DOI: 10.1111/jth.14991

REVIEW ARTICLE

jth

Effectiveness of prothrombin complex concentrate for the treatment of bleeding: A systematic review and meta-analysis

Daan P. van den Brink^{1,2} | Mathijs R. Wirtz^{1,2,3} | Ary Serpa Neto^{1,4} | Herbert Schöchl^{5,6} | Victor Viersen⁷ | Jan Binnekade¹ | Nicole P. Juffermans^{1,2,8}

¹Department of Intensive Care Medicine, Amsterdam UMC, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

²Laboratory of Experimental Intensive Care and Anesthesiology, Amsterdam UMC, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

³Department of Trauma Surgery, Amsterdam UMC, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

⁴Department of Critical Care Medicine, Hospital Israelita Albert Einstein, São Paulo, Brazil

⁵Department of Anesthesiology and Intensive Care Medicine, AUVA Trauma Centre Salzburg, Academic Teaching Hospital of the Paracelsus Medical University, Salzburg, Austria

⁶Institute for Experimental and Clinical Traumatology, AUVA Research Centre, Vienna, Austria

⁷Department of Anesthesiology, Amsterdam UMC, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

⁸Department of Intensive Care Medicine, OLVG Hospital, Amsterdam, The Netherlands

Correspondence

Nicole P. Juffermans, Intensive Care, Amsterdam UMC, Meibergdreef 9, 1105 AZ, Amsterdam, The Netherlands. Email: n.p.juffermans@amsterdamumc.nl

Abstract

Prothrombin complex concentrate (PCC) is increasingly being used as a treatment for major bleeding in patients who are not taking anticoagulants. The aim of this systematic review and meta-analysis is to evaluate the effectiveness of PCC administration for the treatment of bleeding in patients not taking anticoagulants. Studies investigating the effectivity of PCC to treat bleeding in adult patients and providing data on either mortality or blood loss were eligible. Data were pooled using Mantel-Haenszel random effects meta-analysis or inverse variance random effects meta-analysis. From 4668 identified studies, 17 observational studies were included. In all patient groups combined, PCC administration was not associated with mortality (odds ratio = 0.83; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.66-1.06; P = .13; $I^2 = 0$ %). However, in trauma patients, PCC administration, in addition to fresh frozen plasma, was associated with reduced mortality (odds ratio = 0.64; CI, 0.46-0.88; P = .007; $l^2 = 0\%$). PCC administration was associated with a reduction in blood loss in cardiac surgery patients (mean difference: -384; CI, -640 to -128, P = .003, $I^2 = 81\%$) and a decreased need for red blood cell transfusions when compared with standard care across a wide range of bleeding patients not taking anticoagulants (mean difference: -1.80; CI, -3.22 to -0.38; P = .01; I^2 = 92%). In conclusion, PCC administration was not associated with reduced mortality in the whole cohort but did reduce mortality in trauma patients. In bleeding patients, PCC reduced the need for red blood cell transfusions when compared with treatment strategies not involving PCC. In bleeding cardiac surgery patients, PCC administration reduced blood loss.

KEYWORDS

bleeding, blood coagulation factors, hemostasis, meta-analysis, prothrombin complex concentrate, systematic review

Manuscript handled by: Willem Lijfering

Final decision: Willem Lijfering and 26-Jun-2020

Prior presentations: ECISM lives 2019, 1/10/2019, The Cube Berlin

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-NonCommercial License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited and is not used for commercial purposes.

© 2020 The Authors. Journal of Thrombosis and Haemostasis published by Wiley Periodicals LLC on behalf of International Society on Thrombosis and Haemostasis

2458

Severe bleeding is a major health problem, occurring in different clinical settings such as in trauma or perioperatively. Excessive bleeding often results in coagulopathy, with incidences ranging from 1% to 45% depending on the severity of trauma¹⁻³ or type of surgery,^{4,5} and develops through several mechanisms, such as the consumption of clotting factors. Coagulopathy may aggravate bleeding, increase transfusion requirements, and contribute to adverse outcomes.²

Plasma transfusion is frequently used to correct coagulopathy in bleeding patients because it is believed to replenish a deficit of coagulation factors. European guidelines on the management of bleeding trauma patients recommend transfusion of plasma to correct coagulopathy.^{6,7} In the operative setting, guidelines state that plasma can be used to treat coagulopathy.^{8,9} However, the effectiveness of plasma to correct coagulopathy is under debate.¹⁰⁻¹² Because the ability of plasma to restore thrombin generation is limited.¹⁰ This limited ability may be due to the presence of anticoagulant proteins in plasma, which inhibit thrombin generation.¹⁰

An alternative approach for the correction of coagulopathy occurring during bleeding may be the use of factor concentrates, such as prothrombin complex concentrate (PCC). PCC contains either three or four of the vitamin K-dependent coagulation factors (II, IX, X, and sometimes VII). Also, depending on the type of PCC, small amounts of proteins C, S, Z, unfractionated heparin, or antithrombin are present. Because PCCs have gained approval by the US Food and Drug Administration in 2013, they have become the primary treatment for urgent reversal of oral anticoagulation with vitamin K antagonists and congenital vitamin K-dependent coagulation factor deficiencies..¹³

In addition to these established indications, PCCs are increasingly used to correct coagulopathy in bleeding patients unrelated to coagulopathy.^{14,15} Guidelines in both trauma and operative settings support the administration of PCC to bleeding patients to reverse coagulopathy.⁷⁻⁹ However, this is largely based on expert opinion and is supported by limited evidence. By supplementing coagulation factors, PCCs rapidly correct coagulopathy while having lower risks of complications such as transfusion-associated lung injury, transfusion-associated circulatory overload, bacterial contamination, and allergic reactions when compared with plasma transfusion.¹⁶⁻¹⁸ Regarding safety, the risk of thromboembolic complications after administration of 4-factor PCC, when given in the proper dose, seem to be rather low.¹⁹

There are limited trials on the effectivity of PCC. In trauma, a randomized controlled trial showed that PCC is associated with a reduced need for massive transfusion when compared with plasma.¹³ The trial was terminated early for safety reasons because the plasma group showed more adverse outcome compared with the PCC group. However, as all PCC patients also received fibrinogen, it is not clear from this trial whether PCC, fibrinogen, or the combination contributed most to the observed benefit. To date, a summary of the effectiveness of PCC in bleeding patients not taking anticoagulants is not present. The objective of this review is to systematically

evaluate the effectivity of PCC in bleeding unrelated to anticoagulation in different clinical scenarios.

