The effect of variation in donor platelet function on transfusion outcome: a semi-randomised controlled trial

Anne M Kelly PhD[1], Stephen F Garner MSc[1,2], Theodora Foukaneli FRCPath[2], Thomas R Godec MSc[3], Nina Herbert[1], Brennan C Kahan MSc[4], Alison Deary MSc[2], Lekha Bakrania BSc[2], Charlotte Llewelyn PhD[2], Willem H Ouwehand FmedSci[1,2], Lorna M Williamson MD[1,2], and Rebecca A Cardigan PhD[1,2].

[1]Department of Haematology, Cambridge Biomedical Campus, University of Cambridge, UK. [2]NHS Blood & Transplant, Cambridge, UK. [3]Medical Research Council Clinical Trials Unit at University College London, Institute of Clinical Trials & Methodology, London, UK. [4]Pragmatic Clinical Trials Unit, Queen Mary University of London, London, UK.

Address correspondence to:

Rebecca Cardigan PhD, FRCPath
Affiliated Lecturer, Department of Haematology, University of Cambridge.
National Head of Components Development, NHS Blood & Transplant, Long Road, Cambridge, CB2 OPT.

rebecca.cardigan@nhsbt.nhs.uk
Phone: +44 1223 588085
Fax: +44 1223 588911

Word count text 3809

Word count abstract 249

1 Figure and 3 Tables

25 References

Scientific category: Transfusion

Short title: Platelet function and outcome from transfusion

Key points:

There is a variation in platelet function between normal individuals and this function is consistent within the same individual over time.

The data from this study suggest that variation in donor platelet function does not affect the outcome of prophylactic transfusion.

Abstract

The effect of variation in platelet function in platelet donors on patient outcome following platelet transfusion is unknown. This trial assessed the hypothesis that platelets collected from donors with highly responsive platelets to agonists in vitro assessed by flow cytometry (high responder donors), are cleared more quickly from the circulation than those from low responder donors, resulting in lower platelet count increments following transfusion.

This parallel group, semi-randomised double-blinded trial was conducted in a single UK centre. Eligible patients were those 16 or older with thrombocytopenia secondary to bone marrow failure, requiring prophylactic platelet transfusion. Patients were randomly assigned to receive a platelet donation from a high or low responder donor when both were available, or when only one type of platelet was available patients received that. Participants, investigators and those assessing outcomes were masked to group assignment. The primary endpoint was the platelet count increment 10-90 minutes following transfusion. Analysis was by intention-to-treat.

Fifty one patients were assigned to receive platelets from low responder donors, and 49 from high responder donors (47 of which were randomised and 53 non-randomised). There was no significant difference in platelet count increment 10-90 minutes following transfusion in patients receiving platelets from high (mean 21.0 $x10^9$/L, 95% CI 4.9 to 37.2) or low (mean 23.3$x10^9$/L, 95% CI 7.8 to 38.9) responder donors (mean difference 2.3, 95%CI -1.1 to 5.7, p = 0.18).

These results support the current policy of not selecting platelet donors on the basis of platelet function for prophylactic platelet transfusion.

Keywords

Platelet, transfusion, platelet concentrate, platelet function, bleeding, count increment, randomised controlled trial

Introduction

Most platelets are transfused prophylactically, on the basis of platelet count, to reduce the risk of bleeding in patients who have developed thrombocytopenia as a result of treatment for haematological malignancies [1]. Blood Services ensure the safety and efficacy of platelets for transfusion through validation of new processes for their collection, production and storage, and compliance with regulatory standards. However, little attention has been paid to the effect of donor-related variation in the donated material on patient outcomes. This is particularly relevant to platelets collected by apheresis (derived from single donors), where platelet dysfunction in the donor will have a larger effect than those derived from a pool of four or more whole blood donations.

Unlike drugs, that can be produced to uniform potency, the composition of platelet concentrates for the prevention or treatment of bleeding varies, mainly due to natural variation in haematological traits between donors. Platelet function is highly variable between individuals, but for a given individual is highly consistent over time [2]. These observations together with those in twins [3], suggests that platelet function is to a large extent a heritable trait. Consequently, there is great interest in how such variation may relate to an individual's risk of thrombosis or bleeding and in tailoring of pharmacological interventions to reduce this risk. We have shown that inherent variation in platelet responsiveness to agonists assessed by flow cytometry is to a large extent genetically controlled, by employing methods that assess two well characterised but distinct platelet signalling pathways known to be important in platelet activation after atherosclerotic plaque rupture, and that provide information on both platelet receptor activation and degranulation [4]. We have identified 24 genes that show an association between platelet responsiveness and sequence variation and demonstrated that platelet responsiveness of a donor at the extremes of the distribution of responses (high or low) is reproducible over time [4,5] and that donors with highly responsive platelets are more likely to produce a unit of platelets containing a higher level of activated platelets [6].

