TITLE PAGE

Age modulates protein-outcome associations in deceased donor kidneys

Keywords:

Kidney transplantation, Data Independent Acquisition, Proteomics, Donor Age, QUOD

AUTHORSHIP

Authors: Philip D Charles[1,2†], Rebecca H Vaughan[3,4], Sarah Fawaz[3,4], Simon Davis[2], Priyanka Joshi[3], Iolanda Vendrell[2], Roman Fischer[2], Benedikt M Kessler[2], Edward J Sharples[6], Alberto Santos[1,7,8], Rutger J Ploeg[3,4], Maria Kaisar[3,4†]

Affiliations:

[1]Big Data Institute, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford; Oxford, United Kingdom.

[2]Target Discovery Institute, Centre for Medicines Discovery, Nuffield Department of Medicine, University of Oxford; Oxford, United Kingdom.

[3]Research and Development, NHS Blood and Transplant; Bristol & Oxford, United Kingdom.

[4]Nuffield Department of Surgical Sciences and Oxford Biomedical Research Centre, University of Oxford; Oxford, United Kingdom.

[5]Engineering Department, University of Oxford; United Kingdom.

[6]University Hospital Oxford; Oxford, United Kingdom.

[7]Center for Health Data Science, University of Copenhagen; Copenhagen, Denmark.

[8]Novo Nordisk Foundation Center for Protein Research, University of Copenhagen; Copenhagen, Denmark.

†Corresponding authors. Email: philip.charles@ndm.ox.ac.uk;

maria.kaisar@nds.ox.ac.uk

ABBREVIATIONS

AKI, Acute Kidney Injury
CKD, Chronic Kidney Disease
DAO, Donor Age-Only
DBD, Donation after Brain Death
DCD, Donation after Circulatory Death
eGFR, Estimated Glomerular Filtration Rate
eGFR12, Estimated Glomerular Filtration Rate of recipient at 12 months posttransplant
ESKD, End-Stage Kidney Disease
LASSO, Least Absolute Shrinkage and Selection Operator; a regularized regression technique
PRE, Prediction Rule Ensemble
RMSE, Root Mean Squared Error
QUOD, Quality in Organ Donation (biobank)

ABSTRACT

Background. Organ availability limits kidney transplantation, the best treatment for end-stage kidney disease (ESKD). Deceased donor acceptance criteria have been relaxed to include older donors with higher risk of inferior posttransplant outcomes. Donor age, although significantly correlated with transplant outcomes, lacks granularity in predicting graft dysfunction. Better characterization of biological mechanisms associated with deceased donor organ damage and transplant outcome is key to improving donor kidney assessment and developing function-preserving interventions.

Methods. 185 deceased donor pretransplant biopsies were obtained from the Quality in Organ Donation biobank (QUOD) and proteomic profiles were acquired by mass spectrometry. A clinical variable feature selection step guided protein-wise LASSO regression modeling of protein, donor age and protein:age interactions, with performance assessed on held-out data. The modeling approach was further validated by result contextualization against published healthy and disease kidney transcriptomes.

Results. Feature selection revealed that outcomes were informatively modeled by a combination of donor age and protein abundance signatures. Proteins were modeled individually against outcome, revealing 539 proteins with additional donor age-modulated outcome association beyond the independent donor age effect. Observed associations with metabolic and innate immune system pathways suggest biological targets for possible interventions pretransplant. Contextualization of our results against external spatial transcriptomic data suggests overlap with known mechanisms of kidney injury.

Conclusions. The highlighted biological mechanisms and age modulation of protein effects open research directions to developing outcome-predictive models and function-preserving interventions during donor management.

INTRODUCTION

Kidney transplantation is the optimal treatment for ESKD. Compared to dialysis, transplantation increases life-expectancy, improves quality of life and is cost-effective. Limited availability of suitable donor kidneys impedes treatment, and often prolongs dialysis, increasing morbidity and mortality. Deceased donor organ shortages, living donation decline in some countries and emerging ageing populations drive increased utilization of older deceased donor kidneys, now comprising more than half of offered organs[1,2] .

Ageing associates with time-dependent decline of organ function, evidenced in kidneys by nephron loss and histological lesions, such as tubular atrophy, interstitial fibrosis, glomerulosclerosis, and arteriosclerosis. Older kidneys have fewer functioning glomeruli, reduced renal mass, podocyte dysfunction, and impaired cellular repair [3]. Glomerular diseases are more common and associated with worse outcomes in older patients [4].

Age associates with increased prevalence of Chronic Kidney Disease (CKD) and accelerated transition to chronic disease from Acute Kidney Injury (AKI) [5].. In organ donation and transplantation, older donors are more likely to have suffered from additional comorbidities such as diabetes, hypertension or cardiovascular disease, and organs from these ‘higher risk’ donors are more likely to develop graft dysfunction or loss. Consequently, donor age is incorporated in clinical scoring algorithms to guide kidney allocation decisions [6,7]. Current front-line indices that further include clinical factors such as terminal serum creatinine, history of hypertension and diabetes [7,8] show consistent performance across demographics but lack granular accuracy for donor

kidney quality assessment [9], resulting in increased organ decline posttransplant and unnecessary discard of viable organs [10].

Molecular analyses of biopsies plausibly offer higher resolution assessment of organ state; but require ‘big picture’ understanding of mechanisms associated specifically with poor outcome. Deceased donors are frequently assessed as having sustained kidney injury (i.e. AKI) based on serum creatinine levels [11], however this metric alone associates poorly with longer term outcomes [11–14]. Transcriptomic and proteomic studies provide molecular granularity, but until recently low availability of well curated clinical samples and metadata has limited scope for large scale investigations [15]. Integration of deep omic kidney profiles with heterogeneous clinical and demographic factors are now enabling the next steps towards precision medicine [16].

Age-related alterations of the kidney transcriptome and proteome modify the organ capacity to recover from ischemia-reperfusion injury and may determine susceptibility to suboptimal outcomes [17]. However, we have limited data on how donor age may modulate proteomic associations with outcome. Our study seeks to disentangle the effects of ageing on kidney proteome associations with transplant outcome, explore the implications on biological processes driving outcome-relevant damage and identify future organ assessment and intervention targets for organ reconditioning.

METHODS

Study Design

Deceased donor pretransplant biopsies (n=186; 1 sample excluded during data processing) were obtained from the Quality in Organ Donation (QUOD) biobank, a national multi-center UK wide bioresource of deceased donor clinical samples acquired during donor management and organ procurement. Pretransplant biopsies were obtained from Donation after Brain Death (DBD) donors and Donation after Circulatory Death (DCD) donors post retrieval during back table preparation.

