別紙様式第2-1

# 医薬品 研究報告 調査報告書

| 識別番号・報告回数                    |           |                           |        | 報告日                 | 第一報入手日                     | 新田  | 医薬品等の区分 | 機構処理欄          |
|------------------------------|-----------|---------------------------|--------|---------------------|----------------------------|-----|---------|----------------|
|                              |           |                           |        | <b>報口口</b>          | 平成 16 年 10 月 5 日           |     | 該当なし    |                |
| 一般的名称                        |           | テクネチウム大凝集人血清アル            |        | 研究報告の               | MMWR                       | 公表国 |         |                |
|                              |           | フ゛ミン ( <sup>99m</sup> Tc) |        | 公表状況                | August20,2004/53(32);73    |     |         |                |
| 販売名(企業名)                     |           | テクネ MAA キット(第             |        |                     |                            |     | 米国      |                |
|                              |           | — RI)                     |        |                     |                            |     |         |                |
| 研                            | 2003年10月に | ジョージア州                    | の同じ群から | <b>らウエストナイルウイルス</b> | (以下、WNV) 確定症例が2例報告され、これらの患 |     |         | 使用上の注意記載状況・その他 |
| 究報                           | 者は同一日に同   | 参考事項等                     |        |                     |                            |     |         |                |
| 告の                           | 症例の間に同一   | 特になし                      |        |                     |                            |     |         |                |
| 概                            | 尚、疫学調査結   |                           |        |                     |                            |     |         |                |
| 要                            | 特定は出来なか   |                           |        |                     |                            |     |         |                |
|                              |           | 報告企業の                     | 意見     |                     | 今後の対応                      |     |         |                |
| WNV が血液透析を介して、伝播した可能性を示唆する症例 |           |                           |        |                     | 今後とも WNV の新感染経路や血漿分画製剤の曝露  |     |         | ·              |
| が報告された。本報告の感染源については特定されていない  |           |                           |        |                     | による WNV の新たな感染を示唆する情報について  |     |         |                |
| \$0                          | つの、血液透析に。 | t a WNV of                | 伝播の可能性 | を示唆する初              | は、注目していく必要があると考えますが、原材料    |     |         |                |
| めて                           | ての報告であるこ  | とから、これ                    | らの感染が重 | 大感染症の新              | を人血液(採血国:米国)とする薬剤について、現    |     |         |                |
| 感染経路に関する研究報告と判断し、感染症定期報告の対象  |           |                           |        |                     | 時点では特に対応を行う必要はないと判断しており    |     |         |                |
| <u></u> ۲                    | 判断する。しかし  | ながら、今回                    | の報告は、ヒ | ト血液を原材              | ます。                        |     |         |                |
| 料と                           | とした血漿分画製  | 剤には直接の                    | 関連はないこ | とから、とく              |                            |     |         |                |
| に持                           | 昔置等を行う必要  | はないと判断                    | する     |                     |                            |     |         |                |
|                              |           |                           |        |                     |                            |     |         |                |



Search





# Weekly

August 20, 2004 / 53(32);738-739

# Possible Dialysis-Related West Nile Virus Transmission --- Georgia, 2003

In October 2003, the Georgia Division of Public Health (DPH) was notified of two patients from the same county with confirmed West Nile virus (WNV) disease who had received hemodialysis on the same day and on the same dialysis machine. The two dialysis patients (patients A and C) had the only confirmed cases of human WNV disease reported in their county in 2003. Review of the dialysis center's records indicated that another patient (patient B) had received dialysis on the same machine between these two patients on the same day. This report summarizes results of the epidemiologic investigation, which suggested that WNV might have been transmitted at the dialysis center. Hemodialysis centers should adhere strictly to established infection-control procedures to avoid WNV transmission through dialysis.

Patient A. The first patient, who received dialysis on the machine (machine A) in late August, was a man aged 77 years with a history of hypertension and end-stage renal disease (ESRD). Eight days after dialysis, patient A was hospitalized with a 48-hour history of fever, chills, confusion, and anorexia. Blood cultures were negative. Serologic testing of serum revealed IgM and IgG antibodies to WNV by enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) and a higher neutralizing antibody titer to WNV (1:1,280) than to St. Louis encephalitis virus (SLEV) (1:320). Patient A had not received a blood transfusion <30 days before symptom onset. After a 9-day hospitalization, he was afebrile at discharge.

