Check for updates

#### **OPEN ACCESS**

EDITED BY Emanuele Valeriani, Umberto 1 Hospital, Italy

### REVIEWED BY Ilaria Maria Palumbo, Sapienza University of Rome, Italy Arianna Pannunzio,

Sapienza University of Rome, Italy \*CORRESPONDENCE

Lan Xu ⊠ szsgkhlzwh2020@126.com

 $^{\dagger}\mbox{These}$  authors have contributed equally to this work

RECEIVED 01 April 2024 ACCEPTED 16 July 2024 PUBLISHED 02 August 2024

#### CITATION

Tong Y, Ying R, Niu M and Xu L (2024) Effect of venous foot pump intervention on prevention of venous thromboembolism in patients with major orthopedic surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis.

Front. Cardiovasc. Med. 11:1408334. doi: 10.3389/fcvm.2024.1408334

#### COPYRIGHT

© 2024 Tong, Ying, Niu and Xu. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (CC BY). The use, distribution or reproduction in other forums is permitted, provided the original author(s) and the copyright owner(s) are credited and that the original publication in this journal is cited, in accordance with accepted academic practice. No use, distribution or reproduction is permitted which does not comply with these terms.

# Effect of venous foot pump intervention on prevention of venous thromboembolism in patients with major orthopedic surgery: a systematic review and meta-analysis

Yahui Tong<sup>†</sup>, Rulan Ying<sup>†</sup>, Meier Niu and Lan Xu<sup>\*</sup>

Department of Nursing, The First Affiliated Hospital of Soochow University, Suzhou, China

**Background:** Venous thromboembolism (VTE) is a common complication after major orthopedic surgery. The venous foot pump (VFP) is an effective mechanical preventive measure against VTE in patients. However, the differences in effectiveness based on varying usage times of VFP remain unclear. **Objective:** To explore the effectiveness of VFP with different usage times in preventing VTE in patients undergoing major orthopedic surgery.

**Methods:** Nine databases (PubMed, Web of Science, CINAHL, Embase, Cochrane Library, CBM, VIP, CNKI, and Wanfang) were searched to identify randomized controlled trials (RCTs) evaluating VFP interventions for VTE prevention in major orthopedic surgery patients. The risk of bias in each study was assessed using the Cochrane Collaboration tool. Meta-analysis was conducted using RevMan 5.3.

Results: A total of 36 RCTs involving 3,791 patients undergoing major orthopedic surgery were included. Meta-analysis revealed significant differences in VTE incidence between the VFP and blank control groups (RR = 0.27, 95% confidence interval CI: 0.19-0.38, P<0.001) and between the VFP plus chemoprophylaxis and chemoprophylaxis alone groups (RR 0.39, 95% CI: 0.29-0.53, P < 0.001). However, no statistically significant difference was observed between the VFP and the LMWH groups (RR = 0.93, 95% CI: 0.54-1.61, P = 0.8). Subgroup analysis showed no significant difference in effectiveness based on different VFP usage durations (VFP vs. Blank: Chisquare = 0.54, P = 0.46,  $l^2 = 0\%$ ; VFP Plus chemoprophylaxis VS. chemoprophylaxis alone: Chi-square = 1.93, P = 0.86,  $I^2 = 0\%$ ).

**Conclusion:** The current evidence indicates that VFP significantly reduces the incidence of postoperative VTE in patients undergoing major orthopedic surgery. VFP can be considered an add-on strategy to LMWH for patients at low risk of bleeding and an alternative strategy to LMWH in patients at high risk of bleeding. This study found no significant difference in effectiveness between various VFP usage interventions. Future research should focus on economic cost-effectiveness and patient acceptance to help policymakers determine the most efficient usage duration, providing practical guidance for thromboprophylaxis.

### KEYWORDS

venous foot pump, major orthopedic surgery, venous thromboembolism, systematic review, meta-analysis

### 1 Introduction

Venous thromboembolism (VTE) contains deep vein thrombosis (DVT) and pulmonary thromboembolism (PTE). DVT refers to abnormal blood clotting in the deep veins, usually in the lower limbs (1), leading to potential dysfunction or disability. PTE occurs when a blood clot dislodges and travels through the bloodstream to the pulmonary artery. According to risk assessments for VTE in orthopedic surgery patients (2), those undergoing major orthopedic surgeries, such as hip arthroplasty (HA), knee arthroplasty (KA), and hip fracture surgery (HFS) (3), are at high risk for VTE. Studies (4) have revealed that without preventive measures, the incidence of DVT after total HA ranges from 20.6% to 47.1% and from 30.8% to 58.2% after total KA. VTE often lacks typical clinical symptoms but significantly impacts patients' quality of life and can result in perioperative mortality (2). Therefore, early screening and prevention are crucial in VTE prevention (5, 6).

The guidelines (2) strongly recommend implementing effective preventive measures in patients undergoing major orthopedic surgery to reduce the incidence and mortality of VTE, alleviate patient suffering, and reduce healthcare costs. Current preventive measures for VTE in major orthopedic patients mainly include physical and drug prevention and basic preventive measures. Physical prevention is an essential strategy, serving as a necessary supplement and alternative to drug prevention in specific situations. The combination of physical and drug prevention addresses multiple aspects of Virchow's triad, thus synergistically reducing the occurrence of VTE (7). Drug prevention primarily involves using anticoagulant drugs such as LMWH, Xa factor inhibitors, and vitamin K antagonists, which can inhibit the coagulation process and reduce blood hypercoagulability. Physical prevention measures use pressure to accelerate blood flow in the lower limbs, reducing blood stasis and significantly reducing the occurrence of postoperative lower limb DVT while minimizing bleeding risks. The guidelines for the prevention and treatment of VTE recommend physical prevention methods for thrombosis prevention in patients categorized as moderate and high risk for VTE, highlighting the generalizability and importance of physical prevention.