Whether increased activation that occurs during storage of platelets reduces platelet survival once transfused is unclear. Data from animals models is mixed – some suggest that platelet activation is related to platelet clearance [7] whereas others suggest that this is not the case [8,9]. In humans, several studies have suggested that increased platelet activation in platelet concentrates might be associated with reduced survival following infusion to healthy subjects [10,11], whereas others have failed to observe such a relationship [12].

There is increasing evidence to suggest that phenotypic and proteomic changes that occur during the storage of red cells and platelets for transfusion may in part be determined by the genotype of the donor[13–15]. These observations and others have led to an increased international focus on the role of the donor in the quality of red cells and platelets for transfusion. Reduced costs and ease of genotyping now make large scale testing of donors a reality. It is therefore important to understand whether genetic variation in platelet function at the point of donation and/or on subsequent storage translates into clinically relevant outcomes for recipients of platelets. This is the first study in the literature to examine this question.

We conducted a trial in patients receiving platelets for prophylaxis to assess whether differences in platelet function in the donor population affect the clinical outcome from platelet transfusion. To maximise the likelihood of observing a difference between groups, we selected donors with platelet responsiveness at the

extreme ends of the distribution (high or low responders). We hypothesised that platelets derived from high responder donors would be cleared more rapidly from the circulation than those from low responder donors, leading to lower platelet count increments following transfusion, and potentially a shortening of the time until the next platelet transfusion was required.

Methods

Study design

We conducted a parallel-group, double-blinded, semi-randomised trial at a single centre in the UK - the Platelet Responsiveness and Outcome from Platelet Transfusion (PROmPT) trial. Patients were randomised to receive a single platelet transfusion from either a high or low responder donor. Since it was possible that platelets from high or low responder donors may not differ from each other, but that either might differ from those from donors of average responsiveness, we concurrently enrolled a group of 30 patients that received platelets from unselected donors for comparison (referred to as unselected units). Participants, treating clinicians, those assessing outcomes and analysing data were blinded to treatment group throughout. Randomisation was performed using unstratified permuted blocks via an on-line randomisation service (www.sealedenvelope.com) by randomisation coordinators who were not part of the trial personnel involved in the enrolment, treatment or measurement of outcomes. The protocol included a pre-specified interim analysis after 20 patients presented for randomisation, as we predicted that insufficient platelet availability might result in an unacceptably low percentage of enrolled patients being randomised. The study protocol specified that in such circumstances an alternative treatment allocation procedure would be followed, resulting in a semi-randomised study: when donor platelet units from both high and low responders were available, patients would be randomised to receive either, but if only one type of platelet unit were available (i.e. from either a high or low responder) the patient would receive that unit (non-randomised). Although the allocation was not randomised in this circumstance, blinding was maintained. If neither were available then patients received a suitable platelet unit from an unselected donor. The full study protocol is publically available [16].

Participants

a) Donors

We previously established a cohort of 506 donors whose platelets were tested by flow cytometry for responsiveness to two agonists (collagen-related peptide-XL or ADP) each with two measures of response (fibrinogen binding or P-selectin expression) resulting in four endpoints [4]. To provide sufficient donors for this study we increased this cohort to 956 by testing an additional 450 donors using the same methods. To determine the platelet responsiveness phenotype, the percentage positive (PP) platelets for each of the four endpoints was transformed to the logit scale, that is, log(PP/(100-PP)) and then a multiple linear regression model applied with the date of sample testing as a continuous predictor. To combine the data into one overall measure of platelet response and thus assign the donor to a high or low category, the data from each of the four endpoints was transformed so that the data from each output occupied the same range and distribution as described previously

[4]. The standardised residual from the regression model was used to rank how far an individual donor deviated from the average response. High responders were defined as those with the highest minimum response and low responders as those with the lowest maximum of all four endpoints. Those donors with the most reproducible responses in the upper and lower 10% of the distribution were selected to form a panel of donors for the study (26 high responder and 19 low responder donors). An example of donor selection can be found in the supplementary material.

