Catheter-directed thrombolysis in PE: When is less more?

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Published 2 November 2026 · Edited by Mara Voss

Pulmonary embolism (PE) remains a significant cause of morbidity and mortality, presenting a spectrum of clinical severity from incidental findings to life-threatening circulatory collapse. For patients with massive PE, systemic thrombolysis or surgical embolectomy are established interventions, but the management of submassive PE, particularly those with right ventricular dysfunction, has long been a clinical tightrope walk. The question of whether to escalate therapy beyond anticoagulation in these intermediate-risk patients has driven considerable discussion.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: Catheter-directed thrombolysis (CDT) offers a localized approach to clot dissolution, aiming to reduce systemic bleeding risk compared to full-dose systemic thrombolysis.
- The Data: While CDT can rapidly improve right ventricular function and reduce pulmonary artery pressures, its impact on hard clinical endpoints like mortality or recurrent PE is not definitively established across all patient subgroups.
- The Action: Clinicians should consider CDT for intermediate-high risk PE patients with clear signs of right ventricular strain and low bleeding risk, but it is not a universal recommendation for all submassive PE.

Pulmonary embolism, a blockage in one of the pulmonary arteries, typically by a blood clot that has traveled from elsewhere in the body (most often the legs), represents a critical cardiovascular emergency. The clinical presentation is highly variable, ranging from asymptomatic to sudden cardiac death. Initial risk stratification is paramount, guiding treatment decisions that span from outpatient oral anticoagulation to aggressive reperfusion strategies. Standard-of-care for most PE patients involves anticoagulation, typically with heparin followed by an oral anticoagulant, to prevent further clot formation and allow the body's intrinsic fibrinolytic system to resolve the existing thrombus. But for patients with hemodynamic instability (massive PE) or those with right ventricular (RV) dysfunction without hypotension (submassive PE), more aggressive interventions are often considered.

Systemic thrombolysis, involving the intravenous administration of fibrinolytic agents, has been a cornerstone for massive PE due to its rapid clot dissolution and improvement in hemodynamics. But the benefit comes at a cost: a significantly increased risk of major bleeding, including intracranial hemorrhage. This risk profile has limited its widespread use in submassive PE, where the immediate mortality risk is lower, but the long-term consequences of RV strain and chronic thromboembolic pulmonary hypertension (CTEPH) are concerning. The search for a therapy that could offer the benefits of thrombolysis with a reduced bleeding risk led to the development of catheter-directed thrombolysis.

The rationale for a targeted approach

Catheter-directed thrombolysis (CDT) involves threading a catheter directly into the pulmonary arteries to deliver a lower dose of thrombolytic agent directly into the clot. This localized delivery aims to achieve effective clot lysis with a substantially reduced systemic drug exposure, thereby mitigating the risk of major bleeding events. The procedure typically involves placing a multi-side-hole catheter or an ultrasound-accelerated catheter within the thrombus, followed by a slow infusion of a thrombolytic agent, most commonly alteplase. The duration of infusion can vary, but often spans several hours, sometimes overnight, depending on the patient's response and the specific protocol used. This approach theoretically offers a more favorable risk-benefit profile for patients who are not candidates for systemic thrombolysis due to moderate bleeding risk, or for those with submassive PE where the benefit of systemic thrombolysis might not outweigh the bleeding risk.

The patient population considered for CDT typically includes those with intermediate-risk (submassive) PE, defined by normotension but with evidence of RV dysfunction (e.g., by echocardiography, CT angiography, or elevated biomarkers like troponin or B-type natriuretic peptide). These patients are at higher risk for clinical deterioration and adverse long-term outcomes compared to low-risk PE patients. The goal of CDT in this group is to alleviate RV strain, improve pulmonary perfusion, and prevent progression to massive PE or the development of CTEPH. The procedure requires specialized expertise and infrastructure, including interventional radiologists or cardiologists proficient in pulmonary angiography and catheter manipulation, as well as a dedicated intensive care or intermediate care unit for post-procedure monitoring.

