medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Molecular signatures of chronic antibody-mediated rejection in human liver transplants

*Bastian Engel[1], *Ahmed Alaswad[2, 3], Alejandro Campos-Murguia[1], Martijn Zoodsma[2, 3], Anne Klingbeil[1], Kinan Chihab[1], Emily A. Bosselmann[1], Sophia Heinrich[1], Björn Hartleben[4], Danny D. Jonigk[4, 5, &], Murielle Verboom[6], Michael Hallensleben[6], Robert Geffers[7], Heiner Wedemeyer[1], Cheng-Jian Xu[2, 3], Elmar Jaeckel[1, #], +Yang Li[2, 3, 8, 9, 10], +Richard Taubert[1]

* authors share first authorship

+ authors share last authorship

Orcid IDs:

Bastian Engel: 0000-0002-0972-3454

Alejandro Campos-Murguia: 0000-0002-2178-302X

Elmar Jaeckel: 0000-0003-4108-7192

Richard Taubert: 0000-0001-9270-2496

Ahmed Alaswad: 0000-0003-1770-1332

Yang Li: 0000-0003-4022-7341

Robert Geffers: 0000-0003-4409-016X

Martijn Zoodsma: 0000-0003-3636-2209

Murielle Verboom: 0000-0001-8260-2045

Cheng-Jian Xu: 0000-0003-1586-4672

[1] Department of Gastroenterology, Hepatology, Infectious Diseases and Endocrinology, Hannover Medical School, Hannover, Germany

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.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/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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 The copyright holder for this preprint **(which was not certified by peer review)** is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

[2] Department of Computational Biology for Individualised Medicine, Centre for Individualised Infection Medicine (CiiM), a joint venture between the Helmholtz-Centre for Infection Research (HZI) and the Hannover Medical School (MHH), Hannover, Germany

[3] TWINCORE, a joint venture between the Helmholtz-Centre for Infection Research (HZI) and the Hannover Medical School (MHH), Hannover, Germany

[4] Institute for Pathology, Hannover Medical School, Hannover, Germany

[5] Institute of Pathology, RWTH University of Aachen, Aachen, Germany.

[6] Institute for Transfusion Medicine and Transplant Engineering, Hannover Medical School, Hannover, Germany

[7] Research Group Genome Analytics, Helmholtz Centre for Infection Research, Braunschweig, Germany

[8] Department of Internal Medicine and Radboud Institute for Molecular Life Sciences, Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, the Netherlands

[9] Cluster of Excellence RESIST (EXC 2155), Hannover Medical School, Hannover, Germany

[10] Lower Saxony center for artificial intelligence and causal methods in medicine (CAIMed), Hannover, Germany

[&] Biomedical Research in End-stage and Obstructive Lung Disease Hannover (BREATH) of the German Center for Lung Research (DZL), Hannover, Germany.

[#] Current address: Ajmera Transplant Center, Toronto General Hospital, United Health Network, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada

Corresponding author:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

PD Dr. Richard Taubert; Hannover Medical School; Dept. of Gastroenterology, Hepatology, Infectious Diseases and Endocrinology; Carl-Neuberg-Straße 1; 30625 Hannover; Germany.

Tel.: +49-511-532-6766; taubert.richard@mh-hannover.de

Keywords: donor-specific anti-HLA antibodies, T cell-mediated rejection; tumor necrosis factor; interferon gamma; allograft rejection; liver transplantation; RNA-sequencing;

Word count Main Text: 3514

Word count Abstract: 274

Number of Figures: 4

Number of Tables: 2

Financial support: The work was supported by grants from the German Research Foundation (SFB738 project Z2; EJ)), the Transplantation Center Project 19_02 and HiLF II from Hannover Medical School (RT) and the Transplantation Center Project ZN3369 from Hannover Medical School/The Ministry of Science and Culture of the State of Lower Saxony (BE). RT was supported by the Core 100 advanced clinician scientist program from Hannover Medical School. BE was supported by the PRACTIS – Clinician Scientist program of Hannover Medical School, funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG, ME 3696/3). ACM was supported by the DAAD Research Grants – One-year grants for doctoral Candidates, 2023/2024 (57645447). KC was

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

supported by the Else Kröner-Fresenius Stiftung (KlinStrucMed programme). This work was supported by the Radboud University Medical Centre Hypatia Grant, an ERC Starting Grant, grant agreement 948207 (ModVaccine), the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) under Germany's Excellence Strategy - EXC 2155 - project number 390874280, and the Lower Saxony Center for AI and Causal Methods in Medicine (CAIMed) grant funded by the Ministry of Science and Culture of Lower Saxony with funds from the program zukunft.niedersachsen of the VolkswagenStiftung (all to YL).

Conflict of interest: Nothing to declare with regard to this manuscript.

Author contributions to manuscript: Study concept and design: BE, EJ, RT. Acquisition of data: BE (overall data management), ACM (validation cohort), AK (training cohort), BH & DDJ (histopathology). Analysis and interpretation of data: BE (overall data analysis & interpretation), AA (bioinformatics), EJ, YL, RT. Drafting of the manuscript: BE, RT. Critical revision of the manuscript for important intellectual content: All authors. Statistical analysis: BE, AA, ACM, CJX, YL. Obtained funding: BE, ACM, KC, EJ, YL, RT. Administrative, technical, or material support: All authors. Study supervision: CJX, EJ, YL, RT.

Data availability statement: The data that support the plots within this paper and other findings of this study are available from the corresponding author upon reasonable request. The raw gene expression data, including a sample-data relationship file, as well as the count tables are stored conformant with the MINSEQE reporting standard (Version 1.0, June 2012, accessible at https://zenodo.org/doi/10.5281/zenodo.5706411) at MHH RepoMed repository https://doi.org/10.26068/mhhrpm/20240207-000.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Abstract

Background&Aims: The role of antibody-mediated rejection (ABMR) after liver transplantation (LT) remains controversial. Chronic ABMR (cABMR) is often subclinical and potentially missed without surveillance biopsies (svLbx) which are not established in most LT centers. Transcriptome analysis previously characterized molecular changes in T cell-mediated rejection (TCMR) after solid organ transplantation. We aimed to identify molecular cABMR signatures after LT for a more comprehensive understanding of cABMR.

Methods: We retrospectively identified indication and svLbx from our prospective institutional biorepository (n=1207 over 12 years). We performed RNA-sequencing on liver biopsies (discovery cohort: n=71; validation cohort: n=58). Downstream analyses explored the unique and common molecular features of cABMR, clinical (clinTCMR) and subclinical TCMR (subTCMR) compared to no histological rejection (NHR).

