





# Prevention of Fungal Infections: What is the Evidence for Antifungals?

#### SHAHID HUSAIN, MD, MS

Associate Professor of Medicine Director, Transplant Infectious Diseases University Health Network, University of Toronto

# **General Principles for Prophylaxis**

- Risk of infection
- Potential severity of the consequences of disease
- Effectiveness of prophylaxis
- Consequences of prophylaxis for that individual patient

# EPIDEMIOLOGY Risk of Fungal Infection

# Cumulative Incidence of IFI in SOT



#### Pappas P Clin Infect Dis. 2010 Apr 15;50(8):1101-11

# 1-Year Cumulative Incidence of IFI, Candida and Aspergillus Infection

---IFI ----Candida ----Aspergillus



Pappas et al. CID 2010;50

# **Invasive Mucoralis in SOT**



Park BJ EID 2011;17(10):1855-64

# Recent Data on Distribution of IFI in Solid Organ Transplantation



#### Neofytos D Transplant Infect Dis 2010;12(3):220-229

# Timing of IFI



Pappas P Clin Infect Dis 2010;50

# **Endemic Mycoses in SOT**

| Fungus             | Reported Rate | Time to Onset |
|--------------------|---------------|---------------|
| Coccidioidomycosis | 1.4-6.9%      | 3-12 mths     |
| Histoplasmosis     | 0.23-0.5%     | 12-18 mths    |

# RISK FACTORS Risk of Fungal Infection

### **Risk Factors for IFI Common to All SOT**

- Technical/Anatomical Abnormalities
  - Skill in operative/perioperative management
  - Vascular access devices
  - Drainage catheters/endotracheal tubes
- Intensity of Environmental Exposures
  - Community
  - Nosocomial
- Net State of Immunosuppression
  - CMV and other herpes viruses
  - Treatment of rejection with steroid or monoclonal antibodies
  - Renal failure

# Lower Risk (<4%) with 1 Risk Factor

- Choledochojejunostomy anastomosis
- Retransplantation
- Intra-operative administration of ≥40 units of cellular blood products
- Preoperative serum creatinine ≥2.0 mg/dL or need for any form of dialysis within 48 h prior to OLT
- Candida spp. isolated from surveillance culture between 48 h before until 48 h after OLT
- Return to the operating room within 5 d of OLT for laparotomy
- Primary graft nonfunction

# Unique Factors Contributing to the Risk of Infection in Lung Transplantation

Continuous contact with pathogens Higher state of immunosuppression Airways colonization Pulmonary stent The native lung Hypogammaglobulinemia **CARV** Infection

Denervation

Impaired cough reflex

Ischemic reperfusion injury

Decrease mucociliary clearance

# Colonization



1. Helmi M. Chest 2003;123(3):800-8; 2. Nunley 2001 Chest 1998;114(5):1321-9

### Unique Risk Factors: Kidney Pancreas

- 445 consecutive pancreas transplantation
  - SPK 200, pancreas 138, PAK 107
- Risk factors
  - Enteric drained
  - SPK & PAK
  - Donors age >50 years
- Other
- Reperfusion pancreatitis
- Graft thrombosis

# MORTALITY Severity of Fungal Disease

# Mortality Associated with IFI in SOT



Neofytos D. Transplant Infect Dis 2010;12(3):220-229

# Mortality with Invasive Aspergillosis



# Mortality Associated with Candidiasis in Solid Organ Transplantation



Neofytos D. Transplant Infect Dis 2010;12(3):220-229

# Effectiveness of Antifungal Prophylaxis

# Meta-Analyses of Antifungal Prophylaxis in LTR

| Outcomes               | Cruciani RR<br>(95%CI) N=698 | Playford EJ RR<br>(95%Cl) N=1052 |
|------------------------|------------------------------|----------------------------------|
| Total Fungal Infection | 0.31 (0.21-0.46)             | 0.44 (0.28-0.69)                 |
| Invasive Infection     | 0.33 (0.18-0.59)             | 0.39 (0.18-0.85)                 |
| Superficial Infection  | 0.27 (0.16-0.45)             | 0.25 (0.13-0.51)                 |
| Empiric Treatment      | 0.80 (0.39-1.67)             | 0.95 (0.49-1.83)                 |
| Adverse events         | 1.38 (1.04-1.83)             | 1.2 (0.68-2.12)                  |
| Fungal colonization    | -                            | 0.51 (0.41-0.62)                 |
| Resistant Fungal col.  | -                            | 1.57 (0.76-3.24)                 |
| Mortality              | 1.06 (0.69-1.64)             | 0.84 (0.54-1.30)                 |

