

travel, commerce, and routine health care, such as care for malaria, which threaten to further disrupt the already precarious conditions in which millions of people in the region live.⁹

The fear associated with a virulent and potentially deadly contagious infectious disease, which respects neither borders nor social status, has captured the attention of the world. The responders, both local and international, have been dedicated and brave. But far more is needed. It is critical that all members of the global health community — health care workers, scientists, regulators, funders, governments, and local communities — collaborate in responding as rapidly as possible if we are to control this enlarging outbreak. For example, the move by regulators to allow vaccine trials to proceed quickly shows flexibility and good judgment.

We, as a global health care community, must move decisively to bring this dangerous epidemic under control and then to improve the health care systems in the affected region.¹⁰ This will require more resources and more health care workers on the front lines (see the Ebola Outbreak page at NEJM.org for volunteer opportunities). It will also require communication and teamwork to win the trust of those in the affected communities. The *Journal* will continue to report on this unprecedented outbreak with updates on the efforts to control it, the biomedical findings emerging from it, and the difficult stories of those who are suffering through it.

Disclosure forms provided by the authors are available with the full text of this article at NEJM.org.

This article was published on September 19, 2014, at NEJM.org.

1. Baize S, Pannetier D, Oestereich L, et al. Emergence of Zaire ebola virus disease in Guinea — preliminary report. *N Engl J Med* 2014. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa1404505.
2. Center for Disease Control and Prevention. Outbreaks chronology: ebola hemorrhagic fever (<http://www.cdc.gov/vhf/ebola/resources/outbreak-table.html>).
3. World Health Organization. Ebola Response Roadmap situation report 1: 29 August 2014 (http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/131974/1/roadmapsitrep1_eng.pdf?ua=1).
4. World Health Organization. Ebola Response Roadmap update: 18 September 2014 (http://apps.who.int/iris/bitstream/10665/133833/1/roadmapsitrep4_eng.pdf?ua=1).
5. Gire SK, Goba A, Anderson KG, et al. Genomic surveillance elucidates Ebola virus origin and transmission during the 2014 outbreak. *Science* 2014;345:1369-72.
6. Virological analysis: no link between Ebola outbreaks in West Africa and Democratic Republic of Congo. Geneva: World Health Organization, September 2, 2014 (<http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/ebola/2-september-2014/en>).
7. Cohen J. Ebola vaccines racing forward at record pace. *Science* 2014;345:1228-9.
8. Unprecedented number of medical staff infected with Ebola. Geneva: World Health Organization, August 25, 2014 (<http://www.who.int/mediacentre/news/ebola/25-august-2014/en>).
9. Ebola: economic impact already serious: could be “catastrophic” without swift response. Washington, DC: World Bank Group, September 17, 2014 (<http://www.worldbank.org/en/news/press-release/2014/09/17/ebola-economic-impact-serious-catastrophic-swift-response-countries-international-community-world-bank>).
10. Investing in global health systems: sustaining gains, transforming lives. Washington, DC: Institute of Medicine, September 16, 2014 (<http://www.iom.edu/Reports/2014/Investing-in-Global-Health-Systems-Sustaining-Gains-Transforming-Lives.aspx>).

DOI: 10.1056/NEJMe1411378

Copyright © 2014 Massachusetts Medical Society.

Transfusion Threshold of 7 g per Deciliter — The New Normal

Paul C. Hébert, M.D., and Jeffrey L. Carson, M.D.

Holst and colleagues¹ now provide definitive evidence in the *Journal* that a restrictive approach to blood transfusion not only reduced blood use by half but also did not cause harm to 998 critically ill patients with septic shock. It has been 15 years since the publication of the results of the Transfusion Requirements in Critical Care (TRICC) trial in the *Journal*.² In that Canadian Critical Care Trial Group study, 838 critically ill patients were randomly assigned to receive blood transfusions on the basis of a threshold of 7 g per deciliter or 10 g

per deciliter while also agreeing to undergo transfusion 1 unit at a time. Much like the results of the Transfusion Requirements in Septic Shock (TRISS) trial by Holst et al., approximately 50% less blood was administered in the restrictive-strategy group than in the liberal-strategy group. In contrast to this latest trial, overall trends and all the secondary analyses suggested that a liberal transfusion strategy may have resulted in increased mortality, increased rates of pulmonary edema, and increased rates of organ failure.

