

# Report Documentation Page

*Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188*

Public reporting burden for the collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to a penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number.

1. REPORT DATE <b>01 JUL 2011</b>		2. REPORT TYPE <b>N/A</b>		3. DATES COVERED <b>-</b>	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE <b>Routine laboratory monitoring for low-molecular-weight heparin prophylaxis in burns? Not so fast!</b>				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) <b>Lundy J. B., Lairet K., Chung K. K., Renz E. M.,</b>				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) <b>United States Army Institute of Surgical Research, JBSA Fort Sam Houston, TX</b>				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT <b>Approved for public release, distribution unlimited</b>					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT					
15. SUBJECT TERMS					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT <b>UU</b>	18. NUMBER OF PAGES <b>1</b>	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT <b>unclassified</b>	b. ABSTRACT <b>unclassified</b>	c. THIS PAGE <b>unclassified</b>			

## Routine Laboratory Monitoring for Low-Molecular-Weight Heparin Prophylaxis in Burns? Not So Fast!

### To the Editor:

We read with interest the report by Lin et al<sup>1</sup> on the use of a protocol to follow-up anti-Xa levels and adjust prophylactic dose low-molecular-weight heparin (LMWH) dosing to maintain anti-Xa levels between 0.2 and 0.4 U/ml. We agree with the authors in their belief that current venous thromboembolic prophylaxis dosing in patients with severe burns may be inadequate. Several recent reports in the trauma critical care literature have identified similar discrepancies between dose and the desired level of anti-Xa activity.<sup>2,3</sup> However, we are not quite convinced that routine monitoring and titration of our LMWH dose to a specific target are necessarily the correct strategy. Our recent experience with attempting to apply this strategy has quickly reminded us that we must proceed with great caution.

A few months ago, we began checking serum anti-Xa levels 4 hours after subcutaneous administration of LMWH in adults with severe burns (greater than 20% TBSA). If serum anti-Xa levels return to a value less than 0.2 U/ml, each dose of LMWH is increased by 10 mg, and the serum anti-Xa level is rechecked the following day. Consistent with the findings by Lin et al, the standard dose of LMWH for prophylaxis did not seem to be adequate in a large number of patients based on a target anti-Xa level. However, of particular concern was one patient specifically whose anti-Xa level never approached 0.2 U/ml despite reaching a dose as high as 90 mg twice daily. This is the recommended therapeutic dose in an otherwise healthy individual weighing 90 kg for the treatment of a newly diagnosed venous thromboembolism! It seems that Lin et al experienced similar issues as 8 of 38 (21%) never reached their “goal” before discontinuation of therapy. In addition, we would like to point out that although other variables may be at play, both venous thromboembolic events (VTE) in the

reported study occurred in patients who achieved an appropriate anti-Xa level.

Right away, these issues bring up four vital questions in our minds. First, is a target of 0.2 to 0.4 U/ml the right target? Second, if this is true, at what point, do we stop increasing the dose when levels are not “adequate”? In other words, is there a safe ceiling for dose adjustment for the purposes of prophylaxis? Third, is the serum anti-Xa level the ideal test to monitor efficacy of LMWH dosing in patients with severe burns? Finally, is there currently enough evidence to support broad application of this dosing regimen for burn patients; are we confident that the clinical benefit outweighs the potential risk?

We agree that current methods of dosing of LMWH for VTE prophylaxis in severely burned and critically ill patients are possibly inadequate because of changes in bioavailability, volume of distribution, and hepatic and renal metabolism. However, the strategy of measuring efficacy of LMWH dosing using anti-Xa level may not be accurate in patients with severe burns. LMWH at “subtarget” level may still provide significant protection against clot formation. Increasing doses to try to reach a target number may only increase bleeding complications beyond clinically acceptable levels while providing very little or no extra benefit. Only a well-designed, large prospective randomized trial specifically in our population will help tease out the true clinical benefit of this technique over the status quo. Until then, we caution against the wide adoption of a LMWH prophylaxis strategy based on anti-Xa levels.

### REFERENCES

1. Lin H, Faraklas I, Cochran A, Saffle J. Enoxaparin and antifactor Xa levels in acute burn patients. *J Burn Care Rehab* 2011;32:1-5.
2. Malinoski D, Jafari F, Ewing T, et al. Standard prophylactic enoxaparin dosing leads to inadequate anti-Xa levels and increased deep venous thrombosis rates in critically ill trauma and surgical patients. *J Trauma* 2010;68:874-80.
3. Robinson S, Zinck A, Strøm T, Larsen TB, Rasmussen B, Toft P. Enoxaparin, effective dosage for intensive care patients: double-blinded, randomized clinical trial. *Crit Care* 2010;14:R41.

Address correspondence to Jonathan B. Lundy, MD, US Army  
Institute of Surgical Research, 3400 Rawley Chambers Avenue,  
Fort Sam Houston, Texas 78234.  
Copyright © 2011 by the American Burn Association.  
1559-047X/2011

DOI: 10.1097/BCR.0b013e3182223f52

Jonathan B. Lundy, MD  
Kimberly Laird, MD  
Kevin K. Chung, MD  
Evan M. Renz, MD  
U.S. Army Institute of Surgical Research  
Fort Sam Houston, Texas