1. Cruciani M, et al. Liver Transpl 2006;12:850-8; 2. Playford EG, et al. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis 2006;25:549-61

| or sub-category       n/N       n/N         01 Fluconazole       7         Tortorano 1995       0/38       2/37         Meyers 1997       6/23       2/24         Lumbreras 1996       10/76       9/67         Winston 1999       12/108       15/104         Subtotal (95% Cl)       245       232         Total events: 28 (Antifungal), 28 (Control)       Test for heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 3.85, df = 3 (P = 0.28), P = 22.2%       Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.07$ (P = 0.94)         02 Itraconazole       Sharpe 2003       1/25       6/37         Sharpe 2003       1/25       6/37         Diancofiore 2002       5/85       3/44         Subtotal (95% Cl)       110       81         Total events: 6 (Antifungal), 9 (Control)       Test for heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1.02, df = 1 (P = 0.31), P = 1.5%         Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.92$ (P = 0.36)       03 Liposomal amphotericin B         Tollemar 1995       3/43       5/41 | 95% Cl<br>95% Cl<br>0.19 [0.01,<br>3.13 [0.70,<br>0.98 [0.42,<br>0.77 [0.38,<br>0.98 [0.53,<br>0.98 [0.53,<br>0.86 [0.22,<br>0.58 [0.18,<br>0.58 [0.18,<br>0, | 3.93]<br>13.95]<br>2.27]<br>1.57]<br>1.82]<br>1.93]<br>3.44]<br>1.85] |
|---|--|---|
| D1 Fluconazole         Tortorano 1995       0/38       2/37         Meyers 1997       6/23       2/24         Lumbreras 1996       10/76       9/67         Winston 1999       12/108       15/104         Subtotal (95% Cl)       245       232         Total events: 28 (Antifungal), 28 (Control)       Test for heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 3.85, df = 3 (P = 0.28), l <sup>2</sup> = 22.2%       Test for overall effect: Z = 0.07 (P = 0.94)         02 Itraconazole       Sharpe 2003       1/25       6/37         Sharpe 2003       1/25       3/44         Subtotal (95% Cl)       110       81         Total events: 6 (Antifungal), 9 (Control)       Test for heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1.02, df = 1 (P = 0.31), l <sup>2</sup> = 1.5%       Test for overall effect: Z = 0.92 (P = 0.36)         03 Liposomal amphotericin B       3/43       5/41  | 0.19 [0.01,<br>3.13 [0.70,<br>0.98 [0.42,<br>0.77 [0.38,<br>0.98 [0.53,<br>0.98 [0.53,<br>0.86 [0.22,<br>0.58 [0.18,   | 3.93]<br>13.95]<br>2.27]<br>1.57]<br>1.82]<br>1.93]<br>3.44]<br>1.85] |
| Tortorano 1995 $0/38$ $2/37$ Meyers 1997 $6/23$ $2/24$ Lumbreras 1996 $10/76$ $9/67$ Winston 1999 $12/108$ $15/104$ Subtotal (95% Cl) $245$ $232$ Total events: 28 (Antifungal), 28 (Control)       Test for heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = $3.85$ , df = $3$ (P = $0.28$ ), l <sup>2</sup> = $22.2\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.07$ (P = $0.94$ )         02 thraconazole       Sharpe 2003 $1/25$ $6/37$ Sharpe 2003 $1/25$ $6/37$ Biancofiore 2002 $5/85$ $3/44$ Subtotal (95% Cl) $110$ $81$ Total events: 6 (Antifungal), 9 (Control)       Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.92$ (P = $0.36$ ) $743$ 03 Liposomal amphotericin B $7/43$ $5/41$ $-7$  | 0.19 [0.01,<br>3.13 [0.70,<br>0.98 [0.42,<br>0.77 [0.38,<br>0.98 [0.53,<br>0.98 [0.53,<br>0.86 [0.22,<br>0.58 [0.18,   | 3.93]<br>13.95]<br>2.27]<br>1.57]<br>1.82]<br>1.93]<br>3.44]<br>1.85] |
| Meyers 1997 $6/23$ $2/24$ Lumbreras 1996 $10/76$ $9/67$ Winston 1999 $12/108$ $15/104$ Subtotal (95% Cl) $245$ $232$ Total events: 28 (Antifungal), 28 (Control)       Test for heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = $3.85$ , df = $3$ (P = $0.28$ ), l <sup>2</sup> = $22.2\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.07$ (P = $0.94$ )         02 Itraconazole       Sharpe 2003 $1/25$ $6/37$ Subtotal (95% Cl) $110$ $81$ Total events: 6 (Antifungal), 9 (Control)       Test for heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = $1.02$ , df = $1$ (P = $0.31$ ), l <sup>2</sup> = $1.5\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.92$ (P = $0.36$ )         03 Liposomal amphotericin B       Tollemar 1995 $3/43$ $5/41$  | 3.13 (0.70,<br>0.98 (0.42,<br>0.77 (0.38,<br>0.98 (0.53,<br>0.98 (0.53,<br>0.86 (0.22,<br>0.58 (0.18,  | 13.95]<br>2.27]<br>1.57]<br>1.82]<br>1.93]<br>3.44]<br>1.85]          |
