medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Title: Donor-Specific Antibody Testing is an Effective Surveillance Strategy for High-Risk Antibody Mediated Rejection in Heart Transplant Patients in the Contemporary Era

Authors: Vincenzo Cusi,[1] Ashley Cardenas,[2] Yuko Tada,[1] Florin Vaida,[3] Nicholas Wettersten,[4] Jennifer Chak,[1] Victor Pretorius,[5] Marcus Anthony Urey,[1] Gerald P. Morris,[2] Grace Lin,[2] Paul J. Kim[1]

ORCID IDs: Vincenzo Cusi, BS: 0000-0001-9681-6896; Ashley Cardenas, MD: 0009-0007-9012-1445; Yuko Tada, MD, PhD: 0000-0003-1410-9894; Florin Vaida, PhD: 0000-0002-2256-4611; Nicholas Wettersten, MD: 0000-0002-6122-1152; Jennifer Chak: 0009-0005-5828-1049; Victor Pretorius, MBChB: 0000-0001-6360-4002; Marcus Anthony Urey, MD: 0000-0001-8311-5003; Gerald P. Morris, MD, PhD: 0000-0002-1097-4453; Grace Lin, MD, PhD: 0000-0001-8018-5604; Paul J. Kim, MD, MAS: 0000-0002-1755-6182

Affiliations: 1. UC San Diego Health, San Diego, CA. 2. Department of Pathology, University of California, San Diego, California, USA 3. Department of Family Medicine and Public Health, UC San Diego, La Jolla, CA. 4. Cardiology Section, Veterans Affairs San Diego Healthcare System, San Diego, CA. 5. Division of Cardiovascular and Thoracic Surgery, Department of Surgery, University of California, San Diego, California, USA

Total word count: 2,919

Author contributions:
VC: writing, review and editing, data curation, project administration; AC: conceptualization, writing, data curation; YT: writing, review and editing, data curation, adjudication of clinical outcomes; FV: writing, reviewing, editing, and statistical analyses; NW: writing, review and editing, data curation, adjudication of clinical outcomes; JC: writing, review and editing, data curation; PB: writing, review and editing, data curation; VP: writing, review and editing; MAU: writing, review and editing; GPM: writing, review, and editing, project administration; GL: conceptualization, writing, review and editing, project administration; PJK: conceptualization, writing, review and editing, data curation, adjudication of clinical outcomes, project administration.

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

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Address for Correspondence:

Paul J. Kim, MD
Division of Cardiovascular Medicine
Department of Medicine
UC San Diego Health

E-mail: pjk017 at health dot ucsd dot edu

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Non-standard Abbreviations and Acronyms

ACR, Acute cellular rejection
CAV, Cardiac allograft vasculopathy
DCD, Donation after circulatory death
dnDSA, *de novo* donor-specific antibody
DSA, Donor-specific antibody
EMB, Endomyocardial biopsy
HLA, Human leukocyte antigen
HTx, Heart transplantation
ISHLT, International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation
MFI, Mean fluorescence intensity
pAMR, Pathologic antibody mediated rejection
PGD, Primary graft dysfunction
UCSD, University of California, San Diego Health

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Key words: antibody mediated rejection; de novo donor specific antibodies; heart transplantation; cardiac allograft dysfunction; HLA antibody; primary graft dysfunction

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Abstract:

Word count: 236 words

Background:

Pathologic antibody mediated rejection (pAMR) evaluation and donor specific antibody (DSA) testing are recommended in the first year after heart transplantation (HTx) in adult patients. Whether DSA testing adds prognostic information to contemporary pAMR surveillance has not been fully studied.

Methods:

This was a single center study of consecutive endomyocardial biopsies (EMB) performed between November 2010 and February 2023 in adult HTx patients. The primary objective was to evaluate whether DSA testing contributes additional information to pAMR surveillance to better predict overall survival. Secondary endpoints included cardiac allograft dysfunction and loss.

Results:

A total of 6,033 EMBs from 544 HTx patients were reviewed for the study. The pAMR+/DSA+ group had significantly lower overall survival versus the pAMR-/DSA- group (hazard ratio [HR] = 2.63; 95% confidence interval [CI], 1.35-5.11; p_c = 0.013). In

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

the pAMR+/DSA+ group, patients with cardiac allograft dysfunction, compared to those without allograft dysfunction, had significantly lower overall and cardiac survival (p_c < 0.001 for both). In contrast, pAMR+/DSA+ and pAMR-/DSA- patients without cardiac allograft dysfunction showed no difference in overall and cardiac survival. Primary graft dysfunction (PGD) was a novel risk factor for development of *de novo* DSAs (dnDSA) three weeks post-HTx (p = 0.007).

Conclusions:

DSA testing as the primary surveillance method can identify high-risk pAMR+/DSA+ patients. Surveillance pAMR testing in the contemporary era may need to be reevaluated. Earlier DSA testing at 10-14 days post-HTx should be considered in PGD patients.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Introduction

Recognition and standardization for the diagnosis of pAMR occurred in 2013 by the International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation (ISHLT) working group, where surveillance for pAMR in adult HTx patients was first recommended.[1] With the goal of making pAMR a pathologic diagnosis, akin to acute cellular rejection (ACR),[2] the ISHLT working group also removed the presence of DSA and cardiac allograft dysfunction for pAMR diagnosis. These pivotal changes were also made to address the concern for underdetection of asymptomatic pAMR.

While DSA testing continues to be recommended with pAMR surveillance in the first year after HTx,[3] how both results should influence management of HTx patients remains unclear.[4] In this single-center study, we aimed to evaluate whether DSA testing provides additional information to pAMR surveillance to predict overall survival in HTx patients. In addition, because HTx population demographics and HTx management have significantly changed over time,[5] we performed a comprehensive analysis to identify potential predictors for dnDSAs, pAMR, cardiac allograft dysfunction, CAV, cardiac and overall survival in patients with pAMR and DSA testing for the contemporary era (2010-current).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Methods

Data Sharing

The data that support the findings of this study are openly available in Mendeley Data at 10.17632/d4f7g8hs5z.1.

Study Design

Consecutive patients who were 18 years of age or older and underwent HTx between November 2010 to February 2023 were retrospectively reviewed. Patients without prior pAMR and DSA results available were excluded. Database lock occurred March 2024, one year after the inclusion of the final patient. The typical EMB surveillance protocol[6] at the University of California, San Diego Health (UCSD) includes C4d immunofluorescence at 10-14 days post-HTx and subsequently as recommended frequency by the ISHLT.[1] DSA testing is also performed at the same time intervals.[3] VC, AC, PB, and JC collected patient data and clinical outcomes from the electronic medical record. Approval for this study was provided by the UCSD Office of IRB Administration (IRB #805675). This study adheres to the principles of the Declaration of Helsinki formulated by the World Medical Association, the Declaration of Istanbul, and the International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation statement on Transplant Ethics.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Pathologic Tissue Exams and Anti-Human Leukocyte Antigen (HLA) Antibody Testing

C4d immunofluorescence was performed starting November 2010 with positivity defined according to the ISHLT Working Formulation; however, contemporary ISHLT pAMR grading was implemented at UCSD in July 2015.[1] Thus, EMB samples prior to July 2015 were regraded using the current pAMR grading scheme for this study (GL). Anti-HLA testing is performed using single-antigen bead LABScreen HLA Class I and II assays (One Lambda, Canoga Park, CA) on LabScan 100 and FlexMap 3D (Luminex, Austin, TX) instruments. Data is analyzed using HLA Fusion software (One Lambda). Antibodies with normalized mean fluorescence intensity (MFI) values > 3,000 are identified as positive, based upon likelihood of causing a positive flow cytometric crossmatch.[7] DSA are identified by comparison of antibody testing results to donor HLA typing. Concurrent DSA positivity was defined as occurring within a month of a pAMR diagnosis.

