SR TR

SCIENTIFIC REGISTRY 으 TRANSPLANT RECIPIENTS

Clinical and Economic Benefit of CMV Matching in Kidney Transplant: A Decision Analysis

D.A. Axelrod, S. Chang, K.L. Lentine, M. Schnitzler, D. Norman, A. Olyaei, D Malinowski, V. Dharnidharka, G. Istre, J. B. Lockridge

University of Iowa, Saint Louis University, Washington University, Oregon Health Sciences University, Portland Veterans Administration Hospital

Disclosures

David Axelrod, MD, MBA Professor of Surgery University of Iowa Hospitals and Clinics, Iowa City, IA

I have financial relationship(s) within the last 12 months relevant to my presentation with: CareDx - Consultant Talaris - Consultant Scientific Direct - Advisor

<u>AND</u>

My presentation does not include discussion of off-label or investigational use. I do not intend to reference unlabeled/unapproved uses of drugs or products in my presentation.

This work was supported wholly or in part by HRSA contract 75R60220C00011. The content is the responsibility of the authors alone and does not necessarily reflect the views or policies of the Department of HHS, nor does mention of trade names, commercial products, or organizations imply endorsement by the U.S. Government.



Cytomegalovirus In Kidney Transplant

Cytomegalovirus (CMV) is a major cause of morbidity and mortality after solid organ transplant

- Despite prophylaxis with valganciclovir, CMV infection increases the risk of death and graft loss
- Highest risk is in CMV-negative recipients (CMV R-) who receive CMV donor + (CMV D+) kidneys
 - Increased graft failure (D+/R- vs. D-/R-: hazard ratio [HR] = 1.17, P = .01)
 - All-cause mortality (HR = 1.18, *P* < .001)
 - Infection-related mortality (HR = 1.38, P = .03)



Leaphorn et al. *AJT.* 2019. 2:573-584



Benefits of CMV Donor and Recipient Matching

Preferentially transplanting CMV D – organs into CMV R- recipients reduces the risk of posttransplant CMV infection and associated graft loss

- The number of CMV D- exceeds CMV R recipients nationally
 Selective allocation reduces CMV D (P)
- Selective allocation reduces CMV D+/Rtransplant
- Preferential allocation of CMV D- donors did not negatively impact transplant rates in a pilot study

Lockridge et al. AJT. 2020:20:3502-3508



A: US vs. OPO Deceased Donor CMV Serology Pre-PilotB: OPO Pre vs. Post Pilot Deceased Donor CMV SerologyC: US vs. OPO Deceased Donor CMV Serology Post-Pilot



Purpose/Design of study

Purpose:

Assess the potential clinical and economic implications of a national allocation policy to preferentially allocate CMV D- kidneys to CMV R- candidates

Design:

- Markov decision analytic model
- Survival input: Leaphorn et al. *AJT* 2019, based on UNOS analysis
- Economic inputs: Linked Medicare-SRTR data to determine differential cost of D+/R- vs. D-/R- transplant
- Additional input: Pharmaceutical costs, utilities (dialysis, transplant), discount rate (3%)



Model Overview





Results

- Expected survival increased with D-/Rtransplants: **14.3 years vs 12.6 years**
- CMV D-/R- transplant increased quality of lifeadjusted survival: **11.3 QALYs vs 9.8 QALYs**
- CMV D-/R- transplant less expensive than D+Rprocedures: \$529,512 vs \$542,963

Thus, D-R- transplant is a dominant strategy: less expensive and more effective





How long can you wait for CMV- Donor?





Limitations

Markov model based on general survival data

- There may be differences in quality of the organ for CMV D- vs. D+
- Did not specifically model differences by race/ethnicity
- Sensitive to assumptions about the cost of prophylaxis and differential rates of posttransplant survival



Conclusions

- Prospective matching for CMV status results in cost savings and longer posttransplant survival
 - Waiting up to 30 months for a CMV D- organ was associated with equivalent long-term survival
- In 2018, 2699 D+/R- and 3890 D-/R+ deceased donor kidney transplants were performed
 - Reallocating CMV D- donors to CMV R- patients would save \$36,304,249 in expenditures and increase survival by 4,048 QALYs
 - Would not impact access for CMV R+ patients, as D+ organs would be reallocated to them





Transplantation

Director Jon Snyder, PhD, MS

Investigators Bertram Kasiske, MD FACP Ajay Israni, MD, MS Allyson Hart, MD, MS

> Program Caitlyn Nystedt, MPH, PMP Manager

Sr. Administrative Pamela Giles Assistant

> Medical Mary Van Beusekom. MS. ELS **Fditor**

Marketing & Mona Shater, MA Comms. Amy Ketterer Tonya Eberhart

> **Project** Katherine Audette, MS Managers Michael Conboy, Bryn Thompson, MPH

Project Chris Folken Coordinator

Sr. Manager, David Zaun, MS **Biostatistics**

Manager, Melissa Skeans, MS **Biostatistics**

Principal Nicholas Salkowski, PhD Biostatisticians Andrew Wey, PhD Sr. Biostatistician Donnie Musgrove, PhD Biostatisticians David Schladt, MS Tim Weaver, MS Yoon Son Ahn, MS Jon Miller, PhD, MPH IT. Web. Ryan Follmer Database, Carl Fils-Aime Simulation Mark Fredrickson Patrick Johnson

Eugene Shteyn, MS Matthew Tabaka

Joshua Pyke, PhD

Greta Knefelkamp





SCIENTIFIC REGISTRY 으 TRANSPLANT RECIPIENTS

Contact us: SRTR@SRTR.org

Follow us:



in

Scientific Registry of Transplant Recipients

