Title: Benefit and Risk of Endomyocardial Biopsy for Heart Transplant Patients in the Contemporary Era

Target Journal: JACC: Heart Failure

Authors: Vincenzo Cusi[1], Florin Vaida[2], Nicholas Wettersten[3], Nicholas Rodgers[1], Yuko Tada[1], Bryn Gerding[1], Barry Greenberg[1], Marcus Anthony Urey[1], Eric Adler[1], Paul J. Kim[1]

ORCID IDs: Vincenzo Cusi, BS: 0000-0001-9681-6896; Florin Vaida, PhD: 0000-0002-2256-4611; Nicholas Wettersten, MD: 0000-0002-6122-1152; Nicholas Rodgers, BS: 0000-0001-7940-1322; Yuko Tada, MD, PhD: 0000-0003-1410-9894; Bryn Gerding, BS: 0000-0001-7635-0443; Barry Greenberg, MD: 0000-0002-6605-9385; Marcus Anthony Urey, MD: 0000-0001-8311-5003; Eric Adler, MD: 0000-0002-4765-0188; Paul J. Kim, MD: 0000-0002-1755-6182

Affiliations: 1. UC San Diego Health, San Diego, CA. 2. Department of Family Medicine and Public Health, UC San Diego, La Jolla, CA. 3. Cardiology Section, Veterans Affairs San Diego Healthcare System, San Diego, CA.

Total word count: 3,547

Acknowledgements/Funding:
This study was supported by the Altman Clinical & Translational Research Institute (ACTRI) at UC San Diego Health (PJK). The ACTRI is funded from awards issued by the National Center for Advancing Translational Sciences, NIH KL2TR001444 and NIH UL1 TR001442. Dr. Nicholas Wettersten and this work was supported (or supported in part) by Career Development Award Number IK2 CX002105 from the United States (U.S.) Department of Veterans Affairs Clinical Sciences R&D (CSRD) Service. The contents do not represent the view of the U.S. Department of Veterans Affairs or the United States Government.

Disclosure Statement:
PJK reports having received payments from CareDx and Natera for consulting and working at an institution that received research payments from CareDx and Natera. Neither CareDx nor Natera were involved in the conceptualization of the study, data collection and analysis, manuscript preparation, and editing of the final manuscript.

Address for Correspondence:
Paul J. Kim, MD
Division of Cardiovascular Medicine
Department of Medicine

UC San Diego Health

9452 Medical Center Drive, MC 7411
La Jolla, CA 92037
Tel: 858-246-0638
Fax: 858-534-2000

Twitter: @pjkim08
Tweet: Surveillance endomyocardial biopsies in #Hearttx patients show the highest risk for complications early after transplant. Can we improve the benefit/risk for surveillance endomyocardial biopsies with dd-cfDNA testing? #heart #transplantation #JACCHF

Acronyms

ACR - Acute cellular rejection
AMR - Antibody mediated rejection
AR - Acute rejection
dd-cfDNA - donor-derived cell-free DNA
DSA - donor specific antibody
EMB - endomyocardial biopsy
GEP - gene-expression profiling
HTx - heart transplant
pAMR - pathological antibody mediated rejection
PHM - predicted heart mass

Abstract

Word count: 230 words

Background:

The reference standard of detecting acute rejection (AR) in adult heart transplant (HTx) patients is an endomyocardial biopsy (EMB). The majority of EMBs are performed in asymptomatic patients. However, the benefit of diagnosing and treating AR compared to the risk of EMB complications has not been compared in the contemporary era (2010-current).

Objectives:

This study compared treated AR and EMB complications in HTx patients.

Methods:

The authors retrospectively analyzed 2,769 EMB obtained in 326 consecutive HTx patients between August 2019 and August 2022. Variables included surveillance versus for cause indication, recipient and donor characteristics, EMB procedural data and pathologic grades, treatment for AR, and clinical outcomes.

Results:

The overall EMB complication rate was 1.6%. EMBs performed within 1 month after HTx compared to after 1 month HTx showed significantly increased complications (OR = 12.74, $p < 0.001$). The treated AR rate was 14.2% in the for cause EMBs and 1.2% in the surveillance EMBs. We found the benefit/risk ratio was significantly lower in the surveillance compared to the for cause EMB group (OR = 0.05, $p < 0.001$).

Conclusions:

The yield of surveillance EMBs has declined in the contemporary era, while for cause EMBs continued to demonstrate a high benefit/risk ratio. The risk of EMB complications was highest within 1 month after HTx. Surveillance EMB protocols in HTx patients may need to be re-evaluated.

Key words: heart transplant, endomyocardial biopsy, complication, pericardial effusion, acute rejection

Introduction

Acute rejection (AR) has been historically associated with early death after heart transplantation (HTx). Due to the initially high morbidity and mortality of AR, endomyocardial biopsy (EMB) was developed to detect AR early in HTx patients.[1] Although recent advancements in noninvasive blood-based biomarkers show promise in replacing surveillance EMBs,[2–4] EMB continues to be used for surveillance of AR in asymptomatic patients at most institutions.

Previous studies have described various complications associated with EMBs that range from 1% to 5% in HTx patients.[5–8] While EMB complication rates remain unchanged, the incidence of AR detected by EMBs has decreased from 54% to 5%.[9,10] Deaths due to AR have also decreased.[11] This shift has been attributed to advances in post-HTx care, particularly improved immunosuppression regimens.

Because of the marked reduction in AR and also the concern for over immunosuppression,[12] the role for surveillance EMB in HTx patients is being re-evaluated.[13] To date, a direct comparison of the benefit and risk of EMBs in both surveillance and for cause EMBs has not been performed in the contemporary era (2010-current).