2 | METHODS

2.1 | Search strategy

This systematic review and meta-analysis was conducted according to the PRISMA methodology.²⁰ No review protocol is available. To identify all articles investigating the use of PCC for treatment of bleeding, a comprehensive computer-assisted literature search of MEDLINE, EMBASE, and CINAHL electronic databases was performed including articles between 1952 and April 2020. A broad search strategy was used that included multiple synonyms of PCC combined with terms as: "hemorrhage," "mortality," and "bleeding." The full PubMed, EMBASE, and CINAHL search strategies can be found in the supplement (Appendix S1). In addition, the reference list of the most relevant studies and reviews were hand-searched for eligible studies not captured in the initial literature search.

2.2 | Study selection

The selection process was divided in three stages: title, abstract, and full-text selection. The title selection process was done by one author (D.B.). Thereafter, two authors (D.B., N.J.) independently performed the abstract and full-text selection to assess the eligibility of the articles to the predefined criteria. Differences in judgment were resolved by discussion. Inclusion criteria were: (a) patients ≥ 18 years old who received 3- or 4-factor PCC for active bleeding; (b) all patients in the experimental group received PCC; (c) at least one of the following outcomes was reported: mortality, blood product utilization, blood loss or thromboembolic (TE) events; (d) the use of a comparator including: placebo, nothing, usual treatment (eg, fresh frozen plasma [FFP]) or other hemostatic agents (eg, recombinant factor VIIa [rFVIIa]); and (e) language: English. Exclusion criteria were: experimental or preclinical study design; use of activated 4-factor PCC; PCC administration for anticoagulant reversal; use of a different PCC as comparator; and data of outcome could not be extracted. Types of articles eligible for inclusion were randomized controlled trials, nonrandomized controlled trials, and cohort studies. Case reports and congress abstracts were excluded.

2.3 | Data extraction

Using a predefined standard data form, data were collected independently by two authors (D.P., M.W.) for the following data points: study design; number of patients; mean age; study setting; PCC indication; timing of PCC administration; type and dose of PCC; type and dose of comparator; mortality; mortality follow-up days; thromboembolic (TE) events; number of transfused red blood

FIGURE 1 PRISMA flow diagram search strategy



cell (RBC) units; blood loss (total chest tube output at either 12 or 24 hours postsurgery); other significant outcomes; article authors' conclusion.

points received a moderate quality score; and studies receiving \geq 7 points received a good quality score.

2.4 | Outcomes

All-cause mortality was chosen as the primary outcome. Secondary outcomes were: blood loss, RBC utilization, and TE events. Three separate subgroup analyses were performed, including cause of bleeding (trauma, cardiac surgery, liver surgery, other), comparator (PCC with FFP vs FFP, PCC vs FFP, PCC vs rFVIIa, PCC vs nothing), and PCC dosage (<20, 20-30, >30 IU/kg).

2.5 | Study quality assessment

Study quality assessment of all eligible studies was conducted by two authors (D.P., M.W.) independently. Using the Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale, the risk of bias of cohort and case control studies was assessed.²¹ The maximum score of the Newcastle-Ottawa scale is 9 points. All studies were ranked either as poor, moderate, or good quality depending on the total score: studies receiving \leq 5 points received a poor quality score; studies receiving 6

2.6 | Statistical analysis

Data are reported as mean with standard deviation, counts, or percentages. Data retrieved as median with interquartile range were converted to means as reported before to pool data for meta-analysis.²² Meta-analysis was performed using Review Manager 5.3; statistical heterogeneity across the studies was assessed using the Cochran's Q test and l^2 values. Sensitivity analysis to exclude outliers was performed using Review Manager 5.3. The odds ratios (OR) were pooled using the Mantel-Haenszel procedure, which assumes a random effects model. Mean differences were pooled using the Inverse variance procedure, which also assumes a random effects model.

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | Characteristics of included studies

The systematic search identified 4668 studies (Medline: 1554; Embase: 2927; CINAHL: 187; Figure 1). After removing duplicates,

46	∘	th —									VAN	N DEN BRIN
	Conclusion	The use of PCC as an adjunct to FFP is associated with improved survival and reduction in transfusion requirements without increasing the risk of TE	PCC as a component therapy along with FFP is superior to FFP alone in treating coagulopathy	PCC reduced the time to correct INR and time to intervention compared with patients who received FFP	PCC as an adjunct to FFP is associated with reduction of blood product requirement and also lowers overall cost	PCC was associated with had the shortest LOS among survivors, the rFVIIa group had the lowest mortality	Among Jehovah's Witness patients undergoing cardiac surgery, 4-PCC was not associated with a difference in Hb change postoperatively, in the event of excessive blood loss 4pcc may provide a viable option	The use of PCC compared with FFP may reduce the need of blood transfusion after CABG; these results should be considered hypothesis generating	PCC is not associated with an increased risk of TE or unfavorable outcomes compared with conventional treatment. PCC may be acceptable for management of severe perioperative bleeding in open heart surgery	Use of PCCs as part of a multifaceted coagulation management strategy may have blood-sparing effects	Use of rFVIIa vs inactive PCCs was associated with renal failure requiring dialysis and increased postoperative bleeding and transfusions	4-factor PCC may be an equally efficacious alternative to rFVIIa for patients experiencing significant bleeding during cardiac surgery
	Control Group	<u>е</u>	FFP	FFP	FFP	rFVIIa	Nothing	ЕFР	е Н Н	FFP	rFVIIa	rFVIIa
	Intervention Group	4-factor PCC + FFP	4-factor PCC + FFP	3-factor PCC + FFP	3-factor PCC + FFP	4-factor PCC	4-factor PCC	Both 3- and 4-factor PCC + FFP	3-factor PCC + FFP	4-factor PCC + FFP	3-factor PCC	4-factor PCC
	Sample Size	468	120	81	252	78	79	202	160	234	106	129
	Setting	Trauma	Trauma	Trauma	Trauma	Bleeding	Cardiac Surger y	Cardiac surgery	Cardiac surgery	Cardiac surgery	Cardiac surgery	Cardiac surgery
ires of inteladed stadies	Design of Study/Study Duration	Retrospective (propensity matched)	Retrospective (propensity matched)	Retrospective (propensity matched)	Retrospective (propensity matched)	Retrospective	Retrospective	Prospective multicenter trial (propensity matched)	Retrospective (propensity matched)	Retrospective (propensity matched)	Retrospective (propensity matched)	Retrospective
	Reference Number/ Study ID	Zeeshan et al 2019 ³⁸	Jehan et al 2018 ³¹	Joseph et al 2016 ³³	Joseph et al 2014 ³²	DeLoughery et al 2016 ²⁷	Harris et al 2020 ³⁰	Biancari et al 2019 ²⁴	Zweng et al 2018 ³⁹	Fitzgerald et al 2018 ²⁸	Harper et al 2018 ²⁹	Mehringer et al 2018 ³⁵

