting venous thromboembolic events in patients with coronavirus disease 2019 requiring hospitalization: an observational retrospective study by the COVIDIC initiative in a swiss university hospital *Biomed Res Int* 2020 2020 1 11 10.1155/2020/9126148 PMC7656238 33204727 26 Whyte M.B. Kelly P.A. Gonzalez E. Pulmonary embolism in hospitalised patients with COVID-19 *Thromb Res* 195 2020 95 99 10.1016/j.thromres.2020.07.025 32682004 PMC7351054 27 Nauka P.C. Baron S.W. Assa A. Utility of D-dimer in predicting venous thromboembolism in non-mechanically ventilated COVID-19 survivors *Thromb Res* 199 2021 82 84 10.1016/j.thromres.2020.12.023 33476901 PMC7834437 28 Perrier A. Desmarais S. Goehring C. D-dimer testing for suspected pulmonary embolism in outpatients *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 156 1997 492 496 10.1164/ajrccm.156.2.9702032 9279229 29 Olson J.D. Cunningham M.T. Higgins R.A. D-dimer: simple test, tough problems *Arch Pathol Lab Med* 137 2013 1030 1038 10.5858/arpa.2012-0296-CP 23899057 30 Hardy M. Lecompte T. Douxflis J. Management of the thrombotic risk associated with COVID-19: guidance for the hemostasis laboratory *Thrombosis J* 18 2020 17 10.1186/s12959-020-00230-1 PMC7474970 32922211 31 Suzuki K. Wada H. Imai H. A re-evaluation of the D-dimer cut-off value for making a diagnosis according to the ISTH overt-DIC diagnostic criteria: communication from the SSC of the ISTH *J Thromb Haemost* 16 2018 1442 1444 10.1111/jth.14134 29846034 32 Hsu A. Liu Y. Zayac A.S. Intensity of anticoagulation and survival in patients hospitalized with COVID-19 pneumonia *Thromb Res* 196 2020 375 378 10.1016/j.thromres.2020.09.030 32980620 PMC7511207 33 Li J. Wang H. Yin P. Clinical characteristics and risk factors for symptomatic venous thromboembolism in hospitalized COVID-19 patients: a multicenter retrospective study *J Thromb Haemost* 19 2021 1038 1048 10.1111/jth.15261 33534149 PMC8014692 34 Hardy M. Michaux I. Lessire S. Prothrombotic hemostasis disturbances in patients with severe COVID-19: individual daily data *Data Brief* 33 2020 106519 10.1016/j.dib.2020.106519 PMC7654236 33200086 35 Simonnet A. Chetboun M. Poissy J. High prevalence of obesity in severe acute respiratory syndrome Coronavirus-2 (SARS-CoV-2) requiring invasive mechanical ventilation *Obesity* 28 2020 1195 1199 10.1002/oby.22831 32271993 PMC7262326 36 Wang T.-F. Milligan P.E. Wong C.A. Efficacy and safety of high-dose thromboprophylaxis in morbidly obese inpatients *Thromb Haemost* 111 2014 88 93 10.1160/TH13-01-0042 24136071 PMC4505726 37 Witt D.M. Nieuwlaat R. Clark N.P. American Society of Hematology 2018 guidelines for management of venous thromboembolism: optimal management of anticoagulation therapy *Blood Adv* 2 2018 3257 3291 10.1182/bloodadvances.2018024893 30482765 PMC6258922 38 Rocca B. Fox K.A.A. Ajjan R.A. Antithrombotic therapy and body mass: an expert position paper of the ESC Working Group on Thrombosis *Eur Heart J* 39 2018 1672 1686f 10.1093/eurheartj/ehy066 29509886 39 Halaby R. Cuker A. Yui J. Bleeding risk by intensity of anticoagulation in critically ill patients with COVID-19: a retrospective cohort study *J Thromb Haemost* 15310 2021 10.1111/jth.15310 PMC8250316 33774903 40 Hardy M. Lecompte T. Douxflis J. Management of the thrombotic risk associated with COVID-19: guidance for the hemostasis laboratory *Thromb J* 18 2020 17 10.1186/s12959-020-00230-1 32922211 PMC7474970 41 Rauch A. Labreuche J. Lassalle F. Coagulation biomarkers are independent predictors of increased oxygen requirements in COVID-19 *J Thromb Haemost* 18 2020 2942 2953 10.1111/jth.15067 32881304 PMC7461161 42 Martín-Rojas R.M. Pérez-Rus G. COVID-19 coagulopathy: an in-depth analysis of the coagulation system *Eur J Haematol* 105 2020 741 750 10.1111/ejh.13501 32749010 PMC7436538 43 Godier A. Clausse D. Meslin S. Major bleeding complications in critically ill patients with COVID-19 pneumonia *J Thromb Thrombolysis* 2021 10.1007/s11239-021-02403-9 PMC7919235 33646501 44 Gruel Y. De Maistre E. Pouplard C. Diagnosis and management of heparin-induced

