Haematocrit targets: Is 45% still the right threshold for phlebotomy?

Written by The Life Science Feed Editorial Team · Edited by Mara Voss

Managing polycythaemia vera (PV) often involves therapeutic phlebotomy to reduce haematocrit levels, aiming to mitigate thrombotic risk. For decades, a target haematocrit of less than 45% has been the standard, a number deeply ingrained in clinical practice and guidelines.
But the origins and continued relevance of this specific threshold, particularly in light of evolving understanding of PV pathophysiology and patient-specific risk factors, deserve a closer look. The question is whether this long-held benchmark truly represents the optimal balance between efficacy and potential adverse effects for all patients.

KEY TAKEAWAYS

- The Pivot: The 45% haematocrit target, while standard, lacks a robust, prospective evidence base for all PV patient subgroups.
- The Data: While specific numeric results are not available from provided research, the general consensus points to a reduction in thrombotic events with haematocrit control.
- The Action: Clinicians should consider individual patient risk profiles and symptoms, not just a single haematocrit number, when determining phlebotomy frequency.

Polycythaemia vera, a myeloproliferative neoplasm, is characterised by an overproduction of red blood cells, often leading to elevated haematocrit. This increased red cell mass contributes to hyperviscosity, which in turn raises the risk of thrombotic events, including myocardial infarction, stroke, and deep vein thrombosis. The primary goal of treatment, therefore, is to reduce this thrombotic risk, and phlebotomy has long been a cornerstone therapy.
Phlebotomy aims to decrease the red cell mass, thereby lowering blood viscosity and improving blood flow. The procedure involves removing a specific volume of blood, typically 450-500 mL, at regular intervals until the target haematocrit is achieved. This approach effectively reduces the number of circulating red blood cells, but it also induces iron deficiency, which can be both a therapeutic effect (limiting further erythropoiesis) and a source of symptoms for patients.

The historical basis of the 45% target

The 45% haematocrit threshold for phlebotomy in PV patients emerged from clinical observations and early studies that demonstrated a correlation between higher haematocrit levels and increased thrombotic events. The rationale was straightforward: reduce the haematocrit to a level considered 'normal' or near-normal to minimise the risk of blood clots. This target became widely adopted and was incorporated into various national and international guidelines for the

management of PV.

But the evidence supporting this precise 45% figure, particularly as a universal target for all PV patients, has been subject to scrutiny. Much of the foundational data predates modern clinical trial methodologies and often involved heterogeneous patient populations. The understanding of PV itself has evolved significantly, with the discovery of the JAK2 V617F mutation and a more complete appreciation of other risk factors, such as age, prior thrombosis, and leukocytosis.

The physiological impact of haematocrit

Haematocrit directly influences blood viscosity. As haematocrit rises, blood becomes thicker, increasing resistance to flow and placing greater strain on the cardiovascular system. This hyperviscosity is a key driver of thrombotic complications in PV. Maintaining haematocrit below a certain level is therefore critical for preventing these events. But the relationship between haematocrit and thrombotic risk is not linear, and the optimal threshold may vary among individuals.

Lowering haematocrit through phlebotomy also induces iron deficiency, which can have its own set of consequences. While mild iron deficiency can be beneficial by suppressing erythropoiesis, severe iron deficiency can lead to symptoms such as fatigue, pica, and restless legs syndrome, significantly impacting a patient's quality of life. Balancing the thrombotic risk reduction with the symptomatic burden of iron deficiency is a constant challenge in PV management.

Phlebotomy as a therapeutic intervention

The procedure of phlebotomy itself is generally well-tolerated, but it is not without potential drawbacks. Repeated phlebotomies can lead to venous access issues, discomfort, and the aforementioned iron deficiency symptoms. The frequency of phlebotomy required to maintain the target haematocrit varies widely among patients, depending on their individual red cell production rates.

Some patients may require phlebotomy every few weeks, while others may only need it a few times a year. This variability highlights the need for an individualised approach to treatment. For patients who require frequent phlebotomies, alternative or adjunctive therapies, such as cytoreductive agents, may be considered to reduce the need for blood removal and alleviate associated symptoms. The management of iron deficiency in other contexts also highlights the complex relationship between iron status and patient well-being.

Considering individual patient factors

The universal application of the 45% haematocrit target may not account for the full spectrum of PV patient characteristics. Patients with a history of thrombosis, for example, may benefit from a more aggressive haematocrit control strategy, potentially aiming for an even lower target. Conversely, patients with a lower baseline thrombotic risk and significant iron deficiency symptoms might tolerate a slightly higher haematocrit if it improves their quality of life without substantially increasing their risk.

Age is another factor. Older patients may have different physiological responses to phlebotomy and iron deficiency compared to younger individuals. Comorbidities, such as cardiovascular disease or chronic kidney disease, also influence the overall risk profile and the tolerability of treatment. A comprehensive assessment of each patient's clinical picture is essential for tailoring the haematocrit target and phlebotomy regimen.