| Lumbreras 1996 $10/76$ $9/67$ Winston 1999 $12/108$ $15/104$ Subtotal (95% Cl) $245$ $232$ Total events: 28 (Antifungal), 28 (Control)       Test for heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = $3.85$ , df = $3 (P = 0.28)$ , l <sup>2</sup> = $22.2\%$ Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.07 (P = 0.94)$ 02 thraconazole       Sharpe 2003 $1/25$ $6/37$ Sharpe 2003 $1/25$ $6/37$ Biancofiore 2002 $5/85$ $3/44$ Subtotal (95% Cl) $110$ $81$ Total events: 6 (Antifungal), 9 (Control)       Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.92 (P = 0.36)$ $743$ 03 Liposomal amphotericin B $7/43$ $5/41$ $-7$   | 0.98 [0.42,<br>0.77 [0.38,<br>0.98 [0.53,<br>0.98 [0.53,<br>0.86 [0.22,<br>0.58 [0.18,   | 2.27]<br>1.57]<br>1.82]<br>1.93]<br>3.44]<br>1.85]                    |
| Winston 1999       12/108       15/104         Subtotal (95% Cl)       245       232         Total events: 28 (Antifungal), 28 (Control)       Test for heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 3.85, df = 3 (P = 0.28), I <sup>2</sup> = 22.2%       Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.07$ (P = 0.94)         D2 traconazole       Sharpe 2003       1/25       6/37         Sharpe 2003       1/25       3/44         Subtotal (95% Cl)       110       81         Total events: 6 (Antifungal), 9 (Control)       Total events: 6 (Antifungal), 9 (Control)       Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.92$ (P = 0.36)         D3 Liposomal amphotericin B       3/43       5/41       -   | 0.77 [0.38,<br>0.98 [0.53,<br>0.98 [0.53,<br>0.86 [0.22,<br>0.58 [0.18,  | 1.57]<br>1.82]<br>1.93]<br>3.44]<br>1.85]                             |
| Subtotal (95% CI) 245 232<br>Total events: 28 (Antifungal), 28 (Control)<br>Test for heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 3.85, df = 3 (P = 0.28), I <sup>2</sup> = 22.2%<br>Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.07$ (P = 0.94)<br>22 traconazole<br>Sharpe 2003 1/25 6/37<br>Biancofiore 2002 5/85 3/44<br>Subtotal (95% CI) 110 81<br>Total events: 6 (Antifungal), 9 (Control)<br>Test for heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1.02, df = 1 (P = 0.31), I <sup>2</sup> = 1.5%<br>Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.92$ (P = 0.36)<br>23 Liposomal amphotericin B<br>Tollemar 1995 3/43 5/41   | 0.98 [0.53, 1<br>0.25 [0.03, 1<br>0.86 [0.22, 1<br>0.58 [0.18, 1   | 1.82]<br>1.93]<br>3.44]<br>1.85]                                      |
| Total events: 28 (Antifungal), 28 (Control)<br>Test for heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 3.85, df = 3 (P = 0.28), I <sup>2</sup> = 22.2%<br>Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.07$ (P = 0.94)<br>12 traconazole<br>Sharpe 2003 1/25 6/37<br>Biancofiore 2002 5/85 3/44<br>Subtotal (95% Cl) 110 81<br>Total events: 6 (Antifungal), 9 (Control)<br>Test for heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1.02, df = 1 (P = 0.31), I <sup>2</sup> = 1.5%<br>Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.92$ (P = 0.36)<br>13 Liposomal amphotericin B<br>Tollemar 1995 3/43 5/41  | 0.25 [0.03,<br>0.86 [0.22,<br>0.58 [0.18,  | 1.93]<br>3.44]<br>1.85]   |
