

1 **Impact of Multiple Episodes of Cytomegalovirus Infection on Patient Outcomes in**  
2 **Allogeneic Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplant Using a Pre-emptive Monitoring Strategy**

3

4 **Short title:** CMV Episodes and Patient Outcomes in Allogeneic Stem Cell Transplant

5

6 Julia A. Messina<sup>1\*</sup>, Jennifer L. Saullo<sup>1</sup>, Steven Wolf<sup>2</sup>, Yanhong Li<sup>3</sup>, Helen Tang<sup>4</sup>, Lauren B. Hill<sup>4</sup>,

7 Gena G. Foster<sup>5</sup>, Michael Grant<sup>6</sup>, Samantha M. Thomas<sup>2</sup>, Rachel A. Miller<sup>1</sup>, Barbara D.

8 Alexander<sup>1</sup>, Mitchell Horwitz<sup>4</sup>, Anthony D. Sung<sup>7</sup>

9

10 **Author list:**

11 1. Department of Medicine, Division of Infectious Diseases, Duke University School of  
12 Medicine, Durham, NC, USA

13 2. Department of Biostatistics & Bioinformatics, Duke University School of Medicine,  
14 Durham, NC, USA

15 3. Duke Clinical Research Institute, Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, NC,  
16 USA

17 4. Department of Medicine, Division of Hematologic Malignancies and Cellular Therapy,  
18 Duke University School of Medicine, Durham, NC, USA

19 5. Department of Medicine, Division of Hematology, Yale School of Medicine, New Haven,  
20 CT, USA

21 6. Department of Medicine, Division of Medical Oncology, Yale School of Medicine, New  
22 Haven, CT, USA

23 7. Department of Medicine, Division of Hematologic Malignancies and Cellular Therapies,  
24 University of Kansas School of Medicine, Kansas City, KS, USA

25 **\*Corresponding author:**

1 Julia A. Messina, MD, MHS, MS

2 315 Trent Drive

3 Durham, NC, USA, 27705

4 [Julia.messina@duke.edu](mailto:Julia.messina@duke.edu)

5

6

7

## 1 **Abstract**

2           The impact of multiple episodes of clinically significant cytomegalovirus infection  
3 (csCMVi) on clinical outcomes during pre-emptive CMV monitoring in allogeneic hematopoietic  
4 stem cell transplant recipients (HCT) is not well understood.

5           We performed a retrospective cohort study of all consecutive patients undergoing their  
6 first allogeneic HCT at Duke between January 1, 2009 and December 31, 2013, during an era of  
7 pre-emptive CMV monitoring, prior to widespread use of letermovir prophylaxis. Consensus  
8 definitions were utilized for refractory and resistant CMV infection, bacteremia, invasive fungal  
9 disease, and renal dysfunction. The Kaplan-Meier method was used to estimate survival.

10           Three hundred eighty-eight adult patients underwent allogeneic HCT during the study  
11 time period with 91 patients (23%) having one episode of csCMVi and 79 patients (20%) having  
12  $\geq$  one episode of csCMVi. Risk factors for multiple episodes of csCMVi included having a  
13 transplant from a matched unrelated donor, cord blood as HCT source, and graft-versus-host  
14 disease prophylaxis with highly T-cell suppressive agents such as alemtuzumab. Patients with  
15 multiple episodes tended to develop csCMVi earlier post-transplant and were more likely to  
16 have CMV disease and to develop resistant CMV infection. There was no difference in rates of  
17 refractory CMV infection, bacteremia, invasive fungal disease, or survival. However, patients  
18 with multiple episodes of csCMV had reduced one-year relapse-related mortality compared to  
19 patients with one csCMVi episode.

## 21 **Introduction**

22           Cytomegalovirus (CMV) infection remains a critical cause of morbidity and mortality in  
23 the allogeneic hematopoietic cell transplant (HCT) population despite improvements in the  
24 management of CMV infection. Prior studies have shown that CMV infection increases the risk

1 for invasive fungal disease (IFD), graft-versus-host disease (GVHD), and non-relapse related  
2 mortality (NRM) [1-3]. We previously reported that clinically significant CMV infection (csCMVi),  
3 defined as CMV DNAemia necessitating preemptive therapy or CMV disease, is also  
4 significantly associated with increased total costs and hospital length-of-stay [4].

5 An important unanswered question is the impact of multiple episodes of csCMVi on  
6 patient outcomes, which we seek to answer in the current study performed during an era of pre-  
7 emptive CMV monitoring. We hypothesize that patients with multiple episodes of csCMVi have  
8 more frequent resistant and refractory infection and CMV disease as defined by consensus  
9 definitions devised by expert panels [5, 6]. We also hypothesize that multiple episodes of  
10 csCMVi are associated with increased renal dysfunction due to use of nephrotoxic drugs such  
11 as foscarnet as salvage therapy for refractory or resistant infection. A final objective is to  
12 investigate the impact of multiple episodes of csCMVi on clinical outcomes including invasive  
13 bacterial infections, IFD, disease relapse, survival, and renal function through day +365 post-  
14 transplant.

15

## 16 **Methods and methods**

### 17 **Study patients**

18 This retrospective cohort study received approval by the Duke Health Institutional Review  
19 Board, and a waiver of informed consent was obtained. All consecutive patients undergoing their  
20 first allogeneic HCT at Duke University Medical Center between January 1, 2009 and December  
21 31, 2013 were reviewed. We specifically chose a study period that preceded the Food and Drug  
22 Administration approval of letermovir in 2017 for universal prophylaxis of high-risk CMV HCT  
23 recipients. During the study period, all patients underwent CMV pre-emptive monitoring  
24 regardless of CMV serostatus.

1           The following were excluded from the analysis: patients receiving the investigational agent  
2 brincidofovir post-transplant (N=8), with syngeneic donors (N=3), having CMV infection and/or  
3 disease within two months preceding allogeneic HCT (N=3), or undergoing sequential organ  
4 transplant followed by HCT (N=1, lung-HCT transplant). This study was approved by the  
5 Institutional Review Board of Duke University Health System (DUHS). Demographic and clinical  
6 data were abstracted from a prospectively maintained Duke Adult Blood and Marrow Transplant  
7 database, an institutional tool called Duke Enterprise Data Unified Content Explorer, and manual  
8 review of electronic medical records.

