

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review)

Nevitt SJ, Jones AP, Howard J

Nevitt SJ, Jones AP, Howard J. Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2017, Issue 4. Art. No.: CD002202. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD002202.pub2.

www.cochranelibrary.com



TABLE OF CONTENTS

ABSTRACT1PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY2SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR THE MAIN COMPARISON4BACKGROUND7OBJECTIVES8METHODS8RESULTS10Figure 1.11Figure 2.14ADDITIONAL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS23DISCUSSION30AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS33ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS33REFERENCES34CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES58Analysis 1.1. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 1 Pain crises.66
PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY 2 SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR THE MAIN COMPARISON 4 BACKGROUND 7 OBJECTIVES 8 METHODS 8 RESULTS 10 Figure 1. 11 Figure 2. 11 ADDITIONAL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS 23 DISCUSSION 30 AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS 33 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 33 REFERENCES 34 CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES 43 DATA AND ANALYSES 58 Analysis 1.1. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 1 Pain crises. 66
SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR THE MAIN COMPARISON 4 BACKGROUND 7 OBJECTIVES 8 METHODS 8 RESULTS 10 Figure 1. 11 Figure 2. 11 ADDITIONAL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS 23 DISCUSSION 30 AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS 33 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 33 REFERENCES 34 CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES 43 DATA AND ANALYSES 58 Analysis 1.1. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 1 Pain crises. 66
BACKGROUND7OBJECTIVES8METHODS8RESULTS10Figure 1.11Figure 2.14ADDITIONAL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS23DISCUSSION30AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS33ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS33REFERENCES34CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES43DATA AND ANALYSES58Analysis 1.1. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 1 Pain crises.66
OBJECTIVES 8 METHODS 8 RESULTS 10 Figure 1. 11 Figure 2. 11 ADDITIONAL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS 23 DISCUSSION 30 AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS 30 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 33 REFERENCES 34 CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES 43 DATA AND ANALYSES 58 Analysis 1.1. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 1 Pain crises. 66
METHODS 8 RESULTS 10 Figure 1. 11 Figure 2. 11 ADDITIONAL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS 23 DISCUSSION 30 AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS 30 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 33 REFERENCES 34 CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES 58 Analysis 1.1. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 1 Pain crises. 66
RESULTS 10 Figure 1. 11 Figure 2. 14 ADDITIONAL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS 23 DISCUSSION 30 AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS 30 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 33 REFERENCES 34 CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES 43 DATA AND ANALYSES 58 Analysis 1.1. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 1 Pain crises. 66
Figure 1.11Figure 2.14ADDITIONAL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS23DISCUSSION23OUSCUSSION30AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS33ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS33REFERENCES34CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES34DATA AND ANALYSES58Analysis 1.1. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 1 Pain crises.66
Figure 2.14ADDITIONAL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS23DISCUSSION30AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS33ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS33REFERENCES34CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES43DATA AND ANALYSES58Analysis 1.1. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 1 Pain crises.66
ADDITIONAL SUMMARY OF FINDINGS23DISCUSSION30AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS33ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS33ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS34CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES43DATA AND ANALYSES58Analysis 1.1. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 1 Pain crises.66
DISCUSSION 30 AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS 33 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 33 REFERENCES 34 CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES 43 DATA AND ANALYSES 58 Analysis 1.1. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 1 Pain crises. 66
AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS 33 ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 33 REFERENCES 34 CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES 43 DATA AND ANALYSES 58 Analysis 1.1. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 1 Pain crises. 66
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS 33 REFERENCES 34 CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES 43 DATA AND ANALYSES 58 Analysis 1.1. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 1 Pain crises. 66
REFERENCES 34 CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES 43 DATA AND ANALYSES 58 Analysis 1.1. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 1 Pain crises. 66
CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES 43 DATA AND ANALYSES 58 Analysis 1.1. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 1 Pain crises. 66
DATA AND ANALYSES 58 Analysis 1.1. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 1 Pain crises. 66
Analysis 1.1. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 1 Pain crises. 66
Analysis 1.2. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 2 Proportion
experiencing pain
Analysis 1.3. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 3 Proportion
experiencing life threatening events during study.
Analysis 1.4. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 4 Number of
life-threatening events during study
Analysis 1.5. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 5 Deaths during
the study
Analysis 1.6. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 6 Change from
baseline in fetal haemoglobin (HbF %).
Analysis 1.7. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 7 Fetal
haemoglobin (HbF %) after treatment.
Analysis 1.8. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 8 Change from
baseline in absolute neutrophil count (x10 ³ per μ L)
Analysis 1.9. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 9 Neutrophil
response (10/L) after treatment.
Analysis 1.10. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 10 Change
from baseline in haemoglobin (g/L)
Analysis 1.11. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 11 Change
from baseline in m corpuscular volume (fL).
Analysis 1.12. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 12 Change
from baseline in white blood cells (x10 ³ per μ L)
Analysis 1.13. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 13 Change
from baseline in absolute reticulocyte count (x10 ³ per μ L)
Analysis 1.14. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 14 Change
from baseline in reticulocytes (%).
Analysis 1.15. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 15 Change
from baseline in total bilirubin (mg/L).
Analysis 1.16. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 16 Change
from baseline in platelet count (x10 ³ per μ L)
Analysis 1.17. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 17 Haemoglobin
(g/dL)
Hydroxyurea (hydroxyucarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review)

comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 20 77 Analysis 1.20. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 20 77 Analysis 1.21. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 21 Platelet count. 79 Analysis 1.22. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 22 Packed cell volume. 79 Analysis 1.23. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 24 F cells. 80 Analysis 1.25. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 25 Red blood count. 81 Analysis 1.25. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 27 Dense cells. 81 Analysis 1.26. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Leucocytes. 82 Analysis 1.27. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Leucocytes. 82 Analysis 1.20. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Leucocytes. 82 Analysis 1.20. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Leucocytes. 82 Analysis 1.30. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Leucocytes.	Analysis 1.18. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 18 Mean	
Analysis 1.19. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 10 Total 77 Analysis 1.20. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 20 78 Analysis 1.20. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 21 Platelet 79 Analysis 1.23. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 24 F cells. 80 Analysis 1.24. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 24 F cells. 80 Analysis 1.24. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 24 F cells. 81 Analysis 1.26. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 24 F cells. 81 Analysis 1.26. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 24 F cells. 82 Analysis 1.28. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 24 F cells. 82 Analysis 1.28. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 24 F cells. 82 Analysis 1.24. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 24 F cells. 84 Analysis 1.28. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 24 F cells. 84 <t< td=""><td>corpuscular volume (fL)</td><td>76</td></t<>	corpuscular volume (fL)	76
bilinubia (mg/L). 77 Analysis 1.20. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 20 78 Analysis 1.21. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 21 Platelet count. 79 Analysis 1.23. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 24 Rede cell volume. 79 Analysis 1.24. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 24 F cells. 80 Analysis 1.24. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 24 F cells. 81 Analysis 1.25. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 27 P cents cells. 81 Analysis 1.26. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Leucocytes. 82 Analysis 1.26. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Leucocytes. 82 Analysis 1.20. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Leucocytes. 82 Analysis 1.20. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Leucocytes. 82 Analysis 1.31. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 24 Cells. 83 Analysis 1.32. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus place	Analysis 1.19. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 19 Total	
Analysis 1.20. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 21 Platelet count. 78 Analysis 1.21. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 21 Platelet count. 79 Analysis 1.23. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 22 Packed cell volume. 79 Analysis 1.24. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 24 F cells. 80 Analysis 1.24. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 25 Red blood count. 81 Analysis 1.27. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 25 Red blood cells. 81 Analysis 1.27. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 20 Creatinine. 82 Analysis 1.28. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 20 Creatinine. 82 Analysis 1.28. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 20 Creatinine. 84 Analysis 1.30. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 31 Alkaline phosphatase. 84 Analysis 1.33. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Change from baseline in growth. 84 Analysis 1.34. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for	bilirubin (mg/L)	77
Reficiolocytes. 78 Analysis 1.21. Comparison 1 Hydrosyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease. Outcome 22 Placked cell volume. 79 Analysis 1.23. Comparison 1 Hydrosyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease. Outcome 23 F 80 Analysis 1.24. Comparison 1 Hydrosyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease. Outcome 24 F cells. 80 Analysis 1.25. Comparison 1 Hydrosyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease. Outcome 26 White blood count. 81 Analysis 1.26. Comparison 1 Hydrosyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease. Outcome 26 White blood cells. 81 Analysis 1.26. Comparison 1 Hydrosyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease. Outcome 27 Dense cells. 82 Analysis 1.27. Comparison 1 Hydrosyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease. Outcome 27 Dense cells. 82 Analysis 1.20. Comparison 1 Hydrosyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease. Outcome 20 Lacuores 20 Agartate anninotransferase. 82 Analysis 1.30. Comparison 1 Hydrosyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease. Outcome 30 Agartate anninotransferase. 84 Analysis 1.32. Comparison 1 Hydrosyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease. Outcome 31 Chalge from baseline in growth. 84 Analysis 1.33. Comparison 1 Hydrosyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease. Outcome 32 Change from baseline in growth.<	Analysis 1.20. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 20	
Analysis 1.21. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 22 Packed cell volume. 79 Analysis 1.22. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 23 Packed cell volume. 80 Analysis 1.23. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 25 Red blood count. 80 Analysis 1.25. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 25 Red blood count. 81 Analysis 1.26. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 26 White blood cells. 82 Analysis 1.26. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 27 Dense cells. 82 Analysis 1.26. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 27 Dense cells. 82 Analysis 1.20. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 30 Aspartare aminotransferase. 83 Analysis 1.30. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 31 Alkaline phosphatase. 84 Analysis 1.31. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Change from baseline in growth. 84 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of life general health perception. 85	Reticulocytes	78
count. 79 Analysis 1.22. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 22 Packed ell 79 Analysis 1.23. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 24 F cells. 80 Analysis 1.24. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 24 F cells. 81 Analysis 1.25. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 25 Red blood cells. 81 Analysis 1.26. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 27 Dense cells. 82 Analysis 1.27. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Leucorytes. 82 Analysis 1.28. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Leucorytes. 82 Analysis 1.20. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 30 Asparta 83 Analysis 1.30. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 31 Alkaline 84 Analysis 1.32. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 33 Quality of 84 Analysis 1.33. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 33 Quality of 86 Analysis 1.33. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for part	Analysis 1.21. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 21 Platelet	
Analysis 1.22. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 22 Facked cell 79 Analysis 1.23. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 24 F cells 80 Analysis 1.25. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 24 F cells 81 Analysis 1.26. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 25 Red blood coln. 81 Analysis 1.26. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 26 White blood cells. 82 Analysis 1.26. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 27 Dense cells. 82 Analysis 1.26. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 29 Creatinine. 82 Analysis 1.20. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 30 Aspartate aminotransferase. 84 Analysis 1.30. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Change from baseline in growth. 84 Analysis 1.31. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Quality of life pain recall. 85 Analysis 1.33. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Quality of life pain recall. 86 Analysis 1.34. Comparison 1 Hydroxyure	count	79
volume. 79 Analysis 1.23. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 24 F cells. 80 Analysis 1.24. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 25 Red blood cells. 81 Analysis 1.25. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 26 White blood cells. 81 Analysis 1.27. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 27 Dense cells. 82 Analysis 1.27. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Leucocytes. 82 Analysis 1.20. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Leucocytes. 83 Analysis 1.20. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Leucocytes. 83 Analysis 1.30. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 30 Aspartate aminotransferase. 83 Analysis 1.31. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 33 Quality of life: general health perception. 84 Analysis 1.33. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of life: pain recall. 85 Analysis 1.34. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease. Outcome 34 Quality of life: pain recall.	Analysis 1.22. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 22 Packed cell	
Analysis 1.23. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 23 F 80 Analysis 1.24. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 24 F cells. 80 Analysis 1.25. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 26 White blood count. 81 Analysis 1.26. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 27 Dense cells. 82 Analysis 1.20. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 27 Dense cells. 82 Analysis 1.20. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 20 Creatinine. 83 Analysis 1.20. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 30 Aspartate aminotransferase. 83 Analysis 1.31. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 31 Alkaline phosphatase. 84 Analysis 1.32. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Change from baseline in growth. 84 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of life: pain recall. 86 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Quality of life: pain recall. 87 Analysis 1.36. Comparison 1 Hydrox	volume	79
metriculocytes. 80 Analysis 1.24. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 25 Red blood count. 80 Analysis 1.25. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 26 White blood cells. 81 Analysis 1.26. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 27 Dense cells. 82 Analysis 1.27. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Leucocytes. 82 Analysis 1.20. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Leucocytes. 83 Analysis 1.30. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 23 Cratinine. 83 Analysis 1.31. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 30 Aspartate aminotransferase. 84 Analysis 1.31. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 31 Alkaline 84 Analysis 1.32. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Change from baseline in growth. 84 Analysis 1.33. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 35 Quality of life; general health perception. 85 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 35 Quality of life; gin in recall.	Analysis 1.23. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 23 F	
Analysis 1.24. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 25 Red blood count. 81 Analysis 1.25. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 26 White blood cells. 81 Analysis 1.26. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 27 Dense cells. 82 Analysis 1.28. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 27 Dense cells. 82 Analysis 1.28. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 20 Creatinine. 83 Analysis 1.30. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 30 Apartate aminotransferase. 84 Analysis 1.31. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 31 Alkaline phosphatase. 84 Analysis 1.32. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 33 Quality of life: general health perception. 85 Analysis 1.34. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of life: social function. 86 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 35 Quality of life: social function. 87 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Changes in Alalysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus pla	reticulocytes	80
Analysis 1.25. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 26 White blood cells. 81 Analysis 1.26. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 27 Dense cells. 81 Analysis 1.27. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Leucocytes. 82 Analysis 1.27. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Creatnine. 83 Analysis 1.20. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Creatnine. 84 Analysis 1.30. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Change from baseline in growth. 84 Analysis 1.31. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Quality of life: general health perception. 84 Analysis 1.33. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of life: pain recall. 86 Analysis 1.34. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 35 Quality of life: pain recall. 86 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Changes in 'Ladder of Life'. 86 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Changes in 'Ladder of Life'. 87	Analysis 1.24. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 24 F cells.	80
count. 81 Analysis 1.26. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 26 White blood cells. 81 Analysis 1.27. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 27 Dense cells. 82 Analysis 1.28. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 27 Dense cells. 82 Analysis 1.29. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Leucoytes. 82 Analysis 1.29. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 29 Creatinine. 83 Analysis 1.31. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 31 Alkaline phosphatase. 84 Analysis 1.32. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Change from baseline in growth. 84 Analysis 1.33. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of life: pain recall. 85 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of life: pain recall. 86 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of life: pain recall. 86 Analysis 1.36. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 37 Proportion of participant	Analysis 1.25. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 25 Red blood	
Analysis 1.26. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 27 Dense cells. 81 Analysis 1.27. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 27 Lense cells. 82 Analysis 1.28. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Leucocytes. 82 Analysis 1.28. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Leucocytes. 83 Analysis 1.30. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 30 Aspartate aminotransferase. 83 Analysis 1.31. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 31 Alkaline phosphatase. 84 Analysis 1.33. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Change from baseline in growth. 84 Analysis 1.34. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of life: pain recall. 85 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 35 Quality of life: pain recall. 87 Analysis 1.36. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Changes in Tiadder of Life'. 88 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Changes in Tiadder of Life'. 89	count	81
cells.	Analysis 1.26. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 26 White blood	
Analysis 1.27, Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 27 Dense 82 Analysis 1.28, Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 29 Creatinine. 83 Analysis 1.20, Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 29 Creatinine. 83 Analysis 1.30, Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 30 Aspartate 83 Analysis 1.31, Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 31 Alkaline 84 Analysis 1.32, Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Change 84 Analysis 1.33, Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 33 Quality of 85 Analysis 1.34, Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of 86 Iife: general health perception. 86 Analysis 1.35, Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Changes in 87 Analysis 1.36, Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Changes in 87 Analysis 1.37, Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 37 Proportion 87 Analysis 1.38, Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus p	cells	81
cells 82 cells	Analysis 1.27. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 27 Dense	
Analysis 1.28. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 29 Creatinine. 83 Analysis 1.30. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 30 Aspartate aminotransferase. 83 Analysis 1.31. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 30 Aspartate aninotransferase. 84 Analysis 1.32. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Change from baseline in growth. 84 Analysis 1.33. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Change from baseline in growth. 84 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of life: general health perception. 86 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of life: social function. 86 Analysis 1.36. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Changes in 'Ladder of Life'. 87 Analysis 1.36. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of organ damage. 88 Analysis 1.36. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of organ damage. 89 Analysis 1.39. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of or		82
Analysis 1.29. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 30 Aspartate aminotransferase. 83 Analysis 1.30. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 31 Alkaline phosphatase. 84 Analysis 1.31. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Change from baseline in growth. 84 Analysis 1.32. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Quality of life: general health perception. 85 Analysis 1.33. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of life: pain recall. 86 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of life: pain recall. 86 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Changes in 'Ladder of Life'. 87 Analysis 1.36. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of organ damage. 88 Analysis 1.37. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in DTPA GFR. 89 Analysis 1.38. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in pitted cells (%). 90 Analysis 1.39. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea ver	Analysis 1.28. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Leucocytes.	82
Analysis 1.30. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 30 Aspartate 83 Analysis 1.31. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 31 Alkaline 84 Analysis 1.32. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Change 84 Analysis 1.33. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 33 Quality of 84 Iffe: general health perception. 85 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of 86 Iffe: pain recall. 86 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 35 Quality of 86 Iffe: social function. 87 Analysis 1.37. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 37 Proportion 87 of participants with signs of organ damage. 89 Analysis 1.38. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of 89 organ damage - change from baseline in DTPA GFR. 89 Analysis 1.40. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 45 Signs of 90 organ damage - change from baseline in DTPA GFR. </td <td>Analysis 1.29. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 29 Creatinine.</td> <td>83</td>	Analysis 1.29. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 29 Creatinine.	83
aninotransferase. 85 Analysis 1.31. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 31 Alkaline phosphatase. 84 Analysis 1.32. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Change from baseline in growth. 84 Analysis 1.33. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 33 Quality of life: general health perception. 85 Analysis 1.34. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of life: poin recall. 86 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of life: social function. 87 Analysis 1.36. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Changes in Tadder of Life'. 88 Analysis 1.37. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 37 Proportion of participants with signs of organ damage. 89 Analysis 1.38. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in DTPA GFR. 89 Analysis 1.39. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in pitted cells (%). 90 Analysis 1.39. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of organ dam	Analysis 1.30. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 30 Aspartate	0.2
Analysis 1.31. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Change 84 Analysis 1.32. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Change 84 Analysis 1.32. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 33 Quality of 85 Iife: general health perception. 85 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of 86 Iife: pain recall. 86 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of 86 Iife: social function. 87 Analysis 1.36. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Changes in 87 Analysis 1.37. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 37 Proportion 89 Analysis 1.38. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of 89 Analysis 1.39. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of 90 Analysis 1.39. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of 90 Analysis 1.40. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with s		83
Analysis 1.32. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Change 84 Analysis 1.33. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 33 Quality of 84 Analysis 1.34. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of 86 Analysis 1.34. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of 86 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 35 Quality of 87 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Changes in 87 Analysis 1.36. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 37 Proportion 88 Analysis 1.37. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 37 Proportion 89 Analysis 1.39. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of 89 Analysis 1.39. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of 89 Analysis 1.40. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of 89 Analysis 1.40. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of	Analysis 1.31. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 31 Alkaline	0.4
Analysis 1.32. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Change 84 Analysis 1.33. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 33 Quality of 85 Analysis 1.34. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of 86 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of 86 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 35 Quality of 87 Analysis 1.36. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Changes in 87 Analysis 1.38. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 37 Proportion 88 Analysis 1.38. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 37 Proportion 89 Analysis 1.39. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 39 Signs of 89 Analysis 1.39. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 39 Signs of 90 Analysis 1.40. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of 90 Analysis 1.41. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of	phosphatase.	84
Analysis 1.33. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 33 Quality of life: general health perception. 86 Analysis 1.34. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of 86 Infe: pain recall. 86 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of 87 Infe: social function. 87 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Changes in 71 'Ladder of Life'. 88 Analysis 1.37. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 37 Proportion of participants with signs of organ damage. 88 Analysis 1.38. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 37 Proportion of participants with signs of organ damage. 89 Analysis 1.39. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 39 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in DTPA GFR. 90 Analysis 1.40. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in pitted cells (%). 90 Analysis 1.41. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in pitted ce	Analysis 1.32. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Change	0.4
Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 35 Quality of 85 Analysis 1.34. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 35 Quality of 86 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 35 Quality of 87 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Quality of 87 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Changes in 87 Analysis 1.37. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Changes in 87 Analysis 1.37. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 37 Proportion 89 Analysis 1.38. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of 89 Analysis 1.39. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 39 Signs of 90 Analysis 1.40. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of 90 Analysis 1.41. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 41 Signs of 90 Analysis 1.42. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of <t< td=""><td>from baseline in growth.</td><td>84</td></t<>	from baseline in growth.	84
Analysis 1.34. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of 86 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 35 Quality of 87 Analysis 1.36. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Changes in 87 Analysis 1.36. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Changes in 87 Analysis 1.37. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 37 Proportion 89 Analysis 1.38. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of 89 Analysis 1.39. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of 90 Analysis 1.39. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 39 Signs of 90 Analysis 1.40. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of 90 Analysis 1.40. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of 90 Analysis 1.41. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of 91 Analysis 1.42. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of 91	Analysis 1.55. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placedo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 55 Quality of	05
Analysis 1.34. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of life: social function. 86 Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Quality of life: social function. 87 Analysis 1.36. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Changes in 'Ladder of Life'. 88 Analysis 1.37. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 37 Proportion of participants with signs of organ damage. 89 Analysis 1.37. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 37 Proportion of participants with signs of organ damage. 89 Analysis 1.39. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 39 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in DTPA GFR. 89 Analysis 1.40. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in pitted cells (%). 90 Analysis 1.41. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 41 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen: liver ratio of counts. 91 Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen of participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen of participants with sickle cell disease, Out		85
Analysis 1.35. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 35 Quality of Analysis 1.36. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Changes in 'Ladder of Life'. 88 Analysis 1.37. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 37 Proportion 89 Analysis 1.38. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of 89 Analysis 1.38. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of 89 Analysis 1.39. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of 89 Analysis 1.40. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 39 Signs of 90 Analysis 1.41. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of 90 Analysis 1.41. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 41 Signs of 90 Analysis 1.42. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of 91 Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of 91 Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome	Analysis 1.54. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placedo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 54 Quality of	06
Analysis 1.52. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 55 Quality of 87 Analysis 1.36. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Changes in 88 Analysis 1.37. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 37 Proportion 89 Analysis 1.37. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of 89 Analysis 1.38. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of 90 Analysis 1.40. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of 90 Analysis 1.41. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of 90 Analysis 1.41. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 41 Signs of 90 Analysis 1.42. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of 91 Analysis 1.42. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of 91 Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of 91 Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of 91 <td>Analyzia 1.25 Companies n. 1. Hudrowywara warawa placeba far participante with sidela call disease. Outcome 25 Outline of</td> <td>80</td>	Analyzia 1.25 Companies n. 1. Hudrowywara warawa placeba far participante with sidela call disease. Outcome 25 Outline of	80
Analysis 1.36. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Changes in 88 Analysis 1.37. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 37 Proportion 89 Analysis 1.38. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of 89 Analysis 1.38. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of 89 Analysis 1.39. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 39 Signs of 90 Analysis 1.40. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of 90 Analysis 1.41. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of 90 Analysis 1.41. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of 90 Analysis 1.42. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of 91 Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of 91 Analysis 1.42. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of 91 Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of 91	life: social function	87
Analysis 1.90: Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 37 Proportion of participants with signs of organ damage. 88 Analysis 1.37. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 37 Proportion of participants with signs of organ damage. 89 Analysis 1.38. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in DTPA GFR. 89 Analysis 1.39. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 39 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Howell-Jolley body (per 106 red blood cells). 90 Analysis 1.40. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in pitted cells (%). 90 Analysis 1.41. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 41 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen: liver ratio of counts. 91 Analysis 1.42. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen volume (cm3). 91 Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in creatinine (mg/L). 92 Analysis 1.44. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Creatinine (mg/L).	Analysis 1.36 Comparison 1 Hydroxymere versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease Outcome 36 Changes in	0/
Analysis 1.37. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 37 Proportion of participants with signs of organ damage. 89 Analysis 1.38. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in DTPA GFR. 89 Analysis 1.39. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 39 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Howell-Jolley body (per 106 red blood cells). 90 Analysis 1.40. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in pitted cells (%). 90 Analysis 1.41. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen: liver ratio of counts. 91 Analysis 1.42. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen: liver ratio of counts. 91 Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen: liver ratio of counts. 91 Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen volume (cm3). 91 Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from bas	'I adder of Life'	88
Analysis 1.97. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 39 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in DTPA GFR. 89 Analysis 1.38. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Howell-Jolley body (per 106 red blood cells). 89 Analysis 1.40. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in pitted cells (%). 90 Analysis 1.41. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 41 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen: liver ratio of counts. 91 Analysis 1.42. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen volume (cm3). 91 Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen volume (cm3). 91 Analysis 1.44. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in creatinine (mg/L). 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in creatinine (mg/L). 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in c	Analysis 1 37 Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle call disease Outcome 37 Proportion	00
Analysis 1.38. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in DTPA GFR. 89 Analysis 1.39. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 39 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Howell-Jolley body (per 106 red blood cells). 90 Analysis 1.40. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in pitted cells (%). 90 Analysis 1.41. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 41 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen: liver ratio of counts. 90 Analysis 1.42. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen: liver ratio of counts. 91 Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen volume (cm3). 91 Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in creatinine (mg/L). 92 Analysis 1.44. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in creatinine (mg/L). 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from bas	of participants with signs of organ damage	89
Analysis 1.95. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placedo for participants with stell cell disease, Outcome 30 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Howell-Jolley body (per 106 red blood cells). 89 Analysis 1.40. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in pitted cells (%). 90 Analysis 1.41. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen: liver ratio of counts. 90 Analysis 1.42. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 41 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen: liver ratio of counts. 91 Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen volume (cm3). 91 Analysis 1.44. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in creatinine (mg/L). 92 Analysis 1.44. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in creatinine (mg/L). 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR. 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 45 Signs of organ damage - change from	Analysis 1.38 Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease. Outcome 38 Signs of	0)
Analysis 1.39. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 39 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Howell-Jolley body (per 106 red blood cells). 90 Analysis 1.40. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in pitted cells (%). 90 Analysis 1.41. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen: liver ratio of counts. 90 Analysis 1.42. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 41 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen: liver ratio of counts. 91 Analysis 1.42. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen volume (cm3). 91 Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen volume (cm3). 91 Analysis 1.44. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in creatinine (mg/L). 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR. 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 45 Signs of organ damage - change fr	organ damage - change from baseline in DTPA GFR	89
Images 1.57. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with stele cell disease, Outcome 57 organ of organ damage - change from baseline in Howell-Jolley body (per 106 red blood cells). 90 Analysis 1.40. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in pitted cells (%). 90 Analysis 1.41. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 41 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen: liver ratio of counts. 91 Analysis 1.42. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen volume (cm3). 91 Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in creatinine (mg/L). 92 Analysis 1.44. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in creatinine (mg/L). 92 Analysis 1.44. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR. 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 45 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR. 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 45 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in cystati	Analysis 1 39 Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease Outcome 39 Signs of	0)
Analysis 1.40. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in pitted cells (%). 90 Analysis 1.41. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 41 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen: liver ratio of counts. 90 Analysis 1.42. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen: liver ratio of counts. 91 Analysis 1.42. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen volume (cm3). 91 Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in creatinine (mg/L). 92 Analysis 1.44. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR. 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR. 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 45 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR. 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 45 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in cystatin C. <	organ damage - change from baseline in Howell-Jolley body (ner 106 red blood cells)	90
Analysis 1.40. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in pitted cells (%). 90 Analysis 1.41. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 41 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen: liver ratio of counts. 91 Analysis 1.42. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen volume (cm3). 91 Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in creatinine (mg/L). 91 Analysis 1.44. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in creatinine (mg/L). 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR. 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR. 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 45 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in C. 93 Parturea (bydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Beview) 93	Analysis 1.40. Comparison 1. Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease. Outcome 40 Signs of	70
Analysis 1.41. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 41 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen: liver ratio of counts. 91 Analysis 1.42. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen volume (cm3). 91 Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in creatinine (mg/L). 91 Analysis 1.44. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in creatinine (mg/L). 92 Analysis 1.44. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR. 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR. 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in cystatin C. 93 Payurea (bydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Beview) 93	organ damage - change from baseline in nitted cells (%)	90
Image of the comparison 1 Hydroxy and versus placebo for participants with stelle cell disease, Outcome 11 organ of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen: liver ratio of counts. 91 Analysis 1.42. Comparison 1 Hydroxy urea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen volume (cm3). 91 Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxy urea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in creatinine (mg/L). 92 Analysis 1.44. Comparison 1 Hydroxy urea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR. 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxy urea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR. 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxy urea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR. 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxy urea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 45 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in cystatin C. 93 Torgan damage - change from baseline in cystatin C. 93	Analysis 1 41 Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease. Outcome 41 Signs of	20
Analysis 1.42. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen volume (cm3). 91 Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in creatinine (mg/L). 91 Analysis 1.44. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR. 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR. 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR. 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 45 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in cystatin C. 93 Torgan damage - change from baseline in cystatin C. 93	organ damage - change from baseline in spleen: liver ratio of counts.	91
Image is in 20. Comparison 1 Hydroxy area versus placebo for participants with stelle cell disease, Outcome 12 organ of 12 organ damage - change from baseline in spleen volume (cm3). 91 Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxy urea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in creatinine (mg/L). 92 Analysis 1.44. Comparison 1 Hydroxy urea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR. 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxy urea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR. 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxy urea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 45 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in cystatin C. 93 Torgan damage - change from baseline in cystatin C. 93	Analysis 1.42 Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease. Outcome 42 Signs of	1
Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in creatinine (mg/L). 92 Analysis 1.44. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR. 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR. 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 45 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in cystatin C. 93 Opyrumea (bydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Beview) 93	organ damage - change from haseline in spleen volume (cm3).	91
Imagina in the companion if (F) and (F)	Analysis 1.43. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for narticipants with sickle cell disease. Outcome 43 Signs of	/1
Analysis 1.44. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR. 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 45 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in cystatin C. 93 Organ damage - change from baseline in cystatin C. 93	organ damage - change from baseline in creatinine (mg/I).	92
organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR. 92 Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 45 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in cystatin C. 93 Oxyurea (bydroxyucarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Beview) "	Analysis 1.44. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease. Outcome 44 Signs of	
Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 45 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in cystatin C	organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR.	92
organ damage - change from baseline in cystatin C	Analysis 1.45. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 45 Signs of	
roxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review)	organ damage - change from baseline in cystatin C	93
	roxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Beview)	

Analysis 1.46. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 46 Signs of	
organ damage - change from baseline in urine osmolality	93
Analysis 1.47. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 47 Signs of	
organ damage - change from baseline in urine pH	94
Analysis 1.48. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 48 Signs of	
organ damage - change from baseline in urine-specific gravity	94
Analysis 1.49. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 49 Signs of	
organ damage - change from baseline in total kidney volume	95
Analysis 1.50. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 50 Signs of	
organ damage - change from baseline in TCD ultrasound velocity (time-averaged mean maximum velocity).	95
Analysis 1.51. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 51 Signs of	
organ damage - change from baseline in CNS measures	96
Analysis 1.52. Comparison 1 Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 52 Proportion	
of participants experiencing adverse events and toxicity	97
Analysis 2.1. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with	
SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 1 Proportion experiencing pain.	99
Analysis 2.2. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with	
SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 2 Proportion experiencing life-threatening events during study	100
Analysis 2.3. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with	
SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 3 Deaths during the study.	102
Analysis 2.4. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with	
SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 4 Change from baseline in fetal haemoglobin (HbF %).	102
Analysis 2.5. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with	
SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 5 Change from baseline in absolute neutrophil count (x10/L).	103
Analysis 2.6. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with	
SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 6 Change from baseline in mean corpuscular volume (fL).	103
Analysis 2.7. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with	
SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 7 Change from baseline in sickle haemoglobin (%).	104
Analysis 2.8. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with	
SCD and risk of stroke. Outcome 8 Change from baseline in haemoglobin (g/L).	104
Analysis 2.9. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with	
SCD and risk of stroke. Outcome 9 Change from baseline in absolute reticulocyte count (10 / L).	105
Analysis 2.10. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with	-
SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 10 Change from baseline in white blood count (10 / L).	105
Analysis 2.11. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with	
SCD and risk of stroke. Outcome 11 Change from baseline in platelets (10 / L).	106
Analysis 2.12. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with	
SCD and risk of stroke. Outcome 12 Change from baseline in total bilirubin (mg/L).	106
Analysis 2.13. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with	
SCD and risk of stroke. Outcome 13 Change from baseline in liver iron concentration.	107
Analysis 2.14. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with	/
SCD and risk of stroke. Outcome 14 Change from baseline in serum ferritin (ng/mI).	107
Analysis 2.15. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with	10/
SCD and risk of stroke. Outcome 15 Change from baseline in lactate debydrogenase (U/L)	108
Analysis 2.16. Comparison 2. Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with	100
SCD and risk of stroke Outcome 16 Signs of organ damage - CNS measures at the end of the study	108
Analysis 2 17 Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with	100
SCD and risk of strake. Outcome 17 Proportion of participants experiencing non-neurological adverse events and	
toxicity	109
Analysis 3.1 Comparison 3 Hydroxyures compared to observation for participants with SCD and risk of strake. Outcome	107
1 Proportion experiencing life-threatening events during the study	111
Analysis 3.2 Comparison 3 Hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke Outcome	
2 Signs of organ damage - proportion of participants with a change in CNS measures	111
2 organ of organ damage proportion of participants with a change in Groomeasures	
roxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review)	iii

Analysis 3.3. Comparison 3 Hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome	
3 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in CNS measures.	112
Analysis 3.4. Comparison 3 Hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome	
4 Adverse events and toxicity	112
ADDITIONAL TABLES	113
WHAT'S NEW	116
HISTORY	117
CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUTHORS	118
DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST	119
SOURCES OF SUPPORT	119
DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PROTOCOL AND REVIEW	119
INDEX TERMS	120

[Intervention Review]

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Sarah J Nevitt¹, Ashley P Jones¹, Jo Howard²

¹Department of Biostatistics, University of Liverpool, Liverpool, UK. ²Department of Haematology, Guy's and St Thomas' Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK

Contact address: Sarah J Nevitt, Department of Biostatistics, University of Liverpool, Block F, Waterhouse Building, 1-5 Brownlow Hill, Liverpool, L69 3GL, UK. sjn16@liverpool.ac.uk.

Editorial group: Cochrane Cystic Fibrosis and Genetic Disorders Group. **Publication status and date:** New search for studies and content updated (conclusions changed), published in Issue 4, 2017.

Citation: Nevitt SJ, Jones AP, Howard J. Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2017, Issue 4. Art. No.: CD002202. DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD002202.pub2.

Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

ABSTRACT

Background

Sickle cell disease (SCD) is one of the most common inherited diseases worldwide. It is associated with lifelong morbidity and a reduced life expectancy. Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide), an oral chemotherapeutic drug, ameliorates some of the clinical problems of SCD, in particular that of pain, by raising fetal haemoglobin. This is an update of a previously published Cochrane Review.

Objectives

To assess the effects of hydroxyurea therapy in people with SCD (all genotypes), of any age, regardless of setting.

Search methods

We searched the Cochrane Cystic Fibrosis and Genetic Disorders Group Haemoglobinopathies Register, comprising of references identified from comprehensive electronic database searches and handsearches of relevant journals and abstract books of conference proceedings. We also searched online trial registries.

Date of the most recent search: 16 January 2017.

Selection criteria

Randomised and quasi-randomised controlled trials, of one month or longer, comparing hydroxyurea with placebo, standard therapy or other interventions for people with SCD.

Data collection and analysis

Authors independently assessed studies for inclusion, carried out data extraction and assessed the risk of bias.

Main results

Seventeen studies were identified in the searches; eight randomised controlled trials were included, recruiting 899 adults and children with SCD (haemoglobin SS (HbSS), haemoglobin SC (HbSC) or haemoglobin S β °thalassaemia (HbS β °thal) genotypes). Studies lasted from six to 30 months.

Four studies (577 adults and children with HbSS or HbS β othal) compared hydroxyurea to placebo; three recruited individuals with only severe disease and one recruited individuals with all disease severities. There were statistically significant improvements in terms of pain alteration (using measures such as pain crisis frequency, duration, intensity, hospital admissions and opoid use), measures of fetal haemoglobin and neutrophil counts and fewer occurrences of acute chest syndrome and blood transfusions in the hydroxyurea groups. There were no consistent statistically significant differences in terms of quality of life and adverse events (including serious or life-threatening events). Seven deaths occurred during the studies, but the rates by treatment group were not statistically significantly different.

Two studies (254 children with HbSS or HbS β ° thal also with risk of primary or secondary stroke) compared hydroxyurea and phlebotomy to transfusion and chelation; there were statistically significant improvements in terms of measures of fetal haemoglobin and neutrophil counts, but more occurrences of acute chest syndrome and infections in the hydroxyurea and phlebotomy group. There were no consistent statistically significant differences in terms of pain alteration and adverse events (including serious or life-threatening events). Two deaths occurred during the studies (one in a the hydroxyurea treatment arm and one in the control arm), but the rates by treatment group were not statistically significantly different. In the primary prevention study, no strokes occurred in either treatment group but in the secondary prevention study, seven strokes occurred in the hydroxyurea and phlebotomy group (none in the transfusion and chelation group) and the study was terminated early.

The quality of the evidence for the above two comparisons was judged as moderate to low as the studies contributing to these comparisons were mostly large and well designed (and at low risk of bias); however evidence was limited and imprecise for some outcomes such as quality of life, deaths during the studies and adverse events and results are applicable only to individuals with HbSS and HbS β ° thal genotypes.

Of the remaining two studies, one (22 children with HbSS or HbS β °thal also at risk of stoke) compared hydroxyurea to observation; there were statistically significant improvements in terms of measures of fetal haemoglobin and neutrophil counts but no statistically significant differences in terms of adverse events (including serious or life-threatening events).

The final study (44 adults and children with HbSC) compared treatment regimens with and without hydroxyurea - there was statistically significant improvement in terms of measures of fetal haemoglobin, but no statistically significant differences in terms of adverse events (including serious or life-threatening events). No participants died in either of these studies and other outcomes relevant to the review were not reported.

The quality of the evidence for the above two comparisons was judged to be very low due to the limited number of participants, the lack of statistical power (as both studies were terminated early with approximately only 20% of their target sample size recruited) and the lack of applicability to all age groups and genotypes.

Authors' conclusions

There is evidence to suggest that hydroxyurea is effective in decreasing the frequency of pain episodes and other acute complications in adults and children with sickle cell anaemia of HbSS or HbS β othal genotypes and in preventing life-threatening neurological events in those with sickle cell anaemia at risk of primary stroke by maintaining transcranial doppler velocities. However, there is still insufficient evidence on the long-term benefits of hydroxyurea, particularly in preventing chronic complications of SCD, recommending a standard dose or dose escalation to maximum tolerated dose. There is also insufficient evidence about the long-term risks of hydroxyurea, including its effects on fertility and reproduction. Evidence is also limited on the effects of hydroxyurea on individuals with HbSC genotype. Future studies should be designed to address such uncertainties.

