

1 **Research article**

2 Title: Current characteristics and outcomes of Cytomegalovirus Reactivation in kidney
3 transplant seropositive recipients in the era of prophylaxis treatment. Lesson from single
4 Moroccan center experience.

5 Cytomegalovirus reactivation and kidney seropositive recipients.

6 **Bouchra. Rezzouk^{1*}, Tarik. Bouattar^{2,3}, Bouchra. Belkadi¹, Rachid. Razine³, Rabia.
7 Bayahia^{2,3}, Naima. Ouzeddoun^{2,3}, Loubna. Benamar^{2,3}, Hakima. Rhou⁴, Najat. Bouihat⁵,
8 Azeddine Ibrahimi^{3,6}, Myriam. Seffar^{3,5} and Hakima. Kabbaj^{3,5}.**

9 **1** Laboratory of Microbiology and Molecular Biology, Faculty of Science, University
10 Mohammed V, Rabat, Morocco, **2** Department of Nephrology-Dialysis-Renal transplantation,
11 Ibn Sina University Hospital Center, Rabat, Morocco, **3** Faculty of Medicine and Pharmacy,
12 Mohammed V University, Rabat, Morocco, **4** Department of Nephrology – Dialysis- Renal
13 transplantation, Sheikh Zaid International University Hospital, Rabat, Morocco, **5** Central
14 Laboratory of Virology, Hospital of Specialties, Ibn Sina University Hospital Center, Rabat,
15 Morocco, **6** Biotech Laboratory (Med Biotech), Faculty of Medicine and Pharmacy,
16 Mohammed V University, Rabat, Morocco.

17 * Corresponding author

18 E- mail: boraessa12@yahoo.fr (BR)

19 **Abstract**

20 Despite the use of antiviral prophylaxis, the active cytomegalovirus (CMV) replication is still
21 occurred in the seropositive kidney recipients. The aim of this study was to assess the
22 incidence of CMV reactivation and potential risk factors associated with CMV disease. Data
23 of sixty kidney transplant recipients who had received CMV prophylaxis were obtained
24 between 2013 and 2017. Quantitative nucleic acid amplification testing for CMV viraemia
25 was assessed using Abbott RealTime Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR). Among the

26 seropositive recipients, cumulative incidence for reactivation was 63%. In patients with
27 quantitative viraemia, the time of active replication was significantly lower compared to
28 those with detectable viraemia (141.5 ± 96.9 vs 294.1 ± 112.6 days, $P < 0.001$). During
29 prophylactic treatment, 46.7% of patients with quantifiable viraemia had experienced active
30 replication and none among patients with detectable viraemia ($P = 0.017$). Importantly,
31 symptomatic reactivation was significantly observed in the younger patients with higher peak
32 viraemia compared to those with symptoms free (28.8 ± 5.12 vs. 38.1 ± 12.34 years, $P =$
33 0.007) and 3.8 ± 1.59 vs. 2.4 ± 0.79 \log_{10} IU/ml, $P = 0.003$, respectively). Furthermore, the
34 median duration of viraemia (21.2, vs. 13.4 days, $P = 0.028$) and period of CMV therapy (24.3
35 vs 12.3 days, $P < 0.001$) were significantly longer for this group. In addition, intercurrent
36 infections (75% vs. 23%, $P = 0.028$) and acute rejection (50% vs 0%, $P = 0.003$) were
37 significantly more frequent in symptomatic reactivation group. In addition, peak viral load
38 was a potential risk factor for development of symptomatic reactivation with odds ratio 3.39,
39 95%CI=1.21-9.53, $P = 0.02$). In conclusion, CMV reactivation remains serious problem for
40 seropositive recipients who were expected to be on antiviral prophylaxis. Patients with high
41 level of viraemia may be at an increased risk of progression to CMV disease and adverse
42 outcomes.

43 **Introduction**

44 Human cytomegalovirus (HCMV) is an ubiquitous herpesvirus, which causes the
45 common complication in immunocompromised individuals, including the transplant
46 recipients [1–3]. In the absence of antiviral treatment, CMV disease occurs in up to 60% of
47 transplant recipients [4].

48 In patients receiving a kidney transplant, CMV plays a critical role in direct induction
49 of infection syndrome and severity disease [5, 6]. Moreover, it can be responsible indirectly
50 for decreased graft function with increased morbidity such as intercurrent infections,

51 cardiovascular disease, malignancies or graft loss and long term mortality [7–10]. Previously,
52 seropositive donor with seronegative recipient were considered as high serologically risk
53 patients of occurrence CMV disease [11,12]. But, the risk is also observed currently in
54 seropositive recipients who are exposed to CMV reactivation or reinfection by novel strain of
55 donor [13]. The virus reactivation from latency are likely to occur in immunosuppressed
56 patients receiving intensive immunosuppressive agents and may have serious clinical effects
57 after kidney transplantation [14,15]. Therefore, antiviral prophylaxis is usually recommended
58 for a short period with three months of treatment by recent consensus guidelines [16].
59 However, the active CMV replication is still occurred in the D+/R+ population over the first
60 three months of prophylaxis [17,18], and associated with CMV viraemia or with late-onset
61 disease [19–21]. Furthermore, CMV recurrence infections can be developed after the first
62 episode of reactivation in this group [22– 24]. However, Several studies focused for
63 investigation in recipients of various solid organ transplant or in the high- risk kidney patients
64 (D+/R-) [25, 26]. In addition, a majority of the experts proposed for prevention prophylaxis ,
65 the use of oral valganciclovir or ganciclovir as antiviral medication for three months [5,14].
66 But, no recent data is known about the risk of CMV disease after reactivation or recurrence in
67 seropositive patients treated with valaciclovir up to three months post kidney-transplantation.


68 For the present study, only the recipients with specific Ig G antibodies receiving
69 allograft from CMV seropositive donors were taken into account. Furthermore,
70 immunosuppression is frequently conservative and antiviral prophylaxis is performed
71 between 3 to 6 months for all recipients with oral valaciclovir (VACV) or valganciclovir
72 (VGCV). For these reasons, it is of major importance to identify the clinical outcomes of
73 CMV reactivation and to explore the potential risk factors associated with CMV disease after
74 renal transplantation especially in the recipient seropositive population. The aims of this study
75 were to assess the incidence of CMV reactivation and to determine potential risk factors

76 associated with CMV disease after renal transplantation in our recipient's seropositive
77 population.

78 **Materials and Methods**

79 **Study population**

80 For this retrospective study, all renal transplant performed between March 2013 and
81 August 2017 at University hospital Ibn Sina (Morocco) were reviewed using patient's
82 medical records. Throughout this period, all CMV seropositive (IgG) recipients over 15 years
83 old at transplantation, who received live or deceased donor kidney transplant were included in
84 this analysis. Others selection criteria were summarized in flow chart (Figure 1). The study
85 was approved by the institutional ethical committee in biomedical research of Faculty of
86 Medicine and Pharmacy, Rabat (number 26/18- 2017).



110 **Figure 1. Study Flow chart**

111 **Immunosuppressive regimen and CMV treatment**

112 For the most patients of this study, rabbit antithymocyte globulin (rATG/
113 Thymoglobuline) has been used as induction therapy and those with high risk of rejection had
114 received basiliximab induction during the first week post transplantation. The induction
115 therapy was given in association with calcineurin inhibitors (tacrolimus or ciclosporin).
116 Generally, immunosuppressive regimen was based usually on tacrolimus (Tac),
117 mycophenolate mofetil (MMF) or mycophenolic acid (Myfortic) and steroids (bolus
118 solumedrol and cortancyl).

119 Renal graft rejection was diagnosed by renal transplant biopsy and treated with high –
120 dose intravenous corticosteroids and /or switch to tacrolimus if they were initially treated with
121 cyclosporine.

122 CMV prophylaxis was administered for all patients during three to six months after
123 transplantation with following drugs: oral valaciclovir (VLC) or oral valganciclovir (VGCV)
124 with dosage according to our center practice. Valaciclovir was routinely given at dose 4.5 to 6
125 g once daily and the use of valganciclovir involved for patients with early viral replication at
126 dose 450 mg or 900 mg/ day, dose adjusted according to renal function (estimated glomerular
127 diet of renal disease calculated eGFRD by the Modification of Diet in Renal Disease equation
128 MDRD).

129 Patients experiencing CMV viraemia without syndrome or disease were classified as
130 asymptomatic viraemia and monitored for CMV DNAemia by *RealTime* PCR methods until
131 eradication without interventions. If CMV disease was suspected or some patients had high
132 viral load in the absence of clinical signs, a i.v. ganciclovir (250 mg or 500 mg twice daily)
133 was given as main treatment (dose adjusted for renal function). CMV treatment was stopped
134 after CMV DNAemia was undetectable for two consecutive tests. Fewer patients with mild

135 infection or with low viral load had received a valaciclovir (6g/day) or valganciclovir (450-
136 1800 mg/day) as preemptive or curative treatment.