In the present single-center study, we compared the rate of treated AR and EMB complications among HTx patients. Our aim was to provide an update for the benefit/risk profile of EMBs. We hypothesized that the benefit/risk ratio will be significantly decreased in surveillance compared to for cause EMBs.

Methods

Data Sharing

The data that support the findings of this study are openly available in Mendeley Data at ***.

Study Design

This study was a retrospective, observational study of consecutive EMBs performed on HTx patients at the University of California, San Diego Health (UC San Diego Health) between August 2019 to August 2022. Eligible patients were HTx recipients who were 18 years of age or older. For this study, the authors (VC, NR, BG) extracted patient data and clinical outcomes from the electronic medical record. Approval for this study was provided by the UC San Diego Health Office of IRB Administration (#805675). This study adheres to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki formulated by the World Medical Association and the US Federal Policy for the Protection of Human Subjects.

EMB Complications

Potential EMB complications were identified by chart review. All EMB complications were adjudicated by two experienced heart transplant cardiologists (NW and PJK). Where there was disagreement, a third cardiologist (YT) made the final determination.

For Cause vs Surveillance

Surveillance refers to an EMB performed according to a predetermined schedule during the first year after HTx. For cause refers to an EMB performed for clinical suspicion of rejection which includes: signs or symptoms of congestive heart failure, echocardiographic evidence of graft dysfunction, new arrhythmias, repeat EMB specifically requested by the clinical team to confirm the resolution of a recent episode of AR, and development of a de novo donor specific antibody (DSA). EMBs performed with concurrent but not de novo DSA were considered surveillance unless there was documentation indicating clinical suspicion for rejection. Abnormal gene expression profile (GEP; AlloMap®; CareDx; Brisbane, California) testing and donor-derived cell-free (dd-cfDNA; AlloSure®; CareDx; Brisbane, California; see blood-based biomarkers) results were categorized as surveillance EMBs as these are considered biomarkers for AR surveillance.

Biopsy-defined Rejection

We followed the ISHLT classification scheme for clinically significant acute cellular rejection (ACR) and antibody mediated rejection (AMR). AR refers to either clinically significant ACR, AMR, or both (mixed ACR and AMR).[3] Treatment for AR refers to a significant change in a subject's immunomodulatory regimen including: initiation or increase in corticosteroids to a prednisone equivalent of 40 mg/day or higher, intravenous immune globulin, plasmapheresis, rituximab, thymoglobulin, and/or bortezomib use.

Clinical Outcomes

All HTx patients were followed for all-cause death. Cause of death was adjudicated in the same fashion as EMB complications. Additional days of hospitalization after an EMB complication refers to the number of days beyond the initial projected hospitalization discharge date.

Blood-based biomarkers

GEP and dd-cfDNA test results were included if performed within 2 weeks prior to the EMB.[14,15] Dd-cfDNA testing was considered positive at UC San Diego Health if the donor fraction was $\geq$ 0.12%. GEP testing was considered positive if the score was $\geq$ 30 between 2 to 6 months post-HTx or $\geq$ 34 after 6 months post-HTx.[16]

Statistical Analyses

Categorical variables were expressed as frequency and percentage and compared with the use of either the Pearson's chi-square or Fisher's exact test. Continuous variables were expressed as mean $\pm$ standard deviation (SD) for normally distributed variables or median and interquartile range (IQR) for non-normally distributed variables and compared with the use of the Student's t-test or Wilcoxon rank-sum test as appropriate.

We calculated the prevalence of EMB complications, AR, and treated AR and compared differences in proportions between the surveillance and for cause groups. The agreement rate of

the initial adjudication for EMB complications was analyzed by Cohen's kappa statistics. For EMB complications, treated AR, and to identify candidate predictors for prediction models, we performed mixed effects logistic regression with forward model selection to take into account within-subject correlation and determine significant predictors at a subject level using a p-value less than 0.15 threshold. Poisson models were used to evaluate the benefit/risk ratios in the for cause compared to surveillance groups via an interaction term to account for within-subject correlation. Correlation of either dd-cfDNA with treated AR or GEP with treated ACR was evaluated using mixed effects logistic regression.

Analysis was conducted in R (R Core Team, 2022). We used the Bonferroni-Holm procedure whenever multiple comparisons were performed while implementing a particular statistical hypothesis test. The corrected p values are designated as p_c. For single hypothesis testing we report the unadjusted p value. P or $p_c < 0.05$ are considered significant.

Results

Characteristics of the study population

A total of 2,769 consecutive EMBs from 326 unique HTx patients were included in this study. All cases were included for the primary outcome of EMB complications (**Figure 1**). For cause EMBs accounted for 499 (18.0%) samples while surveillance EMBs accounted for 2,270 (82.0%) samples.

Baseline characteristics of the study population are depicted in **Table 1**. Patients were typically male (78.8%) and non-hispanic white (39.0%) with a mean age of 55.5 ± 1.5 years. There were 944.8 person-years in this study from HTx to end of follow-up.

EMB procedural characteristics are summarized in **Table S1**. Eight different transplant cardiologists performed EMBs for this study. The median number of samples per EMB was 4 (IQR, 4-5). The median number of EMB per patient was 9 (IQR, 6-12). Most EMBs were performed in an outpatient setting (78.8%).

EMB complications

In the study population, 45 (1.6%) total complications occurred in 41 unique HTx patients. Initial adjudication of EMB complications was in agreement 90.6% of the time with a Cohen's kappa of 0.81 (0.64, 0.97; $p < 0.001$). There were 33 (73.3%) clinically significant pericardial effusions and 26 of the 33 pericardial effusions required a percutaneous or surgical intervention. Other complications were less frequent and are shown in **Table 2**. There was a mean of 4.0 (95% CI, 2.89-5.11; $p < 0.001$) additional days of hospitalization due to an EMB complication. Clinically significant pericardial effusions occurred separately twice in two HTx patients and no HTx patient had more than two EMB complications. There were 11 (0.4%) non-diagnostic EMB samples in our study. Repeat EMB was performed in 7 of the 11 non-diagnostic cases. No repeat EMBs were associated with complications and 4 of the 7 repeat EMBs were performed in the first month after HTx.

