Vol 10| Issue 2| 2020 | 101-103.

e-ISSN 2248 – 9142
print-ISSN 2248 – 9134

International Journal of
Current Pharmaceutical & Clinical Research

www.ijcpcr.com

General Medicine

AN ANALYSIS OFPROTHROMBIN TIME AND ACTUATED FRACTIONAL THROMBOPLASTIC TIME AND THROMBOCYTOPENIA

Dr.Harika Uppalapati[1]* & Dr.Vijay Kumar[2]

[1]Assistant Professor, Balaji Medcal College, Chromepet, Chennai, Tamilnadu, India.
[2]Assistant Professor, Balaji Medcal College, Chromepet, Chennai, Tamilnadu, India

ABSTRACT

Coagulation anomalies are normally found in fundamentally sick patients. A horde of modified coagulation boundaries are promptly quantifiable, for example, thrombocytopenia, drawn out worldwide coagulation times, decreased degrees of coagulation inhibitors, or significant levels of fibrin split items. Quick and legitimate ID of the hidden reason for these coagulation anomalies is required, since every coagulation issue requires altogether different restorative administration systems. Dispersed intravascular coagulation (DIC) is an impression of a basic fundamental issue which influences the coagulation framework, at the same time bringing about supportive of coagulant initiation, fibrinolytic actuation, and utilization coagulopathy lastly may bring about organ brokenness and passing. In spite of the fact that septicaemia is the most well-known reason for DIC, a few different conditions can likewise prompt it. The clinical range of DIC can extend from a little lessening in platelet tally and sub-clinical prolongation of prothrombin time (PT) and actuated fractional thromboplastic time (aPTT) to a fulminant DIC with far reaching apoplexy and serious dying. Any tissue affront sufficiently adequate to deliver tissue items or poisons into the course can result in DIC. This audit will zero in on definition, aetio-pathogenesis, finding and the board of DIC.This study focuses on the validity of theGlasgow Blatchford score in patients attending our semiurban tertiary care hospital by means of a prospective study and to classify the low risk and high risk in upper gastrointestinal bleeding using the above scoring system.

Key words: Activated Protein C, Anti-Thrombin, Coagulation Factors, Disseminated Intravascular Coagulation, Fibrin Degradation Products, Thrombosis, Tissue Factor.

INTRODUCTION

In this segmentrepresents introduction of this research work.Glasgow Blatchford Scoring was first developed in 2000. It was first published in the University of Glasgow, UK by Blatchford. It is one of the clinical scoring method in upper gastrointestinal bleeding.[1] It helps in predicting the patient who needs outpatient or hospital based management in upper gastrointestinal bleeding. GBS doesnot require invasive procedures like endoscopy, the scoring is based on humble clinical and laboratory variables that are assessed once the patient offerings to the emergency department.[2] A score of 0 denotes low risk patients who are appropriate for outpatientmanagement. On the contrary a score of 6 or more were connected with a greater than 50% risk of needing an intervention like blood transfusion, endoscopic treatment or surgery.[3].

In these articles represents sector 2 of these articles explains the feature on the related works. In section 3 presents the materials and methods adopted and section 4 presents the particulars of the experimentations and discussions. Finally segment 5 accomplishes the articles by allocation our implications and upcoming strategies

