RESEARCH ARTICLE



Open Access

Seroprevalence of Cytomegalo Virus (CMV) among pregnant women in Thika, Kenya

Zakayo Maingi² and Anthony Kebira Nyamache^{1*}

Abstract

Background: The fetal consequences of CMV infection have made it one of the most serious infections contracted during pregnancy. Despite the posed teratogenic risk during pregnancy, there is no national screening test for CMV infection is available during pregnancy in Kenya. Thus little is known on its epidemiological data that is necessary for health planners and care providers.

Methods: A cross sectional study was conducted at Thika district level 5 hospital, Kenya to investigate seroprevalence of CMV infections and associated possible risk factors among pregnant women. Structured questionnaires were used to gather socio-demographic data and ELISA was used to detect CMV infections using IgG and IgM.

Results: Out of 260 pregnant women, 201 (77.3%) were CMV IgG 21(8.1%) CMV IgM being on acute stage of the disease. Marital status (OR = 3.7533, 95% CI = 3.0231-6.9631, P < 0.0001), parity (OR = 3.7533, 95% CI = 3.0231-6.9631, P < 0.0001), and education (OR = 3.7533, 95% CI = 3.0231-6.9631, P < 0.0001), history of blood transfusion (OR = 0.0374, 95% CI = 0.00120-0.1168, OR = 0.3804) were found to significantly influence seropostivity in univariate analysis.

Conclusion: The 88.4% CMV prevalence rate being detected among pregnant women calls for vaccine and routine screening for CMV infections and its associated risk factors in this kind of settings.

Background

Cytomegalovirus (CMV) is the commonest among viral infections during perinatal period that cause congenital CMV infections [1]. Its clinical manifestations range from asymptomatic forms (90% of cases) to severe fetal damage that may include permanent hearing, vision loss, neurological impairment and, in rare cases, death due to abortion [2-4]. Previous studies have confirmed that CMV infection is relatively common among women of reproductive age with seroprevalence ranging from 45% to 100%. African continent like South America and Asia has one of the highest prevalence of CMV [4]. From the previous studies conducted in Africa, CMV prevalence rates in Egypt were found to be 96% [5], 85.7% Tanzania [6], 97.2% Benin [7] and 86.4% South Africa [8].

CMV is transmitted from person-to-person via close non-sexual contact, sexual activity, breastfeeding, blood transfusions, and organ transplantation [9]. For pregnant women, important sources of infection include sexual activity and contact with the urine or saliva of young children, especially their own children [10]. However, seroprevalence varies greatly with a variety of epidemiological factors such as geographical distribution, socio-economic status, marital status and parity [11].

Like other herpes viruses, primary infection is followed with established of lifelong latent infection from which periodic reaction is common [12]. At this stage, symptoms are usually absent including during reaction [13].

As far as prevention is concerned, in addition to health education campaigns, the serological screening of pregnant women has been proposed. However, there is no consensus in the scientific community concerning the implementation of screening and it is not recommended by any public health system despite its teratogenic effects because of its cost/benefit ratio [14]. However, other countries Israel, Belgium, and France their doctors do test their pregnant patients an intervention to CMV infections that should be adopted by all [14].

There is no published data concerning CMV seroprevalence in pregnant women in Kenya. The basic data



© 2014 Maingi and Nyamache; licensee BioMed Central Ltd. This is an Open Access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0), which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly credited. The Creative Commons Public Domain Dedication waiver (http://creativecommons.org/publicdomain/zero/1.0/) applies to the data made available in this article, unless otherwise stated.

^{*} Correspondence: akibera2000@gmail.com

¹Department of Microbiology, Kenyatta University, P.O. Box 43844, 00100 Nairobi, Kenya

Full list of author information is available at the end of the article

concerning CMV infections during pregnancy is important for health planners and care providers. This study was therefore aimed at determining the seroprevalence, associated possible risk factors for CMV infections among pregnant women in Thika Kiambu County.

Methods

To determine the seroprevalence of CMV among the expectant mothers, seeking health services at Thika level 5 hospitals. Consenting pregnant women were approached to participate in the study. A questionnaire was administered and socio-demographic data and blood samples were collected from 260 consenting participants during the period of Sept 2012 to April 2013. The participants were women aged between (18) eighteen years and (45) forty five years old. The participants were sampled from the antenatal clinic. A 5ml blood specimen was obtained for each subject for the evaluation of CMV serum immunoglobulin G antibody using a commercial enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (Wampole; Inverness Medical Professional Diagnostics) in accordance with the manufacturer's instructions.

Quantitative analysis for CMV (IgG and IgM) was performed, and the assay result interpreted as IU/mL. The manufacturer's instructions were followed for the cut off points, which was <9 IU/mL for CMV IgG and IgM. In cases where samples were tested positive for both IgG and IgM, they further evaluated for the avidity of IgG antibodies. From the analysis, samples that were found to have an avidity index >35% were 43(79.63%) while those detected with <35% were 11(20.37%) indicated IgG, IgM predominance respectively, Table 1.

Statistics

Univariate and multivariate Odd ratio analysis was conducted and on CMV seropostivity for IgG and IgM and its association between IgG, IgM seropostivity and, high parity >4 deliveries, marital status, history of blood transfusion, HIV status, illiteracy, occupation, and residing location determined and p values less than 0.05 were considered statistically significant.

Results

Socio-demographic characteristics

A total of 260 pregnant women of the age group of 18– 45 years and in their first or second trimesters were

Table 1 Avidity index among participants with both IgMand IgG antibodies

Avidity index	Participants(n)	%	
<35%	11	20.37	
>35%	43	79.63	
Total	54	100.0	

enrolled into this study. The mean age of the participants was 28years with most of the responds being married 168(64.61%) with those divorced being the least 27(10.39%). More than third (39.4%) of these women were literate and either in business 68(26.2%) or employed 70(26.9%). One hundred and thirty seven 137 (53.08%) of the respondents had 1–4 children with most of the participants residing in urban centres 149 (57.3%), Table 2.

CMV seroprevalence

Out of a total of 260 pregnant women under this study, 201(77.3%) and 21(8%) had seropositive CMV IgG and IgM, respectively (Table 2). Those on the age group between 31–35 year old (54), had the highest IgG seropositive rates IgG 46 (85.19%) while those under age 21–25 years old 52 had the least 7(22.26%). However those who were HIV positive (27), had 23(85.2%) IgG seropositive, Table 2.