Kidneys were selected to cover the outcome continuum i.e. the range of estimated Glomerular Filtration Rate (eGFR) in the recipient at 12 months posttransplant (henceforth, 'eGFR12'), from primary non-function to eGFR12>80 ml/min/1.73 m^2 from donors aged 18 to 78. To minimize the impact of recipient factors, we only included kidneys for which the contralateral kidney was transplanted with similar outcome, both kidneys having eGFR12< 30 ml/min/1.73 m^2, between 30 and 60 ml/min/1.73 m^2, or > 60 ml/min/1.73 m^2). Samples were linked to corresponding donor and recipient demographic and clinical metadata, provided by NHS Blood and Transplant National Registry.

Study Approval and Ethics statement

Informed consent from donor families was obtained prior to sample procurement consistent with the Declaration of Helsinki. Collection of QUOD samples and research ethics approval was provided by QUOD (NW/18/0187). The clinical and research

activities being reported are consistent with the Principles of the Declaration of Istanbul as outlined in the 'Declaration of Istanbul on Organ Trafficking and Transplant Tourism'.

Sample Analysis and Statistical Analyses

Please see Supplementary Methods.

RESULTS

Clinical Variable Associations with Outcome are Dominated by Donor/Recipient Age

The selected cohorts were representative of the deceased donor population when demographic and clinical characteristics were considered (Table 1). All 51 donor variables used in our data modeling are listed in Supplementary Table ST1. As expected, eGFR12 correlated strongly with donor age (R^2=0.2107; p=5.0×10-11). UK Kidney Donor Risk Index (R^2 =0.2042; p=2.5×10-9) interestingly explained less variance in eGFR12 than donor age alone.

Integration of Kidney Proteomes with Clinical Metadata by Rule Ensemble and Regression Modeling Identifies Outcome-Associated Proteins

Proteomic analysis quantified 2984 protein groups with 50% or less missing values (out of 7790 identified protein groups in total; Supplementary Figures SF1A and SF2) over 185 samples and 20 interspersed sample pools as internal controls. Analysis of sample pools showed minimal mass spectrometry-related variance (squared mean pairwise Z-corrected Pearson's r=0.94).

To assess individual protein relationships with outcome, we adopted a descriptive modeling approach, using a subset of our data ('discovery set'; 2/3 of data) to find protein models with improved association with eGFR12 over donor age alone, then assessing individual model performance against unseen (i.e. held out) data ('evaluation set', 1/3 of data). To create our discovery/evaluation split, we randomly selected equal numbers of samples for the training set within each eGFR12 tertile.

Six of the kidneys analyzed were paired (3 pairs from 3 donors); these were analyzed separately from discovery and evaluation set to assess intra-donor reproducibility. All three pairs showed high correlation of protein intensity values between donor pairs (Pearson's r=0.71, 0.92 and 0.91; Supplementary Figure SF1B).

For an unbiased assessment of key relationships between clinical variables, protein measurements, and outcome, we used iterative Prediction Rule Ensemble [18] (PRE) learning on our training set to select features among the set of quantified proteins and donor type-independent clinical variables available pretransplant (Figure 1, inset). PRE modeling uses LASSO regularization to generate a minimal model (preventing overfitting). To investigate the multitude of ways in which clinical factors might interact with protein associations with outcome we expanded the space of proteins considered for interaction with clinical variables by repeating this modeling 2000 times, excluding proteins identified in the rule ensemble at each iteration from future iterations while retaining all clinical variables.

Over 2000 iterations, PRE modeling generated 3282 individual prediction rules (Fig 2A). Despite all clinical variables remaining in the dataset throughout iteration, rules were dominated by prediction functions based on donor age alone (3075/3282; 93.7%). Of the remaining rules, 194 (5.9%) referenced proteins and just over a third of this total (73) also involved donor age. These rules were predominantly decision tree and spline-based (out of 194 rules, 106 were decision trees, 20 were linear fits and 68 were spline fits), indicating that protein effects on outcome are not well-modeled by simple linear associations with protein abundance alone. There were only 13 rules not referencing donor age or any protein; of these, just four referenced donor type.

Comparative model formulations tested associations with outcome for any protein alone, donor age alone, and age:protein interaction terms using LASSO regression [19]. To ensure models would generalize beyond our data, we used a linearized version of eGFR12 as the outcome variable (see Supplementary Methods). We excluded all cases where inclusion of the protein and age:protein terms did not explain additional variance in outcome compared to a donor age-only (DAO) model.

This approach yielded a set of 539 proteins (Supplementary Table ST2), with mean root mean square error (RMSE) on our discovery dataset of 25.78 ml/min/1.73m^2, where the upper limit (the DAO model RMSE) was 25.88 ml/min/1.73m^2. Protein associations identified in the discovery cohort replicated well in our evaluation cohort. RMSE on this evaluation data was consistently lower (mean RMSE 22.25 ml/min/1.73m^2; Figure 2B).

Reactome pathway analysis of the 539 outcome-associated proteins (Figure 2C) indicated that a key mechanistic theme related to metabolism (Fig 2D), including key enzymes in gluconeogenesis (Enolase 1; ENO1 and Fructose-1,6-bisphosphatase 1; FBP1) and the pentose phosphate pathway (Transketolase; TKT), members of the citric acid cycle (Glutamic-oxaloacetic transaminase 2; GOT2, Malate dehydrogenase 2; MDH2) and components of electron transport chain Complexes I (NADH:ubiquinone oxidoreductase subunits A3 and B2; NDUFA3, NDUFB2), III (Cytochrome b-c1 complex subunit 5; UQCRFS1) and IV (Cytochrome c oxidase subunits 5A, 5B and 7C; COX5A, COX5B, COX7C). A second key mechanistic theme was innate immune response (Figure 2E), particularly regulation of complement, via both the classical pathway

(Complement factor 4 and B; CF4A, CF4B) and alternative pathway (Complement factors B, H, I, 3, 5 8A, 8B and 8G; CFB, CFH, CFI, CF3, CF5, CF8A, CF8B, CF8G).

Association of Proteins with Posttransplant Outcome is Modulated by Donor Age

For all 539 proteins, their association with outcome was modulated by donor age (Supplementary Table ST2). To explore the implications of each model further, we considered how the models compared to the expected outcome using a donor age only model (Figure 3A,B). For each protein, considering the cases of low abundance (10th percentile) and high abundance (90th percentile) we compared modeled outcomes across donor age against the DAO model, and ranked proteins by log2 fold change Euclidean distance across ages (Figure 3C,D). Over all 539 proteins that outperformed the DAO model, we found that low protein abundance was associated with better outcome than DAO model (Figure 3C) while high protein abundance was associated with worse outcome than DAO model (Figure 3D). Furthermore, the amount by which high protein abundance associated with worse outcomes generally increased from age 50 onwards.

