Table 1 Patient and transfusion demographics

	Patient characteristics (n = 1400)	Transfusion characteristics (n = 7437)
Gender (n, %)		
Male	858 (61·3%)	4354 (58·5%)
Female	542 (38·7%)	3082 (41·4%)
Unknown		1 (< 0·1%)
Age (years)		
Mean ± SD	60·0 ± 17·8	
Median	63	
(minimum–maximum)	(<1–96)	
Location of transfusion		
Intensive care unit		1145 (15·4%)
Outpatient		382 (5·1%)
Regular ward		5908 (79·4%)
Unknown		2 (< 0·1%)
Haematology–oncology patients	748 (53·4%)	5463 (73·5%)
Conventional chemotherapy	627 (44·8%)	4481 (60·3%)
Stem cell transplant	121 (8·6%)	982 (13·2%)
Surgery patients	241 (17·2%)	480 (6·5%)
Cardiovascular surgery	209 (14·9%)	349 (4·7%)
Solid organ transplantation	32 (2·3%)	131 (1·8%)
Other diagnoses	397 (28·4%)	859 (11·6%)
Missing diagnosis	14 (1·0%)	635 (8·5%)
History of a previous transfusion		
Yes	837 (59·8%)	5029 (67·6%)
No	398 (28·4%)	1927 (25·9%)
Unknown	165 (11·8%)	481 (6·5%)
If 'Yes' – did they experience a transfusion-related adverse event?[a]		
Yes	53 (6·3%)	382 (7·6%)
No	779 (93·0%)	4639 (92·2%)
Unknown	5 (0·6%)	8 (0·2%)

[a]For per-patient basis, the denominator is 837; for per-transfusion basis, the denominator is 5029.

were undergoing cardiovascular surgery or solid organ transplantation. Other diagnoses included haematology–oncology diseases not treated by chemotherapy and/or stem cell transplantation and surgery other than cardiovascular surgery and solid organ transplantation.

Of all patients, 837 patients (59·8%) had already received another blood product before the first PCT-PLT transfusion (Table 1). Among these patients, 53 patients (6·3% of 837) had a history of a transfusion reaction of some type in the past.

Platelet component demographics

Most of the PCT-PLT units were manufactured from apheresis platforms (4822, 64·8% vs. 2615, 35·2% for buffy-coat products). The majority of the PCT-PLTs (7357, 98·9%) were not treated with γ-irradiation [9]. Among the 7437 PCT-PLTs transfused, only 2·5% (189 units) of platelet units were human leucocyte antigen-matched products.

A large proportion of the PCT-PLT components (5908, 79·4%) were transfused in non-intensive care hospital wards (Table 1). Intensive care units and day-hospital units were the location for 15·4 and 5·1% of the PCT-PLT transfusions (1145 and 382 units, respectively). While most of the PCT-PLT components (5463, 73·5%) were administered to haematology–oncology patients, only 480 PCT-PLT components (6·5%) were administered to surgery patients.

The majority of the PCT-PLT components (5029, 67·6%) were administered to patients who had already received another blood component before the first PCT-PLT transfusion (Table 1). Among these transfusions, 382 (7·6% of 5029) PCT-PLT components were transfused to patients reported to have experienced at least one transfusion reaction in the past.

Number of transfusions per patient

The range of PCT-PLT transfusions per patient was 1 to 129, with an average of 5·3 ± 10·8 (median: 2) transfusions per patient. Of the 1400 patients who received PCT-PLT transfusions, 529 patients (37·8%) received only one PCT-PLT transfusion during this study period, 418 patients (29·9%) received two to three transfusions, and 453 patients (32·4%) received more than four PCT-PLT transfusions during the study. The majority of patients who received multiple transfusions had a primary diagnosis of haematology–oncology diseases treated by chemotherapy and/or stem cell transplantation.

Two patients from CTS UCL Mont Godinne received more than 100 transfusions analysed in this haemovigilance plan. One 56-year-old man (J01-636) who was treated by conventional chemotherapy for haematology–oncology disease received 129 PCT-PLT components within an 8-month period (from April 2006 to November 2006). One 72-year-old woman (J01-071) who was also treated by conventional chemotherapy for haematology–oncology disease received 107 PCT-PLT components within a 10-month period (from August 2005 to November 2006).