Results: Nineteen percent of LT recipients with donor-specific antibodies had cABMR. Eighty-one percent of patients with cABMR had ALT and AST ≤2x the upper limit of normal, only being recognized by svLbx. The cABMR group displayed differentially expressed genes (DEGs) uniquely enriched in fibrogenesis-, complement activation- and TNFα-signaling-related pathways. ClinTCMR showed DEGs uniquely enriched in antigen presentation-, interferon-signaling-, and T cell receptor-signaling-related pathways. Common cABMR and clinTCMR DEGs were enriched in chemokine-signaling- and cytokine response-related pathways. Gene set enrichment scores of interferon-signaling and extracellular matrix remodeling pathways discriminated cABMR and clinTCMR. Molecular signatures of clinTCMR correlated with histological

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

TCMR-patterns. Molecular cABMR-signatures correlated with lobular graft injury and liver fibrosis scores. The validation cohort consistently showed patterns of DEGs associating cABMR with fibrogenesis- and NF-κB-signaling-related pathways and clinTCMR with interferon-signaling- and adaptive immunity-related pathways. SubTCMR was molecularly almost indistinguishable from NHR.

Conclusions: We report transcriptome-unique features of cABMR that is a unique molecular identity associated with inflammation and fibrogenesis.

Impact and Implications

- Antibody-mediated rejection (ABMR) is a recognized relevant cause of graft injury and unfavorable patient outcomes after kidney, heart and lung transplantation but the role of ABMR after liver transplantation (LT) remains controversial. Hence, we aimed to characterize chronic ABMR after LT on a molecular basis to identify unique features.

- Our findings highlight chronic ABMR to be a distinct clinical phenotype of rejection after LT. Furthermore, we demonstrate chronic ABMR to present mostly with normal liver enzymes, therefore only being detected if protocol biopsies are performed for graft monitoring.

- Therefore, our work emphasizes the usage of protocol graft biopsies for the detection of a fibrosis associated phenotype of cABMR. Pending external validation, the molecular signature may be used in the future to discriminate cABMR from graft injury of other causes.

Graphical Abstract

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



Highlights

- Chronic ABMR was present in up to 1/5 of DSA-positive biopsies and 1/5 of biopsies with advanced fibrosis

- Chronic ABMR and clinically overt TCMR have largely distinct transcriptome patterns with common up-regulated DEGs enriched in pro-inflammatory pathways

- Clinical TCMR is characterized by up-regulated interferon-signaling at the transcriptome level

- Chronic ABMR signatures include up-regulated DEGs enriched in pathways of fibrogenesis, complement cascades, and TNF-signaling

- Common signatures of TCMR and ABMR are enriched in pathways including NF-κB signaling, chemokine signaling and cytokine responses

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1. Introduction

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Liver transplantation (LT) is a life-saving treatment for patients with end-stage liver disease. Graft survival beyond the first year after LT has not improved in the last decades[1]. In the long-term, morbidity and mortality are related to both sequelae of immunosuppressive drugs as well as graft dysfunction[1]. Additionally, surveillance liver biopsy programs reveal advanced fibrosis in 20 - 60% of LT recipients (LTR) after adult and pediatric LT[2,3].

The existence and relevance of antibody-mediated rejection (ABMR) in AB0-compatible LT has been a matter of ongoing debate for decades and very few centers are testing for donor-specific anti-HLA antibodies (DSA) regularly as part of their post-transplant follow-up protocols. The presence of DSA is associated with more liver graft injury, more liver graft fibrosis, intrahepatic upregulation of transcripts associated with TCMR, and reduced patient and graft survival[2,4–8]. The prevalence of DSA increases over time by up to 50% at more than five years after LT[2]. In 2016, the first consensus document on clinical and histological criteria of acute and chronic ABMR was published by the Banff Foundation, acknowledging a potential role of ABMR after LT but still being controversially discussed[9]. The low prevalence of acute and chronic ABMR (cABMR) after LT, assumed to be below 10-15%[9], prevented faster scientific progress in the understanding of ABMR after LT in comparison to kidney transplantation (KT), where ABMR is one of the major causes of chronic graft dysfunction[10]. ABMR after LT does not necessarily cause an elevation of liver enzymes above the upper limit of normal (ULN)[9]. Hence, the prevalence of ABMR is underestimated without quantification of DSA and without surveillance liver graft biopsies (svLBx), both of which are not part of the regular surveillance in the majority of LT centers. Therefore, the true prevalence as well as the implications of cABMR for LTR are unknown.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Gene expression analysis in graft biopsies fostered the characterization of ABMR, especially after KT, and showed comparable molecular signatures of ABMR in kidney, heart and lung transplants[11–15], with comparable risk of graft loss in kidney transplant recipients based on their molecular profile irrespective of clinical differences[16]. Similar gene expression analyses have already identified intrahepatic molecular signatures of spontaneous operational tolerance, of TCMR but, most importantly, not of ABMR[17–20]. This retrospective single center study aimed to identify molecular signatures of cABMR in distinction to clinically overt TCMR (clinTCMR) and subclinical manifestations of TCMR (subTCMR) in human liver transplant biopsies.

2. Patients and methods

2.1 Patient cohort

Patient samples were retrieved from our ongoing prospective biorepository that was instituted at the end of 2008. The biorepository includes LTR that undergo liver graft biopsy (LBx) either for the work-up of elevated liver enzymes or if signs of liver fibrosis are present, and for surveillance of the liver graft to individualize immunosuppression[21]. All patients provided written informed consent.

The study was approved by the local Ethics Committee (protocol number 933 for project Z2 of the comprehensive research center 738; MHH Ethikkommission, Hannover, Germany). The study was conducted according to the ethical guidelines of the Declarations of Helsinki and Istanbul.

2.2 Liver biopsies, rejection phenotypes, histological grading and staging

Biopsies of patients with viral or bacterial infection or vascular complications were excluded. Relevant obstructive cholestasis was ruled out by ultrasound examination.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Histological examination and scoring for the rejection activity index (RAI)[22], inflammation grade and fibrosis stage (mHAI score)[23], central perivenulitis, portal microvasculitis, ductular reaction[9], fatty liver disease[24] and total liver allograft fibrosis (LAF) score[25] was performed by experienced liver pathologists in a blinded fashion. Significant fibrosis was defined as: periportal fibrosis (Ishak F [24]) ≥2 and/or any LAF score component ≥2. SubTCMR and clinTCMR were defined as recently published[26].

