



Patel, N., Avlontis, V., Jones, H., Reeves, B., Sterne, J., & Murphy, G. (2015). Indications for red blood cell transfusion in cardiac surgery: A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Lancet Haematology*, 2(12), e543-e553. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-3026\(15\)00198-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-3026(15)00198-2)

Peer reviewed version

License (if available):
CC BY-NC-ND

Link to published version (if available):
[10.1016/S2352-3026\(15\)00198-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S2352-3026(15)00198-2)

[Link to publication record in Explore Bristol Research](#)
PDF-document

This is the author accepted manuscript (AAM). The final published version (version of record) is available online via Elsevier at [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2352-3026\(15\)00198-2](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/S2352-3026(15)00198-2). Please refer to any applicable terms of use of the publisher.

University of Bristol - Explore Bristol Research

General rights

This document is made available in accordance with publisher policies. Please cite only the published version using the reference above. Full terms of use are available: <http://www.bristol.ac.uk/red/research-policy/pure/user-guides/ebr-terms/>

Indications for Red Cell Transfusion in Cardiac Surgery: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomised Controlled Trials and Observational Studies.

Nishith N Patel FRCS¹, Vassilios S Avlonitis FRCS², Hayley E Jones PhD³, Barnaby C Reeves PhD⁴, Jonathan AC Sterne PhD³, Gavin J Murphy FRCS⁵.

¹National Heart & Lung Institute, Imperial College London, Hammersmith Hospital Campus, Du Cane Road, London. W12 0NN. UK; ²Department of Cardiac Surgery, Guy's and St Thomas' NHS Foundation Trust, Great Maze Pond, London. SE1 9RT. UK; ³School of Social and Community Medicine, University of Bristol, Canynge Hall, 39 Whatley Road, Bristol. BS8 2PS. UK; ⁴Clinical Trials and Evaluation Unit, School of Clinical Sciences, University of Bristol, Bristol Royal Infirmary, Bristol. UK; ⁵Leicester Cardiovascular Biomedical Research Unit & Department of Cardiovascular Sciences, University of Leicester, Glenfield General Hospital, Leicester, LE3 9QP, UK.

Address for correspondence: Professor Gavin J Murphy, British Heart Foundation Professor of Cardiac Surgery, Department of Cardiovascular Sciences, University of Leicester, Clinical Sciences Wing, Glenfield General Hospital, Leicester, LE3 9QP, UK. Tel: 0044 116 258 3021. Fax: 0044 116 287 5792. Email: gjm19@le.ac.uk

Word Count: 4464 words (excluding abstract, references, tables and figure legends).

Abstract

Background: Good blood management is an important determinant of outcome in cardiac surgery. Current guidelines recommend restrictive red blood cell (RBC) transfusion practice. Our objective was to systematically review the evidence from randomised controlled trials (RCTs) and observational studies that are used to inform transfusion decisions in adult cardiac surgery.

Methods: We searched electronic databases (PUBMED, EMBASE, Cochrane Library, DARE) from inception to May 2015, databases from specialist societies, and bibliographies of included studies and recent relevant review articles. RCTs that evaluated the effect of liberal versus restrictive RBC transfusion threshold in cardiac and non-cardiac surgery patients, and observational studies that evaluated the effect of RBC transfusion compared with no transfusion on postoperative outcomes in adult cardiac surgery patients were included. Adjusted odds ratios were pooled using fixed- and random-effects meta-analyses.

Findings: Data from 6 cardiac surgical RCTs (3352 patients), 19 non-cardiac surgical RCTs (8361 patients), and 39 observational studies (232 806 patients) were included. The pooled mortality odds ratios comparing liberal versus restrictive transfusion thresholds were 0.70 (95% CI 0.49–1.02, $p=0.06$) and 1.10 (95% CI 0.96–1.27, $p=0.16$) for cardiac surgical RCTs and RCTs in settings other than cardiac surgery, respectively. By contrast, observational cohort studies in cardiac surgery found that RBC transfusion compared with no transfusion was associated with substantially higher mortality (OR 2.72; 95% CI 2.11–3.49, $p<0.001$) and other morbidity, although with substantial heterogeneity and small study effects.

Interpretation: Evidence from RCTs in cardiac surgery refutes findings from observational studies that RBC transfusion is associated with a substantially increased risk of mortality and morbidity. Such studies, and RCTs in non-cardiac surgery, should not be used to inform treatment decisions or guidelines for cardiac surgery patients.

Funding: There was no funding source for this study.

Introduction

The aim of perioperative red blood cell (RBC) transfusion in cardiac surgery is to improve or preserve oxygen delivery in the setting of blood loss and anaemia. The decision to transfuse is complicated by several factors; severe anaemia and excessive blood loss are common in this setting^{1,2}, and patients with cardiovascular disease have different transfusion requirements to other patient groups³. Transfusion decisions in cardiac surgery are most commonly based on the severity of perioperative anaemia: guidelines currently recommend (Grade C recommendation) highly restrictive transfusion thresholds with Haemoglobin (Hb) concentrations of 6-7g/dL^{4,5}. These are based largely on the results of RCTs in non-cardiac surgery patients that indicate equivalence for restrictive transfusion thresholds⁶⁻⁸. They are also influenced by evidence from observational studies showing strong associations between the reversal of severe anaemia by RBC transfusion with adverse clinical outcomes, such as death, acute lung injury, acute kidney injury, stroke, myocardial infarction, sepsis, and surgical site infections⁹⁻¹¹.

RBC transfusion has important morbidity; haemolytic transfusion reactions and Transfusion Associated Lung Injury account for a significant number of deaths per year¹² but a causal relationship between RBC transfusion and the adverse outcomes suggested by observational analyses has yet to be established. Severe anaemia, the main indication for transfusion, is also an important predictor of adverse outcomes in cardiac surgery, where patients who have symptomatic cardiac disease are already at the limits of their physiological reserve^{2,11}. Clinical uncertainty as to the appropriate indications

for transfusion is reflected in wide variations in transfusion rates in cardiac surgery; ranging from 25% to 95% between hospitals in contemporary cross sectional studies ¹³.

The aims of this study were to systematically review and critically evaluate the evidence from RCTs and observational studies that are used to inform transfusion guidelines in cardiac surgery, and hence to provide evidence to support clinical transfusion decisions as well as to inform the design of future studies of appropriate transfusion indicators.

Methods

A protocol was developed (eAppendix pg 21) that was restricted to RCTs and observational studies of transfusion in cardiac surgery, but because current transfusion guidelines ^{4,5} are also based on RCTs in non-cardiac surgical patients, we subsequently decided to include these in this systematic review. Despite the limitations of comparing different study designs, we chose to compare RCTs and observational studies as these are the evidence base for current guidelines. The study adhered to MOOSE (eAppendix pg 29) and PRISMA (eAppendix pg 31) guidelines ^{14,15}. Two investigators (VSA, NNP) independently assessed studies for eligibility, risk of bias and data extraction: disagreements were resolved by discussion.