9

## 10 **Antimicrobial prophylaxis**

11           Patients were pre-emptively monitored via plasma quantitative CMV polymerase chain  
12 reaction (PCR) using a DUHS laboratory-developed test incorporating the *artus* CMV PCR kit  
13 (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany) for amplification of a specific region of the CMV genome. Extraction  
14 of CMV DNA was performed on the MagNA Pure Compact (Roche), and amplification and  
15 detection were performed on the Lightcycler (Roche, Indianapolis, IN). Plasma CMV PCR  
16 evaluation occurred at least weekly beginning the first week post-transplant through a minimum  
17 of day +100. Monitoring beyond day +100 was continued at providers' discretion in patients  
18 receiving ongoing immunosuppression. CMV-directed antiviral therapy (e.g., ganciclovir,  
19 foscarnet, or valganciclovir) was initiated in patients with 1) evidence of or concern for CMV  
20 disease; or 2) when the plasma CMV DNA PCR exceeded a designated threshold value. The  
21 recommended threshold value was greater than 250 copies/milliliter (mL) through April 2014 with  
22 modification thereafter to greater than 450 international units (IU)/mL following an update to the  
23 plasma CMV DNA PCR reporting. Per institutional practice, the minimum suggested duration, for  
24 induction therapy was two weeks followed by an additional two weeks of maintenance therapy.  
25 Patients not receiving CMV-directed therapies were maintained on herpes virus prophylaxis with

1 acyclovir. Recommended bacterial prophylaxis was ciprofloxacin through a minimum period of  
2 engraftment. Fungal prophylactic regimens included either fluconazole, voriconazole, or  
3 posaconazole through at least day +100. *Pneumocystis jirovecii* (PJP) prophylaxis consisted of  
4 sulfamethoxazole/trimethoprim during conditioning through day -2 with resumption following  
5 engraftment or day +30.

6

## 7 **Clinical definitions**

8 Clinically significant CMV infection (csCMVi) was defined as CMV DNAemia  
9 necessitating preemptive therapy or CMV disease [7]. Assessment for CMV disease was based  
10 on standardized definitions [5, 6]. Delineation of a second or subsequent episode of csCMVi  
11 required a minimum of a two-week period following completion of CMV-directed therapy. CMV  
12 viral resistance was determined via a CMV genotype demonstrating the presence of a UL97 or  
13 UL54 mutation confirmed in previous studies to confer antiviral resistance through marker  
14 transfer experiments [8]. Resistant CMV infection was defined as the presence of viral genetic  
15 alteration that decreases susceptibility to one or more antiviral drugs.[5] Refractory csCMVi was  
16 defined as greater than one log<sub>10</sub> increase in CMV DNA levels in blood or plasma and  
17 determined by log<sub>10</sub> change from the peak viral load within the first week to the peak viral load at  
18 greater than or equal to two weeks as measured in the same laboratory with the same assay  
19 [5]. Probable refractory csCMVi was defined as persistent viral load (same or higher than peak  
20 viral load within one week but less than one log<sub>10</sub> increase) after at least two weeks of  
21 appropriately dosed antiviral therapy as measured in the same laboratory with the same assay.  
22 Refractory CMV end-organ disease was defined as worsening signs and/or symptoms or  
23 progression to end-organ disease after at least two weeks of appropriate treatment. Probable  
24 refractory end-organ disease was defined as lack of improvement in signs and symptoms after  
25 at least two weeks of appropriately dosed antiviral drugs.

1           Bacteremia was defined as a recognized pathogen from one or more blood cultures. More  
2 than one episode of bacteremia was recorded in the same patient only if it occurred after a  
3 minimum of two weeks from the previous positive blood culture in patients receiving directed  
4 therapy. Common skin commensals, as defined by the National Healthcare Safety Network, were  
5 designated causes of bacteremia only if isolated from two or more blood specimens drawn on  
6 separate occasions meeting criteria that blood from at least two separate blood draws was  
7 collected on the same or consecutive calendar days, and from two separate blood draw sites [9].  
8 Proven and probable invasive fungal infections were based on modified criteria proposed by the  
9 European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer/ Mycoses Study Group [10]. These  
10 definitions were further modified to allow for inclusion of PCR testing from bronchoalveolar lavage  
11 specimens to identify probable PJP pulmonary infections. Acute and chronic GVHD were scored  
12 based on standardized criteria [11-13].

13           Definitions for renal dysfunction were included in a previous publication on foscarnet use  
14 in allogeneic HCT recipients [14]. Estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) was calculated  
15 based on the Chronic Kidney Disease Epidemiology Collaboration (CKD-EPI) formula [15].  
16 Acute kidney injury (AKI) and acute kidney failure was defined as a creatinine increase of at  
17 least two and three times the baseline Cr, or >50% and >75% decrease in eGFR, respectively  
18 [16]. eGFR at three months was calculated using the median of all creatinine measures taken  
19 within 15 days of day +90, eGFR at six months was calculated using the median of all creatinine  
20 measures taken within 45 days of day +180, and eGFR at 12 months was defined as the  
21 median of all measures taken within 45 days of day +365. Comparisons in renal dysfunction  
22 were made between patients without csCMVi, those with one episode of csCMVi, and those  
23 with multiple episodes of csCMVi.

24           Overall survival (OS) was defined as time to death from any cause or last follow up from  
25 the day of transplant. Non-relapse related mortality (NRM) was defined as death without  
26 evidence of disease relapse. Patients who did not experience events were censored on the date

1 of last follow-up. Disease relapse was defined as the recurrence of the underlying hematologic  
2 malignancy after HCT while relapse-related mortality (RRM) was defined as death with evidence  
3 of disease relapse.

