

Introduction

- Acute gastrointestinal bleeding is a common emergency while the safest and most effective transfusion strategy is still controversial.
- · Previous studies showed:
 - In critically ill patients, a restrictive transfusion strategy is at least as effective as a liberal strategy.
 - Transfusion may be harmful in patients with hypovolemic anemia.
 - In animals, transfusion can be harmful with bleeding from portal hypertensive sources.





Methods

- 2003/06 through 2009/12 patients with UGIB
 over 18 y/o in Hospital de la Santa Creu i Sant Pau in Barcelona
- · Diagnosis of UGIB:
 - Patients had hematemesis (or bloody NG aspirate), melena, or both, confirmed by hospital staff
- · Patients were excluded if:
 - Patient declined transfusion
 Massive bleeding
 - ACS, stroke, TIA, symptomatic
 - peripheral vasculopathy – Transfusion within the previous
 - 90 days
- Recent history of trauma or surgery
- Lower gastrointestinal bleeding
- Clinical Rockall score of 0 with
 - Hb level >12 g/dL

Methods

Transfusion strategy:		3623
	Restrictive-strategy	Liberal-strategy
Threshold for transfusion	7 g/dL	9 g/dL
Target post-transfusion Hb	7-9 g/dL	9-11 g/dL
 In both groups, 1 unit of red c Only prestorage leukocyte red 	ells was transfused initially duced units of packed red cel	lls were used
The protocol was applied The protocol allowed for a – symptoms or signs rel – massive bleeding – surgical intervention re	until discharge or deat a transfusion any time i lated to anemia develop equired	h. f: ped
He lovele were measured	OPH in first 2 days on	d OD thereafter and

 Hb levels were measured Q8H in first 2 days and QD thereafter, a also assessed when further bleeding was suspected.

Methods

Randomization

- Performed with computer-generated random numbers, with sealed envelopes
- Stratified according to the presence or absence of liver cirrhosis

Treatment

- All patients underwent emergency gastroscopy in first 6 hours
 nonvariceal lesion → injection of adrenaline + electrocoagulation
- or endoscopic clips
- peptic ulcer → High dose PPI for 3 days, then shifted to oral form
 portal hypertension → band ligation or sclerotherapy, somatostatin + abx with norfloxacin or ceftriaxone for 5 days, portal pressure measured within the first 48 hours and again 2 to somatos nortal pr 3 days later

Methods

· Primary outcome

- Rate of death from any cause within the first 45 days Secondary outcome
- Rate of further bleeding
- Rate in-hospital comp ations

Stastical analysis

- Estimated 430 patients in each group, the study would have the power to detect a between-group difference
- Assuming 10% mortality in the liberal-strategy group, a=0.05, β=0.2
 Actuarial probabilities were calculated with the use of Kaplan–Meier
- A Cox proportional-hazards regression model was used to compare the two transfusion-strategy groups
 The hazard ratios and their 95% CI were calculated.



1610 Patient's were screened 648 Were excluded 962 Were eligible 962 Were eligible 962 Were eligible 921 Underwert randomization 921 Underwert randomization 460 Were excluded to laberal 460 Were assigned to laberal	1610 Patients were screened 648 Were excluded 962 Were eligible 912 Underwent randomization 921 Underwent randomization 461 Were assigned to restrictive 460 Were assigned to restrictive 460 Were assigned to restrictive 17 Withdrew	1610 Patients were screened 464 Were escluded 962 Were eligible 41 Declined to participate 921 Underwert randomization 461 Were assigned to restrictive 460 Were assigned to liberal storategy 17 Withdrew		Res	ults		6
648 Were excluded 952 Were eligible 41 Declined to participate 921 Underwert randomization 460 Were assigned to Iberal strange	643 Were excluded 962 Were eligible 41 Declined to participate 921 Underwent randomization 461 Were assigned to restrictive 460 Were assigned to interal strategy 17 Withdrew 41 Declined to participate 42 Were assigned to restrictive 440 Were assigned to interal strategy 45 Were assigned to restrictive 460 Were assigned to interal strategy	648 Were excluded 942 Were eligible 41 Declined to participate 921 Underwent randomization 461 Were assigned to restrictive 17 Withdrew 41 Declined to liberal 15 Withdrew		1610 Patients v	were screened		1000
461 Were assigned to restrictive 460 Were assigned to restrictive 461 Were assigned to restrictive	461 Were assigned to restrictive 462 Were assigned to restrictive 463 Were assigned to restrictive 17 Withdree	962 Were aligible 921 Underwent randomization 461 Were assigned to restrictive strategy 17 Withdrew 462 Withdrew			648 Were	excluded	
41 Declined to participate 921 Underwent randomization 461 Were assigned to restrictive strange 460 Were assigned to liberal	41 Declined to participate 921 Underwent candomization 461 Were assigned to restrictive 460 Were assigned to liberal strategy 17 Withdrew	41 Declined to participate 921 Underwent candomization 461 Were assigned to restrictive strategy 17 Withdrew		962 Were	e eligible		
461 Were assigned to restrictive strategy	461 Were assigned to restrictive studiegy 17 Withdrew 13 Withdrew	461 Were assigned to restrictive 17 Withdraw 17 Withdraw		-	+ 41 Declin	d to participate	
461 Were as signed to restrictive 460 Were assigned to liberal strategy	460 Were assigned to Iberal strategy 17 Withdrew	460 Were assigned to Iberal strategy 17 Withdrew		921 Underwent	randomization		
461 Were assigned to restrictive 460 Were assigned to liberal strategy	461 Were assigned to restrictive strategy 17 Withdrew	461 Were assigned to restrictive strategy 17 Withdrew					
461 Were assigned to restrictive strategy 460 Were assigned to liberal strategy	461 Were assigned to restrictive 460 Were assigned to lberal strategy	461 Were assigned to restrictive strategy 460 Were assigned to liberal strategy 17 Withdrew + 13 Withdrew + 13 Withdrew					
	17 Withdrew	17 Withdrew	461 Were	assigned to restrictive strategy	460 Were assigned to strategy	liberal	