Study Identification

We attempted to identify all relevant published RCTs and controlled observational (non-randomised) cohort and case-control studies evaluating the impact of RBC transfusion on post-operative outcomes in adult cardiac surgical patients and non-cardiac surgical patients (RCTs only). We searched electronic databases (PUBMED, EMBASE, Cochrane

Library, DARE) from inception to May 2015. Search terms are described in the eAppendix pg 23. To identify RCTs in non-cardiac surgical patients, we re-ran the searches excluding terms relevant to the procedure (e.g. cardiac surgery) and limited the search to RCTs. We also searched relevant transfusion electronic databases. We checked the bibliographies of included studies and recent review articles for additional relevant articles.

Study Selection

Inclusion criteria were (1) Adult patients undergoing cardiac surgery (RCTs and observational studies) or critically ill/non-cardiac surgical patients (RCTs only), (2) Allogeneic RBC transfusion (intra- or post-operative), (3) In RCTs the comparison was liberal versus restrictive transfusion threshold and in observational studies the comparison was RBC transfusion versus no RBC transfusion. Exclusion criteria are provided in eAppendix pg 21. Studies evaluating the effects of storage duration on outcome were excluded as these compared outcomes in patients receiving “old blood” and “young blood”: they did not include data for patients who received “no transfusion”.

Assessment of Risk of Bias

RCTs were assessed using the Cochrane Collaboration’s Risk of Bias tool¹⁶.

Observational studies were assessed using the Newcastle-Ottawa Scales (NOS) for cohort and case-control studies.

Data Extraction

Data extraction was done independently by 2 reviewers and included author, year of publication, country of origin, study design, sample size, inclusion and exclusion criteria, methods of statistical adjustment, transfusion rate, and study results. We also noted variables included for statistical adjustment in observational studies, particularly anaemia and bleeding. Data on the transfusion of non-red cell components was not extracted as it was not our primary objective to explore the interaction between red cell and non-red cell transfusions, but to focus on the effects of red cell transfusion on clinically important endpoints such as death, major morbidity and resource use.

Outcomes

The primary outcome was short-term mortality. The secondary outcomes were acute myocardial infarction (MI), pulmonary morbidity (including adult respiratory distress syndrome, acute lung injury, delayed extubation), acute kidney injury (AKI) (including all stages of AKI, AKI requiring renal replacement therapy), infectious morbidity (including deep sternal wound infection, leg wound infection, sepsis), and cerebrovascular accident (CVA).

Statistical Analysis

Pooled odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals were estimated using both fixed- and random-effects meta-analyses. Where possible, we aimed to pool adjusted odds ratios from observational studies; otherwise we used raw outcome data to estimate unadjusted odds ratios. Sensitivity analyses explored the robustness of results by comparing the results of fixed- and random-effects meta-analyses. We tested for and quantified heterogeneity using the Q and I^2 statistics respectively¹⁷. Small study effects

were assessed by visual inspection of funnel plots and using the Egger test. The Trim and fill method was not used, although it was pre-specified in the protocol, as it is known to perform poorly in the presence of substantial between-study heterogeneity and we therefore concluded that it would not be appropriate to use it for these data.

Analyses were stratified by study design (cardiac surgical RCT, non-cardiac surgical RCT, cohort studies, and case control studies) and cardiac disease state (RCTs exclusively recruiting patients with active cardiac disease versus those RCTs not recruiting patients with active cardiac disease). Differences between groups of studies were quantified using random-effects meta-regression. Potential explanatory variables considered included: study design, transfusion thresholds and number of RBC units transfused. In addition, we used the approach of Greenland and Longnecker¹⁸ to estimate a dose-response effect in each study that provided useable data, and then pooled these estimates across studies. Subgroup analyses were performed by sample size, country, statistical adjustments, year of enrolment of first patient, and number of transfused RBC units. All analyses were carried out using MIX Version 2.0¹⁹ and Stata 10.0 (Statacorp, College Station, Texas).

Role of Funding Source

There was no funding source for this study. All authors had full access to all the data in the study and had the final responsibility for the decision to submit for publication.

Results

Characteristics of studies

A total of six cardiac surgical RCTs²⁰⁻²⁵ (3352 patients), 19 non-cardiac surgical RCTs (8361 patients)^{3,6-8,26-38} and 39 cardiac surgical observational studies^{9-11,39-74} (232 806 patients) met the inclusion criteria. A flow diagram depicting the overall search strategy is provided in Figure 1 and characteristics of included studies are shown in the eAppendix pg 2. All cardiac surgical RCTs compared restrictive with liberal RBC transfusion strategies. Four RCTs included only low-risk surgical patients undergoing elective cardiac or coronary surgery and thus excluded patients at highest risk of requiring RBC transfusion. Only two RCTs included high risk patients defined by a CARE score greater than 3²⁰ or including all patients except those undergoing emergency procedures²⁵. One RCT used non-leucodepleted RBCs²¹ and another RCT used leucodepleted RBCs²⁵. All cardiac surgical RCTs were classified as recruiting patients with active cardiac disease. There was no significant difference in postoperative bleeding between groups (eAppendix pg 7). The median number of RBC units transfused per patient ranged from 1 to 3.

All non-cardiac surgical RCTs compared restrictive with liberal RBC transfusion strategies. Five RCTs evaluated outcomes in orthopaedic patients, five in critical care patients, three in paediatric patients, two in patients with myocardial infarction, two in patients with upper gastrointestinal haemorrhage, and one each in patients admitted because of trauma or needing vascular surgery. Nine RCTs transfused leucodepleted RBCs. Two RCTs exclusively recruited patients with active cardiac disease (myocardial infarction).

Among the observational studies, 21 cohort and 18 case control studies met the inclusion criteria. Thirty-five were retrospective studies that extracted baseline and outcome data from databases of routinely collected patient information. In general, observational studies included all patients undergoing cardiac surgery, including those requiring urgent or emergent surgery, impaired LV function, preoperative anaemia or organ dysfunction, redo surgery, and massive blood loss. All observational studies compared patients who did and did not receive RBC transfusion. Only one study stated that all RBCs administered to participants were leucodepleted⁴⁵. Only 12 studies reported numbers of RBC units transfused: the median number per patient ranged from 3 to 8.

Risk of Bias

The risk of bias assessment of all RCTs is shown in the eAppendix pg 8. Eighteen of 25 studies reported adequate methods of random sequence generation and 15 studies reported adequate methods of allocation concealment. Most studies did not clearly report blinding of participants and blinding of outcome assessment. The reporting and handling of missing data was detailed for 22 studies. Three cardiac surgical studies explicitly reported adherence to a transfusion protocol. The 2 largest cardiac surgical RCTs were judged to be low risk for all elements of the risk of bias tool apart from reporting of adherence which was poorly described in one trial^{21,25}.