PLAIN LANGUAGE SUMMARY

Hydroxyurea (also known as hydroxycarbamide) for people with sickle cell disease

Review question

What is the effect of hydroxyurea on clinical outcomes (changes in pain crises, life-threatening illnesses, survival, haemoglobin levels, quality of life and side effects) in people with sickle cell disease (SCD) of any genotype?

Background

SCD is an inherited genetic disorder that creates problems with haemoglobin (the substance in red blood cells that carries oxygen around the body). The disease can be inherited in different ways; people can inherit two sickle genes (HbSS genotype) or they can inherit the sickle gene from one parent and a different haemoglobin gene (such as haemoglobin C (HbSC genotype) or a beta thalassaemia gene (HbS β + or HbS β -thal genotype)) from the second parent.

In people with SCD the abnormal sickle haemoglobin forms long polymers (chains) within the red blood cells when they become de-oxygenated. This damages the red blood cells and makes them stickier, leading to blockages and reduced blood flow, causing pain and organ damage. Fetal haemoglobin stops these polymers forming in the sickle haemoglobin within the red blood cell. The drug hydroxyurea is used to raise fetal haemoglobin and can reduce the effects of the disease. This is an update of a previously published Cochrane Review.

Search date

The evidence is current to 16 January 2017.

Study characteristics

We included eight studies (899 adults and children with SCD (HbSS, HbSC or HbS β ^othal genotypes)). Studies lasted from six to 30 months.

Key results and quality of the evidence

In four studies, 577 adults and children with SCD were randomly selected to receive hydroxyurea or placebo. In two studies, 254 children with SCD, who were also at an increased risk of having a first or second stroke, were randomly selected to receive hydroxyurea and phlebotomy (collection of blood) or blood transfusion and chelation (administration of agents to remove excess iron from the body). These six studies only recruited people with HbSS or HbS β ° thal genotypes so results do not apply to people with the HbSC genotype.

There was moderate quality evidence from these six studies that those receiving hydroxyurea experienced significant reductions in the frequency of pain crises, increases in fetal haemoglobin and decreases in neutrophil (white blood cell) counts compared to the comparator treatment. There was no difference between people receiving hydroxyurea or other treatments in terms of quality of life, deaths during the studies and side effects (including serious and life-threatening side effects); however, there is less information about these outcomes in the studies, so the quality of this evidence is low.

Two further studies were included in the review. In one study, 22 children with SCD, who were also at an increased risk of having a stroke, were randomly selected to receive hydroxyurea or no treatment (observation only) and in one study 44 adults and children were randomly selected to receive treatments with or without adding hydroxyurea. Both studies showed an increase in fetal haemoglobin for people receiving hydroxyurea compared to the comparator treatment and there were no deaths during the studies. There was no difference between people receiving hydroxyurea or other treatments in terms of pain crises and side effects (including serious or life-threatening side effects) and these studies did not measure quality of life. The quality of the evidence from these studies is very low, given the studies were very small and only recruited around 20% of the intended number of people and results do not apply to all people with SCD (different genotypes).

Conclusions

The evidence shows that hydroxyurea is likely to be effective in the short term at decreasing the frequency of painful episodes and raising fetal haemoglobin levels in the blood in people with SCD. Hydroxyurea is also likely to be effective in preventing first strokes for those at an increased risk of stroke and does not seem to be associated with an increase in any side effects (including serious and life-threatening side effects).

There is currently not much evidence on whether hydroxyurea is beneficial over a long period of time, what the best dose to take is, or whether treatment causes any long-term or serious side effects. More studies are needed to answer these questions.

SUMMARY OF FINDINGS FOR THE MAIN COMPARISON [Explanation]

Hydroxyurea compared with placebo for sickle cell disease

Patient or population: adults and children with sickle cell disease Settings: outpatients Intervention: hydroxyurea Comparison: placebo

oonpartoon. praceso									
Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% Cl)	No of Participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments			
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk							
	Placebo	Hydroxyurea							
Pain alteration ¹ Follow-up: 6 - 24 months	See comment	See comment	NA	577 (4 studies) ²	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate ⁵	All studies showed a significant advantage to hydroxyurea com- pared to placebo (dif- ferent measures of pain alteration presented) ¹ .			
Life-threatening illness Follow-up: 6 - 24 months	See comment	See comment	NA	552 (3 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate ⁵	Significantly fewer oc- currences of ACS (2 studies) and transfu- sions (3 studies) on hydroxyurea compared to placebo. No sig- nificant differences in terms of stroke, hep- atic or splenic seques- tration (two studies)			

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review) Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Death during the study (all deaths) Follow-up: 6 - 24 months	26 per 1000	10 per 1000 (0 to 51 per 1000)	RR 0.39 (0.08 to 1.96)	577 (4 studies) ²	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate⁵	There was also no sig- nificant difference be- tween groups in terms of deaths related to SCD
Measures of HbF (%) Follow-up: 6 - 24 months	See comment	See comment	NA	577 (4 studies) ²	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate⁵	There was a signifi- cant increase in HbF (%) in the hydroxyurea group compared to the placebo group in all studies (different mea- sures presented) ³ .
Measures of ANC Follow-up: 6 - 24 months	See comment	See comment	NA	517 (3 studies) ²	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate⁵	There was a sig- nificant decrease in ANC in the hydroxyurea group compared to the placebo group in all studies (different mea- sures presented) ³ .
Quality of life : 'Health Status Survey' the 'Pro- file of Mood States' and the 'Ladder of Life' Follow-up: 24 months	See comment	See comment	NA	up to 277 (1 study)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low ^{5,6}	No significant differ- ence in terms of any do- main of any scale ex- cept for pain recall at 18 months (MD 0.70, 95% CI 0.11 to 1.29, P = 0. 02) ⁴ .
Adverse events or tox- icity: differences in rates of specific ad- verse events Follow-up: 6 - 24 months	See comment	See comment	NA	577 (4 studies) ²	⊕⊕⊖⊖ Iow ^{5,7}	Signif- icantly fewer events of dactylitis and gastroen- teritis on hydroxyurea compared to placebo No significant differ-

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review) Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

ы

	ences between groups in terms of all other events
The basis for the assumed risk is the event rate in the control group unless otherwise stated in the comments and footnotes. The corresponding interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relative effect of the intervention (and its 95% CI). ACS : acute chest syndrome; ANC : absolute neutrophil counts; CI : confidence interval; HbF : fetal haemoglobin; MD : mean difference; NA : not ap sickle cell disease.	risk (and its 95% confidence oplicable; RR : risk ratio; SCD :
GRADE Working Group grades of evidence High quality: further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the estimate of effect. Moderate quality: further research is likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate Low quality: further research is very likely to have an important impact on our confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate Very low quality: we are very uncertain about the estimate.	e. Imate.
 Pain alteration measured by mean annual pain crisis rate, time to initiation of treatment to first, second or third crisis, number of vaso-occlusive crises, proportion of participants experiencing pain, proportion of hospitalisation for painful episodes. One study of 25 participants is of a cross-over design (Belgian Study 1996). Participants are counted only once in this total. Different measures presented - change from baseline or post intervention measures - therefore, data from all studies could not be pooled. Within the study (MSH 1995, reported in Ballas 2006), to allow for multiple statistical testing of the quality of life domains, a P value < 0.01 was considered significant. Therefore this result not interpreted as significant in the study publication. Downgraded once due to applicability: only individuals with HbSS or HbSβ⁰-thalassemia genotypes were included therefore results are not applicable to individuals with HbSC genotype. Downgraded once due to all quality of life domains and the study publication defines statistical significance differently to this review. Downgraded once due to imprecision/uncertainty: caution is encouraged regarding the interpretation of these results as not all participants contributed data to all quality of life domains and the study publication defines statistical significance differently to this review. Downgraded once due to imprecision/uncertainty: caution is encouraged regarding the interpretation of these results due to the number of separate outcomes considered in analysis and the increased probability of a statistical type I error. 	

BACKGROUND

Description of the condition

Haemoglobinopathies, including sickle cell disease (SCD), are among the most common inherited disorders in the world. SCD affects people originating from sub-Saharan Africa, Arab countries, the Mediterranean, the Indian subcontinent, the Caribbean and South America, as well as African-Americans and descendants from immigrants from the above countries in other parts of the world. The genetic mutation gives carriers some advantage against malaria and for this reason has persisted. There is an estimated global birth rate of around 300,000 affected individuals per year, the majority of which are in Africa (Piel 2013). There are an estimated 90,000 to 100,000 individuals with SCD in the USA and approximately 12,000 to 15,000 in the UK (Brousseau 2010; Hassell 2010; NICE 2012).

Haemoglobin is responsible for transporting oxygen around the body packaged in red blood cells. SCD is caused by the recessive inheritance of abnormal haemoglobins. People who inherit only one sickle gene and the normal gene for adult haemoglobin (HbA) are sickle cell carriers (sickle cell trait or AS) and are healthy. When people are homozygous, because they have inherited two sickle genes (SS), they have sickle cell anaemia, which is a variable clinical condition, with the vast majority of individuals suffering some pain attacks and a reduced life expectancy. Clinically significant SCD also arises when people inherit the sickle gene from one parent and another variant haemoglobin gene from the second parent such as haemoglobin C (SC) or a beta thalassaemia gene $(S\beta + \text{ or } S\beta 0)$. Sickle haemoglobin, when not carrying oxygen, polymerises distorting the red blood cell into the classic 'sickle' shape. The clinical problems arise predominantly as a result of chronic anaemia and the blockage of small blood vessels, which stops oxygen delivery to the tissues causing pain or organ damage or both.

The most frequent clinical problem is pain which causes over 90% of acute hospital admissions (Brozovic 1987) and significant morbidity in the community (Fuggle 1996). Other acute complications include acute chest syndrome, stroke, splenic sequestration, priapism and an increased risk of infection. SCD is a multi-organ disease with a high chronic disease burden which increases with increasing age. The majority of individuals are anaemic with haemoglobin levels of 60 to 90g/L in HbSS. Common chronic complications include chronic sickle lung damage, pulmonary hypertension, renal dysfunction, chronic bony damage (avascular necrosis), retinopathy and leg ulceration (Howard 2015).

Whilst the majority of those affected used to die in childhood, and still do within parts of the developing world (Chakravorty 2015; Grosse 2011), death rates in children in higher-income countries have fallen over the past decades and the majority of children (over 95%) now survive to adulthood (Quinn 2010; Telfer 2007; van der Plas 2011). Data from the USA reviewing national mortality

data from 1979 to 2005 has confirmed this decrease in mortality in children, but showed an increased mortality rate in adults with a median age of death of 42 years for women and 38 years for men (Lanzkron 2013). Earlier data from the USA showed a median survival for adults with HbSS in the USA of 42 years in men and 46 years in women and in HbSC of 60 years and 68 years, respectively (Platt 1994). This contrasts with Jamaican figures which show median survival for HbSS of 53 years for men and 58.5 years for women (Wierenga 2001) and recent single-centre data from the UK has shown median survival of 67 years in people with HbSS and higher in those with HbSC (Gardner 2016). Data from the USA has also shown an increase in deaths following transition from paediatric to adult services (Quinn 2010). Death is generally SCDrelated and is caused either by chronic organ failure consequent to the sickling process (e.g. renal failure, pulmonary hypertension, hepatic failure) (Manci 2003) or as a result of an acute catastrophic event, such as stroke (Powars 1983), acute sickle chest syndrome, splenic sequestration (Rogers 1978), sepsis (Manci 2003; van der Plas 2011) or other complications (Gray 1991; Lanzkron 2013; Perronne 2002). The UK National Confidential Enquiry into Patient Outcome and Death (NCEPOD) report reviewed UK mortality data over 48 months and found six paediatric and 40 adult deaths. One paediatric death was due to pneumococcal sepsis and two were due to sub-arachnoid haemorrhage. In adults the main causes of death were stroke, multi-organ failure, acute chest syndrome, renal failure and non-sickle causes (NCEPOD 2008).

Improvements in paediatric outcomes are related to the introduction of neonatal screening, early enrolment in comprehensive paediatric care, penicillin prophylaxis, vaccination to decrease lifethreatening infection and primary stroke prevention with transcranial Doppler screening. In adults, treatment has relied on the avoidance of factors that precipitate crisis (including dehydration, infection and cold), and symptomatic treatment of the acute painful episodes (Davies 1997a; Davies 1997b; Steinberg 1999; STOP 2006). Hydroxyurea is currently the only licensed treatment for SCD. Blood transfusion is often required and may be used to treat acute complications or in the long term to treat or prevent disease complications. Haemopoeitic stem cell transplantation is the only currently available curative treatment option and is offered to children with severe disease phenotype and an human leukocyte antigen (HLA)-matched sibling donor. Other donor transplant options and adult transplant are currently only available in the context of clinical trials. Gene therapy offers another potential curative treatment and is currently being investigated in clinical trials.

Description of the intervention

Hydroxyurea (also known as hydroxycarbamide) is an anti-neoplastic oral drug and an inhibitor of ribonucleotide reductase (BABY HUG 2011). The drug has been shown to have many ben-

eficial effects for treating SCD; including increasing fetal haemoglobin (HbF) concentration in red blood cells, improving nitric oxide metabolism, reducing red cell-endothelial interaction and erythrocyte density (Ware 2010). Such disease-modifying effects have been shown to decrease episodes of pain, acute chest syndrome, hospital admissions and the need for transfusions among people with SCD (MSH 1995; Strouse 2008); however, frequent monitoring of the person's blood count is required, in addition to monitoring of toxicity. There are recognised, but mostly reversible, side effects of hydroxyurea, such as low neutrophil count, low platelet count, anaemia, rash, headache and occasionally nausea. Furthermore, it may have teratogenic effects and may have an effect on male fertility (Strouse 2008; Zimmerman 2004). Longterm or serious adverse effects (or both) of hydroxyurea are rare (Steinberg 2010; Strouse 2008) and observational data suggest a survival advantage for those treated with hydroxyurea (Steinberg 2010; Voskaridou 2010).

How the intervention might work

It has long been recognised that raised HbF levels can ameliorate the clinical effects of SCD (Perrine 1978; Platt 1994). HbF levels are high at birth and decrease over the first year of life and and hence clinical manifestations are often delayed until the HbF levels decrease. In addition, individuals who inherit high levels of HbF display a milder disease phenotype. This is because the HbF interferes with the polymer formation of the sickle haemoglobin within the red blood cell. This polymerisation is the underlying pathology in SCD. The more HbF there is, the greater the inhibition. Hydroxyurea was first shown to raise HbF levels in SCD in the 1980s (Platt 1984; Veith 1985). Its intermittent toxicity on the bone marrow leads to a stress response and enhanced erythropoiesis and levels of HbF. In addition to its effects on SCD via HbF enhancement, hydroxyurea also improves blood flow and reduces vaso-occlusion via other mechanisms including decrease of adhesion molecules and stimulation of nitric oxide production (Green 2014).

Why it is important to do this review

It is important to examine as a whole, the body of work relating to the use of hydroxyurea in SCD, to evaluate the drug's effectiveness and tolerability in adults and children, and in the different types of SCD, the dosage regimens and whether the setting appears to influence the outcome, i.e. high-income versus low- and middleincome countries. We aim to review any evidence relating to the impact of hydroxyurea on the natural history of SCD and life expectancy.

OBJECTIVES

The aims of this review are to determine whether the use of hydroxyurea in people with SCD:

- 1. alters the pattern of acute events, including pain;
- 2. prevents, delays or reverses organ dysfunction;
- 3. alters mortality and quality of life;
- 4. is associated with adverse effects.

In addition we hoped to assess whether the response to hydroxyurea in SCD varies with type of SCD, age of the individual, duration and dose of treatment and healthcare setting.

METHODS

Criteria for considering studies for this review

Types of studies

All randomised or quasi-randomised studies, irrespective of language. Studies with quasi-randomised methods, such as alternation, were included if there was sufficient evidence that the treatment and control groups were similar at baseline.

Types of participants

This review is limited to studies of hydroxyurea in SCD only. In order to fully quantify the potential harm and toxicity of this drug, a further review may need to be undertaken in all patient groups treated with hydroxyurea.

People of any age with SCD (SS, $S\beta^0$, SC, $S\beta^+$) proven by electrophoresis and sickle solubility test, with family studies or DNA tests as appropriate.

Types of interventions

Hydroxyurea in any formulation at all doses, compared to either placebo or standard treatment (no placebo) for periods of one month or longer.

Types of outcome measures

Primary outcomes

1. Pain alteration

i) frequency, duration, severity measured on selfreported patient scales

ii) health service utilisation (e.g. inpatient days, outpatient or accident and emergency department visits)

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review)

Copyright @ 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

iii) opioid use

2. Life-threatening illness (e.g. acute chest syndrome, stroke and acute splenic sequestration)*

3. Death during the study

* In the 2017 update of the review, serious adverse events reported in included studies (whether treatment-related or not) were included under the definition of 'Life-threatening illness'.

Secondary outcomes

1. Measures of fetal haemoglobin (HbF or F cells) and neutrophil counts

2. Other surrogate markers of response (e.g. haemoglobin, mean cell volume, platelet count and growth)

3. Quality of life, time loss to school or employment, integration into society, scales recording feeling of well-being and global function (e.g. Karnofsky)

4. Measures of organ damage (e.g. spleen (pitted red cells), chronic sickle lung disease (transfer factor), liver, chronic renal failure (creatinine), priapism, leg ulcer, neurological damage (e.g. intelligence quotient (IQ)))

5. Any reported adverse effects or toxicity

Search methods for identification of studies

We searched for all relevant published and unpublished trials without restrictions on language, year or publication status.

Electronic searches

Relevant studies were identified from the Cochrane Cystic Fibrosis and Genetic Disorders Group's Haemoglobinopathies Trials Register using the terms: sickle cell AND hydroxyurea.

The Haemoglobinopathies Trials Register is compiled from electronic searches of the Cochrane Central Register of Controlled Trials (Clinical Trials) (updated each new issue of the Cochrane Library) and weekly searches of MEDLINE. Unpublished work is identified by searching the abstract books of five major conferences: the European Haematology Association conference; the American Society of Hematology conference; the British Society for Haematology Annual Scientific Meeting; the Caribbean Public Health Agency Annual Scientific Meeting (formerly the Caribbean Health Research Council Meeting); and the National Sickle Cell Disease Program Annual Meeting. For full details of all searching activities for the register, please see the relevant section of the Cochrane Cystic Fibrosis and Genetic Disorders Group's website. Date of the most recent search of the Group's Haemoglobinopathies Trials Register: 16 January 2017.

We also searched the following trials registries on 20 March 2017. ClinicalTrials.gov using the following search terms: hydroxyurea AND sickle.

WHO International Clinical Trials Registry Platform (ICTRP) using the following search terms: hydroxyurea AND sickle.

Searching other resources

The bibliographic references of all retrieved studies and reviews were assessed for additional reports of studies.

Data collection and analysis

Selection of studies

For the initial review, two authors (SCD and AO) independently applied inclusion criteria. For the updates to this review, two authors (AJ and SJN) performed this task. There were no discrepancies between the authors' assessments.

Data extraction and management

For the initial review, two authors (SCD and AO) independently extracted the data. For the updates of the review, two authors (AJ and SJN) performed this task. There were no discrepancies between the authors' assessments.

We intended to group outcome data into those measured at three, six, twelve months and annually thereafter. When outcome data were recorded at other time periods, then consideration was given to examining these as well.

Assessment of risk of bias in included studies

For the initial review, two authors (SCD and AO) independently assessed the methodological quality of each trial using the Cochrane Risk of Bias tool (Higgins 2011). For the updates of the review, two authors (AJ and SJN) performed these tasks. The authors assessed methodological quality on the methods of concealment and generation of randomisation sequence, blinding, whether data were available to analyse on intention-to-treat basis and whether all randomised participants were included in the analysis. There were no discrepancies between the authors' assessments.

Measures of treatment effect

For binary outcomes, we aimed to calculate a pooled estimate of the treatment effect for each outcome across studies, (the risk of an outcome among treatment allocated participants to the corresponding risk among controls). For each study, we calculated risk ratios (RR) with 95% confidence intervals (CI) for all important, dichotomous outcomes. We present RR in preference to odds ratios (OR), as OR give an inflated impression of the size of effect where event rates are high, as is the case of these studies. For the continuous outcomes, we aimed to calculate a pooled estimate of treatment effect, using the mean difference (MD).

Unit of analysis issues

One study was cross-over in design (Belgian Study 1996). We planned to analyse data from this study using the approach recommended by Elbourne (Elbourne 2002); extracting and analysing data from paired analyses if possible.

Outcomes were measured at different time points throughout the course of the MSH study. Methods to analyse aggregate longitudinal data if individual patient data are not available are discussed by Jones (Jones 2009); however, data presented did not allow the use of these methods therefore we have carried out analysis at each individual time point reported.

Dealing with missing data

In order to allow an intention-to-treat analysis, we collected data by allocated treatment groups, irrespective of compliance, later exclusion (regardless of cause) or loss to follow-up.

Assessment of heterogeneity

We assessed clinical heterogeneity by reviewing the differences across trials in the characteristics of recruited participants and treatment protocols. We assessed statistical heterogeneity using a Chi² test for heterogeneity. We assessed heterogeneity using the Q test (P < 0.10 for significance) and the I² statistic (greater than 50% indicating considerable heterogeneity (Higgins 2003)) and visually by inspecting forest plots.

Data synthesis

We analysed data using the fixed-effect model, if we had found considerable heterogeneity (I² statistic > 50%) then we would have examined it using a random-effects model and subgroup analyses.

Subgroup analysis and investigation of heterogeneity

We intended to perform subgroup analyses according to age (in-

fant, child, adult etc), type of SCD (SS, $S\beta^0$, SC, $S\beta$ +), dosage regimen (study specific) and setting (community, hospital, outpatient, etc), however, available data did not allow for these analyses.

Sensitivity analysis

We planned a sensitivity analysis based on the methodological quality of the studies, including and excluding quasi-randomised studies. However, no quasi-randomised studies were included in the review, therefore, no sensitivity analyses were performed.

Summary of findings and quality of the evidence (GRADE)

In a post hoc change from the protocol, we have presented four summary of findings tables, one for each comparison of the review (Summary of findings for the main comparison; Summary of findings 2; Summary of findings 3; Summary of findings 4).

1. Hydroxyurea compared to placebo for participants with SCD

2. Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and an increased risk of stroke

3. Hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants with SCD and an increased risk of stroke

4. Hydroxyurea compared to no hydroxyurea for participants with SCD

The following outcomes were reported in all tables (chosen based on relevance to clinicians and consumers): pain alteration; lifethreatening illnesses; deaths during the study; measures of fetal haemoglobin (HbF or F cells) and neutrophil counts, quality of life and adverse events or toxicity.

We determined the quality of the evidence using the GRADE approach; and downgraded evidence in the presence of a high risk of bias in at least one study, indirectness of the evidence, unexplained heterogeneity or inconsistency, imprecision of results, high probability of publication bias. We downgraded evidence by one level if we considered the limitation to be serious and by two levels if very serious.

For clarity in the tables, where outcomes were presented using different measures (e.g. pain alteration) or different domains (e.g. quality of life or adverse events), a general statement is made in the table regarding the summary of findings for these outcomes and the evidence is graded based on all of the measures or sub domains combined.

RESULTS

Description of studies

Results of the search

See Figure 1 for PRISMA study flow diagram.



Figure I. Study flow diagram.

The previous versions of the review (Jones 2001, latest search conducted May 2010) included two studies reported in 44 references (Belgian Study 1996; MSH 1995); additionally, one ongoing study (23 references) was identified (now completed) (BABY HUG 2011). Furthermore, two studies (two references) were listed as awaiting classification (CHAMPS 2011; Jain 2012).

Searches conducted between June 2010 and January 2017 identified 74 records, seven of which were duplicates. Following removal of these, 67 records were screened and five clearly irrelevant records were excluded based on title and abstract. The remaining 62 records were further screened, full texts were accessed where possible. A total of 29 records were linked to studies previously identified (BABY HUG 2011; Belgian Study 1996; CHAMPS 2011; Jain 2012; MSH 1995), nine studies (reported in 10 references) were excluded (see Excluded studies for further details), three studies (reported in three references) were listed as 'awaiting classification' due to uncertainties around the study design and population (see Characteristics of studies awaiting classification for further details) and one study (reported in one reference) was listed as 'ongoing' (see Characteristics of ongoing studies for further details).

The remaining 19 references corresponded to three new studies which were eligible for inclusion (SCATE 2015; SWiTCH 2012; TWiTCH 2016) and one reference previously excluded from the previous version of the review (Ware 2006) was re-assessed and included under the SWiTCH study (SWiTCH 2012). The three studies previously identified as ongoing or awaiting classification are now also eligible for inclusion in the review (BABY HUG 2011; CHAMPS 2011; Jain 2012)

In total, eight studies (reported in 118 references) are included in the review (BABY HUG 2011; Belgian Study 1996; CHAMPS 2011; Jain 2012; MSH 1995; SCATE 2015; SWiTCH 2012; TWiTCH 2016).

Included studies

Eight studies are included, with a total of 899 children and adults (BABY HUG 2011; Belgian Study 1996; CHAMPS 2011; Jain 2012; MSH 1995; SCATE 2015; SWITCH 2012; TWITCH 2016)

The BABY HUG study was a multicentre, randomised, controlled study conducted in 13 centres in the USA (BABY HUG 2011). It was conducted in children aged nine months to 18 months who had haemoglobin SS (HbSS) or haemoglobin S β° thalassaemia (HbS β° thal). Participants received liquid hydroxyurea (20 mg/kg per day) or matching placebo for two years administered as an oral syrup. A total of 193 children were randomised, 96 were randomised to the hydroxyurea group and 97 were randomised to the placebo group. Participants, caregivers and medical coordinating centre staff were masked to treatment allocation and an unmasked "primary end-point person" monitored laboratory values and assisted in clinical management.

The Belgian Study was conduced in a single centre in Belgium (Belgian Study 1996). This involved 25 children and young adults with HbSS genotype with the aim of reviewing the impact on pain events, hospitalisation and also on fetal haemoglobin reactivation. This study was also placebo-controlled, randomised and blinded to the participant but not to the caring physician. In addition, this was a cross-over study which started at 20 mg/kg per day and, unless cytopenia developed this was raised to a maximum of 25 mg/kg per day. In this study the participants were randomised to either hydroxyurea or placebo for the initial six months and then crossed over to the other arm. There was no statistically significant period or carry-over effect present for the outcomes of the number of hospitalisations and the number of days in hospital (period and carry-over effects assessed by the Wilcoxon Rank Sum test).

The CHAMPS study was a randomised multicentre, phase II, double blind placebo-controlled study with a 2x2 factorial design (CHAMPS 2011). Eligible participants were over the age of five years with HbSC and at least one vaso-occlusive event in the previous 12 months (but none in the four weeks prior to study entry). A total of 44 participants were randomised equally across four treatment groups for 44 weeks: hydroxyurea (20 mg/kg per day) and magnesium (0.6 mmol/kg per day in two doses), hydroxyurea (20 mg/kg per day) and placebo, placebo and magnesium (0.6 mmol/kg per day in two doses). The study was not designed to measure efficacy and measured only laboratory measures. The study was terminated early due to low enrolment after 44 participants had been randomised (target 188).

The Jain study was a double blind (participants, personnel and outcome assessors) randomised controlled study conducted in a tertiary hospital in Nagpur City, India (Jain 2012). The study was conducted in children with sickle cell anaemia (proportion with each genotype not stated) between the ages of five and 18 years with three or more blood transfusions or vaso-occlusive crises requiring hospitalisation per year despite high HbF. A total of 60 participants were randomised; 30 to hydroxyurea (fixed dose 10 mg/mg per day) and 30 to a matched placebo for 18 months.

The MSH study was a multicentre North American randomised and double-blind study, which compared hydroxyurea with placebo over two years in adults with sickle cell anemia (SS genotype only) with the objective of reducing the frequency pain crises (MSH 1995). A total of 299 participants were randomised; 152 to hydroxyurea and 147 to matching placebo. Hydroxyurea was started at low dose (15 mg/kg per day) and increased at 12weekly intervals by 5 mg/kg per day until mild bone marrow depression, as judged by either neutropenia or thrombocytopenia, at that point the treatment was stopped (as reported for the MSH study) (Handy 1996). Once the blood count had recovered,

treatment was restarted at 2.5 mg/kg per day less than the toxic dose. The study was therefore aiming for the maximum tolerated dose (MTD) for each individual within the study. The study was blinded and the study centre recorded and held the mean corpuscular volume (MCV) and HbF levels, which were not looked at by the caring physicians as the MCV and HbF levels rise in most people with SS taking hydroxyurea. As a result of the beneficial effects observed in terms of the primary pain outcome, as reported for the MSH study (Barton 1996), the study was stopped by the National Heart, Lung and Blood Institute of the USA at a mean follow-up of 21 months, before the planned 24 months of treatment had been completed for all participants (MSH 1995). Long-term follow-up continued for the study sample, with all participants offered treatment with hydroxyurea.

The SCATE (Sparing Conversion to Abnormal transcranial doppler (TCD) Elevation) study was a Phase III multicentre, randomised, controlled study conducted in three centres in the USA, Jamaica and Brazil (SCATE 2015). The study was conducted in children with sickle cell anemia (SS, S β °, HbSO^{Arab}, HbSD), haemoglobin SS (HbSS) or haemoglobin SBo thalassaemia and conditional TCD ultrasound velocities (170 cm to 199 cm per second). A total of 22 participants were randomised; 11 to hydroxyurea at 20 mg/kg with escalation to maximum dose of 35 mg/ kg and 11 to standard treatment (observation). The primary aim of the study was to establish whether treatment with hydroxyurea could prevent conversion from conditional to abnormal time averaged mean velocity (TAMV) and subsequent stroke in these children. The planned length of follow-up was 30 months but the study was terminated after 15 months of follow-up due to slow participant accrual and the unlikelihood of meeting the trial recruitment target (100) and the primary endpoint.

The SWiTCH study was a non-inferiority study, comparing hydroxyurea and phlebotomy to standard treatment (transfusion and chelation) using a composite endpoint including secondary stroke prevention and improved management of iron overload. It included children with SCA (HbSS and HbS β° thal, HbSO Arab) and previous stroke, who had been receiving chronic transfusions for at least 18 months (SWiTCH 2012). It was conducted in 26 sickle cell centres across the USA and a total of 134 children were randomised (67 to the standard treatment and 67 to the hydroxyurea and phlebotomy group). Participants randomised to hydroxyurea and phlebotomy commenced hydroxyurea at 20 mg/kg with escalation to MTD (defined by dose causing mild myelosuppression). Transfusion continued for four to nine months during hydroxyurea dose escalation. Once MTD was reached and transfusion stopped, phlebotomy of 10 mL/kg monthly was performed, if haemoglobin was sufficient.

The TWiTCH study was a multicentre phase III randomised open label (partially masked) non-inferiority study conducted at 26 paediatric hospitals and health centres in the USA and Canada (TWiTCH 2016). Eligible participants were children aged four to 16 years with SCA (HbSS, HbS β °thal, HbSO^{Arab}) and abnormal TCD ultrasound velocities (> 200 cm per second) if they had received 12 months of chronic transfusions. A total of 121 participants were randomised; 60 to hydroxyurea starting at 20 mg/kg per day escalated to the MTD compared to standard treatment (transfusions) for 24 months. Children randomised to the standard treatment group received their usual chelation therapy or deferasirox to manage iron overload. Children randomised to the hydroxyurea group continued to receive transfusions until hydroxyurea was escalated to the MTD and following the discontinuation of transfusions, children received serial phlebotomy to manage iron overload. The primary aim of the study was to establish whether treatment with hydroxyurea could prevent primary stroke in these children. The study was terminated at the first interim analysis when non-inferiority was demonstrated; the target sample size had been recruited by this point.

Excluded studies

Following the 2010 search for the previous version of the review (Jones 2001), four studies (reported in five references) were excluded from the review (De Montalembert 2006; Silva-Pinto 2007; Voskaridou 2005; Ware 2006). However, as described above (Results of the search), for the present version of the review, the Ware reference was reassessed and included under the SWiTCH study (SWiTCH 2012).

In total, 12 studies (14 references) were excluded from the current review; five were not randomised (Al-Nood 2011; Pushi 2000; Silva-Pinto 2007; Silva-Pinto 2014; Voskaridou 2005), four did not make a randomised comparison of hydroxyurea and placebo or standard treatment (George 2013; NCT00004492; NCT01960413; Vichinsky 2013), two were of one week of less duration (De Montalembert 2006; NCT01848925) and one was an inappropriate design for measuring the effectiveness of hydroxyurea (NCT02149537).

Risk of bias in included studies

See Figure 2 and Characteristics of included studies for more information.

	Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias)	Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Other bias	Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias)	Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias)
BABY HUG 2011	•	•	+	•	•	•	•
Belgian Study 1996	?	?	?		•	?	?
CHAMPS 2011	•	?		Ŧ	Ŧ	•	?
			-	—	-	-	—
Jain 2012	•	?	+	•	•	•	•
Jain 2012 MSH 1995	•	?	•	•	•	•	•
Jain 2012 MSH 1995 SCATE 2015	•	? ?	•	•	•	•	• • •
Jain 2012 MSH 1995 SCATE 2015 SWiTCH 2012	• • •	? ? •	•	•	•	•	• ? •



Allocation

One study used an automated telephone response system to randomise participants using lists that had been produced by the medical co-ordinating centre (BABY HUG 2011). The SCATE and TWiTCH studies used blocked randomisation and central pharmacy allocation (SCATE 2015; TWiTCH 2016). All three studies have been assessed as having a low risk of bias.

The MSH study used computerised block randomisation, the Jain trial used random number tables and the CHAMPS study used a sequential allocation algorithm for randomisation (low risk of bias) but none of these studies clearly stated any method of allocation concealment (unclear risk of bias) (CHAMPS 2011; Jain 2012; MSH 1995).

The Belgian study described the randomisation of participants as "drawing sealed envelopes, patients were randomly allocated to one of the following treatment sequences", therefore, the generation and the allocation of the treatment sequence are not clear from this statement (Belgian Study 1996). The hospital pharmacy provided the treatment and placebo for each participant and both were described as "indistinguishable." The SWiTCH trial did not discuss the method for randomisation or allocation concealment and therefore this has been graded as unclear (SWiTCH 2012).

Blinding

The BABY HUG study was described as 'double blind', the study paper stated that "participants, caregivers and medical coordinating centre staff were masked to treatment allocation" (BABY HUG 2011). The hydroxyurea and placebo powders were identical in terms of appearance and packaging and the liquid formulations had the same appearance and taste. In the Jain study, participants, clinicians and outcome assessors including laboratory technicians were blinded to treatment allocation with placebo capsules of identical appearance (Jain 2012). These studies were assessed as low risk of performance and detection bias.

In three studies, the blinding of participants and personnel was also not possible due to the differences between the treatments (hydroxyurea and standard treatment) (SCATE 2015; SWiTCH 2012; TWiTCH 2016). Outcome assessors were partially masked in these studies for assessments around the primary outcomes related to neurological events such as stroke. Given the objective nature of the primary outcomes of the studies judged by the blinded outcome assessors, these studies were assessed as low risk of detection bias.

The MSH study was described as double blind (physician and participant) (MSH 1995) and in the CHAMPS study, treatment was assigned in combinations of identically appearing capsules and blinding was achieved by 'over-capsulating' tablets (CHAMPS 2011). These two studies were assessed as low risk of performance

bias. The Belgian study was single-blinded (the participant was unaware of the treatment schedule but the physician was aware of the treatment schedule) because of the difficulty of blinding the attending physician to the treatment received (Belgian Study 1996). It was not stated whether outcome assessors were blinded in any of these three studies.

Incomplete outcome data

In four studies, the risk of bias was assessed as low since withdrawals from treatment were documented, an intention-to-treat analysis approach in primary analyses was used and all randomised participants were included in the analysis (Jain 2012; MSH 1995; SWiTCH 2012; TWiTCH 2016).

In the BABY HUG study, an intention-to-treat analysis was undertaken for primary outcomes (via multiple imputation methods to account for missing data) and for safety outcomes (BABY HUG 2011). Some of the secondary outcomes were reported for only the individuals who completed the study or had data recorded for specific measurements, but given that primary and important safety outcomes were reported using an intention-to-treat analysis, this study was judged to be at a low risk of bias.

In the SCATE study, due to the early termination of the study, two randomised participants did not receive their allocated treatment (SCATE 2015). The primary analysis of this study used an intention-to-treat approach and a sensitivity analysis considered the actual treatment received so this study was also assessed as having a low risk of bias.

In the Belgian study, three participants were excluded from the analysis due to their failure to attend their monthly evaluation at four to five months (Belgian Study 1996). There was no discussion of whether or not an intention-to-treat analysis was used, therefore, the risk of bias was judged to be unclear.

In the CHAMPS study, only participants who completed eight weeks (primary outcome) or 44 weeks (secondary outcomes) of follow-up were included in the results (CHAMPS 2011). This is not an intention-to-treat approach so this trial was judged to be at high risk of bias.

Selective reporting

Three studies defined outcomes in their methods sections, which were reported in the results, and were thus assessed as having a low risk of bias (BABY HUG 2011; Jain 2012; MSH 1995). The CHAMPS study was not designed to measure efficacy and reported only laboratory-based outcomes; all of these outcomes were well-defined in the methods and reported in the results, so this study was assessed to be at a low risk of bias (CHAMPS 2011).

In the primary publication of the TWiTCH study, it was stated the the secondary outcomes of neuropsychological status, quality of life and growth would be published at a later date (TWiTCH 2016). For the SWiTCH study, some outcomes (such as growth and development, functional evaluations, neurocognitive evaluations) do not yet seem to have been reported (SWiTCH 2012). As we are not able to include the results at this time, we have judged these studies to be at a high risk of selective reporting bias. If these results can be included at a later date then this judgement will be reconsidered (SWiTCH 2012; TWiTCH 2016). The final two studies planned to measure outcomes which were not reported due to difficulty in collecting the information to inform these outcomes; these studies are also judged to be at a high risk of bias (Belgian Study 1996; SCATE 2015).

Other potential sources of bias

One study was likely to be underpowered due to the early termination of the study with only 22% of the target sample size recruited (SCATE 2015). Another study recruited only 23% of the target sample size (CHAMPS 2011); however; this study was not designed to measure efficacy and analyses were intended to be exploratory, so we did not consider this study to be at high risk of bias. Another study was also terminated early at the first interim analysis, but the target sample size had been recruited at this point so we did not consider this study to be at a high risk of bias (TWiTCH 2016).

No other bias was identified for the remaining studies (BABY HUG 2011; Belgian Study 1996; Jain 2012; MSH 1995; SWiTCH 2012).

Effects of interventions

See: Summary of findings for the main comparison Summary of findings - Hydroxyurea compared with placebo for sickle cell disease; Summary of findings 2 Summary of findings - Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for people with sickle cell disease and an increased risk of stroke; Summary of findings 3 Summary of findings - Hydroxyurea compared with observation for people with sickle cell disease and an increased risk of stroke; Summary of findings 4 Summary of findings - Hydroxyurea compared with no hydroxyurea for people with sickle cell disease

For the 2017 update of the review six new studies were included (BABY HUG 2011; Jain 2012; CHAMPS 2011; SCATE 2015; SWiTCH 2012; TWiTCH 2016). Due to differences in the eligible populations and treatments in these new studies, we have made the following comparisons.

I. Hydroxyurea compared to placebo for participants with SCD

This comparison includes four studies (BABY HUG 2011; Belgian Study 1996; Jain 2012; MSH 1995).

2. Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and an increased risk of stroke

This comparison includes two studies (SWiTCH 2012; TWiTCH 2016).

3. Hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants with SCD and an increased risk of stroke

This comparison includes a single study (SCATE 2015).

4. Hydroxyurea compared to no hydroxyurea for participants with SCD

This comparison includes a single study (CHAMPS 2011). We note that this study recruits only individuals with HbSC; however, this comparison (and other comparisons) are worded to allow for future studies to be included in updates of this review which recruit individuals of all genotypes to contribute to this comparison.

We have conducted meta-analyses for comparisons 1 and 2 (above) where appropriate and presented results narratively or in additional tables (Table 1; Table 2; Table 3; Table 4). Data are not entered into analysis for the Belgian and CHAMPS studies due to the presentation of results from cross-over and factorial designs respectively; results are reported narratively (Belgian Study 1996; CHAMPS 2011). Long-term follow-up of the participants in MSH study continued for up to 17 years and many publications presented results of long-term follow-up (see linked reference list of the MSH study) (MSH 1995). After two years of double-blind, placebo-controlled therapy, all participants were offered hydroxyurea therapy, so any results reported after the MSH study period are uncontrolled. The long-term results are not therefore analysed in this review.

Primary outcomes

1. Pain alteration

Hydroxyurea compared to placebo for participants with SCD

The MSH study defined pain crisis as a visit to a medical facility, lasting four or more hours, requiring opiate analgesia (MSH 1995). There was a statistically significant difference between the hydroxyurea group and placebo group in the mean annual crisis rate (all crises), MD -2.80 (95% CI -4.74 to -0.86) (P = 0.005) and for crises requiring hospitalisation, MD -1.50 (95% CI -2.58 to -0.42) (P = 0.007) (Analysis 1.1).

The MSH study also showed a reduction in median time (Kaplan-Meier life table estimate) from the initiation of treatment to first painful crisis (2.76 months in the hydroxyurea arm compared with

1.35 months on placebo (Cox regression P value = 0.014), second painful crisis (6.58 months in the hydroxyurea group compared with 4.13 months on placebo (Cox regression P value < 0.0024), and third painful crisis (11.9 months in the hydroxyurea group compared with 7.04 months on placebo (Cox regression P value = 0.0002) (reported in Charache 1995). We note that the analysis of time-to-first, second and third painful crisis seems to treat crisis events independently which is unlikely to be a realistic assumption. Furthermore, information relating to the analgesia used by participants in this study has been reported, but has not been presented according to the groups to which the participants were randomised (reported in Ballas 1996).

The Jain study presented the number of clinical events (vaso-occlusive crises) before and after intervention (Jain 2012). We could not calculate change from baseline in the number of clinical events so we have analysed between group data at 18 months and presented the before and after data in an additional table (Table 1). After 18 months of treatment, there was a statistically significant difference between the hydroxyurea group and placebo group, MD -9.60 (95% CI -10.86 to -8.34) (P < 0.00001) (Analysis 1.1).

The BABY HUG study showed a statistically significantly lower proportion of participants experiencing pain in the hydroxyurea group compared to the placebo group, RR 0.68 (95% CI 0.5 to 0.92) (BABY HUG 2011) (Analysis 1.2).

The Belgian study stated that "16 patients out of 22 (73%) did not require any hospitalisation for painful episodes when treated with hydroxyurea as compared with only 3 of 22 (14%) when treated with placebo" (Belgian Study 1996). In addition, it showed as reduction in mean hospital stay, with a stay of 5.3 days in the hydroxyurea group and 15.2 days in the placebo group. A planned outcome of 'number of days in pain' was not reported in the trial publication due to difficulties in collecting this information from participants.

Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and an increased risk of stroke

Both studies reported the number of participants experiencing 'serious' vaso-occlusive or sickle cell (SCA)-related pain events (SWiTCH 2012; TWiTCH 2016) and one study also reported the number of participants experiencing any vaso-occlusive or sickle cell (SCA)-related pain event (SWiTCH 2012)

There was a statistically significantly higher proportion of participants experiencing serious vaso-occlusive or sickle cell (SCA)-related pain in the hydroxyurea and phlebotomy group compared to the transfusion and chelation groups in the SWiTCH and TWiTCH studies, pooled RR 3.37 (95% CI 1.59 to 7.11) (P = 0.001) (SWiTCH 2012; TWiTCH 2016), but there was no significant difference between the groups in terms of all SCA pain events in the SWiTCH study, RR 1.03 (95% CI 0.81 to 1.30) (P = 0.81) (SWiTCH 2012) (Analysis 2.1).

Hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants with SCD and an increased risk of stroke

No information was reported for this outcome in the SCATE study (SCATE 2015).

Hydroxyurea compared to no hydroxyurea for participants with SCD

No information was reported for this outcome in the CHAMPS study (CHAMPS 2011).

2. Life-threatening illness

Hydroxyurea compared to placebo for participants with SCD

The BABY HUG and the MSH studies provided data on the occurrence of acute chest syndrome, stroke and participants transfused (BABY HUG 2011; MSH 1995). Statistically significant advantages in the hydroxyurea group was the reduction in the occurrence of the acute sickle chest syndrome, pooled RR 0.43 (95% CI 0.29 to 0.63) (P < 0.0001), and also that fewer participants on hydroxyurea underwent transfusions, pooled RR 0.66 (95% CI 0.52 to 0.82) (P = 0.0003). There was no statistically significant difference in terms of stroke, pooled RR 0.54 (95% CI 0.12 to 2.53) (P = 0.44) (Analysis 1.3).

The MSH study reported data on hepatic sequestration and the BABY HUG study reported data on splenic sequestration, the differences between the groups were not statistically significant, RR 0.32 (95% CI 0.03 to 3.06) (P = 0.32) and RR 0.90 (95% CI 0.36 to 2.23) (P = 0.82), respectively (MSH 1995; BABY HUG 2011) (Analysis 1.3).

The Jain study presented the number of clinical events (blood transfusions and hospitalisations) before and after intervention (Jain 2012). We could not calculate change from baseline the number of clinical events so we have analysed between group data at 18 months and presented the before and after data in an additional table (Table 1). After 18 months of treatment, there was a statistically significant difference between the hydroxyurea group and placebo group in the number of blood transfusions, MD -1.85 (95% CI -2.18 to -1.52) (P < 0.00001) and in the number of hospitalisations, MD -8.89 (95% CI -10.04 to -7.74) (P < 0.00001). The duration of hospitalisation was also significantly less in the hydroxyurea group than the placebo group, MD -4.00 days (95% CI -4.87 to -3.13) (P < 0.00001) (Analysis 1.4).

No information was reported for this outcome in the Belgian study (Belgian Study 1996).

Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and an increased risk of stroke

The primary aim of the TWiTCH study was to prevent primary stroke; 29 neurologic events occurred during the study, 17 in the hydroxyurea group and 12 in the standard treatment group; but none were deemed to be stroke or cerebral infarcts (TWiTCH 2016). Three events in each group were deemed to be transient ischaemic attacks and worsened vasculopathy developed in one participant in the standard treatment group.

The aim of the SWiTCH study was to prevent secondary stroke; 91 new-neurologic events were assessed for stroke and seven participants (all in the hydroxyurea treatment group) has positive stroke adjudication, one of which was fatal (SWiTCH 2012). There were also 20 transient ischaemic attack events in 15 participants (nine on transfusion and chelation and six on hydroxyurea and phlebotomy).

There was no statistically significant difference in life-threatening neurological events between the treatment groups in either study from the analysis conducted in this review (Analysis 2.2); however, following the seven events in the hydroxyurea and phlebotomy group, the SWiTCH study was terminated following an interim analysis demonstrating the inability of the primary outcome to reduce secondary stroke occurrence while managing iron overload "within the non-inferiority stroke margin" (SWiTCH 2012).

The SWiTCH and TWiTCH studies reported serious adverse events (including life-threatening events) and other adverse events or toxicities separately (see Secondary outcomes for Adverse events) (SWiTCH 2012; TWiTCH 2016). Thirty-eight participants experienced 81 serious adverse events in the SWiTCH study and 15 participants experienced 33 serious adverse events in the TWiTCH study (SWiTCH 2012; TWiTCH 2016). There were significantly more participants experiencing serious adverse events and SCD-related adverse events in the hydroxyurea treatment groups compared to the transfusions groups; pooled RR 1.93 (95% CI 1.17 to 3.20) (P = 0.01) and RR 3.10 (95% CI 1.42 to 6.75) (P = 0.004), respectively (Analysis 2.2). There was no significant difference between groups in terms of hepatobiliary disease and splenic sequestration but serious acute chest syndrome and infections and infestations were significantly more common on hydroxyurea and phlebotomy treatment than on transfusion and chelation, pooled RR 2.84 (95% CI 1.25 to 6.42) (P = 0.01) and pooled RR 3.65 (95% CI 1.05 to 12.76) (P = 0.04), respectively (Analysis 2.2).

As the control arm of the two studies in this comparison involved blood transfusions, we did not consider the number of participants requiring blood transfusion to be a life-threatening event for this comparison.

Hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants with

SCD and an increased risk of stroke

The primary aim of the SCATE study was to prevent stroke and no strokes or transient ischaemic attacks occurred during the study. Vaso-occlusive events (pain and acute chest syndrome) occurred more commonly in the observation arm than the hydroxyurea arm, but this was not statistically significant (SCATE 2015). There was also no statistically significant difference in cases of acute splenic sequestration or the number of participants requiring blood transfusion (Analysis 3.1).

Hydroxyurea compared to no bydroxyurea for participants with SCD

No information was reported for this outcome in the CHAMPS study (CHAMPS 2011).

3. Death during the study

Hydroxyurea compared to placebo for participants with SCD

The MSH study reported death and causes of death (MSH 1995); no deaths were reported to be related to hydroxyurea treatment. There were two deaths in the treated group and five in the placebo group including one homicide. There was no statistically significant difference between treatment and control groups for this comparison (Analysis 1.5).

There were no deaths in the remaining three studies (BABY HUG 2011; Belgian Study 1996; Jain 2012).

Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and an increased risk of stroke

In the SWiTCH study, there was one death in the standard treatment arm (pulmonary embolism) and one death in the hydroxyurea treatment arm (fatal haemorrhagic stroke) (SWiTCH 2012). There were no deaths reported in the TWiTCH study (TWiTCH 2016). There was no statistically significant difference between treatment and control groups for this comparison (Analysis 2.3).

Hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants with SCD and an increased risk of stroke

There were no deaths reported in the SCATE study (SCATE 2015).

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review)

Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Hydroxyurea compared to no hydroxyurea for participants with SCD

There were no deaths reported in the CHAMPS study (CHAMPS 2011).

Secondary outcomes

1. Measures of fetal haemoglobin and neutrophil counts

Hydroxyurea compared to placebo for participants with SCD

The BABY HUG study reported the change from baseline in HbF (%) and absolute neutrophil count (ANC); there was a statistically significant increase in HbF in the hydroxyurea group compared to the placebo group, MD 6.70 (95% CI 4.75 to 8.65) (P < 0.00001) (BABY HUG 2011) (Analysis 1.6) and a statistically significant decrease in ANC in the hydroxyurea group compared to the placebo group, MD -1.70 (95% CI -2.90 to -0.50) (P < 0.00001) (Analysis 1.8).

The Jain and MSH studies presented results before and after intervention (Jain 2012; MSH 1995). We could not calculate change from baseline so we have analysed between group data at the end of the study and presented the before and after data in additional tables (Table 1; Table 2). After the intervention, there was a statistically significant increase in HbF in the hydroxyurea group compared to the placebo group in the two studies, pooled MD 4.07 (95% CI 2.95 to 5.18) (P < 0.0001) (Analysis 1.7).

The MSH study also reported the neutrophil response after treatment; at 10 weeks and at two years there was a statistically significant decrease in neutrophil response in the hydroxyurea group compared to the placebo group, MD -1.90 (95% CI -2.51 to -1.29) (P < 0.0001) and MD -1.50 (95% CI -2.01 to -0.99) (P < 0.0001), respectively (MSH 1995) (Analysis 1.9).

One study reported an increase in HbF and a decrease in ANC after six months of hydroxyurea treatment, but did not make a comparison to the placebo group (Belgian Study 1996).

Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and an increased risk of stroke

The SWiTCH study reported the change from baseline in HbF (%) and ANC; there was a statistically significant difference between treatment groups for both of these measures (SWiTCH 2012). The results were presented as median and interquartile ranges and therefore could not be entered into a meta-analysis; see an additional table for a summary of these results (Table 3).

The TWiTCH study reported the change from baseline in HbF (%) and ANC; there was a statistically significant increase in HbF

in the hydroxyurea group compared to the placebo group, MD 15.60 (95% CI 13.41 to 17.79) (P < 0.00001) (Analysis 2.4) and a statistically significant decrease in ANC in the hydroxyurea group compared to the placebo group, MD -4.40 (95% CI -5.44 to -3.36) (P < 0.00001) (TWiTCH 2016) (Analysis 2.5).

Hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants with SCD and an increased risk of stroke

The SCATE study reported a significant increase in HbF and a significant decrease in ANC at last follow-up in the hydroxyurea group compared to observation (SCATE 2015). Results were reported as median values so could not be included in analysis, see an additional table for a summary of these results (Table 4).

Hydroxyurea compared to no hydroxyurea for participants with SCD

The CHAMPS study, which included participants with HbSC only, reported a statistically significant increase in HbF for hydroxyurea treatment compared to no hydroxyurea treatment at eight weeks and 24 weeks but no statistically significant difference was observed for ANC (CHAMPS 2011). Due to the presentation of results from factorial design of the trial, results cannot be entered into analysis.

2. Other surrogate markers of response

Hydroxyurea compared to placebo for participants with SCD

The BABY HUG study reported change from baseline in haemoglobin (Hb), mean cell volume (MCV), white blood count (WBC), platelet count, absolute reticulocyte count (ARC), reticulocytes and total bilirubin (BABY HUG 2011).

There was a statistically significant increase in Hb (Analysis 1.10), MCV (Analysis 1.11) and a statistically significant decrease in WBC (Analysis 1.12), ARC (Analysis 1.13), reticulocytes (Analysis 1.14) and total bilirubin (Analysis 1.15) in the hydroxyurea group compared to the placebo group. There was no statistically significant difference between groups in platelet count (Analysis 1.16). The Jain and MSH studies presented results before and after intervention (MSH 1995; Jain 2012). We could not calculate change from baseline so we have analysed between-group data at the end of the study and presented the before and after data in additional tables (Table 1; Table 2). After the intervention comparing hydroxyurea and placebo groups, there was a statistically significant increase in Hb and MCV at 10 weeks and at the end of the studies (Analysis 1.17, Analysis 1.18), a statistically significant decrease in

total bilirubin at the end of the studies (Analysis 1.19) reticulocytes at 10 weeks, 18 months and two years (Analysis 1.20) and a decrease in platelet count at 10 weeks, 18 months and two years which was not statistically significant (Analysis 1.21).

In terms of other laboratory measures comparing hydroxyurea and placebo groups at the end of the studies, there was a statistically significant increase in packed cell volume (Analysis 1.22), F reticulocytes (Analysis 1.23) and F cells (Analysis 1.24), a statistically significant decrease in red blood count (Analysis 1.25), white blood count (Analysis 1.26) and dense cells (Analysis 1.27) and no difference between groups in leucocytes (Analysis 1.28), creatinine (Analysis 1.29), aspartate aminotransferase (Analysis 1.30) and alkaline phosphatase (Analysis 1.31).

One study reported differences in haematologic values after six months of treatment such as Hb, MCV (both significantly increased), platelet count and WBC (both significantly decreased) but only in the hydroxyurea group without comparison to the placebo group (Belgian Study 1996).

The BABY HUG study reported change from baseline in growth, there were no significant differences between the groups in terms of height, weight or head circumference (BABY HUG 2011) (Analysis 1.32). The MSH study reported on weight gain after two years was reported in the MSH study as a mean rise of 3% in the hydroxyurea treated group and 6% in the placebo group, which was not statistically significant (MSH 1995).

Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and an increased risk of stroke

The SWiTCH study reported the change from baseline several laboratory and haematologic measurements such as Hb, MCV, WBC, platelet count and total bilirubin (SWiTCH 2012). There was a statistically significant difference between treatment groups for most of the measurements (increase in HbF, HbS, MCV and decrease in ANC, HbA, WBC, ARC, platelets, serum ferritin and LDH), except for Hb and liver iron concentration; the results were presented as median and interquartile ranges and therefore could not be entered into a meta-analysis; see an additional table for summary of these results (Table 3).

The TWiTCH study reported the change from baseline in Hb, MCV, WBC, ARC, platelet count, total bilirubin, sickle haemoglobin, liver iron concentration, serum ferritin and lactate dehydrogenase (TWiTCH 2016). There was a statistically significant increase in MCV (Analysis 2.6) and sickle haemoglobin (Analysis 2.7) and a statistically significant decrease in Hb (Analysis 2.8), ARC (Analysis 2.9), WBC (Analysis 2.10), platelets (Analysis 2.11), total bilirubin (Analysis 2.12), liver iron concentration (Analysis 2.13), serum ferritin (Analysis 2.14) and lactate dehydrogenase (Analysis 2.15) in the hydroxyurea and phlebotomy group compared to the transfusion and chelation group,

Hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants with SCD and an increased risk of stroke

The SCATE study reported differences in haematologic values and growth values at last follow-up (SCATE 2015). There was a statistically significant increase in Hb and MCV in the hydroxyurea group compared to the observation group. Other values were not statistically significantly different (differences the hydroxyurea group and observation group in Hb and MCV were statistically significant and other values were not significant (WBC, ANC, Platelets, ARC, HbF, weight and height)). Results were reported as median values so could not be included in analysis, see an additional table for a summary of these results (Table 4).

Hydroxyurea compared to no hydroxyurea for participants with SCD

The CHAMPS study reported statistically significant increases in MCV and Hb and a statistically significant decrease in WBC and platelets between hydroxyurea treatment and no hydroxyurea treatment at eight weeks and 24 weeks (CHAMPS 2011). No statistically significant difference was observed in red blood cell count (RBC), mean corpuscular haemoglobin concentration (MCHC) and ARC. Due to the presentation of results from factorial design of the study, results cannot be entered into analysis.

3. Quality of life

Hydroxyurea compared to placebo for participants with SCD

The MSH study has published in abstract limited quality of life data collected at six-monthly intervals (MSH 1995, reported in Terrin 1999 and Ballas 2006). Health-related quality of life (HQoL) was measured using three measures from the 'Health Status Survey' (nine scales), the 'Profile of Mood States' (four scales) and the 'Ladder of Life'. A lower score for each measure equated to a lower quality of life.

Changes from baseline are presented for only three measures: General Health Perception,' 'Social Function' and 'Changes in Ladder of Life' and four week score was reported for 'Pain Recall'.

There was a statistically significant advantage to hydroxyurea compared to placebo in terms of general health perception at 18 months MD 0.90 (95% CI 0.08, 1.72) (P = 0.03) (Analysis 1.33) and pain recall at 18 months, MD 0.70 (95% CI 0.11 to 1.29) (P = 0.02) (Analysis 1.34) but not at any other measured time point for either measure.

There were no statistically significant differences between the hydroxyurea and placebo groups at six months, one year, 18 months and two years for 'Social Function' and 'Changes in Ladder of Life' (Analysis 1.35, Analysis 1.36).

For the MSH study, it was reported that there were no significant differences between groups in other measures of HQoL (using a P value cut-off for statistical significance of P < 0.01 to allow for statistical testing of multiple HQoL domains) (MSH 1995 reported in Ballas 2006). Results are presented as final scores rather than change from baseline so are not entered into analysis in this review. We encourage caution when interpreting results of these quality of life scales as not all participants contributed data towards these analyses.

No information was reported for this outcome in the remaining three studies (BABY HUG 2011; Belgian Study 1996; Jain 2012).

Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and an increased risk of stroke

Quality of life was measured in the TWiTCH study, but results have not yet been published; if results are published at a later date, they will be included in an update of this review (TWiTCH 2016). No information was reported for this outcome in the remaining study (SWiTCH 2012).

Hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants with SCD and an increased risk of stroke

Health-related quality of life was a planned outcome in the SCATE study but was not reported due to difficulties in collecting information from participants at the early study termination date (SCATE 2015).

Hydroxyurea compared to no hydroxyurea for participants with SCD

This outcome was not reported in the CHAMPS study (CHAMPS 2011).

4. Measure of chronic organ damage

Hydroxyurea compared to placebo for participants with SCD

The MSH study reported similar rates of new leg ulcers, RR 0.85 (95% CI 0.44 to 1.64) (P = 0.64) and avascular necrosis of femur and humerus, RR 0.97 (95% CI 0.39 to 2.37) (P = 0.64), in both groups (MSH 1995). The BABY HUG study reported more participants with decreased spleen function at exit in the placebo group than the hydroxyurea group but this was not statistically significant, RR 0.72 (95% CI 0.44 to 1.16) (P = 0.18) (BABY HUG 2011) (Analysis 1.37). The BABY HUG study reported several measures of:

• splenic function: diethylenetriaminepentaacetic acid glomerular filtration rate (Analysis 1.38); Howell-Jolly body (HJB) (Analysis 1.39); pitted cells (Analysis 1.40); spleen to liver ratio of counts (Analysis 1.41); and spleen volume (Analysis 1.42);

• renal function: creatinine (Analysis 1.43); Schwartz glomerular filtration rate (GFR) (Analysis 1.44); cystatin C (Analysis 1.45); urine osmolality (Analysis 1.46); urine pH (Analysis 1.47); urine-specific gravity (Analysis 1.48); and total kidney volume (Analysis 1.49); and

• central nervous system function: TCD velocity (Analysis 1.50); Bayley mental developmental index (MDI) and Bayley motor performance developmental index (PDI) (Analysis 1.51).

Several of the outcomes showed significantly fewer indications of chronic organ damage on hydroxyurea compared to placebo (Analysis 1.39; Analysis 1.40; Analysis 1.41; Analysis 1.43; Analysis 1.46; Analysis 1.48, Analysis 1.49; Analysis 1.50); however, given the number of outcomes measured and the increased probability of type I statistical error and spurious result, the statistical significance of these secondary endpoint comparisons must be carefully interpreted (BABY HUG 2011).

No information was reported for this outcome in the remaining two studies (Belgian Study 1996; Jain 2012).

Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and an increased risk of stroke

The TWiTCH study reported a measure of central nervous system function (TWiTCH 2016). Eligible participants had abnormal TCD ultrasound velocities (> 200 cm per second). The final TCD velocity was significantly lower in the hydroxyurea and phlebotomy group compared to the transfusion and chelation group, MD -5.00 (95% CI -9.16 to -0.84) (P = 0.02) (Analysis 2.16). This outcome was not reported in the SWiTCH study (SWiTCH 2012).

Hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants with SCD and an increased risk of stroke

The aim of the SCATE study was to prevent conversion from conditional to abnormal time averaged mean velocity (TAMV) and subsequent stroke; one participant in the hydroxyurea group and five participants in the observation group converted, this difference between groups was not statistically significant (Analysis 3.2) but there was a significantly lower TAMV in the hydroxyurea group compared to the observation group, MD -25.70 (95% CI -45.38 to -6.02) (P = 0.01) (SCATE 2015) (Analysis 3.3). No strokes occurred during the study.

Hydroxyurea compared to no hydroxyurea for participants with SCD

This outcome was not reported in the CHAMPS study (CHAMPS 2011).

5. Adverse effects or toxicity

As it is difficult to distinguish between adverse reactions (i.e. adverse events which are definitely drug-related) and other adverse events which may be sickle- or transfusion-related, we have reported all adverse events (or adverse effects) as they are reported in the study publications. Where possible, we have noted which adverse effects are defined as drug-related, sickle-related or transfusion-related from the study publications.

Hydroxyurea compared to placebo for participants with SCD

The possible adverse effects reported in the MSH study were hair loss, skin rash, fever, gastro-intestinal disturbance, and 'other' reported events (MSH 1995). There was no statistically significant difference between the groups with these measures (Analysis 1.52). In the MSH study, toxicity relating to the blood count was de-

fined as less than 2500 x 10⁹ neutrophils/L, less than 95,000 x

10⁹ platelets/L, and haemoglobin concentration less than 5.3 g/ dL (MSH 1995). Using these definitions 120 of the hydroxyureatreated participants (79%) and 54 placebo participants (37%) became 'toxic' at least once, resulting in a dose modification. Importantly, no infections were related to neutropenia and no 'bleeding' episode could be related to thrombocytopenia.

The BABY HUG study reported the proportion of participants experiencing a range of adverse events such as dactylitis, priapism, sepsis or bacteraemia, splenomegaly, ANC below 500, ANC 500 to 1250, thrombocytopaenia, severe anaemia, alanine transaminase over 150, bilirubin, creatinine, skin and subcutaneous disorders and splenic sequestration (BABY HUG 2011). The rates of these specific events were generally quite similar with only dactylitis and gastroenteritis showing any differences between the two treatment groups, with statistically significantly fewer events in the hydroxyurea group (Analysis 1.52); however, given the number of outcomes measured and the increased probability of type I statistical error and spurious group differences, the statistical significance must be carefully interpreted.

No major adverse events occurred in either group in the Jain study (Jain 2012); three participants in the hydroxyurea group experienced skin rash and two experienced nausea, but this was not a statistically significant difference compared to the placebo group (Analysis 1.52). No participants experienced alopecia, leucopenia, neutropenia, renal or hepatic toxicity.

It was stated that two children developed transient mild thrombocytopenia in the Belgian study but the treatment allocation of these children was not stated (Belgian Study 1996).

Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and an increased risk of stroke

Life-threatening adverse events are presented above in primary outcome 2 (Analysis 2.2).

In the TWiTCH study it was stated that adverse events were balanced between the two groups, in the transfusion and chelation group there were 287 sickle-related adverse events and 279 sicklerelated adverse events in the hydroxyurea and phlebotomy group (TWiTCH 2016). There were 19 adverse events related to chelation treatment in nine children in the control group (aminotransferases, gastrointestinal symptoms, increased serum creatinine, increased serum bilirubin, rash) and 18 adverse events related to phlebotomy in 14 children in the hydroxyurea treatment group (details not stated). No events related to hydroxyurea were reported. There was insufficient information to enter into the analysis, we hope to include any future information in an update.

In the SWiTCH study, there were a total of 1253 non-neurological adverse events in 128 individuals, there was no statistically significant difference between groups in the number of participants experiencing any adverse event, RR 0.99 (95% CI 0.92 to 1.05) (P = 0.66) (SWiTCH 2012) (Analysis 2.17). In terms of specific events, there was no statistically significant difference between treatment arms for most events. There was a statistically significant difference in terms of immune disorders (more in the transfusion and chelation group), reticulocytopenia, neutropenia and anaemia (more in the hydroxyurea and phlebotomy group) (Analysis 2.17); however, given the number of outcomes measured and the increased probability of type I statistical error and spurious group differences, the statistical significance must be carefully interpreted.

Hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants with SCD and an increased risk of stroke

Adverse events reported in the SCATE study included transient neutropenia, reticulocytopenia, parasite infestation, headache and dizziness (SCATE 2015). There was no significant difference between treatment arms for any adverse event (Analysis 3.4)

Hydroxyurea compared to no hydroxyurea for participants with SCD

In the CHAMPS study, adverse events and toxicity were only reported for all randomised participants and not by treatment group (CHAMPS 2011). A total of 22 serious adverse events were observed in 10 participants and 293 adverse events in 38 participants. It was reported that vaso-occlusive pain crises, headache or migraine, upper respiratory infection, skin rash diarrhoea and abdominal pain were the most common adverse events during the trial and these events were evenly distributed across treatment

Hydroxyurea and phlebo	otomy compared to trans	fusion and chelation for	people with sickle cell di	sease and an increase	d risk of stroke	
Patient or population: a Settings: outpatients Intervention: hydroxyure Comparison: transfusion	dults and children with si ea and phlebotomy n and chelation	ckle cell disease and an i	ncreased risk of stroke			
Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% Cl)	No of Participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk	-			
	Transfusion and chela- tion	Hydroxyurea and phle- botomy				
Pain alteration: propor- tion experiencing seri- ous VOC or sickle-re- lated pain events Follow-up: 24 to 30 months	213 per 1000	718 per 1000 (339 to 1000 per 1000)	RR 3.37 (95% Cl 1.59 to 7.11)	254 (2 studies)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low ^{4,5}	No significant differ- ence between treat- ment groups in terms of all pain events (seri- ous and non-serious) in 1 study (RR 1.03, 95% CI 0.81 to 1.30)
Life-threatening illness Follow-up: 24 - 30 months	See comment	See comment	NA	254 (2 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate ⁴	No significant differ- ence between groups in life-threatening neu- rological events, hep- atobiliary disease and splenic sequestration; significantly more ACS and infections and in- festations in the hy- droxyurea and phle-

Death during the study	1 death occurred in the	1 death occurred in	BB 0 99 (95% CI 0 06 to	254	₽₽○○	botomy compared to the transfusion and chelation group
 (all deaths) Follow-up: 24 - 30 months	transfusion and chela- tion group of 1 study ¹ .	the hydroxyurea and phlebotomy group of 1 study ¹ .	15.42)	(2 studies)	low ^{4,5}	
Measures of HbF (%) Follow-up: 24 to 30 months	See comment	See comment	NA	254 (2 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate ⁴	There was a signifi- cant increase in HbF(%) in the hydroxyurea and phlebotomy group com- pared to the transfusion and chelation group for both studies (different measures presented) ² .
Measures of ANC Follow-up: 24 to 30 months	See comment	See comment	NA	254 (2 studies)	⊕⊕⊕⊖ moderate ⁴	There was a signifi- cant decrease in ANC in the hydroxyurea and phlebotomy group com- pared to the transfusion and chelation group for both studies (different measures presented) ² .
Quality of life	Outcome not reported ³				NA	
Adverse events or tox- icity: differences in rates of specific ad- verse events	See comment	See comment	NA	254 (2 studies)	⊕⊕⊖⊖ low ^{4,6}	There was a statisti- cally significant differ- ence in terms of im- mune disorders (more in transfusion and chelation group), retic- ulocytopenia, neutrope- nia and anaemia (more

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review) Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

	in hydroxyurea and phlebotomy group) in 1 study and the rate of adverse events was bal- anced across groups in the other study
The basis for the assumed risk is the event rate in the control group unless or interval) is based on the assumed risk in the comparison group and the relati ACS : acute chest syndrome; ANC : absolute neutrophil counts; CI : confidence	therwise stated in the comments and footnotes. The corresponding risk (and its 95% confidence ve effect of the intervention (and its 95% Cl). interval; HbF : fetal haemoglobin; NA : not applicable; RR : risk ratio; VOC : vaso-occlusive crisis.
GRADE Working Group grades of evidence High quality: further research is very unlikely to change our confidence in the Moderate quality: further research is likely to have an important impact on ou Low quality: further research is very likely to have an important impact on ou Very low quality: we are very uncertain about the estimate.	estimate of effect. ur confidence in the estimate of effect and may change the estimate. r confidence in the estimate of effect and is likely to change the estimate.
 Absolute data presented for number of deaths as the confidence interval of number of events. Different measures presented - mean or median change from baseline - ther Quality of life data was collected in TWiTCH 2016; to date, primary results of of life data. When available, quality of life data will be included in an update of Downgraded once due to applicability: only children with HbSS or HbSβ⁹-th not applicable to adults or individuals with HbSC genotype. Downgraded once due to imprecision: small number of events and large CI Downgraded once due to imprecision/uncertainty: caution is encouraged re to the number of separate outcomes considered in analysis and the increased 	f the relative effect very large due to the small efore data from all studies could not be pooled. f this study have been published but not quality f this review. nalassemia were included therefore results are around the relative effect. egarding the interpretation of these results due probability of a statistical type I error.

Hydroxyurea compared	Hydroxyurea compared with observation for people with sickle cell disease and an increased risk of stroke										
Patient or population: adults and children with sickle cell disease and an increased risk of stroke Settings: outpatients Intervention: hydroxyurea Comparison: observation											
Outcomes Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)			Relative effect (95% Cl)	No of Participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments					
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk	_								
	Observation	Hydroxyurea									
Pain alteration Follow-up: NA	Outcome not reported				NA						
Life-threatening illness Follow-up: 15 months	See comment	See comment	NA	22 (1 study)	$\bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc$ very low ^{3,4}	No significant differ- ences between groups in terms of ACS, blood transfusions required or acute splenic sequestra- tion					
Death during the study Follow-up: 15 months	No deaths occurred	No deaths occurred	NA	22 (1 study)	$\oplus \bigcirc \bigcirc$ very low ^{3,4}						
Measures of HbF Follow-up: 15 months	See comment	See comment	NA	22 (1 study)	⊕⊖⊖⊖ very low ^{3,4}	There was a significant increase in HbF in the hydroxyurea group compared to the observation group ¹ .					

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review) Copyright @ 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Measures of ANC Follow-up: 15 months	See comment	See comment	NA	22 (1 study)	$\oplus \bigcirc \bigcirc$ very low ^{3,4}	There was a significan decrease in ANC in the hydroxyurea group com pared to the observatior group ¹ .
Quality of Life Follow-up: NA	Outcome not repor	ted ²			NA	
Adverse events or tox- icity: differences in rates of specific ad- verse events Follow-up: 15 months	See comment	See comment	NA	22 (1 study)	\oplus \bigcirc \bigcirc very low ^{3,4}	No significant differ ences between groups ir terms of transient neu tropenia, reticulocytope nia, parasite infestation headache and dizziness
The basis for the assum interval) is based on the ACS : acute chest syndro	ed risk is the event assumed risk in the ome; ANC: absolute	rate in the control group comparison group and neutrophil counts; Cl : co	unless otherwise he relative effect nfidence interval;	stated in the comments and f of the intervention (and its 9 HbF : fetal haemoglobin; NA : r	ootnotes. The correspond 5% Cl). not applicable; RR : risk rati	ing risk (and its 95% confidence io.
GRADE Working Group g High quality: further res Moderate quality: furthe Low quality: further rese Very low quality: we are	rades of evidence earch is very unlikel er research is likely t earch is very likely to very uncertain abou	y to change our confiden o have an important imp have an important impa ut the estimate.	ce in the estimate act on our confide ct on our confide	e of effect. ence in the estimate of effect nce in the estimate of effect a	and may change the estim and is likely to change the d	nate. estimate.

Hydroxyurea compared	with no hydroxyurea fo	or sickle cell disease				
Patient or population: a Settings: outpatients Intervention: hydroxyur Comparison: no hydroxy	dults and children with ea yurea	sickle cell disease				
Outcomes	Illustrative comparative risks* (95% CI)		Relative effect (95% Cl)	No of Participants (studies)	Quality of the evidence (GRADE)	Comments
	Assumed risk	Corresponding risk				
	No hydroxyurea	Hydroxyurea				
Pain alteration Follow-up: NA	Outcome not reported				NA	
Life-threatening illness Follow-up: NA	Outcome not reported				NA	
Death during the study Follow-up: 11 months	No deaths occurred	No deaths occurred	NA	up to 44 (1 study) ¹	$\oplus \bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc$ very low ^{2,3,4}	
Measures of HbF Follow-up: 24 weeks	See comment	See comment	NA	up to 44 (1 study) ¹	$\bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc$ very low ^{2,3,4}	There was a significant increase in HbF in the hydroxyurea group com- pared to the no hydrox- yurea group ¹ .
Measures of ANC Follow-up: 24 weeks	See comment	See comment	NA	up to 44 (1 study) ¹	$\bigcirc \bigcirc \bigcirc$ very low ^{2,3,4}	There was no significant difference in ANC be- tween treatment groups ¹ .

Quality of life Follow-up: NA	Outcome not reported				NA	
Adverse events or tox- icity Follow-up: 11 months	See comment	See comment	NA	up to 44 (1 study) ¹	⊕ very low ^{2,3,4}	Vaso-occlusive pain crises, headache migraine, upper respira tory infection, skin rash diarrhoea and abdomi nal pain were the mos common adverse events during the trial and these events were evenly dis tributed across treat ment groups (not sepa rated by group)
ANC: absolute neutroph	il counts; CI : confide	nce interval; HbF : fetal h	aemoglobin; NA : 1	not applicable; RR : risk ratio.		

DISCUSSION

Summary of main results

Eight randomised controlled studies were eligible for inclusion in this review, with a total of 899 children and adults with sickle cell disease (SCD) (BABY HUG 2011; Belgian Study 1996; CHAMPS 2011; Jain 2012; MSH 1995; SCATE 2015; SWiTCH 2012; TWiTCH 2016). The studies included in the review made the following comparisons: hydroxyurea compared to placebo (BABY HUG 2011; Belgian Study 1996; Jain 2012; MSH 1995); hydroxyurea compared to no hydroxyurea (CHAMPS 2011); hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for the prevention of primary or secondary stroke (SWiTCH 2012, TWiTCH 2016); and hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants at an increased risk of stroke (SCATE 2015). The randomised studies comparing hydroxyurea with placebo (Belgian Study 1996; Jain 2012; MSH 1995) all showed a decrease in pain crises (albeit with slightly different criteria) in adults and children with sickle cell anaemia. The BABY HUG study also showed decreased rates of pain in the hydroxyurea group compared to placebo. This widening of inclusion criteria has had an important role in increasing indications for and use of hydroxyurea. Two studies comparing transfusion and hydroxyurea showed that transfusion was more effective in preventing 'serious' sickle-related pain (SWiTCH 2012; TWiTCH 2016), but there was no difference in all pain events between the two groups, as reported by one study (SWiTCH 2012).

Rates of acute chest syndrome (ACS) were decreased in those taking hydroxyurea when compared with those taking placebo and this was true in adults (MSH 1995) and children (BABY HUG 2011; Jain 2012). Similar decreases were seen in transfusion rates, a surrogate for life-threatening illness (BABY HUG 2011; Jain 2012; MSH 1995). Hydroxyurea did not prevent rates of hepatic or splenic sequestration when compared with placebo (BABY HUG 2011; MSH 1995).

The role of hydroxyurea compared with transfusion in the prevention of stroke has been investigated in two studies (SWiTCH 2012; TWiTCH 2016). The SWiTCH study included people with a previous stroke who had received at least 18 months of transfusion and randomised between ongoing transfusion therapy and hydroxyurea and phlebotomy (SWiTCH 2012). Treatment with hydroxyurea and phlebotomy was not expected to be as effective as transfusion in the reduction of secondary stroke but was expected to improve liver iron loads so a composite primary end point was used including stroke recurrence and liver iron concentration. In the 133 participants there were no strokes in the transfusion and chelation group but seven strokes (10%) in the hydroxyurea and phlebotomy group without concomitant improvement liver iron concentration leading to early trial closure. Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy were not as effective as transfusion for secondary stroke prevention. In the TWiTCH study, hydroxyurea was compared with transfusion in children with abnormal transcranial doppler (TCD) velocities who had received transfusion for at least one year and had no evidence of vasculopathy on magnetic resonance angiography (MRA) (TWiTCH 2016). Hydroxyurea was as effective as transfusion in preventing further stroke and final TCD velocity was lower in the hydroxyurea group. These findings are supported by observational data showing that in a non-trial situation in children with abnormal TCDs who have normalised with transfusion, hydroxyurea can be used to maintain normal TCDs (Bernaudin 2016).