2.3 RNA isolation and sequencing

For the training cohort, total RNA was extracted with the AllPrep DNA/RNA/Protein Mini kit (ID: 80004, Qiagen N.V., Venlo, The Netherlands) from biopsies freshly preserved in Allprotect Tissue Reagent (ID: 76405, Qiagen N.V., Venlo, The Netherlands) according to the manufacturer's protocol. For the validation cohort, only FFPE samples were available of which total RNA was extracted with the Qiagen RNeasy FFPE kit (ID: 73504, Qiagen N.V., Venlo, The Netherlands) according to the manufacturer's protocol. RNA was directly stored at -80 °C until further use. The quality and integrity of the total RNA were assessed using the Agilent Technologies 2100 Bioanalyzer (Agilent Technologies; Waldbronn, Germany) according to the manufacturer's instructions. Library preparation and sequencing were performed at HZI Braunschweig (Braunschweig, Germany) (training cohort) and BGI Genomics (Hongkong, China) (validation cohort) according to local protocols.

2.4 Gene expression data processing and analysis

Raw sequencing data were firstly processed using nf-core tool (version 3.9) implemented in Nextflow pipelines[27,28]. Length-scaled gene count tables were imported to Deseq2 (version 1.40.1) using tximport tool (version 1.28.0) for differential expression analysis[29,30]. Genes were considered to be differentially expressed when

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

the $\log_2$ fold change between two conditions exceeded 1, with false-discovery rate (FDR)-adjusted p-value below 0.05. The period in months between the transplantation and the biopsy, recipient age, and sex were included as covariates in the differential gene expression analysis. Functional enrichment of the differentially expressed genes (DEGs) was conducted by the over-representation analysis tool from the ConsensusPathDB-human platform[31]. For the association between clinical scores and gene expression, the R package limma was used (version 3.56.2)[32]. The covariates used for the differential expression analysis are also used in the linear regression model to evaluate this association. Gene sets used in gene set enrichment analysis (positive regulation of response to IFNγ (M24135, GO:0060332, version 2023.1.Hs), collagen chain trimeritation (M27812, R-HSA-8948216, version 2023.1.Hs), and laminin interactions (M27216, R-HSA-3000157, version 2023.1.Hs) were downloaded from the GSE broad-institute website[33].

Methods are outlined further in the supplemental file.

3. Results

3.1 Characterization of the training cohort

The liver biopsies of clinTCMR, subTCMR, cABMR and NHR were selected from a cohort of over 1000 liver biopsies being taken over a period of 12 years. All biopsies with available cryo-conserved tissue were included in the discovery cohort (suppl. Figure 1A). The prevalence of cABMR in DSA positive biopsies was 19% (18/97). Additionally, 19% (18/94) of representative biopsies with advanced fibrosis fulfilled criteria of cABMR.

Patients' samples were grouped according to their clinical phenotype and the characteristics are outlined in Table 1 and suppl. Figure 2. There were no differences

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

in age between all groups (p=0.30) while sex frequency was different between groups (p=0.04) (Table 1). Time after LT was not different between groups in post-hoc testing (Table 1, suppl. Figure 3A). As per definition, patients with NHR and subTCMR had no elevation of liver enzymes, while these were elevated in patients with clinTCMR. Applying the same threshold of liver enzyme elevation as for clinTCMR and subTCMR, 81% of cABMR had ALT, AST, and AP below two xULN and were therefore categorized as subclinical. This means that they are most likely to be picked up by svLBx.

Histological inflammation and fibrosis were absent in patients with NHR while relevant rejection activity was seen in all other entities being highest in clinTCMR. In contrast, fibrosis according to both Ishak F and LAF scores was highest in cABMR, which also had, by definition, the highest frequency of DSA. Fifty-six percent of biopsies with cABMR also had features of TCMR with an RAI ≥1+1+1, similar as in ABMR after other solid organ transplantation (SOT)[34,35]. Usage of cyclosporine A (CsA) and tacrolimus (TAC) as primary immunosuppressive drug was different between the groups (p=0.022 and p=0.006 respectively; Table 1). There were no differences regarding the usage of other immunosuppressive agents between the groups.

3.2 Signature genes of cABMR and clinTCMR are associated with distinct biological processes

The study workflow is highlighted in Figure 1A. To investigate the changes in the transcriptome profile in the rejection groups (cABMR, clinTCMR, subTCMR), differential expression analysis of each group compared to NHR was performed in the training cohort (supp. Figure 4; suppl. Table 1).

cABMR and clinTCMR shared 369 up-regulated and 54 down-regulated DEGs, while there were 946 up-regulated and 166 down-regulated DEGs unique to cABMR and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

354 up-regulated and 223 down-regulated DEGs unique to clinTCMR (Figure 1B; Figure 1C; suppl. Table 3). There were only 35 up-regulated and seven down-regulated DEGs in subTCMR compared to NHR, including two up-regulated and one down-regulated unique DEGs (Figure 1B).

Up-regulated DEGs of cABMR were enriched in processes of fibrogenesis and TNF-signaling (hypergeometric test, FDR-adjusted p <0.05) while up-regulated DEGs of clinTCMR were associated with processes of allograft rejection and cellular responses to cytokines, especially interferon-signaling (hypergeometric test, FDR-adjusted p <0.05) (suppl. Figure 4A, B; suppl. Table 2). Noticeably, the subTCMR transcriptome profile showed minor difference compared to NHR, with up-regulated DEGs involved in antigen presentation, IL-12 production and dendritic cell differentiation (hypergeometric test, FDR-adjusted p <0.05; suppl. Figure 4C; suppl. Table 2).

Next, we explored the transcriptome changes specific to either cABMR or clinTCMR. Unique DEGs in cABMR exhibited enrichment in biological processes of fibrogenesis, cell adhesion and NF-κB-signaling (Figure 2A, B; suppl. Table 4) while unique DEGs in clinTCMR were over-represented in the pathways of allograft rejection, Th1/Th2/Th17 differentiation, antigen processing and presentation, NK cell-mediated cytotoxicity and interferon-signaling among others (Figure 2C, D; suppl. Table 4). To underline the biological relevance of these unique pathways for the pathophysiology of clinTCMR and cABMR, a gene set score enrichment analysis revealed that the positive regulation of response to IFN-gamma was significantly higher in patients with clinTCMR than in patients with cABMR (Student's t-test, p <0.05; Figure 3A). In contrast, the gene set scores for pathways of restructuration of the basement membrane ("Laminin Interactions") and the formation of collagen ("Collagen chain trimerization") were significantly higher in cABMR than in clinTCMR with both processes being relevant to hepatic fibrogenesis (Student's t-test, p=0.008; Figure 3A).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

The 369 up-regulated DEGs in both clinTCMR and cABMR, highlighted involvement of TNF receptor non-canonical NF-κB-signaling, chemokine-signaling and cytokine response to be essential to both clinTCMR and cABMR (suppl. Figure 5; suppl. Tables 5, 6).

