medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.02.20205567; this version posted October 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Impact of pathogen reduction technologies on immunological properties of the COVID-19 convalescent plasma

A. Kostin[1], M. Lundgren*[2], A. Bulanov[1], E. Ladygina[1], K. Chirkova[1], A. Gintsburg[3], D. Logunov[3], I. Dolzhikova[3], D. Shcheblyakov[3], , N. Borovkova[1] , M. Godkov[1] , A. Bazhenov[1], V. Shustov[1], A. Bogdanova[1], A. Kamalova[4], V. Ganchin[5], E. Dombrovskiy[5], S. Volkov[6], N. Drozdova[1], S.Petrikov[1] .

1 - N.V. Sklifosovsky Research Institute for Emergency Medicine, Moscow Department of Healthcare: Bolshaya Sukharevskaya sq., 3, bldg. 1, Moscow, 129090, Russia;
2 - Department of Clinical Immunology and Transfusion Medicine, Office of Medical Services,
Region Skane, Lund, 22184, Sweden, * corresponding author
3 – The Federal State Budgetary Institution "National Research Center of Epidemiology and Microbiology N.F. Gamaleya" of the Ministry of Health of the Russian Federation: Gamaleya street 18, Moscow 123098, Russia;
4 - N.I. Pirogov Federal Russian National Research Medical University, Healthcare Ministry of Russia: Ostrovityanova street 1, Moscow, 117997, Russia;
5 – Autonomous non-commercial organization «Center of Analytical Development of the Social Sector»: Dostoevsky street 31, b. 1A, Moscow, 123473, Russia;
6 - Centre for Mathematical Sciences, Lund University, Lund, 22100, Sweden

ABSTRACT

Background and Objectives In the absence of a vaccine or specific antiviral drugs against SARS-CoV-2 COVID-19 convalescent plasma became one of the experimental treatment options in many countries. Aim of this study was to assess the impact of different pathogen reduction technologies on the immunological properties of COVID-19 convalescent plasma.

Materials and Methods In our experiment 140 doses of plasma collected by plasmapheresis from COVID-19 convalescent donors were subjected to pathogen reduction with one of three different methods: methylene blue (M), riboflavin (R), and amotosalen (A). To conduct a paired two-sample comparison each plasma dose was divided into 2 that were treated by one of these technologies. The titres of SARS-CoV2 neutralizing antibodies (NtAbs) and levels of specific immunoglobulins to RBD, S- and N- proteins of SARS-CoV-2 were measured before and after pathogen reduction.

Results All methods reduced NtAbs titers significantly but not at the same grade: among units with the initial titre 80 or above, 81% of units had unchanged titres while 19% decreased by 1 step after methylene blue; 60% unchanged and 40% - decreased by 1 step after amotosalen; 43% unchanged, 67% a one-step decrease and 6% - a two-step decrease after riboflavin. Pairwise two-sample comparisons (M vs A, M vs R and A vs R) revealed the most prominent and statistically significant decrease in all studied parameters (except anti-RBD) following pathogen reduction with riboflavin.

Conclusion Pathogen reduction with amotosalen and methylene blue provides the greater likelihood of preserving the immunological properties of the COVID-19 convalescent plasma compared to riboflavin.

Key words COVID-19 convalescent plasma, NtAbs, pathogen reduction, amotosalen, riboflavin, methylene blue

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.02.20205567; this version posted October 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Introduction

The new coronavirus infection (COVID-19) caused by the SARS-CoV-2 virus continues its march around the world, increasing the number of cases and deaths every day and causing a global crisis. Treatment is mostly aimed at relieving symptoms and supportive care [1, 2, 3].

In the absence of a vaccine or specific antiviral drugs, doctors considered the possibility of passive immunotherapy with polyclonal antibodies from the blood plasma of convalescents, an approach which has been tested earlier in outbreaks of SARS-CoV, influenza and other dangerous infections during the last century [4, 5, 6].