137 No antiviral treatment was given to patients with kidney function impairment but a
138 reduction of immunosuppression was adopted. Second treatment prophylaxis with
139 valaciclovir was initiated for patients with risk of recurrence.

140 **Outcomes variables**

141 According to the international consensus guidelines and clinical studies definitions
142 [16,27]; CMV infection was defined as “evidence of CMV replication regardless of
143 symptoms (differs from latent CMV), or as detection of viral proteins (antigens), or nucleic
144 acid in any body fluid or tissue specimen”. Asymptomatic viraemia was defined as “presence
145 of quantitative viral load without CMV related clinical symptoms.”

146 CMV disease was categorized as “evidence of CMV infection with attributable symptoms”.
147 CMV disease can be further categorized as “viral syndrome (ie, fever, malaise, leukopenia,
148 and/or thrombocytopenia), or as tissue invasive” [16]. CMV Reactivation was defined as an
149 active viral DNA replication in recipient who had been previously infected by CMV before
150 kidney transplantation. Recurrent cytomegalovirus infection was defined as detectable or
151 measurement of CMV viral load after the first infection episode (achieving initial clearance)
152 [22]. In addition, a detectable viraemia was defined as being the detection of CMV DNA
153 below the quantification threshold ($< 1.49 \log_{10}$ IU/ml) using Abbott RealTime CMV assay.

154 For each patient, Baseline data, follow-up data and data about CMV infections and
155 clinical symptoms were collected from individual patient records. Extracted Baseline data
156 were age recipient at transplant, gender, date of transplantation, previous renal replacement
157 therapy modality (hemodialysis, peritoneal dialysis, or none of patients with preemptive
158 transplantation), primary renal disease, presence of comorbidities, HLA matching (HLA- AB
159 and DR), induction therapy and initial immunosuppressive regimen. For donor, we also

160 recorded demographic characteristics, source of donors (living, deceased), pretransplant CMV
161 serostatus, immunological and serological characteristics.

162 The follow-up data included liver function test (ALT, AST), immunological follow-up (anti-
163 HLA I and II antibodies), renal function (creatinine and clearance creatine), monitoring of
164 blood count (leukocytes, polynuclear neutrophils, lymphocytes). Data recorded with regard to
165 CMV prophylaxis treatment were the type of antiviral drug (valaciclovir, valganciclovir),
166 doses and duration of prophylaxis treatment. Viraemia data at the time of follow-up included
167 quantification of measurement viral load at diagnosis, the peak viral load, duration of
168 quantifiable viraemia, number of reactivation episodes, duration of onset of replication after
169 transplantation, at the time of prophylactic treatment, after discontinuation of treatment and
170 during posttransplant follow-up. The data of CMV infection included clinical findings as
171 clinicals syndrome with fever, malaise, vomiting, asthenia and headaches or as symptoms
172 disease (diarrhea, colitis, hepatitis, pneumonitis...), Whereas data of immunosuppression
173 treatment during infection covered the types of immunosuppressive drugs and their dosage.
174 Other assessed data included antiviral drugs curative treatment received against CMV
175 (ganciclovir, valganciclovir, and valaciclovir), the length of curative duration and treatment of
176 second prophylaxis (type of drug, length of prophylaxis duration). Occurrence of co-infection
177 as viral infections (BK virus, HBV, HCV, EBV), bacterial infection or fungal infections and
178 acute rejection has been also included.

179 **CMV assessments by quantitative PCR -CMV**

180 CMV viraemia was assessed every month during CMV prophylaxis, then just one at the
181 time of discontinuation prophylaxis. After the cessation of prophylaxis, patients were
182 monitored once per month during 90 days. All CMV plasma samples were tested at Central
183 Laboratory of Virology using Abbott RealTime CMV assay (Abbott Molecular System Inc.,
184 Des Plaines, IL, USA). The review was conducted from March 2013, date of introduction of

185 m2000 Real Time platform which had a linear range of 31.2 to 156 000 000 IU/ml according
186 to the World Health Organization WHO international CMV quantitative standard (National
187 Institute for biological Standards and Control [NIBSC] code 09/162; NIBSC, Hertfordshire,
188 Great Britain) [28]. The threshold of detection was 1.49 log₁₀ IU/ml (31.2 IU/ml) and our
189 results were reported in log₁₀ IU/ml.

190 **Statistical analysis**


191 Demographic, clinical, transplant, immunosuppression treatment and antiviral features
192 were described using mean ± standard deviation and /or median for quantitative data.
193 Categorical data were expressed as frequency and proportion. For estimating the timing of
194 CMV reactivation after transplantation, we had used the Kaplan-Meir method. Comparisons
195 in variables distribution between groups were done by using t- student or Mann-Whitney *U*-
196 test for continuous variables and Fischer's exact test or chi-square test for categorical variables.
197 In addition, univariate logistic regression models were applied for prediction either of CMV
198 symptomatic infection, quantitative viraemia and recurrence. We then selected the most
199 significant variables to define risk factor. The Results from the logistic regression were
200 expressed as odds ratio (OR) and 95% confidence interval (CI). A *p*- value < 0.05 was
201 considered significant and the calculations of data were performed with SPSS v.13 (SPSS,
202 Inc., Chicago, Il, USA).

203 **Results**

204 **Incidence of CMV reactivation**

205 During the 4-years period (2013-2017), a total of 60 recipients seropositive were
206 analyzed. The mean follow-up after transplantation was 795 ± 444 days [120 - 1580] during
207 which one patient had died (1.7%) and another recipient (1.7%) returned to dialysis. The
208 cause of death was malignancy and the loss of graft was due to primary hyperoxaluria. Most
209 of transplant patients (83%) received thymoglobulin followed by tacrolimus monotherapy

210 (83%). Whereas 10 (17%) were treated only with basiliximab. 38/60 (63%) had developed
211 first episode of reactivation/reinfection after kidney transplantation. The incidence rate of
212 CMV reactivation was 27 per 100 person -year and median time to reactivation was at 227
213 days [14- 1560 days]. Figure 2 depicts the timing of CMV reactivation after kidney
214 transplantation. No differences in the demographics and transplant features were found
215 between the patients with or without CMV reactivation/reinfection (Table 1).



216

217 **Fig 2. Median time of reactivation/reinfection in seropositive kidney recipients after first kidney**
218 **transplantation using Kaplan Meier.** The time course of CMV reactivation was measured after kidney
219 transplantation during the follow-up period. We illustrated the follow -up time on the axis for all seropositive
220 patients (with experienced CMV replication and without).
221

222
223
224
225
226
227
228
229
230
231
232
233
234
235

236
237
238
239
240
241
242
243

Table 1a. Comparison of patient’s characteristics in those with CMV reactivation and those without, after kidney transplantation.

Characteristic	Total (N=60)	With CMV reactivation (N= 38)	No CMV reactivation (N=22)	p-value
Recipient age at transplant mean in years ± SD	38.8 ±12.74	36.6± 13.19	42.6 ± 11.17	0.07*
Recipient gender (%)				
Female	26 (43.3)	15 (39.5)	11(50)	0.43**
Male	34 (56.7)	23 (60.5)	11(50)	
Cause of kidney failure (%)				
HTA	30 (88.2)	18 (94.7)	12 (80)	0.29***
HTA +Diabetes	4 (11.8)	1 (5.3)	3 (20)	
Renal pathology (%)				
Undetermined nephropathy	38 (63.3)	23 (60.5)	15 (68.2)	0.18***
Polycystic kidney disease	4 (6.7)	2 (5.3)	2 (9.1)	
Chronic glomerulonephritis	4 (6.7)	1 (2.6)	3 (13.6)	
Membranous glomerulonephritis	2 (3.3)	2 (5.3)	0	
Others	12 (20)	10 (26.3)	2 (9.1)	
Time on dialysis, in years (%)				
< 5 years	40 (74.1)	28 (80)	12 (63.2)	0.21***
≥ 5 years	14 (25.9)	7 (20)	7 (36.8)	
Donor age at transplant, mean in years ± SD	39.6 ± 13.78	38.4 ± 14.25	41.7 ± 12.98	0.38*
Donor status (%)				
Living	49 (81.7)	29 (76.3)	20 (90.9)	0.29***
Deceased	11 (18.3)	9 (23.7)	2 (9.1)	
Donor gender (%)				
Female	32 (53.3)	18 (47.4)	14 (63.6)	0.22**
Male	28 (46.7)	20 (52.6)	8 (36.4)	

244 CMV: cytomegalovirus, SD: standard deviation, *: t- student test, **: Chi-square test, ***: Fisher's exact test,
 245 HTA hypertensive arterial.

