International Journal of Medical Science and Clinical Research Studies

ISSN (print): 2767-8326, ISSN (online): 2767-8342

Volume 04 Issue 12 December 2024

Page No: 2450-2454

DOI: https://doi.org/10.47191/ijmscrs/v4-i12-45, Impact Factor: 7.949

Blood Transfusion Indications in Acute Myocardial Infarction and Anemia: A Comprehensive Review of Current Evidence and Clinical Implications

Donaldo Emiliano Silva López[1], Paulina del Carmen Díaz Medina[2], Monserrat Luna Reyes[2], Muro Estrada José Luis Irvin[2], Eduardo Antonio Vera Hernández[2], Geraldine Nieves Vázquez[3]

[1]Tecnológico de Monterrey Campus Monterrey, Nuevo Léon, Mexico

[2]Universidad Cuauhtémoc Plantel Aguascalientes. Aguascalientes, México.

[3]Universidad de Guadalajara. Guadalajara, Jalisco, México.

ABSTRACT

Background: Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI) is a leading cause of morbidity and mortality worldwide. Anemia, commonly encountered in patients with AMI, is associated with worsened outcomes due to impaired oxygen delivery to ischemic myocardium. Blood transfusion is often considered in this clinical scenario, yet its indications remain controversial due to potential risks such as volume overload, inflammatory reactions, and prothrombotic effects.

Objective: This review aims to explore the current evidence surrounding blood transfusion in AMI patients with anemia, focusing on the clinical thresholds, patient selection, and the balance between benefits and risks.

Methods: A thorough literature search of randomized controlled trials, observational studies, and current guidelines was conducted to assess the impact of transfusion strategies in AMI patients with concurrent anemia.

Results: Evidence suggests a restrictive transfusion strategy, targeting hemoglobin thresholds between 7–8 g/dL, may be non-inferior to liberal strategies for most stable AMI patients. However, individualized decision-making is critical, particularly in patients with hemodynamic instability, ongoing ischemia, or comorbidities such as chronic kidney disease.

Conclusions: The management of anemia in AMI is multifaceted and requires a careful assessment of risks and benefits. Future research should address the heterogeneity of patient populations to refine transfusion protocols.

KEYWORDS: acute myocardial infarction, anemia, blood transfusion, restrictive strategy, liberal strategy, ischemic heart disease, hemoglobin threshold, cardiovascular outcomes

ARTICLE DETAILS

Published On:
20 December 2024

Available on:
https://ijmscr.org/

INTRODUCTION

Acute Myocardial Infarction (AMI) remains a critical global health challenge, contributing significantly to morbidity, mortality, and healthcare expenditures. In the setting of AMI, anemia is a frequently encountered comorbidity, present in approximately 10–43% of patients, depending on the population studied. Anemia exacerbates myocardial ischemia by reducing oxygen-carrying capacity and increasing myocardial workload through compensatory mechanisms such as tachycardia and increased cardiac output. This interplay poses a significant clinical dilemma, as both untreated anemia and inappropriate blood transfusion carry potential adverse outcomes.1,2

Blood transfusion, a cornerstone in the management of severe anemia, has long been considered a therapeutic option for AMI patients. However, recent studies highlight the complexity of this intervention in ischemic cardiovascular disease. Transfusion may improve oxygen delivery but is also associated with adverse effects such as volume overload, immunomodulatory reactions, and increased risk of thrombosis, all of which may exacerbate myocardial injury. Consequently, the optimal threshold for transfusion and its impact on outcomes in AMI patients remain subjects of intense debate.2,3

Current clinical guidelines recommend a restrictive transfusion approach, favoring hemoglobin thresholds of 7–8 g/dL in most patients without active bleeding or hemodynamic instability. Nonetheless, patients with AMI represent a unique subset due to the interplay between systemic oxygen delivery, myocardial oxygen demand, and the dynamic progression of ischemic injury. Factors such as ongoing chest pain, signs of heart failure, or comorbidities such as chronic kidney disease and cerebrovascular disease further complicate decision-making.2,3

This article reviews the existing evidence on blood transfusion in AMI patients with anemia, focusing on the pathophysiological rationale, clinical indications, and emerging controversies. By synthesizing data from randomized trials, observational studies, and meta-analyses, we aim to provide clinicians with a nuanced understanding of transfusion strategies in this high-risk population. We will also explore the limitations of current evidence and identify areas for future research to refine clinical practice and improve patient outcomes.4