Clinical Outcomes and Variables

The primary outcome was all-cause death or cardiac retransplant. Cause of death was also adjudicated by three experienced cardiologists (NW, YT, PJK).[6] Secondary outcomes evaluated were: cardiac allograft failure, future episodes of pAMR or dnDSA detection, concurrent or future cardiac allograft dysfunction (echocardiogram demonstrating left ventricular ejection fraction < 50%)[8] occurring after one week post-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

HTx, and ISHLT cardiac allograft vasculopathy (CAV) grade 2 or greater[9]. PGD diagnosis was based on documentation by the HTx clinical team or need of extracorporeal membrane oxygenation and/or percutaneous mechanical circulatory support after HTx.[10] Documentation by a clinical team member of immunosuppressive medication nonadherence after HTx was recorded retrospectively by medical chart review and independent of the study (VC, AC, PB, JC).[11–13]

Statistical Analysis

Demographic and clinical variables were analyzed with standard statistics as previously described for continuous and count variables.[6] The association of pAMR/DSA groups with time to event outcomes was evaluated using single predictor and multipredictor Cox proportional hazards models. The multipredictor models for overall and cardiac survival were adjusted for recipient age, sex, and race/ethnicity. Additional exploratory analyses investigated factors associated with time to event outcomes using Cox models applying a forward model selection procedure with p-value $\leq$ 0.15 threshold for inclusion. Cox models with time-dependent covariates were used when the proportional hazards assumption of constant hazard ratios was violated. To adjust for different causes of death as competing outcomes, a competing-risk regression model was constructed using the Fine and Gray method. We implemented bootstrapping, repeated 10,000 times, to generate approximate sampling distributions for the statistics of interest. The mean and 95% CI for each statistic were taken from the bootstrap sampling distribution.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

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 uncorrected p-value. P or $p_c < 0.05$ are considered significant.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Results

Patient Demographics

A total of 6,033 EMBs from 544 HTx patients, including four cardiac retransplants, were evaluated (**Figure 1**). We divided all patients into one of four groups based on history of pAMR and DSA results: pAMR+/DSA+ (n=45, 8.3%), pAMR+/DSA- (n=30, 5.5%), pAMR-/DSA+ (n=95, 17.5%), and pAMR-/DSA- (n=374, 68.8%) patients.

Characteristics of the study population are summarized in **Tables 1** and **S1**. HTx recipients were followed for a total of 1,999.2 person-years from the time of HTx.

Association of pAMR/DSA classification with overall and cardiac survival

A total of 61 (11.2%) patients died or underwent cardiac retransplant during the follow-up period. Adjudicated causes of death are provided in **Table S2**. Initial adjudication of cause of death agreed 87.7% of the time with a Cohen's kappa of 0.82 (0.69, 0.94; $p < 0.001$).

Overall survival was significantly lower in pAMR+/DSA+ compared to pAMR-/DSA- patients (HR = 2.63; 95% CI, 1.35-5.11; $p_c = 0.013$; **Figure 2A**). Cardiac survival was also significantly lower in the pAMR+/DSA+ compared to pAMR-/DSA- group (HR = 7.00; 95% CI, 2.31-21.20; $p_c = 0.002$; **Figure 2B**). There was no significant difference in overall or cardiac survival in the pAMR+/DSA- ($p_c = 1.000$) and pAMR-/DSA+ groups ($p_c = 1.000$) compared to pAMR-/DSA- patients. Sensitivity analyses performed with

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

dnDSAs and initial pAMR/DSA classification from the first pAMR+ or DSA+ result, with the concurrent corresponding DSA or pAMR test result, also demonstrated similar findings (not shown).

Analysis of pAMR+/DSA+ patients

The pAMR+/DSA+ patients demonstrated significantly later diagnosis of pAMR after HTx compared to the pAMR+/DSA- patients (33.6 vs 3.7 weeks; p = 0.004). The majority (62.2%) of pAMR+/DSA+ patients were diagnosed by pAMR+ and DSA+ results concurrently, i.e., within one month of either test. A small number of patients (6.7%) were found to have a DSA+ results three months after a pAMR+ result. No patient with an initial pAMR+/DSA- classification had a primary outcome of death or retransplant within a year of a pAMR diagnosis.

There was no significant difference in time to dnDSA positivity in pAMR+/DSA+ compared to pAMR-/DSA+ patients (20.3 vs 17.0 weeks; p = 0.941). Detection of both class I and II dnDSAs on initial DSA+ testing demonstrated the highest positive predictive value than other DSAs, as summarized in **Table S3**. Detection of both class I and II dnDSAs on initial DSA+ testing was also associated with greater odds for pAMR2 or pAMR3 grades than class II dnDSAs alone (OR = 5.92; 95% CI, 1.02-33.74; p_c = 0.025) and showed a trend for greater odds compared to class I dnDSAs alone (OR = 4.67; 95% CI, 0.70-36.86; p_c = 0.147). Detection of both class I and II dnDSAs at any time post-HTx had a significantly higher risk of pAMR, cardiac allograft dysfunction,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

CAV, cardiac allograft failure, and all-cause death or retransplant ($p < 0.001$ for all). Class II dnDSAs alone ($p < 0.001$) predicted pAMR but not other clinical outcomes. We did not find specific class II dnDSAs alone that significantly increased the risk for pAMR compared to other class II dnDSAs. Class I dnDSAs alone did not predict pAMR nor other clinical outcomes.

Cardiac allograft dysfunction in pAMR+/DSA+ patients

We found that a pAMR+/DSA+ status independently predicted cardiac allograft dysfunction (**Table 2**). In contrast, the rates of cardiac allograft dysfunction for pAMR+/DSA- ($p = 0.601$) and pAMR-/DSA+ groups ($p = 0.235$) were not significantly different from the pAMR-/DSA- patients, with these three groups demonstrating an occurrence of cardiac allograft dysfunction within the range of 10 to 16%. In pAMR+/DSA+ patients, diagnosis of pAMR in the first year or after 1-year post-HTx also did not show differences in cardiac allograft dysfunction, cardiac survival, or overall survival (not shown).

Presence of cardiac allograft dysfunction was associated with lower overall and cardiac survival (**Table 3** and **Table S4**). In the pAMR+/DSA+ group, patients with cardiac allograft dysfunction had significantly lower overall and cardiac survival compared to those without allograft dysfunction (**Figure 3**). Thus, lower overall and cardiac survival in pAMR+/DSA+ patients were mediated by cardiac allograft dysfunction.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Predictors for dnDSAs

Younger recipient age, medication nonadherence, and PGD were independent predictors for development of dnDSAs (**Table 4**). Patients with PGD demonstrated a significant increase in dnDSAs within three weeks post-HTx (**Figure 4**). PGD also showed a trend towards increased pAMR (HR = 1.66; 95% CI, 0.98-2.79; p = 0.058). Additional subgroup analyses did not show utilization of extracorporeal membrane oxygenation post-HTx or donation after circulatory death (DCD) to be significantly associated with dnDSAs.