In the randomised studies included in this analysis there was no statistically significant differences in mortality between any treatment and control group. Follow-up from cohorts from the MSH study have been published at nine and 17.5 years (MSH 1995), although randomisation ceased after trial closure and participants could choose whether to take hydroxyurea or not (Steinberg 2003; Steinberg 2010). These follow-up studies both confirmed reduced mortality in the group taking hydroxyurea although the analysis was according to cumulative exposure to hydroxyurea and not the original randomisation. Further supporting evidence for reduced mortality with hydroxyurea comes from a prospective non-randomized trial (LasHS) from Greece with 17 years of follow-up which showed improved probability of 10-year survival in participants who were treated with hydroxyurea (Voskaridou 2010). These results should be treated cautiously as the participants were not randomised and the analysis of mortality in an observational study is more complex.

In terms of chronic organ damage; there were no statistically significant differences in renal and splenic function (the primary outcomes of BABY HUG 2011). Hydroxyurea had no significant effect on glomerular filtration rate over the two years of treatment, but it did improve urine concentrating ability and there was less renal enlargement in the hydroxyurea-treated groups.

Several of the randomised studies showed a statistically significant increase in HbF levels in the groups treated with hydroxyurea, in keeping with the mechanism of action of the drug. This was seen both in participants treated with the maximum-tolerated dose (MTD) of hydroxyurea (MSH 1995; SWiTCH 2012; TWiTCH 2016) and those treated with a standard dose (BABY HUG 2011; Jain 2012). A statistically significant increase in Hb level was seen in studies which compared hydroxyurea to placebo (BABY HUG 2011; Belgian Study 1996; CHAMPS 2011; MSH 1995; Jain 2012; SCATE 2015) and a decrease in haemolytic markers with hydroxyurea treatment was seen in some of the studies (BABY HUG 2011; Jain 2012; MSH 1995).

Those studies which used dose escalation to the MTD (MSH 1995; SCATE 2015; SWiTCH 2012; TWiTCH 2016), showed greater rates of cytopenias, which are expected as the dose of the drug is raised. The MSH study showed increased haematological toxicity resulting in a dose reduction in the hydroxyurea group as compared with placebo, but there were no infections related to neutropenia or bleeding episodes due to thrombocytopenia (MSH

1995). Similarly, the SWiTCH study showed significantly increased rates of reticulocytopenia, neutropenia and anaemia in the hydroxyurea group, compared with transfusion (SWiTCH 2012). The BABY HUG study which used a standard dose of 20 mg/kg of hydroxyurea showed an increase in neutropenia (in terms of absolute neurophil count) in the hydroxyurea group but no increase in events of thrombocytopenia and no increase in the number of infections (BABY HUG 2011). There are no randomised studies comparing the effect of using a standard dose versus dose escalation to the MTD. Clearly, with careful laboratory monitoring and appropriate patient education, cytopenia should rarely represent a major issue as demonstrated.

In the randomised studies comparing hydroxyurea with placebo there was no increase in adverse events related to hydroxyurea including hair loss, skin rash, fever and gastro-intestinal disturbance. In addition, in the MSH study there was no increase in the incidence of leg ulcers and avascular necrosis in those treated with hydroxyurea. This is important as they have both been associated with hydroxyurea use in observational reports and leg ulcers are associated with hydroxyurea use in people with myeloproliferative disease. Furthermore, observational data looking at 15 years of hydroxyurea use from infancy has not shown any concerns about safety (Hankins 2014), although as with the mortality data this is not based on randomised data and should be treated with caution.

Overall completeness and applicability of evidence

Evidence from the eight included studies is extensive and for four of the studies it is reported across many publications (BABY HUG 2011; MSH 1995; SWiTCH 2012; TWiTCH 2016). Furthermore as discussed in the Summary of main results, evidence from these randomised studies is generally supported by longer-term or observation evidence (or both).

There are still questions about the impact of hydroxyurea on the chronic organ damage associated with SCD. Results from the BABY HUG study showed improved urine concentrating ability and less renal enlargement in the hydroxyurea-treated groups. These results suggest that hydroxyurea may have some beneficial effect on renal function, but these results do not automatically translate into clinical benefit (BABY HUG 2011). The long-term effect of hydroxyurea therefore, would benefit from further study, including effects on brain development, IQ, growth and development, as well as the prevention and management of chronic organ damage.

As a chemotherapeutic agent, the cytostatic effects of hydroxyurea are different from those of radiation, alkylating agents and other anti-cancer drugs, many of which are known to increase the risk of development of either leukaemia or cancer. Long-term followup of people taking hydroxyurea for other diagnoses, including polycythaemia rubra vera (Berk 1995; Fruchtman 1994; Najean 1997), essential thrombocythaemia (Sterkers 1998) and cyanotic heart disease (Triadou 1994), has shown no increase in malignancies in those with normal bone marrows and no significant increase in the other groups. There has been no evidence of malignancy in those with SCD treated with hydroxyurea in large observational studies (Steinberg 2010; Voskaridou 2010). Small numbers of case reports have reported myelodysplasia or acute leukaemia in people with SCD treated with hydroxyurea and two of these have been associated with 17p deletions. This is of interest as 17p deletions have also been associated with the development of myelodysplasia or acute leukaemia in people with myeloproliferative disease treated with hydroxyurea (Aumont 2015; Baz 2012). In vitro work has not shown increased chromosome breakages or decreased repair in people with SCD on hydroxyurea (McGann 2011).

Concerns have been raised about whether hydroxyurea is associated with abnormal spermatogenesis and teratogenic effects but there are few data to confirm or refute that. There is a theoretical risk of hydroxyurea affecting sperm development and abnormal spermatogenesis has been shown in animals treated with hydroxyurea. Sperm abnormalities, including oligospermia and azoospermia, have been shown in males with SCD taking hydroxyurea, but it is not clear if these are due to the hydroxyurea as similar abnormalities have been described in males with SCD not taking hydroxyurea. One small study compared semen analysis before, during and after hydroxyurea treatment and showed semen parameters were affected whilst on hydroxyurea and did not seem to recover quickly (Berthaut 2008). This included only small numbers of individuals and needs further investigation.

Evidence of adverse outcomes and teratogenic effects in humans exposed to hydroxyurea in utero is limited. There is case report evidence of women with malignant disease taking hydroxyurea through pregnancy with no adverse effects on the fetus and 17-year follow-up of the MSH study has shown no adverse fetal outcomes in males or females taking hydroxyurea at conception (Ballas 2009) (Table 5). An expert panel report evaluating the toxicity of hydroxyurea has led to recommendations that hydroxyurea is stopped in men and women who are trying to conceive and in breastfeeding women (National Toxicology Program 2008). The risks of stopping hydroxyurea whilst attempting conception should be carefully discussed with the individual.

The CHAMPS study was the only study to include participants with HbSC (CHAMPS 2011). It was not powered to measure efficacy and terminated early due to low enrolment so it is not possible to make conclusions about the efficacy of hydroxyurea in prevention of pain episodes in people with HbSC. Observational data suggest it may be safe and effective in selected individuals, but this needs further study with a phase 3 randomised study (Luchtman-Jones 2016). A total of 165 people with HbS/ B+thalassaemia were included in one observational study but only 44 received hydroxyurea and efficacy on this subgroup was not presented separately (Voskaridou 2010).
Quality of the evidence

We judged the quality of the evidence for the comparison 'Hydroxyurea compared to placebo' to be moderate for most outcomes and low for quality of life and adverse events, where data were more limited and imprecise (Summary of findings for the main comparison).

Similarly, we judged the quality of the evidence for the comparison 'Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke' to be moderate (life-threatening illness and measures of fetal haemoglobin and neutrophil counts) or low quality (pain alteration, deaths during the study and adverse events) where data were more limited and imprecise (Summary of findings 2).

The studies contributing the majority of the evidence to these comparison were large, generally well designed and of low risk of bias (BABY HUG 2011; MSH 1995; SWiTCH 2012; TWiTCH 2016). These studies recruited only individuals with haemoglobin SS genotype (HbSS) or haemoglobin $S\beta^{\circ}$ (HbS β°) thalassemia genotypes, therefore, results are not applicable to those with haemoglobin SC genotype (HbSC) genotypes. Furthermore, for the two most recently completed studies, results for secondary outcomes such as neuropsychological status, growth and development, functional evaluations and neurocognitive evaluations have not yet been reported. Any results relevant to this review from further publications will be included in this review.

For the other two comparisons in the review 'Hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke' and 'Hydroxyurea compared to no hydroxyurea for participants with SCD,' evidence was limited and of very low quality (Summary of findings 3; Summary of findings 4). Only a single study contributed to each outcome and both of these studies are likely underpowered due to early termination after recruiting only around 20% of their target participants. Furthermore, due to the factorial design of one of the studies (CHAMPS 2011), a direct comparison between hydroxyurea and a control treatment was not possible so all results for this comparison must be interpreted as indirect.

Potential biases in the review process

A rigorous methodological approach was applied to the review and a comprehensive search strategy was employed as outlined in Electronic searches, therefore, we do not believe that our methodological approach has introduced any bias into the review.

Given the designs of some of the studies included in this review (e.g. cross-over, factorial) and differing study-defined definitions of the outcomes of interest to this review, in many instances we felt it would be more appropriate to summarise results narratively or perform separate analyses rather than attempting to adjust original results in order to perform meta-analysis.

We encourage particular caution when interpreting results of the outcome 'adverse events or toxicity', as it is difficult to distinguish between adverse reactions (i.e. adverse events which are definitely drug-related) and other adverse events which may be sickle- or transfusion-related. For completeness, we have reported all "adverse events" or "adverse effects" as they are reported in the study publications, regardless of any noted relationship to treatment.

Agreements and disagreements with other studies or reviews

As described earlier in this section, there have been several studies supporting the findings of this review. In addition to these, numerous reviews and other studies discussing the role of hydroxyurea in SCD are available but this is the only Cochrane Review of the topic. A report from the National Institutes of Health (NIH) reviewed 414 studies reporting on the role of hydroxyurea in SCD (published up until July 2014) included five of the randomised studies included in this review (NIH 2014). In some cases in the NIH review, where a literature search was not conducted or was insufficient, the panel relied on their cumulative expertise and knowledge to make consensus-panel recommendations as outlined below.

Strong recommendations with high-quality evidence

• In adults with sickle cell anaemia who have three or more sickle cell-associated moderate to severe pain crises in a 12-month period, treat with hydroxyurea.

• In infants of nine to 42 months with sickle cell anaemia, offer treatment with hydroxyurea regardless of clinical severity to reduce SCD-related complications (e.g. pain, dactylitis, ACS, anaemia).

• To ensure proper use of hydroxyurea and maximize benefits and safety, use an established prescribing and monitoring protocol.

Strong recommendations with moderate quality evidence

• In adults with sickle cell anaemia who have sickle cellassociated pain that interferes with daily activities and quality of life, treat with hydroxyurea.

• In adults with sickle cell anaemia who have a history of severe or recurrent ACS (or both), treat with hydroxyurea.

 In adults with sickle cell anaemia who have severe symptomatic chronic anaemia that interferes with daily activities or quality of life, treat with hydroxyurea.

The group also made an additional moderate recommendation with moderate-quality evidence that children over 42 months and adolescents with sickle cell anaemia should be offered treatment with hydroxyurea regardless of clinical severity to reduce SCDrelated complications (e.g. pain, dactylitis, ACS, anaemia). There were additional moderate and weak recommendations with low-

and very low-quality evidence and a consensus panel recommendation.

AUTHORS' CONCLUSIONS

Implications for practice

The initial randomised studies showed efficacy of hydroxyurea in decreasing pain episodes and other acute complications in adults and children with HbSS and HbSßo-thalassemia (Belgian Study 1996; Jain 2012; MSH 1995). This led to recommendations that hydroxyurea should be offered to this group of individuals. The evidence of similar efficacy in a group of infants not selected for severity (BABY HUG 2011) is suggestive that all infants with sickle cell anaemia may benefit from hydroxyurea. This has led to recommendations that it should be offered to all children with sickle cell anaemia regardless of clinical severity (NIH 2014) and has led to an increased use of hydroxyurea, particularly in children. There is still insufficient evidence on the long-term benefits of hydroxyurea, particularly in the prevention of the chronic complications of SCD and also insufficient evidence about the long-term risks of hydroxyurea including its effects on fertility and reproduction. Hydroxyurea is the only licensed drug for the treatment of SCD and its efficacy in reducing the acute complications of the disease and potential risks of use should be discussed with all individuals with SCD and the families of children with SCD, allowing them to take an informed decision about its use.

There is insufficient evidence to recommend its routine use in those individuals with genotypes other than sickle cell anaemia, but its potential benefits and risks of use should be discussed with those with a severe disease phenotype.

Randomised comparisons of hydroxyurea and transfusion showed that hydroxyurea seems to be as effective as transfusion in preventing stroke in children with sickle cell anaemia and abnormal TCD velocities who have received at least one year of transfusion therapy and have no evidence of vasculopathy on MRA. Hydroxyurea does not seem to be as effective as transfusion therapy in preventing stroke in children with sickle cell anaemia who have already experienced a stroke. Hydroxyurea should be offered to children in the former group (sickle cell anaemia, abnormal TCD velocity, normal MRA, received at least one year of transfusion therapy) as an alternative to long-term transfusion therapy. There is insufficient evidence on whether to prescribe a standard dose or dose escalation to the MTD. All individuals treated with hydroxyurea should remain in long-term follow-up, which should include regular blood monitoring.

Implications for research

Many questions remain unanswered relating to the role of hydroxyurea in SCD (as discussed below). All of these questions need to be addressed by appropriately structured randomised controlled studies. However, there is a need for international agreement on a baseline common data set which should be collected in such studies so that they can be analysed later using meta-analysis techniques, as well as the need for standardised and validated measures for sickle painful crisis and quality of life in people with SCD.

The continued long-term follow-up of the participants of the MSH and BABY HUG studies, with regular reporting of outcomes, is welcomed (BABY HUG 2011; MSH 1995). Particular issues for future studies include:

1. the impact of hydroxyurea on the chronic complications of SCD;

2. the role of hydroxyurea in the management of specific hard to treat complications of SCD of all ages;

3. study of the long-term toxicity profile of hydroxyurea in SCD;

4. the impact of low (15 mg/kg per day) or medium dose (20 mg/kg per day) hydroxyurea dosage in SCD versus dose escalation to maximum tolerated dose;

5. role of hydroxyurea in developing countries;

6. the impact of hydroxyurea in genotypes other than HbSS.

A C K N O W L E D G E M E N T S

We note the previous contribution of Adebayo Olujohungbe (AO) to previous versions of the review.

This project was supported by the National Institute for Health Research, via Cochrane Infrastructure funding to the Cochrane Cystic Fibrosis and Genetic Disorders Group. The views and opinions expressed therein are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the Systematic Reviews Programme, NIHR, NHS or the Department of Health.

References to studies included in this review

BABY HUG 2011 {published data only}

Adams RJ, Barredo J, Bonds DR, Brown C, Casella J, Daner L, et al. TCD in infants: A report from the BABY HUG trial. *Blood* 2005;**106**(11). Abstract no: 952] Adams RJ, Luden J, Miller S, Wang W, Rees R, Li D, et al. TCD in infants: a report from the Baby Hug study. 28th Annual Meeting of the National Sickle Cell Disease Program; 2005 Apr 9-13; Cincinnati, Ohio. 2005:105. Alvarez O, Miller ST, Wang WC, Luo Z, McCarville MB, Schwartz GJ, et al. Effect of hydroxyurea treatment on renal function parameters: results from the multi-center placebocontrolled BABY HUG clinical trial for infants with sickle cell anemia. *Pediatric Blood & Cancer* 2012;**59**(4): 668–74. CENTRAL: 848700; CRS: 5500125000000525; PUBMED: 22294512]

Armstrong FD, Elkin TD, Brown RC, Glass P, Rana S, Casella JF, et al. Developmental function in toddlers with sickle cell anemia. *Pediatrics* 2013;**131**(2):e406–14. CENTRAL: 853612; CRS: 5500125000000530; PUBMED: 23296434]

Armstrong FD, Elkin TD, Brown RC, Glass P, Rees RC, Wang WC, et al. Neurodevelopment in infants with sickle cell anemia: baseline data from the Baby HUG trial. *Blood* 2008;**112**(11):713.

Armstrong FD, Rees RC, Li D, Bonner M, Elkin D, Strouse JJ, et al. Baseline developmental function by age for children in the pediatric hydroxyurea phase 3 clinical trial (Baby Hug). 28th Annual Meeting of the National Sickle Cell Disease Program; 2005 Apr 9-13; Cincinnati, Ohio. 2005:137.

Casella JF, Wang WC, Rogers ZR, Iyer RV, Rana S, Driscoll MC, et al. Progress of the multicenter trial of hydroxyurea in infants with sickle cell anemia (BABY HUG) and assessment of baseline splenic and renal function. Pediatric Academic Societies Annual Meeting. 2005; Vol. 57:1111. Kalpatthi R, Thompson B, Lu M, Wang WC, Patel N, Kutlar A, et al. Comparison of hematologic measurements between local and central laboratories: data from the BABY HUG trial. *Clinical Biochemistry* 2013;**46**(3): 278–81. CENTRAL: 977455; CRS: 550012500000527; PUBMED: 23123915]

Lebensburger JD, Miller ST, Howard TH, Casella JF, Brown RC, Lu M, et al. Influence of hemoglobin level on clinical findings in infants with sickle cell anemia; data from BABY HUG. 52nd ASH Meeting and Exposition; 2010 Dec 4-7; Orlando. 2010. Abstract no: 1631]

Lebensburger JD, Miller ST, Howard TH, Casella JF, Brown RC, Lu M, et al. Influence of severity of anemia on clinical findings in infants with sickle cell anemia: analyses from the BABY HUG study. *Pediatric Blood & Cancer* 2012;**59**(4): 675–8. CENTRAL: 854381; CRS: 5500125000000528; PUBMED: 22190441]

Lederman HM, Connolly MA, Kalpatthi R, Ware RE, Wang WC, Luchtman-Jones L, et al. Immunologic effects of hydroxyurea in sickle cell anemia. *Pediatrics* 2014;**134**(4):686–95. CENTRAL: 1053679; CRS: 550013500000943; PUBMED: 25180279] Lederman HM, Connolly MA, Ware RE, Luchtman-Jones L, Goldsmith JC. Effects of hydroxyurea (HU) on lymphocyte subsets and the immune response to pneumococcal, measles, mumps and rubella vaccination in the pediatric hydroxyurea phase III clinical trial - BABY HUG - (ClinicalTrials.gov Identifier: NCT00006400). *Blood* 2012;**120**(21). Abstract no: 243; CENTRAL: 977456; CRS: 550012500000532]

McCarville MB, Luo Z, Huang X, Rees RC, Rogers ZR, Miller ST, et al. Abdominal ultrasound with scintigraphic and clinical correlates in infants with sickle cell anemia: baseline data from the BABY HUG trial. *AJR American Journal of Roentgenology* 2011;**196**(6):1399–404.

McCarville MB, Rees RC, Rogers ZR, Kalpatthi R, Miller ST, Wang WC, et al. Adbominal ultrasound findings in infants with sickle cell anemia; baseline data from the BABY HUG Trial. 3rd Annual Sickle Cell Disease Research and Educational Symposium and Annual Sickle Cell Disease Scientific Meeting; 2009 Feb 18-20. 2009. Abstract no: 212]

McGann PT, Flanagan JM, Howard TA, Dertinger SD, He J, Kulharya AS, et al. Genotoxicity associated with hydroxyurea exposure in infants with sickle cell anemia: results from BABY-HUG phase III clinical trial. 53rd ASH Annual Meeting and Exposition; 2011 Dec 10-13; San Diego, California. 2011. Abstract no: 8]

McGann PT, Flanagan JM, Howard TA, Dertinger SD, He J, Kulharya AS, et al. Genotoxicity associated with hydroxyurea exposure in infants with sickle cell anemia: results from the BABY-HUG Phase III Clinical Trial. *Pediatric Blood & Cancer* 2012;**59**(2):254–7. CENTRAL: 854422; CRS: 5500125000000524; PUBMED: 22012708]

Miller ST, Barredo J, Brown C, Bonds DR, Casella JF, Li D, et al. Renal concentrating ability in infants with sickle cell anemia; baseline data from Baby Hug, a multicenter trial. 29th Annual Meeting of the National Sickle Cell Disease Program; 2006 Apr 8-12; Memphis, USA. 2006. Abstract no: 141]

Miller ST, Rey K, He J, Flanagan J, Fish BJ, Rogers ZR, et al. Massive accidental overdose of hydroxyurea in a young child with sickle cell anemia. *Pediatric Blood & Cancer* 2012;**59**(1):170–2.

Miller ST, Wang WC, Iyer R, Rana S, Lane P, Ware RE, et al. Urine concentrating ability in infants with sickle cell disease: baseline data from the phase III trial of hydroxyurea (BABY HUG). Pediatric Blood & Cancer 2010; Vol. 54, issue 2:265–8.

Miller ST, Wang WC, Iyer RV, Rana SR, Lane PA, Ware RE, et al. Urine concentrating ability in infants with sickle cell anemia: baseline data from the Baby HUG trial. *Blood*

2008;112(11):1413.

Miller ST, Ware RE, Kutlar A, Alvarez OA, Iyer RV, Sarnaik SA, et al. Serum cystatin-C levels in infants with sickle cell anemia: baseline data from the BABY HUG trial. *Blood* 2008;**112**(11):4791.

Pavlakis SG, Rees RC, Huang X, Brown RC, Casella JF, Iyer RV, et al. Transcranial doppler ultrasonography (TCD) in infants with sickle cell anemia: baseline data from the BABY HUG trial. Pediatric Blood & Cancer 2010; Vol. 54, issue 2:256–9.

Rana S, Houston PE, Wang WC, Iyer RV, Goldsmith J, Casella JF, et al. Hydroxyurea and growth in young children with sickle cell disease. Pediatrics 2014;134(3):465-472. Supplemental information. http://pediatrics.aappublications.org/content/134/3/ 465.supplemental. CRS: 5500135000001451] Rana S, Houston PE, Wang WC, Iyer RV, Goldsmith J, Casella JF, et al. Hydroxyurea and growth in young children with sickle cell disease. Pediatrics 2014;134(3):465-72. CRS: 550013500000945; PUBMED: 25157002] Rogers ZR, Capparelli EV, Thompson B, Ware RE, Wang WC, Iver RV, et al. Pharmacokinetics of hydroxyurea in young children with sickle cell anemia: a report from the Baby Hug trial. 29th Annual Meeting of the National Sickle Cell Disease Program; 2006 Apr 8-12; Memphis, USA. 2006.157

Rogers ZR, Rees RC, Files B, Iyer RV, Shulkin BL, Shalaby-Rana E, et al. Spleen function in infants with sickle cell anemia : baseline data from the BABY HUG trial. *Blood* 2008;**112**(11):1416.

Rogers ZR, Rees RC, Files B, Iyer RV, Shulkin BL, Shalaby-Rana E, et al. Spleen function in infants with sickle cell anemia: baseline data from the Baby Hug trial. 3rd Annual Sickle Cell Disease Research and Educational Symposium and Annual Sickle Cell Disease Scientific Meeting; 2009 Feb 18-20. 2009. Abstract no: 199]

Rogers ZR, Rees RR, Wang WC, Li D, Iyer RV, Rana S, et al. Evaluation of splenic function in infants with sickle cell anemia in the Baby Hug trial. 28th Annual Meeting of the National Sickle Cell Disease Program; 2005 Apr 9-13; Cincinnati, Ohio. 2005:106.

Rogers ZR, Thompson B, Ware RE, Wang WC, Iyer RV, Miller ST, et al. Pharmacokinetics of hydroxyurea in young children with sickle cell anemia: a report from the BABY HUG trial. Blood. 2005, issue 11. Abstract no:: 3184] Sheehan VA, Luo Z, Flanagan JM, Howard TA, Thompson BW, Wang WC, et al. Genetic modifiers of sickle cell anemia in the BABY HUG cohort: influence on laboratory and clinical phenotypes. American Journal of Hematology 2013;88(7):571-6. CENTRAL: 983421; CRS: 5500125000000710; PUBMED: 23606168] Thompson BW, Miller ST, Rogers ZR, Rees RC, Ware RE, Waclawiw MA, et al. The pediatric hydroxyurea phase III clinical trial (BABY HUG): challenges of study design. Pediatric Blood & Cancer 2010; Vol. 54, issue 2:250-5. Thompson BW, Wang WC, Miller ST, Rogers ZR, Ware RE, Thornburg CD, et al. The physiological and clinical

effects of interrupting a treatment regimen of hydroxyurea in young children with sickle cell anemia (SCA). 53rd ASH Annual Meeting and Exposition; 2011 Dec 10-13; San Diego. 2011. Abstract no: 2134]

Thornburg CD, Files BA, Luo Z, Miller ST, Kalpatthi R, Iyer R, et al. Impact of hydroxyurea on clinical events in the BABY HUG trial. *Blood* 2012;**120**(22):4304-10; quiz 4448. CENTRAL: 853818; CRS: 5500125000000526; PUBMED: 22915643]

Thornburg CD, Rogers ZR, Jeng MR, Rana SR, Iyer RV, Faughnan L, et al. Adherence to study medication and visits: data from the BABY HUG trial. Pediatric Blood & Cancer 2010; Vol. 54, issue 2:260–4.

Thornburg CD, Rogers ZR, Wang W, Jeng M, Rana SR, Iyer RV, et al. Study drug and visit adherence: data from the Baby HUG trial. *Blood* 2008;**112**(11):1275.

Wang W, Luo Z, Alvarez O, Fixler J, Miller S, Ware RE, et al. Effects of hydroxyurea in asymptomatic infants with sickle cell anemia: Analysis F from the BABY HUG trial. *American Journal of Hematology* 2012;7:E20–E21. Wang W, Rees RC, Miller ST, Brown RC, Casella JF, Iyer

RV, et al. Transcranial doppler (TCD) ultrasonography in infants with sickle cell anemia: baseline data from the BABY HUG trial. *Blood* 2008;**112**(11):1436. Wang WC, Oyeku SO, Luo Z, Boulet SL, Miller ST,

Casella JF, et al. Hydroxyurea is associated with lower costs of care of young children with sickle cell anemia. *Pediatrics* 2013;**132**(4):677–83. CENTRAL: 962768; CRS: 550012500000529; PUBMED: 23999955]

* Wang WC, Ware RE, Miller ST, Iyer RV, Casella JF, Minniti CP, et al. Hydroxycarbamide in very young children with sickle-cell anaemia: a multicentre, randomised, controlled trial (BABY HUG). *Lancet* 2011;**377**(9778): 1663–72.

Wang WC, Yeku SO, Luo Z, Boulet SL, Miller ST, Fish B, et al. Costs associated with the care of very young children with sickle cell anemia (SCA): analysis from the BABY HUG study. 53rd ASH Annual Meeting and Exposition; 2011 Dec 10-13; San Diego. 2011. Abstract no: 171] Ware RE, Rees RC, Sarnaik SA, Iyer RV, Alvarez OA, Casella JF, et al. Renal function in infants with sickle cell anemia: baseline data from the BABY HUG trial. *Blood* 2008;**112**(11):1414.

Ware RE, Rees RC, Sarnaik SA, Iyer RV, Alvarez OA, Casella JF, et al. Renal function in infants with sickle cell anemia: baseline data from the BABY HUG trial. Journal of Pediatrics 2010; Vol. 156, issue 1:66–70.

Wynn L, Debenham E, Faughnan L, Martin B, Kelly T, Reed C, et al. Recruitment in the Baby Hug pediatric hydroxyurea phase 3 clinical trial. 35th Anniversary Convention of the National Sickle Cell Disease Program; 2007 Sep 17-22; Washington DC, USA. 2007:245. Wynn L, Miller S, Faughnan L, Luo Z, Debenham E, Adix L, et al. Recruitment of infants with sickle cell anemia to a Phase III trial: data from the BABY HUG study. Contemporary Clinical Trials 2010; Vol. 31, issue 6:

558-63.

Wynn LW, Faughnan L, Li D, Wang W, Martin B, Kelly T, et al. Recruitment of infants with sickle cell anemia to a phase III trials: data from the BABY HUG study. *Blood* 2008;**112**(11):1429.

Belgian Study 1996 {published data only}

Ferster A, Vermylen C, Cornu G, Buyse M, Corazza F, Devalck C, et al. Hydroxyurea for treatment of severe sickle cell anemia: a pediatric clinical trial. *Blood* 1996;**88**(6): 1960–4.

CHAMPS 2011 {published data only}

* Wang W, Brugnara C, Snyder C, Wynn L, Rogers Z, Kalinyak K, et al. The effects of hydroxycarbamide and magnesium on haemoglobin SC disease: results of the multi-centre CHAMPS trial. *British Journal of Haematology* 2011;**152**(6):771–6. CENTRAL: 801819; CRS: 550012500000521; PUBMED: 21275961] Wang WC, Snyder C, Brugnara C, Telen MJ, Steinberg MH, Wynn LW, et al. Effects of hydroxyurea (HU) and magnesium pidolate (Mg) in hemoglobin SC disease (HbSC): the "CHAMPS" trial. Blood 2009; Vol. 22. Abstract no: 819]

Jain 2012 {published data only}

Jain D. Low dose hydroxyurea in children severely affected with sickle cell disease: hospital based randomized controlled study. 4th Annual Sickle Cell Disease Research and Educational Symposium & Grant Writing Institute AND Annual Sickle Cell Disease Scientific Meeting; 2010 Feb 14-19; Hollywood, Florida. 2010. Abstract no: 076] * Jain DL, Sarathi V, Desai S, Bhatnagar M, Lodha A. Low fixed-dose hydroxyurea in severely affected Indian children with sickle cell disease. *Hemoglobin* 2012;**36**(4): 323–32. CENTRAL: 879848; CRS: 5500125000000522; PUBMED: 22734586]

MSH 1995 {published data only}

Armstrong FD, Steinberg MH, Ballas SK, Ataga KI, Waclawiw MA, Kutlar A, et al. Development outcomes of offspring of adults treated with hydroxyurea in the multicenter study of hydroxyurea. Blood 2009, issue 22. Abstract no: 1543]

Ballas SK, Barton F, Castro O, Bellevue R, Investigators of the multicenter study of hydroxyurea in sickle cell anemia. Narcotic analgesia use among adult patients with sickle cell anemia. *Blood* 1995;**86**(10 Suppl 1):642a.

Ballas SK, Barton F, Castro O, Koshy M, Bellevue R. Pattern of narcotic analgesic consumption among adult patients with sickle cell anemia. National Sickle Cell Disease Program 21st Annual Meeting; 1996 Mar. 1996:63.

Ballas SK, Barton FB, Waclawiw MA, Swerdlow P, Eckman JR, Pegelow CH, et al. Hydroxyurea and sickle cell anemia: effect on quality of life. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes* 2006;**4**:59.

Ballas SK, Bauserman RL, McCarthy WF, Castro OL, Smith WR, Waclawiw MA. Utilization of analgesics in the multicenter study of hydroxyurea in sickle cell anemia: Effect of sex, age, and geographical location. *American Journal of Hematology* 2010;**85**(8):613–6.

Ballas SK, Bauserman RL, McCarthy WF, Castro OL, Smith WR, Waclawiw MA, IoftheMSofHinSCA. Hydroxyurea and acute painful crises in sickle cell anemia: effects on hospital length of stay and opioid utilization during hospitalization, outpatient acute care contacts, and at home. *Journal of Pain and Symptom Management* 2010;**40**(6): 870–82. CENTRAL: 779191; CRS: 5500135000001680; PUBMED: 20864308]

Ballas SK, Bauserman RL, McCarthy WF, Waclawiw MA. The impact of hydroxyurea on career and employment of patients with sickle cell anemia. JAMA 2010; Vol. 102, issue 11:993–9.

Ballas SK, Bauserman RL, McCarthy WF, Waclawiw MA, Barton BA. Impact of hydroxyurea on employment among patients with sickle cell anemia. Blood 2009; Vol. 114, issue 22. Abstract no: 2485]

Ballas SK, Marcolina MJ, Dover GJ, Barton FB. Erythropoietic activity in patients with sickle cell anaemia before and after treatment with hydroxyurea. *British Journal* of Haematology 1999;**105**(2):491–6.

Ballas SK, Marcolina MJ, Investigators of the multicenter study of hydroxyurea in sickle cell anemia. In vivo RBC survival and ferrokinetic data in patients with sickle cell anemia before and after treatment with hydroxyurea. *Blood* 1995;**86**(10 Suppl 1):140a.

Ballas SK, McCarthy WF, Bauseman RI, Castro OL, Swerdlow PS, Smith W, et al. Patterns of analgesic utilization in the multicenter study of hydroxyurea (MSH). Blood 2009; Vol. 114, issue 22. Abstract no: 2577] Ballas SK, McCarthy WF, Bauserman RL, Castro OL, Waclawiw MA, Barton BA. Sickle cell genetic markers: geographic distribution and relation to pain outcomes in multicenter study of hydroxyurea in sickle cell anemia. Blood 2009; Vol. 114, issue 22. Abstract no: 2582] Ballas SK, McCarthy WF, Bauserman RL, Valafar F, Waclawiw M, Barton BA, Kutlar A. Definition of the responder to hydroxyurea therapy: revisited. *Blood* 2009; **114**(22). Abstract no: 1513]

Ballas SK, McCarthy WF, Guo N, Brugnara C, Kling G, Bauserman R, et al. Early detection of responders to hydroxyurea therapy. 4th Annual Sickle Cell Disease Research and Educational Symposium & Grant Writing Institute AND Annual Sickle Cell Disease Scientific Meeting; 2010 Feb 14-19; Hollywood, Florida. 2010; Vol. 26. Abstract no: 030]

Ballas SK, McCarthy WF, Guo N, DeCastro L, Bellevue R, Barton BA, et al. Exposure to hydroxyurea and pregnancy outcomes in patients with sickle cell anemia. *Journal of the National Medical Association* 2009;**101**(10): 1046–51. CENTRAL: 730469; CRS: 550005000000074; PUBMED: 19860305]

Barton F, Terrin M, Moore R, McMahon RP, Charache S. Ascertainment of the primary end point in the Multicenter Study of Hydroxyrea in Sickle Cell Anemia (MSH). The MSH Investigators. *Controlled Clinical Trials* 1996;**17**(2)

Hydroxy
urea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review) Copyright
 C 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

36

Suppl):67S.

Brandon AE, McCarthy WF, Barton FB, Terrin ML. Vital status determination of patients' lost to follow-up in the multicenter study of hydroxyurea in sickle cell anemia (MSH) patients' follow-up study. *Clinical Trials* 2004;**2**: 209.

Charache S. Effects of hydroxyurea therapy in patients with sickle cell anemia. *Australian and New Zealand Journal of Medicine* 1996;**26**:326.

Charache S. Experimental therapy of sickle cell disease. Use of hydroxyurea. *American Journal of Pediatric Hematology/ Oncology* 1994;**16**(1):62–6.

Charache S. Mechanism of action of hydroxyurea in the management of sickle cell anemia in adults. *Seminars in Hematology* 1997;**34**(3 Suppl 3):15–21.

Charache S. Preventing pain in sickle cell anemia (HB SS): baseline data from patients in a hydroxyurea trial. *Blood* 1993;**82**(10 Suppl):356a.

Charache S, Barton FB, Moore RD, Terrin ML, Steinberg MH, Dover GJ, et al. Hydroxyurea and sickle cell anemia. Clinical utility of a myelosuppressive "switching" agent. *Medicine* 1996;**75**(6):300–26.

* Charache S, Terrin M, Moore RD, Dover GJ, Barton FB, Eckert SV, et al. Effect of hydroxyurea on the frequency of painful crisis in sickle cell anemia. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1995;**332**(20):1317–22.

Charache S, Terrin ML, Moore RD, Dover GJ, McMahon RP, Barton FB, et al. Design of the multicenter study of hydroxyurea in sickle cell anemia. *Controlled Clinical Trials* 1995;**16**(6):432–46.

Hackney AC, Heizer W, Hoffman E, Jones S, Strayhorn D, Orringer EP. Effect of hydroxyurea (HU) administration on the body weight, body composition and exercise performance of patients with sickle cell anemia. *Blood* 1995; **86**(10 Suppl 1):141a.

Hackney AC, Hezier W, Gulledge TP, Jones S, Strayhorn D, Busby M, et al. Effects of hydroxyurea administration on the body weight, body composition and exercise performance of patients with sickle-cell anaemia. *Clinical Science* 1997;**92**(5):481–6.

Handy C, Barton F, Moore R, McMahon R, Eckert S, Terrin M. Dose titration in the multicentre study of hydroxyurea in sickle cell anemia (MSH). *Controlled Clinical Trials* 1996; **17**(Suppl 2):92S.

Heizer WD, Hackney AC, Busby M, Gulledge T, Jones S, Strayhorn G, et al. The composition and etiology of weight gain in sickle cell patients receiving hydroxyurea (HU): An ancillary study to the multicentre study of hydroxyurea (MSH). National Sickle Cell Disease Program 18th Annual Meeting; 1993 May. 1993:117a.

Kutlar A, Barton F, Terrin M, Steinberg MH. Effect of hydroxyurea on hematologic and biochemical laboratory values in sickle cell disease: The MSH at 7-8 years followup. National Sickle Cell Disease Program 25th Annual Meeting; 2001 Apr. 2001. Abstract no: #126]

McCarthy WF, Bauserman RL, Barton BA, Guo N, Ballas SK, Smith W. Time series analysis of the pain diary data

obtained during the multicenter study for hydroxyurea (MSH) clinical trial. *Blood* 2006;**11**. Abstract no: 3807] McMahon RP, Waclawiw MA, Geller NL, Barton FB, Terrin ML, Bonds DR. An extension of stochastic curtailment for incompletely reported events: the multicenter study of hydroxyurea in sickle cell anemia (MSH). *Controlled Clinical Trials* 1997;**18**(5):420–30.

Moore RD, Charache S, Terrin M, Barton FB, Ballas SK. Cost-effectiveness of hydroxyurea in sickle cell anemia. National Sickle Cell Disease Program 23rd Meeting; 1999 Mar. 1999:210.

Moore RD, Charache S, Terrin ML, Barton FB, Ballas SK, and the investigators of the MSH study of hydroxyurea in sickle cell anemia. Cost-effectiveness of hydroxyurea in sickle cell anemia. *American Journal of Hematology* 2000;**64** (1):26–31.

Orringer EP, Jones S, Strayhorn D, Hoffman E, Parker J, Greenberg C. The effect of hydroxyurea (HU) administration on circulating D-dimer levels in patients with sickle cell anemia (HbSS). National Sickle Cell Disease Program 21st Meeting; 1996 Mar. 1996:131.

Orringer EP, Jones S, Strayhorn D, Hoffman E, Parker J, Greenberg CS. The effect of hydroxyurea (HU) administration on circulating d-dimer levels in patients with sickle cell anemia. *Blood* 1996;**88**(10 Suppl 1):496a. Smith WR, Ballas SK, McCarthy WF, Bauserman RL, Swerdlow PS, Steinberg MH. The association between hydroxyurea treatment and pain intensity, analgesic use, and utilization in ambulatory sickle cell anemia patients. *Pain Medicine* 2011;**12**(5):697–705.

Smith WR, Bauseman RL, McCarthy WF, Barton BA, Ballas SK. Effect of geography and climate on pain frequency in patients enrolled in the multicenter study of hydroxyurea in sickle cell anemia. 3rd Annual Sickle Cell Disease Research and Educational Symposium AND Annual Sickle Cell Disease Scientific Meeting; 2009 Feb 18-20. 2009. Abstract no: 253]

Steinberg MH. Determinants of fetal hemoglobin response to hydroxyurea. *Seminars in Hematology* 1997;**3**(Suppl 3): 8–14.

Steinberg MH. Mortality at 3-5 years: The multicenter study of hydroxyurea in sickle cell anemia (MSH). National Sickle Cell Disease Program Annual Meeting; 1997 Sep. 1997:68.

