haematologica
Journal of the Ferrata Storti Foundation

Extending duration of letermovir prophylaxis in haploidentical stem cell transplantation

by Pongthep Vittayawacharin, Benjamin J. Lee, Shawn Griffin, Jean Doh, Julie Smith, Hannah Nam, Emily Blodget, Deepa Jeyakumar, Piyanuch Kongtim, and Stefan O. Ciurea

Received: May 4, 2024.
Accepted: July 2, 2024.

Citation: Pongthep Vittayawacharin, Benjamin J. Lee, Shawn Griffin, Jean Doh, Julie Smith, Hannah Nam, Emily Blodget, Deepa Jeyakumar, Piyanuch Kongtim, and Stefan O. Ciurea. Extending duration of letermovir prophylaxis in haploidentical stem cell transplantation. Haematologica. 2024 July 11. doi: 10.3324/haematol.2024.285766 [Epub ahead of print]

Extending duration of letermovir prophylaxis in haploidentical stem cell transplantation

Pongthep Vittayawacharin[1, 2], Benjamin J. Lee[3, 4], Shawn Griffin[3, 4], Jean Doh[3, 4], Julie Smith[1], Hannah Nam[5], Emily Blodget[5], Deepa Jeyakumar[1], Piyanuch Kongtim[1], Stefan O. Ciurea[1]

[1]Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation and Cellular Therapy Program, Division of Hematology/Oncology, Department of Medicine, University of California Irvine, California, USA

[2]Division of Hematology, Department of Medicine, Faculty of Medicine Siriraj Hospital, Mahidol University, Bangkok, Thailand

[3]Department of Pharmacy, University of California Irvine Health, Orange, CA, USA

[4]Department of Clinical Pharmacy Practice, School of Pharmacy & Pharmaceutical Sciences, University of California, Irvine, California, USA

[5]Division of Infectious Diseases, Department of Medicine, University of California Irvine, California, USA

Correspondence: Stefan O. Ciurea, Professor, Hematopoietic Stem cell Transplant and Cellular Therapy Program, University of California, Irvine, 101 The City Drive S, Bldg. 200, Rm. 450, Orange, CA 92868; e-mail: sciurea@hs.uci.edu

Key words: letermovir, cytomegalovirus, haploidentical donor, stem cell transplantation, infectious disorders

Running title: Extending duration of letermovir in haplo-SCT

Data availability statement: The data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request.

Funding statement: This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public, commercial, or not-for-profit sectors.

Conflict of interest: No potential conflict of interest was reported by all the authors.

Authors' contributions: PV, PK and SC conceptualized and designed the study. PV performed data collection from the electrical medical records. PV, PK and SC analyzed the data and wrote the first draft of

the manuscript. BL, SG, JD, JS, HN, EB, DJ, PK and SC took care of the patients. All authors edited and approved the final version of the manuscript.

LETTERS TO THE EDITOR

Result from pivotal phase 3 studies demonstrated a significant reduction in clinically significant cytomegalovirus (CMV) infections (CS-CMVi)[1] in patients who received prophylactic letermovir for the first 14 weeks and 28 weeks after transplantation[2, 3]. However, a significant proportion of participants developed late CS-CMVi after letermovir discontinuation and a small subset of patients underwent haploidentical donor stem cell transplantation (haplo-SCT). Moreover, it has been shown that post-transplantation cyclophosphamide (PTCy)-based graft-versus-host disease (GVHD) prophylaxis is associated with higher likelihood of developing CS-CMVi[4]. Consequently, the optimal duration of letermovir prophylaxis in haplo-SCT with PTCy-based GVHD prophylaxis remains unclear.

We retrospectively evaluated forty-three consecutive adult patients undergoing haplo-SCT using fludarabine-based conditioning regimens with PTCy, tacrolimus, mycophenolate mofetil (MMF) and budesonide as GVHD prophylaxis, with CMV seropositive recipients or donors. MMF and budesonide were tapered off starting at day +90, while tacrolimus was continued for at least 6 months post-transplant. The study protocol was approved by the Institutional Review Board of University of California, Irvine (IRB 20206215). The median follow-up time was 480 days (interquartile range [IQR] 288 to 793 days). The median age of donors was 35 years (IQR, 23 to 40 years). Ten patients (23.3%) developed human herpesvirus 6 reactivation, letermovir prophylaxis was interrupted by preemptive treatment with foscarnet in this group, for a median duration of 7 days (IQR, 6 to 10 days)[5]. Patient characteristics are summarized in Table1.

