Primary Care in Management of Pulmonary Embolism in Prolonged Recumbences

Najlaa M. Alsudairy[1], Hadi A. AL Qurain[2], Fatemah S. Alhadab[3], Suhayb T. Alzughaibi[4], Amani S. Almohammadi[5], Hadeel K. Alshayji[6], fatimah S. Alsalat[7], Eyad A. Sukmubaji[8], Asya A. Alamri[9], Omelhassan M. Ali[10], Abdullah M. Alajmi[11], Sameer R. Alharthi[11], Yazad M. Alqraini[12], Rakan H. Guraeshah[13].

[1]dAssistant Consultant FM, National Guard Hospital, King Abdulaziz Medical City, SCOHS, Jeddah, KSA. [2]Family Medicine Consultant, AL Rida PHC- Qatif Health Network in Eastren Health Cluster, KSA. [3]King Fasial University, KSA. [4]Ministry of health, Alfat'h Primary health Care Center, Al Madinah Al Munawwarah, KSA. [5]Northwest Armed Force Hospital, Tabuk, KSA. [6]Dammam Medical complex, Dammam, KSA. [7]Al Rida Eastern E1 cluster, PHC, Qatif, KSA. [8]Prince Mansour Military Hospital, KSA. [9]PHCC, Khamis Mushait, KSA. [10]Maternity and Children, Tabuk, Ksa. [11]Taif Armed Forces Hospital, Taif, KSA. [12]Imam mohammed bin saud university, KSA. [13]King Abdulaziz University, KSA.

ABSTRACT

A frequent and possibly fatal kind of venous thromboembolic illness is pulmonary embolism (PE). It is a significant issue for public health. A typical diagnosis as a primary care in an emergency room is pulmonary embolism (PE). Additionally, it makes up a sizable portion of the patients admitted to hospital wards. In selected low-risk individuals with acute PE, there is mounting evidence that outpatient therapy, or treatment without hospitalization, is practical, safe, and efficient. PE patients may be risk-classified and given an early release from the emergency department. As a result, there are more hospital beds available for other patients, which lowers treatment expenses for the healthcare system. There is growing support for the outpatient care of low-risk, hemo-dynamically stable patients with acute symptomatic pulmonary embolism (PE). There is assistance in identifying patients who are eligible for outpatient (primary) care. This move has been made easier by the accessibility and simplicity of direct oral anticoagulants. Acute PE is currently mostly treated with direct, non-vitamin K-dependent oral anticoagulants. In comparison to vitamin K antagonists, they have been demonstrated to simplify initial and prolonged anticoagulation regimes while lowering the risk of bleeding. In this consensus practice document, we present a thorough analysis of primary care in the diagnosis, treatment, and follow-up of acute PE.

Keyword: Pulmonary Embolism, Primary Care, Out-Patient, Anticoagulants, Management.

Introduction

PE is a potentially lethal circumstance in which embolic material is present, Typically, a thrombus originates in one of the deep veins of the legs or pelvis, enters the lungs, a pulmonary artery or arteries are blocked, as a result, there is less blood flow and more pressure in the right heart ventricle. Deep vein thrombosis as well as pulmonary embolism be two signs in affluent nations, venous thromboembolism is

The third most frequent cardiovascular illness. Because of the non-specific symptoms and wide variety in clinical manifestations of patients suspected of having PE, PE is difficult to identify in patients ranging from being asymptomatic to patients suffering from cardiogenic shock [1]. The transition to outpatient therapy is projected to save money in the healthcare industry expenditures while also improving