Adverse events following PCT-PLT transfusion

On a per-transfusion basis, 68 (0·9% of 7437 transfusions, 95% CI: 0·7–1·2%) transfusions were associated with an AE (Table 2). Of which, 55 (0·7% of 7437 transfusions, 95% CI: 0·6–1·0%) were classified as ATR possibly related, probably related, or related to PCT-PLT transfusion. Only five events were classified as serious AEs (0·07%, 95% CI: 0·0–0·2%), and were judged as probably unrelated to the PCT-PLT transfusion based on the observation of alternative causes for symptoms and no evidence of causal relationship to the platelet transfusion. No cases of transfusion-related acute lung injury and no deaths due to PCT-PLT transfusions were reported.

Table 2 Clinical characteristics of adverse events (AE)

	On a per-transfusion basis n (% = $n \times 100/7437$)				On a per-patient basis n (% = $n \times 100/1400$)			
	Any AEs	AE attributed to platelets (ATR)[b]	SAE[a]	SAE attributed to platelets[a,b]	Any AEs	AE attributed to platelets (ATR)[b]	SAEs[a]	SAE attributed to platelets[a,b]
Number with at least one event	68 (0·9%)	55 (0·7%)	5 (< 0·1%)	0 (0·0%)	45 (3·2%)	39 (2·8%)	4 (0·3%)	0 (0·0%)
Signs/Symptoms[c]								
Fever	8 (0·1%)	6 (< 0·1%)	0 (0%)	–	7 (0·5%)	5 (0·4%)	0 (0%)	–
Chills	45 (0·6%)	40 (0·5%)	2 (< 0·1%)	–	31 (2·2%)	28 (2·0%)	1 (< 0·1%)	–
Itching	2 (< 0·1%)	2 (< 0·1%)	0 (0%)	–	1 (< 0·1%)	1 (< 0·1%)	0 (0%)	–
Hypotension	1 (< 0·1%)	0 (0%)	1 (< 0·1%)	–	1 (< 0·1%)	0 (0%)	1 (< 0·1%)	–
Urticaria	14 (0·2%)	14 (0·2%)	0 (0%)	–	13 (0·9%)	13 (0·9%)	0 (0%)	–
Skin rash	5 (< 0·1%)	5 (< 0·1%)	0 (0%)	–	4 (0·3%)	4 (0·3%)	0 (0%)	–
Dyspnoea	8 (0·1%)	6 (< 0·1%)	1 (< 0·1%)	–	8 (0·6%)	6 (0·4%)	1 (< 0·1%)	–
Respiratory distress	1 (< 0·1%)	0 (0%)	1 (< 0·1%)	–	1 (< 0·1%)	0 (0%)	1 (< 0·1%)	–
Nausea/vomiting	8 (0·1%)	5 (< 0·1%)	3 (< 0·1%)	–	5 (0·4%)	3 (0·2%)	2 (0·1%)	–
Lower back pain	6 (< 0·1%)	1 (< 0·1%)	0 (0%)	–	2 (0·1%)	1 (< 0·1%)	0 (0%)	–
Chest/abdominal pain	1 (< 0·1%)	1 (< 0·1%)	0 (0%)	–	1 (< 0·1%)	1 (< 0·1%)	0 (0%)	–
Shock	4 (< 0·1%)	0 (0%)	4 (< 0·1%)	–	3 (0·2%)	0 (0%)	3 (0·2%)	–
Tachycardia	4 (< 0·1%)	3 (< 0·1%)	1 (< 0·1%)	–	3 (0·2%)	2 (0·1%)	1 (< 0·1%)	–
Other	14 (0·2%)	11 (0·1%)	3 (< 0·1%)	–	12 (0·9%)	10 (0·7%)	3 (0·2%)	–

[a]Serious adverse event (SAE): long-term life threatening, immediate life threatening or death.

[b]Causal relationship that was possibly related, probably related, or related to PCT-PLT transfusion.