TABLE 1 Characteristics of included studies

(Continues)

2460

Reference Number/ Study ID	Design of Study/Study Duration	Setting	Sample Size	Intervention Group	Control Group	Conclusion	
Cappabianca et al 2015 ²³	Prospective observational (propensity matched)	Cardiac surgery	450	3-factor PCC	d:	The use of PCC compared with FFP was associated with decreased postoperative blood loss and RBC transfusion requirements. However, PCC may be associated with a higher risk of AKI	
Bradford et al 2015 ²⁵	Retrospective	Cardiac surgery	68	3-factor PCC	Nothing	PCC in LVAD insertion does not appear to be associated with a significant increase in thromboembolic events	
Ortmann et al 2014 ³⁶	Retrospective (propensity matched)	Cardiac surgery	100	4-factor PCC	FFP 15	PCC may be an alternative to FFP in patients who are coagulopathic and bleeding after cardiac surgery	
Tanaka et al 2013 ³⁷	Retrospective	Cardiac surgery	150	3-factor PCC	rFVIIa	3-factor PCC could be hemostatically effective in dilutional coagulopathy because of its high prothrombin content despite the lower FVII content	
Colavecchia et al 2017 ²⁶	Retrospective (propensity matched)	Liver surgery	117	4-factor PCC + FFP	FFP	Use of PCC and fibrinogen concentrate during liver transplantation did not reduce intraoperative blood product requirements	
Kirchner et al 2014 ³⁴	Retrospective	Liver surgery	266	4-factor PCC + FFP	FFP	In liver transplantation, ROTEM-guided treatment with fibrinogen and/or PCC did not increase the occurrence of thrombosis and ischemic events	
bbreviations: AKI, acute k	idney injury; CABG, coronary artery	/ bypass graft; Hb, hemog	lobin; INR, Inter	rnational Normalized Ratio; LOS	i, length of stay	LVAD, left ventricular assist device; ROTEM,	

Abbreviations: AKI, acute kidney injury; CABG, coronary arter rotational thromboelastometry; TE, thromboembolic events.

TABLE 1 (Continued)

jth

VAN DEN BRINK ET AL.

3423 studies remained. Of these, 3297 were excluded based on exclusion criteria, yielding 126 studies. Of these, full text was assessed, leading to the exclusion of another 109 studies, resulting in 17 studies that were included in the analysis. Studies included two prospective studies^{23,24} and 15 retrospective studies,²⁵⁻³⁹ yielding a total of 3060 patients (Figure 1). Characteristics of the included studies are shown in Table 1. Studies were conducted in patients undergoing cardiothoracic surgery (10 studies with a total of 1678 patients)^{23-25,28-30,35-37,39} in trauma patients (four studies with a total of 932 patients),^{31-33,38} in patients undergoing orthotopic liver transplantation (two studies with a total of 383 patients)^{26,34} and in patients who were bleeding from various causes (one study with a total of 78 patients).²⁷

The most frequent comparator to PCC was FFP with two studies investigating PCC only in comparison to FFP only^{23,36} and nine studies investigating a combination of PCC and FFP in comparison to FFP only.^{24,26,28,31-34,38,39} Other comparators included rFVII, which was compared with PCC in four studies.^{27,29,35,37} In one study that was conducted in Jehovah's Witness patients, the comparator consisted of not giving any coagulation factor or transfusion product,³⁰ and in one study the comparator was standard care that was not further specified.²⁵ Subgroup analyses for comparators for each outcome are available in the supplement (Figures S1-S4).

The PCC product that was mostly evaluated was 4-factor PCC (nine studies),^{12,26-28,31,34-36,38} whereas 3-factor PCC was evaluated in seven studies.^{23,25,29,32,33,37,39} Multiple types of PCC were used in one study.²⁴ The dose of PCC ranged from 10 to 50 IU/kg. In 13 studies, PCC was administered based on clinical judgment.^{24-27,29-33,35,37-39} In four studies, PCC administration was protocolized, usually guided by thromboelastometry.^{27,29,31,32} A summary regarding PCC type, dose, and setting can be found in the supplement (Table S1).

3.2 | Quality assessment

Of the 17 included studies, 13 were assessed as having a good quality^{23-26,28,29,31-33,36-39} according to the Newcastle-Ottawa quality assessment scale,²¹ one had a fair quality,³⁰ and three were rated as having a poor quality.^{27,34,35} Details regarding quality assessment can be found in the supplement (Table S2).

3.3 | Mortality outcome

Mortality data were available in 14 of the 17 included studies, with a total of 2548 patients. Follow-up time to mortality ranged from in hospital mortality to 60 days. In all patient groups taken together, PCC administration was not associated with a reduction in mortality (OR 0.83; 95% confidence interval [CI], 0.66-1.06; P = .13; $I^2 = 0\%$; Figure 2). Subgroup analysis in specific patient populations showed similar results for patients undergoing

cardiac surgery (OR 1.04; 95% CI, 0.72-1.51; P = .83; $I^2 = 0$ %; P for heterogeneity = .92; Figure 2). However, in the trauma subgroup, there was a significant reduction in mortality in patients receiving PCC compared with patients not receiving PCC (OR 0.64; 95% CI, 0.46-0.88; P = .007; $I^2 = 0$ %; P for heterogeneity = .81; Figure 2). This benefit was observed when PCC was added to FFP compared with FFP alone, but not when PCC as a stand-alone therapy was compared with FFP (Figure S1). The studies in patients undergoing liver surgery did not report any data on mortality. Subgroup analyses on the dose-dependent effectiveness of PCC on mortality is available in the supplement (Figure S5). There were no significant differences between lower and higher PCC dosages. A sensitivity analysis excluding outliers did not change results (OR 0.79; 95% CI, 0.62-1.01; P = .06; $I^2 = 0$ %; P for heterogeneity = .78; Figure S7).

