

CADTH RAPID RESPONSE REPORT: SUMMARY OF ABSTRACTS

International Normalized Point of Care Testing for Patients on Anticoagulant Therapies: Clinical Utility, Cost-Effectiveness and Guidelines

Service Line:	Rapid Response Service
Version:	1.0
Publication Date:	April 22, 2020
Report Length:	8 Pages

Authors: Shannon Hill, Suzanne McCormack

Cite As: *International Normalized Point of Care Testing for Patients on Anticoagulant Therapies: Clinical Utility, Cost-Effectiveness and Guidelines*. Ottawa: CADTH; 2020 Apr. (CADTH rapid response report: summary of abstracts).

Disclaimer: The information in this document is intended to help Canadian health care decision-makers, health care professionals, health systems leaders, and policy-makers make well-informed decisions and thereby improve the quality of health care services. While patients and others may access this document, the document is made available for informational purposes only and no representations or warranties are made with respect to its fitness for any particular purpose. The information in this document should not be used as a substitute for professional medical advice or as a substitute for the application of clinical judgment in respect of the care of a particular patient or other professional judgment in any decision-making process. The Canadian Agency for Drugs and Technologies in Health (CADTH) does not endorse any information, drugs, therapies, treatments, products, processes, or services.

While care has been taken to ensure that the information prepared by CADTH in this document is accurate, complete, and up-to-date as at the applicable date the material was first published by CADTH, CADTH does not make any guarantees to that effect. CADTH does not guarantee and is not responsible for the quality, currency, propriety, accuracy, or reasonableness of any statements, information, or conclusions contained in any third-party materials used in preparing this document. The views and opinions of third parties published in this document do not necessarily state or reflect those of CADTH.

CADTH is not responsible for any errors, omissions, injury, loss, or damage arising from or relating to the use (or misuse) of any information, statements, or conclusions contained in or implied by the contents of this document or any of the source materials.

This document may contain links to third-party websites. CADTH does not have control over the content of such sites. Use of third-party sites is governed by the third-party website owners' own terms and conditions set out for such sites. CADTH does not make any guarantee with respect to any information contained on such third-party sites and CADTH is not responsible for any injury, loss, or damage suffered as a result of using such third-party sites. CADTH has no responsibility for the collection, use, and disclosure of personal information by third-party sites.

Subject to the aforementioned limitations, the views expressed herein do not necessarily reflect the views of Health Canada, Canada's provincial or territorial governments, other CADTH funders, or any third-party supplier of information.

This document is prepared and intended for use in the context of the Canadian health care system. The use of this document outside of Canada is done so at the user's own risk.

This disclaimer and any questions or matters of any nature arising from or relating to the content or use (or misuse) of this document will be governed by and interpreted in accordance with the laws of the Province of Ontario and the laws of Canada applicable therein, and all proceedings shall be subject to the exclusive jurisdiction of the courts of the Province of Ontario, Canada.

The copyright and other intellectual property rights in this document are owned by CADTH and its licensors. These rights are protected by the Canadian *Copyright Act* and other national and international laws and agreements. Users are permitted to make copies of this document for non-commercial purposes only, provided it is not modified when reproduced and appropriate credit is given to CADTH and its licensors.

About CADTH: CADTH is an independent, not-for-profit organization responsible for providing Canada's health care decision-makers with objective evidence to help make informed decisions about the optimal use of drugs, medical devices, diagnostics, and procedures in our health care system.

Funding: CADTH receives funding from Canada's federal, provincial, and territorial governments, with the exception of Quebec.

Questions or requests for information about this report can be directed to requests@cadth.ca

Research Questions

1. What is the clinical utility of international normalized ratio point of care testing for patients on anticoagulation therapies?
2. What is the cost-effectiveness of international normalized ratio point of care testing for patients on anticoagulation therapies?

Key Findings

Nine non-randomized studies were identified regarding the clinical utility of international normalized ratio point of care testing for patients on anticoagulation therapies. No relevant economic evaluations were identified regarding the cost-effectiveness of international normalized ratio point of care testing for patients on anticoagulation therapies.

Methods

A limited literature search was conducted by an information specialist on key resources including Medline, Embase, the Cochrane Library, the University of York Centre for Reviews and Dissemination (CRD) databases, the websites of Canadian and major international health technology agencies, as well as a focused internet search. The search strategy was comprised of both controlled vocabulary, such as the National Library of Medicine's MeSH (Medical Subject Headings), and keywords. The main search concepts were International Normalized Ratio (INR) or Prothrombin time and point-of-care (PoC) testing. No search filters were applied to limit retrieval by study type. Where possible, retrieval was limited to the human population. The search was also limited to English language documents published between January 1, 2015 and April 6, 2020. Internet links were provided, where available.

