OPEN

Current status of primary, secondary and tertiary prevention of congenital cytomegalovirus disease: a call to action

Heather Bailey[a], *Helen Payne*[b,c] *and Hermione Lyall*[d]

Purpose of review
Globally, sequelae of congenital CMV (CCMV) impact an estimated 350 000 children born annually. In this review, we consider new evidence across primary, secondary and tertiary prevention approaches, and remaining evidence gaps.

Recent findings
Education on hygiene precautions can reduce risk of primary CMV acquisition in pregnancy, and may have a role in some settings in reducing CCMV cases resulting from nonprimary infection, but public and health worker knowledge and awareness remains low. Evidence that valaciclovir treatment can reduce CMV vertical transmission has led to renewed interest in antenatal CMV screening in some high-income countries over recent years, although there is a lack of recommendation in most guidelines and significant evidence gaps remain. Newborn CCMV screening has been adopted in some states/provinces in Canada/USA, with first results recently published. Newborn prognostic scoring systems are evolving, with potential for more effective targeting of newborn treatment and tertiary prevention of CCMV disease.

Summary
We make suggestions for clinical practice and research, particularly to address evidence gaps around: safety and effectiveness of antenatal CMV screening and antiviral prophylaxis; findings relating to detection of nonprimary infection in pregnancy; new prognostic neonatal scoring systems; and learning from follow-up of children born into state-wide universal CMV screening programmes.

Keywords
antivirals, congenital cytomegalovirus, deafness, neurodisability, prevention, screening

INTRODUCTION

Globally, congenital cytomegalovirus (CCMV) is by far the commonest congenital infection, although arguably, the least well recognized by the public and healthcare professionals (HCP), and least well researched considering its frequency and consequences. A meta-analysis of neonatal screening studies found a global CCMV birth prevalence of 0.67% [95% confidence interval (CI) 0.54–0.83%], and three-fold higher in low-income and middle-income countries (LMICs) than high-income countries (HIC) [1]. This reflects the importance of nonprimary maternal CMV infection in the epidemiology of CCMV, with prepregnancy CMV-seroprevalence of more than 90 and 50–60% in LMICs and HICs, respectively [1]. Worldwide, there are an estimated 1 760 000 infants born annually with CCMV, 356 400 of whom have CMV-related long-term sequelae [2–4] (Fig. 1). Routine neonatal screening for CCMV remains rare, with state-wide screening only underway in: Ontario, New York State and Minnesota [5▪▪,6▪▪].

In-utero transmission of CMV, usually following asymptomatic maternal infection, causes a spectrum of newborn effects, from severe life-limiting disease to no apparent impact, although most infants are at the less severe end of the spectrum. Following primary infection, transplacental CMV transmission in

[a]Institute for Global Health, University College London (UCL), [b]Section of Paediatric Infectious Disease, Imperial College London, London, UK, [c]Department of Paediatrics and Child Health, and Department of Immunology, Stellenbosch University, South Africa and [d]Department of Paediatric Infectious Diseases, Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust, London, UK

Correspondence to Heather Bailey, UCL Institute for Global Health, Mortimer Market Centre, Capper Street, London, WC1E 6JB, UK.
E-mail: heather.bailey@ucl.ac.uk

Curr Opin Infect Dis 2025, 38:000–000

DOI:10.1097/QCO.0000000000001137

KEY POINTS

- Education on hygiene precautions can reduce primary CMV acquisition in pregnancy, and may have a role in some settings in reducing CCMV cases resulting from nonprimary infection, but this is dependent on improving public awareness and healthcare workers' knowledge.
- Valaciclovir treatment can reduce first trimester CMV vertical transmission and this has led to renewed interest in antenatal screening for maternal primary CMV in some high-income countries, although there is a lack of recommendation in most guidelines and significant evidence gaps remain.
- Newborn CCMV screening has been adopted in some states/provinces in Canada/USA, with first promising results recently published.
- Newborn prognostic scoring systems are evolving, with potential for more effective targeting of newborn treatment for tertiary prevention of CCMV disease.
- We make suggestions for clinical practice and research, particularly to address evidence gaps around: safety and effectiveness of antenatal CMV screening and antiviral treatment and prophylaxis; findings relating to detection of nonprimary infection in pregnancy; new prognostic neonatal scoring systems and hearing and functional developmental outcomes for children born into universal CMV screening programmes.

early pregnancy leads to significant sequelae including sensorineural hearing loss (SNHL), and brain injury with severe neurodevelopmental consequences in up to a fifth of infants [7]. This has been described as the embryopathy of first trimester CCMV, with structural and inflammatory tissue damage to foetal brain, cochleae, and vestibular apparatus [8,9]. In contrast, foetal infection in the second or third trimester appears much less likely to be associated with long-term consequences, although further studies with longer term follow-up are needed to fully understand the long-term impacts of cCMV. CMV-seronegative women with a short inter-pregnancy interval are at particular risk for a first trimester primary CMV infection in a subsequent pregnancy, with a French study indicating that risk peaked at 7% with an inter-pregnancy interval of 1–2 years [10].