Comparing the top five proteins which diverged the most from the DAO model at low protein abundance (in order of decreasing divergence: Immunoglobulin heavy constant mu; IGHM, Cadherin 13; CDH13, Cofilin 2; CFL2, Hemoglobin subunit delta; HBD and COMM domain-containing protein 9; COMMD9) (Figure 3C) and the top five which diverged the most at high protein abundance (in order of decreasing divergence: COMMD9, Lectin galactoside-binding-like protein; LGALSL, HBD, CFL2 and Glyoxalase domain-containing protein 4; GLOD4) (Figure 3D), there was considerable overlap (CFL2, HBD and COMMD9). These three proteins behaved similarly at both low and

high abundance, associated with better outcomes than the DAO model at low age but trending towards worse outcomes as age increased (Figure 4A,B,C). At high abundance the gradient with respect to age was so steep that high abundance of these proteins associated with slightly better than otherwise expected outcome (better than DAO model) in young donors but considerably worse than otherwise expected outcome (worse than DAO model) in old donors.

In contrast, the other four most divergent proteins across low and high abundance (IGHM, CDH13, GLOD4, LGALSL) behaved differently in their association with outcome over age at low abundance, with protein abundance associating with better outcomes regardless of age (IGHM, CDH13; Figure 4D,E) or even slightly improving with age (GLOD4, LGALSL; Figure 4F,G).

While proteins with the most exaggerated difference from the DAO model have the strongest mechanistic implications, our list of 539 candidates also includes proteins classically associated with kidney function. Of particular note was Cystatin-C (CST3), which showed a similar relationship with age as IGHM and CDH13, i.e. relatively consistent over age at low abundance but associating with increasingly worse outcomes as age increased at high abundance (Figure 4H). Another protein associated with outcomes was Apolipoprotein E (APOE) and with a strong genetic age association in other pathologies (particularly Alzheimer's Disease). We observed modest improvement in outcomes with age at low APOE abundance, similar to GLOD4 and LGALSL (Figure 4I).

Comparison to Spatial Expression Data Suggests Spatial Localization of Outcome-Associated Signal

To further characterize our set of 539 eGFR12-associated proteins, we sought to contextualize them in the wider context of kidney damage. AKI and CKD both impact kidney function and post-transplant potential [20], with a substantial portion of transplanted organs thought to suffer AKI before retrieval [21].

We evaluated our protein set against a spatial scRNA-seq dataset comparing AKI and CKD [22]. Comparison between proteomic and transcriptomic quantitative measurements is complicated by highly variable degrees of association between transcript and corresponding protein product abundance [23]. To address this issue, we compared within the transcriptomic data, comparing genes matching our protein set against a background of all other genes. Since our analysis so far had sought to identify proteins that were associated with outcome after accounting for effects well modeled by donor age alone, and since chronic disease associates strongly with age, we reasoned that our candidate set would be likely to be enriched for markers for acute injury, and therefore should show greater differences between AKI and CKD.

We compared the correlation of AKI to CKD expression across samples within our set of proteins versus the background of all other transcripts in the dataset, across nephron cell types, and observed that our candidate protein set showed more differences (lower correlation than background) in almost all nephron structures distinguished in the scRNA-seq data (Figure 5). Differences in statistical significance between regions also suggested the possibility of spatially relevant gene expression differences.

DISCUSSION

We examined the relationship between posttransplant kidney function with pretransplant kidney proteomes by analyzing 185 deceased donor kidneys with complete donor and recipient associated metadata. Initial minimal-assumption modeling of associations recapitulated previous findings of a strong effect of donor age on outcome. However, our analysis indicated 539 proteins associated with outcome in an age-dependent manner even after the independent effect of donor age was accounted for. As life expectancy rises, increased demand of donor kidneys to treat end stage chronic diseases will be met predominantly by older donor organ offers. Donor age modulation effects on omic associations with outcome therefore have high clinical relevance in the search for robust and accurate biomarkers that add useful information, and to identify pathway changes affecting organ resilience and posttransplant recovery capacity.

Minimal-assumption exploration of our data using iterative PRE feature selection indicated a substantial number of proteins associating with outcome, but despite all clinical variables being available for rule selection at every iteration, only donor age was consistently selected, leading us to include only age, protein and donor age:protein interaction as terms in our regularized regression modeling. Donor age is a key contributor in clinical decisions and is a strongly weighted term in extant kidney allocation scoring systems [7,24] but a clinical variable notable by its omission from our association findings was donor type [25] which appeared in just 4 (0.1%) of the initial feature selection rules. It is possible that outcome-predictive information ‘carried’ by donor type is also derivable from the proteome directly, which precluded selection of the

clinical variable as a PRE feature. Previous transcriptomic comparisons of DBD and DCD biopsies to living donors found very similar results across donor type except in samples taken after reperfusion [26], suggesting that donor type subclinical differences in tissue may only detectably manifest after reperfusion stress.

Kidney metabolism is altered as a result of biological stress occurring during donor management, in both DBDs and DCDs [26]. Within our final list of 539 proteins associated with outcome there are common themes of metabolic disruption and innate immune responses (Figure 2C,D,E); we identify core energy storage and release components, and multiple components of the complement pathway. This finding is consistent with previous studies of omic associations with outcome [17,27], as well as transcriptomic comparisons of AKI, CKD and diabetic kidney disease [22,28]. In particular, complement activation in donors is associated with both acute rejection [26,29,30] and 12-month outcome [31]; existing evidence, including our own findings, particularly indicates inflammation mediated by regulation of the anaphylatoxins C3A, C4B, C5A [32] as a transplant-relevant consequence of complement activation. Preventing inflammation and associated damage by anti-complement interventions in the donor, or during organ preservation (as demonstrated successfully in mouse models [33]) is likely to improve outcomes [34,35].

In our individual regression modeling of proteins, all models retained a protein:donor age interaction term; that is to say, we show that even after accounting for the independent effect of donor age on outcome, the metabolic disruption and innate immune response changes with donor age. This second-order effect has not (to our knowledge) been explored in transplantation, and we suggest is highly relevant to

understanding molecular mechanisms of damage. Some caution should be considered given the relative strength of the donor age effect relative to individual protein contribution; a larger study would have increased power to deconvolute age and protein effects, especially if paired with variant sequencing to understand genetic diversity.

Our confidence in our modeling was strengthened by detection of known kidney markers. Both Cystatin-C (CST3) and Apolipoprotein E (APOE) are known to associate with transplant outcomes in recipients [36–41]. Serum CST3 is recognized as a marker of kidney function [42,43], including in transplantation for both recipients [36,37,44] and donors [45] since levels are linked to both glomerular filtration rate and its role as an inflammatory mediator [46–48]. Our identification of an association between outcome and tissue CST3 further emphasizes the relevance of the inflammatory role. APOE genetic variants are not only associated with kidney dysfunction risk [49–51] (possibly manifested by lipidomic differences between alleles [52] and/or a role in senescence mediation [53]) but have widely characterized age-dependent genetic association with other pathologies such as cardiovascular disease and Alzheimer's Disease [54]. Both proteins were also identified in the transcriptomic dataset as indicators of cellular damage [22].