Similarly, venous foot pump (VFP) is a common mechanical precaution, and compared to graduated compression stockings (GCS) and intermittent pneumatic compression devices (IPCD), it offers the advantages of better effectiveness and ease of wear (8-13). While research on the effectiveness of VFP in preventing VTE in major orthopedic surgery patients continues to be published, there remains some controversy over the conclusions. Numerous studies have demonstrated that VFP can effectively prevent VTE in orthopedic surgery patients (14-16). However, Pitto and colleagues (17, 18) have revealed that compared to Low molecular weight heparin (LMWH), VFP does not significantly differ in preventing postoperative VTE in these patients. Moreover, the differences in the effects of VFP intervention at different usage times remain unclear, and researchers hold varying views on the optimal duration of VFP use (14, 16, 19, 20). For example, the consensus among experts in the mechanical prevention of VTE (9) suggests that IPCD should be used for at least 18 h per day. For patients

who are completely immobilized, the daily usage time should be extended as much as possible. However, the usage time of VFP is not specified. Windish and colleagues (17, 19) demonstrated that continuous VFP application for 24 h can reduce the incidence of postoperative VTE in orthopedic surgery patients. Conversely, several studies (16, 20, 21) have used VFP intervention at a usage time of 30 min twice a day, showing an effective reduction of postoperative VTE in these patients. Based on the current studies, the effectiveness of VFP in postoperative VTE prevention in patients undergoing major orthopedic surgery and the optimal usage time of intervention remains to be further examined.

Therefore, this study used a systematic evaluation method to assess the effectiveness of VFP in preventing postoperative VTE in orthopedic surgery patients. It also compared and analyzed studies on VFP intervention at different usage times to provide a reference basis for clinical decision-making.

### 2 Methods

This study followed the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) statement. The PRISMA checklist is shown in Supplementary File 1 (22).

### 2.1 Search strategy

The following electronic databases were systematically searched from their inception until September 2023: PubMed, Embase, CINAHL, Cochrane Library, Web of Science, and four Chinese databases (CBM, CNKI, VIP, and WanFang). Searches in each database were performed using a combination of subject terms and free terms. The search terms included VTE ("venous thromboembolism," "venous thrombosis," "phlebothrombosis," "deep venous thrombosis," "DVT"), major orthopedic surgerv ("arthroplasty," "replacement," "hip fracture surgery," "orthopedic/ orthopaedic," "fracture," "joint prosthesis implantation," "orthopedic surgery"), VFP ("venous foot pump," "A-V impulse system"), and RCT ("randomized controlled trial," "randomized"). The complete search strategy for the PubMed database is provided in the Supplementary File 2).

### 2.2 Inclusion and exclusion criteria

The inclusion criteria for the literature were as follows: (1) Study population (P): patients undergoing major orthopedic surgery (including hip/knee arthroplasty and surgeries for hip fractures such as intertrochanteric fractures, subtrochanteric fractures, femoral neck fractures, femoral head fractures, and acetabular fractures); (2) intervention (I): the experimental group receiving VFP therapy; (3) control (C): the group receiving only anticoagulant therapy or serving as the blank control group; (4) outcome measures (O): incidence of DVT/PTE; (5) study type (S): randomized controlled trials (RCTs).

The exclusion criteria for the literature were as follows: (1) Studies with duplicate outcomes; (2) studies with incomplete or unextractable data; (3) studies with low quality.

### 2.3 Study selection and data extraction

Two researchers independently screened the literature based on the inclusion and exclusion criteria and extracted data from articles that met the inclusion criteria. The extracted data primarily included the first author, country, publication year, sample size, gender and age of the study subjects, intervention measures (intervention content and usage time), and outcome indicators. In case of any disagreements, they consulted a third researcher to reach the final decision.

### 2.4 Quality appraisal

The two researchers used the Cochrane risk of bias assessment tool (23) to evaluate the quality in seven aspects: random sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding of participants and personnel, blinding of outcome assessors, completeness of outcome data, selective outcome reporting, and other biases. Each aspect was evaluated as low risk of bias, unclear risk of bias, or high risk of bias.

### 2.5 Data analysis

Data analysis was performed using the RevMan 5.3 software provided by the Cochrane Library. The relative risk (RR) and a 95% confidence interval (CI) from different studies were synthesized. Heterogeneity among the included studies was assessed using the Cochrane Q test and the calculation of the I<sup>2</sup> value. If there was no statistically significant heterogeneity among the studies (I<sup>2</sup>  $\leq$  50%,  $P \geq 0.10$ ), a fixed-effects model was selected for the meta-analysis. Otherwise, a random-effects model was used. If there was statistically significant heterogeneity (I<sup>2</sup> > 50%, P < 0.10), subgroup analysis and sensitivity analysis will be used to explore the potential sources of heterogeneity. Publication bias was assessed using a funnel plot and Egger's test for studies with a sample size of 10 or more (24). A *p*-value of less than 0.05 was considered significant.

### **3** Results

### 3.1 Search outcomes

After reviewing the full texts, 36 articles were included in the final analysis (Figure 1).