4

## 5 **Statistical analyses**

6 Descriptive statistics were used to report baseline demographics, clinical characteristics,  
7 and outcomes. Percentages and numbers were reported for categorical variables. Means,  
8 standard deviations, medians, and the 25<sup>th</sup> and 75<sup>th</sup> percentiles were reported for continuous  
9 variables. In comparisons of baseline characteristics between patient groups, Chi-squared or  
10 Fisher's exact tests were used for categorical variables, and Wilcoxon rank-sum tests were used  
11 for continuous variables. We examined change in renal function within patients from baseline to  
12 90 days, 6 months and 12 months, we compared patients with at least one csCMVi to patients  
13 who didn't have any csCMVi events. We tested for differences between csCMVi patients to those  
14 who didn't have csCMVi using the Wilcoxon rank-sum test for continuous variables and either a  
15 Chi-squared or Fisher's exact test where appropriate.

16 The Kaplan-Meier method was used to estimate overall survival, and NRM and RRM as  
17 competing-risk outcomes. Comparisons between patient groups were based on log-rank tests.  
18 We compared patients based on whether they had one csCMVi episode, more than one csCMVi  
19 episode, or no csCMVi episodes. All statistical analyses were conducted using SAS Version 9.4  
20 (SAS Institute, Cary, NC).

21

## 22 **Results and discussion**

23 During the study period, 388 adult patients underwent allogeneic HCT at Duke with 170  
24 patients (43.8%) having at least one episode of csCMVi (Table 1). Among the 170 patients with  
25 csCMVi, 91 patients (54%) had one episode of csCMVi while 50 patients (29%) had two



1 episodes, 15 patients (9%) had three episodes, 12 patients (7%) had four episodes, and two  
 2 patients (1%) had five episodes. Thirty-seven (21.8%) patients had CMV disease, and the most  
 3 common site of CMV disease was the gastrointestinal tract (28/37 patients; 75.7%) (Table 2).

4

5 **Table 1: Baseline Patient Demographics**

	<b>1 csCMVi (N=91)</b>	<b>&gt;1 csCMVi (N=79)</b>	<b>All Patients (N=170)</b>	<b>p-value</b>
<b>Age at Transplant</b>				0.17
Median (Q1-Q3)	53 (43-60)	49 (38-58)	52 (39-60)	
<b>Race</b>				0.62
Asian	1 (1.1%)	2 (2.5%)	3 (1.8%)	
Black	16 (17.6%)	12 (15.2%)	28 (16.5%)	
More Than One	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.3%)	1 (0.6%)	
White	74 (81.3%)	64 (81.0%)	138 (81.2%)	
<b>Ethnicity</b>				0.06
Hispanic	0 (0.0%)	3 (3.8%)	3 (1.8%)	
Not Hispanic	91 (100.0%)	76 (96.2%)	167 (98.2%)	
<b>Diagnosis at Transplant</b>				0.20
Acute Leukemia	46 (50.5%)	35 (44.3%)	81 (47.6%)	
Lymphoma	16 (17.6%)	22 (27.8%)	38 (22.4%)	
MDS/MPN	19 (20.9%)	10 (12.7%)	29 (17.1%)	
Other	10 (11.0%)	12 (15.2%)	22 (12.9%)	
<b>Conditioning</b>				0.09
Myeloablative	51 (56.0%)	34 (43.0%)	85 (50.0%)	
Non-myeloablative	40 (44.0%)	45 (57.0%)	85 (50.0%)	
<b>Donor Type</b>				0.01
Related	42 (46.2%)	22 (27.8%)	64 (37.6%)	
Unrelated	49 (53.8%)	57 (72.2%)	106 (62.4%)	
<b>Graft Source</b>				0.02
BM	5 (5.5%)	1 (1.3%)	6 (3.5%)	
Cord	11 (12.1%)	21 (26.6%)	32 (18.8%)	
PBSC	75 (82.4%)	57 (72.2%)	132 (77.6%)	
<b>GVHD Prophylaxis</b>				0.01
MMF	13 (15.1%)	13 (17.6%)	26 (16.3%)	
MMF/ Alemtuzumab	17 (19.8%)	23 (31.1%)	40 (25.0%)	
MMF/ CNI	16 (18.6%)	25 (33.8%)	41 (25.6%)	

MTX/ CNI	36 (41.9%)	12 (16.2%)	48 (30.0%)
MTX/ CNI/ MMF	1 (1.2%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (0.6%)
Other	3 (3.5%)	1 (1.4%)	4 (2.5%)

1 Q1: 25<sup>th</sup> quartile, Q3: 75<sup>th</sup> quartile, MDS/MPN: myelodysplastic disorder/ myeloproliferative  
 2 disorder, BM: bone marrow, PBSC: peripheral blood stem cell, GVHD: graft-versus-host  
 3 disease, MMF: mycophenolate, CNI: calcineurin inhibitor, MTX: methotrexate

4

5 **Table 2:** Clinically significant cytomegalovirus infection (csCMVi) characterization

	1 csCMVi (N=91)n	>1 csCMVi (N=79)	All Patients (N=170)	p-value
<b>Patient CMV Status</b>				0.10
Indeterminate	3 (3.3%)	3 (3.8%)	6 (3.5%)	
Negative	12 (13.2%)	3 (3.8%)	15 (8.8%)	
Positive	76 (83.5%)	73 (92.4%)	149 (87.6%)	
<b>Time from transplant to 1<sup>st</sup> csCMVi, median days (Q1-Q3)</b>	40 (27-61)	32 (22-47)	34 (26-53)	0.01
<b>CMV disease</b>				0.03
Any CMV disease, n (%)	14 (15.4%)	23 (29.1%)	37 (21.8%)	
CMV disease site, n (%)				
Proven upper GI	5 (5.5%)	6 (7.6%)	11 (6.5%)	
Probable upper GI	2 (2.2%)	2 (2.5%)	4 (2.4%)	
Proven lower GI	2 (2.2%)	4 (5.1%)	6 (3.5%)	
Probable lower GI	3 (3.3%)	4 (5.1%)	7 (4.1%)	
Proven pulmonary	3 (3.3%)	1 (1.3%)	4 (2.4%)	
Probable pulmonary	3 (3.3%)	4 (5.1%)	7 (4.1%)	
Proven CNS	0 (0%)	1 (1.3%)	1 (0.6%)	
Probable CNS	0 (0%)	1 (1.3%)	1 (0.6%)	

6

7 CMV: cytomegalovirus, csCMVi: clinically significant CMV infection, Q1: 25<sup>th</sup> quartile, Q3: 75<sup>th</sup>  
 8 quartile, GI: gastrointestinal, CNS: central nervous system, SD: standard deviation

