ORIGINAL ARTICLE



Pattern of Venous Thrombosis in Cancer Patients: Frequency and Survival Effect; Single Center Experience

Amrallah A. Mohammed · Abdullah S. Al-Zahrani · Mian U. Farooq · Hafez M. Ghanem · Lobna A. Abdelaziz · Hani M. EL-Khatib

Received: 5 March 2014/Accepted: 30 December 2014/Published online: 23 January 2015 © Indian Society of Haematology & Transfusion Medicine 2015

Abstract Venous thromboembolism (VTE) represents one of the most important causes of morbidity and mortality in cancer patients. This investigation was undertaken to investigate the natural history of VTE in the oncology center in a tertiary care hospital. We did a retrospective study on cancer patients who presented to King Abdullah Medical city in Holly capital; a tertiary care hospital; from May 2011 to June 2013. Follow up period was calculated from time of VTE diagnosis till the last clinical visit or till patient death. Among 1,678 cancer patients, 132 (7.87 %) were diagnosed with VTE. The median patient age was 53.5 years, with female to male ratio 1.3/1. Thirty one patients (23.5 %) were diagnosed with VTE and cancer simultaneously, seventy four patients (56.1 %) were on chemotherapy and twenty eight patients (21.2 %) were on best supportive care.VTE were symptomatic in 110 patients (83.3 %) and asymptomatic in 22 patients (16.7 %). Lower limbs were the commonest site (42.4 %) with the highest incidence in patients with

A. A. Mohammed (⊠) · A. S. Al-Zahrani · H. M. Ghanem · H. M. EL-Khatib Oncology Center, King Abdullah Medical City, Muzdallifa Street, P.O. Box 57657, Holy Capital 21995, Saudi Arabia e-mail: amrallaabdelmoneem@yahoo.com

A. A. Mohammed

Medical Oncology Department, Faculty of Medicine, Zagazig University, Zagazig, Egypt

M. U. Farooq Strategic Planning Department, King Abdullah Medical City, Holy Capital, Saudi Arabia

L. A. Abdelaziz

Clinical Oncology Department, Faculty of Medicine, Zagazig University, Zagazig, Egypt advanced stages (93 %). Forty nine (37 %) patients were receiving LMWH as prophylaxis. Median survival in months for patients with VTE prophylaxis versus without prophylactic, and asymptomatic versus symptomatic were (12.6 vs 6.3; p 0.12 and 9.8 vs 12.4; p 0.885, respectively). There is underutilization of thromboprophylaxis in our region, which needs more effort to reduce VTE burden. Also we need large prospective studies to clarify the impact of VTE symptoms and presentation on patient's survival.

Keywords Venous thromboembolism · Cancer patient · Deep venous thrombosis

Introduction

Venous thromboembolism (VTE) is defined broadly to include deep venous thrombosis (DVT), pulmonary embolism (PE), superficial vein thrombosis (SVT) and thrombosis in the other vascular territories. The association between VTE and malignancy was first reported by Armand Trousseau in 1865 and is supported by the results of more studies [1, 2]. In a population-based study, cancer was associated with a 4.1-fold greater risk of thrombosis, whereas the use of chemotherapy increased the risk 6.5-fold [3]. Virchow's triad of stasis, thrombophilia, and endothelial injury plays a critical role in the pathophysiology of VTE in patients with cancer. However, a second triad comprising changes in tumor biology, coagulation activation, and inflammation further describes the pathogenesis of thrombosis in the patient with malignancy [4].

It is unclear from available studies whether the risk of VTE is increasing for all cancers or only for specific subgroups of cancer patients. We hypothesized that the rate of VTE was increasing primarily in patients on active chemotherapy and was not because of increased diagnostic testing. Cancer sites, such as the pancreas, stomach, brain, lung, and metastatic disease are associated with higher rates of VTE in multiple studies [5–7].

The incidence of VTE in cancer patients has been difficult to determine due to the heterogeneity of the patient population [8]. Thus, identifying clinical characteristics that predispose cancer patients to increased risk of VTE is important to achieve better outcomes. There is limited data about VTE in cancer in Saudi Arabia; we undertook this study to evaluate the frequency, clinical pattern and outcome.