[c]Number of signs/symptoms can exceed number of AE due to multiple observed signs/symptoms per AE.

On a per-patient basis, 45 patients (3·2% of 1400 patients) who received at least one transfusion of PCT-PLT experienced the 68 AEs following PCT-PLT transfusions (Table 2). Only 39 patients (2·8% of 1400 patients) experienced the 55 ATRs attributed to the PCT-PLT transfusion. Four patients experienced serious AEs following transfusion; however, no causal relationship to PCT-PLT transfusion could be established.

All AEs regardless of the relationship with the PCT-PLT transfusion occurred within 4 h after the start of the platelet transfusion (mean time: 0·3 ± 0·51 h, 0–3·3 h). The majority of AEs (64, or 94·1% of 68 AEs) occurred in patients who were not premedicated. The other four AEs occurred in patients who were premedicated with antipyretic or antihistaminic drugs, or corticosteroids.

Characteristics of clinical signs and symptoms associated with adverse event

On a per-transfusion basis, the most frequently observed symptoms/signs (≥ 0·1% of the total 7437 transfusions) were fever, chills, urticaria, dyspnoea, nausea and/or vomiting (Table 2). The individual incidence of each of the following signs/symptoms was < 0·1%: itching, hypotension, skin rash, respiratory distress, lower back pain, chest or abdominal pain, shock and tachycardia. All additional symptoms included in the category of other, such as refractoriness to platelet transfusion, hypertension, cephalea, pain in the leg, flush, malaise, cyanosis, oxygen desaturation and volume overload were also reported but with an individual incidence of less than 0·1%. Most of ATRs were described principally as Grade 1 chills and urticaria (Table 2).

On a per-patient basis, the most frequently observed symptoms/signs (≥ 0·5% of the total 1400 patients) were fever, chills, urticaria and dyspnoea (Table 2). Approximately 0·1–0·4% of the population (from 2 to 5/1400) experienced the following signs/symptoms: skin rash, nausea/vomiting, shock, lower back pain and tachycardia. Clinical refractoriness to transfusion, hypertension, headache and flushing were additional symptoms reported in the category of 'other'. Less than 0·1% of the study population (only 1/1400) experienced the following signs/symptoms such as hypotension, itching, respiratory distress and chest/abdominal pain. Symptoms such as pulse increase, leg pain, cyanosis, oxygen desaturation, malaise and/or volume overload were also reported in the category of 'other'. Most of the ATRs consisted of various combinations of fever (0·4%), chills (2·0%), urticaria (0·9%), skin rash (0·3%), dyspnoea (0·4%), nausea/vomiting (0·2%), tachycardia (0·1%) and others symptoms (0·7%) (Table 2).

Serious adverse events following platelet transfusion

During the course of this surveillance, five serious AEs were reported following transfusion of PCT-PLT (0·07%, 95% CI: 0·0–0·2). These serious AEs were assessed by the investigators as being 'unrelated or probably unrelated' to the PCT-PLT transfusions and were attributed to progression of underlying illness.

Patient B01-201 was admitted to hospital for a presumed pulmonary infection postchemotherapy. Additional co-morbidities at the time of admission were septic shock, acute renal insufficiency, neutropenia and thrombocytopenia. Intravenous (i.v.) antibiotic therapy was initiated and multiple transfusions of blood products (including PCT-PLT) were administered. One hour after administration of the second platelet unit, the patient complained of dyspnoea, respiratory distress was found to be hypotensive and tachycardic. Severe volume overload was determined to be the aetiology and treatment with oxygen, diuretics, and dialysis was initiated. The event was assessed by the investigator to be unrelated to the PCT-PLT transfusion.

Patient J01-382 experienced chills, nausea and sudden hypotension during transfusion with PCT-PLT. Prior to this, the patient had received at least four PCT-PLT transfusions with no AE. The transfusion was stopped and the patient was treated with i.v. fluids and recovered. Four days later, the patient experienced a second hypotensive episode after transfusion, which was spontaneously resolved. Subsequent to this, the patient received 19 additional PCT-PLT transfusions without any clinical sequelae. This patient did not receive any angiotensin-converting enzyme (ACE) inhibitors. Based on the patient's history and the lack of transfusion reaction with the subsequent transfusions, the investigator assessed both of these events as probably unrelated to PCT-PLT transfusion.

