



Cochrane
Library

Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews

Comparison of a therapeutic-only versus prophylactic platelet transfusion policy for people with congenital or acquired bone marrow failure disorders (Review)

Malouf R, Ashraf A, Hadjinicolaou AV, Doree C, Hopewell S, Estcourt LJ

Malouf R, Ashraf A, Hadjinicolaou AV, Doree C, Hopewell S, Estcourt LJ.
Comparison of a therapeutic-only versus prophylactic platelet transfusion policy for people with congenital or acquired bone marrow failure disorders.

Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews 2018, Issue 5. Art. No.: CD012342.

DOI: [10.1002/14651858.CD012342.pub2](https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD012342.pub2).

www.cochranelibrary.com

Comparison of a therapeutic-only versus prophylactic platelet transfusion policy for people with congenital or acquired bone marrow failure disorders (Review)

Copyright © 2018 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

WILEY

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT	1
PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY	2
BACKGROUND	4
OBJECTIVES	6
METHODS	6
RESULTS	10
Figure 1.	11
Figure 2.	13
DISCUSSION	14
AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS	14
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	15
REFERENCES	16
CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES	20
APPENDICES	23
CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUTHORS	42
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	42
SOURCES OF SUPPORT	42
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PROTOCOL AND REVIEW	42
NOTES	43
INDEX TERMS	43

[Intervention Review]

Comparison of a therapeutic-only versus prophylactic platelet transfusion policy for people with congenital or acquired bone marrow failure disorders

Reem Malouf¹, Asma Ashraf², Andreas V Hadjinicolaou³, Carolyn Doree⁴, Sally Hopewell⁵, Lise J Estcourt⁶

¹National Perinatal Epidemiology Unit (NPEU), University of Oxford, Oxford, UK. ²Haematology, Calvary Mater Hospital; University of Newcastle, Waratah, Australia. ³Human Immunology Unit, Institute of Molecular Medicine, Radcliffe Department of Medicine, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK. ⁴Systematic Review Initiative, NHS Blood and Transplant, Oxford, UK. ⁵Nuffield Department of Orthopaedics, Rheumatology and Musculoskeletal Sciences (NDORMS), University of Oxford, Oxford, UK. ⁶Haematology/Transfusion Medicine, NHS Blood and Transplant, Oxford, UK

Contact: Lise J Estcourt, Haematology/Transfusion Medicine, NHS Blood and Transplant, Level 2, John Radcliffe Hospital, Headington, Oxford, OX3 9BQ, UK. lise.estcourt@nhsbt.nhs.uk, lise.estcourt@ndcls.ox.ac.uk.

Editorial group: Cochrane Haematological Malignancies Group.

Publication status and date: New, published in Issue 5, 2018.

Citation: Malouf R, Ashraf A, Hadjinicolaou AV, Doree C, Hopewell S, Estcourt LJ. Comparison of a therapeutic-only versus prophylactic platelet transfusion policy for people with congenital or acquired bone marrow failure disorders. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2018, Issue 5. Art. No.: CD012342. DOI: [10.1002/14651858.CD012342.pub2](https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD012342.pub2).

Copyright © 2018 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

ABSTRACT

Background

Bone marrow disorders encompass a group of diseases characterised by reduced production of red cells, white cells, and platelets, or defects in their function, or both. The most common bone marrow disorder is myelodysplastic syndrome. Thrombocytopenia, a low platelet count, commonly occurs in people with bone marrow failure. Platelet transfusions are routinely used in people with thrombocytopenia secondary to bone marrow failure disorders to treat or prevent bleeding. Myelodysplastic syndrome is currently the most common reason for receiving a platelet transfusion in some Western countries.

Objectives

To determine whether a therapeutic-only platelet transfusion policy (transfusion given when patient is bleeding) is as effective and safe as a prophylactic platelet transfusion policy (transfusion given to prevent bleeding according to a prespecified platelet threshold) in people with congenital or acquired bone marrow failure disorders.

Search methods

We searched for randomised controlled trials (RCTs), non-RCTs, and controlled before-after studies (CBAs) in the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL) (the Cochrane Library 2017, Issue 9), Ovid MEDLINE (from 1946), Ovid Embase (from 1974), PubMed (e-publications only), the Transfusion Evidence Library (from 1950), and ongoing trial databases to 12 October 2017.

Selection criteria

We included RCTs, non-RCTs, and CBAs that involved the transfusion of platelet concentrates (prepared either from individual units of whole blood or by apheresis any dose, frequency, or transfusion trigger) and given to treat or prevent bleeding among people with congenital or acquired bone marrow failure disorders.

We excluded uncontrolled studies, cross-sectional studies, and case-control studies. We excluded cluster-RCTs, non-randomised cluster trials, and CBAs with fewer than two intervention sites and two control sites due to the risk of confounding. We included all people with

long-term bone marrow failure disorders that require platelet transfusions, including neonates. We excluded studies of alternatives to platelet transfusion, or studies of people receiving intensive chemotherapy or a stem cell transplant.

Data collection and analysis

We used the standard methodological procedures outlined by Cochrane. Due to the absence of evidence we were unable to report on any of the review outcomes.

Main results

We identified one RCT that met the inclusion criteria for this review. The study enrolled only nine adults with MDS over a three-year study duration period. The trial was terminated due to poor recruitment rate (planned recruitment 60 participants over two years). Assessment of the risk of bias was not possible for all domains. The trial was a single-centre, single-blind trial. The clinical and demographic characteristics of the participants were never disclosed. The trial outcomes relevant to this review were bleeding assessments, mortality, quality of life, and length of hospital stay, but no data were available to report on any of these outcomes.

We identified no completed non-RCTs or CBAs.

We identified no ongoing RCTs, non-RCTs, or CBAs.

Authors' conclusions

We found no evidence to determine the safety and efficacy of therapeutic platelet transfusion compared with prophylactic platelet transfusion for people with long-term bone marrow failure disorders. This review underscores the urgency of prioritising research in this area. People with bone marrow failure depend on long-term platelet transfusion support, but the only trial that assessed a therapeutic strategy was halted. There is a need for good-quality studies comparing a therapeutic platelet transfusion strategy with a prophylactic platelet transfusion strategy; such trials should include outcomes that are important to patients, such as quality of life, length of hospital admission, and risk of bleeding.

PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY

In people with bone marrow disorders, a comparison of giving platelet transfusions only when bleeding occurs to also giving them to prevent bleeding

Review aim

In people with bone marrow disorders bleeding can be a problem due to a low platelet count, or because the platelets do not work properly, or both. Platelet transfusions can be given when bleeding occurs in order to stop the bleeding, or before bleeding occurs in order to prevent it.

In this review we investigated whether transfusions should be given only when bleeding occurs, or in advance as a preventative measure. Our target population was people of any age with bone marrow disorders.

Background

The bone marrow is where many types of blood cells are produced. Red blood cells are needed to bring oxygen to all parts of the body; white blood cells fight against infection; and platelets in the blood help to form clots and prevent bleeding. Bone marrow failure can have different causes and can happen at birth or later in life, and may result in too few of any or all of the three types of blood cells in the body.

Too few platelets can put a person at risk of serious or life-threatening bleeding. Platelet transfusions have been commonly used to prevent or treat bleeding in people with bone marrow disorders. However, there are risks involved with regular use of platelet transfusions, such as transfusion reactions and transfusion-transmitted infections.

It is currently unclear if the best transfusion policy is to give platelet transfusions only when bleeding occurs or to give them to prevent bleeding.

Study characteristics

We searched scientific databases for clinical studies (randomised controlled trials and well-designed non-randomised studies) of people of any age with bone marrow disorders and a low platelet count. The evidence is current to 12 October 2017. One study was eligible for inclusion in the review. This study was stopped after recruiting only nine participants because it had taken three years to recruit the nine participants (the study had planned to recruit 60 participants in two years). We found no ongoing studies.

Key results

The only included study in this review did not report any outcomes.

Conclusion

We found no evidence to help us decide whether giving platelet transfusions to treat bleeding is as good as giving platelet transfusions when the platelet count is below a prespecified level. There is an urgent need for good-quality studies to answer the questions of this review.

Quality of evidence

We did not assess the quality of the evidence because no data were available from the one included study.

BACKGROUND

Please see [Published notes](#) for a glossary of technical terms.

Description of the condition

The bone marrow is the site of the production of red cells, white cells, and platelets from stem cells (termed collectively as haematopoiesis). Bone marrow failure disorders encompass a wide range of diseases that cause quantitative (reduced numbers (cytopenia)) or qualitative (reduced function) defects of red cells, white cells, and platelets.

Clinical symptoms of people with bone marrow failure disorders are related to the underlying cytopenias (anaemia, neutropenia, and thrombocytopenia) that arise from this ineffective haematopoiesis. People can present with fatigue and shortness of breath due to anaemia (low red cell count), recurrent infections due to neutropenia (low neutrophil count, a type of white cell), and bleeding or bruising due to thrombocytopenia (low platelet count). Although anaemia is the most common cytopenia, at least one-third of people with conditions like myelodysplastic syndromes (MDS) have moderate or severe thrombocytopenia ([Hellstrom-Lindberg 2003](#)). Symptoms due to thrombocytopenia depend not only on the severity of the thrombocytopenia but also any associated comorbidities (coagulation abnormalities or lesions that are more likely to bleed, e.g. peptic ulcer).

Bone marrow failure syndromes can be broadly classified into congenital and acquired disorders.

The most common causes of acquired bone marrow failure are aplastic anaemia and MDS, with MDS being the most commonly diagnosed acquired bone marrow failure in adults ([Sekeres 2010](#)).

Myelodysplastic syndromes encompass a diverse group of clonal stem cell disorders that are characterised by dysplasia in one or more cell lines (blood cells have an abnormal shape or size), ineffective haematopoiesis, development of peripheral cytopenias, and an increased risk of developing acute myeloid leukaemia (AML) ([Steensma 2006](#)). Overall, the incidence of MDS is estimated at between 2.3 to 4.5 per 100,000 per year ([Dinmohamed 2014](#); [Garcia-Manero 2012](#); [Ma 2007](#); [Ma 2012](#); [Neukirchen 2011](#)). However, the incidence increases markedly with age, with the highest incidence in those aged over 80 years (> 30 per 100,000 per year) ([Dinmohamed 2014](#); [Ma 2007](#); [Ma 2012](#); [Neukirchen 2011](#); [Rollison 2008](#)). It is also estimated that the incidence of secondary myelodysplasia is increasing because there are a larger number of long-term cancer survivors who have been treated with chemotherapy such as anthracyclines and etoposide, which increase the risk of developing myelodysplasia ([Le Deley 2007](#)).

Acquired aplastic anaemia is a rare disorder that is characterised by 'empty bone marrow' replaced by fat cells. The incidence in Europe and North America is about two per million population per year ([Issaragrisil 2006](#); [Montané 2008](#)), whereas the incidence in Asia is higher, with estimates ranging from 3.9 to 7.4 cases per million per year ([Young 2008](#)). In most cases the cause is unknown, but environmental factors (industrial chemicals, agricultural pesticides) ([Issaragrisil 2006](#); [Young 2008](#)), drugs ([Issaragrisil 2006](#); [Young 2008](#)), and hepatitis viruses have been reported to cause aplastic anaemia ([Rauff 2011](#)). Treatment is tailored to the individual needs of the patient, but involves

a combination of supportive care for pancytopenia (reduced numbers of all the cellular elements of blood) (red cell and platelet transfusions, prophylactic antimicrobials), immunosuppressive therapy, and haemopoietic stem cell transplantation. Most patients are not deemed suitable for a haemopoietic stem cell transplant owing to advanced age, comorbidities, or lack of a compatible donor. As a result, supportive management remains the mainstay of treatment.

The inherited bone marrow failure syndromes include Fanconi anaemia, dyskeratosis congenita, Shwachman-Diamond syndrome, Pearson syndrome, congenital amegakaryocytic thrombocytopenia, familial aplastic anaemia (X-linked and autosomal forms), and Diamond Blackfan anaemia ([Shimamura 2009](#)). Fanconi anaemia is the most common inherited bone marrow failure disorder, with a reported incidence of approximately 1 in 360,000 live births and a carrier frequency of 1 in 300 ([Giri 2004](#)). Haematopoietic stem cell transplantation is the definitive treatment in many of these disorders, but supportive therapy in terms of red cell and platelet transfusions is often needed for symptomatic relief, either prior to transplant, or for those people not suitable to undergo transplant.

Description of the intervention

Despite increasing knowledge about the biology of the underlying diseases, supportive management remains the mainstay of treatment for most people with chronic bone marrow failure disorders.

Platelet transfusions are used in modern clinical practice to prevent and treat bleeding in people with thrombocytopenia. Platelet transfusions have an obvious beneficial effect in the management of active bleeding in people with severe thrombocytopenia. However, questions still remain on how this limited resource should be used to prevent severe and life-threatening bleeding. Prophylactic platelet transfusions have been shown to reduce World Health Organization (WHO) Grade 2 or above bleeding in people with haematological malignancies receiving chemotherapy or an allogeneic haematopoietic stem cell transplant ([Crichton 2015](#); [Stanworth 2013](#); [Wandt 2012](#)).

The evidence for the use of platelet transfusions to prevent bleeding in people with other conditions is less clear-cut ([Schiffer 2013](#); [Stanworth 2013](#); [Stanworth 2014](#); [Wandt 2012](#)). International guidelines considering people with long-term thrombocytopenia recommend either a therapeutic-only strategy (platelet transfusions are given to treat bleeding) ([Kaufman 2015](#); [Killick 2014](#); [Liumbruno 2009](#)), or a prophylactic platelet transfusion strategy (platelet transfusions are given when the platelet count falls below a prespecified platelet count threshold) ([German Medical Association 2014](#); [Killick 2016](#); [NBA 2012](#); [Zeller 2016](#)). This threshold is most commonly a platelet count of $5 \times 10^9/L$, [German Medical Association 2014](#), or $10 \times 10^9/L$ ([Bosly 2007](#); [Killick 2016](#)). This threshold can also vary if a person has additional risk factors for bleeding such as sepsis ([Killick 2016](#)).

People can become refractory to platelet transfusions ([Stanworth 2015](#)). In an analysis of the TRAP 1997 study data, there was a progressive decrease in the post-transfusion platelet count increments and time interval between transfusions as the number of preceding transfusions increased ([Slichter 2005](#)). This effect was seen irrespective of whether the patient developed

detectable human leukocyte antigen (HLA) antibodies (Slichter 2005). Avoidance of unnecessary prophylactic platelet transfusions is therefore very important in people who are likely to require repeated platelet transfusions over a prolonged period of time because they can become refractory to treatment after repeated transfusions (Hod 2008; Slichter 2005; Stanworth 2015).

Platelet transfusions are associated with adverse events. Mild to moderate reactions to platelet transfusions include rigor, fever, and urticaria (Tinegate 2012). These reactions are not life-threatening but can be extremely distressing for the recipient. Rarer, but more serious sequelae include anaphylaxis, haemolytic transfusion reactions, transfusion-transmitted infections, transfusion-associated circulatory overload (TACO), and transfusion-related acute lung injury (TRALI) (Blumberg 2010; Kaufman 2015; Raval 2015).

This review does not focus on the absolute need for platelet transfusions in people with chronic bone marrow failure disorders, but instead focuses on whether a prophylactic platelet transfusion policy is required.

How the intervention might work

The morning platelet count is usually used to indicate when a person requires a prophylactic platelet transfusion. In the 1970s it became standard practice to transfuse platelets at platelet counts below $20 \times 10^9/L$ in an attempt to prevent bleeding (Beutler 1993). This practice was based partly on the findings of non-randomised studies that showed that gross haemorrhage (haematuria (blood in the urine), haematemesis (vomiting of blood), and melaena (dark-coloured stools)) was present at platelet counts below $5 \times 10^9/L$ more frequently than when the platelet count was between $5 \times 10^9/L$ and $100 \times 10^9/L$ (Gaydos 1962; Slichter 1978). However, these studies did not show any threshold effect at a platelet count of $20 \times 10^9/L$, nor was any threshold effect seen (Gaydos 1962; Slichter 1978). A threshold of $10 \times 10^9/L$ is now considered the standard platelet count threshold in people with haematological malignancies who have reversible bone marrow failure (Estcourt 2015; Kaufman 2015; NICE 2015), after multiple studies confirmed the threshold of $10 \times 10^9/L$ as "safe enough" for prophylactic platelet transfusion (Gmur 1991; Rebull 1997; Schiffer 2001; Wandt 1998).

