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**Background.** Diarrhea is common among hematopoietic stem cell transplant (HSCT) recipients, but the etiology is rarely identified. Multiplexed PCR may increase the detection of diarrheal pathogens, but its role has not been evaluated in this population.

**Methods.** In June 2016, the FilmArray Gastrointestinal panel (GI PCR) was implemented at NewYork-Presbyterian Hospital/Western Cornell Medical Center to diagnose infectious diarrhea, replacing stool culture and other conventional methods. We reviewed all adult patients who received a HSCT at our center from June 2014–May 2015 (pre-GI PCR) and June 2016–March 2017 (post-GI PCR). *Clostridium difficile* infection was diagnosed by PCR for toxin B gene in both cohorts. Patients were followed for 1 year post-transplant. We compared the percentage of patients with an identified diarrheal pathogen, yield of testing per diarrheal episode, and number and cost of stool tests between cohorts.

**Results.** We identified 163 HSCT recipients in the pre-GI PCR cohort and 146 in the post-GI PCR cohort. Patients had a median of two diarrheal episodes during 1-year follow-up in both cohorts. The proportion of patients with at least one identified infectious etiology of diarrhea increased from 21.5% to 34.3% after initiating prophylaxis compared with prophylaxis. In the late post-transplant period, administering protracted CMV replication as suggested by the low frequency of CMV disease in this group compared with prophylaxis. In the late post-transplant period, administering intermittent anti-virals with a rejection diagnosis may be necessary to prevent CMV disease associated with late rejection episodes.
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**Background.** Optimal CMV prevention strategies for pediatric solid-organ transplant (SOT) patients have not been clearly defined for early and late post-transplant periods.

**Methods.** We analyzed CMV prevention strategies in liver, kidney, heart, lung and intestinal SOT patients from 2005 to 2015 in our institution. A hybrid strategy was defined as prophylaxis for ≤6 months post-transplant and then transition to a pre-emptive strategy.

**Results.** Of 833 patients, 769 were prophylaxis and 62 were hybrid strategies. Compared with prophylaxis, hybrid patients were more likely to have a D-/R—CMV serology status, be ≤1 year old and have a heart transplant (P < 0.001). We found no significant differences in CMV disease frequency, rejection or mortality between hybrid and prophylaxis groups. In total, we found 13 cases of CMV disease, of which 1 was a hybrid and the rest a prophylaxis strategy. The median time to CMV disease was 1.5 years post-transplant. We found no alloergic rejection (n = 9) in patients with CMV disease compared with patients with CMV infection or no infection. For the same comparisons, no significant difference was found for age or type of organ transplant. Late rejection was frequent (n = 8/13, 62%) in patients with CMV disease and the majority were not started on empiric anti-virals with the rejection episode. In contrast, no CMV disease was found in patients who had late rejection and received empiric anti-viral with the rejection episode, even though these patients had increasing CMV DNAemia (P = 0.04).

**Conclusion.** In the early post-transplant period, a hybrid CMV prevention strategy is effective with similar clinical outcomes compared with a prophylaxis strategy, even in younger CMV naive patients and relatively more immune suppressed heart transplant patients. A hybrid strategy may provide effective long-term control of intermittent CMV replication as suggested by the low frequency of CMV disease in this group compared with prophylaxis. In the late post-transplant period, administering prophylactic anti-virals with a rejection diagnosis may be necessary to prevent CMV disease associated with late rejection episodes.
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**Background.** Levofloxacin given at a standard dose of 500 mg daily is recommended for prophylactic antipseudomonal chemotherapy in patients receiving myeloablative chemotheraphy. Obese patients have been shown to exhibit enhanced clearance of levofloxacin and may be at risk for prophylactic failure.