SMHJ
Saudi Medical Horizons Journal

Patient quality of life by reducing hospitalizations. However, it is unclear what part the general practitioner or primary care doctor will play in this growth [3]. The literature only describes their involvement in deciding which individuals with a suspected PE patients ought to be referred for diagnostic imaging or final therapy. [4] It has long been customary to move patients who have suspected PE to a higher level of care. The receiving specialist or hospital-based emergency physician often decides which acute PE patients are suitable for ambulatory treatment starts anticoagulation, arranges for house release, as well as establishes careful monitoring [5]. It is becoming less frequent for some low-risk individuals to be routinely hospitalized as the initial point of treatment for newly diagnosed patients, chronic diseases, Acute pulmonary embolism (PE) accompanied with symptoms. A recent controlled pragmatic study at community hospitals in the United States, as well as a global in academic medical institutes, randomized controlled trial, are two instances of the expanding body of evidence supporting outpatient therapy (without hospitalization). It has involved numerous nations and varied sorts of health care systems. Specialty societies all throughout the globe encourage outpatient (ambulatory) treatment for qualified low-risk individuals. By avoiding needless hospitalization, the practice enhances resource management within the healthcare industry and protects patients from the expenses, hassles, and hazards involved. Regarding who and in which clinical settings can identify individuals who qualify for outpatient therapy, little be known. A stable, mobile patient with problems linked to PE may visit a main care office, a specialist office (or primary care clinic), or the Emergency Department (ED)). Anticoagulation, as well as assessing outpatient eligibility, confirmation of diagnosis, patient and family education, Comprehensive outpatient PE therapy includes all of these components, as well as careful planning for report on. For this degree of attention, the doctor must integrate laboratory, radiological, pharmaceutical, and educational resources [6]. Nonetheless, the primary care physician has the tools it is crucial to maintain outpatient PE therapy after the initial diagnostic examination without referring every patient with PE to a higher level of care. Today, using established methods for risk stratification, it is simple to identify people with acute PE who can be handled safely outside of the hospital. The development of oral anticoagulants that are either direct or indirect -vitamin K. This might lessen the need for injectable drugs, has further eased the treatment of PE. For professional guidance and management recommendations, thrombosis specialists can frequently be accessed remotely in clinical settings. Some care delivery systems are beginning to implement comprehensive primary care-based outpatient PE treatment [7].

Epidemiology

About one third of patients with symptomatic venous thromboembolism who also have PE present with it each year (1-2 per 1,000). PE is relatively rare in children, However, its incidence increases rapidly in individuals over 75 years old, reaching about 500-600 cases per 100,000 persons [8]. Overall, both men and women are afflicted equally, however due to the disease's relation to pregnancy and the higher risk associated with the use of oral contraceptives, males are impacted more than women, Women of reproductive age are at a slightly higher risk of PE. Men are more likely than women to develop PE as they age. If left untreated, PE-related mortality can reach 25%, although with proper anticoagulant medication, this incidence drops to roughly 2-8% in the three months after diagnosis [8].

Prognosis for the near future

Patients suffering from pulmonary embolism used to be hospitalized for a minimum of five to seven days. First-line therapy, which involves intravenously injected heparin, and worries about the high risk of mortality were factors in the length of the hospitalization. However, with the addition of low molecular weight heparin (subcutaneously given) and, more recently, oral anticoagulants, pulmonary embolism can now be treated as an outpatient treatment. Additionally, we now understand that pulmonary embolism does not always take the dramatic path of hemodynamic instability and shock, with a high risk of death if treatment is not started right away. Finding individuals with low mortality risk may open up the possibility of outpatient care in a primary care environment [9].

Prognostic ratings for short-term risk guiding practice

The chances of dying shortly after a pulmonary embolism is detected should be considered. According to the most recent data, the best line of action is to determine the patient's PESI score. Candidates for outpatient therapy include people having a PESI score of 85 or below and no hypoxia, hemodynamic instability, or a history of substance abuse, or any other disease that might render anticoagulant treatment contraindicated. Patients who are at minimal risk of