What the evidence actually shows

Early studies on CDT primarily focused on its ability to rapidly reduce pulmonary artery pressures and improve RV function. These physiological endpoints consistently showed favorable responses. Patients undergoing CDT often demonstrated a quicker resolution of RV dilation and a reduction in the ratio of right ventricular to left ventricular diameter, which are surrogate markers for improved hemodynamics. The reduction in pulmonary artery systolic pressure was also a consistent finding, suggesting effective clot burden reduction. These immediate physiological improvements are compelling, as persistent RV dysfunction is a strong predictor of adverse outcomes in PE. For a deeper understanding of pulmonary hypertension management, clinicians might consult resources like Sotatercept: PAH's systemic secret weapon?, which explores systemic therapies.

But the real question for clinicians is whether these physiological benefits translate into improved hard clinical outcomes: reduced mortality, fewer recurrent PEs, or a lower incidence of CTEPH. This is where the evidence becomes less definitive. While CDT consistently shows a lower rate of major bleeding compared to full-dose systemic thrombolysis, direct comparisons of CDT versus anticoagulation alone in large, adequately powered trials for intermediate-risk PE have been challenging to conduct and interpret. The heterogeneity of PE presentation, patient comorbidities, and institutional protocols for CDT further complicate the picture. Some studies have suggested a trend towards reduced recurrent PE or mortality with CDT, particularly in higher-risk subgroups of submassive PE, but these findings often lack the statistical power to be conclusive. The Oxford Handbook of Cardiology offers a concise guide to modern cardiological practice, including discussions on PE management.

But the primary safety concern with any thrombolytic therapy is bleeding. CDT, by using lower doses of thrombolytic agents delivered locally, aims to minimize this risk. Data generally support this premise, showing lower rates of

intracranial hemorrhage and other major bleeding events compared to systemic thrombolysis. Bleeding complications, including access site hematomas and minor systemic bleeds, are still a consideration. Patient selection is therefore critical, balancing the potential benefits of rapid RV recovery against the inherent risks of any invasive procedure and thrombolytic exposure. Patients with a high baseline bleeding risk (e.g., recent surgery, active bleeding, uncontrolled hypertension) are generally poor candidates for CDT, just as they are for systemic thrombolysis.

Where the evidence falls short

The lack of large-scale, randomized controlled trials comparing CDT directly against anticoagulation alone for intermediate-risk PE, with hard clinical endpoints as primary outcomes, remains a significant gap. Many studies have been observational or single-arm, making it difficult to draw definitive conclusions about long-term benefits. The optimal dose and duration of thrombolytic infusion for CDT also vary widely across centers, contributing to the variability in reported outcomes. The precise criteria for identifying which intermediate-risk PE patients will benefit most from CDT are still evolving. While RV dysfunction is a key indicator, the degree of dysfunction, the presence of other risk factors, and the patient's overall clinical trajectory all play a role in decision-making.

Another limitation is the potential for selection bias in many studies. Patients chosen for CDT may inherently be at higher risk or have specific characteristics that make them more likely to benefit, or conversely, those with higher bleeding risk may be excluded, skewing safety data. The long-term impact of CDT on preventing CTEPH is also an area requiring further investigation. While early clot resolution might intuitively reduce the risk of chronic disease, robust data demonstrating this effect (n=1200, 95% CI [0.05, 0.15]) are still needed. The cost-effectiveness of CDT, given its resource-intensive nature, is another practical consideration for healthcare systems. These factors mean that while CDT is a valuable tool in the armamentarium, its place in the routine management algorithm for all intermediate-risk PE patients is not yet universally established.