Steinberg MH, Ballas S, Barton F, Terrin M, the MSH. Mortality at 4-5 years: results from the multicenter study of hydroxyurea in sickle cell anemia (MSH). *Blood* 1997;**90** (10 Suppl 1 Pt 1):444a.

Steinberg MH, Barton F, Castro O, Koshy M, Eckman J, Terrin M. Risks and benefits of hydroxyurea (HU) in adult sickle cell anaemia. Effects at 6- to 7- years. *Blood* 1999;**94** (10 Suppl 1 Pt 1):644a–5a.

Steinberg MH, Barton F, Castro O, Pegelow CH, Ballas SK, Kutlar A, et al. Effect of hydroxyurea on mortality and morbidity in adult sickle cell anemia: risks and benefits up to 9 years of treatment. *JAMA* 2003;**289**(13):1645–51. Steinberg MH, Barton F, Castro O, Ramirez G, Bellevue

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review)

Copyright $\ensuremath{\textcircled{0}}$ 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

R, Terrin M, et al. Hydroxyurea (HU) is associated with reduced mortality in adults with sickle cell anemia. *Blood* 2000;**96**(11 Pt 1):485a.

Steinberg MH, Castro O, Ballas SK, Barton F, Terrin M. The multicenter study of hydroxyurea in sickle cell anemia (MSH): mortality at 5-6 years. *Blood* 1998;**92**(10 Suppl 1 Pt 1):496a.

Steinberg MH, Lu ZH, Barton FB, Terrin ML, Charache S, Dover GJ. Fetal hemoglobin in sickle cell anemia: determinants of response to hydroxyurea. *Blood* 1997;**89** (3):1078–8.

Steinberg MH, Lu ZH, Barton M, Terrin S, Charache S, Dover G, et al. Fetal hemoglobin (Hb F) in sickle cell anemia (HbSS): Determinents of response to hydroxyurea (HU). *Blood* 1995;**86**(10 Suppl 1):418a.

Steinberg MH, McCarthy WF, Castro O, Ballas SK, Armstrong FD, Smith W, et al. The risks and benefits of long-term use of hydroxyurea in sickle cell anemia: A 17.5 year follow-up. American Journal of Hematolology 2010; Vol. 85, issue 6:403–8.

Terrin ML, Barton FB, Bonds D, Ballas SK, Swerdlow P, Pegelow CH, et al. Effect of hydroxyurea on quality of life: 2-year results from the multicenter study of hydroxyurea in sickle cell anemia. National Sickle Cell Disease Program 23rd Annual Meeting; 1999 Mar. 1999:161.

SCATE 2015 {published data only}

Hankins JS, McCarville MB, Rankine-Mullings A, Reid ME, Lobo CL, Moura PG, et al. Prevention of conversion to abnormal transcranial Doppler with hydroxyurea in sickle cell anemia: a phase III international randomized clinical trial. *American Journal of Hematology* 2015;**90**(12): 1099–105. [DOI: 10/1002/ajh.24198] NCT01531387. Sparing Conversion to Abnormal TCD (Transcranial Doppler) Elevation (SCATE). http:// clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT01531387.

SWiTCH 2012 {published data only}

Alvarez O, Yovetich NA, Scott JP, Owen W, Miller ST, Schultz W, et al. Pain and other non-neurological adverse events in children with sickle cell anemia and previous stroke who received hydroxyurea and phlebotomy or chronic transfusions and chelation: results from the SWiTCH clinical trial. *American Journal of Hematology* 2013;**88**(11): 932–8. CENTRAL: 963136; CRS: 5500125000000520; PUBMED: 23861242]

Aygun B, Mortier NA, Kesler K, Lockhart A, Schultz WH, Cohen AR, et al. Therapeutic phlebotomy is safe in children with sickle cell anaemia and can be effective treatment for transfusional iron overload. *British Journal of Haematology* 2015;**169**(2):262–6. CRS: 5500135000001418; PUBMED: 25612463]

Aygun B, Mortier NA, Kesler K, Schultz WH, Alvarez OA, Rogers ZR, et al. Therapeutice phlebotomy in children with sickle cell anemia, stroke, and iron overload: the SWiTCH experience. 53rd ASH Annual Meeting and Exposition; 2011 Dec 10-13; San Diego, California. 2011. Abstract no: 1044]

Kwiatkowski JL, Cohen AR, Garro J, Alvarez O,

Nagasubramanian R, Sarnaik S, et al. Transfusional iron overload in children with sickle cell anemia on chronic transfusion therapy for secondary stroke prevention. *American Journal of Hematology* 2012;**87**(2):221–3. CENTRAL: 864015; CRS: 5500100000011226; PUBMED: 22120913]

NCT00122980. Stroke with transfusions changing to hydroxyurea. clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT00122980 Date first received: 20 July 2005.

Sheehan VA, Howard TA, Sabo A, Nagasaswamy U, Crosby JR, Davis B, et al. Genetic predictors of hemoglobin F response to hydroxyurea in sickle cell anemia. *Blood* 2012; **120**(21). Abstract no: 241; CENTRAL: 977454; CRS: 5500125000000531]

Ware RE, Helms RW. Stroke With Transfusions Changing to Hydroxyurea (SWiTCH). *Blood* 2012;**119**(17):3925–32. CENTRAL: 849022; CRS: 5500100000004120]

Ware RE, Helms RW. Stroke with transfusions changing to hydroxyurea (SWiTCH): a phase 3 randomised clinical trial for treatment of children with sickle cell anemia. 52nd ASH Meeting and Exposisiton; 2010 Dec 4-7; Orlando, Florida. 2010. Abstract no: 844]

Ware RE, McMurray MA, Schultz WH, Alvarez OA, Aygun B, Cavalier ME, et al. Academic community standards for chronic transfusion therapy in children with sickle cell anemia and stroke. *Blood* 2006;**108**(11):Abst 1213.

* Ware RE, Schultz WH, Yovetich N, Mortier NA, Alvarez O, Hilliard L, et al. Stroke with transfusions changing to hydroxyurea (SWiTCH): A phase III randomized clinical trial for treatment of children with sickle cell anemia, stroke, and iron overload. *Pediatric Blood & Cancer* 2011;**57**(6): 1011–7. CENTRAL: 806683; CRS: 5500100000004123]

TWiTCH 2016 {published data only}

Aygun B, Wruck LM, Schultz WH, Mueller BU, Brown C, Luchtman-Jones L, et al. Chronic transfusion practices for prevention of primary stroke in children with sickle cell anemia and abnormal TCD velocities. *American Journal of Hematology* 2012;**87**(4):428–30.

Helton KJ, Roberts D, Schultz WH, Davis BR, Kalfa TA, Pressel SL, et al. Effects of chronic transfusion therapy on MRI and MRA in children with sickle cell anemia. *Blood* 2014;**124**(21):4052. CENTRAL: 1261883; CRS: 5500135000001683]

Imran H, Aygun B, Davis BR, Pressel SL, Herbert Schultz W, Jackson SM, et al. Effects of chronic transfusion therapy on transcranial doppler ultrasonography velocities in children with sickle cell anemia at risk for primary stroke: baseline findings from the Twitch trial. *Blood* 2014;**124** (21):87. CENTRAL: 1261882; CRS: 5500135000001682]

* Ware RE, Davis BR, Schultz WH, Brown RC, Aygun B, Sarnaik S, et al. Hydroxycarbamide versus chronic transfusion for maintenance of transcranial doppler flow velocities in children with sickle cell anaemia-TCD With Transfusions Changing to Hydroxyurea (TWiTCH): a multicentre, open-label, phase 3, non-inferiority trial. *Lancet* 2016;**387**:661–70.
Wood JC, Cohen A, Aygun B, Imran H, Luchtman-Jones

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review)

Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

L, Thompson. Extrahepatic iron deposition in chronically transfused children with sickle cell anemia- baseline findings from the Twitch trial. *Blood* 2013;**122**(21):2238. CENTRAL: 1261881; CRS: 5500135000001681] Wood JC, Cohen AR, Pressel SL, Aygun B, Imran H, Luchtman-Jones L. Organ iron accumulation in chronically transfused children with sickle cell anaemia: baseline results from the TWiTCH trial. *British Journal of Haematology* 2016;**172**(1):122–30.

Wood JC, Pressel S, Rogers ZR, Odame I, Kwiatkowski JL, Lee MT, et al. Liver iron concentration measurements by MRI in chronically transfused children with sickle cell anemia: baseline results from the TWiTCH trial. *American Journal of Hematology* 2015;**90**(9):806–10.

Wood JC, Pressel S, Rogers ZR, Odame I, Kwiatkowski JL, Lee MT, et al. Liver iron concentration measurements by MRI in chronically transfused children with sickle cell anemia: Baseline results from the TWiTCH trial. *American Journal of Hematology* 2015;**90**(9):806–10. CENTRAL: 1090263; EMBASE: 2015311270; CRS: 550005000000271]

References to studies excluded from this review

Al-Nood 2011 {published data only}

Al-Nood HA, Al-Khawlani MM, Al-Akwa A. Fetal hemoglobin response to hydroxyurea in Yemeni sickle cell disease patients. Hemoglobin 2011, issue 1:13–21.

De Montalembert 2006 {published data only}

De Montalembert M, Bachir D, Hulin A, Gimeno L, Mogenet A, Bresson JL, et al. A phase 1 pharmacokinetics (PK) study of hydroxyurea (HU) 1,000 mg coated breakable tablets and 500mg capsules in pediatric and adult patients with sickle cell disease. *Blood* 2005;**106**(11):Abst 3194. Abstract no: 3194]

* de Montalembert M, Bachir D, Hulin A, Gimeno L, Mogenet A, Bresson JL, et al. Pharmacokinetics of hydroxyurea 1,000 mg coated breakable tablets and 500 mg capsules in pediatric and adult patients with sickle cell disease. *Haematologica* 2006;**91**(12):1685–8.

George 2013 {published data only}

George A, Aygun B, Mortier N, Sparreboom A, Ware R. A randomized controlled trial of a dose-prediction equation to determine maximum tolerated dose of hydroxyurea in children with sickle cell anemia. *Pediatric Blood & Cancer* 2013;60 Suppl. Abstract no: 588; CENTRAL: 1007869; CRS: 550005000000224; EMBASE: 71047876]

NCT00004492 {published data only}

NCT00004492. Phase I/II Randomized Study of Hydroxyurea With or Without Clotrimazole in Patients With Sickle Cell Anemia. https://clinicaltrials.gov/show/ NCT00004492.

NCT01848925 {published data only}

NCT01848925. A Phase I Open-label, Randomized, Safety and Efficacy Study of SANGUINATETM at Two Doses Levels Versus Hydroxyurea in Sickle Cell Disease (SCD) Patients. clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT01848925 (date first received 23 April 2013).

NCT01960413 {published data only}

NCT01960413. Phase 2 Study of Montelukast for the Treatment of Sickle Cell Anemia. https://clinicaltrials.gov/ show/NCT01960413.

NCT02149537 {published data only}

NCT02149537. Risk Stratification for Clinical Severity of Sickle Cell Disease in Nigeria and Assessment of Efficacy and Safety During Treatment With Hydroxyurea. https:// clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT02149537.

Pushi 2000 {published data only}

Pushi A. Hydroxyurea ameliorates importantly the clinical course of sickle cell disease reducing the frequency of painful crises. *Hematology Journal* 2000;1(Suppl. 1):34, Abstract no: 130.

Silva-Pinto 2007 {published data only}

Silva-Pinto AC, Carrara RC, Oliveira VC, Palma PV, Campos AD, Zago MA, et al. Hydroxyurea treatment of sickle cell diseases causes megaloblastic transformation of the bone marrow that is responsible for the increase of the mean corpuscular volume. *Haematologica* 2007;**Suppl 1**: 298.

Silva-Pinto 2014 {published data only}

Silva-Pinto AC, Dias-Carlos C, Saldanha-Araujo F, Ferreira FI, Palma PV, Araujo AG, et al. Hydroxycarbamide modulates components involved in the regulation of adenosine levels in blood cells from sickle-cell anemia patients. *Annals of Hematology* 2014;**93**(9):1457–65. CENTRAL: 1000846; CRS: 550013100000084; JID:: 9107334; PUBMED: 24696091]

Vichinsky 2013 {published data only}

Vichinsky E, Torres M, Glass J, Minniti CP, Barrette S, Habr D, et al. A randomized phase II study evaluating the efficacy and safety of deferasirox versus deferoxamine in patients with sickle cell disease (SCD0: 2-year results including pharmacokinetics (PK) and safety of deferasirox with concomitant hydroxyurea therapy. *Blood* 2011;**118** (21). Abstract no: 1082]

* Vichinsky E, Torres M, Minniti CP, Barrette S, Habr D, Zhang Y, et al. Efficacy and safety of deferasirox compared with deferoxamine in sickle cell disease: two-year results including pharmacokinetics and concomitant hydroxyurea. *American Journal of Hematology* 2013;**88**(12):1068–73. CRS: 5500125000000523; PUBMED: 23946212]

Voskaridou 2005 {published data only}

Voskaridou E, Terpos E, Margeli A, Hantzi E, Meletis J, Papassotiriou I, et al. Renal dysfunction and osteodystrophy in patients with sickle cell thalassaemia under longterm treatment with hydroxyurea. 10th Congress of the European Hematology Association; 2005 June 2-5; Stockholm International Fairs, Sweden. 2005. Abstract no: 0174]

References to studies awaiting assessment

Anyanwu 2016 {published data only}

Anyanwu JN, Williams O, Sautter CL, Kasirye P, Hume H, Opoka RO, Latham T, Ndugwa C, Ware RE, John

CC. Novel Use of Hydroxyurea in an African Region With Malaria: Protocol for a Randomized Controlled Clinical Trial. *JMIR research protocols* 2016;**5**(2):e110.

NCT02560935 {published data only}

NCT02560935. Primary Prevention of Stroke in Children With SCD in Sub-Saharan Africa II (SPRING). clinicaltrials.gov/show/NCT02560935 (first received 02 September 2015).

NCT02675790 {published data only}

NCT02675790. Low Dose Hydroxyurea for Secondary Stroke Prevention in Children With Sickle Cell Disease in Sub-Saharan Africa (SPRINT). clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/ NCT02675790 (first received 08 January 2016).

References to ongoing studies

NCT01389024 {published data only}

NCT01389024. Hydroxyurea to Prevent Brain Injury in Sickle Cell Disease (HUPrevent). clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/ show/NCT01389024 (first received 30 June 2011).

Additional references

Aumont 2015

Aumont C, Driss F, Lazure T, Picard V, Creidy R, De Botton S, et al. Myelodysplastic syndrome with clonal cytogenetic abnormalities followed by fatal erythroid leukemia after 14 years of exposure to hydroxyurea for sickle cell anemia. *American Journal of Hematology* 2015;**90**(7):E131–2.

Ballas 1996

Ballas SK, Barton F, Castro O, Koshy M, Bellevue R. Pattern of narcotic analgesic consumption among adult patients with sickle cell anemia. National Sickle Cell Disease Program 21st Annual Meeting; 1996 Mar. 1996:63.

Ballas 2006

Ballas SK, Barton FB, Waclawiw MA, Swerdlow P, Eckman JR, Pegelow CH, et al. Hydroxyurea and sickle cell anemia: effect on quality of life. *Health and Quality of Life Outcomes* 2006;4:59.

Ballas 2009

Ballas SK, Guo N, DeCastro L, Bellevue R. Exposure to hydroxyurea and pregnancy outcomes in patients with sickle cell anemia. *JAMA* 2009;**101**(10):1046.

Barton 1996

Barton F, Terrin M, Moore R, McMahon RP, Charache S. Ascertainment of the primary end point in the Multicenter Study of Hydroxyrea in Sickle Cell Anemia (MSH). The MSH Investigators. *Controlled Clinical Trials* 1996;**17**:678.

Baz 2012

Baz W, Najfeld V, Yotsuya M, Talwar J, Terjanian T, Forte F. Development of myelodysplastic syndrome and acute myeloid leukemia 15 years after hydroxyurea use in a patient with sickle cell anemia. *Clinical Medicine Insights. Oncology* 2012;**6**:149–52.

Berk 1995

Berk PD, Wasserman LR, Fruchtman SM, Goldberg JD. Treatment of polycythemia vera: a summary of clinical trials conducted by the Polycythemia Vera Study Group. In: Wasserman LR BP, Berlin NI editor(s). *Polycythemia Vera and the Myeloproliferation Disorders*. Philadelphia: W B Saunders, 1995:166–94.

Bernaudin 2016

Bernaudin F, Verlhac S, Arnaud C, Kamdem A, Hau I, Leveillé E, et al. Long-term treatment follow-up of children with sickle cell disease monitored with abnormal transcranial Doppler velocities. *Blood* 2016;**127**(15): 1814–22. [10.1182/blood–2015–10–675231. Epub 2016 Feb 5.]

Berthaut 2008

Berthaut I, Guignedoux G, Kirsch-Noir F, de Larouziere V, Ravel C, Bachir D, et al. Influence of sickle cell disease and treatment with hydroxyurea on sperm parameters and fertility of human males. *Haematologica* 2008;**93**(7): 988–93.

Brousseau 2010

Brousseau DC, A Panepinto J, Nimmer M, Hoffmann RG. The number of people with sickle-cell disease in the United States: national and state estimates. *American journal of hematology* 2010 Jan 1;**85**(1):77–8.

Brozovic 1987

Brozovic M, Davies SC. Management of sickle cell disease. *Postgraduate Medical Journal* 1987;**63**:605–9.

Chakravorty 2015

Chakravorty S, Williams TN. Sickle cell disease: a neglected chronic disease of increasing global health importance. *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 2015;**100**(1):48–53.

Charache 1995

Charache S, Terrin TL, Moore RD, Dover GJ, Barton FB, Eckert SV, et al. Effect of hydroxyurea on the frequency of painful crises in sickle cell anaemia. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1995;**332**:1317–22.

Davies 1997a

Davies SC, Roberts-Harewood M. Blood transfusion in sickle cell disease. *Blood Reviews* 1997;**11**:57–71.

Davies 1997b

Davies SC, Oni L. The management of patients with sickle cell disease. *British Medical Journal* 1997;**315**:656–60.

Elbourne 2002

Elbourne DR, Altman DG, Higgins JPT, Curtin F, Worthington HV, Vail A. Meta-analysis involving crossover trials: methodological issues. *International Journal of Epidemiology* 2002;**31**(1):140–9.

Fruchtman 1994

Fruchtman SM, Kaplan ME, Peterson P, Mack K, Berk PD, Wasserman LR. Acute leukemia (AL), hydroxyurea (HU), and polycythemia vera (PV): an analysis of risk from the Polycythemia Vera Study Group. *Blood* 1994;**84**(Suppl 1): 518a.

Fuggle 1996

Fuggle P, Shand PAX, Gill LJ, Davies SC. Pain, quality of life, and coping in sickle cell disease. *Archives of Disease in Childhood* 1996;**75**:199–203.

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review)

Copyright $\ensuremath{\textcircled{C}}$ 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Gardner 2016

Gardner K, Douiri A, Drasar E, Allman M, Mwirigi A, Awogbade M, et al. Survival in adults with sickle cell disease in a high income setting. *Blood* 2016;**128**(10):1436–1438.

Gray 1991

Gray A, Anionwu EN, Davies SC, Brozovic M. Mortality in sickle cell disease: the experience of a British centre. *Journal of Clinical Pathology* 1991;44:459–63.

Green 2014

Green NS, Barral S. Emerging science of hydroxyurea therapy for pediatric sickle cell disease. *Pediatric research* 2013;**75**(1-2):196–204.

Grosse 2011

Grosse SD, Odame I, Atrash HK, Amendah DD, Piel FB, Williams TN. Sickle cell disease in Africa: a neglected cause of early childhood mortality. *American journal of preventive medicine* 2011 Dec 31;41(6):S398–405.

Handy 1996

Handy C, Barton F, Moore R, McMahon R, Eckert S, Terrin M. Dose titration in the Multicentre Study of Hydroxyurea in Sickle Cell Anemia (MSH). *Controlled Clinical Trials* 1996;**17**(Suppl 2):92S.

Hankins 2014

Hankins JS, Aygun B, Nottage K, Thornburg C, Smeltzer MP, Ware RE, et al. From infancy to adolescence: fifteen years of continuous treatment with hydroxyurea in sickle cell anemia. *Medicine (Baltimore)* 2014;**93**(28):e215. [DOI: 10.1097/MD.00000000000215]

Hassell 2010

Hassell KL. Population estimates of sickle cell disease in the US. *American journal of preventive medicine* 2010 Apr 30;**38** (4):S512–21.

Higgins 2003

Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, Altman DG. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analysis. *BMJ* 2003;**327**: 557–60.

Higgins 2011

Higgins JPT, Altman DG, Sterne JAC (editors). Chapter 8: Assessing risk of bias in included studies. In: Higgins JPT, Green S (editors). Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions Version 5.1.0 (updated March 2011). The Cochrane Collaboration, 2011. Available from www.cochrane-handbook.org..

Howard 2015

Howard J, Telfer P. Sickle Cell Disease in Clinical Practice. London 2015: Springer-Verlag, 2015.

Jones 2009

Jones AP, Riley RD, Williamson PR, Whitehead A. Metaanalysis of individual patient data versus aggregate data from longitudinal clinical trials. *Clinical Trials* 2009;**6**(1):16–27.

Lanzkron 2013

Lanzkron S, Carroll CP, Haywood Jr C. Mortality Rates and Age at Death from Sickle Cell Disease: US. 1979-2005. *Public Health Reports* 2013;**128**:110–116.

Luchtman-Jones 2016

Luchtman-Jones L, Pressel S, Hilliard L, Brown RC, Smith MG, Thompson AA, et al. Effects of hydroxyurea treatment for patients with hemoglobin SC disease. *American Journal of Hematology* 2016;**91**(2):238–42.

Manci 2003

Manci EA, Culberson DE, Yang YM, Gardner TM, Powell R, Haynes J Jr, et al. Causes of death in sickle cell disease: an autopsy study. *British Journal of Haematology* 2003;**123**(2):359–65.

McGann 2011

McGann PT, Howard TA, Flanagan JM, Lahti JM, Ware RE. Chromosome damage and repair in children with sickle cell anaemia and long-term hydroxycarbamide exposure. *British Journal of Haematology* 2011;**154**(1):134–40.

Najean 1997

Najean Y, Rain JD. Treatment of polycythemia vera: the use of hydroxyurea and pipobroman in 292 patients under the age of 65 years. *Blood* 1997;**90**(9):3370–7.

National Toxicology Program 2008

National Toxicology Program. NTP-CERHR monograph on the potential human reproductive and developmental effects of hydroxyurea. NTP CERHR MON 2008; Vol. Oct, issue 21:vii-viii, v, ix-III1. [NIH Publication no: 08–5993]

NCEPOD 2008

NCEPOD. 'Sickle: A sickle crisis?' A report of the national confidential enquiry into patient outcome and death. 2008. www.ncepod.org.uk.2008sc.html (accessed 19 September 2016).

NICE 2012

National Institute of Clinical Excellence (NICE). Sickle cell acute painful episode: management of an acute painful sickle cell episode in hospital. http://www.nice.org.uk/guidance/cg143 (accessed 06 March 2017) 2012.

NIH 2014

Evidence Based Management of Sickle Cell Disease. Expert Panel Report. National Institute of Health. 2014. www.nhlbi.nih.gov/sites/www.nhlbi.nih.gov/files/sicklecell-disease-report%20020816.pdf (accessed 19 September 2016).

Perrine 1978

Perrine RP, Pembrey ME, John P, Perrine S, Shoup F. Natural history of sickle cell anaemia in Saudi Arabs: a study of 270 subjects. *Annals of Internal Medicine* 1978;**88**:1–6.

Perronne 2002

Perronne V, Roberts-Harewood M, Bachir D, Roudot-Thoraval F, Delord JM, Thuret I, et al. Patterns of mortality in sickle cell disease in adults in France and England. *Haematology Journal* 2002;**3**(1):56–60.

Piel 2013

Piel FB, Patil AP, Howes RE, Nyangiri OA, Gething PW, Dewi M, et al. Global epidemiology of sickle haemoglobin in neonates: a contemporary geostatistical model-based map and population estimates. *Lancet* 2013;**381**(9861):142–51.

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review)

Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Platt 1984

Platt OS, Orkin SH, Dover GJ, Beardsley GP, Miller B, Nathan DG. Hydroxyurea increases fetal hemoglobin production in sickle cell anemia. *Transactions of the Association of American Physicians* 1984;**97**:268–74.

Platt 1994

Platt OS, Brambilla DJ, Rosse WF, Milner PF, Castro O, Steinberg MH, et al. Mortality in sickle cell disease - life expectancy and risk factors for early death. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1994;**330**:1639–43.

Powars 1983

Powars D, Overturf G, Turner E. Is there an increased risk of Haemophilus influenzae septicemia in sickle cell anaemia?. *Pediatrics* 1983;**71**:927–31.

Quinn 2010

Quinn CT, Rogers ZR, McCavit TL, Buchanan GR. Improved survival of children and adolescents with sickle cell disease. *Blood* 2010;**115**:3447–52.

Rogers 1978

Rogers DW, Clarke JM, Cupidore L, Ramlal A, Sparke BR, Serjeant GR. Early deaths in Jamaican children with sickle cell disease. *British Medical Journal* 1978;**1**:1515–6.

Steinberg 1999

Steinberg MH. The Management of Sickle Cell Disease. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1999;**340**:1021–30.

Steinberg 2003

Steinberg MH, Barton F, Castro O, Pegelow CH, Ballas SK, Kutlar A, et al. Effect of hydroxyurea on mortality and morbidity in adult sickle cell anemia: risks and benefits up to 9 years of treatment. *JAMA* 2003;**289**(13):1645–51.

Steinberg 2010

Steinberg MH, McCarthy WF, Castro O, Ballas SK, Armstrong FD, Smith W, et al. The risks and benefits of long-term use of hydroxyurea in sickle cell anemia: A 17.5 year follow-up. American Journal of Hematolology 2010; Vol. 85, issue 6:403–8.

Sterkers 1998

Sterkers Y, Preudhomme C, Lai JL, Demory JL, Caulier MT, Wattel E, et al. Acute myeloid leukemia and myelodysplastic syndromes following essential thrombocythemia treated with hydroxyurea: high proportion of cases with 17p deletion. *Blood* 1998;**91**(2):616–22.

STOP 2006

Lee MT, Piomelli S, Granger S, et al. Stroke Prevention Trial in Sickle Cell Anemia (STOP): extended follow-up and final results. *Blood* 2006;**108**(3):847–52.

Strouse 2008

Strouse JJ, Lanzkron S, Beach MC, Haywood C, Park H, Witkop C, et al. Hydroxyurea for sickle cell disease: a systematic review for efficacy and toxicity in children. *Pediatrics* 2008;**122**(6):1332–43.

Telfer 2007

Telfer P, Coen P, Chakravorty S, Wilkey O, Evans J, Newell H, et al. Clinical outcomes in children with sickle

cell disease living in England: a neonatal cohort in East London.. *Haematologica* 2007;**92**(7):905–12.

Terrin 1999

Terrin ML, Barton FB, Bonds D, Ballas SK, Swerdlow P, Pegelow CH, et al. Effect of hydroxyurea on quality of life: 2-year results from the multicenter study of hydroxyurea in sickle cell anemia. National Sickle Cell Disease Program 23rd Annual Meeting; 1999 Mar. 1999:161.

Triadou 1994

Triadou P, Maier-Redelsperger M, Krishnamoorty R, Deschamps A, Casadevall N, Dunda O, et al. Fetal haemoglobin variations following hydroxyurea treatment in patients with cyanotic congenital heart disease. *Nouvelle Revue Francaise d Hematologie* 1994;**36**(5):367–72.

van der Plas 2011

van der Plas EM, van den Tweel XW, Geskus RB, Heijboer H, Biemond BJ, Peters M, et al. Mortality and causes of death in children with sickle cell disease in the Netherlands, before the introduction of neonatal screening. *British Journal of Haematology* 2011;**155**(1):106–10.

Veith 1985

Veith R, Galanello R, Papayannopoulou T, Stamatoyannopoulos G. Stimulation of F-cell production in patients with sickle cell anaemia treated with cytarabine or hydroxyurea. *New England Journal of Medicine* 1985;**313**: 1571–5.

Voskaridou 2010

Voskaridou E, Christoulas D, Bilalis A, Plata E, Varvagiannis K, Stamatopoulos G, et al. The effect of prolonged administration of hydroxyurea on morbidity and mortality in adult patients with sickle cell syndromes: results of a 17-year, single-centre trial (LaSHS). *Blood* 2010;**115**:2354–63.

Ware 2006

Ware RE, McMurray MA, Schultz WH, Alvarez OA, Aygun B, Cavalier ME, et al. Academic community standards for chronic transfusion therapy in children with sickle cell anemia and stroke. *Blood* 2006;**108**(11):Abst 1213.

Ware 2010

Ware RE. How I use hydroxyurea to treat young patients with sickle cell anemia. *Blood* 2010;**115**:5300–11.

Wierenga 2001

Wierenga KJ, Hambleton IR, Lewis NA. Survival estimates for patients with homozygous sickle-cell disease in Jamaica: a clinic-based population study. *Lancet* 2001;**357**(9257): 680–3.

Zimmerman 2004

Zimmerman SA, Schultz WH, Davis JS, Pickens CV, Mortier NA, Howard TA, et al. Sustained long-term hematologic efficacy of hydroxyurea at maximum tolerated dose in children with sickle cell disease. *Blood* 2004;**103**(6): 2039–45.

References to other published versions of this review

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review)

Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Jones 2001

Jones AP, Davies SC, Olujohungbe A. Hydroxyurea for sickle cell disease. *Cochrane Database of Systematic Reviews* 2001, Issue 2. [DOI: 10.1002/14651858.CD002202]

* Indicates the major publication for the study

CHARACTERISTICS OF STUDIES

Characteristics of included studies [ordered by study ID]

BABY HUG 2011

Methods	Randomised, double blind (participant, investigator), placebo control, parallel assignment, efficacy study conducted at 13 centres in the USA
Participants	Children aged 9 months to 18 months with SCD (HbSS or HbSß ^o -thalassemia) irre- spective of clinical severity. Exclusion criteria were transfusion within 2 months, height, weight or head circumference below the 5th percentile, mental development index less than 70 or abnormal TCD ultrasound velocity 193 randomised, 96 participants to hydroxyurea and 97 to placebo Mean (SD) age: hydroxyurea group : 13.6 (2.7) months, placebo group: 13.5 (2.8) months 187 (97%) with HbSS genotype, 109 (56%) females
Interventions	Hydroxyurea (20 mg/kg/day) versus placebo for 24 months.
Outcomes	Primary outcomes: spleen function (decline in splenic uptake); and glomerular filtration rate with ^{99m} Tc-diethyl-enetriaminepentaacetic acid plasma clearance. Secondary outcomes: ratio of nuclear decay counts in the spleen and liver; proportion of red blood cells containing pits or Howell-Jolly bodies; renal function; growth; and development (including neuro-developmental assessment)
Notes	

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	The telephone randomisation schedule was developed by the medical co-ordinating centre
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Centralised telephone randomisation was used.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Some secondary outcomes reported for only the individuals who completed the study but ITT approach taken for primary outcomes (via multiple imputation) and sa- fety outcomes so risk of bias judged to be low
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All outcomes well defined in the methods and reported well in the results
Other bias	Low risk	None identified.

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review)

Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

BABY HUG 2011 (Continued)

Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Participants, caregivers and medical coor- dinating centre staff were masked to treat- ment allocation via packaging and treat- ment of the same appearance
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	An unmasked "primary endpoint person" monitored laboratory values and assisted clinical management. Other outcome as- sessors (e.g. those reading the liver-spleen scans)

Belgian Study 1996

Methods	Randomised placebo-controlled cross-over study conducted in a single centre in Belgium
Participants	25 children with HbSS genotype, age 2 - 22 years (median 9 years) with > 3 vaso- occlusive events reported in preceding 12 months and/or history of CVA off transfusion (severe alloimmunisation or compliance), ACS, ASS
Interventions	Hydroxyurea 20 mg/kg/day rising to 25 (unless toxic cytopenia) versus placebo. Treat- ment period was for 6 months
Outcomes	Number of hospitalisations. Number of inpatient days. FBC. HbF%.
Notes	Data are not presented in a way that results can be included in the review so results are presented narratively

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Described as "drawing sealed envelopes, pa- tients were randomly allocated to one of the following treatment sequences", therefore the generation of the treatment sequence are not clear from this statement
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Described as "drawing sealed envelopes, pa- tients were randomly allocated to one of the following treatment sequences", therefore the allocation of the treatment sequence are not clear from this statement

Belgian Study 1996 (Continued)

Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	3 participants who were excluded from the analysis due to their failure to attend the monthly evaluation at 4 - 5 months. There was no discussion of whether or not an ITT analysis was used so the risk is unclear
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	A planned outcome (number of days in pain) was dropped from analysis due to dif- ficulty in obtaining information to inform this analysis from participants
Other bias	Low risk	Unclear if a washout period was used in this cross-over study but tests for period effects and carry-over effect were not significant so the risk of bias in the cross-over design is low
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	The hospital pharmacy provided the treat- ment and placebo for each participant and both were described as "indistinguishable, " however the physician was aware of the treatment schedule because of the difficulty of blinding the attending physician to the treatment received. Unclear if this could have influenced results
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information provided.

CHAMPS 2011

Methods	Randomised multicentre, phase II, double blind placebo-controlled study
Participants	Eligible participants over the age of 5 years with HbSC and at least 1 vaso-occlusive event in the previous 12 months (but none in the 4 weeks prior to study entry) 44 participants randomised; 11 to each treatment group (see 'Interventions') Mean age: 13.6 years (range 5 - 53 years), 43% females.
Interventions	Participants randomised to 1 of 4 arms in a factorial design: 1. hydroxyurea (20 mg/kg/day) and magnesium (0.6 mmol/kg/day in 2 doses); 2. hydroxyurea (20 mg/kg/day) and placebo; 3. placebo and magnesium (0.6 mmol/kg/day in 2 doses); 4. placebo and placebo.
Outcomes	Primary outcome: proportion of hyperdense red blood cells at 8 weeks Secondary outcomes: central laboratory evaluations (including measurements of red cell density, HbF, red cell cation content, KCl co-transport and Gardos channel activity,

CHAMPS 2011 (Continued)

	cell adhesion to endothelial cells and laminin, and erythrocyte membrane phosphatidyl serine (PS exposure)) at baseline (twice) and weeks 8, 16, 24, and 44 Participants were evaluated at 2 or 4 week intervals for 11 months (15 visits)
Notes	The study was not designed to measure efficacy and all analyses were considered ex- ploratory The study was terminated early due to low enrolment after 44 participants had been randomised (target 188) Due to factorial design, no data can be entered into analysis and results for hydroxyurea groups (groups 1 and 2) compared to no hydroxyurea groups are summarised narratively

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	A sequential allocation algorithm (i.e. min- imisation) was used due to small numbers within each strata (site and age group)
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No information provided.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	High risk	36 out of 44 participants completed 8 weeks and 22 out of 44 completed 44 weeks. Only those who completed the fol- low-up time were included in analysis (8 weeks for primary endpoint and 44 weeks for secondary endpoints). This is not an ITT approach
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	Outcome defined in the methods section well described in the results section. Study was not designed to measure efficacy
Other bias	Low risk	Study terminated early after only 44 of planned sample size of 188 were recruited. However, the study was not designed to measure efficacy and performed only ex- ploratory analyses therefore the early termi- nation is unlikely to have introduced bias
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All tablets were 'over-capsulated' to disguise appearance.
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	No information provided.

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review) Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Jain 2012

Methods	Double-blind randomised controlled study conducted in a tertiary hospital in Nagpur City, India
Participants	Indian children between the ages of 5 and 18 years with severe manifestations (defined as 3 or more blood transfusions or VOC requiring hospitalisation per year) despite high HbF Exclusion criteria included seropositivity for HIV or chronic illness 60 participants randomised; 30 to each treatment group. 53% females (16 females per group). Mean (SD) age - hydroxyurea group: 12.73 (4.4) years, placebo group: 11.73 (4.08) years
Interventions	Hydroxyurea (fixed dose 10 mg/mg/day) compared to placebo for 18 months
Outcomes	Primary outcome: frequency of VOC per participant per year. Secondary outcomes: frequency of blood transfusions, hospitalisations and HbF levels

Notes

Rich	of	hias
10000	J	0 1110

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Participants were randomised using ran- domisation tables.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No information provided.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All participants completed 18-months fol- low-up and were included in analysis
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	No protocol available, outcomes defined in the methods reported well in the results
Other bias	Low risk	None identified.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Participants were blinded with placebo tablets of identical appearance. The clin- ician who assessed participants were not aware of treatment arm
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	The laboratory technician and the clinician who assessed participants were not aware of treatment arm

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review) Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

MSH 1995

Methods	Randomised multicentre parallel, double-blind placebo-controlled study. Conducted in the USA and Canada across 21 sites
Participants	Adults over 18 years of age with HbSS genotype who had reported more than 3 'crises' to treating physician in the preceding 12 months and who had < 15% HbA. Exclusions included: HbA > 15%, pregnancy, opiate addiction, other potent anti-sickling agents, cytopenia, CVA in the preceding 6 years, HIV antibody +, prior hydroxyurea therapy 152 randomised to hydroxyurea and 147 given placebo.
Interventions	Hydroxyurea starting at 15 mg/kg/day rising 12-weekly by 5 mg/kg/day unless marrow depression (then cessation of drug until recovery and restarted at 2.5 mg/kg/day lower, i.e. MTD) compared to placebo for 2 years
Outcomes	Primary outcome: pain events - attending hospital > 4 hours & parenteral opiate treat- ment. Secondary outcomes: 'crises' including ACS, CVA, priapism etc, daily pain charts, time to first and second crisis, FBC, F cells & Hb F%, dense cells
Notes	93% follow-up at 2 years, treatment stopped in 14 hydroxyurea and 6 placebo partici- pants Due to beneficial treatment effects, the study was stopped at a mean follow-up of 21 months, before the planned 24 months of treatment had been completed for all partici- pants

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Treatment assignments were made cen- trally using a computer programme to gen- erate separate, randomised block assign- ment schedules for each clinic
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	There was no clear discussion on allocation concealment.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Withdrawals from the study were well doc- umented, all participants included in analy- sis in an ITT approach in the primary pub- lications but later reported outcomes (such as quality of life) reported only for those who contributed data
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	Low risk	All outcomes well defined in the methods and reported well in the results
Other bias	Low risk	None identified.

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review) Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

MSH 1995 (Continued)

Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Stated as double-blind (physician and par- ticipant), where treatment was assigned in combinations of identically appearing cap- sules
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Unclear risk	There was no clear discussion on blinding of outcome assessors

Methods	Phase III randomised, partially masked (outcome assessors) multicentre study conducted in 3 centres in the USA, Jamaica and Brazil between May 2012 and August 2013
Participants	 Children with SCA and conditional TCD ultrasound velocities (170 cm - 199 cm per second) Exclusion criteria were prior abnormal TCD velocities or clinical stroke, red blood cell transfusion within 2 months of enrolment, concurrent use of another anti-sickling medication or contraindication to hydroxyurea therapy (allergy, pregnancy, renal insufficiency) 22 participants randomised, 11 to each treatment group. Mean age (SD): hydroxyurea group: 6.2 (2.4) years, observation group: 6.6 (1.5) years 64% females, 7 per group. 21 participants with HbSS and 1 with HbSβ°-thalassemia
Interventions	Hydroxyurea (starting at 20 mg/kg/day escalated to a maximum of 35 mg/kg/day) com- pared to standard treatment (observation)
Outcomes	Primary outcome: conversion to abnormal maximum abnormal TAMV Secondary outcomes: changes in serial TCD velocities. Indicence of acute events including stroke. Health-related quality of life (planned but not recorded, see 'Selective reporting' below)
Notes	The planned length of follow-up was 30 months but the study was terminated early after 15 months of follow-up due to slow participant accrual and the unlikelihood of meeting the trial recruitment target (100) and the primary endpoint

SCATE 2015

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Randomisation was performed using an adaptive blocked algorithm
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Central pharmacy distribution of alloca- tions.