246

247

248

249

250 **Table 1b. Comparison of patient's characteristics in those with CMV reactivation and**
 251 **those without, after kidney transplantation.**

Characteristic	Total(N=60)	With CMV reactivation(N=38)	No CMV reactivation(N=22)	p- value
Blood transfusion history				
No	34 (58.6)	21 (56.8)	13 (61.9)	0.7**
Yes	24 (41.4)	16 (43.2)	8 (38.1)	
Group compatibility (%)				
Identical	42 (70)	27 (71.1)	15 (68.2)	0.81**
Different but compatible	18 (30)	11(28.9)	7 (31.8)	
HLA-AB mismatch (%)				
1 – 4	52 (88.1)	33 (89.2)	19 (86.4)	1***
0	7 (11.9)	4 (10.8)	3 (13.6)	
HLA-DR mismatch (%)				
1 – 2	44 (75.9)	30 (83.3)	14 (63.6)	0.09**
0	14 (24.1)	6 (16.7)	8 (36.4)	
Induction therapy (%)				
Thymoglobuline	50 (83.3)	32 (84.2)	18(81.8)	1***
Basiliximab	10 (16.7)	6 (15.8)	4 (18.2)	
Anti-calcineurin treatment (%)				
Cyclosporine	1 (1.7)	1 (2.6)	0	1***
Tacrolimus	49 (83.1)	31 (81.6)	18 (85.7)	
Cyclosporine + Tacrolimus	9 (15.3)	6 (15.8)	3 (14.3)	
Traitement Inhibition cellular multiplication treatment (%)				
Mofetil Mycophenolat	47 (78.3)	31 (81.6)	16 (72.7)	0.34***
Mycophenolat acid (Myfortic)	1 (1.7)	0	1 (4.5)	
MMF follow -up by Myfortic	10 (16.7)	5 (13.2)	5 (22.7)	
MMF follow-up by Azathioprine	2 (3.3)	2 (5.3)	0	
Duration of primary CMV prophylaxis (days), mean ± SD	125 ± 45	119 ± 48	136 ± 39	0.16*
Patients receiving antiviral prophylaxis (%)				
Valaciclovir	48 (80)	32 (84.2)	16 (72.7)	0.33***
Valganciclovir	12 (20)	6 (15.8)	6 (27.3)	
Opportunistic infections (%)				
No	25 (43.1)	13 (34.2)	12 (60)	0.06**
Yes	33 (56.9)	25 (65.8)	8 (40)	

252 HLA: human leukocytes antigens, ATG: anti-thymocyte globulin, MMF: mycophenolate mofetil, CMV:
 253 cytomegalovirus, SD: standard deviation, *: t- student test, **: Chi-square test, ***: Fisher's exact test.

254

255

256

257
258
259
260
261

In the context of CMV viraemia, thirty out of the reactivated patients (78.9%) had at least one episode of quantitative viral load (mean = 2.4 ± 1.19 log IU/ml) with [1.49 to 6.79] log IU/ml. Eight (21.1%) patients had developed one episode of detectable viraemia below the quantification threshold ($<1.49 \log_{10}$ IU/ml).

265
266
267
268
269
270
271
272
273
274
275

Significantly lower period of viral replication after transplantation was observed among the transplant patients with CMV quantifiable viral load compared to patients with only detectable viraemia (141.5 ± 96.9 vs. 294.1 ± 112.4 days, $P < 0.001$). Furthermore, A reactivation at the time of prophylactic treatment was significantly more frequent in patients who experienced a quantifiable viral load, compared to patients with only detectable viraemia (14 (47%) vs. 0 (0%), $P = 0.017$). Nevertheless, reactivation with quantifiable viral load occurred earlier after the end of prophylaxis in patients who presented an important level viral load (78.1 ± 70.3 vs. 166.8 ± 118.3 days, $P = 0.06$). Interestingly, no differences were observed in the total average of leukocyte, neutrophils polynuclear or lymphocytes counts at diagnosis between patients with or without quantifiable viraemia. Additional CMV viraemia related outcomes are shown in Table 2.

276
277
278
279
280
281
282
283
284
285
286

288 **Table 2. Comparison of patient’s characteristics in those who developed quantitative**
 289 **detectable viraemia versus in those who did not.**
 290

Characteristic	Total (N=38)	With detectable viraemia(N=8)	With quantitative viraemia (N=30)	p- value
Age, mean and SD, years	36.6 ± 13.19	40.3 ± 18.53	35.6 ± 11.58	0.37*
Sex (%)				
Female	15 (39.5)	4 (50)	11 (36.7)	0.69**
Male	23 (60.5)	4 (50)	19 (63.3)	
Source of donor (%)				
Living	29 (76.3)	6 (75)	23 (76.7)	1**
Deceased	9 (23.7)	2 (25)	7 (23.3)	
Blood transfusion history (%)				
No	21 (56.8)	2 (25)	19 (65.5)	0.055**
Yes	16 (43.2)	6 (75)	10 (34.5)	
HLA- AB mismatch (%)				
1 -4	33 (89.2)	8	25 (86.2)	0.56**
0	4 (10.8)	0	4 (13.8)	
HLA -DR mismatch (%)				
1 -2	30 (83.3)	7 (87.5)	23 (82.1)	1**
0	6 (16.7)	1 (12.5)	5 (17.9)	
Duration of prophylactic treatment (days), mean ± SD	118.7 ± 48.13	107.3 ± 28.43	121.7 ± 52.11	0.46*
Time of active replication after transplantation (days), mean ± SD	173.6 ± 117.18	294.1 ± 112.6	141.5 ± 96.9	<0.001*
Active replication at prophylactic period treatment (%)				
No	24 (63.2)	8	16 (53)	0.017**
Yes	14 (36.8)	0	14 (47)	
Time of active replication after prophylactic treatment (days), mean ± SD	95.8 ± 86.25	166.7 ± 118.33	78.1± 70.34	0.064*
Mean leukocytes count at diagnosis ± SD (/ml)	6605 ± 3012	5278 ± 1550	6880 ± 3183	0.24*
Mean polynuclear neutrophils counts at diagnosis ± SD (/ml)	5136 ± 2911	3713 ± 1708	5430 ± 3040	0.19*
Mean lymphocytes count at diagnosis ± SD (/ml)	845 ± 518	1090 ± 382	795 ± 533	0.21*
Intercurrent infections				
No	28 (73.7)	7 (87.5)	21 (70)	0.65*
Yes	10 (26.3)	1 (12.5)	9 (30)	

291 SD: standard deviation, HLA: human leukocytes antigens, *: t- student test, **: Fisher’s exact test .

292
 293

294 CMV disease occurred in eight (13%) of the transplanted population. Among patients
295 with quantifiable viraemia, CMV infection progressed to CMV syndrome or disease in 8/30
296 (27%) and 22/30 (73%) of reactivated patients were with asymptomatic viraemia.

297 The incidence rate of symptomatic reactivation was six patients per 100 person-year.
298 Most symptomatic recipients developed CMV syndrome or disease within the first five
299 months from solid organ transplantation (7/8, 87.5%). The CMV syndrome was diagnosed in
300 2/8 (25%) of symptomatic patients and 6/8 (75%) patients experienced CMV disease. Two
301 patients with syndrome infection presented a low-grade fever, mild lymphocytopenia and low
302 increased level of alanine aminotransferase (ALT). Among patients with CMV disease,
303 diarrhea, leucopenia, lymphopenia and low impairment in renal function were more
304 frequently observed. One patient had both diarrheas, vomiting and severe abdominal pain
305 without confirmed by tissue-invasive.

306 Interestingly for demographic characteristics, younger patients were significantly
307 associated with CMV disease reactivation (28.8 ± 5.12 vs. 38.1 ± 12.34 , $P = 0.007$) (Table
308 3a). Despite using the dose of all immunosuppressive drugs as thymoglobuline induction,
309 mycophenolate mofetil, tacrolimus or cyclosporine, no effect was demonstrated on viral
310 disease reactivation.

311 Significant higher peak viral load was also observed for patients with CMV disease
312 compared with those who remained symptoms free (3.8 ± 1.59 vs. 2.4 ± 0.79 , $P = 0.003$).
313 Furthermore, the median duration of viraemia appeared to be also statistically significant for
314 this group 21.2 [1 to 570 days] vs. 13.4 [1 to 42 days], $P = 0.028$.