Letermovir at 480 mg once daily was administered starting on day +7 and was extended up to one-year post-transplant, due to perceived higher incidence of CS-CMVi after discontinuation at day 100 post-transplant and because adaptive immunity recovers approximately at 1-year post-transplant[6]. The plasma CMV DNA level was quantified by PCR method and quantitative

measurement range of CMV DNA assay was 50-156 million IU/mL (1.70 - 8.19 log IU/mL). Preemptive treatment was initiated when detection of CMV DNA in plasma exceeded 50 IU/mL for two consecutive instances. Letermovir was resumed for secondary prophylaxis after completing preemptive treatment, with at least two consecutive undetected plasma CMV DNA. The median duration of letermovir exposure was 255 days (IQR, 179 to 344 days). Twenty-six patients (60.5%) developed at least one episode of CS-CMVi, with 6 patients (24%) receiving additional immunosuppressive agents (five on corticosteroids and one on eculizumab plus rituximab). The median time to CS-CMVi post-transplant was 50 days (IQR, 11 to 213 days), with a median plasma level of CMV DNA of 160 IU/mL (IQR, 74 to 276 IU/mL). The median peak plasma level of CMV DNA was 665 IU/mL (IQR, 326 to 1,900 IU/mL) at a median of 79 days post-transplant (IQR, 35 to 215 days). The cumulative incidence of first CS-CMVi at day 100, 180, 270 and 365 were 34.9% (95% confidence interval [CI] 21.2-48.9%), 39.5% (95% CI 25.1-53.6%), 54.2% (95% CI 38.1-67.7%) and 63.1% (95% CI 46.1-76.1%), respectively (Figure 1). One patient (2.3%) developed CMV pneumonitis at 29 days post-transplant. CMV resistance testing was not performed during the first episode of CS-CMVi. Twenty-three (88.5%) patients with first CS-CMVi, including fourteen patients who had an initial plasma level of CMV DNA above 150 IU/mL, responded to first-line preemptive treatment with either foscarnet (*N*=11) or valganciclovir (*N*=12). However, three patients received maribavir as a salvage treatment due to refractory CS-CMVi. Twenty-four patients received letermovir as secondary prophylaxis after completing preemptive treatment. Eight of these patients (33.3%) subsequently developed a second CS-CMVi, with a 100-day cumulative incidence of failure from secondary prophylaxis at 29.4% (95% CI 13.1-48.0%) (Figure 1). The median duration of second CS-CMVi was 37 days after starting secondary letermovir prophylaxis (IQR, 14 to 42 days), with a median level of plasma CMV DNA at 64 IU/mL (IQR, 54 to 86 IU/mL). One patient out of eight developed a third episode of CS-CMVi on day 118 post-transplant, and subsequently died from COVID pneumonia on day 134 post-transplant. The median post-transplant day for letermovir

discontinuation was 374 (IQR, 351 to 418 days), with 1-year cumulative incidence of letermovir discontinuation at 80.6% (95% CI 63.0%-90.4%) (Supplemental Figure 1). The only factor associated with a lower risk of CS-CMVi was lower hematopoietic cell transplantation comorbidity index (HCT-CI) (subdistribution hazard ratio [SHR] 0.82, [95% CI 0.68-0.99], P=0.04). No CMV-related mortality occurred.