Patient B. The second patient, who received dialysis on machine A between patients A and C, was a woman aged 71 years with a history of type 2 diabetes, ESRD, and hypertension. Dialysis center and hospital records and patient interview revealed no symptoms of illness during late August or early September, and patient B had not received a blood transfusion in July, August, or September. In addition, she had never received a flavivirus vaccination (which might elicit cross-reactive antibody to serologic tests for WNV) or traveled outside the United States. A serum sample obtained 42 days after dialysis was uninterpretable for IgM antibody to WNV (i.e., because of high background reactivity), negative for IgM to SLEV, and positive for IgG to both WNV and SLEV by ELISA; the neutralizing antibody titers were 1:160 to WNV and 1:10 to SLEV. A second specimen taken from this patient 84 days after dialysis was negative for IgM antibody to WNV and SLEV by ELISA; positive for IgG to both WNV and SLEV by ELISA, and had neutralizing antibody titers of 1:320 to WNV and 1:20 to SLEV.

Patient C. The third and last patient to receive dialysis on machine A on the same day in late August was a man aged 60 years with a history of type 2 diabetes, hypertension, alcoholism, recent onset of ESRD, and prostate cancer. Nineteen days after his dialysis procedure, patient C was admitted to a local hospital with fever, chills, altered mental status, and cachexia. After admission, he had seizures and was intubated and placed on a ventilator. Analysis of cerebrospinal fluid (CSF) indicated a mild pleocytosis (67 white blood cells [62% polynuclear cells, 38% mononuclear cells] and five red blood cells/mm³) and an elevated protein level (122 mg/dL). Computerized tomography scans of the patient's brain on the second and tenth days of hospitalization revealed bilateral lacunar infarcts, white matter changes, and cortical and subcortical atrophy. Serologic tests of serum were positive for IgM and IgG antibodies to WNV by ELISA. The neutralizing antibody titer was higher to WNV (1:1,280) than to SLEV (1:20). Patient C had not received a blood transfusion <30 days before symptom onset. Twenty days after admission, he had a high fever and respiratory failure and died.

DPH and the local health department investigated practices and procedures at the dialysis center. No breakdowns in disinfection procedures for the dialysis machine or dialyzers and no breaches in infection-control practices were revealed. All bloodline attachments to the dialysis machine were disposable and

discarded after each dialysis session. Patient blood samples were withdrawn from the bloodline for testing on a monthly basis, unless otherwise directed by the physician. Medications were bottled in multiple-dose units but were drawn by using a needle in a separate medication room and injected into the patients' bloodlines with a syringe. Both the needle and syringe were then discarded. No single medication was administered to all three patients on the day of their dialyses. However, patients A and B had received a common medication, and patients A and C also had received a common medication, although most likely from separate vials. Blood samples from three other patients who had received dialysis on machine A on the previous day and on the following day were all negative for IgM and IgG antibodies to WNV.

Patients A and C resided in the same neighborhood, 0.2 miles apart, and patient B resided approximately 1 mile away from this neighborhood. An environmental assessment around the homes of patients A and C and in the neighborhood where they resided revealed a high potential for mosquito exposure, including lack of window screens, barrels of stagnant water, and wooded areas between homes. Mosquito surveillance of the area in mid-October indicated that *Culex quinquefasciatus* mosquitoes were the most abundant mosquito species; however, no WNV-positive mosquitoes were identified, as would be expected from mosquito collections obtained so late in the transmission season. Pesticide spraying to kill adult mosquitoes in the neighborhood was conducted two days after surveillance. Three neighbors of patients A and C submitted blood samples for testing for WNV; all samples were negative for IgM and IgG antibodies to WNV.

Reported by: CE Smith, MD, JM Jenkins, D Staib, PJ Newell, MD, KJ Mertz, MD, S Lance-Parker, DVM, RM Kelly, PhD, KA Bryant, MPH, Georgia Div of Public Health; EB Hayes, MD, GL Campbell, MD, Div of Vector-Borne Infectious Diseases, National Center for Infectious Diseases; A Srinivasan, MD, D Jernigan, MD, M Arduino, MD, Div of Healthcare Quality Promotion; K Abe, PhD, EIS Officer, CDC.

