## **Supplementary Material**

Brazilian Guidelines for the Pharmacological Treatment of Pulmonary Embolism. Official document of the Brazilian Society of Pulmonology and Phthisiology based on the GRADE methodology.

## Chart S1 - Tables with search strategies for PICO questions:

Question 1 - Should home anticoagulation be used compared to hospitalization in patients with low-risk PE?

#### Structured question

P: Acute low-risk PE and initiation of treatment with low molecular weight heparin or DOACS (Apixaban, Rivaroxaban, Edoxaban, Dabigatran)

I: Outpatient treatment

C: In-hospital treatment

O: Recurrence of PE or Hemodynamic Instability or Severe Bleeding or Clinically Relevant Bleeding or Mortality

#### Medline/EMBASE strategy

(Pulmonary Embolism OR Pulmonary Embolisms OR Pulmonary Thromboembolisms OR Pulmonary Thromboembolism) AND (Heparin, Low-Molecular-Weight OR LMWH OR Low Molecular Weight Heparin) OR (Dalteparin OR Enoxaparin OR Nadroparin OR Tinzaparin) OR (Apixaban OR Rivaroxaban OR Edoxaban OR Dabigatran) AND (home OR house OR residence OR domicile OR habitation OR Outpatient OR Ambulatory) AND (Random\*)

Question 2 - Should anticoagulation with DOACs\* be used compared to anticoagulation with LMWH in patients with PE and diagnosed with cancer?

#### **Structured question**

P: Cancer patient diagnosed with PE

I: DOACS (Apixaban, Rivaroxaban, Edoxaban, Dabigatran)

C: Low molecular weight heparin

O: Recurrence of PE or Hemodynamic Instability or Severe Bleeding or Clinically Relevant Bleeding or Mortality

## Medline/Embase straregy

(Pulmonary Embolism OR Pulmonary Embolisms OR Pulmonary Thromboembolisms OR Pulmonary Thromboembolism) AND (Tumor OR Neoplasm OR Tumors OR Neoplasia OR Neoplasias OR Cancer OR Cancers OR Malignancy OR Malignancies OR Neoplasms) AND (Heparin, Low-Molecular-Weight OR LMWH OR Low Molecular Weight Heparin) AND (Dalteparin OR Enoxaparin OR Nadroparin OR Tinzaparin OR Apixaban OR Rivaroxaban OR Edoxaban OR Dabigatran)

OR

(Pulmonary Embolism OR Pulmonary Embolisms OR Pulmonary Thromboembolisms OR Pulmonary Thromboembolism) AND (Tumor OR Neoplasm OR Tumors OR Neoplasia OR Neoplasias OR Cancer OR Cancers OR Malignancy OR Malignancies OR Neoplasms) AND (Heparin, Low-Molecular-Weight OR LMWH OR Low Molecular Weight Heparin) OR (Dalteparin OR Enoxaparin OR Nadroparin OR Tinzaparin OR Apixaban OR Rivaroxaban OR Edoxaban OR Dabigatran) AND Random\*

Question 3 - Should it be recommended to maintain extended anticoagulation versus comparator (ASA or placebo) in patients diagnosed with unprovoked PE, who have completed at least 3 months of anticoagulation?

### **Structured question**

P: Patient diagnosed with low-risk PE, low-intermediate risk, high-intermediate risk, after stabilization or high risk, after reperfusion and stabilization

I: DOACS (Apixaban, Rivaroxaban, Edoxaban, Dabigatran)

C: LMWH in combination with antivitamin K

O: VTE recurrence, Severe bleeding, Clinically relevant bleeding, Mortality

#### Estratégia Medline/Embase

(Pulmonary Embolism OR Pulmonary Embolisms OR Pulmonary Thromboembolisms OR Pulmonary Thromboembolism) AND ((Heparin, Low-Molecular-Weight OR LMWH OR Low Molecular Weight Heparin) AND vitamin K) AND (Dalteparin OR Enoxaparin OR Nadroparin OR Tinzaparin OR Apixaban OR Rivaroxaban OR Edoxaban OR Dabigatran) AND (low OR intermediate OR high OR reperfusion OR stabilization OR stabilized)

OR

(Pulmonary Embolism OR Pulmonary Embolisms OR Pulmonary Thromboembolisms OR Pulmonary Thromboembolism) AND ((Heparin, Low-Molecular-Weight OR LMWH OR Low Molecular Weight Heparin) AND vitamin K) AND (Dalteparin OR Enoxaparin OR Nadroparin OR Tinzaparin OR Apixaban OR Rivaroxaban OR Edoxaban OR Dabigatran) AND random\*

OR

(Pulmonary Embolism OR Pulmonary Embolisms OR Pulmonary Thromboembolisms OR Pulmonary Thromboembolism) AND (Heparin, Low-Molecular-Weight OR LMWH OR Low Molecular Weight Heparin) AND ((Heparin, Low-Molecular-Weight OR LMWH OR Low Molecular Weight Heparin) AND vitamin K) AND (recurrence OR bleeding OR mortality)

Question 4 - Treatment (3 to 6 months) with DOACs\* should be recommended compared to conventional anticoagulation (LMWH or UFH initially followed by warfarin), in patients diagnosed with low-risk PE, low-intermediate risk, high-intermediate risk, after stabilization or high risk, after reperfusion and stabilization?

#### Structured question

P: Patient diagnosed with low-risk PE, low-intermediate risk, high-intermediate risk, after stabilization or high risk, after reperfusion and stabilization

I: DOACS (Apixaban, Rivaroxaban, Edoxaban, Dabigatran)

C: LMWH in combination with antivitamin K

O: VTE recurrence, Severe bleeding, Clinically relevant bleeding, Mortality

#### Medline/Embase Strategy

(Pulmonary Embolism OR Pulmonary Embolisms OR Pulmonary Thromboembolisms OR Pulmonary Thromboembolism) AND ((Heparin, Low-Molecular-Weight OR LMWH OR Low Molecular Weight Heparin) AND vitamin K) AND (Dalteparin OR Enoxaparin OR Nadroparin OR Tinzaparin OR Apixaban OR Rivaroxaban OR Edoxaban OR Dabigatran) AND (low OR intermediate OR high OR reperfusion OR stabilization OR stabilized)

OR

(Pulmonary Embolism OR Pulmonary Embolisms OR Pulmonary Thromboembolisms OR Pulmonary Thromboembolism) AND ((Heparin, Low-Molecular-Weight OR LMWH OR Low Molecular Weight Heparin) AND vitamin K) AND (Dalteparin OR Enoxaparin OR Nadroparin OR Tinzaparin OR Apixaban OR Rivaroxaban OR Edoxaban OR Dabigatran) AND random\*

OR

(Pulmonary Embolism OR Pulmonary Embolisms OR Pulmonary Thromboembolisms OR Pulmonary Thromboembolism) AND (Heparin, Low-Molecular-Weight OR LMWH OR Low Molecular Weight Heparin) AND ((Heparin, Low-Molecular-Weight OR LMWH OR Low Molecular Weight Heparin) AND vitamin K) AND (recurrence OR bleeding OR mortality)

Question 5 - Should systemic thrombolysis be recommended compared to isolated anticoagulation (LMWH or UFH) in patients with intermediate-high risk PE?

#### Structured question

P: Patients diagnosed with high-intermediate risk PE or submassive PE

I: Systemic thrombolysis (streptokinase, rTpa, alteplase, urokinase, tenecteplase)

C: LMWH or UFH

O: VTE recurrence, Severe bleeding, Clinically relevant bleeding, Mortality, CTEPH

#### Medline/Embase Strategy

(Pulmonary Embolism OR Pulmonary embolisms OR Pulmonary Thromboembolisms OR Pulmonary Thromboembolisms

AND

(Heparin, Low-Molecular-Weight OR LMWH OR Low Molecular Weight Heparin OR Heparin OR unfractionated Heparin OR anticoagulation)

AND

(Tenecteplase OR r-tPA OR Alteplase OR Streptokinase OR Urokinase OR Thrombolysis OR Thrombolytic OR Reperfusion) AND random\*

AND

(recurrence OR hemodynamic decompensation OR hemodynamic collapse OR bleeding OR mortality OR chronic thromboembolic pulmonary hypertension OR CTEPH)

1.6-Question 6 - Should systemic thrombolysis be recommended compared to isolated anticoagulation (LMWH, UFH) in patients with high-risk PE?