3.3 Association of histopathological scores and differentially expressed genes

Next, we linked unique DEGs to common histopathological scores that assess liver TCMR (RAI), liver allograft fibrosis (LAF) and inflammatory activity (mHAI) (Figure 3B). RAI was most strongly associated with unique DEGs of clinTCMR but only little with unique DEGs of cABMR. DEGs of cABMR correlated most strongly with the LAF score and mHAI, underlining the more lobular graft injury pattern in cABMR. Therefore, histopathological patterns of TCMR (RAI) correlate most strongly with molecular signatures of clinTCMR but less with those of cABMR. In contrast, molecular signatures of cABMR are associated with histopathological patterns of graft fibrosis and lobular graft injury. Thus, clinTCMR and cABMR are characterized by different molecular signatures and different histopathological patterns of injury.

3.4 Validation of possible cABMR and clinTCMR gene signature in an independent validation cohort

The clinical features of the validation cohort were mostly consistent with the training cohort (Table 2). Most notably, the median time after LT at sampling was longer for all phenotypes than in the training cohort, which was accounted for in the biostatistical analysis (see methods section, suppl. Figure 3B). In contrast to the training cohort, primary immunosuppressive therapy was comparable between the groups, because TAC became the leading calcineurin inhibitor over time at our center. Criteria of cABMR were fulfilled in 13% (7/54) of DSA-positive biopsies and 5% (7/135) of biopsies with

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

advanced fibrosis (suppl. Figure 1B). Again, 50% of cABMR had ALT, AST, and AP below two xULN, therefore being likely to be only picked up in svLBx.

Overall consistency of gene expression was high between both cohorts. Eighty-seven percent of cABMR DEGs and 93% of clinTCMR DEGs from the discovery cohort with high-quality RNA from cryoconserved LBx were validated in the validation cohort that used highly degraded RNA being isolated from FFPE tissue (Figure 4A). As in the discovery cohort, up-regulated DEGs in cABMR were enriched in processes of fibrogenesis as well as TNF non-canonical NF-κB-signaling (Figure 4B; suppl. Figure 6A, 7A; suppl. Tables 7, 8). Up-regulated DEGs in clinTCMR were enriched in pathways of Th1/Th2/Th17 cell differentiation, antigen processing and presentation, T cell receptor-signaling, allograft rejection and innate and adaptive immunity (Figure 4B; suppl. Figure 6B; suppl. Tables 7, 8). There were 23 up-regulated and zero down-regulated DEGs in subTCMR compared to NHR, with enrichment in Th1 and Th2 cell differentiation, interferon-signaling, and cellular response to cytokines (suppl. Figure 6C; suppl. Tables 7, 8). DEGs specific to cABMR showed enrichment in the processes of fibrogenesis, cell adhesion, TNFs binding their physiological receptors, TNFR2 non-canonical NF-κB-signaling and complement and coagulation cascades (suppl. Figure 7B; suppl. Tables 9, 10). DEGs specific to clinTCMR were over-represented in pathways of interferon-signaling, antigen processing and presentation, Th1/2/17 cell differentiation, adaptive immunity, T cell receptor-signaling, IL-2-signaling as well as other pathways related to T cells (suppl. Figure 7C; suppl. Tables 9, 10), with findings from the discovery cohort being largely replicated in the validation cohort. Common DEGs of cABMR and clinTCMR were enriched in pathways including cytokine-signaling, especially interferon-gamma, cell adhesion and allograft rejection (suppl. Figure 8A, B; suppl. Tables 11, 12).

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

4. Discussion

In this study, molecular signatures of three different rejection entities, clinTCMR, cABMR and subTCMR, were characterized using whole-transcriptome sequencing methodologies (mRNA from fresh frozen and FFPE liver biopsies) in two independent cohorts from our center. Hereinafter, we systemically previewed how common and unique features of all three rejection phenotypes highlight potential pathophysiological commonalities and differences. We provide evidence for cABMR to be pathophysiologically distinct from clinTCMR, mainly by fibrogenetic processes, by TNF-signaling via NF-κB as well as complement activation. Lastly, we demonstrated plausibility by linking the molecular phenotype of clinTMCR to hallmark genes of T cell-mediated signaling and to typical histological TCMR patterns by a correlation with the RAI. Likewise, the molecular phenotype of cABMR was associated with genes of fibrogenesis, and histological features of lobular hepatitis and liver fibrosis by a correlation with the HAI and with the LAF score. Of note, in a rat model of ABMR after LT DEGs enriched in pathways of TNF-signaling via NF-κB were more abundant in ABMR[36].

Various attempts were made to derive a gene signature of clinTCMR in LTR by using a microarray gene expression approach[5,18,19]. Most recently, an 11-gene signature showed an excellent diagnostic performance to discriminate clinTCMR from NHR[18]. Ten out of eleven (all but *HLA-DMA* with $\log_2$ fold change of 0.99 and adjusted p-value of 3.3×10^{-7}) of these DEGs were significantly up-regulated (adjusted p-value <0.05 and $\log_2$ fold change >1) in clinTCMR compared to NHR in our discovery cohort while 4/11 were up-regulated in the smaller validation cohort (*CXCL9, TOP2A, GPNMB, PLA2G7)*. Of these, only *PLA2G7,* a gene encoding for a phospholipase that inactivates platelet-activating factor, was uniquely associated with clinTCMR but not with other rejection phenotypes in our study. The low concordance of the 11-gene set

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

with the unique transcriptomic clinTCMR patterns described here underlines the importance of a comprehensive approach including all rejection types for the identification of transcriptomic modules shared by different rejection types and rejection type-specific pathways.

The multicenter INTERLIVER study could not identify ABMR-specific signatures in a cohort of 235 prospectively collected LBx[20]. This probably relates to the mostly missing DSA testing in the participating centers and the low percentage of svLBx (15%) in this study. The current study selected 22 cABMR cases out of 1207 LBx over a period of 12 years and up to 81% of cABMR had no relevant elevation of liver enzymes and would have been missed without svLBx. So, the missing ABMR signature in the INTERLIVER study potentially relates to a selection bias due to the low frequency of svLBx, again emphasizing the use of svLBx to monitor liver graft function. Of the top ten genes that were most strongly associated with clinTCMR in the INTERLIVER study[20], 8/10 (all but *PSMB8* and *PSMB10*) were significantly overexpressed in clinTCMR compared to NHR in our discovery cohort while 6/10 were significantly overexpressed in the validation cohort (*GBP1, GBP5, CXCL9, STAT1, PSMB9* and *TAP1*). Two genes (*GBP1* and *PSMB9*) from the INTERLIVER study were uniquely associated with clinTCMR in our cohort, both of which are interferon-inducible with the former encoding for a guanylate binding protein involved in host defense against pathogens and the latter being related to antigen processing via the immunoproteasome and presentation via MHC-molecules with antigen-recognition by $CD8^+$ T cells[37,38]. Comparison of published literature with our current study highlights that currently used gene array-based classifiers do not necessarily quantify features unique to clinTCMR but those that may be shared with other rejection phenotypes, e.g. cABMR, in highly-selected, and phenotypically well-characterized cohorts without prevalent ABMR cases. Hence, the final clinical use case of such classifiers will be