Risk factors for CMV infections

Multivariate and univariate analysis was used for CMV IgG and IgM seropositive groups as dependent variable and socio-demographic variables as independent variables. P value <0.05 was considered significant. We therefore determined if age, high parity >4 deliveries, marital status, history of blood transfusion, HIV status, illiteracy, occupation, and residing location had any significance risk to predict CMV infections. However, marital status, high parity, history of blood transfusion and age were significant risk factors for CMV infection. Geographical location and occupation and HIV status were not significantly associated with CMV infection, Table 2.

Discussion

This is the first published data on the epidemiology of CMV infections among pregnant women in Kenya. Equally few studies have been conducted among pregnant women with most studies being among blood donors. However, in this study, seroprevalence of CMV IgG 77.3% and IgM 8.1% were detected. These findings were similar to those obtained in Sudan (77.2%) [15]. Contrary to previous studies conducted in Africa, higher rates have been reported, in Benin (97.2%) [7], Egypt (96%) [16], Gambia (87%) [17], South Africa (86.4%) [18], Nigeria (100%), [19], 87% [17] Dares Salaam, Tanzania [6] and also in South East Asia [20]. However, in some of European countries, low CMV infection rates have been reported, Australia (56.9%) and France (46.8%) [21]. The low prevalence rates could be due to the inclusion of CMV screening among the antenatal profile tests and better hygienic standards [22]. The low prevalence rates of CMV in this study compared to the rest of the studies in African countries, could be due to diverse HIV infections (which is an