Patient J01-516 was admitted for ischaemic cardiomyopathy and underwent double vessel coronary artery bypass graft (CABG). The patient's postoperative recovery was complicated by a significant decrease in blood pressure, which occurred 10 min after start of transfusion of PCT-PLT. Despite vasopressor support and a 6-min period of circulatory arrest, the patient's condition continued to deteriorate and he died. Cause of death was attributed to an aortic dissection with major disseminated intravascular coagulopathy and mesenteric infarct and was assessed by the investigator as unrelated to the PCT-PLT transfusion.

Patient J01-780 experienced a hypotensive episode, cyanosis, oxygen desaturation and nausea approximately 30 min after receipt of PCT-PLT. The patient received oxygen therapy to treat the event and recovered. The patient had received two units of PCT-PLT before and one unit after this event with no adverse reactions. The patient had a history of hypotensive episodes, which occurred in the absence of transfusions. Based on the patient's history, the event was assessed by the investigator as probably unrelated to the PCT-PLT transfusion.

Risk factors associated with adverse event

The risk for AE was not correlated with the patient gender, age, or antigen-matching. The risk for AE for patients who already had been transfused before the first PCT-PLT transfusion appeared trending higher compared to patients who did not have any transfusion history; however, the difference did not reach statistical significance ($P = 0·0675$; odds ratio: 1·875; 95% CI: 0·956–3·648). Buffy-coat-derived platelets were associated with a lower risk for AE compared to apheresis products ($P = 0·0305$; odds ratio: 0·473; 95% CI: 0·240–0·932). Irradiated PCT-PLTs were of similar risk for AE compared to non-irradiated PCT-PLTs ($P = 0·0848$; odds ratio: 6·344; 95% CI: 0·776–51·862). No trending can be concluded because, of the total 7437 platelet transfusions, only 80 PCT-PLT components were γ-irradiated in EFS-Bretagne and EFS-Auvergne-Loire. Haematology-oncology patients treated with conventional chemotherapy were at a higher risk for AE compared to the other patients ($P \leq 0·0001$; odds ratio: 7·660; 95% CI: 3·014–19·467).

Number of transfusions prior to the first adverse event

Among the 45 patients who experienced at least one AE, repeated exposure to PCT-PLT did not appear to increase the likelihood of a transfusion reaction (Table 3). By using the non-survival analysis method (a subset analysis for patients with any AE only), the mean number of transfusions before first AE occurrence was 8·8 ± 10·1 (median = 4, minimum = 0 and maximum = 37).

Discussion

In accordance with the recommendations made by the panel of the Canadian Consensus Conference, an active haemovigilance programme has been implemented in Europe to document the occurrence of AE following transfusion of PCT-PLT [6]. To date, two reports have been prepared. The first report was on the transfusion of 5106 PCT-PLT components administered to patients in five European centres from October 2003 to December 2005 [4]. The second report as described here was on additional 7437 transfusions of PCT-PLT administered to patients in seven European centres between May 2005 and January 2007. This represents a total of 12 543 independent transfusions documented to date. There are no overlaps of PCT-PLT transfusions reported in this haemovigilance programme.

Overall, the incidence of ATR attributed to transfusion of PCT-PLT in both of the haemovigilance reporting periods was infrequent either on a per-transfusion basis (0·8% first period

Table 3 Number of PCT-PLT transfusions per patient prior to the first adverse event (AE)

Number of PCT-PLT transfusions per patient until first occurrence of AE	Full analysis population (n = 1400)
1	11 (0·79%)
2	6 (0·43%)
3	3 (0·21%)
4	3 (0·21%)
5	1 (0·07%)
6–10	9 (0·64%)
11–19	6 (0·43%)
≥ 20	6 (0·43%)
N (non survival analysis method)	45
Mean ± SD	8·8 ± 10·1
Median	4
Minimum–maximum	0–37

vs. 0·7% second period) or on a per-patient basis (4·9% first period vs. 2·8% second period). The slightly higher occurrence of ATR per patient in the first reporting period was not surprising, because the mean number of transfusions per patient (7·8 ± 16·2) [4] was greater than those observed in the second period (5·3 ± 10·8). All ATRs were mild in severity and of Grade 1 or lower. No serious AE from both study periods were attributed specifically to transfusion of PCT-PLT.