**Methods.** This was a single-center, retrospective cohort study evaluating the infectious outcomes of obese (BMI ≥ 30 kg/m²) and non-obese (BMI ≤ 30 kg/m²) adult patients who received standard dose levofloxacin as primary prophylaxis after chemotheraphy. Patients were included if they were treated at our institution from June 1, 2014 through May 31, 2017 and had National Comprehensive Cancer Network (NCCN) defined intermediate infection risk at diagnosis. Patients were excluded if they were lost to follow-up, treated at another institution for febrile neutropenia (FN), or had renal impairment (estimated creatinine clearance (CrCl) < 50 mL/minute). The primary endpoint was incidence of FN as defined by NCCN guidelines. Secondary endpoints included 30-day mortality and the correlation between estimated levofloxacin AUC and rates of FN. Levofloxacin AUC was estimated from CrCl using the method of Pai et al.

**Results.** A total of 98 patients met the inclusion criteria (34 obese and 64 non-obese). Estimated CrCl was similar between obese and non-obese patients (mean 84.7 vs. 82.3 kg/m², P = 0.61), as was estimated maximum drug concentration (mean 115.1 mg/hour/L vs. 107.8 mg/hour/L, P = 0.25). FN occurred in 26 patients: 12 (35.3%) obese and 14 (21.9%) non-obese (P = 0.16). Bivariate comparisons between patients who did and did not experience FN found no significant associations with the weight related variables total body weight (mean 84.7 vs. 82.3 kg, P = 0.56), BMI (mean 28.8 vs. 28.0 kg/m², P = 0.51), or body surface area (1.99 vs. 1.96 m², P = 0.62). Multivariate analysis identified presence of mucositis and diagnosis of multiple myeloma as variables independently associated with FN. No patients died within 30 days of the FN event.

**Conclusion.** There were no significant associations between body weight-related variables and FN in this cohort of patients with similar renal function. Obesity should not be a justification for more aggressive levofloxacin dosing schemes when used for FN prophylaxis.
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**Background.** Trimethoprim/sulfamethoxazole (TMP/SMX) is the agent of choice for *Pneumocystis jirovecii* Pneumonia (PJP) prophylaxis in renal transplant (RT) recipients. All other prophylactic agents are considered second-line due to efficacy, drug intolerances, cost, administration requirements, and lack of coverage of *Toxoplasma*. Anecdotally, alternative agents are commonly used at our institution due to clinician inferred or perceived risk of drug reactions (ADR). Our objective was to assess the safety of TMP/SMX prophylaxis in RT recipients.

**Methods.** RT recipients transplanted at a tertiary US medical center between May 9, 2015 and November 30, 2017 were retrospectively identified. Patient charts were reviewed for antimicrobial agents used for PJP prophylaxis and ADRs due to TMP/SMX. ADRs were classified using the National Institutes of Health, Division of Microbiology and Infectious Diseases (DMID) criteria and were scored for probability of association with TMP/SMX using the NCCN guidelines. Secondary endpoints included 30-day mortality and the correlation between estimated levofloxacin AUC and rates of FN. TMP/SMX prophylaxis.

**Results.** During the study period, 64 of 95 adult RT recipients (67.4%) received TMP/SMX for PJP prophylaxis. Of the patients who received TMP/SMX, 26 (46.0%) had a clinician-documented ADR attributed to TMP/SMX and 24 (37.5%) had the drug discontinued. The most frequent provider-reported ADRs due to TMP/SMX were hyperkalemia (10 patients, 15.6%), neutropenia (nine patients, 14.1%), and elevated liver function tests (LFTs) (three patients, 4.7%). However, when classified using DMID criteria, nine of the 26 ADRs were less severe than Grade 1. Two ADRs were Grade 3 (severe), including 1 case each of neutropenia and elevated LFTs. No ADRs were Grade 4 (life-threatening). All ADRs received a score ≤4 on the Naranjo ADR probability scale, indicating a possible ADR related to TMP/SMX. Often, ADRs did not resolve or other additional medication adjustments were needed following TMP/SMX discontinuation (19 of 26 patients, 73.1%). No cases of PJP occurred.

**Conclusion.** TMP/SMX is underutilized in RT recipients at our institution, despite being well-tolerated and efficacious. Clinician hesitancy with TMP/SMX in this population may be unfounded. Internal efforts are underway to increase the use of TMP/SMX in RT recipients.
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