#### Structured question

P: Patients diagnosed with high-risk PE or massive PE

I: Systemic thrombolysis (streptokinase, rTpa, alteplase, urokinase, tenecteplase)

C: LMWH or UFH

O: VTE recurrence, Severe bleeding, Clinically relevant bleeding, Mortality, CTEPH

#### Medline/Embase Strategy

(Pulmonary Embolism OR Pulmonary embolisms OR Pulmonary Thromboembolisms OR Pulmonary Thromboembolisms

AND

(Heparin, Low-Molecular-Weight OR LMWH OR Low Molecular Weight Heparin OR Heparin OR unfractionated Heparin OR anticoagulation)

AND

(Tenecteplase OR r-tPA OR Alteplase OR Streptokinase OR Urokinase OR Thrombolysis OR Thrombolytic OR Reperfusion) AND random\*

AND

(recurrence OR hemodynamic decompensation OR hemodynamic collapse OR bleeding OR mortality OR chronic thromboembolic pulmonary hypertension OR CTEPH)

## Figure S1 - Flowcharts of the selection of the recovered papers on the virtual bases of scientific information for the PICO questions

Question 1 - Should home anticoagulation be used compared to hospitalization in patients with low-risk PE?



Question 2 - Should anticoagulation with DOACs be used compared to anticoagulation with LMWH in patients with PE and diagnosed with cancer?



Question 3 - Should it be recommended to maintain extended anticoagulation versus comparator (ASA or placebo) in patients diagnosed with unprovoked PE, who have completed at least 3 months of anticoagulation?



Question 4 - Treatment (3 to 6 months) with DOACs\* should be recommended compared to conventional anticoagulation (LMWH or UFH initially followed by warfarin), in patients diagnosed with low-risk PE, low-intermediate risk, high-intermediate risk, after stabilization or high risk, after reperfusion and stabilization?



Question 5 - Should systemic thrombolysis be recommended compared to isolated anticoagulation (LMWH or UFH) in patients with intermediate-high risk PE?



Question 6 - Should systemic thrombolysis be recommended compared to isolated anticoagulation (LMWH, UFH) in patients with high-risk PE?



# Chart S2 - Tabelas com a descrição dos estudos incluídos na análise quantitativa das questões PICO.

Question 1 - Should home anticoagulation be used compared to hospitalization in patients with low-risk PE?

Study	Study design	Population	Intervention	Comparato r	Outcome	Time
Lancet 2011; 378: 41- 48.	Open, randomized, non-inferiority clinical trial. Multicenter, involving 19 emergency departments in 4 countries. Number of	Patients diagnosed with acute, symptomatic PE, with a low risk of death (conventional PESI - score I or II).	Discharged from hospital within 24 hours or less, after randomization, using LMWH, followed by VKA, for at least 90 days.	Usual hospitalizati on starting with LMWH, followed by VKA, for at least 90 days.	Primary outcome: confirmed symptomatic VTE recurrence. Secondary: major bleeding (14-90 days); mortality from any cause (within 90 days).	90 days (evaluati ons at 14,30,60 and 90 days). Study design
Am J Respir Crit Care Med 2016; 194: 998- 1006.	Open, randomized, non-inferiority clinical trial. Multicenter, involving 17 hospitals in the Netherlands. Number of patients: 558	Patients diagnosed with acute, symptomatic PE, with low risk of death and/or adverse events (negative Hestia score for all questions).	Patients who had NT- proBNP lower than 500pg/ml were discharged 24 hours after confirming the diagnosis of PE and patients with levels higher than this value were hospitalized	Usual hospitalizati on starting with LMWH, followed by VKA, for at least 90 days	Primary outcome: Adverse outcome defined by: PE-related death, bleeding-related mortality. Cardiopulmonary resuscitation, admission to intensive care, need for thrombolysis or surgical embolectomy. Secondary: symptomatic recurrence of VTE, major bleeding, death from any cause within 3 months.	90 days (evaluati ons at 4- 6 weeks and 90 days).

Academic	Open,	Patients	Discharged	Hospitalizati	Primary outcome:	90 days
Emergenc	randomized	diagnosed	from hospital	on and	duration in hours of	(evaluati
у	clinical trial.	with acute,	12-24 hours	usual	hospital stay for VTE or	ons in 7,
Medicine	Multicenter,	symptomatic	after	treatment at	bleeding in the first 30	14, 30
2018; 25:	involving 60	PE, with low	screening	medical	days of the study.	and 90
995-1003.	centers in the	risk of death	(screening <	discretion	Primary safety	days).
	United States of	and/or	12 hours from	(LMWH and	outcome: major	
	America.	adverse	diagnosis),	VKA or	bleeding	
	Number of	events	using	DOAC).	Secondary:	
	patients: 114	(negative	rivaroxaban		symptomatic	
		Hestia score	15mg every		recurrence of VTE,	
		for all	12 hours for		VTE-related death,	
		questions).	21 days,		number of unscheduled	
			followed by a		visits for VTE-related	
			reduction to		symptoms and/or	
			20mg until the		bleeding, duration of	
			end of the		initial hospitalization	
			study.		and other	
					hospitalizations for any	
					cause, non-major	
					bleeding, and patient	
					satisfaction with care.	

AVK: anti-vitamin K; DOAC: direct-acting oral anticoagulant; LMWH: low molecular weight heparin; NTproBNP: N-terminal fragment of type B natriuretic peptide; PESI: Pulmonary Embolism Severity Index; PE: pulmonary embolism; VTE: venous thromboembolism.

Questior	2 - Should a	nticoagulation w	ith DOACs be	used compa	red to anticoagulation
with LMV	VH in patients	with PE and dia	gnosed with ca	ancer?	

Study	Study design	Population	Intervention	Comparato r	Outcome	Time
J Thromb	Open,	Patients > 18	Apixaban 10	Dalteparin	Primary outcome: any	6 months
Haemost.	randomized	years old,	mg every 12	200UI/Kg/d	bleeding episode.	(monthly
2020;	clinical trial of	diagnosed	hours for 7	ay in the	Secondary: recurrence	assessme
18:411-	superiority in	with active	days, followed	first month,	of VTE, death due to	nts)
421.	relation to the	cancer, life	by a dose of 5	followed by	PE or arterial	
	risk of bleeding.	expectancy	mg every 12	a dose of	thromboembolism.	
	Multicenter,	greater than	hours.	150UI/Kg.		
	involving 28	60 days and				
	centers in the	diagnosed				
	United States of	with acute				
	America.	VTE				
	Number of					
	patients: 300.					

N Engl J Med 2020; 382:1599- 1607.	Open, randomized, non-inferiority clinical trial. Multicenter, involving 119 centers in 9 European countries, in addition to Israel	Adults, with a diagnosis of active cancer and a new diagnosis of VTE (incidental or symptomatic).	Apixaban 10 mg every 12 hours for 7 days, followed by a dose of 5 mg every 12 hours	Dalteparin 200UI/Kg/d ay in the first month, followed by a dose of 150UI/Kg.	Primary outcome: VTE recurrence. Main safety outcome: major bleeding.	Six months of treatment (evaluation s at 4 weeks, 3 months, 6 months and 7 months).
	And the United States of America. Number of patients: 1170.					
Chest 2022: 161: 781- 790.	Pilot, open, randomized, non-inferiority clinical trial. Multicenter, involving 18 centers in France. Number of patients: 158.	Adults, with a diagnosis of active cancer and a new diagnosis of VTE (incidental or symptomatic).	Rivaroxaban 15mg every 12 hours for 3 weeks, followed by a dose of 20mg daily.	Dalteparin 200UI/Kg/d ay in the first month, followed by a dose of 150UI/Kg.	Primary efficacy outcome: VTE recurrence. Secondary: Lower limb DVT, major bleeding or clinically relevant, non- major bleeding.	Three months (1 and 3 month assessme nts).
J Clin Oncol 2018; 36:2017- 2023.	Pilot, open, randomized clinical trial. Multicentre, involving 58 UK centres. Number of patients: 406.	Adults, with a diagnosis of active cancer and a new diagnosis of VTE (incidental or symptomatic).	Rivaroxaban 15mg every 12 hours for 3 weeks, followed by a dose of 20mg daily.	Dalteparin 200UI/Kg/d ay in the first month, followed by a dose of 150UI/Kg.	Primary efficacy outcome: VTE recurrence. Secondary: Lower limb DVT, major bleeding or clinically relevant, non- major bleeding.	Treatment for 6 months (quarterly assessme nts until completing 12 months. Subseque ntly, every six months until completing 24 months).