Age group: 1.2.5 52(20) 31 (12) 7(22.26) 25-30 95(86) S(13.88) 77(81.05) OR = 0.0698 3.3866 31-35 54(21) 2(3.7) 46(85.19) 95% C1 = 0.0017.44637 0.0665.172.5 36-40 18(7) 4(22.22) 1005.56) P = 0.2310 0.5430 41-45 10(4) 11(10) 9600 1 0.0665.172.5 Single 66(24.39) 9(13.6) 38(5/.6) OR = 3.7533 0.3897 Marited 166(64.61) 12.72.2 13.782 95% C1 = 0.0231-6.3633 0.004-00451 Divorced 27(10.39) 0(0) 2696.3) P < 0.0001 0.0004 Sub total 260 21 201 P 0.0031 4.0657 Parity: None 1170.451 12(10.35) 70(65.5) OR = 0.7373 0.2724 Sub total 260 20 240 P 0.0031 4.0677 P < 0.0001 P = 0.0532 0.7756 Sub total 260 21 201 P = 0.6532 0.7764 5.0277	Variable	Participants (n/%)	lgM (n/%)	lgG (n/%)	Univariate	Multivariate
21-25 52(20) 31(12) 7(22.26) 25-30 95(26) 5(11.26) //481.3) 949.0 = 0.001/-4.461/ 0.0665-17.25 36-40 18(7) 42(2.22) 1065.56) P = 0.2310 0.054.30 41-5 10(4) 11(10) 969.0 P 0.054.30 0.054.30 Subtoal 260 21(8.1) 20107.1 P 0.0231 0.034.44 Marial staux 0.000 26(0.23) 9<<0.0001	Age group:					
24-3095(36)91(328)77(3105)0R = 0.08983.338631-3554(2)2(3.7)4665.19998(0 = 0.0174.46370.0665.72.535-4010(4)10(109(30)5541-4510(4)10(109(30)5Subtoal260218.120(7)5Marial staus:550.0231.656310.004-0.051Marial staus:127.2137.82)999.6 1-3.0231.656310.004-0.051Diverced27(10.39)0.012012010.003Parity:127.2137.82)0.999.6 1-3.0231.656310.004-0.051Diverced27(10.39)0.66700.0240.0034One foru138(308)86.58121.197.7998.6 1-3.0234.645190.1243.64Sub total26020202020001P=0.0033Sub total26020201P<0.0001	21-25	52(20)	31(12)	7(22.26)		
31-35 54(21) 2(3.7) 4(4(65.19) 99% CI = 0.017-4.4637 0.0665-172.5 3a-60 18(7) 4(22.27) 10(5.56) P=0.3310 0.0480 341-45 10(0) 9000 P=0.3310 0.0480 Subtotal 260 21(8.1) 201(77.1) Maried 168(6.5) 0.08 3.0397 Maried 168(6.56) 12(7.2) 33(57.6) OR = 3.733 0.004-0.051 Maried 168(6.56) 12(7.2) 137(62) 95% CI = 3.0231-6.9631 0.004-0.051 Diverced 2/(10.39) 0(0) 26(6.53) OR = 0.237.3 0.237.4 Sub total 260 21 201 P<0.0001 P<0.0033 Sub total 260 20 240 P<0.0001 P<0.0334 Sub total 260 20 240 P<0.0001 P<0.0237 Sub total 260 21 201 P<0.0231 2346 Sub total 260 21 201 P<0.0532 0.0474	26-30	95(36)	5(13.68)	77(81.05)	OR = 0.0898	3.3866
36-40 18(7) 4(222) 10(65.56) P=0.2310 0.5430 41-45 10(4) 10(0) 9(9) Subtoal 260 21(8.1) 201(7.1) Marial staure 0.3897 0.3897 0.3897 Maride 1 166(6.40) 127.2 137(8) 95% CI =0.3231.6031 0.040.0451 Downeed 27(09) 0(0) 26(9.3) P < 0.001	31-35	54(21)	2(3.7)	46(85.19)	95% CI = 0.0017-4.4637	0.0665-172.5
41-45 10(4) 11(10) 9900 Subtoal 260 21(8.) 2017.1) Marinal status: U Single 66(04.30) 0(1.60 38(57.6) OR = 3.75.33 0.3007 Marinal status: 120(2.0) 137(0.0) 95% CI = 3.0231-6.96.31 0.040-0.051 Diverced 260 21 2001 0.004-0.051 0.001 0.001 0.001 0.001 P<0.0001 0.004-0.051 Sub total 260 21 201 P<0.0001 9.013.05.04 0.013.05.04 0.013.05.04 0.013.05.04 0.013.05.04 0.013.05.04 0.013.05.04 0.013.05.04 0.013.05.04 0.013.05.04 0.013.05.04 0.013.05.04 0.013.05.04 0.013.05.04 0.013.05.04 0.013.05.04 0.005.05 0.014.05.05 0.014.05.05 0.014.05.05 0.014.05.05 0.014.05.05 0.014.05.05 0.014.05.05 0.025.05.05 0.015.05.05 0.015.05.05 0.015.05.05 0.015.05.05 0.015.05.05 0.015.05.05 0.015.05.05 0.015.05.05 0.015.05.05 <	36-40	18(7)	4(22.22)	10(55.56)	P = 0.2310	0.5430
Subtool26021(8.1)201(77.1)Married66(24.30)9(13.6)38(57.6)0.R=3.753.30.804Married66(24.30)0(0)26(86.3)P<0.0001	41-45	10(4)	1(10)	9(90)		
Marikel Single 660(24)9 9(13,0) 38(57,6) OR=3,733 0.3897 Mariked 168(64,6) 12(7,2) 137(80) 9K C = 30.237.53 0.0340 Divorced 27(03) 000 26(63) 9K C = 0.373.3 0.004-0.0451 Sub total 260 21 201 201 201 201 Paris: 7 12(0.33) 676(55) 0.06 - 0.237.3 0.2224 One to four 13(50) 0.00 4667 P < 0.000	Subtotal	260	21(8.1)	201(77.1)		
Single 66(24.39) 9(13.6) 38(57.6) OR=3.7533 0.3897 Marid 168(64.61) 12(2) 137(82) 05% (-=.0.231.6.68.1) 0.004-0.051 Divorced 27(10.39) 0(0) 26(63.2) P 0.0001 0.0004 Sub total 260 21 201 201 201 0.001 0.0004 Parity: 138(53.08) 8(5.8) 121(87.7) 99% Cl=0.1246-0.4319 0.1143-0.5643 Soft total 260 20 240 201 701 P=0.0031 Sub total 260 20 240 201 P 2.3346 Sub total 260 21 201 P=0.832 0.7756 Sub total 260 21 201 P=0.832 0.7756 Location: 117(8.7) 95% Cl=-0.4448-2.617 0.8995-217 Sub total 260 21 201 P=0.832 0.7756 Location: 117(8.7) 95% Cl=-0.4448-2.617 <td>Marital status:</td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td> <td></td>	Marital status:					
Married 168(64.61) 12(7.2) 137(82) 95% CI =3.0231-6.9631 0.004-0.051 Divorced 27(10.39) 0(0) 26(6.5) P < 0.0001	Single	66(24.39)	9(13.6)	38(57.6)	OR = 3.7533	0.3897
Divorced 27(10.39) 0(0) 26(96.3) P < 0.0001 0.0004 Sub total 260 21 201 201 Parity: None 117(45) 2(10.28) 0/66.55 0.R = 0.237.3 0.2224 One to four 13863.08 8(5.8) 121(87.7) 99% CI = 0.1246-0.4519 0.1143-0.5643 Solu total 260 203 240 P < 0.0001 P = 0.003 Sub total 260 203 240 P < 0.0001 P = 0.003 Sub total 260 10(07.1) 0.R = 1.81 2.334 Sub total 260 12(9.3) 100(7.5) 95% CI = 0.4448-2.6617 0.8996-3217 Sub total 260 21 201 P = 0.832 0.475 urbait 114(2.7) 9(81) 84(75.7) 0.816.20 0.437 urbait 149(57.3) 12(81) 117(7.8) 95% CI = 0.4446-1.5256 0.4892-444 Sub total 260 201	Married	168(64.61)	12(7.2)	137(82)	95% CI =3.0231-6.9631	0.004-0.0451