9

10 In comparison to patients with one episode of csCMVi, patients with multiple episodes of  
 11 csCMVi were significantly more likely to have a transplant from an unrelated donor (72.2%  
 12 versus 53.8%; p=0.014), have a cord blood transplant (26.6% vs. 12.1%; p=0.024), and to have  
 13 received mycophenolate plus alemtuzumab for GVHD prophylaxis (31.1% vs. 19.8%; p=0.007)  
 14 or mycophenolate plus a calcineurin inhibitor (33.8% vs. 18.6%; p=0.007) for GVHD prophylaxis  
 15 (Table 1). Per Table 2, patients with multiple episodes of csCMVi had a shorter time from

1 transplant to first csCMVi episode than patients with only one episode of csCMVi (median 32  
2 days [Q1-Q3 22-47 days] vs. 40 days [22-47];  $p < 0.01$ ) had significantly higher frequency of  
3 CMV disease (29.1% vs. 15.4%;  $p = 0.03$ ).

4       Antiviral resistance was more frequent among patients with multiple episodes of  
5 csCMVi compared to patients with one episode (6 patients, 7.6% versus 1 patient, 1.1%). For  
6 the single patient with resistant CMV infection during their first and only csCMVi, their csCMVi  
7 met the definition of probable refractory infection, prompting a switch from ganciclovir to  
8 foscarnet. The patient subsequently developed signs of CMV colitis, and CMV resistance  
9 evaluation revealed a UL54 gene mutation. Among the seven patients with resistant csCMVi,  
10 four patients had UL54 gene mutations, and three patients had UL97 mutations.

11       Few cases met the consensus definitions for refractory and probable refractory csCMVi  
12 and disease. We analyzed cases of refractory and probable refractory infections by CMV  
13 episode. Among patients with one episode of csCMVi, one episode met criteria for probable  
14 refractory csCMVi. Among multiple episodes of csCMVi, only three episodes met criteria for  
15 refractory csCMVi, eight episodes met criteria for probable refractory csCMVi, five episodes met  
16 criteria for refractory CMV disease, and one episode met criteria for probable refractory CMV  
17 disease.

18       Per Table 3, 59 (34.7%) of patients had at least one episode of bacteremia post-HCT,  
19 and the majority of these infections were monomicrobial (50 out of 59; 84.7%) and due to gram-  
20 positive organisms (31 out of 59; 52.5%). Twenty patients (11.8%) had a proven or probable  
21 IFD with the lung being the most common site of infection (14 out of 20; 70%). There was no  
22 significant difference in the rates of bacteremia or IFD based on multiple versus one episode of  
23 csCMVi.

24  
25  
26

1 **Table 3:** Comparison of bloodstream infections and invasive infections based on the number of  
 2 clinically significant cytomegalovirus infection (csCMVi) episodes.

3

	<b>1 csCMVi (N=91)</b>	<b>&gt;1 csCMVi (N=79)</b>	<b>All Patients (N=170)</b>	<b>p value</b>
<b>Number of Bacteremia Episodes</b>				0.80
1 episode	26 (28.6%)	24 (30.4%)	50 (29.4%)	
≥ 2 episodes	4 (4.4%)	5 (6.3%)	9 (5.3%)	
<b>Bacteremia type</b>				0.76
Monomicrobial	25 (83.3%)	25 (86.2%)	50 (84.7%)	
Polymicrobial	5 (16.7%)	4 (13.8%)	9 (15.3%)	
<b>Gram-status Bacterium</b>				0.92
Gram-Positive	15 (50.0%)	16 (55.2%)	31 (52.5%)	
Gram-Negative	14 (46.7%)	12 (41.4%)	26 (44.1%)	
Nocardia/ Mycobacteria	1 (3.3%)	1 (3.4%)	2 (3.4%)	
<b>IFD Category<sup>a</sup></b>				0.20
Probable	3 (27.3%)	5 (55.6%)	8 (40.0%)	
Proven	8 (72.7%)	4 (44.4%)	12 (60.0%)	
<b>IFD Type</b>				0.78
Aspergillosis	2 (18.2%)	4 (44.4%)	6 (30.0%)	
<i>Candida</i>	1 (9.1%)	1 (11.1%)	2 (10.0%)	
Mold, other	1 (9.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (5.0%)	
Mucormycosis	4 (36.4%)	2 (22.2%)	6 (30.0%)	
PJP	2 (18.2%)	1 (11.1%)	3 (15.0%)	
Unspecified IFD	1 (9.1%)	1 (11.1%)	2 (10.0%)	
<b>IFDSite</b>				0.43
Bloodstream	1 (9.1%)	1 (11.1%)	2 (10.0%)	
Disseminated	2 (18.2%)	0 (0.0%)	2 (10.0%)	
Lung	7 (63.6%)	7 (77.8%)	14 (70.0%)	
Rhinocerebral	1 (9.1%)	0 (0.0%)	1 (5.0%)	
Sinonasal	0 (0.0%)	1 (11.1%)	1 (5.0%)	

4 IFD (invasive fungal disease), PJP (*Pneumocystis jirovecii* pneumonia)

5 a. Invasive fungal infection type defined by European Organization for Research and  
 6 Treatment of Cancer and the Mycoses Study Group Education and Research  
 7 Consortium [17].

1 Patients with multiple episodes of csCMVi were significantly more likely to receive  
 2 treatment with foscarnet than patients with one episode of csCMVi (25.3% vs. 9.9%; p=0.01).  
 3 The impact of csCMVi on renal function post-HCT was assessed by comparing changes in  
 4 eGFR, incidence of AKI and acute renal failure at 90 days, 6 months, and 12 months post-  
 5 transplant (Table 4). Patients with any csCMVi had significantly greater decline in eGFR at 12  
 6 months post-transplant compared with those never experiencing a csCMVi. Patients with any  
 7 csCMVi also had significantly higher rates of AKI at 12 months post-transplant than patients  
 8 without csCMVi (17.6% vs.11%; p=0.03). There was no difference in the rate of renal failure  
 9 between the groups at any time point.