In our 2012 Cochrane review of transfusion thresholds, we identified 19 randomized clinical trials involving 6264 patients.³ A restrictive transfusion strategy was associated with more than one third fewer transfusions, without any apparent harm among a variety of patient populations including patients with perioperative care, those with cardiac surgery, and those with gastrointestinal hemorrhage. We did not identify any additional studies involving critically ill adults. However, a trial of transfusion in pediatric critical care patients included in the review also showed a dramatic decrease in blood transfusions with the adoption of a restrictive transfusion threshold, without increased rates of organ failure.⁴

Since the last Cochrane update, the results of four new trials involving critical care patients have been published,⁵⁻⁷ including the results of a trial by Peake et al. now published in the *Journal*.⁸ None have shown improved survival with a liberal transfusion strategy. Two trials evaluated early goal-directed therapy versus usual care in patients with septic shock. The Protocolized Care for Early Septic Shock (ProCESS) trial⁷ included 1341 patients with severe sepsis and septic shock, and the Australasian Resuscitation in Sepsis Evaluation (ARISE) trial compared 1600 patients with septic shock who received either usual care or early goal-directed therapy.⁸ The early goal-directed therapy groups in these two trials included several interventions guided by an algorithm that was based on continuous central venous oxygen saturations first promoted by Rivers et al.⁹ The clinical protocols of the two trials included a transfusion threshold of a hematocrit of 30% when central venous oxygen saturations remained below 70%. There were no differences in overall mortality at 90 days despite the fact that twice the number of patients in the goal-directed groups as in the usual-care groups were administered blood.

Even in patients with major gastrointestinal hemorrhage, Villanueva and colleagues found an absolute decrease in mortality of 4 percentage points when patients were transfused with the use of a restrictive transfusion strategy.¹⁰ On the basis of the results of this study, a liberal transfusion strategy would result in a number needed to be harmed of 25.

We believe it has become abundantly clear that a transfusion threshold of 7 g per deciliter

should become the new normal, recommended in all critically ill patients, including those with severe sepsis and septic shock. To speed up adoption, we should ensure that clinical practice guidelines are rapidly updated with new information. Indeed, most transfusion guidelines have already been updated,¹¹⁻¹⁴ but this is not so for sepsis guidelines.

The Surviving Sepsis Campaign has been effective in promoting best practices. Among its many recommendations, the guideline advised on transfusion strategies. In the 2012 edition, the authors recommended adopting a transfusion threshold of 7 g per deciliter on the basis of the results of the TRICC trial and reports in cardiac surgery (evidence base for the recommendation,¹⁵ grade 1B [moderate recommendation and evidence]).¹³ However, the recommendation begins with the statement, “Once hypoperfusion has resolved and in the absence of extenuating circumstances, such as myocardial ischemia, severe hypoxemia, acute hemorrhage, or ischemic coronary artery disease, we recommend” This clause effectively allows clinicians to exclude most critically ill patients in the midst of any form of resuscitation from adopting a more restrictive approach to transfusion, in large part using the results of the trial by Rivers et al. as justification. With all the exceptions and citing the vague notion of hypoperfusion, the current guidance would suggest that the default option is to administer blood at a high transfusion threshold — perhaps because a liberal transfusion threshold is still considered safer, either by default or long-standing tradition.

It is time to adopt a transfusion threshold of 7 g per deciliter as the standard of care. To help promote this perspective, we suggest a substantial shift in the Surviving Sepsis Campaign guidelines. This may be easily accomplished with the use of the same recommendation without any of the caveats. Given the many new studies, we would also endorse upgrading the evidence base for the recommendation to 1A (strong recommendation and evidence).

Evidence stills remains weak in patients with an acute coronary syndrome. It may yet be proved that this distinct group of patients benefits from higher hemoglobin concentrations (9 or 10 g per deciliter).¹⁴ Oxygen delivery to the myocardium is flow-dependent since the heart

extracts a high percentage of oxygen, and myocardial ischemia may be precipitated by low hemoglobin concentrations.

