

# UFH Monitoring in ECMO and Cardiac Surgery: The Search for a Valid Reference Standard

Summary of a Perspective article | *Frontiers in Medicine* 2026;13:1818646 | Weber CF, Zacharowski K, Calatzis A, Lindner ML

## Why this paper matters to Haemoview

This Perspective article — co-authored by Andreas Calatzis, inventor of ClotPro® — delivers a landmark challenge to conventional UFH monitoring in the two clinical settings where ClotPro® and Multiclot® are most commonly deployed: cardiac surgery with cardiopulmonary bypass (CPB) and extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO). The authors argue that no universally validated reference assay exists for UFH in these settings, that anti-Xa assays are being used as if validated when they are not, and that the entire field requires conceptual re-evaluation. Published in *Frontiers in Medicine* in May 2026, it also directly cites a 2026 prospective study comparing ClotPro® IN/HI-test against aPTT and anti-Xa in critically ill patients.

## Study at a glance

Item	Detail
Article type	Perspective (expert opinion/analysis), open access CC BY
Authors	Weber CF, Zacharowski K, Calatzis A*, Lindner ML (*ClotPro inventor, LMU Munich)
Journal	<i>Frontiers in Medicine</i> 2026;13:1818646. DOI: 10.3389/fmed.2026.1818646
Clinical scope	Cardiac surgery with CPB, ECMO, ICU heparin therapy
Core argument	Anti-Xa assays have never been formally validated as a reference standard in CPB or ECMO. Using an unvalidated assay to calibrate other tests creates a methodological paradox that undermines the entire evidence base for current UFH monitoring targets.
ClotPro link	ClotPro IN-test is explicitly named in the paper as a VET assay used for UFH monitoring; a 2026 ClotPro prospective ICU study (Mirus et al., <i>BMC Anaesthesiology</i> ) is cited as key evidence.

## The methodological paradox — the core finding

The paper's central argument: the assay clinicians treat as the 'gold standard' for UFH monitoring in CPB and ECMO (anti-Xa) has never been validated for those specific settings. Yet it is used to calibrate and benchmark all other tests — including point-of-care tools and VET. The authors call this a conceptual circularity that cannot be resolved until context-specific validation studies are done.

**Key message:** Sixty years after the introduction of the ACT, reliable UFH monitoring in extracorporeal circulation remains, in the authors' own words, 'an unresolved challenge'.

## Key findings in detail

### 1 | The dextran sulphate problem — assays over- or underestimate heparin

- Anti-Xa assays differ fundamentally on whether they contain dextran sulphate (DS). DS was added to prevent ex vivo heparin neutralisation by platelet factor 4 (PF4) during sample handling. Assays with DS: HemosIL Liquid Anti-Xa (Werfen), INNOVANCE Heparin (Siemens), BIOPHEN Heparin LRT (Hyphen). Assays without DS: STA Liquid Anti-Xa (Stago), Technochrom Anti-Xa (Technoclone).
- In CPB and ECMO, in vivo PF4 release is substantial. DS-containing assays may liberate heparin already neutralised in vivo by PF4 or by protamine, generating falsely elevated anti-Xa values that do not reflect biologically active heparin.
- Conversely, assays without DS may allow ex vivo PF4 to neutralise heparin during transport and centrifugation, producing falsely low anti-Xa values.
- After protamine in cardiac surgery, DS-containing assays may show residual anti-Xa activity that does not exist biologically — leading to unnecessary additional protamine dosing.

### 2 | Four clinical scenarios demand different monitoring approaches

Clinical scenario	Key issue for monitoring
Standard-dose UFH (e.g., DVT/ICU)	DS may be appropriate — ex vivo PF4 is the dominant problem here. Anti-Xa with DS performs best.
High-dose UFH during CPB	Very high concentrations dominate — DS effect proportionally small. ACT is established POC standard.
Low-moderate UFH during ECMO	Lower concentrations magnify DS distortion. Anti-Xa results may be meaningfully misleading. Most problematic scenario.
Post-protamine residual heparin	DS liberation of protamine-bound heparin creates falsely elevated readings — clinically dangerous for protamine dosing.

### 3 | VET (including ClotPro) — named, cited, and positioned for validation

- The paper explicitly names ClotPro IN-test (alongside ROTEM in-tem and TEG CK) as VET assays proposed for UFH monitoring in ECMO and cardiac surgery.
- A 2026 prospective study (Mirus et al., BMC Anaesthesiology) comparing ClotPro<sup>®</sup> IN/Hi-test against aPTT and anti-Xa in critically ill patients is cited as key supporting evidence.
- Using clotting time ratios (IN-test vs HI-test — with vs without heparinase) may improve assay performance in quantifying residual heparin.
- The paper also honestly acknowledges that VET assays share some confounders with aPTT/ACT — underscoring why prospective validation studies in CPB/ECMO are urgently needed.

### 4 | A research agenda — and where ClotPro belongs

- Authors call for three steps per indication: (1) define an appropriate reference method, (2) establish clinically meaningful acceptance criteria, and (3) validate candidate monitoring tools — explicitly including point-of-care assays.
- This positions VET-based heparin monitoring, including ClotPro<sup>®</sup>, as a legitimate candidate for formal validation — not an outlier.

## Relevance to ClotPro® and Multiclot® users

This paper directly strengthens the Haemoview clinical narrative across the most common settings for ClotPro® and Multiclot® use.