We evaluated 47 predictors for EMB complications using single predictor logistic regression as shown in **Table S2**. Using multi-predictor logistic regression, only time since HTx was found to be a significant predictor for EMB complications with the highest risk period to be within 1 month after HTx (OR 12.74; 95% CI, 6.67-24.40; $p_c < 0.001$; **Figure 2**). There was a nonsignificant trend for increased EMB complications with surveillance indication ($p = 0.230$). Other factors including bioptome size, different operators, trainee involvement, and elevated intracardiac filling pressures were not found to be significantly associated with EMB complications after adjusting for multiple covariates.

The rate of significant pericardial effusions, defined as pericardial effusions moderate or greater in size, was low at 1.7%. We found no significant association for donor-recipient predicted heart mass (PHM) mismatch (i.e., small donor heart transplanted in a large HTx recipient) and incidental pericardial effusion ($p = 0.120$). The majority of pericardial effusions was adjudicated as EMB complications (67.3%; 95% CI, 52.3%-79.6%). While ACR was not associated with pericardial effusions, AMR demonstrated a significant correlation with incidental pericardial effusions (OR 3.63; 95% CI, 1.39-9.49; $p = 0.009$). However, AMR did not significantly correlate with pericardial effusions that were adjudicated as EMB complications ($p = 0.725$).

Sensitivity analysis with EMB-related pericardial effusion as the outcome was also performed. Only EMBs performed within 1 month after HTx (OR 1.99; 95% CI, 8.92-100.20; $p_c < 0.001$) were found to be significantly associated with EMB-related pericardial effusion.

Treated AR by EMB

AR was diagnosed in 133 (4.8%) EMB samples from 67 unique HTx patients (**Table S3**). However, only 99 (3.6%) AR samples from 61 unique HTx patients were treated. There was one EMB sample negative for ACR and AMR that was treated in the setting of focal myocyte necrosis and inflammation and concurrent cardiac allograft dysfunction. All "untreated" samples showed AMR without ACR (i.e., ACR 0R or 1R grades). Of the 35 untreated AMR samples, 28 were pAMR1 and 7 were pAMR2, including 2 patients that recently received immunomodulatory therapy and 1 patient that refused treatment.

We found treated AR diagnosed more frequently in for cause samples (14.2%) compared to surveillance EMB samples (1.2%; $p < 0.001$). The for cause indication demonstrated a significantly increased OR of 9.17 (95% CI, 4.56-18.46; $p_c < 0.001$; **Table 3**) for the diagnosis of treated AR. We found time from HTx was not significantly associated with treated AR after adjusting for multiple covariates ($p_c = 0.909$; **Figure 3**). We did not observe a significantly increased time interval between EMBs for treated AR samples compared to samples without treated AR (3.7 ± 2.4 versus 3.4 ± 2.1 weeks; $p = 0.300$).

Of the EMB samples within 1 month after HTx, 382 (88.2%) were surveillance and 51 (11.8%) were for cause. Of the EMB samples after 1 month HTx, 1,888 (80.8%) were surveillance and 448 (19.2%) were for cause. The number of EMB samples performed for cause was significantly increased after 1 month HTx compared to surveillance (OR 1.78; 95% CI, 1.30-2.47; $p = 0.002$). Among surveillance EMB within 1 month after HTx, we found 5 out of 11 AR samples prompted treatment (**Table S4**). The 6 surveillance AR cases that were not treated were all pAMR1 without

concurrent DSA. Among the for cause EMB within 1 month after HTx, we found 10 out of 11 AR samples were treated and the 1 untreated AR sample was a pAMR1 (I+) without concurrent DSA that was subsequently followed by repeated EMB until resolution of the AMR.

Benefit of detecting treated AR compared to risk of EMB complications in for cause versus surveillance EMBs

The overall benefit/risk ratio (i.e., treated AR/EMB complication) was 2.2. In the for cause EMB group, we found the benefit/risk ratio increased to 14.2. In contrast, we found the benefit/risk ratio decreased to 0.7 in the surveillance EMB group. As a result, the ratio of benefit/risk ratios comparing surveillance to for cause EMB groups was significantly decreased at 0.05 ($p < 0.001$).

Benefit of detecting treated AR compared to risk of EMB complications in EMBs performed before and after 1 month HTx

We found the benefit/risk ratio was significantly improved in surveillance EMB when comparing EMBs performed after 1 month HTx versus within 1 month after HTx (OR 11.59; 95% CI, 3.28-49.31; $p < 0.001$). However, we did not observe the benefit/risk ratio in for cause EMBs to be significantly different when comparing EMBs performed after 1 month HTx versus within 1 month after HTx (OR 3.96; 95% CI, 0.30-39.39; $p = 0.200$).

Blood-based biomarkers for treated AR surveillance

We also evaluated dd-cfDNA and GEP samples matched with EMB results. There were 1,243 dd-cfDNA samples from 234 unique HTx patients and 1,006 GEP samples from 247 unique HTx patients for this analysis. We found an elevated dd-cfDNA to be a significant predictor for treated AR (OR 2.60; 95% CI, 1.20-5.65; p = 0.016) while an elevated GEP, on the other hand, did not predict treated ACR (p = 0.947). When evaluating surveillance EMBs only, an elevated dd-cfDNA result was no longer significant for treated AR (OR 2.29; 95% CI, 0.68-7.64; p = 0.179). In the surveillance EMB subset matched for dd-cfDNA testing, we found that 6 out of 11 EMB complications could have potentially been prevented using dd-cfDNA testing while detecting 7 out 14 treated AR cases. Of the treated AR samples, all 14 represented ACR grade 2R samples.