EPIDEMIOLOGY

Anemia is a common comorbidity in patients presenting with acute myocardial infarction (AMI), and its prevalence varies widely depending on the studied population, diagnostic criteria, and underlying comorbidities. Epidemiological data suggest that the prevalence of anemia in patients with AMI ranges between 10% and 43%, with higher rates observed in specific subgroups such as the elderly, those with chronic kidney disease, and patients with a history of heart failure or prior cardiovascular disease. This high prevalence underscores the clinical importance of addressing anemia as part of the comprehensive management of AMI.4

The epidemiology of anemia in AMI is influenced by both demographic factors and healthcare practices. Older adults, who represent a significant proportion of AMI patients, are particularly susceptible to anemia due to age-related factors such as decreased erythropoietin production, malnutrition, and the high prevalence of chronic diseases. Studies indicate that the prevalence of anemia increases with age, affecting up to 50% of AMI patients over 80 years old. Additionally, sex differences have been reported, with women more likely to present with anemia during AMI, partly due to baseline differences in hemoglobin levels and higher rates of iron deficiency.5

Anemia in AMI often stems from a multifactorial etiology. Chronic conditions such as chronic kidney disease (CKD), diabetes mellitus, and heart failure contribute significantly to the development of anemia through mechanisms such as reduced erythropoietin production, iron sequestration, and chronic inflammation. Acute factors, including blood loss from gastrointestinal sources or antithrombotic therapies, further exacerbate anemia in this population. Moreover, inflammation and oxidative stress associated with AMI itself can impair erythropoiesis, creating a vicious cycle that exacerbates oxygen delivery deficits to the ischemic myocardium.5

The impact of anemia on AMI outcomes is profound and well-documented in large-scale registries and cohort studies. Anemia is independently associated with increased short- and long-term mortality in AMI patients, as well as higher rates of major adverse cardiovascular events (MACE), including recurrent myocardial infarction, heart failure, and arrhythmias. Mechanistically, anemia exacerbates myocardial ischemia by reducing systemic oxygen-carrying capacity and increasing myocardial oxygen demand due to compensatory tachycardia and increased cardiac workload. These physiological derangements are particularly detrimental in patients with limited myocardial reserve, such as those with significant coronary artery disease or prior myocardial infarction.6,7

Geographical and regional variations in anemia prevalence and management practices also play a role in its epidemiology. In high-income countries, where healthcare systems are well-equipped to manage chronic conditions, anemia in AMI is more likely to reflect age-related and inflammatory etiologies. Conversely, in low- and middle-income countries, anemia may be more frequently attributable to nutritional deficiencies, parasitic infections, or untreated chronic diseases, further complicating the clinical picture.6,7

The epidemiology of blood transfusion in AMI patients with anemia mirrors these trends, with substantial variability in transfusion practices between institutions and regions. Observational studies indicate that up to 20–30% of anemic AMI patients receive a blood transfusion, though the indications and thresholds for transfusion vary widely. Liberal transfusion strategies, historically favored in clinical practice, have given way to more restrictive approaches in light of emerging evidence and updated guidelines. Nevertheless, disparities in adherence to evidence-based transfusion practices persist, influenced by clinician preferences, institutional policies, and patient-specific factors.7,8

Given the high prevalence and prognostic significance of anemia in AMI, as well as the variability in transfusion practices, understanding the epidemiology of this comorbidity is essential for improving patient outcomes. Robust epidemiological data can inform risk stratification, guide clinical decision-making, and identify subgroups of patients who may benefit most from targeted interventions, including blood transfusion. Moreover, recognizing patterns of anemia and transfusion in different healthcare settings can highlight gaps in care and opportunities for optimizing resource allocation and management strategies.8,9

Future epidemiological research should focus on longitudinal studies that evaluate the interplay between anemia, transfusion practices, and cardiovascular outcomes in diverse patient populations. Such studies should also incorporate emerging biomarkers of oxygen delivery and myocardial ischemia to refine our understanding of the clinical implications of anemia in AMI. Ultimately, a deeper understanding of the epidemiology of anemia and transfusion in AMI will pave the way for personalized, evidence-based approaches that balance the risks and benefits of intervention, improving outcomes for this high-risk population.10