On a per-transfusion basis, the prevalence of ATR has been reported in the literature to range from 18 to 31%; however, these studies were conducted some years ago with variable methods of platelet preparation [10–13]. More recently, the incidence of moderate and severe ATR has been reported from the trial to reduce alloimmunization to platelets (TRAP) study, which examined 8769 platelet transfusions in 598 patients during induction therapy for acute leukaemia [14]. In the TRAP study, platelet components were prepared by four methods: unfiltered pooled whole blood-derived platelets in plasma; filtered pooled whole blood-derived platelets in plasma; unfiltered pooled whole blood-derived platelets in plasma treated with ultraviolet B illumination to reduce human leucocyte antigen sensitization; and filtered apheresis platelets in plasma. None of these components were prepared with additive solutions. The overall incidence of ATR was 2·2% of transfusions, and 22% of patients experienced at least one ATR. In comparison to the TRAP trial, the current study in which all grades of reactions were reported, both the proportion of transfusions associated with a reaction was lower (0·7%) as well as the proportion of patients (2·8%) experiencing at least one ATR. The use of 65% InterSol, a platelet additive solution, in the preparation of PCT-PLT may partially contribute to the reduction in the observed incidence of ATR [15].

The incidence of ATR in this study can be compared to data from the haemovigilance network in France [7]. In France, data were reported for transfusion reactions, with an incidence of four events per 1000 platelet components (0·4%), during 2 years in which the reporting system was first implemented. However, this may be an underestimate since each whole blood platelet concentrate in a pool was tabulated as an individual component transfusion. More recently, Kerkhoffs *et al.* [16] compared the incidence of transfusion reactions for leucoreduced pooled platelet components in plasma and plasma with additive solution in a study of 168 patients and 765 transfusions. They observed an incidence of 5·5% of transfusions with reactions for platelets in plasma vs. 2·4% of transfusions for platelets in a mixture of plasma and additive solution. On a per-patient basis, 9·5% of patients transfused with platelets in plasma plus additive solutions had reactions compared to 15·5% of patients supported with platelets suspended in plasma. These results further support the role of the platelet additive solution, InterSol, in the reduction of ATR observed in this study.

During the conduct of this study, an interim analysis of 2497 PCT-PLT transfusions administered to 606 patients in the three regions of France (EFS-Alsace, EFS-Auvergne-Loire and EFS-Bretagne) was performed [5]. Of the 606 patients, the predominant recipients of PCT-PLT were haematology–oncology patients (46·2%); 39·9% treated with chemotherapy and 6·3% treated with stem cell transplantation. These proportions were only slightly lower than those in the overall study population of 1400 patients, yet only four of the 606 patients (0·7%) reported an AE, including one serious AE of volume overload classified as unrelated to PCT-PLT transfusion. This low rate of AE observed in the French regions could contribute to the overall low incidence of ATR per patient in this study.

Premedication in patients did not play a role in the overall low incidence of ATR reported in this study. Information on premedication was only requested in case of AE occurrence. Of the 68 transfusions with occurrence of at least one AE, only two antipyretic, two antihistaminic and one corticosteroid were prescribed to patients. For the majority (64/68, or 94·1%) of these transfusions, patients were not premedicated.