Discussion

In this retrospective cohort of 544 adult HTx patients with 2,000 patient-years of follow-up, we observed the following key findings. First, DSA testing with contemporary ISHLT pAMR grading identified pAMR+/DSA+ patients to have significantly lower overall and cardiac survival compared to pAMR-/DSA- patients. Second, in the pAMR+/DSA+ group, we found that lower overall and cardiac survival was mediated by cardiac allograft dysfunction. Third, detection of both class I and II dnDSAs had the highest predictive value for pAMR. Fourth, PGD is a novel risk factor for the development of dnDSAs.

With the reevaluation of the utility of surveillance EMBs in the contemporary era,[6] the current study findings support the use of DSA testing as the primary method of surveillance for clinically relevant pAMR. While Clerkin et al. previously showed no

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

difference in cardiac allograft failure in patients with pAMR or DSAs,[14] substudy analysis showed that dnDSAs were associated with significantly lower cardiac survival, which are consistent with our findings as well as others.[15,16] However, we go further to demonstrate that the risk of lower overall and cardiac survival is found specifically in the pAMR+/DSA+ group. Thus, our proposed strategy would redefine the current role of pAMR surveillance[3] to for-cause testing upon a DSA+ result.[6] Coutance et al. also recently proposed a clinical prediction model which includes history of a prior ISHLT pAMR2 diagnosis, cardiac allograft dysfunction, and DSA as 3 of the 5 predictor variables.[8] In contrast, our suggested strategy only requires DSA screening and, more importantly, provides an opportunity to prevent cardiac allograft dysfunction in pAMR+/DSA+ patients. Additionally, we note that new noninvasive biomarker testing, including donor-derived cell-free DNA,[17] may play a future role in pAMR risk stratification. However, DSA testing will continue to be an essential assay in the foreseeable future and ongoing randomized controlled trials (e.g., NCT06414603: ACES-EMB) are evaluating novel noninvasive biomarkers as an adjunct to DSA testing.

We hypothesize that ischemia-reperfusion tissue injury post-HTx predominantly contributes to early positive C4d immunostaining in pAMR+/DSA- patients, while complement activation due to dnDSAs is likely responsible for later positive C4d immunostaining that occurs in pAMR+/DSA+ patients. Previous studies have shown positive C4d immunostaining in the early post-HTx period could result from the lectin complement pathway related to ischemia-reperfusion tissue injury.[18,19] Mantell et al. also have shown transcriptomic differences between the pAMR+/DSA+ and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

pAMR+/DSA- groups, with significant upregulation of genes related to immunity in the pAMR+/DSA+ patients.[20] In addition, while non-HLA antibodies continue to be investigated in pAMR,[21] there was no appreciable difference in outcomes in the pAMR+/DSA- compared to the pAMR-/DSA- group to suggest a meaningful clinical effect by non-HLA antibodies.

Furthermore, we found that the pAMR+/DSA+ patients with cardiac allograft dysfunction carried most of the increased risk for lower overall and cardiac survival and accounted for 18% of deaths or cardiac retransplants while representing only 4% of our HTx cohort. Cardiac allograft dysfunction was previously part of the clinical criteria for diagnosis of antibody mediated rejection,[22] and prior studies have also demonstrated the prognostic importance of cardiac allograft dysfunction, although not specifically in pAMR+/DSA+ patients.[23,24] Thus, our study highlights the importance of surveillance for cardiac allograft dysfunction in pAMR+/DSA+ patients, given the significant increase in mortality once cardiac allograft dysfunction occurs.[25] Of note, cardiac allograft dysfunction also occurred in pAMR-/DSA+ and pAMR-/DSA- patients, albeit at much lower rates. The cause was not identified in many cases (36%) and thus were considered to be nonspecific graft dysfunction.[26]

Detection of both class I and II dnDSAs increased the risk for pAMR+ diagnosis three times compared to detection of other dnDSAs. In contrast to some other studies,[14,27] we were not able to identify specific class II dnDSAs alone that significantly increased the risk for future pAMR more than other class II dnDSAs. We hypothesize some of the

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

differences in literature are related to how HLA-DQ DSAs, the most frequently detected of the DSAs, are categorized when occurring in the presence of other DSAs.[28] In the current study, we evaluated class I alone, class II alone, and both class I and II dnDSAs as separate categories and also evaluated for progression from one dnDSA category to another in subsequent testing.

Additionally, our study findings indirectly suggest increased immunogenicity associated with detection of both class I and II dnDSAs compared to either class I or II dnDSAs alone. HTx patients with both class I and II dnDSAs demonstrated a higher rate of more severe initial pAMR+ grades compared to patients with either class I or II dnDSAs alone. Patients with both class I and II dnDSAs were also at a significantly increased risk for pAMR-mediated clinical outcomes, including CAV, while patients with either class I or II dnDSAs alone were not. Prior studies have also shown that detection of class I and II DSAs, using the contemporary solid phase assays, were more predictive of persistent and cytotoxic DSAs than either class I or II DSAs alone.[29,30] While class II DSAs can activate endothelial cells toward a proinflammatory response,[31] the potential synergistic interaction of both class I and II DSAs warrants further study.

Finally, our data demonstrates PGD as a possible risk factor for development of dnDSAs, providing a novel insight into the potential relationship of PGD, dnDSAs, and pAMR in the peri-transplant period. Han et al. previously showed a similar incidence of dnDSAs in patients with PGD compared to those without PGD.[32] However, this study included a patient cohort with a much higher preformed DSA prevalence and lower rate

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

of moderate or severe PGD than typically described from other centers,[33] which likely explains the differences from our study findings. Additionally, at our institution, patients are initially tested for a DSA response at 10-14 days post-HTx. Thus, we found a significant increase in dnDSAs three weeks post-HTx, suggesting a memory B-cell response related to PGD. Early inflammatory injury to the donor heart and increased transfusions of blood products[34,35], both factors associated with PGD, may contribute to allosensitization that leads to dnDSAs. Interestingly, DCD HTx were not associated with dnDSAs in a subgroup analysis, perhaps related to a prior observation that DCD HTx patients experience a different mechanism for PGD with quicker recovery than donation after brain death HTx patients.[36] As the incidence for PGD continues at a high rate in the contemporary era,[33,37] earlier DSA testing at 10-14 days post-HTx should be considered in PGD patients and future studies should evaluate specific factors associated with PGD that may cause allosensitization.

Limitations

This study should be interpreted within the context of several important limitations. First, this was a retrospective study from a single center and carries with it the usual limitations for these studies, including generalizability and the potential confounding of treatment effect. Thus, our findings do not provide guidance for treatment decisions, due to the wide variability in treatment for pAMR in our study. However, only a minority of pAMR+/DSA- patients were treated (23%) and, despite this, the pAMR+/DSA- group had more favorable outcomes when compared to the pAMR+/DSA+ group (73%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

treated). Second, our center utilizes C4d immunofluorescence with the use of CD68 and C4d immunoperoxidase staining in equivocal cases or when immunofluorescence is not feasible.[1] However, previous studies have shown that immunofluorescence and immunoperoxidase staining are similarly sensitive and specific for C4d positivity and our prevalence of pAMR was similar to prior studies.[14,38] Third, we did not evaluate different MFI values for DSAs as the goal of our study was to determine the utility of DSA with pAMR testing using prespecified MFI cutoffs. Additionally, MFI measurements have been known to vary among HLA laboratories, limiting translatability of MFI findings.[39] Lastly, PGD diagnosis was based on documentation by HTx clinical team members or use of mechanical circulatory support within 24 hours after HTx. Thus, while the PGD rate was similar to most prior studies,[33] mild and moderate PGD are potentially underestimated, a recognized limitation due to the current PGD criteria.[37]