Current Considerations for Blood Transfusion in Acute Myocardial Infarction and Anemia

The management of anemia in patients with acute myocardial infarction (AMI) is a delicate balance between optimizing oxygen delivery to the ischemic myocardium and mitigating the potential risks associated with blood transfusion. Despite its widespread use in clinical practice, blood transfusion remains a topic of significant debate, with conflicting evidence regarding its benefits and risks. Current considerations for transfusion in this context are shaped by recent studies, clinical guidelines, and a growing emphasis on individualized patient care.10

Pathophysiological Basis for Transfusion in AMI with Anemia

Anemia, defined as a reduction in hemoglobin concentration below normal reference ranges, compromises systemic oxygen delivery and exacerbates myocardial ischemia during AMI. The ischemic myocardium relies on adequate oxygen supply to maintain cellular function and prevent irreversible damage. Severe anemia reduces the oxygen-carrying capacity of blood, which can trigger compensatory mechanisms such as tachycardia and increased cardiac output, further straining the heart and potentially worsening ischemic injury.10

Transfusion theoretically reverses these effects by increasing hemoglobin levels, thereby improving oxygen delivery to the myocardium. However, the beneficial impact of transfusion is counterbalanced by its potential adverse effects, including immunomodulation, pro-inflammatory responses, volume overload, and increased risk of thrombosis. These mechanisms can exacerbate myocardial injury and lead to worse clinical outcomes, underscoring the importance of a judicious approach to transfusion.10

Restrictive vs. Liberal Transfusion Strategies

Two primary transfusion strategies have been evaluated in the management of anemia in AMI patients:

1. **Restrictive Transfusion Strategy:**
   This approach involves withholding transfusion until hemoglobin levels fall below a predefined threshold, typically 7–8 g/dL. Restrictive strategies aim to minimize transfusion-related complications while maintaining adequate oxygen delivery. Recent evidence suggests that a restrictive approach is non-inferior to liberal strategies in most AMI patients and may even be associated with better outcomes, including lower rates of mortality and adverse cardiovascular events.11
2. **Liberal Transfusion Strategy:**
   Liberal strategies advocate for transfusion at higher hemoglobin thresholds, typically 9–10 g/dL or higher, with the aim of optimizing oxygen delivery early in the course of anemia. While this approach may seem beneficial in theory, studies have demonstrated mixed results, with some suggesting no significant benefit and others indicating an increased risk of adverse events, such as recurrent myocardial infarction, heart failure, and in-hospital mortality.11

Current guidelines, including those from the American College of Cardiology (ACC) and European Society of Cardiology (ESC), generally favor a restrictive transfusion approach in hemodynamically stable patients with AMI. However, these recommendations are based on limited high-quality evidence, highlighting the need for further research in this area.11

Patient-Centered Considerations

The decision to transfuse in AMI patients with anemia should not rely solely on hemoglobin thresholds but should also consider individual patient factors, including:

1. **Hemodynamic Stability:**
   Patients with hemodynamic compromise, such as hypotension, shock, or ongoing ischemia, may benefit from transfusion regardless of hemoglobin levels, as the primary goal in these scenarios is to restore perfusion and oxygenation.11
2. **Severity of Anemia**
   Severe anemia (e.g., hemoglobin <7 g/dL) is generally considered an indication for transfusion due to the high risk of hypoxic injury. However, for mild to moderate anemia, the risks of transfusion may outweigh the potential benefits, particularly in stable patients.11
3. **Comorbidities:**
   The presence of comorbid conditions such as chronic kidney disease, heart failure, or chronic obstructive pulmonary disease may influence the decision to transfuse, as these conditions can exacerbate the physiological impact of anemia and impair the body's compensatory mechanisms.11
4. **Clinical Presentation of AMI**
   Patients presenting with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction (STEMI) may have different transfusion needs compared to those with non-ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction (NSTEMI), given the higher risk of extensive myocardial damage and complications in STEMI.11
5. **Ongoing Ischemia:**
   Symptoms of persistent chest pain, dynamic ECG changes, or biomarker evidence of ongoing myocardial injury may warrant a more aggressive

approach to transfusion, even in the absence of severe anemia.11

Risks Associated with Transfusion in AMI

Blood transfusion, while potentially lifesaving, carries several risks that must be carefully weighed in the decision-making process:

1. **Volume Overload:**
   Transfusion can lead to fluid overload, particularly in patients with heart failure or reduced ejection fraction, worsening pulmonary congestion and cardiac strain.11
2. **Prothrombotic Effects:**
   Transfusion is associated with increased platelet activation and coagulation, potentially exacerbating the thrombotic milieu of AMI and increasing the risk of recurrent infarction.12
3. **Inflammatory and Immunomodulatory Responses:**
   Blood products can trigger systemic inflammation and immunosuppression, both of which are associated with adverse outcomes in critically ill patients.12
4. **Infection Risk:**
   Though rare, transfusion-related infections remain a concern, particularly in regions with limited access to rigorous blood screening protocols.13

Current Guidelines and Evidence Gaps

Despite growing evidence, significant gaps remain in our understanding of the optimal transfusion strategy for AMI patients with anemia. Current guidelines emphasize the importance of a restrictive approach in stable patients but lack consensus on precise thresholds for transfusion in high-risk or unstable individuals. Moreover, the heterogeneity of patient populations and clinical presentations complicates the extrapolation of study findings to real-world practice.14

Emerging research, including ongoing randomized controlled trials, aims to address these uncertainties by evaluating the impact of transfusion strategies on long-term outcomes such as mortality, recurrent ischemia, and quality of life. Novel biomarkers and hemodynamic monitoring tools may also improve risk stratification and guide personalized transfusion decisions in the future.15

The decision to transfuse in patients with AMI and anemia requires careful consideration of individual patient factors, clinical presentation, and the risks and benefits of intervention. While a restrictive transfusion strategy appears safe and effective for most stable patients, clinical judgment remains paramount, particularly in complex cases. Future research should focus on refining transfusion thresholds and developing evidence-based protocols that optimize outcomes in this high-risk population.15

CONCLUSION

The indication for blood transfusion in patients with acute myocardial infarction (AMI) and anemia remains a complex and multifaceted clinical decision that demands careful evaluation of the interplay between anemia's pathophysiological burden and the potential risks associated with transfusion. Anemia in the setting of AMI poses a significant challenge by reducing oxygen delivery to ischemic myocardial tissue, potentially exacerbating myocardial injury and leading to adverse outcomes. However, blood transfusion, while aimed at ameliorating this oxygen deficit, carries its own set of risks, including volume overload, increased thrombotic tendencies, inflammatory responses, and potential for worsened cardiovascular outcomes.

Current evidence suggests that a restrictive transfusion strategy, favoring transfusion at lower hemoglobin thresholds (typically <7–8 g/dL), is as effective as a liberal strategy in most hemodynamically stable patients, with some studies even suggesting improved outcomes. This approach aligns with efforts to minimize transfusion-related complications while ensuring adequate oxygen delivery to the myocardium. Nevertheless, the optimal transfusion threshold remains a topic of ongoing debate, as emerging data highlight the need for nuanced and individualized approaches to transfusion decisions.

Key factors influencing the decision to transfuse include the severity of anemia, the extent of myocardial ischemia, patient hemodynamic status, and comorbidities such as chronic kidney disease or heart failure. Patients with hemodynamic instability, persistent ischemia, or severe anemia may benefit from more liberal transfusion practices, whereas stable patients with mild to moderate anemia may be better served by a conservative approach. Importantly, clinical decision-making should be informed by a comprehensive assessment of the patient’s risk profile and the presence of complicating factors, rather than solely relying on hemoglobin thresholds.

Despite advancements in our understanding of transfusion in AMI, several critical knowledge gaps persist. Current guidelines, though increasingly emphasizing restrictive strategies, are derived from heterogeneous studies with variable patient populations and study designs. The lack of high-quality, large-scale randomized controlled trials specifically evaluating transfusion thresholds in AMI patients with anemia limits the generalizability of existing recommendations. Furthermore, the influence of factors such as the timing of transfusion, the role of red blood cell storage duration, and the use of adjunctive therapies (e.g., iron supplementation or erythropoiesis-stimulating agents) remains underexplored.