There is much less evidence for the benefit of prophylactic platelet transfusions for people with chronic bone marrow failure. A small retrospective study considered platelet transfusion in outpatients with stable chronic severe aplastic anaemia (Sagmeister 1999). Prophylactic platelets were given if the count was $5 \times 10^9/L$ or less. In total, 55,239 patient days were reviewed with 18,706 days when the platelet count was $10 \times 10^9/L$ or less. Three major bleeding episodes occurred while participants were on the treatment protocol. The authors concluded that this restrictive policy, with a median transfusion interval of seven days, was feasible, safe, and economical.

Only $7.1 \times 10^9/L$ platelets per day are required to maintain vascular integrity, and hence spontaneous bleeding in clinically stable patients is uncommon unless the platelet count is less than $5 \times 10^9/L$ (Slichter 2004). A further large study also showed no relationship between the morning platelet count and the risk of clinically significant bleeding (WHO Grade 2 bleeding) the following day

except when the platelet count was very low ($\leq 5 \times 10^9/L$) (Slichter 2010).

A large retrospective review of almost 3000 adults with thrombocytopenia showed no relationship between the morning platelet count or the lowest platelet count of the day and the risk of severe or life-threatening bleeding (WHO Grade 3 to 4 bleeding) (Friedmann 2002). This raised the question as to whether a threshold-defined prophylactic platelet transfusion approach is appropriate.

Most recent clinical trials of platelet transfusions have used bleeding as an outcome. An assessment of bleeding is a more clinically relevant measure of the effect of platelet transfusions than surrogate markers such as the platelet count increment. The definition of what constitutes clinically significant bleeding has varied between studies. Although the majority of more recent platelet transfusion studies now classify it as WHO Grade 2 or above, there has been greater heterogeneity in the past (Estcourt 2013; WHO 1979). One limitation of all the scoring systems that have been based on the WHO system is that the categories are relatively broad and subjective. This means that a small change in a patient's bleeding risk may not be detected. Another limitation is that the modified WHO categories are partially defined by whether a bleeding patient requires a blood transfusion. The threshold for intervention may vary between clinicians and institutions, and so the same level of bleeding could be graded differently in different institutions. The difficulties with assessing and grading bleeding may limit the ability to compare results between studies, which should be kept in mind when interpreting the evidence for the effectiveness of prophylactic platelet transfusions in this review.

Why it is important to do this review

Blood products including platelet components are a valuable and finite resource, and their availability depends on the goodwill of voluntary donations. Also, platelet components have a limited shelf life of five to seven days, which makes management of platelet inventories difficult and resource intensive (Fuller 2011; Riley 2012).

As discussed above, the recommended platelet count threshold varies significantly from country to country (German Medical Association 2014; Kaufman 2015; Killick 2014; Killick 2016; Liumbruno 2009). This indicates significant uncertainty among clinicians regarding the correct management of people with chronic bone marrow disorders.

This review aimed to provide evidence of whether a therapeutic-only platelet transfusion strategy is as effective and safe as a prophylactic platelet transfusion strategy for the prevention of clinically significant or life-threatening bleeding in people with primary bone marrow failure disorders who are thrombocytopenic.

Overall, avoiding the need for unnecessary prophylactic platelet transfusions in people with bone marrow failure disorders will have significant logistical and financial implications for national health services as well as decreasing patients' exposure to the risks of transfusion. It will also have implications on the quality of life of patients, as it is challenging for patients and caregivers to visit hospital on a regular basis to receive platelet transfusions. The outcomes of this review are perhaps even more important in the development of platelet transfusion strategies in the developing

world, where access to blood components is much more limited (Verma 2009).

OBJECTIVES

To determine whether a therapeutic-only platelet transfusion policy (transfusion given when patient is bleeding) is as effective and safe as a prophylactic platelet transfusion policy (transfusion given to prevent bleeding according to a prespecified platelet threshold) in people with congenital or acquired bone marrow failure disorders

METHODS

Criteria for considering studies for this review

Types of studies

We included randomised controlled trials (RCTs), non-RCTs, and controlled before-after studies (CBAs) irrespective of language or publication status. We excluded uncontrolled studies, cross-sectional studies, and case-control studies.

We excluded cluster-RCTs, non-randomised cluster trials, and CBAs with fewer than two intervention sites and two control sites due to the risk of confounding.

Types of participants

We included all people with long-term bone marrow failure disorders that require platelet transfusions who were not being actively treated with a haematopoietic stem cell transplant or intensive chemotherapy. These disorders include myelodysplastic syndromes (MDS), acquired aplastic anaemia, and congenital bone marrow failure disorders. Due to the inherited nature of a number of bone marrow failure disorders, we included people of all ages, including neonates.

We excluded studies of alternatives to platelet transfusion, or studies of people receiving intensive chemotherapy or a stem cell transplant, as these were the subjects of separate reviews (Crichton 2015; Desborough 2016).

Types of interventions

Intervention

Participants received transfusions of platelet concentrates, prepared either from individual units of whole blood or by apheresis to treat bleeding (therapeutic platelet transfusions).

Control

Participants received prophylactic platelet transfusions and therapeutic platelet transfusions. Prophylactic platelet transfusions are typically given when the platelet count falls below a given trigger level.

There was no restriction on the dose, frequency, type of platelet component, or transfusion trigger of the platelet transfusions, but we also took this information into account in the analysis, where available.

We included the following comparisons.

- Therapeutic-only platelet transfusions (on-demand triggered by bleeding) versus prophylactic platelet transfusions.

- Placebo and therapeutic-only platelet transfusions (on-demand triggered by bleeding) versus prophylactic platelet transfusions.

Types of outcome measures

The primary and secondary outcomes of this review were outcomes of interest and were not used as inclusion criteria for the assessment of studies.

We planned to categorise all outcomes according to short-, medium-, and long-term outcomes. However, we included only one RCT in the review that did not report any outcomes (NCT01615146).

Primary outcomes

- The number of participants with at least one bleeding episode (WHO Grade 1 to 4, or WHO Grade 2 to 4)
- The total number of days on which bleeding occurred or the total number of bleeding episodes per participant (WHO Grade 1 to 4, or WHO Grade 2 to 4)
- The number of participants with at least one episode of severe or life-threatening bleeding
- Time to first bleeding episode from the start of the study (WHO Grade 1 to 4, or WHO Grade 2 to 4)

Secondary outcomes

- Mortality (all-cause, secondary to bleeding, and secondary to infection)
- Number of platelet transfusions per participant and number of platelet components per participant
- Number of red cell transfusions per participant and number of red cell components per participant
- Platelet transfusion interval
- Proportion of participants requiring additional interventions to stop bleeding (surgical, medical (e.g. tranexamic acid), other blood products (e.g. fresh frozen plasma, cryoprecipitate, fibrinogen)) within 30 days from the start of the study
- Number of hospital admissions and length of hospital stay
- Quality of life assessment using validated tools
- Transfusion-related adverse events (transfusion reactions, transfusion-associated infections, development of platelet antibodies or platelet refractoriness, thromboembolic events)

Search methods for identification of studies

The Systematic Review Initiative's Information Specialist (CD) formulated the search strategies in collaboration with the Cochrane Haematological Malignancies Group.

Electronic searches

We searched the following databases.

- Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (CENTRAL, the Cochrane Library 2017, Issue 9) (Appendix 1).
- MEDLINE (OvidSP, 1946 to 12 October 2017) (Appendix 2).
- Embase (OvidSP, 1974 to 12 October 2017) (Appendix 3).
- CINAHL (Cumulative Index to Nursing and Allied Health Literature) (EBSCOhost, 1937 to 12 October 2017) (Appendix 4).
- PubMed (e-publications only) (www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed) (Appendix 5).

- Transfusion Evidence Library (www.transfusionevidencelibrary.com) (1950 to 12 October 2017) (Appendix 6).
- LILACS (Latin American and Caribbean Health Sciences Literature database) (BIREME, 1980 to 12 October 2017) (Appendix 7).
- IndMED (1986 to 12 October 2017) (Appendix 8).
- PakMediNet (1995 to 12 October 2017) (Appendix 9).
- KoreaMed (1958 to 12 October 2017) (Appendix 9).
- Web of Science Conference Proceedings Citation Index-Science (CPCI-S) (Thomson Reuters, 1990 to 12 October 2017) (Appendix 10).

We searched for ongoing trials to 12 October 2017 in the following clinical trial registers.

- ClinicalTrials.gov (www.clinicaltrials.gov/) (Appendix 11).
- World Health Organization International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (WHO ICTRP) (apps.who.int/trialsearch/) (Appendix 12).

We applied the sensitivity-maximising Cochrane RCT search filter to the MEDLINE search and the SIGN RCT studies filter (www.sign.ac.uk/methodology/filters.html) to Embase and CINAHL (Lefebvre 2011). We did not apply any restrictions on date, language, or publication status.

Once we identified studies for inclusion we searched MEDLINE (Ovid) for errata or retraction statements for the reports of these studies.

Searching other resources

We conducted handsearching of the reference lists of included studies and any relevant systematic reviews to identify further relevant studies. We contacted lead authors of included studies to identify any unpublished material, missing data, or information regarding ongoing studies where possible.

Data collection and analysis

We planned to summarise data in accordance with standard Cochrane methodologies. However, this was not possible due to lack of data.

Selection of studies

We selected studies according to the methods outlined in the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* (Higgins 2011a). The Systematic Review Initiative's Information Specialist (CD) initially screened all search hits for relevance against the eligibility criteria, discarding all those that were clearly irrelevant. Two review authors (AA, AH) thereafter independently screened all the remaining references for relevance against the full eligibility criteria.

Full-text papers were retrieved for all references for which a decision on eligibility could not be made from title and abstract alone. We requested additional information from study authors as necessary to assess the eligibility for inclusion of individual studies. Any disagreements regarding study selection were resolved by discussion, or by consulting a third review author (LJE) when necessary.

We reported the results of study selection using a PRISMA flow diagram (Moher 2009). We also recorded the reasons for excluding studies based on full-text assessment, which we included in the 'Characteristics of excluded studies' table.

We collated multiple reports of one study so that the study, and not the report, was the unit of analysis.

Data extraction and management

As recommended in the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions*, two review authors (AA, AH) independently extracted data onto standardised forms and performed a cross-check (Higgins 2011a). We planned to pilot two different data extraction forms for the included RCTs and non-randomised studies. However, this was not possible because we found one eligible RCT that was halted after recruiting nine participants. The review authors reached consensus on the required changes with the assistance of a third review author (LJE). The review authors were not blinded to the names of authors, institutions, or journals, or to the study outcomes. We reported the characteristics of the one included study in the 'Characteristics of included studies' table.

We planned to extract the following information for each study.

- Source: study ID, report ID, review author ID, date of extraction, ID of author checking extracted data, citation of paper, contact authors' details.
- General study information: publication type, study objectives, funding source, conflict of interest declared, other relevant study publication reviewed.
- Study details and methods: location, country, setting, number of centres, total study duration, recruitment dates, length of follow-up, power calculation, primary analysis (and definition), stopping rules, method of sequence generation, allocation concealment, blinding (of clinicians, participants, and outcome assessors), any other concerns regarding bias, inclusion and exclusion criteria.
- Characteristics of interventions: number of study arms, description of experimental arm, description of control arm, and other relevant information.
- Characteristics of participants: age; gender; primary diagnosis; subgroup classification of primary disease type where appropriate, severity of primary disease, where appropriate, prognostic classification of primary disease where appropriate; additional therapy received; risk of alloimmunisation; baseline haematology laboratory parameters; confounders reported.
- Participant flow: total number screened for inclusion, total number recruited, total number excluded, total number allocated to each study arm, total number analysed (for review outcomes), number of allocated participants who received planned treatment, number of dropouts with reasons (percentage in each arm), protocol violations, missing data.
- Outcomes: number of participants with at least one bleeding episode; total number of days on which bleeding occurred or the total number of bleeding episodes per participant; number of participants with at least one episode of severe or life-threatening bleeding; time to first bleeding episode; mortality (all-cause, secondary to bleeding, and secondary to infection); number of platelet transfusions per participant and number of platelet components per participant; number of red cell transfusions per participant and number of red cell components

per participant; platelet transfusion interval; proportion of participants requiring additional interventions to stop bleeding (surgical, medical (e.g. tranexamic acid), other blood products (e.g. fresh frozen plasma, cryoprecipitate, fibrinogen)); quality of life assessment.

- For interventional cohort and pre-post single-arm or multiple-arm studies, we collected data on: confounding factors, the comparability of groups on confounding factors; methods used to control for confounding and on multiple effect estimates (both unadjusted and adjusted estimates) as recommended in Chapter 13 of the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* (Reeves 2011).

Assessment of risk of bias in included studies

Randomised controlled trials

Only one RCT was eligible for inclusion in this review. The information related to methodology of this trial was limited to the trial registration document.

In future updates of this review we will assess the risk of bias for all included RCTs using the Cochrane 'Risk of bias' tool according to Chapter 8 of the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* (Higgins 2011b). Two review authors will independently assess each element of potential bias listed below as 'high', 'low', or 'unclear' risk of bias. We will also briefly describe the support for our judgement of risk of bias in the 'Characteristics of included studies' table. In addition, we will ensure that consensus on the degree of risk of bias is achieved through comparison of the review authors' statements or by consulting with a third review author when necessary. We used Cochrane's tool for assessing risk of bias, which includes the following domains.

Selection bias

We will describe for each included study if and how the allocation sequence was generated and if allocation was adequately concealed prior to assignment. We will also describe the method used to conceal the allocation sequence in detail and determine if intervention allocation was foreseen in advance of, or during recruitment, or changed after assignment.

Performance bias

For each included study, we will describe, where possible, if the study participants and personnel were adequately blinded from knowledge of which intervention a participant received. We will judge studies as low risk of bias if they were blinded, or if we judge that lack of blinding could not have affected the results.

Detection bias

Was blinding of the outcome assessors effective in preventing systematic differences in the way in which the outcomes were determined?

Attrition bias

We will describe for each included study the attrition bias due to the amount, nature, or handling of incomplete outcome data. We will also attempt to evaluate whether intention-to-treat analysis was performed or could be performed from published information.

Reporting bias

We will describe for each included study the possibility of selective outcome reporting bias.

Other issues

Was the study apparently free of other problems that could put it at risk of bias?

We will also summarise the risk of bias for each key outcome for each included study. We will judge studies with at least one domain of high risk as at high risk of bias overall.

Non-randomised studies

No non-randomised studies were eligible for inclusion in this review.

In the future, when we identify non-randomised studies meeting our inclusion criteria, we will use the ROBINS-I tool (formerly known as ACROBAT-NRSI) to rate the quality of included non-randomised studies (Sterne 2014). This tool is based on the Cochrane 'Risk of bias' tool for rating the quality of RCTs (Higgins 2011c). The tool covers seven domains, and the quality of evidence is rated as low, moderate, serious, critical, or no information (see Appendix 13 for a copy of the tool), and uses signalling questions for the assessment of the following.

- Bias due to confounding
- Bias in the selection of participants
- Bias in measurement of interventions
- Bias due to departure from intended interventions
- Bias due to missing data
- Bias in measurement of outcomes
- Bias in the selection of the reported result

In the future, when we identify studies to include in the review, any disagreements on the assessment of the quality of an included study will be resolved by discussion or by consulting a third review author (LJE) when necessary.

We prespecified the main potential confounding factors.

- Primary diagnosis (aplastic anaemia, MDS, congenital bone marrow disorders)
- Age: variability in the age of included participants, e.g. infant (nought to one year) versus paediatric (one to 16 years) versus adult (> 16 years) versus older adult (> 60 years)
- Gender: male-to-female ratio
- Previous severe bleeding (e.g. WHO Grade 3 or 4 or equivalent)
- Use of anticoagulation during study
- Performance status (e.g. Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG), Karnofsky Performance Score (KPS))
- Treatment (e.g. azacytidine) versus no treatment (supportive care only)
- Presence of sepsis or infection
- Presence of bleeding disorder

We prespecified the possible co-interventions that could differ between intervention groups and could have an impact on outcomes.

- Concomitant use of antiplatelet therapy
- Factor replacements such as fresh frozen plasma, cryoprecipitate, fibrinogen
- Use of thrombopoietin mimetics (romiplostim, eltrombopag)
- Whole blood transfusions
- Use of steroids or danazol
- Over-the-counter or herbal medicines

Measures of treatment effect

Randomised controlled trials

No data available were available for assessment of outcomes and result formulation. In future updates, if RCT data are available, we will measure treatment effect as follows.

For continuous outcomes, we will record the mean, standard deviation (SD), and total number of participants in both the treatment and control groups. For dichotomous outcomes, we will record the number of events and the total number of participants in both the treatment and control groups.

For continuous outcomes using the same scale, we will perform analyses using the mean difference (MD) with 95% confidence intervals (CIs). We will use standardised mean difference (SMD) for continuous outcomes reported using different scales.