The TRISS trial and two negative trials of early goal-directed therapy were unable to detect any benefit from the use of a liberal transfusion threshold. Although certainty would be nice, less is proving to be the safer option.

Disclosure forms provided by the authors are available with the full text of this article at NEJM.org.

From the Canadian Critical Care Trials Group, Department of Medicine and Centre de Recherche, Centre Hospitalier de l'Université de Montréal (CRCHUM), Montreal (P.C.H.); and the Division of General Internal Medicine, Rutgers Robert Wood Johnson Medical School, New Brunswick, NJ (J.L.C.).

This article was published on October 1, 2014, at NEJM.org.

1. Holst LB, Haase N, Wetterslev J, et al. Lower versus higher hemoglobin threshold for transfusion in septic shock. *N Engl J Med* 2014;371:1381-91.
2. Hébert PC, Wells G, Blajchman MA, et al. A multicenter, randomized, controlled clinical trial of transfusion requirements in critical care. *N Engl J Med* 1999;340:409-17. [Erratum, *N Engl J Med* 1999;340:1056.]
3. Carson JL, Carless PA, Hébert PC. Transfusion thresholds and other strategies for guiding allogeneic red blood cell transfusion. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev* 2012;4:CD002042.
4. Lacroix J, Hébert PC, Hutchison JS, et al. Transfusion strategies for patients in pediatric intensive care units. *N Engl J Med* 2007;356:1609-19.
5. Walsh TS, Boyd JA, Watson D, et al. Restrictive versus liberal

transfusion strategies for older mechanically ventilated critically ill patients: a randomized pilot trial. *Crit Care Med* 2013;41:2354-63.

6. Robertson CS, Hannay HJ, Yamal JM, et al. Effect of erythropoietin and transfusion threshold on neurological recovery after traumatic brain injury: a randomized clinical trial. *JAMA* 2014;312:36-47.
7. The ProCESS Investigators. A randomized trial of protocol-based care for early septic shock. *N Engl J Med* 2014;370:1683-93.
8. The ARISE Investigators and the ANZICS Clinical Trials Group. Goal-directed resuscitation for patients with early septic shock. *N Engl J Med*. DOI: 10.1056/NEJMoa1404380.
9. Rivers E, Nguyen B, Havstad S, et al. Early goal-directed therapy in the treatment of severe sepsis and septic shock. *N Engl J Med* 2001;345:1368-77.
10. Villanueva C, Colomo A, Bosch A, et al. Transfusion strategies for acute upper gastrointestinal bleeding. *N Engl J Med* 2013;368:11-21. [Erratum, *N Engl J Med* 2013;368:2341.]
11. Napolitano LM, Kurek S, Luchette FA, et al. Clinical practice guideline: red blood cell transfusion in adult trauma and critical care. *Crit Care Med* 2009;37:3124-57. [Erratum, *Crit Care Med* 2010;38:1621.]
12. Carson JL, Grossman BJ, Kleinman S, et al. Red blood cell transfusion: a clinical practice guideline from the AABB. *Ann Intern Med* 2012;157:49-58.
13. Retter A, Wyncoll D, Pearse R, et al. Guidelines on the management of anaemia and red cell transfusion in adult critically ill patients. *Br J Haematol* 2013;160:445-64.
14. Patient blood management guidelines. Canberra, ACT, Australia: National Blood Authority Australia, 2012 (<http://www.blood.gov.au/pbm-guidelines>).
15. Surviving Sepsis Campaign (<http://www.survivingsepsis.org/Guidelines/Pages/default.aspx>).

DOI: 10.1056/NEJMe1408976

Copyright © 2014 Massachusetts Medical Society.

NEJM CLINICAL PRACTICE CENTER

Explore a new page designed specifically for practicing clinicians, the NEJM Clinical Practice Center, at NEJM.org/clinical-practice-center. Find practice-changing research, reviews from our Clinical Practice series, a curated collection of clinical cases, and interactive features designed to hone your diagnostic skills.