



This is a repository copy of *Which is the best model to assess risk for venous thromboembolism in hospitalised patients?*.

White Rose Research Online URL for this paper:  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/174788/>

Version: Supplemental Material

---

**Article:**

Horner, D., Goodacre, S. [orcid.org/0000-0003-0803-8444](https://orcid.org/0000-0003-0803-8444), Davis, S. [orcid.org/0000-0002-6609-4287](https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6609-4287) et al. (2 more authors) (2021) Which is the best model to assess risk for venous thromboembolism in hospitalised patients? *BMJ: British Medical Journal*, 373. n1106. ISSN 1759-2151

<https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n1106>

---

This article has been published in *British Medical Journal*, 2021 following peer review, and the Version of Record can be accessed online at <http://dx.doi.org/10.1136/bmj.n1106>. © Authors (or their employer(s)) 2021. Reuse of this manuscript version (excluding any databases, tables, diagrams, photographs and other images or illustrative material included where a another copyright owner is identified) is permitted strictly pursuant to the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial 4.0 International (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>)

**Reuse**

This article is distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial (CC BY-NC) licence. This licence allows you to remix, tweak, and build upon this work non-commercially, and any new works must also acknowledge the authors and be non-commercial. You don't have to license any derivative works on the same terms. More information and the full terms of the licence here:  
<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/>

**Takedown**

If you consider content in White Rose Research Online to be in breach of UK law, please notify us by emailing [eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk) including the URL of the record and the reason for the withdrawal request.



[eprints@whiterose.ac.uk](mailto:eprints@whiterose.ac.uk)  
<https://eprints.whiterose.ac.uk/>

Table 3: Ongoing studies of VTE Risk Assessment Methods (RAMs) for general medical and surgical patients requiring emergency hospitalisation

Study, setting, sample size, design	Intervention and comparator	Outcome measures	Strengths and limitations
<i>Randomised controlled trials</i>			
NCT04267718 <sup>1</sup> Hospitalised medical patients in 35 Italian centres N=2880 Open label RCT	Cluster randomisation to systematic evaluation using the Padua VTE risk score and the IMPROVE bleeding score, compared to clinical judgement only	A composite outcome of major complications, to include death, VTE and major bleeding by 90 days follow up	Large, multicentre RCT which allows assessment of clinical and cost effectiveness.  VTE and bleeding outcomes.  Open label design and easily available scores confer a risk of contamination
NCT04768036 <sup>2</sup> Hospitalised medical patients in 4 North American centres N=11000 Open label cluster randomised RCT	Cluster randomisation to embedded risk assessment using the IMPROVE RAM within an electronic health record, compared to usual medical care	Primary pilot outcome of proportion of whether high risk patients are prescribed 'appropriate' thromboprophylaxis.  Secondary outcomes include VTE within 90 days of hospital admission by diagnostic coding	Large sample size, cluster randomisation will ensure pragmatic assessment of RAM.  Potential contamination across sites. Single country therefore potential issues with generalisability.  Primary outcome not a clinical one. Use of coding data for outcome ascertainment introduces risk of bias through inaccuracy.
<i>Observational Studies</i>			
NIHR127454 <sup>3</sup>	No intervention. Aim is to determine efficient methods	Decision analysis modelling aims to estimate the	Cost effectiveness work incorporates patient related

Table 3: Ongoing studies of VTE Risk Assessment Methods (RAMs) for general medical and surgical patients requiring emergency hospitalisation

<p>Hospitalised medical and Surgical patients in 4 UK Centres N=3000 Observational feasibility study with decision analysis modelling and cost effectiveness analysis</p>	<p>for a future implementation study of risk assessment models.</p>	<p>prognostic accuracy of current RAMs and determine the risk threshold which optimises effectiveness and cost effectiveness</p>	<p>outcome measures, including bleeding and downstream health costs.  Feasibility study clinical outcomes likely to be confounded by widespread use of thromboprophylaxis in an NHS setting</p>
<p>NCT04439383<sup>4</sup> Hospitalised medical patients in 4 Swiss centres N=1350 Prospective observational cohort study</p>	<p>No intervention. Aim is to examine VTE risk factors and evaluate existing risk assessment models.</p>	<p>Primary outcome of symptomatic, objectively confirmed hospital-acquired VTE.</p>	<p>Multicentre, broad inclusion criteria.  Likely to be confounded by clinical use of thromboprophylaxis</p>

References:

1. Dentali F, Valerio A. Efficacy of the Use of Risk Scores in Reducing Important Clinical Outcomes in Hospitalized Medical Ill Patients: the RICO Cluster-randomized Controlled Trial. <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04267718?term=risk&cond=Thrombosis+Embolism&draw=6&rank=47>. Published 2020. Accessed 1/7, 2020.
2. Spyropoulos AC, Goldin M. A Universal Electronic Health Record-based IMPROVE VTE Risk Assessment Model for the Prevention of Venous Thromboembolism in Hospitalized Medically Ill Patients: NCT04768036. <https://www.clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04768036>. Published 2021. Accessed 17/3/2021, 2021.
3. Goodacre SG, Horner D, Hogg K, et al. The cost-effectiveness of venous thromboembolism risk assessment tools for hospital inpatients. NIHR. <https://fundingawards.nihr.ac.uk/award/NIHR127454>. Published 2020. Accessed 1/7, 2020.
4. Baumgartner C, Mean M. Risk Stratification for Venous Thromboembolism in Hospitalized Medical Patients (RISE). <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT04439383?term=risk&cond=Thrombosis+Embolism&draw=2&rank=8>. Published 2020. Accessed 1/7, 2020.