Conclusions

Our study findings support the potential use of DSA testing as the primary surveillance method to identify the high-risk pAMR+/DSA+ patients. Additionally, PGD is a novel risk factor for dnDSAs and earlier DSA testing at 10-14 days post-HTx should be considered in patients with PGD.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Acknowledgements: The authors acknowledge Priyesha Bijlani, MD, from UCSD for her contribution to data collection and review and editing of prior versions of the article, Hyoungmin Kim, from UCSD for his contribution to data collection, Taylor Tran, BS, from UCSD for his contribution to data collection, Layla Myers, BS, from UCSD for her contribution to data collection, and Michael C. Fishbein, MD, from UCLA for his review and editing of the final manuscript.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Sources of Funding:

The project described was partially supported by the National Institutes of Health (PJK), Grants UL1TR001442 and 1KL2TR001444. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the NIH. 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.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

REFERENCES

1. Berry GJ, Burke MM, Andersen C, et al. The 2013 International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation Working Formulation for the standardization of nomenclature in the pathologic diagnosis of antibody-mediated rejection in heart transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. 2013;32(12):1147-1162. doi:10.1016/j.healun.2013.08.011

2. Stewart S, Winters GL, Fishbein MC, et al. Revision of the 1990 working formulation for the standardization of nomenclature in the diagnosis of heart rejection. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. 2005;24(11):1710-1720. doi:10.1016/j.healun.2005.03.019

3. Velleca A, Shullo MA, Dhital K, et al. The International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation (ISHLT) guidelines for the care of heart transplant recipients. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. 2023;42(5):e1-e141. doi:10.1016/j.healun.2022.10.015

4. 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

5. 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

6. Cusi V, Vaida F, Wettersten N, et al. Incidence of Acute Rejection Compared With Endomyocardial Biopsy Complications for Heart Transplant Patients in the Contemporary Era. *Transplantation*. 2024;108(5):1220-1227. doi:10.1097/TP.0000000000004882

7. Zavyalova D, Abraha J, Rao P, Morris GP. Incidence and impact of allele-specific anti-HLA antibodies and high-resolution HLA genotyping on assessing immunologic compatibility. *Hum Immunol*. 2021;82(3):147-154. doi:10.1016/j.humimm.2021.01.002

8. 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

9. Mehra MR, Crespo-Leiro MG, Dipchand A, et al. International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation working formulation of a standardized nomenclature for cardiac allograft vasculopathy-2010. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. 2010;29(7):717-727. doi:10.1016/j.healun.2010.05.017

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

10. Kobashigawa J, Zuckermann A, Macdonald P, et al. Report from a consensus conference on primary graft dysfunction after cardiac transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. 2014;33(4):327-340. doi:10.1016/j.healun.2014.02.027

11. Sellarés J, de Freitas DG, Mengel M, et al. Understanding the causes of kidney transplant failure: the dominant role of antibody-mediated rejection and nonadherence. *Am J Transplant*. 2012;12(2):388-399. doi:10.1111/j.1600-6143.2011.03840.x

12. Kindem IA, Bjerre A, Hammarstrøm C, Naper C, Midtvedt K, Åsberg A. Kidney-transplanted Adolescents—Nonadherence and Graft Outcomes During the Transition Phase: A Nationwide Analysis, 2000–2020. *Transplantation*. 2023;107(5):1206. doi:10.1097/tp.0000000000004431

13. Wiebe C, Gibson IW, Blydt-Hansen TD, et al. Evolution and clinical pathologic correlations of de novo donor-specific HLA antibody post kidney transplant: Clinical pathologic correlations of DE Novo DSA. *Am J Transplant*. 2012;12(5):1157-1167. doi:10.1111/j.1600-6143.2012.04013.x

14. Clerkin KJ, Farr MA, Restaino SW, et al. Donor-specific anti-HLA antibodies with antibody-mediated rejection and long-term outcomes following heart transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. 2017;36(5):540-545. doi:10.1016/j.healun.2016.10.016

15. Smith JD, Banner NR, Hamour IM, et al. De novo donor HLA-specific antibodies after heart transplantation are an independent predictor of poor patient survival. *Am J Transplant*. 2011;11(2):312-319. doi:10.1111/j.1600-6143.2010.03383.x

16. Setia G, Nishihara K, Singer□Englar T, Zhang X, Patel J, Kobashigawa J. Crossing low/moderate□level donor□specific antibodies during heart transplantation. *Clinical Transplantation*. 2021;35(3). doi:10.1111/ctr.14196

17. 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

18. Baldwin WM 3rd, Samaniego-Picota M, Kasper EK, et al. Complement deposition in early cardiac transplant biopsies is associated with ischemic injury and subsequent rejection episodes. *Transplantation*. 1999;68(6):894-900. doi:10.1097/00007890-199909270-00024

19. Collard CD, Väkevä A, Morrissey MA, et al. Complement activation after oxidative stress: role of the lectin complement pathway. *Am J Pathol*. 2000;156(5):1549-1556. doi:10.1016/S0002-9440(10)65026-2

20. Mantell BS, Cordero H, See SB, et al. Transcriptomic heterogeneity of antibody mediated rejection after heart transplant with or without donor specific antibodies. *J*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Heart Lung Transplant. 2021;40(11):1472-1480. doi:10.1016/j.healun.2021.06.012

21. Butler CL, Hickey MJ, Jiang N, et al. Discovery of non-HLA antibodies associated with cardiac allograft rejection and development and validation of a non-HLA antigen multiplex panel: From bench to bedside. *Am J Transplant*. 2020;20(10):2768-2780. doi:10.1111/ajt.15863

22. Reed EF, Demetris AJ, Hammond E, et al. Acute antibody-mediated rejection of cardiac transplants. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. 2006;25(2):153-159. doi:10.1016/j.healun.2005.09.003

23. Clerkin KJ, Restaino SW, Zorn E, Vasilescu ER, Marboe CC, Mancini DM. The effect of timing and graft dysfunction on survival and cardiac allograft vasculopathy in antibody-mediated rejection. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. 2016;35(9):1059-1066. doi:10.1016/j.healun.2016.04.007

24. Tan CD, Sokos GG, Pidwell DJ, et al. Correlation of Donor-Specific Antibodies, Complement and Its Regulators with Graft Dysfunction in Cardiac Antibody-Mediated Rejection. *American Journal of Transplantation*. 2009;9(9):2075-2084. doi:10.1111/j.1600-6143.2009.02748.x

25. Hodges AM, Lyster H, McDermott A, et al. Late antibody-mediated rejection after heart transplantation following the development of de novo donor-specific human leukocyte antigen antibody. *Transplantation*. 2012;93(6):650-656. doi:10.1097/TP.0b013e318244f7b8

26. Pham MX, Teuteberg JJ, Kfoury AG, et al. Gene-expression profiling for rejection surveillance after cardiac transplantation. *N Engl J Med*. 2010;362(20):1890-1900. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa0912965

27. Zhang X, Kransdorf E, Levine R, Patel JK, Kobashigawa JA. HLA-DQ mismatches stimulate de novo donor specific antibodies in heart transplant recipients. *Hum Immunol*. 2020;81(7):330-336. doi:10.1016/j.humimm.2020.04.003

28. DeVos JM, Gaber AO, Knight RJ, et al. Donor-specific HLA-DQ antibodies may contribute to poor graft outcome after renal transplantation. *Kidney Int*. 2012;82(5):598-604. doi:10.1038/ki.2012.190