	Dooulto		
Table 1. Baseline Characteristics of the Patients			
Characteristic	Restrictive Strategy (N = 444)	Liberal Strategy (N = 445)	P Value
In-hospital bleeding — no. (%)†	20 (5)	30 (7)	0.19
Rockall score:	5.3±2.0	5.4±1.7	0.18
Source of bleeding — no./total no. (%)			
Peptic ulcer	228/444 (51)	209/445 (47) 49.1%	0.20
Location			0.95
Gastric	76/228 (33)	71/209 (34)	
Duodenal	143/228 (63)	131/209 (63)	
Stomal	9/228 (4)	7/209 (3)	
Stigmata			0.93
Active bleeding	35/228 (15)	33/209 (16)	
Visible vessel	127/228 (56)	119/209 (57)	
Gastroesophageal varices	101/444 (23)	109/445 (24) 23.6%	0.58
Mallory-Weiss tears	25/444 (6)	30/445 (7)	0.49
Erosive gastritis or esophagitis	38/444 (9)	29/445 (7)	0.26
Neoplasms	16/444 (4)	20/445 (4)	0.50
Other	36/444 (8)	48/445 (11)	



Res	sults		
Table 2. Hemoglobin Levels, Transfusions, and Cointervent	ions.*		
Variable	Restrictive Strategy (N = 444)	Liberal Strategy (N=445)	P Value
Hemoglobin level — g/dl			
At admission	9.6.±2.2	9.4±2.4	0.45
Lowest value during hospital stay	7.3±1.4	8.0±1.5	< 0.001
At discharge†	9.2±1.2	10.1±1.0	<0.001
At day 45	11.6±1.7	11.7±1.8	0.67
Patients with lowest hemoglobin <7 g/dl — no. (%)	202 (45)	81 (18)	< 0.001
Patients with lowest hemoglobin >9 g/dl — no. (%)	55 (12)	67 (15)	0.28
			A COL

Res	ults		
Table 2. Hemoglobin Levels, Transfusions, and Cointervent	ions.®	00000	
Variable	Restrictive Strategy	Liberal Strategy	P Valu
Red-cell transfusion	(11-111)	(11-113)	· · ·
Any no. of patients (%)	219 (49)	384 (86)	<0.001
Units transfused — no.			
Total\$	671	1638	< 0.001
Mean/patient	1.5±2.3	3.7±3.8	< 0.001
Median	0	3	< 0.001
Range	0-19	0-36	
During index bleedings	1.2±1.8	2.9±2.2	< 0.001
Transfusion not adjusted to hemoglobin level — no. of patients (%) ¶	35 (8)	12 (3)	0.001
Major protocol violation — no. of patients (%)	39 (9)	15 (3)	<0.001
			J

Variable	Restrictive Strategy (N = 444)	Liberal Strategy (N=445)	P Value
Duration of storage of red cells — days®#			0.95
Median	15	15	
Range	1-40	1-42	
Fresh-frozen plasma transfusion — no. of patients (%) ††	28 (6)	41 (9)	0.13
Platelet transfusion — no. of patients (%) ‡‡	12 (3)	19 (4)	0.27
Crystalloids administered within first 72 hr — ml	5491±3448	5873±4087	0.19
Receipt of colloids — no. of patients (%)	86 (19)	93 (21)	0.62





Results B Death by 6 Weeks, According to Subgroup Restrictive Subgroup Strategy Liberal Strategy otal no. (%) Hazard Ratio (95% CI) P Value no. of patie
 0.55 (0.33-0.92)
 0.02