Transmission rates following maternal nonprimary infection are difficult to determine due to challenges establishing CMV reinfection or reactivation during pregnancy but are estimated at 3.5% or lower [11]. CCMV birth prevalence overall increases with higher HIV prevalence [1]. Although vertical transmission rates are higher among mothers with primary seroconversion, worldwide, many more infants with CCMV are born to women who are already seropositive, and most are not diagnosed, with no access to treatment [12].

Initial categorization of infants with CCMV as clinically 'symptomatic' or 'asymptomatic' at birth predated newborn hearing screening and brain imaging; a significant proportion of infants who examine normally at birth may have SNHL and/or abnormal findings on brain MRI. Clinical follow-up should continue until school age to identify late-onset and progressive SNHL, and other neurodevelopmental sequelae [13▪▪], but studies with this length of follow-up are limited [14].

Economic costs of CCMV are high, including lifelong support for children with cerebral palsy and epilepsy, as well as cochlear implantation for profound SNHL, although costs are more difficult to assess for those less severely affected. Recent studies suggest that universal neonatal screening is more cost-effective than targeted testing to reduce CCMV-related sequelae [15,16]. Although the foetal effects of CCMV can be mitigated by treatment after birth, they cannot be cured like congenital syphilis, or fully suppressed like HIV. As for these other prevalent congenital infections, the best way to protect infants from CCMV is to prevent vertical transmission. Here, we review recent evidence across primary, secondary and tertiary prevention of CCMV disease (Fig. 2).

PRIMARY PREVENTION: PREVENTION OF ACQUISITION OF CYTOMEGALOVIRUS IN PREGNANCY

Provision of hygiene information for CMV-seronegative pregnant women can reduce the proportion seroconverting antenatally, with high acceptability, as demonstrated in a controlled intervention study [17]. However, an Italian study, which aimed to assess a similar intervention in CMV-seropositive women did not proceed due to lower rates of CCMV than anticipated [18]. Authors used several methods to attempt to distinguish between reinfection or reactivation of maternal CMV where CCMV had occurred. Where available, genotype-specific IgG showed that only one of seven women had a potential reinfection with a new CMV strain. In addition, lack of association between CCMV and maternal contact with young children as well as increased risk of transmission among women with comorbidities, particularly diabetes, were taken as indirect evidence that in this cohort, most transmissions were due to reactivation rather than reinfection [18]. In contrast, reinfection with new CMV strains have been



FIGURE 1. Global prevalence of congenital cytomegalovirus and sequelae. This figure has used global birth data [4] and two studies that reported frequencies of long-term sequelae [2,3] to estimate numbers of infants severely affected by CCMV annually. These studies utilized universal screening for CCMV from 2007 and 2017, although the more recent study required parental consent for retrospective testing of dried blood spots and then data linkage to outcomes, which may have introduced an element of bias in reported prevalence of sequelae. The Venn diagram is a visual representative of potential overlap between domains of sequelae but not based on absolute numbers as follow-up data is limited. Infants with symptomatic disease with long-term sequelae more frequently have a combination of hearing loss, motor and cognitive impairment.

responsible for vertical transmission in other studies (e.g. in Brazil [19]) with reinfection identified in 2.7% of CMV-seropositive pregnant women in a recent study in Canada [20▪]. Thus, the potential for hygiene recommendations to prevent CCMV among seropositive women is likely to vary by setting. Many HCPs remain inadequately informed to impart CMV hygiene advice, and there is a lack of stakeholder advocacy to integrate CMV knowledge into routine antenatal care [21].

CMV vaccine studies have been underway for over 50 years, and seven candidate vaccines are currently under trial [22]. Results of a CMV mRNA phase III randomised, placebo-controlled vaccine trial in CMV-seronegative women of child-bearing age, exposed to young children, are awaited [23]. In future, a potential CMV vaccine could be included in routine childhood immunizations, offered to adolescents, or to CMV-seronegative women planning pregnancy [24]. However, protection of infants of CMV-seropositive women requires significant progress to be made in understanding how to counteract the multiple ways in which CMV evades the host immune response [25]. An in-vitro placental immunology study in seropositive women found that CMV-specific tissue-resident CD8+ T cells in decidual tissues can exert cytotoxic effector functions, and provide antiviral protection upon CMV-reinfection, which could inform future vaccine development approaches [26].



FIGURE 2. Key points for primary, secondary and tertiary prevention of congenital cytomegalovirus disease. Superscript numbers indicate references in the main text.

SECONDARY PREVENTION: PREVENTION OF VERTICAL TRANSMISSION OF CMV

It is 5 years since publication of a randomized controlled trial showing that high-dose valaciclovir reduces CMV vertical transmission following primary CMV infection in the first trimester [27]. An individual patient data meta-analysis including this trial and two quasi-randomized studies showed a similar reduction in risk of vertical transmission with valaciclovir following periconception primary infection [adjusted odds ratio (aOR) 0.34, 95% CI 0.18–0.61 for periconception and aOR 0.35, 95% CI 0.16–0.76 for first-trimester infection], with higher rates of vertical transmission when valaciclovir was initiated at a later gestational week [28▪▪].