If available, we will extract and report hazard ratios (HRs) for mortality data. If HRs are not available, we will make every effort to estimate as accurately as possible the HR using the available data and a purpose-built method based on the Parmar and Tierney approach (Parmar 1998; Tierney 2007). If sufficient studies provide HRs, we will use HRs in favour of risk ratios (RRs) in a meta-analysis, but for completeness we will also perform a separate meta-analysis of data from studies providing only RRs for the same outcome.

For dichotomous outcomes, we will report the pooled RR with a 95% CI (Deeks 2011). Where the number of observed events is small (< 5% of sample per group) and where trials have balanced treatment groups, we will report Peto's odds ratio (OR) with 95% CIs (Deeks 2011).

For cluster-RCTs, we will extract and report direct estimates of the effect measure (e.g. RR with a 95% CI) from an analysis that accounts for the clustered design. We will obtain statistical advice to ensure the analysis is appropriate. If appropriate analyses are not available, we will make every effort to approximate the analysis following the recommendations in Chapter 16 of the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* (Higgins 2011d).

If data allow, we will undertake quantitative assessments using Review Manager 5 (RevMan 2014).

Non-randomised studies

No non-randomised studies were eligible for inclusion in this review. In future updates, if data from non-randomised studies are available, we will measure treatment effect as follows.

For dichotomous outcomes, if available we will extract and report the RR with a 95% CI from statistical analyses adjusting for baseline differences (such as Poisson regressions or logistic regressions) or the ratio of risk ratios (i.e. the risk ratio postintervention/risk ratio pre-intervention).

For continuous variables, if available we will extract and report the absolute change from a statistical analysis adjusting for baseline differences (such as regression models, mixed models, or hierarchical models) or the relative change adjusted for baseline differences in the outcome measures (i.e. the absolute postintervention difference between the intervention and control groups, as well as the absolute pre-intervention difference between the intervention and control groups/the postintervention level in the control group) (EPOC 2015).

If data allow, we will undertake quantitative assessments using Review Manager 5 (RevMan 2014).

All studies

We did not report the number needed to treat for an additional beneficial outcome (NNTB) and the number needed to treat for an additional harmful outcome (NNTH) with CIs as no information was available.

We could not report the available data in any of the formats described above, nor could we perform a narrative report.

Unit of analysis issues

We did not encounter unit of analysis issues due to insufficient studies and reported outcomes. In future updates, if we identify any cluster-randomised trials, cross-over studies, or multiple observations for the same outcome, we will treat these in accordance with the recommendations in Chapter 16 of the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* (Higgins 2011c).

Dealing with missing data

We dealt with missing data according to the recommendations in the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* (Higgins 2011b). We had access to further information for one excluded study, Grossman 1980, from previous reviews. We contacted the author of the only included study, NCT01615146, to ask for additional data, but no data were provided.

Assessment of heterogeneity

We did not assess statistical heterogeneity because no analyses were performed. However, in future updates when more studies are included, we will assess statistical heterogeneity using the I^2 and χ^2 statistics. We will assess statistical heterogeneity of treatment effects between studies using a χ^2 test with a significance level at $P < 0.1$. We will use the I^2 statistic to quantify the degree of potential heterogeneity and classify it as low if I^2 is $\leq 50\%$, moderate if I^2 is 50% to 80%, or considerable if I^2 is $> 80\%$. We will use the random-effects model for low-to-moderate heterogeneity. If statistical heterogeneity is considerable, we will not report the overall summary statistic. We will assess potential causes of heterogeneity by sensitivity and subgroup analyses (Deeks 2011).

Assessment of reporting biases

We did not perform a formal assessment of publication bias because no analyses were performed. In future updates of this review when at least 10 studies are identified for inclusion in a meta-analysis, we will explore potential publication bias (small-trial bias) by generating a funnel plot and using a linear regression test. We

will consider a P value of less than 0.1 as significant for this test (Sterne 2011).

Data synthesis

We planned to perform analyses according to the recommendations in the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* (Deeks 2011). However, no available outcome data were reported in the single included study (NCT01615146), and we did not receive any data from the trial authors after we requested unpublished data.

Randomised controlled trials

In future updates of this review where meta-analysis is feasible, we will use the random-effects model for pooling data. We will use the Mantel-Haenszel method for dichotomous outcomes and the inverse-variance method for continuous outcomes, or outcomes that include data from cluster-RCTs, or outcomes where HRs are available. If we assess heterogeneity as above 80%, and we identify a cause for the heterogeneity, we will explore this with subgroup analyses. If we cannot find a cause for the heterogeneity, then we will not perform a meta-analysis, but comment on the results as a narrative with the results from all studies presented in tables.

Non-randomised studies

In future updates of this review, if meta-analysis is feasible for non-RCTs or CBA studies, we will analyse non-RCTs and CBA studies separately. We will only analyse outcomes with adjusted effect estimates if these are adjusted for the same factors using the inverse-variance method as recommended in Chapter 13 of the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* (Reeves 2011).

All studies

In future updates of this review, we will use the random-effects model for all analyses, as we anticipate that true effects will be related, but not the same for included studies. If we cannot perform a meta-analysis, we will comment on the results narratively with the results from all studies presented in tables.

Summary of findings

In future updates of this review, we will use the GRADE tool (study limitations, consistency of effect, imprecision, indirectness, and publication bias) to assess the quality of evidence for each outcome. We will present a 'Summary of findings' table as suggested in Chapters 11 and 12 of the *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* (Schunemann 2011a; Schunemann 2011b). The outcomes included are listed below in order of most relevant endpoints for patients.

- Number of participants with at least one bleeding episode.
- Total number of bleeding episodes per participant.
- Number of participants with at least one severe or life-threatening bleeding episode.

- All-cause mortality.
- Number of units of platelet transfusion per participant.
- Quality of life.
- Transfusion-related adverse events (transfusion reactions, transfusion-associated infections, development of platelet antibodies or platelet refractoriness, thromboembolic events).

Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity

We did not perform subgroup analysis due to lack of data. If adequate data are available in future updates, we will perform subgroup analyses for each of the following outcomes to assess the effect on heterogeneity.

- Type of bone marrow failure disorder (MDS, aplastic anaemia, congenital bone marrow failure disorder).
- Age of participants grouped as neonatal (nought to one year), paediatric (one to 16 years), adult (17 years to 60 years), elderly adult (greater than 60 years).
- Underlying bleeding tendencies (gastric ulcer, angiodysplasia, acquired coagulopathy, etc.).
- Concomitant treatment for the underlying disorder (azacytidine).

Sensitivity analysis

We did not perform sensitivity analysis. In future updates of this review we will assess the robustness of our findings by performing the following sensitivity analyses where appropriate.

- Including only those studies with low risk of bias (e.g. RCTs with methods assessed as low risk for random sequence generation and concealment of treatment allocation, and for non-RCTs if the study is judged to be at low risk of bias for all domains).
- Including only those studies with less than a 20% dropout rate.

RESULTS

Description of studies


Refer to [Characteristics of included studies](#) and [Characteristics of excluded studies](#) for more details.

One RCT was eligible for inclusion in the review (NCT01615146). No non-RCTs were eligible for inclusion in the review.

Results of the search

The search conducted on 12 October 2017 retrieved 9058 potentially relevant records (see PRISMA flow diagram in [Figure 1](#)). There were 6975 references after removal of duplicates. We excluded 6957 records based on the abstract. We assessed the eligibility of the remaining 18 references based on full-text papers checking against the review eligibility criteria. Only one trial met the inclusion criteria for this review (NCT01615146). There were no eligible non-RCTs.

Figure 1. Study flow diagram.



Included studies

See [Characteristics of included studies](#) for full details of the included trial ([NCT01615146](#)).

Study design and duration

[NCT01615146](#) was a parallel, single-centre RCT conducted in Canada. The trial was designed as a single-blind trial in which the medical and research staff and investigators were blinded to the intervention allocation status. The study started in June 2012 and closed in June 2015. Participants were followed up for six months.

Study participants

Only nine participants were enrolled in the trial over a three-year trial period; poor participant recruitment rate was the main reason for discontinuation of the trial. The demographic and clinical characteristics of this small number of participants have not been disclosed. However, the following clinical and laboratory data were collected at baseline: participants' demographic data, diagnosis including date and disease stage, history of prior chemotherapy treatment, ECOG performance status, any other comorbidity, previous platelet and red cell transfusions history, red cell transfusion history, prior bleeding events, quality of life questionnaire, routine blood work, and weekly full blood count.

Once the participant's platelet count was greater than $20 \times 10^9/L$ for at least six weeks, the weekly platelet count test was replaced by clinical monitoring.

Study interventions

Therapeutic platelet transfusion group

Participants in this group did not receive routine prophylactic platelet transfusions. Platelet transfusion was only given to treat clinically documented bleeding, defined as WHO bleeding of Grade 2 or greater.

Prophylactic platelet transfusion group

Platelet transfusions were given to participants in this group when the platelet count was less than $10 \times 10^9/L$. A single dose of random

donor platelets (four unit pool or random donor platelets or one apheresis unit) was used.

Off-protocol transfusion: Any additional platelet transfusions given to participants in either group were recorded.

Study outcomes

The trial's primary outcomes were feasibility outcomes of enrolment, compliance with transfusion protocols, and completion of bleeding evaluations.

The trial's secondary outcomes were bleeding assessments, blood transfusions, frequency of hospital visits, quality of life, and mortality.

Study funding

The trial was publicly sponsored by the following collaborators: the Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, the Canadian Blood Services, and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research.

Excluded studies


We excluded nine studies within 17 full-text articles for the following the reasons:

- wrong patient population: five studies ([Andrew 1993](#); [Grossman 1980](#); [Sintnicolaas 1981](#); [Stanworth 2013](#); [Wandt 2012](#));
- wrong study design: four studies ([Ferrara 2007](#); [Pisciotta 1995](#); [Sagmeister 1999](#); [Siitonen 2004](#)).

Risk of bias in included studies

We assessed the risk of bias of the one included trial based on the information from the trial registry record ([NCT01615146](#)). See [Figure 2](#) for a visual representation of the risk of bias in the included study. See the 'Risk of bias' table within the [Characteristics of included studies](#) for further information regarding the risk of bias in this trial.

Figure 2. Risk of bias summary: review authors' judgements about each risk of bias item for each included study.



Allocation

We rated [NCT01615146](#) as at low risk for selection bias.

Random sequence generation

We rated [NCT01615146](#) as at low risk of bias for randomisation sequence generation, as the study used a web-based randomisation method.

Allocation concealment

We rated [NCT01615146](#) as at low risk of bias for allocation concealment, as the study used a web-based randomisation method.

Blinding

Blinding of participants and personnel

We assessed [NCT01615146](#) as at high risk of performance bias because participants were aware of the status of the intervention.

Blinding of clinical assessors

We assessed [NCT01615146](#) as at low risk of detection bias because outcome assessors were blinded to the participants' intervention status.

Incomplete outcome data

We assessed [NCT01615146](#) as at unclear risk of attrition bias because the trial was only available as a web page via the clinical trial registry.

Selective reporting

We assessed [NCT01615146](#) as at unclear risk of reporting bias because the trial was only available as a web page via the clinical trial registry.

Other potential sources of bias

We assessed [NCT01615146](#) as at unclear risk of other bias because the trial was only available as a web page via the clinical trial registry.

Effects of interventions

We were unable to report on any of our review's primary or secondary outcomes due to the absence of relevant data.

The one included trial, [NCT01615146](#), was terminated after enrolling a small number of participants. No data were reported on any of the trial outcomes.

DISCUSSION

Summary of main results

We included only one trial in this review ([NCT01615146](#)), which closed after recruiting only nine participants. No data were reported and no additional data were provided by the authors.

Overall completeness and applicability of evidence

This review provides an up-to-date picture of the lack of evidence regarding the use of therapeutic platelet transfusion strategies compared to prophylactic platelet transfusion strategies for people with bone marrow disorders.

We tried to maximise the number of studies eligible for inclusion in the review by including good-quality non-randomised studies (non-RCTs and CBAs). Despite this, we identified only one trial for inclusion ([NCT01615146](#)). This trial was discontinued due to a slow recruitment rate, with only nine participants enrolled over three years. We were unable to report on any of our primary and secondary outcomes because data relevant to this small group of participants were never disclosed. This study was based in a single centre, which might to some extent explain the slow rate of enrolment. We did not identify any ongoing trials eligible for inclusion in the future.

We excluded from this review some studies that had methodologically low-quality study designs. We consider it important for evidence related to platelet transfusion in this population to be reliable, and drawing conclusions from low-quality studies such as cross-sectional or retrospective design studies could be misleading and is not justified.

Quality of the evidence

We found one eligible RCT ([NCT01615146](#)), for which the only available information was on the trial registry record. We could not assess the quality of any of the outcomes of our review.

The trial used a web-based randomisation system (low risk of selection bias). Participants were unblinded to the intervention (high risk of performance bias), but outcome assessors were blinded to the intervention (low risk of detection bias). We could not assess attrition bias, reporting bias, or other bias due to the lack of data.

Potential biases in the review process

To our knowledge, this review is free from bias. We applied a broad and comprehensive search strategy across multiple databases and clinical trial registries to ensure that all relevant studies were retrieved. We did not apply any restriction criteria to our searches. We carefully assessed the relevance of each paper identified and performed all screening and data extractions in duplicate. We prespecified all outcomes and subgroups prior to analysis.

We included only one RCT. We tried to contact the study authors to obtain further information about the trial but have been unsuccessful.

None of the review authors were involved in the included or excluded studies.

Agreements and disagreements with other studies or reviews

Thrombocytopenia (platelet counts $< 100 \times 10^9/L$) is commonly seen in people with MDS, with a prevalence of 40% to 65% ([Kantarjian 2007](#)). Platelet transfusions have been given to people with MDS for decades, and it is currently one of the most common underlying reasons for receiving a prophylactic platelet transfusion ([NCABT 2016](#)). Despite this, we identified a major research gap with regard to current platelet transfusion practice for people with bone marrow failure. Guidelines recommend not using a prophylactic platelet transfusion policy in people with chronic bone marrow failure if they are well and not undergoing treatment to cure their bone marrow disorder ([Estcourt 2017](#); [Schiffer 2017](#)). Platelet transfusions are known to cause harm in other patient groups ([Lee 2016](#)).

One of the studies excluded in this review assessed the use of a restrictive platelet transfusion policy in people with severe aplastic anaemia ([Sagmeister 1999](#)). This was a retrospective analysis of 25 adults that included 18,706 patient days with platelet counts less than $10 \times 10^9/L$, and 55,239 patient days in total. Only three episodes of major bleeding occurred during the study. The number of platelet transfusions given was 1135; 88% were at platelet counts less than $10 \times 10^9/L$ and 57% at platelet counts less than $5 \times 10^9/L$. Sagmeister and colleagues concluded that a more restrictive policy with low thresholds for platelet transfusions combined with a gradual lengthening of the transfusion intervals was safe and cost-effective. This study is part of the underlying evidence for the current advice from platelet transfusion guidelines.

AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS

Implications for practice

Evidence related to the efficacy and safety of a therapeutic platelet transfusion strategy in comparison with a prophylactic platelet transfusion strategy is still absent. However, we identified one randomised controlled trial for inclusion with no data. We can make no recommendations to support or refute therapeutic platelet transfusion policies for this patient population. The absence of evidence should stimulate research priorities in this area. Platelet transfusions for people with bone marrow disorders should still be managed according to national transfusion guidelines.

Implications for research

In this review we identified a major gap in the literature, and further research to examine the therapeutic application of platelet transfusions in people with acquired or hereditary bone marrow disorders is justified.

There is an urgent need for good-quality studies in which therapeutic and prophylactic platelet transfusion strategies are directly compared in this population. A multicentre randomised controlled trial might be the ideal study design in order to enrol a sufficient number of participants as the prevalence of people with bone marrow disorders is low, and also to allow for a longer follow-up study period. Future studies should determine a standardised set of outcome measures. Patient-reported outcomes such as quality of life and the length and frequency of hospital admissions should also be considered.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank the editorial base of the Cochrane Haematological Malignancies Review Group.

We thank NHS Blood and Transplant (NHSBT).

We thank the National Institute of Health Research (NIHR). This review is part of a series of reviews that have been funded by

the NIHR Cochrane Programme Grant - Safe and Appropriate Use of Blood Components. This research was also supported by the NIHR Oxford Biomedical Research Centre Programme. The views and opinions expressed therein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Systematic Reviews Programme, NIHR, National Health Service (NHS), or the Department of Health.

We thank Marialena Trivella, who was an author of the protocol.