Sub total26021201Parity:	Divorced	27(10.39)	0(0)	26(96.3)	P < 0.0001	0.0004
Parity: None 117(45) 12(10.35) 76(65.5) OR=0.237.3 0.2224 One to for 138(53.08) 85.80 12(187.7) 95% CI=0.1246-04519 0.1145-0.6643 > four 5(13.59) 0.00 4667 95% CI=0.1246-04519 0.1145-0.6643 Sub total 260 20 7 7 7 7 Timester of pregneuro 13(150.4) 9(6.9) 101(7.1) OR = 1.881 2.3346 Second 129(49.6) 12(9.3) 10007.5 95% CI=0.4448-2.6617 0.899-63217 Sub total 260 20 P=0.8322 0.765 Location:	Sub total	260	21	201		
None117(45)12(10.35)76(65.5) $OR = 0.2373$ 0.2224One to four138(53.08)8(5.8)12(187.7)95% CI = 0.1246-0.45190.1143-0.5643>fourS(13.55)0(0)4(667)P < 0.0001	Parity:					
One to four138(53.08)8(5.8)121(87.7)95% C1 = 0.1246-0.45190.1143-0.5643> four5(13.59)0(0)4(66.7) $P < 0.0001$ $P = 0.003$ Sub total26020240 $P < 0.001$ $P = 0.003$ Timester of pregnavy:77777First131(50.4)9(6.9)101(77.1)OR = 1.8812.3346Second129(49.6)120(33)10007.5)95% C1 = 0.4448-2.66170.8996-3217Sub total26021201 $P = 0.8532$ 0.7756Location:79(8.1)84(75.7)OR = 0.85091.0074urban149(57.3)12(8.1)117(78.5)95% C1 = 0.4746-1.52560.489-2.484Sub total2602120195% C1 = 0.0318-1.273010.0132-1.3820Iduation:795% C1 = 0.0318-1.273010.0132-1.38200.0132-1.3820Sub total260212602612610.0132-1.3820Sub total260261261261261261Primary12(4.6)4(33.3)8(66.7)95% C1 = 0.0318-1.273010.0132-1.3820Sub total260261261261261261Primary12(4.6)3(1.2)0(0)3(100CR = 0.63640.427Primary12(4.6)4(33.3)8(66.7)95% C1 = 0.0318-1.273010.0132-1.3820Sub total2603(7.4)58(7.3)95% C1 = 0.210-1.38390.2047-1.2729Far	None	117(45)	12(10.35)	76(65.5)	OR = 0.2373	0.2224
⇒four 5(13.59) 0(0) 4(66.7) P < 0.001 P = 0.003 Sub total 260 20 240 Timeser of pregname U U Sub total 260 10177.1 OR = 1.81 2.3346 Second 12(94.96) 12(9.3) 10007.5 95% CI = 0.4448-2.661.7 0.8996-321 Sub total 260 21 201 P = 0.8532 0.8996-321 Sub total 260 21 201 P = 0.8532 0.489-2.484 Sub total 260 21 201 P = 0.8579 0.489-2.484 Sub total 260 21 2161 11.7785 0.489-2.484 Sub total 260 21 217 0.489-2.484 0.489-2.484 Sub total 260 21 2161 95% CI = 0.4745-1.526 0.489-2.484 Sub total 260 21 0.310.0 OR = 0.6364 0.427 Pimary 12(4.6) 433.33 8(6.67) 95% CI = 0.0318-12.7301 0.0132-13820 <tr< td=""><td>One to four</td><td>138(53.08)</td><td>8(5.8)</td><td>121(87.7)</td><td>95% CI =0.1246-0.4519</td><td>0.1143-0.5643</td></tr<>	One to four	138(53.08)	8(5.8)	121(87.7)	95% CI =0.1246-0.4519	0.1143-0.5643
Sub total26020240Transter of pregnererererTimester of pregnererTimester of pregnererFirst131(504)9(6.9)101(77.1)OR = 1.8812.3346Sub total20(94.0)12(9.3)1007095% C = 0.4448-2.66170.8996-3217Sub total20(900201P = 0.85320.8996-321Location:1.00741.0074urban111(42.7)9(8.1)84(75.7)OR = 0.85091.0074urban149(57.3)12(8.1)117(78.5)95% C = 0.4746-1.52560.489-2.484Sub total26021201P = 0.58780.9873Sub total26021201P = 0.58780.9873Finany12(4.6)4(3.3.3)8(6.7)95% C = 0.4348-1.273010.132-13820Sub total2603(10.0)3(10.0)OR = 0.63640.427Pimary12(4.6)4(3.3.3)8(6.6.7)95% C = 0.0318-12.73010.132-13820Sub total2603(1.4)26101.01011.0101Tertiary12(6.6)8(8.9)95% C = 0.0318-12.73010.132-13820Sub total260257.4)55(80.9)1.61430.427Employed70(2.6)3(1.3)58(82.9)OR 0.63691.6143Sub total261/2.13(1.2)26(78.8)95% C = 0.217-1.83590.2047-1.2799Farmer431(5.5)3(0.0)34(9.1)P = 0.40350.2047-1.2791Sub-total <td< td=""><td>>four</td><td>5(13.59)</td><td>0(0)</td><td>4(66.7)</td><td>P < 0.0001</td><td>P = 0.0003</td></td<>	>four	5(13.59)	0(0)	4(66.7)	P < 0.0001	P = 0.0003
Armseter of pregnancy: First 131(50.4) 9(6.9) 101(77.1) OR = 1.881 2.3346 Second 129(49.6) 12(9.3) 100(77.5) 95% CI = 0.4448-2.6017 0.8996-3217 Sub total 260 21 201 P = 0.8532 0.7756 Location: U U 96(8.1) 84(75.7) OR = 0.8509 1.0074 Gub total 149(57.3) 12(8.1) 117(78.5) 95% CI = 0.4746-1.5256 0.489-2.484 Sub total 496(57.3) 12(8.1) 117(78.5) 95% CI = 0.4746-1.5256 0.489-2.484 Sub total 30.102 OR 30.102 OR 0.489-2.484 Sub total 96(57.3) 12(8.1) 117(78.5) 95% CI = 0.4746-1.5256 0.489-2.484 Sub total 3(1.2) 0(0) 3(100 OR = 0.6364 0.427 None 3(1.2) 0(0) 3(100 OR = 0.6364 0.427 Sub total 260 21 201 21 21 21 21 Sub total </td <td>Sub total</td> <td>260</td> <td>20</td> <td>240</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Sub total	260	20	240		
First 131(50.4) 9(6.9) 101(77.1) OR = 1.881 2.3346 Second 129(49.6) 12(9.3) 100(77.5) 95% CI = 0.4448-2.6617 0.8996-3217 Sub total 260 21 201 P = 0.8532 0.7756 Location:	Trimester of preg	jnancy:				
Second12(949.6)12(9.3)100(77.5)95% C1=0.4448-2.66170.8996-3217Sub total26021201P=0.85320.7756Location:rural111(42.7)9(8.1)84(75.7)OR=0.85091.0074urban149(57.3)12(8.1)117(78.5)95% C1=0.4746-1.52560.489-2.484Sub total26021201P=0.58780.9873Education: $$	First	131(50.4)	9(6.9)	101(77.1)	OR = 1.881	2.3346
