MAYO CLINIC

Comparison of Cytomegalovirus DNA Load in Whole Blood and Plasma of Transplant **Recipients with CMV Infection and Disease**

Background

Cytomegalovirus (CMV) causes significant morbidity after solid organ (SOT) and hematopoietic stem cell transplantation (HSCT). Currently, quantitative nucleic acid test (QNAT) is the most common method for diagnosis and monitoring treatment of CMV disease.

CMV viral load (VL) can be quantified in plasma (PL) and whole blood (WB). Prior studies suggested that WB is a more sensitive sample, with earlier detection of viremia, and at higher VL levels, when compared to PL. Whether this increased sensitivity is clinically beneficial remains debatable.

The First WHO International Standard for CMV QNAT was released in 2010. To date, there have only been a limited numbers of studies that correlated PL and WB measurements of CMV VL, using a test calibrated to the WHO International Standard.

We prospectively quantified CMV DNA in paired PL and WB from SOT and HSCT recipients diagnosed and treated for CMV disease. We aimed primarily to compare the results between these 2 compartments tested with a CMV QNAT calibrated to the WHO International Standard. In the process, we also defined viral load thresholds that distinguish CMV asymptomatic from symptomatic disease which could assist in determining the CMV VL threshold values for preemptive therapy.

Demographic data

Patient characteristic	No. patients with data available Result			~	CMV VL in WB		Overall	
Age (in years) at time of transplant Male gender Caucasian Year of transplant	88 88 87 88	56.7 (47.8, 63.0)^ 54 (61%) 75 (86%) 2013 [1989, 2015]*	CMV VL in PL	Target not detected	Detected, but <lloq< td=""><td>Quantifiable</td><td>agreement (%)</td><td>(95% CI)</td></lloq<>	Quantifiable	agreement (%)	(95% CI)
Type of transplant: Solid organ HSCT, autologous HSCT, allogenic	88	46 (52%) 3 (3%) 39 (44%)	Target not detected Detected, but <lloq< td=""><td>72 (17.9%) 44 (10.9%)</td><td>9 (2.2%) 22 (5.5%)</td><td>0 (0.0%) 5 (1.2%)</td><td>279/403</td><td>0.49</td></lloq<>	72 (17.9%) 44 (10.9%)	9 (2.2%) 22 (5.5%)	0 (0.0%) 5 (1.2%)	279/403	0.49
CMV status, pre-transplant, SOT & HSCT groups D+R- D+R+ D-R+	78	17 (22%) 36 (46%) 25 (32%)	Quantifiable	17 (4.2%)	49 (12.2%)	185 (45.9%)	(09.2%)	(0.43, 0.50)
CMV status, pre-transplant, SOT subgroup D+R- D+R+ D-R+	43	17 (40%) 18 (42%) 8 (19%)			Difference imits of Agreement Estimator noe=0 (ideal)	10000000 Deming Regression Lin Correlation r = 0.699 (r Lin's Concordance Cor	ne: log10(Y) = -0.477 + 1.024"log -squared = 0.489) relation Coefficient = 0.638	
CMV status, pre-transplant, HSCT subgroup D+R- D+R+ D-R+	35	0 (0%) 18 (51%) 17 (49%)	en WB anc	ہ م م م م	JL (log IU/	100000	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
Year of CMV infection Type of CMV infection Asymptomatic Syndrome (all SOT recipients) Tissue-invasive Initial VL (IU/mL), plasma Initial VL (IU/mL), whole blood	88 88 83 83	2014 [2013, 2015]* 57 (65%) 11 (13%) 20 (23%) 954 (363, 4,880)^ 5 480 (1740, 18 200)	ference betwee		CMV QNAT in F			o
Peak VL (IU/mL), plasma Peak VL (IU/mL), whole blood Patients free of relapse (since end of treatment) 6 months	88 88 88	1,380 (442, 5,690)^ 6,240 (2,020, 22,400)^ 82% (12) ⁺	اللہ اللہ کے لیے تھا۔ Mean of WB	and PL results (Ic	bg IU/ml)	100 1000 CMV Q	NAT in WB (log I	- Regression Line Line of Identity 000000 10000000 U/ml)
2 years Event total Patients free of death (since end of treatment)	88	74% (16)* 74% (16) ⁺ 16	Conclusions					
6 months 1 year 2 years Event total Patients free of death (since transplant) 6 months	88	76% (21) ⁺ 73% (24) ⁺ 58% (31) ⁺ 31 90% (9) ⁺	 There was mode pair samples sho being more sens 	st agreemer wing discore itive in detee	nt in CMV VL dant results, cting low CM	between PL mostly due to VVL.	and WB, w PL measu	ith 31% of rements
1 year 2 years 10 years Event total		82% (16) ⁺ 67% (26) ⁺ 59% (27) ⁺ 31	 Median initial CM disease than tho in PL measurement 	IV VL was g se with asyn ents for both	enerally high	er in those w emia, which v SCT. but not v	ith symptom was consiste WB in HSC1	natic ently found Faroup
 [^] Median (25th, 75th percentiles) * Median [minimum, maximum] ⁺ Kaplan-Meier estimate (no. of events) Note: Peak VL for PL and WB were derived observed in each subject during the c 	from the highest C ourse of the study.	MV VL values	 ROC analyses so HSCT and 1,700 symptomatic dise 	uggest a CM IU/mL for c ease and as	IV VL thresho our SOT grou a quide to in	old of 1,350 l ps to distinguitiate antivira	U/mL in PL f uish asympto	for our omatic from those on

M. Veronica Dioverti, Brian Lahr, Jeffrey J. Germer, Joseph D.C. Yao, Raymund R. Razonable Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN

Agreement of CMV VL in WB and PL (All Subjects)

pre-emptive monitoring (furthers studies needed to support clinical use).



^ Median (Q1, Q3); K-W rank sum test

References

- Razonable RR, Humar A. Cytomegalovirus in solid organ transplant. Am J Transplant. 2013; 13(Suppl 4):93-
- Razonable R.R., Asberg A., Rollag J., et al. Virologic supression measured by a cytomegalovirus (CMV) DNA test calibrated to the World Health Organization International Standard Is predictive of CMV disease resolution in transplant recipients. Clin Infect Dis 2013; 56(11):1546-1553.