## **Editorial Note:**

This cluster of hemodialysis patients with WNV infections suggests possible transmission of WNV in the dialysis center. However, the epidemiologic investigation was inconclusive in determining a source of infection. One or more of these dialysis patients might have acquired WNV infection at the dialysis center through an undetected breach in infection-control procedures, or outside the dialysis center from the bite of an infected mosquito. Mosquito bites are the most common transmission route for WNV; however, WNV transmissions through blood transfusion, organ transplantation, in utero, and possibly through breast milk have been described (1--4). Unlike patients A and C, patient B was not confirmed with WNV disease, although laboratory results for patient B were consistent with previous WNV infection (with typical cross-reactivity to the closely related SLEV). The lack of detectable IgM and stable neutralization titers precluded very recent infection of patient B but was consistent with infection as recent as early September.

In the United States, transmission of bloodborne pathogens such as hepatitis B and hepatitis C viruses has occurred in health-care settings. The majority of the outbreaks of hepatitis viruses among hemodialysis patients were caused by cross-contamination of supplies, equipment, or medication and lapses in infection-control practices (5). Human immunodeficiency virus transmission to hemodialysis patients outside of the United States has been associated with reuse of access needles, dialyzers, and improper injection practices (6--8).

Patients on dialysis are highly susceptible to infections because they often are immunocompromised and are exposed routinely to invasive techniques and devices (9.10). The possibility that WNV might be transmitted during dialysis underscores the necessity for dialysis facilities to strictly adhere to proper infection-control procedures at all times (9).

# References

- 1. Pealer LN, Marfin AA, Petersen LR, et al. Transmission of West Nile virus through blood transfusion in the United States, 2002. N Engl J Med 2003;349:1236--45.
- 2. Iwamoto M, Jernigan DB, Guasch A, et al. Transmission of West Nile virus from an organ donor to four transplant recipients. N Engl J Med 2003;348:2196--203.
- 3. CDC. Possible West Nile virus transmission to an infant through breast-feeding---Michigan, 2002. MMWR 2002;51:877--8.
- 4. CDC. Intrauterine West Nile virus infection---New York, 2002. MMWR 2002;51:1135--6.
- 5. Alter MJ, Tokars JI, Arduino MJ, Favero MS. Control of infections associated with hemodialysis. In: Mayhall CG, ed. Hospital Epidemiology and Infection Control, 3rd edition, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania:

- Lippincott Williams & Wilkins, 2004.
- 6. El Sayed NM, Gomatos PJ, Beck-Sague CM, et al. Epidemic transmission of human immunodeficiency virus in renal dialysis centers in Egypt. J Infect Dis 2000;181:91--7.
- 7. Velandia M, Fridkin SK, Cardenas V, et al. Transmission of HIV in dialysis centre. Lancet 1995;345:1417--22.
- 8. Dyer E. Argentinian doctors accused of spreading AIDS. BMJ 1993;307:584.
- 9. CDC, Recommendations for preventing transmission of infections among chronic hemodialysis patients. MMWR 2001;50(No. RR-5).
- 10. Horl WH. Neutrophil function and infections in uremia. Am J Kidney Dis 1999;33:xlv--xlviii.

# Return to top.

Use of trade names and commercial sources is for identification only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

References to non-CDC sites on the Internet are provided as a service to MMWR readers and do not constitute or imply endorsement of these organizations or their programs by CDC or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. CDC is not responsible for the content of pages found at these sites. URL addresses listed in MMWR were current as of the date of publication.

**Disclaimer** All MMWR HTML versions of articles are electronic conversions from ASCII text into HTML. This conversion may have resulted in character translation or format errors in the HTML version. Users should not rely on this HTML document, but are referred to the electronic PDF version and/or the original MMWR paper copy for the official text, figures, and tables. An original paper copy of this issue can be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO), Washington, DC 20402-9371; telephone: (202) 512-1800. Contact GPO for current prices.

\*\*Questions or messages regarding errors in formatting should be addressed to mmwrq@cdc.gov.