Sub total26021201P=083320.7756Location:rural111(42.7)9(8.1)84(75.7)OR=0.85091.0074urban149(57.3)12(8.1)117(78.5)95% C1=0.4746-152560.489-2.484Sub total26021201P=058780.9873Education:None3(1.2)0(0)3(100)OR=0.63640.427Primary12(4.6)4(33.3)8(66.7)95% C1=0.0318-12.73010.0132-13820Secondary79(33.04)9(11.4)58(73.4)P=0.76750.1001Tertiary166(63)8(4.8)132(79.5)Sub total68(26.2)5(7.4)58(80.9)Employed70(26.9)3(4.3)58(82.9)OR 0.63691.6143Housewife33(12.7)5(15.2)26(78.8)95% C1=0.2210-1.83590.2047-12.7299Farmer43(16.5)3(7.0)28(60.9)Sub-total26021201P=0.40360.6494Studert3(12.7)5(15.2)26(78.8)95% C1=0.2210-1.83590.6494Studert3(12.7)5(15.2)26(78.8)95% C1=0.2210-1.83590.6494Studert43(16.5)3(7.0)28(60.9)Farmer43(16.5)3(7.0)28(60.9)Sub-total26021201Mos46(7.7)5(10.9)28(0.9). <td< td=""><td>Second</td><td>129(49.6)</td><td>12(9.3)</td><td>100(77.5)</td><td>95% CI = 0.4448-2.6617</td><td>0.8996-3217</td></td<>	Second	129(49.6)	12(9.3)	100(77.5)	95% CI = 0.4448-2.6617	0.8996-3217
Location: viral 111(42/) 9(8.1) 84(75.7) OR = 0.8509 1.0074 urban 149(57.3) 12(8.1) 117(78.5) 95% C1 = 0.4746-1.5256 0.489-2.484 Sub total 260 21 201 P = 0.5878 0.9873 Education: 4(33.3) 8(66.7) 95% C1 = 0.0318-12.7301 0.0132-13820 Secondary 79(30.4) 9(11.4) 58(73.4) P = 0.7675 0.1001 Tertiary 166(63.8) 8(4.8) 132(79.5) 0.1031-13200 0.1031-13200 Sub total 260 21 201 -	Sub total	260	21	201	P = 0.8532	0.7756
rural111(42.7)9(8.1) $84(75.7)$ $OR = 0.8509$ 1.0074urban149(57.3)12(8.1)117(78.5) $95\% CI = 0.4746 \cdot 1.5256$ $0.489 \cdot 2.484$ Sub total26021201 $P = 0.5878$ 0.9873 Education: 201 $P = 0.5878$ 0.9873 None $3(1.2)$ 0(0) $3(100)$ $OR = 0.6364$ 0.427 Primary12(4.6)4(33.3) $8(66.7)$ $95\% CI = 0.0318 \cdot 12.7301$ $0.0132 \cdot 13820$ Secondary79(30.4)9(11.4) $58(73.4)$ $P = 0.7675$ 0.1001 Tertiary166(63.8) $8(4.8)$ $132(79.5)$ 0.001×10^{-1} Sub total26021201 V V Decupation: $S(82.2)$ $OR 0.6369$ 1.6143 Housewife $33(12.7)$ $5(15.2)$ $26(78.8)$ $95\% CI = 0.2210 \cdot 1.8359$ $0.2047 \cdot 12.7299$ Farmer $43(16.5)$ $3(7.0)$ $34(79.1)$ $P = 0.04036$ 0.6494 Student $46(17.7)$ $5(10.9)$ $28(60.9)$ V V Student $46(17.7)$ $5(10.9)$ $28(60.9)$ V V Farmer $43(16.5)$ $3(7.0)$ $28(60.9)$ V V Student $46(17.7)$ $5(10.9)$ $28(0.9)$ V V Housewife $33(12.7)$ $5(10.9)$ $28(0.9)$ V V Student $46(17.7)$ $5(10.9)$ $28(0.9)$ V V Housewife 1260 $20(8.2)$ <t< td=""><td>Location:</td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td><td></td></t<>	Location:					
urban 149(57.3) 12(8.1) 117(78.5) 95% C1=0.4746-1.5256 0.489-2.484 Sub total 260 21 201 P=0.5878 0.9873 Education: None 3(1.2) 0(0) 3(100) OR = 0.6364 0.427 Primary 12(4.6) 4(33.33) 8(66.7) 95% C1=0.0318-12.7301 0.0132-13820 Secondary 79(330.4) 9(11.4) 58(73.4) P = 0.7675 0.1001 Tertiary 16(63.8) 8(48.8) 132(79.5) Sub total 260 21 21 21 Business 68(26.2) 5(7.4) 55(80.9) Employed 70(26.9) 3(13.2) 5(15.2) 26(78.8) 95% C1=0.2210-1.8359 0.2047-12.7299 Farmer 43(16.5) 3(7.0) 24(60.9) Student 260 21 201	rural	111(42.7)	9(8.1)	84(75.7)	OR = 0.8509	1.0074
Sub total26021201P=0.58780.9873Education:None $3(1.2)$ $0(0)$ $3(100)$ $OR = 0.6364$ 0.427 Primary12(4.6) $4(33.3)$ $8(6.7)$ 95% CI = 0.0318-12.7301 $0.0132-132.02$ Secondary $79(30.4)$ $9(11.4)$ $58(7.4)$ $P = 0.7675$ 0.0101 Tertiary $166(3.8)$ $8(4.8)$ $132(79.5)$ T T Sub total 260 21 201 T T Business $68(26.2)$ $5(7.4)$ $55(80.9)$ T T Employed $70(26.9)$ $3(4.3)$ $58(82.9)$ $OR 0.6369$ 1.6143 Housewife $33(12.7)$ $5(15.2)$ $26(78.8)$ 95% CI = 0.2210-1.8359 $0.2047-12.729$ Farmer $43(16.5)$ $3(7.0)$ $34(7.91)$ $P = 0.04036$ $0.2047-12.729$ Farmer $43(16.5)$ $3(7.0)$ $28(6.9)$ T T Student $46(1.7.7)$ $5(10.9)$ $28(6.9)$ T T History erbitor 208.2 $OR = 0.0374$ 2.7125 No $243(93.5)$ $20(8.2)$ $OR = 0.0374$ 2.7125 Yes $17(6.5)$ $1(5.9)$ $12(70.6)$ 95% CI = 0.00110-0.01168 $0.0132-0.01326$ Sub Total 260 21 32 $P < 0.001$ $P < 0.003$	urban	149(57.3)	12(8.1)	117(78.5)	95% CI = 0.4746-1.5256	0.489-2.484
Education: None 3(1.2) 0(0) 3(100) OR = 0.6364 0.427 Primary 12(4.6) 4(33.33) 8(66.7) 95% CI = 0.0318-12.7301 0.0132-13820 Secondary 79(330.4) 9(11.4) 58(73.4) P = 0.7675 0.1001 Tertiary 166(63.8) 8(4.8) 132(79.5) . . . Sub total 260 21 201 . <th< td=""><td>Sub total</td><td>260</td><td>21</td><td>201</td><td>P = 0.5878</td><td>0.9873</td></th<>	Sub total	260	21	201	P = 0.5878	0.9873
None 3(1.2) 0(0) 3(100) OR = 0.6364 0.427 Primary 12(4.6) 4(33.3) 8(6.6.7) 95% CI = 0.0318-12.7301 0.0132-13820 Secondary 79(330.4) 9(11.4) 58(7.34) P = 0.7675 0.1001 Tertiary 166(63.8) 8(4.8) 132(79.5) . . . Sub total 260 21 201 Business 68(26.2) 5(7.4) 55(80.9) .	Education:					