N Eng J Med 2018: 378:615- 624.	Open, randomized, non-inferiority clinical trial. Multicenter, involving 114 centers in 13 countries. Number of patients: 1050.	Adults, with a diagnosis of active cancer and a new diagnosis of VTE (incidental or symptomatic).	LMWH 5 days after diagnosis, followed by edoxaban 60mg/day.	Dalteparin 200UI/Kg/d ay in the first month, followed by a dose of 150UI/Kg	Primary outcome: composite of VTE recurrence or major bleeding. Secondary: VTE recurrence, DVT recurrence, PE recurrence, Major bleeding, clinically relevant non-major bleeding, death from any cause and event- free survival.	Treatment for 6 to 12 months (assessme nts: 31 days after randomizat ion, 3, 6, 9 and 12 months. Minimum until the ninth month).
JAMA 2023; 329: 1924- 1933.	Open, randomized, non-inferiority clinical trial. Multicenter, involving 67 centers in the USA. Number of patients: 671.	Adults, with a diagnosis of active cancer and a new diagnosis of VTE (incidental or symptomatic).	DOACS according to patient preference and convenience.	LMWH according to patient preference and convenienc e.	Primary efficacy outcome: VTE recurrence. Secondary: major bleeding, non-major and clinically relevant bleeding, minor bleeding, incidence of death and survival in the 6 months of follow- up, quality of life (SF12) and perception of harms and benefits of anticoagulation, based on a specific questionnaire.	Treatment for 6 months (evaluation s at 3 and 6 months).

AVK: anti-vitamin K; DOAC: direct-acting oral anticoagulant; LMWH: low molecular weight heparin; LL: lower limbs; PE: pulmonary embolism; VTE: venous thromboembolism; DVT: deep vein thrombosis.

Question 3: Should it be recommended to maintain extended anticoagulation versus comparator (ASA or placebo) in patients diagnosed with unprovoked PE, who have completed at least 3 months of anticoagulation?

Study	Study design	Population	Intervention	Comparato r	Outcome	Time
N Engl J	Double-blind,	Adult patients,	Apixaban	Placebo	Combined primary	Treatment
Med	randomized,	previously	2.5mg every		efficacy endpoint of:	time: 12

2013:	multicenter	diagnosed	12 hours or		VTE recurrence or	months.
368:699-	clinical trial	with VTE,	Apixaban 5mg		death from any cause.	Monthly
708	involving 328	treated for at	every 12		Primary safety	telephone
	hospitals in 28	least 6 to 12	hours.		outcome: major	contacts
	countries.	months with			bleeding.	were made
	Number of	standard			Secondary outcomes:	for 12
	patients: 2486.	treatment or			recurrence of	months
		apixaban or			symptomatic VTE,	and 1
		enoxaparin			death related to VTE,	month
		and warfarin			combined outcome of	after the
		(such as			recurrence of	end of
		participants in			symptomatic VTE,	treatment.
		the AMPLIFY			acute myocardial	
		study)			infarction, stroke or	
		.,			death related to	
					cardiovascular disease.	
N Engl J	Double-blind,	Adult patients,	Rivaroxaban	Aspirin	Primary efficacy	Treatment
Med	randomized	with a	20mg per day	100mg daily	outcome: combination	time: 1
2017:	clinical trial	previous	or		of VTE recurrence and	year.
376:1211	involving 244	diagnosis of	Rivaroxaban		death of unknown	Telephone
-1222	centers in 31	VTE, treated	10mg per day.		cause for which PE	contacts
	countries.	for at least 6			could not be excluded.	were made
	Number of	to 12 months			Primary efficacy	on days
	patients: 3396.	with VKA or			outcome: major	30, 90,
		DOACS			bleeding.	180, 270,
		(dabigatran,			Secondary safety	360 from
		rivaroxaban,			outcomes: acute	randomizat
		apixaban or			myocardial infarction,	ion and 30
		edoxaban.			ischemic stroke,	days after
					systemic embolism,	stopping
					other venous	the study
					thrombosis, in addition	drug.
					to lower limb DVT and	
					death from any cause.	
					Secondary safety	
					endpoints: non-major	
					bleeding, composite	
					outcome of major	
					bleeding or non-major	
					but clinically relevant	
					bleeding, and non-	
					major bleeding that led	
					to interruption of study	
					drug for more than 14	
					days.	
N Engl J	Double-blind,	Adult patients,	Dabigatran	Placebo	Primary efficacy	Treatment
Med	randomized	with a	150mg every		outcome: combination	time: 6
2013;	clinical trial	previous	12 hours.		of recurrence of	months.

368: 709- 718.	involving 147 centers in 21 countries. Number of patients: 1353.	diagnosis of VTE, treated for at least 3 months with an anticoagulant approved for the treatment of VTE.			symptomatic VTE and death of unknown cause for which PE could not be excluded. Safety outcome: major bleeding and non-major but clinically relevant bleeding.	Assessme nt was carried out 12 months after randomizat ion.
N Engl J Med 1999; 340: 901- 907.	Double-blind, randomized clinical trial involving 14 centers in Canada and the USA. Number of patients: 162.	Adult patients, with a previous diagnosis of VTE, without identified risk factors, treated for at least 3 months with VKA.	Warfarin in a dose sufficient to maintain the INR between 2.0- 3.0	Placebo	Primary efficacy outcome: recurrence of symptomatic VTE. Secondary outcomes: Major bleeding, non- major bleeding and death.	Treatment time: 24 months.
JAMA 2015; 314: 31- 40	Double-blind, randomized clinical trial involving 14 centers in France. Number of patients: 371.	Adult patients, with a previous diagnosis of VTE, without identified risk factors, treated for at least 6 months with VKA.	Warfarin in a dose sufficient to maintain the INR between 2.0- 3.0	Placebo	Combined primary outcome of symptomatic VTE recurrence and major bleeding. Secondary outcomes: death not related to PE or major bleeding, recurrence of symptomatic VTE, major bleeding.	Treatment time: 18 months. Patients were followed up for an average of 24 months after the end of treatment. Follow-up visits were made at 3, 6, 12, 18, 30 and 42 months after randomizat ion. Telephone contact at 24 and 36 months.

AVK: anti-vitamin K; DOAC: direct-acting oral anticoagulant; LL: lower limbs; PE: pulmonary embolism; VTE: venous thromboembolism; DVT: deep vein thrombosis.

Question 4 - Treatment (3 to 6 months) with DOACs should be recommended compared to conventional anticoagulation (LMWH or UFH initially followed by warfarin), in patients diagnosed with low-risk PE, low-intermediate risk, high-intermediate risk, after stabilization or high risk, after reperfusion and stabilization?

Study	Study design	Population	Intervention	Comparato r	Outcome	Time
Circulation 2014; 129: 764	Multicenter, double blind, double dummy, randomized, non-inferiority clinical study involving European American and Asian centers. Number of patients: 2589.	Adult patients diagnosed with acute, symptomatic VTE.	Dabigatran 150mg every 12 hours.	Warfarin with target INR between 2 - 3	Primary outcome: recurrence of symptomatic VTE. Secondary: Major bleeding, non-major but relevant bleeding and other bleeding.	Treatment time: 6 months. Assessme nts every 7 days and monthly until 6 months.
N Engl J Med 2013; 369: 1406- 1415	Estudo clínico multicêntrico, duplo cego, randomizado, de não inferioridade, envolvendo 439 centros em 37 países. Nº de pacientes: 8292.	Adult patients diagnosed with acute, symptomatic VTE.	Edoxaban 60mg per day.	Warfarin with target INR between 2 - 3	Primary efficacy outcome: recurrence of symptomatic VTE. Secondary efficacy endpoints: combination of recurrence or death from cardiovascular causes or death from any cause. Primary safety outcome: Clinically relevant bleeding (combination of major bleeding or clinically relevant non-major bleeding).	Treatment time from 3 to 12 months, according to the attending physician. Visits were scheduled for 5, 12, 30 and 60 days. Subseque ntly, the visits were monthly, if the patient was undergoin g treatment, or

						quarterly if the treatment had been suspended for up to 12 months.
N Engl J Med 2013; 369: 799 – 808.	Multicenter, double-blind, randomized, non-inferiority clinical study involving 358 centers in 28 countries. Number of patients: 5400.	Adult patients diagnosed with acute, symptomatic VTE.	Apixaban 5mg every 12 hours	Warfarin with target INR between 2 - 3	Combined primary efficacy endpoint: symptomatic VTE recurrence or thromboembolism- related death. Secondary efficacy outcomes: symptomatic VTE recurrence, thromboembolism- related death, cardiovascular death, death from any cause, or VTE-related death and major bleeding. Desfecho primário de segurança: sangramento maior. Desfechos secundários de segurança: composto de sangramento clinicamente relevante (combinação de sangramento maior ou sangramento não maior clinicamente relevante).	Treatment time of 6 months. Visits scheduled at weeks 2, 4, 8, 12, 16, 20 and 24, after randomizat ion and 30 days after the expected end of treatment.