The quality assessment of all observational studies is shown in the eAppendix pg 9. With regard to cohort studies, 14 of 21 studies (67%) were assessed to be of high quality (NOS score higher than 6). All observational studies adjusted for common risk factors

associated with mortality following cardiac surgery. However, over 90% of cohort studies either completely or partly failed to adjust for important confounders related to transfusion and mortality. These include the severity of preoperative (n=11/21 studies) and intraoperative (n=13/21) anaemia, and bleeding (n=16/21). In case-controlled studies, 14 of 18 studies (78%) were assessed to be of high quality. However, all studies failed to adjust for at least one of the following potential confounders in their analyses: the severity of preoperative (n=14/18 studies) and intraoperative (n=16/18) anaemia, or bleeding (n=12/18)(eTable 3). None of the observational studies attempted to adjust for potential lead-time bias.

RBC Transfusion and adverse outcomes in RCTs and observational studies

Based on the results of five cardiac surgical RCTs, the pooled mortality odds ratio for the comparison liberal versus restrictive transfusion thresholds was 0.70 (95% CI 0.49-1.02, p=0.06). There was no evidence of between-study heterogeneity ($I^2=0\%$) (Figure 2, Table 1).

By contrast, based on the results of 19 RCTs in non-cardiac surgical patients the pooled mortality odds ratio for the comparison liberal versus restrictive transfusion thresholds was 1.10 (95% CI 0.96-1.27, p=0.16). There was some evidence of between study heterogeneity ($I^2=30\%$)(Figure 2, Table 1). After combining all trials (cardiac and non-cardiac surgical RCTs) there was no evidence that the risk of mortality differed between patients randomised to liberal or restrictive transfusion strategies (random effects OR 1.00, 95% CI 0.82-1.21) (Figure 2).

To test the hypothesis that liberal transfusion thresholds may benefit patients with active cardiac disease, we performed a post-hoc subgroup analysis of RCTs stratified by active cardiac disease state. Based on a meta-analysis of seven RCTs in patients with active cardiac disease (five cardiac surgical trials and two trials recruiting myocardial infarction patients), there was evidence that liberal RBC transfusion led to a reduction in mortality compared with restrictive transfusion strategies (OR 0.67, 95% CI 0.47-0.95, $p=0.03$). There was little evidence of between study heterogeneity ($I^2=2\%$) (eAppendix pg 11). By contrast, meta-analysis of 12 RCTs recruiting patients with stable cardiac disease or no cardiac disease provided evidence that liberal RBC transfusion significantly increased mortality compared with restrictive transfusion strategies (OR 1.17, 95% CI 1.01-1.36, $p=0.04$). There was moderate between study heterogeneity ($I^2=28\%$). A meta-regression found a significant reduction in mortality associated with liberal transfusion in RCTs recruiting patients with compared to without active cardiac disease (ratio of ORs: 0.57, 95% CI 0.36 – 0.91, $p=0.02$).

Based on a random-effects meta-analysis of results from 16 observational cohort studies in cardiac surgery patients, RBC transfusion was associated on average with a substantial increase in mortality compared with no transfusion (random effects OR 2.72, 95% CI 2.11 - 3.49, $p<0.001$, Figure 3 and Table 1). There was substantial heterogeneity between results of cohort studies ($I^2=93\%$), and smaller observational studies tended to estimate the adverse effect of RBC transfusion to be greater than did larger studies (Egger test P value 0.02, eAppendix pg 12), for which reason the fixed-effect estimate of the association between RBC transfusion and mortality was substantially attenuated (OR 1.63, 95% CI 1.56 – 1.70, $p<0.001$), compared with the random-effects estimate⁷⁵.

There was substantial heterogeneity ($I^2=98\%$) between the associations estimated in three case-control studies. The association of RBC transfusion with mortality was significantly higher in cohort studies than was the effect of liberal compared with restrictive transfusion estimated in cardiac surgical RCTs (ratio of ORs: 3.11, 95% CI 1.87 – 5.19, $p<0.001$).

Among the six cardiac surgical RCTs there was no evidence that liberal RBC transfusion led to increased pulmonary morbidity compared to restrictive transfusion strategies (OR 0.94, 95% CI 0.76–1.17, $p=0.58$). There was no evidence of between-study heterogeneity ($I^2=0\%$) (Table 1 and eAppendix pg 13). Similarly, seven RCTs in non-cardiac surgical patients suggested that liberal RBC transfusion did not increase pulmonary morbidity compared to restrictive transfusion strategies (OR 1.15, 95% CI 0.95–1.40, $p=0.14$, $I^2=18\%$). By contrast, random-effects meta-analysis of results from seven observational studies suggested that on average RBC transfusion was associated with a substantial increase in pulmonary morbidity (average OR 1.99, 95% CI 1.47–2.69, $p<0.001$, Table 1 and eAppendix pg 13) with evidence of significant heterogeneity between results ($I^2=97\%$).

There was no evidence from cardiac surgical RCTs that liberal transfusion led to increased AKI (5 RCTs: OR 0.86, 95% CI 0.68–1.09, $p=0.22$) or infectious morbidity (4 RCTs: OR 0.97, 95% CI 0.79–1.19, $p=0.75$) compared to restrictive transfusion strategies, and no evidence of between-study heterogeneity (Table 1, eAppendix pg 14 and 15). Amongst 11 RCTs in non-cardiac surgical patients the pooled infectious morbidity odds ratio for the comparison liberal versus restrictive transfusion was 1.16

(95% CI 0.99-1.37, $p=0.07$, $I^2=0\%$). By contrast, random-effects meta-analysis of results from observational studies suggested that on average RBC transfusion was associated with a substantial increase in AKI (14 observational studies: OR 3.05, 95% CI 2.10-4.44, $p<0.001$) and infectious morbidity (11 observational studies: OR 2.30, 95% CI 1.85 – 2.86, $p<0.001$). There was substantial heterogeneity between results of observational studies (AKI: $I^2=97\%$; Infection: $I^2=73\%$) and smaller observational studies tended to estimate the adverse effect of RBC transfusion to be greater than did larger observational studies (AKI: Egger test P value 0.075; Infection: Egger test P value 0.037, eAppendix pg 16 and 17.). Correspondingly, the fixed-effect estimates of the associations between RBC transfusion and AKI (OR 1.73, 95% CI 1.65-1.83, $p<0.001$), and RBC transfusion and infection (OR 1.81, 95% CI 1.73-1.89, $p<0.001$) were substantially attenuated, compared with the random-effects estimates.

Only 1 cardiac surgical RCT reported on MI and CVA. There was no evidence from non-cardiac surgical RCTs that liberal transfusion led to increased MI (10 RCTs: OR 0.79, 95% CI 0.58-1.09, $p=0.15$) or CVA (8 RCTs: OR 1.53, 95% CI 0.83–2.83, $p=0.18$) compared to restrictive transfusion strategies, and no evidence of between-study heterogeneity (Table 1, eAppendix pg 18 and 19). Random-effects meta-analysis of results from observational studies suggested that on average RBC transfusion was associated with an increase in MI (8 observational studies: OR 1.93, 95% CI 1.45-2.58, $p<0.001$) and CVA (7 observational studies: OR 2.03, 95% CI 1.42-2.90, $p<0.001$) with substantial heterogeneity between study results (MI: $I^2=89\%$; CVA: $I^2=79\%$) (Table 1, eAppendix pg 18 and 19).