Experts from different countries came to the conclusion about the possibility of using COVID-19 convalescent plasma (CCP) for therapeutic purposes in patients with COVID-19 [7, 8, 9]. In many countries, national campaigns have been launched to collect CCP.

Various mechanisms have been suggested as responsible for the therapeutic effect of CCP such as virus neutralization and immunomodulation [10]. Virus neutralizing antibodies (NAbs) of IgG, IgM and IgA classes bind to different parts of glycoprotein S, including the region of the receptor-binding domain (RBD), spatially blocking its interaction with the membrane protein ACE2 of host cells, which limits the penetration of the virus into the cell and, as a consequence, its replication [11, 12, 13].

However, every plasma transfusion is associated with risks of transferal of viruses such as HIV, HBV, HCV, etc. [14]. At the moment, there are no scientific publications reporting on the transmission of SARS-CoV-2 through transfusion of blood components [15]. The International Society for Blood Transfusion (ISBT) Global Transfusion Safety Working Group recommended the use of pathogen-inactivation of convalescent plasma to minimize the residual risk of blood-borne infections and to address the problem of possible superinfection with the SARS-CoV-2 virus [8].

To date, there is no data on how pathogen reduction affects the immunological properties of CCP and what methods of pathogen reduction are preferable to use to maintain its quality and effectiveness.

The objective of this study was to assess the effect of various technologies for pathogen reduction on the immunological characteristics of CCP.

Materials and methods

The COVID-19 convalescent plasma procurement program in Russia was launched on April 2, 2020 at the Department of Transfusion Medicine of the Sklifosovsky Research Institute for Emergency Medicine, Moscow. At present, this program involves many hospitals in several regions and has more than 3000 donations and about 1500 transfusions of CCP in Moscow alone. According to the adopted regulations, donors of convalescent plasma were recruited among individuals with prior diagnosis of COVID-19 infection documented by a positive RCR-test who received treatment either in a

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.02.20205567; this version posted October 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

hospital setting or on an outpatient basis. Donors fulfilled the standard blood donor selection criteria. Plasma was collected at least 2 weeks after the complete disappearance of clinical symptoms.

Plasmapheresis procedures were performed using Auto-C, Aurora and PCS2 machines. Plasmapheresis was carried out in accordance with standard protocols, in the amount of 650 ml. Pathogen reduction procedures were carried out immediately after the end of plasmapheresis. For comparison, three systems for pathogen reduction were selected: Intercept – (amotosalen plus UVA light), Mirasol (riboflavin plus UVB light) and Macotronic (methylene blue plus visible light). Subsequently, the plasma was frozen and became available for clinical use after receiving negative results of all serology/virology tests for transfusion-transmitted diseases.

This study included 420 plasma samples obtained from 140 COVID-19 convalescent donors and, in the course of pathogen reduction of 140 doses of convalescent plasma collected by plasmapheresis at our Department of Transfusion Medicine.

To conduct a paired two-sample comparison to assess the effect of each of these technologies on the immunological parameters of CCP, each plasma dose from one donor was divided into 2 parts and each part was simultaneously subjected to a pathogen reduction procedure by one of the two technologies according to the following scheme:

pair 1: methylene blue (M) vs. riboflavin (R),

pair 2: amotosalen (A) vs. riboflavin (R), and

pair 3: methylene blue (M) vs. amotosalen (A).

From each plasma unit, samples were collected before and after pathogen reduction for the determination of the titres of SARS-CoV2 neutralizing antibodies (NtAbs), as well as quantitative determination of specific IgG to the receptor-binding domain (RBD) of the glycoprotein S of the SARS-CoV-2 virus, and specific IgM and IgG to S- and N- proteins of this virus.

The titres of SARS-CoV2 neutralizing antibodies were measured at the Gamaleya National Research Center of Epidemiology and Microbiology, Moscow by a modified microneutralization assay on a Vero E6 cell culture, with an assessment of the virus' cytopathic effect after 96 hours of incubation. The virus neutralization titre of the studied plasma was taken as its highest dilution, at which the cytopathic effect is suppressed in 2 out of 3 wells.