Primary12(4.6)4(33.33)8(66.7) 95% Cl = 0.0318-12.73010.0132-13820Secondary $79(330.4)$ $9(11.4)$ $58(73.4)$ $P = 0.7675$ 0.1001 Tertiary166(63.8) $8(4.8)$ $132(79.5)$ V Sub total 26021201 V Occupation:Business $68(26.2)$ $5(7.4)$ $55(80.9)$ Employed $70(26.9)$ $3(4.3)$ $58(82.9)$ $OR 0.6369$ Housewife $33(12.7)$ $5(15.2)$ $26(7.8)$ 95% Cl = 0.2210-1.8359 $0.2047-12.7299$ Farmer $43(16.5)$ $3(7.0)$ $34(7.91)$ $P = 0.04036$ 0.6494 Student $46(17.7)$ $5(10.9)$ $28(60.9)$ V V Student 260 21 $20(8.2)$ $OR = 0.0374$ 2.7125 No $243(93.5)$ $20(8.2)$ $20(8.2)$ $OR = 0.00120-0.1168$ $0.0132-0.01382$ Sub Total 260 21 32 $P < 0.001$ $P < 0.003$	None	3(1.2)	0(0)	3(100)	OR = 0.6364	0.427
Secondary $79(330.4)$ $9(11.4)$ $58(73.4)$ $P=0.7675$ 0.1001 Tertiary $166(63.8)$ $8(4.8)$ $132(79.5)$ D Sub total 260 21 201 $P=0.7675$ $D.1001$ Occupation: V 201 D V V Business $68(26.2)$ $5(7.4)$ $55(80.9)$ V V Employed $70(26.9)$ $3(4.3)$ $58(82.9)$ $OR 0.6369$ 1.6143 Housewife $33(12.7)$ $5(15.2)$ $26(78.8)$ 95% $C1=0.2210-1.8359$ $0.2047-12.7299$ Farmer $43(16.5)$ $3(7.0)$ $34(79.1)$ $P=0.04036$ 0.6494 Student $46(17.7)$ $5(10.9)$ $28(60.9)$ V V Student 260 21 $20(8.2)$ $OR=0.0374$ 2.7125 No $243(93.5)$ $20(8.2)$ $20(8.2)$ $OR=0.0374$ 2.7125 Yes $17(6.5)$ 15.9 $12(70.6)$ 95% $C1=0.00120-0.1168$ $0.0132-0.01320$ Sub Total 260 21 32 $P<0.001$ $P<0.003$	Primary	12(4.6)	4(33.33)	8(66.7)	95% CI = 0.0318-12.7301	0.0132-13820
Tertiary166(63.8)8(4.8)132(79.5)Sub total26021201Occupation: $ -$ Business68(26.2)5(7.4)55(80.9)Employed70(26.9)3(4.3)58(82.9)OR 0.6369160usewife33(12.7)5(15.2)26(78.8)95% CI = 0.2210-1.83590.2047-12.7299Farmer43(16.5)3(7.0)24(79.1)P = 0.040360.6494Student46(17.7)5(10.9)28(60.9) $ -$ Stub-total2602120(8.2)OR = 0.03742.7125Mo243(93.5)20(8.2)20(8.2)OR = 0.03742.7125Yes17(6.5)1(5.9)12(70.6)95% CI = 0.00120-0.11680.00132-0.01382Sub Total2602132P < 0.001	Secondary	79(330.4)	9(11.4)	58(73.4)	P = 0.7675	0.1001
Sub total 260 21 201 Occupation: - <td>Tertiary</td> <td>166(63.8)</td> <td>8(4.8)</td> <td>132(79.5)</td> <td></td> <td></td>	Tertiary	166(63.8)	8(4.8)	132(79.5)		
Occupation: Business 68(26.2) 5(7.4) 55(80.9) CR 0.6369 1.6143 Employed 70(26.9) 3(4.3) 58(82.9) OR 0.6369 1.6143 Housewife 33(12.7) 5(15.2) 26(78.8) 95% CI = 0.2210-1.8359 0.2047-12.7299 Farmer 43(16.5) 3(7.0) 34(79.1) P = 0.04036 0.6494 Student 46(17.7) 5(10.9) 28(60.9) - - Sub-total 260 21 201 - - Mo 243(93.5) 20(8.2) OR = 0.0374 2.7125 Yes 17(6.5) 1(5.9) 12(70.6) 95% CI = 0.00120-0.1168 0.0132-0.01382 Sub Total 260 21 32 P < 0.001 P < 0.003	Sub total	260	21	201		
Business 68(26.2) 5(7.4) 55(80.9) Employed 70(26.9) 3(4.3) 58(82.9) OR 0.6369 1.6143 Housewife 33(12.7) 5(15.2) 26(78.8) 95% CI = 0.2210-1.8359 0.2047-12.7299 Farmer 43(16.5) 3(7.0) 34(79.1) P = 0.04036 0.6494 Student 46(17.7) 5(10.9) 28(60.9)	Occupation:					
Employed 70(26.9) 3(4.3) 58(82.9) OR 0.6369 1.6143 Housewife 33(12.7) 5(15.2) 26(78.8) 95% CI = 0.2210-1.8359 0.2047-12.7299 Farmer 43(16.5) 3(7.0) 34(79.1) P = 0.04036 0.6494 Student 46(17.7) 5(10.9) 28(60.9) - - Sub-total 260 21 201 - - Mo 243(93.5) 20(8.2) OR = 0.0374 2.7125 Yes 17(6.5) 1(5.9) 12(70.6) 95% CI = 0.00120-0.1168 0.0132-0.01382 Sub Total 260 21 32 P < 0.001 P < 0.003	Business	68(26.2)	5(7.4)	55(80.9)		
Housewife33(12.7)5(15.2)26(78.8)95% Cl = 0.2210-1.83590.2047-12.7299Farmer43(16.5)3(7.0)34(79.1)P = 0.040360.6494Student46(17.7)5(10.9)28(60.9)Sub-total26021201History of blood transfusion:No243(93.5)20(8.2)OR = 0.03742.7125Yes17(6.5)1(5.9)12(70.6)95% Cl = 0.00120-0.11680.0132-0.01382Sub Total2602132P < 0.001	Employed	70(26.9)	3(4.3)	58(82.9)	OR 0.6369	1.6143
Farmer43(16.5)3(7.0)34(79.1)P = 0.040360.6494Student46(17.7)5(10.9)28(60.9)Sub-total26021201History of blood transfusion:No243(93.5)20(8.2)OR = 0.03742.7125Yes17(6.5)1(5.9)12(70.6)95% CI = 0.00120-0.11680.0132-0.01382Sub Total2602132P < 0.001	Housewife	33(12.7)	5(15.2)	26(78.8)	95% CI = 0.2210-1.8359	0.2047-12.7299
Student 46(17.7) 5(10.9) 28(60.9) Sub-total 260 21 201 History of blood transfusion: 20(8.2) OR = 0.0374 2.7125 No 243(93.5) 20(8.2) 0R = 0.0374 2.7125 Yes 17(6.5) 1(5.9) 12(70.6) 95% CI = 0.00120-0.1168 0.0132-0.01382 Sub Total 260 21 32 P < 0.001	Farmer	43(16.5)	3(7.0)	34(79.1)	P = 0.04036	0.6494
Sub-total 260 21 201 History of blood transfurmer No 243(93.5) 20(8.2) OR = 0.0374 2.7125 Yes 17(6.5) 1(5.9) 12(70.6) 95% CI = 0.00120-0.1168 0.0132-0.01382 Sub Total 260 21 32 P < 0.001	Student	46(17.7)	5(10.9)	28(60.9)		
History of blood transfusion: No 243(93.5) 20(8.2) 20(8.2) OR = 0.0374 2.7125 Yes 17(6.5) 1(5.9) 12(70.6) 95% CI = 0.00120-0.1168 0.0132-0.01382 Sub Total 260 21 32 P < 0.001 P < 0.003	Sub-total	260	21	201		
No 243(93.5) 20(8.2) 20(8.2) OR = 0.0374 2.7125 Yes 17(6.5) 1(5.9) 12(70.6) 95% CI = 0.00120-0.1168 0.0132-0.01382 Sub Total 260 21 32 P < 0.001	History of blood	transfusion:				
Yes 17(6.5) 1(5.9) 12(70.6) 95% CI = 0.00120-0.1168 0.0132-0.01382 Sub Total 260 21 32 P < 0.001	No	243(93.5)	20(8.2)	20(8.2)	OR = 0.0374	2.7125
Sub Total 260 21 32 P < 0.001 P < 0.003	Yes	17(6.5)	1(5.9)	12(70.6)	95% CI = 0.00120-0.1168	0.0132-0.01382
	Sub Total	260	21	32	P < 0.001	P < 0.003