The proteins highlighted as showing the most difference from the donor age-only model were also consistent with the broader mechanistic theme of inflammation across the full list of proteins. Cofilin-2 (CFL2) is a regulator of actin transport, function and organization. CFL2 is thought to be part of the ischemic stress response in the brain [55] and may be under redox regulation [56]. Cofilins have been shown to be significantly upregulated in an AKI cell model, and are implicated in damage induction via endoplasmic reticulum stress-mediated ferroptosis [57], which is also a key major

mechanism in diabetic nephropathy [58]. Both COMMD9 and HBD showed similar modeled effects of eGFR12 as CFL2. COMMD9 is a member of the 16-protein Commander Complex that is also associated with inflammatory response via the NF-kB pathway [59] and regulates sodium uptake via the epithelial sodium channel in the distal kidney [60]. Hemoglobin subunit delta (HBD) is a relatively small component of adult hemoglobin which is known to show increased expression in inflammatory conditions [61,62]. Previous proteomic studies of kidneys have identified HBD as a marker for early diabetic kidney disease [63]. Since HBD is a blood component, further investigation is required to determine whether the signal is due to variance in flushing of the kidneys pre-biopsy, and if so whether this is purely an artefact of variation in flushing protocol or a true signal related to effects on kidney microvasculature that impair flushing.

Immunoglobulin heavy constant mu (IGHM), and Cadherin-13 (CDH13) demonstrated a different relationship with age, where high protein abundance associated with poorer outcomes while low protein abundance was relatively unchanged over age (albeit predicting a higher baseline eGFR12 then the donor age-only model). Difference in IGHM expression may reflect general changes in immune cell distribution (naïve B-cell population) as part of the inflammatory response. Interestingly, increases in IGHM have previously been reported during AKI-CDK transition in a mouse model of sepsis-induced kidney injury [64]. CDH13 has been implicated in podocyte differentiation [65], and CDH13 knockout increases renal tubule susceptibility to ischemia-reperfusion injury [66] in mice, suggesting a protective or recovery role, where increased expression may be in response to nephron damage.

Glyoxalase domain-containing protein 4 (GLOD4) is a key component of detoxification of methylglyoxal, accumulation of which drives renal injury in diabetic-drive hyperglycemia [67]. Lectin galactoside-binding-like protein (LGALSL) is a poorly characterized carbohydrate binding gene. Its paralog LGALS9 (encoding Galectin 9) implicated in kidney-damaging autoimmune disorders such as Lupus [68], and regulates plasma membrane redox state and T-cell migration [69]. Both proteins showed the notable pattern of low amounts of protein associating with improved outcomes as donor age increased, while high amounts of protein associated with worse outcomes (Figure 3J,K). As above for CHD13, this effect may reflect these two proteins rising in response to cell stress by metabolic toxin accumulation/inflammatory challenge rather than driving a biological mechanism of damage themselves.

A potential hurdle in contextualizing our findings in existing orthogonal transcriptomic data was that proteomes and transcriptomes are generally poorly correlated in terms of abundance changes [23]. In order to avoid this problem, we considered how the pattern of injury scenario-related expression compared between genes matching our outcome-associated protein set and all other genes, within the same transcriptomic dataset [22]. Since our set of proteins is likely associated with specific patterns of kidney injury, we expected corresponding gene transcripts to be more different than baseline when comparing two different injury scenarios. Indeed, we found that the correlation across samples between AKI and CKD within the matched genes was significantly lower than the correlation for genes not matching our outcome-associated protein set, supporting our hypothesis. Since the expression data was spatially localized, we were able to observe that the degree of difference was stronger

in certain nephron substructures (specifically the ascending loop of Henle), which suggests the intriguing possibility that outcome associated protein or gene expression signals, and their underlying biological mechanisms, may be spatially localized. In particular, nephron substructure-specific information would be consistent with the known kidney injury associations for CFL2, HBD and CDH13 discussed above.

We note that our list of outcome-associated candidates cannot be exhaustive. Practicalities of sample acquisition limited sampling of a wide range of outcomes outside the 30-60 donor age range, especially limited high eGFR12 outcome events in older donors. Furthermore, organ allocation algorithms impose a close link between donor and recipient age in the sample cohort, so while we might interpret these age-moderated effects as an increase in organ susceptibility with donor age, it could also represent a greater ability to repair a given level of damage in younger recipients. In addition, we have considered only chronological donor age, rather than a more nuanced representation of the epigenomic biological clock [70], or organ-specific ageing [71,72], both of which may account for some variation observed with respect to both donors and recipients.

However, given the limitations of our dataset, our protein models generalized well to samples unseen during model training (Figure 2B), reproduced known markers of kidney damage among many new leads and were consistent with independent kidney damage transcriptome data. With a larger training cohort to address the caveats acknowledged above, a substantial component of early posttransplant outcome may be predictable solely using subclinical measurements moderated by donor age. The

importance of donor age interaction terms in our results suggests that such terms should be considered as a matter of course in future work.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Supplementary Methods: Technical protocols for sample extraction, mass spectrometry deep proteome analysis of samples and statistical analysis.

Supplementary Table ST1: Clinical variable p-values for association with donor type and outcome, and summary of clinical value imputation.

Supplementary Table ST2: Summary of results for all proteins identified as associating with eGFR12.

> Note that coefficient values provided are for linearized eGFR12, i.e. they relate to eGFR12 quantiles ranging from 0 to 1.

Supplementary Figure SF1: Summary of protein quantitation quality. A: Percentage of missing values across all proteins, showing the cut-off (red line) for poorly quantified proteins excluded from analysis. B: Correlation between quantitation values for each of the 3 sets of paired kidneys.

Supplementary Figure SF2: Summary of protein quantitation imputation, showing the fraction of imputed values across distribution of all values.

DATA AND MATERIALS AVAILABILITY

The mass spectrometry proteomics data have been deposited to the ProteomeXchange Consortium via the PRIDE [73] partner repository with the dataset identifier PXD033428.

