
BACKGROUND

The American Society of Hematology (ASH) aims to develop a rapid, living clinical practice guideline for the use of anticoagulation in adult patients with COVID-19. Patients with COVID-19 appear to be at increased risk for experiencing venous thromboembolism (VTE) and other thromboembolic complications compared with other patients with similar severity of illness.1,2 VTE, which includes pulmonary embolism (PE) and deep venous thrombosis (DVT), has a substantial risk of death and recurrent event, especially in patients who have high risk factors, and requires short-term treatment and long-term prophylaxis of recurrences.3-5 Micro thromboembolic complications may play a role in the cause of hypoxemic respiratory failure and death.1 Practitioners are using a variety of primary prophylactic anticoagulation practices in the absence of trustworthy COVID-19 specific guidance.6-9 Trustworthy recommendations are based on the best available research evidence, and are formulated following a systematic and transparent process using best practices in guideline development, such as the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) approach.10 Recent ASH clinical practice guidelines addressed 10 different topics regarding VTE management, using both advanced and innovative methods to ensure trustworthiness, transparency, user-friendliness, and rigor.11 Although developed prior to the COVID-19 pandemic, these guidelines may inform current practice in COVID-19 patients. However, there is a need for COVID-19 specific recommendations considering the potential different pathophysiology, different or additional risk factors for VTE, and higher risk for adverse effects of anticoagulation in COVID-19 patients compared to the general population.7 In addition, given the observed propensity for VTE in COVID-19 patients, practitioners are raising new questions (i.e., not addressed in the ASH VTE guidelines) relating to choices of anticoagulant type and intensity.6,8,9

To ensure the trustworthiness of the ASH COVID-19 guidelines, it will be crucial to have reliable estimates for the effect of anticoagulation strategies on patient-important outcomes, e.g., mortality, VTE, major bleeding, and potentially others. In addition, it is important to know if this effect varies among important subgroups of COVID-19 patients. Similarly, it would be helpful to explore whether the anticoagulation effects in COVID-19 patients are different from those in other critically and acutely ill patients.

This protocol describes an initial and living systematic review addressing the desirable and undesirable health effects of anticoagulation in adult patients with COVID-19 who are critically or acutely ill.

RESEARCH QUESTIONS

1. What are the desirable and undesirable effects of prophylactic-intensity vs. intermediate-intensity vs. therapeutic-intensity anticoagulation in adults with COVID-19 who are critically ill?
2. What are the desirable and undesirable effects of prophylactic-intensity vs. intermediate-intensity vs. therapeutic-intensity anticoagulation in adults with COVID-19 who are acutely ill?

METHODS
This protocol was developed based on previous work for the ASH guidelines on the management of VTE, and with input of clinical experts and patient representatives as part of the ASH anticoagulation in COVID-19 guideline panel. The review will address the two research questions and will be performed in two phases. We will indicate it when methods apply to only one research question, and which methods are relevant for each phase:

1. **Phase I – Initial review:** initially we will develop the ‘base’ (or ‘baseline’) review. This process will be achieved by following the usual systematic review process with a large team at high speed, to inform GRADE Evidence Profile and Summary of Findings tables for the guideline questions of interest. The methods for the review are written to allow modifying some aspects of the process according to the nature and volume of the evidence, notably for language of the full text report, study design, literature sources searched, and electronic availability of full text reports.

2. **Phase II – Living review:** following phase I, a living systematic review process will ensue to update the initial reviews on a continual basis. During the living review process, steps that were performed at high speed will now be completed with more time. Any potential restrictions made in Phase I will be considered for inclusion in Phase II.

**Eligibility**

We will include studies meeting the eligibility criteria as outlined in Table 1.

**Table 1. Eligibility criteria.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Inclusion</th>
<th>Exclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **COVID-19 & absence of VTE** | • Adults (18 years of age or over) with suspected or confirmed COVID-19 (WHO definition\textsuperscript{12}), with or without comorbidities  
• Patients should not have confirmed or suspected VTE at enrolment | Other coronavirus conditions, such as SARS and MERS. 
Certainty that the outcomes occurred before detection of suspected or confirmed COVID-19. |
| **COVID-19 disease severity** | At study baseline, these patients can be:  
• Acutely ill requiring hospitalization  
• Critically ill requiring advanced clinical support |  
Disease severity will not be linked to specific settings (ICU, general ward, community) given patients with specific level of disease severity may not be treated in the usual setting due to overcrowding conditions. Our definition of critical illness will be based on the need for respiratory or cardiovascular failure that without therapy would probably lead to death. |
| **Timing of COVID-19 diagnosis or positive SARS-CoV-2 test** | Patients may have had VTE as the primary diagnosis on presentation to a clinic. If COVID-19 diagnosis or positive SARS- |
CoV-2 test were found on the same day, or symptomatic history suggested that COVID-19 was present before the VTE, patients will be included.