Sources of Heterogeneity

Pooled analysis of each outcome in observational studies revealed clear heterogeneity (Table 1). For all outcomes considered in observational studies, the heterogeneity of effect could not be attributed to differences in sample size, country, statistical adjustment or year of enrolment of first patient: when stratifying analyses by these variables I^2 remained high (eAppendix pg 10). Exclusion sensitivity analysis did not reduce heterogeneity amongst observational studies (eAppendix pg 34). Important confounders that were not adjusted for included severity of anaemia, bleeding, and volume of blood transfused, all key predictors of both transfusion and adverse outcome. We therefore attempted to assess each of these as potential sources of heterogeneity. Volume of RBC transfusion was most commonly reported across studies (Table 3). For MI and infection, heterogeneity was substantially reduced when analyses were stratified according to the number of RBC units transfused. Among the 8 studies that stratified their analyses by the number of RBC units transfused the association of MI and infection with transfusion increased with the number of RBC units transfused (Table 3). Dose-response relationships were estimable in three studies: a meta-analysis of these found an average increase in the odds of infection per unit of RBC administered of 1.20 (95% CI 1.13 – 1.28, eAppendix pg 20). Only 6 observational studies stratified their analyses based on preoperative or nadir haematocrit. Only 1 study adjusted for blood loss. Reporting of these analyses was inconsistent and therefore we were unable to conduct subgroup analyses based on these variables.

Discussion

Our systematic review found that estimated effects of RBC transfusion differed markedly between cardiac surgical RCTs, non-cardiac surgical RCTs and observational studies. In RCTs of adult patients undergoing cardiac surgery, there was some evidence that a liberal RBC transfusion strategy reduced mortality compared with a restrictive transfusion strategy. There was no evidence of between-trial heterogeneity in results. However, fewer than 3400 patients have been randomised in such trials and only two included high-risk patients. In RCTs of more than 8000 non-cardiac surgical patients, there was little evidence that liberal transfusion reduced mortality compared to restrictive transfusion thresholds, and little evidence of between-trial heterogeneity in results. However, these trials included both adult and paediatric patients with different primary pathologies, as well as patients with important differences in comorbidities such as cardiovascular disease⁸. Stratifying analyses by cardiac disease state suggested that liberal transfusion strategies reduce mortality in RCTs exclusively recruiting patients with active or symptomatic cardiac disease, such as those undergoing cardiac surgery or experiencing myocardial infarction. Conversely, liberal transfusion strategies may increase mortality in RCTs recruiting patients without active or symptomatic cardiac disease.

By contrast with results from RCTs, observational studies of adult patients undergoing cardiac surgery reported substantially increased mortality, MI, pulmonary morbidity, AKI, CVA and infectious morbidity in those receiving RBC transfusion compared with those not transfused. However, there was substantial heterogeneity between the results of observational studies, and smaller studies tended to estimate the adverse effect of

RBC transfusion to be greater than larger studies. The adverse effect of RBC transfusion appeared to increase with increasing number of RBC units transfused.

The principal explanation for the divergence in our estimates of the risks and benefits of red cell transfusion between observational studies and RCTs in cardiac surgery is that the nature of comparisons, and groups being compared, differ between these types of studies. RCTs directly address the question of primary clinical interest by comparing transfusion thresholds that reflect the variability of contemporary clinical practice. They are the best way to evaluate the effect of transfusion on clinical outcomes, and have the least risk of bias. They achieve this by comparing outcomes in groups of patients that are similar because of randomisation, but who receive different frequencies and volumes of red cell transfusion. In these trials some patients in the liberal transfusion group do not receive a transfusion whereas some patients in the restrictive group do receive a transfusion, reproducing the effect of using different thresholds in clinical settings. Conversely, the observational studies compared transfusion with no transfusion. This is problematic because the substantial risk of death and other serious adverse events mean that it would not be ethically justified to consider no transfusion as a treatment policy in patients with severe bleeding or anaemia: transfusion can be lifesaving and no alternatives to transfusion are available in such patients. It follows that estimated effects of transfusion from observational studies are likely to have been subject to unmeasured confounding, because they included in the transfusion group patients who became so severely ill during surgery that they could never have remained transfusion free. The TRACS and TITRE2 trial investigators clearly demonstrated the potential for such bias. The intention to treat comparison in both trials showed no evidence of an adverse effect

of a liberal transfusion strategy ^{21,25}. However, a secondary multivariable logistic regression analysis of the data from both trials comparing patients who did and did not receive an RBC transfusion found that patients who received RBC transfusion were at higher risk of mortality: they were older, had higher Euroscores, longer CPB times, higher lactate values at the end of the operation, higher Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation (APACHE) II and Simplified Acute Physiology Score (SAPS) II scores and longer ITU and hospital stay compared to those who were not transfused ⁷⁶. Even after adjusting for these factors, receipt of transfusion was independently associated with an increase in adverse outcome and this apparent adverse effect increased with greater transfusion volume.

Two broad ways to address unmeasured confounding in observational studies could be considered. First, it might in principle be possible to precisely record the degree of morbidity present at the time of transfusion and measure such morbidity in non-transfused patients at an equivalent time. Propensity score methods could then be used to identify groups of patients whose probability of transfusion was close to 1 (or close to zero) and exclude them from analyses ⁷⁷. Second, observational analyses might mimic RCTs of liberal versus restrictive transfusion strategies, by following patients from the start of surgery and censoring those who depart from one or other strategy ⁷⁸. Such an approach was used to address the effect on mortality of commencing antiretroviral therapy at different CD4 count thresholds, in HIV-1 infected patients ⁷⁹. In practice, observational analyses of the effects of blood transfusion face considerable difficulties, even when appropriate analysis methods are used. For example, observational studies determine outcomes in patients from the time of exposure to the intervention i.e.

transfusion, and not the point of clinical decision making i.e. severe perioperative anaemia. This may produce a lead-time bias that exaggerates the effect by excluding clinical adverse events in patients who may have been severely anaemic, but were not initially transfused. In particular, it is extremely difficult to measure and control for all the factors influencing the decision to transfuse, since these vary during the operation and may be impossible to measure at times of emergency intervention. Importantly, none of the observational studies included in our review controlled for all the principal confounders, that is bleeding and anaemia. These findings lead us to question whether the results of existing observational studies should inform clinical transfusion decisions or blood management guidelines. Treatment guidelines are best informed by RCTs.

In RCTs of adult patients undergoing cardiac surgery, there was evidence that a liberal RBC transfusion strategy reduces mortality compared with a restrictive transfusion strategy. This however did not reach statistical significance. These apparent differences therefore could have arisen by chance: relatively few patients have been randomised in the context of cardiac surgery. Effects of transfusion estimated in RCTs may also be subject to bias. Studies were not blinded and, therefore decisions about perioperative care may have been affected by clinicians' knowledge of the randomised intervention ("performance bias"). Only three of the 6 cardiac surgical RCTs described the extent of adherence to the study protocol ^{20,21,25}. If transfusion thresholds in practice were more similar than specified in the protocol then differences between groups may have been attenuated. Nonetheless it is striking that the effects in four of the five cardiac surgical RCTs that reported on mortality were in the direction of benefit from liberal, compared with restrictive, transfusion thresholds. This is in contrast to RCTs in non-cardiac

surgical populations, which found no difference between liberal and restrictive transfusion strategies but instead a trend towards increased mortality with liberal transfusion. A survival benefit with more liberal transfusion is plausible; patients undergoing cardiac surgery, who are at the limits of their cardiovascular reserve preoperatively, and who frequently develop oxygen supply dependency postoperatively may benefit from higher haemoglobin levels to improve oxygen delivery. Our post hoc analysis that stratified RCTs into patients with or without active cardiac disease further supports this hypothesis.

