

Challenges and Benefits of Automated Red Blood Cell Exchange Transfusion

Ines Balestrino*

Department of Hematology, Arak University, Arak, Iran

DESCRIPTION

Sickle Cell Disease (SCD) is a genetic blood disorder characterized by the production of abnormal hemoglobin, which causes red blood cells to take on a crescent or sickle shape [1]. These sickle-shaped cells are rigid and can block blood flow, leading to episodes of pain, organ damage, and other complications. One of the most common and effective treatments for managing these complications is Red Blood Cell Exchange Transfusion (RBC-ET), a procedure that removes sickled red blood cells from a patient's bloodstream and replaces them with healthy donor cells. While exchange transfusion has significantly improved the quality of life for many SCD patients, there are two main methods of performing the procedure: chronic manual RBC-ET and automated RBC-ET [2,3]. Both methods aim to reduce sickling episodes and improve oxygen delivery to tissues, but they differ in their execution, advantages, and limitations [4].

Chronic manual red blood cell exchange transfusion

Manual RBC-ET involves the physician or clinical team manually removing blood from the patient, separating out the red blood cells, and replacing them with donor blood through a process known as apheresis. This procedure is often performed on a chronic basis, especially in patients who suffer from severe or frequent vaso-occlusive crises, stroke, or organ damage [5]. The key advantage of chronic manual RBC-ET is that it can be specific to the individual needs of the patient.

In a manual exchange, the physician can decide how much blood to remove and how much to replace, allowing for more precise control over the hematocrit (the proportion of blood made up of red blood cells) and hemoglobin levels. This can be especially useful in patients with specific concerns about iron overload or other blood-related complications. Manual exchanges can also be done in settings where automated systems may not be available, making them more accessible in certain healthcare environments [6].

However, manual RBC-ET carries significant limitations. The procedure is time-consuming, often requiring several hours per

session, which can place a burden on patients, particularly those requiring regular transfusions [7]. Additionally, it is physically demanding for the healthcare providers involved, requiring significant skill and attention to detail. Manual exchange also tends to result in less consistency and higher risk of human error compared to automated systems, which can impact patient outcomes.

Automated red blood cell exchange transfusion

Automated RBC-ET, on the other hand, involves the use of specialized machines that perform the apheresis process automatically. These machines are capable of separating the red blood cells from the patient's blood and replacing them with donor cells with minimal input from the clinical staff. Automated systems are designed to be more efficient, faster, and more consistent than manual methods, making them an attractive option for chronic management of SCD.

One of the main advantages of automated RBC-ET is its efficiency. The procedure is generally quicker than manual exchanges, with sessions typically taking less time to complete. This is particularly important for patients who need regular transfusions, as it minimizes the burden on both the patient and the healthcare provider [8]. Furthermore, automated systems are less prone to human error, which can reduce the risk of complications associated with incorrect blood removal or transfusion. The consistency of automated procedures ensures that the exchange process is standardized, leading to more predictable results.

Automated systems also allow for more precise monitoring and adjustment during the transfusion process. Parameters such as blood flow rate, hematocrit levels, and the volume of blood exchanged can be continuously tracked and adjusted, ensuring a higher level of control over the procedure. This can be especially helpful in preventing complications such as iron overload or alloimmunization, which can occur with repeated transfusions.

However, automated RBC-ET is not without its challenges. The equipment required is expensive, and not all healthcare facilities may have access to the necessary technology or trained personnel

Correspondence to: Ines Balestrino, Department of Hematology, Arak University, Arak, Iran, E-mail: balestrino888@Ines.il

Received: 01-Oct-2024, Manuscript No. JHTD-24-35081; **Editor assigned:** 03-Oct-2024, PreQC No. JHTD-24-35081 (PQ); **Reviewed:** 17-Oct-2024, QC No. JHTD-24-35081; **Revised:** 24-Oct-2024, Manuscript No. JHTD-24-35081 (R); **Published:** 31-Oct-2024, DOI: 10.35248/2329-8790.24.12.629.

Citation: Balestrino I (2024). Challenges and Benefits of Automated Red Blood Cell Exchange Transfusion. J Hematol Thrombo Dis. 12:629.