#### TABLE 1 The characteristics of included studies (n = 36).

Author	Year	Country	Sample ( <i>n</i> )		Sex ( <i>n</i> )		Age (median, year)		Interver	ntion		
			Experimental	Control	Male	Female	Experimental	Control	Experimental	Control	VFP	Indicator
Liao Z	2022	China	57	58	58	57	70.75	70.19	VFP	Blank control	VFP:20 min BID	DVT
Li HX	2003	China	42	20	55	7	52.5	50.5	VFP	Blank control	VFP:30 min BID	DVT
Pan LX	2018	China	43	43	56	30	76.2	77.9	VFP	Blank control	VFP:30 min Q8H	DVT
Fan XC	2009	China	33	33	50	16	_	_	VFP	Blank control	VFP:2 h BID	DVT
Wang LX	2012	China	100	100	109	91	69.42	66.56	VFP	Blank control	VFP:3 h BID	DVT
He LY	2009	China	28	21	21	28	69.4	66.5	VFP	Blank control	VFP:3 h BID	DVT
Sun YQ	2008	China	30	28	25	33	70	67	VFP	Blank control	VFP:24 h	DVT
Wong YC	2013	China	47	44	29	62	68.4	67.8	VFP	Blank control	VFP:24 h	DVT
Fordyce	1992	England	39	40	30	49	68.1	71.2	VFP	blank control	VFP:24 h	DVT
Stranks	1992	England	41	39	15	65	79.1	82	VFP	Blank control	VFP:24 h	DVT
Wilson	1992	England	28	32	15	44	71.1	70.1	VFP	Blank control	VFP:24 h	DVT
Blanchard	1999	Switzerland	63	67	31	99	72	74	VFP	LMWH	VFP:24 h	DVT/PE
Pietsch	2003	NewZealand	50	50	33	67	56	56	VFP	LMWH	VFP:24 h	DVT/PE
Pitto	2004	New Zealand	100	100	62	138	57.3	58.1	VFP	LMWH	VFP:24 h	DVT/PE
Santori	1994	Italy	67	65	34	98	72.4	69.8	VFP	LMWH	VFP:24 h	DVT/PE
Warwick	1998	United Kingdom	147	143	181	109	68	68	VFP	LMWH	VFP:24 h	DVT/PE
Warwick	2002	England	99	89	80	149	73	71	VFP	LMWH	VFP:24 h	DVT/PE
Wang HM	2021	China	51	51	71	31	54.71	54.37	VFP, LMWH	LMWH	VFP:20 min QD	DVT
Chang B	2018	China	64	56	58	62	71.4	73.3	VFP, LMWH	LMWH	VFP:20 min BID	DVT
Wei W	2012	China	31	31	37	25	_	_	VFP, LMWH	LMWH	VFP:20 min BID	DVT
Zhang L	2022	China	60	60	66	54	47.12	46.92	VFP, Rivaroxaban	Rivaroxaban	VFP:30 min BID	DVT
Liu ZQ	2019	China	40	40	51	29	65.12	65.11	VFP, LMWH	LMWH	VFP:30 min BID	DVT
Meng XM	2013	China	30	30	28	32	_	_	VFP, LMWH	LMWH	VFP:30 min BID	DVT
Wei L	2011	China	51	49	74	26	45.71	48.36	VFP, LMWH	LMWH	VFP:30 min BID	DVT
Cao J	2010	China	38	38	25	51	_	_	VFP, LMWH	LMWH	VFP:30 min BID	DVT
Zhang SH	2008	China	50	50	28	72	62.2	60.9	VFP, LMWH	LMWH	VFP:30 min BID	DVT
Zhou C	2015	China	40	40	57	23	_	_	VFP, aspirin	Aspirin	VFP:30 min Q8H	DVT
Kuang WB	2010	China	65	65	47	83	76.3	79.5	VFP, aspirin, warfarin	Aspirin, warfarin	VFP:30 min Q8H	DVT
Tian LZ	2010	China	56	56	47	65	_	_	VFP, LMWH, aspirin	LMWH, aspirin	VFP:2 h BID	DVT
Tamir	1999	Israel	24	24	12	36	69	70	VFP, LMWH	LMWH	VFP:16 h QD	DVT
Windisch	2011	Germany	40	40	_	_	68.93	68.15	VFP, LMWH	LMWH	VFP:24 h	DVT
Westrich	1996	New YorK	61	61	40	82	_	_	VFP, aspirin	Aspirin	VFP:24 h	DVT
Cheng P	2014	China	67	65	34	98	72.4	69.8	VFP, LMWH	VFP, LMWH	Unreported	DVT
Zhou FL	2013	China	44	43	32	55	70.09	66.15	VFP, Fondaparinux Sodium	Fondaparinux Sodium	Unreported	DVT
Sakai	2016	Japan	58	62	20	100	73	74.3	VFP, Edoxaban	Edoxaban	Unreported	DVT
Bradly	1993	United Kingdom	30	44	_	-	_	-	VFP, heparin , Hydroxychloroquine sulfate	Heparin, hydroxychloroquine sulfate	Unreported	DVT



### 3.2 Characteristics of included studies

The basic characteristics of the 36 included articles are shown in Table 1. A total of 3,791 patients undergoing major orthopedic surgery were included in the studies. The methodological quality and risk of bias assessment of the included studies are displayed in Figure 2.

### 3.3 Meta-analysis results

# 3.3.1 Comparison of the incidence of DVT in patients with VFP alone group and blank control group

Eleven studies (15, 25–34) compared the DVT incidence between VFP and blank control group. The results depicted a significant difference in the incidence of postoperative DVT between the two groups of orthopedic surgery patients (pooled RR = 0.27, 95% CI: 0.19–0.38, P < 0.001;  $I^2 = 0\%$ , P = 0.59) (Figure 3A).

Among the 11 studies, there were 2 different VFP intervention usage times (3 h BID, 24 h). Subgroup analysis of the two usage times showed that the RR values were 0.20 (3 h BID), 0.29 (24 h) in order from low to high. However, there was no statistical significance among the subgroups (Chi-square = 0.54, P = 0.46,  $I^2 = 0\%$ ) (Figure 4).

# 3.3.2 Comparison of the incidence of DVT in patients with VFP group and LMWH group

Six studies (17, 18, 35–38) compared the incidence of DVT between the VFP group (24 h) and the LMWH group. The results indicated a non-significant difference in the incidence of postoperative DVT between the VFP group and the LMWH group in orthopedic surgery patients (RR = 0.93, 95% CI: 0.54–1.61, P = 0.8;  $I^2 = 77\%$ , P = 0.0006) (Figure 3B).

Three of the six studies (36–38) compared the incidence of PTE between the VFP group (24 h) and the LMWH group. The results revealed a non-significant difference in the incidence of postoperative PTE between the VFP group and the LMWH group in orthopedic surgery patients (pooled RR = 1.7, 95% CI: 0.36–8.00, P = 0.5;  $I^2 = 0$ %, P = 0.46) (Figure 3C).

# 3.3.3 Comparison of the incidence of DVT in patients with VFP plus chemoprophylaxis group and chemoprophylaxis alone group

A total of 19 studies (14, 16, 19–21, 39–52) were included in the meta-analysis comparing the incidence of DVT between the group receiving VFP combined with anticoagulant drugs and the group receiving anticoagulant drugs alone. The results showed a significant difference in the incidence of postoperative DVT between the two groups of orthopedic patients [RR = 0.39, 95% CI (0.29, 0.53), P < 0.001; I<sup>2</sup> = 35%, P = 0.08] (Figure 3D).