N Engl J Med 2009; 361:2342- 2352	Multicenter, double-blind, double- dummy, randomized, non-inferiority clinical study involving 228 centers in 29 countries. Number of patients: 2564.	Adult patients diagnosed with acute, symptomatic VTE.	Dabigatran 150mg every 12 hours.	Warfarin with target INR between 2 - 3	Primary efficacy outcome: symptomatic VTE recurrence or thromboembolism- related death. Secondary efficacy outcomes: recurrence of symptomatic DVT, recurrence of symptomatic PE, VTE- related death, and death from any cause. Safety endpoints: Major	Treatment time: 6 months. Assessme nts every 7 days and monthly until 6 months. An assessme nt was carried out
					bleeding or clinically relevant non-major bleeding, any bleeding.	after the end of treatment.
N Engl J Med 2010; 363:2499- 510.	Multicenter, open, randomized, non-inferiority clinical study. Number of patients: 3449.	Pacientes adultos, com diagnóstico de TVP aguda, sintomática.	Rivaroxaban 20mg/day	Warfarin with target INR between 2 - 3	Dieeding, any bleeding.Primary efficacyoutcome: recurrence ofsymptomatic VTE.Primary safetyoutcome: majorbleeding or clinicallyrelevant non-majorbleeding.Secondary safetyoutcomes: majorbleeding, clinicallyrelevant non-majorbleeding, clinicallyrelevant non-majorbleeding, death fromany cause, vascularevents (acutecoronoary syndrome,stroke, TIA or systemicembolic event) andother adverse events.	Treatment time in 3 strata: 3, 6 and 12 months.
N Engl J Med 2012; 366:1287- 97.	Multicenter, open, randomized, non-inferiority clinical study. Number of patients: 4832.	Adult patients diagnosed with acute, symptomatic VTE.	Rivaroxaban 20mg/day	Warfarin with target INR between 2 - 3	Primary efficacy outcome: recurrence of symptomatic VTE. Primary safety outcome: major bleeding or clinically relevant non-major bleeding. Secondary outcomes: major bleeding, death	Treatment time in 3 strata: 3, 6 and 12 months.

			from any cause,	
			vascular events (acute	
			coronary syndrome,	
			ischemic stroke, TIA or	
			systemic embolic	
			event) and clinical	
			benefit composed of	
			VTE recurrence or	
			major bleeding.	
			, ,	
				1

TIA: transient ischemic attack; DOAC: direct-acting oral anticoagulant; VTE: venous thromboembolism; DVT: deep vein thrombosis.

Question 5 - Should systemic thrombolysis be recommended compared to isolated anticoagulation (LMWH or UFH) in patients with intermediate-high risk PE?

Study	Study design	Population	Intervention	Comparator	Outcome	Time
Am J Med Sci 2011; 341: 33- 39.	Randomized, double-blind, single-center clinical study. In patients: 72.	Adult patients diagnosed with submassive PE (signs of RV dysfunction on echocardiogra m and ECG, with hemodynamic stability) and onset of symptoms up to 6 hours before randomization.	Alteplase 100mg. Maintained UFH 1000U/h, IV, adjusted according to aPTT. Long- term treatment with warfarin.	Placebo. Maintained UFH 1000U/h, IV, adjusted according to aPTT. Long- term treatment with warfarin.	Primary efficacy outcome: improvement in RV dysfunction assessed by echocardiogram at admission and up to 180 days from randomization. Secondary outcomes: recurrence of PE or clinical deterioration (need for infusion of vasoactive drugs due to persistent hypotension, intubation, CPR, emergency embolectomy or embolectomy for hemodynamic intervention. Safety outcomes: major and non-major bleeding.	Assessm t of patier up to 180 days afte randomiz on.

1.71	D and a start	A . I If f f				1. I 9
	Randomized,	Adult patients	All patients	All patients	Outcome related to PE,	in-nospita
	double-blind,	diagnosed with	initially	initially	up to 5 days of	assessme
2014, 12.					nospitalization. death,	l – 5 days
409-408	clinical study, No	IISK PE (RV			shock of need for	Long-tern
	patients: 83.	nypokinesia on	addition to the	addition to	Treatment related	
		echocardiogra	study drug:	the study	irealment-related	- 90 days
		tranania Las T	Leng term	arug.	of begritalization, dooth	
		or PND or NT	trootmont was	placebo.	due to blooding major	
			with worforin	trootmont	blooding or olinically	
		piobine).	unless there		relevant non major	
				was with warfarin	bleeding	
			contraindicatio	unless there	Long-term outcomes 90	
			ns	were any	days: VTE recurrence:	
			110.	contraindicat	reduced functional	
				ions.	capacity (signs of IVD on	
					echocardiogram or	
					exercise intolerance);	
					quality of life (SF36 and	
					VEINES QOL).	
JACC	Randomized,	Adult patients	Tenecteplase	Bolus of	Primary efficacy	Evaluatio
2017;	double-blind,	diagnosed with	(dose	placebo,	outcome: death within	in 30 days
69:1536-	multicenter	PE and	calculated	followed by	the first 30 days of	and 24
1544	clinical study	symptom onset	according to	IV UFH, for	follow-up and death at	months.
	involving 76	within the	weight,	48 hours.	any point between	
	centers in 13	previous 15	according to	Subsequentl	randomization and 24	
	countries.	days. RV	the leaflet)	у,	months.	
	Number of	dysfunction	bolus, followed	anticoagulan	Secondary outcome:	
	patients: 1005.	assessed by	by IV UFH, for	t medication	СТЕРН	
		ecnocardiogra	48 hours.	tollowed the		
		m or signs	Subsequently,	service		
		observed on	anticoaguiant	routine.		
		UI ongiographi				
		anglography				
		and myocardial	service routine.			
		iiijuiy				
		tropoping L or				
		1.	1	1	1	

N Engl J Med 2002; 347: 1143- 1150	Randomized, double-blind, multicenter clinical study involving 49 centers in Germany. Number of patients: 256.	Adult patients diagnosed with acute PE and signs of right ventricular dysfunction assessed by echocardiogra m, invasive hemodynamics or new signs of right ventricular overload on ECG.	Alteplase 100mg. Maintained UFH 1000U/h, IV, adjusted according to aPTT (2.0 to 2.5 times the upper limit of normal). Long- term treatment with VKA, with target INR of 2.5 and 3.0.	Placebo. Maintained UFH 1000U/h, IV, adjusted according to aPTT (2.0 to 2.5 times the upper limit of normal). Long-term treatment with VKA, with target INR of 2.5 and 3.0.	Primary efficacy outcome: death during hospitalization or clinical deterioration requiring therapeutic escalation (need for vasoactive drugs, rescue thrombolysis, intubation, CPR and surgical embolectomy or catheter thrombus fragmentation). Secondary outcomes: VTE recurrence and major bleeding.	Assessme t at hospit discharge or 30 day after randomize on, whicheve came first
N Engl J Med 2014; 370: 1402- 1411.	Randomized, double-blind, multicenter clinical study involving 76 centers in 13 countries. Number of patients: 1005.	Adult patients diagnosed with PE and symptom onset within the previous 15 days. RV dysfunction assessed by echocardiogra m or signs observed on CT angiography and myocardial injury confirmed by troponins I or T.	Tenecteplase (dose calculated according to weight, according to the leaflet) bolus, followed by IV UFH, for 48 hours. Subsequently, anticoagulant medication followed the service routine.	Bolus placebo, followed by IV UFH, for 48 hours. Subsequentl y, anticoagulan t medication followed the service routine.	Primary efficacy outcome: death from any cause or hemodynamic decompensation within 7 days of randomization. Secondary efficacy outcomes: death within 7 days of randomization, hemodynamic decompensation within 7 days of randomization, VTE recurrence within 7 days of randomization, VTE recurrence within 7 days of randomization, death within 30 days of randomization, and major adverse effects within 30 days of randomization. Safety outcomes: hemorrhagic stroke within 7 days of randomization, major extracranial bleeding within 7 days of randomization and serious adverse events within 30 days of randomization.	Assessme ts at 7 day and 30 days after randomiza on.