Corresponding Author :- **Dr.Harika Uppalapati**

RELATED WORKS

In this part presents centers the related works of this exploration work. Numerous fundamentally sick patients create hemostatic irregularities, running from secluded thrombocytopenia or delayed worldwide thickening tests to complex deformities, for example, spread intravascular coagulation.[4] There are numerous foundations for an unhinged coagulation in basically sick patients and every one of these hidden issues may require explicit remedial or strong management.[5] lately, new experiences into the pathogenesis and clinical administration of numerous coagulation deserts in fundamentally sick patients have been collected and this information is useful in deciding the ideal indicative and restorative system.[6]Peptic ulcer disease Causes erosion of gastric or intestinal mucosa by either caustic agents or infection. [7] Patient may present with the history of peptic ulcer disease or alcohol use or Helicobacter pylori infection or NSAID abuse.[8]Mallory-Weiss tear is due to longitudinal oesophageal mucosal laceratrion usually at the gastroesophageal junction after forceful retching. Patient usually presents with the history of forceful emesis and a minor upper gastrointestinal bleeding.[9]Malignancy causes bleeding from the vasculature and clinically patient may have unexplained weight loss, previous episodes of bleeding and history of alcohol or tobacco abuse.[10]Esophageal varices is due to the fibrotic liver parenchyma causing portal hypertension and dilation of collaterals.[11] Usually presents with the history of alcohol or liver cirrhosis, ascites or previous history of esophageal bleeding.Arteriovenous malformation is due to the congenital vascular malformations which are predisposed to rupture.[12] Family history is likely to be the clinical cue.Aortoenteric fistula is due to the erosion of aortic graft into intestinal lumen and patient may have clinical history of aortic procedure with presentation of either sentinel bleed or massive hematochezia or hematemesis.[13]A conclusion of DIC ought to be made uniquely within the sight of a causative factor upheld by rehashed lab tests for coagulation profile and thickening elements. A powerful scoring framework assists with distinguishing a plain DIC and a high score intently associates with mortality.[14]Disseminated intravascular coagulopathy ought not be considered as an unmistakable sickness substance but instead an indication of another malady. It has been related with practically all hazardous ailments.[15]

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In this segmentrepresents the materials and methods of this research work.Patients with upper gastrointestinal bleeding admitted in Chennai Region Hospitals, Tamilnadu over a period of two years from 2013 october – 2015 october were included in this study.About Fifty (50) or more patients satisfying the inclusion criteria were takenup for the study.Patients admitted with upper gastrointestinal bleeding were included in this study. Purpose of the study was explained to the patient and educatedagreement was gotten.

Patients included in the study were examined and subsequently subjected to Hb, BUN. By applying the Glasgow Blatchford scoring, patient were confidential in to low risk and high risk in upper gastro intestinal bleeding.The study instrument measured the following parameters

- Clinical profile
- Pulse rate
- Systolic blood pressure
- Haemoglobin
- BUN

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

In these segment emphases the results and discussions of this research work.A total of 54 subjects with UGI bleeding were registered in the study. 74%were male. Mean age was 44.1 ± 17.84 years, mean GBS was 5.91 ± 4.27. The meanGBS had statistically significant correlation with tachycardia, hypotension, uraemia, liver disease, malena and low Hemoglobin. However, the role of Syncope andCardiac Failure in the scoring system was not found to be statistically significant in this study.

	No. of patients (n)	**% of patients**
PT	9	16.7
aPTT	2	3.7
Thrombocytopenia	7	13

The distribution of thrombocytopenia in 13%, high aPTT in 3.7% and high PT INR in 16.7% with the UGI bleeding.Males had more incidence of upper gastrointestinal bleeding in the study Malena was the most common symptom noted in the study. Hemodynamic instability was noted with 13% showing Tachycardia and 16.7% having Hypotension.Men and women were evaluated separately in terms of the Hb values in which revealed that 28% mild, 22% moderate and 17% had severe anaemia.Comorbidities analysis showed that patients in the study group had an increased incidence of liver disease.Uraemia is a better marker of risk in upper Gastro intestinal bleeding.Oesophagealvarices is the most common endoscopic finding in the study.Glasgowblatchford score has correlation with the number of units of blood transfusion. ie) more the score, higher the number of blood transfusion.Patients with a score of less than six did not require blood transfusion.Almost all the patients with

a score of zero in the study had normal endoscopic finding and also they had no blood transfusion or interventions.

Number of blood transfusion is directly proportional to the Glasgow Blatchford Score, which when compared with mean GBS and was found statistically significant in the study (p – 0.000). who showed that GBS would have a high correlation with the number of units of blood transfused for patients.