3.4 | Blood loss outcome

Data on blood loss were available in five studies with a total of 875 patients, all of which were performed in patients undergoing cardiac surgery.^{23,29,30,36,37} The timeframe in which blood loss was recorded was either 12 or 24 hours. Four studies reported blood loss in median values,^{29,30,36,37} which were converted into mean values. Mean blood loss ranged from 353 to 1159 mL in patients receiving PCC and 480 to 1644 mL in patients not receiving PCC. Total blood loss was significantly lower in the PCC group (mean difference –293 mL; 95% CI, –546 to –41; P = .02; $I^2 = 86\%$; Figure 3).

3.5 | Red blood cell product utilization

Data on the number of RBC units that were transfused was available in 11 of the 17 included studies, ranging across all subpopulations,^{23,26,28,29,31-34,36-38} with a total of 2294 patients. In four studies, data were reported in median, 28,29,36,37 which were converted into mean. The mean number of RBC units that were transfused ranged from 2.3 to 12.4 in patients receiving PCC and from 1.0 to 10.7 in patients not receiving PCC. The amount of administered RBC products was significantly lower in the PCC group (mean difference -1.61 units; 95% CI, -3.0 to -0.2; P = .02; $I^2 = 93\%$; Figure 4). Also, in the specific patient populations, RBC requirements were lower in the PCC groups. In trauma patients, PCC use resulted in a reduction of 3.0 RBC units compared with patients not receiving PCC (95% CI, -4.1 to -1.9; P < .00001; $l^2 = 68\%$; P for heterogeneity = .02; Figure 4). In cardiac surgery patients, PCC resulted in a reduction of 2.0 units (95% CI, -3.4 to -0.7; P = .003; $I^2 = 81\%$; P for heterogeneity = .0003; Figure 4) compared with those not receiving PCC. Of importance, all analyses showed high heterogeneity. In contrast, patients undergoing liver transplant surgery showed opposite results because patients who received PCC had an increase use of 2.1 RBC units in comparison to patients

	PCC	;	no PC	00		Odds Ratio		Odds	Ratio	
Study or subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% Cl		M-H, Rand	lom, 95% Cl	
1.1.1 Trauma										
Jehan 2018	10	40	26	80	7.7%	0.69 [0.29, 1.63]			<u> </u>	
Joseph 2014	15	63	53	189	12.9%	0.80 [0.41, 1.55]			<u> </u>	
Joseph 2016	6	27	15	54	4.8%	0.74 [0.25, 2.20]			<u> </u>	
Zeeshan 2019	41	234	65	234	28.8%	0.55 [0.35, 0.86]				
Subtotal (95% Cl)		364		557	54.2%	0.64 [0.46, 0.88]		•		
Total events	72		159							
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	.00; Chi ²	= 0.98	, df = 3 (F	P = 0.81	l); l ² = 0%					
Test for overall effect: Z	2 = 2.72 (P = 0.0	07)							
1.1.2 Cardiac surgery										
Biancari 2019	5	101	5	101	3.5%	1.00 [0.28, 3.57]				
Bradford 2015	1	41	0	27	0.5%	2.04 [0.08, 51.86]			<u> </u>	_
Cappabianca 2016	21	225	19	225	13.3%	1.12 [0.58, 2.14]			—	
Fitzgerald 2018	15	117	15	117	9.6%	1.00 [0.46, 2.15]				
Harper 2018	6	59	7	53	4.2%	0.84 [0.26, 2.69]				
Harris 2020	1	19	0	60	0.5%	9.81 [0.38, 251.18]			<u> </u>	
Ortmann 2014	3	45	4	55	2.3%	0.91 [0.19, 4.30]				
Tanaka 2013	5	50	14	100	4.8%	0.68 [0.23, 2.02]			<u> </u>	
Zweng 2018	5	80	3	80	2.6%	1.71 [0.39, 7.41]				
Subtotal (95% Cl)		731		818	41.4%	1.04 [0.72, 1.51]				
Total events	62		67							
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	.00; Chi ²	= 3.25	, df = 8 (F	P = 0.92	2); l ² = 0%					
Test for overall effect: Z	2 = 0.22 (P = 0.8	3)							
1.1.3 Bleeding various I	reasons									
DeLoughery 2016	9	16	21	62	4.5%	2.51 [0.82, 7.69]		-		
Subtotal (95% CI)		16		62	4.5%	2.51 [0.82, 7.69]		-		
Total events	9		21							
Heterogeneity: Not appl	licable									
Test for overall effect: Z	2 = 1.61 (P = 0.1	1)							
Total (95% CI)		1111		1437	100.0%	0.83 [0.66,1.06]		•		
Total events	143		247							
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	.00; Chi ²	= 11.9	5, df = 13	8 (P = 0	.53); l ² = 0)%	+		ł	+
Test for overall effect: Z	2 = 1.52 (P = 0.1	3)				0.005	0.1	1 10	200
Test for subgroup different	ences: Cl	hi ² = 0.0	00; df = 2	(P = 0.1)	.02); l ² = 7	' 4.1%		Favours PCC	Favours no PC	C

FIGURE 2 Forest plot comparison of overall and subgroup mortality in patients treated with PCC vs patients not treated with PCC