**Exposure (anticoagulation)**

Studies comparing:
1. at least two of: 1) prophylactic-intensity anticoagulation; 2) intermediate-intensity anticoagulation; 3) therapeutic-intensity anticoagulation, or
2. any anticoagulation regimen with no anticoagulation/placebo. This includes studies whereby the event rates are not separately reported for different AC intensities, but the event rates for any AC and no AC/placebo are separately reported. ‘Any AC’ can also include a clinic’s specific anticoagulation strategy/protocol.

**Types of anticoagulant to be included & intensity categorization**
- See appendix

**Outcomes**

The outcomes of interest will be prioritized as critical for anticoagulation decision-making using a standard GRADE process for selecting and ranking outcomes, based on a previous ASH guideline on VTE management and supplemented based on core outcome sets for COVID-19 research and expertise of the current panel members.

Incidence of one or more of the following critical outcomes (NOTE: list of outcomes to be finalized):
- All-cause mortality
- Pulmonary thromboembolism
- Deep vein thrombosis (any site)
- Major bleeding (including gastrointestinal bleeding)
- Hemorrhagic stroke/intracranial hemorrhage
- Heparin-induced thrombocytopenia
- Multiple organ failure
- Hospitalization
- ICU admission
- Limb amputation
- Invasive ventilation
- Non-invasive ventilation
- Dialysis
- Ischemic stroke
- ST-elevation myocardial infarction
- Non-ST-elevation myocardial infarction
- Peripheral arterial disease

Reporting of outcomes may vary and include global (e.g., unspecified VTE/extremity), unspecified severity, ‘symptomatic’ versus ‘asymptomatic’, or a composite of various outcomes. Where applicable, assumptions may be considered.

Studies assessing the effect of antiplatelet therapy

Patient outcomes that were not rated as being ‘critical’ for anticoagulation decision-making
As to whether, or to what extent, reporting variations (such as global, unspecified, or composite events) are abstracted during data collection will depend on the volume of more adequately reported outcomes.

Standardized outcome definitions and marker states will be not be used during data collection, but outcomes will be collected as reported by authors whereby the definition and assessment will be recorded. We will then assess the indirectness compared to established health outcome descriptors.

No minimum length of follow-up for inclusion will be applied.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Setting</th>
<th>Any setting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| **Study design** | • Randomized controlled trials, reporting the outcomes of interest in relevant patient groups  
• Observational comparative studies, reporting outcomes of interest in relevant patient groups. This can include prospective cohort, retrospective cohort, and case-control studies |
| RCTs will be given priority, but given the short timeframe since onset of the pandemic, we do not expect to find many relevant high-quality RCTs and we will also include observational comparative studies. Systematic reviews on the effect of anticoagulation in the populations of interest will be checked for relevant individual studies. |
| Studies not comparing at least two of the anticoagulation intensity groups. |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th><strong>Publication types</strong></th>
<th>Peer reviewed published studies will be included.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Abstracts without full text reports; Commentaries; Letters; Reply to author; narrative reviews</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| **Language** | Any language. If language restrictions are applied for feasibility of conducting the Phase I initial review, those reports will be included during the Phase II living update. We anticipate having adequate resource support for language translation for the duration of the living review. |

| **Publication or Report Date** | As of December 2019 onwards, to coincide with the first identification of COVID-19 |

**Search Sources and Strategy**

We will search the following general bibliographic databases: MEDLINE (Ovid), EMBASE (Ovid), SCOPUS.

In addition, we will search databases dedicated to COVID-19: Cochrane COVID-19 study register, CYTEL map of ongoing clinical trials, Epistemonikos COVID-19 (LOVE platform), and the WHO Global [COVID-19] Research Database.
Table 2. Databases & considerations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phase I</th>
<th>Phase II</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Databases</strong></td>
<td>MEDLINE, EMBASE, Epistemonikos, SCOPUS</td>
<td>MEDLINE, EMBASE, and the Cochrane COVID-19 study register, will be searched on an ongoing basis, with results collated monthly.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cochrane COVID-19 study register, CYTEL map of ongoing clinical trials, WHO Global Covid-19 research database</td>
<td>If the number of monthly results are sufficiently large (e.g. &gt; 5000 citations), the strategy may be revised to be more specific and/or machine learning algorithms used to prioritize results.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Considerations</strong></td>
<td>OVID Methodology filters will be applied to MEDLINE and EMBASE searches.</td>
<td>Additional databases will be searched periodically, as feasible.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Results will be limited, where possible, to database records entered ≥ December 2019</td>
<td>Preprints (available through bioRxiv, chemRxiv, medRxiv, or JIMIR preprints) may be sought and incorporated but will not be searched a priori.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For the Phase I review, we will scan their references for individual studies. Systematic reviews will be defined according to the definition outlined in the WHO Handbook for Guideline Development (2012). Eligible reviews will have “a specific and clearly focused question (in PICO format); an explicit, reproducible method including pre-defined eligibility criteria; a comprehensive, exhaustive and systematic search for primary studies; a selection of studies using clear and reproducible eligibility criteria; critical appraisal of included studies for quality; and a systematic presentation and synthesis of the characteristics and findings of the included studies.” Those reviews will have searched in a minimum of two bibliographic databases.