10

11 **Table 4. Renal Function in patients with any clinically significant CMV infection (csCMVi)**  
 12 **versus patients without clinically significant CMV infection.**

Characteristic	Any csCMVi N=170 (43.8%)	No csCMVi N=218 (56.2%)	All Patients N=388 (100%)	p-value
Change in eGFR 90 days post-transplant; Median (Q1-Q3)	-19 (-43.0 - 0)	-27 (-48.0 - 0)	-22.9 (-46.05 - 0)	0.11
Change in eGFR at 6 months	-21.22 (-42.8 - 0)	-25.79 (-47.4 - -6.88)	-23.64 (-44.87 - -5.66)	0.18
Change in eGFR at 12 months	-31.86 (-51.25 - -18.46)	-28.47 (-43.03 - -9.09)	-29.3 (-46.49 - -12.78)	0.04
eGFR decreased by 20% at 90 days	76 (44.7%)	106 (48.6%)	182 (46.9%)	0.09
eGFR decreased by 30% at 90 days	60 (35.3%)	77 (35.3%)	137 (35.3%)	0.50
eGFR decreased by 20% at 6 months	78 (45.9%)	93 (42.7%)	171 (44.1%)	0.45
eGFR decreased by 30% at 6 months	53 (31.2%)	64 (29.4%)	117 (30.2%)	0.54
eGFR decreased by 20% at 12 months	64 (37.6%)	72 (33%)	136 (35.1%)	0.11
eGFR decreased by 30% at 12 months	48 (28.2%)	47 (21.6%)	95 (24.5%)	0.05
Acute kidney failure at 100 days	34 (20%)	55 (25.2%)	89 (22.9%)	0.22
Acute kidney injury at 100 days	84 (49.4%)	125 (57.3%)	209 (53.9%)	0.11
Acute kidney injury at 6 months	33 (19.4%)	50 (22.9%)	83 (21.4%)	0.17

Characteristic	Any csCMVi N=170 (43.8%)	No csCMVi N=218 (56.2%)	All Patients N=388 (100%)	p-value
Acute kidney failure at 6 months	5 (2.9%)	7 (3.2%)	12 (3.1%)	0.69
Acute kidney injury at 12 months	30 (17.6%)	24 (11%)	54 (13.9%)	0.03
Acute kidney failure at 12 months	4 (2.4%)	4 (1.8%)	8 (2.1%)	0.69
Received foscarnet	29 (17.1%)	22 (10.1%)	51 (13.1%)	0.05

1  
2 eGFR: estimated glomerular filtration rate expressed as mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>, Q1: 25<sup>th</sup> quartile, Q3:  
3 75<sup>th</sup> quartile

4  
5 When comparing patients with one episode of csCMVi to patients with multiple episodes  
6 of csCMVi, patients with multiple csCMVi had significantly larger declines in eGFR at 12 months  
7 (reduction by a median of -37.99mL/min/1.73m<sup>2</sup> [-59.87 to -25.68] vs. -26.2 [-44.08 to -9.78];  
8 p<0.01; Table 5). At 12 months post-transplant, a significant difference was observed in the  
9 percentage of patients with a 30% decrease in eGFR (36.7% vs. 20.9%; p=0.02).

10  
11 **Table 5: Comparison of renal function based on number of clinically significant**  
12 **cytomegalovirus infection (csCMVi) episodes.**

	1 csCMVi N=91 (53.5%)	>1 csCMVi N=79 (46.5%)	All Patients with csCMVi N=170 (100%)	p-value
Change in eGFR at 90 days post-transplant; Median (Q1-Q3)	-20.63 (-41.35 - -7.44)	-18.47 (-45.03 - 0)	-19.13 (-42.74 - 0)	0.64
Change in eGFR at 6 months	-26.64 (-42.26 - -4.91)	-18.19 (-43.27 - 0)	-21.22 (-42.8 - 0)	0.54
Change in eGFR at 12 months	-26.2 (-44.08 - -9.78)	-37.99 (-59.87 - -25.68)	-31.86 (-51.25 - -18.46)	<0.01
eGFR decreased by 20% 90 days	39 (42.9%)	37 (46.8%)	76 (44.7%)	0.75
eGFR decreased by 30% at 90 days	32 (35.2%)	28 (35.4%)	60 (35.3%)	0.51
eGFR decreased by 20% by at 6 months	40 (44%)	38 (48.1%)	78 (45.9%)	0.33
eGFR decreased by 30% at 6 months	27 (29.7%)	26 (32.9%)	53 (31.2%)	0.53
eGFR decreased by 20% at 12 months	29 (31.9%)	35 (44.3%)	64 (37.6%)	0.07

eGFR decreased by 30% at 12 months	19 (20.9%)	29 (36.7%)	48 (28.2%)	0.02
Acute kidney failure at 100 days	20 (22%)	14 (17.7%)	34 (20%)	0.49
Acute kidney injury at 100 days	50 (54.9%)	34 (43%)	84 (49.4%)	0.12
Acute kidney injury at 6 months	19 (20.9%)	14 (17.7%)	33 (19.4%)	0.22
Acute kidney failure at 6 months	1 (1.1%)	4 (5.1%)	5 (2.9%)	0.20
Acute kidney injury at 12 months	13 (14.3%)	17 (21.5%)	30 (17.6%)	0.29
Acute kidney failure at 12 months	1 (1.1%)	3 (3.8%)	4 (2.4%)	0.28
Received foscarnet	9 (9.9%)	20 (25.3%)	29 (17.1%)	0.01

1

2 eGFR: estimated glomerular filtration rate expressed as mL/min/1.73 m<sup>2</sup>, Q1: 25<sup>th</sup> quartile, Q3:  
3 75<sup>th</sup> quartile

4

5 There were no significant differences in one- and five-year OS or NRM based on  
6 csCMVi versus no csCMVi, or number of episodes of csCMVi (Figures 1 and 2).

7

8 **Figure 1:** Overall survival for three groups: One csCMVi episode, greater than one csCMVi  
9 episode, and no csCMVi at one-year (A) and five-years post-transplant (B).

10

11 **Figure 2.** Non-relapse mortality (NRM) for three groups: one csCMVi episode, greater than one  
12 csCMVi episode, and no csCMVi at one-year (A) and (B) five-years post-transplant.