29. Ho EK, Vasilescu ER, Vlad G, Clynes RA, Ratner LE, Suciu-Foca N. Detection of donor-specific-antibodies by solid phase assay and its relevance to complement-dependent-lymphocytotoxicity cross-matching in kidney transplantation. *Hum Immunol*. 2014;75(6):520-523. doi:10.1016/j.humimm.2014.03.002

30. Irving CA, Carter V, Gennery AR, et al. Effect of persistent versus transient donor-specific HLA antibodies on graft outcomes in pediatric cardiac transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. 2015;34(10):1310-1317. doi:10.1016/j.healun.2015.05.001

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

31. Cross AR, Lion J, Poussin K, et al. HLA-DQ alloantibodies directly activate the endothelium and compromise differentiation of FoxP3high regulatory T lymphocytes. *Kidney Int*. 2019;96(3):689-698. doi:10.1016/j.kint.2019.04.023

32. Han J, Moayedi Y, Henricksen EJ, et al. Primary Graft Dysfunction Is Associated With Development of Early Cardiac Allograft Vasculopathy, but Not Other Immune-mediated Complications, After Heart Transplantation. *Transplantation*. 2023;107(7):1624-1629. doi:10.1097/TP.0000000000004551

33. Benck L, Kransdorf EP, Emerson DA, et al. Recipient and surgical factors trigger severe primary graft dysfunction after heart transplant. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. 2021;40(9):970-980. doi:10.1016/j.healun.2021.06.002

34. McDonald MM, Mihalj M, Zhao B, et al. Clinicopathological correlations in heart transplantation recipients complicated by death or re-transplantation. *Front Cardiovasc Med*. 2022;9. doi:10.3389/fcvm.2022.1014796

35. Holmström EJ, Syrjälä SO, Dhaygude K, et al. Severe primary graft dysfunction of the heart transplant is associated with increased plasma and intragraft proinflammatory cytokine expression. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. 2023;42(6):807-818. doi:10.1016/j.healun.2023.01.005

36. Ayer A, Truby LK, Schroder JN, et al. Improved outcomes in severe primary graft dysfunction after heart transplantation following donation after circulatory death compared with donation after brain death. *J Card Fail*. 2023;29(1):67-75. doi:10.1016/j.cardfail.2022.10.429

37. Truby LK, Takeda K, Topkara VK, et al. Risk of severe primary graft dysfunction in patients bridged to heart transplantation with continuous-flow left ventricular assist devices. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. 2018;37(12):1433-1442. doi:10.1016/j.healun.2018.07.013

38. Chantranuwat C, Qiao JH, Kobashigawa J, Hong L, Shintaku P, Fishbein MC. Immunoperoxidase staining for C4d on paraffin-embedded tissue in cardiac allograft endomyocardial biopsies: comparison to frozen tissue immunofluorescence. *Appl Immunohistochem Mol Morphol*. 2004;12(2):166-171. doi:10.1097/00129039-200406000-00012

39. Reed EF, Rao P, Zhang Z, et al. Comprehensive assessment and standardization of solid phase multiplex-bead arrays for the detection of antibodies to HLA. *Am J Transplant*. 2013;13(7):1859-1870. doi:10.1111/ajt.12287

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Figure 1. Flow diagram for heart transplants included then grouped based on history of pAMR and DSA results. HTx, heart transplantation; DSA, donor-specific antibodies; pAMR, pathologic antibody mediated rejection.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Figure 2. Kaplan-Meier Curves by pAMR/DSA Status for (**A**) Overall and (**B**) Cardiac Survival. The pAMR+/DSA+ patients show significantly reduced overall and cardiac survival compared to the pAMR-/DSA- group. The pAMR+/DSA- and pAMR-/DSA+ groups were not significantly different from the pAMR-/DSA- group. Fine-Gray subdistribution hazard model was used to account for competing causes of death. Adjusted p-values for pairwise comparisons compared to the pAMR-/DSA- reference group are provided next to the survival curves. DSA, donor-specific antibodies; pAMR, pathologic antibody mediated rejection.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

A.



Number at risk

pAMR+/DSA+	45	44	41	39	37	34	32
pAMR+/DSA-	30	28	27	25	24	24	22
pAMR-/DSA+	95	93	87	78	73	62	57
pAMR-/DSA-	374	347	301	260	235	203	187

B.



Number at risk

pAMR+/DSA+	45	44	43	42	41	38	36
pAMR+/DSA-	30	28	27	26	25	25	23
pAMR-/DSA+	95	93	88	80	75	64	59
pAMR-/DSA-	374	356	314	277	252	218	198

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Figure 3. Kaplan-Meier Curves by Cardiac Allograft Dysfunction for (**A**) Overall and (**B**) Cardiac Survival. The pAMR+/DSA+ patients with graft dysfunction showed significantly worse overall and cardiac survival compared to both pAMR+/DSA+ and pAMR-/DSA- patients without graft dysfunction. Adjusted p-values for pairwise comparisons compared to the pAMR-/DSA- patients without allograft dysfunction, as a reference group, are provided next to the survival curves. DSA, donor-specific antibodies; pAMR, pathologic antibody mediated rejection.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .



pAMR+/DSA+ **with** graft dysfunction	22	21	19	17	16	14	12
pAMR+/DSA+ *without* graft dysfunction	23	23	22	22	21	20	20
pAMR-/DSA- *without* graft dysfunction	334	308	266	230	207	175	160



pAMR+/DSA+ **with** graft dysfunction	22	21	20	19	19	17	15
pAMR+/DSA+ *without* graft dysfunction	23	23	23	23	22	21	21
pAMR-/DSA- *without* graft dysfunction	334	316	277	244	222	188	171

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Figure 4. Kaplan-Meier Curves for Freedom from De Novo DSA Detection in HTx patients with and without PGD. HTx patients with PGD demonstrated a significant increase in de novo DSAs three weeks post-HTx (triangle), after which the hazard ratios were not significantly different between HTx patients with and without PGD. DSA, donor-specific antibodies; pAMR, pathologic antibody mediated rejection.



HTx patients **with** PGD	424	400	389	381	370	363	355
HTx patients *without* PGD	118	103	100	95	93	89	85

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 1. Baseline characteristics of heart transplant patients by pAMR and DSA results. ACR, acute cellular rejection; AMR, antibody mediated rejection; BMI, body mass index; CMV, cytomegalovirus; DCD, donation after cardiac death; DSA, donor-specific antibodies; HTx, heart transplantation; ICM, ischemic cardiomyopathy; MCS, mechanical circulatory support; NICM, nonischemic cardiomyopathy; PHM, predicted heart mass; PRA, panel reactive antibodies.