| Test for heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 3.85$ , $df = 3$ (P = 0.28), $P = 22.2\%$<br>Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.07$ (P = 0.94)<br>2)2 traconazole<br>Sharpe 2003 1/25 6/37<br>Biancofiore 2002 5/85 3/44<br>Subtotal (95% Cl) 110 81<br>Total events: 6 (Antifungal), 9 (Control)<br>Test for heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 1.02$ , $df = 1$ (P = 0.31), $P = 1.5\%$<br>Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.92$ (P = 0.36)<br>13 Liposomal amphotericin B<br>Tollemar 1995 3/43 5/41  | 0.25 [0.03, 1<br>0.86 [0.22, 1<br>0.58 [0.18, 1  | 1.93]<br>3.44]<br>1.85]   |
| Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.07$ (P = 0.94)<br>22 traconazole<br>Sharpe 2003 1/25 6/37<br>Biancofiore 2002 5/85 3/44<br>Subtotal (95% Cl) 110 81<br>Total events: 6 (Antifungal), 9 (Control)<br>Test for heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1.02, df = 1 (P = 0.31), l <sup>2</sup> = 1.5%<br>Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.92$ (P = 0.36)<br>13 Liposomal amphotericin B<br>Tollemar 1995 3/43 5/41   | 0.25 [0.03, 1<br>0.86 [0.22, 1<br>0.58 [0.18, 1  | 1.93]<br>3.44]<br>1.85]   |
| D2 traconazole         Sharpe 2003 $1/25$ $6/37$ Biancofiore 2002 $5/85$ $3/44$ Subtotal (95% Cl)       110       81         Total events: 6 (Antifungal), 9 (Control)       10       81         Fest for heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1.02, df = 1 (P = 0.31), I <sup>2</sup> = 1.5%       1.5%         Test for overall effect: Z = 0.92 (P = 0.36)       3/43       5/41  | 0.25 [0.03, 1<br>0.86 [0.22, 1<br>0.58 [0.18, 1  | 1.93]<br>3.44]<br>1.85]   |
| Sharpe 2003       1/25       6/37         Biancofiore 2002       5/85       3/44         Subtotal (95% Cl)       110       81         Total events: 6 (Antifungal), 9 (Control)       81       81         Test for heterogeneity: Chi² = 1.02, df = 1 (P = 0.31), l² = 1.5%       76         Test for overall effect: Z = 0.92 (P = 0.36)       81         03 Liposomal amphotericin B       3/43         Tollemar 1995       3/43  | 0.25 [0.03, 1<br>0.86 [0.22, 1<br>0.58 [0.18, 1  | 1.93]<br>3.44]<br>1.85]   |
| Biancofiore 2002         5/85         3/44           Subtotal (95% Cl)         110         81           Total events: 6 (Antifungal), 9 (Control)         81         81           Test for heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1.02, df = 1 (P = 0.31), l <sup>2</sup> = 1.5%         7           Test for overall effect: Z = 0.92 (P = 0.36)         5/41           31 Liposomal amphotericin B         5/41  | 0.86 [0.22, 30.58 [0.18, 30.58 [  | 3.44]   |
| Subtotal (95% CI) 110 81<br>Total events: 6 (Antifungal), 9 (Control)<br>Test for heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1.02, df = 1 (P = 0.31), l <sup>2</sup> = 1.5%<br>Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.92$ (P = 0.36)<br>D3 Liposomal amphotericin B<br>Tollemar 1995 3/43 5/41 -  | 0.58 (0.18, 1  | 1.85]   |
| Total events: 6 (Antifungal), 9 (Control)<br>Test for heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 1.02, df = 1 (P = 0.31), I <sup>2</sup> = 1.5%<br>Test for overall effect: $Z = 0.92$ (P = 0.36)<br>D3 Liposomal amphotericin B<br>Tollemar 1995 3/43 5/41  |  |   |
| Test for heterogeneity: $Chi^2 = 1.02$ , $df = 1$ (P = 0.31), $I^2 = 1.5\%$<br>Test for overall effect: Z = 0.92 (P = 0.36)<br>D3 Liposomal amphatericin B<br>Tollemar 1995 3/43 5/41 -   |  |   |
| Test for overall effect: Z = 0.92 (P = 0.36)<br>03 Liposomal amphotericin B<br>Tollemar 1995 3/43 5/41 -  |  |   |
| 03 Liposomal amphotericin B<br>Tollemar 1995 3/43 5/41 -  |  |   |
| Tollemar 1995 3/43 5/41 -   |  |   |
| 0/10  | 0.57 [0.15, 3  | 2.241   |
| Subtotal (95% Cl) 43 41 -   | 0.57 [0.15, 3  | 2.24]   |
| Total events: 3 (Antifungal), 5 (Control)   |  |   |
| fest for heterogeneity; not applicable  |  |   |
| lest for overall effect: Z = 0.80 (P = 0.42)  |  |   |
| Total (95% CI) 398 354  | 0.84 [0.54, ]  | 1.30]   |
| Total events: 37 (Antifungal), 42 (Control)   |  |   |
| rest for heterogeneity: Chi <sup>2</sup> = 5.76, df = 6 (P = 0.45), I <sup>2</sup> = 0%   |  |   |
| Test for overall effect: Z = 0.79 (P = 0.43)  |  |   |

