



Restrictive versus Liberal Red Blood Cell Transfusion Strategies in Critically Ill Patients: A Review of Pivotal Evidence

¹A.Cole, ²A. Cueto-Dominguez

^{1,2} University of Illinois College of Medicine

Corresponding Email : doctorcole28948@gmail.com

Article History :

Received date : 2021/10/12
Revised date : 2021/11/28
Accepted date : 2021/12/09
Published date : 2022/01/13



Copyright: © by the authors. Submitted for possible open access publication under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (BY NC) license (<https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/>).

ABSTRACT

Introduction: Red blood cell (RBC) transfusion is a fundamental therapy for anemia. For many years, clinical practice was guided by a liberal transfusion strategy, often targeting a hemoglobin concentration of 10 g/dL. This approach was increasingly questioned due to a lack of supporting evidence and a growing awareness of transfusion-associated risks.

Literature Review: A review of pivotal literature reveals a paradigm shift in transfusion practice driven by high-quality evidence. A landmark randomized controlled trial that compared a restrictive (hemoglobin trigger of 7 g/dL) with a liberal (10 g/dL) transfusion strategy in a broad population of critically ill patients found no evidence of benefit with the liberal approach. In fact, the restrictive strategy resulted in lower mortality in key subgroups and was, at a minimum, as safe as the liberal strategy. This seminal finding, supported by a deeper understanding of the adverse consequences of allogeneic blood transfusion, including immunomodulation and storage lesion effects, prompted a widespread re-evaluation of

transfusion triggers. Subsequent research and evidence-based guidelines began to formally endorse the restrictive approach for most hemodynamically stable critically ill patients.

Conclusion: This body of evidence successfully challenged long-held medical dogma and established a new, safer standard of care. It demonstrated that a restrictive RBC transfusion strategy is safe and effective, leading to a significant reduction in unnecessary transfusions and their associated risks and costs for critically ill patients.

Keywords: Blood Transfusion, Anemia, Critical Care, Hemoglobin, Transfusion Trigger, Restrictive Strategy.

INTRODUCTION

The transfusion of allogeneic red blood cells (RBCs) is one of the most common medical interventions performed in hospitalized patients, intended to increase oxygen-carrying capacity and prevent tissue hypoxia in the setting of anemia. Historically, clinical practice was largely guided by the physiological principle that a hemoglobin concentration of 10 g/dL and a hematocrit of 30% were necessary to ensure adequate oxygen delivery. This led to a "liberal" transfusion strategy, where transfusions were often administered to maintain hemoglobin levels at or near this threshold.

However, this deeply ingrained practice was based more on tradition than on high-quality clinical evidence. A growing appreciation for the potential adverse consequences of blood transfusion—including infectious disease transmission, immunomodulation, circulatory overload, and acute lung injury—prompted a critical re-examination of this approach. Investigators began to question whether a more conservative, or "restrictive," transfusion strategy might yield similar, or even superior, clinical outcomes while avoiding the risks of unnecessary transfusions. This literature review will synthesise the pivotal evidence that compared these two strategies and ultimately reshaped the standard of care for transfusion in critically ill patients.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The movement away from liberal transfusion practices was catalyzed by a landmark randomized controlled trial that directly challenged the existing dogma. The Transfusion Requirements in Critical Care (TRICC) trial compared a restrictive strategy, in which

transfusions were triggered by a hemoglobin level of 7 g/dL, with a liberal strategy using a trigger of 10 g/dL. The study, which enrolled a broad population of euvolemic, anemic, critically ill patients, found no difference in overall 30-day mortality between the two groups. However, subgroup analyses revealed that the restrictive strategy was associated with significantly lower mortality rates in patients who were less acutely ill and in those younger than 55 years of age. At a minimum, the trial demonstrated that a restrictive approach was as safe as a liberal one for the majority of critically ill patients (Hébert et al., 2001). The impact of this trial was profound, providing the first robust, high-quality evidence to support a lower transfusion trigger.