Though subject to the limitations described above, our meta-analysis of RCTs represents the best available evidence that RBC transfusion may be safe (compared with available alternatives) in adult cardiac surgery, although the best threshold (in terms of severity of bleeding or anaemia) remains to be defined and may vary for different patient groups or stages of the perioperative journey⁸⁰⁻⁸². Importantly, no RCT has shown that transfusion in these patients should be withheld until haemoglobin thresholds of 6-7g/dL (except in patients with evidence of critical end-organ ischemia), as per current guidelines^{4,5}.

RBC transfusion rates range from 25-90% of patients across centres in contemporary studies^{13,83}. This is largely because appropriate indications for the use of this costly and valuable resource are unknown. Such uncertainty with respect to an expensive pharmacological intervention would be unthinkable. The results of RCTs in non-cardiac surgery patients may not be transferrable to a population with symptomatic cardiac disease and it is of concern that these, as well as the results of observational studies, which we have concluded are unable to guide transfusion practice, form the basis of

national and international blood conservation guidelines ^{4,5,84}. Such guidelines urge clinicians to adopt restrictive transfusion practices due to the adverse outcomes demonstrated in these studies ^{4,5}. Reduction of this uncertainty requires adequately powered and well conducted RCTs that anticipate the limitations that we have described: they should include patients at high-risk of transfusion (for example by using validated transfusion risk scores), and document measures taken to ensure that other aspects of care are the same across intervention groups, for example by blinding surgeons and anaesthetists to treatment allocation and allowing other staff to make transfusion decisions according to the study protocol. The feasibility of large trials enrolling high-risk patients has been demonstrated in the TITRE2 trial²⁵ and other patient groups, such as gastrointestinal haemorrhage²⁷ and high risk patients following hip surgery⁸.

Author Contributions: NNP and GJM had full access to all of the data in the study and take responsibility for the integrity of the data and the accuracy of the data analysis.

Study concept and design: NNP, GJM.

Acquisition of data: VSA, NNP.

Analysis and interpretation of data: NNP, HEJ, BR, JACS, GJM.

Drafting of the manuscript: NNP, JACS, GJM.

Statistical analysis: NNP, HEJ, JACS.

Study supervision: GJM.

Sources of Funding: NNP is supported by the National Institute of Health Research and the British Heart Foundation (PG11/95/29173), GJM is supported by the Higher Education Funding Council of England and the British Heart Foundation (CH/12/1/29419). JACS is funded by a National Institute for Health Research Senior Investigator award (NF-SI-0611-10168). HEJ is funded by an MRC career development award in biostatistics (MR/M014533/1).

Conflict of Interest Disclosures: All authors have completed and submitted the ICMJE Form for Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest. GJM has acted as a paid consultant for the company Ethicon Biosurgery. HEJ has performed paid consultancy work on statistical methodology for Novartis AG. No other disclosures were reported.

References

1. Karkouti K, Wijeyesundera DN, Yau TM, et al. Advance Targeted Transfusion in Anemic Cardiac Surgical Patients for Kidney Protection: An Unblinded Randomized Pilot Clinical Trial. *Anesthesiology* 2012; **116**(3): 613-21.
2. Karkouti K, Wijeyesundera DN, Beattie WS. Risk associated with preoperative anemia in cardiac surgery: a multicenter cohort study. *Circulation* 2008; **117**(4): 478-84.
3. Hebert PC, Yetisir E, Martin C, et al. Is a low transfusion threshold safe in critically ill patients with cardiovascular diseases? *Crit Care Med* 2001; **29**(2): 227-34.
4. Ferraris VA, Brown JR, Despotis GJ, et al. 2011 update to the Society of Thoracic Surgeons and the Society of Cardiovascular Anesthesiologists blood conservation clinical practice guidelines. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2011; **91**(3): 944-82.
5. Napolitano LM, Kurek S, Luchette FA, et al. Clinical practice guideline: red blood cell transfusion in adult trauma and critical care. *Crit Care Med* 2009; **37**(12): 3124-57.
6. Lacroix J, Hebert PC, Hutchison JS, et al. Transfusion strategies for patients in pediatric intensive care units. *N Engl J Med* 2007; **356**(16): 1609-19.
7. Hebert PC, Wells G, Blajchman MA, et al. A multicenter, randomized, controlled clinical trial of transfusion requirements in critical care. Transfusion Requirements in Critical Care Investigators, Canadian Critical Care Trials Group. *N Engl J Med* 1999; **340**(6): 409-17.
8. Carson JL, Terrin ML, Noveck H, et al. Liberal or restrictive transfusion in high-risk patients after hip surgery. *N Engl J Med* 2011; **365**(26): 2453-62.
9. Murphy GJ, Reeves BC, Rogers CA, Rizvi SI, Culliford L, Angelini GD. Increased mortality, postoperative morbidity, and cost after red blood cell transfusion in patients having cardiac surgery. *Circulation* 2007; **116**(22): 2544-52.
10. Ranucci M, Pazzaglia A, Bianchini C, Bozzetti G, Isgro G. Body size, gender, and transfusions as determinants of outcome after coronary operations. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2008; **85**(2): 481-6.
11. Habib RH, Zacharias A, Schwann TA, et al. Role of hemodilutional anemia and transfusion during cardiopulmonary bypass in renal injury after coronary revascularization: implications on operative outcome. *Crit Care Med* 2005; **33**(8): 1749-56.
12. Bolton-Maggs P, Poles D, Watt A, Cohen H, Thomas D, Group obotSS. The Annual SHOT Report. Available at: <http://www.shotuk.org/wp-content/uploads/2013/08/SHOT-Annual-Report-2012.pdf>, 2012. Last accessed 7th August 2015.
13. Bennett-Guerrero E, Zhao Y, O'Brien SM, et al. Variation in use of blood transfusion in coronary artery bypass graft surgery. *JAMA* 2010; **304**(14): 1568-75.
14. Liberati A, Altman DG, Tetzlaff J, et al. The PRISMA statement for reporting systematic reviews and meta-analyses of studies that evaluate healthcare interventions: explanation and elaboration. *BMJ* 2009; **339**: b2700.
15. Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, et al. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. *JAMA* 2000; **283**(15): 2008-12.
16. Higgins JP, Altman DG, Gotzsche PC, et al. The Cochrane Collaboration's tool for assessing risk of bias in randomised trials. *BMJ* 2011; **343**: d5928.
17. Higgins JP, Thompson SG. Quantifying heterogeneity in a meta-analysis. *Statistics in medicine* 2002; **21**(11): 1539-58.