Playford EG, et al. Eur J Clin Microbiol Infect Dis. 2006;25(9):549-61

# ABLC Prophylaxis in HR LTR

- In total, 251/615 patients (40.8%) experienced ≥1 episodes of any fungal infection during follow-up including 91 (14.8%) cases which were considered to be proven IFI
- Low-dose ABLC (Abelcet®, Cephalon, Maisons-Alfort, France) was administered prophylactically in patients meeting ≥1 of the following criteria:
  - Acute liver failure
  - End-stage cirrhosis treated in the ICU
  - Re-transplantation and early re-interventions
- ABLC was administered at a dose of 1 mg/kg/day for 1 week after which the dose was reduced to 2.5 mg/kg twice a week for the subsequent 2 weeks

# ABLC Prophylaxis in HR LTR

|  | ABLC prophylaxis<br>(n=146) | No ABLC prophylaxis<br>(n=469) | <i>P</i> value |
|--|-----------------------------|--------------------------------|----------------|
| Any Candida infection  | 43 (29.5%)                  | 193 (41.2%)                    | 0.011          |
| <i>Candida</i> colonization (lung, urine, gastro-<br>intestinal, excluding skin)       | 37 (25.3%)                  | 161 (34.3%)                    | 0.04           |
| Probable invasive Candida infection (> 2 sites)  | 15 (10.3%)                  | 110 (23.5%)                    | 0.0005         |
| Proven invasive Candida infection  | 10 (6.8%)                   | 47 (10%)                       | 0.25           |
| Candidemia   | 5 (3.4%)                    | 12 (2.6%)                      | 0.57           |
| Candiduria   | 8 (5.5%)                    | 51 (10.9%)                     | 0.053          |
| Abdominal Candida infection  |                             |                                |                |
| At any time point  | 10 (6.8%)                   | 54 (11.5%)                     | 0.11           |
| Probable or proven invasive <i>Candida</i> infection treated with systemic antifungals |                             |                                |                |
| At any time point  | 27 (18.5%)                  | 152 (32.4%)                    | 0.001          |
| Any Aspergillus infection  |                             |                                |                |
| Probable aspergillosis   | 6 (4.1%)                    | 15 (3.2%)                      | 0.60           |
| Proven aspergillosis   | 2 (1.4%)                    | 13 (2.8%)                      | 0.54           |

### Patient Outcomes in ABLC Prophylaxis



# Azole Prophylaxis in Low-Risk LTR



San Juan R. Transplantation 2011;92(3):346-50

# Characteristics of Low-Risk LTR According to Inclusion or Not in UPF

|  | UPF<br>(N=206) | No UPF<br>(N=593) | Р       |
|--|----------------|-------------------|---------|
| Induction immunosuppression including: n (%)                       |                |                   |         |
| Cyclosporine   | 35 (17)        | 211 (35.6)        | <0.0001 |
| Tacrolimus   | 165 (80.1)     | 294 (49.6)        | <0.0001 |
| Early surgical graft complications (stenosis or dehiscence): n (%) | 9 (4.4)        | 40 (6.7)          |         |
| At least one episode of early acute rejection: n (%)               | 36 (17.5)      | 115 (19.4)        |         |
| At least one episode of early bacterial infection: n (%)           | 47 (22.8)      | 125 (21.1)        |         |
| At least one episode of CMV disease in the first 6 mo: n (%)       | 18 (8.7)       | 61 (10.3)         |         |
| At least one episode of IFI in the first 30 d of transplant: n (%) | 4 (1.9)        | 6 (1)             |         |
| IFI due to fluconazole-resistant Candida                           | 2 (0.9)        | 0                 |         |
| Global early mortality: n (%)                                      | 1 (0.5)        | 15 (2.5)          |         |

# Echinocandins: Caspofungin

Prospective open label trial in 78 HR LT patients with follow-up for 100 days

| Outcome         | Frequency     |
|-----------------|---------------|
| IFI Incidence   | 2.8% (2/71)   |
| Dose Reduction  | 15.5% (11/71) |
| Discontinuation | 8.4% (6/71)   |

# Micafungin vs. ABLC for the Prevention of IFIs in High-Risk LTRs

- The efficacy and safety of targeted prophylaxis with micafungin or ABLC was assessed in a sequential cohort of high-risk patients and compared with those without high risk who did not receive prophylaxis. Outcomes were assessed at 90 days
- IFIs developed in 11.1% (2/18) of micafungin recipients, 8.3% (2/24) of ABLC recipients, and 3% (7/234) of patients without high risks (P=0.12)
- In nondialyzed patients, ABLC vs. micafungin recipients had significantly higher serum creatnine on day 14 (P=0.04)

# Targeted Antifungal Prophylaxis in Heart Transplant Recipients

- In a prospective cohort (2003-10), prophylaxis with an echinocandin was only administered to patients with risk factors (13/133) and duration was personalized, starting with the risk factor (reoperation CMV, MCD infection) and continued a median of 20 days after resolution
- Antifungal prophylaxis was prescribed only in 9.8% of recipients and was effective in all but one patient.
- Despite suffering an outbreak of IA in the ICU due to extremely high concentration of spores in the air (3 cases with no personal risk factors), there was a reduction in the incidence of IA (8.6% vs. 2.2%; P=0.01) and Aspergillusrelated mortality (5.75% vs. 1.5%; P=0.06)