	I	PCC		n	o PCC			Mean Difference			Mean D	Differen	ice	
Study or subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% C	Cl Year		IV, Rand	om, 95	% CI	
Tanaka 2013	723.33	422.72	50	1,397.69	1,002.69	100	20.0%	-674.36 [-903.16, -445.56]	2013		_			
Ortmann 2014	353.33	331.59	45	683.33	570.95	55	21.4%	-330.00 [-509.32, -150.68]	2014					
Cappabianca 2016	836	1,226	225	935	583	225	21.4%	-99.00 [-276.38, 78.38]	2016			+		
Harper 2018	1,158.67	770.42	53	1,644.33	1,108.77	53	16.0%	-485.66 [-849.15, -122.17]	2018		-			
Harris 2020	533.33	412.67	19	480.58	189.9	60	21.1%	52.75 [-138.93, 244.43]	2020			•		
Total (95% Cl)			392			493	100.0%	-293.76 [-546.54, -40.99]						
Heterogeneity: Tau ²	= 69357.69	; Chi ² = 3	27.95	, df = 4 (P	< 0.0001)); l ² = 8	86%		H		+	1	+	— I
Test for overall effect	: Z = 2.28	(P = 0.02)	2)						-100	0 –5	500	0	500	1000
		-								E	avours PCC	; Favo	ours no PCC	



not receiving PCC (95% Cl, 1.2 to -2.8; P = <.00001; $I^2 = 0\%$; P for heterogeneity = .64; Figure 4). Subgroup analyses on the dose-dependent effectiveness of PCC on RBC utilization is available in the supplement (Figure S6). Dosages < 30 IU/kg showed effects in favor of PCC whereas dosages > 30 IU/kg showed no differences between groups.

3.6 | Thromboembolic events

Data on TE events was available in 15 of the 17 included studies with a total of 2745 evaluable patients.^{23-25,27-36,38,39} The TE rate ranged between 0% and 41% in the PCC group and between 4% and 26% in the no-PCC group. Overall, PCC administration was not

2463

Jui														
-	I	PCC		nc	PCC			Mean Difference			Me	an Differen	ce	
Study or subgroup	Mean	SD	Total	Mean	SD	Total	Weight	IV, Random, 95% Cl	l Year		IV, F	andom, 95	% CI	
1.3.1 Trauma														
Joseph 2014	6.6	4.1	63	10	8.3	189	9.2%	-3.40 [-4.96, -1.84]	2014	ļ		-		
Joseph 2016	3.2	1.9	27	5.4	4.1	54	9.6%	-2.20 [-3.51, -0.89]	2016	6				
Jehan 2018	7	3	40	9	5	80	9.4%	-2.00 [-3.44, -0.56]	2018	3				
Zeeshan 2019 Subtotal (95% Cl)	6	4	234 364	10	4	234 557	10.2% 38.4%	-4.00 [-4.72, -3.28] -2.99 [-4.06, -1.91]	2019	9	-	•		
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 0	.80; Chi ²	² = 9.45	5, df = 3	B (P < 0.	0001);	l ² = 68	8%							
Test for overall effect: Z	2 = 5.44 ((P < 0.0	00001)											
1.3.2 Cardiac surgery														
Tanaka 2013	5.6	4 43	50	10.67	5 27	100	9.2%	-5 07 [-6 67 -3 47]	2012	2	_			
Ortmann 2014	2.33	23	45	3	3.05	55	9.9%	-0.67 [-1.72, 0.38]	2010	, 1				
Cappabianca 2016	3.4	3.1	225	52	4.3	225	10.2%	-1 80 [-2 49 -1 11]	2016	5				
Fitzgerald 2018	3 67	4.5	117	5	5 25	117	9.6%	-1.33 [-2.58, -0.08]	2018	3	-			
Harper 2018	2.42	3.71	3	3.31	2 35	53	5.3%	-0.89 [-5.14, 3.36]	2018	3			_	
Subtotal (95% Cl)			440		2.00	550	44.2%	–2.01 [–3.35, –0.67]			•			
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 1	.67; Chi ²	² = 21.1	1, df =	4 (P < 0	0.0003); l ² = 8	81%							
Test for overall effect: Z	2 = 2.94 ((P = 0.0	003)	,										
1.3.3 Liver surgery														
Kirchner 2014	3	4.49	156	1	2.25	110	10.1%	2.00 [-1.18, 2.82]	2014	ļ			-	
Colavecchia 2017	12.4	8	39 105	9.7	5.6	100	7.3%	2.70 [-1.10, 5.50]	2017	<i>,</i>				
	00 OL 12		100	(a 12	100	17.4%	2.00 [1.27, 2.04]						
Heterogeneity: $Iau^2 = 0$.00; Chi ²	= 0.22	2, df = 1	(P = 0.	64); I-	= 0%								
Test for overall effect: 2	. = 5.12 ((P < 0.0	JUUUT)											
Total (95% CI)			999			1295	100.0%	-1.61 [-3.00, -0.22]			•			
Heterogeneity: Tau ² = 4	.82; Chi ²	2 = 152	.76, df :	= 10 (P<	< 0.000	01); l ²	= 93%	-		+		<u> </u>		+
Test for overall effect: Z	. = 2.27 ((P = 0.0	02)							-10	-5	0	5	10
Test for subgroup different	ences: C	hi² = 64	4.16; df	= 2 (P<	: 0.000	01); l ²	= 96.9%				Favours	PCC Favo	ours no PCC	

FIGURE 4 Forest plot comparison of overall and subgroup RBC utilization in patients treated with PCC vs patients not treated with PCC

associated with the occurrence of TE (OR 1.11; 95% CI, 0.82-1.50; P = .49; $I^2 = 0\%$; Figure 5). In subgroup analyses, similar results were found (Figure 5).

4 | DISCUSSION

2464

This systematic review analyzes the effectivity of PCC to control bleeding in various patient populations who were no on anticoagulants. Overall, we found that PCC did not reduce mortality in comparison to plasma or to other hemostatic agents. However, in the subgroup analysis, PCC administration when added to FFP was associated with reduced mortality in trauma patients.

An explanation for the difference of an effect between patient groups could be that PCC could play a more important role in patients that are bleeding more excessively, which is more probable in trauma patients compared with the cardiac and liver surgery patients, which may experience more "controlled" blood loss.