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

determined in an unbiased real-world scenario pending further validation. Differences in DEGs between our cohort and previous literature may also be related to different techniques (gene array in the INTERLIVER study and mainly in studies of the Sanchez-Fueyo group[18–20,39] with mostly fresh frozen tissue in comparison to whole-transcriptome sequencing in the present study) that were used to quantify gene expression. While it was shown that the number of genes varies between technological platforms, biological processes as well as the performance of diagnostic classifiers were consistent across platforms in patients after KT[40]. These similar results in terms of biological processes in sequencing techniques from fresh frozen versus FFPE tissue underline that further validation studies can also be performed from stored samples rather than from fresh frozen LBx. Although the BANFF group has recently described the histological changes of cABMR, they are not always clearly applicable in daily clinical practice and are not very specific. Thereby, the diagnosis of cABMR is rarely made based on biopsies. By molecularly identifying patients with cABMR, the diagnostic accuracy of biopsies may be improved.

Concerning cABMR, deposition of complement C4d is regarded as a key feature for the histopathological suspicion of ABMR[9]. However, it is acknowledged that the performance of various assays to stain C4d is heterogeneous dependent on the technique and the protocol of the local center[9]. Staining for C4d on FFPE liver tissue exhibits acceptable performance in acute ABMR in comparison to the gold standard of immunofluorescence on frozen tissue, but data on assay performance in cABMR is lacking[41]. However, it is widely acknowledged that the sensitivity of C4d staining for cABMR is generally low[9, 42]. Also, C4d deposition may occur in case of biliary obstruction, viral infection of the liver or autoimmune liver injury[9] thereby reducing specificity. Given the methodological pitfalls of C4d staining, we included patients with

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

possible cABMR and not only with probable cABMR as defined by the current Banff consensus definition from 2016[9]. Additionally, diagnosing cABMR in the absence of C4d deposition is well established also after KT or lung transplantation with the same prognostic implications as C4d positive ABMR[43,44]. The consistency of the molecular phenotype found for cABMR in the present study and in published studies from KT supports the validity of our approach[45]. Hence, our findings fit current pathophysiological concepts of ABMR derived from other SOT, add evidence in favor of the existence of cABMR after LT[46].

We report two independent cohorts from our center that are separated by time (discovery cohort: 2008 – 2016, validation cohort 2018 – 2022). In addition, different material with different qualities of RNA was used in these cohorts (discussed above), but we can still demonstrate biological consistency as evidenced by highly overlapping pathways between both cohorts for clinTCMR and cABMR. The molecular profile in terms of biological processes of cABMR was largely maintained in the validation cohort, despite lower sample numbers for cABMR. Nonetheless, these findings have to be validated externally by future multicenter efforts. However, a reasonable amount of cABMR may be missed in such studies if svLBx and DSA testing were not performed routinely as up to 81% of cABMR in our cohort had liver enzymes below two xULN and would not be eligible for liver biopsy in studies that do not incorporate svLBx[47,48].

We highlight biological processes of cABMR taking place in LTR that may provide druggable targets in the future to prevent disease progression. Concerning the latter, implementation of svLBx programs[3,21] will probably be a relevant prerequisite to determine the real prevalence of cABMR across countries, centers, and IS regimens. SvLBx programs reported superior survival of participants[3]. These programs select long-term survivors, without contraindications for a LBx and with a high adherence and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

motivation to perform an invasive measurement to potentially decrease their long-term maintenance immunosuppression. The broader application of DSA measurement and elastography for the assessment of graft fibrosis can help to enrich for LTR with relevant graft injury [2,49,50]. In case of relevant fibrosis or positivity for DSA, a biopsy is often warranted.

This study indicates cABMR after LT as a unique entity with a similar gene signature as described in other SOT. The distinct phenotype of cABMR after LT is characterized by fibrogenesis, and TNF-mediated signaling via NF-κB and involves endothelial cell-signaling as well as complement cascades. The cABMR gene signature is closely associated with histological fibrosis (LAF score) and is frequently detected in DSA-positive LTR. Pending external validation, we highlight a possible application of RNA-sequencing on liver biopsies to facilitate the detection of cABMR in LTR.

Acknowledgements:

We thank Szilvia Ziegert and Konstantinos Iordanidis from the “immune tolerance working group” at Hannover Medical School for technical assistance. We thank Stefan Huebscher, already retired from his work in the pathology department of the University of Birmingham/UK, for his advice in initiating this project and for his training of the pathologists at Hannover Medical School during a fruitful workshop in September 2016.

References

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

1. Rana A, Ackah RL, Webb GJ, et al. No Gains in Long-term Survival After Liver Transplantation Over the Past Three Decades. *Ann Surg*. 2019;269(1):20-27. doi:10.1097/SLA.0000000000002650

2. Höfer A, Jonigk D, Hartleben B, et al. Non-invasive screening for subclinical liver graft injury in adults via donor-specific anti-HLA antibodies. *Sci Rep*. 2020;10(1):14242. doi:10.1038/s41598-020-70938-7

3. Rocque B, Zaldana A, Weaver C, et al. Clinical Value of Surveillance Biopsies in Pediatric Liver Transplantation. *Liver Transplant*. 2022;28(5):843-854. doi:10.1002/lt.26399

4. Kaneku H, O'Leary JG, Banuelos N, et al. De Novo Donor-Specific HLA Antibodies Decrease Patient and Graft Survival in Liver Transplant Recipients. *Am J Transplant*. 2013;13(6):1541-1548. doi:10.1111/ajt.12212

5. Londoño MCC, Souza LN, Lozano JJJ, et al. Molecular profiling of subclinical inflammatory lesions in long-term surviving adult liver transplant recipients. *J Hepatol*. 2018;69(3):626-634. doi:10.1016/j.jhep.2018.04.012

6. Iacob S, Cicinnati VR, Lindemann M, et al. Donor-Specific Anti-HLA Antibodies and Endothelial C4d Deposition—Association With Chronic Liver Allograft Failure. *Transplantation*. 2015;99(9):1869-1875. doi:10.1097/TP.0000000000000613