The primary end point of the current retrospective study was to evaluate the prevalence of VTE in cancer patients and the correlation with the demographic features, secondary end point was to evaluate the overall survival; in King Abdullah Medical City; a Saudi tertiary care hospital.

Materials and Methods

In our retrospective study, we reviewed medical records of cancer patients in King Abdullah Medical City—Holy Capital. We targeted patients during the period from May 2011 to June 2013.

The eligibility criteria were; age ≥ 18 years, pathological diagnosis of cancer, and objectively proven VTE. History of a thromboembolic event was determined on the basis of information in the patients' records at the primary medical evaluation and follow-up clinic visits. The following data were collected; the demographic features including (sex, age, marital status and residence), disease stage, timing of VTE in relation to cancer diagnosis either before or simultaneous or after it. The diagnosis of thromboembolic event was based on the clinical back ground; the presentation and by imaging studies; Doppler ultrasound, computed tomography and angiography.

Follow up period was calculated from time of VTE diagnosis till the last clinical visit at the time of data collection or till the death of patients.

Statistical Analysis

Data collected were analyzed using SPSS computer soft ware. Continuous variables were summarized using mean, median, mode and standard deviation. Chi square test was used for categorical variables. Student's *t* test was used t-test for numerical data. Significance was defined as a p value of <0.05. Multivariate logistic regression analysis was used to determine predictor variables that are associated with outcome.

Results

Patient Characteristics

We reviewed the medical record of 1,678 cancer patients (solid and hematology tumors) treated in KAMC oncology center during the study period. Demographic characteristics are summarized in Table 1.

The median age at the time of diagnosis was 53.5 years (range, 15-84 years), with female to male ratio of patients 1.3/1.

The VTE was categorized as symptomatic in 110 patients (83.3 %), and asymptomatic (discovered accidently during routine radiological investigations and/or clinical judgment as documented in the files) in 22 patients (16.7 %).

There were 31 patients (23.5 %) with concurrently diagnosed VTE, 74 patients (56.1 %) during chemotherapy

Table 1 Patient characteristics

| Parameters | Number | (%) |
|--------------------------------|-------------|------|
| Age | | |
| Median | 53.5 | |
| Range | 15-84 | |
| Gender | | |
| Female | 74 | 56.1 |
| Male | 58 | 43.9 |
| Total | 132 | 100 |
| Relation between VTE and cance | r diagnosis | |
| Simultaneous | 31 | 23.5 |
| After diagnosis | 101 | 76.5 |
| Total of treatment | 132 | 100 |
| Туре | | |
| Chemotherapy | 74 | 56.1 |
| Best supportive care | 28 | 21.2 |
| Others | 30 | 22.7 |
| Presentation of VTE | | |
| Asymptomatic | 22 | 16.7 |
| Symptomatic | 110 | 83.3 |
| VTE prophylaxis | | |
| Yes | 49 | 37.1 |
| No | 83 | 62.9 |
| Type of treatment | | |
| LMWH | 107 | 81.1 |
| IVC Filter | 11 | 8.3 |
| Best supportive care * | 14 | 10.6 |
| Complications | | |
| Bleeding | 6 | 4.5 |
| Thrombocytopenia | 5 | 3.8 |

VTE Venous thromboembolism, LMWH low molecular weight heparin, IVC inferior vena cava

* No treatment modifying agents

and 28 patients (21.2 %) during the best supportive care period (No treatment modifying agents).

Off all VTE cases, only 37 % patients received prophylactic dose of low molecular weight heparin (LMWH), with 11 patients developed treatment related complications (six patients developed bleeding and five patients developed thrombocytopenia), where they managed by putting IVC filter.

Among the patients receiving chemotherapy, 4.41 % developed VTE which is greater than the rate observed in the rest of study group (3.5 %).

The basic features of asymptomatic VTE are summarized in Table 2.

Venous Thromboembolism

Among 1,678 cancer cases were treated during the study period, VTE was diagnosed in 7.87 %. The most common type of VTE was DVT in the lower limbs in 56 patients (42.4 %), followed by DVT in upper limbs in 32 patients (24.4 %), and PE in 16 patients (12.1 %). More details are shown in Table 3.