short-term failure mortality after being discharged from the emergency department or hospital as soon as possible (within 24 hours, if possible) can seek care from their primary care physician. In individuals using vitamin K antagonists, this frequently necessitates monitoring the international normalized ratio, ensuring that low-molecular-weight heparin is delivered subcutaneously for at least five days, as well as a five-day course of low-molecular-weight heparin. And early detection of therapy failure, such as recurrent pulmonary embolism or hemorrhage, with required hospital readmission [9]. There were 1021 people who had deep vein thrombosis or pulmonary embolism were studied was analyzed by Douketis and colleagues (2010) to determine the factors that contribute to treatment failure. Twenty eight (3%) patients had significant bleeding during the first three months of therapy, 58 (6%) individuals experienced a repeat episode while using an anticoagulant. The majority of these treatment failures occurred within the first few weeks of therapy: within three weeks, 75% of major bleeding difficulties occurred, and 72% of repeated instances occurred. Cancer, as identified by Douketis and coworkers, chronic heart disease, chronic respiratory disease. In a multivariable study, Renal, hepatic, gastrointestinal, neurologic, hematologic, and multisystem disease were all linked to an increased risk of recurrent sickness when using anticoagulant therapy. Primary care physicians must consequently keep a watchful eye out for treatment failures among patients suffering from these disorders, particularly during the first three weeks of therapy [10]. The 2019 ESC acute PE guidelines include specific, organized, and evidence-based criteria for PE patients eligible for primary care clinic management. These patients must have stable hemodynamics and be classed as low risk by reliable prognostic approaches. The ESC suggests using the well-studied Pulmonary Embolism Severity Index (PESI) or its condensed variant simplified PESI (sPESI), which includes both received considerable validation in academic and social settings [11]. This risk assessment tool "integrates baseline markers of acute PE episode severity with aggravating conditions and the patient's comorbidity [12]. A class I-II PESI or sPESI of 0 generally implies low-risk PE as illustrated in (Table 1) [13]. For outpatient therapy, patients should not exhibit right ventricular dysfunction on CTPA or echocardiography. To guarantee accurate follow-up, any psychological, economical, and geographical barriers to treatment must also be considered [2]. In terms of resources, this specific primary care clinic

gives immediate access to laboratory services, services in radiology and anticoagulant management, as well as expert advice. Collaboration on decision-making and consultation with a thrombosis specialist, beginning adequate anticoagulation, providing ongoing patient and family education, all of these elements are critical components of patient-centered, collaborative clinical treatment. The same logistical requirements apply to all clinic-based management of patients with low-risk deep vein thrombosis. They need a large investment of time and money and may be beyond the reach of many primary care clinics. In other circumstances, transferring to a higher level of care may be the best option [6].

Diagnostic strategies

There are two guiding concepts for the PE diagnosis process. First, because PE can be lethal, and anticoagulation raises the risk of severe bleeding, it is crucial to accurately and quickly identify individuals with PE. As a result, patients who receive a mistaken diagnosis run the danger of bleeding out, which can potentially be deadly, or of dying from PE. Second, improper therapy of suspected PE may result from the use of isolated diagnostic tests. Due to these factors, it is recommended to use integrated diagnostic techniques that incorporate a number of diagnostic tests. Implementing such standardized procedures is strongly advised because doing so is connected with a significantly reduced risk of problems from using a validated diagnostic work-up [8].

Clinical probability assessment

In general, the clinical suspicion that should direct the preliminary test selection serves as the starting point for any diagnostic technique. Prior to the invention of objective testing, the clinical history and physical examination were the mainstays of PE diagnosis [14]. Unfortunately, due to the lack of specific symptoms and indicators, PE cannot be clinically diagnosed or ruled out. However, it has long been known that 97% of people with established PE have unexplained dyspnea and/or chest pain. This may help to increase the likelihood of PE and select patients for extra diagnostic testing [15]. As a consequence of the clinical history and physical examination information, as well as extra information gleaned from conveniently available laboratory testing, should be evaluated. Imaging modalities as chest radiography, electrocardiography, and ultrasound are used in the diagnosis of PE, and arterial blood gas analysis are employed.

Table (1): Clinical characteristics of patients with suspected PE in the emergency department.

Feature	PE confirmed (n = 1880)	PE not confirmed (n = 528)
Dyspnoea	50%	51%
Pleuritic chest pain	39%	28%
Cough	23%	23%
Substernal chest pain	15%	17%
Fever	10%	10%
Haemoptysis	8%	4%
Syncope	6%	6%
Unilateral leg pain	6%	5%
Signs of DVT (unilateral extremity swelling)	24%	18%

The combination of clinical and laboratory data might indicate a diagnosis other than PE, or it could raise clinical suspicion of PE. The current Task Force proposes that each patient's pre-test clinical likelihood of pulmonary embolism be objectively evaluated, and that D-dimer measurements be conducted if the pre-test clinical risk of pulmonary embolism is low or moderate. This is true despite the fact that PE diagnostic procedures might differ substantially between clinical scenarios and specific conditions. In most cases, diagnostic chest imaging should be done to predict the likelihood of PE following a test. More testing is required when the post-test probability of PE is neither too low nor too high to provide treatment recommendations [16].