REFERENCES

References to studies included in this review

NCT01615146 {published data only}

NCT01615146. Outpatient platelet transfusions in myelodysplastic syndromes and leukemia: The OPTIMAL pilot (OPTIMAL). clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT01615146 (first received 6 June 2012).

References to studies excluded from this review

Andrew 1993 {published data only}

Andrew M, Vegh P, Caco C, Kirpalani H, Jefferies A, Ohlsson A, et al. A randomized controlled trial of platelet transfusions in thrombocytopenic premature infants. *Journal of Pediatrics* 1993;**123**(2):285–91.

Ferrara 2007 {published data only}

Ferrara M, Capozzi L, Coppola A, Save G, Coppola L. Prophylactic platelet transfusion in children with thrombocytopenic disorders: a retrospective review. *Hematology* 2007;**12**(4):297–9.

Grossman 1980 {published and unpublished data}

Grossman L, Mangal A, Hislop TG, Buskard NA. Preliminary report on a randomized study of prophylactic (P) vs. therapeutic (T) platelet transfusions. *Blood* 1980;**80**:271.

Pisciotta 1995 {published data only}

Pisciotta PT, Benson K, Hume H, Glassman AB, Oberman H, Popovsky M, et al. Prophylactic versus therapeutic platelet transfusion practices in hematology and/or oncology patients. *Transfusion* 1995;**35**(6):498–502.

Sagmeister 1999 {published data only}

Sagmeister M, Oec L, Gmur JA. A restrictive platelet transfusion policy allowing long term support of outpatients with severe aplastic anaemia. *Blood* 1999;**93**:3124–6.

Siitonen 2004 {published data only}

Siitonen T, Koistinen P. Prophylactic platelet transfusion in patients with hematologic diseases [Veritautipotilaiden profylaktiset trombosyyttien siirrot]. *Verensiirtoboito* 2004;**120**(7):877–84.

Sintnicolaas 1981 {published data only}

Sintnicolaas K, van de Velden K, Sizoo W, Haije WG, Abels J, Lowenberg B. Comparison of 'prophylactic' and 'therapeutic' single-donor platelet transfusions in patients with acute leukemia. *British Journal of Haematology* 1981;**50**(4):684.

Stanworth 2013 {published data only}

ISRCTN08758735. A randomised controlled trial of prophylactic versus no-prophylactic platelet transfusion in patient with haematological malignancies. www.isrctn.com/ISRCTN08758735 (first received 31 July 2006).

Stanworth SJ, Dyer C, Choo L, Bakrania L, Copplestone A, Llewelyn C, et al. Do all patients with hematologic malignancies and severe thrombocytopenia need prophylactic platelet

transfusions?: Background, rationale, and design of a clinical trial (trial of platelet prophylaxis) to assess the effectiveness of prophylactic platelet transfusions. *Transfusion Medicine Reviews* 2010;**24**(3):163–71.

Stanworth SJ, Estcourt L, Powter G, Kahan BC, Dyer C, Bakrania L, et al. The effect of a no-prophylactic versus prophylactic platelet transfusion strategy on bleeding in patients with hematological malignancies and severe thrombocytopenia (TOPPS trial). A randomized controlled, non-inferiority trial. *Blood* 2012;**120**(21):1.

Stanworth SJ, Estcourt LJ, Llewelyn CA, Murphy MF, Wood EM. Impact of prophylactic platelet transfusions on bleeding events in patients with hematologic malignancies: a subgroup analysis of a randomized trial (CME). *Transfusion* 2014;**54**(10):2385–93.

* Stanworth SJ, Estcourt LJ, Powter G, Kahan BC, Dyer C, Choo L, et al. A no-prophylaxis platelet-transfusion strategy for hematologic cancers. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2013;**368**(19):1771–80.

Stanworth SJ, Hudson CL, Estcourt LJ, Johnson RJ, Wood EM, TOPPS study investigators. Risk of bleeding and use of platelet transfusions in patients with hematologic malignancies: recurrent event analysis. *Haematologica* 2015;**100**(6):740–7.

Wood EM, Hudson C, Estcourt L, Johnson R, Stanworth SJ. Risk factors for bleeding: a modelling analysis of the TOPPS randomized controlled trial of prophylactic platelet transfusion. *Blood* 2014;**124**:1551.

Wandt 2012 {published data only}

NCT00521664. A trial comparing a prophylactic with a therapeutic platelet transfusion strategy in two groups. clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT00521664 (first received 27 August 2007).

Wandt H. Indication for platelet transfusion in patients with haematological disease: less is more. *Deutsche Medizinische Wochenschrift* 2010;**135**(38):1877–9.

* Wandt H, Schaefer-Eckart K, Wendelin K, Pilz B, Wilhelm M, Thalheimer M, et al. Therapeutic platelet transfusion versus routine prophylactic transfusion in patients with haematological malignancies: an open-label, multicentre, randomised study. *Lancet* 2012;**380**(9850):1309–16.

Additional references

Beutler 1993

Beutler E. Platelet transfusions: the 20,000/ μ L trigger. *Blood* 1993;**81**:1411–3.

Blumberg 2010

Blumberg N, Heal JM, Phillips GL. Platelet transfusions: trigger, dose, benefits, and risks. *F1000 Medical Reports* 2010; Vol. 2:5.

Bosly 2007

Bosly A, Muylle L, Noens L, Pietersz R, Heim D, Hübner R, et al. Guidelines for transfusion of platelets. *Acta Clinica Belgica: International Journal of Clinical and Laboratory Medicine* 2007;**62**(1):36-47.

Crichton 2015

Crichton GL, Estcourt LJ, Wood EM, Trivella M, Doree C, Stanworth S. A therapeutic-only versus prophylactic platelet transfusion strategy for preventing bleeding in patients with haematological disorders after myelosuppressive chemotherapy or stem cell transplantation. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2015, Issue 9. [DOI: [10.1002/14651858.CD010981.pub2](https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD010981.pub2)]

Deeks 2011

Deeks JJ, Higgins JP, Altman DG (editors). Chapter 9: Analysing data and undertaking meta-analyses. In: Higgins JPT, Green S (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from handbook.cochrane.org.

Desborough 2016

Desborough M, Estcourt LJ, Chaimani A, Doree C, Hopewell S, Trivella M, et al. Alternative agents versus prophylactic platelet transfusion for preventing bleeding in patients with thrombocytopenia due to chronic bone marrow failure: a network meta-analysis and systematic review. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2016, Issue 1. [DOI: [10.1002/14651858.CD012055](https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD012055)]

Dinmohamed 2014

Dinmohamed AG, Visser O, Van Norden Y, Huijgens PC, Sonneveld P, Van de Loosdrecht AA, et al. Trends in incidence, initial treatment and survival of myelodysplastic syndromes: a population-based study of 5144 patients diagnosed in the Netherlands from 2001 to 2010. *European Journal of Cancer* 2014;**50**(5):1004-12.

EPOC 2015

Effective Practice, Organisation of Care (EPOC). EPOC Resources for review authors. www.epoc.cochrane.org/epoc-specific-resources-review-authors (accessed prior to 4 July 2017).

Estcourt 2013

Estcourt LJ, Heddle N, Kaufman RM, McCullough J, Murphy MF, Slichter S, et al. On behalf of the BEST (Biomedical Excellence for Safer Transfusion) Collaborative. The challenges of measuring bleeding outcomes in clinical trials of platelet transfusions. *Transfusion* 2013;**53**(7):1531-43.

Estcourt 2015

Estcourt LJ, Stanworth SJ, Doree C, Hopewell S, Trivella M, Murphy MF. Comparison of different platelet count thresholds to guide administration of prophylactic platelet transfusion for preventing bleeding in people with haematological disorders after myelosuppressive chemotherapy or stem cell transplantation. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2015, Issue 11. [DOI: [10.1002/14651858.CD010983.pub2](https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD010983.pub2)]

Estcourt 2017

Estcourt LJ, Birchall J, Allard S, Bassey SJ, Hersey P, Kerr JP, et al. Guidelines for the use of platelet transfusions. *British Journal of Haematology* 2017;**176**:365-94.

Friedmann 2002

Friedmann AM, Sengul H, Lehmann H, Schwartz C, Goodman S. Do basic laboratory tests or clinical observations predict bleeding in thrombocytopenic oncology patients?. *Transfusion Medicine Reviews* 2002;**16**:34-45.

Fuller 2011

Fuller AK, Uglić KM, Braine HG, King KE. A comprehensive program to minimize platelet outdating. *Transfusion* 2011;**51**(7):1469-76.

Garcia-Manero 2012

Garcia-Manero G. Myelodysplastic syndromes: 2012 update on diagnosis, risk-stratification, and management. *American Journal of Hematology* 2012;**87**(7):692-701.

Gaydos 1962

Gaydos LA, Freireich EJ, Mantel N. The quantitative relation between platelet count and hemorrhage in patients with acute leukemia. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1962;**266**(18):905-9.

German Medical Association 2014

Executive Committee of the German Medical Association on the recommendation of the Scientific Advisory Board. Cross-sectional guidelines for therapy with blood components and plasma derivatives. www.bundesaeztekammer.de/aerzte/medizin-ethik/wissenschaftlicher-beirat/veroeffentlichungen/haemotherapie-transfusionsmedizin/english/ 2014 (accessed prior to 21 January 2016).

Giri 2004

Giri N. The inherited bone marrow failure syndromes. *Haematologia* 2004;**8**(2):57-9.

Gmur 1991

Gmur J, Burger J, Schanz U, Fehr J, Schaffner A. Safety of stringent prophylactic platelet transfusion policy for patients with acute leukaemia. *Lancet* 1991;**338**(8777):1223-6.

Hellstrom-Lindberg 2003

Hellström-Lindberg E, Gulbrandsen N, Lindberg G, Ahlgren T, Dahl IM, Dybedal I, et al. A validated decision model for treating the anaemia of myelodysplastic syndromes with erythropoietin and granulocyte colony-stimulating factor: significant effects on quality of life. *British Journal of Haematology* 2003;**120**(6):1037-46.

Higgins 2011a

Higgins JP, Deeks JJ (editors). Chapter 7: Selecting studies and collecting data. In: Higgins JPT, Green S (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from handbook.cochrane.org.

Higgins 2011b

Higgins JP, Altman DG, Sterne JA (editors). Chapter 8: Assessing risk of bias in included studies. In: Higgins JPT, Green S (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from handbook.cochrane.org.

Higgins 2011c

Higgins JP, Deeks JJ, Altman DG (editors). Chapter 16: Special topics in statistics. In: Higgins JPT, Green S (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from handbook.cochrane.org.

Higgins 2011d

Higgins JP, Deeks JJ, Altman DG on behalf of the Cochrane Statistical Methods Group (editors). Chapter 16: Special topics in statistics. In: Higgins JPT, Green S (editors). *Cochrane Handbook of Systematic Reviews of Interventions* Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from handbook.cochrane.org.

Hod 2008

Hod E, Schwartz J. Platelet transfusion refractoriness. *British Journal of Haematology* 2008;**42**(3):348-60.

Issaragrisil 2006

Issaragrisil S, Kaufman D, Anderson T, Chansung K, Leaverton P, Shapiro S, et al. The epidemiology of aplastic anemia in Thailand. *Blood* 2006;**107**:1299-307.

Kantarjian 2007

Kantarjian H, Giles F, List A, Lyons R, Sekeres MA, Pierce S, et al. The incidence and impact of thrombocytopenia in myelodysplastic syndromes. *Cancer* 2007;**109**:1705-14.

Kaufman 2015

Kaufman RM, Djulbegovic B, Gernsheimer T, Kleinman S, Tinmouth AT, Capocelli KE, et al. Platelet transfusion: a clinical practice guideline from the AABB. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2015;**162**:205-13.

Killick 2014

Killick SB, Carter C, Culligan D, Dalley C, Das-Gupta E, Drummond M, et al. Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of adult myelodysplastic syndromes. *British Journal of Haematology* 2014;**164**(4):503-25.

Killick 2016

Killick SB, Bown N, Cavenagh J, Dokal I, Foukaneli T, Hill A, et al. Guidelines for the diagnosis and management of adult aplastic anaemia. *British Journal of Haematology* 2016;**172**(2):187-207.

Le Deley 2007

Le Deley MC, Suzan F, Cutuli B, Delaloge S, Shamsaldin A, Linassier C, et al. Anthracyclines, mitoxantrone, radiotherapy, and granulocyte colony-stimulating factor: risk factors for leukemia and myelodysplastic syndrome after breast cancer. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2007;**25**(3):292-300.

Lee 2016

Lee TH, Wong JG, Leo YS, Thein TL, Ng EL, Lee LK, et al. Potential harm of prophylactic platelet transfusion in adult dengue patients. *PLoS Neglected Tropical Diseases* 2016;**10**(3):e0004576.

Lefebvre 2011

Lefebvre C, Manheimer E, Glanville J. Chapter 6: Searching for studies. In: Higgins JPT, Green S (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from handbook.cochrane.org.

Liumbruno 2009

Liumbruno G, Bennardello F, Lattanzio A, Piccoli P, Rossetti G. Recommendations for the transfusion of plasma and platelets. *Blood Transfusion* 2009;**7**(2):132-50.

Ma 2007

Ma X, Does M, Raza A, Mayne ST. Myelodysplastic syndromes: incidence and survival in the United States. *Cancer* 2007;**109**(8):1536-42.

Ma 2012

Ma X. Epidemiology of myelodysplastic syndromes. *American Journal of Medicine* 2012;**125**(7):S2-5.

McCaffrey 2016

McCaffrey N, Kaambwa B, Currow DC, Ratcliffe J. Health-related quality of life measured using the EQ-5D-5L: South Australian population norms. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes* 2016;**14**:133.

Moher 2009

Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic reviews and Meta-Analyses: The PRISMA Statement. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 2009;**151**(4):264-9.

Montané 2008

Montané E, Ibáñez, L, Vidal X, Ballarin E, Pig R, Garcia N, et al. Epidemiology of aplastic anemia: a prospective multicenter study. *Haematologica* 2008;**93**(4):518-23.

NBA 2012

National Blood Authority. Patient Blood Management Guideline: Module 3 - Medical. www.blood.gov.au/pbm-module-3 (accessed prior to 4 November 2017).

NCABT 2016

National Comparative Audit of Blood Transfusion (NCABT). Red cell & platelet transfusions in adult haematology patients. hospital.blood.co.uk/audits/national-comparative-audit/medical-audits/2016-red-cell-platelet-transfusion-in-adult-haematology-patients/ (accessed prior to 10 October 2017).

Neukirchen 2011

Neukirchen J, Schoonen WM, Strupp C, Gattermann N, Aul C, Haas R, et al. Incidence and prevalence of myelodysplastic syndromes: data from the Dusseldorf MDS-registry. *Leukemia Research* 2011;**35**(12):1591-6.

NICE 2015

National Institute for Health and Care Excellence. Blood transfusion NG24. www.nice.org.uk/guidance/ng24 2015 (accessed prior to 1 March 2016).

Parmar 1998

Parmar MK, Torri V, Stewart L. Extracting summary statistics to perform meta-analyses of the published literature for survival endpoints. *Statistics in Medicine* 1998;**17**(24):2815-34.

Rauff 2011

Rauff B, Idrees M, Shah SA, Butt S, Butt AM, Ali L, et al. Hepatitis associated aplastic anemia: a review. *Virology Journal* 2011;**28**:87.

Raval 2015

Raval JS, Mazepa MA, Russell SL, Immel CC, Whinna HC, Park YA. Passive reporting greatly underestimates the rate of transfusion-associated circulatory overload after platelet transfusion. *Vox Sanguinis* 2015;**108**(4):387-92.

Rebulla 1997

Rebulla P, Finazzi G, Marangoni F, Avvisati G, Gugliotta L, Tognoni G, et al. The threshold for prophylactic platelet transfusions in adults with acute myeloid leukemia. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1997;**337**(26):1870-5.

Reeves 2011

Reeves BC, Deeks JJ, Higgins JP, Wells GA. Chapter 13: Including non-randomised studies. In: Higgins JP, Green S (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from handbook.cochrane.org.

RevMan 2014 [Computer program]

The Nordic Cochrane Centre. The Cochrane Collaboration. Review Manager (RevMan). Version 5.3. Copenhagen: The Nordic Cochrane Centre. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2014.

Riley 2012

Riley W, Smalley B, Pulkrabek S, Clay ME, McCullough J. Using lean techniques to define the platelet (PLT) transfusion process and cost-effectiveness to evaluate PLT dose transfusion strategies. *Transfusion* 2012;**52**(9):1957-67. [PubMed: 22320153]

Rollison 2008

Rollison DE, Howlader N, Smith MT, Strom SS, Merritt WD, Ries LA, et al. Epidemiology of myelodysplastic syndromes and chronic myeloproliferative disorders in the United States, 2001-2004, using data from the NAACCR and SEER programs. *Blood* 2008;**112**(1):42-52.