Table 2 Features of Asymptomatic VTE

| Age | |
|--------------------|-------|
| Median | 57.5 |
| Range | 17-83 |
| Sex; females/males | 10/12 |

Cancer type

NHL(8), Sarcoma(1), CUP(2), pancreas(1), lung(1),

cholangiocarcinoma (1), colon(1), germ cell(1), breast(1), HL(1), NPC(2), endometrium (1), melanoma (1).

Type of thrombosis

| 51 | |
|-------------------------------|----|
| DVT lower limb | 4 |
| DVT upper limb | 0 |
| IVC | 4 |
| SVC | 4 |
| PV | 3 |
| PE | 4 |
| Mesenteric | 2 |
| Internal jugular | 1 |
| Timing | |
| At the same time of diagnosis | 14 |
| With treatment | 8 |
| Outcome | |
| A life | 11 |
| Died | 11 |
| | |

CUP Carcinoma of unknown primary, HL Hodjkin's Lymphoma, NPC nasopharyngeal carcinoma, DVT deep vein thrombosis, IVC inferior vena cava, SVC superior vena cava, PV portal vein, PE pulmonary embolism Distribution of Underlying Malignancy Associated with VTE

The most common type of cancers associated with thrombosis were non-Hodgkin's lymphoma, colon, acute leukemia, genitourinary and breast cancer. Majority of the patients (93 %) with VTE diagnosis had advanced stage of cancer. The type and stage of cancer are given in Table 4.

Survival Analysis

Log rank (Mantel-Cox) survival analysis was summarized in Table 5.

Figure 1, shows the survival curve for patients with symptomatic and asymptomatic.

Table 3 Type of thrombosis

| VTE sites | Numbers (%) | |
|------------------------|-------------|--|
| Total numbers with DVT | 132 (7.87) | |
| DVT in lower limb | 56 (42.4) | |
| DVT in upper limb | 32 (24.4) | |
| PE | 16 (12.1) | |
| PE and DVT | 5 (3.8) | |
| Abdominal | | |
| SVC | 7 (5.3) | |
| IVC | 5 (3.8) | |
| PV | 3 (2.3) | |
| Mesenteric | 2 (1.5) | |
| Internal jugular | 6 (4.5) | |

DVT Deep vein thrombosis, IVC inferior vena cava, SVC superior vena cava, PV portal vein, PE pulmonary embolism

Table 4 Distribution of underlying malignancy associated with VTE

| Type of cancer | Number | Early stage | Advanced stage | |
|-----------------|--------|-------------|----------------|--|
| NHL | 24 | 6 | 18 | |
| Colon | 17 | 1 | 16 | |
| Acute leukemia | 13 | 0 | 13 | |
| Genitor-urinary | 16 | 0 | 16 | |
| Breast | 15 | 1 | 14 | |
| Lung | 11 | 0 | 11 | |
| Gastric | 7 | 0 | 7 | |
| HL | 5 | 1 | 4 | |
| Other GIT | 5 | 0 | 5 | |
| OS | 4 | 0 | 4 | |
| Others | 15 | 0 | 15 | |
| Total | 132 | 9 (7 %) | 123 (93 %) | |

OS Osteosarcoma, NHL non Hodjkin's lymphoma, GIT gastrointestinal tract

Table 5 Survival groups

| | Number | (%) | Estimated median survival | P value** |
|---------------------|--------|------|---------------------------|-----------|
| Prophylaxis status | | | | |
| Yes | 49 | 40.8 | 12.6 | 0.12 |
| No | 83 | 56.6 | 6.3 | |
| Presentation of VTE | | | | |
| Asymptomatic | 22 | 16.7 | 9.8 | 0.88 |
| Symptomatic | 110 | 83.3 | 12.4 | |
| | | | | |





VTE (median survival 12.4 months vs 9.8 months, respectively; p = 0.88 with no significant difference). Also there is no difference in overall survival between patients with VTE prophylaxis versus no prophylaxis group (median survival 12.6 months vs 6.3 months, respectively; p = 0.12) as shown in Fig. 2.