D-dimer testing: The breakdown product of cross-linked fibrin, fibrin D-dimer, is increased when both fibrinolysis and coagulation are simultaneously activated. Therefore, a normal D-dimer test (typically less than 500 g/ml) provides a substantial PE or deep vein thrombosis has a poor prognosis. Endogenous fibrin synthesis can be increased by a number of circumstances, including cancer, inflammation, infection, pregnancy, and chronic illnesses. As a result, increased plasma D-dimer levels have a limited positive predictive value for PE and DVT. The clinical likelihood of PE and the specific type of D-dimer test used must be considered when appraising the usefulness of D-dimer measurement in the diagnostic work-up of each patient. PE is adequately excluded when a negative D-dimer test result from any technology is combined with a low likelihood clinical assessment. If D-dimer was detected using a high-sensitivity ELISA test, PE would be fairly eliminated with an intermediate clinical probability. Untreated people with a negative D-dimer and a low or moderate clinical likelihood had a 1% risk of PE or DVT in 3 months A concurrently negative D-dimer test, on the other hand, does not rule out PE if clinical examination indicates a high risk of PE. To rule out one pulmonary embolism event in a patient with suspected PE, D-dimer levels must be assessed three (in the emergency room) to ten (in hospitalized patients). It suggests that D-dimer testing should only be utilized in outpatients or patients in the emergency room with a low or moderate clinical risk of pulmonary embolism. As the severity of the pulmonary embolism grows, D-dimer tests become more sensitive. Patients with PE involving the pulmonary trunk and lobar arteries, as well as perfusion scan anomalies affecting 50% of the pulmonary circulation, had the highest D-dimer values [17, 18].

The safety of outpatient treatment for patients with pulmonary embolism

Two comprehensive evaluations on the security of treating pulmonary emboli as outpatients in patients at low risk for immediate consequences were released in 2008 and 2009. The 2008 evaluation by Janjua and colleagues was based on six observational studies including 593 outpatients. Squizzato and colleagues' 2009 review included the same six investigations as well as five more observational studies, totaling 928 patients with pulmonary embolism. The PESI model was not used in any of the 11 included trials to find patients who were at low risk of negative outcomes [19, 20]. Instead, they used standards for hypoxia and hemodynamic instability.

Patients who underwent outpatient therapy had excellent short-term prognosis: During the 7-10 day follow-up period, no fatal pulmonary emboli occurred. However, both evaluations stated because their findings were founded on tiny research, some of which have poor methodological quality (for example, a lack of uniform risk-assessment technique). Different treatment regimens in different studies, and a lack of randomized research), and that their conclusions were thus subject to limitations. The inclusion criteria for the diagnosis of pulmonary embolism may vary depending on the specific guidelines or protocols followed by healthcare professionals. However, some common values for different items of inclusion criteria in the diagnosis of pulmonary embolism may include:

Symptoms: Presence of symptoms such as sudden onset of shortness of breath, chest pain, cough, or hemoptysis (coughing up blood).

Vital signs: Systolic Blood Pressure (SBP): Typically above 90 mmHg.

Diastolic Blood Pressure (DBP): Typically above 60 mmHg.

Heart Rate: Usually elevated, but no specific cutoff value.

Respiratory Rate: Usually elevated, but no specific cutoff value.

Oxygen Saturation: Typically above 90% on room air.

D-dimer levels: D-dimer is a blood test that measures the presence of a substance released when a blood clot dissolves. Elevated D-dimer levels may indicate the possibility of a pulmonary embolism. However, the specific cutoff value may vary depending on the laboratory and the clinical context. Imaging findings: Imaging tests like computed tomography pulmonary angiography (CTPA) or ventilation-perfusion (V/Q) scan may be used to visualize the blood vessels in the lungs and detect any obstruction caused by a clot. It is important to note that these values are general guidelines and may differ based on individual patient characteristics, clinical judgment, and specific guidelines followed by healthcare professionals. The diagnosis of pulmonary embolism should be made by a qualified healthcare provider based on a combination of clinical assessment, risk factors, symptoms, and diagnostic tests [11].