Selection Criteria

One reviewer screened citations and selected studies based on the inclusion criteria presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Selection Criteria

Population	Patients on anticoagulant therapies
Intervention	International Normalized Ratio (INR) point of care (PoC) testing
Comparator	Central laboratory testing or no testing

Outcomes	Q1: Clinical utility (e.g., length of hospital stay, timely treatment, hospital admission, morbidity, mortality) Q2: Cost-effectiveness
Study Designs	Health technology assessments, systematic reviews, randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies, economic evaluations

Results

Rapid Response reports are organized so that the higher quality evidence is presented first. Therefore, health technology assessment reports and systematic reviews are presented first. These are followed by randomized controlled trials, non-randomized studies, and economic evaluations.

Nine non-randomized studies¹⁻⁹ were identified regarding the clinical utility of international normalized ratio (INR) point of care testing for patients on anticoagulation therapies. No relevant health technology assessments, systematic reviews, or randomized controlled trials were identified. In addition, no relevant economic evaluations were identified regarding the cost-effectiveness of INR point of care testing for patients on anticoagulation therapies.

Additional references of potential interest are provided in the appendix.

Overall Summary of Findings

Nine non-randomized studies¹⁻⁹ were identified regarding the clinical utility of international normalized ratio (INR) point of care (PoC) testing for patients on anticoagulation therapies. The authors of the first identified non-randomized study¹ evaluated the feasibility, reliability and usefulness of PoC testing for prothrombin time INR for stroke patients. The authors found that PoC testing reduced door-to-INR time compared to laboratory testing and concluded that PoC testing for prothrombin time INR was feasible for stroke patients.¹ The second non-randomized study² evaluated PoC testing compared to laboratory testing for prothrombin INR test results to determine INR measurement agreement relative to dosing decision. The authors found that measuring INR through PoC testing and laboratory testing lead to different dosing decisions and concluded that PoC INR testing may require laboratory INR confirmation to provide a decision on dosing.² The third non-randomized study³ assessed the use of PoC testing compared to laboratory testing for INR measurements inpatients presenting with symptoms of stroke at the emergency department. The authors found that PoC testing produced faster results for INR measurements than laboratory testing and concluded that PoC testing is a safe and rapid method to determine patients INR values in acute care situations.³ The authors of the fourth identified non-randomized study examined patient INR values measured by PoC testing versus laboratory testing and found that laboratory verification of PoC testing prevented adverse treatment events for patients undergoing warfarin therapy compared to PoC testing.⁴ The fifth non-randomized study⁵ evaluated the clinical decision making variability of two PoC testing devices compared to laboratory testing methods for INR measurements for patients undergoing warfarin therapy. The authors of this study concluded that PoC INR measurements with a correction factor reduced variability in dosing decisions.⁵ The authors of the sixth non-randomized study aimed to evaluate the clinical utility of PoC testing for INR values for patients undergoing warfarin therapy and patients with mechanical health

valve replacement compared to laboratory testing INR values, however, patient outcomes were not specified in the identified abstract.⁶ The seventh non-randomized study⁷ evaluated the safety, efficacy and quality of anticoagulant control using PoC INR monitoring compared to laboratory INR monitoring. The authors found that PoC monitoring was associated with lower time in therapeutic range (TTR) and is a safe alternative to laboratory INR monitoring.⁷ The authors of the eighth non-randomized study⁸ evaluated whether the use of PoC testing produced more rapid INR results compared to laboratory testing in trauma patients and found that PoC INR testing produced more rapid results than laboratory INR testing.⁸ Finally, the last identified non-randomized study⁹ evaluated the outcomes of monitoring anticoagulation patients using i-STAT PoC machines and found that the use of the i-STAT PoC machines improved safety and cost for anticoagulation patients.⁹

References Summarized

Health Technology Assessments

No literature identified.

Systematic Reviews and Meta-analyses

No literature identified.

Randomized Controlled Trials

No literature identified.

Non-Randomized Studies

1. Han JH, Jang S, Choi MO, et al. Point-of-care coagulation testing for reducing in-hospital delay in thrombolysis. *Hong Kong Journal of Emergency Medicine*. 2019 01 Jul;26(4):218-224.
2. Moiz B, Rashid A, Hasan M, Jafri L, Raheem A. Prospective Comparison of Point-of-Care Device and Standard Analyzer for Monitoring of International Normalized Ratio in Outpatient Oral Anticoagulant Clinic. *Clin Appl Thromb Hemost*. 2018 Oct;24(7):1153-1158.
[PubMed: PM29374969](#)
3. Zenlander R, von Euler M, Antovic J, Berglund A. Point-of-care versus central laboratory testing of INR in acute stroke. *Acta Neurol Scand*. 2018 Feb;137(2):252-255.
[PubMed: PM29068041](#)
4. Baker WS, Albright KJ, Berman M, et al. POCT PT INR - Is it adequate for patient care? A comparison of the Roche CoaguChek XS vs. Stago Star vs. Siemens BCS in patients routinely seen in an anticoagulation clinic. *Clin Chim Acta*. 2017 Sep;472:139-145.
[PubMed: PM28774502](#)