The testing of donors was approved by the Huntingdon Research Ethics Committee (Reference 05/Q0104/27).

b) Patients

Eligible patients, aged 16 years or above, were stable haematology patients requiring platelets for prophylactic transfusion. Both in patients and outpatients were recruited, diagnoses included acute leukaemia, bone marrow failure and both autologous and allogenic transplant. Exclusion criteria included patients with inherited or acquired coagulation or platelet function disorders, current acute promyelocytic leukaemia or other active malignancy in past 5 years (other than the current primary diagnosis), previously documented WHO Grade 4 bleeding, palpable splenomegaly, were pregnant or lactating, immunological refractoriness to platelet transfusion or those requiring HLA or HPA matched platelets. Patients were temporarily excluded from the trial for factors such as fever, that might influence the primary and secondary endpoints measured (see supplementary information). Once resolved, patients with temporary exclusion criteria were eligible for inclusion. Patients were eligible to receive a single transfusion from both an unselected donor and either one high or low-responder donor in the course of their treatment, but only once the follow-up period from their previous trial transfusion was complete (5 days or until their next platelet transfusion).

Approval for the study was granted from the Hertfordshire Research Ethics Committee (Reference 11/EE/0227).

Procedures

Donors for the study fulfilled all requirements for platelet donation according to national guidelines[17]. Leucocyte-depleted platelets were collected by apheresis using a single type of collection device for the entire study duration (Trima Accel, Terumo BCT, Lakewood, Co, USA) and stored in plasma for up to 5 days from donation. Patients that were likely to become thrombocytopenic and require a prophylactic platelet transfusion were enrolled by their clinical care team. The decision to transfuse was made by the clinician caring for the patient, usually when the platelet count fell below 10 $x10^9$/L according to local and national guidelines. Patients received a single unit of platelets and were followed up for 5 days or until their next platelet transfusion. Platelets were matched for ABO and RhD blood group according to local guidelines. The threshold for red cell transfusion in the absence of bleeding was 90g/L haemoglobin. Blood samples were taken on the day of transfusion, and 10-90 minutes and 12-36 hours after transfusion. A full blood count was made on samples anticoagulated with EDTA using a haematology analyser to measure platelet count (LH750, Beckman Coulter, High Wycombe, UK). Bleeding symptoms were recorded on the day of transfusion and daily thereafter by the clinical team and by validated patient self-assessment [18]. Clinician and patient self-assessment were made for days when patients were in hospital, but patient self-assessment only for periods of follow up when patients

were at home. Bleeding was graded according to a modified WHO system by the use of a computer generated algorithm. In this, the most commonly used method of assessing bleeding in platelet transfusion trials, bleeding is categorised as grade 1 (mild), grade 2 (moderate, not usually requiring red cells transfusion), grade 3 (severe, requiring red cell transfusion) and grade 4 (debilitating or life-threatening). In accordance with a recent trial of platelet transfusion that required assessment of bleeding[19], two types of grade 1 bleeding (spreading or generalised petechiae or a nose bleed lasting more than 30 minutes) were classified as grade 2 for this study since these may be considered clinically significant in patients with thrombocytopenia and regarded by many treating clinicians as a trigger for platelet transfusion.

Outcomes

The primary outcome was the platelet count increment (CI) 1 hour (10-90 minutes) following transfusion, i.e. the difference between platelet count before and after transfusion. Secondary outcomes were the platelet CI at 24 hours (12-36 hours); the corrected count increment (CCI) at 1 hour (10-90 minutes) and 24 hours (12-36 hours); number of patients with at least one WHO bleeding event grade 2,3 or 4 within the follow up period; number of days with WHO bleeding events grade 2,3 or 4 within the follow up period; number of red cell transfusions within the follow up period and time to next platelet transfusion. The CCI was defined as (CI x body surface area)/ platelet dose ($x10^{11}$). Bleeding assessed by study clinician or patient self-assessment were considered as separate outcomes. Data on adverse events were collected according to standard definitions used in the UK Serious Hazards of Transfusion Haemovigilance scheme. Events which were judged to be expected and as a result of the patient's underlying diagnosis were not reported as serious adverse events (SAEs) but were logged as adverse events. The rationale for choice of endpoints can be found in the full study protocol [16].

Statistical Analysis

The required sample size was calculated based on the difference in the platelet count increment (primary outcome) following transfusion between patients receiving platelets from high or low responder donors. Interim data from another clinical study of platelets ongoing in our organisation at the time and since reported for the same measure [20] gave a standard deviation of $11.5x10^9$/L (at 12-36 hours, from 65 patients and 95 transfusions). Based on 80% power, a 5% significance level, and a presumed 10% dropout rate, 100 patients (50 in each group) would be required to detect a mean difference of $7x10^9$/L between the two groups.