Most of the included studies compared PCC in conjunction with FFP to solely FFP. Whereas PCC added to FFP was associated with a reduction in mortality, this effect was not noted in the other comparisons, such as PCC versus FFP or PCC versus no therapy. This implies that PCC is beneficial as an adjunct to standard treatment including FFP rather than a replacement of FFP. This benefit could lie in a more rapid correction of coagulopathy and coagulation factor replacement while not losing the benefit of FFP. In cardiac surgery patients, a significantly reduced blood loss in favor of the PCC group was found. However, substantial statistical heterogeneity may hamper credibility of results. This heterogeneity is explained by two reasons. First, blood loss was recorded in different time frames (either within 12 or 24 hours postsurgery), yielding a wide range. Second, we extrapolated means from medians in four studies. However, results on amount of blood loss are congruent with the finding of a reduction in RBC utilization in the PCC-treated patients when compared with the patients not receiving PCC. In most patient categories, results point in the same direction, suggesting that PCC is associated with reduced blood loss.

VAN DEN BRINK ET AL.

Of note, liver surgery patients showed opposite results, with more RBC products needed in patients treated with PCC versus a comparator. This may be due to baseline imbalances between groups, with more severe liver injury and coagulopathy in the PCC group.³⁴ Also, two studies with small sample sizes were included. Therefore, we feel that results in the subgroup of liver failure patients are uncertain.

Regarding safety, the use of PCC did not result in an increase in TE events when compared with patients not receiving PCC. Of note, the CIs of the ORs were very wide, suggesting differential results across studies. However, the large number of patients included in this analysis is a strength. Taken together, PCCs do not seem to come at a cost of increased venous thromboembolic events.

This review has certain limitations because a small number of eligible studies were available with substantial heterogeneity. This heterogeneity is caused by a number of reasons. First, most

N DEN BRINK ET AL.	
--------------------	--

VA

	500							
	PCC	;			14/- 1-1-1	Odds Ratio		Udds Ratio
Study or Subgroup	Events	Total	Events	Total	Weight	M-H, Random, 95% C	l Year	M-H, Random, 95% Cl
1.4.1 Irauma		~~~		100	0.00/	0.00.00.00.40.451	0014	
Joseph 2014	2	63	3	189	2.8%	2.03 [0.33, 12.45]	2014	
Joseph 2016	4	27	5	54	4.6%	1.70 [0.42, 6.95]	2016	
Jenan 2018	1	40	2	80	1.5%	1.00 [0.09, 11.37]	2018	
Subtatal (05% CI)	11	234	17	234	14.9%	0.63 [0.29, 1.38]	2019	
Subtotal (95% CI)	10	364	07	557	23.8%	0.90 [0.49, 1.67]		
	18		27					
Heterogeneity: $Iau^2 =$	0.00; Ch	$l^2 = 2.3$	38, df = 3	(P < 0	.50); l ² =	0%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.33	(P = 0).74)					
1.4.2 Cardiac surgery								
Ortmann 2014	1	45	1	55	1.2%	1.23 [0.07, 20.19]	2014	
Bradford 2015	12	29	6	27	6.6%	2.47 [0.77, 7.96]	2015	
Cappabianca 2016	26	225	22	225	25.2%	1.21 [0.66, 2.20]	2016	
Mehringer 2018	2	56	4	73	3.0%	0.64 [0.11, 3.62]	2018	
Zweng 2018	8	80	4	80	5.9%	2.11 [0.61, 7.32]	2018	—
Fitzgerald 2018	8	117	9	117	9.3%	0.88 [0.33, 2.37]	2018	
Harper 2018	8	53	14	53	9.7%	0.50 [0.19, 1.30]	2018	— +
Biancari 2019	5	101	3	101	4.3%	1.70 [0.40, 7.32]	2019	
Harris 2020	2	19	2	60	2.2%	3.41 [0.45, 26.05]	2020	
Subtotal (95% CI)		725		791	67.5%	1.18 [0.82, 1.70]		•
Total events	72		65					
Heterogeneity: Tau ² =	0.00; Ch	i ² = 7.5	57, df = 8	(P = 0	.48); l ² =	0%		
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.87	(P = 0	.38)					
1.4.3 Liver surgery								
Kirchner 2014	11	156	5	110	7.7%	1.59 [0.54, 4.72]	2014	
Subtotal (95% Cl)		156		110	7.7%	1.59 [0.54, 4.72]		
Total events	. 11		5					
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable							
Test for overall effect:	Z = 0.84	(P = 0.	.40)					
1.4.4 Bleeding various	reasons	;						
Del oughery 2016	0	, 16	3	26	1.0%	0.20 [0.01, 4.21]	2016 -	
Subtotal (95% CI)	Ũ	16	· ·	26	1.0%	0.20 [0.01, 4.21]	2010	
Total events	0		3					
Heterogeneity: Not ap	plicable		-					
Test for overall effect:	Z = 1.03	(P = 0.	.30)					
Total (95% CI)		1261	,	1484	100.0%	1.11 [0.82, 1.50]		
Total events	101		100			[,]		ľ
Heterogeneity: Tau ² –	0.00 Ch	i ² = 12	12 df -	14 (P-	0 60) · 12	= 0%	-+	i i i
Test for overall effect:	7 = 0.68	(P = 0)	.49)	(. –	5.55), 1	0.10	0.005	0.1 1 10 200
Test for subgroup differen	 ices: Chi ²	= 2.16:	df = 3 (P=	0.54): I ²	² = 0%			Favours PCC Favours no PCC
3		,	- \.	,, .				

FIGURE 5 Forest plot comparison of overall and subgroup thromboembolic events in patients treated with PCC vs patients not treated with PCC

studies had a retrospective study design, in which PCC was administered based on clinical judgment. This may introduce confounding and bias because PCC may potentially be administered to more severely ill and hemodynamically unstable patients, resulting in underrepresentation of the actual effect. Second, because there is no optimal dose for PCC, there is considerable variety in the type and dose of PCC, as well as the trigger for administration. This could lead to both an under- or overrepresentation of the actual effects as certain PCCs might have better effectiveness and safety profiles compared with others. Third, not all included studies had strict inclusion or exclusion criteria of their study population, leading to a heterogeneous study population. Furthermore, we only included articles published in English, which might lead to language bias. Of interest, our search also yielded multiple studies, including a randomized controlled trial,⁴⁰ that used a point-of-care coagulation testing-based protocol in which both PCC and fibrinogen concentrate as were administered as an adjunct to FFP in comparison to a FFP-based protocol.^{15,40-43} Unfortunately, these studies were not included because outcome data from patients receiving PCC could not be separated from those not receiving PCC. Innerhofer et al found that patients receiving PCC and fibrinogen had a decreased need for massive transfusion and rescue therapy when compared with the FFP group.⁴⁰ Schöchl et al and Nienaber et al also showed reduced exposure of trauma patients to blood products in the PCC/fibrinogen group when compared with the FFP group.^{41,43} Görlinger et al also showed reduced blood product utilization after implementing the PCC/fibrinogen based protocol

2465

2466 | it

in cardiac surgery patients.^{44,45} Inclusion of these studies probably would have strengthened the suggestion that a PCC and/or fibrinogen-based approach may be a reasonable strategy to treat bleeding patients.