18. Greenland S, Longnecker MP. Methods for trend estimation from summarized dose-response data, with applications to meta-analysis. *Am J Epidemiol* 1992; **135**(11): 1301-9.
19. Bax L, Yu LM, Ikeda N, Tsuruta H, Moons KG. Development and validation of MIX: comprehensive free software for meta-analysis of causal research data. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2006; **6**: 50.
20. Shehata N, Burns LA, Nathan H, et al. A randomized controlled pilot study of adherence to transfusion strategies in cardiac surgery. *Transfusion* 2012; **52**(1): 91-9.
21. Hajjar LA, Vincent JL, Galas FR, et al. Transfusion requirements after cardiac surgery: the TRACS randomized controlled trial. *JAMA* 2010; **304**(14): 1559-67.
22. Slight RD, Fung AK, Alonzi C, Bappu NJ, McClelland DB, Mankad PS. Rationalizing blood transfusion in cardiac surgery: preliminary findings with a red cell volume-based model. *Vox Sang* 2007; **92**(2): 154-6.
23. Bracey AW, Radovancevic R, Riggs SA, et al. Lowering the hemoglobin threshold for transfusion in coronary artery bypass procedures: effect on patient outcome. *Transfusion* 1999; **39**(10): 1070-7.
24. Murphy GJ, Rizvi SI, Battaglia F, et al. A pilot randomized controlled trial of the effect of transfusion- threshold reduction on transfusion rates and morbidity after cardiac surgery. *Transfusion Alternatives in Transfusion Medicine* 2007; **9**(Suppl 1): 41 - 2.
25. Murphy GJ, Pike K, Rogers CA, et al. Liberal or restrictive transfusion after cardiac surgery. *N Engl J Med* 2015; **372**(11): 997-1008.
26. Carson JL, Brooks MM, Abbott JD, et al. Liberal versus restrictive transfusion thresholds for patients with symptomatic coronary artery disease. *Am Heart J* 2013; **165**(6): 964-71 e1.
27. Villanueva C, Colomo A, Bosch A, et al. Transfusion strategies for acute upper gastrointestinal bleeding. *N Engl J Med* 2013; **368**(1): 11-21.
28. Cooper HA, Rao SV, Greenberg MD, et al. Conservative versus liberal red cell transfusion in acute myocardial infarction (the CRIT Randomized Pilot Study). *Am J Cardiol* 2011; **108**(8): 1108-11.
29. So-Osman C, Nelissen R, Te Slaa R, Coene L, Brand R, Brand A. A randomized comparison of transfusion triggers in elective orthopaedic surgery using leucocyte-depleted red blood cells. *Vox Sang* 2010; **98**(1): 56-64.
30. Foss NB, Kristensen MT, Jensen PS, Palm H, Krasheninnikoff M, Kehlet H. The effects of liberal versus restrictive transfusion thresholds on ambulation after hip fracture surgery. *Transfusion* 2009; **49**(2): 227-34.
31. Colomo A, Hernandez-Gea V, Muniz E, et al. Transfusion strategies in patients with cirrhosis and acute gastrointestinal bleeding. *Hepatology* 2008; **48**(4 (Suppl)): 413A.
32. Kirpalani H, Whyte RK, Andersen C, et al. The Premature Infants in Need of Transfusion (PINT) study: a randomized, controlled trial of a restrictive (low) versus liberal (high) transfusion threshold for extremely low birth weight infants. *J Pediatr* 2006; **149**(3): 301-7.
33. Grover M, Talwalkar S, Casbard A, et al. Silent myocardial ischaemia and haemoglobin concentration: a randomized controlled trial of transfusion strategy in lower limb arthroplasty. *Vox Sang* 2006; **90**(2): 105-12.

34. Bell EF, Strauss RG, Widness JA, et al. Randomized trial of liberal versus restrictive guidelines for red blood cell transfusion in preterm infants. *Pediatrics* 2005; **115**(6): 1685-91.
35. McIntyre L, Hebert PC, Wells G, et al. Is a restrictive transfusion strategy safe for resuscitated and critically ill trauma patients? *J Trauma* 2004; **57**(3): 563-8; discussion 8.
36. Carson JL, Terrin ML, Barton FB, et al. A pilot randomized trial comparing symptomatic vs. hemoglobin-level-driven red blood cell transfusions following hip fracture. *Transfusion* 1998; **38**(6): 522-9.
37. Bush RL, Pevac WC, Holcroft JW. A prospective, randomized trial limiting perioperative red blood cell transfusions in vascular patients. *Am J Surg* 1997; **174**(2): 143-8.
38. Walsh TS, Boyd JA, Watson D, et al. Restrictive versus liberal transfusion strategies for older mechanically ventilated critically ill patients: a randomized pilot trial. *Crit Care Med* 2013; **41**(10): 2354-63.
39. De Santo LS, Amarelli C, Della Corte A, et al. Blood transfusion after on-pump coronary artery bypass grafting: focus on modifiable risk factors. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2012.
40. Paone G, Brewer R, Theurer PF, Bell GF, Cogan CM, Prager RL. Preoperative predicted risk does not fully explain the association between red blood cell transfusion and mortality in coronary artery bypass grafting. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2012; **143**(1): 178-85.
41. Dorneles Cde C, Bodanese LC, Guaragna JC, et al. The impact of blood transfusion on morbidity and mortality after cardiac surgery. *Rev Bras Cir Cardiovasc* 2011; **26**(2): 222-9.
42. Dardashti A, Ederoth P, Algotsson L, Bronden B, Luhrs C, Bjursten H. Blood transfusion after cardiac surgery: is it the patient or the transfusion that carries the risk? *Acta Anaesthesiol Scand* 2011; **55**(8): 952-61.
43. Karkouti K, Wijeyesundera DN, Yau TM, et al. Influence of erythrocyte transfusion on the risk of acute kidney injury after cardiac surgery differs in anemic and nonanemic patients. *Anesthesiology* 2011; **115**(3): 523-30.
44. Vivacqua A, Koch CG, Yousuf AM, et al. Morbidity of bleeding after cardiac surgery: is it blood transfusion, reoperation for bleeding, or both? *Ann Thorac Surg* 2011; **91**(6): 1780-90.
45. Vlaar AP, Hofstra JJ, Determann RM, et al. The incidence, risk factors, and outcome of transfusion-related acute lung injury in a cohort of cardiac surgery patients: a prospective nested case-control study. *Blood* 2011; **117**(16): 4218-25.
46. Mohnle P, Snyder-Ramos SA, Miao Y, et al. Postoperative red blood cell transfusion and morbid outcome in uncomplicated cardiac surgery patients. *Intensive Care Med* 2011; **37**(1): 97-109.
47. van Straten AH, Bekker MW, Soliman Hamad MA, et al. Transfusion of red blood cells: the impact on short-term and long-term survival after coronary artery bypass grafting, a ten-year follow-up. *Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg* 2010; **10**(1): 37-42.
48. Engoren M, Habib RH, Hadaway J, et al. The effect on long-term survival of erythrocyte transfusion given for cardiac valve operations. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2009; **88**(1): 95-100, e1-3.
49. Koch C, Li L, Figueroa P, Mihaljevic T, Svensson L, Blackstone EH. Transfusion and pulmonary morbidity after cardiac surgery. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2009; **88**(5): 1410-8.