### Overall Estimate of IA in Comparative Studies (Antifungals with No Prophylaxis)

|                                     | Antifur      | ngal    | Placebo/ No treat     | ment    |        | Risk Ratio              | Risk Ratio                                  |
|-------------------------------------|--------------|---------|-----------------------|---------|--------|-------------------------|---|
| Study or Subgroup                   | Events       | Total   | Events                | Total   | Weight | M-H, Random, 95% Cl Yea | r M-H, Random, 95% Cl                       |
| Reichenspurner 1997                 | 3            | 126     | 12                    | 101     | 36.9%  | 0.20 [0.06, 0.69] 199   | <i>i</i> — <b>•</b> /                       |
| Calvo 1999                          | 0            | 52      | 2                     | 13      | 21.9%  | 0.05 [0.00, 1.04] 1999  | )   |
| Tofte 2012                          | 16           | 57      | 14                    | 82      | 41.2%  | 1.64 [0.87, 3.10] 2012  | <u>2</u> +=- !                              |
| Total (95% CI)                      |              | 235     |                       | 196     | 100.0% | 0.36 [0.05, 2.62]       |   |
| Total events                        | 19           |         | 28                    |         |        |                         |   |
| Heterogeneity: Tau <sup>2</sup> = 2 | 2.41; Chi² = | = 13.28 | , df = 2 (P = 0.001); | ² = 85% | 6      |                         |   |
| Test for overall effect: Z          | . = 1.02 (P  | = 0.31  | )                     |         |        |                         | Favours Antifungal Favours Placebo/ no trea |

#### Bhaskaran A : In print Current Infectious Disease Reports

# Effect Sizes of Comparative Studies Using Various Antifungals for IA

|                     | interventior | arm   | control | arm   | Risk Ratio          |      | Risk Ratio  |
|---------------------|--------------|-------|---------|-------|---------------------|------|---|
| Study or Subgroup   | Events       | Total | Events  | Total | M-H, Random, 95% Cl | Year | M-H, Random, 95% Cl                               |
| Reichenspurner 1997 | 3            | 126   | 12      | 101   | 0.20 [0.06, 0.69]   | 1997 |   |
| Calvo 1999          | 0            | 52    | 2       | 13    | 0.05 [0.00, 1.04]   | 1999 | <b>← </b>   |
| Drew 2004           | 1            | 51    | 1       | 49    | 0.96 [0.06, 14.94]  | 2004 |   |
| Mattner 2005        | 2            | 65    | 5       | 54    | 0.33 [0.07, 1.65]   | 2005 |   |
| Husain 2006         | 1            | 65    | 7       | 30    | 0.07 [0.01, 0.51]   | 2006 | <b>←</b>  |
| Lowry 2007          | 0            | 11    | 1       | 18    | 0.53 [0.02, 11.93]  | 2007 |   |
| Cadena 2009         | 0            | 35    | 4       | 32    | 0.10 [0.01, 1.82]   | 2009 | <b>← ⊢ ⊢</b>                                      |
| Monforte 2010       | 3            | 104   | 4       | 49    | 0.35 [0.08, 1.52]   | 2012 |   |
| Koo 2012            | 2            | 83    | 8       | 82    | 0.25 [0.05, 1.13]   | 2012 |   |
| Tofte 2012          | 16           | 57    | 14      | 82    | 1.64 [0.87, 3.10]   | 2012 | +   |
|                     |              |       |         |       |                     |      | 0.01 0.1 1 10 100<br>Intervention arm control arm |

Bhaskaran A : In print Current Infectious Disease Reports

# Effect of Antifungal Prophylaxis on Colonization

 A single study by Tofte el al compared the incidence of Aspergillus colonization with universal voriconazole and no prophylaxis. They reported an incidence rate of 21% (12/57) in the voriconazole arm and 28% (23/82) in the control arm, p-value= 0.48.

The indirect comparison involving more than 637 patients, the incidence Aspergillus colonization employing universal prophylaxis with various anti-fungals and no prophylaxis did not yield significant results.

Bhaskaran A :submitted

Consequences of Antifungal Prophylaxis

# **AMPHO** the Terrible



# Adverse Events with Inh AMB Preparations

|                 | L-AMB<br>(n=118) | ABLC<br>(n=51) | AMB-D<br>(n=49) |
|-----------------|------------------|----------------|-----------------|
| Wheezing        | 4%               | 4.2%           | 6.4%            |
| Cough           | 10%              | 2.1%           | 10.6%           |
| SOB             | NR               | 2.1%           | 20%             |
| Nausea          | 7%               | 2.1%           | 8.5%            |
| Decline in FEV1 | None             | 11.1%          | 10.6%           |
| >1 AE           | NR               | 27.5%          | 42.9%           |
| Discontinuation | 2.5%             | 5.9%           | 12.2%           |