5 | CONCLUSION

PCC administration in bleeding patients not using anticoagulants had no effect on mortality in the whole cohort of patients. However, in trauma patients, a resuscitation strategy using both PCC and FFP transfusion was associated with reduced mortality when compared to a resuscitation strategy involving solely FFP. Also, PCC reduced the need for RBC transfusions when compared with treatment strategies not involving PCC. In bleeding cardiac surgery patients, PCC administration reduced perioperative blood loss. Risk of TE events was not increased. However, results are subject to considerable heterogeneity and should be interpreted with caution. These data, derived from observational studies, can be used to design trials to further explore the effectivity of PCC in different clinical scenarios of bleeding.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Not applicable.

CONFLICT OF INTEREST None.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Daan P. van den Brink contributed substantially to the conception, design, acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of data for the work; and drafted and revised the work. Mathijs R Wirtz contributed substantially to the acquisition, analysis, interpretation of data, and revising the intellectual content. A. Serpa Neto made substantial contributions to the interpretation of data and revising the intellectual content. Herbert Schöchl made substantial contributions to the interpretation of data and revislectual content. Victor Viersen made substantial contributions to the interpretation of data and revising the intellectual content. Victor Viersen made substantial contributions to the interpretation of data and revising the intellectual content. J Binnekade made substantial contributions to the statistical analyses of the data for the work. Nicole P. Juffermans contributed substantially to the conception, design, acquisition, analysis, and interpretation of data for the work; and drafted and revised the work.

ORCID

Mathijs R. Wirtz D https://orcid.org/0000-0002-1923-083X

REFERENCES

- MacLeod JB, Lynn M, McKenney MG, Cohn SM, Murtha M. Early coagulopathy predicts mortality in trauma. J Trauma. 2003;55:39-44.
- Brohi K, Singh J, Heron M, Coats T. Acute traumatic coagulopathy. J Trauma. 2003;54:1127-1130.

- Maegele M, Lefering R, Yucel N, et al. Early coagulopathy in multiple injury: an analysis from the German trauma registry on 8724 patients. *Injury*. 2007;38:298-304.
- 4. Bassin L, Stone M, Krol M, Reich DL. Risk factors for intraoperative coagulopathy in cardiac surgery. *Heart Lung Circ.* 2010;19:506.
- Singh SA, Vivekananthan P, Sharma A, Sharma S, Bharathy KG. Retrospective analysis of post-operative coagulopathy after major hepatic resection at a tertiary care centre in Northern India. *Indian J Anaesth.* 2017;61:575-580.
- 6. Holcomb JB, Tilley BC, Baraniuk S, et al. Transfusion of plasma, platelets, and red blood cells in a 1:1:1 vs a 1:1:2 ratio and mortality in patients with severe trauma: the PROPPR randomized clinical trial. *JAMA*. 2015;313:471-482.
- 7. Rossaint R, Bouillon B, Cerny V, et al. The European guideline on management of major bleeding and coagulopathy following trauma: fourth edition. *Crit Care*. 2016;20(1).
- 8. Lisman T, Porte RJ. Pathogenesis, prevention, and management of bleeding and thrombosis in patients with liver diseases. *Res Pract Thromb Haemost*. 2017;1:150-161.
- 9. Pagano D, Milojevic M, Meesters MI, et al. 2017 EACTS/EACTA guidelines on patient blood management for adult cardiac surgery. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* 2018;53:79-111.
- Desborough M, Sandu R, Brunskill SJ, et al. Fresh frozen plasma for cardiovascular surgery. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev.* 2015;10:Cd007614.
- 11. Khan S, Davenport R, Raza I, et al. Damage control resuscitation using blood component therapy in standard doses has a limited effect on coagulopathy during trauma hemorrhage. *Intensive Care Med*. 2015;41:239-247.
- Balvers K, van Dieren S, Baksaas-Aasen K, et al. Combined effect of therapeutic strategies for bleeding injury on early survival, transfusion needs and correction of coagulopathy. *Br J Surg.* 2017;104:222-229.
- Tornkvist M, Smith JG, Labaf A. Current evidence of oral anticoagulant reversal: a systematic review. *Thromb Res.* 2018;162: 22-31.
- Tang M, Fenger-Eriksen C, Wierup P, et al. Rational and timely haemostatic interventions following cardiac surgery - coagulation factor concentrates or blood bank products. *Thromb Res.* 2017;154:73-79.
- 15. Schochl H, Nienaber U, Hofer G, et al. Goal-directed coagulation management of major trauma patients using thromboelastometry (ROTEM)-guided administration of fibrinogen concentrate and pro-thrombin complex concentrate. *Crit Care*. 2010;14:R55.
- Franchini M, Lippi G. Prothrombin complex concentrates: an update. *Blood Transfus*. 2010;8:149-154.
- 17. Li G, Rachmale S, Kojicic M, et al. Incidence and transfusion risk factors for transfusion-associated circulatory overload among medical intensive care unit patients. *Transfusion*. 2011;51:338-343.
- Pandey S, Vyas GN. Adverse effects of plasma transfusion. Transfusion. 2012;52(Suppl 1):65s-79s.
- Hanke AA, Joch C, Gorlinger K. Long-term safety and efficacy of a pasteurized nanofiltrated prothrombin complex concentrate (Beriplex P/N): a pharmacovigilance study. Br J Anaesth. 2013;110:764-772.
- 20. Moher D, Liberati A, Tetzlaff J, Altman DG. Preferred reporting items for systematic reviews and meta-analyses: the PRISMA statement. *PLoS Med.* 2009;6:e1000097.
- 21. Zeng X, Zhang Y, Kwong JS, et al. The methodological quality assessment tools for preclinical and clinical studies, systematic review and meta-analysis, and clinical practice guideline: a systematic review. *J Evid Based Med.* 2015;8:2-10.
- 22. Luo D, Wan X, Liu J, Tong T. Optimally estimating the sample mean from the sample size, median, mid-range, and/or mid-quartile range. *Stat Methods Med Res.* 2018;27:1785-1805.