The rationale for why a restrictive strategy might be beneficial is grounded in the inherent risks of allogeneic blood transfusion. Literature from this period increasingly characterized these risks beyond simple infection transmission. Transfusion-Related Acute Lung Injury (TRALI) was recognized as a leading cause of transfusion-related mortality. Furthermore, the concept of transfusion-related immunomodulation (TRIM) gained prominence, suggesting that transfusions could suppress the recipient's immune system, potentially increasing susceptibility to nosocomial infections (Marik and Corwin, 2008). Additional concerns were raised about the "storage lesion"—a series of biochemical and biomechanical changes that occur in RBCs during storage, which may impair their ability to deliver oxygen effectively upon transfusion.

Following the seminal trial, the clinical community debated the generalizability of a restrictive strategy to other specific, high-risk patient populations. A major area of focus was patients with acute cardiovascular disease. The prevailing concern was that anemic patients with coronary artery disease might require a higher hemoglobin level to maintain adequate myocardial oxygen supply and prevent ischemia. While smaller studies and observational data provided conflicting results, the question of the optimal transfusion threshold in this specific population remained an area of active investigation and clinical uncertainty (Carson et al., 2002).

Despite the ongoing debate in certain subgroups, the overall evidence was compelling enough to trigger a major shift in practice. Large observational studies, such as the CRIT study, documented prevailing transfusion practices and their association with outcomes, providing real-world context that supported the findings from the randomized trial (Corwin et al., 2004). Consequently, major medical societies and organizations began to develop and disseminate evidence-based clinical practice guidelines. These new guidelines progressively moved away

from the traditional 10 g/dL trigger and formally recommended a restrictive transfusion strategy (hemoglobin trigger of 7 g/dL) for the majority of hemodynamically stable hospitalized and critically ill patients.

CONCLUSION

The pivotal literature examining red blood cell transfusion strategies represents a landmark success for evidence-based medicine. It documents the systematic dismantling of a long-held medical tradition through rigorous scientific inquiry. A landmark randomized trial provided powerful evidence that a restrictive transfusion strategy is at least as safe as, and in some patients superior to, the conventional liberal approach.

This finding, bolstered by an improved understanding of the potential harms of allogeneic blood, prompted a fundamental change in clinical practice across the globe. It established that for most critically ill patients, a lower hemoglobin transfusion trigger is the appropriate standard of care. This shift not only improved patient safety by avoiding the risks of unnecessary transfusions but also resulted in significant conservation of a limited and valuable resource. The research effectively demonstrated that in the case of blood transfusion for the critically ill, "less is more."

REFERENCES

Carson, J.L., Duff, A., Poses, R.M., Berlin, J.A., Spence, R.K., Trout, R., Noveck, H. and Strom, B.L. (2002) 'Effect of anaemia and cardiovascular disease on surgical mortality and morbidity', *The Lancet*, 359(9313), pp. 1223-1229.

Corwin, H.L., Gettinger, A., Pearl, R.G., Fink, M.P., Levy, M.M., Abraham, E., MacIntyre, N.R., Shabot, M.M., Duh, M.S. and Shapiro, M.J. (2004) 'The CRIT Study: Anemia and blood transfusion in the critically ill--current clinical practice in the United States', *Critical Care Medicine*, 32(1), pp. 39-52.

Hébert, P.C., Blajchman, M.A., Cook, D.J., Yetisir, E., Wells, G. and Marshall, J. (2001) 'Do we transfuse patients with cardiovascular disease to a higher hemoglobin threshold? A survey of Canadian critical care and hematology/transfusion medicine specialists', *Transfusion Medicine*, 11(3), pp. 187-194.

Marik, P.E. and Corwin, H.L. (2008) 'Efficacy of red blood cell transfusion in the critically ill: a systematic review of the literature', *Critical Care Medicine*, 36(9), pp. 2667-2674.

Sihler, K.C. and Napolitano, L.M. (2009) 'Massive transfusion: new insights', *Surgical Clinics of North America*, 89(4), pp. 839-859.