7. Kim PTW, Demetris AJ, O'Leary JG, O'Leary JG. Prevention and treatment of liver allograft antibody-mediated rejection and the role of the 'two-hit hypothesis.' *Curr Opin Organ Transplant*. 2016;21(2):209-218. doi:10.1097/MOT.0000000000000275

8. Varma S, Ambroise J, Komuta M, et al. Progressive Fibrosis Is Driven by

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Genetic Predisposition, Allo-immunity, and Inflammation in Pediatric Liver Transplant Recipients. *EBioMedicine*. 2016;9:346-355. doi:10.1016/j.ebiom.2016.05.040

9. Demetris AJ, Bellamy C, Hübscher SG, et al. 2016 Comprehensive Update of the Banff Working Group on Liver Allograft Pathology: Introduction of Antibody-Mediated Rejection. *Am J Transplant*. 2016;16(10):2816-2835. doi:10.1111/ajt.13909

10. Loupy A, Lefaucheur C, Vernerey D, et al. Complement-Binding Anti-HLA Antibodies and Kidney-Allograft Survival. *N Engl J Med*. 2013;369(13):1215-1226. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1302506

11. Gauthier PT, Mackova M, Hirji A, et al. Defining a natural killer cell-enriched molecular rejection-like state in lung transplant transbronchial biopsies. *Am J Transplant*. 2023;23(12):1922-1938. doi:10.1016/j.ajt.2023.06.003

12. Halloran PF, Reeve J, Akalin E, et al. Real Time Central Assessment of Kidney Transplant Indication Biopsies by Microarrays: The INTERCOMEX Study. *Am J Transplant*. 2017;17(11):2851-2862. doi:10.1111/ajt.14329

13. Madill-Thomsen KS, Reeve J, Aliabadi-Zuckermann A, et al. Assessing the Relationship Between Molecular Rejection and Parenchymal Injury in Heart Transplant Biopsies. *Transplantation*. 2022;106(11):2205-2216. doi:10.1097/TP.0000000000004231

14. Halloran PF, Madill-Thomsen KS. The Molecular Microscope Diagnostic System: Assessment of Rejection and Injury in Heart Transplant Biopsies. *Transplantation*. 2023;107(1):27-44. doi:10.1097/TP.0000000000004323

15. Loupy A, Duong Van Huyen JP, Hidalgo L, et al. Gene Expression Profiling for

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

the Identification and Classification of Antibody-Mediated Heart Rejection. *Circulation*. 2017;135(10):917-935. doi:10.1161/CIRCULATIONAHA.116.022907

16. Halloran PF, Madill-Thomsen KS, Pon S, et al. Molecular diagnosis of ABMR with or without donor-specific antibody in kidney transplant biopsies: Differences in timing and intensity but similar mechanisms and outcomes. *Am J Transplant*. 2022;22(8):1976-1991. doi:10.1111/ajt.17092

17. Bohne F, Martínez-Llordella M, Lozano JJJ, et al. Intra-graft expression of genes involved in iron homeostasis predicts the development of operational tolerance in human liver transplantation. *J Clin Invest*. 2012;122(1):368-382. doi:10.1172/JCI59411

18. Vionnet J, Miquel R, Abraldes JG, et al. Non-invasive alloimmune risk stratification of long-term liver transplant recipients. *J Hepatol*. 2021;75(6):1409-1419. doi:10.1016/j.jhep.2021.08.007

19. Bonaccorsi-Riani E, Pennycuick A, Londoño MCC, et al. Molecular Characterization of Acute Cellular Rejection Occurring During Intentional Immunosuppression Withdrawal in Liver Transplantation. *Am J Transplant*. 2016;16(2):484-496. doi:10.1111/ajt.13488

20. Madill-Thomsen K, Abouljoud M, Bhati C, et al. The molecular diagnosis of rejection in liver transplant biopsies: First results of the INTERLIVER study. *Am J Transplant*. 2020;20(8):2156-2172. doi:10.1111/ajt.15828

21. Saunders EA, Engel B, Höfer A, et al. Outcome and safety of a surveillance biopsy guided personalized immunosuppression program after liver transplantation. *Am J Transplant*. 2022;22(2):519-531. doi:10.1111/ajt.16817

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

22. Banff schema for grading liver allograft rejection: An international consensus document. *Hepatology*. 1997;25(3):658-663. doi:10.1002/hep.510250328

23. Ishak K, Baptista A, Bianchi L, et al. Histological grading and staging of chronic hepatitis. *J Hepatol*. 1995;22(6):696-699. doi:10.1016/0168-8278(95)80226-6

24. Kleiner DE, Brunt EM, Van Natta M, et al. Design and validation of a histological scoring system for nonalcoholic fatty liver disease. *Hepatology*. 2005;41(6):1313-1321. doi:10.1002/hep.20701

25. Venturi C, Sempoux C, Bueno J, et al. Novel Histologic Scoring System for Long-Term Allograft Fibrosis After Liver Transplantation in Children. *Am J Transplant*. 2012;12(11):2986-2996. doi:10.1111/j.1600-6143.2012.04210.x

26. Höfer A, Jonigk D, Hartleben B, et al. DSA Are Associated With More Graft Injury, More Fibrosis, and Upregulation of Rejection-associated Transcripts in Subclinical Rejection. *Transplantation*. 2020;104(3):551-561. doi:10.1097/TP.0000000000003034

27. Ewels PA, Peltzer A, Fillinger S, et al. The nf-core framework for community-curated bioinformatics pipelines. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2020;38(3):276-278. doi:10.1038/s41587-020-0439-x

28. Di Tommaso P, Chatzou M, Floden EW, Barja PP, Palumbo E, Notredame C. Nextflow enables reproducible computational workflows. *Nat Biotechnol*. 2017;35(4):316-319. doi:10.1038/nbt.3820

29. Love MI, Huber W, Anders S. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-seq data with DESeq2. *Genome Biol*. 2014;15(12):550. doi:10.1186/s13059-014-0550-8

30. Soneson C, Love MI, Robinson MD. Differential analyses for RNA-seq:

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

transcript-level estimates improve gene-level inferences. *F1000Research*. 2016;4:1521. doi:10.12688/f1000research.7563.2

31. Kamburov A, Pentchev K, Galicka H, Wierling C, Lehrach H, Herwig R. ConsensusPathDB: toward a more complete picture of cell biology. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2011;39(suppl_1):D712-D717. doi:10.1093/nar/gkq1156

32. Ritchie ME, Phipson B, Wu D, et al. limma powers differential expression analyses for RNA-sequencing and microarray studies. *Nucleic Acids Res*. 2015;43(7):e47-e47. doi:10.1093/nar/gkv007