	Study or Subgroup	Experim Events	Total	Contro Events	n Total	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
	Fan XC 2009	3	33	8	33		0.38 [0.11, 1.29]	
	Fordyce 1992	4	39	16	40		0.26 [0.09, 0.70]	
	He LY 2009	2	28	7	21	6.7%	0.21 [0.05, 0.93]	
	Li HX 2003	9	42	11	20	12.4%	0.39 [0.19, 0.79]	
	Liao Z 2022	2	57	10	58	8.2%	0.20 [0.05, 0.89]	
	Pan LX 2018	0	43	5	43		0.09 [0.01, 1.59]	
	Stranks 1992	0	41	9	39		0.05 [0.00, 0.83]	
	Sun YQ 2008	0	30	2	28		0.19 [0.01, 3.73]	
	Wang LX 2012	5	100	25	100		0.20 [0.08, 0.50]	
	Wilson 1992	5	28	19	32		0.30 [0.13, 0.70]	
	Wong YC 2013	4	47	3	44	2.6%	1.25 [0.30, 5.27]	
	Total (95% CI)		488	445	458	100.0%	0.27 [0.19, 0.38]	•
	Total events Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	34 . 0 42 df-	10/0-	115	204			
	Toot for overall offect	: 8.42, ui =	10 (P =	0.59); F = 1	7.20			0.005 0.1 1 10 200
	Test for overall effect							avours [experimental] Favours [control]
	Study or Subgroup	Experime Events		Control Events T		Weight M	Risk Ratio A-H, Random, 95% Cl	Risk Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl
-	Blanchard 1999	34	63	16	67	22.1%	2.26 [1.39, 3.67]	
	Pietsch 2003	0	50	4	50	3.2%	0.11 [0.01, 2.01]	
	Pitto 2004	3	100		100	10.1%	0.50 [0.13, 1.94]	
	Santori 1994	9	67	23	65	18.7%	0.38 [0.19, 0.76]	
	Warwick 1998	24	147	18	143	20.8%	1.30 [0.74, 2.28]	
	Warwick 2002	57	99	48	89	25.2%	1.07 [0.83, 1.38]	
	Total (95% CI)		526		514	100.0%	0.93 [0.54, 1.61]	+
	Total events	127		115				
	Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0.29; Chi <sup>2</sup>	= 21.87	df = 5 (P =	0.00	106); I <sup>2</sup> = 77	'%	
	Test for overall effect:	Z=0.25 (F	P = 0.80)					0.005 0.1 1 10 20 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
		Experim	ental	Contro	1		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
_	Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events			M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
	Santori 1994	0	67	1	65	59.6%	0.32 [0.01, 7.80]	
	Warwick 1998	1	147	0	143	19.8%	2.92 [0.12, 71.06]	
	Warwick 2002	2	99	0	89	20.6%	4.50 [0.22, 92.49]	
	Total (95% CI)	-	313		297	100.0%	1.70 [0.36, 8.00]	
	Total events	3		1				
	Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:				Хо			0.002 0.1 1 10 500
	restion overall ellect.							avours [experimental] Favours [control]
	Study or Subgroup	Experime Events		Control Events To	otal	Weight N	Risk Ratio I-H, Random, 95% CI	Risk Ratio M-H, Random, 95% Cl
	Bradly 1993	2	30	12	44	3.6%	0.24 [0.06, 1.01]	
	Cao J 2010	5	38	14	38	6.9%	0.36 [0.14, 0.89]	
	Chang B 2018	9	64	20	56	9.4%	0.39 [0.20, 0.79]	
	Cheng P 2014	9	67	23	65	9.5%	0.38 [0.19, 0.76]	
	Kuang WB 2010	10	65	23	65	10.0%	0.43 [0.23, 0.84]	
	Liu ZQ 2019	4	40	14	40	6.0%	0.29 [0.10, 0.79]	
	Meng XM 2013	0	30	6	30	1.1%	0.08 [0.00, 1.31]	
	Sakai 2016 Tamir 1999	18 0	58 24	11 0	62 24	10.0%	1.75 [0.90, 3.38] Not estimable	
	Tian LZ 2010	0	56	1	56	0.9%	0.33 [0.01, 8.01]	
	Wang HM2021	2	51	9	51	3.4%	0.22 [0.05, 0.98]	
	Wei L 2011	2	51	9	49	3.4%	0.21 [0.05, 0.94]	
	Wei W 2012	4	31	10	31	5.7%	0.40 [0.14, 1.14]	
	Westrich 1996	16	61	41	61	13.3%	0.39 [0.25, 0.62]	
	Windisch 2011	0	40	0	40		Not estimable	
	Zhang L 2022	2	60	9	60	3.3%	0.22 [0.05, 0.99]	
		5	50	15	50	6.7%	0.33 [0.13, 0.85]	
	Zhang SH 2008		40	13	40 43	5.9% 1.0%	0.31 [0.11, 0.86] 0.11 [0.01, 1.96]	
		4	44					
	Zhang SH 2008 Zhou C 2015 Zhou FL 2013				DOF	100.0%	0 30 10 20 0 521	▲
	Zhang SH 2008 Zhou C 2015 Zhou FL 2013 Total (95% CI) Total events	92	900	234		100.0%	0.39 [0.29, 0.53]	•
	Zhang SH 2008 Zhou C 2015 Zhou FL 2013 Total (95% CI) Total events Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> =	0 92 0.12; Chi²	<b>900</b> = 24.68,	234 df = 16 (P				◆ 1005 01 1 10 200
	Zhang SH 2008 Zhou C 2015 Zhou FL 2013 Total (95% CI) Total events	0 92 0.12; Chi²	<b>900</b> = 24.68,	234 df = 16 (P			6	0.005 0.1 1 10 20 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]

Forest map of VTE prevention effect between VFP group and control group [(A) VFP versus blank control; (B) VFP versus LMWH (outcome: DVT); (C) VFP versus LMWH (outcome: PTE); (D) VFP plus chemoprophylaxis versus chemoprophylaxis alone].

Among the 15 studies (16, 19–21, 40, 41, 43–51), there were 7 different usage times of VFP intervention (20 min once daily, 20 min twice daily, 30 min twice daily, 30 min every eight hours, two hours twice daily, 16 h once daily, 24 h). Subgroup analysis of the seven usage times showed that the RR values were 0.22 (20 min QD), 0.27 (30 min BID), 0.33 (2 h BID), 0.39 (30 min Q8 H), 0.39 (24 h), 0.40 (20 min BID) and "not estimable" (16 h QD). However, there was a non-significant difference among the subgroups (Chi-square = 1.93, P = 0.86,  $I^2 = 0\%$ ) (Figure 5).

### 3.3.4 Sensitivity analysis and publication bias

Sensitivity analysis disclosed that the results were robust. Funnel plot and Egger's test were performed to analyze publication bias for the 11 studies comparing the VFP group with the blank control group and the 19 studies comparing the VFP combined with the anticoagulant drugs group with the anticoagulant drugs only group. The results were non-significant in publication bias for the VFP vs. control group (t = -1.21, P = 0.258, P > 0.05) and the VFP combined with anticoagulant drugs vs. anticoagulant drugs only group (t = -2.02, P = 0.062, P > 0.05) (Figure 6).