Page converted: 8/19/2004

# **Print Help**

MMWR Home | MMWR Search | Help | Contact Us

CDC Home | Search | Health Topics A-Z

This page last reviewed 8/19/2004

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention
Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report

# 医薬品 研究報告 調査報告書

|                         |  | 1       |            |   | trent to ke      | LET () | 原生光净水加油槽    |     |  |  |
|-------------------------|--|---------|------------|---|------------------|--------|-------------|-----|--|--|
|                         | 2161   |         | 報告日        | 第一報入手日  | 新医薬品等の           | )区分    | 厚生労働省処理欄    | - } |  |  |
| 識別番号·報告回                | 数  |         |            | 2004年9月17日  | 該当なし             | ,      |             |     |  |  |
| 一般的名                    | 称 別紙のとおり   |         | 研究報告の公表    | Transfusion –As<br>Transmission of W<br>Arizona,2004] | est Nile Virus — | 公表国    |             |     |  |  |
| 販売名(企業:                 | 名) 別紙のとおり  | 1       | <b></b>    | CDC/MMWR 53(36<br>(2004, 9, 17)                       | 842-844/         | 米国     |             |     |  |  |
| (問題点:米                  | 国アリゾナ州において輸血後  | の西ナイルウ  | カイルス(WNV)感 | 染が疑われる症例が発  | 生した。)            |        | 使用上の注意記載状況・ | ·   |  |  |
|                         |  |         |            |   |                  |        |             |     |  |  |
|                         | 概要: 2004年7月、43歳の男性は、糖尿病の合併症により膝上部切断を余儀なくされ、アリゾナ州マリコパ郡の専門病院に収容された。患者は貧血で、濃厚赤血球(RBC)2ユニットの投与を受けた。手術は入院3日後に行われ、8日後に容体が安定し退れた。患者は貧血で、濃厚赤血球(RBC)2ユニットの投与を受けた。手術は入院3日後に行われ、8日後に容体が安定し退にした。退院2日後、倦怠感、食欲不振、下痢が発現した1日後、反応が鈍くなり、地元の病院に入院した。入院時、傷口にした。退院2日後、倦怠感、食欲不振、下痢が発現した1日後、反応が鈍くなり、地元の病院に入院した。入院時、傷口はきれいであったが、低血糖で上肢に紅斑性丘疹があった。低血糖症への治療を行ったにもかかわらず、反応は非常に鈍いますのた。そして、翌日、切断術を行った専門病院に転送された。入院時、熱発しており、また、精神状態の変調、動揺視、歯車様硬直が見られた。頭部 MRI 所見は、WNV 脳炎と一致した。アリゾナ州検査サービス局で行った髄液検査結果は、機関、歯車様硬直が見られた。頭部 MRI 所見は、WNV 脳炎と一致した。アリゾナ州検査サービス局で行った髄液検査結果は、水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水水 |         |            |   |                  |        |             |     |  |  |
| れた。患者に                  |  |         |            |   |                  |        |             |     |  |  |
| -                       |  |         |            |   |                  |        |             |     |  |  |
| 報しままであった                |  |         |            |   |                  |        |             |     |  |  |
|                         |  |         |            |   |                  |        |             |     |  |  |
| 概   へ移され、3   要   れなかった。 | : へ移され、3 日後に死亡した。死亡の第一原因は、重症の進行性神経子的機能不至に続先した心不至であった。 的疾は142   |         |            |   |                  |        |             |     |  |  |
|                         |  |         |            | ・地方物師もわたりへの   | がある。             | は では   |             |     |  |  |
|                         | 患者が投与された赤血球 (RBC) ユニットは6月にアリゾナ州マリコパ郡で採取された2つの献血血液から製造され、両献血血液は核酸増幅検査 (NAT) によるスクリーニングでは反応がなかった。また、両献血血液が関係する新鮮凍結血漿ユニ血血液は核酸増幅検査 (NAT) によるスクリーニングでは反応がなかった。また、両は血液が関係する88の血液成分が光胃の輸  |         |            |   |                  |        |             |     |  |  |
| ットは回収る                  | され、2004年9月7日現在,2   | 2004年では | 西ナイルウイルス   | を含んでいる可能性の  | ある 98 の血液成分か     | ・米国の輸  |             |     |  |  |
| 血用血液かり                  | ら除外された。  |         | :          |   | <br>今後の対応        |        |             |     |  |  |
|                         | 報告企業の意   | . 見     |            | TER共長1アナバ   | いては、特段の対応に       | ナ不更レ老  | -           |     |  |  |
| 別紙のとおり                  |  |         |            | 現時点にわり えるが、今後と  | も関連情報の収集に        | 努め、本剤  |             |     |  |  |
|                         |  |         | ·          |   | 尽を図っていきたい。       |        |             |     |  |  |
|                         |  |         |            |   |                  |        |             |     |  |  |
|                         | -  | •       |            |   |                  |        |             |     |  |  |
|                         |  |         |            |   |                  |        |             |     |  |  |
|                         |  |         |            | e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e e                 |                  |        | ·           |     |  |  |