Copyright: © 2024 Balestrino I. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

[9]. In addition, while the procedure is generally faster than manual RBC-ET, it can still take several hours, and patients may experience discomfort due to the long duration or the need for a central venous catheter. Moreover, automated systems are not always able to handle complex cases, such as patients with multiple comorbidities or those who require highly individualized treatment plans.

A comparison of the two methods

Both chronic manual and automated RBC-ET have their distinct benefits and limitations, and the choice between them often depends on the individual needs of the patient, the available resources, and the clinical setting. Manual RBC-ET is more flexible and can be specific to the unique needs of patients with complex conditions, while automated RBC-ET offers greater consistency, efficiency, and a reduced risk of human error.

In terms of outcomes, both methods have been shown to be effective in reducing complications of SCD, such as stroke, acute chest syndrome, and organ damage. However, studies have suggested that automated RBC-ET may have a slight edge in terms of reducing the frequency of transfusion-related complications, such as iron overload, because of its precision and ability to control the volume of blood exchanged [10]. Conversely, manual RBC-ET may be more appropriate for patients with unique medical needs or for those receiving transfusions in settings without access to automated systems.

CONCLUSION

As chronic RBC-ET becomes an increasingly integral part of managing sickle cell disease, the choice between manual and automated methods will continue to be shaped by factors such as healthcare infrastructure, patient preferences, and the specific medical challenges faced by each individual. Both manual and automated RBC-ET are highly effective in improving the lives of SCD patients, but the decision regarding which method to use should be personalized to achieve the best possible outcomes. Future advances in technology and more widespread access to automated systems may eventually shift the balance in favor of automated RBC-ET, but for now, both methods offer valuable tools in the ongoing management of sickle cell disease.

REFERENCES

- Christiansen S, Stypmann J, Tjan TD, Wichter T, van Aken H, Scheld HH, et al. Minimally-invasive *versus* conventional aortic valve replacement—perioperative course and mid-term results. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* 1999;16(6):647-652.
- Corbi P, Rahmati M, Donal E, Lanquetot H, Jayle C, Menu P, et al. Prospective comparison of minimally invasive and standard techniques for aortic valve replacement: Initial experience in the first hundred patients. *J Card Surg.* 2003;18(2):133-139.
- Dalén M, Oliveira Da Silva C, Sartipy U, Winter R, Franco-Cereceda A, Barimani J, et al. Comparison of right ventricular function after ministernotomy and full sternotomy aortic valve replacement: A randomized study. *Interact Cardiovasc Thorac Surg.* 2018;26(5):790-797.
- Dalén M, Biancari F, Rubino AS, Santarpino G, Glaser N, de Praetere H, et al. Aortic valve replacement through full sternotomy with a stented bioprosthesis *versus* minimally invasive sternotomy with a sutureless bioprosthesis. *Eur J Cardiothorac Surg.* 2016;49(1):220-227.
- Kasama K, Juvonen T, Deste W, Pollari F, Meuris B, Fischlein T, et al. Ministernotomy *versus* full sternotomy aortic valve replacement with a sutureless bioprosthesis: A multicenter study. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2015;99(2):524-530.
- Detter C, Deuse T, Boehm DH, Reichenspurner H, Reichart B. Midterm results and quality of life after minimally invasive *vs.* conventional aortic valve replacement. *Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2002;50(6):337-341.
- Vaumas C, Philip I, Daccache G, Depoix JP, Lecharny JB, Enguerand D, et al. Comparison of minithoracotomy and conventional sternotomy approaches for valve surgery. *J Cardiothorac Vasc Anesth.* 2003;17(3):325-328.
- Dogan S, Dzemali O, Wimmer-Greinecker G, Derra P, Doss M, Khan MF, et al. Minimally invasive *versus* conventional aortic valve replacement: A prospective randomized trial. *J Heart Valve Dis.* 2003;12(1):76-80.
- D'Onofrio A, Tessari C, Lorenzoni G, Cibin G, Martinelli G, Alamanni F, et al. Minimally invasive *vs.* conventional aortic valve replacement with rapid-deployment bioprostheses. *Ann Thorac Surg.* 2021;111(6):1916-1922.
- Filip G, Bryndza MA, Konstany-Kalandyk J, Piatek J, Wegrzyn P, Ceranowicz P, et al. Ministernotomy or sternotomy in isolated aortic valve replacement? early results. *Kardiochirurgia i torakochirurgia polska/polish.* *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg.* 2018;15(4):213-218.