315 Symptomatic patients were treated with either intravenous ganciclovir alone or with
316 relay by valacyclovir or valganciclovir. One patient who suffered from serious dysfunction
317 transplant did not receive curative treatment and was treated only with reduction of

318 immunosuppression (MMF). In addition, mycophenolate dose was temporally reduced for all
319 symptomatic patients. On the other hand, five patients without CMV related symptoms but
320 who showed a high viral load were also treated with intravenous ganciclovir and one patient
321 received only oral valaciclovir (Table 3a, 3b). Seventeen asymptomatic patients with low viral
322 load were monitored regularly by real- time PCR without interventions. The median duration
323 of antiviral treatment was 12 [15 to 55] days. However, the duration of CMV therapy was
324 significantly longer in the symptomatic patients than in the asymptomatic recipients (median
325 period = 24.3 days ranging 21- 55 vs. median = 12.3 days ranging 15 - 30, $P < 0.001$,
326 respectively). Nine cases were suspected of antiviral resistance with persistence of viraemia
327 after three weeks of treatment or increased viral load at time of curative treatment. After
328 achieving viral load clearance, a secondary prophylaxis was given to nine patients who
329 received antiviral therapy (Table 3b). Viral Infections with polyoma BK virus was more
330 observed in this group. Likewise, most patients with symptomatic CMV reactivation showed
331 significantly high proportion of intercurrent infections compared to asymptomatic patients
332 (6/8 (75%) vs. 5/22 (23%), $P = 0.028$). Furthermore, acute graft rejection was statistically
333 recorded in 4/8 (50% with $P = 0.003$, Table 3c). In the other hand, 6% of population had
334 recurrent CMV and was seen more frequently among patients who presented syndrome or
335 disease compared to patients without symptoms (62.5% vs 22.7%, $P = 0.08$).

336

337

338

339

340

341

342

343
344
345
346

Table 3a. Comparison of patient's characteristics in those with symptomatic CMV reactivation and in those with asymptomatic reactivation.

Characteristic	Total (N=30)	With symptomatic reactivation (n=8)	With asymptomatic reactivation (n=22)	p- value
Recipient Age at transplantation in years(± SD)	35.6 ± 11.58	28.8 ± 5.12	38.1 ± 12.34	<u>0.007</u> *
Donor age at transplantation in years (± SD)	38.5 ± 14.22	36.8 ± 14.87	39.1 ± 14.28	0.69*
Donor source				
Living	23 (76.7)	5 (62.5)	18 (81.8)	0.34*
Deceased	7 (23.3)	3 (37.5)	4 (18.2)	
HLA-AB mismatch (%)				
1 -4	25 (86.2)	6 (85.7)	19 (86.4)	1**
0	4 (13.8)	1 (14.3)	3 (13.6)	
HLA -DR (%)				
1 -2	23 (82.1)	5 (71.4)	18 (85.7)	0.57**
0	5 (17.9)	2 (28.6)	3 (14.3)	
Induction treatment (%)				
Thymoglobulin	26 (86.7)	7(87.5)	19(86.4)	1**
Basiliximab	4 (13.3)	1(12.5)	3 (13.6)	
Average creatinine level(mg/l) mean at 3 months of monitoring (± SD)	11.2 ± 4.16	11.2 ± 4.65	11.2 ± 4.07	0.99*
Average creatine clearance rate (ml/min/1.73m²) at 3 months of monitoring (± SD)	78.7 ± 23.13	81.3 ± 28.21	77.7 ± 21.53	0.71*
Mean leukocyte counts(/ml) at 3 months of monitoring (± SD)	6240 ± 3007	5131 ± 1076	6706 ± 3441	0.08*
Mean polynuclear neutrophil counts (/ml) at 3 months of monitoring (± SD)	4784 ± 2744	3602 ± 1074	5282 ± 3090	0.047*
Mean lymphocytes counts (/ml) at 3 months of monitoring (± SD)	858 ± 476	944 ± 474	822 ± 485	0.55*

347
348
349
350

CMV: cytomegalovirus, SD: standard deviation, HLA: human leukocyte antigen, *: t- student, **: Exact Fisher test,

351
352
353
354

Table 3b. Comparison of patient’s characteristics in those with symptomatic CMV reactivation and in those with asymptomatic reactivation.

Characteristic	Total (N= 30)	With symptomatic reactivation (n= 8)	With asymptomatic reactivation (n= 22)	p- value
Average creatinine level(mg/l) mean at 6 months of monitoring (± SD)	11.0 ± 3.88	12.5 ± 5.77	10.4 ± 2.79	0.34*
Average creatine clearance rate (ml/min/1.73m²) at 6 months of monitoring (± SD)	83.1 ± 27.47	80.2 ± 40.44	84.2 ± 21.56	0.79*
Mean leukocyte counts(/ml) at 6 months of monitoring (± SD)	5820.3 ± 1748.18	5540.0 ± 2677.63	5938.4 ± 1255.61	0.69*
Mean polynuclear neutrophil counts (/ml) at 6 months of monitoring (± SD)	3902.7 ± 1396.44	3795.3 ± 2264.46	3948.0 ± 902.94	0.86*
Mean lymphocytes counts (/ml) at 6 months of monitoring (± SD)	1099.8 ± 669.48	1045.3 ± 688.12	1122.8 ± 679.25	0.79*
Antiviral prophylaxis (%)				
Valaciclovir	26 (86.7)	6 (75)	20 (90.9)	0.39**
Valganciclovir	3 (10)	1(12.5)	2 (9.1)	
Valaciclovir follow-up Valganciclovir	1 (3.3)	1 (12.5)	0	
Duration of prophylactic treatment (days) (± SD)	124.9 ± 47.04	146.2 ± 34.87	138.5 ± 35.89	0.60*
Mean CMV viral load at diagnosis (logUI/ml)	2.3 ± 1.19	2.9 ± 1.91	2.1 ± 0.74	0.29*
Mean lymphocytes counts at diagnosis (/ml)	795 ± 533	674 ± 424	841 ± 572	0.46*
Duration of appearance reactivation after kidney transplantation (days)	132.9 ± 84.10	140.1 ± 109.20	130.3 ± 75.93	0.78*

355
356
357

CMV: cytomegalovirus, SD: standard deviation, HLA: human leukocyte antigen, *: t- student, **: Exact Fisher test.

358
359
360

Table 3c. Comparison of patient’s characteristics in those with symptomatic CMV reactivation and in those with asymptomatic reactivation.

Characteristic	Total (N=30)	With symptomatic reactivation (N=8)	With asymptomatic reactivation (N=22)	p- value
Mean peak viral load (log ₁₀ IU/ml) (± SD)	2.74 ± 1.21	3.8 ± 1.59	2.4 ± 0.79	<u>0.003*</u>
Duration of onset viral load peak after kidney transplantation (days) (± SD)	153.8 ± 83.78	190.2 ± 95.72	140.5 ± 77.13	0.15*
Duration of quantifiable viraemia (days) (median, range)	42.5 (1-1280)	21.2 (1 -1280)	13.4 (1 – 55)	<u>0.028***</u>
Antiviral curative treatment (%)				
Valaciclovir	1 (8.3)	0	1 (20)	0.49**
Valganciclovir	1 (8.3)	1 (14.3)	0	
Ganciclovir	7 (58.3)	3 (42.9)	4 (80)	
Ganciclovir follow-up by Valganciclovir	2 (16.7)	2 (28.6)	0	
Ganciclovir follow-up by Valaciclovir	1 (8.3)	1 (14.3)	0	
Duration of curative treatment (days) (median, range)	12.3 (15-55)	24.3 (21-55)	12.3 (15-30)	<u>< 0.001***</u>
Patients receiving secondary prophylaxis (%)				
No	4 (30.8)	2 (25)	2 (40)	1**
Yes	9 (69.2)	6 (75)	3 (60)	
Duration of second prophylaxis (days) (± SD)	72.7 ± 56.30	82.0 ± 56.78	63.4 ± 60.75	0.63*
Recurrence (%)				
No	20 (66.6)	3 (37.5)	17 (77.3)	0.08*
Yes	10 (33.3)	5 (62.5)	5 (22.7)	
Intercurrent infections (%)				
Negative	19 (63.3)	2 (25)	17 (77.3)	<u>0.028**</u>
Positive	11 (36.7)	6 (75)	5 (22.7)	
Type of intercurrent infections (%)				
Viral infections	6 (60)	3 (60)	3 (60)	1**
Bacterial infections	4 (40)	2 (40)	2 (40)	
Acute rejection (%)				
No	26 (86.7)	4 (50)	22 (100)	<u>0.003**</u>
Yes	4 (13.3)	4 (50)	0	

361

CMV: cytomegalovirus, SD: standard deviation, *: t- student test, **: exact – Fisher test, ***: Mann -Whitney test.