Determination of specific anti-RBD IgG was carried out at the same institution by the enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) using their own SARS-CoV-2-RBD-IFA-Gamaleya test system (registered in Russia, RZN 2020/10393).

In parallel, quantitative determination of IgM and IgG antibodies to a mixture of recombinant S- and N-proteins of SARS-CoV-2 was carried out by the immunochemiluminescent method (IHLA) using reagent kits for Shenzhen Mindray Bio-Medical Electronics Co., Ltd (China).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.02.20205567; this version posted October 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Statistical analysis

This study was aimed to answer following questions: does pathogen reduction diminish the immunological parameters of COVID-19 convalescent plasma and which of the technologies, chosen for the comparison (M, A or R) provides the minimal decrease in antibody levels.

Since the data for NtAbs are presented in the format 10 times an integer power of two (i.e., 20, 40 , 80, 160 etc.) we believe it is appropriate to use y=log2x10 transformation, where x is the reported value of NtAbs, thus 20→1, 40→2, 80→3, etc. Also, titers which were "<20" are replaced by "10", in order not to lose valid data. Thus, after the log-transformation, NtAbs levels below 20 corresponded to "0", NtAbs levels of 20 corresponded to "1", levels of 40 corresponded to "2", and so on, in the transformed data set.

To identify the methods of pathogen reduction which have least negative effect on NtAbs levels, the two-sample paired T-tests (M vs A, M vs R, and A vs R) were applied to compare the difference in reduction in titers of NtAbs, anti-RBD IgG, and anti-S + N IgG and IgM titers respectively, after pathogen reduction by different methods. The software used to analyze the data was Maple™.

Results

The assessment of the impact of various technologies of pathogen reduction on the titres of SARS-CoV2 neutralizing antibodies (NtAbs) showed a statistically significant decrease in antibody titres after all pathogen reduction processes (Figure 1, Table 1).

If all plasma units, regardless of the initial titer were included in the analysis, it was shown that in $\mathbf{p_M=86\%}$ (n=95; confidence interval 79% - 93%) of units NtAbs titers were unchanged after pathogen reduction with methylene blue while a one titre reduction was observed in remaining 14%. In $\mathbf{p_A=68\%}$ (n=81; 95% confidence interval 58% - 78%) of units treated with amotosalen the NtAbs titre did not change, and in 32% it decreased by 1 step. Pathogen reduction with riboflavin left NtAbs titres unchanged in $\mathbf{p_R=53\%}$ (n=69; confidence interval 42% - 65%) of the units, in 47% decreased by 1 step and 4% by two steps.

To compare the impact of different methods of pathogen reduction, we used the data collected on paired data: the plasma units from the same donor were treated using e.g. method A and M, and then the resulting NtAbs were noted for both methods. We had three different datasets: one compared A vs. R, the other M vs. R and the third M vs. A. As a result, the paired samples T-test seems to be the most appropriate for the analysis. The results are the following: M is better than R (p-value=0.00002, n=48), A is better than R (p-value=0.0002, n=36), M is better than A (p-value=0.0012, n=56).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.02.20205567; this version posted October 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

When only units with the initial NtAbs titre 80 or above were chosen (this is the level that is generally considered to be suitable for therapeutic purposes) the distribution was similar: after treatment with methylene blue, $\mathbf{p_M=81}$% of plasma samples had unchanged NtAbs titres (n=53; confidence interval 71% - 91%), while in the other 19% samples the titres decreased by 1 step. Pathogen reduction with amotosalen gave worse results: $\mathbf{p_A=60\%}$ of samples had the same NtAbs after the reduction (n=55; confidence interval 47% - 73%), while in the remaining 40% samples the titres decreased by 1 step. Finally, after treatment with riboflavin, only $\mathbf{p_R=43\%}$ of the samples preserved the level of NTABs titres (n=30; confidence interval 26% - 61%), while a one-step decrease was observed in 67% samples, and a two-step decrease in 6% samples.