Focusing on transplant outcomes, all patients achieved neutrophil engraftment at a median of 17 days post-transplant (IQR, 15 to 19 days). Forty-two patients (97.7%) achieved platelet engraftment at a median of 23 days post-transplant (IQR, 19 to 27 days), one patient died from pneumonia prior to platelet engraftment at day 206 post-transplant. There was no significant difference between patients with and without CS-CMVi with regards to median day post-transplant for neutrophil (17 vs. 16 days; P=0.97) and platelet (24 vs. 23 days; P=0.17) engraftment. Cox proportional hazards and subdistribution hazard model using CS-CMVi as a time-varying covariate, did not demonstrate differences in transplant outcomes between patients with and without CS-CMVi. The 1-year non-relapse mortality in subgroups with and without CS-CMVi were 23.0% (95% CI 8.3%-42.1%) and 31.0% (95% CI 11.2%-53.6%), respectively (SHR 0.13, [95% CI 0.01-1.71], P=0.12). The 1-year cumulative incidence of relapse in subgroups with and without CS-CMVi were 11.5% (95% CI 2.9%-26.7%) and 5.9% (95% CI 0.4%-23.5%), respectively (SHR 1.86, [95% CI 0.18-19.75], P=0.61). The 1-year progression-free survival (PFS) and overall survival (OS) between the cohort with and without CS-CMVi were 65.5% (95% CI 42.1%-81.3%) vs. 63.1% (95% CI 35.3%-81.6%), (HR 0.48, [95% CI 0.09-2.69], P=0.40) and 69.4% (95% CI 45.9%-84.3%) vs. 69.1% (95% CI 40.7%-85.9%) (HR 0.28, [95% CI 0.03-2.74], P=0.28), respectively. In addition, there were no differences in cumulative incidence of grade II-IV acute GVHD (7.7% [95% CI 1.3%-21.7%] vs. 5.9% [95% CI 0.04%-23.5%] at 100 days, SHR 0.84 [95% CI 0.05-14.04], P=0.90) and moderate to severe chronic GVHD (6.6% [95% CI 0.4%-25.7%] vs. 9.0% [95% CI 0.6%-32.8%] at 2 years post-transplant,

SHR 0.59 [95% CI 0.04-8.77], P=0.70) between patients with and without CS-CMVi (Supplemental Figure 2). After adjusting for age, sex, Karnofsky Performance Scale, HCT-CI and disease risk index, there were no differences in PFS (HR 0.94, [95% CI 0.16-5.51], P=0.95) and OS (HR 0.45, [95% CI 0.05-4.26], P=0.48) between the two groups.

Immune reconstitution was evaluated by analyzing peripheral blood absolute lymphocyte subset count including $CD3^+$, $CD3^+CD4^+$, $CD3^+CD8^+$, $CD19^+$, and $CD3^-CD56^+$ lymphocytes. Using a mixed effects linear model to account for multiple measurements per patient and multiple imputation method to impute missing lymphocyte subsets data, the occurrence of CS-CMVi was associated with lower $CD3^+$ (coefficient -79.65, P=0.03), $CD3^+CD4^+$ (coefficient -35.52, P=0.02), $CD3^+CD8^+$ (coefficient -60.23, P=0.02) and $CD19^+$ (coefficient -38.68, P=0.04) lymphocyte subsets at 1-year post-transplant. However, no association was found between CS-CMVi and $CD56^+$ lymphocyte recovery after transplant (coefficient 29.45, P=0.54) (Figure 2).

This reports demonstrated one of the longest durations of letermovir administration for CMV prophylaxis after transplantation. Despite a median duration of letermovir exposure of 255 days, the cumulative incidence of CS-CMVi was high at 63.1% throughout the first-year post-transplant. Significantly, 39.5% and 54.2% of patients experienced CMV reactivation by day 180 and day 270 post-transplant, respectively, demonstrating the need to further extend the duration of letermovir or to investigate a novel prophylaxis strategy other than letermovir. However, it remains unclear whether the consistent use of PTCy-based GVHD prophylaxis could be the main factor, and if the higher incidence and need to extend letermovir prophylaxis will be observed in HLA-matched donor transplants in the future, as PTCy is being extended to these transplants[7, 8]. The incidence of CS-CMVi in our report was higher than in previous studies[2, 3]. The inclusion of only haploidentical donors with PTCy-based GVHD prophylaxis and early preemptive treatment with a lower cutoff plasma CMV DNA level at 50 IU/mL, compared with

other studies suggesting a cutoff of 137 IU/mL (150 copies/mL)[2, 9] might be contributing to a higher incidence of CS-CMVi. We have found a consistent decrease in absolute T-cell subsets and B-cells in CS-CMVi cohort which significantly associated with a higher HCT-CI, suggesting that either that patients with higher comorbidities have been less likely to develop an immune response or that CMV exerts a negative impact on immunologic reconstitution in these patients. Extending letermovir for CMV prophylaxis might overcome the negative impact of CS-CMVi, as our study showed no significant differences in transplant outcomes between the two groups of patients with and without CS-CMVi. Despite the apparent safety and tolerability of extending duration of letermovir prophylaxis, delay in recovery of CMV-specific immunity and letermovir resistance could be a concern associated with extending the duration prophylaxis[10, 11]. Prospective randomized studies are needed in this group of patients as well as patients receiving PTCy-based GVHD prophylaxis to assess the need for extended duration. Additionally, a cost-effectiveness analysis would be useful to assess resource utilization.