Clinical Outcomes

There were 24 deaths (7.4%; **Table S5**) and 1 retransplant. The majority of the deaths were due to infection. Of the 11 deaths due to infection, 7 (63.6%) were on either triple or quadruple immunosuppression and 10 (90.9%) were still taking prednisone. We did not observe any treated AR episodes in the preceding EMB prior to the diagnosis of the fatal infection. AR accounted for 3 (12.5%) deaths and all were due to AMR. One AR episode associated with death was positive for dd-cfDNA testing while the two others underwent for cause EMB at which time the AR diagnosis was made.

Discussion

In this retrospective single-center study, several key findings were observed. First, the rate of treated AR compared to EMB complications, calculated as the benefit/risk ratio, was significantly lower in surveillance compared to for cause EMBs. Second, we found the highest risk period for EMB complications to be within 1 month after HTx. In the contemporary era, the benefit of detecting treated AR has decreased to the extent that we found the risk for EMB complications outweighed the benefit in surveillance EMBs.[8,10,17,18] Third, the benefit/risk ratio for surveillance EMBs improved after 1 month HTx, mainly due to the significant decrease in EMB complications. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study to directly compare the rates of treated AR to EMB complications in the contemporary era and evaluate predictors for EMB complications.

We found the EMB complication rate to be low (1.6%) with rates similar to previous studies.[5,6] While not a direct cause of death, EMB complications did contribute to increased morbidity, additional interventions, and a significant increase in time hospitalized by 4 days per EMB complication. Historically, tricuspid valve injury and vascular complications received greater attention for EMB complications.[6,19] In recent studies, pericardial effusions contributed to a greater proportion of EMB complications, consistent with our study findings.[5,18] We hypothesize that vascular complications and tricuspid valve injury have decreased due to improved techniques utilizing ultrasound for vascular access and increased attention to avoiding tricuspid valve injury, respectively. However, the incidence of pericardial effusions as an EMB complication is likely unchanged due to the fact that the majority of studies, including this study, continue to report the practice of fluoroscopy-guided EMBs,[5,6,8] despite the feasibility of echo-guided EMBs.[20]

Compared to others, our patients more frequently prompted intervention for the pericardial effusion, which may reflect differences in practice between centers. We found the incidence of pericardial effusions to occur infrequently compared to prior eras[21] and to be similar to recent studies evaluating EMB complications.[5,6,8] Furthermore, PHM mismatch and ACR did not demonstrate a significant association with the development of pericardial effusion. Our study did demonstrate a significant association of incidental pericardial effusions and AMR but we did not find AMR to be associated with EMB-related pericardial effusions.

We show that earlier time from HTx was associated with a higher rate of EMB complications, with the rate significantly increased within 1 month after HTx. This finding was driven by a significantly increased rate of EMB-related pericardial effusions. We hypothesize that myocyte necrosis from ischemia-reperfusion injury and its persistence related to immunosuppression predisposes patients to EMB-related pericardial effusions within 1 month after HTx.[22,23] This hypothesis is also supported by greater levels dd-cfDNA early in the post-HTx period, indicating a vulnerable period due to allograft injury in the early post-HTx period.[2]

Our study findings also corroborated a reduced incidence of ACR in the contemporary era compared to prior eras, attributed to modern immunosuppression regimens and improved post-HTx care.[10,11,17] In contrast to earlier studies,[6,17] our findings in the contemporary era showed that time from HTx was not independently associated with treated ACR.[18] However, while ACR rates declined, we observed an increased incidence of AMR, which may be reflection of increasing awareness of AMR.[24,25] However, we showed that a large proportion of AMR (42.7%) were not

treated. The majority of untreated samples were pAMR1 and the inconsistency in treatment of AMR likely reflects the current uncertainty of benefit with treatment.[26]

Our study demonstrates that for cause EMBs still detects treated AR at a high rate. In addition, we showed no significant difference in time between EMBs for treated AR samples compared to samples without treated AR. This finding supports our observation that decreased frequency of surveillance EMBs 3 months after HTx does not lead to a delayed diagnosis of treated AR. We also demonstrated a trend towards reduced EMB complications in the for cause group as the utilization of for cause compared to surveillance EMBs was significantly decreased within 1 month after HTx. Thus, a potential added benefit of prioritizing for cause EMBs would be reducing EMBs performed within 1 month after HTx, the highest risk period for EMB complications.

A possible solution to improving the benefit/risk ratio in surveillance EMBs could be to use dd-cfDNA testing in the early HTx time period (**Central Illustration**). By identifying asymptomatic HTx patients at highest risk for treated AR, the yield for surveillance EMBs can be increased. However, challenges using only dd-cfDNA for surveillance testing remain as Agbor-Enoh showed the maximal test performance occurred after 1 month HTx.[2] We also demonstrated relatively low sensitivity for detecting treated AR using dd-cfDNA.[14] Thus, continued development of dd-cfDNA testing, including use of dd-cfDNA absolute quantity,[3] will likely be needed to further improve the yield of surveillance EMBs.

Finally, we observed that the majority of deaths within 5 years of follow-up after HTx were due to infection. Thus, we believe there is a need for future studies to continue evaluating refinement of immunosuppression to reduce the rate of deaths from infection while maintaining the low rate of cardiac deaths due to AR. Studies such as MOSAIC (NCT05459181) will be important in evaluating the reduction of surveillance EMBs while refining immunosuppression regimens based on a patient's risk status.