J Th Univ Heart Ctr 2014; 9: 104-108.	Randomized clinical study, blinded only to the patient. Unicentric, No patients: 50.	Adult patients diagnosed with submassive PE (right ventricular dysfunction on echocardiogra m)	Alteplase 100mg or streptokinase 1,500,000 u/2 hours, in addition to enoxaparin 1mg/kg twice a day.	Placebo and enoxaparin 1mg/kg twice a day.	Primary efficacy outcome: death during hospitalization or clinical deterioration, requiring therapeutic escalation (at least one of the conditions: catecholamine infusion, rescue thrombolysis, intubation, CPR, emergency surgical embolectomy or thrombus fragmentation by catheter). Secondary outcomes: major bleeding, pulmonary hypertension assessed by echocardiography and ventricular dilation at the end of the first week after randomization.	Echocard graphic assessme t one wee after randomize on and at hospital discharge
J Clin Med res 2017; 9:163- 169.	Randomized clinical study. Unicentric, No patients: 86.	Adult patients diagnosed with acute PE, with onset of symptoms within 14 days of randomization, hemodynamica Ily stable, with signs of right ventricular dysfunction assessed by echocardiogra m and/or myocardial injury by biomarkers.	Tenecteplase (dose calculated according to weight, according to the leaflet) bolus, followed by IV UFH, with a target aPTT between 2 – 2.5 times the upper limit of normality.	Placebo, followed by IV UFH, bolus, followed by infusion with aPTT target between 2 – 2.5 times the upper limit of normal.	Primary efficacy outcome: composite of death from any cause, hemodynamic decompensation within 7 days of randomization. Secondary efficacy outcomes: composition of the primary outcome and recurrence of PE, within 7 days after randomization; death and re-hospitalization within 30 days since randomization. Safety endpoints: ischemic or hemorrhagic stroke or major extracranial bleeding within 7 days after randomization.	Assessme ts on the 7th and 30th days after randomiza on.

BNP: B-type natriuretic peptide; ECG: electrocardiogram; LMWH: low molecular weight heparin; UFH: unfractionated heparin; CTEPH: chronic thromboembolic pulmonary hypertension; NT-proBNP: N-terminal fragment of type B natriuretic peptide; CPR: cardiopulmonary resuscitation;

PE: pulmonary embolism; VTE: venous thromboembolism; aPTT: activated partial thromboplastin time; RV: right ventricle.

Question 6 - Should systemic thrombolysis be recommended compared to isolated anticoagulation (LMWH, UFH) in patients with high-risk PE?

Study	Study design	Population	Intervention	Comparator	Outcome	Time
Journal of Thrombos is and Thrombol ysis 1995; 2: 227- 229	Randomized, single-center clinical study, No patients: 8.	Patients with massive PE (more than 9 obstructed segments according to V/Q scintigraphy assessment, with or without hypotension, but with RV dysfunction*.	Streptokinase 1,500,000UI, followed by UFH.	UFH	Hospital mortality	Hospital admission and 2 years after randomiza on.

\*All patients had hemodynamic instability.

V/Q scintigraphy: ventilation and perfusion scintigraphy; UFH: unfractionated heparin; PE: pulmonary embolism; RV: right ventricle.

## **Chart S3- Evidence tables for decisions**

Question 1	Should home anticoagulation be used compared to hospitalization in patients with low-risk PE?		
	Question of interest	Answer options	
Importance of the	Is the problem a priority?	🗆 No	
problem		🗆 Probably not	
		🗆 Probably yes	
		X Yes	
		🗆 Varies	

		🗆 Unknown		
Desirable effects	What is the magnitude of the	🗆 Trivial		
	desirable effects?	X Small		
		□ Moderate		
		🗆 Large		
		□ Varies		
		🗆 Unknown		
Undesirable effects	What is the magnitude of the	🗆 Trivial		
	undesirable effects?	X Small		
General certainty of	How certain is the evidence	X Very low		
evidence	(level of evidence for the set	□ Low		
	of evidence)?	Moderate		
		🗆 High		
Balanco botwoon	Doos the balance between			
risks and benefits	risks and benefits favor the	$\Box$ Favors the comparator		
	intervention or the comparator?	□ Probably favors the comparator		
		X Does not favor the comparator		
		or the intervention		
		□ Probably favors intervention		
		□ Encourages intervention		
		□ Varies		
		🗆 Unknown		
Feasibility	Is the intervention feasible for			
	implementation?	Probably not		
		X Probably ves		
	Ear low rick thromboombolism			
Conclusion	healthcare requirements we su	Datients, who meet access to		
	recommendation, very low quality of evidence)			

Question 2	Should anticoagulation with DOACs be used compared to			
	anticoagulation with LIVIVVH in p	atients with PE and diagnosed with		
	Question of interest	Answer options		
Importance of the	Is the problem a priority?	🗆 No		
problem		Probably not		
		□ Probably yes		
		X Yes		
		□ Varies		
		🗆 Unknown		
Desirable effects	What is the magnitude of the	🗆 Trivial		
	desirable effects?	🗆 Small		
		X Moderate		
		🗆 Large		
		□ Varies		
		🗆 Unknown		
Undesirable effects	What is the magnitude of the	🗆 Trivial		
	undesirable effects?	🗆 Small		
		X Moderate		
		Large		
General certainty of	How certain is the evidence	□ Very low		
evidence	(level of evidence for the set of	X Low		
	evidence)?			
		⊔ High		
Balance between	Does the balance between	Favors the comparator		
risks and benefits	risks and benefits favor the	□ Probably favors the comparator		
	intervention or the	Does not favor the comparator		
	comparator?	or the intervention		
		X Probably favors intervention		
		□ Encourages intervention		
		□ Varies		
		🗆 Unknown		
Feasibility	Is the intervention feasible for	🗆 No		
	implementation?	Probably not		

		X Probably yes	
		□ Yes	
		🗆 Varies	
		🗆 Unknown	
Conclusion	For patients with thromboembol	ism and cancer, we suggest direct-	
	acting oral anticoagulants (conditional recommendation, low quality		
	of evidence).		

Question 3	Should it be recommended to maintain extended anticoagulation				
	versus comparator (ASA or placebo) in patients diagnosed with				
	unprovoked PE, who have comp	pleted at least 3 months of			
	anticoagulation?				
	Question of interest	Answer options			
Importance of the	Is the problem a priority?	□ No			
problem		Probably not			
		Probably yes			
		X Yes			
		□ Varies			
		Unknown			
Desirable effects	What is the magnitude of the	🗆 Trivial			
	desirable effects?	🗆 Small			
		□ Moderate			
		X Large			
		□ Varies			
		Unknown			
Undesirable effects	What is the magnitude of the	🗆 Trivial			
	undesirable effects?	X Small			
		□ Moderate			
		🗆 Large			
		Varies			
		🗆 Unknown			
Conoral cortainty of	How cortain is the ovidence				
	(lovel of ovidence for the set of				
evidence	evidence)?				
		лпун			
Balance between	Does the balance between	□ Favors the comparator			

risks and benefits	risks and benefits favor the intervention or the comparator?	<ul> <li>Probably favors the comparator</li> <li>Does not favor the comparator</li> <li>or the intervention</li> <li>Probably favors intervention</li> <li>X Encourages intervention</li> <li>Varies</li> <li>Unknown</li> </ul>	
Feasibility	Is the intervention feasible for implementation?	<ul> <li>No</li> <li>Probably not</li> <li>Probably yes</li> <li>X Yes</li> <li>Varies</li> <li>Unknown</li> </ul>	
Conclusion	For patients with thromboembolism who have completed 3 mo of anticoagulation we recommend extended anticoagulation (s recommendation, high quality of evidence)		