Paper finding	Relevance to ClotPro/Multiclot users
No validated reference assay for UFH in CPB/ECMO	When clinicians claim anti-Xa is their gold standard, this paper — from leading authorities including the ClotPro inventor — explains why that is a flawed assumption in cardiac surgery and ECMO.
DS anti-Xa may overestimate post-protamine heparin	A whole-blood VET approach (IN-test vs HI-test ratio) circumvents the plasma-based dextran sulphate problem — directly measuring the clotting response including all in vivo interactions.
ECMO: most problematic scenario for current assays	ECMO teams face the greatest uncertainty in UFH monitoring. The 2026 Mirus et al. ClotPro study provides prospective data supporting the IN/HI-test approach in exactly this population.
ClotPro IN-test named for UFH monitoring	Direct third-party endorsement by co-author Calatzis (ClotPro inventor) and independent experts Weber, Zacharowski, and Lindner — in peer-reviewed <i>Frontiers in Medicine</i> .
Validation studies called for urgently	Positions Haemoview — through ClotPro/Multiclot and the growing VET evidence base — at the frontier of what the field needs next.

## Suggested customer conversation points

- When you measure anti-Xa in your ECMO patients — do you know whether your reagent contains dextran sulphate? This paper explains why it matters significantly.
- After protamine, do you trust your anti-Xa result? The authors — including the inventor of ClotPro — argue that DS-based assays may be overestimating residual heparin.
- A whole-blood VET approach using heparinase — comparing the IN-test and HI-test — reflects what is actually happening in the patient's blood, not just in platelet-poor plasma.

## Source

Weber CF, Zacharowski K, Calatzis A, Lindner ML. Monitoring unfractionated heparin in ECMO and cardiac surgery: the search for a valid reference standard. *Front. Med.* 2026;13:1818646.

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.3389/fmed.2026.1818646> | Open access (CC BY)

Related: Mirus M et al. ClotPro® IN/HI-test vs aPTT and anti-Xa in critically ill patients. *BMC Anaesthesiology* 2026;26:222.

## Disclaimer

*This brief is educational information only, prepared for healthcare professionals in Australia. It summarises an external peer-reviewed publication and is not a product claim, instruction for use, or substitute for clinical judgement. Clinical decisions must be made according to local protocols, institutional governance, the full clinical context of the individual patient, and the official instructions for use of the relevant device and assays. ClotPro® and Multiclot® are registered trademarks of their respective owners.*

Visual Summary — Infographic

The following infographic provides a visual overview of the key points from Weber et al. 2026, suitable for sharing with clinical colleagues.

Weber et al. | *Frontiers in Medicine* 2026 | Perspective

## UFH Monitoring in ECMO & Cardiac Surgery

### The search for a valid reference standard

Anti-Xa is useful - but not a universal reference standard

Extracorporeal circulation creates a moving target: PF4, protamine, assay design and clinical context can all change what the number means.

**WHY THIS MATTERS**

UFH remains the standard anticoagulant for cardiopulmonary bypass (CPB) and ECMO, where both under- and over-anticoagulation can have serious consequences.

- CPB: high-dose UFH
- ECMO: lower-dose, prolonged
- Post-protamine: residual UFH?

### 3 KEY POINTS

- #### 1 The reference standard is missing

ACT and aPTT are rapid and familiar, but they lack heparin specificity and standardisation. VET adds whole-blood context, but contact-pathway activation and limited CPB/ECMO validation mean it is not yet a reference standard.

**Key insight:** a more specific assay is not automatically a validated reference method.
- #### 2 Anti-Xa is assay-dependent

Dextran sulfate (DS) changes what anti-Xa can see. The same sample may read differently depending on reagent design, PF4 release, sample handling and protamine.

**WITH DS:** PF4, UFH, PROT → May overestimate. Can release bound heparin in vitro, creating an apparent high-value.

**WITHOUT DS:** Sample handling PF4 can neutralise heparin before analysis. May underestimate.

**Bottom line:** anti-Xa assays are not automatically interchangeable across sites or studies.
- #### 3 Context changes interpretation

Monitoring is not one problem. Standard IV UFH, high-dose CPB, low/moderate ECMO and post-protamine residual UFH are distinct analytical scenarios.

  - IV UFH without bypass
  - High-dose CPB
  - Low/moderate ECMO
  - After protamine

**Story of the science:** the assay, reagent, sample path and clinical phase all shape the result.

**Clinician takeaway**

- Know your anti-Xa configuration: with or without dextran sulfate, and how samples are handled.
- Be cautious after protamine and during ECMO, where PF4/protamine complexes may distort anti-Xa results.
- Do not treat ACT, aPTT, VET or anti-Xa as a universal truth; interpret with patient context and local validation.

**Ideas for further research**

- Define an appropriate reference method for biologically active UFH in CPB/ECMO.
- Set acceptance criteria linked to thrombotic and hemorrhagic outcomes.
- Validate candidate lab and point-of-care assays in multicenter CPB/ECMO cohorts.
- Test CTAD/no-DS strategies and low residual UFH measurement after protamine.

**TAKE-HOME MESSAGE**

No single assay is currently a universally validated reference standard for biologically active UFH in CPB/ECMO. Monitoring needs scenario-specific validation.

Source: Weber CF, Zacharowski K, Calatzis A, Lindner ML. Monitoring unfractionated heparin in ECMO and cardiac surgery: the search for a valid reference standard. *Frontiers in Medicine*. 2026;13:1818646.

Source: Weber CF, Zacharowski K, Calatzis A, Lindner ML. *Front. Med.* 2026;13:1818646. Open access (CC BY).