	Experime	ental	Contr	ol		Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events		Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Fixed, 95% CI	M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
1.2.5 VFP 3h bid							
He LY 2009	2	28	7	21	9.8%	0.21 [0.05, 0.93]	
Wang LX 2012	5	100	25	100	30.5%	0.20 [0.08, 0.50]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		128		121	40.3%	0.20 [0.09, 0.44]	$\bullet$
Total events	7		32				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	0.01, df = 1	(P = 0)	.94); l <sup>2</sup> = (	)%			
Test for overall effect:	Z = 4.00 (F	° < 0.00	01)				
1.2.6 VFP 24h							
Fordyce 1992	4	39	16	40	19.3%	0.26 [0.09, 0.70]	
Stranks 1992	0	41	9	39	11.9%	0.05 [0.00, 0.83]	
Sun YQ 2008	0	30	2	28	3.2%	0.19 [0.01, 3.73]	
Wilson 1992	5	28	19	32	21.6%	0.30 [0.13, 0.70]	
Wong YC 2013	4	47	3	44	3.8%	1.25 [0.30, 5.27]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		185		183	59.7%	0.29 [0.17, 0.50]	◆
Total events	13		49				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	5.59, df = 4	4 (P = 0.	23); l² = 2	28%			
Test for overall effect:	Z= 4.46 (F	° < 0.00	001)				
Total (95% CI)		313		304	100.0%	0.26 [0.16, 0.40]	•
Total events	20		81				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =	6.47, df = 6	6 (P = 0	.37); l² = 7	7%			0.005 0.1 1 10 200
Test for overall effect:	Z = 6.00 (F	, < 0.00	001)			,	0.005 0.1 1 10 200 Favours [experimental] Favours [control]
Test for subaroup diff	erences: C	hi² = 0.	54. df = 1	(P = 0.	46). I <sup>z</sup> = 0	%	
GURE 4			(50.1				
ubgroup analysis of diffe	rent frequer	icies of '	VEP alone.				

## 4 Discussion

### 4.1 Effectiveness of VFP

The meta-analysis results of this study indicated that VFP has significantly prevented postoperative VTE in patients undergoing major orthopedic surgery. This finding is consistent with Zhang and colleagues (53) and emphasizes the critical role of VFP in reducing postoperative VTE risk in orthopedic surgery patients. VFP stimulates the body's "physiological foot pump" and generates high-speed pulsatile blood flow similar to cardiac function. This mechanism rapidly impacts the plantar region, creating a pulsatile acceleration state similar to walking. It increases blood flow velocity, prevents clotting, and avoids blood stasis and thrombus formation in the vascular endothelium. Given its low risk of bleeding, VFP can be an effective alternative to pharmacological prevention (54).

# 4.2 Effect of combined use of VFP and anticoagulant drugs

The research findings highlighted that combining VFP with anticoagulant drugs provides better prevention of postoperative DVT in orthopedic surgery. VFP not only promotes blood flow in the lower extremities but also stimulates the synthesis and release of plasminogen activators in endothelial cells, activating plasmin and facilitating fibrinolysis, preventing blood coagulation (55). Anticoagulant drugs such as rivaroxaban prevent thrombosis by directly inhibiting the activity of clotting factor Xa to prevent platelet activation and cross-binding of clotting proteins (56). When used with anticoagulant drugs, VFP complements their mechanisms, jointly preventing venous thrombosis and more effectively reducing the incidence of VTE than anticoagulant drugs alone. Therefore, the combination of VFP and anticoagulant drugs may effectively reduce postoperative VTE in orthopedic surgery patients (57), with VFP serving as a necessary complement to drug prevention.

### 4.3 Comparison between VFP and LMWH

Meta-analysis results show no significant difference in the effectiveness of VFP and LMWH in preventing postoperative VTE in orthopedic surgery patients. Although VFP and LMWH may operate through different mechanisms, their ultimate goal is to reduce blood stasis and promote blood circulation. LMWH reduces thrombus formation by inhibiting coagulation factor activity and increasing the activity of anticoagulant protein C (58). Conversely, VFP promotes blood flow through movement and pressure application, preventing venous blood stasis (59). Due to these similar mechanisms, VFP and LMWH are comparably effective in preventing postoperative VTE. Therefore, VFP can be considered as an alternative strategy to LMWH in patients at high risk of bleeding.

Study or Subgroup	Experime		Contro		Woight	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl	Risk Ratio M-H, Fixed, 95% Cl
1.2.1 VFP 20min qd	LYCIILS	Total	LVCIILS	Total	Veigin	WI-II, TIXEU, 55/0 CI	
	2	<b>5</b> 4	0	<b>5</b> 4	4.000	0.00 10.05 0.001	
Wang HM2021	2	51	9	51	4.8%	0.22 [0.05, 0.98]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		51		51	4.8%	0.22 [0.05, 0.98]	
Total events	2		9				
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable						
Test for overall effect:		9 = 0.05)	1				
1.2.2 VFP 20min bid							
Chang B 2018	9	64	20	56	11.4%	0.39 [0.20, 0.79]	
Wei W 2012	4	31	10	31	5.4%	0.40 [0.14, 1.14]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		95		87	16.8%	0.40 [0.22, 0.71]	•
	13	00	30	0,	10.0 /0	0.10 [0.22, 0.11]	•
Total events		~ ~ ~		~			
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:				%			
1.2.3 VFP 30min bid							
Cao J 2010	5	38	14	38	7.5%	0.36 [0.14, 0.89]	
Liu ZQ 2019	4	40	14	40	7.5%	0.29 [0.10, 0.79]	<b>-</b>
Meng XM 2013	0	30	6	30	3.5%	0.08 [0.00, 1.31]	+
Wei L 2011	2	51	9	49	4.9%	0.21 [0.05, 0.94]	
	2						
Zhang L 2022		60	9	60	4.8%	0.22 [0.05, 0.99]	
Zhang SH 2008	5	50	15	50	8.0%	0.33 [0.13, 0.85]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		269		267	36.3%	0.27 [0.17, 0.44]	•
Total events	18		67				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:		`	,,	%			
1.2.4 VFP 30min Q8H							
Kuang WB 2010	10	65	23	65	12.3%	0.43 [0.23, 0.84]	
Zhou C 2015	4	40	13	40	7.0%	0.31 [0.11, 0.86]	
	4		15				
Subtotal (95% CI)		105		105	<b>1</b> 9.3%	0.39 [0.22, 0.68]	•
Total events	14		36				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = Test for overall effect:		•	, .	%			
1.2.5 VFP 2h bid							
Tian LZ 2010	0	56	1	56	0.8%	0.33 [0.01, 8.01]	
Subtotal (95% CI)		56		56	0.8%	0.33 [0.01, 8.01]	
Total events	0	00	1	00	0.0 /0		
	-		1				
Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:		9 = 0.50)	1				
1.2.6 VFP 16h qd							
Tamir 1999	0	24	0	24		Not estimable	
Subtotal (95% CI)		24		24		Not estimable	
Total events	0		0				
Heterogeneity: Not ap			U				
Test for overall effect:		able					
1.2.7 VFP 24h							
Westrich 1996	16	61	41	61	22.0%	0.39 [0.25, 0.62]	-
Windisch 2011	0	40	0	40		Not estimable	
Subtotal (95% CI)		101	_	101	22.0%	0.39 [0.25, 0.62]	$\bullet$
Total events	16		41			. ,	
Heterogeneity: Not ap Test for overall effect:	plicable	9 < 0.00					
Total (95% CI)		701		691	100.0%	0.34 [0.26, 0.44]	♦
Total events	63		184				
Heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> =		2 (P = 1		0%			
Test for overall effect:							0.005 0.1 1 10 200
Test for subaroup diff			,	(P – 0	86) I≅ – ∩	۹۵ F	avours [experimental] Favours [control]
reactor adductoud ull	erences. C	un – 1.3	55. ur – 3	u – U.	00). I – U	10	