- 23. Cappabianca G, Mariscalco G, Biancari F, et al. Safety and efficacy of prothrombin complex concentrate as first-line treatment in bleeding after cardiac surgery. *Crit Care.* 2016;20:5.
- 24. Biancari F, Ruggieri VG, Perrotti A, et al. Comparative analysis of prothrombin complex concentrate and fresh frozen plasma in coronary surgery. *Heart Lung Circ*. 2019;28:1881-1887.
- Bradford CD, Stahovich MJ, Dembitsky WP, Adamson RM, Engelbert JJ, Perreiter AS. Safety of prothombin complex concentrate to control excess bleeding during continuous flow LVAD insertion. ASAIO J. 1992;2015(61):509-513.
- Colavecchia AC, Cohen DA, Harris JE, et al. Impact of intraoperative factor concentrates on blood product transfusions during orthotopic liver transplantation. *Transfusion*. 2017;57:3026-3034.
- DeLoughery E, Avery B, DeLoughery TG. Retrospective study of rFVIIa, 4-factor PCC, and a rFVIIa and 3-factor PCC combination in improving bleeding outcomes in the warfarin and non-warfarin patient. Am J Hematol. 2016;91:705-708.
- Fitzgerald J, Lenihan M, Callum J, et al. Use of prothrombin complex concentrate for management of coagulopathy after cardiac surgery: a propensity score matched comparison to plasma. *Br J Anaesth.* 2018;120:928-934.
- 29. Harper PC, Smith MM, Brinkman NJ, et al. Outcomes following three-factor inactive prothrombin complex concentrate versus recombinant activated factor VII administration during cardiac surgery. J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth. 2018;32:151-157.
- Harris JE, Varnado S, Herrera E, Salazar E, Colavecchia AC. Evaluation of postoperative clinical outcomes in Jehovah's Witness patients who receive prothrombin complex concentrate during cardiac surgery. J Card Surg. 2020;35(4):801-809.
- Jehan F, Aziz H, O'Keeffe T, et al. The role of four-factor prothrombin complex concentrate in coagulopathy of trauma: a propensity matched analysis. J Trauma Acute Care Surg. 2018;85:18-24.
- Joseph B, Aziz H, Pandit V, et al. Prothrombin complex concentrate versus fresh-frozen plasma for reversal of coagulopathy of trauma: is there a difference? World J Surg. 2014;38:1875-1881.
- Joseph B, Khalil M, Harrison C, et al. Assessing the efficacy of prothrombin complex concentrate in multiply injured patients with high-energy pelvic and extremity fractures. J Orthop Trauma. 2016;30:653-658.
- Kirchner C, Dirkmann D, Treckmann JW, et al. Coagulation management with factor concentrates in liver transplantation: a single-center experience. *Transfusion*. 2014;54:2760-2768.
- Mehringer SL, Klick Z, Bain J, et al. Activated factor 7 versus 4-factor prothrombin complex concentrate for critical bleeding post-cardiac surgery. Ann Pharmacother. 2018;52:533-537.
- Ortmann E, Besser MW, Sharples LD, et al. An exploratory cohort study comparing prothrombin complex concentrate and fresh frozen plasma for the treatment of coagulopathy after complex cardiac surgery. Anest Analg. 2015;121:26-33.

- Tanaka KA, Mazzeffi MA, Grube M, Ogawa S, Chen EP. Threefactor prothrombin complex concentrate and hemostasis after high-risk cardiovascular surgery. *Transfusion*. 2013;53:920-921.
- Zeeshan M, Hamidi M, Feinstein AJ, et al. Four-factor prothrombin complex concentrate is associated with improved survival in trauma-related hemorrhage: a nationwide propensity-matched analysis. *J Trauma Acute Care Surg.* 2019;87:274-281.
- Zweng I, Galvin S, Robbins R, et al. Initial experience of the use of 3-factor prothrombin complex concentrate and thromboembolic complications after cardiac surgery. *Heart Lung Circ.* 2019;28:1706-1713.
- 40. Innerhofer P, Fries D, Mittermayr M, et al. Reversal of trauma-induced coagulopathy using first-line coagulation factor concentrates or fresh frozen plasma (RETIC): a single-centre, parallel-group, open-label, randomised trial. *Lancet Haematol*. 2017;4:e258-e271.
- 41. Schochl H, Forster L, Woidke R, Solomon C, Voelckel W. Use of rotation thromboelastometry (ROTEM) to achieve successful treatment of polytrauma with fibrinogen concentrate and prothrombin complex concentrate. *Anaesthesia*. 2010;65:199-203.
- 42. Innerhofer P, Westermann I, Tauber H, et al. The exclusive use of coagulation factor concentrates enables reversal of coagulopathy and decreases transfusion rates in patients with major blunt trauma. *Injury*. 2013;44:209-216.
- 43. Nienaber U, Innerhofer P, Westermann I, et al. The impact of fresh frozen plasma vs coagulation factor concentrates on morbidity and mortality in trauma-associated haemorrhage and massive transfusion. *Injury*. 2011;42:697-701.
- 44. Weber CF, Gorlinger K, Meininger D, et al. Point-of-care testing: a prospective, randomized clinical trial of efficacy in coagulopathic cardiac surgery patients. *Anesthesiology*. 2012;117:531-547.
- 45. Gorlinger K, Dirkmann D, Hanke AA, et al. First-line therapy with coagulation factor concentrates combined with point-of-care coagulation testing is associated with decreased allogeneic blood transfusion in cardiovascular surgery: a retrospective, single-center cohort study. *Anesthesiology*. 2011;115:1179-1191.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section.

How to cite this article: van den Brink DP, Wirtz MR, Neto AS, et al. Effectiveness of prothrombin complex concentrate for the treatment of bleeding: A systematic review and metaanalysis. *J Thromb Haemost*. 2020;18:2457–2467. <u>https://doi.</u> org/10.1111/jth.14991