The efficacy of valaciclovir has prompted off-label use in pregnant women identified with primary CMV [29]. There is renewed interest in first trimester serological screening in HICs [13▪▪], and this is increasingly being adopted, despite lack of recommendation in most guidelines. For example, in Italy [30] and in Germany, where up to 40% of pregnant women are tested at their own expense [31]. In Spain, a recent first trimester pilot study in a population with a CMV seroprevalence of 70.6%, found that 0.14% of 2777 women screened had primary CMV infection, and vertical transmission occurred in one of four treated pregnancies, after valaciclovir was initiated late [32▪▪]. A French modelling study demonstrated that universal antenatal CMV screening with valaciclovir as prophylaxis would be cost-saving versus current practice, where only 25–50% of women are screened [33].

However, a recent opinion piece argued that criteria for a universal antenatal CMV screening have not yet been met, due to a lack of evidence of the safety and efficacy of screening programmes based on universal first-trimester serological screening followed by valaciclovir as secondary prevention [34]. There are also gaps in understanding of the epidemiology of CMV and acceptability of the screening pathway in different settings. For example, a recent Australian qualitative study highlighted the psychological impact of a suspected CMV infection in pregnancy, intensified by lack of CMV knowledge in family support networks and HCPs [35]. Concerns have also been raised that positive screening tests may result in termination of pregnancies with a good chance of a healthy outcome [36]. Importantly, criteria for the introduction of population screening state that other options such as primary prevention strategies, should be implemented as a prerequisite [37] and yet awareness of CMV and preventive interventions, among HCP and pregnant women remains low [21].

Importantly, serological screening cannot identify nonprimary maternal CMV infections, which account for a significant proportion of CCMV cases, even in low-seroprevalence HICs (e.g. 50% of CCMV cases in France [38]). Recent Dutch studies have used DNA sequencing data generated by first trimester non-invasive prenatal testing (NIPT) for foetal aneuploidy screening to identify maternal blood samples containing CMV cell-free DNA fragments [39▪▪,40▪]. There is evidence that these fragments could arise as a result of maternal infection and infection of the placenta and may identify both primary and nonprimary CMV

infections in the first trimester [39▪▪,40▪]. Incorporating CMV screening into an existing antenatal NIPT screening programme has potential logistical and cost benefits, but prospective clinical studies are required to link these findings with clinical outcomes.

In parallel with changes in use of CMV testing in pregnancy, there have been changes in the epidemiology of children diagnosed with CCMV in Europe, with an increasing proportion diagnosed, including some treated, *in utero*, and often without clinically apparent symptoms at birth [41]. The implications of diagnosis and treatment *in utero* should be explored by routine collation of data, alongside outcomes for children identified with CCMV after birth.

TERTIARY PREVENTION: LIMITATION OF SEVERE CONSEQUENCES OF CONGENITAL CYTOMEGALOVIRUS DISEASE

Two randomized controlled trials of ganciclovir/valganciclovir demonstrated a significant reduction in progressive and late-onset hearing loss, and improvement in developmental outcomes in symptomatic infants born more than 32 weeks gestation, birthweight greater than 1.8 kg, initiating therapy at less than 1 month of age [42]. Treating early makes biological sense, as treatment is more likely to be beneficial during immunological immaturity of early infancy when there is reduced ability to control CMV, and indeed, makes the case for treatment *in utero* with antenatal diagnosis [43–46]. In a more recent nonrandomised study in the Netherlands, children born at term (≥37 weeks) with normal birthweight, unilateral or bilateral hearing loss (≥21 dB), and diagnosed with cCMV through targeted screening incorporated into the Newborn Hearing Screening Programme without prior clinical suspicion, had the option of initiating valganciclovir up to 13 weeks of age. Whether to initiate treatment was determined by parental choice; children receiving 6 weeks of valganciclovir had reduced subsequent hearing loss up to 20 months of age, as compared with a control group (those who chose nontreatment and historical controls) [47]. However, a small randomised study of 6 weeks valganciclovir versus placebo for children diagnosed with CCMV and SNHL aged 1 month to 3 years of age (up to their fourth birthday) did not demonstrate improved hearing outcomes 6 months later [48]. Small and heterogeneous study populations, complexities of audiological testing, and short and incomplete follow-up, are among the methodological issues that complicate interpretation of these and many CCMV studies.

Early treatment initiation depends on early diagnosis, and screening studies have shown that even infants symptomatic at birth can be clinically missed [6▪▪]. Barriers to universal screening include: uncertainty regarding whether screening tests will identify those most at risk of long-term neurodevelopmental and hearing problems; whether asymptomatic infants require treatment or not; and whether the investigation of asymptomatic infants leads to undue cost and parental anxiety [49]. In Ontario, these concerns have been closely examined, and subsequent to the pilot study, universal neonatal screening will continue [6▪▪].