Discussion

VTE represents one of the most important causes of morbidity and mortality in cancer patients. It has important implications on cancer patients; these include significantly worse survival, compromised quality of life, and increased the risk of bleeding complication following the use of anticoagulants, risk of recurrent VTE and additional burden on the resources [9].

To our knowledge, No population-based study has determined the incidence of VTE among patients diagnosed

with specific types and stages of cancer. Reported rates of VTE in cancer patients range from as low as 1.6 % to as high as 20 % [10–13]. In addition to this real difference, variations in these estimates may also depend on the study design, case definition, and age distribution. The rate of VTE in our study was not very high (7.9 %). However, we believe that the actual rate is much higher than our results. This may be due to the retrospective nature of the study in addition to death of some patients from cancer before diagnosis of VTE. Third, autopsies for diagnostic purposes are usually not carried out routinely in Saudi Arabia because of religious and cultural beliefs, so it is reasonable to believe that the actual rate of VTE in Saudi cancer patients is probably much higher than found in our study.

In our study, VTE was diagnosed in 31 patients (23.5 %) simultaneously with cancer diagnosis and incidentally during routine investigation which are frequently reported in other studies; in a retrospective cohort analysis by Moore et al., 44 % of all VTE events were incidental

Fig. 2 Log rank (Mantel-Cox) survival analysis showed no difference in overall survival was found between patients who have been given prophylaxis versus no prophylaxis group (p = 0.12)



diagnosed and in another cohort study by Singh et al., 50 % of DVTs and 35 % of PEs were incidentally discovered [14–19].

An important finding from our study is the presence of a considerable number of patients with asymptomatic thrombosis; 22 patients (16.7 %), and the majority of these patients had thrombosis in abdominal vessels; 13 patients (9.8 %) and four patients were found to have PE.

The high percentage of asymptomatic VTE raises the question of screening. There is much uncertainty about of which, if any, subgroups should be screened, and whether this would have an important impact on clinical outcome so, the routine screening for VTE in cancer patients till now is generally not recommended. In our center, we generally start by therapeutic dose anticoagulation for all cancer patients with asymptomatic VTE.

Another important finding from our study is the under utilization of thrombosis prophylaxis in cancer patients; only 49 patients (37.9 %) received medical prophylaxis. Several studies from around the world have consistently shown a lack of prophylaxis in hospitalized medical patients, including cancer patients [20, 21]. This is a particular problem in the developing countries but also a common observation even in the developed countries [22, 23]. There are several reasons that might explain why prophylaxis is not a widespread practice, include; failure to appreciate the risk of VTE in medical and cancer patients, complexity of existing risk assessment models, poor implementation and compliance with the guidelines, and cost issues. Although VTE commonly occurs in patients with cancer, most oncologists underestimate both the prevalence of VTE and its negative impaction. With this background in mind, The American Society of Clinical Oncology (ASCO) first published an evidence-based clinical practice guideline on prophylaxis and treatment of VTE in 2007 [24], and updated at intervals determined by an Update Committee in 2013 [25].

Given the underutilization of VTE prophylaxis in cancer patients, an integrated risk stratification checklist along with a pre-printed order sheet for VTE prophylaxis is a useful way of promoting its use, and should be part of the routine assessment of all cancer patients.

The impact of symptomatic VTE on survival is described in literatures [26, 27]. Sorensen et al. found that the 1-year survival rate for cancer patients with thrombosis was 12 % compared with 36 % in control patients (p < 0.001) [28]. This high mortality was thought to reflect deaths due to both thromboembolism and a more aggressive course of malignancies associated with VTE. In our study; 1-year survival rate for cancer patients with thrombosis was 18.9 %. Survival analysis showed no difference in overall survival between patients with VTE prophylaxis versus no prophylaxis group (12.6 months vs 6.3 months, respectively) (p = 0.12), which did not match with literatures. This can be explained by the difference in sample sizes, type or stage of cancer in addition to the retrospective nature of the study.