A secondary set of analyses included patients who received units from unselected donors, in order to assess whether units from high or low responder donors differed to those from donors not at the extremes of the distribution. Recruiting 30 patients who received platelets from unselected donors allowed calculation of a 95% confidence interval for the difference in platelet increments between a treatment group and the unselected group to within +/-2.5 (i.e. the width of the confidence interval will be 5). As some of the patients that received a transfusion from an unselected donor also received a transfusion from a high or low-responder donor, this also increased the precision of estimates.

All analyses were by intention-to-treat and all patients allocated to receive a trial unit were included in the analysis, regardless of whether they were randomised to receive that unit, or not except for two patients in the

unselected group who received a pooled platelet concentrate rather than apheresis and were excluded from analysis. Analyses were two-sided, and the significance level was 5%. Platelet count increments at 1 and 24 hours were analysed using a mixed-effects linear regression model with a treatment-time interaction. In order to increase power, the model was adjusted for body surface area, platelet dose, and age of platelet unit, factors known to affect these outcomes. All patients with an observed platelet count increment at either 1 or 24 hours were included in the analysis. Further details of the regression models used can be found in the supplementary materials and methods for dealing with missing data are given in the study Statistical Analysis Plan [21].

An independent data monitoring committee reviewed patient safety and the results of the interim data analysis. The study was adopted by the National Cancer Research Network and included in the UK NIHR Clinical Research Network Portfolio. Due to a change in trial managers in the run-up to trial commencement, and the reminders to register the trial being sent to an obsolete email account, the trial was registered on the ISCTRN database (ISRCTN56366401) about half way through recruitment [first patient enrolled October 2011, trial registered November 2012, last patient enrolled December 2013].

Results

The interim analysis took place after 21 patients had presented for randomisation, of which only 9 had been successfully randomised, predominantly due to insufficient supply of trial units. Therefore, as pre-specified in the protocol, the study became semi-randomised at that point.

Of 428 patients screened, 252 consented to be part of the study (Figure 1). Of the 252 patients consented, 137 were not allocated to receive a transfusion as there was either no suitable platelet unit available or the patient had a temporary exclusion criterion. One hundred patients were allocated to receive a trial unit: 49 from a high responder donor (23 randomised, 26 non-randomised) and 51 from a low responder donor (24 randomised, 27 non-randomised). One patient due to receive platelets from a donor in the low responder group withdrew consent prior to transfusion. Therefore, 49/49 patients in the high responder group and 50/51 in the low responder group received their allocated trial unit. Thirty patients consented and were assigned to receive a transfusion from an unselected donor. Two of the 30 patients received a pooled platelet concentrate rather than apheresis and were excluded from analysis. In total, 15 patients received a transfusion from both an unselected donor and either a high or low-responder donor.

Baseline characteristics were well matched between study groups (Table 1). Platelets for the trial were derived from 15 high responder and 16 low responder donors. Platelet units that were ABO identical to that of the donor were received by 96% of patients, and 98% of trial units transfused were irradiated. All RhD negative patients received RhD negative units.

The platelet count increment at 1 hour (the primary endpoint) was available for 90% of patients in the low responder group and 100% of patients in the high responder group. For the 24 hour platelet count increment, these values were 90% and 96% respectively. Assessment of bleeding symptoms by a clinician was made for 94% of patients in the low responder group and 90% in the high responder group, and by patient self-assessment

for 92% and 94% of patients respectively. Data on red cell transfusions and time to next platelet transfusion were collected on 100% of patients.

Results are shown in Tables 2 and 3. There was no significant difference between patients receiving platelets from high or low responder donors in either the 1 hour platelet count increment (primary endpoint) (low responder $23.3x10^9$/L versus high responder 21.04; difference 2.30, 95%CI -1.09 to 5.69, p = 0.18), or the 24 hour platelet count increment (high responder 12.90 versus low responder $14.31x10^9$/L; difference 1.41, 95% CI -1.96, 4.78, p = 0.41). There was also no significant difference between groups in corrected count increments at 1 or 24 hours.

There were no significant differences in any bleeding outcome between patients receiving platelets from high or low responder donors, including clinician assessed bleeding scores (odds ratio 0.78, 95% confidence interval 0.29-2.16, p=0.64) and number of days with a Grade 2-4 bleed (rate ratio was 0.70, 95% confidence interval 0.16 to 2.97, p = 0.63), Table 3. In addition, there was no significant difference in any of the outcomes measured between high or low responder groups and patients that received platelets from unselected donors (Tables 2 & 3).

