

# EFFECT OF A MULTIFACETED CLINICAL DECISION SUPPORT INTERVENTION ON ADHERENCE TO THROMBOPROPHYLAXIS GUIDELINES IN NON-SURGICAL PATIENTS

T.C.C. Jaspers<sup>1\*</sup>, M. Duisenberg-van Essenberg<sup>1</sup>, B. Maat<sup>1</sup>, M. Durian<sup>2</sup>, R. van den Berg<sup>3</sup> and P.M.L.A. van den Bemt<sup>4</sup> <u>\*E-mail address corresponding author: Liaspers@etz.nl</u><sup>1</sup> Department of Hospital Pharmacy. Elisabeth TweeSteden Hospital, Tilburg, the Netherlands <sup>2</sup> Department of Oncology & Hematology. Elisabeth TweeSteden Hospital, Tilburg, The Netherlands <sup>3</sup> Intensive Care Unit, Elisabeth TweeSteden Hospital, Tilburg, The Netherlands <sup>4</sup> Department of Clinical Pharmacy and Pharmacology. University Medical Center Groningen. Groningen. The Netherlands

### BACKGROUND AND IMPORTANCE

- Venous thromboembolism (VTE) is a potentially fatal complication of hospitalisation, **affecting ±3% of non-surgical patients.**
- Administration of low molecular weight heparins to appropriate patients **decreases VTE incidence with 80%**, but guideline adherence is notoriously low.

#### MATERIALS AND METHODS

A prospective study with a **pre- and post-intervention measurement** was conducted between October 2018 and March 2020. The components of the intervention are presented in Table 1. Adherence to guidelines was assessed by calculating the **Padua prediction** and **Improve bleeding risk score** for each patient.

#### AIM AND OBJECTIVES

A multifaceted intervention was introduced to increase adherence to thromboprophylaxis guidelines in nonsurgical patients.

- **Primary objective:** to determine the effect of the intervention on guideline adherence.
- **Secondary objective:** to study the effect on guideline adherence specifically in patients with a high VTE risk.
- **Exploratory objective:** to determine how many VTEs may have been prevented.

Table 1: The components of the multifaceted intervention. EHR = Electronic Health Record; VTE = venous thromboembolism; CDS = Clinical Decision Support

Component	Description			
Mobile phone application	A decision support mobile phone application, based on the Padua prediction score, could be consulted at any time by the prescriber.			
'Pocket Cards'	Patients' risk factors for a VTE had to be entered manually, with no link to the EHR.			
Clinical rule 'duplicate	A patient list in the EHR that automatically demonstrated patients with combinations of thromboprophylaxis and therapeutic			
anticoagulant medication'	anticoagulation. The patient list was assessed daily by a pharmacist for rationale of combinations of anticoagulants.			
Training of prescribers	Training of prescribers on the wards, covering the incidence of VTEs in non-surgical patients, the effect of thromboprophylaxis on the			
	incidence of VTEs and the results of the control group data collection about prescribers' guideline adherence.			
CDS	An advanced CDS, with a built-in Padua prediction score calculation, gave an automated advice to the physician in the EHR if a patient had a			

#### RESULTS

170 patients were included. No significant differences in baseline characteristics between both groups were present.

- Guideline adherence significantly increased from 42/85 to 70/85 (Table 2).
- Guideline adherence in the patient group with a high VTE risk also increased significantly from 30/55 to 43/51.
- Extrapolation of these results to an annual admission rate of 25,000 patients in our hospital, resulted in the potential prevention of ±261 VTEs per year.

## CONCLUSION AND RELEVANCE

Table 2: Overall guideline adherence in pre- and post-intervention measurement. T0 = pre-intervention measurement; T1 = post-intervention measurement; OR = Odds Ratio, CI = Confidence interval. \*Statistically significant (95%CI > 1.00) \*Adjusted for immobility, malignancy and VTE in the past.

Guideline adherence	Т0	T1	OR (95%CI)	Adjusted OR (95%CI) <sup>a</sup>
	(n=85)	(n=85)		
Overall guideline adherence, n	42	70	4.78 (2.37 - 9.63)*	5.88 (2.74 - 12.62)*
- Thromboprophylaxis	17	30	2.18 (1.09 - 4.36)*	2.56 (1.21 - 5.42)*
according to guidelines				
- No thromboprophylaxis	25	40	2.13 (1.13 - 4.01)*	2.59 (1.21 - 5.58)*
according to guidelines				

- Our multifaceted intervention significantly increased guideline adherence from 42/85 to 70/85, preventing ± 261 VTEs per year in our hospital.
- Implementation of this multifaceted intervention globally may prevent numerous VTEs.

#### REFERENCES

Barbar S, Noventa F, Rossetto V, et al. A risk assessment model for the identification of hospitalized medical patients at risk for venous thromboembolism: the Padua Prediction Score. J Thromb Haemost. 2010;8:2450-2457 Rosenberg DJ, Press A, Fishbein J, et al. External validation of the IMPROVE Bleeding Risk Assessment Model in medical patients. Thromb Haemost 2016;116:530-536.

Cohen AT, Tapson VF, Bergmann JF, et al. Venous thromboembolism risk and prophylaxis in the acute hospital care setting (ENDORSE study): a multinational cross-sectional study. Lancet. 2008;371:387-394

Moesker MJ, Damen NL, Groot JFd, Bruijne MCd, Wagner C. Antistollingszorg in Nederlandse ziekenhuizen. Evaluatie van tromboseprofylaxe en perioperatief antistollingsbeleid in vergelijking met geldende richtlijnen [Internet]. Utrecht/Amsterdam: NIVEL and EMGO+/VUmc; 2017. 73 p. ISBN 978-94-6122-445-3

Kahn SR, Lim W, Dunn AS, et al. Prevention of VTE in nonsurgical patients: Antithrombotic Therapy and Prevention of Thrombosis, 9th ed: American College of Chest Physicians Evidence-Based Clinical Practice Guidelines. Chest. 2012;141:e195S-e226S.