33. Subramanian A, Tamayo P, Mootha VK, et al. Gene set enrichment analysis: A knowledge-based approach for interpreting genome-wide expression profiles. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*. 2005;102(43):15545-15550. doi:10.1073/pnas.0506580102

34. Nickerson PW. What have we learned about how to prevent and treat antibody-mediated rejection in kidney transplantation? *Am J Transplant*. 2020;20:12-22. doi:10.1111/ajt.15859

35. Fedrigo M, Berry GJ, Coutance G, et al. Report of the 2022 Banff Heart Concurrent: Focus on non-human leukocyte antigen antibodies in rejection and the pathology of “mixed” rejection. *Am J Transplant*. Published online October 2023. doi:10.1016/j.ajt.2023.10.004

36. Tajima T, Hata K, Kusakabe J, et al. Anti-complement 5 antibody ameliorates antibody-mediated rejection after liver transplantation in rats. *Front Immunol*. 2023;14(June):1-17. doi:10.3389/fimmu.2023.1186653

37. Fisch D, Bando H, Clough B, et al. Human <scp>GBP</scp> 1 is a microbe-specific gatekeeper of macrophage apoptosis and pyroptosis. *EMBO J*. 2019;38(13). doi:10.15252/embj.2018100926

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

38. Ferrington DA, Gregerson DS. Immunoproteasomes. In: ; 2012:75-112. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-397863-9.00003-1

39. Madill-Thomsen KS, Abouljoud M, Bhati C, et al. The molecular phenotypes of injury, steatohepatitis, and fibrosis in liver transplant biopsies in the INTERLIVER study. *Am J Transplant*. 2022;22(3):909-926. doi:10.1111/ajt.16890

40. Kurian SM, Velazquez E, Thompson R, et al. Orthogonal Comparison of Molecular Signatures of Kidney Transplants With Subclinical and Clinical Acute Rejection: Equivalent Performance Is Agnostic to Both Technology and Platform. *Am J Transplant*. 2017;17(8):2103-2116. doi:10.1111/ajt.14224

41. Neil DAH, Bellamy CO, Smith M, et al. Global quality assessment of liver allograft C4d staining during acute antibody-mediated rejection in formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded tissue. *Hum Pathol*. 2018;73:144-155. doi:10.1016/j.humpath.2017.12.007

42. Demir Z, Raynaud M, Aubert O, et al. Identification of liver transplant biopsy phenotypes associated with distinct liver biological markers and allograft survival. *Am J Transplant*. Published online December 2023. doi:10.1016/j.ajt.2023.12.007

43. Orandi BJ, Alachkar N, Kraus ES, et al. Presentation and Outcomes of C4d-Negative Antibody-Mediated Rejection After Kidney Transplantation. *Am J Transplant*. 2016;16(1):213-220. doi:10.1111/ajt.13434

44. Aguilar PR, Carpenter D, Ritter J, et al. The role of C4d deposition in the diagnosis of antibody-mediated rejection after lung transplantation. *Am J Transplant*. 2018;18(4):936-944. doi:10.1111/ajt.14534

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

45. Kong F, Ye S, Zhong Z, et al. Single-Cell Transcriptome Analysis of Chronic Antibody-Mediated Rejection After Renal Transplantation. *Front Immunol*. 2022;12(January):1-17. doi:10.3389/fimmu.2021.767618

46. Loupy A, Lefaucheur C. Antibody-Mediated Rejection of Solid-Organ Allografts. Ingelfinger JR, ed. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;379(12):1150-1160. doi:10.1056/NEJMra1802677

47. Uebayashi EY, Okajima H, Yamamoto M, et al. The New Challenge in Pediatric Liver Transplantation: Chronic Antibody-Mediated Rejection. *J Clin Med*. 2022;11(16):4834. doi:10.3390/jcm11164834

48. Lee BT, Fiel MI, Schiano TD. Antibody-mediated rejection of the liver allograft: An update and a clinico-pathological perspective. *J Hepatol*. 2021;75(5):1203-1216. doi:10.1016/j.jhep.2021.07.027

49. Bhat M, Tazari M, Sebastiani G. Performance of transient elastography and serum fibrosis biomarkers for non-invasive evaluation of recurrent fibrosis after liver transplantation: A meta-analysis. Strnad P, ed. *PLoS One*. 2017;12(9):e0185192. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0185192

50. Bosselmann EA, Engel B, Hartleben B, et al. Prospective comparison of liver stiffness measurement methods in surveillance biopsies after liver transplantation. *Front Transplant*. 2023;2. doi:10.3389/frtra.2023.1148195

Abbreviations: ABMR: antibody-mediated rejection; cABMR: chronic antibody-mediated rejection; CsA: cyclosporine A; clinTCMR: clinically overt T cell-mediated rejection; DEGs: differentially expressed genes; DSA: donor-specific anti-HLA antibodies; FDR: false-discovery rate; FFPE: formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded; KT: kidney transplantation; LAF: liver allograft fibrosis; LBx: liver graft biopsy; LT: liver

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

transplantation; LTR: liver transplant recipient; NHR: no histological rejection; mHAI: modified histological activity index; RAI: rejection activity index; RIN: RNA integrity number; SOT: solid organ transplantation; subTCMR: subclinical T cell-mediated rejection; svLBx: surveillance liver graft biopsies; TAC: tacrolimus; TCMR: T cell-mediated rejection; ULN: upper limit of normal; x ULN: times the upper limit of normal.