In the absence of universal screening, targeted CMV testing of high-risk groups less than 3 weeks of age is an alternative approach including: premature infants; HIV-exposed; infants with growth restriction; or infants who have failed new-born hearing screening. However, this relies upon HCPs' awareness and local policies, and there is considerable disparity in service delivery [50].

Although there is evidence for early treatment in symptomatic infants, this is lacking for those considered 'asymptomatic', a proportion of whom may have hearing loss and or abnormal findings on MRI [51], although an observational study has suggested treatment initiated for infants with milder hearing loss at diagnosis had high likelihood of hearing improvement [52]. Neonatal prognostic scores, constructed from clinical, biochemical and radiological features are being developed to predict long-term outcomes across the spectrum of CCMV, to identify with increased precision which infants will benefit from treatment. In a cohort of 227 children, absence of SNHL at birth, with normal cerebral ultrasound and platelet count, was predictive of no risk of neurologic sequelae, and a low risk of delayed unilateral SNHL up to 2 years of age [53▪]. A prognostic score focusing upon identifying infants with progressive CMV disease is also being developed from a prospective cohort of 1500 children with follow-up to school age in the European CCMVNET registry. Prospective follow-up of infants born into recent state screening systems will provide further insight in predicting consequences of mildly affected or asymptomatic infants [5▪▪,6▪▪]. Emerging evidence for antenatal and neonatal biomarkers for CCMV long-term sequelae may be useful additions to baseline clinical findings include immunomodulatory proteins [54], and plasma and cell-associated CMV reservoirs [55], and a 13-gene signature predictive of late-onset hearing loss [56]. Recent additions to this field include magnitude of amniotic CMV viral load [57] or reduced or absent CMV-specific neonatal immune responses associated with developmental delay, and high levels of exhausted CD8 T cells in children with progressive SNHL [43]. The validated CCMV-specific brain MRI score correlates neonatal imaging findings in symptomatic infants with developmental outcomes at median 3–4 years of age, also adding to the predictive

neonatal battery of investigations [58▪▪]. However, for predictive approaches to be reliable, systematic measures of functional developmental outcomes should also be applied, and described alongside environmental context and other developmental support [59].

Ganciclovir/valganciclovir remains unlicensed for treatment of cCMV in neonates. Evidence-based rationale for treatment is essential, particularly in LMICs where rates of CCMV are higher [60] and side-effect monitoring challenging. Neutropenia and transaminitis occur in up to 46% of treated term and preterm infants [61], and animal data implies potential risk of teratogenicity and carcinogenesis [13▪▪]. Important treatment issues, which remain to be addressed include: optimal duration of treatment; dosing for premature infants with CCMV; best treatment for infants with HIV and CCMV; and how to improve treatment outcomes while minimizing side effects. Alternative approaches to be evaluated could include, valganciclovir to suppress CMV, followed by antivirals with less toxicity to maintain suppression.

The value of psychological support for families in managing an unexpected and life-changing newborn diagnosis, and the challenges that lie ahead managing a child with disability, should not be overlooked [13▪▪]. A holistic approach informed by the lived experience of families affected by CCMV, and including integrated clinical psychology support, will ultimately improve clinical, developmental and socio-emotional outcomes for the child and family.

CONCLUSION

Despite recent progress, many questions remain unanswered, including better understanding of the immunology and virology of CMV vertical transmission, and optimal approaches for secondary and tertiary prevention of CCMV-related sequelae (Table 1). However, there are key clinical interventions that can be implemented now, which reflect a shift towards prevention of CMV infection, alongside addressing treatment. Indisputably, the immediate focus should be upon public and HCP education (including awareness of hygiene-based prevention measures), alongside developing and strengthening equitable and evidence-based pathways for antenatal and postnatal management, even in the absence of universal screening. Advocacy from

Table 1. Clinical practice and research recommendations

Clinical practice
Education of public and healthcare workers on CCMV: Primary prevention hygiene measures to reduce the risk of CMV acquisition during pregnancy Features of neonatal presentation, to improve diagnosis of symptomatic infection.
Establishing and evaluating management and treatment pathways for antenatally diagnosed CMV, for prophylaxis of VT and foetal treatment, to ensure equitable and evidence-based options and family support.
Use of predictive neonatal scoring approaches: cCMV-specific brain MRI, to assess severity and need for treatment Normal cranial ultrasound scan, normal hearing and platelets at diagnosis identifies low-risk infants who may not require intensive follow-up.
Research priorities
Epidemiological research to investigate the role of first trimester screening and antenatal antiviral prophylaxis in reducing CCMV disease burden
Clinical, implementation and social science research to evaluate the effectiveness and safety of antenatal CMV screening and antiviral prophylaxis in reducing CCMV, and acceptability of the antenatal screening pathway in real-world settings.
Health economic assessments of universal screening of first trimester primary maternal CMV infection and antiviral prophylaxis of vertical transmission; screening and treating neonatal CCMV.
Further research on the detection of first trimester maternal blood CMV DNA fragments to diagnose nonprimary as well as primary maternal CMV infection, and how this links with vertical transmission and clinical outcomes.
Development and evaluation of prognostic value of new neonatal scoring systems for CCMV.
Immunology, virology, transcriptomic/proteomic profiling studies to better identify biomarkers for severity of CCMV
Long-term follow-up of modern cohorts (LMIC and HIC) of children with CCMV to at least 5–6 years of age, to ascertain true burden of disease, across the spectrum of symptomatology.
Randomized controlled trials of new/different antiviral combinations for CMV suppression, both antenatally and postnatally.