Future research should focus on addressing these gaps through rigorous clinical trials designed to evaluate not only short-term outcomes, such as mortality and recurrent myocardial infarction, but also long-term endpoints, including functional recovery, quality of life, and healthcare resource utilization. The integration of advanced biomarkers, such as markers of tissue hypoxia or myocardial strain, may provide additional insights into the dynamic interplay between anemia and ischemia, thereby refining transfusion practices.

In conclusion, the management of anemia with blood transfusion in the setting of AMI represents a delicate balance of risks and benefits that necessitates individualized, evidence-based decision-making. While restrictive transfusion strategies appear to provide a safe and effective framework for most patients, clinical judgment remains essential, particularly in cases of hemodynamic instability or severe anemia. By bridging current knowledge gaps and embracing personalized approaches to transfusion, clinicians can optimize outcomes and improve the care of patients with this challenging and high-risk condition.

REFERENCES

I. M.S. Sabatine, D.A. Morrow, R.P. Giugliano, *et al.* Association of hemoglobin levels with clinical outcomes in acute coronary syndromes Circulation, 111 (2005), pp. 2042-2049

II. S.D. Anker, A. Voors, D. Okonko, *et al.* Prevalence, incidence, and prognostic value of anaemia in patients after an acute myocardial infarction: data from the OPTIMAAL trial Eur Heart J, 30 (2009), pp. 1331-1339

III. A.C. Salisbury, A.P. Amin, K.J. Reid, *et al.* Hospital-acquired anemia and in-hospital mortality in patients with acute myocardial infarction Am J Cardiol, 162 (2011), pp. 300-309.e3

IV. A.C. Salisbury, K.P. Alexander, K.J. Reid, *et al.* Incidence, correlates, and outcomes of acute, hospital-acquired anemia in patients with acute myocardial infarction Circ Cardiovasc Qual Outcomes, 3 (2010), pp. 337-346

V. A. Shander, L.T. Goodnough Why an alternative to blood transfusion? Crit Care Clin, 25 (2009), pp. 261-277

VI. A. Shander, M. Javidroozi, S. Ozawa, G.M. Hare What is really dangerous: anaemia or transfusion? Br J Anaesth, 107 (Suppl 1) (2011), pp. i41-i59

VII. W.C. Wu, S.S. Rathore, Y. Wang, M.J. Radford, H.M. Krumholz Blood transfusion in elderly patients with acute myocardial infarction N Engl J Med, 345 (2001), pp. 1230-1236

VIII. D. Aronson, E.J. Dann, L. Bonstein, *et al.* Impact of red blood cell transfusion on clinical outcomes in patients with acute myocardial infarction

a. Am J Cardiol, 102 (2008), pp. 115-119

IX. S.V. Rao, J.G. Jollis, R.A. Harrington, *et al.* Relationship of blood transfusion and clinical outcomes in patients with acute coronary syndromes JAMA, 292 (2004), pp. 1555-1562

X. S. Chatterjee, J. Wetterslev, A. Sharma, E. Lichstein, D. Mukherjee Association of blood transfusion with increased mortality in myocardial infarction: a meta-analysis and diversity-adjusted study sequential analysis JAMA Intern Med, 173 (2013), pp. 132-139

XI. M.H. Shishehbor, S. Madhwal, V. Rajagopal, *et al.*Impact of blood transfusion on short- and long-term mortality in patients with ST-segment elevation myocardial infarction J Am Coll Cardiol Intv, 2 (2009), pp. 46-53

XII. P.C. Austin The relative ability of different propensity score methods to balance measured covariates between treated and untreated subjects in observational studies Med Decis Making, 29 (2009), pp. 661-677

XIII. A.C. Salisbury, K.J. Reid, K.P. Alexander, *et al.* Diagnostic blood loss from phlebotomy and hospital-acquired anemia during acute myocardial infarction Arch Intern Med, 171 (2011), pp. 1646-1653

XIV. M. Kosiborod, S.E. Inzucchi, A. Goyal, *et al.* Relationship between spontaneous and iatrogenic hypoglycemia and mortality in patients hospitalized with acute myocardial infarction JAMA, 301 (2009), pp. 1556-1564

XV. S.T. Normand, M.B. Landrum, E. Guadagnoli, *et al.* Validating recommendations for coronary angiography following acute myocardial infarction in the elderly: a matched analysis using propensity scores J Clin Epidemiol, 54 (2001), pp. 387-39