Question 4	Treatment (3 to 6 months) with DOACs should be recommended compared to conventional anticoagulation (LMWH or UFH initially followed by warfarin), in patients diagnosed with low-risk PE, low- intermediate risk, high-intermediate risk, after stabilization or high									
	risk, after reperfusion and stabili	ization?								
	Question of interest	Answer options								
Importance of the	Is the problem a priority?	□ No								
problem		Probably not								
		Probably yes								
		X Yes								
		□ Varies								
		🗆 Unknown								
Desirable effects	What is the magnitude of the	X Trivial								
	desirable effects?	🗆 Small								
		□ Moderate								
		🗆 Large								
		$\Box$ Varies								
		□ Unknown								
l Indesirable effects	What is the magnitude of the									
Undesirable effects	What is the magnitude of the	Trivial								

	undesirable effects?	X Small D Moderate Large Varies Unknown
General certainty of evidence	How certain is the evidence (level of evidence for the set of evidence)?	□ Very low □ Low X Moderate □ High
Balance between risks and benefits	Does the balance between risks and benefits favor the intervention or the comparator?	<ul> <li>Favors the comparator</li> <li>Probably favors the comparator</li> <li>Does not favor the comparator</li> <li>or the intervention</li> <li>X Probably favors intervention</li> <li>Encourages intervention</li> <li>Varies</li> <li>Unknown</li> </ul>
Feasibility	Is the intervention feasible for implementation?	<ul> <li>No</li> <li>Probably not</li> <li>Probably yes</li> <li>X Yes</li> <li>Varies</li> <li>Unknown</li> </ul>
Conclusion	For patients with stable thrombo stabilization, we recommend dir to 6 months (strong recommend evidence).	pembolism or after hemodynamic ect-acting oral anticoagulant for 3 lation, moderate quality of

Question 5	Should systemic thrombolysis be recommended compared to isolated anticoagulation (LMWH or UFH) in patients with intermediate-high risk PE?							
	Question of interest         Answer options							
Importance of the	Is the problem a priority?	🗆 No						
problem		Probably not						
		Probably yes						
		X Yes						

		□ Varies							
		🗆 Unknown							
Desirable effects	What is the magnitude of the	X Trivial							
	desirable effects?	🗆 Small							
		🗆 Moderate							
		🗆 Large							
		🗆 Varies							
		🗆 Unknown							
Undesirable effects	What is the magnitude of the	🗆 Trivial							
	undesirable effects?	X Small							
		Moderate							
		Large							
		U Varies							
General certainty of	How certain is the evidence	Very low							
evidence	(level of evidence for the set of								
	evidence)?	X Moderate							
		🗆 High							
Balance between	Does the balance between	Favors the comparator							
risks and benefits	risks and benefits favor the	X Probably favors the comparator							
	comparator?	Does not favor the comparator							
		or the intervention							
		Probably favors intervention							
		Encourages intervention							
		Varies							
		🗆 Unknown							
Feasibility	Is the intervention feasible for	□ No							
	implementation?	Probably not							
		X Probably yes							
		🗆 Yes							
		🗆 Varies							
		🗆 Unknown							
Conclusion	For patients with high-intermedia	ate risk thromboembolism, we							
	suggest not using drug thrombo	lysis (conditional recommendation,							
	moderate quality of evidence).								

Question 6	Should systemic thrombolysis be recommended compared to							
	isolated anticoagulation (LMWH, UFH) in patients with high-risk PE?							
	Question of interest	Answer options						
Importance of the	Is the problem a priority?	🗆 No						
problem		Probably not						
		□ Probably yes						
		X Yes						
		□ Varies						
		Unknown						
Desirable effects	What is the magnitude of the	🗆 Trivial						
	desirable effects?	🗆 Small						
		□ Moderate						
		X Large						
		□ Varies						
		🗆 Unknown						
Undesirable effects	What is the magnitude of the	X Trivial						
	undesirable effects?	🗆 Small						
		□ Moderate						
		🗆 Large						
		Unknown						
General certainty of	How certain is the evidence	X Very low						
evidence	(level of evidence for the set of	□ Low						
	evidence)?	□ Moderate						
		🗆 High						
Balance between	Does the balance between	$\Box$ Favors the comparator						
risks and benefits	risks and benefits favor the	$\Box$ Probably favors the comparator						
	intervention or the	$\Box$ Probably lavors the comparator						
	comparator?	or the intervention						
		V Probably favors intervention						
Feasibility	Is the intervention feasible for	□ No						

	implementation?	Probably not				
		Probably yes				
		X Yes				
		□ Varies				
		🗆 Unknown				
Conclusion	For patients with high-risk throm	boembolism, we suggest systemic				
	drug thrombolysis (conditional re	ecommendation, very low quality of				
	evidence)					

### **Figure S2- Forest plots of PICO questions.**

Question 1 - Should home anticoagulation be used compared to hospitalization in patients with low-risk PE?

## Venous Thromboembolism (VTE) recurrence

	Outpat	ient	Inpatie	ent		<b>Risk Difference</b>		Risl	<b>Oifferen</b>	ce	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	I	М-Н,	Fixed, 95%	% CI	
Aujesky et al 2011	1	172	0	172	33.9%	0.01 [-0.01, 0.02]			•		
den Exter et al 2016	3	279	2	279	55.0%	0.00 [-0.01, 0.02]			<b>•</b>		
Peacock et al 2018	0	51	0	63	11.1%	0.00 [-0.03, 0.03]			+		
Total (95% CI)		502		514	100.0%	0.00 [-0.01, 0.01]			•		
Total events	4		2								
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0	).11, df = 2	2 (P = 0	).95); l² =	0%			1	0.5	<u> </u>	0.5	
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 0.71 (I	⊃ = 0.4	8)				-1	-0.5 Outpati	ent Inpati	0.5 ient	

## Death for any cause

	Outpat	ient	Inpatie	ent		<b>Risk Difference</b>		Risk	Differenc	e	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	I	M-H, F	ixed, 95%	/a Cl	
Aujesky et al 2011	1	172	1	172	33.9%	0.00 [-0.02, 0.02]			•		
den Exter et al 2016	3	279	4	279	55.0%	-0.00 [-0.02, 0.01]			<b></b>		
Peacock et al 2018	0	51	0	63	11.1%	0.00 [-0.03, 0.03]			+		
Total (95% CI)		502		514	100.0%	-0.00 [-0.01, 0.01]					
Total events	4		5								
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 0	).10, df = :	2 (P = 0	).95); l² =	0%			4	0.5	<u> </u>	0.5	
Test for overall effect: 2	z = 0.32 (	P = 0.7	5)				-1	-0.5 Outpatie	nt Inpati	ient	1

## Any bleeding

	Outpat	ient	Inpatie	ent		Risk Difference	Risk Difference
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Aujesky et al 2011	3	172	0	172	33.9%	0.02 [-0.01, 0.04]	•
den Exter et al 2016	3	279	1	279	55.0%	0.01 [-0.01, 0.02]	•
Peacock et al 2018	2	51	4	63	11.1%	-0.02 [-0.10, 0.06]	
Total (95% CI)		502		514	100.0%	0.01 [-0.01, 0.02]	
Total events	8		5				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1	.39, df =	2 (P = 0	).50); l² =	0%			
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 1.00 (	P = 0.3	2)				Favours [Outpatient] Favours [Inpatient]

Question 2 - Should anticoagulation with DOACs be used compared to anticoagulation with LMWH in patients with PE and diagnosed with cancer?

#### TEV recurrence

	DOAC	s	LMW	н		Risk Difference		Risk Difference
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	I	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Agnelli G 2020	32	585	46	585	31.2%	-0.02 [-0.05, 0.00]		•
McBane RD 2020	1	150	9	150	8.0%	-0.05 [-0.09, -0.01]		-
Planquette B 2022	4	74	6	84	4.2%	-0.02 [-0.09, 0.06]		-
Raskob GE 2018	41	525	59	525	28.0%	-0.03 [-0.07, 0.00]		•
Schrang D 2023	8	203	18	203	10.8%	-0.05 [-0.10, -0.00]		-
Young A 2018	20	335	27	336	17.9%	-0.02 [-0.06, 0.02]		4
Total (95% CI)		1872		1883	100.0%	-0.03 [-0.05, -0.01]		*
Total events	106		165					
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 2	2.42, df =	5 (P = 0	).79); l² =	0%			F_	
Test for overall effect: 2	Z = 3.69 (	P = 0.0	002)				-1	Favours [DOACS] Favours [LMWH]