Limitations

This study should be interpreted within the context of several important limitations. First, this was a retrospective study from a single center and may not necessarily represent the experience of other centers with different patient demographics, procedural characteristics, and variations in post-HTx management. Second, UC San Diego Health does not consistently perform echocardiograms after every EMB, as reported in some other studies.[5,6] Thus, it is possible asymptomatic significant pericardial effusions are underdiagnosed, especially 3 months after HTx when the frequency of echocardiograms decreases at our center. However, the incidence of pericardial effusions in this study is similar to recent studies.[5,18] In addition, incidental pericardial effusion has been previously reported to be rare after 3 months HTx. Third, this study solely focused on HTx patients and thus conclusions for the benefit/risk ratio for EMBs in primary cardiomyopathy patients cannot be made. Fourth, our center did not consistently obtain dd-cfDNA testing until June 2021, and thus, this study is not adequately powered to determine whether dd-cfDNA testing can accurately detect treated AR within 1 month after HTx. The Surveillance HeartCare Outcomes Registry (NCT03695601: SHORE) is a prospective observational registry study that includes dd-cfDNA

testing within 1 month after HTx that will be informative in this regard. Finally, all EMBs in this study were performed with fluoroscopic guidance. Increased use of echo-guided or the hybrid method (echo- and fluoroscopy-guided) could potentially further reduce EMB complications.

Conclusion

Detection of treated AR by surveillance EMBs in adult HTx patients has declined in the contemporary era resulting in a significantly lower benefit/risk ratio in surveillance compared to for cause EMBs. Further studies to improve noninvasive risk stratification, particularly within the first month after HTx where the risk for EMB complications is highest, are needed to improve the benefit/risk ratio for surveillance EMBs.

Clinical Perspectives:

Competency in medical knowledge 1: The rate of diagnosis for treated acute rejection by surveillance endomyocardial biopsy in heart transplant patients is low in the contemporary era.

Competency in medical knowledge 2: The risk of endomyocardial biopsy complications is highest within 1 month after heart transplantation.

Competency in practice-based learning: Heart transplant centers should evaluate how to reduce endomyocardial complications within 1 month after heart transplantation and institute protocols to improve the benefit/risk ratio of surveillance endomyocardial biopsies.

Translational outlook 1: Further studies that improve dd-cfDNA testing in the early HTx period are needed to improve the benefit/risk ratio of surveillance endomyocardial biopsies.

Translational outlook 2: Studies that evaluate reducing immunosuppression in heart transplant patients based on blood-based biomarkers can potentially demonstrate a reduction in infectious deaths related to immunosuppression.

Acknowledgements:

The authors acknowledge Melissa McLenon, DNP, ACNP from UC San Diego Health for her contribution to data collection and Priyesha Bijlani, MD from UC San Diego Health for her contribution to the review and editing of the final manuscript.

Author contributions:

VC: conceptualization, writing, review and editing, data curation, project administration; FV: writing, review and editing, statistical analyses; NW: writing, review and editing, data curation, adjudication of endomyocardial biopsy complications and clinical outcomes; NR: writing, review and editing, data curation; YT: writing, review and editing, data curation, adjudication of endomyocardial biopsy complications and clinical outcomes; Bryn Gerding: writing, review and editing, data curation; Barry Greenberg: writing, review and editing; MAU: writing, review and editing; EAdler: writing, review and editing; PJK: conceptualization, writing, review and editing, data curation, adjudication of endomyocardial biopsy complications and clinical outcomes, project administration.

Figure 1. Flow diagram. AR, acute rejection; EMB, endomyocardial biopsy



Figure 2. Endomyocardial biopsy (EMB) complications over time since heart transplantation (HTx). A. Scatterplot of endomyocardial biopsies for all 326 HTx patients. Each gray dot represents an EMB sample negative for EMB complications and each red diamond represents an EMB sample associated with a complication. EMB complications show a pattern of occurring within the first month after HTx. **B**. Barplot showing percentage of EMB complications within each time interval. There is a significant difference in percentage of EMB complications occurring in the first month compared to the rest of the first year after HTx ($p < 0.001$).


A.
HTx patient
0
1 mth
3 mths
6 mths
9 mths
12 mths
B.
EMB Complications (%)
0
5
10
15
20
OR 12.8 (6.5-26.2)
*, p < 0.001
*
0-1 mth
1-3 mths
3-6 mths
6-9 mths
9-12 mths
Time from HTx (months)

Figure 3. Treated acute rejection (AR) over time since heart transplantation (HTx). A. Scatterplot of endomyocardial biopsies for all 326 HTx patients. Each gray dot represents an EMB sample negative for treated AR and each red diamond represents an EMB sample positive for treated AR. Treated AR does not show a pattern of occurring at a higher rate early after HTx (i.e., within the first 6 months) in the contemporary era. **B**. Barplot showing percentage of treated AR within each time interval. There is no significant difference in the percentage of treated AR in 0-6 months compared to 6-12 months after HTx ($p = 0.17$).


A.
HTx patient
0
1 mth
3 mths
6 mths
9 mths
12 mths


B.
Treated AR (%)
0
5
10
15
20
OR 1.4 (0.8-2.3)
p = 0.166
0-1 mth
1-3 mths
3-6 mths
6-9 mths
9-12 mths
Time from HTx (months)

Figure 4. Endomyocardial biopsy complication (EMB) and treated acute rejection (AR) over time since heart transplantation (HTx). A. Surveillance EMB incidence curves for benefit and risk. EMB complications incidence acutely increases within the first month after HTx. Incidence of treated AR does not increase above the rate of EMB complications for surveillance EMBs. **B**. For cause EMB incidence curves for benefit and risk. The incidence of treated AR increases above the rate of EMB complications in for cause EMBs within the first month after HTx.