The decrease in anti-RBD IgG in pairwise comparison with baseline values was more pronounced after pathogen reduction with riboflavin while after amotosalen or methylene blue there were no significant differences (Table 1).

Plasma pathogen inactivation with methylene blue did not lead to a significant decrease in anti-S + N IgG and IgM, while the use of amotosalen significantly reduced the level of anti-S + N IgG (Table 1). In the study of 83 pairs of samples before and after pathogen reduction with riboflavin, the differences were significant in the anti-S + N levels of both IgG and IgM (Table 1).

Pairwise two-sample comparisons (M vs A, M vs R and A vs R) revealed the most prominent and statistically significant decrease in titers of NtAbs, anti-S + N IgG and IgM, but not anti-RBD IgG titers, after pathogen reduction by riboflavin (Table 2).

Discussion and conclusions:

The key safety issue of using convalescent plasma is played by the choice of a pathogen-inactivation method that minimizes the residual transfusion risk of transmissible viruses in the final product, while maintaining a high titer of antibodies to the SARS-Cov-2 virus. A number of different pathogen reduction technologies are available today [16]. Ultraviolet (UV) A [17, 18] and UVB radiation [19], in combination with amotosalen and riboflavin, respectively, makes it possible to inactivate nucleic acids of pathogenic organisms. These systems can reduce the activity of SARS and MERS viruses in plasma or platelet concentrates to varying degrees.

Methylene blue is a phenothiazive compound that, in combination with visible light, is also capable of inactivating coronaviruses in plasma [20, 21]. The photoactive agents used in these technologies have different chemical structures, are activated at different wavelengths of radiation (visible light about 590 nm, UVA from 400 nm - 315 nm and UVB from 315 nm - 280 nm). Accordingly, various mechanisms are involved in ensuring the reduction of pathogens through binding of nucleic acids.

The current study is the first to examine the impact of pathogen reduction technology on SARS-CoV-2 antibody levels in convalescent plasma.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.02.20205567; this version posted October 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

The hypothesis tested in this study is that different types of photo-chemical reactions used in the technologies of pathogen reduction can affect differently the amount and functional activity of SARS-CoV2 specific IgG and IgM antibodies in the final product - convalescent plasma. The results obtained indicate a lesser effect on the immunological quality of CCP of pathogen reduction with methylene blue and amotosalen.

Based on the study, we can recommend using inactivation technologies with amotosalen and methylene blue to ensure the safety and quality of CCP, due to the greater likelihood of preserving the immunological properties of the final product. Since even these methods of pathogen reduction are associated with a risk of reducing the quantity and quality of antibodies against SARS-CoV-2, it is recommended to transfuse at least 2 units of convalescent plasma (200-300 ml) from different donors to one patient, especially in those medical institutions where it is impossible to reproduce in routine practice technology for determining of NtAbs titres.

In those blood establishments where pathogen reduction with riboflavin is traditionally used, it may be worth to consider increasing the dose of transfused convalescent plasma in order to compensate for the decrease in baseline neutralizing antibody titer after this method of pathogen reduction.

Acknowledgement

The authors thank the medical and laboratory staff of the Department of Transfusion Medicine of the Sklifosovsky Research Institute of Emergency Medicine and at the Gamaleya National Research Center of Epidemiology and Microbiology without whose assistance the study would not have been possible. They also thank Professor Jens Kjeldsen-Kragh, Department of Clinical Immunology and Transfusion Medicine, Region Skane Medical Service, Lund, Sweden for the scientific and English reviewing of the paper.

Funding

This study was made possible in the context of Moscow Government COVID-19 Convalescent Plasma Program. Stanislav Volkovs research is partially supported by the Swedish Research Council and the Crafoord foundation.