たい。

①人血清アルブミン②人血清アルブミン③人血清アルブミン④人免役グロブリン⑤乾燥ペプシン処理人免疫グロブリン⑥乾燥スルホ化人免疫グロブリン⑧乾燥濃縮人活性化プロテインC⑨乾燥濃縮人血液凝固第700円の乾燥濃縮人血液凝固

このから、仮に原料自体にWNVが混入していたとしても、製造過程で充分にウイルスの不活化はできているものと考えられる。

弊所製品のWNVに対する安全性は高いレベルで保たれていると考えるが、今後とも情報収集に努め、更なる安全性の向上を図っていき

δ



CDC Home Search Health Topics A-Z



# Weekly

September 17, 2004 / 53(36);842-844

# Transfusion-Associated Transmission of West Nile Virus --- Arizona, 2004

Blood transfusion--associated transmission (TAT) of West Nile virus (WNV) in the United States was first identified in 2002 (1). In 2003, blood collection agencies (BCAs) responded by screening donations for WNV by using nucleic acid--amplification tests (NATs) (2). The majority of BCAs use a two-tiered NAT-screening algorithm. On the basis of the test manufacturer's format, NATs are conducted on minipools of samples from either six or 16 blood donations. If a minipool is nonreactive, its constituent donations are released for transfusion. If a minipool is reactive, the constituent donations undergo individual testing. If an individual donation is reactive, associated blood components are impounded, and the donor is notified for further testing to confirm the infection. In 2003, blood-donation screening for WNV resulted in the impounding of approximately 800 blood components potentially containing WNV. However, six reported cases of transfusion-associated WNV disease were associated with units of blood components with viral concentrations too small to be detected by minipool NAT (3). In 2004, to improve the sensitivity of WNV screening, BCAs implemented systems to trigger a switch from minipool NAT to individual NAT in areas with epidemic WNV transmission. This report describes the first transfusionassociated WNV infection identified in 2004; the implicated blood donation was collected before the switch to individual testing. Clinicians should remain aware of the risk for WNV transmission through blood-product transfusion and alert state health officials to hospitalized patients with WNV disease symptoms who have had a transfusion during the preceding 28 days.

# Case Report

In July 2004, a man aged 43 years was admitted to a tertiary-care hospital in Maricopa County, Arizona, for an above-knee amputation necessitated by complications of diabetes mellitus. The patient was anemic and received two units of packed red blood cells (RBCs). His surgery occurred 3 days after admission, and he was discharged in stable condition 8 days later.

Two days after discharge, after a day of malaise, anorexia, and diarrhea, the man was found unresponsive and was admitted to a local hospital. On admission, his wound site was clean, but he was hypoglycemic and had an erythematous maculopapular rash on his upper extremities. He remained poorly responsive despite treatment for hypoglycemia, and the next day he was transferred to the tertiary-care hospital that had performed his amputation. On admission, he was febrile, had altered mental status, oscillopsia, and cogwheel rigidity. Magnetic resonance imaging of the brain was consistent with WNV encephalitis (4). The patient's cerebrospinal fluid was positive for WNV-specific IgM antibody by enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay at the Arizona Bureau of State Laboratory Services and positive for WNV RNA by reverse transcriptase--polymerase chain reaction at CDC.

The patient was discharged to a nursing home in mid-August and died 3 days later. Primary cause of death was cardiorespiratory failure secondary to severe progressive neurologic dysfunction. An autopsy was not performed.