Characteristics	**pAMR+/DSA+ Group 1 (n = 45)**	**pAMR+/DSA- Group 2 (n = 30)**	**pAMR-/DSA+ Group 3 (n = 95)**	**pAMR-/DSA- Group 4 (n = 374)**	**p-value**
Donor characteristics					
Age, y, mean (SD)	32.1 (10.7)	36.6 (11.9)	31.6 (10.3)	33.0 (10.6)	0.996
Female, N (%)	12 (28.6)	5 (17.2)	20 (21.3)	54 (15.3)	0.123
Recipient characteristics					
Age, y, mean (SD)	45.7 (18.5)	58.0 (11.5)	51.0 (15.3)	55.3 (13.2)	**<0.001**
Female, N (%)	15 (33.3)	6 (20.0)	16 (16.8)	71 (19.0)	0.136
Race					0.428
Asian, N (%)	1 (2.2)	3 (10.0)	6 (6.3)	27 (7.2)	-
Black, N (%)	8 (17.8)	5 (16.7)	14 (14.7)	42 (11.2)	-
Native American, N (%)	0	0	2 (2.1)	2 (0.5)	-
Other Race, N (%)	4 (8.9)	0	2 (7.4)	24 (6.4)	-
Pacific Islander, N (%)	0	1 (3.3)	3 (3.2)	8 (2.1)	-
White, N (%)	32 (71.1)	21 (70.0)	63 (66.3)	271 (72.5)	-
Ethnicity					
Hispanic or Latino, N (%)	17 (37.8)	7 (23.3)	34 (35.8)	107 (28.6)	0.293
Recipient BMI, mean (SD)	25.4 (4.6)	25.8 (5.1)	26.2 (4.5)	26.8 (4.3)	**0.020**
Indication for Transplant					0.192
NICM, N (%)	27 (60.0)	21 (70.0)	57 (60.0)	220 (58.8)	-
ICM, N (%)	13 (28.9)	7 (23.3)	29 (30.5)	136 (36.4)	-
Congenital, N (%)	4 (8.9)	0	6 (6.3)	12 (3.2)	
Cardiac allograft failure, N (%)	1 (2.2)	2 (6.7)	3 (3.2)	6 (1.6)	-
Allosensitization pre-HTx (PRA $\geq$ 10%), N (%)	10 (28.6)	3 (11.5)	21 (23.9)	51 (16.6)	0.135
Durable MCS, N (%)	12 (26.7)	10 (33.3)	33 (34.7)	133 (35.7)	0.710

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Medical nonadherence, N (%)	21 (46.7)	5 (16.7)	17 (17.9)	46 (12.3)	**<0.001**
Transplant characteristics					
Multiorgan transplant, N (%)	8 (17.8)	2 (6.7)	18 (18.9)	48 (12.8)	0.245
Cold ischemic time, min, mean (SD)	195.5 (49.4)	208.4 (55.2)	200.5 (58.4)	200.1 (67.7)	0.941
Sex mismatch (female D-male R), N (%)	3 (7.1)	1 (3.4)	10 (10.6)	28 (7.9)	0.675
PHM difference, % recipient PHM, mean (SD)	7.9 (22.1)	2.8 (26.3)	4.6 (18.9)	5.2 (20.9)	0.741
Induction therapy, N (%)	24 (60.0)	17 (58.6)	46 (48.9)	169 (47.5)	0.348
DCD, N (%)	3 (6.7)	4 (13.3)	12 (12.6)	63 (16.8)	0.290
CMV mismatch (D+/R-), N (%)	7 (16.3)	6 (20.0)	20 (21.3)	72 (19.8)	0.856
Transplant outcomes					
De novo DSA	43 (97.7)	-	86 (95.6)	-	1.000
Mixed ACR and AMR	5 (11.1)	3 (10.0)	-	-	1.000
Cardiac allograft dysfunction	22 (48.9)	3 (10.0)	15 (15.8)	40 (10.7)	**<0.001**
Cardiac allograft vasculopathy	8 (20.0)	3 (11.1)	6 (7.0)	16 (5.0)	**0.008**
Future ACR	12 (28.6)	5 (16.7)	12 (12.8)	40 (11.1)	**0.024**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Unipredictor and multipredictor Cox proportional hazards analyses for cardiac allograft dysfunction. Unipredictor parameters with a p-value ≤ 0.15 are included in addition to certain clinical parameters of interest. HRs and CIs are not provided for categorical variables in this table. ACR, acute cellular rejection; CI, confidence interval; cPRA, calculated panel reactive antibodies; DSA, donor-specific antibodies; ECMO, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation; HR, hazard ratio; HTx, heart transplantation; MCS, mechanical circulatory support; pAMR, pathologic antibody mediated rejection; PHM, predicted heart mass; pMCS, percutaneous mechanical circulatory support; UNOS, United Network for Organ Sharing. *, allosensitized patients defined as having a UNOS cPRA >= 10%.

Predictor	No. of patients (n = 544)	No. of events (n = 80)	HR	95% CI	p-value
Unipredictor analysis					
HTx indication (vs. non-ischemic cardiomyopathy)	544	80	-	-	**0.020**
Allosensitization pre-HTx*	457	67	0.89	0.48-1.67	0.715
Durable MCS at time of HTx (yes vs. no)	543	80	1.44	0.92-2.24	0.107
Medical nonadherence (yes vs. no)	544	80	2.64	1.67-4.18	**<0.001**
Donor age (by 10-yr)	520	78	0.88	0.71-1.08	0.207
Induction therapy (yes vs. no)	519	77	0.84	0.53-1.33	0.458
Cold ischemic time (per hour)	519	78	0.90	0.73-1.11	0.330
PHM difference (per % recipient PHM increment)	513	77	1.01	1.00-1.02	0.130
Donation after cardiac death (vs. brain death)	544	80	1.37	0.69-2.71	0.373
ECMO pre-HTx (yes vs. no)	540	79	2.62	0.82-8.32	0.103
pMCS pre-HTx (yes vs. no)	540	79	0.55	0.28-1.11	0.096

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Primary graft dysfunction (yes vs. no)	542	80	2.95	1.87-4.67	**<0.001**
De novo DSAs (vs. no DSA)	528	73	2.17	1.35-3.46	**0.001**
Class I de novo DSAs alone (vs. no DSA)	528	73	0.40	0.06-2.91	0.366
Class II de novo DSAs alone (vs. no DSA)	528	73	1.41	0.74-2.69	0.292
Both class I and II de novo DSAs (vs. no DSA)	528	73	5.91	3.36-10.40	**<0.001**
Concurrent ACR grade with pAMR+ diagnosis (vs. pAMR+ with ACR grade 0R)	75	25	-	-	0.301
CMV mismatch (vs. CMV D-/R-)	531	80	-	-	0.190
Sex mismatch (female D-male R vs. male D-male R)	519	78	0.58	0.21-1.58	0.285
pAMR/DSA group (vs. pAMR-/DSA- group)	544	80	-	-	**<0.001**
Cardiac allograft Vasculopathy (vs. CAV grades 0 or 1)	445	63	8.82	3.18-24.44	**<0.001**
History of ACR > 1R (vs. ACR grades 0R/1R)	514	76	1.54	0.88-2.72	0.133
Multipredictor analysis					
Medical nonadherence	544	80	2.36	1.36-4.08	**0.002**
Primary graft dysfunction	542	80	2.25	1.29-3.92	**0.004**
Ischemic cardiomyopathy as HTx indication*	544	80	2.07	1.22-3.51	**0.007**
pAMR+/DSA+ group[#]	544	80	2.36	1.19-4.66	**0.014**
Cardiac allograft vasculopathy	445	63	3.67	1.21-11.10	**0.021**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

pMCS pre-HTx	540	79	0.46	0.19-1.11	0.083
PHM difference	513	77	1.01	1.00-1.02	0.084

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 3. Unipredictor and multipredictor Cox proportional hazards analyses for overall survival. Unipredictor parameters with a p-value ≤ 0.15 are included in addition to certain clinical parameters of interest. HRs and CIs are not provided for categorical variables in this table. ACR, acute cellular rejection; CI, confidence interval; CMV, cytomegalovirus; cPRA, calculated panel reactive antibodies; DSA, donor-specific antibodies; ECMO, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation; HTx, heart transplantation; HR, hazard ratio; MCS, mechanical circulatory support; pAMR, pathologic antibody mediated rejection; PHM, predicted heart mass; pMCS, percutaneous mechanical circulatory support; UNOS, United Network for Organ Sharing. *, allosensitized patients defined as having a UNOS cPRA >= 10%.