Schiffer 2001

Schiffer CA, Anderson KC, Bennett CL, Bernstein S, Elting LS, Goldsmith M, et al. Platelet transfusion for patients with cancer: clinical practice guidelines of the American Society of Clinical Oncology. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2001;**19**(5):1519-38.

Schiffer 2013

Schiffer CA. Haematological cancer: Prophylactic platelet transfusion is frequently not necessary. *Nature Review Clinical Oncology* 2013;**10**(8):431-2.

Schiffer 2017

Schiffer CA, Bohlke K, Delaney M, Hume H, Magdalinski AJ, McCullough JJ, et al. Platelet transfusion for patients with cancer: American Society of Clinical Oncology clinical practice guideline update. *Journal of Clinical Oncology* 2017;**36**(3):283-99.

Schunemann 2011a

Schünemann HJ, Oxman AD, Higgins JPT, Vist GE, Glasziou P, Guyatt GH. Chapter 11: Presenting results and 'Summary of findings' tables. In: Higgins JP, Green S (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from handbook.cochrane.org.

Schunemann 2011b

Schünemann HJ, Oxman AD, Vist GE, Higgins JP, Deeks JJ, Glasziou P, et al. Chapter 12: Interpreting results and drawing conclusions. In: Higgins JP, Green S (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from handbook.cochrane.org.

Sekeres 2010

Sekeres MA. The epidemiology of myelodysplastic syndromes. *Hematology/Oncology Clinics of North America* 2010;**24**(2):287-94.

Shimamura 2009

Shimamura A. Clinical approach to marrow failure. *ASH Education Program Book* 2009;**2009**(1):329-37.

Slichter 1978

Slichter SJ, Harker LA. Thrombocytopenia: mechanisms and management of defects in platelet production. *Clinics in Haematology* 1978;**7**(3):523-39.

Slichter 2004

Slichter SJ. Relationship between platelet count and bleeding risk in thrombocytopenic patients. *Transfusion Medicine Reviews* 2004;**18**(3):153-67.

Slichter 2005

Slichter SJ, Davis K, Enright H, Braine H, Gernsheimer T, Kao KJ, et al. Factors affecting posttransfusion platelet increments, platelet refractoriness, and platelet transfusion intervals in thrombocytopenic patients. *Blood* 2005;**105**(10):4106-14.

Slichter 2010

Slichter SJ, Kaufman RM, Assmann SF, McCullough J, Triulzi DJ, Strauss RG, et al. Dose of prophylactic platelet transfusions and prevention of hemorrhage. *New England Journal of Medicine* 2010;**362**:600-13.

Stanworth 2014

Stanworth SJ, Estcourt LJ, Llewelyn CA, Murphy MF, Wood EM. Impact of prophylactic platelet transfusions on bleeding events in patients with hematologic malignancies: a subgroup analysis of a randomised trial. *Transfusion* 2014;**54**(10):2385-93.

Stanworth 2015

Stanworth SJ, Navarrete C, Estcourt L, Marsh J. Platelet refractoriness - practical approaches and ongoing dilemmas in patient management. *British Journal of Haematology* 2015;**171**(3):297-305.

Steensma 2006

Steensma DP, Bennett JM. The myelodysplastic syndromes: diagnosis and treatment. *Mayo Clinic Proceedings* 2006;**81**(1):104-30.

Sterne 2011

Sterne JA, Egger M, Moher D. Chapter 10: Addressing reporting biases. In: Higgins JP, Green S (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* Version 5.1.0 [updated March 2011]. The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from handbook.cochrane.org.

Sterne 2014

Sterne JA, Higgins JPT, Reeves BC on behalf of the development group for ACROBAT-NRSI. A Cochrane Risk of Bias Assessment Tool: for Non-Randomized Studies of Interventions (ACROBAT-NRSI), Version 1.0.0. www.riskofbias.info 2014 (accessed prior to 12 February 2016).

Tierney 2007

Tierney JF, Stewart LA, Ghera D, Burdett S, Sydes MR. Practical methods for incorporating summary time-to-event data into meta-analysis. *Trials* 2007; Vol. 8:16. [DOI: [10.1186/1745-6215-8-16](https://doi.org/10.1186/1745-6215-8-16)]

Tingate 2012

Tingate H, Birchall J, Gray A, Haggas R, Massey E, Norfolk D, et al. Guideline on the investigation and management of acute transfusion reactions. *British Journal of Haematology* 2012;**159**(2):143-53.

TRAP 1997

The Trial to Reduce Alloimmunization to Platelets Study Group. Leukocyte reduction and ultraviolet B irradiation of

platelets to prevent alloimmunization and refractoriness to platelet transfusions. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1997;**337**(26):1861-70.

Verma 2009

Verma A, Agarwal P. Platelet utilization in the developing world: strategies to optimise platelet transfusion practices. *Transfusion and Apheresis Science* 2009;**41**(2):145-9.

Wandt 1998

Wandt H, Frank M, Ehninger G, Schneider C, Brack N, Daoud A, et al. Safety and cost effectiveness of a 10x10⁹/L trigger for prophylactic platelet transfusions compared with the traditional 20x10⁹/L trigger: a prospective comparative trial in 105 patients with acute myeloid leukemia. *Blood* 1998;**91**(10):3601-6.

WHO 1979

World Health Organization. WHO Handbook for Reporting Results of Cancer Treatment. WHO Offset publication No. 48. Geneva: World Health Organization, 1979.

Young 2008

Young NS, Kaufman DW. The epidemiology of acquired aplastic anemia. *Haematologica* 2008;**93**(4):489-92.

Zeller 2016

Zeller, M. Chapter 18: Platelet transfusion, alloimmunization and management of platelet refractoriness. <https://professionaleducation.blood.ca/en/transfusion/clinical-guide/platelet-transfusion-alloimmunization-and-management-platelet> (accessed prior to 11 July 2017).

References to other published versions of this review

Ashraf 2016

Ashraf A, Hadjinicolaou AV, Doree C, Hopewell S, Trivella M, Estcourt LJ. Comparison of a therapeutic-only versus prophylactic platelet transfusion policy for people with congenital or acquired bone marrow failure disorders. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2016, Issue 9. [DOI: [10.1002/14651858.CD012342](https://doi.org/10.1002/14651858.CD012342)]

* Indicates the major publication for the study

CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES

Characteristics of included studies [ordered by study ID]

NCT01615146

Methods

Type of study: parallel randomised controlled trial

Setting and country: Ottawa Hospital, Canada

Number of centres: 1

Dates of trial (start and end): June 2012 to June 2015

Follow-up period: 6 months

Comparison of a therapeutic-only versus prophylactic platelet transfusion policy for people with congenital or acquired bone marrow failure disorders (Review)

Copyright © 2018 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

NCT01615146 (Continued)

Power calculation: unclear

Participants	<p>Number of participants: 9</p> <p>Inclusion criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> adults 18 years or older with documented MDS (including MDS subtype CMML) or AML (as defined by WHO criteria) severe thrombocytopenia defined as a platelet count of $\leq 10 \times 10^9/L$ documented on 2 consecutive samples at least 7 days apart receiving outpatient-based supportive or palliative care including palliative cytoreductive, immunomodulatory, or hypomethylating therapy, e.g. hydroxyurea or low-dose cytarabine, lenalidomide, azacytidine, or decitabine Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group (ECOG) performance status of 0 to 2 <p>Exclusion criteria:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> high-dose therapy in the past 2 months, e.g. AML-type induction or consolidation therapy thrombocytopenia suspected to be due to immune or peripheral destruction splenomegaly, palpated at greater than 5 cm below the costal margin or greater than 20 cm on imaging alloimmune platelet refractoriness clinically relevant bleed (Grade 3 or higher) within the past 3 months coagulopathy (prothrombin time or activated partial thromboplastin more than 1.5 times the upper limit of normal or fibrinogen less than 2 g/L) require anticoagulant therapy, e.g. heparin, or antiplatelet therapy, e.g. aspirin significant renal impairment (creatinine more than 1.5 times the upper limit of normal) geographic inaccessibility resulting in the inability to comply with follow-up visits pregnant or breastfeeding unwilling or unable to provide informed consent
Interventions	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> Therapeutic platelet transfusion: platelet transfusions were given to treat documented clinically relevant bleeding defined as WHO bleeding of Grade 2 or greater. Prophylactic platelet transfusion: platelet transfusion (a single dose of random donor platelets (4 unit pool or random donor platelets or 1 apheresis unit) when the measured platelet count is $< 10 \times 10^9/L$.
Outcomes	<p>Primary outcome measures:</p> <p>Feasibility at 18 months:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> overall trial enrolment off-protocol platelet transfusions total number of platelet transfusions per group participant compliance with daily self assessment of bleeding <p>Secondary outcome measures:</p> <p>Bleeding events at 6 months' follow-up:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> non-cutaneous Grade 2 bleeding or higher by the WHO bleeding assessment scale Grade 3 bleeding or higher events: from randomisation to first bleeding event of Grade 3 or higher total number of red cell transfusions per group total number of hospital days per group number of completed daily bleeding assessments per group quality of life mortality
Assessment of outcomes	Bleeding assessment

NCT01615146 (Continued)

Study participants were asked to complete a diary of a simple bleeding questionnaire. Participants received a short training session and written material training course on how to complete the bleeding assessment form. The bleeding assessment was performed at all study follow-up visits and involved interview, physical exam, and review of daily bleeding forms. Participants were asked to report any non-cutaneous Grade 2 or greater bleeding immediately to their treating physicians and the study team. All the self assessments of bleeding will be reviewed at each participant visit to ensure that all clinically relevant bleeding episodes have been captured.

Bleeding events and the assignment of the bleeding grade were performed by study personnel. The final bleeding grade was assigned independently by two blinded physicians.

Blood transfusions

All platelet and red cell transfusions were recorded, including the date of transfusion and the number of units given. The type of platelet components transfused (apheresis or buffy coat) was also documented. The indication for all transfusions, i.e. prophylactic or to treat bleeding, was documented.

Quality of life

This was one of the trial's secondary outcomes and was assessed using the EuroQol-5 dimensions (EQ-5D) questionnaire. Quality of life assessments were performed at baseline and at all subsequent participant visits.

The EQ-5D, which is a health-related quality of life instrument, comprises a health state classification followed by a health evaluation using a visual analogue scale (VAS). The VAS part provides a single global rating of self perceived health and is scored on a 0-to-100-millimetre scale representing "the worst..." and "the best health you can imagine", respectively (McCaffrey 2016).

Notes

Trial registration number: NCT01615146

Source(s) of funding and collaborator: Ottawa Hospital Research Institute, Canadian Blood Services, Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR)

Conflicts of interest: unclear

Investigators: Alan Tinmouth, Ottawa Hospital Research Institute

Other

The trial was terminated due to poor recruitment.

Other study ID: OHREB 2011500

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomised controlled trial design using a web-based randomisation method. "A local study nurse used a web-based randomization system (permuted random blocks of two or four patients) to allocate consenting patients."
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomised controlled trial design using a web-based randomisation method. "A local study nurse will use a web-based randomization system (permuted random blocks of two or four patients) to allocate consenting patients"
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	High risk	Single-blind study design

NCT01615146 (Continued)

Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Single-blind trial; outcome assessors were blind to the intervention status. "Medical and research staff and investigators will be blinded to randomization scheme"
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information available to assess this domain
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Unclear risk	No information available to assess this domain
Other bias	Unclear risk	No information available to assess this domain

AML: acute myeloid leukaemia

CMML: chronic myelomonocytic leukaemia

MDS: myelodysplastic syndrome

WHO: World Health Organization

Characteristics of excluded studies [ordered by study ID]

Study	Reason for exclusion
Andrew 1993	Wrong population - premature infants
Ferrara 2007	Wrong study design - retrospective analysis
Grossman 1980	Wrong patient population - only people receiving intensive chemotherapy
Pisciotta 1995	Wrong study design - survey of institutional members of blood bank
Sagmeister 1999	Wrong study design - retrospective evaluation
Siitonen 2004	Wrong study design - survey
Sintnicolaas 1981	Wrong patient population - single-donor platelets versus multiple-donor platelets
Stanworth 2013	Wrong patient population - only people receiving intensive chemotherapy
Wandt 2012	Wrong patient population - only people receiving intensive chemotherapy

APPENDICES

Appendix 1. CENTRAL (the Cochrane Library) search strategy

#1 MeSH descriptor: [Hematologic Neoplasms] explode all trees

#2 MeSH descriptor: [Hematologic Diseases] this term only

#3 MeSH descriptor: [Leukemia] explode all trees

#4 MeSH descriptor: [Preleukemia] this term only

#5 MeSH descriptor: [Bone Marrow Diseases] explode all trees

#6 MeSH descriptor: [Thrombocytopenia] explode all trees

#7 MeSH descriptor: [Bone Marrow] this term only and with qualifier(s): [Pathology - PA]

#8 ((myelos* near/2 (nonleukemic or nonleukaemic or non-leukemic or non-leukaemic or aleukemic or aleukaemic)) or (myeloid near/2 metaplasia*) or myelofibros* or (bone marrow near/5 fibros*) or myeloscleros*)

#9 (myelodysplas* or myeloid dysplasia or preleukemi* or preleukaemi* or dysmyelopoie* or 5Q syndrome)
#10 ((aplast* or hypoplast* or refractory or aregenerative or sideroblastic or sideroachrestic or chronic*) near/2 an?emia)
#11 ((haematolog* or hematolog* or hemato-oncolog* or haemato-oncolog*) near/2 patients)
#12 ((haematolog* or hematolog* or blood or red cell* or white cell* or lymph* or marrow or platelet*) near/3 (malignan* or oncolog* or cancer* or neoplasm* or carcinoma*))
#13 erythroid aplasia or erythrodysplas* or hematopoietic aplasia or haematopoietic aplasiapancytopen*
#14 (IMF or PMF or MDS):ti
#15 (bone marrow near/3 (fail* or disease* or disorder* or aplasia or dysplasia or hypoplasia))
#16 (thrombocytopeni* or leuk?emi* or myelodysplas* or myeloproliferat* or shwachman diamond or (dyskeratosis next congenita*) or AML)
#17 (fanconi* next (an?emia or panmyelopathy or syndrome*))
#18 #1 or #2 or #3 or #4 or #5 or #6 or #7 or #8 or #9 or #10 or #11 or #12 or #13 or #14 or #15 or #16 or #17
#19 MeSH descriptor: [Blood Platelets] explode all trees
#20 (platelets or thrombocytes):ti
#21 MeSH descriptor: [Platelet Transfusion] explode all trees
#22 MeSH descriptor: [Plateletpheresis] explode all trees
#23 ((platelet* or thrombocyte*) near/5 (prophyla* or transfus* or infus* or administ* or requir* or need* or product or products or component* or concentrate* or apheres* or pooled or single donor* or random donor*))
#24 thrombocytopheres* or plateletphereses*
#25 ((platelet* or thrombocyte*) near/5 (protocol* or trigger* or threshold* or schedul* or dose* or dosing or usage or utilisation or utilization))
#26 #19 or #20 or #21 or #22 or #23 or #24 or #25
#27 #18 and #26

Appendix 2. MEDLINE (OvidSP) search strategy

1. exp Hematologic Neoplasms/
2. Hematologic Diseases/
3. exp Leukemia/
4. Preleukemia/
5. exp Bone Marrow Diseases/
6. Bone Marrow/pa
7. exp Thrombocytopenia/
8. (bone marrow adj3 (fail* or disease* or disorder* or aplasia or hypoplasia or dysplasia)).tw,kf.
9. (thrombocytopeni* or thrombopen* or leuk?emi* or myeloproliferat* or shwachman diamond or (dyskeratosis adj1 congenita*) or AML).tw,kf.
10. (myelodysplas* or myeloid dysplasia or preleukemi* or preleukaemi* or dysmyelopoie* or 5Q syndrome).tw,kf.
11. ((aplast* or hypoplast* or refractory or aregenerative or sideroblastic or sideroachrestic or chronic*) adj2 an?emia).tw,kf.
12. (erythroid aplasia or erythrodysplas* or hematopoietic aplasia or haematopoietic aplasia or pancytopen*).tw,kf.
13. (fanconi* adj (an?emia or panmyelopathy or syndrome)).tw,kf.
14. ((myelos* adj2 (nonleuk?emic or non-leuk?emic or aleuk?emic)) or (myeloid adj2 metaplasia*) or myelofibros* or (bone marrow adj5 fibros*) or myeloscleros*).tw,kf.
15. (IMF or PMF or MDS):ti.
16. ((haematolog* or hematolog* or blood or red cell* or white cell* or lymph* or marrow or platelet*) adj3 (malignan* or oncolog* or cancer* or neoplasm*)).tw,kf.
17. ((haematolog* or hematolog* or haemato-oncolog* or hemato-oncolog*) adj2 patients).tw,kf.
18. or/1-17
19. Platelet Transfusion/
20. Plateletpheresis/
21. (thrombocytopheres* or plateletphereses*).tw,kf.
22. ((platelet* or thrombocyte*) adj5 (prophyla* or transfus* or infus* or administ* or requir* or need* or product* or component* or concentrate* or apheres* or pooled or single donor* or random donor* or unit* or protocol* or trigger* or threshold* or schedul* or dose* or dosing or usage or utili?ation)).tw,kf.
23. platelets.ti.
24. 19 or 20 or 21 or 22 or 23
25. 18 and 24
26. RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIAL.pt.
27. CONTROLLED CLINICAL TRIAL.pt.
28. (randomi* or trial*).tw,kf.
29. (placebo* or randomly or groups).ab.
30. CLINICAL TRIALS AS TOPIC.sh.
31. or/26-30