The RBC units the patient received were produced from two donations collected in June in Maricopa County. Both donations were nonreactive by minipool NAT screening. Two fresh frozen plasma units associated with these donations were recalled and tested individually for WNV. One plasma unit was

nonreactive by NAT, and a follow-up sample from the donor was negative for WNV IgM. The other plasma unit was reactive by NAT, but negative for WNV-specific IgM antibody. To determine the efficacy of minipool testing for this unit, a minipool including this plasma unit was reconstructed and was reactive in two of 10 replicated minipool NAT tests. Individual NAT was reactive in nine of 10 replicated tests. Follow-up donor serum was positive for WNV IgM.

Because the transfusion recipient had a confirmed WNV infection, the implicated donation was NAT reactive, and the associated donor seroconverted; this is considered a probable case of WNV TAT (3). As of July 27, only one WNV-infected horse and no human cases of WNV disease had been reported in the recipient's county of residence. However, this case does not meet the criteria for a confirmed case of WNV TAT because the patient traveled to an area experiencing epidemic WNV transmission for his amputation. Exposure of the patient to infectious mosquitoes while in this area cannot be ruled out.

Reported by: S Caglioti, Blood Systems Laboratories, Tempe; P Tomasulo, MD, Blood Systems Incorporated, Scottsdale; R Raschke, MD, M Rodarte, DO, Banner Good Samaritan Medical Center, Phoenix; T Sylvester, A Diggs, MPH, Maricopa County Dept of Public Health; C Kioski, MPH, C Levy, MS, Arizona Dept of Health Svcs. M Traeger, MD, J Redd, MD, J Cheek, MD, Indian Health Svc. M Kuehnert, MD, Div of Viral and Rickettsial Diseases; S Montgomery, DVM, Div of Bacterial and Mycotic Diseases; A Marfin, MD, R Lanciotti, PhD, G Campbell, MD, T Smith, MD, Div of Vector-Borne Infectious Diseases, National Center for Infectious Diseases; J Brown, DVM, EIS Officer, CDC.

### Editorial Note:

As of September 7, a total of 98 blood components potentially containing WNV had been removed from the U.S. blood supply during 2004. The risk for WNV transmission via blood products has been reduced but not eliminated. Minipool NAT is an effective screening method for WNV, but donations containing low levels of virus can escape detection by this test. Although individual NAT is more sensitive than minipool NAT, the United States has limited laboratory capacity and test reagent availability for NAT. For this reason, BCAs developed systems to trigger a switch from minipool to individual NAT in areas of epidemic WNV transmission (5). Nonetheless, in the case described in this report, results of testing the implicated donation revealed that even individual NAT might not have detected WNV (i.e., in one of 10 tests).

BCAs in the United States had not planned to implement their trigger systems until June 2004. However, the WNV epidemic in Maricopa County began in May, earlier than widespread WNV was expected. Evidence of year-round WNV activity has been documented in east Texas and Louisiana (6). This year's experience demonstrates that BCAs might need to prepare for onset of human WNV transmission as early as May in areas of the country similar to Arizona. As a result of the case described in this report, the BCA involved plans to implement its trigger system year-round in all its collection areas.

Clinicians should consider WNV disease in any patient with consistent symptoms who has received a blood transfusion during the 28 days preceding illness onset. Suspected cases should be reported to state health authorities, who are encouraged to notify CDC. The vigilance of clinicians and public health officials is essential to identify breakthrough TAT cases. Identification of such cases allows recovery of stored components that might contain WNV, which further increases the safety of the blood supply.

The benefits of blood transfusion far outweigh the risk for transfusion-associated WNV disease. However, clinicians should use blood products judiciously to reduce the risk for adverse events and should be alert for cases of transfusion-associated WNV disease. BCAs will continue to evaluate WNV-screening strategies in consultation with CDC and the Food and Drug Administration to ensure that blood products are as safe as possible.

## Acknowledgments

This report is based, in part, on contributions by A Lambert, A Noga, MPH, R Hochbein, D Martin, N Crall, Div of Vector-Borne Infectious Diseases, National Center for Infectious Diseases, CDC.