Table 1. Characteristics of Subjects and Endomyocardial Biopsies. DCD, donation after cardiac death; DPP-NMP, direct procurement perfusion-normothermic machine perfusion; ICM, ischemic cardiomyopathy; NICM, nonischemic cardiomyopathy; NRP-CSS, normothermic regional perfusion-cold static storage; PHM, predicted heart mass; PRA, panel reactive antibodies; VAD, ventricular assist device

	N	
Donor characteristics		
Age, y, mean (SD)	321	33.3 (10.7)
Male, N (%)	326	267 (81.9)
Recipient characteristics		
Age, y, mean (SD)	326	55.5 (13.8)
Male, N (%)	326	257 (78.8)
Race		
Asian, N (%)	326	24 (7.4)
Black, N (%)	326	44 (13.5)
Native American, N (%)	326	2 (0.6)
Other Race, N (%)	326	27 (8.3)
Pacific Islander, N (%)	326	4 (1.2)
White, N (%)	326	225 (69.0)
Ethnicity		
Hispanic or Latino, N (%)	326	98 (30.1)
Not Hispanic or Latino, N (%)	326	228 (69.9)
Transplant characteristics		
Multi-organ transplant, N (%)	326	53 (16.3)
Total donor ischemic time, min, mean (SD)	319	211 (70)
Sex mismatch, N (%)	326	54 (16.6)
PHM difference, % recipient PHM, mean (SD)	321	5.9 (21.7)
Sensitized patients (PRA $\geq$ 10%)	319	58 (18.2)
VAD use, N (%)	326	108 (33.1)
Indication for Transplant		

NICM, N (%)	326	188 (57.7)
ICM, N (%)	326	113 (34.7)
Congenital, N (%)	326	18 (5.5)
Retransplant, N (%)	326	7 (2.1)
Induction therapy		
Thymoglobulin, N (%)	326	109 (33.4)
Basiliximab, N (%)	326	26 (8.0)
Eculizumab, N (%)	326	2 (0.6)
DCD, N (%)	326	65 (19.9)
NRP-CSS	326	49 (15.0)
DPP-NMP	326	16 (4.9)
Endomyocardial biopsy characteristics		
Time post-transplant, d, median (IQR)	2769	100 (48-217)
Concurrent DSA, N (%)	2757	233 (8.5)
Concurrent cardiac allograft dysfunction, N (%)	2769	135 (4.9)

Table 2. Endomyocardial biopsy complications.

	Endomyocardial cases	Unique heart transplant patients
Clinically significant pericardial effusion – no. of patients/total no. (%)	33/45 (73.3)	31/41 (75.6)
Pericardiocentesis with pericardial drain – no. of patients/total no.	25/33	24/31
Surgical pericardial window – no. of patients/total no.	1/33	1/31
Tricuspid valve injury – no. of patients/total no. (%)	3/45 (6.7)	3/41 (7.3)
Inadvertent arterial access – no. of patients/total no. (%)	3/45 (6.7)	3/41 (7.3)
Failed venous access attempt – no. of patients/total no. (%)	4/45 (8.9)	4/41 (9.8)
Right atrial lead dislodgement – no. of patients/total no. (%)	1/45 (2.2)	1/41 (2.4)
Extraction of embedded bioptome – no. of patients/total no. (%)	1/45 (2.2)	1/41 (2.4)

Table 3. Multi-predictor logistic regression for treated acute rejection for all endomyocardial biopsies. CI, confidence interval; DSA, donor specific antibody; HTx, heart transplant; OR, odds ratio.

Variables	OR	95% CI	p-value
For cause indication	9.17	[4.56-18.46]	$p_c < 0.001$
Concurrent DSA	5.12	[2.56-10.25]	$p_c < 0.001$
Inpatient status	1.74	[0.93-3.26]	$p_c = 0.124$
Right atrial pressure (per 1 mmHg)	1.06	[1.00-1.13]	$p_c = 0.124$
Fick cardiac index (per 1 LPM/m2)	0.65	[0.44-0.96]	$p_c = 0.093$
Time since HTx (per week)	1.00	[1.00-1.00]	$p_c = 0.909$

References.

1. Caves PK, Stinson EB, Billingham ME, Rider AK, Shumway NE. Diagnosis of human cardiac allograft rejection by serial cardiac biopsy. *J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg*. 1973;66(3):461-466. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/4582104

2. Agbor-Enoh S, Shah P, Tunc I, et al. Cell-Free DNA to Detect Heart Allograft Acute Rejection. *Circulation*. 2021;143(12):1184-1197. doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.120.049098

3. Kim PJ, Olymbios M, Siu A, et al. A novel donor-derived cell-free DNA assay for the detection of acute rejection in heart transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. 2022;41(7):919-927. doi:10.1016/j.healun.2022.04.002

4. Khush KK, Patel J, Pinney S, et al. Noninvasive detection of graft injury after heart transplant using donor-derived cell-free DNA: A prospective multicenter study. *Am J Transplant*. 2019;19(10):2889-2899. doi:10.1111/ajt.15339

5. Bermpeis K, Esposito G, Gallinoro E, et al. Safety of Right and Left Ventricular Endomyocardial Biopsy in Heart Transplantation and Cardiomyopathy Patients. *JACC Heart Fail*. 2022;10(12):963-973. doi:10.1016/j.jchf.2022.08.005

6. Strecker T, Rösch J, Weyand M, Agaimy A. Endomyocardial biopsy for monitoring heart transplant patients: 11-years-experience at a german heart center. *Int J Clin Exp Pathol*. 2013;6(1):55-65. https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23236543

7. Deckers JW, Hare JM, Baughman KL. Complications of transvenous right ventricular endomyocardial biopsy in adult patients with cardiomyopathy: a seven-year survey of 546 consecutive diagnostic procedures in a tertiary referral center. *J Am Coll Cardiol*. 1992;19(1):43-47. doi:10.1016/0735-1097(92)90049-s