# 4.4 Comparison of effects between different usage times of VFP intervention

Subgroup analysis revealed non-significant differences in the effects of different VFP usage times, whether combined with anticoagulant drugs or not. This may be linked to the small number of studies with varied VFP usage durations included in this analysis. Among these, the frequencies of "30 min BID" and "24 h" were represented in about six studies, while other VFP durations were included in only one to two studies. Moreover, individual patient differences, implementation of the intervention, and duration may contribute to variability in the results, affecting their statistical significance.

## **5** Limitations

The scope and variety of VFP intervention times included in this study were not comprehensive, and the impact of the VFP

intervention duration was not thoroughly examined. Additionally, the quality of the included literature was mostly moderate. Therefore, a more comprehensive multicenter, large sample, high-quality studies of VFP intervention with varying usage durations are needed to verify these findings.

## 6 Conclusions

Based on the current evidence, VFP can effectively prevent the occurrence of postoperative VTE in patients undergoing major orthopedic surgery. Combining VFP with drugs provides even better prevention. VFP can be considered an add-on strategy to LMWH for patients at low risk of bleeding and an alternative strategy to LMWH in patients at high risk of bleeding. Subgroup analysis revealed a non-significant difference in the effectiveness of VFP interventions with different usage durations. Future studies should conduct more comprehensive comparative research on VFP intervention with varying use times to help decision-makers choose the most effective treatment duration

with limited resources, providing reference and practical guidance for thromboprophylaxis.

### Data availability statement

The original contributions presented in the study are included in the article/Supplementary Material, further inquiries can be directed to the corresponding author.

### Author contributions

YT: Data curation, Formal Analysis, Funding acquisition, Investigation, Methodology, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. RY: Data curation, Formal Analysis, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing. MN: Writing – review & editing. LX: Project administration, Supervision, Validation, Writing – original draft, Writing – review & editing.

### Funding

The author(s) declare financial support was received for the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

This work was supported by research project of Suzhou Municipal Health Commission (KJXW-2022003), The National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 72104168), and

### References

1. Giuliano KK, Pozzar R, Hatch C. Thromboprophylaxis after hospitalization for joint replacement surgery. *J Healthc Qual.* (2019) 41:384–91. doi: 10.1097/JHQ. 00000000000204

2. Chinese Orthopaedic Association. Prevention of venous thromboembolism after major orthopaedic surgery. *Chin J Orthopaed*. (2016) 2:65–71. doi: 10.3760/cma.j.issn. 0253-2352.2016.02.001

3. Commission OEGO, Association OEPC, Promotion OEPC. Expert consensus on the prevention and treatment of perioperative venous thromboembolism in major orthopaedic surgery in enhanced recovery after surgery program. *Chin J Bone Joint Surg.* (2022) 15:754–62. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.2095-9958.2022.10.06

4. Mengchun Z, Yujin Y, Ping W, Xingwei Y, Huanhuan Z, Sumin W, et al. Effcacy of intermittent pneumatic compression devices with different treatment duration on proventing deep vein thrombosis after joint replacement. *Chinese Nurs Res.* (2020) 34:329–32. doi: 10.12102/j.issn.1009-6493.2020.02.032

5. Segon YS, Summey RD, Slawski B, Kaatz S. Surgical venous thromboembolism prophylaxis: clinical practice update. *Hosp Pract (1995).* (2020) 48:248–57. doi: 10. 1080/21548331.2020.1788893

 Speth J. Guidelines in practice: prevention of venous thromboembolism. AORN J. (2023) 118:321–8. doi: 10.1002/aorn.14019

7. Douketis JD, Spyropoulos AC, Murad MH, Arcelus JI, Dager WE, Dunn AS, et al. Perioperative management of antithrombotic therapy: an American college of chest physicians clinical practice guideline. *Chest.* (2022) 162(5):e207–43. doi: 10.1016/j. chest.2022.07.025

8. Sachdeva A, Dalton M, Lees T. Graduated compression stockings for prevention of deep vein thrombosis (review. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* (2018) 11:CD1484. doi: 10.1002/14651858.CD001484.pub4

9. China Health Promotion Foundation Committee. Chinese Expert consensus on mechanical prevention of venous thromboembolism. *Nat Med J Chin.* (2020) 100:484–92. doi: 10.3760/cma.j.issn.0376-2491.2020.07.002

10. Kakkos S, Kirkilesis G, Caprini JA, Geroulakos G, Nicolaides A, Stansby G, et al. Combined intermittent pneumatic leg compression and pharmacological prophylaxis Suzhou 32nd Batch of Science and Technology Development Plan (Medical and Health Technology Innovation) (2021) (No. SKJY2021036).

### Conflict of interest

The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

### Publisher's note

All claims expressed in this article are solely those of the authors and do not necessarily represent those of their affiliated organizations, or those of the publisher, the editors and the reviewers. Any product that may be evaluated in this article, or claim that may be made by its manufacturer, is not guaranteed or endorsed by the publisher.