## References

- 1. Pealer LN, Marfin AA, Petersen LR, et al. Transmission of West Nile virus through blood transfusion in the United States in 2002. N Engl J Med 2003;349:1236--45.
- 2. <u>CDC. Detection of West Nile virus in blood donations---United States, 2003. MMWR 2003;52:769--72.</u>
- 3. <u>CDC. Update: West Nile virus screening of blood donations and transfusion-associated transmission---United States</u>, 2003. MMWR 2004;53:281--4.
- 4. Solomon T. Flavivirus encephalitis [Review]. N Engl J Med 2004;351: 370--8.
- 5. Custer B, Tomasulo PA, Murphy EL, et al. Triggers for switching from mini-pool nucleic acid technology testing to individual donation testing: analysis of 2003 data to inform 2004 decision-making. Transfusion 2004 (in press).
- 6. Tesh RB, Parsons R, Siirin M, et al. Year-round West Nile virus activity, Gulf Coast region, Texas and Louisiana. Emerg Infect Dis 2004;10:1649--52.

Use of trade names and commercial sources is for identification only and does not imply endorsement by the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services.

References to non-CDC sites on the Internet are provided as a service to MMWR readers and do not constitute or imply endorsement of these organizations or their programs by CDC or the U.S. Department of Health and Human Services. CDC is not responsible for the content of pages found at these sites. URL addresses listed in MMWR were current as of the date of publication.

**Disclaimer** All MMWR HTML versions of articles are electronic conversions from ASCII text into HTML. This conversion may have resulted in character translation or format errors in the HTML version. Users should not rely on this HTML document, but are referred to the electronic PDF version and/or the original MMWR paper copy for the official text, figures, and tables. An original paper copy of this issue can be obtained from the Superintendent of Documents, U.S. Government Printing Office (GPO), Washington, DC 20402-9371; telephone: (202) 512-1800. Contact GPO for current prices.

\*\*Questions or messages regarding errors in formatting should be addressed to mmwrq@cdc.gov.

Page converted: 9/16/2004

#### Print Help

MMWR Home | MMWR Search | Help | Contact Us

CDC Home | Search | Health Topics A-Z

This page last reviewed 9/16/2004

Centers for Disease Control and Prevention Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report Transfusion -Associated Transmission of West Nile Virus - Arizona,2004 輸血に関連した西ナイルウイルス感染-米アリゾナ州

(CDC/MMWR 53 (36) 842-844/ (2004. 9. 17) )

米国での輸血に関連した西ナイルウイルス (WNV) 感染 (TAT) は、2002 年に初めて確認された。 2003 年に採血機関 (BCA) は、核酸増幅検査 (NAT) を用い WNV に対する献血スクリーニングに対応した。 BCA の大多数は、二重 NAT スクリーニング分析を用いている。検査の製造会社の評価法に基づき、NAT は 6 人分または 16 人分のサンプルのミニプールで実施された。 ミニプールで 陽性でなければ、献血用として供給される。 ミニプールで陽性であれば、血液成分の個別検査を行う。 個別の献血が陽性であれば、関連する血液成分は撤収され、ドナーは感染を確認するために再検査を受けるよう通知される。

2003 年、WNV に対する献血スクリーニングで、WNV を含む可能性のある約800 の血液成分を撤収することになった。しかしながら、輸血に関連した西ナイルウイルス病の6例の報告例は、ウイルス量が少なすぎたためミニプールのNATで検出できなかった血液成分と関連していた。

2004 年、WNV スクリーニングの感度を向上させるために、BCA は WNV の流行が見られた地域で、ミニプール NAT から個別 NAT に切り替えるシステムを導入した。本レポートは 2004 年に初めて確認された輸血関連 WNV 感染について述べたものである。関係していると思われる献血は個別検査へ移行前に行われていた。依然として、医師は血液製剤輸注を通じた WNV 伝播のリスクに留意しなければならない、また、WNV 症状を有する入院患者で発症前 28 日以内に輸血を受けた者を州衛生当局に通告しなければならない。

# 症例報告

2004年7月、43歳の男性は、糖尿病の合併症により膝上部切断を余儀なくされ、アリゾナ州マリコパ郡の専門病院に収容された。患者は貧血で、濃厚赤血球 (RBC) 2 ユニットの投与を受けた。手術は入院3日後に行われ、8日後に容体が安定し退院した。