362 The incidence of recurrence CMV was 10 (17%) of 60 patients. Recurrence of CMV
363 infection occurred an average of 288.9 ± 206.4 days after transplantation, or appeared after
364 first episode of reactivation at mean 136.2 ± 120.5 days. The duration of recurrence was at
365 median 5.5 days (range 1- 710 days). After discontinuation of antiviral therapy, recurrence
366 was observed at mean time of 158.4 ± 139.7 days. Among patients with recurrence, 3/10
367 (30%) had only detectable viraemia and seven of 10 patients (70 %) developed quantifiable
368 viraemia which an average viral load at diagnosis was $2.3 \pm 0.8 \log_{10}\text{IU/ml}$. In addition, mean
369 peak viral load of recurrence remained higher than in no recurrent patients (2.7 ± 0.7
370 $\log_{10}\text{IU/ml}$). In this study, the most recurrent patients had no clinical symptoms (8/10, 80%).
371 But, two recipients (20%) with symptomatic CMV recurrence presented either with hepatitis,
372 hematuria or diarrhea. All patients with higher viral load were treated with intravenous GCV
373 and carefully monitored until viraemia subsided. Renal function (plasma creatinine and
374 estimated glomerular filtration rate eGFR) and blood white cell counts (leukocyte,
375 polynuclear neutrophils and lymphocyte) measured at 3 and 6 months of follow-up in patients
376 with recurrent infection were similar (Table 4). For baseline characteristics and outcomes of
377 recurrence, no significative differences were observed between patients with or without
378 recurrent CMV infections (Table 4).

379
380
381
382
383
384
385
386
387
388
389
390

391
392
393
394

Table 4. Comparison of patient's characteristics with and those without CMV recurrence.

Characteristic	Total (N = 30)	With CMV recurrence (N= 10)	Without CMV recurrence (N = 20)	p-value
Age at transplantation, mean years (\pm SD)	35.6 \pm 11.58	31.2 \pm 12.44	37.8 \pm 10.78	0.14*
Sex (%)				
Female	11(36.7)	3 (30)	8 (40)	0.70**
Male	19 (63.3)	7 (70)	12 (60)	
Plasma creatinine at 3 months of follow-up	11.3 \pm 4.16	12.3 \pm 4.13	10.8 \pm 4.19	0.38*
Clearance creatine at 3 months of follow-up	78.8 \pm 23.13	75.7 \pm 27.93	80.2 \pm 21.19	0.64*
Leukocytes counts at 3 months of follow-up (/ml)	6240 \pm 3008	5274 \pm 2849	6723 \pm 3046	0.25*
Polynuclear neutrophils counts (/ml) at 3 months of follow-up	4784.6 \pm 2711.7	3866.8 \pm 2616.7	5243.5 \pm 2762.6	0.23*
Lymphocytes counts (/ml) at 3 months of follow-up	858 \pm 476	920 \pm 496	827 \pm 477	0.64*
Plasma creatinine at 6 months of follow-up (ml/min/1.73m ²)	11.0 \pm 3.9	12.9 \pm 4.4	9.9 \pm 3.2	0.05*
Clearance creatine at 6 months of follow-up (ml/min/1.73m ²)	83.1 \pm 27.5	73.8 \pm 30.01	88.2 \pm 25.3	0.19*
Leukocytes counts at 6 months of follow-up (/ml)	5820 \pm 1748	5971 \pm 2274	5745 \pm 1490	0.76*
Polynuclear neutrophils counts (/ml) at 6 months of follow-up	3902 \pm 1396	4054 \pm 1953	3826 \pm 1081	0.75*
Lymphocytes counts (/ml) at 6 months of follow-up	1099 \pm 669	1209 \pm 990	1045 \pm 463	0.65*
HLA- AB mismatch (%)				
No	4 (13.8)	1(11.1)	3 (15)	1**
Yes	25 (86.2)	8 (88.9)	17 (85)	
HLA-DR mismatch (%)				
No	5 (17.9)	2 (25)	3 (15)	0.61**
Yes	23 (82.1)	6 (75)	17 (85)	
Induction treatment (%)				
Thymoglobulin	26 (86.7)	8 (80)	18 (90)	0.58**
Basiliximab	4 (13.3)	2 (20)	2 (10)	
Anti-calcineurin treatment (%)				
Cyclosporine	2 (6.7)	2 (20)	0	0.09*
Tacrolimus	23 (76.7)	6 (60)	17 (85)	
Cyclosporine follow-up by Tacrolimus	5 (16.7)	2 (20)	3 (15)	

395 CMV: cytomegalovirus, SD: standard deviation, *: t- student test, **: exact – Fisher test.

396

397 **Univariate analysis regression logistic**

398 In the present study, first univariate analysis was performed in order to determine risk
399 factors related to reactivation and recurrence. In this model, univariate analysis included
400 factors that were associated with quantitative viraemia and symptomatic reactivation. We
401 specifically viral factors that influenced symptomatic reactivation (Table 5). Following renal
402 transplantation, peak viral load has significantly predicted the risk of symptomatic CMV
403 reactivation [OR 3.39 (95% IC 1.21, 9.53), ($P = 0.02$)], whereas time of active replication was
404 related to occurrence with quantitative viraemia [OR 0.98 (95% IC 0.98, 0.99), ($P = 0.004$)].
405 The risk associated with viral load at diagnosis, antiviral prophylactic treatment (generally
406 with valaciclovir) and duration of primary prophylaxis were not associated with symptomatic
407 CMV reactivation ($P = 0.14$, $P = 0.18$ and $P = 0.06$, respectively).

408

409

410

411

412

413

414

415

416

417

418

419

420

421

422 **Tableau 5. Analysis of risk factors of reactivation with quantitative viraemia, clinical symptoms and recurrence CMV infection in kidney**
 423 **seropositive patients (D+/R+).**
 424

Variable	CMV reactivation T(n=38)		Reactivation with quantitative viraemia (n=30)		Reactivation with clinical symptomatic CMV(n=8)		CMV recurrence (n=10)	
	Odds ratio (95% CI)	P-value*	Odds ratio (95% CI)	P-value*	Odds ratio (95% CI)	P-value*	Odds ratio (95% CI)	P-value*
Age of recipients at transplantation (years)	0.96 (0.92,1.00)	0.08	0.97 (0.92, 1.03)	0.36	0.92(0.83, 1.01)	0.07	0.95 (0.88,1.02)	0.15
Donor age (years)	0.98(0.95,1.02)	0.37	1.00 (0.95, 1.06)	0.96	0.99 (0.93, 1.05)	0.70	1.02 (0.96, 1.07)	0.60
Deceased donor	3.10(0.61,15.91)	0.17	0.91 (0.15, 5.58)	0.92	2.7 (0.45,16.26)	0.28	1.71 (0.30, 9.77)	0.54
Number of HLA-DR mismatch	2.86(0.83,9.82)	0.09	0.66 (0.07, 6.61)	0.72	0.42 (0.05, 3.22)	0.40	0.53 (0.07, 3.98)	0.54
Blood transfusion history	0.81(0.27, 2.41)	0.70	5.7 (0.97, 33.60)	0.05	3.56 (0.61, 20.81)	0.16	0.93(0.18, 4.90)	0.93
Time of active replication after transplantation (days)	NA	NA	0.99 (0.98, 0.99)	<u>0.004</u>	1 (0.99, 1.01)	0.76	NA	NA
Viral load at diagnosis (log ₁₀ IU/ml)	NA	NA	NA	NA	1.71 (0.83, 3.50)	0.14	NA	NA
Mean Peak viral load (log ₁₀ IU/ml)	NA	NA	NA	NA	3.39 (1.21, 9.53)	<u>0.02</u>	1.65 (0.83, 3.30)	0.16
Antiviral prophylaxis	0.50 (0.14,1.8)	0.29	0.46 (0.07, 3.13)	0.43	3.38 (0.58, 19.60)	0.18	6.6 (0.69, 63.25)	0.10
Length of primary prophylaxis (days)	0.99 (0.98,1.00)	0.16	1.01 (0.99, 1.02)	0.45	1.03 (0.99, 1.06)	0.06	0.99 (0.97, 1.01)	0.53

425 CMV: Cytomegalovirus, D+: seropositive donor, R+: seropositive recipient, HLA: human leukocytes antigens, IU: international unit, NA: not applicable.

426 *p-values were calculated using univariate analysis regression logistic.

Discussion

We found that virus replication after renal transplantation is frequent in seropositive recipients. Despite prophylaxis, 63% of first episodes reactivation was observed in this group. This finding was in accordance with data of recent literature, 43 to 61.9% CMV seropositive transplant patients had experienced virus reactivation or re-infection by detection of viral DNA [18, 29]. One study [30] demonstrated that transplanted organ of seropositive donor was associated with 49% infection rates in the recipients with lack of prophylactic treatment. The other study [15] has reported that if the donor was CMV seropositive, the risk of CMV reactivation was found to be more than doubled within the first-year post-transplantation.

We postulate that this high rate could indicate the role of seropositive donor who can play through the recipient's exposure to new virus strains. A number of previous studies had suggested that seropositive patients were more likely to be re-infected with new strains than to have active replication of the latent virus [31]. Otherwise, CMV reactivation could also be caused by contact with immunocompetent infected individuals after post transplantation where seroprevalence of CMV reached 96.7% in our population [32].

Nevertheless, others studies reported that kidney transplant recipients were commonly exposed to the risk of reactivation as they received a high immunosuppression treatment during the first three months of follow-up [25, 33]. However, in our study, induction therapy with lymphocyte-deleting agents as ATG (thymoglobulin) did not show a significant difference compared to basiliximab. Moreover, our data demonstrated that reactivated patients receiving triple maintenance therapy such as tacrolimus, mycophenolate and steroids did not reach statistical results.

