



Sarah Green has completed this personal reflection on **02/12/2021**

Paper: Autumn 2021 CPD Questions

Personal Reflection:

Description of learning - The first article looked at COVID-19 and the arterial thromboembolic complications associated with this virus. The study concluded that patients with COVID-19 are at risk for acute arterial thromboembolic complications despite a lack of the normal conventional risk factors (such as sex, race, ethnicity, history of HTN/DM/PVD/COPD/DVT).

Analysis - Very interesting and insightful research paper, demonstrating this illness to have a link with causing an ACUTE arterial complication, however this study was a very small study and based over a very short time frame, therefore limiting the capture of patients.

Conclusion - Very interesting little piece of research, and very current with today's pandemic. This study demonstrates just a small part of what this virus can do - it will be interesting to read future research looking at the longer term impact of this virus.#

Description of learning - The second article looked at a review and meta-analysis of research looking at COVID-19 with the association of PE and DVT, and the diagnostic accuracy of D-Dimer test in COVID-19 positive patients. The study concluded that PE and DVT occurred in 16.5% and 14.8% of patients with COVID-19, and the D-Dimer test cut-off levels used in pre-existing guidelines are also applicable to patients with COVID-19.

Analysis - I was a little confused with this article as it just looked at the incidence of DVT and PE in COVID-19 patients, but did not compare this figure to anything i.e. incidence in patients who do not have COVID-19. I think by comparing the incidence of PE and DVT in another population, the researcher could have looked at and demonstrated another link of COVID-19 in causing a vascular related problem (although this research is already been conducted elsewhere). The study was also very selective, and eliminated a large number of studies from its analysis (it only used 27 studies out of 1075!!) - excluding 989 studies based on titles/abstracts?? maybe some of these studies would have been relevant had the authors read on further?? It was interesting, however, that the authors deemed that the same D-dimer levels were satisfactory to use on both COVID-19 patients and patients who don't have COVID-19.

CONCLUSION - Interesting meta-analysis, if not a little confusing on what the authors were trying to demonstrate. They quote how many patients with COVID-19 had a DVT/PE, but what is the significance of this number when the authors don't compare this to anything? It is reassuring that the authors deem the D-Dimer level still usable for patients with COVID-19.