5. Vazquez SR, Fleming RP, Johnson SA. Comparison of two point-of-care international normalized ratio devices and laboratory method. *Blood Coagul Fibrinolysis*. 2017 Oct;28(7):534-539.
[PubMed: PM28379875](#):
6. Benade EL, Jacobson BF, Louw S, Schapkaitz E. Validation of the CoaguChek XS international normalised ratio point-of-care analyser in patients at Charlotte Maxeke Johannesburg Academic Hospital, South Africa. *Samj, S*. 2016 Feb 03;106(3):280-283.
[PubMed: PM26915943](#)
7. Biedermann JS, van Rein N, van den Besselaar AM, et al. Impact of point-of-care international normalized ratio monitoring on quality of treatment with vitamin K antagonists in non-self-monitoring patients: a cohort study. *J Thromb Haemost*. 2016 Apr;14(4):695-703.
[PubMed: PM26806724](#)
8. Weyrauch E, Walliser G, Hartwell J. Point-of-care international normalized ratio testing is rapid and reliable: A prospective observational cohort study. *International Journal of Academic Medicine*; 2016;2(1):27-31.
9. Challen L, Agbahiwe S, Cantieri T, et al. Impact of Point-of-Care Implementation in Pharmacist-Run Anticoagulation Clinics Within a Community-Owned Health System: A Two-Year Retrospective Analysis. *Hosp Pharm*. 2015 Oct;50(9):783-788.
[PubMed: PM26912919](#)

Economic Evaluations

No literature identified.

Appendix — Further Information

Previous CADTH Report

10. Point-of-Care testing. (*CADTH Evidence bundles*); Ottawa (ON): CADTH; 2019: <https://www.cadth.ca/evidence-bundles/point-care-testing>
Accessed 2020 Apr 20.
11. Frequency of Prothrombin Time and International Normalized Ratio Testing: Guidelines. (*CADTH Rapid Response Report*). Ottawa (ON): CADTH; 2018: <https://www.cadth.ca/frequency-prothrombin-time-and-international-normalized-ratio-testing-guidelines>
Accessed 2020 Apr 20.
12. Point-of-Care Testing: Summary of Evidence. (*CADTH Tools*). Ottawa (ON): CADTH; 2017: <https://www.cadth.ca/tools/point-care-testing-summary-evidence>
Accessed 2020 Apr 20.
13. Point-of-Care INR Testing Compared with Lab INR Testing: What Does the Evidence Say? (*CADTH Optimum Use Report*). Ottawa (ON): CADTH; 2015. <https://www.cadth.ca/tools/point-care-inr-testing-compared-lab-inr-testing-what-does-evidence-say>
Accessed 2020 Apr 20.

Systematic Reviews

Outcomes Not Specified

14. Buss VH, Deeks LS, Shield A, Kosari S, Naunton M. Analytical quality and effectiveness of point-of-care testing in community pharmacies: A systematic literature review. *Res Social Adm Pharm.* 2019 05;15(5):483-495.
[PubMed: PM30057328](#)

Non-Randomized Studies

Alternative Outcome

15. Guisado-Alonso D, Fayos-Vidal F, Marti-Fabregas J, et al. Reliability of point-of-care coagulometer measurements in patients with acute ischaemic stroke receiving intravenous fibrinolysis. *Neurologia.* 2017 Sep 25;25:25.
[PubMed: PM28958393](#)
16. Dillinger JG, Si Moussi T, Berge N, Bal Dit Sollier C, Henry P, Drouet L. Accuracy of point of care coagulometers compared to reference laboratory measurements in patients on oral anticoagulation therapy. *Thromb Res.* 2016 Apr;140:66-72.
[PubMed: PM26901852](#)
17. Niederdockl J, Dempfle CE, Schonherr HR, et al. Point-of-care PT and aPTT in patients with suspected deficiencies of coagulation factors. *Int J Lab Hematol.* 2016 Aug;38(4):426-434.
[PubMed: PM27384253](#)

18. Sen I, Stephen E, Agarwal S, Rebekah G, Nair SC. Analytical performance of a point-of-care device in monitoring patients on oral anticoagulation with vitamin K antagonists. *Phlebology*. 2016 Oct;31(9):660-667.
[PubMed: PM26415605](#)

19. Al-Meman A. I-stat, CoaguChek XS plus, And hemochron versus reference laboratory INRs: Pharmacist-managed clinics. *International Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Sciences*. 2015;7(1):284-288.

Alternative Population

20. Singer AJ, Taylor M, LeBlanc D, et al. Early Point-of-Care Testing at Triage Reduces Care Time in Stable Adult Emergency Department Patients. *J Emerg Med*. 2018 08;55(2):172-178.
[PubMed: PM29887410](#)

Review Articles

21. Barcellona D, Fenu L, Marongiu F. Point-of-care testing INR: an overview. *Clin Chem Lab Med*. 2017 May 01;55(6):800-805.
[PubMed: PM27754958](#)

22. Moffat KA, Lewis CW. Laboratory Monitoring of Oral Vitamin K Anticoagulation. *Semin Thromb Hemost*. 2017 Apr;43(3):245-252.
[PubMed: PM27677177](#)

23. Bolliger D, Zenklusen U, Tanaka KA. Point-of-care coagulation management algorithms during ECMO support: are we there yet? *Minerva Anesthesiol*. 2016 09;82(9):1000-1009.
[PubMed: PM27028451](#)