32. exp COHORT STUDIES/
33. (cohort* or controlled trial or controlled study or comparative trial or comparative study or comparison group or comparator group).tw,kf.
34. ((follow up or observational) adj (study or studies)).tw,kf.
35. (longitudinal* or retrospective* or cross sectional*).tw,kf.
36. CROSS-SECTIONAL STUDIES/
37. CONTROLLED BEFORE-AFTER STUDIES/
38. HISTORICALLY CONTROLLED STUDY/
39. INTERRUPTED TIME SERIES ANALYSIS/
40. (nonrandomi* or non randomi*).tw,kf.
41. "before and after study".tw,kf.
42. or/32-41
43. Meta-Analysis.pt.
44. (meta analy* or metaanaly*).ab.
45. META-ANALYSIS/
46. or/43-45
47. (studies or trials).ab.
48. 46 and 47
49. (meta analy* or metaanaly*).ti.
50. (systematic* adj2 (review* or overview*)).tw,kf.
51. (cochrane or medline or pubmed or embase or cinahl or cinhal or lilacs or "web of science" or science citationindex or search terms or published articles or search strateg* or reference list* or bibliograph* or handsearch* or hand search* or manual* search*).ab.
52. (additional adj (papers or articles or sources)).ab.
53. (electronic adj (sources or resources or databases)).ab.
54. (relevant adj (journals or articles)).ab.
55. "REVIEW LITERATURE AS TOPIC"/
56. META-ANALYSIS AS TOPIC/
57. or/48-56
58. Review.pt.
59. exp CLINICAL TRIALS AS TOPIC/
60. selection criteria.ab. or critical appraisal.ti.
61. (data adj2 (extract* or analys*)).ab.
62. RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIALS/
63. OBSERVATIONAL STUDY/
64. ((cohort* or observational or retrospective*) adj1 (trial* or stud*)).tw,kf.
65. or/59-64
66. 58 and 65
67. 57 or 66
68. (Comment or Letter or Editorial).pt.
69. 67 not 68
70. 31 or 42 or 69
71. exp ANIMALS/ not HUMANS/
72. 70 not 71
73. 25 and 72

Appendix 3. Embase (OvidSP) search strategy

1. Thrombocyte Transfusion/
2. Thrombocytophoresis/
3. ((platelet* or thrombocyte*) adj5 (prophyla* or transfus* or infus* or administ* or requir* or need* or product* or component* or concentrate* or apheres* or pooled or single donor or random donor or unit* or protocol* or trigger* or threshold* or schedul* or dose* or dosing or usage or utili?ation)).tw.
4. (thrombocytopheres* or plateletpheres*).tw.
5. (platelets or thrombocytes).ti.
6. or/1-5
7. exp Bone Marrow Disease/
8. Thrombocytopenia/ or Refractory Thrombocytopenia/
9. exp Myelodysplastic Syndrome/
10. Myelodysplasia/
11. exp Preleukemia/
12. Hematologic Malignancy/
13. (bone marrow adj3 (fail* or disease* or disorder* or aplasia or hypoplasia or dysplasia)).tw.

14. ((myelos* adj2 (nonleuk?emic or non-leuk?emic or aleuk?emic)) or (myeloid adj2 metaplasia*) or myelofibros* or (bone marrow adj5 fibros*) or myeloscleros*).tw.
15. (thrombocytopeni* or thrombopen* or leuk?emi* or myeloproliferat* or shwachman diamond or (dyskeratosis adj1 congenita*) or AML).tw.
16. (erythroid aplasia or erythrodysplas* or hematopoietic aplasia or haematopoietic aplasia or pancytopen*).tw.
17. (fanconi* adj (an?emia or panmyelopathy or syndrome*)).tw.
18. ((haematolog* or hematolog* or haemato-oncolog* or hemato-oncolog*) adj2 patients).tw.
19. ((haematolog* or hematolog* or blood or red cell* or white cell* or lymph* or marrow or platelet*) adj3 (malignan* or oncolog* or cancer* or neoplasm*)).tw.
20. (myelodysplas* or myeloid dysplasia or preleukemi* or preleukaemi* or dysmyelopoie* or 5Q syndrome).tw.
21. ((aplast* or hypoplast* or refractory or aregenerative or sideroblastic or sideroachrestic or chronic*) adj2 an?emia).tw.
22. (MDS or IMF or PMF).ti.
23. or/7-22
24. 6 and 23
25. Meta Analysis/
26. Systematic Review/
27. (meta analy* or metaanalys*).tw.
28. ((systematic* or literature) adj2 (review* or overview* or search*)).tw.
29. (cochrane or embase or cinahl or cinhal or lilacs or BIDS or science citation index or psyclit or psychlit or psycinfo or psychinfo or cancerlit).ti,ab.
30. (electronic* adj (sources or resources or databases)).ab.
31. (additional adj (articles or papers or sources)).ab.
32. (reference lists or bibliograph* or handsearch* or hand search* or manual* search*).ab.
33. (relevant adj (journals or articles)).ab.
34. (search term* or published articles or search strateg*).ab.
35. or/25-34
36. (data extraction or selection criteria).ab.
37. review.pt.
38. 35 or (36 and 37)
39. editorial.pt.
40. 38 not 39
41. Controlled Clinical Trial/ or Phase 3 Clinical Trial/ or Phase 4 Clinical Trial/
42. Randomized Controlled Trial/
43. Randomization/
44. Single Blind Procedure/
45. Double Blind Procedure/
46. Crossover Procedure/
47. Placebo/
48. (randomi* or RCT or placebo*).tw.
49. (random* adj2 (allocat* or assign* or divid* or receiv*)).tw.
50. ((single or double or triple or treble) adj blind*).tw.
51. Prospective Study/
52. ((crossover* or cross over* or cross-over*) adj2 (trial or study)).tw.
53. or/41-52
54. Case Study/
55. case report\$.tw.
56. (note or editorial).pt.
57. or/54-56
58. 53 not 57
59. 40 or 58
60. MAJOR CLINICAL STUDY/
61. LONGITUDINAL STUDY/
62. RETROSPECTIVE STUDY/
63. OBSERVATIONAL STUDY/
64. INTERVENTION STUDY/
65. PROSPECTIVE STUDY/ not RANDOMIZED CONTROLLED TRIAL/
66. COHORT ANALYSIS/
67. COMPARATIVE STUDY/
68. ((follow up or observational* or controlled or comparative) adj2 (trial* or stud*)).tw.
69. ((comparison or comparator) adj group*).tw.
70. (cohort* or retrospective* or longitudinal*).tw.
71. (cross sectional adj (study or studies)).tw.

72. (nonrandomi* or non randomi*).tw.
73. or/60-72
74. 59 or 73
75. 24 and 74

Appendix 4. CINAHL (EBSCOhost) search strategy

S1 (MH "Hematologic Neoplasms+")
S2 (MH Leukemia+)
S3 (MH "Anemia, Aplastic+")
S4 (MH "Bone Marrow Diseases+")
S5 (MH Thrombocytopenia+)
S6 (thrombocytopeni* or thrombocytopaeni* or thrombopeni* or thrombopaeni* or leukemi* or leukaemi* or myelodysplas* or myeloproliferat* or myelofibros* or AML or shwachman diamond or (dyskeratosis N1 congenita*))
S7 (myelodysplas* or bone marrow dysplas* or preleukemi* or preleukaemi* or dysmyelopoie* or 5Q syndrome)
S8 ((aplast* or hypoplast* or refractory or aregenerative or sideroblastic or sideroachrestic or chronic*) N2 (anemia or anaemia))
S9 ((myelos* N2 (nonleukemic or nonleukaemic or non-leukemic or non-leukaemic or aleukemic or aleukaemic)) or (myeloid N2 metaplasia*) or myelofibros* or (bone marrow N5 fibros*) or myeloscleros*)
S10 MDS or PMF or IMF or pancytopen* or erythroid aplasia or erythrodysplas* or hematopoietic aplasia
S11 (bone marrow N3 (fail* or disease* or disorder* or aplasia or dysplasia or hypoplasia))
S12 (fanconi* N2 (anemia or anaemia or panmyelopathy or syndrome*))
S13 ((haematolog* or hematolog* or blood or red cell* or white cell* or lymph* or marrow or platelet*) N3 (malignan* or oncolog* or cancer* or neoplasm*))
S14 ((haematolog* or hematolog* or haemato-oncolog* or hemato-oncolog*) N2 patients)
S15 S1 OR S2 OR S3 OR S4 OR S5 OR S6 OR S7 OR S8 OR S9 OR S10 OR S11 OR S12 OR S13 OR S14
S16 (MH "Blood Platelets")
S17 TI (platelet* or thrombocyte*)
S18 (MH "BLOOD TRANSFUSION+")
S19 TI transfus*
S20 S16 OR S17
S21 S18 OR S19
S22 S20 AND S21
S23 (MH "PLATELET TRANSFUSION")
S24 (MH PLATELETPHERESIS)
S25 ((platelet* or thrombocyte*) N5 (prophyla* or transfus* or infus* or administ* or requir* or need* or product* or component* or concentrate* or apheres* or pooled or single donor or random donor))
S26 (thrombocytopheres* or plateletpheres*)
S27 ((platelet* or thrombocyte*) N5 (protocol* or trigger* or threshold* or schedul* or dose* or dosing or usage or utili?ation))
S28 TI (platelets OR thrombocytes)
S29 S22 OR S23 OR S24 OR S25 OR S26 OR S27 OR S28
S30 S15 AND S29
S31 (MH "Prospective Studies+")
S32 (MH "Case Control Studies+")
S33 (MH "Correlational Studies") OR (MH "Cross Sectional Studies")
S34 TI ((cohort study or cohort studies)) OR AB ((cohort study or cohort studies))
S35 TI ((observational stud* or retrospective stud*)) OR AB ((observational stud* or retrospective stud*))
S36 S31 or S32 or S33 or S34 or S35
S37 (MH Clinical Trials+)
S38 PT Clinical Trial
S39 TI ((controlled trial*) or (clinical trial*)) OR AB ((controlled trial*) or (clinical trial*))
S40 TI ((singl* blind*) OR (doubl* blind*) OR (trebl* blind*) OR (tripl* blind*) OR (singl* mask*) OR (doubl* mask*) OR (tripl* mask*)) OR AB ((singl* blind*) OR (doubl* blind*) OR (trebl* blind*) OR (tripl* blind*) OR (singl* mask*) OR (doubl* mask*) OR (tripl* mask*))
S41 TI randomi* OR AB randomi*
S42 MH RANDOM ASSIGNMENT
S43 TI ((phase three) or (phase III) or (phase three)) or AB ((phase three) or (phase III) or (phase three))
S44 (TI (random* N2 (assign* or allocat*))) OR (AB (random* N2 (assign* or allocat*))))
S45 MH PLACEBOS
S46 MH META ANALYSIS
S47 MH SYSTEMATIC REVIEW
S48 TI ("meta analys*" OR metaanalys* OR "systematic review" OR "systematic overview" OR "systematic search*") OR AB ("meta analys*" OR metaanalys* OR "systematic review" OR "systematic overview" OR "systematic search*")

S49 TI ("literature review" OR "literature overview" OR "literature search*") OR AB ("literature review" OR "literature overview" OR "literature search*")

S50 TI (cochrane OR embase OR cinahl OR cinhal OR lilacs OR BIDS OR science AND citation AND index OR cancerlit) OR AB (cochrane OR embase OR cinahl OR cinhal OR lilacs OR BIDS OR science AND citation AND index OR cancerlit)

S51 TI placebo* OR AB placebo*

S52 MH QUANTITATIVE STUDIES

S53 S37 or S38 or S39 or S40 or S41 or S42 or S43 or S44 or S45 or S46 or S47 or S48 or S49 or S50 or S51 or S52

S54 S36 or S53

S55 S30 AND S54

Appendix 5. PubMed (e-publications only) search strategy

#1 (thrombocytopenia* OR leukemia* OR leukaemia* OR preleukemia* OR myelodysplasia* OR "bone marrow dysplasia" OR "bone marrow aplasia" OR "bone marrow hypoplasia" OR myeloproliferative* OR myelofibrosis* OR myeloid dysplasia* OR shwachman diamond OR dyskeratosis congenital OR AML OR dysmyelopoiesis* OR "5Q syndrome" OR "erythroid aplasia" OR erythroid dysplasia* OR "hematopoietic aplasia" OR "haematopoietic aplasia" OR pancytopenia* OR "bone marrow failure" OR "bone marrow disease" OR "bone marrow diseases" OR "bone marrow disorder" OR "bone marrow disorders" OR "aplastic anemia" OR "aplastic anaemia" OR "hypoplastic anemia" OR "hypoplastic anaemia" OR "refractory anemia" OR "refractory anaemia" OR "sideroblastic anemia" OR "sideroblastic anaemia" OR "aregenerative anemia" OR "aregenerative anaemia" OR "chronic anemia" OR "chronic anaemia" OR fanconi* OR (myelos* AND (nonleukemic OR nonleukaemic OR non-leukemic OR non-leukaemic OR aleukemic OR aleukaemic)) OR (myeloid AND metaplasia*) OR ("bone marrow" AND fibrosis*) OR IMF[TI] OR PMF[TI] OR MDS[TI] OR "haematology patients" OR "hematology patients" OR "haematological patients" OR "hematological patients" OR "haematology patients" OR "hemato-oncology patients" OR "hemato-oncology patients" OR "haematological patients" OR "hemato-oncological patients" OR "hemato-oncological patients")

#2 (((platelet* OR thrombocyte*) AND (prophylaxis* OR transfusion* OR infusion* OR administration* OR requirement* OR need* OR product* OR component* OR concentrate* OR apheresis* OR pooled OR "single donor" OR "single donors" OR "random donor" OR "random donors" OR protocol* OR trigger* OR threshold* OR schedule* OR dose* OR dosing OR usage OR utilisation OR utilization)) OR thrombocytopenia* OR plateletpheresis* OR platelets[TI] OR thrombocytes[TI])

#3 ((random* OR blind* OR "control group" OR placebo OR "controlled trial" OR "controlled study" OR groups OR trials OR "systematic review" OR "systematic overview" OR "meta-analysis" OR metaanalysis OR "literature search" OR medline OR cochrane OR embase)

#4 (publisher[SB] OR inprocess[SB] OR pubmednotmedline[SB])

#5 #1 AND #2 AND #3 AND #4

Appendix 6. Transfusion Evidence Library search strategy

All Fields: (haematological OR hematological OR haematology OR hematology OR haemato-oncology OR hemato-oncology OR pancytopenia OR bone marrow failure OR bone marrow disease OR bone marrow disorder OR leukemia OR leukaemia OR preleukemia OR preleukaemia OR aplastic OR hypoplastic OR refractory OR sideroblastic OR fanconi OR thrombocytopenia OR thrombocytopenic OR myelodysplasia OR bone marrow dysplasia OR myeloproliferative OR myelofibrosis OR fibrosis OR myeloid dysplasia OR shwachman OR dyskeratosis OR AML OR dysmyelopoiesis OR 5Q syndrome) AND Subject Area: Platelets

OR
keywords: "Platelet Transfusion" AND (haematological OR hematological OR haematology OR hematology OR haemato-oncology OR hemato-oncology OR pancytopenia OR bone marrow failure OR bone marrow disease OR bone marrow disorder OR leukemia OR leukaemia OR preleukemia OR preleukaemia OR aplastic OR hypoplastic OR refractory OR sideroblastic OR fanconi OR thrombocytopenia OR thrombocytopenic OR myelodysplasia OR bone marrow dysplasia OR myeloproliferative OR myelofibrosis OR fibrosis OR myeloid dysplasia OR shwachman OR dyskeratosis OR AML OR dysmyelopoiesis OR 5Q syndrome)