Table 2 Socio-demographic characteristics and associated factors with CMV infection of pregnant women in Thika, Kenva

HIV status:					
positive	27(10.3)	1(3.7)	23(85.2)	OR = 0.3804	1.7767
negative	233(89.6)	20(8.6)	178(76.4)	95% CI = -0.0491-2.9448	0.5890-5.3589
Sub total	260	21	201	P = 0.3546	0.3076

Table 2 Socio-demographic characteristics and associated factors with CMV infection of pregnant women in Thika, Kenya (Continued)

Abbreviations: OR Odds Ratio, CI confidence interval.

important coinfections with CMV) [23], diverse sociodemographics, diverse cultures, population behaviour, child cares, breast feeding and sexual activity [24]. The detected 77.3% of CMV infections showed that these women were at high risk of CMV infections.

From this study, we determined the risk factors that could influence HIV infections to CMV infections. From the analysis, women who were married, aged or with high parity, were found to be at higher risk for CMV infection (Table 2). These risk factors were similar to those found by previous studies [15]. These factors increased susceptibility to acquisition of CMV infection, perhaps through the direct contact with contagious secretions from their own children or poor hygiene practiced by these women [25,26]. In addition, in these settings, most women are usually married based on the customs of most African settings with high number of children.

There is a lot of debate concerning maternal age and CMV infection; however most studies including this study have shown elderly women to be at higher risk of CMV infection [27], while others reporting contrary [7,18,27]. However, other factors like geographical location, education and occupation are not significantly associated with CMV infection.

CMV IgG avidity assay seems to be one of the most accessible tools to differentiate between primary from non-primary CMV infection [28]. This technique is less expensive and it could be used to confirming CMV primary infections without the use of sophiscated polymerase chain reactions. In our study, high CMV IgG avidity were confirmed implying that in these women, their pregnancy could be maintained with a lower risk of transmitting CMV infections to their offspring (Table 1) [29]. However, this study was limited with failure to confirm CMV infections by Polymerase Chain Reaction (PCR) including failure to make a follow up of IgM seropostivity women to ascertain their infection status/ seroconversion.

Conclusion

This study shows the prevalence of 77.3% similarly to those obtain from other countries with those married aged and with high parity being at a high risk to CMV infections. This study concurs with previous studies that have suggested all women of the child bearing age to be incorporated in routine antenatal screening profile.

Ethical

This study was approved by Kenyatta University Ethical review committee.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Authors' contributions

ZM and AKN carried out the study and participated in the statistical analysis and procedures. ZN carried out the practical part of the study. AKN coordinated and participated in the design of the study, statistical analysis and the drafting of the manuscript. Both authors read and approved the final version.

Acknowledgements

The authors would like to thank all the expectant women for participating in this study. The study was funded from the accrued funds generated within the department of Medical laboratory sciences, Kenyatta University.

Author details

¹Department of Microbiology, Kenyatta University, P.O. Box 43844, 00100 Nairobi, Kenya. ²Department of Medical Laboratory Science, Kenyatta University, Nairobi, Kenya.

Received: 10 April 2014 Accepted: 24 October 2014 Published: 12 November 2014

References

- De Paschale M, Agrappi C, Manco MT, Paganini A, Clerici P: Incidence and risk of cytomegalovirus infection during pregnancy in an urban area of Northern Italy. Infect Dis Obstet Gynecol 2009, 5. doi:10.1155/2009/206505.
- Alford CA, Stagno S, Pass RF, Britt WJ: Congenital and perinatal cytomegalovirus infections. *Rev Infect Dis* 1990, 12(7):745–753. doi:10.1093/clinids/12.Supplement_7.S745 2.
- Tabatabaee M, Tayyebi D: Seroepidemiologic study of human cytomegalovirus in pregnant women in Valiasr Hospital of Kazeroon, Fars, Iran. J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med 2009, 22(6):517–521. doi:10.1080/ 14767050902801678.
- Cannon MJ, Scott Schmid D, Terri B: Hyde review of cytomegalovirus seroprevalence and demographic characteristics associated with infection. *Rev Med Virol* 2010, 20:202–213.
- Kamel N, Metwally L, Gomaa N, Sayed Ahmed WA, Lotfi M, Younis S: Primary cytomegalovirus infection in pregnant Egyptian women confirmed by cytomegalovirus IgG avidity testing. *Med Princ Pract* 2013, doi:10.1159/000354758.
- Mhalu F, Haukenes G: Prevalence of cytomegalovirus antibody in pregnant women, AIDS patients and STD patients in Dar es Salaam. AIDS 1990, 4(12):1294–1295.
- Rodier MH, Berthonneau J, Bourgoin A, Giraudeau G, Agius G, Burucoa C, Hekpazo A, Jacquemin JL: Seroprevalences of Toxoplasma, malaria, rubella, cytomegalovirus, HIV and treponemal infections among pregnant women in Cotonou, Republic of Benin. *Acta Trop* 1995, 59(4):271–277.