DISCLOSURE AND FUNDING

This study was supported by NHS Blood and Transplant funding awarded to MK & RJP. SF was supported by Kidney Research UK, grant reference KS_RP_002_20210111 awarded to MK. PDC was supported by Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences 2018-I2M-2-002 awarded to BMK. Authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Author contributions:

Conceptualization: MK

Methodology: PDC, SF, RV, SD, RF, BMK, AS, ES, RJP, MK

Investigation: PDC, SF, RV, PJ, SD, IV, KT, AS

Visualization: PDC

Funding acquisition: BMK, RJP, MK

Project oversight: MK

Supervision: RF, AS, MK

Writing – original draft: PDC, ES, MK

Writing – review & editing: All authors

REFERENCES

1. Callaghan CJ, Mumford L, Pankhurst L, Baker RJ, Bradley JA, Watson CJE. Early Outcomes of the New UK Deceased Donor Kidney Fast-Track Offering Scheme. *Transplantation*. 2017;101(12):2888-2897. doi:10.1097/TP.0000000000001860

2. Summers DM, Johnson RJ, Hudson AJ, et al. Standardized deceased donor kidney donation rates in the UK reveal marked regional variation and highlight the potential for increasing kidney donation: a prospective cohort study†. *Br J Anaesth*. 2014;113(1):83-90. doi:10.1093/bja/aet473

3. Denic A, Glassock RJ, Rule AD. The Kidney in Normal Aging: A Comparison with Chronic Kidney Disease. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2022;17(1):137-139. doi:10.2215/CJN.10580821

4. O'Hare AM, Choi AI, Bertenthal D, et al. Age affects outcomes in chronic kidney disease. *J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2007;18(10):2758-2765. doi:10.1681/ASN.2007040422

5. Ishani A, Xue JL, Himmelfarb J, et al. Acute Kidney Injury Increases Risk of ESRD among Elderly. *J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2009;20(1):223-228. doi:10.1681/ASN.2007080837

6. Rao PS, Schaubel DE, Guidinger MK, et al. A comprehensive risk quantification score for deceased donor kidneys: the kidney donor risk index. *Transplantation*. 2009;88(2):231-236. doi:10.1097/TP.0b013e3181ac620b

7. Watson CJE, Johnson RJ, Birch R, Collett D, Bradley JA. A Simplified Donor Risk Index for Predicting Outcome After Deceased Donor Kidney Transplantation. *Transplantation*. 2012;93(3):314-318. doi:10.1097/TP.0b013e31823f14d4

8. Neuberger J, Callaghan C. Organ utilization - the next hurdle in transplantation? *Transpl Int*. 2020;33(12):1597-1609. doi:10.1111/tri.13744

9. Clayton PA, Dansie K, Sypek MP, et al. External validation of the US and UK kidney donor risk indices for deceased donor kidney transplant survival in the Australian and New Zealand population. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2019;34(12):2127-2131. doi:10.1093/NDT/GFZ090

10. Aubert O, Reese PP, Audry B, et al. Disparities in acceptance of deceased donor kidneys between the United States and France and estimated effects of increased US acceptance. *JAMA Intern Med*. 2019;179(10):1365-1374. doi:10.1001/jamainternmed.2019.2322

11. Yu K, Husain SA, King K, Stevens JS, Parikh CR, Mohan S. Kidney nonprocurement in deceased donors with acute kidney injury. *Clin Transplant*. Published online August 4, 2022:e14788. doi:10.1111/ctr.14788

12. Hall IE, Akalin E, Bromberg JS, et al. Deceased-donor acute kidney injury is not associated with kidney allograft failure. *Kidney Int*. 2019;95(1):199-209. doi:10.1016/j.kint.2018.08.047

13. Liu C, Hall IE, Mansour S, Thiessen Philbrook HR, Jia Y, Parikh CR. Association of Deceased Donor Acute Kidney Injury With Recipient Graft Survival. *JAMA Network Open*. 2020;3(1):e1918634. doi:10.1001/jamanetworkopen.2019.18634

14. Mansour SG, Khoury N, Kodali R, et al. Clinically adjudicated deceased donor acute kidney injury and graft outcomes. *PLoS One*. 2022;17(3):e0264329. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0264329

15. von Moos S, Akalin E, Mas V, Mueller TF. Assessment of Organ Quality in Kidney Transplantation by Molecular Analysis and Why It May Not Have Been Achieved, Yet. *Front Immunol*. 2020;11:833. doi:10.3389/fimmu.2020.00833

16. Raynaud M, Aubert O, Divard G, et al. Dynamic prediction of renal survival among deeply phenotyped kidney transplant recipients using artificial intelligence: an observational, international, multicohort study. *The Lancet Digital Health*. 2021;3(12):e795-e805. doi:10.1016/S2589-7500(21)00209-0

17. Zhang R, Trotter PB, McCaffrey J, et al. Assessment of biological organ age using molecular pathology in pre-transplant kidney biopsies. *Kidney Int*. Published online April 29, 2024. doi:10.1016/j.kint.2024.03.028

18. Fokkema M. Fitting prediction rule ensembles with R package pre. *J Stat Softw*. 2020;92(1):1-30. doi:10.18637/jss.v092.i12

19. Friedman JH, Hastie T, Tibshirani R. Regularization Paths for Generalized Linear Models via Coordinate Descent. *J Stat Softw*. 2010;33:1-22. doi:10.18637/jss.v033.i01

20. Forni LG, Darmon M, Ostermann M, et al. Renal recovery after acute kidney injury. *Intensive Care Med*. 2017;43(6):855-866. doi:10.1007/s00134-017-4809-x

21. Palmisano A, Gandolfini I, Delsante M, et al. Acute Kidney Injury (AKI) before and after Kidney Transplantation: Causes, Medical Approach, and Implications for the Long-Term Outcomes. *J Clin Med Res*. 2021;10(7). doi:10.3390/jcm10071484

22. Lake BB, Menon R, Winfree S, et al. An atlas of healthy and injured cell states and niches in the human kidney. *Nature*. 2023;619(7970):585-594. doi:10.1038/s41586-023-05769-3

23. Cox J, Mann M. 1D and 2D annotation enrichment: a statistical method integrating quantitative proteomics with complementary high-throughput data. *BMC Bioinformatics*. 2012;13(16):S12. doi:10.1186/1471-2105-13-S16-S12

24. Li B, Cairns JA, Robb ML, et al. Predicting patient survival after deceased donor kidney transplantation using flexible parametric modelling. *BMC Nephrol*. 2016;17(1):51. doi:10.1186/s12882-016-0264-0

25. Gill J, Rose C, Lesage J, Joffres Y, Gill J, O'Connor K. Use and Outcomes of Kidneys from Donation after Circulatory Death Donors in the United States. *J Am Soc Nephrol*. 2017;28(12):3647-3657. doi:10.1681/asn.2017030238

26. Damman J, Bloks VW, Daha MR, et al. Hypoxia and Complement-and-Coagulation Pathways in the Deceased Organ Donor as the Major Target for Intervention to Improve Renal Allograft Outcome. *Transplantation*. 2015;99(6):1293-1300. doi:10.1097/TP.0000000000000500