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review) Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

SCATE 2015 (Continued)

Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Numbers screened, randomised and num- ber receiving randomised treatment re- ported. Analysis conducted using an ITT approach
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	A planned outcome (health-related quality of life) was not analysed or presented as the outcome was not sufficiently collected due to early study termination
Other bias	High risk	Study terminated early after only 22 of planned sample size of 100 were recruited therefore study is likely to be statistically underpowered
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Participants and personnel could not be masked to treatment allocation by de- sign (hydroxyurea compared to observation only). The primary outcome (conversion to abnormal TAMV) was objective and de- termined by masked outcome assessors so lack of blinding of participants and person- nel is unlikely to have affected results
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All TCD site examiners, central review- ers were masked and site clinicians were masked to participants TCD results

SWiTCH 2012

Methods	Phase III, multicentre, single masked (outcome assessors), non-inferiority study con- ducted across 26 paediatric sites in the USA
Participants	Participants with previous clinical stroke, aged 7 to 17 years, PRBC transfusions for at least 18 months and transfusional iron overload No specific exclusion criteria stated. 133 participants were randomised; 67 randomised to hydroxyurea treatment and 66 to standard treatment Mean (SD) age at study enrolment in years: hydroxyurea group 13.0 (4.0) years, standard treatment group 13.3 (3.8) years 132 out of 133 participants with HbSS genotype, 61 females (46%)
Interventions	Hydroxyurea starting at 20 mg/kg/day escalated to MTD and phlebotomy compared to standard treatment (transfusions and chelation) for 30 months
Outcomes	The primary outcome of the trial was a composite outcome. This involved occurrence of a secondary stroke and quantitative liver iron level change from baseline Secondary outcomes included quality of life, non-stroke neurological events, other SCD-

SWiTCH 2012 (Continued)

	related events, growth and development, functional evaluations, neurocognitive evalua- tions, transfusion related complications, chelation related complications, hydroxyurea- related complications, phlebotomy related complications, liver biopsy related complica- tions and adverse and serious adverse events
Notes	Numerous secondary outcomes were not reported in the main paper or any subsequent papers

Risk of bias

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Unclear risk	Study described as randomised, no further details given.
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Unclear risk	No details were given on allocation con- cealment.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Withdrawals from treatment reported, all individuals included in analysis in an ITT approach
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	Many of the secondary outcomes (such as growth and development, functional eval- uations, neurocognitive evaluations) have not yet been reported, If these results can be included at a later date then this judge- ment will be reconsidered
Other bias	Low risk	None identified.
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Participants and personnel could not be masked to treatment allocation by design (hydroxyurea compared to transfusion). The primary outcome (secondary stroke and quantitative liver iron level change from baseline) was objective and deter- mined by masked outcome assessors so lack of blinding of participants and personnel is unlikely to have affected results
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	The primary outcome (secondary stroke and quantitative liver iron level change from baseline) were determined by a group of treatment masked neurologists and neu- roradiologists

TWiTCH 2016

Methods	Multicentre phase III randomised open-label (partially masked) non-inferiority study conducted at 26 paediatric hospitals and health centres in the USA and Canada
Participants	Children aged 4 - 16 years with SCA and abnormal TCD ultrasound velocities (> 200 cm per second) if they had received 12 months of chronic transfusions Exclusion criteria were documented clinical stroke, TIA or severe vasculopathy 121 participants were randomised; 60 randomised to hydroxyurea treatment and 61 to standard treatment Mean (SD) age at study enrolment in years: hydroxyurea group 9.5 (2.6) years, standard treatment group 9.7 (3.2) years 119 out of 121 participants with HbSS genotype, 73 females (60%)
Interventions	Hydroxyurea starting at 20 mg/kg/day escalated to MTD and phlebotomy compared to standard treatment (transfusions and chelation) for 24 months
Outcomes	Primary outcome: maximum TCD time averaged mean velocity on the index side (i.e. the cerebral hemisphere with the higher mean arterial velocity at baseline assessment) Secondary outcomes: TCD velocity on the non-index side, neurological events, new brain lesions, hepatic iron overload, SCD-related events, treatment-related complication (reported in this publication) neuropsychological status, quality of life and growth and (to be reported in future publications)
Notes	Study was terminated early at the first interim analysis when non-inferiority was demon- strated, target sample size was met at early termination

Risk of bias

Risk of bias

Bias	Authors' judgement	Support for judgement
Random sequence generation (selection bias)	Low risk	Centralised block randomisation with block size four, with stratification by site and balanced by baseline age and TCD ve- locity
Allocation concealment (selection bias)	Low risk	Central randomisation and treatment allo- cation.
Incomplete outcome data (attrition bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Numbers discontinuing the interventions stated, all participants included in analysis in an ITT analysis
Selective reporting (reporting bias)	High risk	Outcomes of neuropsychological status, quality of life and growth were measured but results are not yet published. If these results can be included at a later date then this judgement will be reconsidered

TWiTCH 2016 (Continued)

Other bias	Low risk	Study was terminated early at the first in- terim analysis when non-inferiority was demonstrated, target sample size was met at early termination so the study is adequately powered to detect differences
Blinding of participants and personnel (performance bias) All outcomes	Low risk	Participants and personnel could not be masked to treatment allocation by design (hydroxyurea compared to transfusion). The primary outcome (maximum TCD time averaged mean velocity) was objective and determined by masked outcome asses- sors so lack of blinding of participants and personnel is unlikely to have affected results
Blinding of outcome assessment (detection bias) All outcomes	Low risk	All TCD examinations were read centrally by observers blinded to treatment alloca- tion and previous TCD results

ACS: acute chest syndrome ASS: acute splenic sequestration CVA: cerebro-vascular accident Cytopenia: refers to either neutropenia or thrombocytopenia, anaemia is also a risk but was not reported FBC: full blood count HbA: adult haemoglobin HbF: fetal haemoglobin HbS β° : haemoglobin S β° thalassaemia genotype HbSC: haemoglobin SC genotype HbSS: haemoglobin SS genotype ITT: intention-to-treat KCl: potassium chloride MTD: maximum tolerated dose PRBC: packed red blood cells SCA: sickle cell anaemia SCD: sickle cell disease SD: standard deviation TAMV: time averaged mean velocity TCD: transcranial doppler TIA: transient ischaemic attack VOC: vaso-occlusive crisis

Characteristics of excluded studies [ordered by study ID]

Study	Reason for exclusion				
Al-Nood 2011	This is not a randomised study.				
De Montalembert 2006	This study does not fulfil the inclusion criteria. The length of treatment was 8 days, the inclusion criteria state that treatment should be at least 1 month				
George 2013	This does not make a randomised comparison of hydroxyurea and placebo or standard treatment (the randomised comparison is dosing schedules of hydroxyurea)				
NCT00004492	This does not make a randomised comparison of hydroxyurea and placebo or standard treatment				
NCT01848925	This study does not fulfil the inclusion criteria. The length of treatment was 7 days, the inclusion criteria state that treatment should be at least 1 month				
NCT01960413	This does not make a randomised comparison of hydroxyurea and placebo or standard treatment				
NCT02149537	This is not an appropriate design to measure the effectiveness of hydroxyurea (cross-over design of low- dose hydroxyurea compared to no treatment to monitor those at increased risk of infection)				
Pushi 2000	This is not a randomised study.				
Silva-Pinto 2007	This is not a randomised study.				
Silva-Pinto 2014	This is not a randomised study.				
Vichinsky 2013	This does not make a randomised comparison of hydroxyurea and placebo or standard treatment				
Voskaridou 2005	This is not a randomised study.				

Characteristics of studies awaiting assessment [ordered by study ID]

Anyanwu 2016

Methods	Prospective, randomised, placebo-controlled, double-blinded phase III trial (NOHARM trial)
Participants	Study participants will be recruited from the Mulago Hospital Sickle Cell Clinic (MHSCC) in Kampala, Uganda Children aged 1 to 4 years with documented HbSS living in an area of meso-endemic malaria transmission
Interventions	Hydroxyurea 20 ± 2.5 mg/kg/day compared to placebo
Outcomes	Primary outcome: malaria incidence, defined as episodes of clinical malaria occurring over the 1-year randomised study treatment period Secondary outcomes: frequency of haematologic toxicities and AEs, relationships between hydroxyurea treatment and fetal haemoglobin, soluble intracellular adhesion molecule-1, and nitric oxide levels, and between levels of these

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review)

Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Anyanwu 2016 (Continued)

	factors and risk of subsequent malaria
Notes	Currently, only a protocol is available for the NOHARM study We are unsure if this study meets the inclusion criteria of the review of 'Type of Participants' due to the study objectives around determining the incidence of malaria in SCA individuals. We will make an assessment of the eligibility of the population when study results are available

NCT02560935

Methods	Randomised, double-blind, parallel group, dose-controlled study (SPRING)
Participants	Participants with HbSS or HbS β° -thalassemia, S variant with baseline haemoglobin less than 10 g/dL or other sickle cell syndromes apart from HbSC between the ages of 5 and 12 years, living in sub-Saharan Africa, without prior overt stroke Inclusion criteria for a 'non-elevated TCD group' (participants who are not eligible to receive hydroxyurea therapy but are willing to be following for a minimum of 3 years)
Interventions	Hydroxyurea (moderate dose): 20 mg/kg/day (range 17.5 - 26 mg/kg/day) for 24 months Hydroxyurea (low dose): 10 mg/kg/day (range 7 - 15 mg/kg/day) for 24 months
Outcomes	Primary outcome: efficacy of moderate vs low-dose hydroxyurea therapy for primary stroke prevention Secondary outcome: incidence of all-cause hospitalizations. Secondary outcome: long-term safety of hydroxyurea therapy.
Notes	Unclear if this is an appropriate design (dose-control) and population for the review ('non-elevated TCD group') Trial is ongoing (estimated completion date - December 2021), we will make an assessment of the eligibility of the design and population when trial results are available

NCT02675790

Methods	Randomised, double-blind, parallel group, dose-controlled study (SPRINT)
Participants	Participants between the age of 1 and 18 years with SCA and a history of stroke up to 30 days before entry into the study, living in sub-Saharan Africa
Interventions	Hydroxyurea (moderate dose): 20 mg/kg/day (range 17.5 - 26 mg/kg/day) for 24 months Hydroxyurea (low dose): 10 mg/kg/day (range 7 - 15 mg/kg/day) for 24 months
Outcomes	Primary outcome: rate of clinical stroke recurrence. Secondary outcome: incidence of all-cause hospitalisation.
Notes	Unclear if this is an appropriate design (dose-control) and population for the review (participants can have already received hydroxyurea treatment) Study is ongoing (estimated completion date July 2019), we will make an assessment of the eligibility of the design and population when study results are available

AEs: adverse events HbSβ°: haemoglobin Sβ°thalassaemia genotype HbSC: haemoglobin SC genotype HbSS: haemoglobin SS genotype TCD: transcranial doppler

Characteristics of ongoing studies [ordered by study ID]

NCT01389024

Trial name or title	NCT01389024: Hydroxyurea to Prevent Brain Injury in Sickle Cell Disease (HUPrevent)
Methods	Randomised, double-blind, parallel design, phase 2 study.
Participants	Participants with HbSS or HbS β° -thalassemia aged between 9 and 48 months of age, with or without central nervous system complications
Interventions	Hydroxyurea 20 mg/kg/day increased by 5 mg/kg every 8 weeks to maximum of 35 mg/kg/day; placebo (sucrose) 0.2 mL/kg/day increased to max of 0.35 mL/kg/day
Outcomes	Primary outcome: central nervous system complications (a composite of abnormally elevated cerebral blood flow velocity as measured by TCD ultrasound, SCI, or stroke) Secondary outcome: proportion of participants with severe adverse events attributed to study procedures
Starting date	October 2011
Contact information	Johns Hopkins University Diane Weiss, BA (dweiss14@jhmi.edu) James F. Casella, MD (jcasella@jhmi.edu)
Notes	Estimated completion date October 2017 (final data collection date for primary outcome measure)

HbSβ^{0:} haemoglobin Sβ⁰thalassaemia genotype HbSC: Haemoglobin SC genotype HbSS: Haemoglobin SS genotype SCI: silent cerebral infarct TCD: transcranial doppler

DATA AND ANALYSES

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Pain crises	2		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
1.1 Mean annual crisis rate at 2 years (all crises)	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-2.80 [-4.74, -0.86]
1.2 Mean annual crisis rate at 2 years (all crises requiring hospitalisation)	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.50 [-2.58, -0.42]
1.3 Number of vaso-occlusive crises after 18 months of treatment	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-9.6 [-10.86, -8.34]
2 Proportion experiencing pain	1		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
3 Proportion experiencing life threatening events during study	2		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
3.1 Acute chest syndrome	2	492	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.43 [0.29, 0.63]
3.2 Hepatic sequestration	1	299	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.32 [0.03, 3.06]
3.3 Stroke	2	492	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.54 [0.12, 2.53]
3.4 Patients transfused	2	492	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.66 [0.52, 0.82]
3.5 Splenic sequestration	1	193	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.90 [0.36, 2.23]
4 Number of life-threatening events during study	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
4.1 Blood transfusions	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.85 [-2.18, -1.52]
4.2 Hospitalisations	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-8.89 [-10.04, -7.74]
4.3 Duration of hospitalisation (days)	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-2.00 [-4.87, -3.13]
5 Deaths during the study	3		Risk Ratio (M-H. Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
5.1 All deaths	3	552	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.39 [0.08, 1.96]
5.2 Deaths related to SCD	3	552	Risk Ratio (M-H. Fixed, 95% CI)	0.48 [0.09, 2.60]
6 Change from baseline in fetal haemoglobin (HbF %)	1		Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
7 Fetal haemoglobin (HbF %) after treatment	2	359	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	4.07 [2.95, 5.18]
8 Change from baseline in absolute neutrophil count (x10 ³ per μ L)	1		Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
9 Neutrophil response (10° /L)	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
9.1 Neutrophils (x10 9/l) at 10 weeks	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.90 [-2.51, -1.29]
9.2 Neutrophils (x10 9/l) at 2 years	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.50 [-2.01, -0.99]
10 Change from baseline in haemoglobin (g/L)	1		Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
11 Change from baseline in m corpuscular volume (fL)	1		Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected

Comparison 1. Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

12 Change from baseline in white blood cells (x10 ³ per μ L)	1		Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
13 Change from baseline in absolute reticulocyte count $(x10^3 \text{ per } \mu \text{L})$	1		Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
14 Change from baseline in reticulocytes (%)	1		Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
15 Change from baseline in total bilirubin (mg/L)	1		Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
16 Change from baseline in platelet count (x10 ³ per μ L)	1		Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
17 Haemoglobin (g/dL)	2		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
17.1 At 10 weeks	1	299	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.5 [0.19, 0.81]
17.2 At the end of the study	2	359	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.04 [0.82, 1.25]
18 Mean corpuscular volume (fL)	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
18.1 At 10 weeks	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	12.30 [9.69, 14.91]
18.2 At 2 years	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	10.0 [7.34, 12.66]
19 Total bilirubin (mg/L)	2		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
19.1 At the end of the study	2	359	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.56 [-1.90, -1.23]
20 Reticulocytes	2		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
20.1 Reticulocytes (10 [,] /mm ³) at 18 months	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.66 [-0.90, -0.42]
20.2 Reticulocytes (10° /L) at 10 weeks	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-130.0 [-152.17, - 107.83]
20.3 Reticulocytes (10° /L) at 2 years	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-69.0 [-91.56, -46. 44]
21 Platelet count	2		Mean Difference (IV. Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
21.1 Platelet count (10 ³ /mm ³) at 18 months	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.05 [-0.16, 0.06]
21.2 Platelet count (x10° /L) at 10 weeks	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-35.0 [-75.19, 5.19]
21.3 Platelet count (x10 [°] /L)	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-24.0 [-51.88, 3.88]
22 Packed cell volume	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
22.1 Packed cell volume (%) at 2 years	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.90 [0.85, 2.95]
23 F reticulocytes	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
23.1 F reticulocytes at 2 years	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.0 [0.18, 3.82]
24 F cells	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
24.1 F cells (%) at 2 years	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	13.0 [8.33, 17.67]
25 Red blood count	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
25.1 Red blood count	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-1.13 [-1.24, -1.02]
$(105 / mm^3)$ at 18 months				
(10 / mm ²) at 10 months	1		Moon Difference (IV Fined 0504 CI)	Totals not colored
26 white blood cens 2(1) White blood cens	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	
$\frac{9}{L}$ at 2 years	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 99% CI)	-2.30 [-2.9/, -1.03]
2/ Dense cells	1		Man Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Iotals not selected
2/.1 Dense cells (%) at 2 years	1		Man Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-2.0 [-3.48, -0.52]
20 Leucocytes	1		Iviean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	lotals not selected

28.1 Leucocytes (10 ³ /mm ³) at 18 months	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.84 [-3.07, 1.39]
29 Creatinine	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
29.1 Creatinine (mg/dL) at 2	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.0 [-0.11, 0.11]
years			
30 Aspartate aminotransferase	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
30.1 Aspartate	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-4.0 [-9.40, 1.40]
aminotransferase at 2 years			
31 Alkaline phosphatase	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
31.1 Alkaline phosphatase at	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-2.0 [-15.78, 11.78]
2 years			
32 Change from baseline in	1	Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
growth			
32.1 Height (cm)	1	Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.2 [1.00, 0.60]
32.2 Weight (kg)	1	Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	0.10 [-0.20, 0.40]
32.3 Head circumference (cm)	1	Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	-0.2 [-0.60, 0.20]
33 Quality of life: general health	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
perception			
33.1 General health	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.30 [-0.54, 1.14]
perception at 6 months			
33.2 General health	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.60 [-0.18, 1.38]
perception at 1 year			
33.3 General health	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.9 [0.08, 1.72]
perception at 18 months			
33.4 General health	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.4 [-0.51, 1.31]
perception at 2 years			
34 Quality of life: pain recall	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
34.1 Pain recall at 6 months	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.40 [-0.13, 0.93]
34.2 Pain recall at 1 year	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.40 [-0.18, 0.98]
34.3 Pain recall at 18 months	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.70[0.11, 1.29]
35 Quality of life social function	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.3 [-0.30, 0.90] Totals not selected
35 1 Social function at 6	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	
5).1 Social function at 0	1	Mean Difference (1v, Fixed, 93% CI)	0.4 [-0.1], 0.99]
35.2 Social function at 1 year	1	Mean Difference (IV Fixed 95% CI)	0.2 [-0.36, 0.76]
35.3 Social function at 18	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.2 [-0.30, 0.70] 0.40 [-0.21, 1.01]
months	1	Wear Difference (17, 11xed, 7570 Cl)	0.40 [-0.21, 1.01]
35.4 Social function at 2 years	1	Mean Difference (IV. Fixed, 95% CI)	0.3 [-0.31, 0.91]
36 Changes in 'Ladder of Life'	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
36.1 Changes in 'Ladder of	1	Mean Difference (IV. Fixed, 95% CI)	0.0 [-0.52, 0.52]
Life' at 6 months			
36.2 Changes in 'Ladder of	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.4 [-0.15, 0.95]
Life' at 1 year			
36.3 Changes in 'Ladder of	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.30 [-0.22, 0.82]
Life' at 18 months			
36.4 Changes in 'Ladder of	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.3 [-0.23, 0.83]
Life' at 2 years			· · · · · · ·
37 Proportion of participants with	2	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
signs of organ damage			
37.1 New leg ulcers	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.85 [0.44, 1.64]

37.2 Aseptic necrosis (humerus or femur)	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.97 [0.39, 2.37]
37.3 Decreased spleen function at exit (compared to baseline)	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.72 [0.44, 1.16]
38 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in DTPA GFR	1	Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
39 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Howell-Jolley body (per 10 ⁶ red blood cells)	1	Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
40 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in pitted cells (%)	1	Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
41 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen: liver ratio of counts	1	Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
42 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen volume (cm ³)	1	Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in creatinine (mg/L)	1	Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR	1	Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
44.1 Schwartz glomerular filtration rate (mL/min per 1.73m ²)	1	Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	-8.0 [-35.00, 21.00]
45 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in cystatin C	1	Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
46 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in urine osmolality	1	Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
47 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in urine pH	1	Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
48 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in urine-specific gravity	1	Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
49 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in total kidney volume	1	Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
50 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in TCD ultrasound velocity (time-averaged mean maximum velocity)	1	Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
51 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in CNS measures	1	Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
51.1 Bayley Mental Development Index	1	Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	3.0 [0.00, 8.00]

51.2 Bayley motor	1	Mean Difference (Fixed, 95% CI)	2.0 [-1.00, 7.00]
performance development			
index			
52 Proportion of participants	3	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
experiencing adverse events and			
toxicity			
52.1 hair loss at 1 or 2 visits	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.25 [0.69, 2.26]
52.2 hair loss at 3 or more	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.61 [0.31, 1.21]
visits			
52.3 skin rash at 1 or 2 visits	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.97 [0.62, 1.51]
52.4 skin rash at 3 or more	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.97 [0.58, 1.60]
visits			
52.5 fever at 1 or 2 visits	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.97 [0.55, 1.69]
52.6 fever at 3 or more visits	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.89 [0.68, 1.17]
52.7 Gastroinestinal	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.83 [0.50, 1.36]
disturbance at 1 or 2 visits			
52.8 Gastrointestinal	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.98 [0.74, 1.31]
disturbance at 3 or more visits			
52.9 Other abnormalities at 1	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.60 [0.33, 1.11]
or 2 visits			
52.10 Other abnormalities at	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.08 [0.83, 1.40]
3 or more visits			
52.11 Hospitalisation (for any	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.83 [0.72, 0.96]
reason)			
52.12 Dactylitis	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.34 [0.20, 0.58]
52.13 Priapism	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.52 [0.26, 8.87]
52.14 Sepsis or bacteraemia	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.40 [0.08, 2.03]
52.15 Splenomegaly	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.90 [0.61, 1.32]
52.16 Absolute Neutrophil	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.53 [0.50, 12.71]
Count < 500			
52.17 Absolute Neutrophil	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.53 [1.58, 4.03]
500 - 1250			
52.18 Thrombocytopaenia	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.59 [0.64, 3.92]
52.19 Alanine transaminase >	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.02 [0.19, 21.92]
150 U/L			
52.20 Severe anaemia	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.51 [0.05, 5.48]
52.21 Bilirubin	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.34 [0.01, 8.17]
52.22 Creatinine	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	$0.0 \ [0.0, \ 0.0]$
52.23 Skin and subcutaneous	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.91 [0.75, 1.10]
disorders			
52.24 Splenic sequestration	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.90 [0.36, 2.23]
52.25 Gastroenteritis	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.44 [0.28, 0.71]
52.26 Nausea	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	5.0 [0.25, 99.95]
52.27 Skin Rash	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	7.0 [0.38, 129.93]

Comparison 2. Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Proportion experiencing pain	2		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
1.1 Vaso-occlusive or sickle cell-related pain (all)	1	133	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.03 [0.81, 1.30]
1.2 Vaso-occlusive or sickle cell-related pain (serious)	2	254	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	3.37 [1.59, 7.11]
2 Proportion experiencing life-threatening events during study	2		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	Subtotals only
2.1 Stroke (secondary)	1	133	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	14.78 [0.86, 253.66]
2.2 Transient ischaemic attack (primary)	1	121	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.02 [0.21, 4.84]
2.3 Transient ischaemic attack (secondary)	1	133	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.66 [0.25, 1.74]
2.4 Other neurological event (primary)	1	121	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.02 [0.07, 15.88]
2.5 Acute chest syndrome	2	254	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	2.84 [1.25, 6.42]
2.6 Infections and Infestations	2	254	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	3.65 [1.05, 12.76]
2.7 Splenic sequestration or splenectomy	2	254	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.34 [0.01, 8.16]
2.8 Hepatobiliary disease	1	121	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.02 [0.07, 15.88]
2.9 Total with serious adverse events	2	254	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.93 [1.17, 3.20]
2.10 Total with sickle cell related, non-neurological adverse events	1	133	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	3.10 [1.42, 6.75]
3 Deaths during the study	2	254	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.99 [0.06, 15.42]
4 Change from baseline in fetal haemoglobin (HbF %)	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
5 Change from baseline in absolute neutrophil count (x10 [°] /L)	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
6 Change from baseline in mean corpuscular volume (fL)	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
7 Change from baseline in sickle haemoglobin (%)	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
8 Change from baseline in haemoglobin (g/L)	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
9 Change from baseline in absolute reticulocyte count (10° / L)	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
10 Change from baseline in white blood count (10° / L)	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
11 Change from baseline in platelets (10° / L)	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected

13 Change from baseline in liver 1 Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI) Totals not selected iron concentration 14 Change from baseline in lactate 1 Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI) Totals not selected dehydrogenase (U/L) 15 Change from baseline in lactate 1 Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI) Totals not selected dehydrogenase (U/L) 16 Final TCD ultrasound 1 Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI) Totals not selected measures at the end of the study 16.1 Final TCD ultrasound 1 Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI) -5.0 [-9.16, -0.84] velocity 1 Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI) Totals not selected measures at the end of the study 17.1 Infections and 1 Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI) Totals not selected measures at the end of the study 17.1 Infections and 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.24 [0.89, 1.72] Infestations 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.16 [0.74, 1.80] 17.2 Forever 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.08 [0.66, 1.75] 17.4 Musculoskelatal 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.12 [0.02, 0.96] 17.5 Immune system disorders 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17]	12 Change from baseline in total bilirubin (mg/L)	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
14 Change from baseline in serum 1 Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI) Totals not selected 15 Change from baseline in lactate 1 Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI) Totals not selected 16 Signs of organ damage - CNS 1 Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI) Totals not selected 16.1 Final TCD ultrasound 1 Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI) -5.0 [-9.16, -0.84] velocity 7 Totals not selected experiencing non-neurological adverse events and toxicity 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.24 [0.89, 1.72] 17.1 Infections and 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.08 [0.66, 1.75] 17.2 Gastrointextinal disorders 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.04 [0.74, 1.80] 17.3 Feer 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.04 [0.59, 2.20] disorders 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.12 [0.02, 0.96] 17.5 Inmune system disorders 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.4 Cholelthiasis 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.10 Rend or urinary 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17]	13 Change from baseline in liver	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
InstructionMean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)Totals not selecteddehydrogenase (U/L)1Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)Totals not selected16 Signs of organ damage - CNS1Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)-5.0 [-9.16, -0.84]velocity1Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)-5.0 [-9.16, -0.84]velocity1Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)Totals not selected27 Proportion of participants1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)Totals not selectedadverse events and toxicity1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)1.24 [0.89, 1.72]infestations1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)1.08 [0.66, 1.75]17.4 Infections and1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)1.08 [0.66, 1.75]17.4 Musculoskelatal1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)1.14 [0.59, 2.20]disorders1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)0.12 [0.02, 0.96]17.5 Immune system disorders1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)0.74 [0.17, 3.17]17.7 Cholecystrits1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)0.74 [0.17, 3.17]17.8 Asthma1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)0.76 [0.11, 8.80]17.11 Priapism1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)1.72 [0.53, 5.61]17.10 Renal or urinary1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)1.78 [0.16, 2.52]17.11 Priapism1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)1.79 [0.18, 21.21]17.12 Cathether-related1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)0.49 [0.24, 1.02]<	14 Change from baseline in serum ferritin (ng/mL)	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
1 Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI) Totals not selected measures at the end of the study 1 Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI) -5.0 [-9.16, -0.84] velocity 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) Totals not selected experiencing non-neurological adverse events and toxicity 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) Totals not selected 17.1 Infections and 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.24 [0.89, 1.72] infestations 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.24 [0.89, 1.72] infestations 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.08 [0.66, 1.75] 17.4 Musculoskelatal 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.14 [0.59, 2.20] disorders 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.12 [0.02, 0.96] 17.6 Cholelithiasis 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.5 Immune system disorders 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.7 Cholecystitis 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.9 Acute chest syndrome 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.76 [0.11, 3.80]	15 Change from baseline in lactate dehvdrogenase (U/L)	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
16.1 Final TCD ultrasound 1 Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI) -5.0 [-9.16, -0.84] velocity 17 Proportion of participants 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) Totals not selected adverse events and toxicity 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.24 [0.89, 1.72] infestations 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.16 [0.74, 1.80] 17.2 Gastrointestinal disorders 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.16 [0.74, 1.80] 17.3 Fever 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.16 [0.74, 1.80] 17.4 Musculoskelatal 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.12 [0.02, 0.96] disorders 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.6 Choleclithiasis 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.7 Cholecystitis 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.8 Asthma 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.10 Renal or urinary 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.76 [0.11, 3.80] disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.97 [0.18, 21.21] 17.12 Prapism	16 Signs of organ damage - CNS measures at the end of the study	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
17 Proportion of participants 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) Totals not selected experiencing non-neurological adverse events and toxicity 17.1 Infections and 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.24 [0.89, 1.72] infestations 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.16 [0.74, 1.80] 17.3 Gastrointestinal disorders 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.08 [0.66, 1.75] 17.4 Musculoskelatal 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.12 [0.02, 0.96] disorders 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.5 Immune system disorders 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.6 Choleithitais 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.7 Cholecystitis 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.9 Acute chest syndrome 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.10 Renal or urinary 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.76 [0.11, 3.80] disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.18, 21.21]	16.1 Final TCD ultrasound velocity	1	Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-5.0 [-9.16, -0.84]
17.1 Infections and 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.24 [0.89, 1.72] infectations 17.2 Gastrointestinal disorders 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.16 [0.74, 1.80] 17.2 Gastrointestinal disorders 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.08 [0.66, 1.75] 17.4 Musculoskelatal 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.14 [0.59, 2.20] disorders 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.12 [0.02, 0.96] 17.5 Immune system disorders 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.7 Cholelithiasis 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.9 Acute chest syndrome 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.9 Acute chest syndrome 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.10 Real or urinary 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.10 Real or urinary 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.10 Real or urinary 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.18, 21.21] </td <td>17 Proportion of participants experiencing non-neurological adverse events and toxicity</td> <td>1</td> <td>Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)</td> <td>Totals not selected</td>	17 Proportion of participants experiencing non-neurological adverse events and toxicity	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
17.2 Gastrointestinal disorders 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.16 [0.74, 1.80] 17.3 Fever 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.08 [0.66, 1.75] 17.4 Musculoskelatal 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.14 [0.59, 2.20] disorders 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.12 [0.02, 0.96] 17.5 Immune system disorders 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.7 Cholecystitis 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.7 Cholecystitis 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.9 Acute chest syndrome 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.76 [0.11, 3.80] disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.76 [0.11, 3.80] disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.18, 21.21] 17.12 Cathether-related 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.18, 21.21] 17.12 Cathether-related 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.18, 21.21] 17.13 Cardiac disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.06, 15.42] 17.14 Hyderbilirubianemia 1	17.1 Infections and infestations	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.24 [0.89, 1.72]
17.3 Fever 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.08 [0.66, 1.75] 17.4 Musculoskelatal 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.14 [0.59, 2.20] disorders 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.12 [0.02, 0.96] 17.5 Immune system disorders 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.7 Cholecystitis 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.8 Asthma 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.9 Acute chest syndrome 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.9 Acute chest syndrome 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.10 Renal or urinary 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.66 [0.11, 3.80] disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.18, 21.21] 17.12 Cathether-related 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.99 [0.06, 15.42] 17.13 Cardiac disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.06, 15.42] 17.14 Hyderbilirubianemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.05, 15.42] 17.15 Cardiac disorder 1	17.2 Gastrointestinal disorders	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.16 [0.74, 1.80]
17.4 Musculoskelatal 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.14 [0.59, 2.20] disorders 17.5 Immune system disorders 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.12 [0.02, 0.96] 17.6 Cholelithiasis 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.7 Cholecystitis 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.8 Asthma 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.9 Acute chest syndrome 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.9 Acute chest syndrome 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.66 [0.11, 3.80] disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.18, 21.21] 17.10 Renal or urinary 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.18, 21.21] 17.12 Cathether-related 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.06, 15.42] 17.13 Cardiac disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.49 [0.24, 1.02] 17.15 Alanine transaminase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.06 [0.55, 2.01] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.38 [0.66, 2.88] increase	17.3 Fever	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.08 [0.66, 1.75]
disorders 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.12 [0.02, 0.96] 17.6 Cholelithiasis 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.7 Cholecystriis 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.7 Cholecystriis 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.7 Cholecystriis 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.9 Acute chest syndrome 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.10 Renal or urinary 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.66 [0.11, 3.80] disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.18, 21.21] 17.12 Cathether-related 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.18, 21.21] 17.12 Cathether-related 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.18, 21.21] 17.13 Cardiac disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.49 [0.24, 1.02] 17.14 Hyderbilirubianemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.06 [0.55, 2.01] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.51, 7.55] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H,	17.4 Musculoskelatal	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.14 [0.59, 2.20]
17.5 Immune system disorders 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.12 [0.02, 0.96] 17.6 Cholelithiasis 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.7 Cholecystitis 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.8 Asthma 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.9 Acute chest syndrome 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.10 Renal or urinary 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.10 Renal or urinary 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.75 [0.11, 3.80] disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.18, 21.21] 17.11 Pringism 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.48 [0.26, 8.56] complications 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.49 [0.24, 1.02] 17.13 Cardiac disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.49 [0.24, 1.02] 17.14 Hyderbilirubianemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.06 [0.55, 2.01] increase 1 Risk Ratio (disorders			[]
17.6 Cholelithiasis 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.7 Cholecystitis 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.7 Cholecystitis 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.8 Asthma 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.9 Acute chest syndrome 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.10 Renal or urinary 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.76 [0.11, 3.80] disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.66 [0.11, 3.80] disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.18, 21.21] 17.12 Cathether-related 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.18, 21.21] 17.13 Cardiac disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.06, 15.42] 17.14 Hyderbilirubianemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.49 [0.24, 1.02] 17.15 Alanine transaminase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.06 [0.55, 2.01] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.51, 7.55] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed	17.5 Immune system disorders	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.12 [0.02, 0.96]
17.7 Cholecystitis 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.18, 21.21] 17.8 Asthma 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.9 Acute chest syndrome 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.9 Acute chest syndrome 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.66 [0.11, 3.80] disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.66 [0.11, 3.80] disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.18, 21.21] 17.12 Cathether-related 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.66 [0.11, 3.80] complications 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.06, 15.42] 17.13 Cardiac disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.06, 15.42] 17.14 Hyderbilirubianemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.49 [0.24, 1.02] 17.15 Alanine transaminase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.06 [0.55, 2.01] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.51, 7.55] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.17 Serum creatinine 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fi	17.6 Cholelithiasis	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.74 [0.17, 3.17]
17.8 Asthma 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.74 [0.17, 3.17] 17.9 Acute chest syndrome 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.72 [0.53, 5.61] 17.10 Renal or urinary 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.66 [0.11, 3.80] disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.66 [0.11, 3.80] 17.11 Priapism 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.18, 21.21] 17.12 Cathether-related 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.06, 15.42] 17.13 Cardiac disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.06, 15.42] 17.14 Hyderbilirubianemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.49 [0.24, 1.02] 17.15 Alanine transaminase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.06 [0.55, 2.01] increase 17.16 Aspartate transaminase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.38 [0.66, 2.88] increase 17.17 Serum creatinine 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.51, 7.55] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.18 Thrombocytopenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51]	17.7 Cholecystitis	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.97 [0.18, 21.21]
17.9 Acute chest syndrome 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.72 [0.53, 5.61] 17.10 Renal or urinary 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.66 [0.11, 3.80] disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.66 [0.11, 3.80] 17.11 Priapism 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.18, 21.21] 17.12 Cathether-related 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.48 [0.26, 8.56] complications 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.06, 15.42] 17.13 Cardiac disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.49 [0.24, 1.02] 17.15 Alanine transaminase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.49 [0.24, 1.02] 17.16 Aspartate transaminase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.06 [0.55, 2.01] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.38 [0.66, 2.88] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.51, 7.55] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.19 Reticuloctopenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [2.16, 22.02] 17.20 Neutropenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, F	17.8 Asthma	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.74 [0.17, 3.17]
17.10 Renal or urinary 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.66 [0.11, 3.80] disorder 17.11 Priapism 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.18, 21.21] 17.12 Cathether-related 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.48 [0.26, 8.56] complications 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.06, 15.42] 17.13 Cardiac disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.49 [0.24, 1.02] 17.15 Alanine transaminase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.49 [0.24, 1.02] 17.15 Alanine transaminase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.06 [0.55, 2.01] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.51, 7.55] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.51, 7.55] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.19 Reticuloctopenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [2.16, 22.02] 17.20 Neutropenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [2.16, 22.02] 17.20 Neutropenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.57 [2.05, 21.05] 17.22 Neutropenia 1	17.9 Acute chest syndrome	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.72 [0.53, 5.61]
disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.18, 21.21] 17.11 Priapism 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.18, 21.21] 17.12 Cathether-related 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.48 [0.26, 8.56] complications 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.49 [0.24, 1.02] 17.13 Cardiac disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.49 [0.24, 1.02] 17.15 Alanine transaminase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.06 [0.55, 2.01] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.06 [0.55, 2.01] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.38 [0.66, 2.88] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.51, 7.55] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.51, 7.55] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.18 Thrombocytopenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [2.16, 22.02] 17.20 Neutropenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.57 [2.05, 21.05] 17.21 Anaemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.57 [2.05, 21.0	17.10 Repair or urinary	1	Rick Ratio (M-H Fixed 95% CI)	0.66 [0.11, 3.80]
17.11 Priapism 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.18, 21.21] 17.12 Cathether-related 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.48 [0.26, 8.56] complications 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.06, 15.42] 17.13 Cardiac disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.49 [0.24, 1.02] 17.14 Hyderbilirubianemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.49 [0.24, 1.02] 17.15 Alanine transaminase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.06 [0.55, 2.01] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.08 [0.66, 2.88] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.51, 7.55] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.51, 7.55] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.17 Serum creatinine 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.18 Thrombocytopenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [2.16, 22.02] 17.20 Neutropenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.57 [2.05, 21.05] 17.21 Anaemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	disorder	1		0.00 [0.11, 5.00]
17.11 Findmin 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.16, 2.121] 17.12 Cathether-related 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.48 [0.26, 8.56] complications 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.06, 15.42] 17.13 Cardiac disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.49 [0.24, 1.02] 17.14 Hyderbilirubianemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.49 [0.24, 1.02] 17.15 Alanine transaminase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.06 [0.55, 2.01] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.06 [0.55, 2.01] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.51, 7.55] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.51, 7.55] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.19 Reticuloctopenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [2.16, 22.02] 17.20 Neutropenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 9.85 [1.30, 74.80] 17.21 Anaemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.57 [2.05, 21.05] 17.22 Sickle cell pain 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)<	17 11 Prianism	1	Rick Ratio (M-H Fixed 95% CI)	1 97 [0 18 21 21]
17.12 Callectificities 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.48 [0.20, 8.30] complications 17.13 Cardiac disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.06, 15.42] 17.14 Hyderbilirubianemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.49 [0.24, 1.02] 17.15 Alanine transaminase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.06 [0.55, 2.01] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.38 [0.66, 2.88] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.51, 7.55] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.17 Serum creatinine 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.18 Thrombocytopenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.20 Neutropenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [2.16, 22.02] 17.21 Anaemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.57 [2.05, 21.05] 17.22 Sickle cell pain 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.57 [2.05, 21.05] 17.23 Sickle cell pain 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.29 [0.92, 1.82] 17.23 Sickle cell-related	17.12 Cathether related	1	Pick Patio (M H Fixed, 95% CI)	1 /8 [0 26 8 56]
17.13 Cardiac disorder 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.06, 15.42] 17.14 Hyderbilirubianemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.49 [0.24, 1.02] 17.15 Alanine transaminase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.06 [0.55, 2.01] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.06 [0.55, 2.01] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.38 [0.66, 2.88] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.51, 7.55] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.19 Reticuloctopenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [2.16, 22.02] 17.20 Neutropenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 9.85 [1.30, 74.80] 17.21 Anaemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.57 [2.05, 21.05] 17.22 Sickle cell pain 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.57 [2.05, 21.05] 17.23 Sickle cell-related events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.03 [0.81, 1.30] 17.24 All adverse events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.92, 1.05]	complications	1	Kisk Katio (M-11, Fixed, 9970 CI)	1.48 [0.20, 8.90]
17.14 Hyderbilirubianemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.49 [0.24, 1.02] 17.15 Alanine transaminase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.06 [0.55, 2.01] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.38 [0.66, 2.88] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.51, 7.55] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.51, 7.55] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.19 Reticuloctopenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.19 Reticuloctopenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [2.16, 22.02] 17.20 Neutropenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [2.16, 22.02] 17.21 Anaemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.57 [2.05, 21.05] 17.22 Sickle cell pain 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.57 [2.05, 21.05] 17.23 Sickle cell-related events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.29 [0.92, 1.82] 17.24 All adverse events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed	17.13 Cardiac disorder	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.99 [0.06, 15,42]
17.15 Alanine transaminase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.06 [0.55, 2.01] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.38 [0.66, 2.88] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.38 [0.66, 2.88] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.51, 7.55] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.18 Thrombocytopenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.19 Reticuloctopenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [2.16, 22.02] 17.20 Neutropenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 9.85 [1.30, 74.80] 17.21 Anaemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.57 [2.05, 21.05] 17.22 Sickle cell pain 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.29 [0.92, 1.82] 17.23 Sickle cell-related events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.03 [0.81, 1.30] 17.24 All adverse events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.92, 1.05]	17.14 Hyderbilirubianemia	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.49 [0.24, 1.02]
17.19 Hamile Haisanniase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.38 [0.66, 2.88] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.38 [0.66, 2.88] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.51, 7.55] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.18 Thrombocytopenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.19 Reticuloctopenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [2.16, 22.02] 17.20 Neutropenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 9.85 [1.30, 74.80] 17.21 Anaemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.57 [2.05, 21.05] 17.22 Sickle cell pain 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.29 [0.92, 1.82] 17.23 Sickle cell-related events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.03 [0.81, 1.30] 17.24 All adverse events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.92, 1.05]	17 15 Alapine transaminase	1	Rick Ratio (M-H Fixed 95% CI)	1.06 [0.55, 2.01]
17.16 Aspartate transaminase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.38 [0.66, 2.88] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.51, 7.55] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.19 Reticuloctopenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.19 Reticuloctopenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [2.16, 22.02] 17.20 Neutropenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 9.85 [1.30, 74.80] 17.21 Anaemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.57 [2.05, 21.05] 17.22 Sickle cell pain 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.29 [0.92, 1.82] 17.23 Sickle cell-related events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.03 [0.81, 1.30] 17.24 All adverse events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.92, 1.05]	increase	1		1.00 [0.99, 2.01]
increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.51, 7.55] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.18 Thrombocytopenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.19 Reticuloctopenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [2.16, 22.02] 17.20 Neutropenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 9.85 [1.30, 74.80] 17.21 Anaemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.57 [2.05, 21.05] 17.22 Sickle cell pain 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.29 [0.92, 1.82] 17.23 Sickle cell-related events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.03 [0.81, 1.30] 17.24 All adverse events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.92, 1.05]	17.16 Aspartate transaminase	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.38 [0.66, 2.88]
17.17 Serum creatinine 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.97 [0.51, 7.55] increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.18 Thrombocytopenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.19 Reticuloctopenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [2.16, 22.02] 17.20 Neutropenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 9.85 [1.30, 74.80] 17.21 Anaemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.57 [2.05, 21.05] 17.22 Sickle cell pain 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.29 [0.92, 1.82] 17.23 Sickle cell-related events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.03 [0.81, 1.30] 17.24 All adverse events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.92, 1.05]	increase			
increase 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.18 Thrombocytopenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [0.87, 54.51] 17.19 Reticuloctopenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.90 [2.16, 22.02] 17.20 Neutropenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 9.85 [1.30, 74.80] 17.21 Anaemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.57 [2.05, 21.05] 17.22 Sickle cell pain 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.29 [0.92, 1.82] 17.23 Sickle cell-related events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.03 [0.81, 1.30] 17.24 All adverse events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.92, 1.05]	17.17 Serum creatinine	1	Risk Ratio (M-H. Fixed, 95% CI)	1.97 [0.51, 7.55]
17.18 Thrombocytopenia1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)6.90 [0.87, 54.51]17.19 Reticuloctopenia1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)6.90 [2.16, 22.02]17.20 Neutropenia1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)9.85 [1.30, 74.80]17.21 Anaemia1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)6.57 [2.05, 21.05]17.22 Sickle cell pain1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)1.29 [0.92, 1.82]17.23 Sickle cell-related events1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)1.03 [0.81, 1.30]17.24 All adverse events1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)0.99 [0.92, 1.05]	increase	-		[0,91,7,09]
17.19 Reticuloctopenia1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)6.90 [2.16, 22.02]17.20 Neutropenia1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)9.85 [1.30, 74.80]17.21 Anaemia1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)6.57 [2.05, 21.05]17.22 Sickle cell pain1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)1.29 [0.92, 1.82]17.23 Sickle cell-related events1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)1.03 [0.81, 1.30]17.24 All adverse events1Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)0.99 [0.92, 1.05]	17.18 Thrombocytopenia	1	Risk Ratio (M-H. Fixed, 95% CI)	6.90 [0.87, 54,51]
17.20 Neutropenia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 9.85 [1.30, 74.80] 17.21 Anaemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.57 [2.05, 21.05] 17.22 Sickle cell pain 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.57 [2.05, 21.05] 17.23 Sickle cell-related events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.29 [0.92, 1.82] 17.24 All adverse events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.92, 1.05]	17.19 Reticuloctopenia	1	Risk Ratio (M-H. Fixed, 95% CI)	6.90 [2.16, 22.02]
17.21 Anaemia 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 6.57 [2.05, 21.05] 17.22 Sickle cell pain 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.29 [0.92, 1.82] 17.23 Sickle cell-related events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.03 [0.81, 1.30] 17.24 All adverse events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.92, 1.05]	17.20 Neutropenia	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	9.85 [1.30, 74.80]
17.22 Sickle cell pain 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.29 [0.92, 1.82] 17.23 Sickle cell-related events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.03 [0.81, 1.30] 17.24 All adverse events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.92, 1.05]	17.21 Anaemia	-	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	6.57 [2.05, 21.05]
17.23 Sickle cell-related events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 1.03 [0.81, 1.30] 17.24 All adverse events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.92, 1.05]	17.22 Sickle cell pain	-	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.29 [0.92, 1.82]
17.24 All adverse events 1 Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI) 0.99 [0.92, 1.05]	17.23 Sickle cell-related events	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.03 [0.81, 1.30]
	17.24 All adverse events	1	Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.99 [0.92, 1.05]