- Bos P, Steele AD, Peenze I, Aspinall S: Sero-prevalence to hepatitis B and C virus infection in refugees from Mozambique in southern Africa. *East Afr Med J* 1995, 72(2):113–115.
- Stagno S: Cytomegalovirus. In Infectious Diseases of the Fetus and Newborn Infant. Edited by Remington JS, Klein JO. Philadelphia: W.B. Saunders Company; 2001:389–424.
- Pass RF, Hutto C, Ricks R, Cloud GA: Increased rate of cytomegalovirus infection among parents of children attending daycare centers. N Engl J Med 1986, 314:1414–1418.
- Bawaraju A, Mane PM, Vijayadurga S: The reactivation of the cytomegalovirus (CMV) infection in HIV infected patients. J of Clinical and Diagnostic Research 2011, 5(4):749–751.
- Rautemaa R, Helander T, Meri S: Herpes simplex virus 1 infected neuronal and skin cells differ in their susceptibility to complement attack. *Immunology* 2002, 106(3):404–411.
- Boppana SB, Rivera LB, Fowler KB, Mach M, Britt WJ: Intrauterine transmission of cytomegalovirus to infants of women with preconceptional immunity. N Engl J Med 2001, 344:1366–1371.
- 14. Revello MG, Gerna G: Diagnosis and management of human cytomegalovirus infection in the mother, fetus, and newborn infant. *Clin Microbiol Rev* 2002, **15**(4):680–715.
- Hamdan HZ, Abdelbagi IE, Nasser NM, Adam I: Seroprevalence of cytomegalovirus and rubella among pregnant women in Western Sudan. Virol J 2011, 8:217.
- el-Nawawy A, Soliman AT, El Azzouni O, Amer e-S, Karim MA, Demian S, el-Sayed M: Maternal and neonatal prevalence of toxoplasma and cytomegalovirus (CMV) antibodies and hepatitis-B antigens in an Egyptian rural area. *J Trop Pediatr* 1996, 42(3):154–157. doi:10.1093/tropej/42.3.154.
- Bello C, Whittle H: Cytomegalovirus infection in Gambian mothers and their babies. J Clin Pathol 1991, 44(5):366–369. doi:10.1136/jcp.44.5.366.
- Schoub BD, Johnson S, McAnerney JM, Blackburn NK, Guidozzi F, Ballot D, Rothberg A: Is antenatal screening for rubella and cytomegalovirus justified? S Afr Med J 1993, 83(2):108–110.
- 19. Williams JO, Fagbami AH, Omilabu SA: Cytomegalovirus antibodies in Nigeria. *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg* 1989, **83**(2):260.
- Taechowisan T, Sutthent R, Louisirirotchanakul S, Puthavathana P, Wasi C: Immune status in congenital infections by TORCH agents in pregnant Thais. Asian Pac J Allergy Immunol 1997, 15(2):93–97.
- 21. Picone O, Vauloup-Fellous C, Cordier AG: A 2-year study on cytomegalovirus infection during pregnancy in a French hospital. *BJOG* 2009, 116:818.
- Guerra B, Simonazzi G, Banfi A, Lazzarotto T, Farina A, Lanari M, Rizzo N: Impact of diagnostic and confirmatory tests and prenatal counseling on the rate of pregnancy termination among women with positive cytomegalovirus immunoglobulin M antibody titers. *AJOG* 2007, 196:221.e1–6.
- Fabiani M, Nattabi B, Opio AA, Musinguzi J, Biryahwaho B, Ayella EO, Ogwang M, Declich S: A high prevalence of HIV-1 infection among pregnant women living in a rural district of North Uganda severely affected by civil strife. *Trans Roy Soc Trop Med Hyg* 2006, 100(6):586–593. doi:10.1016/j. trstmh.2005.09.002.
- Peckham CS, Johnson C, Ades A, Pearl K, Chin KS: Early acquisition of cytomegalovirus infection. Arch Dis Child 1987, 62(8):780–785. doi:10.1136/ adc.62.8.780.
- 25. Kramer A, Schwebke I, Kampf G: How long do nosocomial pathogens persist on inanimate surfaces? A systematic review. *BMC Infect Dis* 2006, 6:130. doi:10.1186/1471-2334-6-130 28.
- Bate SL, Dollard SC, Cannon MJ: Cytomegalovirus seroprevalence in the United States: the national health and nutrition examination surveys, 1988–2004. *Clin Infect Dis* 2010, 50(11):1439–1447. doi:10.1086/652438.
- Bukbuk DN, el Nafaty AU, Obed JY: Prevalence of rubella-specific IgG antibody in non-immunized pregnant women in Maiduguri, north eastern Nigeria. Cent Eur J Public Health 2002, 10(1–2):21–23.

Page 5 of 5

- Luerez- Ville M, Seller Y, Salomon LJ, Stirnemann JJ, Jacquemard F, Ville Y: Prediction of fetal infection in cases with cytomegalo virus immunoglobulin M in the first trimester of pregnancy, a retrospective cohort. *Clinical infection Dis* 2013, 56:1428–1435.
- 29. Duff P: A Thoughtful algorithm for the accurate diagnosis of primary CMV infection in pregnancy. Obstet Gynaec 2007, **196**:196–197.

doi:10.1186/1756-0500-7-794

Cite this article as: Maingi and Nyamache: Seroprevalence of Cytomegalo Virus (CMV) among pregnant women in Thika, Kenya. *BMC Research Notes* 2014 7:794.

Submit your next manuscript to BioMed Central and take full advantage of:

- Convenient online submission
- Thorough peer review
- No space constraints or color figure charges
- Immediate publication on acceptance
- Inclusion in PubMed, CAS, Scopus and Google Scholar
- Research which is freely available for redistribution

) BioMed Central

Submit your manuscript at www.biomedcentral.com/submit