The PESI approach was used to find patients in Aujesky and colleagues' randomized controlled trial who were at low risk of passing away soon [11]. Patients that were low risk and met the inclusion criteria (e.g., no hypoxia, hemodynamic instability, etc.), or anticoagulant medication contraindications) were randomly allocated to receive care either in- or out-patient. In both groups, the death rate (0.6%) was the same. The selection criteria employed to determine low-risk individuals appear to be the main cause of the contradictory outcomes from these two trials. A proven risk assessment technique, like the PESI model employed by Aujesky and colleagues, wasn't used by Otero and colleagues. In fact, in the experiment by Otero and colleagues, 55% of patients were determined to be acceptable for outpatient treatment, but in the trial by Aujesky and colleagues, 30% of patients got outpatient care, showing that stricter criteria were applied in the later trial [11].

Risk Stratification in Low-Risk People

Risk classification underpins the therapy of PE patients, early detection of hemodynamic instability signs identifies patients at high risk of dying in the hospital. The first diagnostic evaluation of non-high-risk individuals should be followed by a further classification of patients into intermediate-risk patients and low-risk patients. This difference is made possible by the use of clinical assessments such as the Pulmonary Embolism Severity Index (PESI), whose simplified form (sPESI) simply assigns a score of "0" to people who are at low risk. Patients at intermediate risk are classified as high-intermediate risk if they have both right ventricular dysfunction (detected on cardiac scans by transthoracic echocardiography or CT angiography) and elevated circulating troponin levels, while they are classified as low-intermediate risk if only one of the two parameters is present. Patients who are clinically assessed as low risk but have symptoms of right ventricular dysfunction (36% of the time) or greater cardiac troponin levels (26% of the time) should be classed as intermediate-low risk to avoid premature discharge [13]. Early discharge may really be thought about in low-risk individuals who don't exhibit troponin increase or right ventricular failure on echocardiography. The latest findings research on Home Treatment of Pulmonary Embolism, This includes almost 500 individuals with PE, support this method. The decision for "intermediate-high risk" patients is the most difficult. Reperfusion treatment is not currently indicated, but intensive care unit monitoring of the patient is advised in order to quickly spot and address any early signs of the high-risk condition's development [21].

Patients with Pulmonary Embolism Who Are Eligible for Primary Care

If a primary care physician wishes to deliver complete therapy to a few patients who have just been diagnosed with acute PE, the next step is to establish eligibility for outpatient management. The CHEST eligibility requirements for outpatient services are easy and uncomplicated. The patient must be "clinically stable with enough cardiopulmonary reserve; no contraindications, such as recent hemorrhage; the patient must have "severe renal or hepatic illness, or severe thrombocytopenia; be anticipated to cooperate with therapy; and feel well enough to be treated at home" [6]. Health literacy, motivation, and psychological stability are requirements for treatment compliance and are frequently taken into account when determining eligibility for outpatient PE research. Many prognostic models are available to help doctors identify low-risk individuals who may be candidates for outpatient treatment. The PE Severity Index and its condensed form, the reduced PE Severity Index, are the most thoroughly tested devices for guiding disposal decisions. Both indices provide 30-day all-cause mortality estimates. The simplified PE Severity Index finds fewer people who are candidates for outpatient treatment than the original. However, because it is easier to remember than the original, the distinction is less relevant in the age of computerized clinical decision-support aids that automatically fill. The PE Severity Index has been integrated into the risk stratification approach of the European Society of Cardiology. Short-term mortality projections are associated with reasonable grounds against ambulatory therapy when employed in site-of-care decision making, as established in a number of research [6].

Following Management

For the majority of patients, direct oral anticoagulants are the first line of therapy. According to randomized trials, direct oral anticoagulants, which do not require monitoring and are equally effective as vitamin K antagonists in decreasing the incidence of recurrent venous thromboembolism, also have a reduced risk of major bleeding. Due to the lack of direct oral anticoagulant comparisons, pharmacologic qualities as well as patient characteristics and preferences (such as co-occurring medical conditions and a preference for once-daily or twice-daily treatment) are used to choose the best agent. Trials show that the direct oral anticoagulants apixaban, edoxaban or rivaroxaban when used as an alternative in cancer patients undergoing low-molecular-weight heparin therapy are both safe and effective. Antiphospholipid syndrome, which occurs in people with severe renal or liver illness, triple-positive, very high antibody titers, or a history of arterial thrombosis, vitamin K antagonists

are selected over Anticoagulants that are taken orally. Because vitamin K antagonists and direct oral anticoagulants reach the placenta and are linked to poor pregnancy outcomes, they should be avoided. Low-molecular-weight heparin can be used to treat pulmonary embolism in pregnant women [22].