CMV replication has been known as dynamic process in the human host. Therefore, the management of CMV levels relies on quantitative analysis of CMV markers. In the

current era, several tests were proposed for detecting and monitoring CMV replication after solid organ transplantation. However, quantitative real-time PCR is now the standard assay for measuring viral load with increased sensitivity [16, 34]. In our study, 79 % of reactivated patients had shown quantitative viral load with a limit detection threshold of 1.49 log₁₀ IU/ml. The incidence of symptomatic viraemia (13%) among our transplant population was similar with previous study that included only seropositive kidney transplants [33]. However, our result seemed to be lower in comparison with Madi's data which 68.5% of most kidney recipients had symptomatic infection [35]. We postulate that the different variations observed between our results and those of others studies could be attributed either to CMV preventions strategies (universal prophylaxis versus preemptive treatment), or to antiviral drugs used (valaciclovir versus valganciclovir or ganciclovir), and longer duration of prophylaxis treatment (six versus three months) for R+ recipients. However, the use of prophylaxis treatment for D+/R+ group did not spare a subset of patients to be exposed to CMV disease.

Additionally, among the group of symptomatic CMV infection, the mean peak viral load was greater than in patients with asymptomatic viraemia. This finding was corroborated by the results of systematic review and meta-analysis [36] which indicated that mean viral load remained significantly higher in patients with CMV disease [OR 9.3 (95% CI, 4.6-19.3)]. Furthermore, these patients had substantially prolonged viraemia (average 21 versus 13 days, $P= 0.028$) to reach viral clearance compared to those with symptoms free. This finding supported previous study [37], which revealed that high initial viral load was associated with prolonged time to CMV clearance. According to several studies, the high viral load and rapid increase in plasma were associated with the occurrence of invasive CMV disease [1, 35, 38].

Advanced age was also considered as the main risk factor of development of symptomatic infection [9, 39, 40]. However, in our cohort, we found that the young patients were more likely to have symptomatic viral reactivation (28.75 ± 5.12 vs. 38.09 ± 12.34 , $p <$

0.007). Several authors had suggested that reactivation was more frequent in elderly patients because they had a weakened immune system exacerbated by immunosuppressive treatment [18, 41]. Even if our population was composed mainly of young patients, the frequency of observations related to clinical manifestations does not exclude the possibility of interference from immunological factors. Indeed, one study (42) demonstrated through the QuantiFERON-CMV test regardless of age that patients with low levels of anti-CMV immune cells were more likely to experience intensive viraemia associated with severe clinical manifestations. Reasonably, it was impossible for us to explain this situation for our patients due to the lack of data on immunological parameters such as measurement of specific CMV-antibodies titers and T- cell lymphocytes.

Regards to clinical consequences of intensity viraemia, gastrointestinal manifestations were the most common of CMV disease reported in (4/8) 50% of symptomatic patients associated to laboratory abnormalities such as leucopenia, lymphopenia or elevated transaminases, and only two recipients (25%) developed CMV syndrome. These manifestations were observed before discontinuing treatment and without confirmation by invasive diagnosis. As opposed to previous report, fever was considered the most prevalent manifestation in such patients [43], however, a largest cohort of kidney transplant recipients study including 1129 patients from Germany and Finland revealed that gastrointestinal tract infections were detected in 46% and fever in 27% of patients who exhibited symptomatic reactivation [23]. Despite the use of prophylactic treatment was not routinely applied to CMV- kidney seropositive patients, the findings of this cohort study were almost similar to those of our present study which prophylaxis was extended to 6 months in our group of renal transplants.

However, in the current study, even with a significant high viral load measured in some cases, the clinical symptoms were not observed. This result was in accordance with

previous study [35]. The author of this report indicated that 13 patients without CMV -related clinical consequences showed a high viral load. These discrepancies may be explained by different factors such as the presence of re-stimulated CMV specific cellular immunity in the host, limited dissemination of virus, source of reactivated CMV strains and possibly concomitant reactivation of several strains. Those patients who developed high-level viral reactivation without evidence of organ invasive disease may be exposed to indirect effects of CMV. Therefore, it is very important to implement a rigorous viral load monitoring throughout the post-transplant follow-up [44].

For kidney transplant recipients D+/R+, the use of pre-emptive treatment as preventive strategies has led to the definition of optimal viral load thresholds in order to initiate treatment or even predict the occurrence of disease or graft dysfunction. Thus, the majority of studies have explored several tests of real-time PCR in order to determine the optimal viral thresholds expressed in different units. In our context, we have also used quantitative PCR for detecting CMV DNA in plasma according to recommendations of international guideline [14]. But, we did not establish previously viral load thresholds for defining patients at high risk of CMV disease for that reason we should performed another specific study taking in account the baseline risk of the kidney seropositive patients for developing high viral loads. There is another significant point which we were unable to compare our results of viral loads with other data of different laboratory tests because there is still variability of measurement expression in units or copies notwithstanding use of international referenced to standard units defined by World Health of Organization like our study.

Interestingly, the time of therapeutic treatment was significantly twice longer than that of asymptomatic patients with only quantitative viraemia 24.3 [15 to 55] vs. 12.3 [15 to 30] days, $p < 0.001$. Otherwise, we found that the incidence of CMV disease during prophylaxis

was 7/8 (87.5%) and 50% of symptomatic patients had CMV symptoms during the first three months of prophylactic treatment. Therefore, we also discovered very high rates of quantifiable viraemia and disease during prophylaxis while other studies did not. Recently, the transplantation society international CMV consensus group [16] suggested that valaciclovir can be used as a first line prophylactic drug for both D+/R- and D±/R+. Because, according to several randomized studies, the use of high dose valaciclovir significantly reduced the incidence of infection and even the severity of CMV disease [45 – 47]. Recent study [48] had demonstrated that valaciclovir was significantly effective in the prevention with reduction of the incidence of CMV infection (9.6% in valaciclovir group vs 67.6% in control group; $p < 0.001$). As result, our finding may be explained by the fact that all patients had received lower dose of valaciclovir varied from 4.5g to 6g /daily instead of 8g/daily as recommended dose for most of whom were given rATG induction therapy [47]. Another explanation would be proposed in the context of patient compliance that could affect the effectiveness of the treatment chosen. Indeed, in the absence of full coverage by the national health insurance system, patients would be more likely to reduce the number of antiviral treatments in order to optimize the cost of the antiviral medication despite the fact that it was associated to lower cost used in prophylaxis treatment [46, 49]. With regard to the use of valganciclovir as prophylactic treatment, we could not distinguish a significant difference between the symptomatic and symptom-free groups due to the limited number of patients receiving this type of antiviral drug. On the other hand, ganciclovir was the main antiviral agent for curative therapy. However, according to the Transplantation Society International Consensus group [16], nine cases were seemingly suspected to develop antiviral resistance during assessment. This observation cannot be valited to explain this phenomenon because the proportion of cases (9/30, 30%) observed was higher compared to other research data.

Three cases are highly suspected because they showed an extension of treatment beyond six weeks and one of these patients had shown a viraemia with a persistent high viral load during the first 570-days episode. The other six cases had reactivated during prophylactic treatment with valaciclovir in low dose. Such cases are considered to be weakly suspected for resistance. Thus, a second part of this research will be focused on the analysis of potential genetic mutations using the sequencing method.

Regarding the indirect CMV outcomes, previous studies demonstrated that CMV disease is an important risk factor for acute renal allograft rejection [50, 51]. In our study, we found that the four patients who developed transplant rejection had all a CMV disease (4 (50%) vs. 0%, $P = 0.003$). CMV disease can cause dysregulation in immune system. This imbalance in the immune system may increase the risk of transplant rejection. One study [52] showed that CMV disease can increase the risk of acute kidney transplant rejection, and factors controlling CMV infection, can reduce episode of acute rejection.

The rate was found higher than in the previously two published studies [47, 53] with 34% and 30%, respectively. Similarly, in another report, the high level of CMV viraemia was positively associated with acute rejection [OR= 3.27, 95%IC = 1.08-9.4, $P= 0.039$] [54]. But in our study, the number of events was too small to assess a peak viral load effect on the occurrence of rejection episode.

Considering other infections than CMV, the occurrence of intercurrent infection was more frequent in those patients with symptomatic reactivation 6 (75%) vs. 5 (22.7%), $P= 0.028$. Our finding agreed with Blazquez-Navarro et al [54] who revealed a strong association between the reactivation of cytomegalovirus and BK virus regardless of the level of viral load measurement.