CCMV, congenital cytomegalovirus; HIC, high-income countries; LMICs, low-income and middle-income countries; VT, vertical transmission.

the CCMV community has built international recognition of the global impact of CCMV for children and families, health and social care services. It is now time for the clinical and academic community to step-up and collaboratively apply the evidence we have for pragmatic clinical practice while on-going and new scientific studies address the gaps in understanding.

Acknowledgements

None.

Financial support and sponsorship

None.

Conflicts of interest

H.B. is a co-investigator of the European Pregnancy and Paediatric Infections Cohort Collaboration (EPPICC), which has received funding from ViiV Healthcare and Merck Sharp & Dohme via Penta Foundation and a member of the Advisory Group for the UK National Screening Committee review of evidence on CMV screening.

REFERENCES AND RECOMMENDED READING

Papers of particular interest, published within the annual period of review, have been highlighted as:

- ■ of special interest
- ■■ of outstanding interest

1. Ssentongo P, Hehnly C, Birungi P, *et al.* Congenital cytomegalovirus infection burden and epidemiologic risk factors in countries with universal screening: a systematic review and meta-analysis. JAMA Netw Open 2021; 4:e2120736.
2. Dollard SC, Grosse SD, Ross DS. New estimates of the prevalence of neurological and sensory sequelae and mortality associated with congenital cytomegalovirus infection. Rev Med Virol 2007; 17:355–363.
3. Korndewal MJ, Oudesluys-Murphy AM, Kroes ACM, *et al.* Long-term impairment attributable to congenital cytomegalovirus infection: a retrospective cohort study. Dev Med Child Neurol 2017; 59:1261–1268.
4. database.earth. Annual population births by country in 2024. Available at: https://database.earth/population/births/2024. [Accessed 1 April 2025]
5. ■■ Kaye T, Dufort EM, Rosendahl SD, *et al.* Notes from the field: universal newborn screening and surveillance for congenital cytomegalovirus - Minnesota. MMWR Morb Mortal Wkly Rep 2024; 73:703–705.

A short report giving some initial findings from Minnesota's universal newborn screening programme. This programme found a CCMV birth prevalence of 0.29% among 60 115 infants screened between February 2023 and February 2024, with 75% of these infants comprehensively evaluated and linked to care.

6. ■■ Dunn JKE, Chakraborty P, Reuvers E, *et al.* Outcomes of a population-based congenital cytomegalovirus screening program. JAMA Pediatr 2025; 179: 332–339.

First state-wide prospective study of neonatal CMV screening to report from Ontario, where CMV screening was introduced as a risk factor for SNHL. Very comprehensive assessment of: the testing process, both clinically and virologically. One in 800 infants were found to be CMV DNA positive at birth, a lower prevalence than expected, and only 16% were symptomatic at birth. Prospective follow-up of the cohort will give very important information on outcomes of CCMV.

7. Chatzakis C, Ville Y, Makrydimas G, *et al.* Timing of primary maternal cytomegalovirus infection and rates of vertical transmission and fetal consequences. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2020; 223:870.e11–883.e11.
8. Piccirilli G, Gabrielli L, Bonasoni MP, *et al.* Fetal brain damage in human fetuses with congenital cytomegalovirus infection: histological features and viral tropism. Cell Mol Neurobiol 2023; 43:1385–1399.
9. Teissier N, Delezoide AL, Mas AE, *et al.* Inner ear lesions in congenital cytomegalovirus infection of human fetuses. Acta Neuropathol 2011; 122: 763–774.
10. Leruez-Ville M, Guilleminot T, Stirnemann J, *et al.* Quantifying the burden of congenital cytomegalovirus infection with long-term sequelae in subsequent pregnancies of women seronegative at their first pregnancy. Clin Infect Dis 2020; 71:1598–1603.
11. Zelini P, d'Angelo P, De Cicco M, *et al.* Human cytomegalovirus nonprimary infection during pregnancy: antibody response, risk factors and newborn outcome. Clin Microbiol Infect 2022; 28:1375–1381.
12. Mussi-Pinhata MM, Yamamoto AY. Natural history of congenital cytomegalovirus infection in highly seropositive populations. J Infect Dis 2020; 221 (Suppl 1):S15–S22.
13. ■■ Leruez-Ville M, Chatzakis C, Lilleri D, *et al.* Consensus recommendation for prenatal, neonatal and postnatal management of congenital cytomegalovirus infection from the European congenital infection initiative (ECCI). Lancet Reg Health Eur 2024; 40:100892.