#### Death for any cause

	DOAC	s	LMW	н		Risk Difference	Risk Difference
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Agnelli G 2020	135	585	153	585	31.2%	-0.03 [-0.08, 0.02]	-
McBane RD 2020	23	150	15	150	8.0%	0.05 [-0.02, 0.13]	
Planquette B 2022	19	74	20	84	4.2%	0.02 [-0.12, 0.15]	
Raskob GE 2018	206	525	192	525	28.0%	0.03 [-0.03, 0.09]	+
Schrang D 2023	73	335	59	336	17.9%	0.04 [-0.02, 0.10]	
Young A 2018	48	203	56	203	10.8%	-0.04 [-0.12, 0.05]	
Total (95% CI)		1872		1883	100.0%	0.01 [-0.02, 0.03]	•
Total events	504		495				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6	6.67, df =	5 (P = 0	0.25); l² =	25%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.44 (I	P = 0.6	6)				Favours [DOACS] Favours [LMWH]

## Major bleeding

	DOAC	s	LMW	н		Risk Difference	Risk Difference
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	CI M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Agnelli G 2020	22	585	23	585	31.2%	-0.00 [-0.02, 0.02]	2] 🗖
McBane RD 2020	0	150	2	150	8.0%	-0.01 [-0.04, 0.01]	1] +
Planquette B 2022	1	74	3	84	4.2%	-0.02 [-0.07, 0.03]	3] 🚽
Raskob GE 2018	36	525	21	525	28.0%	0.03 [0.00, 0.06]	5] 🗖
Schrang D 2023	17	335	17	336	17.9%	0.00 [-0.03, 0.03]	3] 🕇
Young A 2018	11	203	6	203	10.8%	0.02 [-0.01, 0.06]	5]
Total (95% CI)		1872		1883	100.0%	0.01 [-0.00, 0.02]	g )
Total events	87		72				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 8	3.94, df = {	5 (P = 0	).11); l² =	44%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.24 (I	P = 0.2	1)				Favours [DOACS] Favours [LMWH]

#### Any bleeding

	DOACS	LMV	/H		Risk Difference	Risk Difference
Study or Subgroup	Events To	otal Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Agnelli G 2020	70	585 56	585	31.2%	0.02 [-0.01, 0.06]	• •
McBane RD 2020	9	150 7	150	8.0%	0.01 [-0.04, 0.06]	+
Planquette B 2022	9	74 8	84	4.2%	0.03 [-0.07, 0.12]	- <del>-</del>
Raskob GE 2018	97 5	525 73	525	28.0%	0.05 [0.00, 0.09]	-
Schrang D 2023	46 3	335 43	336	17.9%	0.01 [-0.04, 0.06]	+
Young A 2018	25 2	203 7	203	10.8%	0.09 [0.04, 0.14]	-
Total (95% CI)	18	872	1883	100.0%	0.03 [0.01, 0.05]	<b>♦</b>
Total events	256	194				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 6	6.42, df = 5 (I	P = 0.27); l <sup>2</sup> =	= 22%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 3.20 (P =	= 0.001)				Favours [DOACS] Favours [LMWH]

Question 3 - Should it be recommended to maintain extended anticoagulation versus comparator (ASA or placebo) in patients diagnosed with unprovoked PE, who have completed at least 3 months of anticoagulation?

#### TEV recurrence

	Extende	ed tt*	Placebo/A	AAS**		Risk Difference	Risk Difference			
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl	M-H, Rand	lom, 95% Cl		
Agnelli G 2013	36	1657	75	829	24.6%	-0.07 [-0.09, -0.05]	•			
Couturaud F 2015	3	184	25	187	15.4%	-0.12 [-0.17, -0.07]				
Kearon C 1999	1	79	17	83	8.2%	-0.19 [-0.28, -0.10]				
Schulman S 2013 (PC)	3	685	37	668	25.3%	-0.05 [-0.07, -0.03]	-			
Weitz JI 2017	31	2234	50	1131	26.4%	-0.03 [-0.04, -0.02]		(		
Total (95% Cl)		4839		2898	100.0%	-0.07 [-0.10, -0.04]	•			
Total events	74		204							
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.0	00; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 2	29.90, d	f = 4 (P < 0	.00001);	l² = 87%	F	1 0.5	+ +	-	
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 4.57 (P <	0.0000	1)			-	Favours [Extended tt]	Favours [Placebo/AAS]	1	

#### Death for any cause

	Extende	ed tt*	Placebo/A	AS**		<b>Risk Difference</b>	Risk Difference
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	CI M-H, Fixed, 95% CI
Agnelli G 2013	11	1657	14	829	31.1%	-0.01 [-0.02, -0.00]	] 📕
Couturaud F 2015	2	184	2	187	5.2%	0.00 [-0.02, 0.02]	1 +
Kearon C 1999	1	79	3	83	2.3%	-0.02 [-0.07, 0.02]	] –
Schulman S 2013 (PC)	0	685	2	668	19.1%	-0.00 [-0.01, 0.00]	] •
Weitz JI 2017	10	2234	7	1131	42.3%	-0.00 [-0.01, 0.00]	] 🛉
Total (95% CI)		4839		2898	100.0%	-0.01 [-0.01, -0.00]	
Total events	24		28				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 4.0	5, df = 4 (F	⊃ = 0.40	); I² = 1%				
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 2.36 (P =	0.02)					Favours [Extended tt] Favours [Placebo/AAS]

#### Major Bleeding

	Extended tt* Placebo/AAS**					Risk Difference	Risk Difference			
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	I M-H, Fixed, 95% CI			
Agnelli G 2013	3	1657	4	829	31.1%	-0.00 [-0.01, 0.00]	•			
Couturaud F 2015	4	184	1	187	5.2%	0.02 [-0.01, 0.04]				
Kearon C 1999	3	79	0	83	2.3%	0.04 [-0.01, 0.09]				
Schulman S 2013 (PC)	2	685	0	668	19.1%	0.00 [-0.00, 0.01]	•			
Weitz JI 2017	11	2234	3	1131	42.3%	0.00 [-0.00, 0.01]	•			
Total (95% CI)		4839		2898	100.0%	0.00 [-0.00, 0.01]				
Total events	23		8							
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 7.6	9, df = 4 (F	P = 0.10	); I² = 48%							
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 1.48 (P =	0.14)					Favours [Extended tt] Favours [PLacebo/AAS]			

#### Any bleeding

	Tto estendido* Placebo/AAS**					Risk Difference		Risk Difference			
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	I	M-H, Random, 95% Cl			
Agnelli G 2013	62	1657	22	829	34.9%	0.01 [-0.00, 0.03]		•			
Kearon C 1999	6	79	1	83	11.5%	0.06 [0.00, 0.13]					
Schulman S 2013 (PC)	72	685	39	668	25.9%	0.05 [0.02, 0.08]		<b>=</b>			
Weitz JI 2017	408	2234	165	1131	27.7%	0.04 [0.01, 0.06]		•			
Total (95% CI)		4655		2711	100.0%	0.03 [0.01, 0.06]		<b>♦</b>			
Total events	548		227								
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.0	00; Chi <sup>2</sup> = 9.	.97, df =	3 (P = 0.02	); l² = 70	%		4				
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 2.59 (P = 0	0.010)					-1	Favours [Extended tt] Favours [Placebog/AAS]			

\* Anticoagulation after at least 3 months of treatment

\*\*Placebo or acetyl salicylic acid after at least 3 months of treatment

Question 4 - Treatment (3 to 6 months) with DOACs\* should be recommended compared to conventional anticoagulation (LMWH or UFH initially followed by warfarin), in patients diagnosed with low-risk PE, low-intermediate risk, high-intermediate risk, after stabilization or high risk, after reperfusion and stabilization?