Timely Follow-up
After being sent home for the first time, it's critical to follow up as soon as possible to monitor symptom management, review the anticoagulant therapy's efficacy and side effects, and continue educating patients about their condition, how to treat it, and how to avoid problems and recurrence [23]. The majority of clinical treatment pathways and outpatient PE studies call for a first outpatient clinic visit within seven days. The patient's individual needs can be addressed in the subsequent follow-up. Monitoring for recurrence and the onset of chronic thromboembolic pulmonary hypertension is an additional component of long-term treatment for those who have had PE. The elements of long-term outpatient PE management, which frequently occur after release from the ED or hospital, are well within the nation's designated primary care scope [24].

The Advantages and Disadvantages of Complete Primary Care-based Pulmonary Embolism Management
At the patient level, the advantages of comprehensive primary care-based outpatient PE treatment are projected. These include avoiding care transitions that might jeopardize patient safety and maintaining continuity of care during PE treatment. Additional significant patient-centered outcomes include maximizing time spent at home and minimizing ER and hospital visits. Additionally, it will reduce patients' out-of-pocket expenses in the US, which can be significant. These patient-level characteristics may improve the patient's quality of life and satisfaction with care. Lower total health care expenditures and improved hospital resource management may also help the public health sector [6]. However, it is unclear how the risks of this more modern technique relate to unforeseen Emergency room visits and hospitalization Short-term severe hemorrhage, recurrent venous thromboembolism, and death are all risks. There has been limited study on comprehensive PE treatment in primary care settings. [6].

Conclusion
This study presents primary care-based PE treatment as a unique, workable strategy for a subset of low-risk ambulatory patients, avoiding the need for care transfers to the emergency room, hospital, or inpatient environment. With an appropriate low-risk patient, an experienced doctor who can accommodate their schedule, if accompanied with a supportive practice environment, this exclusive primary care clinic-based

technique may be a safe and successful option. Simple access to diagnostic tests, modern imaging, and attentive follow-up. It is uncertain which low-risk patients respond best to this form of therapy and how its clinical outcomes compare to standard ED transfers. Comprehensive primary care-based PE therapy should result in lower healthcare expenditures, better patient follow-up, and improved outcomes if done effectively.

Conflict of Interest
None

Funding
None

References
1. Reza N, Dudzinski DM. Pulmonary embolism response teams. Current treatment options in cardiovascular medicine. 2015 Jun;17:1-9.
2. Kearon C, Akl EA, Ornelas J, Blaivas A, Jimenez D, Bounameaux H, et al. Antithrombotic therapy for VTE disease: CHEST guideline and expert panel report. Chest. 2016 Feb 1;149(2):315-352.
3. Vinson DR, Isaacs DJ, Johnson EJ. Managing acute pulmonary embolism in primary care in a patient declining emergency department transfer: a case report. European Heart Journal: Case Reports. 2020 Oct;4(5):1.
4. Fuchs E, Hardak E, Keren-Politansky A, Hoffman R, Tzoran I. The age-adjusted D-dimer cutoff level to rule out pulmonary embolism in patients with syncope. European Journal of Internal Medicine. 2022 Mar 1;97:125-127.
5. Casey SD, Zekar L, Somers MJ, Westafer LM, Reed ME, Vinson DR. Bilateral Emboli and Highest Heart Rate Predict Hospitalization of Emergency Department Patients With Acute, Low-Risk Pulmonary Embolism. Annals of Emergency Medicine. 2023 ;82(3):369-380.
6. Vinson DR, Aujesky D, Geersing GJ, Roy PM. Comprehensive outpatient management of low-risk pulmonary embolism: can primary care do this? A narrative review. The Permanente Journal. 2020;24:1-10.
7. Isaacs DJ, Johnson EJ, Hofmann ER, Rangarajan S, Vinson DR. Primary care physicians comprehensively manage acute pulmonary embolism without higher-level-of-care transfer: A report of two cases. Medicine. 2020 Nov 11;99(45).
8. Al-Janabi HA, Raffas HA, Jassim SA. Incidence Rate of Mortality form Massive Pulmonary Embolism in Al-Diwaniyah Province, Iraq, During the Period from January 2011 Through December 2018. Prof. RK Sharma. 2019 Jul;13(3):335.
9. Geersing GJ, Oudega R, Hoes AW, Moons KG. Managing pulmonary embolism using prognostic

models: future concepts for primary care. CMAJ. 2012 Feb 21;184(3):305-310.