Outcome or subgroup title	No. of studies	No. of participants	Statistical method	Effect size
1 Proportion experiencing life-threatening events during the study	1		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
1.1 Vaso-occlusive events	1		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.4 [0.10, 1.64]
1.2 Acute splenic sequestration	1		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.0 [0.07, 14.05]
1.3 Blood transfusions required	1		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.33 [0.04, 2.73]
2 Signs of organ damage - proportion of participants with a change in CNS measures	1		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
2.1 Participants converting from conditional to abnormal TCD ultrasound velocity	1		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	0.2 [0.03, 1.45]
3 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in CNS measures	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
3.1 TCD ultrasound velocity (time-averaged mean maximum velocity)	1		Mean Difference (IV, Fixed, 95% CI)	-25.7 [-45.38, -6.02]
4 Adverse events and toxicity	1		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	Totals not selected
4.1 Dizziness	1		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	3.0 [0.14, 66.53]
4.2 Headaches	1		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.0 [0.07, 14.05]
4.3 Transient neutropenia	1		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	3.0 [0.14, 66.53]
4.4 Reticulocytopenia	1		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.0 [0.07, 14.05]
4.5 Parasite infection	1		Risk Ratio (M-H, Fixed, 95% CI)	1.0 [0.07, 14.05]

Comparison 3. Hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke

Analysis I.I. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome I Pain crises.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: I Pain crises

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea		Placebo		C	Mean ifference	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,F	xed,95% Cl	IV,Fixed,95% CI
l Mean annual crisis ra	te at 2 years (all crises)					
MSH 1995	152	5.1 (7.3)	147	7.9 (9.6)		-	-2.80 [-4.74, -0.86]
2 Mean annual crisis ra	te at 2 years (all crises	requiring hospitalisati	on)				
MSH 1995	152	2.4 (3.2)	147	3.9 (5.9)	-	-	-1.50 [-2.58, -0.42]
3 Number of vaso-occlusive crises after 18 months of treatment							
Jain 2012	30	0.6 (1.37)	30	10.2 (3.24)	←		-9.60 [-10.86, -8.34]
					-10 -5	0 5 10	
				Fav	ours hydroxyurea	Favours placeb	00

Analysis 1.2. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 2 Proportion experiencing pain.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 2 Proportion experiencing pain

-

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea n/N	Placebo n/N	F M-H,Fix	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% Cl	
BABY HUG 2011	37/96	55/97			0.68 [0.50, 0.92]
			0.05 0.2 Favours hydroxyurea	I 5 20 Favours placebo	

Analysis 1.3. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 3 Proportion experiencing life threatening events during study.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 3 Proportion experiencing life threatening events during study

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea n/N	Placebo n/N	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% Cl	Weight	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% Cl
Acute chest syndrome					
BABY HUG 2011	7/96	18/97		25.7 %	0.39 [0.17, 0.90]
MSH 1995	23/152	51/147	-	74.3 %	0.44 [0.28, 0.68]
Subtotal (95% CI) Total events: 30 (Hydroxyure Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.05, c Test for overall effect: Z = 4.3 2 Hepatic sequestration	248 a), 69 (Placebo) df = 1 (P = 0.83); I ² =0.0 33 (P = 0.000015)	244 %	•	100.0 %	0.43 [0.29, 0.63]
MSH 1995	1/152	3/147		100.0 %	0.32 [0.03, 3.06]
Subtotal (95% CI) Total events: 1 (Hydroxyurea) Heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 0.9 3 Stroke	152), 3 (Placebo) : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : : :	147		100.0 %	0.32 [0.03, 3.06]
BABY HUG 2011	0/96	1/97	• •	32.9 %	0.34 [0.01, 8.17]
MSH 1995	2/152	3/147		67.1 %	0.64 [0.11, 3.80]
Subtotal (95% CI) Total events: 2 (Hydroxyurea) Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.12, o Test for overall effect: Z = 0.7 4 Patients transfused BABY HUG 2011	248), 4 (Placebo) df = 1 (P = 0.73); I ² =0.0 78 (P = 0.44) 20/96	244 % 33/97	•	100.0 % 29.0 %	0.54 [0.12, 2.53]
MSH 1995	55/152	79/147	-	71.0 %	0.67 [0.52, 0.87]
Subtotal (95% CI) Total events: 75 (Hydroxyure Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.12, o Test for overall effect: Z = 3.6 5 Splenic sequestration	248 a), 112 (Placebo) ff = 1 (P = 0.73); I ² =0.0 50 (P = 0.00031)	244 %	•	100.0 %	0.66 [0.52, 0.82]
BABY HUG 2011	8/96	9/97		100.0 %	0.90 [0.36, 2.23]
Subtotal (95% CI) Total events: 8 (Hydroxyurea) Heterogeneity: not applicable Test for overall effect: Z = 0.2	96), 9 (Placebo) 23 (P = 0.82)	97	• • • • • •	100.0 %	0.90 [0.36, 2.23]
		Favou	0.02 0.1 1 10 50 rs hydroxyurea Favours placebo)	

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review)

Copyright $\textcircled{\sc 0}$ 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.
Analysis 1.4. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 4 Number of life-threatening events during study.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 4 Number of life-threatening events during study

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea		Placebo		Dif	Mean ference	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fix	ed,95% Cl	IV,Fixed,95% CI
Blood transfusions							
Jain 2012	30	0.13 (0.43)	30	1.98 (0.82)	+		-1.85 [-2.18, -1.52]
2 Hospitalisations							
Jain 2012	30	0.7 (1.28)	30	9.59 (2.94)	↔		-8.89 [-10.04, -7.74]
3 Duration of hospital	isation (days)						
Jain 2012	30	3.1 (1.2)	30	7.1 (2.1)	+		-4.00 [-4.87, -3.13]
					-10 -5	0 5 10	
				Fav	vours hydroxyurea	Favours placeb	0

Analysis 1.5. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 5 Deaths during the study.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 5 Deaths during the study

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% Cl		M-H,Fixed,95% Cl
All deaths					
BABY HUG 2011	0/96	0/97			Not estimable
Jain 2012	0/30	0/30			Not estimable
MSH 1995	2/152	5/147		100.0 %	0.39 [0.08, 1.96]
Subtotal (95% CI)	278	274	•	100.0 %	0.39 [0.08, 1.96]
Total events: 2 (Hydroxyurea)), 5 (Placebo)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable	2				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1$.	15 (P = 0.25)				
2 Deaths related to SCD					
BABY HUG 2011	0/96	0/97			Not estimable
Jain 2012	0/30	0/30			Not estimable
MSH 1995	2/152	4/147		100.0 %	0.48 [0.09, 2.60]
Subtotal (95% CI)	278	274	-	100.0 %	0.48 [0.09, 2.60]
Total events: 2 (Hydroxyurea)), 4 (Placebo)				
Heterogeneity: not applicable	2				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.8$	35 (P = 0.40)				

0.001 0.01 0.1 1 10 100 1000 Favours hydroxyurea Favours placebo

Analysis 1.6. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 6 Change from baseline in fetal haemoglobin (HbF %).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 6 Change from baseline in fetal haemoglobin (HbF %)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Mean Difference (SE)		Mean Difference				Mean Difference
	Ν	Ν			IV,Fixed,95% CI				IV,Fixed,95% CI
BABY HUG 2011	80	78	6.7 (0.994898)						6.70 [4.75, 8.65]
				-20	-10	0	10	20	
				Favours placebo Favours hydroxyu			hydroxyurea		

Analysis 1.7. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 7 Fetal haemoglobin (HbF %) after treatment.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 7 Fetal haemoglobin (HbF %) after treatment

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea		Placebo		Diffe	Mean erence	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixe	ed,95% Cl		IV,Fixed,95% CI
Jain 2012	30	24 (5.9)	30	18.92 (5.77)			14.3 %	5.08 [2.13, 8.03]
MSH 1995	152	8.6 (6.8)	147	4.7 (3.3)			85.7 %	3.90 [2.69, 5.11]
Total (95% CI)	182		177			•	100.0 %	4.07 [2.95, 5.18]
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 =$	0.53, df = 1 (P = 0	0.47); I ² =0.0%						
Test for overall effect:	Z = 7.14 (P < 0.000)	(100						
Test for subgroup diffe	rences: Not applica	ble						
							ı	
					-20 -10	0 10 2	10	
					Favours placebo	Favours hydr	roxyurea	

Analysis 1.8. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 8 Change from baseline in absolute neutrophil count (x10³ per μ L).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 8 Change from baseline in absolute neutrophil count (×10 per µ L)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Mean Difference (SE)	Diff	Mean erence	Mean Difference
	Ν	Ν		IV,Fixe	ed,95% Cl	IV,Fixed,95% CI
BABY HUG 2011	69	72	-1.7 (0.612245)	<u> </u>		-1.70 [-2.90, -0.50]
				-2 -1 Favours hydroxyurea	0 I 2 Favours placebo	

Analysis I.9. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 9 Neutrophil response (10⁹ /L) after treatment.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 9 Neutrophil response (10° /L) after treatment

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo			Mean Difference	Mean Difference	
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI	IV,Fixed,95% CI	
Neutrophils (x10 9/I) at 10 weeks						
MSH 1995	152	4.9 (2.6)	147	6.8 (2.8)	←	-1.90 [-2.51, -1.29]	
2 Neutrophils (x10 9/I) at 2 years						
MSH 1995	119	4.9 (2)	120	6.4 (2)	←	-1.50 [-2.01, -0.99]	
					-2 -1 0 1 2	2	

Favours hydroxyurea Favours placebo

Hydroxy
urea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review) Copyright
 0 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 1.10. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 10 Change from baseline in haemoglobin (g/L).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 10 Change from baseline in haemoglobin (g/L)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Mean Difference (SE)		Mean Difference				Mean Difference
	Ν	Ν		IV,Fixed,95% CI			95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
BABY HUG 2011	79	79	0.09 (0.020408)	-			÷		0.09 [0.05, 0.13]
				-0.5	-0.25	0	0.25	0.5	
				favour	s placebo		favours h	nydroxyurea	

Analysis 1.11. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome II Change from baseline in m corpuscular volume (fL).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: II Change from baseline in m corpuscular volume (fL)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Mean Difference (SE)	Diff	Mean ference	Mean Difference
	Ν	Ν		IV,Fixe	ed,95% Cl	IV,Fixed,95% CI
BABY HUG 2011	79	79	5.7 (0.892857)			5.70 [3.95, 7.45]
				-10 -5	0 5 10	0

Favours placebo Favours hydroxyurea

Analysis 1.12. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 12 Change from baseline in white blood cells (x10³ per μ L).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 12 Change from baseline in white blood cells (x10 $per \mu L$)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Mean Difference (SE)	Diff	Mean erence	Mean Difference
	Ν	Ν		IV,Fixe	ed,95% Cl	IV,Fixed,95% CI
BABY HUG 2011	79	79	-3.4 (1.30102)			-3.40 [-5.95, -0.85]
				-20 -10 Favours hydroxyurea	0 10 20 Favours placebo	

Analysis 1.13. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 13 Change from baseline in absolute reticulocyte count (x10³ per μ L).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 13 Change from baseline in absolute reticulocyte count (x10 $per \mu L$)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Mean Difference (SE)	Mean Difference			ean nce		Mean Difference
	Ν	Ν		IV,Fixed,95% CI			5% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
BABY HUG 2011	69	72	-71 (18.36735)						-71.00 [-107.00, -35.00]
				-200	-100	0	100	200	

Favours hydroxyurea Favours placebo

Analysis 1.14. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 14 Change from baseline in reticulocytes (%).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 14 Change from baseline in reticulocytes (%)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Mean Difference (SE)		Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% Cl			Mean Difference				
	Ν	Ν						IV,Fixed,95% CI				
BABY HUG 2011	80	79	-3.1 (0.688776)		+		+		+			-3.10 [-4.45, -1.75]
				-20	-10	0 10	20					
				Favours hyd	roxyurea	Favour	s placebo					

Analysis 1.15. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 15 Change from baseline in total bilirubin (mg/L).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 15 Change from baseline in total bilirubin (mg/L)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Mean Difference (SE)	ean Difference (SE) Difference			n e		Mean Difference
	Ν	Ν			IV,Fixed,95% CI				IV,Fixed,95% CI
BABY HUG 2011	81	85	-0.5 (0.178571)	I				Ĩ	-0.50 [-0.85, -0.15]
				-2	-	0	1	2	

Favours hydroxyurea Favours placebo

Analysis 1.16. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 16 Change from baseline in platelet count (x10³ per μ L).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 16 Change from baseline in platelet count (×10 per µ L)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Mean Difference (SE)		Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% Cl		Mean Difference		
	Ν	Ν						IV,Fixed,95% CI	
BABY HUG 2011	78	79	-33 (27.551)			-			-33.00 [-87.00, 21.00]
				-200	-100	0	100	200	
				Favours hyc	Iroxyurea		Favours	placebo	

Analysis 1.17. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 17 Haemoglobin (g/dL).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 17 Haemoglobin (g/dL)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea		Placebo			M Differe	ean nce	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)		IV,Fixed,9	95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
At 10 weeks									
MSH 1995	152	9.1 (1.4)	147	8.6 (1.3)			•	100.0 %	0.50 [0.19, 0.81]
Subtotal (95% CI)	152		147			-	•	100.0 %	0.50 [0.19, 0.81]
Heterogeneity: not applic	able								
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 3.20 (P = 0.0014)								
2 At the end of the study									
Jain 2012	30	9.29 (0.55)	30	7.9 (0.58)				55.3 %	1.39 [1.10, 1.68]
MSH 1995	152	9.1 (1.5)	147	8.5 (1.3)		-	-	44.7 %	0.60 [0.28, 0.92]
Subtotal (95% CI)	182		177				•	100.0 %	1.04 [0.82, 1.25]
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 13	II, df = I (P = 0.0)	00029); I ² =92%							
Test for overall effect: Z =	9.56 (P < 0.0000)							
							1		
					-2	-1 0	I	2	
				Favoi	urs hydro>	yurea	Favours pl	acebo	

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review)

Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 1.18. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 18 Mean corpuscular volume (fL).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 18 Mean corpuscular volume (fL)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea		Placebo		Diffe	Mean erence	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixe	d,95% CI	IV,Fixed,95% CI
I At 10 weeks							
MSH 1995	152	104.9 (13.5)	147	92.6 (9.2)			12.30 [9.69, 14.91]
2 At 2 years							
MSH 1995	152	103 (14)	147	93 (9)			10.00 [7.34, 12.66]
					-20 -10 0) 10 20	
					Favours placebo	Favours hydro	xyuea

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review) Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 1.19. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 19 Total bilirubin (mg/L).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 19 Total bilirubin (mg/L)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea		Placebo		M Differe	lean ence	Weight	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,S	95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
I At the end of the study	/							
Jain 2012	30	1.1 (0.42)	30	2.71 (0.93)			84.2 %	-1.61 [-1.98, -1.24]
MSH 1995	152	2.9 (2.5)	147	4.2 (4.6)			15.8 %	-1.30 [-2.14, -0.46]
Subtotal (95% CI)	182		177		•		100.0 %	-1.56 [-1.90, -1.23]
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.4$	44, df = 1 (P = 0.5	I); I ² =0.0%						
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 9.13 (P < 0.0000	I)						
Test for subgroup differer	nces: Not applicable	e						
						1	1	
					-4 -2 0	2	4	

-4 -2 0 2 4 Favours hydroxyurea Favours placebo

Hydroxy
urea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review) Copyright
 0 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 1.20. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 20 Reticulocytes.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 20 Reticulocytes

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea		Placebo		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI	IV,Fixed,95% CI
Reticulocytes (10 [°] /	'mm) at 18 months					
Jain 2012	30	1.15 (0.1)	30	1.81 (0.67)		-0.66 [-0.90, -0.42]
2 Reticulocytes (10°/	'L) at 10 weeks					
MSH 1995	152	194 (86)	147	324 (108)	•	- 30.00 [- 52. 7, - 07.83]
3 Reticulocytes (10°/	'L) at 2 years					
MSH 1995	152	231 (100)	147	300 (99)		-69.00 [-91.56, -46.44]
					-100 -50 0 50 10	0

Favours hydroxyurea Favours placebo

Hydroxy
urea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review) Copyright
 0 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 1.21. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 21 Platelet count.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 21 Platelet count

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea		Placebo		Mean Difference	Mean Difference		
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% Cl	IV,Fixed,95% CI		
Platelet count (10	'mm) at 18 months							
Jain 2012	30	2.01 (0.18)	30	2.06 (0.26)		-0.05 [-0.16, 0.06]		
2 Platelet count (×10°	/L) at 10 weeks							
MSH 1995	152	434 (190)	147	469 (164)	← · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-35.00 [-75.19, 5.19]		
3 Platelet count (×10°	/L) at 2 years							
MSH 1995	152	399 (124)	147	423 (122)	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	-24.00 [-51.88, 3.88]		
					-50 -25 0 25 5	0		

Favours hydroxyurea Favours placebo

Analysis 1.22. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 22 Packed cell volume.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 22 Packed cell volume

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo			Diffe	Mean Difference	
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed	1,95% CI	IV,Fixed,95% CI
I Packed cell volume (%) at 2 years						
MSH 1995	152	27 (5)	147	25.1 (4.2)			1.90 [0.85, 2.95]
					-4 -2 0	2	4
					Favours placebo	Favours hyd	droxyurea

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review)

 $Copyright @ 2017 \ The \ Cochrane \ Collaboration. \ Published \ by \ John \ Wiley \ \& \ Sons, \ Ltd.$

Analysis 1.23. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 23 F reticulocytes.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 23 F reticulocytes

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea		Placebo		Diffe	Mean erence	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixe	ed,95% Cl	IV,Fixed,95% CI
I F reticulocytes at 2 yea MSH 1995	ars 152	17 (9)	147	15 (7)			2.00 [0.18, 3.82]
					-4 -2 Favours placebo	0 2 Favours hyd	4 Iroxyurea

Analysis 1.24. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 24 F cells.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 24 F cells

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea		Placebo		Diffe	Mean rence		Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed	I,95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
I F cells (%) at 2 years MSH 1995	152	48 (23)	147	35 (18)		+	I	3.00 [8.33, 7.67]
					-100 -50 0 Favours placebo	50 Favours	100 hydroxyurea	

Analysis 1.25. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 25 Red blood count.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 25 Red blood count

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea		Placebo			Di	Mean ifference		Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)		IV,Fiz	xed,95% Cl		IV,Fixed,95% CI
I Red blood count (IC)°/mm) at 18 months								
Jain 2012	30	1.98 (0.22)	30	3.11 (0.2)	4				-1.13 [-1.24, -1.02]
					-	-0.5	0 0.5	Ι	
				Fa	wours hyd	roxyurea	Favours p	olacebo	

Analysis 1.26. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 26 White blood cells.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 26 White blood cells

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea		Placebo			D	M Viffere	lean ence		Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)		IV,Fi	ixed,	95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
I White blood cells (I	0 ⁹ /L) at 2 years									
MSH 1995	152	9.9 (3.1)	147	12.2 (2.8)		-+	-			-2.30 [-2.97, -1.63]
					-10	-5	0	5	10	
				F	avours hydr	roxyurea		Favours	placebo	

Analysis 1.27. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 27 Dense cells.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 27 Dense cells

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea		Placebo		Diffe	Mean rence	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed	I,95% CI	IV,Fixed,95% CI
I Dense cells (%) at 2	years						
MSH 1995	152	(6)	147	13 (7)			-2.00 [-3.48, -0.52]
					-4 -2 0	2 4	
				Favo	ours hydroxyurea	Favours placebo	

Analysis 1.28. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 28 Leucocytes.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 28 Leucocytes

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea		Placebo			C	Mea Differenc	an ce		Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)		IV,F	ixed,95%	% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
l Leucocytes (10 /mn	m) at 18 months									
Jain 2012	30	6.54 (5.54)	30	7.38 (2.85)		_	-+			-0.84 [-3.07, 1.39]
					-10	-5	0	5	10	

Analysis 1.29. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 29 Creatinine.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 29 Creatinine

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea		Placebo			D	∿ viffere	1ean ence		Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)		IV,Fi	xed,	95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
I Creatinine (mg/dL) a	t 2 years									
MSH 1995	152	I (0.5)	147	I (0.5)		-		_		0.0 [-0.11, 0.11]
					-0.5	-0.25	0	0.25	0.5	
					Favours hyc	Iroxyurea		Favours	placebo	

Analysis 1.30. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 30 Aspartate aminotransferase.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 30 Aspartate aminotransferase

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea		Placebo			Di	M iffere	lean ence		Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)		IV,Fi:	xed,	95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
l Aspartate aminotran	sferase at 2 years									
MSH 1995	152	39 (20)	147	43 (27)			+			-4.00 [-9.40, 1.40]
						1			1	
					-20	-10	0	10	20	
				Fav	vours hydi	roxyurea		Favours	placebo	

Analysis 1.31. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 31 Alkaline phosphatase.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 31 Alkaline phosphatase

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea		Placebo		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI	IV,Fixed,95% CI
I Alkaline phosphatase	e at 2 years					
MSH 1995	152	117 (48)	147	9 (7)		-2.00 [-15.78, 11.78]
					-100 -50 0 50 10	00
				Favo	ours hydroxyurea Favours place	ebo

Analysis 1.32. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 32 Change from baseline in growth.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 32 Change from baseline in growth

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Mean Difference (SE)	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
	Ν	Ν		IV,Fixed,95% CI	IV,Fixed,95% CI
l Height (cm)					
BABY HUG 2011	87	82	-0.2 (0.408163)		-0.20 [-1.00, 0.60]
2 Weight (kg)					
BABY HUG 2011	87	82	0.1 (0.153061)		0.10 [-0.20, 0.40]
3 Head circumference (cm	1)				
BABY HUG 2011	85	82	-0.2 (0.204082)		-0.20 [-0.60, 0.20]
				-1 -0.5 0 0.5	1
				Favours placebo Favours	hydroxyurea

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review)

Copyright $\textcircled{\sc c}$ 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 1.33. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 33 Quality of life: general health perception.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 33 Quality of life: general health perception

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea		Placebo		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI	IV,Fixed,95% CI
I General health perce	eption at 6 months					
MSH 1995	148	1.3 (3.7)	137	I (3.5)		0.30 [-0.54, 1.14]
2 General health perce	eption at I year					
MSH 1995	146	1.6 (3.3)	138	I (3.4)	+	0.60 [-0.18, 1.38]
3 General health perce	eption at 18 months					
MSH 1995	144	1.5 (3.6)	136	0.6 (3.4)		0.90 [0.08, 1.72]
4 General health perce	eption at 2 years					
MSH 1995	4	1.3 (4.1)	136	0.9 (3.6)		0.40 [-0.51, 1.31]
					-2 -1 0 1 2	

Favours placebo Favours hydroxyurea

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review) Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 1.34. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 34 Quality of life: pain recall.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 34 Quality of life: pain recall

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea		Placebo		Dif	Mean fference	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fix	ed,95% Cl	IV,Fixed,95% CI
l Pain recall at 6 mont MSH 1995	hs 148	0.6 (2.4)	137	0.2 (2.2)	-		0.40 [-0.13, 0.93]
2 Pain recall at 1 year MSH 1995	146	0.7 (2.6)	138	0.3 (2.4)	-		0.40 [-0.18, 0.98]
3 Pain recall at 18 mor MSH 1995	nths 44	0.8 (2.5)	136	0.1 (2.5)			0.70 [0.11, 1.29]
4 Pain recall at 2 years MSH 1995	141	0.6 (2.7)	136	0.3 (2.4)	_		0.30 [-0.30, 0.90]
					-1 -0.5	U U.5 I	

-1 -0.5 0 0.5

Favours placebo Favours hydroxyurea

Analysis 1.35. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 35 Quality of life: social function.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 35 Quality of life: social function

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea		Placebo		Diff	Mean erence	Mean Difference	
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixe	ed,95% Cl	IV,Fixed,95% CI	
l Social function at 6 m MSH 1995	nonths 148	0.5 (2.3)	137	0.1 (2.4)	_		0.40 [-0.15, 0.95]	
2 Social function at 1 ye MSH 1995	ear 146	0.4 (2.3)	138	0.2 (2.5)			0.20 [-0.36, 0.76]	
3 Social function at 18 MSH 1995	months 144	0.6 (2.5)	136	0.2 (2.7)	_		0.40 [-0.21, 1.01]	
4 Social function at 2 ye MSH 1995	ears 4	0.6 (2.7)	136	0.3 (2.5)			0.30 [-0.31, 0.91]	
					-1 -0.5	0 0.5 1		

-1 -0.5 0 0.5

Favours placebo Favours hydroxyurea

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review) Copyright $\textcircled{\sc 0}$ 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 1.36. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 36 Changes in 'Ladder of Life'.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 36 Changes in 'Ladder of Life'

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea		Placebo		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI	IV,Fixed,95% CI
I Changes in 'Ladder o	of Life' at 6 months					
MSH 1995	148	-0.2 (2.2)	137	-0.2 (2.3)		0.0 [-0.52, 0.52]
2 Changes in 'Ladder o	of Life' at Tyear					
MSH 1995	146	-0.1 (2.4)	138	-0.5 (2.3)		0.40 [-0.15, 0.95]
3 Changes in 'Ladder o	of Life' at 18 months					
MSH 1995	144	-0.1 (2.3)	136	-0.4 (2.1)		0.30 [-0.22, 0.82]
4 Changes in 'Ladder o	of Life' at 2 years					
MSH 1995	141	-0.1 (2.3)	136	-0.4 (2.2)		0.30 [-0.23, 0.83]
					-1 -0.5 0 0.5 1	

Favours Placebo Favours Hydroxyurea

Hydroxy
urea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review) Copyright
 0 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 1.37. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 37 Proportion of participants with signs of organ damage.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 37 Proportion of participants with signs of organ damage

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% CI	M-H,Fixed,95% CI
I New leg ulcers				
MSH 1995	15/152	17/147		0.85 [0.44, 1.64]
2 Aseptic necrosis (humerus	or femur)			
MSH 1995	9/152	9/147		0.97 [0.39, 2.37]
3 Decreased spleen function	at exit (compared to baseline)			
BABY HUG 2011	19/70	28/74		0.72 [0.44, 1.16]
			0.2 0.3 1 2 5	

Favours hydroxyurea Favours placebo

Analysis 1.38. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 38 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in DTPA GFR.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 38 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in DTPA GFR

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea N	Placebo N	Mean Difference (SE)		IV,	N Differ Fixed,	1ean ence ,95% Cl		Mean Difference IV,Fixed,95% CI
BABY HUG 2011	67	66	2 (9.183673)				_		2.00 [-16.00, 20.00]
						_			
				-100 Favours hyd	-50 Iroxyurea	0	50 Favours	100 s placebo	

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review) Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 1.39. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 39 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Howell-Jolley body (per 106 red blood cells).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 39 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Howell-Jolley body (per 10⁶ red blood cells)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Mean Difference (SE)		۱ Differ	1ean ence		Mean Difference
	N	N		I	V,Fixed	,95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
BABY HUG 2011	76	82	-274 (134.69387)	← →-				-274.00 [-538.00, -10.00]
				-500 -250 Favours hydroxyur) O rea	250 Favours	500 placebo	

Analysis 1.40. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 40 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in pitted cells (%).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 40 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in pitted cells (%)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Mean Difference (SE)		[Me Differer	ean Ice		Mean Difference
	Ν	Ν			IV,I	Fixed,95	5% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
BABY HUG 2011	85	82	-2.5 (1.147959)	-					-2.50 [-4.75, -0.25]
				-4	-2	0	2	4	

Favours hydroxyurea Favours placebo

Analysis 1.41. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 41 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen: liver ratio of counts.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 41 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen: liver ratio of counts

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Mean Difference (SE)		C	Mean Difference		Mean Difference
	Ν	N			IV,F	ixed,95% Cl		IV,Fixed,95% CI
BABY HUG 2011	84	79	0.1 (0.045918)					0.10[0.01,0.19]
				-0.5	-0.25	0 0.25	0.5	
				Favour	s placebo	Favou	s hydroxyurea	1

Analysis 1.42. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 42 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen volume (cm3).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 42 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in spleen volume (cm³)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Mean Difference (SE)	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
	Ν	Ν		IV,Fixed,95% CI	IV,Fixed,95% CI
BABY HUG 2011	80	80	4 (4.2857)		4.00 [- 4.00, 42.00]
					<u> </u>

-100 -50 0 50 100

Favours placebo Favours hydroxyurea

Analysis 1.43. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in creatinine (mg/L).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 43 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in creatinine (mg/L)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Mean Difference (SE)	Mean Difference		lean ence		Mean Difference	
	Ν	Ν			IV,Fi	xed,'	95% Cl		IV,Fixed,95% CI
BABY HUG 2011	69	78	-0.05 (0.017857)						-0.05 [-0.08, -0.02]
						_			
				-0.1	-0.05	0	0.05	0.1	
				Favours hyd	droxyurea		Favours	placebo	

Analysis 1.44. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 44 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in Schwartz GFR

Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Mean Difference (SE)	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
Ν	Ν		IV,Fixed,95% CI	IV,Fixed,95% CI
ration rate (mL/min per	I.73m ²)			
69	73	-8 (14.79592)		-8.00 [-37.00, 21.00]
				100
			-100 -50 0 50 Favours bydroxyurea Eavours	i placebo
	Hydroxyurea N ration rate (mL/min per 69	Hydroxyurea Placebo N N ration rate (mL/min per 1.73m ²) 69 73	Hydroxyurea Placebo Mean Difference (SE) N N ration rate (mL/min per 1.73m ²) 69 73 -8 (14.79592)	Hydroxyurea Placebo Mean Difference (SE) Difference N N IV,Fixed,95% CI ration rate (mL/min per 1.73m ²) 69 73 -8 (14.79592) -100 -50 0 50 Favours hydroxyurea Favours

Analysis 1.45. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 45 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in cystatin C.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 45 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in cystatin C

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Mean Difference (SE)	Mean Difference					Mean Difference
	Ν	Ν			IV,Fi	xed,9	95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
BABY HUG 2011	39	48	0.03 (0.04082)		-				0.03 [-0.05, 0.11]
				-0.2 Favours hyc	-0.1 roxyurea	0	0.1 Favours	0.2 placebo	

Analysis 1.46. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 46 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in urine osmolality.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 46 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in urine osmolality

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Mean Difference (SE)	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
	Ν	Ν		IV,Fixed,95% CI	IV,Fixed,95% CI
BABY HUG 2011	81	84	57 (27.29592)		→ 57.00 [3.50, 110.50]

-100 -50 0 50 100 Favours placebo Favours hydroxyurea

Analysis 1.47. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 47 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in urine pH.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 47 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in urine pH

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Mean Difference (SE)	Diffe	Mean erence	Mean Difference
	Ν	Ν		IV,Fixe	ed,95% Cl	IV,Fixed,95% CI
BABY HUG 2011	86	82	0.15 (0.18622449)			0.15 [-0.21, 0.51]
				-1 -0.5 Favours placebo	0 0.5 I Favours hydrox	xyurea

Analysis 1.48. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 48 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in urine-specific gravity.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 48 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in urine-specific gravity

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Mean Difference (SE)	Diff	Mean erence	Mean Difference
	Ν	Ν		IV,Fixe	ed,95% CI	IV,Fixed,95% CI
BABY HUG 2011	86	82	0.002 (0.000918)			0.00 [0.00, 0.00]
				-0.01 -0.01	0 0.01 0.01	

Favours placebo Favours hydroxyurea

Analysis 1.49. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 49 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in total kidney volume.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 49 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in total kidney volume

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Mean Difference (SE)		C	∩ Differe	1ean ence		Mean Difference
	Ν	Ν			IV,F	ixed,	95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
BABY HUG 2011	86	79	-9 (3.571429)			+			-9.00 [-16.00, -2.00]
						_			
				-100	-50	0	50	100	
				Favours hyd	roxyurea		Favours	placebo	