thrombocytopenia *Anaesth Crit Care Pain Med* 39 2020 291 310 10.1016/j.accpm.2020.03.012 32299756 45 Smahi M. De Pooter N. Hollestelle M.J. Toulon P. Monitoring unfractionated heparin therapy: lack of standardization of anti-Xa activity reagents *J Thromb Haemost* 18 2020 2613 2621 10.1111/jth.14969 32573889 46 White D. MacDonald S. Bull T. Heparin resistance in COVID-19 patients in the intensive care unit *J Thromb Thrombolysis* 50 2020 287 291 10.1007/s11239-020-02145-0 32445064 PMC7242778 47 Beun R. Kusadasi N. Sikma M. Thromboembolic events and apparent heparin resistance in patients infected with SARS-CoV-2 *Int J Lab Hematol* 42 2020 19 20 10.1111/ijlh.13230 32311843 PMC7264532 48 Cosmi B. Fredenburgh J.C. Rischke J. Effect of nonspecific binding to plasma proteins on the antithrombin activities of unfractionated heparin, low-molecular-Weight heparin, and dermatan sulfate *Circulation* 95 1997 118 124 10.1161/01.CIR.95.1.118 8994426 49 Roberts L.N. Whyte M.B. Georgiou L. Postdischarge venous thromboembolism following hospital admission with COVID-19 *Blood* 136 2020 1347 1350 10.1182/blood.2020008086 32746455 PMC7483432 50 Giannis D. Allen S. Tsang J. Post-discharge thromboembolic outcomes and mortality of hospitalized COVID-19 patients: the CORE-19 registry *Blood* 2021 10.1182/blood.2020010529 PMC8032474 33824972

Acknowledgements The authors gratefully thank all following members of the GIHP and the GFHT for their help in defining these proposals. Members of the “Groupe d'intérêt en hémostase périopératoire” (GIHP): P. Albaladejo (Anaesthesia and Critical Care, Grenoble France), N. Blais (Haematology-Haemostasis, Montréal, Canada), F. Bonhomme (Anaesthesia and Critical Care, Geneva, Switzerland), A. Borel-Derlon (Haematology-Haemostasis, Caen, France), A. Cohen (Cardiology, Paris, France), J.-P. Collet (Cardiology, Paris, France), E. de Maistre (Haematology-Haemostasis, Dijon, France), P. Fontana (Haematology-Haemostasis, Geneva, Switzerland), D. Garrigue Huet (Anaesthesia and Critical Care, Lille, France), A. Godier (Anaesthesia and Critical Care, Paris, France), Y. Gruel (Haematology-Haemostasis, Tours, France), A. Godon (Anaesthesia and Critical Care, Grenoble, France), B. Ickx (Anaesthesia and Critical Care, Brussels, Belgium), S. Laporte (Clinical Pharmacology, Saint- Etienne, France), D. Lasne (Haematology-Haemostasis, Paris, France), J. Llau (Anaesthesia and Critical Care, Valencia, Spain), G. Le Gal (Vascular Medicine, Ottawa, Canada), T. Lecompte (Haematology-Haemostasis, Geneva, Switzerland), S. Lessire (Anaesthesia and Critical Care, Namur, Belgium), J.H. Levy (Anaesthesia and Critical Care, Durham, USA), D. Longrois (Anaesthesia and Critical Care, Paris, France), S. Madi-Jebara (Anaesthesia and Critical Care, Beyrouth, Lebanon), A. Mansour (Anaesthesia and Critical Care, Rennes, France), M. Mazighi (Neurology, Paris, France), P. Mismetti (Clinical Pharmacology, Saint-Etienne), P.E. Morange (Haematology-Haemostasis, Marseille, France), S. Motte (Vascular Medicine, Brussels, Belgium), F. Mullier (Haematology- Haemostasis, Namur, Belgium), N. Nathan (Anaesthesia and Critical Care, Limoges, France), P. Nguyen (Haematology-Haemostasis, Reims, France), G. Pernod (Vascular Medicine, Grenoble, France), N. Rosencher (Anaesthesia and Critical Care, Paris, France), S. Rouillet (Anaesthesia and Critical Care, Bordeaux, France), P.M. Roy (Emergency Medicine, Angers, France), S. Schlumberger (Anaesthesia and Critical Care, Suresnes, France), P. Sié (Haematology- Haemostasis, Toulouse, France), A. Steib (Anaesthesia and Critical Care, Strasbourg, France), S. Susen (Haematology-Haemostasis, Lille, France), C.A. Tacquard (Anaesthesia and Critical Care, Strasbourg, France), S. Testa (Haematology, Cremona, Italy), A. Vincentelli (Cardiac Surgery, Lille, France), and P. Zufferey (Anesthesia and Critical Care, Saint-Etienne, France). Members of the “Groupe Français d'études en Hémostase et Thrombose” (GFHT): A. Borel-Derlon (Haematology-Haemostasis, Caen), E. Boissier (Haematology-Haemostasis, Nantes), B. Dumont (Haematology-Haemostasis, Paris), E. de Maistre (Haematology-Haemostasis, Dijon), Y. Gruel (Haematology-Haemostasis, Tours, France), C. James (Hématology, Bordeaux), D. Lasne (Haematology-Haemostasis, Paris), T. Lecompte (Haematology-Haemostasis, Genève, Suisse), P.E. Morange (Haematology-Haemostasis, Marseille), P. Nguyen (Haematology-Haemostasis, Reims, France), P. Sié (Haematology-Haemostasis, Toulouse), V. Siguret (Haematology-Haemostasis, Paris), and S. Susen (Haematology-Haemostasis, Lille, France).