8. Hamour IM, Burke MM, Bell AD, Panicker MG, Banerjee R, Banner NR. Limited utility of endomyocardial biopsy in the first year after heart transplantation. *Transplantation*. 2008;85(7):969-974. doi:10.1097/TP.0b013e318168d571

9. Subherwal S, Kobashigawa JA, Cogert G, Patel J, Espejo M, Oeser B. Incidence of acute cellular rejection and non-cellular rejection in cardiac transplantation. *Transplant Proc*. 2004;36(10):3171-3172. doi:10.1016/j.transproceed.2004.10.048

10. Moayedi Y, Foroutan F, Miller RJH, et al. Risk evaluation using gene expression screening to monitor for acute cellular rejection in heart transplant recipients. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. 2019;38(1):51-58. doi:10.1016/j.healun.2018.09.004

11. Khush KK, Hsich E, Potena L, et al. The International Thoracic Organ Transplant Registry of the International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation: Thirty-eighth adult heart transplantation report - 2021; Focus on recipient characteristics. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. 2021;40(10):1035-1049. doi:10.1016/j.healun.2021.07.015

12. Jäämaa-Holmberg S, Salmela B, Lemström K, Pukkala E, Lommi J. Cancer incidence and mortality after heart transplantation - A population-based national cohort study. *Acta Oncol*. 2019;58(6):859-863. doi:10.1080/0284186X.2019.1580385

13. Holzhauser L, DeFilippis EM, Nikolova A, et al. The End of Endomyocardial Biopsy?: A Practical Guide for Noninvasive Heart Transplant Rejection Surveillance. *JACC Heart Fail*. 2023;11(3):263-276. doi:10.1016/j.jchf.2022.11.002

14. Rodgers N, Gerding B, Cusi V, Vaida F, Tada Y, Morris GP, Adler EA, Stehlik J, Kim PJ. Comparison of two donor-derived cell-free DNA tests and a blood gene-expression profile test in heart transplantation. *Clin Transplant*. Published online April 3, 2023:e14984. doi:10.1111/ctr.14984

15. Henricksen EJ, Moayedi Y, Purewal S, et al. Combining donor derived cell free DNA and gene expression profiling for non-invasive surveillance after heart transplantation. *Clin Transplant*. 2023;37(3):e14699. doi:10.1111/ctr.14699

16. Crespo-Leiro MG, Stypmann J, Schulz U, et al. Clinical usefulness of gene-expression profile to rule out acute rejection after heart transplantation: CARGO II. *Eur Heart J*. 2016;37(33):2591-2601. doi:10.1093/eurheartj/ehv682

17. Shah KB, Flattery MP, Smallfield MC, et al. Surveillance Endomyocardial Biopsy in the Modern Era Produces Low Diagnostic Yield for Cardiac Allograft Rejection. *Transplantation*. 2015;99(8):e75-e80. doi:10.1097/TP.0000000000000615

18. Weckbach LT, Maurer U, Schramm R, et al. Lower frequency routine surveillance endomyocardial biopsies after heart transplantation. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(8):e0182880. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0182880

19. Williams MJ, Lee MY, DiSalvo TG, et al. Biopsy-induced flail tricuspid leaflet and tricuspid regurgitation following orthotopic cardiac transplantation. *Am J Cardiol*. 1996;77(15):1339-1344. doi:10.1016/s0002-9149(96)00202-0

20. Fiorelli AI, Coelho GB, Santos RHB, et al. Successful endomyocardial biopsy guided by transthoracic two-dimensional echocardiography. *Transplant Proc*. 2011;43(1):225-228. doi:10.1016/j.transproceed.2010.12.049

21. Al-Dadah AS, Guthrie TJ, Pasque MK, Moon MR, Ewald GA, Moazami N. Clinical course and predictors of pericardial effusion following cardiac transplantation. *Transplant Proc*. 2007;39(5):1589-1592. doi:10.1016/j.transproceed.2006.11.014

22. Fyfe B, Loh E, Winters GL, Couper GS, Kartashov AI, Schoen FJ. Heart transplantation-associated perioperative ischemic myocardial injury. Morphological features and clinical significance. *Circulation*. 1996;93(6):1133-1140. doi:10.1161/01.cir.93.6.1133

23. Kaczorowski DJ, Nakao A, Vallabhaneni R, et al. Mechanisms of Toll-like receptor 4 (TLR4)-mediated inflammation after cold ischemia/reperfusion in the heart. *Transplantation*. 2009;87(10):1455-1463. doi:10.1097/TP.0b013e3181a36e5e

24. Colvin MM, Cook JL, Chang P, et al. Antibody-mediated rejection in cardiac transplantation: emerging knowledge in diagnosis and management: a scientific statement from the American Heart Association. *Circulation*. 2015;131(18):1608-1639. doi:10.1161/CIR.0000000000000093

25. Coutance G, Kransdorf E, Aubert O, et al. Clinical Prediction Model for Antibody-Mediated Rejection: A Strategy to Minimize Surveillance Endomyocardial Biopsies After Heart

Transplantation. *Circ Heart Fail*. 2022;15(10):e009923. doi:10.1161/CIRCHEARTFAILURE.122.009923

26. Bruneval P, Angelini A, Miller D, et al. The XIIIth Banff Conference on Allograft Pathology: The Banff 2015 Heart Meeting Report: Improving Antibody-Mediated Rejection Diagnostics: Strengths, Unmet Needs, and Future Directions. *Am J Transplant*. 2017;17(1):42-53. doi:10.1111/ajt.14112

Central Illustration:



Proposed pathway to guide decision-making to perform EMB in heart transplant patients
AR, acute rejection; DSA, donor specific antibody; EMB, endomyocardial biopsy; HTx, heart transplant; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction

Appendix.