The active haemovigilance programme described here is a prospective observational study, which was designed to assess the safety profile of PCT-PLT in routine clinical practice. The data from this programme represent the largest prospective experience to date for recording potential AE associated with platelet transfusions compared to prior studies of retrospective design and limited in size [10,16–18]. The present study was designed to be consistent with European haemovigilance practices in which reporting of all grades of transfusion-associated reactions has been emphasized [7,8]. In contrast to other haemovigilance studies, obligatory reporting for all platelet transfusions was required irrespective of whether or not an AE was observed. The current study focused on AE that could be linked to PCT-PLT transfusions after starting transfusion, but there were no specific limitations

on when adverse events could be reported following transfusion. Based on the patient population supported with platelet transfusion, the study was designed to capture repeated transfusions of PCT-PLT within patients to determine potential effects of repeated exposure to this new type of platelet component.

A limitation of the present study is the absence of a concurrent control group receiving conventional platelet components with which to determine a comparative baseline incidence of ATR. However, because reporting is obligatory, the expected outcomes of this active haemovigilance study are the increase in clinical experience with transfusion of PCT-PLT, the detection of unexpected AE following PCT-PLT transfusions in patient populations and for indications that were not studied previously in a formal clinical trial environment, and the establishment of a safety database for future reference.

In the current study, which was specifically designed to capture all grades of transfusion reactions, the prevalence of ATR per transfusion, was at the lower range of those reported in studies with conventional components. Prior exposure to PCT-PLT transfusions did not increase the likelihood of an ATR. The overall incidence of ATR was lower than that previously reported either on a per-transfusion or on a per-patient basis. Based on experience in a broad patient population, platelet components prepared with amotosalen photochemical treatment were well-tolerated in routine clinical practice.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank the following individuals of Fenwal, formerly Baxter R&D Europe, who assisted in the implementation of the INTERCEPT Blood System at the blood centres, provided critical input into the scope and design of the haemovigilance programme, and training of site personnel on data entering: Jocelyne Flament, Jean-Marc Payrat, Nick Moerman, Valentine Franck, and Veronique Mayaudon. Quintiles provided data management and statistics service for this haemovigilance programme. This study was supported in part by Cerus Corporation. Three authors (D. Sundin, L. Lin and L. Corash) were affiliated with and held stock or stock options of Cerus Corporation during the conduct of this study. Three authors (J. C. Osselaer, J. P. Cazenave and O. Garraud) served on Cerus's European Scientific Advisory Board.

References

1 van Rhenen DJ, Gulliksson H, Cazenave JP, Pamphilon D, Ljungman P, Klüter H, Vermeij H, Kappers-Klunne M, de Greef G, Laforet M, Lioure B, Davis K, Marblie S, Mayaudon V, Flament J, Conlan M, Lin L, Metzel P, Buchholz D, Corash L: Transfusion of pooled buffy coat platelet components prepared with photochemical pathogen inactivation treatment: the euroSPRITE trial. *Blood* 2003; 101:2426–2433

2 McCullough J, Vesole DH, Benjamin RJ, Slichter SJ, Pineda A, Snyder E, Stadtmauer E, Lopez-Plaza I, Coutre S, Strauss RG, Goodnough LT, Fridey JL, Raife T, Cable R, Murphy S, Howard F, Davis K, Lin J-S, Metzel P, Corash L, Koutsoukos A, Lin L, Buchholz D, Conlan M: Therapeutic efficacy and safety of platelets treated with a photochemical process for pathogen inactivation: the SPRINT trial. *Blood* 2004; 104:1534–1541

3 Janetzko K, Cazenave JP, Kluter H, Kientz D, Michel M, Beris P, Lioure B, Hastka J, Marblie S, Mayaudon V, Lin L, Lin J-S, Conlan MG, Flament J: Therapeutic efficacy and safety of photochemically treated apheresis platelets processed with an optimized integrated set. *Transfusion* 2005; 45:1443–1452

4 Osselaer J, Messe N, Hervig T, Bueno JL, Castro E, Espinosa A, Lacone A, Junge K, Jacquet M, Flament J, Corash L: A prospective observational cohort safety study of 5106 platelet transfusions prepared with photochemical treatment. *Transfusion* 2008: doi: 10.1111/j.1537-2995.2008.01643.x