27. Kaisar M, Van Dullemen L, Charles P, et al. Subclinical Changes in Deceased Donor Kidney Proteomes Are Associated with 12-month Allograft Function Posttransplantation-A Preliminary Study. *Transplantation*. 2019;103(2):323-328. doi:10.1097/TP.0000000000002358

28. Abedini A, Levinsohn J, Klötzer KA, et al. Single-cell multi-omic and spatial profiling of human kidneys implicates the fibrotic microenvironment in kidney disease progression. *Nat Genet*. Published online July 24, 2024:1-13. doi:10.1038/s41588-024-01802-x

29. Damman J, Seelen MA, Moers C, et al. Systemic complement activation in deceased donors is associated with acute rejection after renal transplantation in the recipient. *Transplantation*. 2011;92(2):163-169. doi:10.1097/TP.0b013e318222c9a0

30. Damman J, Daha MR, van Son WJ, Leuvenink HG, Ploeg RJ, Seelen MA. Crosstalk between complement and Toll-like receptor activation in relation to donor brain death and renal ischemia-reperfusion injury: Complement and TLRs in kidney transplantation. *Am J Transplant*. 2011;11(4):660-669. doi:10.1111/j.1600-6143.2011.03475.x

31. van Leeuwen LL, Spraakman NA, Brat A, et al. Proteomic analysis of machine perfusion solution from brain dead donor kidneys reveals that elevated complement, cytoskeleton and lipid metabolism proteins are associated with 1-year outcome. *Transpl Int*. 2021;34(9):1618-1629. doi:10.1111/tri.13984

32. Dunkelberger JR, Song WC. Complement and its role in innate and adaptive immune responses. *Cell Res*. 2010;20(1):34-50. doi:10.1038/cr.2009.139

33. Lewis AG, Köhl G, Ma Q, Devarajan P, Köhl J. Pharmacological targeting of C5a receptors during organ preservation improves kidney graft survival: C5aR targeting improves kidney graft survival. *Clin Exp Immunol*. 2008;153(1):117-126. doi:10.1111/j.1365-2249.2008.03678.x

34. Biglarnia AR, Huber-Lang M, Mohlin C, Ekdahl KN, Nilsson B. The multifaceted role of complement in kidney transplantation. *Nat Rev Nephrol*. 2018;14(12):767-781. doi:10.1038/s41581-018-0071-x

35. van Zanden JE, Jager NM, Daha MR, Erasmus ME, Leuvenink HGD, Seelen MA. Complement therapeutics in the multi-organ donor: Do or don't? *Front Immunol*. 2019;10:329. doi:10.3389/fimmu.2019.00329

36. Coll E, Botey A, Alvarez L, et al. Serum cystatin C as a new marker for noninvasive estimation of glomerular filtration rate and as a marker for early renal impairment. *Am J Kidney Dis*. 2000;36(1):29-34. doi:10.1053/ajkd.2000.8237

37. Christensson A, Ekberg J, Grubb A, Ekberg H, Lindström V, Lilja H. Serum cystatin C is a more sensitive and more accurate marker of glomerular filtration rate than enzymatic measurements of creatinine in renal transplantation. *Nephron Physiol*. 2003;94(2):19-27. doi:10.1159/000071287

38. Rodrigo E, Ruiz JC, Fernández-Fresnedo G, et al. Cystatin C and albuminuria as predictors of long-term allograft outcomes in kidney transplant recipients. *Clin Transplant*. 2013;27(2):E177-83. doi:10.1111/ctr.12082

39. Kahraman S, Kiykim AA, Altun B, et al. Apolipoprotein E gene polymorphism in renal transplant recipients: effects on lipid metabolism, atherosclerosis and allograft function. *Clin Transplant*. 2004;18(3):288-294. doi:10.1111/j.1399-0012.2004.00162.x

40. Hernández D, Salido E, Linares J, et al. Role of apolipoprotein E epsilon 4 allele on chronic allograft nephropathy after renal transplantation. *Transplant Proc*. 2004;36(10):2982-2984. doi:10.1016/j.transproceed.2004.10.038

41. Cofán F, Cofan M, Rosich E, et al. Effect of apolipoprotein E polymorphism on renal transplantation. *Transplant Proc*. 2007;39(7):2217-2218. doi:10.1016/j.transproceed.2007.06.011

42. Kyhse-Andersen J, Schmidt C, Nordin G, et al. Serum cystatin C, determined by a rapid, automated particle-enhanced turbidimetric method, is a better marker than serum creatinine for glomerular filtration rate. *Clin Chem*. 1994;40(10):1921-1926. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/7923773

43. Newman DJ, Thakkar H, Edwards RG, et al. Serum cystatin C measured by automated immunoassay: a more sensitive marker of changes in GFR than serum creatinine. *Kidney Int*. 1995;47(1):312-318. doi:10.1038/ki.1995.40

44. Lima JR, Salgado JV, Ferreira TC, Oliveira MI, dos Santos AM, Filho NS. Cystatin C and inflammatory markers in kidney transplant recipients. *Rev Assoc Médica Bras (Engl Ed)*. 2011;57(3):341-346. doi:10.1016/s2255-4823(11)70070-4

45. Michelakis I, Fawaz S, Vaughan R, et al. #1645 The role of donor Cystatin-C in posttransplant outcomes in kidney transplantation. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2024;39(Supplement_1):gfae069-0175-1645. doi:10.1093/ndt/gfae069.175

46. Singh D, Whooley MA, Ix JH, Ali S, Shlipak MG. Association of cystatin C and estimated GFR with inflammatory biomarkers: the Heart and Soul Study. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. 2007;22(4):1087-1092. doi:10.1093/ndt/gfl744

47. Okura T, Jotoku M, Irita J, et al. Association between cystatin C and inflammation in patients with essential hypertension. *Clin Exp Nephrol*. 2010;14(6):584-588. doi:10.1007/s10157-010-0334-8

48. Potok OA, Ix JH, Shlipak MG, et al. Cystatin C- and Creatinine-Based Glomerular Filtration Rate Estimation Differences and Muscle Quantity and Functional Status in Older Adults: The Health, Aging, and Body Composition Study. *Kidney Med*. 2022;4(3):100416. doi:10.1016/j.xkme.2022.100416

49. Czaplińska M, Ćwiklińska A, Sakowicz-Burkiewicz M, et al. Apolipoprotein e gene polymorphism and renal function are associated with apolipoprotein e concentration in patients with chronic kidney disease. *Lipids Health Dis*. 2019;18(1):1-9. doi:10.1186/s12944-019-1003-x