13

14 There was a significant decrease one-year RRM in patients with multiple episodes of  
15 csCMVi compared to patients with one episode of csCMVi or no csCMVi (p=0.04; Figure 3A).

16 Additionally, we observed a trend toward increased incidence of five-year RRM in patients  
17 without csCMVi compared to patients with one episode of csCMVi or multiple episodes of  
18 csCMVi, but this comparison was not statistically significant (p=0.12; Figure 3B).

19

1 **Figure 3:** Disease relapse-related mortality (RRM) for three groups: one clinically significant  
2 CMV infection (csCMVi) episode, greater than one csCMVi episode, and no csCMVi at one-year  
3 (A) and five-years (B) post-transplant.  
4

5 In the present study, we identify having a transplant from a matched unrelated donor,  
6 stem cell source as cord blood, and GVHD prophylaxis with highly T-cell suppressive agents,  
7 such as alemtuzumab, as risk factors for multiple episodes of csCMVi. Patients with multiple  
8 episodes tend to develop csCMVi earlier post-transplant and are more likely to have CMV  
9 disease. We did not find evidence to suggest patients with multiple episodes of csCMV had  
10 worse survival but do have lower one-year RRM compared to patients with one episode of  
11 csCMVi.

12 Prior reports of allogeneic HCT recipients experiencing multiple CMV episodes are  
13 limited to the early post-transplant time period. A study from Japan examined clinical outcomes  
14 and costs related to CMV within first 180 days post-transplant[18]. This retrospective study  
15 included patients who underwent transplant from April 2010 to March 2018 but did not  
16 differentiate whether patients received pre-emptive therapy versus universal prophylaxis. In  
17 this study, 64% of patients (479 out of 752 patients) had multiple episodes of CMV infection in  
18 comparison to 46% of patients (79 out of 170) in the present study.

19 In contrast to prior studies examining the impact of CMV infection on clinical outcomes,  
20 we did not observe a significant difference in bacteremia or IFD based on number of CMV  
21 episodes. This finding might have been impacted by our use of mold-active antifungal  
22 prophylaxis for at least the first 100 days post allogeneic HCT. Regarding prior relationships  
23 between csCMVi and IFD, in a multicenter retrospective cohort study in Australia, investigators  
24 found that CMV reactivation was an independent risk factor for IFD [2]. IFD occurred  
25 significantly later post-transplant in patients with CMV reactivation (median 184 days) compared



1 to patients without CMV reactivation (37 days). Notably, having multiple episodes of CMV  
2 reactivation did not predict risk for IFD in the setting of standard antifungal prophylaxis.

3       Regarding renal dysfunction, our finding of more long-term kidney dysfunction is  
4 consistent with prior reports looking at the impact of foscarnet use on renal function in transplant  
5 recipients. One study examined the impact of foscarnet treatment for ganciclovir resistant or  
6 refractory CMV on outcomes among 39 solid organ transplant and HCT recipients[19]. In this  
7 study, renal dysfunction, defined as a >20% eGFR, was observed in 51% of patients between  
8 the start and end of foscarnet therapy and in 28% of the patients, renal dysfunction persisted six  
9 months after foscarnet therapy.

10       As was found in a prior study of foscarnet use in allogeneic HCT recipients, we  
11 observed a similar signal of long-term decline of renal function at the 12-month post-transplant  
12 time point in patients with multiple episodes of csCMVi [14]. Of note, both studies were  
13 performed at Duke University Medical Center during overlapping time periods (2009-13 for the  
14 present study and 2002-15 for the foscarnet study). In addition, we have demonstrated that  
15 patients with multiple episodes of csCMVi had higher frequencies of treatment with foscarnet.  
16 Regardless, the repeated observation of more long-term renal dysfunction in patients with  
17 multiple episodes of csCMVi and foscarnet exposure is important to keep in mind as a risk for  
18 chronic kidney disease post-allogeneic HCT.

19       In the present study, we did not observe an increase in non-relapse-related (treatment-  
20 related) mortality among patients with multiple episodes of csCMVi. In a prior study of the  
21 impacts of CMV serostatus on clinical outcomes in allogeneic HCT recipients, investigators  
22 determined CMV donor seropositive / recipient seronegative cases were at the highest risk for  
23 one-year mortality due to bacteremia or fungal infection [20]. However, when high CMV viral  
24 load and receipt of ganciclovir were introduced into the multivariable model, the association  
25 between CMV serostatus and mortality was not as pronounced.

26       In our analysis of mortality, patients with multiple episodes of csCMVi had

1 significantly lower one-year relapse-related mortality. The impact of csCMVi on relapse-related  
2 mortality has not been studied as frequently as the impact on overall survival or non-relapse  
3 related mortality. A prior retrospective cohort study observed significantly lower risk of leukemia  
4 relapse among reduced-intensity allo HCT recipients of CMV-seropositive donors; however, this  
5 effect was offset by these same recipients having higher treatment-related mortality [21]. In  
6 another retrospective study, which was multicenter cohort of 9469 patients with leukemia and  
7 myelodysplastic disorder through the Center for International Blood and Bone Marrow  
8 Transplant Research, early CMV reactivation occurring prior to Day +100 was not associated  
9 with reduced risk for disease relapse but was associated with increased risk for NRM [2].

10 In the present study, we did not evaluate the occurrence of acute GVHD and compare  
11 rates of GVHD between patients with and without multiple episodes of csCMVi. One potential  
12 hypothesis as to why we observe reduced relapse-related mortality in patients with multiple  
13 episodes of csCMVi is that these patients also had more GVHD, which could infer more graft-  
14 versus-tumor effect to prevent relapse.

15 In the present study, we only identified nine csCMVi episodes that met criteria for  
16 probable refractory CMV infection, three episodes that met criteria for refractory CMV infection,  
17 one episode that met criteria for probable refractory CMV disease, and five episodes that met  
18 criteria for refractory CMV disease. Based on the low incidence of probable refractory or  
19 refractory csCMVi, we did not pursue further analysis of correlations with clinical outcomes. In  
20 contrast, a prior study of 488 allogeneic HCT recipients with CMV infection diagnosed with pre-  
21 emptive monitoring revealed that 50.6% of recipients met consensus criteria for refractory  
22 infection [1]. Risk factors for refractory infection included receipt of transplant from HLA-  
23 mismatched donors and development of acute GVHD. Recipients with refractory CMV infection  
24 had an increased incidence of CMV disease and higher NRM. In this prior study, there was no  
25 report of association of invasive infections and refractory CMV infection that may confound  
26 association with increased NRM.