Authors contribution

Design of the study – A. Kostin; convalescent plasma donor recruiting – V. Ganchin, E. Dombrovskiy; collection of data – E. Ladygina, K. Chirkova, A. Kamalova; development of test systems for NtAbs and anti-RBD - A. Gintsburg, D. Shcheblyakov, I. Dolzhikova, D. Logunov; experimental work M. Godkov, A. Bazhenov, A. Bogdanova, V. Shustov; organization of the working processes for collection of convalescent plasma - S.Petrikov, A. Bulanov, N. Drozdova, N. Borovkova; statistical analysis and interpretation of the data and drafting of the manuscript – A. Kostin, M. Lundgren, S.Volkov. All co-authors critically reviewed and approved the manuscript.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.02.20205567; this version posted October 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

Conflict of interest

The authors declare no conflict of interests.

References

1. Dos Santos WG: Natural history of COVID-19 and current knowledge on treatment therapeutic options. *Biomed Pharmacother.* 2020 Sep; 129:110493
2. Lamontagne F, Agoritsas T, Macdonald H, *et al.*: A living WHO guideline on drugs for covid-19. *BMJ.* 2020; 370: m3379. Published 2020 Sep 4
3. Pennica A, Conforti G, Falangone F, *et al.*: Clinical Management of Adult Coronavirus Infection Disease 2019 (COVID-19) Positive in the Setting of Low and Medium Intensity of Care: a Short Practical Review *SN Compr Clin Med* 2020;1-6.
4. Mair-Jenkins J, Saavedra-Campos M, Baillie JK, *et al.*: The effectiveness of convalescent plasma and hyperimmune immunoglobulin for the treatment of severe acute respiratory infections of viral etiology: a systematic review and exploratory meta-analysis. *J Infect Dis* 2015; 211:80–90
5. Luke TC, Kilbane EM, Jackson JL, Hoffman SL: Meta-analysis: convalescent blood products for Spanish influenza pneumonia: a future H5N1 treatment? *Ann Intern Med* 2006; 145:599–609
6. Hung IF, To KK, Lee CK, *et al.*: Convalescent plasma treatment reduced mortality in patients with severe pandemic influenza A (H1N1) 2009 virus infection. *Clin Infect Dis* 2011; 52(4):447-456
7. Chen L, Xiong J, Bao L, Shi Y: Convalescent plasma as a potential therapy for COVID-19. *Lancet Infect Dis* 2020; 20(4):398-400
8. Epstein J, Burnouf T: Points to consider in the preparation and transfusion of COVID-19 convalescent plasma. *Vox Sang* 2020; 10.1111/vox.12939?
9. Tiberghien P, de Lamballerie X, Morel P, *et al.*: Collecting and evaluating convalescent plasma for COVID-19 treatment: why and how? *Vox Sang* 2020; 10.1111/vox.12926?
10. Rojas M, Rodríguez Y, Monsalve DM, et al.: Convalescent plasma in Covid-19: Possible mechanisms of action. *Autoimmun Rev* 2020; 19(7):102554
11. Jiang S, Hillyer C, Du L: Neutralizing Antibodies against SARS-CoV-2 and Other Human Coronaviruses *Trends Immunol* 2020; 41(5):355-359
12. Shang J, Wan Y, Luo C, et al. Cell entry mechanisms of SARS-CoV-2. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 2020; 117(21):11727-11734
13. Hoffmann M., Kleine-Weber H., Schroeder S *et al.*: SARS-CoV-2 cell entry depends on ACE2 and TMPRSS2 and is blocked by a clinically proven protease inhibitor. *Cell* 2020; 181(2):271–280
14. Bihl F, Castelli D, Marincola F *et al.*: Transfusion-transmitted infections. *J Transl Med* 2007; 5:25.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.02.20205567; this version posted October 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