Appendix 7. LILACS search strategy

tw:((platelet OR thrombocyte OR platelets OR thrombocytes) AND transfusion) AND (instance:"regional") AND (db:"LILACS") AND type_of_study:(clinical_trials))

Appendix 8. IndMED search strategy

(platelet OR platelets OR thrombocyte OR thrombocytes OR thrombocytopenia OR plateletpheresis)

AND

(haematological OR hematological OR haematology OR hematology OR haemato-oncology OR hemato-oncology OR pancytopenia OR bone marrow OR leukemia OR leukaemia OR preleukemia OR preleukaemia OR aplastic OR hypoplastic OR refractory OR sideroblastic OR fanconi OR thrombocytopenia OR thrombocytopenic OR myelodysplasia OR myeloproliferative OR myelofibrosis OR fibrosis OR myeloid dysplasia OR shwachman OR dyskeratosis OR AML OR dysmyelopoiesis OR 5q syndrome)

AND

(randomized OR randomised OR randomly OR blind OR blinded OR trial OR control group OR groups)

Appendix 9. PakMediNet & KoreaMed search strategy

platelet*[ALL] AND "Randomized Controlled Trial" [PT] OR

thrombocyt*[ALL] AND "Randomized Controlled Trial" [PT]

Appendix 10. Web of Science Conference Proceedings Citation Index - Science (CPCI-S) search strategy

Topic: (haematological OR hematological OR haematology OR hematology OR haemato-oncology OR hemato-oncology OR pancytopenia OR bone marrow failure OR bone marrow disease OR bone marrow disorder OR leukemia OR leukaemia OR preleukemia OR preleukaemia OR aplastic OR hypoplastic OR refractory OR sideroblastic OR fanconi OR thrombocytopenia OR thrombocytopenic OR myelodysplasia OR bone marrow dysplasia OR myeloproliferative OR myelofibrosis OR fibrosis OR myelosclerosis OR shwachman OR dyskeratosis OR AML OR dysmyelopoiesis OR 5q syndrome)

AND

Topic: (platelet* NEAR/5 transfus*) OR (platelet* NEAR/1 concentrate*)

AND

Topic: (systematic* OR random* OR blind* OR trial* OR control* OR groups)

Appendix 11. ClinicalTrials.gov search strategy

Search Terms: randomized OR randomised OR randomly

Conditions: (hematological malignancies OR hemato-oncology OR bone marrow failure OR pancytopenia OR bone marrow disease OR leukemia OR preleukemia OR aplastic anemia OR hypoplastic anemia OR refractory anemia OR sideroblastic anemia OR fanconi OR thrombocytopenia OR myelodysplasia OR bone marrow dysplasia OR myeloproliferative OR myelofibrosis OR myelosclerosis OR shwachman OR dyskeratosis OR dysmyelopoiesis OR 5Q) Intervention: platelets OR platelet transfusion OR platelet concentrate

Appendix 12. WHO ICTRP search strategy

Title/Condition: (hematological malignancies OR hemato-oncology OR pancytopenia OR bone marrow failure OR pancytopenia OR bone marrow disease OR leukemia OR preleukemia OR aplastic anemia OR hypoplastic anemia OR refractory anemia OR sideroblastic anemia OR fanconi OR thrombocytopenia OR myelodysplasia OR bone marrow dysplasia OR myeloproliferative OR myelofibrosis OR myelosclerosis OR shwachman OR dyskeratosis OR dysmyelopoiesis OR 5Q)

Title/Intervention: platelets OR platelet transfusion OR platelet concentrate

Appendix 13. ROBINS-I (A Cochrane 'Risk of bias' assessment tool: for non-randomised studies of interventions)

ROBINS-I tool (Stage I)

Specify the review question

Participants	All people with long-term bone marrow failure disorders that require platelet transfusions, who are not being actively treated with a haematopoietic stem cell transplant, or intensive chemotherapy. These disorders include myelodysplastic syndromes (MDS), acquired or inherited aplastic anaemia and other congenital bone marrow failure disorders. Due to the inherited nature of a number of bone marrow failure disorders, we will include people of all ages, including neonates.
Experimental intervention	Participants will receive transfusions of platelet concentrates, prepared either from individual units of whole blood or by apheresis to treat bleeding (therapeutic platelet transfusions).
Control intervention	Participants will receive transfusions of platelet concentrates to prevent bleeding in addition to transfusions of platelet concentrates, prepared either from individual units of whole blood or by apheresis to treat bleeding. Prophylactic platelet transfusions are typically given when the platelet count falls below a given trigger level.
Outcomes	<p>Primary outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> the number of participants with at least one bleeding episode the total number of days on which bleeding occurred or the total number of bleeding episodes per participant the number of participants with at least one episode of severe or life-threatening bleeding time to first bleeding episode from the start of the study <p>Secondary outcomes</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> mortality (all-cause, secondary to bleeding, and secondary to infection) number of platelet transfusions per participant and number of platelet components per participant

(Continued)

- number of red cell transfusions per participant and number of red cell components per participant
- platelet transfusion interval
- proportion of participants requiring additional interventions to stop bleeding (surgical, medical (e.g. tranexamic acid), other blood products (e.g. fresh frozen plasma, cryoprecipitate, fibrinogen)) within 30 days from the start of the study
- quality of life assessment using validated tools
- transfusion-related adverse events (transfusion reactions, transfusion-associated infections, development of platelet antibodies or platelet refractoriness, thromboembolic events)

List the confounding areas relevant to all or most studies

We have prespecified the main potential confounding factors.

- Primary diagnosis (aplastic anaemia, myelodysplastic syndromes, congenital bone marrow disorders)
- Age: variability in the age of included participants, e.g. paediatric (less than 16 years) versus adult (> 16 years) versus older adult (> 60 years)
- Gender: male-to-female ratio
- Previous severe bleeding (e.g. WHO Grade 3 or 4 or equivalent)
- Use of anticoagulation during study
- Performance status (e.g. ECOG, KPS)
- Treatment (e.g. azacytidine) versus no treatment (supportive care only)
- Presence of sepsis or infection
- Presence of bleeding disorder

List the possible co-interventions that could differ between intervention groups and could have an impact on outcomes

We have prespecified the possible co-interventions that could differ between intervention groups and could have an impact on outcomes.

- Concomitant use of antiplatelet therapy
- Factor replacements like fresh frozen plasma, cryoprecipitate, fibrinogen
- Use of TPO mimetics (romiplostim, eltrombopag)
- Whole blood transfusions
- Use of steroids or danazol
- Over-the-counter or herbal medicines

The ROBINS-I tool (Stage II): For each study

Specify a target trial specific to the study.

Design	Individually randomised/cluster randomised/matched
Participants	
Experimental intervention	
Control intervention	

Is your aim for this study...?

- ☐ to assess the effect of initiating intervention (as in an intention-to-treat analysis)
- ☐ to assess the effect of initiating and adhering to intervention (as in a per-protocol analysis)

Specify the outcome

Specify which outcome is being assessed for risk of bias (typically from among those earmarked for the 'Summary of findings' table). Specify whether this is a proposed benefit or harm of intervention.

Specify the numerical result being assessed

In case of multiple alternative analyses being presented, specify the numeric result (e.g. risk ratio (RR) 1.52 (95% confidence interval (CI) 0.83 to 2.77) and/or a reference (e.g. to a table, figure, or paragraph) that uniquely defines the result being assessed.

Preliminary consideration of confounders

Complete a row for each important confounding area.

(i) listed in the review protocol; and

(ii) relevant to the setting of this particular study, or which the study authors identified as potentially important. 'Important' confounding areas are those for which, in the context of this study, adjustment is expected to lead to a clinically important change in the estimated effect of the intervention. 'Validity' refers to whether the confounding variable or variables fully measure the area, while 'reliability' refers to the precision of the measurement (more measurement error means less reliability).

(i) Confounding areas listed in the review protocol

Confounding area	Measured variable (s)	Is there evidence that controlling for this variable was unnecessary?*	Is the confounding area measured validly and reliably by this variable (or these variables)?	OPTIONAL: Is adjusting for this variable (alone) expected to favour the experimental or the control group?
			Yes / No / No information	Favour intervention / Favour control / No information

(ii) Additional confounding areas relevant to the setting of this particular study, or which the study authors identified as important

Confounding area	Measured variable (s)	Is there evidence that controlling for this variable was unnecessary?*	Is the confounding area measured validly and reliably by this variable (or these variables)?	OPTIONAL: Is adjusting for this variable (alone) expected to favour the experimental or the control group?
			Yes / No / No information	Favour intervention / Favour control / No information

*In the context of a particular study, variables can be demonstrated not to be confounders and so not included in the analysis: (a) if they are not predictive of the outcome; (b) if they are not predictive of intervention; or (c) because adjustment makes no or minimal difference to the estimated effect of the primary parameter. Note that 'no statistically significant association' is not the same as 'not predictive'.

Preliminary consideration of co-interventions

Complete a row for each important co-intervention (i) listed in the review protocol; and (ii) relevant to the setting of this particular study, or which the study authors identified as important.

'Important' co-interventions are those for which, in the context of this study, adjustment is expected to lead to a clinically important change in the estimated effect of the intervention.

(i) Co-interventions listed in the review protocol		
Co-intervention	Is there evidence that controlling for this co-intervention was unnecessary (e.g. because it was not administered)?	Is presence of this co-intervention likely to favour outcomes in the experimental or the control group?
		Favour experimental / Favour comparator / No information
		Favour experimental / Favour comparator / No information
		Favour experimental / Favour comparator / No information
(ii) Additional co-interventions relevant to the setting of this particular study, or which the study authors identified as important		
Co-intervention	Is there evidence that controlling for this co-intervention was unnecessary (e.g. because it was not administered)?	Is presence of this co-intervention likely to favour outcomes in the experimental or the control group?
		Favour experimental / Favour comparator / No information
		Favour experimental / Favour comparator / No information
		Favour experimental / Favour comparator / No information

'Risk of bias' assessment (cohort-type studies)

Bias domain	Signalling questions	Elaboration	Response options
Bias due to confounding	1.1 Is there potential for confounding of the effect of intervention in this study?	In rare situations, such as when studying harms that are very unlikely to be related to factors that influence treatment decisions, no confounding is expected and the study can be considered to be at low risk of bias due to confounding, equivalent to a fully randomised trial.	Y / PY / PN / N

(Continued)

If N or PN to 1.1: the study can be considered to be at low risk of bias due to confounding and no further signalling questions need be considered.

There is no NI (No information) option for this signalling question.

If Y or PY to 1.1: determine whether there is a need to assess time-varying confounding:

1.2. Was the analysis based on splitting participants' follow-up time according to intervention received?

If participants could switch between intervention groups, then associations between intervention and outcome may be biased by time-varying confounding. This occurs when prognostic factors influence switches between intended interventions.

NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI

If **N or PN**, answer questions relating to baseline confounding (1.4 to 1.6).

If **Y or PY**, proceed to question 1.3.

1.3. Were intervention discontinuations or switches likely to be related to factors that are prognostic for the outcome?

If intervention switches are unrelated to the outcome, e.g. when the outcome is an unexpected harm, then time-varying confounding will not be present and only control for baseline confounding is required.

NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI

If **N or PN**, answer questions relating to baseline confounding (1.4 to 1.6).

If **Y or PY**, answer questions relating to both baseline and time-varying confounding (1.7 and 1.8).

Questions relating to baseline confounding only

1.4. Did the authors use an appropriate analysis method that controlled for all the important confounding areas?

Appropriate methods to control for measured confounders include stratification, regression, matching, standardisation, and inverse probability weighting. They may control for individual variables or for the estimated propensity score. Inverse probability weighting is based on a function of the propensity score. Each method depends on the assumption that there is no unmeasured or residual confounding.

NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI

1.5. **If Y or PY to 1.4:** Were con-

Appropriate control of confounding requires that the variables adjusted for are valid and reliable measures of the confound-

NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI

(Continued)

founding areas that were controlled for measured validly and reliably by the variables available in this study?

ing domains. For some topics, a list of valid and reliable measures of confounding domains will be specified in the review protocol, but for others such a list may not be available. Study authors may cite references to support the use of a particular measure. If authors control for confounding variables with no indication of their validity or reliability pay attention to the subjectivity of the measure. Subjective measures (e.g. based on self report) may have lower validity and reliability than objective measures such as lab findings.

1.6. Did the authors control for any postintervention variables?	Controlling for postintervention variables is not appropriate. Controlling for mediating variables estimates the direct effect of intervention and may introduce confounding. Controlling for common effects of intervention and outcome causes bias.	NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
--	---	---------------------------

Questions relating to baseline and time-varying confounding

1.7. Did the authors use an appropriate analysis method that adjusted for all the important confounding areas and for time-varying confounding?	Adjustment for time-varying confounding is necessary to estimate per-protocol effects in both randomised trials and NRSI. Appropriate methods include those based on inverse-probability weighting. Standard regression models that include time-updated confounders may be problematic if time-varying confounding is present.	NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
---	---	---------------------------

1.8. If Y or PY to 1.7: Were confounding areas that were adjusted for measured validly and reliably by the variables available in this study?	See 1.5 above.	NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
---	----------------	---------------------------

'Risk of bias' judgement	Low - No confounding expected.	Low / Moderate / Serious / Critical / NI
	Moderate - Confounding expected; all known important confounding domains appropriately measured and controlled for; and reliability and validity of measurement of important domains were sufficient, such that we do not expect serious residual confounding.	
	Serious - At least one known important domain was not appropriately measured, or not controlled for; or reliability or validity of measurement of a important domain was low enough that we expect serious residual confounding.	
	Critical - Confounding inherently not controllable, or the use of negative controls strongly suggests unmeasured confounding.	

Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to confounding?	Can the true effect estimate be predicted to be greater or less than the estimated effect in the study because one or more of the important confounding domains was not controlled for? Answering this question will be based on expert knowledge and results in other studies and therefore can only be completed after all of the studies in the body of evidence have been reviewed. Consider the potential effect of each of the unmeasured domains and whether all important confounding domains not controlled for in the analysis would be likely to	Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Unpredictable
---	---	---

(Continued)

change the estimate in the same direction, or if one important confounding domain that was not controlled for in the analysis is likely to have a dominant impact.

Bias in selection of participants into the study	2.1. Was selection of participants into the study (or into the analysis) based on participant characteristics observed after the start of intervention?	This domain is concerned only with selection into the study based on participant characteristics observed after the start of intervention. Selection based on characteristics observed before the start of intervention can be addressed by controlling for imbalances between intervention and control groups in baseline characteristics that are prognostic for the outcome (baseline confounding).	Y / PY / PN / N / NI
	If N or PN to 2.1: go to 2.4		
	2.2. If Y or PY to 2.1: Were the postintervention variables that influenced selection likely to be associated with intervention?	Selection bias occurs when selection is related to an effect of either intervention or a cause of intervention and an effect of either the outcome or a cause of the outcome. The result is therefore at risk of selection bias if selection into the study is related to both the intervention and the outcome.	NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
	2.3 If Y or PY to 2.2: Were the postintervention variables that influenced selection likely to be influenced by the outcome or a cause of the outcome?		NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
	2.4. Do start of follow-up and start of intervention coincide for most participants?	If participants are not followed from the start of the intervention, then a period of follow-up has been excluded, and individuals who experienced the outcome soon after intervention will be missing from analyses. This problem may occur when prevalent, rather than new (incident), users of the intervention are included in analyses.	Y / PY / PN / N / NI
	2.5. If Y or PY to 2.2 and 2.3, or N or PN to 2.4: Were adjustment techniques used that are likely to correct for the presence of selection biases?	It is in principle possible to correct for selection biases, e.g. by using inverse probability weights to create a pseudo-population in which the selection bias has been removed, or by modelling the distributions of the missing participants or follow-up times and outcome events and including them using missing data methodology. However, such methods are rarely used, and the answer to this question will usually be 'No'.	NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
'Risk of bias' judgement		<p>Low - All participants who would have been eligible for the target trial were included in the study, and start of follow-up and start of intervention coincide for all participants.</p> <p>Moderate - Selection into the study may have been related to intervention and outcome, but the authors used appropriate methods to adjust for the selection bias; or start of follow-up and start of intervention do not coincide for all participants, but (a) the proportion of participants for which this was the case was too low to induce important bias; (b) the authors used appropriate methods to adjust for the selection bias; or (c) the re-</p>	Low / Moderate / Serious / Critical / NI

(Continued)

view authors are confident that the rate (hazard) ratio for the effect of intervention remains constant over time.

Serious - Selection into the study was related to intervention and outcome; or start of follow-up and start of intervention do not coincide; and a potentially important amount of follow-up time is missing from analyses; and the rate ratio is not constant over time.

