



Q/ Do endovascular filters prevent PE as effectively as anti-coagulants in patients with DVT?

Allison Flaim, DO;
Michal Brennan, MA, DO
University of Washington,
Tacoma Family Medicine,
Tacoma

Sarah Safranek, MLIS
University of Washington
Health Sciences Libraries,
Seattle

EVIDENCE-BASED ANSWER

A | It's **UNCLEAR**, given that no studies directly compare the efficacy of endovascular filters with other types of prophylaxis to prevent pulmonary embolism (PE) in adults with deep venous thrombosis (DVT).

Although inferior vena cava filters (IVCFs) reduced the incidence of PE in a randomized controlled trial (RCT), patients treated with IVCFs and anticoagulation with unfractionated heparin or low-molecular-weight heparin had a greater

risk of developing recurrent DVT than patients treated with anticoagulation alone (SOR: **B**, 1 RCT).

Patients should be considered for IVCF placement in the following circumstances (SOR: **C**, consensus guideline):

- anticoagulation is contraindicated
- a serious complication has resulted from anticoagulation treatment
- thromboembolism recurs despite adequate anticoagulation.



Consider placing a filter when anticoagulation is contraindicated, causes a complication, or fails to prevent recurrent thromboembolism.

Evidence summary

One RCT examined PE rates in 400 patients with acute proximal DVT who were randomized to receive or not receive a permanent IVCF and also randomized to receive either unfractionated heparin or low-molecular-weight heparin for at least the first 3 months.^{1,2} Patients with a contraindication to anticoagulation or history of anticoagulation failure were excluded.

After 8 years of follow-up, symptomatic PE occurred less often in the filter group than the nonfilter group (6.2% vs 15.1%; $P=.008$; hazard ratio [HR]=0.36, 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.17-0.77; number needed to treat [NNT]=11.2). The filter group had a higher incidence of recurrent DVT than the nonfilter group (35.7% vs 27.5%; HR=1.52, 95% CI, 1.02-2.27; number needed to harm=12.2).^{1,2}

The study lacked statistical power to draw any conclusion about the efficacy of IVCFs in preventing PE over shorter time periods or in reducing PE-related or overall mortality.³ Further research, including RCTs, needs to

be done to determine how the efficacy of endovascular filters compares with standard PE prophylaxis.

How often does PE occur in patients with filters?

Patients with DVT generally have associated PE 10% of the time.⁴ Several cohort studies have examined the prevalence of recurrent PE in patients with IVCFs, but none compared prevalence in patients with and without filters.

A prospective cohort study followed 481 patients who received an IVCF because of either a contraindication to anticoagulation or sustained recurrent embolization despite adequate anticoagulation. Of the patients who had a filter for 6 months or longer, 2% had clinically suspected PE, but PE was confirmed in only 0.5%.⁵

Another multicenter, prospective cohort study (N=222) found radiographically confirmed PE after filter placement in only 2% of patients with IVCFs after a mean follow-up of 15 months.⁶

CONTINUED

A retrospective cohort study (N=318) concluded that 3.1% of the patients with IVCs had a recurrent PE, diagnosed radiographically.⁷

A single-center retrospective cohort study of 1731 patients with IVCs placed for various indications showed PE in 5.6% of patients. Some embolisms were clinically suspected and not confirmed.⁸

Complications of filter placement

Complications from IVCF placement generally occur less than 3% of the time. The most common complication is postthrombotic syndrome (70%). Risks associated with IVCF placement include DVT, postthrombotic syndrome, maldeployed filter, caval thrombosis, retroperitoneal hemorrhage, malposition, filter migration, arrhythmia, insertion site complications (such as infection or hematoma), PE, myocardial infarction, and death.^{1,2,5-12}

Recommendations

The American College of Chest Physicians recommends considering an IVCF for patients with DVT who have a contraindication to an-

ticoagulation, complication of anticoagulation, or recurrent thromboembolism despite adequate anticoagulation.¹²

JFP

References

- Decousus H, Leizorovicz A, Parent F, et al. A clinical trial of vena caval filters in the prevention of pulmonary embolism in patients with proximal deep-vein thrombosis. *N Engl J Med*. 1998;338:409-415.
- PREPIC Study Group. Eight-year follow-up of patients with permanent vena cava filters in the prevention of pulmonary embolism: the PREPIC (Prevention du Risque d'Embolie Pulmonaire par Interruption Cave) randomized study. *Circulation*. 2005;112:416-422.
- Young T, Tang H, Aukes J, et al. Vena caval filters for the prevention of pulmonary embolism. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2007;(4): CD006212.
- Irwin RS, Rippe JM. *Intensive Care Medicine*. 5th ed. Philadelphia: Lippincott Williams & Wilkins; 2000, p 571.
- Roehm JO Jr, Johnsrude IS, Barth MH, et al. The bird's nest inferior vena cava filter: progress report. *Radiology*. 1988;168:745-749.
- Ricco JB, Dubreuil F, Reynaud P, et al. The LGM Vena-Tech caval filter: results of a multicenter study. *Ann Vasc Surg*. 1995;9(suppl): S89-S100.
- David W, Gross WS, Colaiuta E, et al. Pulmonary embolus after vena cava filter placement. *Am Surg*. 1999;65:341-346.
- Athanasoulis CA, Kaufman JA, Halpern EF, et al. Inferior vena caval filters: review of a 26-year single-center clinical experience. *Radiology*. 2000;216:54-66.
- Headrick JR Jr, Barker DE, Pate LM, et al. The role of ultrasonography and inferior vena cava filter placement in high-risk trauma patients. *Am Surg*. 1997;63:1-8.
- Greenfield LJ, Proctor MC, Michaels AJ, et al. Prophylactic vena caval filters in trauma: the rest of the story. *J Vasc Surg*. 2000;32:490-497.
- Wallace MJ, Jean JL, Gupta S, et al. Use of inferior vena caval filters and survival in patients with malignancy. *Cancer*. 2004;101:1902-1907.
- Buller HR, Agnelli G, Hull RD, et al. Antithrombotic therapy for venous thromboembolic disease: the Seventh ACCP Conference on Antithrombotic and Thrombolytic Therapy. *Chest*. 2004;126(suppl 3):S401-S428.

CME/CE opportunities



from the **American Society for Reproductive Medicine** and its journal, *Sexuality, Reproduction & Menopause*



Depression, endometrial health, and discontinuation

PRESENTED BY Nanette F. Santoro, MD, Veronica A. Ravnikar, MD, FACOG, and James H. Liu, MD
Supported by an educational grant from Solvay Pharmaceuticals, Inc.

E-NEWSLETTER 1: Counseling patients about bioidentical hormone preparations

PRESENTED BY Nanette F. Santoro, MD
Supported by an educational grant from Solvay Pharmaceuticals, Inc.

E-NEWSLETTER 2: Risk for venous thromboembolism associated with postmenopausal hormone use

PRESENTED BY Veronica A. Ravnikar, MD, FACOG
Supported by an educational grant from Solvay Pharmaceuticals, Inc.

E-NEWSLETTER 3: Alternatives to hormone therapy for treatment of vasomotor symptoms

PRESENTED BY James H. Liu, MD
Supported by an educational grant from Solvay Pharmaceuticals, Inc.

Luteal support in reproduction

PRESENTED BY Sandra A. Carson, MD, Valerie L. Baker, MD, and James H. Liu, MD
Supported by an educational grant from Columbia Laboratories.

UP TO
2.25 CME
CREDITS
AVAILABLE

Click on Free CME at
www.srm-ejournal.com