Predictor	**No. of patients (n = 544)**	**No. of events (n = 61)**	**HR**	**95% CI**	**p-value**
Unipredictor analysis					
Recipient age (by 10-yr)	544	61	1.02	0.86-1.21	0.793
Recipient race and ethnicity (vs. non-Hispanic White)	544	61	-	-	**0.027**
Multiorgan Transplant (yes vs. no)	544	61	0.62	0.25-1.55	0.304
HTx indication (vs. non-ischemic cardiomyopathy)	544	61	-	-	0.403
Allosensitization pre-HTx*	457	44	0.98	0.47-2.05	0.962
Durable MCS at time of HTx (yes vs. no)	543	61	1.13	0.68-1.89	0.639
Medical nonadherence (yes vs. no)	544	61	2.33	1.37-3.96	**0.002**
Donor age (by 10-yr)	520	58	0.97	0.77-1.23	0.814
Induction therapy (yes vs. no)	519	58	1.23	0.71-2.11	0.463
Cold ischemic time (per hour)	519	58	0.86	0.66-1.11	0.238
PHM difference (per % recipient PHM increment)	513	58	1.00	0.99-1.01	0.775

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Donation after cardiac death (vs. brain death)	544	61	1.16	0.45-3.01	0.759
ECMO pre-HTx (yes vs. no)	540	60	2.34	0.57-9.63	0.237
pMCS pre-HTx (yes vs. no)	540	60	1.37	0.72-2.61	0.337
Primary graft dysfunction (yes vs. no)	542	61	2.51	1.46-4.32	**0.001**
De novo DSAs (vs. no DSAs)	533	59	1.19	0.67-2.10	0.550
Class I de novo DSAs alone (vs. no DSAs)	533	59	-	-	0.996
Class II de novo DSAs alone (vs. no DSAs)	533	59	0.95	0.45-2.03	0.897
Both class I and II de novo DSAs (vs. no DSAs)	533	59	2.64	1.28-5.44	**0.009**
CMV mismatch (vs. D-/R-)	531	60	-	-	0.593
Sex mismatch (female D-male R vs. male D-male R)	519	58	2.27	1.16-4.42	**0.016**
pAMR/DSA group (vs. pAMR-/DSA- group)	544	61	-	-	**0.018**
Cardiac allograft vasculopathy (vs. CAV grades 0 or 1)	474	41	2.48	1.17-5.24	**0.018**
Cardiac allograft dysfunction (yes vs. no)	544	61	2.74	1.61-4.66	**<0.001**
History of ACR > 1R (vs. ACR grades 0R/1R)	530	61	1.56	0.88-2.76	0.130
Multipredictor analysis					
Cardiac allograft dysfunction	544	61	2.27	1.27-4.06	**0.006**
Medical nonadherence	544	61	1.93	1.09-3.39	**0.023**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Primary graft dysfunction	542	61	2.09	1.18-3.71	**0.012**
Recipient race and ethnicity	544	61	-	-	**0.035**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 4. Unipredictor and multipredictor Cox proportional hazards analyses for de novo donor-specific antibody positivity. Unipredictor parameters with a p-value ≤ 0.15 are included in addition to certain clinical parameters of interest. HRs and CIs are not provided for categorical variables in this table. ACR, acute cellular rejection; CI, confidence interval; CMV, cytomegalovirus; cPRA, calculated panel reactive antibodies; DSA, donor-specific antibodies; ECMO, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation; HTx, heart transplantation; HR, hazard ratio; MCS, mechanical circulatory support; pAMR, pathologic antibody mediated rejection; pMCS, percutaneous mechanical circulatory support; UNOS, United Network for Organ Sharing. *, allosensitized patients defined as having a UNOS cPRA >= 10%.

Predictor	No. of patients (n = 533)	Total # of events (n = 129)	HR	95% CI	p-value
Unipredictor analysis					
Recipient age (by 10-yr)	533	129	0.83	0.75-0.93	**0.001**
Recipient race and ethnicity (vs. non-Hispanic White)	533	129	-	-	0.127
Multiorgan transplant (yes vs. no)	533	129	1.61	1.04-2.52	**0.035**
HTx indication (vs. non-ischemic cardiomyopathy)	533	129	-	-	0.318
Allosensitization pre-HTx*	452	118	1.45	0.95-2.22	0.084
Blood type (vs. blood type O)	518	129	-	-	**0.013**
Durable MCS at time of HTx (yes vs. no)	532	129	0.83	0.57-1.19	0.310
Medical nonadherence (yes vs. no)	533	129	1.87	1.27-2.75	**0.001**
Donor age (by 10-yr)	511	127	0.89	0.76-1.05	0.159
Induction therapy (yes vs. no)	511	126	1.01	0.71-1.44	0.947
Cold ischemic time (per hour)	510	126	1.03	0.87-1.21	0.752
Donation after cardiac death (vs. brain death)	533	129	0.98	0.57-1.69	0.936

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

ECMO pre-HTx (yes vs. no)	530	127	2.34	0.86-6.35	0.095
pMCS pre-HTx (yes vs. no)	530	127	0.99	0.64-1.54	0.974
ECMO post-HTx (yes vs. no)	530	127	1.71	0.80-3.67	0.168
Primary graft dysfunction (yes vs. no)	531	129	1.75	1.14-2.68	**0.010**
CMV mismatch (vs. D-/R-)	523	129	-	-	0.535
Sex mismatch (vs. male D-male R)	510	127	-	-	0.701
History of ACR > 1R (vs. ACR grades 0R/1R)	520	129	0.56	0.31-1.02	**0.058**
Multipredictor analysis					
Recipient age	533	129	0.82	0.73-0.91	**<0.001**
Medical nonadherence	533	129	1.71	1.15-2.52	**0.007**
Primary graft dysfunction	531	129	1.67	1.13-2.48	**0.010**
Multiorgan transplant	533	129	1.49	0.95-2.33	0.084
History of ACR > 1R	520	129	0.60	0.33-1.10	0.098

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table S1. Baseline characteristics of heart transplant patients and outcomes for the total study cohort. ACR, acute cellular rejection; AMR, antibody mediated rejection; BMI, body mass index; CMV, cytomegalovirus; DCD, donation after cardiac death; DSA, donor-specific antibodies; HTx, heart transplantation; ICM, ischemic cardiomyopathy; ISHLT, International Society for Heart and Lung Transplantation; MCS, mechanical circulatory support; NICM, nonischemic cardiomyopathy; pAMR, pathologic antibody mediated rejection; PHM, predicted heart mass; PRA, panel reactive antibodies.