15. Leblanc JF, Germain M, Delage G *et al.*: Risk of transmission of severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus 2 by transfusion: A literature review. *Transfusion*. 2020; Aug 15 : 10
16. Cicchetti A, Berrino A, Casini M, *et al.*: Health Technology Assessment of pathogen reduction technologies applied to plasma for clinical use. *Blood Transfus* 2016; 14(4):287-386
17. Hashem AM, Hassan AM, Tolah AM *et al.*: Amotosalen and ultraviolet A light efficiently inactivate MERS coronavirus in human platelet concentrates. *Transfus Med* 2019; 29:434–41
18. Hindawi SI, Hashem AM, Damanhouri GA *et al.*: Inactivation of Middle East respiratory syndrome-coronavirus in human plasma using amotosalen and ultraviolet A light. *Transfusion* 2018; 58:52–9
19. Ragan I, Hartson L, Pidcoke H *et al.*: Pathogen reduction of SARS-CoV-2 virus in plasma and whole blood using riboflavin and UV light. PLoS One. 2020 May 29;15(5):e0233947
20. Eickmann M, Gravemann U, Handke W *et al.*: Inactivation of three emerging viruses—severe acute respiratory syndrome coronavirus, Crimean-Congo haemorrhagic fever virus and Nipah virus—in platelet concentrates by ultraviolet C light and in plasma by methylene blue plus visible light. *Vox Sang* 2020.
21. Eickmann M, Gravemann U, Handke W *et al.*: Inactivation of Ebola virus and Middle East respiratory syndrome coronavirus in platelet concentrates and plasma by ultraviolet C light and methylene blue plus visible light, respectively. *Transfusion* 2018; 58:2202–7

Table 1: Comparison of individual methods of pathogen reduction with the initial values, using two sample paired t-test. The numbers show differences in means and respective p-values in parenthesis below. Statistically significant differences are in **bold font**.

Method (sample size)	NtAbs*	Anti-RBD IgG (AU)	Anti S+N IgG (U/L)	Anti-S+N IgM (COI)
Methylene blue vs initial (n=104)	**0.10** (0.01)	**0.03** (0.03)	1.1 (0.23)	0.007 (0.59)
Amotosalen vs initial (n=88)	**0.23** (0.0003)	0.0 (0.99)	**1.7** (0.008)	0.01 (0.53)
Riboflavin vs initial	**0.40**	**0.07**	**8.9**	**0.19**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2020.10.02.20205567; this version posted October 5, 2020. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. All rights reserved. No reuse allowed without permission.

(n=83)	(<0.0001)	(0.001)	(<0.0001)	(<0.0001)

* The shown values are $\log_2$-transformed and divided by 10.

Table 2: Comparison of different methods of pathogen reduction using two sample paired t-test. The numbers show differences in means and respective p-values in parenthesis below. Statistically significant differences are in **bold font**.

Method (sample size)	NtAbs*	Anti-RBD IgG (AU)	Anti S+N IgG (U/L)	Anti-S+N IgM (COI)
Methylene blue vs Amotosalen (n=56)	**0.27** (0.001)	-0.02 (0.60)	3.1 (0.21)	0.045 (0.29)
Amotosalen vs Riboflavin (n=36)	**0.33** (0.0002)	0.06** (0.27)	**6.7** (<0.0001)	**0.20** (<0.0001)
Methylene blue vs Riboflavin (n=48)	**0.42** (<0.0001)	0.007 (0.82)	**6.6** (<0.0001)	**0.16** (<0.0001)

* The shown values are $\log_2$-transformed and divided by 10.

** one data point is missing, so n=35 here

Figure 1. Proportion of COVID-19 convalescent plasma units that had no decrease in NtAbs titer ( ), one step titer decrease ( ) or two step titer decrease ( ) after pathogen reduction with methylene blue (A, D), amotosalen (B, E) and riboflavin (C, F) among all plasma units (A, B, C) or only units with initial NtAbs titer 80 or above (D, E, F).

METHYLENE BLUE, ALL PLASMA UNITS (N=95)



A

AMOTOSALEN, ALL PLASMA UNITS (N=81)



B

RIBOFLAVIN, ALL PLASMA UNITS (N=69)



C

METHYLENE BLUE, TITERS ≥ 80 (N=53)



D

AMOTOSALEN, TITERS ≥ 80 (N=55)



E

RIBOFLAVIN, TITERS ≥ 80 (N=30)



F