

# Identification of risk of malaria and selective post-transplant testing of deceased organ donors in the UK

**Ines Ushiro-Lumb**<sup>1</sup>, Christie Geoghegan<sup>1</sup>, Marita Smit<sup>1</sup>, Ruwanika Kothalawala<sup>1</sup>, Victoria Maddox<sup>1</sup>, Mhairi Webster<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>NHS Blood and Transplant, London, United Kingdom

The authors have no financial disclosures to make as regards to the work presented

# Background & Aim

- In the UK, serological screening for HIV, HBV, HCV, HTLV, CMV, EBV, syphilis and toxoplasma infection is applied to all potential organ donors, pre-donation
- Demographics and epidemiological information is gathered to inform the risk of geographically restricted, asymptomatic infections such as malaria
- When risks are identified, according to set criteria, post donation screening is performed
- Transmission of donor-derived malaria through organ transplantation has been well described and it can hold high morbidity and mortality, mainly due to late recognition
- It is an uncommon event in non-endemic countries, but recipient harm can be mitigated through awareness, early diagnosis and appropriate treatment

## AIM of this work:

- Inform the basis for post-transplant selective testing of deceased donors, and raise awareness of existing processes, criteria for testing and relevance to the safety of organ donation and transplantation
- Summarise results obtained since introduction of discretionary post-donation malaria testing for deceased organ donors in the UK

# Methods

Summarised in table 1:

- Criteria applied for selective donor screening for asymptomatic infection
- Screening is done by Captia™ Total Malaria Antibody, followed by a validated confirmatory algorithm if sero-reactivity detected
- Two qualitative PCR assays are performed, one to detect *P. falciparum* and one combined assay to detect *P. ovale*, *P. vivax*, *P. malariae* and *P. knowlesi* DNA
- Pathway of communication of results to transplant centres

Table 1: Screening for asymptomatic malaria infection in deceased organ donors, UK

| Identification of donor risk, testing and recipient management advice |   |
|---|---|
| Risk exposure to Plasmodium spp                                       | Residency in endemic areas at any point<br>Travel to endemic areas in the last 12 months<br>History of past malaria infection at any point    |
| Action  | Whole blood sample submitted to a centralised laboratory  |
|   | Screening for malaria antibodies and confirmation of sero-reactive samples post-donation  |
|   | Testing for Plasmodium DNA by Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR)   |
| Antibody positive/PCR negative  | Transplant centres advised to include malaria in the diagnostic differential of any compatible illness in the 4-6 months post-transplantation |
| Antibody positive/ PCR positive                                       | Species- specific PCR performed   |
|   | Assessment for treatment according to current guidelines, under specialist advice   |



# Results

Table 2: Selective screening of deceased organ donors for risk of Plasmodium spp transmission (UK, July 2014 - 2023)

| YEAR             | DONORS CHARACTERISED (n) | MALARIA RISK IDENTIFIED |            |                   |             |                           |                  |  |
|------------------|--------------------------|-------------------------|------------|-------------------|-------------|---------------------------|------------------|--|
|                  |                          | DONORS TESTED           |            | MALARIA RESULTS   |             |                           |                  | ★Residency★ risk in malaria antibody positive donors (%) |
|                  |                          | Numbers                 | %          | ANTIBODY POSITIVE |             |                           | DNA POSITIVE     |  |
|                  |                          |                         |            | Number of donors  | % of tested | % of donors characterised | Number of donors |  |
| (July- Dec) 2014 | 980                      | 28                      | 2.86       | 5                 | 17.86       | 0.51                      | 0                | 100%   |
| 2015             | 1956                     | 104                     | 5.32       | 8                 | 7.69        | 0.41                      | 0                | 100%   |
| 2016             | 2055                     | 98                      | 4.77       | 8                 | 8.16        | 0.39                      | 0                | 75%  |
| 2017             | 2163                     | 125                     | 5.78       | 12                | 9.60        | 0.55                      | 0                | 75%  |
| 2018             | 2296                     | 131                     | 5.71       | 11                | 8.40        | 0.48                      | 0                | 73%  |
| 2019             | 2374                     | 171                     | 7.20       | 18                | 10.53       | 0.76                      | 0                | 94%  |
| 2020             | 1772                     | 86                      | 4.85       | 14                | 16.28       | 0.79                      | 0                | 86%  |
| 2021             | 1861                     | 113                     | 6.07       | 16                | 14.16       | 0.86                      | 0                | 81%  |
| 2022             | 1860                     | 140                     | 7.53       | 16                | 11.43       | 0.86                      | 0                | 100%   |
| 2023             | 2008                     | 178                     | 8.86       | 10                | 5.62        | 0.50                      | 0                | 100%   |
| <b>TOTAL</b>     | <b>19325</b>             | <b>1174</b>             | <b>6.1</b> | <b>118</b>        | <b>10.1</b> | <b>0.6</b>                | <b>0</b>         | <b>70%</b>   |

Potential risk identified in 6.1% of donors

10% of donors tested have detectable antibodies

No parasitaemia detected

# Discussion & Conclusion

- In the UK, as a non-endemic area for many geographically restricted infections of relevance, post-transplant testing offers the possibility of harm avoidance through selective recipient monitoring and treatment, without compromising organ acceptance
- Selective testing of donors for malaria is aimed at identification of asymptomatic parasitaemia, allowing appropriate monitoring and interventions for recipients
- History of residency in endemic areas is the best indicator of risk of malaria seropositivity
- The combined use of serology and NAT aim to address:
  - The possibility of semi-immunity to malaria with low levels of parasitaemia
  - Lack of sensitivity of antibody screening assays in early infection or infections by non-falciparum Plasmodium species
- To date, no cases of malaria transmission via solid organ transplantation have been described in the UK
- This strategy is monitored and given the current epidemiology, it is effective; if changes in epidemiology occur, the strategy may need modification to maintain donation safety