Also there was no difference in overall survival between symptomatic and asymptomatic patients (12.4 months,

9.8 months respectively; p = 0.885). To our knowledge, no long-term survival studies of patients with an asymptomatic VTE have been reported in the literature. Engelke et al. in a retrospective study found that those with an incidentally diagnosed VTE, despite failure to treat, had a benign prognosis [29]. This retrospective trial was also limited by small patient numbers, and the investigators recommended further assessment.

Limitations

The potential limitations of this study included the fact that information about some patients was incomplete in view of the retrospective nature of the study might have introduced some bias in our findings. Specifically, there was not enough information about chemotherapy type, radiotherapy, hormone therapy or targeted therapy.

Small sample size is also one of the most limiting factor, owing to the given sample size, one further limitation of the study is the low number of events when separating according to sites (abdominal, superficial, distal, proximal) or presentation (symptomatic, asymptomatic) DVT for outcome analysis. Therefore, larger prospective studies are needed to validate our findings and which are powered to detect differences in short-term survival between the above-mentioned subgroups of venous thrombosis. Furthermore, we did not measure recently published bloodbased biomarkers, such as tissue factor which may be helpful in management of asymptomatic DVT.

Conclusion

Although the incidence of VTE in our region is not very high; it may be underestimated due to multiple factors, added to underutilization of thromboprophylaxis. Regardless of the cause, VTE in cancer patients is of considerable consequence, given its strong association with poor survival. Much work needs to be done to reduce the burden of VTE among cancer patients.

Ethical Consideration Ethical approval to conduct the study was taken from the IRB review committee before the commencement of the study.

Conflict of Interest The authors certify that is no potential or actual conflict of interest related to this research.

References

 Trousseau A (1865) Phlegmasia Alba dolens. In: Clinique Medicale d'Hotel-Dieu de Paris, vol 3 JB Balliere et Fils, Paris, p 654–812

- Heit JA, O'Fallon WM, Petterson TM (2002) Relative impact of risk factors for deep veins and pulmonary embolism: a population-based study. Arch Intern Med 162:1245–1248
- Silverstein MD, Heit JA, Mohr DN, Petterson TM, O'Fallon WM, Melton LJ 3rd (1998) Trends in the incidence of deep vein thrombosis and pulmonary embolism: a 25-year populationbased study. Arch Intern Med 158:585–593
- Bick RL (2006) Cancer associated thrombosis: focus on extended therapy with delteparin. J Support Oncol 4:115–120
- Khorana AA, Francis CW, Culakova E, Lyman GH (2005) Risk factors for chemotherapy-associated venous thromboembolism in a prospective observational study. Cancer 104:2822–2829
- Di Nisio M, Ferrante N, De Tursi M, Iacobelli S, Cuccurullo F, Buller HR, Feragalli B, Porreca E (2010) Incidental venous thromboembolism in ambulatory cancer patients receiving chemotherapy. Thromb Haemost 104(5):1049–1054
- Stein PD, Beemath A, Meyers FA, Skaf E, Sanchez J, Olson RE (2006) Incidence of venous thromboembolism in patients hospitalized with cancer. Am J Med 119:60–68
- Khorana AA, Francis CW, Culakova E, Fisher RI, Kuderer NM, Lyman GH (2006) Thromboembolism in hospitalized neutropenic cancer patients. J Clin Oncol 24:484–490
- Chew HK, Davies AM, Wun T, Harvey D, Zhou H, White RH (2008) The incidence of venous thromboembolism among patients with primary lung cancer. J Thromb Haemost 6:601–608
- Khorana AA, Streiff MB, Farge D (2009) Venous thromboembolism prophylaxis and treatment in cancer: a consensus statement of major guidelines panels and call to action. J Clin Oncol 27:4919–4926
- Kröger K, Weiland D, Ose C, Neumann N, Weiss S, Hirsch C, Urbanski K, Seeber S, Scheulen ME (2006) Risk factors for venous thromboembolic events in cancer patients. Ann Oncol 17:297–303
- Wun T, White RH (2009) Venous thromboembolism (VTE) in patients with cancer: epidemiology and risk factors. Cancer Invest 27:63–74
- Vemulapalli S, Chintala L, Tsimberidou AM, Dhillon N, Lei X, Hong D, Kurzrock R (2009) Clinical outcomes and factors predicting development of venous thromboembolic complications in patients with advanced refractory cancer in a Phase I Clinic: the M. D. Anderson Cancer Center experience. Am J Hematol 84:408–413
- Moore RA, Adel N, Riedel E, Bhutani M, Feldman DR, Tabbara NE, Soff G, Parameswaran R, Hassoun H (2011) High incidence of thromboembolic events in patients treated with cisplatin-based chemotherapy: a large retrospective analysis. J Clin Oncol 29:3466–3473
- Singh R, Sousou T, Mohile S, Khorana AA (2010) High rates of symptomatic and incidental thromboembolic events in gastrointestinal cancer patients. J Thromb Haemost 8:1879–1881
- Palla A, Rossi G, Falaschi F, Marconi L, Pistolesi M, Prandoni P (2012) Is incidentally detected pulmonary embolism in cancer patients less severe? A case-control study. Cancer Invest 30:131–134
- Shinagare AB, Guo M, Hatabu H, Krajewski KM, Andriole K, Van den Abbeele AD, DiPiro PJ, Nishino M (2011) Incidence of pulmonary embolism in oncologic outpatients at a tertiary cancer center. Cancer 117:3860–3866
- Den Exter PL, Hooijer J, Dekkers OM, Huisman MV (2011) Risk of recurrent venous thromboembolism and mortality in patients with cancer incidentally diagnosed with pulmonary embolism: a comparison with symptomatic patients. J Clin Oncol 29:2405–2409
- Menapace LA, Peterson DR, Berry A, Sousou T, Khorana AA (2011) Symptomatic and incidental thromboembolisms are both associated with mortality in pancreatic cancer. Thromb Haemost 106:371–378