50. Rogers MA, Blumberg N, Saint S, Langa KM, Nallamotheu BK. Hospital variation in transfusion and infection after cardiac surgery: a cohort study. *BMC Med* 2009; **7**: 37.
51. Ranucci M, Bozzetti G, Ditta A, Cotza M, Carboni G, Ballotta A. Surgical reexploration after cardiac operations: why a worse outcome? *Ann Thorac Surg* 2008; **86**(5): 1557-62.
52. Arnaoutakis GJ, Bihorac A, Martin TD, et al. RIFLE criteria for acute kidney injury in aortic arch surgery. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2007; **134**(6): 1554-60; discussion 60-1.
53. Cislighi F, Condemi AM, Corona A. Predictors of prolonged mechanical ventilation in a cohort of 3,269 CABG patients. *Minerva Anesthesiol* 2007; **73**(12): 615-21.
54. Landoni G, Bove T, Crivellari M, et al. Acute renal failure after isolated CABG surgery: six years of experience. *Minerva Anesthesiol* 2007; **73**(11): 559-65.
55. Koch CG, Li L, Duncan AI, et al. Morbidity and mortality risk associated with red blood cell and blood-component transfusion in isolated coronary artery bypass grafting. *Crit Care Med* 2006; **34**(6): 1608-16.
56. Michalopoulos A, Geroulanos S, Rosmarakis ES, Falagas ME. Frequency, characteristics, and predictors of microbiologically documented nosocomial infections after cardiac surgery. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2006; **29**(4): 456-60.
57. Nakajima T, Kawazoe K, Izumoto H, Kataoka T, Niinuma H, Shirahashi N. Risk factors for hypoxemia after surgery for acute type A aortic dissection. *Surg Today* 2006; **36**(8): 680-5.
58. Rogers MA, Blumberg N, Saint SK, Kim C, Nallamotheu BK, Langa KM. Allogeneic blood transfusions explain increased mortality in women after coronary artery bypass graft surgery. *Am Heart J* 2006; **152**(6): 1028-34.
59. Stamou SC, White T, Barnett S, Boyce SW, Corso PJ, Lefrak EA. Comparisons of cardiac surgery outcomes in Jehovah's versus Non-Jehovah's Witnesses. *Am J Cardiol* 2006; **98**(9): 1223-5.
60. Surgenor SD, DeFoe GR, Fillinger MP, et al. Intraoperative red blood cell transfusion during coronary artery bypass graft surgery increases the risk of postoperative low-output heart failure. *Circulation* 2006; **114**(1 Suppl): I43-8.
61. Kuduvalli M, Oo AY, Newall N, et al. Effect of peri-operative red blood cell transfusion on 30-day and 1-year mortality following coronary artery bypass surgery. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg* 2005; **27**(4): 592-8.
62. Bove T, Calabro MG, Landoni G, et al. The incidence and risk of acute renal failure after cardiac surgery. *J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth* 2004; **18**(4): 442-5.
63. Crabtree TD, Codd JE, Fraser VJ, Bailey MS, Olsen MA, Damiano RJ, Jr. Multivariate analysis of risk factors for deep and superficial sternal infection after coronary artery bypass grafting at a tertiary care medical center. *Semin Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2004; **16**(1): 53-61.
64. Olsen MA, Sundt TM, Lawton JS, et al. Risk factors for leg harvest surgical site infections after coronary artery bypass graft surgery. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2003; **126**(4): 992-9.
65. Chelemer SB, Prato BS, Cox PM, Jr., O'Connor GT, Morton JR. Association of bacterial infection and red blood cell transfusion after coronary artery bypass surgery. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2002; **73**(1): 138-42.
66. Olsen MA, Lock-Buckley P, Hopkins D, Polish LB, Sundt TM, Fraser VJ. The risk factors for deep and superficial chest surgical-site infections after coronary artery bypass graft surgery are different. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2002; **124**(1): 136-45.

67. Leal-Noval SR, Marquez-Vacaro JA, Garcia-Curiel A, et al. Nosocomial pneumonia in patients undergoing heart surgery. *Crit Care Med* 2000; **28**(4): 935-40.
68. Rady MY, Ryan T. Perioperative predictors of extubation failure and the effect on clinical outcome after cardiac surgery. *Crit Care Med* 1999; **27**(2): 340-7.
69. Rady MY, Ryan T, Starr NJ. Perioperative determinants of morbidity and mortality in elderly patients undergoing cardiac surgery. *Crit Care Med* 1998; **26**(2): 225-35.
70. Godet G, Fleron MH, Vicaut E, et al. Risk factors for acute postoperative renal failure in thoracic or thoracoabdominal aortic surgery: a prospective study. *Anesth Analg* 1997; **85**(6): 1227-32.
71. Zacharias A, Habib RH. Factors predisposing to median sternotomy complications. Deep vs superficial infection. *Chest* 1996; **110**(5): 1173-8.
72. Bhaskar B, Dulhunty J, Mullany DV, Fraser JF. Impact of blood product transfusion on short and long-term survival after cardiac surgery: more evidence. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2012; **94**(2): 460-7.
73. Stone GW, Clayton TC, Mehran R, et al. Impact of major bleeding and blood transfusions after cardiac surgery: analysis from the Acute Catheterization and Urgent Intervention Triage strategY (ACUITY) trial. *Am Heart J* 2012; **163**(3): 522-9.
74. Paone G, Likosky DS, Brewer R, et al. Transfusion of 1 and 2 units of red blood cells is associated with increased morbidity and mortality. *Ann Thorac Surg* 2014; **97**(1): 87-93; discussion -4.
75. Sterne JA, Sutton AJ, Ioannidis JP, et al. Recommendations for examining and interpreting funnel plot asymmetry in meta-analyses of randomised controlled trials. *BMJ* 2011; **343**: d4002.
76. Reeves B, Pike K, Rogers C, Brierley R, Stokes E, Wordsworth S. A multi-centre randomised controlled trial of Transfusion Indication Threshold Reduction on transfusion rates, morbidity and healthcare resource use following cardiac surgery (TITRe2). *Health Technol Assess* 2017; **XX**(X).
77. Rosenbaum PR, Rubin DB. The Central Role of the Propensity Score in Observational Studies for Causal Effects. *Biometrika* 1983; **70**(1): 41-55.
78. Cain LE, Robins JM, Lanoy E, Logan R, Costagliola D, Hernan MA. When to start treatment? A systematic approach to the comparison of dynamic regimes using observational data. *Int J Biostat* 2010; **6**(2): Article 18.
79. Cain LE, Logan R, Robins JM, et al. When to initiate combined antiretroviral therapy to reduce mortality and AIDS-defining illness in HIV-infected persons in developed countries: an observational study. *Ann Intern Med* 2011; **154**(8): 509-15.
80. Casutt M, Seifert B, Pasch T, Schmid ER, Turina MI, Spahn DR. Factors influencing the individual effects of blood transfusions on oxygen delivery and oxygen consumption. *Crit Care Med* 1999; **27**(10): 2194-200.
81. Utoh J, Moriyama S, Okamoto K, Kunitomo R, Hara M, Kitamura N. The effects of cardiopulmonary bypass on postoperative oxygen metabolism. *Surg Today* 1999; **29**(1): 28-33.
82. Perel P, Clayton T, Altman DG, et al. Red blood cell transfusion and mortality in trauma patients: risk-stratified analysis of an observational study. *PLoS Med* 2014; **11**(6): e1001664.
83. Snyder-Ramos SA, Mohnle P, Weng YS, et al. The ongoing variability in blood transfusion practices in cardiac surgery. *Transfusion* 2008; **48**(7): 1284-99.