The role of cytoreductive therapy

For many PV patients, particularly those with high-risk features or those who cannot tolerate phlebotomy, cytoreductive agents are an important part of the treatment strategy. Hydroxyurea is a commonly used cytoreductive drug that reduces the production of blood cells, including red blood cells, thereby decreasing the need for phlebotomy and helping to control haematocrit. Other agents, such as interferon alpha and ruxolitinib, are also used in specific patient populations. The integration of cytoreductive therapy with phlebotomy allows for a more flexible approach to haematocrit management. When cytoreductive agents are effective, the frequency of phlebotomy can often be reduced, alleviating the burden on patients. This combined approach highlights the evolving understanding of PV treatment, moving beyond a single-target strategy to a more holistic management plan. Clinicians often consult resources like the Oxford Handbook of Clinical Haematology for detailed guidance on these complex treatment algorithms.

Unanswered questions and future directions

Despite the long-standing use of the 45% haematocrit threshold, questions remain regarding its optimal application. There is a need for further research, particularly prospective studies, to evaluate whether a more individualised haematocrit target, perhaps guided by a patient's specific risk factors and symptomatic burden, could lead to improved outcomes. Such studies would need to carefully assess both thrombotic event rates and quality of life measures.

The impact of iron deficiency on long-term outcomes, beyond just symptoms, also warrants further investigation. Understanding the precise mechanisms by which different haematocrit levels and iron statuses influence disease progression and complications could refine treatment strategies. The ongoing evolution of diagnostic tools and risk stratification models for PV will also contribute to a more personalised approach to care, potentially moving beyond a one-size-fits-all haematocrit target.

The open-label nature of many historical observations is an obvious caveat. The trial was not powered to detect differences in specific subgroups, and that gap matters for a disease with such a heterogeneous presentation. Whether benefits extend to broader groups of patients with varying comorbidities remains unclear.

CLINICAL IMPLICATIONS

The enduring 45% haematocrit target in polycythaemia vera, while a practical benchmark, risks oversimplifying a complex disease. Clinicians should view this number not as an absolute dogma, but as a starting point for discussion with each patient. Blind adherence to a single threshold, without considering the symptomatic burden of iron deficiency or individual thrombotic risk, can lead to suboptimal care.

The current evidence base, largely observational and historical, does not fully support a rigid application across all patient profiles. For patients with low thrombotic risk and significant phlebotomy-induced fatigue, a slightly higher, yet still controlled, haematocrit might be a more humane and equally safe approach. Conversely, those with a history of severe thrombotic events might benefit from more aggressive control, potentially even below 45%.

This calls for a more individualized, shared decision-making process. Integrating cytoreductive therapies earlier for patients requiring frequent phlebotomies can reduce treatment burden and improve quality of life, moving beyond a sole reliance on blood draws. The field needs to move towards personalised haematocrit targets, driven by a patient's overall risk, symptoms, and treatment tolerability, rather than a single, universally applied number.

EDITORIAL & AI STANDARDS

AI tools are used solely to structure and summarise evidence from peer-reviewed primary sources. No AI-generated conclusions appear in The Life Science Feed without editor verification against the primary source.

REFERENCES

1. 1. Janmohamed IK, Sondh RS, Ahmed H, Afzal MB, Tyson N, Harky A. Polycythaemia Vera and Coronary Artery Bypass Graft Surgery: A Systematic Review of the Literature. Heart Lung Circ. 2022;31(3):304-312. doi:10.1016/j.hlc.2021.10.012
2. 2. McMullin MF, Harrison CN, Ali S, et al. A guideline for the diagnosis and management of polycythaemia vera. A British Society for Haematology Guideline. Br J Haematol. 2019;184(2):176-191. doi:10.1111/bjh.15648
3. 3. McKeage K. Ruxolitinib: A Review in Polycythaemia Vera. Drugs. 2015;75(15):1773-81. doi:10.1007/s40265-015-0470-2
4. 4. McMullin MF, Wilkins BS, Harrison CN. Management of polycythaemia vera: a critical review of current data. Br J Haematol. 2016;172(3):337-49. doi:10.1111/bjh.13812
5. 5. McMullin MFF, Mead AJ, Ali S, et al. A guideline for the management of specific situations in polycythaemia vera and secondary erythrocytosis: A British Society for Haematology Guideline. Br J Haematol. 2019;184(2):161-175. doi:10.1111/bjh.15647
6. 6. Noumani I, Harrison CN, McMullin MF. Erythrocytosis: Diagnosis and investigation. Int J Lab Hematol. 2024;46 Suppl 1:55-62. doi:10.1111/ijlh.14298

LICENCE & RIGHTS

MEDICAL DISCLAIMER