Updated, evidence-based European consensus guidelines on management of CMV infection in pregnancy and the neonate.

14. Smyrli A, Raveendran V, Walter S, *et al.* What are the neurodevelopmental outcomes of children with asymptomatic congenital cytomegalovirus infection at birth? A systematic literature review. Rev Med Virol 2024; 34:e2555.
15. Saito H, Sakai K, Tanaka M, *et al.* Economic evaluation of newborn screening for congenital cytomegalovirus infection: a systematic review. Eur J Pediatr 2025; 184:123.
16. Lantos PM, Gantt S, Janko M, *et al.* A geographically weighted cost-effectiveness analysis of newborn cytomegalovirus screening. Open Forum Infect Dis 2024; 11:ofae311.
17. Revello MG, Tibaldi C, Masuelli G, *et al.* CCPE Study Group. Prevention of primary cytomegalovirus infection in pregnancy. EBioMedicine 2015; 2: 1205–1210.
18. Lilleri D, Tassis B, Pugni L, *et al.* CHILd Study Group. Prevalence, outcome, and prevention of Congenital Cytomegalovirus Infection in Neonates Born to Women With Preconception Immunity (CHILd Study). Clin Infect Dis 2023; 76:513–520.
19. Yamamoto AY, Mussi-Pinhata MM, Boppana SB, *et al.* Human cytomegalovirus reinfection is associated with intrauterine transmission in a highly cytomegalovirus-immune maternal population. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2010; 202:297.e1–297.e8.
20. ■ St-Georges J, Balegamire SJ, Larouche A, *et al.* Reinfection with cytomegalovirus during pregnancy: a prospective cohort study in Canada. J Med Virol 2025; 97:e70261.

A serological study to identify the rate of CMV reinfection during pregnancy and its risk factors. CMV reinfection was defined as the appearance of an antibody response to a new epitope in the third compared to the first trimester. Among 1614 participants, CMV reinfection was identified in 2.7%. Age, marital status, income, continent of birth or ethnicity were not associated with reinfection during pregnancy.

21. Benou S, Dimitriou G, Papaevangelou V, Gkentzi D. Congenital cytomegalovirus infection: do pregnant women and healthcare providers know enough? A systematic review. J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med 2022; 35:6566–6575.
22. Permar SR, Schleiss MR, Plotkin SA. A vaccine against cytomegalovirus: how close are we? J Clin Invest 2025; 135:e182317.
23. clinicaltrials.gov. A study to evaluate the efficacy, safety, and immunogenicity of mRNA-1647 cytomegalovirus (CMV) vaccine in healthy participants 16 to 40 years of age. Available at: ClinicalTrials.gov ID NCT05085366. https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT05085366?cond=CMV%20&intr=vaccine&page=2&rank=11. [Accessed 25 March 2025]
24. Boppana SB, van Boven M, Britt WJ, *et al.* Vaccine value profile for cytomegalovirus. Vaccine 2023; 41 (Suppl 2):S53–S75.
25. Li S, Xie Y, Yu C, *et al.* The battle between host antiviral innate immunity and immune evasion by cytomegalovirus. Cell Mol Life Sci 2024; 81:341.
26. Alfi O, Cohen M, Bar-On S, *et al.* Decidual-tissue-resident memory T cells protect against nonprimary human cytomegalovirus infection at the maternal-fetal interface. Cell Rep 2024; 43:113698.
27. Shahar-Nissan K, Pardo J, Peled O, *et al.* Valaciclovir to prevent vertical transmission of cytomegalovirus after maternal primary infection during pregnancy: a randomised, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial. Lancet 2020; 396:779–785.
28. ■■ Chatzakis C, Shahar-Nissan K, Faure-Bardon V, *et al.* The effect of valacyclovir on secondary prevention of congenital cytomegalovirus infection, following primary maternal infection acquired periconceptionally or in the first trimester of pregnancy. An individual patient data meta-analysis. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2024; 230:109.e2–117.e2.

Individual patient data meta-analysis of effectiveness and safety of valacyclovir treatment in the secondary prevention of CCMV, including three studies (n=527 women). Valacyclovir reduced the vertical transmission rate of CMV (adjusted odds ratio, 0.34; 95% CI 0.18–0.61). Later gestational age at the initiation of treatment was correlated with higher vertical transmission. The overall prevalence of severe side effects was 2.1%.

29. Roberts SL, Kendall GS, Edwards S, *et al.* UCL cCMV MDT. Screening policies for cytomegalovirus in pregnancy in the era of antivirals. Lancet 2022; 400:489–490.
30. Zammarchi L, Tomasoni LR, Liuzzi G, *et al.* MEGAL-ITALI Working Group. Treatment with valacyclovir during pregnancy for prevention of congenital cytomegalovirus infection: a real-life multicenter Italian observational study. Am J Obstet Gynecol MFM 2023; 5:101101.
31. Hadjiiona A, Michaelides I, Kummer P, *et al.* Frequency of CMV testing during pregnancy-a retrospective study. Arch Gynecol Obstet 2025; 311: 1297–1304.