退院2日後、倦怠感、食欲不振、下痢が発現した1日後、反応が鈍くなり、地元の病院に入院した。入院時、傷口はきれいであったが、低血糖で上肢に紅斑性丘疹があった。低血糖症への治療を行ったにもかかわらず、反応は非常に鈍いままであった。そして、翌日、切断術を行った専門病院に転送された。入院時、熱発しており、また、精神状態の変調、動揺視、歯車様硬直が見られた。頭部 MRI 所見は、WNV 脳炎と一致した。アリゾナ州検査サービス局で行った髄液検査結果は、WNV 特異 IgM ELISA 抗体陽性であり、CDC での逆転写酵素による WNV RNA-PCR は陽性であった。

患者は8月中旬に養護施設へ移され、3日後に死亡した。死亡の第一原因は、重症の進行性神経 学的機能不全に続発した心不全であった。剖検は行われなかった。 患者が投与を受けた RBC ユニットは、マリコパ郡で 6 月に集められた 2 名の献血者から製造されたものであった。両献血ともミニプール NAT スクリーニングで陽性ではなかった。これらの献血に関連する 2 ユニットの新鮮凍結血漿は回収され、個別に WNV の検査が行われた。血漿 1 ユニットは NAT 非陽性で、ドナーからの追加検査サンプルは WNV IgM 陰性であった。もう一方の血漿ユニットは NAT 陽性であったが、WNV 特異 IgM 抗体は陰性であった。このユニットに関するミニプール検査の効果を評価するために、この血漿ユニットを含むミニプールは再検証され、10 例の反復ミニプール NAT 検査で 2 例が陽性であった。NAT 個別検査では、反復検査 10 例中 9 例が陽性であった。ドナー血清の追跡調査は、WNV IgM 陽性であった。

輸血レシピエントは WNV 感染が確定していたため、関連する献血は NAT 陽性であり、関係するドナーは血清陽転化した。これは WNV TAT の可能性が高い症例と考えられる。7月27日の時点で、レシピエントの居住する郡では、WNV 感染馬は1例のみで、人の WNV 症例は報告されていない。しかしながら、患者は切断術のために WNV 流行地域に移動しているため、この症例は WNV TAT の確定診断基準を満たしていない。この地域に居る間に、患者が感染性のある蚊の曝露を受けた可能性を排除することは出来ない。

#### 短評

9月7日時点で、WNVを含む可能性のある計 98 の血液成分が、2004年の間米国血液供給から取り除かれた。血液製剤を介したWNVの感染リスクは低減化されてきたが、除去されていない。 ミニプール NAT は、WNV に対して有効なスクリーニング法であるが、低レベルのウイルスを含む献血が、この検査をすり抜ける可能性がある。 個別 NAT の方がミニプール NAT より高感度であるが、米国の NAT 用の検査能及び検査試薬の供給能には限界がある。この理由により、BCA は WNV 流行地域ではミニプールから個別 NAT に切り替えるシステムに移行した。 にもかかわらず、本レポートで述べた症例で、関連する献血の検査結果は、個別 NAT でも WNV を検出できないことがあるということを示した。 (即ち、10 検査中の1つ)

米国の BCA は、2004 年 6 月までに新たなシステムを導入する計画はない。しかしながら、マリコパ郡の WNV の流行は 5 月に始まり、予測された WNV の大流行より早かった。通年で WNV が活動している証拠は、東テキサスとルイジアナで記録されている。この年の事象は、BCA はアリゾナと類似した郡の地域において、早くも 5 月に人の WNV 感染の発生に対応する必要があるであろうことを示している。本レポートで述べた症例の結果から、BCA は全ての採血区域における通年でのシステムに変更する計画を導入した。

医師は、発症前 28 日間に輸血を受けた人と一致する症状を有する全ての患者で、WNV 病の可能性を考慮すべきである。疑われる症例は、CDC に知らせる立場の州衛生専門家に報告を行う

べきである。医師及び公衆衛生当局の監視は、画期的な TAT 症例を確認する上で重要である。 そのような症例の確定は、WNV を含む可能性がある貯蔵された血液成分の回収を可能にし、血 液供給の安全性を高めることになる。

輸血のベネフィットは輸血に関連した WNV 病のリスクをはるかに上回る。しかしながら、医師は有害事象のリスクを減じるために血液製剤を慎重に使用すべきであり、輸血に関連した WNV 症例に注意すべきである。BCA は WNV のスクリーニング法を CDC と FDA に相談しながら検証し続け、可能な限り血液製剤の安全性を確保するつもりである。