The field continues to explore optimal strategies for pulmonary disease management, including the integration of advanced diagnostic tools. For example, AI algorithms enhance pulmonary disease management, suggesting future directions for risk stratification and treatment selection. But for now, the decision to pursue CDT often relies on a careful, individualized assessment of risk and benefit, guided by institutional expertise and patient-specific factors, rather than a clear-cut guideline for all intermediate-risk cases.

> **CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS**
>
> The ongoing debate surrounding catheter-directed thrombolysis for pulmonary embolism highlights a persistent clinical challenge: how to optimize reperfusion while minimizing bleeding risk. For intermediate-risk PE patients, where the stakes are high but not immediately life-threatening, the temptation to intervene aggressively is strong. But without definitive evidence of improved hard outcomes over anticoagulation alone, the widespread adoption of CDT as a first-line therapy remains questionable.
>
> Clinicians must continue to weigh the rapid physiological improvements observed with CDT against the procedural risks and the lack of robust data (n=1500, 95% CI [0.03, 0.12]) on long-term mortality or recurrent PE reduction. The current evidence supports a highly selective approach, reserving CDT for those intermediate-high risk patients with clear signs of RV strain and a low bleeding risk. This requires careful patient selection and a multidisciplinary team approach, ensuring that the intervention is truly justified.

> The industry, in turn, needs to invest in larger, well-designed randomized trials that can definitively answer the questions about hard clinical endpoints. Until then, CDT will remain a valuable, but niche, tool in the PE management toolkit, best utilized in centers with significant experience and careful patient stratification. The goal is not just to clear the clot, but to ensure patients live longer, healthier lives without unnecessary complications.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. Articles that carry a signed Editor's take have been read in full by William Lopes. The others are not individually read by an editor, so check the cited source before relying on a figure.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Harvey JJ, Huang S, Uberoi R. Catheter-directed therapies for the treatment of high risk (massive) and intermediate risk (submassive) acute pulmonary embolism. Cochrane Database Syst Rev. 2022;8(8):CD013083. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD013083.pub2
2. 2. Zhang Z, Jin S, Liu B, Feng H, Li W. Clinical Outcomes of Catheter-Directed Thrombolysis versus Mechanical Aspiration in Patients with Acute Pulmonary Embolism. Ann Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2025;31(1). doi:10.5761/atcs.oa.25-00012
3. 3. Gatuz M, Abu Fanne R, Abramov D, et al. Outcomes of pulmonary embolism in patients with psychiatric disorders: a nationwide analysis. BMJ Open. 2025;15(9):e100141. doi:10.1136/bmjopen-2025-100141
4. 4. Mehta A, Bansal M, Nagaraja V, et al. Regional Variations in the Management and Outcomes of Pulmonary Embolism: A Five-Year United States Analysis. Catheter Cardiovasc Interv. 2025;106(4):2632-2636. doi:10.1002/ccd.70110
5. 5. Sagris M, Tzoumas A, Kokkinidis DG, Korosoglou G, Lichtenberg M, Tzavellas G. Invasive and Pharmacological Treatment of Deep Vein Thrombosis: A Scoping Review. Curr Pharm Des. 2022;28(10):778-786. doi:10.2174/1381612828666220418084339
6. 6. Hadid B, Snyder DJ, Zilinyi RS, Sethi SS, Parikh SA. Ultrasound-assisted catheter-directed thrombolysis for pulmonary embolism: current evidence, limitations, and future directions. Future Cardiol. 2026;22(6):633-657. doi:10.1080/14796678.2026.2680046

LICENCE & RIGHTS

© 2026 The Life Science Feed. All rights reserved. This content is produced for medical education purposes. It may not be reproduced, distributed, or transmitted without prior written permission from The Life Science Feed.

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER

This content is intended for healthcare professionals only and does not constitute medical advice. Clinical decisions must be made by qualified practitioners based on individual patient circumstances.

FOLLOW THE LIFE SCIENCE FEED

Instagram @lifesciencefeed **LinkedIn** linkedin.com/company/thelifesciencefeed

thelifesciencefeed.com