Moderate-High Risk for Rejection (heart transplant):

1. Giant Cell Myocarditis
2. Protein-losing Enteropathy with Hypogammaglobulinemia or on Immunoglobulin Treatment
3. Panel of Reactive Antibodies > 40%
4. Prior Desensitization
5. Positive Prospective or Retrospective Crossmatch at Time of Transplant

Low Risk for Rejection (heart transplant):

No criteria for moderate-high risk for rejection.

Dual-organ Transplant:

Heart-Kidney: Follows heart only protocol.

Heart-Lung: Case by case biopsy schedule.

Heart-Liver: Follows low risk for rejection heart only protocol.

Post-transplant Month 1-3 Schedule
Right Heart Catheterization and Endomyocardial Biopsy Week 2, 4, 6, 8, 10, 12
Post-transplant Month 4-6
Endomyocardial Biopsy Week 16, 20, 24
Post-transplant Month 7-11
Low-risk for rejection: No scheduled biopsies. If there is a de novo donor specific antibody or an episode of treated rejection seen in the first 6 months, these patients should be moved to the moderate-high risk for rejection category. Moderate-high risk for rejection: Endomyocardial Biopsy Week 28, 32, 36, 40, 44
Post-transplant Indication for Biopsy Outside of Prespecified Testing Time Frame
Symptoms or signs of rejection Graft dysfunction (left ventricular ejection fraction < 50%) AlloSure® ≥ 0.19% or 2x established baseline on serial checks Arrhythmias (if new type of arrhythmias is seen, consider repeat biopsy)

SECTION 3: REFERENCES

1. Stewart S, Winters GL, Fishbein MC, Tazelaar HD, Kobashigawa J, Abrams J, Andersen CB, Angelini A, Berry GJ, Burke MM, Demetris AJ, Hammond E, Itescu S, Marboe CC, McManus B, Reed EF, Reinsmoen NL, Rodriguez ER, Rose AG, Rose M, Suciu-Focia N, Zeevi A, Billingham ME. Revision of the 1990 working formulation for the standardization of nomenclature in the diagnosis of heart rejection. *J Heart Lung Transplant* [Internet]. 2005;24:1710–1720. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.healun.2005.03.019

2. Inker LA, Eneanya ND, Coresh J, Tighiouart H, Wang D, Sang Y, Crews DC, Doria A, Estrella MM, Froissart M, Grams ME, Greene T, Grubb A, Gudnason V, Gutiérrez OM, Kalil R, Karger AB, Mauer M, Navis G, Nelson RG, Poggio ED, Rodby R, Rossing P, Rule AD, Selvin E, Seegmiller JC, Shlipak MG, Torres VE, Yang W, Ballew SH, Couture SJ, Powe NR, Levey AS. New Creatinine- and Cystatin C–Based Equations to Estimate GFR without Race. *N Engl J Med* [Internet]. 2021;385:1737–1749. Available from: https://doi.org/10.1056/NEJMoa2102953

3. Bermpeis K, Esposito G, Gallinoro E, Paolisso P, Bertolone DT, Fabbricatore D, Mileva N, Munhoz D, Buckley J, Wyffels E, Sonck J, Collet C, Barbato E, De Bruyne B, Bartunek J, Vanderheyden M. Safety of Right and Left Ventricular Endomyocardial Biopsy in Heart Transplantation and Cardiomyopathy Patients. *JACC Heart Fail* [Internet]. 2022;10:963–973. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.jchf.2022.08.005

4. Rodgers N, Gerding B, Cusi V, Vaida F, Tada Y, Morris GP, Adler EA, Stehlik J, Kim PJ. Comparison of two donor-derived cell-free DNA tests and a blood gene-expression profile test in heart transplantation. *Clin Transplant* [Internet]. 2023;e14984. Available from: http://dx.doi.org/10.1111/ctr.14984

5. Bates D, Mächler M, Bolker B, Walker S. Fitting Linear Mixed-Effects Models Using lme4. *J Stat Softw* [Internet]. 2015 [cited 2022 Jul 15];67:1–48. Available from: https://www.jstatsoft.org/article/view/v067i01/0

6. Canty A. Ripley B. boot: Bootstrap R (S-Plus) functions. R package version 1.3--23. 2019. 2021;

7. Wickham H. ggplot2: elegant graphics for data analysis Springer-Verlag New York; 2009. 2016;

8. Therneau, Grambsch. Modeling Survival Data: Extending the Cox Model 2000 New York. *NY Springer Crossref.*



Proposed pathway to guide decision-making to perform EMB in heart transplant patients

dd-cfDNA, donor-derived cell-free DNA; DSA, donor specific antibody; EMB, endomyocardial biopsy; HTx, heart transplant; LVEF, left ventricular ejection fraction


All HTx patients
2,769 EMBs
n = 326 unique HTx patients
Surveillance
2,270 EMBs
n = 283 unique HTx patients
Treated AR: 28 (1.2%)
EMB complications: 40 (1.8%)
For cause
499 EMBs
n = 176 unique HTx patients
Treated AR: 71 (14.2%)
EMB complications: 5 (1.0%)


A.
HTx patient
B.
OR 12.8 (6.5-26.2)
*, p < 0.001
*
EVS Complications (%)
Time from HTx (months)


A.
HTx patient
0
1 mth
3 mths
6 mths
9 mths
12 mths
B.
Treated AR (%)
OR 1.4 (0.8-2.3)
p = 0.166
Time from HTx (months)


A.
Surveillance
EMB complications
Treated AR
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
0
4
8
12
16
20
24
28
32
Time from HTx (weeks)


B.
For cause
EMB complications
Treated AR
1.0
0.8
0.6
0.4
0.2
0.0
0
4
8
12
16
20
24
28
32
Time from HTx (weeks)