There was one febrile transfusion reaction reported in the low responder arm of the trial. This was initially reported as a SAE, but on further analysis did not meet criteria as the patient recovered rapidly with no increased duration of hospitalisation. There were no other SAEs.

Discussion

In the first controlled trial to assess whether differences in the level of platelet responsiveness in the donor population affect clinical outcome, we have shown that the outcome from prophylactic platelet transfusion in haematology patients does not differ whether the donor of the platelets has very low or highly responsive platelets to agonists in vitro.

The results from our study add to those conducted in healthy subjects and suggest that the ability of platelets to survive in the circulation following transfusion to patients is not related to how responsive the platelets of the donor are. Since the main indication to transfuse platelets is to prevent bleeding, and there is a poor correlation between bleeding risk and platelet count increments in thrombocytopenic patients we also assessed bleeding according to the WHO grading system, the most commonly used method of assessing bleeding in platelet transfusion trials. We also collected data on the number of red cell transfusions and time to next platelet transfusion as surrogates for bleeding. There was no significant difference between groups in any of these endpoints. Although the study was not powered with bleeding as the primary endpoint, these data indicate that in addition to there being no difference in the survival of platelets following transfusion between groups, the ability of platelets to prevent bleeding was also not different. The percentage of patients experiencing grade 2 or higher bleeding symptoms was lower in this study (18-25%) compared with other recent prophylactic platelet trials such as TOPPS (43%) and PLADO (70%). We attribute this to the strict exclusion criteria in this study,

especially temporary deferral for fever, and because patients were only studied for one platelet transfusion.

Only two other clinical studies have attempted to address whether differences in the functionality of platelets might influence outcome from platelet transfusion. An observational study measuring levels of P-selectin, a marker of platelet activation, in platelet concentrates suggested that lower 1 hour count increments were observed with increasing levels of platelet activation [22]. However, the study was too small (eight patients) to draw any conclusions. In another observational study, transfusions to 40 children were retrospectively categorised into two groups (high and low) based on the immature platelet fraction (IPF) of the platelet concentrate transfused [23]. The IPF is a parameter reported by some haematology analysers that indicates the proportion of platelets that are reticulocytes, those platelets most recently formed [24]. Those receiving platelets from the 'high' group received fewer platelet transfusions, and had fewer bleeding episodes, although the method of assessing bleeding in the study is unclear. In our study we observed a higher IPF in the whole blood of high-responder donors, but following transfusion there was no difference in the IPF measured between patients receiving platelets from high or low-responder donors (data not shown). This discrepancy could be due to preferential removal of sub-populations of platelets by either the apheresis device or transfusion set.

The data from our study are intriguing, indicating that differences identified by laboratory testing of measures such as platelet responsiveness in platelet donors prior to donation do not translate to differences in clinical outcome from platelet transfusion. It is therefore essential that major changes to platelet production that might affect their function undergo clinical assessment prior to introduction, rather than rely solely on laboratory data. In addition, there is insufficient evidence to recommend that platelet donors be selected on the basis of platelet function. Therefore, our data support the current policy employed by blood services internationally of not assessing platelet function in apheresis donors prior to donation.

The strengths of our study include the high level of adherence to protocol and little loss to follow up or missing data. Although approximately 50% of patients were not randomised, the number of transfusions from high or low responder donors was almost equal, the baseline characteristics of patients between groups were similar, and the blinding of the study meant that study personnel could not bias outcomes between groups. Limitations of our study include that patients received a single trial transfusion only. Data from trials of pathogen inactivated platelets have shown that differences between control and treated units are more pronounced with increasing number of platelet transfusions [25] and we therefore cannot exclude that differences between groups in our study may have been observed if patients received multiple transfusions. We also cannot exclude the potential influence of previous non-trial transfusions on the outcomes measured.

An important limitation to the generalisability of our data are that we assessed stable non-bleeding patients requiring platelets for prophylaxis. We cannot extrapolate these data to patients actively bleeding at the time of transfusion, where the immediate haemostatic effectiveness of platelets might be more important than the ability to remain in the circulation. It is conceivable that platelets from high responder donors could be the product of choice for bleeding patients, but this can only be elucidated by further research. The role of genetic factors in determining aspects of platelet function that may be important in disease states as well as platelet storage and the outcome from transfusion warrants further study.