### Supplementary material

The Supplementary Material for this article can be found online at: https://www.frontiersin.org/articles/10.3389/fcvm.2024. 1408334/full#supplementary-material

for prevention of venous thromboembolism. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* (2022) 1: CD005258. doi: 10.1002/1465 1858.CD005258.pub4

11. Liu P, Liu J, Chen L, Xia K, Wu X. Intermittent pneumatic compression devices combined with anticoagulants for prevention of symptomatic deep vein thrombosis after total knee arthroplasty: a pilot study. *Ther Clin Risk Manag.* (2017) 13:179–83. doi: 10.2147/TCRM.\$129077

12. Pitto RP, Young S. Foot pumps without graduated compression stockings for prevention of deep-vein thrombosis in total joint replacement: efficacy, safety and patient compliance: a comparative, prospective clinical trial. *Int Orthop.* (2008) 32:331-6. doi: 10.1007/s00264-007-0326-9

13. Wang LQ, Zhang HY, Ning N, Chen JL, Zhou ZK, Liao X, et al. Application of transient pulse plantar venous pump in the prevention of deep venous thrombosis after hip and knee arthroplasty. *Orthopedics*. (2022) 13:441–6. doi: 10.3969/j.issn. 1674-8573.2022.05.012

14. Sakai T, Izumi M, Kumagai K, Kidera K, Yamaguchi T, Asahara T, et al. Effects of a foot pump on the incidence of deep vein thrombosis after total knee arthroplasty in patients given edoxaban: a randomized controlled study. *Medicine (Baltimore).* (2016) 95:e2247. doi: 10.1097/MD.00000000002247

15. Liao Z. Effect of plantar vein pump combined with predictive nursing in prevention of deep vein thrombosis in elderly patients with hip fracture after operation. *Med Equip*. (2022) 35:140–2. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1002-2376.2022.16.054

16. Wang H, Jin H, Huang Y. Preventive effect of planar arteriovenous pump on lower extremity dvt after artificial femoral head replacement. *J Vasc Endovasc Surg.* (2021) 7:571–5. doi: 10.19418/j.cnki.issn2096-0646.2021.05.15

17. Pitto RP, Hamer H, Heiss-Dunlop W, Kuehle J. Mechanical prophylaxis of deepvein thrombosis after total hip replacement a randomised clinical trial. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* (2004) 86:639–42. doi: 10.1302/0301-620x.86b5.14763

18. Pietsch M, Kühle J, Hamer H, Pitto RP. Mechanical versus drug prevention of thrombosis after total hip endoprosthesis implantation. A randomized, controlled clinical study. *Biomed Tech (Berl).* (2003) 48:207–12. doi: 10.1515/bmte. 2003.48.7-8.207

19. Windisch C, Kolb W, Kolb K, Grutzner P, Venbrocks R, Anders J. Pneumatic compression with foot pumps facilitates early postoperative mobilisation in total knee arthroplasty. *Int Orthop*. (2011) 35:995–1000. doi: 10.1007/s00264-010-1091-8

20. Zhang L, Wu WT. Effect of plantar vein pump on preventing deep vein thrombosis of lower extremity after artificial joint replacement. *Med Equip.* (2022) 35:126–7. doi: 10.3969 /j.issn.1002-2376.2022.12.051

21. Liu ZQ, Zhu XP. Study on preventive nursing of deep vein thrombosis using plantar vein pump after orthopedic lower extremity joint replacement. *Feet Health Care.* (2019) 28:157–8. doi: 10. 19589/j.cnki.issn1004-6569.2019.18.157

22. Page MJ, Mckenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, et al. The prisma 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *Br Med J*. (2021) 372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

23. Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gøtzsche PC, Jüni P, Moher D, Oxman AD, et al. The cochrane collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *Br Med J.* (2011) 343:d5928. doi: 10.1136/bmj.d5928

24. Yin YK, Wang JL, Sun JZ. Therapeutic effect of different-frequency repetitive transcranial magnetic stimulations on post-stroke cognitive impairment: a metaanalysis. *Chin J Tissue Eng Res.* (2023) 27:3274–80. doi: 10.12307/2023.150

25. Fan X, Zhou D, Sun Z, Dong J. Preventive effect of foot a-v pump on lower limb dvt formation after acetabular fracture. *Shandong Med J.* (2009) 49:57–8. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1002-266X.2009.14.026

26. Fordyce MJF, Ling RSM. A venous foot pump reduces thrombosis after total hip replacement. J Bone Joint Surg Br. (1992) 74:45–9. doi: 10.1302/0301-620x.74b1. 1732264

27. He LY, Zeng ZF, Shen CH, He F. Effect of plantar arteriovenous pump in preventing venous embolization of lower extremities after total hip arthroplasty. *Nurs Rehab J.* (2009) 8:676–7. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1671-9875.2009.08.021

28. Li HX, Jia WW, Qiu YM, Zou R. Clinical study of prevention of deep vein thrombsis by a foot sole pump. J Prac Med Tech. (2003) 10:486-7. doi: 10.3969/j. issn.1671-5098.2003.05.069

29. Pan L, Wu J. Observation of nursing intervention effect of plantar vein pump in preventing deep vein thrombosis after hip fracture in elderly patients. *Elect J Pract Clin Nurs.* (2018) 3:95. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.2096-2479.2018.41.075

30. Stranks GJ, Mackenzie NA, Grover ML, Fail T. The a-v impulse system reduces deep-vein thrombosis and swelling after hemiarthroplasty for hip fracture. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* (1992) 74:775–8. doi: 10.1302/0301-620X.74B5.1527133

31. Sun YQ, Yang J. Effect of plantar dynamic pulse system on reducing swelling of affected limb after total hip/total knee arthroplasty. *J Nurs.* (2008) 15:59–61. doi: 10. 3969/j.issn.1008-9969.2008.08.022

32. Wilson NV, Das SK, Kakkar VV, Maurice HD, Smibert JG, Thomas EM, et al. Thromboembolic prophylaxis in total knee replacement evaluation of the av impulse system. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* (1992) 74:50–2. doi: 10.1302/0301-620X. 74B1.1732265

33. Wong YC, Cheung HY, Li PH, Lee QJ, Wai YL, Wong CW. A prospective study of venous thromboembolic prophylaxis using foot pumps following total knee replacement in a Chinese population. *J Orthop Trau Rehab.* (2013) 17:9–12. doi: 10. 1016/j.jotr.2012.04.002

34. Wang LX, Tang I, Tang Y, Zhou MY, Wei C. Application and effect of plantar arteriovenous pump in patients with hip fracture. *J Nurs Adm.* (2012) 12:835–6. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1671-315X.2012.11.033

35. Blanchard J, Meuwly JY, Leyvraz PF, Miron MJ, Bounameaux H, Hoffmeyer P, et al. Prevention of deep-vein thrombosis after total knee replacement. Randomised comparison between a low-molecular-weight heparin (nadroparin) and mechanical prophylaxis with a foot-pump system. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* (1999) 81:654–9. doi: 10.1302/0301-620x.81b4.9464