### Where in the Lung Did the Drugs Go?





Corcoran et al. Am J Transplant 2006;6:2765–2773

# Amphotericin Concentration in ELF & Serum

| Sample<br>collection<br>time after last<br>dose (hrs) | Number of subjects | ELF<br>conce120ntra<br>tion median<br>mcg/mL | 25-75 IQR | Plasma<br>concentratio<br>n median<br>mcg/mL | 25-75 IQR  | ELF/plasma<br>ratio |
|---|--------------------|--|-----------|--|------------|---------------------|
| 4   | 5                  | 7.20   | 1.3-17.6  | 0.08   | 0.06-0.11  | 90                  |
| 24  | 6                  | 8.26   | 3.9-82.7  | 0.05   | 0.03-0.06  | 165.2               |
| 48  | 5                  | 2.15   | 1.4-5.5   | 0.05   | 0.03-0.06  | 43                  |
| 72  | 4                  | 1.25   | 0.75-5.5  | 0.02   | 0.009-0.06 | 62.5                |
| 96  | 6                  | 0.80   | 0.55-1.4  | 0.01   | 0.009-0.02 | 80                  |
| 120   | 4                  | 1.04   | 0.44-1.6  | 0.005  | 0.004-0.01 | 208                 |
| 144   | 1                  | 4.25   | -         | 0.01   | -          | 425                 |
| 168   | 3                  | 1.14   | 0.01-1.9  | 0.005  | 0.002-0.02 | 228                 |
| 192   | 1                  | 0.25   | -         | 0.0019                                       | -          | 131.5               |

# Implication

Invasive candidiasis
11% (11/100) in inh ABLC study
4% (6/153) in inh Ambisome Study

### Voriconazole and Skin Cancer in LTR

| Study                 | Patients with skin cancer | Risk factors  | Hazard<br>ratio    |
|-----------------------|---------------------------|---|--------------------|
| Vadnerkar et al, 2010 | 17                        | Duration of voriconazole therapy<br>Residence in high sun exposure area | 2.1<br>3.8         |
| Singer et al, 2012    | 50                        | Exposure to voriconazole therapy  | 2.6                |
| Zwald et al, 2012     | 28                        | Duration of voriconazole therapy<br>Time since Tx<br>Pre-Tx skin cancer | NR                 |
| Feist et al, 2012     | 17                        | Duration of voriconazole therapy<br>Age<br>Pre-Tx skin cancer           | 1.8<br>2.8<br>11.0 |

# Hepatic Enzymopathy

| Author                | Definition   | Elevated LFTs<br>(%) | Discontinuation<br>(%) |
|-----------------------|--|----------------------|------------------------|
| Husain et al, 2006    | >3x increase AST,<br>ALT, ALK and Bili on<br>voriconazole  | 37                   | 14                     |
| Cadena et al,<br>2009 | <ul> <li>&gt;3x increase AST,<br/>ALK</li> <li>&gt;1.5x increase Bili in<br/>the absence of<br/>other etiologies and<br/>improvement with<br/>d/c of voriconazole</li> </ul> | 34                   | 34                     |
| Luong et al, 2012     | >3x increase AST,<br>ALT, ALK and Bili or<br>voriconazole  | 51                   | 34                     |

### Should We Continue Universal Voriconazole Prophylaxis & Extend Beyond 1 Year?



- Increased risk of side effects
  - Hepatic enzymopathy
  - Periostitis
- Development of resistant Aspergillus strains
- Selection of non-Aspergillus spp. (eg. zygomycetes)

Association with SCC?

### How to Better Risk Stratify LTRs for IA?



- Clinical risk stratification through cohort studies
- Measurement of immunity against Aspergillus
- Use of galactomannan assay or Aspergillus PCR to identify the patient at higher risk of IA



# Kaplan Meier Curve - Mortality



# What Are We Doing?

# Antifungal Prophylaxis in Liver Transplant

Survey of all liver transplants in North America

Response rate of 63% (67 centers)

Targeted prophylaxis 72% (43 centers)

Universal prophylaxis 28% (16 centers)

Singh N. Am J Transplant 2008;8(2):426-31

# Indication for Targeted Prophylaxis

| Clinical condition                            | Percentage |
|---|------------|
| Retransplantation                             | 78%        |
| Dialysis requirement                          | 72%        |
| Re-exploration                                | 61%        |
| Fulminant hepatic failure                     | 57%        |
| Colonization with Candida spp.                | 57%        |
| Prolonged ICU stay or ventilatory requirement | 48%        |
| High transfusion requirements                 | 39%        |
| Receipt of T-cell depleting antibodies        | 4%         |

# Choices of Antifungal Agents: Liver

Universal Targeted



Singh N. Am J Transplant 2008;8(2):426-31

# Duration of Antifungal Prophylaxis in Liver Transplant Recipients

Universal Targeted



Singh N. Am J Transplant 2008;8(2):426-31

# Antifungal Prophylaxis in LT



# Choices of Antifungal Agents: Lung

VRC Itra Inhaled Ampho



# Duration of Post Transplant Antifungal Prophylaxis



**Duration of prophylaxis** 

Dummer JS. J Heart Lung Transplant 2004;23(12):1376-81

# **Current Recommendations**

# General Rules for Antifungal Prophylaxis in SOT

- Targeted prophylaxis in high risk patients
  - Kidney
  - Pancreas
  - Liver
  - Heart
  - Lung
- Universal antifungal prophylaxis
  - Small Bowel