1           Regarding CMV resistance, we did not see any cases of both UL97 and UL54  
2 mutations. We did observe four cases of UL54 mutations (without UL96 mutations), which could  
3 be explained by our institution's frequent use of foscarnet for prevention of complications from  
4 human herpes virus-6 reactivation or upfront treatment of CMV, over ganciclovir, due to  
5 cytopenias.

6           Strengths of the present study include clinical outcomes data for one-year post-  
7 transplant, focus on a population that underwent pre-emptive CMV monitoring, and the  
8 utilization of consensus definitions of csCMVi and refractory and resistant infection. We  
9 acknowledge multiple limitations of this study including its retrospective design taking place over  
10 a 5-year period from 2009-2013. We have intentionally chosen this time period as it reflects the  
11 pre-letermovir prophylaxis era for CMV high-risk HCT recipients. In the present study, we are  
12 reporting clinical outcomes associated with multiple episodes of csCMVi identified by pre-  
13 emptive monitoring to serve as a comparison group for future study of allogeneic HCT cohorts in  
14 the post-letermovir prophylaxis era.

15

## 16 **Conclusions**

17           Patients with multiple episodes of csCMVi have higher frequency of CMV disease and  
18 although they have higher rates of antiviral resistance, rates of antiviral resistance and  
19 refractory CMV infection were surprisingly low in this cohort. In addition, we did not find an  
20 association between multiple episodes of csCMVi and rates of invasive bacterial and fungal  
21 infections. We did find that patients with multiple episodes of csCMVi had reduced one-year  
22 RRM compared to patients with one episode of csCMVi. Future study should focus on clinical  
23 outcomes of csCMVi and re-evaluate rates of multiple CMV episodes in cohorts that include  
24 patients receiving universal letermovir prophylaxis.

25

## 1   **References**

- 2   1.     Liu J, Kong J, Chang YJ, Chen H, Chen YH, Han W, et al. Patients with refractory  
3   cytomegalovirus (CMV) infection following allogeneic haematopoietic stem cell transplantation  
4   are at high risk for CMV disease and non-relapse mortality. *Clin Microbiol Infect*.  
5   2015;21(12):1121 e9-15. Epub 20150617. doi: 10.1016/j.cmi.2015.06.009. PubMed PMID:  
6   26093077.
- 7   2.     Yong MK, Ananda-Rajah M, Cameron PU, Morrissey CO, Spencer A, Ritchie D, et al.  
8   Cytomegalovirus Reactivation Is Associated with Increased Risk of Late-Onset Invasive Fungal  
9   Disease after Allogeneic Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation: A Multicenter Study in the  
10   Current Era of Viral Load Monitoring. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2017;23(11):1961-7. Epub  
11   20170807. doi: 10.1016/j.bbmt.2017.07.025. PubMed PMID: 28797778.
- 12   3.     Cantoni N, Hirsch HH, Khanna N, Gerull S, Buser A, Bucher C, et al. Evidence for a  
13   bidirectional relationship between cytomegalovirus replication and acute graft-versus-host  
14   disease. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2010;16(9):1309-14. Epub 2010/04/01. doi:  
15   10.1016/j.bbmt.2010.03.020. PubMed PMID: 20353832.
- 16   4.     Saullo JL, Li Y, Messina JA, Thompson J, Dalton T, Giri VK, et al. Cytomegalovirus in  
17   Allogeneic Hematopoietic Transplantation: Impact on Costs and Clinical Outcomes Using a  
18   Preemptive Strategy. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2020;26(3):568-80. Epub 2019/11/13. doi:  
19   10.1016/j.bbmt.2019.11.005. PubMed PMID: 31712193; PubMed Central PMCID:  
20   PMCPMC7418947.
- 21   5.     Chemaly RF, Chou S, Einsele H, Griffiths P, Avery R, Razonable RR, et al. Definitions of  
22   Resistant and Refractory Cytomegalovirus Infection and Disease in Transplant Recipients for  
23   Use in Clinical Trials. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2019;68(8):1420-6. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciy696. PubMed  
24   PMID: 30137245; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7348585.
- 25   6.     Ljungman P, Boeckh M, Hirsch HH, Josephson F, Lundgren J, Nichols G, et al.  
26   Definitions of Cytomegalovirus Infection and Disease in Transplant Patients for Use in Clinical

- 1 Trials. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2017;64(1):87-91. Epub 20160928. doi: 10.1093/cid/ciw668. PubMed  
2 PMID: 27682069.
- 3 7. Marty FM, Ljungman P, Chemaly RF, Maertens J, Dadwal SS, Duarte RF, et al.  
4 Letemovir Prophylaxis for Cytomegalovirus in Hematopoietic-Cell Transplantation. *N Engl J*  
5 *Med*. 2017;377(25):2433-44. Epub 2017/12/07. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1706640. PubMed PMID:  
6 29211658.
- 7 8. Lurain NS, Chou S. Antiviral drug resistance of human cytomegalovirus. *Clin Microbiol*  
8 *Rev*. 2010;23(4):689-712. doi: 10.1128/CMR.00009-10. PubMed PMID: 20930070; PubMed  
9 Central PMCID: PMCPMC2952978.
- 10 9. Network NHS. Bloodstream Infection Event (Central Line-Associated Bloodstream  
11 Infection and Non-central Line Associated Bloodstream Infection) 2024 [updated January 2024;  
12 cited 2024 March 21]. Available from:  
13 [https://www.cdc.gov/nhsn/pdfs/pscmanual/4psc\\_clabscurrent.pdf](https://www.cdc.gov/nhsn/pdfs/pscmanual/4psc_clabscurrent.pdf).
- 14 10. De Pauw B, Walsh TJ, Donnelly JP, Stevens DA, Edwards JE, Calandra T, et al.  
15 Revised definitions of invasive fungal disease from the European Organization for Research  
16 and Treatment of Cancer/Invasive Fungal Infections Cooperative Group and the National  
17 Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases Mycoses Study Group (EORTC/MSG) Consensus  
18 Group. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2008;46(12):1813-21. doi: 10.1086/588660. PubMed PMID: 18462102;  
19 PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC2671227.
- 20 11. Glucksberg H, Storb R, Fefer A, Buckner CD, Neiman PE, Clift RA, et al. Clinical  
21 manifestations of graft-versus-host disease in human recipients of marrow from HL-A-matched  
22 sibling donors. *Transplantation*. 1974;18(4):295-304. PubMed PMID: 4153799.
- 23 12. Shulman HM, Cardona DM, Greenson JK, Hingorani S, Horn T, Huber E, et al. NIH  
24 Consensus development project on criteria for clinical trials in chronic graft-versus-host disease:  
25 II. The 2014 Pathology Working Group Report. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2015;21(4):589-