Acknowledgements

The trial was supported in part by program grants from the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR, RP-PG-0310-1002), NHS Blood and Transplant (BS07/1R) and from the NIHR Cambridge BioResource.

We thank the following for their help, without whom this study would not have been possible. Louise Hawkins, Heather Smethurst and Heather Lloyd-Jones for recruitment of participants. Simon Rodwell, lay representative, for advice regarding communications with donors and patients. Staff in NHSBT Blood Donation, Hospitals Services and Manufacturing for assistance in the collection, processing and quality monitoring of platelets. Staff in Addenbrooke's Transfusion Laboratory and Haematology wards for the provision of clinical services. Most of all, we would like to thank donors and patients for agreeing to be participants in this study.

Contributors

Donor Study design and testing SFG, BCK, AMK, WHO
PROmPT study design and protocol AMK, RAC, BCK, TRG, NH, SFG, AD, LB, CL, TF, LMW, WHO
Statistical analysis and statistical analysis plan TRG, BCK, AMK, RAC, SFG, AD
Patient recruitment AMK NH
Database design LB, CL, AD, AMK
Writing of paper AMK, RAC, TRG, BCK, SFG, CL, AD, LB, TF, LMW, WHO

Declaration of interests: All authors declare no interests.

References

1. Estcourt LJ, Stanworth SJ, Murphy MF. Platelet transfusions for patients with haematological malignancies: Who needs them? *Br. J. Haematol.* 2011;154(4):425–440.
2. Fontana P, Dupont A, Gandrille S, et al. Adenosine diphosphate-induced platelet aggregation is associated with P2Y12 gene sequence variations in healthy subjects. *Circulation*. 2003;108(8):989–995.
3. Gaxiola B, Friedl W, Propping P. Epinephrine-induced platelet aggregation. A twin study. *Clin. Genet.* 2008;26(6):543–548.
4. Jones CI, Garner SF, Angenent W, et al. Mapping the platelet profile for functional genomic studies and demonstration of the effect size of the GP6 locus. *J. Thromb. Haemost.* 2007;5(8):1756–1765.
5. Garner SF, Furnell A, Kahan BC, et al. Platelet responses to agonists in a cohort of highly characterised platelet donors are consistent over time. *Vox Sang.* 2017;112(1):18–24.
6. Garner SF, Jones CI, Stephens J, et al. Apheresis donors and platelet function: Inherent platelet responsiveness influences platelet quality. *Transfusion*. 2008;48(4):673–680.
7. Leytin V, Allen DJ, Gwozdz A, Garvey B, Freedman J. Role of platelet surface glycoprotein Ibalpha and P-selectin in the clearance of transfused platelet concentrates. *Transfusion*. 2004;44(10):1487–1495.
8. Berger G, Hartwell DW, Wagner DD. P-Selectin and platelet clearance. *Blood*. 1998;92(11):4446–52.
9. Michelson AD, Barnard MR, Hechtman HB, et al. In vivo tracking of platelets: circulating degranulated platelets rapidly lose surface P-selectin but continue to circulate and function. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* 1996;93(21):11877–82.
10. Rinder H, Murphy M, Mitchell J, et al. Progressive platelet activation with storage: evidence for shortened survival of activated platelets after transfusion. *Transfusion*. 1991;31(5):409–414.
11. Dumont LJ, AuBuchon JP, Whitley P, et al. Seven-day storage of single-donor platelets: recovery and survival in an autologous transfusion study. 2002.
12. Slichter SJ, Bolgiano D, Corson J, et al. Extended storage of autologous apheresis platelets in plasma. *Vox Sang.* 2013;104(4):324–330.
13. Van't Erve TJ, Wagner BA, Martin SM, et al. The heritability of hemolysis in stored human red blood cells. *Transfusion*. 2015;55(6):1178–1185.
14. Schubert P, Culibrk B, Karwal S, Slichter SJ, Devine D V. Optimization of platelet concentrate quality: Application of proteomic technologies to donor management. *J. Proteomics*. 2012;76:329–336.
15. Waterman HR, Kapp LM, Howie HL, et al. Analysis of 24-h recovery of transfused stored RBCs in recipient mice of distinct genetic backgrounds. *Vox Sang.* 2015;109(2):148–154.
16. PROmPT Trial Management Group. Clinical Trial Protocol. http://www.nhsbt.nhs.uk/download/prompt_trial_protocol.pdf. Accessed November 20, 2016.
17. Guidelines for the Blood Transfusion Services in the United Kingdom. The Stationary Office, London; 2013.
18. Stanworth SJ, Dyer C, Casbard A, Murphy MF. Feasibility and usefulness of self-assessment of bleeding in patients with haematological malignancies, and the association between platelet count and bleeding. *Vox Sang.* 2006;91(1):63–69.
19. Stanworth SJ, Estcourt LJ, Powter G, et al. A no-prophylaxis platelet-transfusion strategy for hematologic cancers. *N. Engl. J. Med.* 2013;368(19):1771–80.
20. MacLennan S, Harding K, Llewelyn C, et al. A randomized noninferiority crossover trial of corrected count increments and bleeding in thrombocytopenic hematology patients receiving 2- to 5- versus 6- or 7-day-stored platelets. *Transfusion*. 2015;55(8):1856–1865.
21. PROmPT Trial Management Group. PROmPT Statistical Analysis Plan. http://www.nhsbt.nhs.uk/download/PROMPT_SAP.pdf. Accessed November 20, 2016.
22. Triulzi DJ, Kickler TS, Braine HG. Detection and significance of alpha granule membrane protein 140 expression on platelets collected by apheresis. *Transfusion*. 1992;32(6):529–533.
23. Parco S, Vascotto F. Application of reticulated platelets to transfusion management during autologous stem cell transplantation. *Onco. Targets. Ther.* 2012;5:1–5.
24. Briggs C, Hart D, Kunka S, Oguni S, Machin SJ. Immature platelet fraction measurement: A future guide to platelet transfusion requirement after haematopoietic stem cell transplantation. *Transfus. Med.* 2006;16(2):101–109.
25. Butler C, Doree C, Estcourt LJ, et al. Pathogen-reduced platelets for the prevention of bleeding. *Cochrane database Syst. Rev.* 2013;3(3):1–90.