# Risk Factors for IA in Organ Transplant Recipients

#### Liver

- Retransplantation
- Renal failure, particularly requiring renal replacement therapy
- Transplantation for fulminant hepatic failure
- Reoperation

### Lung

- Single lung tx
- Early airway ischemia
- CMV infection
- Rejection and augmented immunosuppression
- Pre-tx Aspergillus colonization
- Post-tx Aspergillus colonization within a year of tx
- Acquired hypogammaglobulinemia (IgG < 400 mg/dL)</li>

# Risk Factors for IA in Organ Transplant Recipients

#### Heart

- Isolation of Aspergillus spp. in respiratory tract cultures
- Reoperation
- CMV disease
- Post-tx hemodialysis
- Existence of an episode of IA in the program 2 months before or after heart tx

### Kidney

- Graft failure require hemodialysis
- High and prolonged duration of corticosteroids

# Recommendations for Prophylaxis for IA in SOTR

| Organ      | Antifungal prophylaxis  | Duration  |
|------------|---|---|
| Liver II-2 | Lipid formulation of<br>amphotericin B (3-5 mg/kg/day)<br>OR an echinocandin  | Initial hospital stay or for 4 weeks posttransplant   |
| Lung       | Inhaled amphotericin B 6 mg/q8<br>or 25 mg/day<br>OR  | Preferably guided by interval<br>airway inspection, respiratory<br>surveillance fungal cultures, and<br>clinical risk factors   |
|            | Inhaled Albelcet 50 mg<br>OR<br>Inhaled Ambisome 25 mg<br>OR<br>Voriconazole 200 mg BID<br>OR<br>Intraconazole 200 mg BID | Once every 2 wks & then once<br>per week for at least 13 wks<br>Three times/week for 2 months,<br>followed by weekly<br>administration for 6 months and<br>twice per month afterwards<br>4 months or longer |
| Heart II-3 | Itraconazole 200 mg BID<br>OR<br>Voriconazole 200 mg BID  | 50-150 days   |

# Risk Factors for Candida Infection

| Organ       | Risk factors   |
|-------------|--|
| Liver       | Prolonged or repeat operation<br>Retransplantation<br>Renal failure<br>Choledocho-jejunostomy<br><i>Candida</i> colonization<br>High transfusion requirement |
| Small bowel | Graft rejection/dysfunction<br>Enhanced immunosuppression<br>Anastomotic dysruption<br>Abdominal reoperation<br>Multivisceral transplantation                |
| Pancreas    | Enteric drainage<br>Vascular thrombosis<br>Postperfusion pancreatitis  |

# Recommended Prophylaxis Strategies to Prevent Candida Infection in SOT

| Organ       | Antifungal prophylaxis                        | Duration  |
|-------------|---|---|
| Liver       | Fluconazole 400 mg/day<br>LFAmB 3-5 mg/kg/day | Up to 4 weeks or<br>Until resolution of risk<br>factors                         |
| Small bowel | Fluconazole 400 mg/day<br>LFAmB 3-5 mg/kg/day | At least 4 weeks<br>Until healing of<br>anastomosis and<br>absence of rejection |
| Pancreas    | Fluconazole 400 mg/day<br>LFAmB 3-5 mg/kg/day | At least 4 weeks  |

Silveira FP, Kusne S, AST Infectious Diseases Community of Practice. Am J Transplant 2013;13:220-7

# **Pancreas Transplantation**

| Risk factors                   | Antifungal agent  | Duration  |
|--------------------------------|---|---|
| Enteric drainage               |   | Duration of prophylaxis<br>will depend on reduction<br>of risk factor |
| Vascular thrombosis            | Fluconazole   |   |
| Post perfusion<br>pancreatitis | LFAmB is preferred in<br>centers with a high<br>prevalence of non-<br>albicans spp. |   |

# Coccidioidomycosis: Prophylaxis

- Targeted antifungal prophylaxis with fluconazole
  - Transplant recipients with a past or recent history of coccidioidomycosis or positive *Coccidioides* serologies prior to surgery
  - Active infection or positive serologies in the donor
- Lifelong antifungal prophylaxis is recommended for organ transplant recipients

# Histoplasmosis

 Patients who have recovered from active histoplasmosis infection, with or without treatment, during the 2 years prior to initiation of immunosuppression may be considered for itraconazole prophylaxis (200 mg daily), although the efficacy and appropriate duration of prophylaxis is unknown (lung tx)

# Antifungal Prophylaxis: Unanswered Questions

 Risk stratification especially with biomarkers and diagnostics methods to identify highest risk transplant recipients

### Optimal antifungal prophylaxis

- Universal vs. preemptive
- Choice of agents
- Duration of prophylaxis

 Life is an unanswered question, but lets still believe in the dignity and importance of the question

- Tennessee Williams