5 Garraud O, Fabrigli P, Tardivel R, Gouezec H, Waller C, Mendel I, Raidot JP, Kandel G, Isola H, Cazenave JP: Hemovigilance for transfusion of INTERCEPTTM platelets in routine therapeutic use: experience in Etablissement Francais du Sang (EFS) blood centers. *Vox Sang* 2007; 93(S1):32

6 Klein HG, Anderson D, Bernardi MJ, Cable R, Carey W, Hoch JS, Robitaille N, Sivilotti MLA, Smaill F: Pathogen inactivation: making decisions about new technologies. Report of a consensus conference. *Transfusion* 2007; 47:2338–2347

7 Andreu G, Morel P, Forestier F, Debeir J, Rebibo D, Janvier G, Hervé P: Hemovigilance network in France: organization and analysis of immediate transfusion incident reports from 1994–1998. *Transfusion* 2002; 42:1356–1364

8 Faber JC: Haemovigilance in Europe: now and tomorrow; in Rouger P, Hossenlopp C (eds): *Blood Transfusion in Europe*. Paris, Elsevier SAS, 2005:213–232

9 Corash L, Lin L: Novel processes for inactivation of leukocytes to prevent transfusion-associated graft-versus-host disease. *Bone Marrow Transplant* 2004; 33:1–7

10 Chambers LA, Kruskall MS, Pacini DG, Donovan LM: Febrile reactions after platelet transfusion: the effect of single versus multiple donors. *Transfusion* 1990; 30:219–221

11 Heddle NM, Kalma L, Singer J, Richards C, Fedak P, Walker I, Kelton JG: The role of the plasma from platelet concentrates in transfusion reactions. *N Engl J Med* 1994; 331:625–628

12 Mangano MM, Chambers LA, Kruskall MS: Limited efficacy of leukopoor platelets for prevention of febrile transfusion reactions. *Am J Clin Pathol* 1991; 95:733–738

13 Heddle NM, Klama LN, Griffith L, Roberts R, Shukla G, Kelton JG: A prospective study to identify the risk factors associated with acute reactions to platelet and red cell transfusions. *Transfusion* 1993; 33:794–797

14 Enright H: Factors influencing moderate to severe reactions to PLT transfusions: experience of the TRAP multicenter clinical trial. *Transfusion* 2003; 43:1545–1552

15 Isola H, Kientz D, Wiesel ML, Laforet M, Ohlmann P, Waller C, Mendel I, Raidot JP, Kandel G, Cazenave JP: Implementation of photochemical inactivation (INTERCEPT Blood System for platelets) in a regional blood center. *Vox Sang* 2007; 93(S1):165

16 Kerkhoffs JH, Eikenboom JC, Schipperus MS, van Wordragen-Vlaswinkel RJ, Brand R, Harvey MS, de Vries RR, Barge R, van Rhenen DJ, Brand A: A muticenter randomized study of the efficacy of transfusions with platelets stored in platelet additive solution II versus plasma. *Blood* 2006; 108:3210–3215

17 deWildt-Eggen J, Nauta S, Schrijver JG, van Marwijk Kooy M, Bins M, van Prooijen HC: Reactions and platelet increments after transfusion of platelet concentrates in plasma or an additive solution: a prospective, randomized study. *Transfusion* 2000; 40:398–403

18 Heddle NM, Blajchman MA, Meyer RM, Lipton JH, Walker IR, Sher GD, Constantini LA, Patterson B, Roberts RS, Thorpe KE, Levine MN: A randomized controlled trial comparing the frequency of acute reactions to plasma-removed platelets and prestorage WBC-reduced platelets. *Transfusion* 2002; 42:556–566

別紙様式第 2-1
番号 10

医薬品
医薬部外品　　研究報告　調査報告書
化粧品

識別番号・報告回数			報告日	第一報入手日 2008 年 5 月 22 日	新医薬品等の区分 該当なし	厚生労働省処理欄
一般的名称	人ハプトグロビン		研究報告の公表状況	WHO Representative Office in China /19 May 2008	公表国 中国	
販売名（企業名）	ハプトグロビン注－ヨシトミ(ベネシス)					