 0.57 (0.30-1.08)
 0.08

 0.30 (0.11-0.83)
 0.02

 1.04 (0.45-2.37)
 0.91

 0.58 (0.27-1.27)
 0.18

 0.70 (0.26-1.25)
 0.26
 Overall 23/444 (5) 41/445 (9) Overall Patients with cirrhosis Child–Pugh class A or B Child–Pugh class C Bleeding from varices Bleeding from peptic ulcer 23/444 (5) 15/139 (11) 5/113 (4) 10/26 (38) 10/93 (11) 7/228 (3) 41/445 (9) 25/138 (18) 13/109 (12) 12/29 (41) 17/97 (18) 11/209 (5) -10.0 0.1 1.0 Restrictive Strategy Liberal Strategy Better Better

	Resul	ts		
able 3. Study Outcomes. ^o				
Dutcome	Restrictive Strategy (N = 444)	Liberal Strategy (N=445)	Hazard Ratio with Restrictive Strategy (95% CI)	P Value
Adverse events — no. (%)†				
Anyt	179 (40)	214 (48)	0.73 (0.56-0.95)	0.02
Transfusion reactions	14 (3)	38 (9)	0.35 (0.19-0.65)	0.001
Fever	12 (3)	16 (4)	0.74 (0.35-1.59)	0.56
Transfusion-associated circulatory overload	2 (<1)	16 (4)	0.06 (0.01-0.45)	0.001
Allergic reactions	1 (<1)	6 (1)	0.16 (0.02-1.37)	0.12
Cardiac complications§	49 (11)	70 (16)	0.64 (0.43-0.97)	0.04
Acute coronary syndrome¶	8 (2)	13 (3)	0.61 (0.25-0.49)	0.27
Pulmonary edema	12 (3)	21 (5)	0.56 (0.27-1.12)	0.07
Pulmonary complications	48 (11)	53 (12)	0.89 (0.59-1.36)	0.67
Acute kidney injury	78 (18)	97 (22)	0.78 (0.56-1.08)	0.13
Stroke or transient ischemic attack	3 (1)	6 (1)	0.49 (0.12-2.01)	0.33
Bacterial infections	119 (27)	135 (30)	0.87 (0.63-1.21)	0.41



Discussion – primary outcome

- With a restrictive transfusion strategy, the outcome of survival rate improved probably due to better control of
 - Further bleeding
 - The need for rescue therapy
 - Serious adverse events
- Our results are consistent with previous observational studies and randomized trials performed in other settings

– compare with previous studies

- Current international guidelines recommend decreasing the Hb threshold for transfusion from 10 to 7 g/dL in GI bleeding patients,
 - based on patients with normovolemic anemia due to acute bleeding
 - excluded factors such as hemodynamic instability, rapid onset of anemia, or extremely low Hb levels
- The current study addressed the effects of transfusion in which above guidelines had excluded.

Discussion – effect on further bleeding

- These harmful effects of transfusion may be related to an impairment of hemostasis
 - Counteract the splanchnic vasoconstrictive response caused by hypovolemia, inducing an increased splanchnic blood flow that impair the formation of clots
 - Transfusion may also induce abnormalities in coagulation properties
 - induce rebound increases in portal pressure that may precipitate portal hypertensive related bleeding in patients of liver cirrhosis

Discussion – effect on complications

- 6
- Cardiac complications, particularly pulmonary edema

 More frequently with liberal transfusion strategy
 - Indicate a higher risk of circulatory overload
- Transfusion-related immunomodulation, may increase
 the risk of complications or death
 - Unlikely to have occurred in current study given the similar incidence of bacterial infections in two groups
 - The universal use of prestorage leukocytereduced red cells

Discussion Discussion - effect on complications - Violation of strategies The safest and most effective transfusion strategy · In Long storage blood, storage lesions become apparent depends not only on the hemoglobin level but also on after about 14 days - the median duration of storage was 15 days in both group coexisting conditions Allowed transfusions when symptoms of anemia developed, massive bleeding occurred, or surgical intervention required - The more use of long storage blood in the liberal-strategy group may have contributed to the worse outcome n required • Violations of the transfusion protocol - occurred more often in the restrictive strategy group - The deviations from the protocol occurred in less than 10% of cases

Discussion – Limitations

• The results cannot be generalized to all patients with acute gastrointestinal bleeding

- Low risk of rebleeding were not included
 However these patients are less likely to require transfusion
- massive exsanguinating hemorrhage were also excluded
- The study was not blinded; however, bias was unlikely to introduced
 - Objective definition of the primary outcome
 - Use of a randomized design with concealed assignments

Summary

- A restrictive transfusion strategy improved the outcomes among patients with acute UGI bleeding.
 - Reduce the risk of further bleeding
 - Reduce the need for rescue therapy
 - Reduce the rate of complications
 - Increase the rate of survival was increased
- Our results suggest that in patients with acute UGI bleeding, not performing transfusion until the Hb level falls below 7g/dL.