- 1 603. doi: 10.1016/j.bbmt.2014.12.031. PubMed PMID: 25639770; PubMed Central PMCID:  
2 PMCPMC4359636.
- 3 13. Jagasia MH, Greinix HT, Arora M, Williams KM, Wolff D, Cowen EW, et al. National  
4 Institutes of Health Consensus Development Project on Criteria for Clinical Trials in Chronic  
5 Graft-versus-Host Disease: I. The 2014 Diagnosis and Staging Working Group report. *Biol*  
6 *Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2015;21(3):389-401 e1. doi: 10.1016/j.bbmt.2014.12.001. PubMed  
7 PMID: 25529383; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC4329079.
- 8 14. Foster GG, Grant MJ, Thomas SM, Cameron B, Raiff D, Corbet K, et al. Treatment with  
9 Foscarnet after Allogeneic Hematopoietic Cell Transplant (Allo-HCT) Is Associated with Long-  
10 Term Loss of Renal Function. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2020;26(9):1597-606. Epub  
11 20200523. doi: 10.1016/j.bbmt.2020.05.007. PubMed PMID: 32450288; PubMed Central  
12 PMCID: PMCPMC8026759.
- 13 15. Levey AS, Stevens LA, Schmid CH, Zhang YL, Castro AF, 3rd, Feldman HI, et al. A new  
14 equation to estimate glomerular filtration rate. *Ann Intern Med*. 2009;150(9):604-12. doi:  
15 10.7326/0003-4819-150-9-200905050-00006. PubMed PMID: 19414839; PubMed Central  
16 PMCID: PMCPMC2763564.
- 17 16. Bellomo R, Ronco C, Kellum JA, Mehta RL, Palevsky P, Acute Dialysis Quality Initiative  
18 w. Acute renal failure - definition, outcome measures, animal models, fluid therapy and  
19 information technology needs: the Second International Consensus Conference of the Acute  
20 Dialysis Quality Initiative (ADQI) Group. *Crit Care*. 2004;8(4):R204-12. Epub 20040524. doi:  
21 10.1186/cc2872. PubMed PMID: 15312219; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC522841.
- 22 17. Donnelly JP, Chen SC, Kauffman CA, Steinbach WJ, Baddley JW, Verweij PE, et al.  
23 Revision and Update of the Consensus Definitions of Invasive Fungal Disease From the  
24 European Organization for Research and Treatment of Cancer and the Mycoses Study Group  
25 Education and Research Consortium. *Clin Infect Dis*. 2020;71(6):1367-76. doi:  
26 10.1093/cid/ciz1008. PubMed PMID: 31802125; PubMed Central PMCID: PMCPMC7486838.

- 1 18. Ueno R, Nishimura S, Fujimoto G, Piao Y, Takenaka K. The clinical and economic  
2 burden of cytomegalovirus management post allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation  
3 in Japan - a retrospective database study. *Curr Med Res Opin.* 2019;35(12):2089-96. Epub  
4 20190811. doi: 10.1080/03007995.2019.1649379. PubMed PMID: 31353971.
- 5 19. Avery RK, Arav-Boger R, Marr KA, Kraus E, Shoham S, Lees L, et al. Outcomes in  
6 Transplant Recipients Treated With Foscarnet for Ganciclovir-Resistant or Refractory  
7 Cytomegalovirus Infection. *Transplantation.* 2016;100(10):e74-80. doi:  
8 10.1097/TP.0000000000001418. PubMed PMID: 27495775; PubMed Central PMCID:  
9 PMC5030152.
- 10 20. Nichols WG, Corey L, Gooley T, Davis C, Boeckh M. High risk of death due to bacterial  
11 and fungal infection among cytomegalovirus (CMV)-seronegative recipients of stem cell  
12 transplants from seropositive donors: evidence for indirect effects of primary CMV infection. *J*  
13 *Infect Dis.* 2002;185(3):273-82. Epub 20020117. doi: 10.1086/338624. PubMed PMID:  
14 11807708.
- 15 21. Nachbaur D, Clausen J, Kircher B. Donor cytomegalovirus seropositivity and the risk of  
16 leukemic relapse after reduced-intensity transplants. *Eur J Haematol.* 2006;76(5):414-9. Epub  
17 20060215. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-0609.2005.00625.x. PubMed PMID: 16480430.
- 18





Figure 1A






Number of CMVs

1: No csCMV    2: 1 csCMV Episode    3: >1 csCMV Episode


1	218	105	63	33
2	91	44	30	17
3	79	39	23	12

Figure 1B




1	218	185	164	153	140	128
2	91	80	71	60	54	51
3	79	79	72	63	57	49

Figure 2A



1	218	105	63	33
2	91	44	30	17
3	79	39	23	12

Figure 2B




Number of CMVs

1: No csCMV    2: 1 csCMV Episode    3: >1 csCMV Episode

1	218	179	154	144	131	118
2	91	78	69	59	53	50
3	79	79	71	62	55	48

Figure 3A



Number of CMVs

— 1: No csCMV   
 — 2: 1 csCMV Episode   
 — 3: >1 csCMV Episode

1	218		96		59		32
2	91		44		30		17
3	79		38		22		12

Figure 3B