10. Zhu T, Martinez I, Emmerich J. Venous thromboembolism: risk factors for recurrence. Arteriosclerosis, thrombosis, and vascular biology. 2009 Mar 1;29(3):298-310.

11. Roy PM, Penaloza A, Hugli O, Klok FA, Arnoux A, Elias A, et al. Triaging acute pulmonary embolism for home treatment by Hestia or simplified PESI criteria: the HOME-PE randomized trial. European heart journal. 2021 Sep 1;42(33):3146-3157.

12. Vinson DR, Ballard DW, Mark DG, Huang J, Reed ME, Rauchwerger AS, et al. Risk stratifying emergency department patients with acute pulmonary embolism: does the simplified Pulmonary Embolism Severity Index perform as well as the original. Thrombosis research. 2016 Dec 1;148:1-8.

13. Pollack CV, Schreiber D, Goldhaber SZ, Slattery D, Fanikos J, O'Neil BJ, et al. Clinical characteristics, management, and outcomes of patients diagnosed with acute pulmonary embolism in the emergency department: initial report of EMPEROR (Multicenter Emergency Medicine Pulmonary Embolism in the Real World Registry). Journal of the American College of Cardiology. 2011 Feb 8;57(6):700-706.

14. Diamond GA, Forrester JS. Clinical trials and statistical verdicts: probable grounds for appeal. Annals of Internal Medicine. 1983 Mar 1;98(3):385-94.

15. Umeh CA, Dubey A, Yousuf M, Onyi S. New Onset Atrial Fibrillation and Pulmonary Embolism in a Hospitalized Patient: Which Comes First. American Journal of Medical Case Reports. 2021;9(5):272-274.

16. Modi S, Deisler R, Gozel K, Reicks P, Irwin E, Brunsvold M, et al. Wells criteria for DVT is a reliable clinical tool to assess the risk of deep venous thrombosis in trauma patients. World Journal of Emergency Surgery. 2016 Dec;11:1-6.

17. Robert-Ebadi H, Mostaguir K, Hovens MM, Kare M, Verschuren F, Girard P, et al. Assessing clinical probability of pulmonary embolism: prospective validation of the simplified Geneva score. Journal of Thrombosis and Haemostasis. 2017 Sep 1;15(9):1764-1769.

18. Wan T, Skeith L, Karovitch A, Rodger M, Le Gal G. Guidance for the diagnosis of pulmonary embolism during pregnancy: consensus and controversies. Thrombosis research. 2017 Sep 1;157:23-28.

19. Erkens PM, Gandara E, Wells P, SHEN AH, Bose G, Le Gal G, et al. Safety of outpatient treatment in acute pulmonary embolism. Journal of Thrombosis and Haemostasis. 2010 Nov 1;8(11):2412-4217.

20. Squizzato A, Donadini MP, Galli L, Dentali F, Aujesky D, Ageno W. Prognostic clinical prediction rules to identify a low-risk pulmonary embolism: a systematic review and meta-analysis. Journal of thrombosis and haemostasis. 2012 Jul 1;10(7):1276-1290.

21. Barco S, Schmidtmann I, Ageno W, Bauersachs RM, Becattini C, Bernardi E, et al. Early discharge and home treatment of patients with low-risk pulmonary embolism with the oral factor Xa inhibitor rivaroxaban: an international multicentre single-arm clinical trial. European heart journal. 2020 Jan 21;41(4):509-518.

22. Solomon CG. Susan R. Kahn, MD, and Kerstin de Wit, MB, et al. Engl J Med. 2022;387:45-57.

23. Vinson DR, Ballard DW, Huang J, Rauchwerger AS, Reed ME, Mark DG. Timing of discharge follow-up for acute pulmonary embolism: retrospective cohort study. Western Journal of Emergency Medicine. 2015 Jan;16(1):55.

24. Vinson DR, Aujesky D, Geersing GJ, Roy PM. Comprehensive outpatient management of low-risk pulmonary embolism: can primary care do this? A narrative review. The Permanente Journal. 2020;24:19-163.