研究報告の概要

2008 年 3 月後半、阜陽市（安徽省）で一人の病院臨床医が、重篤な肺炎と症状の悪化が急に進む未就学児症例が連続して 3 例発症したことによって、危険性を察知した。4 月中旬までに、15 人の小児が同様の重篤な疾患で死亡した。現地および国の専門家によって行われた疫学、臨床、検査及び病理のエビデンスに基づき、その疾患はエンテロウイルス 71(EV71)が引き起こす手足口病(HFMD)であることが 4 月 23 日に確認された。回顧的な症例調査により、小児が手、足及び口に皮膚発疹と水泡を示し、同じエリアで同じ時期に大流行していることが明らかになった。

阜陽市では、3 月 1 日から 5 月 9 日の間に 6,049 例の HFMD が報告され、353 例が重篤、そして 22 例が死亡した(致死率 0.4%)。回顧的な症例所見により、3 月 1 日から 4 月 22 日の間に 302 例の発生が確認され、第 1 症例は早くも 3 月 10 日に発生したことが明らかになった。発症日を基にした患者数は、4 月初めに増加し始め、4 月 28 日にピークに達した。阜陽市で報告された HFMD 症例数は、5 月 5 日以後減少した。阜陽市で報告された 6,049 症例中、性比は 1.9：1 であった。年齢範囲は生後 28 日から 18 歳であり、3 歳以下が 78%をしめた。阜陽市の全ての地区/郡は、HFMD 症例を報告し、3 つの地区（Yingzhou、Yingdong と Yingquan）に半分以上の症例が集中した。疫学的な調査において、22 の致死症例の間に接触はみられなかったが、症例の家庭の環境的調査でこれらの家庭内の低い衛生状態が明らかになった。

2008 年 1 月 1 日から 5 月 9 日までの 61,459 の HFMD 症例と 36 例の死亡は、中国本土の疾患報告制度を通して報告された。5 月 2 日に届出が必要になった後、報告症例数は急激に増加し、ほとんどすべての行政区から報告された。最も多く症例を報告した行政区は、広東（11,374）、安徽（9,235）、浙江（6,134）、山東（4,566）と河南（3,230）であった。

非ポリオエンテロウイルスは、ありふれたウイルスで世界中に存在する。感染は多くの場合症状を示さず、気づかれないが、これらウイルスは、時折通常より多くの患者に臨床的症状が現れ、時々死亡を伴う。1997 年以降、アジア太平洋地域で EV71 HFMD の多くの大流行があった。中国では、大流行が、1998 年に台湾省(100,000 以上の症例、78 例の死亡)で、2007 年に山東省(38,606 症例、14 例の死亡)であった。

報告企業の意見	今後の対応
中国の阜陽市（安徽省）でエンテロウイルス 71 による手足口病が大流行し、中国全土でも手足口病が流行しているとの報告である。 本剤の原料血漿は国内献血血漿のみであり、中国からは輸入していない。 また、万一原料血漿にエンテロウイルスが混入したとしても、EMC 及び CPV をモデルウイルスとしたウイルスバリデーション試験成績から、製造工程において十分に不活化・除去されると考えている。	本報告は本剤の安全性に影響を与えないと考えるので、特段の措置はとらない。

使用上の注意記載状況・その他参考事項等

2. 重要な基本的注意

(1) 本剤の原材料となる献血者の血液については、HBs 抗原、抗 HCV 抗体、抗 HIV-1 抗体、抗 HIV-2 抗体、抗 HTLV-Ⅰ抗体陰性で、かつ ALT(GPT)値でスクリーニングを実施している。更に、プールした試験血漿については、HIV-1、HBV 及び HCV について核酸増幅検査(NAT)を実施し、適合した血漿を本剤の製造に使用しているが、当該 NAT の検出限界以下のウイルスが混入している可能性が常に存在する。本剤は、以上の検査に適合した血漿を原料として、Cohn の低温エタノール分画で得た画分から人ハプトグロビンを濃縮・精製した製剤であり、ウイルス不活化・除去を目的として、製造工程において 60℃、10 時間の液状加熱処理及びろ過膜処理(ナノフィルトレーション)を施しているが、投与に際しては、次の点に十分注意すること。