CONCLUSION

Finally this work concludes that all the patients with a score of zero in the study had normal endoscopic finding and also they did not need any blood transfusion or interventions. A Glasgow Blatchford score of zero had more than 99% sensitivity in identification of risk and those who donot require blood transfusion, intervention and rebleed in studies from United Kingdom, China, Taiwan, Japan, United states of America and Hong kong. Glasgowblatchford score of less than 6 did not require any blood transfusion in the study. In a similar study by Stevenson et al, it was observed that no patients with a score of less than six required blood transfusion.

REFERENCE:

1. Stephens JR, Hare NC, Warshow U, et al. Management of minor upper gastrointestinal haemorrhage in the community using the Glasgow Blatchford Score. Eur J Gastro Hep 2009; 21: 1340–6.
2. Peter DJ, Dougherty JM. Evaluation of the patient with gastrointestinal bleeding: an evidence based approach. Emerg Med Clin North Am. Feb 1999;17(1):239-61,
3. Saeed ZA, Winchester CB, Michaeletz PA, Woods KL, Graham DY. A scoring system to predict rebleeding after endoscopic therapy of non-variceal upper gastrointestinal hemorrhage. Am J Gastroenterol 1993; 88: 1842–9.
4. Hay JA, Maldonado L, Weingarten SR, Ellrodt AG. Prospective evaluation of a clinical guideline recommending hospital length of stay in upper gastrointestinal tract hemorrhage. JAMA 1997; 278: 2151–6.
5. Cameron EA, Pratap JN, Sims TJ, et al. Three year prospective validation of a pre-endoscopic risk stratification in patients with acute upper-gastrointestinal haemorrhage. Eur J Gastro Hepatol 2002; 14: 497–501.
6. Romagnuolo J, Barkun AN, Enns R, Armstrong D, Gregor J. Simple clinical predictors may obviate urgent endoscopy in selected patients with nonvariceal upper gastrointestinal tract bleeding. Arch Intern Med 2007; 167: 265–70.
7. Stanley AJ, Ashley D, Dalton HR, et al. Out-patient management of patients with low-risk upper gastrointestinal haemorrhage: multicentre validation and prospective evaluation. Lancet 2009; 373: 42–7.
8. PANG S.H., CHING J.Y., LAU J.Y., SUNG J.J., GRAHAM D.Y., CHAN F.K. Comparing the Blatchford and pre-endoscopic Rockall score in predicting the need for endoscopic therapy in patients with upper GI hemor-rhage. Gastrointest. Endosc., 2010, 71 : 1134-1140.
9. Fallah MA, Prakash C, Edmundowicz S. Acute gastrointestinal bleeding. Med Clin North Am 2000;84:1183-208.
10. Yavorski RT, Wong RK, Maydonovitch C, Battin LS, Furnia A, Amundson DE. Analysis of 3,294 cases of upper gastrointestinal bleeding in military medical facilities. Am J Gastroenterol 1995;90:568-73.
11. World J Gastroenterol 2012 Mar; 18(11): 1154-1158. Published online 2012 Mar 21.doi: 10. 3748/wjg.v18.i11.1154
12. Blatchford O, Murray WR, Blatchford M. A risk score to predict need for treatment for upper gastrointestinal haemorrhage. Lancet 2000; 356: 1318– 21.
13. Cipolletta L, Bianco MA, Rotondano G, Marmo R, Piscopo R. Outpatient management for low-risk nonvariceal upper GI bleeding: a randomized controlledtrial. GastrointestEndosc 2002; 55:1–5.
14. Longstreth GF, Feitelberg SP. Successful outpatient management of acute upper gastrointestinal hemorrhage: use of practice guidelines in a large patient series. GastrointestEndosc 1998; 47: 219–22.
15. Chen IC, Hung MS, Chiu TF, Chen JC, Hsiao CT. Risk scoring systems to predict need for clinical intervention for patients with nonvariceal upper gastrointestinal tract bleeding. The American journal of emergency medicine. 2007 Sep; 25(7):774-9.