TEV recurrence

	DOAO	DOACS VKAs		Risk Difference			Risk Difference				
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl		M-H, Fiz	ked, 95% C		
Agnelli, G NEJM 2013	59	2691	71	2704	19.9%	-0.00 [-0.01, 0.00]			•		
Bauersachs, R NEJM 2010	36	1731	51	1718	12.7%	-0.01 [-0.02, 0.00]			•		
Büller, Harry R NEJM 2012	50	2420	44	2413	17.8%	0.00 [-0.01, 0.01]			•		
Büller, Harry R NEJM 2013	130	4143	146	4149	30.6%	-0.00 [-0.01, 0.00]			•		
Schulman, S Circulation 2014	30	1293	28	1296	9.5%	0.00 [-0.01, 0.01]			+		
Schulman, S NEJM 2009	30	1281	27	1283	9.5%	0.00 [-0.01, 0.01]			t i		
Total (95% CI)		13559		13563	100.0%	-0.00 [-0.01, 0.00]					
Total events	335		367								
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 4.43, df =	5 (P = 0.4	9); l² = (	)%				<u> </u>	0.5	-		
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.22 (	P = 0.22)						-1	-0.5 Favours [DOACS	] Favours	[VKA]	1

#### Death of any cause

	DOAG	CS	VKA	S	Risk Difference			Risk Differe		ce	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C		М-Н,	Fixed, 95	% CI	
Agnelli, G NEJM 2013	41	2691	52	2704	19.9%	-0.00 [-0.01, 0.00]			•		
Bauersachs, R NEJM 2010	38	1731	49	1718	12.7%	-0.01 [-0.02, 0.00]			•		
Büller, Harry R NEJM 2012	58	2420	50	2413	17.8%	0.00 [-0.01, 0.01]			- <b>+</b> -		
Büller, Harry R NEJM 2013	132	4143	126	4149	30.6%	0.00 [-0.01, 0.01]			•		
Schulman, S Circulation 2014	25	1293	25	1296	9.5%	0.00 [-0.01, 0.01]			- <b>†</b> -		
Schulman, S NEJM 2009	21	1281	21	1283	9.5%	0.00 [-0.01, 0.01]			t		
Total (95% CI)		13559		13563	100.0%	-0.00 [-0.00, 0.00]					
Total events	315		323								
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 3.32, df =	5 (P = 0.6	5); l² = (	0%				H_	0.5	<u> </u>		1
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.32 (	(P = 0.75)						-1	-0.5 Favours [DOA	.CS] Favo	0.5 [VKA] ours	

#### Major bleeding

	DOACS VKAs		Risk Difference			Risk Difference				
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C		M-H, Fix	ed, 95% Cl	
Agnelli, G NEJM 2013	15	2691	49	2704	19.9%	-0.01 [-0.02, -0.01]		I		
Bauersachs, R NEJM 2010	14	1731	20	1718	12.7%	-0.00 [-0.01, 0.00]			•	
Büller, Harry R NEJM 2012	26	2420	52	2413	17.8%	-0.01 [-0.02, -0.00]			•	
Büller, Harry R NEJM 2013	56	4143	66	4149	30.6%	-0.00 [-0.01, 0.00]			•	
Schulman, S Circulation 2014	15	1293	22	1296	9.5%	-0.01 [-0.01, 0.00]			•	
Schulman, S NEJM 2009	20	1281	24	1283	9.5%	-0.00 [-0.01, 0.01]			t	
Total (95% CI)		13559		13563	100.0%	-0.01 [-0.01, -0.00]				
Total events	146		233							
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 9.33, df =	5 (P = 0.1	0); l <sup>2</sup> = 4	46%				<b>F</b>	0.5		
Test for overall effect: Z = 4.50 (	P < 0.000	01)					-1	-0.5 Favours [DOACS]	Favours [VKA]	1

## Any bleeding

	DOAO	cs	VKA	s	Risk Difference			Risk Difference		nce	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI		М-Н,	Random, 9	95% CI	
Agnelli, G NEJM 2013	103	2691	215	2704	18.7%	-0.04 [-0.05, -0.03]			-		
Bauersachs, R NEJM 2010	126	1731	119	1718	17.7%	0.00 [-0.01, 0.02]			- + -		
Büller, Harry R NEJM 2012	228	2420	235	2413	17.8%	-0.00 [-0.02, 0.01]			•		
Büller, Harry R NEJM 2013	895	4143	1056	4149	17.4%	-0.04 [-0.06, -0.02]			•		
Schulman, S Circulation 2014	200	1293	285	1296	14.3%	-0.07 [-0.10, -0.04]			•		
Schulman, S NEJM 2009	205	1281	277	1283	14.2%	-0.06 [-0.09, -0.03]			•		
Total (95% CI)		13559		13563	100.0%	-0.03 [-0.05, -0.01]			•		
Total events	1757		2187								
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00; Chi	² = 37.55, (	df = 5 (F	o < 0.000	01); l² =	87%		H	0.5	<u> </u>	0.5	
Test for overall effect: Z = 2.92 (	P = 0.003	)					-1	-0.5 Favours [DO	ACS] Favo	0.5 ours [VKA]	1

Question 5: Should systemic thrombolysis be recommended compared to isolated anticoagulation (LMWH or UFH) in patients with intermediate-high risk PE?

### TEV recurrence

	Thrombo	rombolytic Anticoagulation				Risk Difference	Risk Difference
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Fesullo, 2011	0	37	1	35	4.8%	-0.03 [-0.10, 0.05]	
Kline, JA, 2014	1	40	4	43	5.5%	-0.07 [-0.17, 0.03]	
Konstantinides, Stavros 2002	4	118	4	138	17.0%	0.00 [-0.04, 0.05]	+
Meyer, Guy, 2014	1	506	5	499	67.0%	-0.01 [-0.02, 0.00]	
Sinha, SK, 2017	2	45	1	41	5.7%	0.02 [-0.06, 0.10]	-
Total (95% CI)		746		756	100.0%	-0.01 [-0.02, 0.00]	
Total events	8		15				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 2.58, df =	= 4 (P = 0.63	3); l² = 0	0%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 1.34	(P = 0.18)						Favours [Thrombolytic] Favours [Anticoagulation]

## Death of any cause

	Trombol	íticos	Anticoagulação			Risk Difference	Risk Difference
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% C	I M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
Fesullo, 2011	0	37	6	35	3.2%	-0.17 [-0.30, -0.04]	
Kline, JA, 2014	1	40	1	43	3.7%	0.00 [-0.06, 0.07]	
Konstantinides, Stavros 2002	4	118	3	138	11.3%	0.01 [-0.03, 0.05]	+
Konstantinides, Stavros 2017	65	359	53	350	31.4%	0.03 [-0.03, 0.08]	-
Meyer, Guy, 2014	12	506	16	499	44.5%	-0.01 [-0.03, 0.01]	•
Sinha, SK, 2017	2	45	2	41	3.8%	-0.00 [-0.09, 0.08]	- <b>+</b> -
Taherkhani, M, 2014	0	25	3	25	2.2%	-0.12 [-0.26, 0.02]	
Total (95% CI)		1130		1131	100.0%	-0.00 [-0.02, 0.02]	•
Total events	84		84				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 11.33, df	= 6 (P = 0.0	08); l² =	47%				
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.12	(P = 0.91)						Favours [Thrombolytics] Favours [Anticoagulation]

## Major bleeding

	Thrombo	olytic	Anticoagu	lation	Risk Difference			Risk Difference	
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl		M-H, Random, 95% Cl	
Fesullo, 2011	2	37	0	35	16.8%	0.05 [-0.03, 0.14]		<b>-</b>	
Konstantinides, Stavros 2017	1	118	5	138	22.5%	-0.03 [-0.06, 0.01]		-	
Meyer, Guy, 2014	58	506	12	499	22.8%	0.09 [0.06, 0.12]		-	
Sinha, SK, 2017	1	45	1	41	19.6%	-0.00 [-0.07, 0.06]		+	
Taherkhani, M, 2014	0	25	0	25	18.3%	0.00 [-0.07, 0.07]		+	
Total (95% CI)		731		738	100.0%	0.02 [-0.04, 0.09]		•	
Total events	62		18						
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 0.00; Chi	² = 33.54, c	lf = 4 (P	< 0.00001);	l <sup>2</sup> = 88%		-		-	
Test for overall effect: Z = 0.69					-1	Favours [Thrombolytic] Favours [Anticoagulation]	1		

	Thrombo	olytic	Anticoagu	lation		Risk Difference	Risk Difference
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% CI	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
Fesullo, 2011	16	37	9	35	17.8%	0.18 [-0.04, 0.39]	+
Meyer, Guy, 2014	165	506	43	499	32.7%	0.24 [0.19, 0.29]	
Sinha, SK, 2017	7	45	5	41	24.0%	0.03 [-0.11, 0.18]	<b>e</b>
Taherkhani, M, 2014	2	25	1	25	25.5%	0.04 [-0.09, 0.17]	
Total (95% CI)		613		600	100.0%	0.13 [-0.00, 0.26]	-
Total events	190		58				
Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.01; Chi <sup>2</sup> =	= 13.85,	df = 3 (P = C)	).003); l²	= 78%	ł	1 05 0 05 1
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.91$ (P = 0.06)						Favours [Thrombolytic] Favours [Anticoagulation]	