In conclusion, our study reported real-world experience with extended letermovir prophylaxis in a cohort of haplo-SCT patients. CS-CMVi developed up to one-year post-transplant suggesting that extending letermovir prophylaxis or novel prophylaxis strategy is needed. In addition, secondary prophylaxis with letermovir can be applied after completing preemptive treatment. Larger studies are needed to confirm these findings and assess the need to extend letermovir prophylaxis in HLA matched transplants receiving PTCy-based GVHD prophylaxis.

References

1. Ljungman P, Boeckh M, Hirsch HH, et al. Definitions of Cytomegalovirus Infection and Disease in Transplant Patients for Use in Clinical Trials. Clin Infect Dis. 2016;64(1):87-91.

2. Marty FM, Ljungman P, Chemaly RF, et al. Letermovir Prophylaxis for Cytomegalovirus in Hematopoietic-Cell Transplantation. N Engl J Med. 2017;377(25):2433-2444.

3. Russo D, Schmitt M, Pilorge S, et al. Efficacy and safety of extended duration letermovir prophylaxis in recipients of haematopoietic stem-cell transplantation at risk of cytomegalovirus infection: a multicentre, randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled, phase 3 trial. Lancet Haematol. 2024;11(2):e127-e135.

4. Goldsmith SR, Abid MB, Auletta JJ, et al. Posttransplant cyclophosphamide is associated with increased cytomegalovirus infection: a CIBMTR analysis. Blood. 2021;137(23):3291-3305.

5. Vittayawacharin P, E'Leimat G, Lee BJ, et al. Once-Daily Foscarnet Is Effective for Human Herpesvirus 6 Reactivation after Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation. Transplant Cell Ther. 2023;29(6):397.e1-397.e6.

6. Storek J. Immunological reconstitution after hematopoietic cell transplantation - its relation to the contents of the graft. Expert Opin Biol Ther. 2008;8(5):583-597.

7. Bolaños-Meade J, Reshef R, Fraser R, et al. Three prophylaxis regimens (tacrolimus, mycophenolate mofetil, and cyclophosphamide; tacrolimus, methotrexate, and bortezomib; or tacrolimus, methotrexate, and maraviroc) versus tacrolimus and methotrexate for prevention of graft-versus-host disease with haemopoietic cell transplantation with reduced-intensity conditioning: a randomised phase 2 trial with a non-randomised contemporaneous control group (BMT CTN 1203). Lancet Haematol. 2019;6(3):e132-e143.

8. Bolaños-Meade J, Hamadani M, Wu J, et al. Post-Transplantation Cyclophosphamide-Based Graft-versus-Host Disease Prophylaxis. N Engl J Med. 2023;388(25):2338-2348.

9. Hakki M, Aitken SL, Danziger-Isakov L, et al. American Society for Transplantation and Cellular Therapy Series: #3-Prevention of Cytomegalovirus Infection and Disease After Hematopoietic Cell Transplantation. Transplant Cell Ther. 2021;27(9):707-719.

10. Zamora D, Duke ER, Xie H, et al. Cytomegalovirus-specific T-cell reconstitution following letermovir prophylaxis after hematopoietic cell transplantation. Blood. 2021;138(1):34-43.

11. Douglas CM, Barnard R, Holder D, et al. Letermovir Resistance Analysis in a Clinical Trial of Cytomegalovirus Prophylaxis for Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplant Recipients. J Infect Dis. 2020;221(7):1117-1126.