36. Santori FS, Vitullo A, Stopponi M, Santori N, Ghera S. Prophylaxis against deepvein thrombosis in total hipreplacement comparison of heparin and foot impulse pump. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* (1994) 76B:579–83. doi: 10.1302/0301-620X. 76B4.8027144

37. Warwick D, Harrison J, Glew D, Mitchelmore A, Peters TJ, Donovan J. Comparison of the use of a foot pump with the use of low-molecular-weight heparin for the prevention of deep-vein thrombosis after total hip replacement. A prospective, randomized trial. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* (1998) 80:1158–66. doi: 10. 2106/00004623-199808000-00009

38. Warwick D, Harrison J, Whitehouse S, Mitchelmore A, Thornton M. A randomised comparison of a foot pump and low-molecular-weight heparin in the prevention of deep-vein thrombosis after total knee replacement. *J Bone Joint Surg Br.* (2002) 84B:344–50. doi: 10.1302/0301-620x.84b3.12372

39. Bradley JG, Krugener GH, Jager HJ. The effectiveness of intermittent plantar venous compression in prevention of deep venous thrombosis after total hip arthroplasty. J Arthroplasty. (1993) 8:57-61. doi: 10.1016/s0883-5403(06)80108-7

40. Cao J, Wang JL, Zhang H, Wang LL. The combination of dynamic pulse system and low molecular weight heparin calcium for prevention of deep vein thrombosis after total knee arthroplasty. *Chin J Restor Recons Surg.* (2010) 24:538–40.

41. Chang B, Zhao JQ. Plantar vein pump prevents perioperative deep vein thrombosis in elderly patients with hip fractures. *Zhejiang J Trau Surg.* (2018) 23:151–3. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1009-7147.2018.01.075

42. Cheng P, Zheng YB, Li L. Comparison of treatment methods for preventing thromboembolism after total hip arthroplasty. *Zhejiang J Trau Surg.* (2014) 19:479–80. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1009-7147.2014.03.076

43. Kuang WB, Hou WM. Nursing care of plantar vein pump for prevention of deep vein thrombosis after hip fracture in elderly patients. *Guangdong Med J.* (2010) 31:1631–2. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1001-9448.2010.12.054

44. Meng X, Wang DF. Nursing of plantar venous pump in the prevention of deep venous thrombosis after lower limb arthroplasty in department of orthopedics. *J Clin Med Prac.* (2013) 17:85–6. doi: 10.7619/jcmp.201302032

45. Tamir L, Hendel D, Neyman C, Eshkenazi AU, Ben-Zvi Y, Zomer R. Sequential foot compression reduces lower limb swelling and pain after total knee arthroplasty. *J Arthroplasty.* (1999) 14:333–8. doi: 10.1016/s0883-5403(99)90060-8

46. Tian LZ. Clinical observation of plantar dynamic pulse system for preventing deep vein thrombosis after lower limb joint replacement surgery. *Mod Hosp.* (2010) 10:46–8. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1671-332X.2010.04.021

47. Wei L, Ouyang ZL, Chen YH, Chen WL, Yuan SQ, Ju CF. Observation on the effect of plantar vein pump in preventing deep venous thrombosis of lower extremity after major orthopaedic surgery. *J Nurs*. (2011) 18:50–1. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1008-9969. 2011.10.019

48. Wei W. Application of plantar vein pump in postoperative nursing of elderly hip fracture. *Morden Nurse.* (2012) 19:59–60. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1006-6411-B.2012.06.034

49. Westrich GH, Sculco TP. Prophylaxis against deep venous thrombosis after total knee arthroplasty. Pneumatic plantar compression and aspirin compared with aspirin alone. *J Bone Joint Surg Am.* (1996) 78:826–34. doi: 10.2106/00004623-199606000-00004

50. Zhang SH, Wu XX, Lu YH. Efficacy of low molecular weight heparin combined with plantar pump in prevention of deep vein thrombosis after knee joint surface replacement. *Nurs Prac Res.* (2008) 5:62–3. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1672-9676.2008.09.046

51. Zhou C. Evaluation of nursing effect of plantar vein pump for prevention of deep vein thrombosis in elderly patients after hip fracture. *Guid China Med.* (2015) 13:279. doi: 10.15912/j.cnki.gocm.2015.03.217

52. Zhou F, Xu G, Ren M, Shan J, Jiang H. Prevention of deep vein thrombosis of lower limbs after hip and knee arthroplasty with fonda hepatodecane sodium combined with plantar venous pump. *Zhejiang J Trau Surg.* (2013) 18:469–71. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1009-7147.2013.04.008

53. Zhang HY, Ning N, Chen JL, Li PF, Liu Y, He CM. Meta analysis on effectiveness of venous foot pump in preventing deep vein thrombosis after hip and knee arthroplasty. *Chongqing Med.* (2021) 50:3713–9. doi: 10.3969/j.issn.1671-8348. 2021.21.024

54. Fan D, Ouyang Z, Ying Y, Huang S, Tao P, Pan X, et al. Thromboelastography for the prevention of perioperative venous thromboembolism in orthopedics. *Clin Appl Thromb Hemost.* (2022) 28:10760296221077975. doi: 10.1177/10760296221077975

55. Pour AE, Keshavarzi NR, Purtill JJ, Sharkey PF, Parvizi J. Is venous foot pump effective in prevention of thromboembolic disease after joint arthroplasty: a metaanalysis. J Arthroplasty. (2013) 28:410–7. doi: 10.1016/j.arth.2012.08.003

56. Duggan ST, Scott LJ, Plosker GL. Rivaroxaban: a review of its use for the prevention of venous thromboembolism after total hip or knee replacement surgery. *Drugs.* (2009) 69(13):1829–51. doi: 10.2165/11200890-00000000000000

57. Fey B, Meurer A. Thromboembolic prophylaxis in orthopaedics: update on the current S3 guideline, effective 2015. *Orthopade*. (2019) 48:629–42. doi: 10.1007/s00132-019-03759-w

58. Nimerta F, Faisal S, Reyaz N, Shah SU, Gurajala S, Khenhrani RR, et al. Comparison of the efficacy and safety of aspirin and low-molecular-weight heparin in patients with a fracture: a meta-analysis. *Curēus.* (2023) 15:e39025. doi: 10.7759/ cureus.39025

59. Horwood A. The biomechanical function of the foot pump in venous return from the lower extremity during the human gait cycle: an expansion of the gait model of the foot pump. *Med Hypotheses.* (2019) 129:109220. doi: 10.1016/j.mehy. 2019.05.006