

Diagnostic Stewardship to Limit Repeat Plasma Cytomegalovirus Viral Load Testing

Poster 171

Akeatit Trirattanapikul M.D.¹, Ekawat Pasomsub Ph.D.², Sukanya Siriyotha M.Sc.³, Oraluck Pattanaprateep Ph.D.³, Angsana Phuphuakrat M.D., Ph.D.¹

¹Division of Infectious Diseases, ²Department of Pathology, ³Department of Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Faculty of Medicine Ramathibodi Hospital, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

CONTACT INFORMATION: Akeatit Trirattanapikul M.D. Email: akeatit.tri@mahidol.ac.th

INTRODUCTION

 Serial monitoring of plasma cytomegalovirus (CMV) viral load (VL) with intervals of <5 days may result in unnecessary budgets without changes in treatment, morbidity, and mortality

AIMS

 To reduce plasma CMV VL testing performed at intervals of <5 days after protocol implementation

METHODS

- A quasi-experimental pre-post intervention study in a university hospital in Thailand
- Inclusion: patients aged ≥18 years old who required plasma CMV VL testing
- In 2021, the inpatient electronic pop-up and telephone interview and feedback were used to limit unnecessary plasma CMV VL testing
- The rate of plasma CMV VL testing being performed with intervals of <5 days was compared before and after protocol implementation using the Poisson regression model
- The cost-effectiveness of plasma CMV VL testing after protocol implementation was studied

RESULTS

- After protocol implementation, there was a significant decrease in the rate of plasma CMV VL test requests with intervals of <5 days from 11.8% to 6.2%
- After telephone interviews, the rate of plasma CMV
 VL test requests decreased further to 4.7%
- There were no statistically significant differences in the incidence of CMV viremia, plasma CMV VL >1,000 IU/mL, CMV syndrome, and CMV disease after protocol implementation (p=0.733, 0.505, 1.000, and 0.827, respectively)

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of patients requiring plasma CMV VL testing

	Pre-intervention (N=904)	Post-intervention (N=1024)	p-value
Age (years) [median (IQR)]	55 (40-66)	58 (43-69)	0.003
Male gender [n (%)]	441 (48.8)	456 (44.5)	0.056
Outpatient [n (%)]	392 (43.4)	432 (42.2)	0.603
General ward [n (%)]	367 (40.6)	361 (35.3)	0.016
Intensive care unit [n (%)]	145 (16.4)	231 (22.6)	<0.001
SOT [n (%)]	301 (33.3)	256 (25.0)	<0.001
Kidney	275 (30.4)	245 (23.9)	
Liver	20 (2.2)	2 (0.2)	
Heart	7 (0.8)	11 (1.1)	
HSCT [n (%)]	40 (4.4)	38 (3.7)	0.427
Autoimmune diseases [n (%)]	237 (26.2)	269 (26.3)	0.979
Leukemia [n (%)]	63 (7.0)	52 (5.1)	0.080
Lymphoma [n (%)]	47 (5.2)	59 (5.8)	0.589
Solid malignancy [n (%)]	39 (4.3)	20 (2.0)	0.003
HIV [n (%)]	41 (4.5)	26 (2.5)	0.017
COVID-19 [n (%)]	0 (0.0)	162 (15.8)	<0.001

Table 2. Incidences of plasma CMV VL testing performed in intervals of <5 days

Plasma CMV VL testing performed in	Pre-intervention	Post-intervention	Incidence rate ratio	p-value
intervals <5 days [n (%)]	(N=2,800)	(N=2,945)	(95% CI)	
Electronic pop-up	329 (11.8)	185 (6.2)	0.50 (0.41-0.59)	<0.001
Electronic pop-up and telephone interview and feedback	329 (11.8)	138 (4.7)	0.37 (0.30-0.45)	<0.001

Table 3. Costs of plasma CMV VL testing, anti-CMV drug, bronchoscopy, and gastrointestinal endoscopy

	Pre-intervention Post-intervention		p-value
	(N=2,800, Thai Baht)	(N=2,945, Thai Baht)	
Overall plasma CMV VL testing	6,987,000	7,339,200	0.190
Plasma CMV VL testing in intervals of < 5 days	822,500	345,000	<0.001
Anti-CMV drugs	12,327,436	7,860,187	0.001
Bronchoscopy	170,100	136,600	0.215
Gastrointestinal endoscopy	149,688	188,788	0.815
1 USD equals 37.3 Thai Baht on 22 Sep 2022			

CONCLUSIONS

- A diagnostic stewardship program is useful to limit plasma CMV VL testing at appropriate intervals and reduce unnecessary cost
- The testing limitation does not increase incidences of CMV viremia or disease
- An electronic hard stop alert as a part of computerized provider order entry should be developed and studied

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

 A.T. received travel funding from Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine Ramathibodi Hospital, Mahidol University for the conference presentation`

REFERENCES

- . Kraft CS, et al. Clin Infect Dis. 2012;54:1793-1797.
- 2. Tremblay MA, et al. J Virol Methods. 2015;225:1-3.
- 3. Lodding IP, et al. EBioMedicine. 2015;2:699-705.
- 4. Bieniek R, et al. LabMedicine. 2011;42:339-343.