50. Hsu CC, Kao WHL, Coresh J, et al. Apolipoprotein E and progression of chronic kidney disease. *J Am Med Assoc*. 2005;293(23):2892-2899. doi:10.1001/jama.293.23.2892

51. Saito T, Ishigaki Y, Oikawa S, Yamamoto TT. Etiological significance of apolipoprotein E mutations in lipoprotein glomerulopathy. *Trends Cardiovasc Med*. 2002;12(2):67-70. doi:10.1016/S1050-1738(01)00148-7

52. Sienski G, Narayan P, Bonner JM, et al. APOE4 disrupts intracellular lipid homeostasis in human iPSC-derived glia. *Sci Transl Med*. 2021;13(583):eaaz4564. doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.aaz4564

53. Zhao H, Ji Q, Wu Z, et al. Destabilizing heterochromatin by APOE mediates senescence. *Nature Aging*. 2022;2(4):303-316. doi:10.1038/s43587-022-00186-z

54. Liu CC, Kanekiyo T, Xu H, Bu G. Apolipoprotein E and Alzheimer disease: risk, mechanisms, and therapy. *Nat Rev Neurol*. 2013;9(2):106-118. doi:10.1038/nrneurol.2012.263

55. Alsegiani AS, Shah ZA. The role of cofilin in age-related neuroinflammation. *Neural Regeneration Res*. 2020;15(8):1451-1459. doi:10.4103/1673-5374.274330

56. Namme JN, Bepari AK, Takebayashi H. Cofilin Signaling in the CNS Physiology and Neurodegeneration. *Int J Mol Sci*. 2021;22(19). doi:10.3390/ijms221910727

57. Lin S, Wang J, Cao B, Huang Y, Sheng X, Zhu Y. Cofilin-1 induces acute kidney injury via the promotion of endoplasmic reticulum stress-mediated ferroptosis. *Hum Cell*. 2023;36(6):1928-1937. doi:10.1007/s13577-023-00949-9

58. Li L, Dai Y, Ke D, et al. Ferroptosis: new insight into the mechanisms of diabetic nephropathy and retinopathy. *Front Endocrinol* . 2023;14:1215292. doi:10.3389/fendo.2023.1215292

59. Laulumaa S, Varjosalo M. Commander Complex-A Multifaceted Operator in Intracellular Signaling and Cargo. *Cells*. 2021;10(12). doi:10.3390/cells10123447

60. Liu YF, Swart M, Ke Y, Ly K, McDonald FJ. Functional interaction of COMMD3 and COMMD9 with the epithelial sodium channel. *Am J Physiol Renal Physiol*. 2013;305(1):F80-9. doi:10.1152/ajprenal.00158.2013

61. Kobayashi S, Ito A, Okuzaki D, et al. Expression profiling of PBMC-based diagnostic gene markers isolated from vasculitis patients. *DNA Res*. 2008;15(4):253-265. doi:10.1093/dnares/dsn014

62. Brunyanszki A, Erdelyi K, Szczesny B, et al. Upregulation and Mitochondrial Sequestration of Hemoglobin Occur in Circulating Leukocytes during Critical Illness, Conferring a Cytoprotective Phenotype. *Mol Med*. 2015;21(1):666-675. doi:10.2119/molmed.2015.00187

63. Golea-Secara A, Munteanu C, Sarbu M, et al. Urinary proteins detected using modern proteomics intervene in early type 2 diabetic kidney disease - a pilot study. *Biomark Med*. 2020;14(16):1521-1536. doi:10.2217/bmm-2020-0308

64. Lin YH, Platt MP, Fu H, et al. Global Proteome and Phosphoproteome Characterization of Sepsis-induced Kidney Injury. *Mol Cell Proteomics*. 2020;19(12):2030-2047. doi:10.1074/mcp.RA120.002235

65. Arnemann J, Sultani O, Hasgün D, Coerdt W. T-/H-cadherin (CDH13): a new marker for differentiating podocytes. *Virchows Arch*. 2006;448(2):160-164. doi:10.1007/s00428-005-0055-7

66. Tsugawa-Shimizu Y, Fujishima Y, Kita S, et al. Increased vascular permeability and severe renal tubular damage after ischemia-reperfusion injury in mice lacking adiponectin or T-cadherin. *Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab*. 2021;320(2):E179-E190. doi:10.1152/ajpendo.00393.2020

67. Schumacher D, Morgenstern J, Oguchi Y, et al. Compensatory mechanisms for methylglyoxal detoxification in experimental & clinical diabetes. *Mol Metab*. 2018;18:143-152. doi:10.1016/j.molmet.2018.09.005

68. Zeggar S, Watanabe KS, Teshigawara S, et al. Role of Lgals9 Deficiency in Attenuating Nephritis and Arthritis in BALB/c Mice in a Pristane-Induced Lupus Model. *Arthritis Rheumatol*. 2018;70(7):1089-1101. doi:10.1002/art.40467

69. Bi S, Hong PW, Lee B, Baum LG. Galectin-9 binding to cell surface protein disulfide isomerase regulates the redox environment to enhance T-cell migration and HIV entry. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2011;108(26):10650-10655. doi:10.1073/pnas.1017954108

70. Horvath S, Raj K. DNA methylation-based biomarkers and the epigenetic clock theory of ageing. *Nat Rev Genet*. 2018;19(6):371-384. doi:10.1038/s41576-018-0004-3

71. Nie C, Li Y, Li R, et al. Distinct biological ages of organs and systems identified from a multi-omics study. *Cell Rep*. 2022;38(10):110459. doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2022.110459

72. Shen X, Wang C, Zhou X, et al. Nonlinear dynamics of multi-omics profiles during human aging. *Nat Aging*. Published online August 14, 2024. doi:10.1038/s43587-024-00692-2

73. Perez-Riverol Y, Csordas A, Bai J, et al. The PRIDE database and related tools and resources in 2019: improving support for quantification data. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2019;47(D1):D442-D450. doi:10.1093/nar/gky1106

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the UK QUOD Consortium and NHS Blood and Transplant UK Registry for providing the samples and the associated clinical and demographic metadata. ; in particular we thank Sheba Ziyenge, Lewis Simmonds , Dr Meng Sun and Dr Sarah Cross, Dr Sergei Maslau and Mr Tomas Surik for their support on the QUOD sample selection.

We thank members of the Discovery Proteomics Facility within the TDI Mass Spectrometry Laboratory for expert help with mass spectrometry analysis, and members of the Lindgren and Nellåker groupz at the BDI for informative discussions regarding statistical modeling.

FIGURES AND TABLES



Figure 1: Experimental design to discover donor kidney proteome associations with transplant outcome

We selected biopsies from QUOD biobank taken from one kidney from each donor pair. Donor kidney samples were selected randomly from pairs where both recipients had similar outcomes. The biopsy samples were subjected to proteomic analysis to yield a snapshot of the organ proteome at kidney retrieval. We analyzed donor characteristics and clinical variables and protein abundances in a combined model against recipient eGFR at 12 months posttransplant (eGFR12; units given in ml/min/1.73 m^2).