32. ■■ Castillo KP, Guirado L, Cahuana A, *et al.* First trimester universal one-time serology screening for cytomegalovirus. A pilot study at two tertiary referral centers in Barcelona (Catalunya, Spain). Fetal Diagn Ther 2025; 52:388–396.
An implementation study in Barcelona of routine CMV screening in first trimester of pregnancy, including 2777 pregnant women between 8 and 13 gestational weeks. IgG seroprevalence was 70.6%, and 22 (0.8%) had IgM antibodies, four with low or intermediate IgG avidity, suggesting a recent primary infection, and they received oral valacyclovir (VCV) 2 g/6 h. Vertical transmission occurred in one with a delayed start of VCV treatment.

33. Perillaud-Dubois C, Hachicha-Maalej N, Lepers C, *et al.* Cost-effectiveness of screening and valacyclovir-based treatment strategies for first-trimester cytomegalovirus primary infection in pregnant women in France. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 2023; 62:573–584.

34. Billette de Villemeur A, Hoen B, Billaud E, *et al.* Current evidence gaps to support systematic cytomegalovirus screening in pregnancy. EClinicalMedicine 2024; 78:102941.

35. Tripathi T, Watson J, Skrzypek H, *et al.* "The anxiety coming up to every scan-It destroyed me": a qualitative study of the lived experience of cytomegalovirus infection during pregnancy.

36. Hui L, Shand A. Is it time to adopt routine cytomegalovirus screening in pregnancy? No!. Am J Obstet Gynecol MFM 2021; 3:100355.

37. WHO Regional Office for Europe. Screening programmes: a short guide. Increase effectiveness, maximize benefits and minimize harm. Available at: https://iris.who.int/bitstream/handle/10665/330829/9789289054782-eng.pdf . [Accessed 19 January 2025]

38. Leruez-Ville M, Magny JF, Couderc S, *et al.* Risk factors for congenital cytomegalovirus infection following primary and nonprimary maternal infection: a prospective neonatal screening study using polymerase chain reaction in saliva. Clin Infect Dis 2017; 65:398–404.

39. ■■ Faas BHW, Astuti G, Melchers WJG, *et al.* Early detection of active Human CytomegaloVirus (hCMV) infection in pregnant women using data generated for noninvasive fetal aneuploidy testing. EBioMedicine 2024; 100:104983.
Anonymized sequencing NIPT data from 204 818 pregnant women analysed for the presence of hCMV cell-free DNA, in 0.94%, hCMV fragments were detected. Validation by hCMV-qPCR showed that samples with high cfDNA-hCMV load tested positive and cfDNA-hCMV-negative samples tested negative. In 32 of 112 (28.6%) cfDNA-hCMV-positive samples, the serological profile suggested a recent primary infection: this was more likely in samples with high cfDNA-hCMV load (78.6%) than in samples with low cfDNA-hCMV load (11.0%). In none of the cfDNA-hCMV-negative samples was serology indicative of recent primary infection. These findings raise the possibility that large-scale screening for both genetic foetal aberrations and active maternal CMV infections during pregnancy could be combined in one cfDNA-sequencing test, performed on a single blood sample, drawn in the first trimester of pregnancy.

40. ■ Faas BHW, Meuleman T, Astuti G, *et al.* Detection of human cytomegalovirus cell-free DNA in pregnant women with symptomatically infected fetuses: proof-of-concept study. Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol 2025; 65:470–477.
A study to evaluate the presence and levels of CMV cell-free DNA (cfDNA) fragments in blood of nine pregnant women with a foetus with symptomatic CCMV diagnosed at 20 + 4 to 34 + 1 weeks' gestation, or neonatally after primary or nonprimary maternal infection. CMV-cfDNA was detectable in all cases. Mostly low levels of CMV-cfDNA were observed in samples obtained at 11–13 weeks' gestation and high levels of CMV-cfDNA were present in samples obtained at CCMV diagnosis.

41. Bolchova J, Pedrero-Tome R, Rios M, *et al.* Temporal trends in the clinical presentation, management and outcomes of children with congenital cytomegalovirus infection in Europe. (European Congenital Cytomegalovirus Initiative (ECCI). Leiden, 2024.

42. Kimberlin DW, Jester PM, Sanchez PJ, *et al.* National Institute of Allergy and Infectious Diseases Collaborative Antiviral Study Group. Valganciclovir for symptomatic congenital cytomegalovirus disease. N Engl J Med 2015; 372: 933–943.

43. Medoro AK, Dhital R, Sanchez PJ, *et al.* T cell responses and clinical symptoms among infants with congenital cytomegalovirus infection. JCI Insight 2024; 9: e171029.