Table 1. Patient characteristics

	N = 43
Median age (range)	50 (22-73)
Male: Female (*N*)	26:17
Median KPS (range)	90 (70-100)
Median HCT-CI (range)	2 (0-7)
DRI, *N* (%)	
• Low	• 5 (11.6)
• Intermediate	• 24 (55.8)
• High	• 11 (25.6)
• Very high	• 0 (0)
• N/A	• 3 (7)
Diagnosis, *N* (%)	
• AML	• 12 (27.9)
• ALL	• 11 (25.6)
• NHL, HL	• 9 (20.9)
• MDS, MPN, MDS/MPN	• 8 (18.6)
• AA	• 3 (7)
Intensity of conditioning regimen, *N* (%)	
• Myeloablative	• 7 (16.3)
• Reduced intensity	• 36 (83.7)
Type of conditioning regimen, *N* (%)	
• Flu/Mel/TBI	• 26
• Flu/Cy/TBI ± ATG	• 10
• Flu/Mel/TT	• 7
Stem cell source, *N* (%)	
• Peripheral blood	• 29 (67.4)
• Bone marrow	• 14 (32.6)
ABO compatibility, *N* (%)	
• Match	• 25 (58.1)
• Minor mismatch	• 6 (14)
• Major mismatch	• 11 (25.6)
• Bidirectional mismatch	• 1 (2.3)
CMV serology, *N* (%)	
• R+/D+	• 27(62.8)
• R+/D-	• 15 (34.9)
• R-/D+	• 1 (2.3)

Abbreviation AA: aplastic anemia, ALL: acute lymphoblastic leukemia, AML: acute myeloid leukemia, ATG: anti-thymocyte globulin, Cy: cyclophosphamide, D: donor, Flu: fludarabine, KPS: Karnofsky Performance Scale, DRI: disease risk index, HCT-CI: Hematopoietic Cell Transplantation-specific Comorbidity Index, HL: Hodgkin lymphoma, MDS: myelodysplastic syndromes, Mel: melphalan, MPN: myeloproliferative neoplasm, N/A: not applicable, NHL: non-Hodgkin lymphoma, R: recipient, TBI: total body irradiation, TT: thiotepa

Figure 1. * Cumulative incidence of clinically significance CMV infection (A) The cumulative incidence of clinically significant CMV infection at 1 year was 63.1% (95% CI: 46.1-76.1%). (B) The cumulative incidence of failure in secondary letermovir prophylaxis at 100 days was 29.4% (95% CI 13.1-48.0%).

Abbreviation: CI: confidence interval, CS-CMVi: clinically significant cytomegalovirus infection

Figure 2. *Mean of absolute lymphocyte subset count. CS-CMVi cohort was significantly associated with lower mean of absolute counts of $CD3^+$, $CD4^+$, $CD8^+$, and $CD19^+$ lymphocytes, but no significant difference was observed in CD56+ lymphocytes. (A) Mean of absolute $CD3^+$ count (B) Mean of absolute $CD4^+$ count (C) Mean of absolute $CD8^+$ count (D) Mean of absolute $CD19^+$ count (E) Mean of absolute $CD56^+$ count

Abbreviation: CS-CMVi: clinically significant cytomegalovirus infection


A
CS-CMVi
Cumulative Incidence
0
.2
.4
.6
.8
1
0
100
200
300
400
Days after transplant


B
CS-CMVi
Cumulative Incidence
0
.2
.4
.6
.8
1
0
20
40
60
80
100
Days after secondary letermovir prophylaxis


A
Mean CD3+
0
200
400
600
800
0
100
200
300
400
Day after transplant
P=0.03
No CS-CMVi
CS-CMVi


B
Mean CD4+
50
100
150
200
250
0
100
200
300
400
Day after transplant
P=0.02
No CS-CMVi
CS-CMVi


C
Mean CD8+
0
100
200
300
400
500
0
100
200
300
400
Day after transplant
P=0.02
No CS-CMVi
CS-CMVi


D
Mean CD19+
0
50
100
150
0
100
200
300
400
Day after transplant
P=0.04
No CS-CMVi
CS-CMVi


E
Mean CD56+
100
150
200
250
300
0
100
200
300
400
Day after transplant
P=0.54
No CS-CMVi
CS-CMVi

Supplementary Figure 1: Cumulative incidence of letermovir discontinuation



<u>Supplementary Figure 2.</u> (2A) Non-relapse mortality, (2B) Relapse, (2C) Progression-free survival, (2D) Overall survival, (2E) Acute GVHD, (2F) Chronic GVHD

Abbreviation: CI: confidence interval, CS-CMVi: clinically significant cytomegalovirus infection, GVHD: graft-versus-host disease, HR hazard ratio, SHR subdistribution hazard ratio



(2A)



(2B)



(2C)



(2D)



(2E)



(2F)