Another important finding was that our incidence of recurrence was (33%) in patients with quantifiable viraemia occurring during the first year after transplantation. Recently, few

studies have reported similar results ranging from 30.5% to 36% [22 – 24]. However, the appearance of recurrence observed is relatively late in comparison with results of these previous studies. To further add to this, we were not able to show a clinical or virologic factor associated with increased risk of recurrence in our small study.

There are several significant limitations to consider. First, our study was conducted retrospectively with small sample size, which limited to performing more robust statistical tests to explore a several variables considered as risk factors. According to the recommendation is not available to include more than one variable per 10 events, we could not perform multivariate regression models for all factors with *P* less than 0.2 on univariate analysis. Second, we investigated in a single hospital center, which may limit a generalizability of our results. Third, we did not perform specific tests of CMV immune monitoring; it is possible that cases with high viral load without symptoms may have immune dysfunction during prophylaxis. Due to the fact that most of our patients were given valaciclovir as the basis for prophylactic treatment, it has been impossible to make a comparison with the data from the other studies.

Nevertheless, the important strengths of our study included representative population of typical kidney seropositive transplant recipient. All measurements of CMV DNAemia were performed in plasma by the same QNAT technique in the same laboratory and reported in international standards units. The same standardized protocol of immunosuppression and different strategies of treatment were adopted for our population of kidney recipients.

Conclusion

There is increasing evidence, in the light of these results, that CMV reactivation remains serious problem for seropositive transplant recipients who were expected to be on antiviral prophylaxis. Patients with high level of viraemia may be at an increased risk of

progression to CMV disease and adverse events such as acute rejection. In this sense, to support current prevention strategies, the use of immunological markers is essential associated with intensive viral load monitoring within the first year post- transplantation as well as the investigation of suspected antiviral resistance. Although not specifically examined in our study, there is also need to determine viral load thresholds at which preemptive therapy must be initiated for our patient's populations.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank all patients who participated in the study and staff at the renal service in Ibn Sina hospital. Special thanks were also addressed to group members at central laboratory of virology for their technical assistance in performing the real-time PCR assays.

References

1. Mazon M, Alain S, Schnepf N. Infections à cytomégalo virus. EMC - Mal Infect. 2015;12:1–17.
2. Griffiths P, Baraniak I, Reeves M. The pathogenesis of human cytomegalovirus. J Pathol. 2015;235(2):288–97.
3. Kotton CN. CMV: Prevention, diagnosis and therapy. Am J Transplant. 2013;13(SUPPL. 3):24–40.
4. Sagedal S, Hartmann A, Rollag H. The impact of early cytomegalovirus infection and disease in renal transplant recipients. Clin Microbiol Infect [Internet]. 2005;11(7):518–30. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/j.1469-0691.2005.01190.x>
5. Razonable RR, Humar A. Cytomegalovirus in Solid Organ Transplantation. Am J Transplant [Internet]. 2013;13(s4):93–106. Available from: <http://doi.wiley.com/10.1111/ajt.12103>
6. Emery VC. Cytomegalovirus: Recent progress in understanding pathogenesis and

- control. *Qjm*. 2012;105(5):401–5.
7. Kaminski H, Couzi L, Déchanet-Merville J, Merville P. Immunomonitoring for cytomegalovirus infection in kidney transplantation: Development and prospects. *Nephrol Ther*. 2015;11(6):465–73.
 8. Weclawiak H, Mengelle C, Ould Mohamed A, Izopet J, Rostaing L, Kamar N. Effets du cytomegalovirus en transplantation et place de la prophylaxie antivirale. *Nephrol Ther* [Internet]. 2010;6(6):505–12. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.nephro.2010.06.003>
 9. Kanter J, Pallardó L, Gavela E, Escudero V, Beltrán S, Morales A, et al. Cytomegalovirus Infection Renal Transplant Recipients: Risk Factors and Outcome. *Transplant Proc* [Internet]. 2009;41(6):2156–8. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.transproceed.2009.06.057>
 10. Seale H, Dwyer DE, Chapman JR, MacIntyre CR, School of Public Health and Community Medicine, Faculty of Medicine, University of New South Wales, Australia. 2Centre for Infectious Diseases and Microbiology Laboratory Services, Institute of Clinical Pathology and Medical Research (ICPMR), Westmead Hos A. Cytomegalovirus Disease Amongst Renal Transplant Recipients in Australia and New Zealand. *Viol Res Treat*. 2017;1(2):VRT.S920.
 11. Schlott F, Steubl D, Hoffmann D, Matevossian E, Lutz J, Heemann U, et al. Primary cytomegalovirus infection in seronegative kidney transplant patients is associated with protracted cold ischemic time of seropositive donor organs. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(1):1–10.
 12. Becker BN, Becker YT, Levenson GE, Simmons WD, Sollinger HW, Pirsch JD. Reassessing the impact of cytomegalovirus infection in kidney and kidney-pancreas transplantation. *Am J Kidney Dis*. 2002;39(5):1088–95.

13. Kim T, Lee H-J, Kim S-M, Jung JH, Shin S, Kim Y-H, et al. Diagnostic usefulness of the cytomegalovirus (CMV)-specific T cell-based assay for predicting CMV infection after kidney transplant. *Korean J Intern Med.* 2018;(Cmv).
14. Camille N. Kotton, 1, 8 Deepali Kumar, 2 Angela M. Caliendo, 3 Anders A □sberg, 4 Sunwen Chou, 5 Lara Danziger-Isakov, 6 and Atul Humar 7, Group on behalf of TTSICC. Updated International Consensus Guidelines on the Management of Cytomegalovirus in Solid-Organ Transplantation. *Transplantation.* 2013;96:333–60.
15. Nassim Kamar, 1* Catherine Mengelle, 2 Laure Esposito, 1 Joe □lle Guitard 1, Marion Mehrenberger, 1 Laurence Lavayssi`re, 1 David Ribes, 1 Olivier Cointault, 1 Dominique Durand, 1 Jacques Izopet 2 and Lionel Rostaing1. Predictive Factors for Cytomegalovirus Reactivation in Cytomegalovirus-Seropositive Kidney-Transplant Patients. *J Med Virol.* 2008;80:1012–7.
16. Kotton CN, Kumar D, Caliendo AM, Huprikar S, Chou S, Danziger-Isakov L, et al. The Third International Consensus Guidelines on the Management of Cytomegalovirus in Solid-organ Transplantation. *Transplantation.* 2018;102(6):900–31.
17. Khan S, Fischman C, Huprikar S. Low-dose valganciclovir prophylaxis for cytomegalovirus in intermediate-risk (R+) renal transplant recipients: Single-center experience. *Transpl Infect Dis.* 2017;19(6).
18. Iglesias-Escudero M, Moro-García MA, Marcos-Fernández R, García-Torre A, Álvarez-Argüelles ME, Suárez-Fernández ML, et al. Levels of anti-CMV antibodies are modulated by the frequency and intensity of virus reactivations in kidney transplant patients. *PLoS One.* 2018;13(4):1–16.
19. Jarque M, Melilli E, Crespo E, Manonelles A, Montero N, Torras J, et al. CMV-specific Cell-mediated Immunity at 3-month Prophylaxis Withdrawal Discriminates D+/R+ Kidney Transplants at Risk of Late-onset CMV Infection Regardless the Type

- of Induction Therapy. Vol. 102, Transplantation. 2018. 472–480 p.
20. Lollinga WT, Rurenga-Gard L, van Doesum W, van Bergen R, Diepstra A, Vonk JM, et al. High human cytomegalovirus DNAemia early post-transplantation associates with irreversible and progressive loss of renal function – a retrospective study. *Transpl Int*. 2017;30(8):817–26.
 21. Madi N, Al-Nakib W, Mustafa AS, Saeed T, Pacsa A, Nampoory MRN. Detection and monitoring of cytomegalovirus infection in renal transplant patients by quantitative real-time PCR. *Med Princ Pract*. 2007;16(4):268–73.
 22. Natori Y, Humar A, Husain S, Rotstein C, Renner E, Singer L, et al. Recurrence of CMV infection & the effect of prolonged antivirals in organ transplant recipients. *Transplantation*. 2017;101(6):1449–54.
 23. Helanterä I, Schachtner T, Hinrichs C, Salmela K, Kyllönen L, Koskinen P, et al. Current characteristics and outcome of cytomegalovirus infections after kidney transplantation. *Transpl Infect Dis*. 2014;16(4):568–77.
 24. Helanterä I, Lautenschlager I, Koskinen P. The risk of cytomegalovirus recurrence after kidney transplantation. *Transpl Int*. 2011;24(12):1170–8.
 25. Heli Harvala, Camilla Stewart, Kate Muller, Sheila Burns, Lorna Marson, Alastair MacGilchrist and IJ. Title: High risk of cytomegalovirus infection following solid organ transplantation despite prophylactic therapy. *J Clin Virol*. 2013;85:893–8.
 26. Humar A, Kumar D, Boivin G, Caliendo AM. Cytomegalovirus (CMV) Virus Load Kinetics to Predict Recurrent Disease in Solid-Organ Transplant Patients with CMV Disease. *J Infect Dis*. 2002;186(6):829–33.
 27. Per Ljungman , Michael Boeckh, Hans. Hirsch, Filip Josephson, Jens Lundgren, Garret Nichols, Andreas Pikis, Raymund R. Razonable, Veronica Miller, Paul D. Griffiths for DDWG. Definitions of CMV infection and disease in transplant patients