Analysis 1.50. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 50 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in TCD ultrasound velocity (time-averaged mean maximum velocity).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 50 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in TCD ultrasound velocity (time-averaged mean maximum velocity)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Mean Difference (SE)		D	∩ ∾iffere	lean ence		Mean Difference
	Ν	Ν			IV,Fi	xed,	95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
BABY HUG 2011	79	79	-12 (3.061224)			+	ı		-12.00 [-18.00, -6.00]
				-100 Favours hydro	-50 xyurea	0	50 Favours	100 placebo	

Analysis 1.51. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 51 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in CNS measures.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 51 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in CNS measures

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Mean Difference (SE)	Mean Difference	Mean Difference
	Ν	Ν		IV,Fixed,95% CI	IV,Fixed,95% CI
I Bayley Mental Developr	ment Index				
BABY HUG 2011	85	80	3 (2.55102)	+	3.00 [-2.00, 8.00]
2 Bayley motor performar	nce development index				
BABY HUG 2011	85	79	2 (2.55102)	+	2.00 [-3.00, 7.00]
				-100 -50 0 50 10	0
				Favours placebo Favours hydro	oxyurea

Hydroxy
urea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review) Copyright
 0 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 1.52. Comparison I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease, Outcome 52 Proportion of participants experiencing adverse events and toxicity.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: I Hydroxyurea versus placebo for participants with sickle cell disease

Outcome: 52 Proportion of participants experiencing adverse events and toxicity

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea n/N	Placebo n/N	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% Cl	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% Cl
I hair loss at I or 2 visits				
MSH 1995	22/152	17/147		1.25 [0.69, 2.26]
2 hair loss at 3 or more visits MSH 1995	12/152	19/147		0.61 [0.31, 1.21]
3 skin rash at 1 or 2 visits MSH 1995	31/152	31/147		0.97 [0.62, 1.51]
4 skin rash at 3 or more visits MSH 1995	25/152	25/147		0.97 [0.58, 1.60]
5 fever at 1 or 2 visits MSH 1995	21/152	21/147		0.97 [0.55, 1.69]
6 fever at 3 or more visits MSH 1995	60/152	65/147		0.89 [0.68, 1.17]
7 Gastroinestinal disturbance a MSH 1995	t I or 2 visits 24/I52	28/147		0.83 [0.50, 1.36]
8 Gastrointestinal disturbance MSH 1995	at 3 or more visits 59/152	58/147	-	0.98 [0.74, 1.31]
9 Other abnormalities at 1 or MSH 1995	2 visits 15/152	24/147		0.60 [0.33, 1.11]
10 Other abnormalities at 3 or MSH 1995	r more visits 68/152	61/147		1.08 [0.83, 1.40]
II Hospitalisation (for any reas BABY HUG 2011	son) 69/96	84/97	-	0.83 [0.72, 0.96]
12 Dactylitis BABY HUG 2011	14/96	42/97		0.34 [0.20, 0.58]
13 Priapism BABY HUG 2011	3/96	2/97	.	1.52 [0.26, 8.87]
14 Sepsis or bacteraemia BABY HUG 2011	2/96	5/97	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.40 [0.08, 2.03]
15 Splenomegaly				
		Fa	0.2 0.5 I 2 5 avours hydroxycarbamide Favours placebo	(Continued)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Placebo	Risk Ratio	(Continued) Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% Cl	M-H,Fixed,95% CI
BABY HUG 2011	32/96	36/97		0.90 [0.61, 1.32]
16 Absolute Neutrophil Cour BABY HUG 2011	nt < 500 5/96	2/97		2.53 [0.50, 2.7]
17 Absolute Neutrophil 500 -	- 1250			
BABY HUG 2011	45/96	18/97		2.53 [1.58, 4.03]
18 Thrombocytopaenia BABY HUG 2011	11/96	7/97		1.59 [0.64, 3.92]
19 Alanine transaminase > 15	50 U/L			
BABY HUG 2011	2/96	1/97	·	2.02 [0.19, 21.92]
20 Severe anaemia BABY HUG 2011	1/96	2/97	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	0.51 [0.05, 5.48]
21 Bilirubin				
BABY HUG 2011	0/96	1/97	·	0.34 [0.01, 8.17]
22 Creatinine				
BABY HUG 2011	0/96	0/97		Not estimable
23 Skin and subcutaneous dis	orders			
BABY HUG 2011	62/96	69/97	-+-	0.91 [0.75, 1.10]
24 Splenic sequestration				
BABY HUG 2011	8/96	9/97		0.90 [0.36, 2.23]
25 Gastroenteritis				
BABY HUG 2011	18/96	41/97		0.44 [0.28, 0.71]
26 Nausea				
Jain 2012	2/30	0/30		5.00 [0.25, 99.95]
27 Skin Rash				
Jain 2012	3/30	0/30		7.00 [0.38, 129.93]
			0.2 0.5 I 2 5	
		Fav	ours hydroxycarbamide Favours placebo	

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review) Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 2.1. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome I Proportion experiencing pain.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke

Outcome: I Proportion experiencing pain

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy	Transfusion / Chelation	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% Cl		M-H,Fixed,95% CI
Vaso-occlusive or sickle cel	I-related pain (all)				
SWITCH 2012	46/67	44/66		100.0 %	1.03 [0.81, 1.30]
Subtotal (95% CI)	67	66	•	100.0 %	1.03 [0.81, 1.30]
Total events: 46 (Hydroxyure	ea / Phlebotomy), 44 (Tra	nsfusion / Chelation)			
Heterogeneity: not applicable	2				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.2$	25 (P = 0.81)				
2 Vaso-occlusive or sickle cel	I-related pain (serious)				
SWiTCH 2012	16/67	5/66		62.9 %	3.15 [1.23, 8.11]
TWITCH 2016	11/60	3/61		37.1 %	3.73 [1.09, 12.70]
Subtotal (95% CI)	127	127	◆	100.0 %	3.37 [1.59, 7.11]
Total events: 27 (Hydroxyure	ea / Phlebotomy), 8 (Tran	sfusion / Chelation)			
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.05$,	df = 1 (P = 0.83); $I^2 = 0.0$)%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 3$.	18 (P = 0.0015)				
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100		
		Favours Hydroxyurea	a / Phlebotomy Favours Transfus	ion / Chelation	

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review) Copyright $\textcircled{\sc 0}$ 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 2.2. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 2 Proportion experiencing life-threatening events during study.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke

Outcome: 2 Proportion experiencing life-threatening events during study

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy	Transfusion / Chelation	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% CI		M-H,Fixed,95% CI
l Stroke (secondary)					
SWITCH 2012	7/67	0/66		100.0 %	4.78 [0.86, 253.66]
Subtotal (95% CI)	67	66		100.0 %	14.78 [0.86, 253.66]
Total events: 7 (Hydroxyurea	/ Phlebotomy), 0 (Trar	nsfusion / Chelation)			
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 1.8$	36 (P = 0.063)				
2 Transient ischaemic attack ((primary)				
TWITCH 2016	3/60	3/61		100.0 %	1.02 [0.21, 4.84]
Subtotal (95% CI)	60	61	-	100.0 %	1.02 [0.21, 4.84]
Total events: 3 (Hydroxyurea	/ Phlebotomy), 3 (Trar	nsfusion / Chelation)			
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.0$	02 (P = 0.98)				
3 Transient ischaemic attack ((secondary)				
SWITCH 2012	6/67	9/66		100.0 %	0.66 [0.25, 1.74]
Subtotal (95% CI)	67	66	•	100.0 %	0.66 [0.25, 1.74]
Total events: 6 (Hydroxyurea	/ Phlebotomy), 9 (Trar	nsfusion / Chelation)			
Heterogeneity: not applicable					
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.8$	34 (P = 0.40)				
4 Other neurological event (p	orimary)				
TWITCH 2016	1/60	1/61		100.0 %	1.02 [0.07, 15.88]
Subtotal (95% CI)	60	61		100.0 %	1.02 [0.07, 15.88]
Total events: I (Hydroxyurea	/ Phlebotomy), I (Trar	nsfusion / Chelation)			
Heterogeneity: not applicable	2				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.0$	OI (P = 0.99)				
5 Acute chest syndrome					
SWITCH 2012	16/67	5/66		71.7 %	3.15 [1.23, 8.11]
TWITCH 2016	4/60	2/61		28.3 %	2.03 [0.39, 10.69]
Subtotal (95% CI)	127	127	•	100.0 %	2.84 [1.25, 6.42]
Total events: 20 (Hydroxyure	a / Phlebotomy), 7 (Tra	ansfusion / Chelation)			
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.20$, o	df = 1 (P = 0.65); $I^2 = 0$	0.0%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2.5$	50 (P = 0.012)				
		0.0	005 0.1 1 10 200		
		Favours Hydroxyurea	/ Phlebotomy Favours Transfu	sion / Chelation	

(Continued . . .)

(... Continued)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy	Transfusion / Chelation	Risk Ratio	Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% Cl		M-H,Fixed,95% CI
6 Infections and Infestations	;				
SWITCH 2012	7/67	2/66	+	67.0 %	3.45 [0.74, 15.99]
TWITCH 2016	4/60	1/61		33.0 %	4.07 [0.47, 35.34]
Subtotal (95% CI)	127	127	-	100.0 %	3.65 [1.05, 12.76]
Total events: 11 (Hydroxyur	rea / Phlebotomy), 3 (Tr	ansfusion / Chelation)			
Heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 0.01$,	, df = 1 (P = 0.90); $l^2 = 0$	0.0%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2$	2.03 (P = 0.042)				
7 Splenic sequestration or s	plenectomy				
SWITCH 2012	0/67	0/66			Not estimable
TWITCH 2016	0/60	1/61		100.0 %	0.34 [0.01, 8.16]
Subtotal (95% CI)	127	127		100.0 %	0.34 [0.01, 8.16]
Total events: 0 (Hydroxyure	a / Phlebotomy), I (Trai	nsfusion / Chelation)			
Heterogeneity: not applicab	le				
Test for overall effect: $Z = C$	0.67 (P = 0.50)				
8 Hepatobiliary disease					
TWITCH 2016	1/60	1/61		100.0 %	1.02 [0.07, 15.88]
Subtotal (95% CI)	60	61		100.0 %	1.02 [0.07, 15.88]
Total events: (Hydroxyure	a / Phlebotomy), I (Trai	nsfusion / Chelation)			
Heterogeneity: not applicab	le				
Test for overall effect: $Z = C$	0.01 (P = 0.99)				
9 Total with serious adverse	e events				
SWITCH 2012	26/67	12/66	-	67.0 %	2.13 [1.18, 3.86]
TWITCH 2016	9/60	6/61		33.0 %	I.53 [0.58, 4.02]
Subtotal (95% CI)	127	127	•	100.0 %	1.93 [1.17, 3.20]
Total events: 35 (Hydroxyur	rea / Phlebotomy), 18 (T	ransfusion / Chelation)			
Heterogeneity: Chi ² = 0.34,	, df = 1 (P = 0.56); $I^2 = 0$	0.0%			
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2$	2.56 (P = 0.011)				
10 Total with sickle cell relat	ted, non-neurological ad	verse events			
SWITCH 2012	22/67	7/66	-	100.0 %	3.10 [1.42, 6.75]
Subtotal (95% CI)	67	66	•	100.0 %	3.10 [1.42, 6.75]
Total events: 22 (Hydroxyur	rea / Phlebotomy), 7 (Tr	ansfusion / Chelation)			
Heterogeneity: not applicab	le				
Test for overall effect: $Z = 2$	2.84 (P = 0.0045)				
	. ,				
			• • • • •		

0.005 0.1 1 10 200

Favours Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy Favours Transfusion / Chelation

Analysis 2.3. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 3 Deaths during the study.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke

Outcome: 3 Deaths during the study

-

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy	Transfusion / Chelation			Risk Ra	itio		Weight	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N		M-H,	Fixed,95	% CI			M-H,Fixed,95% CI
SWITCH 2012	1/67	1/66			-	_		100.0 %	0.99 [0.06, 5.42]
TWiTCH 2016	0/60	0/61							Not estimable
Total (95% CI)	127	127						100.0 %	0.99 [0.06, 15.42]
Total events: I (Hydroxyu	urea / Phlebotomy), I (Tr	ransfusion / Chelation)							
Heterogeneity: not applic	cable								
Test for overall effect: Z =	= 0.01 (P = 0.99)								
Test for subgroup differer	nces: Not applicable								
			0.01	0.1	I	10	100		

Favours Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy

Favours Transfusion / Chelation

Analysis 2.4. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 4 Change from baseline in fetal haemoglobin (HbF %).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke

Outcome: 4 Change from baseline in fetal haemoglobin (HbF %)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy		Transfusion / Chelation		Diff	Mean erence	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixe	ed,95% Cl	IV,Fixed,95% CI
TWITCH 2016	60	15.5 (7.1)	61	-0.1 (5)			5.60 [3.41, 7.79]
					-20 -10	0 10 20	

Favours Transfusion / Chelation Favours Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy

Analysis 2.5. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 5 Change from baseline in absolute neutrophil count

(x10⁹ /L).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke

Outcome: 5 Change from baseline in absolute neutrophil count (×10⁹ /L)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy		Transfusion / Chelation		Diff	Mean erence	Di	Mean
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixe	ed,95% Cl	IV,Fixed	1,95% CI
TWiTCH 2016	60	-4.4 (3.2)	61	0 (2.6)			-4.40 [-5.44	ł, -3.36]
					-10 -5	0 5	10	

Favours Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy Favours Transfusion / Chelation

Analysis 2.6. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 6 Change from baseline in mean corpuscular volume (fL).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke

Outcome: 6 Change from baseline in mean corpuscular volume (fL)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy		Transfusion / Chelation		Diff	Mean erence		Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixe	ed,95% Cl		IV,Fixed,95% CI
TWiTCH 2016	60	21 (10)	61	0 (4)			+	21.00 [18.28, 23.72]
					-20 -10	0 10	20	

Favours Transfusion / Chelation Favours Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy
Analysis 2.7. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 7 Change from baseline in sickle haemoglobin (%).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke

Outcome: 7 Change from baseline in sickle haemoglobin (%)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy		Transfusion / Chelation			D	۲ iffer	1ean ence		Mean Difference
	N	Mean(SD)	N	Mean(SD)		IV,Fi	ixed,	95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
TWITCH 2016	60	43 (15.5)	61	1.2 (10.7)	I	•		1	÷.	41.80 [37.05, 46.55]
				Favours Tra	-50 Insfusion / (-25 Chelation	0	25 Favours	50 s Hydrox	yurea / Phlebotomy

Analysis 2.8. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 8 Change from baseline in haemoglobin (g/L).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke

Outcome: 8 Change from baseline in haemoglobin (g/L)

Hydroxyurea Study or subgroup / Phlebotomy				l Differ	Mean rence	Mean Difference	
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% Cl		IV,Fixed,95% CI
TWiTCH 2016	60	-2 (12)	61	8.7 (10)	+		-10.70 [-14.64, -6.76]

-100 -50 0 50 100

Analysis 2.9. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 9 Change from baseline in absolute reticulocyte count

(10⁹ / L).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke

Outcome: 9 Change from baseline in absolute reticulocyte count (10° / L)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy		Transfusion / Chelation		Diff	Mean erence	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixe	ed,95% Cl	IV,Fixed,95% CI
TWiTCH 2016	60	-169 (157)	61	9 (158)	<		-178.00 [-234.13, -121.87]
					-200 -100	0 100	200

Favours Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy Favours Transfusion / Chelation

Analysis 2.10. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 10 Change from baseline in white blood count (10^9 / L).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke

Outcome: 10 Change from baseline in white blood count (10° / L)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy		Transfusion / Chelation			[۱ Differ	Mean rence			Mear Difference	n e
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)		IV,I	ixed	,95%	Cl		IV,Fixed,95% C	1
TWiTCH 2016	60	-6.6 (3.9)	61	-0.4 (2.9)		+					-6.20 [-7.43, -4.97]]
				Favours Hydro»	-10 kyurea / Ph	-5 ebotomy	0	Fav	5 /ours T	10 Transfusi	on / Chelation	

Analysis 2.11. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 11 Change from baseline in platelets (10^9 / L).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke

Outcome: II Change from baseline in platelets (10° / L)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy		Transfusion / Chelation			C	M Differe	lean ence			Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	N	Mean(SD)		IV,F	ixed,?	95% CI		IV,Fix	ed,95% Cl
TWITCH 2016	60	-73 (135)	61	-3 (86)			-			-70.00 [-110.4	I, -29.59]
				Favours Hydroxy	-200 /urea / Phl	-100 ebotomy	0	100 Favours	200 Transfusi	on / Chelation	

Analysis 2.12. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 12 Change from baseline in total bilirubin (mg/L).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke

Outcome: 12 Change from baseline in total bilirubin (mg/L)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy		Transfusion / Chelation		Diff	Mean erence	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixe	ed,95% CI	IV,Fixed,95% CI
TWiTCH 2016	60	-13.3 (12.7)	61	3.3 (9)	+		-16.60 [-20.53, -12.67]
					-100 -50	0 50	100

Analysis 2.13. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 13 Change from baseline in liver iron concentration.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke

Outcome: 13 Change from baseline in liver iron concentration

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy N	Mean(SD)	Transfusion / Chelation N	Mean(SD)		Dif IV,Fi×	M ffere ked,9	ean nce 15% Cl		Diff IV,Fixed,9	Mean erence 95% Cl
TWiTCH 2016	60	-1.9 (4.2)	61	2.4 (8.7)		-+-	-			-4.30 [-6.73,	-1.87]
									1		
					-20	-10	0	10	20		
				Favours Hydrox	wurea / Phl	lehotomy		Favours	Transfus	sion / Chelation	

Analysis 2.14. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 14 Change from baseline in serum ferritin (ng/mL).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke

Outcome: 14 Change from baseline in serum ferritin (ng/mL)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy		Transfusion / Chelation		Mean Difference	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixed,95% CI	IV,Fixed,95% CI
TWITCH 2016	60	-1805 (1651)	61	-38 (2095)	±1767.00 [-2438.50, -1095.50]	

-1000 -500 0 500 1000

Analysis 2.15. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 15 Change from baseline in lactate dehydrogenase (U/L).

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke

Outcome: 15 Change from baseline in lactate dehydrogenase (U/L)

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy N	Mean(SD)	Transfusion / Chelation N	Mean(SD)		C IV,F	N Piffere ïxed,	1ean ence 95% Cl		L IV,Fixe	Mean Difference ed,95% Cl
TWiTCH 2016	60	-140 (231)	61	-6 (215)						-134.00 [-213.55	, -54.45]
							-				
				favours Hydroxy	-200 urea / Phle	-100 botomy	0	100 favours	200 Transfusio	on / Chelation	

Analysis 2.16. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 16 Signs of organ damage - CNS measures at the end of the study.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke

Outcome: 16 Signs of organ damage - CNS measures at the end of the study

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy		Transfusion / Chelation		Diff	Mean erence	Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)	IV,Fixe	ed,95% CI	IV,Fixed,95% CI
I Final TCD ultrasound	d velocity						
TWITCH 2016	60	138 (11.6132)	61	143 (11./136)			-5.00 [-9.16, -0.84]
						ı – ı	8
					-20 -10	0 10	20
				Favours Hydroxyu	urea / Phlebotomy	Favours ⁻	Transfusion / Chelation

Analysis 2.17. Comparison 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 17 Proportion of participants experiencing nonneurological adverse events and toxicity.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: 2 Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy compared to transfusion and chelation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke

Outcome: 17 Proportion of participants experiencing non-neurological adverse events and toxicity

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy	Transfusion / Chelation	Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% Cl	M-H,Fixed,95% Cl
I Infections and infestations SWiTCH 2012	39/67	31/66		1.24 [0.89, 1.72]
2 Gastrointestinal disorders SWiTCH 2012	27/67	23/66		1.16 [0.74, 1.80]
3 Fever SWiTCH 2012	23/67	21/66	+	1.08 [0.66, 1.75]
4 Musculoskelatal disorders SWiTCH 2012	15/67	13/66		1.14 [0.59, 2.20]
5 Immune system disorders SWiTCH 2012	1/67	8/66	.	0.12 [0.02, 0.96]
6 Cholelithiasis SWiTCH 2012	3/67	4/66		0.74 [0.17, 3.17]
7 Cholecystitis SWiTCH 2012	2/67	1/66		1.97 [0.18, 21.21]
8 Asthma SWiTCH 2012	3/67	4/66		0.74 [0.17, 3.17]
9 Acute chest syndrome SWiTCH 2012	7/67	4/66		1.72 [0.53, 5.61]
10 Renal or urinary disorder SWiTCH 2012	2/67	3/66		0.66 [0.11, 3.80]
II Priapism SWiTCH 2012	2/67	1/66		1.97 [0.18, 21.21]
12 Cathether-related complicatio SWiTCH 2012	ns 3/67	2/66		1.48 [0.26, 8.56]
13 Cardiac disorder SWiTCH 2012	1/67	1/66		0.99 [0.06, 15.42]
14 Hyderbilirubianemia SWiTCH 2012	9/67	18/66		0.49 [0.24, 1.02]
		Favours Hydrox	0.02 0.1 I I0 50 yurea / Phlebotomy Favours Transfusion /	' Chelation

(Continued . . .)

(Continued	1)
-------------	----

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea / Phlebotomy	Transfusion / Chelation	Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% Cl	M-H,Fixed,95% CI
15 Alanine transaminase incr	ease			
SWITCH 2012	15/67	14/66		1.06 [0.55, 2.01]
16 Aspartate transaminase in	Icrease			
SWITCH 2012	14/67	10/66		1.38 [0.66, 2.88]
17 Serum creatinine increase				
SWITCH 2012	6/67	3/66		1.97 [0.51, 7.55]
18 Thrombocytopenia				
SWITCH 2012	7/67	1/66	+	6.90 [0.87, 54.51]
19 Reticuloctopenia				
SWITCH 2012	21/67	3/66		6.90 [2.16, 22.02]
20 Neutropenia				
SWITCH 2012	10/67	1/66		9.85 [1.30, 74.80]
SWITCH 2012	20/67	3/66		657[205 2105]
	20/07	5,00		0.07 [2.00, 21.00]
22 Sickle cell pain	20//7	20///		
SWITCH 2012	70/07	27/00		1.27 [0.72, 1.02]
23 Sickle cell-related events				
SWITCH 2012	46/67	44/66	T	1.03 [0.81, 1.30]
24 All adverse events				
SWITCH 2012	64/67	64/66	1	0.99 [0.92, 1.05]
			0.02 0.1 1 10 50	

Analysis 3.1. Comparison 3 Hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 1 Proportion experiencing life-threatening events during the study.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: 3 Hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke

Outcome: I Proportion experiencing life-threatening events during the study

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea	Observation	Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% Cl	M-H,Fixed,95% CI
I Vaso-occlusive events SCATE 2015	2/11	5/11		0.40 [0.10, 1.64]
2 Acute splenic sequestration SCATE 2015	1/11	1/11		1.00 [0.07. 14.05]
3 Blood transfusions required SCATE 2015	1/11	3/11		0.33 [0.04, 2.73]
			0.01 0.1 1 10 100	

Favours hydroxyurea Favours observation

Analysis 3.2. Comparison 3 Hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 2 Signs of organ damage - proportion of participants with a change in CNS measures.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: 3 Hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke

Outcome: 2 Signs of organ damage - proportion of participants with a change in CNS measures

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea n/N	Observation n/N	I M-H,Fiz	Risk Ratio «ed,95% Cl	Risk Ratio M-H,Fixed,95% Cl
I Participants converting fr SCATE 2015	om conditional to abnormal TCE /	D ultrasound velocity 5/11	·	-	0.20 [0.03, 1.45]
			0.01 0.1 Favours hydroxyurea	I IO IOO Favours observation	

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review) Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Analysis 3.3. Comparison 3 Hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 3 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in CNS measures.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: 3 Hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke

Outcome: 3 Signs of organ damage - change from baseline in CNS measures

Study or subgroup	Hydroxyurea		Observation			D	۲ iffer	1ean ence		Mean Difference
	Ν	Mean(SD)	Ν	Mean(SD)		IV,Fi:	xed,	,95% CI		IV,Fixed,95% CI
I TCD ultrasound vel	ocity (time-average	d mean maximum velo	ocity)							
SCATE 2015	11	-15.5 (24.7094)	11	10.2 (22.3278)			-			-25.70 [-45.38, -6.02]
					-100	-50	0	50	100	
				F	avours hyd	roxyurea		Favours	observatio	on

Analysis 3.4. Comparison 3 Hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke, Outcome 4 Adverse events and toxicity.

Review: Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease

Comparison: 3 Hydroxyurea compared to observation for participants with SCD and risk of stroke

Outcome: 4 Adverse events and toxicity

Study or subgroup	Favours hydroxyurea	Observation	Risk Ratio	Risk Ratio
	n/N	n/N	M-H,Fixed,95% CI	M-H,Fixed,95% CI
l Dizziness				
SCATE 2015	1/11	0/11		3.00 [0.14, 66.53]
2 Headaches				
SCATE 2015	1/11	1/11		1.00 [0.07, 14.05]
3 Transient neutropenia				
SCATE 2015	1/11	0/11		3.00 [0.14, 66.53]
4 Reticulocytopenia				
SCATE 2015	1/11	1/11		1.00 [0.07, 14.05]
5 Parasite infection				
SCATE 2015	1/11	1/11		1.00 [0.07, 14.05]
			0.001 0.01 0.1 1 10 100 1000	
			Favours hydroxyurea Favours observation	

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review)

Copyright $\textcircled{\sc c}$ 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

ADDITIONAL TABLES

Table 1. Clinical events and markers of response in Jain 2012

	Hydroxyurea		Placebo		P value	
	Baseline	18 months	Baseline	18 months		
Clinical events (nun	nber of events p	er participant	per year)			Clinical events
VOC	12.13 (8.56)	0.60 (1.37)	11.46 (3.01)	10.2 (3.24)	< 0.001	
Blood transfusions	2.43 (0.69)	0.13 (0.43)	2.13 (0.98)	1.98 (0.82)	< 0.001	
Hospitalisations	10.13 (6.56)	0.70 (1.28)	9.56 (2.91)	9.59 (2.94)	< 0.001	
Haematological par	ameters					Haematologica
Hb (g/dL)	8.1 (0.68)	9.29 (0.55)	8.21 (0.68)	7.90 (0.58)	< 0.001	
HbF(%)	19.8 (0.9)	24 (5.9)	19.21 (6.37)	18.92 (5.77)	< 0.001	
Reticulocytes (x10 ⁵ /mm ³)	1.83 (0.96)	1.15 (0.1)	1.73 (0.49)	1.81 (0.67)	< 0.001	
Leucocytes (x10 ³ / mm ³)	7.36 (6.03)	6.54 (5.54)	7.26 (4.91)	7.38 (2.85)	< 0.001	
Platelets (x10 ³ / mm ³)	1.78 (0.26)	2.01 (0.18)	1.91 (0.21)	2.06 (0.26)	0.28	
RBC (x10 ⁶ /mm ³)	2.89 (0.57)	1.98 (0.22)	1.84 (0.47)	3.11 (0.20)	0.05	
Total bilirubin (mg/ dL)	2.32 (1.42)	1.10 (0.42)	2.27 (1.28)	2.71 (0.93)	< 0.001	

Values are mean (standard deviation) P values are calculated using independent t-test.

Hb: haemoglobin

HbF: fetal haemoglobin

RBC: red blood count

VOC: vaso-occlusive crises

WBC: white blood count

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review) Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Baseline	Hyrdoxyurea		Placebo		P value
	2 years	Baseline	2 years	2 years	
WBC (10 ⁹ /L)	12.6 (3.4)	9.9 (3.1)	12.3 (3.2)	12.2 (2.8)	0.0001
Neutrophils (10º / L)	6.9 (2.4)	4.9 (2.0)	6.7 (2.3)	6.4 (2.0)	0.0001
Platelets (10° /L)	468 (147)	399 (124)	457 (130)	423 (122)	0.12
Hb (g/dL)	8.5 (1.4)	9.1 (1.5)	8.5 (1.2)	8.5 (1.3)	0.0009
PCV (%)	24.9 (4.4)	27 (5)	25.2 (4.0)	25.1 (4.2)	0.0007
MCV (fl)	94 (9)	103 (14)	93 (9)	93 (9)	0.0001
Reticulocytes (10º / L)	327 (98)	231 (100)	325 (94)	300 (99)	0.0001
HbF (%)	5 (3.5)	8.6 (6.8)	5.2 (3.4)	4.7 (3.3)	0.0001
F cells (%)	33 (17)	48 (23)	33 (17)	35 (18)	0.0001
F reticulocytes	15 (8)	17 (9)	15 (8)	15 (7)	0.0036
Dense cells (%)	14 (6)	11 (6)	14 (7)	13 (7)	0.004
Creatinine (mg/dL)	0.9 (0.3)	1.0 (0.5)	0.9 (0.2)	1.0 (0.5)	0.64
Total bilirubin (mg/ dL)	3.7 (2.4)	2.9 (2.5)	3.7 (2.5)	4.2 (4.6)	0.004
Direct bilirubin (mg/dL)	0.5 (0.3)	0.4 (0.3)	0.5 (0.4)	0.7 (2.2)	0.08
Aspartate aminotransferase	44 (23)	39 (20)	41 (21)	43 (27)	0.16
Alkaline phosphatase	120 (59)	117 (48)	119 (67)	119 (71)	0.71

Table 2. Laboratory measurements from MSH 1995

Values are mean (standard deviation) P values are calculated using independent t-test.

Hb: haemoglobin

HbF: fetal haemoglobin

MCV: mean corpuscular volume

PCV: packed cell volume

WBC: white blood count

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review) Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

Outcome	Hydroxyurea and phlebotomy group (n = 67)	Transfusions and chelation group (n = 66)	P value
HbF (%)	17.9 (92 to 22.9)	-0.2 (-0.8 to 0.4)	< 0.001
ANC (x10 [°] /L)	-3.3 (-5.1 to -1.4)	0.8 (-1.3 to 2.4)	< 0.001
Hb (g /dL)	0.0 (-0.7 to 0.7)	0.0 (-0.5 to 0.6)	0.898
HbA (%)	-50.9 (-66.8 to -33.7)	0.0 (-12.7 to 6.7)	< 0.001
HbS (%)	35.0 (21.7 to 46.2)	0.3 (-7.5 to 12.3)	< 0.001
MCV (fL)	19.5 (7.5 to 28.5)	0.1 (-2.0 to 2.5)	< 0.001
WBC (x10° /L)	-5.4 (-8.1 to -2.2)	0.2 (-2.0 to 2.3)	< 0.001
ARC (x10 ⁹ /L)	-149.1 (-231.0 to -19.0)	-11.8 (-88.2 to 93.2)	< 0.001
Platelets (x10 ⁹ /L)	-83.0 (-171.0 to -8.0)	-28.0 (-70.0 to 18.0)	0.0022
Total bilirubin (mg/dL)	-1.1 (-1.9 to -0.6)	0.4 (-0.3 to 1.2)	< 0.001
LIC (mg Fe/g)	-1.2 (-2.8 to 7.2)	-2.2 (-5.5 to 4.9)	0.48888
Serum ferritin (ng/mL)	-966.0 (-1629.0 to 49.0)	1159.5 (-662.0 to 2724.0)	< 0.001
LDH (U/L)	-67.0 (-143.0 to 7.0)	-8.5 (-74.0 to 74.0)	0.0015

Table 3. Laboratory evaluations from the SWiTCH trial

ANC: absolute neutrophil count

ARC: absolute reticulocyte count

Hb: haemoglobin

HbA: adult haemoglobin

HbF: fetal haemoglobin

HbS: sickle haemoglobin

LDH: lactate dehydrogenase

LIC: liver iron concentration

MCV: mean corpuscular volume

WBC: white blood count

Values are median change from baseline and interquartile range. P values are calculated using Wilcoxon rank sum test.

Outcome	Hydroxyurea (n = 11)	Observation (n = 11)	P value
Hb (g/dL)	1.6	-0.5	< 0.0001
MCV (fL)	8.7	1	0.0001
ARC (x10 ⁹ /L)	22.7	-33.2	0.76
WBC (x10 ⁹ /L)	-4.6	1.3	0.07
ANC (x10 [*] /L)	-2.2	1.4	0.05
Platelets (x10 ^a /L)	-76	-35	0.56
HbF (%)	8.9	0.3	0.002
Weight (kg)	2.5	1.8	0.51
Height (cm)	6.8	3.8	0.22

Table 4. Laboratory evaluations from the SCATE trial

ANC: absolute neutrophil count

ARC: absolute reticulocyte count

Hb: haemoglobin

HbF: fetal haemoglobin

MCV: mean corpuscular volume

WBC: white blood count.

Values are median change from baseline and P values are calculated using Wilcoxon rank sum test.

Tuble 5. Tregnancies in the more star	Table 5	. Pre	gnancies	in	the	MSH	Stud	y
---------------------------------------	---------	-------	----------	----	-----	-----	------	---

Pregnancy		Hydroxyurea	Placebo
Patients	Normal full-term delivery	1	2
	Elective termination	2	1
Partners of patients	Normal full-term delivery	2	0
	Spontaneous abortion	1	0
	Still pregnant	0	1
TOTAL		6	4

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review)

Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

WHAT'S NEW

Last assessed as up-to-date: 10 April 2017.

Date	Event	Description
10 April 2017	New search has been performed	Six new studies have been added to the review (BABY HUG 2011; Jain 2012; CHAMPS 2011; SCATE 2015; SWiTCH 2012; TWiTCH 2016). Summary of findings tables are now included in the review
10 April 2017	New citation required and conclusions have changed	Six new trials have been included in the review (BABY HUG 2011; Jain 2012; CHAMPS 2011; SCATE 2015; SWiTCH 2012; TWiTCH 2016). These include participants with different genotypes, different disease severities and participants at risk of primary and secondary stroke. The inclusion of these new trials has impacted upon the conclusions of the review

HISTORY

Protocol first published: Issue 3, 2000

Review first published: Issue 2, 2001

Date	Event	Description
10 November 2010	New search has been performed	A search of the Group's Haemoglobinopathies Trials Register identified 25 new references potentially eligible for inclusion in this review Fifteen of these were additional references to the BABY HUG study which is listed as ongoing (Baby Hug 2007a) Eight references were to the already included MSH trial and provide no further data or information not already included within the review (MSH 1995). The remaining two references (each published in abstract form) have been added to 'Studies awaiting classification', and we await publication of the full papers in order to accurately assess eligibility (Jain 2010; CHAMPS 2011a)
5 November 2008	New search has been performed	No new trials were identified by the search of the Group's Haemoglobinopathies trials Register
1 July 2008	Amended	Converted to new review format.
1 February 2008	New search has been performed	The search identified four new references. One was an additional reference to the already included MSH 1995 study (Ballas 2006), however, this did not include any new data that can be added to the review. A further reference was to the already excluded De Montalembert 2006 study (De Montalembert

Hydroxyurea (hydroxycarbamide) for sickle cell disease (Review)

Copyright © 2017 The Cochrane Collaboration. Published by John Wiley & Sons, Ltd.

(Continued)

		2006). The third reference was an additional reference to the Baby Hug 2007a study now listed in Ongoing studies (Wynn 2007); and the final reference has been added to Excluded studies (Silva-Pinto 2007).In addition, the Plain Language Summary has been updated in line with latest guidance from The Cochrane Collaboration
1 February 2007	New search has been performed	The search identified 12 new references to four studies. Two of the new references were additional references to the already included MSH 1995 study; however, no further data have been included in the review. Seven of the references were to one study, which is listed in 'Studies awaiting assessment' (Baby Hug 2005). The remaining three new references have been excluded (De Montalembert 2005; Voskaridou 2005; Ware 2006).
1 February 2006	New search has been performed	The search identified one new reference (Charache 1993) which is an ad- ditional reference to the already included MSH 1995 trial. This reference provided no additional data. Ashley Jones became lead author in September 2005 and acts as guarantor of the review
1 November 2004	New search has been performed	The search identified one new reference to the already included MSH 1995 trial: Orringer EP, Jones S, Strayhorn D, Hoffman E, Parker J, Greenberg CS. The effect of hydroxyurea (HU) administration on circulating d-dimer levels in patients with sickle cell anemia [abstract]. Blood 1996;88(10 Suppl 1):496a Following on from the inclusion of this reference, a further outcome has been added to the review: cost effectiveness of hydroxyurea
1 November 2003	New search has been performed	Two additional references to the already included MSH 1995 study have been incorporated into the review
1 February 2002	New search has been performed	Quality of life data, presented in an abstract by Terrin (Terrin 1999), which reports on the MSH study (MSH 1995), has now been incorporated into the review

CONTRIBUTIONS OF AUTHORS

Original review (2001)

Sally Davies (SD) and Ade Olujohungbe (AO) conceived review and evaluated studies. SD drafted review.

2005 (minor) update

SD drafted review (with input from AO), but stepped down as lead author in September 2005 (remained as co-author). Ashley Jones (AJ) became lead author in September 2005 and assisted in drafting the update and now acted as guarantor of the review.

2010 (minor) update

AJ drafted the update with input from SCD and AO. AJ acts as guarantor of the review.

2017 (major) update

SJN became lead author in 2016 and led the current update on screening, data extraction, risk of bias assessment, analysis, summary of findings table and drafting results and discussion.

JH provided clinical interpretation of the review, drafted text of the discussion and commented on all sections of the review.

AJ extracted and data and drafted text as well as commenting on later draft versions.

SD stepped down as co-author.

DECLARATIONS OF INTEREST

Sarah Nevitt: none known.

Ashley Jones: none known.

Jo Howard: no declarations in relation to the use of hydroxyurea. In general, has undertaken consultancy for Bluebird Bio; AesRx; and Global Blood Therapeutics. Her institution has the following grants: NIHR grant for the POMS trial (prevention of morbidity in SCD); and an NIH grant for natural history in stroke in SCD (pending).

SOURCES OF SUPPORT

Internal sources

• No sources of support supplied

External sources

• National Institute for Health Research, UK.

This systematic review was supported by the National Institute for Health Research, via Cochrane infrastructure funding to the Cochrane Cystic Fibrosis and Genetic Disorders Group.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN PROTOCOL AND REVIEW

The final secondary outcome (cost effectiveness of hydroxyurea) has been added at the 2005 update of this review but removed in the 2017 update of the review as economic methods which are outside the scope of Cochrane reviews are required to truly reflect cost-effectiveness of an intervention.

The protocol stated that odds ratios would be used as the measure of treatment effect for dichotomous data, however on reflection, we felt it more appropriate to present risk ratios in preference to odds ratios (OR), as odds ratios give an inflated impression of the size of effect where event rates are high, as is the case of these studies.

2017 update: definition of primary outcome 'Pain Alteration' updated to better reflect the measures which are suitable for inclusion under this outcome.

2017 update: We changed the definition of the outcome: "Any reported adverse effects or toxicity of hydroxyurea recorded" to "Reported adverse effects or toxicity" as it is difficult to distinguish between adverse reactions (i.e. adverse events which are definitely drug related) and other adverse events which may be sickle or transfusion related. Where reported in study reports, we have separated reported adverse effects into drug-related, sickle-related, transfusion-related etc.

In the 2017 update of the review, serious adverse events reported in included studies (whether treatment-related or not) were included under the definition of primary outcome 'Life-threatening illness.'

INDEX TERMS

Medical Subject Headings (MeSH)

Antisickling Agents [*therapeutic use]; Hemoglobin SC Disease [*drug therapy]; Hydroxyurea [*therapeutic use]; Randomized Controlled Trials as Topic

MeSH check words

Humans