84. Ranucci M, Aronson S, Dietrich W, et al. Patient blood management during cardiac surgery: do we have enough evidence for clinical practice? *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg* 2011; **142**(2): 249 e1-32.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Flow diagram of study selection.

Figure 2. Forest plot of the odds of mortality in RCTs stratified according to patient population.

Figure 3. Forest plot of the odds of mortality in observational studies.

Table 1. Summary of results of meta-analyses estimating the effect of red blood cell transfusion, according to outcome and study design.

| Outcome | Type of study | No. of studies / no. of patients | Fixed-effect OR (95% CI) | Fixed-effect P value | Random-effect OR (95% CI) | Random-effect P value | I²(%) | Heterogeneity P value | Egger test P value |
|------------------|--------------------------|---|-------------------------------------|---------------------------------|--------------------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| Mortality | Cardiac Surgical RCT | 5/3304 | 0.70 (0.49–1.02) | 0.06 | 0.70 (0.49–1.02) | 0.06 | 0 | 0.46 | 0.80 |
| | Non-Cardiac Surgical RCT | 19/8341 | 1.10 (0.96–1.27) | 0.16 | 1.07 (0.88–1.31) | 0.49 | 29.7 | 0.11 | 0.41 |
| | Observational | 19/138357 | 1.48 (1.42–1.53) | <0.001 | 2.81 (2.21–3.56) | <0.001 | 95.4 | <0.001 | 0.02 |
| Pulmonary | Cardiac Surgical RCT | 6/3357 | 0.94 (0.76–1.17) | 0.58 | 0.94 (0.76–1.17) | 0.58 | 0 | 0.51 | 0.66 |
| | Non-Cardiac Surgical RCT | 7/4944 | 1.15 (0.95–1.40) | 0.14 | 1.15 (0.91–1.44) | 0.25 | 17.6 | 0.30 | 0.90 |
| | Observational | 7/43431 | 1.68 (1.63–1.74) | <0.001 | 1.99 (1.47–2.69) | <0.001 | 97.0 | <0.001 | 0.74 |
| AKI | Cardiac Surgical RCT | 5/3304 | 0.86 (0.68–1.09) | 0.22 | 0.86 (0.68–1.09) | 0.22 | 0 | 0.83 | 0.75 |
| | Non-Cardiac Surgical RCT | 2/1119 | 1.27 (0.95–1.69) | 0.10 | 1.27 (0.95–1.69) | 0.10 | 0 | 0.73 | - |
| | Observational | 14/59003 | 1.73 (1.65–1.83) | <0.001 | 3.06 (2.10–4.46) | <0.001 | 97.0 | <0.001 | 0.08 |
| Infection | Cardiac Surgical RCT | 4/2802 | 0.97 (0.79–1.19) | 0.75 | 0.97 (0.79–1.19) | 0.75 | 0 | 0.69 | 0.21 |
| | Non-Cardiac Surgical RCT | 11/6225 | 1.16 (0.99–1.37) | 0.07 | 1.16 (0.99–1.37) | 0.07 | 0 | 0.45 | 0.48 |
| | Observational | 11/88025 | 1.81 (1.73–1.89) | <0.001 | 2.30 (1.85–2.86) | <0.001 | 72.9 | <0.001 | 0.04 |
| MI | Cardiac Surgical RCT | 1/2003 | 1.34 (0.30- 6.02) | 0.70 | 1.34 (0.30- 6.02) | 0.70 | - | - | - |
| | Non-Cardiac Surgical RCT | 10/5539 | 0.79 (0.58–1.09) | 0.15 | 0.88 (0.56–1.37) | 0.57 | 25.8 | 0.21 | 0.11 |
| | Observational | 8/35763 | 1.55 (1.48–1.62) | <0.001 | 1.93 (1.45–2.58) | <0.001 | 89.1 | <0.001 | 0.38 |
| CVA | Cardiac Surgical RCT | 1/2003 | 1.14 (0.57- 2.30) | 0.71 | 1.14 (0.57- 2.30) | 0.71 | - | - | - |
| | Non-Cardiac Surgical RCT | 8/3648 | 1.53 (0.83–2.83) | 0.18 | 1.53 (0.83–2.83) | 0.18 | 0 | 0.71 | 0.35 |
| | Observational | 7/43649 | 1.41 (1.34–1.48) | <0.001 | 2.03 (1.42–2.90) | <0.001 | 79.4 | <0.001 | 0.08 |

Table 2. Summary of meta-analyses in observational studies estimating the effect of red blood cell transfusion in adult cardiac surgery, stratified according to the quantity of RBC units transfused.

| Outcome | No. of RBC Units | No. of studies | Random-effects OR (95% CI) | I²(%) | Heterogeneity P value |
|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| Mortality | 1-2 units | 1 | 2.97 (0.96–9.20) | - | - |
| | 3-6 units | 1 | 5.82 (1.30–26.04) | - | - |
| | >6 units | 3 | 3.84 (1.69–8.74) | 43 | 0.17 |
| Pulmonary | 1-2 units | - | - | - | - |
| | 3-6 units | - | - | - | - |
| | >6 units | - | - | - | - |
| AKI | 1-2 units | 2 | 3.45 (1.92–6.20) | 86 | 0.01 |
| | 3-6 units | 2 | 6.74 (3.68–12.33) | 90 | 0.01 |
| | >6 units | 3 | 3.42 (2.35–4.97) | 95 | <0.001 |
| Infection | 1-2 units | 4 | 1.73 (1.34–2.25) | 0 | 0.64 |
| | 3-6 units | 4 | 2.68 (1.49–4.82) | 67 | 0.03 |
| | >6 units | 4 | 5.50 (2.62–11.53) | 71 | 0.02 |
| MI | 1-2 units | 2 | 2.22 (1.74 – 2.82) | 62 | 0.11 |
| | 3-6 units | 2 | 4.87 (3.80 – 6.24) | 0 | 0.62 |
| | >6 units | 2 | 9.66 (7.49 – 12.46) | 11 | 0.29 |
| CVA | 1-2 units | - | - | - | - |
| | 3-6 units | - | - | - | - |
| | >6 units | - | - | - | - |