- Rashid ST, Thursz MR, Razvi NA, Voller R, Orchard T, Rashid ST, Shlebak AA (2005) Venous thromboprophylaxis in UK medical inpatients. J R Soc Med 98:507–512
- Amin A, Stemkowski S, Lin J, Yang G (2008) Appropriate thromboprophylaxis in hospitalized cancer patients. Clin Adv Hematol Oncol 6:910–920
- 22. Abba AA, Al Ghonaim MA, Rufai AM (2004) Physicians' practice for prevention of venous thromboembolism in medical patients. J Coll Physicians Surg Pak 14:211–214
- 23. Sleiman Zade Asfahani WH, Taher AT, Al Rahawi D, Khalil I (2005) Venous thromboembolism in cancer patients referred to the American University of Beirut-Medical Center secondary to deep vein thrombosis; occurrence and risk factors. J Thromb Thrombolysis 20:179–182
- 24. Lyman GH, Khorana AA, Falanga A (2007) American Society of Clinical Oncology guideline: recommendations for venous thromboembolism prophylaxis and treatment in patients with cancer. J Clin Oncol 25:5490–5505
- 25. Gary HL, Alok AK, Nicole MK (2013) Venous Thromboembolism Prophylaxis and Treatment in Patients With Cancer:

American society of clinical oncology clinical practice guideline update. J Clin Oncol 49:1200–1218

- 26. Lee KW, Bang SM, Kim S, Lee HJ, Shin DY, Koh Y, Lee YG, Cha Y, Kim YJ, Kim JH, Park DJ, Kim HH, Oh D, Lee JS (2010) The incidence, risk factors and prognostic implications of venous thromboembolism in patients with gastric cancer. J Thromb Haemost 8(3):540–547
- 27. Sandhu R, Pan CX, Wun T, Harvey D, Zhou H, White RH, Chew HK (2010) The incidence of venous thromboembolism and its effect on survival among patients with primary bladder cancer. Cancer 116(11):2596–2603
- Sorensen HT, Mellemkjaer L, Olsen JH, Baron JA (2000) Prognosis of cancers associated with venous thromboembolism. N Engl J Med 343:1846–1850
- Engelke C, Rummeny EJ, Marten K (2006) Pulmonary embolism at multi-detector row CT of chest: one year survival of treated and untreated patients. Radiology 239:563–575