Critical - Selection into the study was strongly related to intervention and outcome; or a substantial amount of follow-up time is likely to be missing from analyses; and the rate ratio is not constant over time.

	Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to selection of participants into the study?	If the likely direction of bias can be predicted, it is helpful to state this. The direction might be characterised either as being towards (or away from) the null, or as being in favour of one of the interventions.	Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null / Away from null / Unpredictable
Bias in classification of interventions	3.1 Were intervention groups clearly defined?	A prerequisite for an appropriate comparison of interventions is that the interventions are well-defined. Ambiguity in the definition may lead to bias in the classification of participants. For individual-level interventions, criteria for considering individuals to have received each intervention should be clear and explicit, covering issues such as type, setting, dose, frequency, intensity and/or timing of intervention. For population-level interventions (e.g. measures to control air pollution), the question relates to whether the population is clearly defined, and the answer is likely to be 'Yes'.	Y / PY / PN / N / NI
	3.2 Was the information used to define intervention groups recorded at the start of the intervention?	In general, if information about interventions received is available from sources that could not have been affected by subsequent outcomes, then differential misclassification of intervention status is unlikely. Collection of the information at the time of the intervention makes it easier to avoid such misclassification. For population-level interventions (e.g. measures to control air pollution), the answer to this question is likely to be 'Yes'.	Y / PY / PN / N / NI
	3.3 Could classification of intervention status have been affected by knowledge of the outcome or risk of the outcome?	Collection of the information at the time of the intervention may not be sufficient to avoid bias. The way in which the data are collected for the purposes of the NRSI should also avoid misclassification.	Y / PY / PN / N / NI
	'Risk of bias' judgement	<p>Low - Intervention status is well-defined and based solely on information collected at the time of intervention.</p> <p>Moderate - Intervention status is well-defined, but some aspects of the assignments of intervention status were determined retrospectively.</p> <p>Serious - Intervention status is not well-defined, or major aspects of the assignments of intervention status were deter-</p>	Low / Moderate / Serious / Critical / NI

(Continued)

mined in a way that could have been affected by knowledge of the outcome.

Critical - (Unusual) An extremely high amount of misclassification of intervention status, e.g. due to unusually strong recall biases.

Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to measurement of outcomes or interventions?	If the likely direction of bias can be predicted, it is helpful to state this. The direction might be characterised either as being towards (or away from) the null, or as being in favour of one of the interventions.	Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null / Away from null / Unpredictable
Bias due to departures from intended interventions	4.1. Was the intervention implemented successfully for most participants?	Consider the success of implementation of the intervention in the context of its complexity. Was recommended practice followed by those administering the intervention?
If your aim for this study is to assess the effect of initiating and adhering to intervention (as in a per-protocol analysis), answer questions 4.2 to 4.4.		
4.2. Did study participants adhere to the assigned intervention regimen?	<p>Lack of adherence to assigned intervention includes cessation of intervention, cross-overs to the comparator intervention, and switches to another active intervention. We distinguish between analyses where:</p> <p>(1) intervention switches led to follow-up time being assigned to the new intervention, and</p> <p>(2) intervention switches (including cessation of intervention) where follow-up time remained allocated to the original intervention.</p> <p>(1) is addressed under time-varying confounding, and should not be considered further here.</p> <p>Consider available information on the proportion of study participants who continued with their assigned intervention throughout follow-up. Was lack of adherence sufficient to impact the intervention effect estimate?</p>	NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
4.3. Were important co-interventions balanced across intervention groups?	Consider the co-interventions that are likely to affect the outcome and to have been administered in the context of this study, based on the preliminary consideration of co-interventions and available literature. Consider whether these co-interventions are balanced between intervention groups.	NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
4.4. If N or PN to 4.1, 4.2, or 4.3: Were adjustment techniques used that are likely to correct for these issues?	Such adjustment techniques include inverse-probability weighting to adjust for censoring at deviation from intended intervention, or inverse probability weighting of marginal structural models to adjust for time-varying confounding. Specialist advice may be needed to assess studies that used these approaches.	NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI
'Risk of bias' judgement	Low - No bias due to deviation from the intended intervention is expected, e.g. if both the intervention and comparator are implemented over a short time period, and subsequent interventions are part of routine medical care, or if the specified	Low / Moderate / Serious / Critical / NI

(Continued)

comparison relates to initiation of intervention regardless of whether it is continued.

Moderate - Bias due to deviation from the intended intervention is expected, and switches, co-interventions, and some problems with intervention fidelity are appropriately measured and adjusted for in the analyses. Alternatively, most (but not all) deviations from intended intervention reflect the natural course of events after initiation of intervention.

Serious - Switches in treatment, co-interventions, or problems with implementation fidelity are apparent and are not adjusted for in the analyses.

Critical - Substantial deviations from the intended intervention are present and are not adjusted for in the analysis.

Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to departures from the intended interventions?

If the likely direction of bias can be predicted, it is helpful to state this. The direction might be characterised either as being towards (or away from) the null, or as being in favour of one of the interventions.

Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null / Away from null / Unpredictable

Bias due to missing data

5.1 Were there missing outcome data?

This aims to elicit whether the proportion of missing observations is likely to result in missing information that could substantially impact our ability to answer the question being addressed. Guidance will be needed on what is meant by 'reasonably complete'. One aspect of this is that review authors would ideally try to locate an analysis plan for the study.

Y / PY / PN / N / NI

5.2 Were participants excluded due to missing data on intervention status?

Missing intervention status may be a problem. This requires that the intended study sample is clear, which it may not be in practice.

Y / PY / PN / N / NI

5.3 Were participants excluded due to missing data on other variables needed for the analysis?

This question relates particularly to participants excluded from the analysis due to missing information on confounders that were controlled for in the analysis.

Y / PY / PN / N / NI

5.4 **If Y or PY to 5.1, 5.2, or 5.3:** Are the proportion of participants and reasons for missing data similar across interventions?

This aims to elicit whether either (i) differential proportion of missing observations or (ii) differences in reasons for missing observations could substantially impact on our ability to answer the question being addressed.

NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI

5.5 **If Y or PY to 5.1, 5.2, or 5.3:** Were appropriate statistical methods used to account for missing data?

It is important to assess whether assumptions employed in analyses are clear and plausible. Both content knowledge and statistical expertise will often be required for this. For instance, use of a statistical method such as multiple imputation does not guarantee an appropriate answer. Review authors should seek naïve (complete-case) analyses for comparison, and clear differences between complete-case and multiple im-

NA / Y / PY / PN / N / NI

(Continued)

putation-based findings should lead to careful assessment of the validity of the methods used.

'Risk of bias' judgement		Low - Data were reasonably complete; or proportions of and reasons for missing participants were similar across intervention groups; or analyses that addressed missing data are likely to have removed any risk of bias.	Low / Moderate / Serious / Critical / NI
		Moderate - Proportions of missing participants differ across interventions, or reasons for missingness differ minimally across interventions, and missing data were not addressed in the analysis.	
		Serious - Proportions of missing participants differ substantially across interventions; or reasons for missingness differ substantially across interventions; and missing data were addressed inappropriately in the analysis; or the nature of the missing data means that the risk of bias cannot be removed through appropriate analysis.	
		Critical - (Unusual) There were critical differences between interventions in participants with missing data that were not, or could not, be addressed through appropriate analysis.	
	Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to missing data?	If the likely direction of bias can be predicted, it is helpful to state this. The direction might be characterised either as being towards (or away from) the null, or as being in favour of one of the interventions.	Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null / Away from null / Unpredictable
Bias in measurement of outcomes	6.1 Could the outcome measure have been influenced by knowledge of the intervention received?	Some outcome measures involve negligible assessor judgment, e.g. all-cause mortality or non-repeatable automated laboratory assessments. Risk of bias due to measurement of these outcomes would be expected to be low.	Y / PY / PN / N / NI
	6.2 Were outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants?	If outcome assessors were blinded to intervention status, the answer to this question would be 'No'. In other situations, outcome assessors may be unaware of the interventions being received by participants despite there being no active blinding by the study investigators; the answer to this question would then also be 'No'. In studies where participants report their outcomes themselves, e.g. in a questionnaire, the outcome assessor is the study participant. In an observational study, the answer to this question will usually be 'Yes' when the participants report their outcomes themselves.	Y / PY / PN / N / NI
	6.3 Were the methods of outcome assessment comparable across intervention groups?	Comparable assessment methods (i.e. data collection) would involve the same outcome detection methods and thresholds, same time point, same definition, and same measurements	Y / PY / PN / N / NI
	6.4 Were any systematic errors in measurement of the outcome related to intervention received?	This question refers to differential misclassification of outcomes. Systematic errors in measuring the outcome, if present, could cause bias if they are related to intervention or to a confounder of the intervention-outcome relationship. This will usually be due either to outcome assessors being aware of the intervention received or to non-comparability of outcome assess-	Y / PY / PN / N / NI

(Continued)

ment methods, but there are examples of differential misclassification arising despite these controls being in place.

'Risk of bias' judgement		Low - The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups; and the outcome measure was unlikely to be influenced by knowledge of the intervention received by study participants (i.e. is objective) or the outcome assessors were unaware of the intervention received by study participants; and any error in measuring the outcome is unrelated to intervention status.	Low / Moderate / Serious / Critical / NI
		Moderate - The methods of outcome assessment were comparable across intervention groups; and the outcome measure is only minimally influenced by knowledge of the intervention received by study participants; and any error in measuring the outcome is only minimally related to intervention status.	
		Serious - The methods of outcome assessment were not comparable across intervention groups; or the outcome measure was subjective (i.e. likely to be influenced by knowledge of the intervention received by study participants) and was assessed by outcome assessors aware of the intervention received by study participants; or error in measuring the outcome was related to intervention status.	
		Critical - The methods of outcome assessment were so different that they cannot reasonably be compared across intervention groups.	
	Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to measurement of outcomes?	If the likely direction of bias can be predicted, it is helpful to state this. The direction might be characterised either as being towards (or away from) the null, or as being in favour of one of the interventions.	Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null / Away from null / Unpredictable
Bias in selection of the reported result	Is the reported effect estimate unlikely to be selected, on the basis of the results, from...		
	7.1. ... multiple outcome <i>measurements</i> within the outcome domain?	For a specified outcome domain, it is possible to generate multiple effect estimates for different measurements. If multiple measurements were made, but only one or a subset is reported, there is a risk of selective reporting on the basis of results.	Y / PY / PN / N / NI
	7.2 ... multiple <i>analyses</i> of the intervention-outcome relationship?	Because of the limitations of using data from non-randomised studies for analyses of effectiveness (need to control confounding, substantial missing data, etc.), analysts may implement different analytic methods to address these limitations. Examples include unadjusted and adjusted models; use of final value versus change from baseline versus analysis of covariance; different transformations of variables; a continuously scaled outcome converted to categorical data with different cut-points; different sets of covariates used for adjustment; and different analytic strategies for dealing with missing data. Application of such methods generates multiple effect estimates for a specific outcome metric. If the analyst does not prespecify the methods to be applied, and multiple estimates are generated but only one or a subset is reported, there is a risk of selective reporting on the basis of results.	Y / PY / PN / N / NI
	7.3 ... different <i>subgroups</i> ?	Particularly with large cohorts often available from routine data sources, it is possible to generate multiple effect estimates	Y / PY / PN / N / NI

(Continued)

for different subgroups or simply to omit varying proportions of the original cohort. If multiple estimates are generated but only one or a subset is reported, there is a risk of selective reporting on the basis of results.

	'Risk of bias' judgement	Low - There is clear evidence (usually through examination of a pre-registered protocol or statistical analysis plan) that all reported results correspond to all intended outcomes, analyses, and subcohorts.	Low / Moderate / Serious / Critical / NI
		Moderate - The outcome measurements and analyses are consistent with an a priori plan; or are clearly defined and both internally and externally consistent; and there is no indication of selection of the reported analysis from among multiple analyses; and there is no indication of selection of the cohort or subgroups for analysis and reporting on the basis of the results.	
		Serious - Outcome measurements or analyses are internally or externally inconsistent; or there is a high risk of selective reporting from among multiple analyses; or the cohort or subgroup is selected from a larger study for analysis and appears to be reported on the basis of the results.	
		Critical - There is evidence or strong suspicion of selective reporting of results, and the unreported results are likely to be substantially different from the reported results.	
	Optional: What is the predicted direction of bias due to selection of the reported result?	If the likely direction of bias can be predicted, it is helpful to state this. The direction might be characterised either as being towards (or away from) the null, or as being in favour of one of the interventions.	Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null / Away from null / Unpredictable
Overall bias	'Risk of bias' judgement	Low - The study is judged to be at low risk of bias for all domains.	Low / Moderate / Serious / Critical / NI
		Moderate - The study is judged to be at low or moderate risk of bias for all domains.	
		Serious - The study is judged to be at serious risk of bias in at least one domain, but not at critical risk of bias in any domain.	
		Critical - The study is judged to be at critical risk of bias in at least one domain.	
		No information - There is no clear indication that the study is at serious or critical risk of bias, and there is a lack of information in one or more key domains of bias (a judgement is required for this).	
	Optional: What is the overall predicted direction of bias for this outcome?		Favours experimental / Favours comparator / Towards null / Away from null / Unpredictable

Abbreviations:

Comparison of a therapeutic-only versus prophylactic platelet transfusion policy for people with congenital or acquired bone marrow failure disorders (Review)

Copyright © 2018 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

ECOG: Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group
KPS: Karnofsky Performance Score
NRSI: non-randomised studies of interventions
TPO: thrombopoietin

CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUTHORS

- Reem Malouf: protocol and review development, searching, selection of studies, eligibility and quality assessment, and data extraction.
- Asma Ashraf: protocol and review development, searching, selection of studies.
- Andreas Hadjinicolaou: protocol and review development, searching, selection of studies.
- Carolyn Doree: protocol and review development and search specialist.
- Sally Hopewell: protocol and review development and methodological expert.
- Lise Estcourt: protocol and review development, searching, selection of studies, eligibility and quality assessment, data extraction, and content expert.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Reem Malouf: partly funded by the NIHR Cochrane Programme Grant - Safe and Appropriate Use of Blood Components.

Asma Ashraf: none to declare.

Andreas Hadjinicolaou: none to declare.

Carolyn Doree: none to declare.

Sally Hopewell: partly funded by the NIHR Cochrane Programme Grant - Safe and Appropriate Use of Blood Components.

Lise Estcourt: partly funded by the NIHR Cochrane Programme Grant - Safe and Appropriate Use of Blood Components.

SOURCES OF SUPPORT

Internal sources

- NHS Blood and Transplant, Research and Development, UK.
To fund the work of the Systematic Review Initiative (SRI)

External sources

- National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Cochrane Programme Grant, UK.
To provide funding for systematic reviewers and methodological support from the Centre for Statistics in Medicine, Oxford

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PROTOCOL AND REVIEW

There were no changes between the protocol, [Ashraf 2016](#), and the completed review. However, many aspects of the review could not be implemented due to the fact that we identified only a single study for inclusion with no actual data. We were unable to perform the following.

- **Completed randomised controlled trials with sufficient data:** one trial found with no data.
- **Including non-randomised trials:** we did not identify any non-randomised trials that fulfilled the inclusion criteria of the review.
- **Primary outcome:** we were unable to report on any of the primary outcomes of the review.
- **Secondary outcomes:** we were unable to report on any of the secondary outcomes of the review.
- **'Summary of findings' table:** we were unable to apply the GRADE tool to rate the quality of evidence for the key outcomes of the review. Consequently, we were unable to create a 'Summary of findings' table for the outcomes prespecified in the protocol: number of participants with at least one bleeding episode; total number of bleeding episodes per participant; number of participants with at least one severe or life-threatening bleeding episode; all-cause mortality; number of units of platelet transfusion per participant; quality of life; and transfusion-related adverse events.
- **Data synthesis:** we were unable to conduct any form of data synthesis, i.e. narrative analysis as well as meta-analysis, for any of the outcomes of the review.
- **Subgroup analysis:** we were unable to perform any of the subgroup analyses prespecified in the review protocol.
- **Assessment of heterogeneity:** this was not possible due to insufficient studies included in the review.

- **Publication bias:** we were unable to examine publication bias via completing the funnel plot because only one trial was included in the review.

NOTES

Glossary

Allogeneic: the cells (blood cells or stem cells) come from someone other than the patient.

Cytopenia: the reduction of one or more blood cell types.

Dysplasia: defects in stem cells can cause blood cells to have an abnormal shape or size.

Haematopoiesis: the production of red blood cells, white blood cells, and platelets from stem cells within the bone marrow.

INDEX TERMS

Medical Subject Headings (MeSH)

Myelodysplastic Syndromes [congenital] [*therapy]; Platelet Transfusion [*methods]

MeSH check words

Adult; Humans