	DBD	DCD	Total	Proportion of Variance Explained	Association p-value
n	100	85	185		
Recipient kidney function (mean eGFR, mL/min per 1.73 m^2) at 12 Months Posttransplant (eGFR12)	53.47 ± 28.29	47.38 ± 25.17	50.67 ± 27.00	-	-
Recipient kidney function (mean eGFR, mL/min per 1.73 m^2) at 3 Months Posttransplant	54.26 ± 28.94	48.14 ± 21.20	51.47 ± 25.81	0.6589	6.7079×10^{-44} (***)
Donor Age, y	48.37 ± 14.98	49.60 ± 12.81	48.94 ± 14.00	0.2107	5.0067×10^{-11} (***)
Donor Sex				0.0051	$3.3568e\times10^{-1}$
Female	50 (50.0%)	31 (36.5%)	81 (43.8%)		
Male	50 (50.0%)	54 (63.5%)	104 (56.2%)		
Donor Ethnicity				0.008	9.1804×10^{-1}
White	96 (96.0%)	83 (97.6%)	179 (96.8%)		
Other	4 (4.0%)	2 (2.4%)	6 (3.2%)		
Donor Weight, kg	80.26 ± 17.97	80.60 ± 15.34	80.42 ± 16.77	0.0017	5.7320×10^{-1}
Donor Height, cm	171.19 ± 9.96	171.95 ± 8.99	171.54 ± 9.51	0.0229	3.9808×10^{-2} (*)
Donor S-Cr terminal, umol/l	86.76 ± 54.60	68.14 ± 28.14	78.04 ± 45.08	0.0055	3.3332×10^{-1}
Donor Cold Ischemia Time, h	14.70 ± 4.35	13.92 ± 5.58	14.34 ± 4.95	0.0002	8.3482×10^{-1}
Donor Cause of death				0.0396	6.5924×10^{-3} (*)
Trauma	7 (7.0%)	11 (12.9%)	18 (9.7%)		
Other	93 (93.0%)	74 (87.1%)	167 (90.3%)		
Donor UKKDRI	1.11 ± 0.47	1.08 ± 0.45	1.10 ± 0.46	0.2042	2.5337e-09 (***)
Donor Delayed Graft Function				0.025	1.3182e-01
Immediate	73 (73.0%)	54 (63.5%)	127 (68.6%)		
Delayed	17 (17.0%)	18 (21.2%)	35 (18.9%)		
Primary Non-Function	0 (0.0%)	1 (1.2%)	1 (0.5%)		
Not Reported	10 (10.0%)	12 (14.1%)	22 (11.9%)		
Recipient Age, y	49.25 ± 14.36	51.80 ± 12.68	50.42 ± 13.64	0.1117	3.3146e-06 (***)
Recipient Sex				0.0005	7.5185e-01
Female	46 (46.0%)	21 (24.7%)	67 (36.2%)		
Male	54 (54.0%)	64 (75.3%)	118 (63.8%)		
Recipient Ethnicity				0.0191	7.4663e-01
White	72 (72.0%)	65 (76.5%)	137 (74.1%)		
Other	28 (28.0%)	20 (23.5%)	48 (25.9%)		
HLA Mismatch Groups				0.03	1.3682e-01
0 Mismatches	16 (16.0%)	2 (2.4%)	18 (9.7%)		
0 DR and 0/1 B	30 (30.0%)	24 (28.2%)	54 (29.2%)		
0 DR and 2 B	44 (44.0%)	49 (57.6%)	93 (50.3%)		
or 1 DR and 0/1 B	10 (10.0%)	10 (11.8%)	20 (10.8%)		
Donor/Recipient Sex Mismatch				0.0017	5.7505e-01
No	58 (58.0%)	26 (30.6%)	84 (45.4%)		
Yes	42 (42.0%)	59 (69.4%)	101 (54.6%)		

Table 1: Donor and recipient clinical and demographic variables
Donor kidney associated metadata. Samples are subdivided by donor type for information purposes. Numerical variables are given as mean ± standard deviation. Categorial variables are given as frequency alongside percentage of total cohort. Correlation values and associated p values given are for the correlation between each variable and Recipient eGFR at 12 months posttransplant (i.e. not a comparison between DBD and DCD)



Figure 2: Protein association with transplant outcome is dominated by donor age effects.
A: Breakdown of prediction function ('rule') terms identified in any ensemble across 2000 PRE iterations. B: Evaluation of individual protein model performance (Root-Mean-Squared Error, lower is better) on the discovery dataset used for fitting each model (circles) and corresponding performance on a 'held out' evaluation dataset (diamonds). The dashed line indicates the performance of the donor-age only model on the discovery dataset, applied as a maximum threshold for protein selection. C: Top 10 Reactome terms identified by pathway analysis of all 539 proteins. D & E: STRINGdb functional association networks of identified proteins associated with Metabolism (D) and Innate Immune System (E), the most and second most significant Reactome terms respectively. Only connected vertices are shown. Edges represent 'highest confidence' functional interactions (confidence score >0.9).



Figure 3: Modeled associations between proteins and kidney transplant outcome change with donor age

Our modeling found that the effect of candidate protein levels on outcome changed with age.
A: Distribution of donor age over out dataset. B: Donor-age-only model; fitted effect of donor age on eGFR12.
C & D: Effect of low protein abundance (10th percentile) (C) and high protein abundance (90th percentile) (D) on modeled eGFR12, relative to donor age-only (DAO) model eGFR12, across donor age. The 5 most different (highest Euclidean distance to donor age-only model) proteins are shown in each case.



Figure 4: Effect of difference in protein abundances change with age
Comparisons of the effect of low and high protein abundance on modeled eGFR12, across donor age. Panels A-G (yellow, purple and pink backgrounds; qualitative grouping by relationship with age – see Results): proteins highlighted in Figure 3C,D. Panels H & I (green background): known kidney function markers. Fold changes shown (y axes) are the modeled eGFR12 relative to donor age-only (DAO) model eGFR12, across donor age. Qualitative summaries of low and high abundance effects are given below the panels.



Figure 5: Independent scRNA-seq Data Suggest Identified Proteins Associate with Acute Injury
Evaluation of our protein set against independent transcriptomic data comparing AKI and CKD [22]. The correlation of transcripts corresponding to identified proteins between AKI and CKD was compared to background correlation (all other transcripts). We observed significantly lower correlation between AKI and CKD in transcripts matching our protein set (indicating increased variability in expression versus background), across almost all nephron cell types.