Table 1 – Baseline characteristics patients

		Phenotype of platelet donor		
		Unselected (n=28)[a]	**High responder (n=49)**[b]	**Low responder (n=51)**[c]
Age (years) – mean (SD)		52.5 (16.0)	52.2 (16.6)	49.7 (17.8)
Male – no. (%)		22 (79%)	29 (59%)	27 (53%)
Body Surface Area – mean (SD)		1.95 (0.20)	1.91 (0.21)	1.89 (0.24)
Diagnosis – no. (%)	*AML*	10 (36%)	15 (31%)	18 (35%)
	ALL	2 (7%)	3 (6%)	6 (12%)
	CML	0	0	0
	Lymphoma	7 (25%)	14 (29%)	15 (29%)
	Myeloma	5 (18%)	9 (18%)	6 (12%)
	Other	4 (14%)	8 (16%)	6 (12%)
Treatment plan – no. (%)	*Induction*	6 (21%)	8 (16%)	9 (18%)
	Consolidation	1 (4%)	2 (4%)	4 (8%)
	Autograft	10 (36%)	16 (33%)	10 (20%)
	Allograft	6 (21%)	8 (16%)	12 (24%)
	Other	5 (18%)	15 (31%)	16 (31%)
Pre-transfusion platelet count (10^9/L)– mean (SD)		8.96 (3.81)	9.73 (4.81)	10.51 (5.94)
Irradiated platelets given – no. (%)		27 (96%)	48 (98%)	50 (98%)
Volume of platelets transfused (mL) – mean (SD)		176 (13.6)	175 (10.11)	174 (12.42)
Platelet dose transfused ($x10^9$) – mean (SD)		269 (49)	264 (40)	244 (30)
Platelet dose transfused per body surface area ($10^9/m^2$) – mean (SD)		140 (32)	142 (27)	130 (19)
Age of platelets (days) - median (IQR)		4 (4 - 5)	4 (3 - 5)	4 (3 - 5)
ABO fully matched – no. (%)		26 (93%)	47 (96%)	49 (96%)
Number of donors* – no.		N/A	15	16

Values are means with (SD) except for age of platelets (median with IQR). [a]for dose transfused ($x10^9$ or 10^9 per BSA) n=15, [b]for dose transfused ($x10^9$ or 10^9 per BSA) n=44 , [c]for pre-transfusion platelet count n=49 and for dose transfused ($x10^9$ or 10^9 per BSA) n=48. *The number of donors who have donated platelets transfused to patients. There were no significant differences between groups.