Characteristics	No. of patients (n = 544)	Study cohort
Donor characteristics		
Age, y, mean (SD)	520	32.8 (10.6)
Male, N (%)	519	428 (82.5)
Recipient characteristics		
Age, y, mean (SD)	544	53.9 (14.3)
Male, N (%)	544	436 (80.1)
Race		
Asian, N (%)	544	37 (6.8)
Black, N (%)	544	69 (12.7)
Native American, N (%)	544	4 (0.7)
Other Race, N (%)	544	35 (6.4)
Pacific Islander, N (%)	544	12 (2.2)
White, N (%)	544	387 (71.1)
Ethnicity		
Hispanic or Latino, N (%)	544	165 (30.3)
Recipient BMI, mean (SD)	521	26.5 (4.4)
Indication for HTx		
NICM, N (%)	544	325 (59.7)
ICM, N (%)	544	185 (34.0)
Congenital, N (%)	544	22 (4.0)
Cardiac allograft failure, N (%)	544	12 (2.2)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Allosensitization pre-HTx (PRA ≥ 10%), N (%)	457	85 (18.6)
Durable MCS, N (%)	543	188 (34.6)
HTx characteristics		
Multiorgan transplant, N (%)	544	76 (14.0)
Cold ischemic time, min, mean (SD)	520	200.3 (64.0)
Sex mismatch (female D-male R), N (%)	519	42 (8.1)
PHM difference, % recipient PHM, mean (SD)	513	5.2 (20.9)
Induction therapy, N (%)	519	256 (49.3)
DCD, N (%)	544	82 (15.1)
CMV mismatch (D+/R-), N (%)	531	105 (19.8)
HTx outcomes		
Primary graft dysfunction	542	118 (21.8)
History of pAMR positivity	544	75 (13.8)
pAMR1i	75	44 (58.7)
pAMR1h	75	5 (6.7)
pAMR2	75	26 (34.7)
Mixed ACR (ISHLT grade ≥ 2R) and pAMR	75	8 (10.7)
History of DSA positivity	544	140 (25.7)
De novo DSA	134	129 (96.3)
Class I de novo DSAs alone	129	23 (17.8)
Class II de novo DSAs alone	129	75 (58.1)
Both class I and II de novo DSAs	129	31 (24.0)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Concurrent cardiac allograft vasculopathy with initial pAMR positivity	20	5 (25.0)
Concurrent cardiac allograft dysfunction with initial pAMR positivity	72	17 (23.6)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table S2. Causes of death compared across pAMR/DSA groups. DSA, donor-specific antibody; pAMR, pathologic antibody mediated rejection.

Outcomes	**pAMR+/DSA+ (n = 45)**	**pAMR+/DSA- (n = 30)**	**pAMR-/DSA+ (n = 95)**	**pAMR-/DSA- (n = 374)**	**Total**
All-cause mortality or cardiac retransplant (%)	13 (28.9)	4 (13.3)	6 (6.3)	38 (10.2)	61 (11.2)
Cardiovascular related death (%)	7 (15.6)	1 (3.3)	3 (3.2)	6 (1.6)	17 (3.1)
Infectious related mortality (%)	1 (2.2)	1 (3.3)	2 (2.1)	19 (5.1)	23 (4.2)
Cancer (%)	0	0	0	5 (1.3)	5 (0.9)
Other cause of death (%)	2 (4.4)	1 (3.3)	1 (1.1)	4 (1.1)	8 (1.5)
Unknown cause of death (%)	1 (2.2)	1 (3.3)	0	2 (0.5)	4 (0.7)

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table S3. Comparison of different de novo DSA patterns for diagnosis of pathologic antibody mediated rejection. DSA, donor-specific antibody. 95% confidence intervals are in parenthesis. #, reference is all other DSAs group.

De novo DSAs	Positive predictive value	p_c-value#	Odds ratio	p_c-value#
Both class I and II DSAs on initial DSA+ testing	64.2% (36.4%-88.9%)	0.031	6.44 (1.14-45.82)	0.016
Progression from one DSA to both class I and II DSAs	58.2% (28.6%-87.5%)	0.124	5.02 (0.81-35.88)	0.087
Two or more class II DSAs on initial DSA+ testing	52.9% (28.6%-77.3%)	0.103	4.05 (0.85-20.26)	0.087
All other DSAs	21.5% (12.9%-30.5%)	-	-	-

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table S4. Unipredictor and multipredictor Cox proportional hazards analyses for cardiac survival. Unipredictor parameters with a p-value ≤ 0.15 are included in addition to certain clinical parameters of interest. HRs and CIs are not provided for categorical variables in this table. ACR, acute cellular rejection; CI, confidence interval; cPRA, calculated panel reactive antibodies; DSA, donor-specific antibodies; ECMO, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation; HTx, heart transplantation; HR, hazard ratio; MCS, mechanical circulatory support; pAMR, pathologic antibody mediated rejection; PHM, predicted heart mass; pMCS, percutaneous mechanical circulatory support; UNOS, United Network for Organ Sharing. *, allosensitized patients defined as having a UNOS cPRA >= 10%.

Predictors	**Total # of patients (n = 544)**	**Total # of events (n = 21)**	**HR**	**95% CI**	**p-value**
Unipredictor analysis					
Recipient age (by 10-yr)	544	21	0.73	0.57-0.93	**0.010**
Recipient female sex (vs. recipient male sex)	544	21	1.48	0.57-3.82	0.423
Recipient race and ethnicity (vs. non-Hispanic White)	544	21	-	-	0.222
Multiorgan transplant (yes vs. no)	544	21	0.79	0.18-3.43	0.757
HTx indication (vs. non-ischemic cardiomyopathy)	544	21	-	-	0.661
Allosensitization pre-HTx*	457	16	1.19	0.38-3.68	0.769
Durable MCS at time of HTx (yes vs. no)	543	21	1.58	0.67-3.73	0.295
Medical nonadherence (yes vs. no)	544	21	4.15	1.75-9.82	**0.001**
Donor age (by 10-yr)	520	19	1.30	0.88-1.93	0.188
Induction therapy (yes vs. no)	519	19	1.22	0.48-3.13	0.675
Cold ischemic time (per hour)	519	19	0.84	0.53-1.33	0.454

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

PHM difference (per % recipient PHM increment)	513	19	1.00	0.98-1.02	0.839
Donation after cardiac death (vs. brain death)	544	21	2.84	0.55-14.65	0.212
Primary graft dysfunction (yes vs. no)	542	21	3.31	1.36-8.08	**0.009**
ECMO pre-HTx (yes vs. no)	540	20	3.96	0.53-29.88	0.182
pMCS pre-HTx (yes vs. no)	540	20	0.28	0.04-2.10	0.215
De novo DSAs (vs. no DSA)	533	20	3.40	1.41-8.22	**0.007**
Class I de novo DSAs alone (vs. no DSA)	533	20	-	-	0.997
Class II de novo DSAs alone (vs. no DSA)	533	20	2.66	0.89-7.97	0.080
Both class I and II de novo DSAs (vs. no DSA)	533	20	7.16	2.54-20.14	**<0.001**
Sex mismatch (female D-male R vs. male D-male R)	519	19	1.71	0.49-5.93	0.397
pAMR/DSA group (vs. pAMR-/DSA- group)	544	21	-	-	**0.003**
Cardiac allograft vasculopathy (vs. CAV grades 0 or 1)	474	19	5.31	2.08-13.58	**<0.001**
Cardiac allograft dysfunction (yes vs. no)	544	21	6.30	2.65-14.98	**<0.001**
History of ACR > 1R (vs. ACR grades 0R/1R)	530	21	3.21	1.35-7.62	**0.008**
Multipredictor analysis					
Cardiac allograft	544	21	5.68	1.87-17.19	**0.002**

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2023.12.01.23299311; this version posted October 1, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

dysfunction					
Recipient Age	544	21	1.85	1.06-3.23	**0.029**
Donor Age	520	19	1.64	1.02-2.63	**0.040**
Medical nonadherence	544	21	2.62	0.92-7.48	0.071
Primary graft dysfunction	542	21	2.42	0.86-6.82	0.094
Cardiac allograft vasculopathy	474	19	2.57	0.83-7.94	0.100