44. Smith MD, Seleme MC, Marquez-Lago T, *et al.* Early control of cochlear viral load limits cochlear inflammation and prevents virus-induced sensorineural hearing loss. J Neuroinflammation 2025; 22:92.

45. Bourgon N, Lopez R, Fourgeaud J, *et al.* In utero treatment of congenital cytomegalovirus infection with valganciclovir: an observational study on safety and effectiveness. J Antimicrob Chemother 2024; 79:2500–2508.

46. Leruez-Ville M, Ghout I, Bussieres L, *et al.* In utero treatment of congenital cytomegalovirus infection with valacyclovir in a multicenter, open-label, phase II study. Am J Obstet Gynecol 2016; 215:462.e1–462.e10.

47. Chung PK, Schornagel FAJ, Soede W, *et al.* Valganciclovir in infants with hearing loss and clinically inapparent congenital cytomegalovirus infection: a nonrandomized controlled trial. J Pediatr 2024; 268:113945.

48. Kimberlin DW, Aban I, Peri K, *et al.* Collaborative Antiviral Study Group (CASG). Oral valganciclovir initiated beyond 1 month of age as treatment of sensorineural hearing loss caused by congenital cytomegalovirus infection: a randomized clinical trial. J Pediatr 2024; 268:113934.

49. UK National Screening Committee recommendations (cytomegalovirus). Cytomegalovirus - UK National Screening Committee (UKNSC). Available at: https://view-health-screening-recommendations.service.gov.uk/cytomegalovirus/. [Accessed 25 March 2025]

50. Raveendran V, Garnett H, Magee C, *et al.* Early congenital cytomegalovirus detection pathways in pediatric audiology services in England: findings from a national audit in England. Pediatr Infect Dis J 2025; 44:e27–e28.

51. Blazquez-Gamero D, Soriano-Ramos M, Vicente M, *et al.* for PICCSA Study Group. Prevalence and clinical manifestations of congenital cytomegalovirus infection in a screening program in Madrid (PICCSA Study). Pediatr Infect Dis J 2020; 39:1050–1056.

52. Morioka I, Kakei Y, Imai T, *et al.* Japanese Congenital Cytomegalovirus Study Group.. Three-year hearing outcomes in infants with congenital cytomegalovirus disease treated with oral valganciclovir: interim results of a six-year follow-up study in Japan. J Clin Virol 2025; 177:105778.

53. ■ Fourgeaud J, Magny JF, Couderc S, *et al.* Predictors of the outcome at 2 years in neonates with congenital cytomegalovirus infection. Pediatrics 2024; 153: e2023063531.
A study of 227 children with CCMV were followed up for 2 years. A predictive model demonstrated no risk of sequelae at 2 years of age according to Infants with no hearing loss at birth, normal cerebral ultrasound, and normal platelet count. The model had 98% specificity, 69% sensitivity, and 0.89 area under the curve (95% confidence interval, 0.83-0.96).

54. Vorontsov O, Levitt L, Lilleri D, *et al.* Amniotic fluid biomarkers predict the severity of congenital cytomegalovirus infection. J Clin Invest 2022; 132: e157415.

55. Yamaguchi M, Kawada JI, Torii Y, *et al.* Quantitative assessment of viral load in the blood and urine of patients with congenital cytomegalovirus infection using droplet digital PCR. J Med Virol 2022; 94:4559–4564.

56. Ouellette CP, Sanchez PJ, Xu Z, *et al.* Blood genome expression profiles in infants with congenital cytomegalovirus infection. Nat Commun 2020; 11: 3548.

57. Gilad N, Agrawal S, Philippopoulos E, *et al.* Is a higher amniotic fluid viral load associated with a greater risk of fetal injury in congenital cytomegalovirus infection-a systematic review and meta-analysis. J Clin Med 2024; 13:2136.

58. ■■ Alarcon A, de Vries LS, Parodi A, *et al.* Neuroimaging in infants with congenital cytomegalovirus infection and its correlation with outcome: emphasis on white matter abnormalities. Arch Dis Child Fetal Neonatal Ed 2024; 109: 151–158.
A multicentre retrospective cohort study of 160 infants with CCMV (103 symptomatic) demonstrating the use of a four-grade CCMV-specific neonatal MRI brain score. Scores highly correlated with outcome at a median of 4 years follow-up. The absence of temporal-pole white matter abnormalities was found to have a negative=predictive value, indicating a low risk of poor outcomes.

59. Soares-Marangoni DA, Arguelho AO, Mendonca A, *et al.* STORCH Brazil: multicenter cohort study protocol to investigate neurodevelopmental paths and functioning in infants exposed to STORCH in Brazil. BMC Pediatr 2025; 25:217.

60. Payne H, Barnabas S. Congenital cytomegalovirus in sub-Saharan Africa-a narrative review with practice recommendations". Front Public Health 2024; 12:1359663.

61. Nishikawa JK, Aban I, Acosta EP, *et al.* Examining neutropenia during treatment of cytomegalovirus disease in neonates. Pediatr Infect Dis J 2025; 44: 759–763.