Table 2. Primary and secondary platelet count increment outcomes

Outcome	Phenotype of platelet donor			
	Unselected (n=28)	High responder (n=49)	Low responder platelets (n=51)	
		Difference from unselected group	Difference from unselected group	Difference from high responder group
Platelet increment at 1 hour				
Mean (SE)	24.00 (1.96)	22.96 (1.54)	22.39 (1.25)	
Difference in means (95% CI)	NA	-2.20 (-6.15, 1.75)*	-0.15 (-4.31, 4.02)*	2.30 (-1.09, 5.69)†
P-value	NA	0.28*	0.95*	0.18†
Platelet increment at 24 hours				
Mean (SE)	15.61 (1.75)	14.87 (1.42)	13.74 (1.27)	
Difference in means (95% CI)	NA	-2.06 (-5.72, 1.59)*	-0.93 (-4.82, 2.96)*	1.41 (-1.96, 4.78)†
P-value	NA	0.27*	0.64*	0.41†
CCI at 1 hour				
Mean (SE)	17.13 (1.22)	16.26 (0.84)	17.29 (0.84)	
Difference in means (95% CI)	NA	-1.46 (-4.13, 1.22)**	-0.12 (-2.84, 2.60)**	1.36 (-0.89, 3.61)††
P-value	NA	0.29**	0.93**	0.24††
CCI at 24 hours				
Mean (SE)	11.01 (1.08)	10.51 (0.88)	10.40 (0.86)	
Difference in means (95% CI)	NA	-1.12 (-3.69, 1.44)**	-1.02 (-3.54, 1.49)**	0.13 (-2.18, 2.44)††
P-value	NA	0.39**	0.43**	0.91††

* taken from a linear mixed-effects model on both 1 and 24 hour time-points with the unselected group as reference, adjusted for body surface area (BSA), the platelet dose transfused, age of platelets transfused.
** taken from a linear mixed-effects model on both 1 and 24 hour time-points with the unselected group as reference, adjusted for age of platelets transfused.
† taken from a linear mixed-effects model on both 1 and 24 hour time-points with the high responder group as reference, adjusted for BSA, the platelet dose transfused, age of platelets transfused.
†† taken from a linear mixed-effects model on both 1 and 24 hour time-points with the high responder group as reference, adjusted for age of platelets transfused.

Table 3. Secondary bleeding outcomes

Outcome	Phenotype of platelet donor			
	Unselected (n=28)	High responder (n=49)	Low responder (n=51)	
		Difference from unselected group	Difference from unselected group	Difference from high responder group
Patients with grade 2-4 bleed: clinical assessment – no. (%)	7 (25%)	10 (20%)	9 (18%)	
Odds ratio (95% CI)	NA	0.84 (0.28, 2.56)	0.66 (0.21, 2.03)	0.78 (0.29, 2.16)
P-value	NA	0.76	0.47	0.64
Patients with grade 2-4 bleed: patient self-assessment – no. (%)	8 (29%)	16 (33%)	21 (41%)	
Odds ratio (95% CI)	NA	1.27 (0.45, 3.53)	1.92 (0.70, 5.25)	1.51 (0.66, 3.49)
P-value	NA	0.65	0.20	0.33
Days with grade 2-4 bleed: clinical assessment – median (IQR)	0 (0 - 1)	0 (0 - 0)	0 (0 - 0)	
Rate ratio (95% CI)	NA	0.66 (0.13, 3.41)	0.46 (0.09, 2.30)	0.70 (0.16, 2.97)
P-value	NA	0.62	0.34	0.63
Days with grade 2-4 bleed: patient self-assessment – median (IQR)	0 (0 - 1)	0 (0 - 1)	0 (0 - 1)	
Rate ratio (95% CI)	NA	0.86 (0.25, 2.98)	1.05 (0.31, 3.52)	1.26 (0.53, 3.00)
P-value	NA	0.81	0.94	0.60
Red cell transfusions –no. median (IQR)	0 (0 - 1)	1 (0 - 1)	0 (0 - 1)	
Rate ratio (95% CI)	NA	1.27 (0.64, 2.53)	0.78 (0.38, 1.62)	0.60 (0.33, 1.08)
P-value	NA	0.49	0.50	0.09
Time from randomisation to next platelet transfusion (days) – median (IQR)	3 (2 - 3)	3 (2 - 4)	3 (3 - 4)	
Hazard ratio (95% CI)	NA	0.85 (0.47, 1.55)	0.68 (0.36, 1.28)	0.81 (0.49, 1.34)
P-value	NA	0.60	0.23	0.42

Differences in means are high response vs low response.

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Study enrolment and randomisation

Figure 1. Study enrolment and randomisation



* 15 patients also received a unit from a high or low responder donor, **One randomised patient withdrew consent prior to transfusion