For practical consideration for the review, only electronically-available reports will be included; any outstanding reports will be ordered via interlibrary loan for the Phase II living update.

The search strategies will be based on a combination of controlled vocabulary (e.g., MeSH) and free text terms (as applicable). Using sample relevant articles we will refine these search strategies. The search strategies will be developed initially in MEDLINE and peer-reviewed using PRESS prior to implementation and translation to other databases.

**Study selection**
Multifile downloads from bibliographic databases will be de-duplicated in EndNote prior to uploading to Covidence (https://www.covidence.org/). Each title-and-abstract record will be screened by two independent persons for potential relevance. In case of disagreement, references are included for full-text screening. All potentially relevant full text reports will be screened by two independent persons. Disagreements will be resolved by a senior team member. A pilot process using the first 100 title/abstract records and 10 full text articles on standardized screening forms will be used to calibrate the research team. Reports that are co-publications or multiple reports of the same study will be identified as such.

**Data extraction**

A focused data extraction form will be developed and piloted among the research team using a sample of five studies for calibration. The form will capture general study details (e.g., type of study, citation, setting), study risk of bias, patient population details (e.g., age, comorbidity profile, severity of COVID-19 disease, method of COVID-19 detection, type of anticoagulation and dose intensity), and per outcome: definition/assessment, duration of follow-up, measure of association, and subgroup effects. Extractions will be performed by one reviewer and verified by a second reviewer. Disagreements will be resolved by a senior team member.

**Risk of bias assessment**

Risk of bias for RCTs will be assessed using the Cochrane RoB 2.0 tool. Risk of bias for observational comparative studies will be assessed using ROBINS-I.

In the Phase I initial review, studies will be assessed by one person and uncertainties verified by a senior team member. In the Phase II living review, risk of bias will be assessed by two independent reviewers, and disagreements will be resolved by a senior team member. The pilot phase of the same five studies for the extraction pilot will calibrate the team also for risk of bias assessment.

Important potential confounders in observational studies: to assess whether prognostic factor analysis was adjusted for important confounders as known for non-COVID-19 patients, the factors identified by Darzi et al.\textsuperscript{15} will be used for the outcomes of VTE and Major bleeding:

- **For VTE-related outcomes:** Age, Previous VTE, Thrombophilia, Lower limb paralysis, Reduced mobility/immobilization, Current cancer, intensive/critical care unit (ICU/CCU) stay, Recent (≤1-month trauma and/or surgery), Obesity, Ongoing hormonal treatment, Acute infection and/or rheumatologic disorder, Acute MI and/or ischemic stroke, Heart and/or respiratory failure
- **For bleeding outcomes:** Gastro-duodenal ulcer, Bleeding prior 3 months, Admission platelets levels, Hepatic failure, ICU/CCU stay, central venous catheter, Rheumatic diseases, Current cancer, Sex, Age, glomerular filtration rate (GFR)

**Synthesis**
Results will be stratified based on population differences as specified in the guideline PICO questions, i.e. according to baseline COVID-19 disease severity, comorbidity or high risk factor (i.e. pregnancy), and thromboprophylaxis type or intensity. General study characteristics will be reported in tables using appropriate measures (e.g., frequency and proportion, means and standard deviations, medians and interquartile ranges) with accompanying descriptive text.

We will use GRADE to assess the certainty of evidence for comparisons. The overall certainty of the evidence will be assessed across all included studies for a specific outcome and will include judgments regarding risk of bias, indirectness, inconsistency, imprecision, and factors that may increase certainty (large effect, dose-response gradient, or plausible residual confounding).

Results will be reported using the following hierarchy:

**RCTs**

Event rates will be combined in meta-analysis to calculate a pooled effect estimate for research question #1 and #2.

**Non-randomized evidence - Adjusted measures of association**

Studies reporting adjusted measures of association for question 1# or #2 will only be pooled if deemed appropriate, i.e. if they were performed in comparable populations with comparable anticoagulation strategies, and adjusted for comparable confounders.

**Non-randomized evidence - Unadjusted measures of association**

Unadjusted measures of association will be combined in meta-analysis to calculate a pooled effect estimate for each research question.

If feasibility, poor reporting, or data distribution precludes pooling of studies in any of the three categories above, effect estimates will be reported narratively.

**Sensitivity analysis**

Sensitivity analyses will be considered based on the following factors. If not possible in the Phase I initial review, we will analyze this in the Phase II living review:

- Diagnosis of COVID-19: laboratory confirmed diagnosis vs. suspected diagnosis
- Risk of bias: studies with low risk of bias vs. moderate/high risk of bias
- Study design: RCT vs. prospective cohort vs. retrospective cohort vs. case-control
- Study size: studies with fewer than 5 outcome events vs. studies with 5 or more outcome events
- If relevant:
  - Direct comparison vs network meta-analysis effect
  - Event rates with using different clinic protocols (without having a comparison)

**Subgroup analysis**
Heterogeneity will be explored using subgroup analyses, which can include type or dose of thromboprophylaxis, severity of COVID-19, comorbidities, among others.
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