- for use in clinical trials. *Clin Infect Dis Adv.* 2017;64(1):87–91.
28. Jacqueline F. Fryer 1, 3, Alan B. Heath 2, Rob Anderson 1 PDM 1 and the CSG*. Collaborative Study to Evaluate the Proposed 1st WHO International. *Options.* 2010;(October):1–40.
 29. Chitasombat MN, Watcharananan SP. Burden of cytomegalovirus reactivation post kidney transplant with antithymocyte globulin use in Thailand: A retrospective cohort study. *F1000Research.* 2018;7(0):1568.
 30. Hughes D, Hafferty J, Fulton L, Friend P, Devaney A, Loke J, et al. Donor and recipient CMV serostatus and antigenemia after renal transplantation: An analysis of 486 patients. *J Clin Virol [Internet].* 2008;41(2):92–5. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/10.1016/j.jcv.2007.10.006>
 31. Sunwen C. Acquisition of donor strains of cytomegalovirus by renal -transplant recipients. *N Engl J Med.* 1986;314:1418–23.
 32. Elmoumou L, Mtioui N, Zamd M, Ramdani B, Fellah H. Séroprévalence des anticorps (IgM / IgG) anti Cytomégalovirus chez les hémodialysés au CHU Ibn Rochd de Casablanca (Maroc) [Seroprevalence of antibodies to Cytomegalovirus (IgM / IgG) among hemodialysis patients in Ibn Rochd University Hospital , C. 2016;16(3):9324.
 33. Reusing JO, Feitosa EB, Agena F, Pierrotti LC, Azevedo LSF, Kotton CN, et al. Cytomegalovirus prophylaxis in seropositive renal transplant recipients receiving thymoglobulin induction therapy: Outcome and risk factors for late CMV disease. *Transpl Infect Dis.* 2018;20(5):0–1.
 34. Noble J, Gatault P, Sautenet B, Gaudy-Graffin C, Beby-Defaux A, Thierry A, et al. Predictive factors of spontaneous CMV DNAemia clearance in kidney transplantation. *J Clin Virol [Internet].* 2018;99–100:38–43. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jcv.2017.12.011>

35. Madi N, Al-Qaser M, Edan R, Al-Nakib W. Clinical Utility of Viral Load in the Management of Cytomegalovirus Infection in Solid Organ Transplant Patients in Kuwait. *Transplant Proc* [Internet]. 2015;47(6):1802–7. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.transproceed.2015.05.007>
36. Natori Y, Alghamdi A, Tazari M, Miller V, Husain S, Komatsu T, et al. Use of Viral load as a surrogate marker in clinical studies of cytomegalovirus in solid organ transplantation: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Vol. 66, *Clinical Infectious Diseases*. Toronto: Oxford University Press.; 2018. p. 617–31.
37. Levitsky J, Freifeld AG, Puumala S, Bargenquast K, Hardiman P, Gebhart C, et al. Cytomegalovirus viremia in solid organ transplantation: Does the initial viral load correlate with risk factors and outcomes? *Clin Transplant*. 2008;22(2):222–8.
38. Emery VC, Sabin CA, Cope A V, Gor D, Hassan-walker AF, Griffiths PD. Application of viral-load kinetics to identify patients who develop cytomegalovirus disease after transplantation Vincent. *Lancet*. 2000;355:2032–6.
39. Navarro-Rodríguez V, Herrera-Munoz A, Castro A, Ramos-Esquivel A. Risk factors for cytomegalovirus disease in seropositive renal transplant recipients; a single-center case-controlled study. *J Nephropathol*. 2017;6(3):240–7.
40. Nemati E, Eizadi M, Lankarani MM, Kardavani B, Khoddami-Vishteh HR, Kalantar E, et al. Cytomegalovirus Disease After Kidney Transplantation: Clues to Accurate Diagnosis. *Transplant Proc*. 2007;39(4):987–9.
41. Zieliński M, Tarasewicz A, Zielinska H, Jankowska M, Moszkowska G, Debska-Slizien A, et al. Impact of donor and recipient human cytomegalovirus status on kidney transplantation. *Int Immunol*. 2017;29(12):541–9.
42. Thompson G, Boan P, Baumwol J, Chakera A, MacQuillan G, Swaminathan S, et al. Analysis of the QuantiFERON-CMV assay, CMV viraemia and antiviral treatment

- following solid organ transplantation in Western Australia. *Pathology*. 2018;50(5):554–61.
43. Cordero E, Casasola C, Ecarma R, Danguilan R. Cytomegalovirus disease in kidney transplant recipients: Incidence, clinical profile, and risk factors. *Transplant Proc* [Internet]. 2012;44(3):694–700. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.transproceed.2011.11.053>
44. Selvey LA, Lim WH, Boan P, Swaminathan R, Slimings C, Harrison AE, et al. Cytomegalovirus viraemia and mortality in renal transplant recipients in the era of antiviral prophylaxis. Lessons from the western Australian experience. *BMC Infect Dis*. 2017;17(1):1–10.
45. Reischig T, Prucha M, Sedlackova L, Lysak D, Jindra P, Bouda M, et al. Valganciclovir prophylaxis against cytomegalovirus impairs lymphocyte proliferation and activation in renal transplant recipients. *Antivir Ther*. 2011;16(8):1227–35.
46. Pavlopoulou ID, Syriopoulou VP, Chelioti H, Daikos GL, Stamatiades D, Kostakis A, et al. A comparative randomised study of valganciclovir vs. oral ganciclovir for cytomegalovirus prophylaxis in renal transplant recipients. *Clin Microbiol Infect* [Internet]. 2005 Sep 1 [cited 2019 Jun 4];11(9):736–43. Available from: <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/16104989>.
47. DAVID LOWANCE, M.D., HANS-H. NEUMAYER, M.D., CHRISTOPHE M. LEGENDRE, M.D., JEAN-PAUL SQUIFFLET, M.D., PH.D., JOSEF KOVARIK, M.D., PATRICK J. BRENNAN, M.D., DOUGLAS NORMAN, M.D., RAFAEL MENDEZ, M.D., MICHAEL R. KEATING, M.D., GARY L. COGGON, B.S., ADAM CRI PD, GROUP* FTIVCPTS. VALACYCLOVIR FOR THE PREVENTION OF CYTOMEGALOVIRUS DISEASE AFTER RENAL TRANSPLANTATION. *N Engl J Med*. 1999;340(19):1462–70.
48. Ko EJ, Yu JH, Yang CW, Chung BH. Usefulness of valganciclovir prophylaxis for

- cytomegalovirus infection after anti-thymocyte globulin as rejection therapy. *Korean J Intern Med.* 2019;34(2):375–82.
49. Kacer M, Kielberger L, Bouda M, Reischig T. Valganciclovir versus valacyclovir prophylaxis for prevention of cytomegalovirus: An economic perspective. *Transpl Infect Dis.* 2015;17(3):334–41.
50. Bal Z, Uyar ME, Tural E, Erdogan E, Colak T, Sezer S, et al. Cytomegalovirus infection in renal transplant recipients: One center's experience. *Transplant Proc* [Internet]. 2013;45(10):3520–3. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.transproceed.2013.08.098>
51. Reischig T, Jindra P, Švecová M, Kormunda S, Opatrný K, Třeška V. The impact of cytomegalovirus disease and asymptomatic infection on acute renal allograft rejection. *J Clin Virol.* 2006;36(2):146–51.
52. Hasanzamani B, Hami M, Zolfaghari V, Torkamani M, Ghorban Sabagh M, Ahmadi Simab S. The effect of cytomegalovirus infection on acute rejection in kidney transplanted patients. *J Ren Inj Prev* [Internet]. 2016;5(2):85–8. Available from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15171/jrip.2016.18>
53. Keven K, Basu A, Tan HP, Thai N, Khan A, Marcos A, et al. Cytomegalovirus prophylaxis using oral ganciclovir or valganciclovir in kidney and pancreas-kidney transplantation under antibody preconditioning. *Transplant Proc.* 2004;36(10):3107–12.
54. Blazquez-Navarro A, Dang-Heine C, Wittenbrink N, Bauer C, Wolk K, Sabat R, et al. BKV, CMV, and EBV Interactions and their Effect on Graft Function One Year Post-Renal Transplantation: Results from a Large Multi-Centre Study. *EBioMedicine* [Internet]. 2018;34:113–21. Available from: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ebiom.2018.07.017>




Figure 1. Study Flow chart