Tables

Table 1	Overall	NHR	subTCMR	cABMR	clinTCMR	p
sample number	71	18	26	16	11	
age [years] (median (range))	52 (18 – 76)	50 (20 – 69)	52 (21 – 67)	59 (22 – 67)	47 (18 – 76)	0.30
female sex [n (%)]	24 (33.8)	8 (44.4)	5 (19.2)	4 (25.0)	7 (63.6)	0.04
time after liver transplantation [months] (median (range))	13 (2 – 298)	10 (5 – 60)	19 (5 – 116)	32 (6 – 298)	7 (2 – 152)	0.04
AST [xULN] (median (range))	0.8 (0.3 – 11.9) (n = 70)	0.6 (0.4 – 0.8) (n = 17)	0.7 (0.3 – 1.2)	0.9 (0.5 – 1.6)	3 (1.5 – 11.9)	< 0.001
ALT [xULN] (median (range))	0.5 (0.1 – 17.2)	0.4 (0.2 – 0.6)	0.5 (0.1 – 1.5)	0.5 (0.3 – 2.1)	4.1 (2.4 – 17.2)	< 0.001
AP [xULN] (median (range))	0.9 (0.2 – 3.9) (n = 62)	0.7 (0.2 – 1.1) (n = 14)	0.8 (0.2 – 1.3)	1.2 (0.7 – 3.1)	1.8 (0.8 – 3.9)	< 0.001
bilirubin [xULN] (median (range))	0.5 (0.2 – 2.5)	0.5 (0.2 – 2.5)	0.5 (0.2 – 1.5)	0.6 (0.2 – 2.2)	0.9 (0.3 – 2.5)	0.02
RAI (median (range))	3 (0 – 8)	0 (0 – 1)	3.5 (3 – 6)	3.5 (1 – 8)	5 (3 – 7)	< 0.001
mHAI (median (range))	3 (0 – 8)	1 (0 – 2)	2 (0 – 8)	5 (2 – 7)	4 (2 – 6)	< 0.001
Ishak fibrosis stage (median (range))	1 (0 – 6)	0 (0 – 1)	1 (0 – 4)	2.5 (1 – 6)	1 (0 – 2)	< 0.001
LAF Score (median (range))	1 (0 – 8)	0 (0 – 1)	1 (0 – 5)	4 (2 – 8)	1 (0 – 3)	< 0.001
DSA positive [n (%)]	28 (39.4)	1 (5.6)	7 (26.9)	16 (100)	4 (36.4)	< 0.001
TAC [n (%)]	25 (35.2)	10 (55.6)	10 (38.5)	0 (0.0)	5 (45.5)	0.006
CsA [n (%)]	44 (62.0)	8 (44.4)	15 (57.7)	15 (93.8)	6 (54.5)	0.022
Sirolimus [n (%)]	1 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (6.3)	0 (0.0)	0.32
Prednisolone [n (%)]	57 (80.3)	13 (72.2)	21 (80.8)	12 (75.0)	1 (100)	0.29
Mycophenolate-mofetil [n (%)]	63 (88.7)	15 (83.3)	24 (92.3)	15 (93.8)	9 (81.8)	0.62
Azathioprine [n (%)]	1 (1.4)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	1 (9.1)	0.14

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Table 2	Overall	NHR	subTCMR	cABMR	clinTCMR	p
sample number	58	20	20	6	12	
age [years] (median (range))	49.5 (19 - 75)	50 (19 - 74)	49.5 (19 - 67)	57.5 [19 - 75)	35.0 (25 - 67)	0.51
female sex [n (%)]	17 (29.3)	7 (35.0)	6 (30.0)	3 (50.0)	1 (8.3)	0.25
time after liver transplantation [months] (median (range))	77 (1.0 - 276.0)	83 (10 - 257)	77 (13 - 198)	149 (80 - 276)	14 (1 - 189)	0.003
AST [xULN] (median (range))	0.8 (0.3 - 26.1)	0.7 (0.4 - 1.1)	0.7 (0.3 - 2.0)	1.3 (0.7 - 7.1)	3.1 (0.6 - 26.1)	<0.001
ALT [xULN] (median (range))	0.6 (0.2 - 46.3)	0.4 (0.2 - 0.9)	0.6 (0.3 - 1.7)	0.5 (0.3 - 11.0)	3.9 (1.0 - 46.3)	<0.001
AP [xULN] (median (range))	0.9 (0.4 - 9.4)	0.6 (0.4 - 1.1)	0.7 (0.5 - 1.6)	1.4 (0.5 - 3.5)	2.9 (1.2 - 9.4)	<0.001
bilirubin [xULN] (median (range))	0.5 (0.2 - 3.5)	0.4 (0.2 - 1.3)	0.5 (0.2 - 1.5)	0.6 (0.3 - 2.1)	1.2 (0.4 - 3.5)	0.002
RAI (median (range))	3 (0 - 7)	0 (0 - 1)	3 (3 - 5)	1 (1 - 4)	5 (3 - 7)	<0.001
mHAI (median (range))	3 (0 - 12)	1 (0 - 1)	3 (1 - 6)	5 (2 - 8)	4 (2 - 12)	<0.001
Ishak fibrosis stage (median (range))	1 (0 - 5)	0 (0 - 1)	1 (0 - 1)	3 (2 - 5)	0 (0 - 2)	<0.001
LAF score (median (range))*	1 (0 - 6)*	1 (0 - 1)*	1 (0 - 2)*	4 (2 - 6)*	2 (0 - 2)*	0.008
DSA positive [n (%)]**	10 (18.9)**	1 (6.7)**	2 (10.0)	6 (100.0)	1 (8.3)	<0.001
TAC [n (%)]	43 (74.1)	15 (75.0)	16 (80.0)	3 (50.0)	9 (75.0)	0.53
CsA [n (%)]	13 (22.4)	5 (25.0)	3 (15.0)	3 (50.0)	2 (16.7)	0.33
Sirolimus [n (%)]	7 (12.1)	4 (20.0)	1 (5.0)	0 (0.0)	2 (16.7)	0.36
Prednisolone [n (%)]	25 (43.1)	5 (25.0)	8 (40.0)	3 (50.0)	9 (75.0)	0.049
Mycophenolate-mofetil [n (%)]	47 (81.0)	15 (75.0)	16 (80.0)	6 (100.0)	10 (83.3)	0.59
Azathioprine [n (%)]	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	NA
*Venturi LAF score available in 26/58 biopsies (NHR 11/20. subTCMR 3/20. cABMR 4/6. clinTCMR 8/12)						
**DSA available in 53/58 samples (NHR 15/20)						

Figure legends

Figure 1: Study design and molecular differences between the rejection groups

(A) Study design. **(B)** Venn diagram showing the numbers of the up-regulated and

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

down-regulated DEGs in each rejection group compared to NHR. **(C)** Heatmap of scaled gene count. Rows are unique DEGs of cABMR and clinTCMR and columns represent samples. clinTCMR: clinical T cell-mediated rejection; cABMR: chronic antibody-mediated rejection; subTCMR: subclinical T cell-mediated rejection; NHR: no histological rejection, DEGs: differentially expressed genes.

Figure 2: Molecular signature and functional enrichment of unique DEGs of cABMR and clinTCMR

(A) Volcano plot showing the unique cABMR vs NHR DEGs (p-value adjusted by false discovery rate (FDR) <0.05, absolute $\log_2$ fold change (LogFc) > 1). (**B)** Over-represented pathways out of DEGs in panel A. (**C)** Volcano plot showing the unique clinTCMR vs NHR DEGs (FDR <0.05, LogFc >1) (**D)** Over-represented pathways out of DEGs in panel C. clinTCMR: clinical T cell-mediated rejection; cABMR: chronic antibody-mediated rejection; subTCMR: subclinical T cell-mediated rejection; NHR: no histological rejection, DEGs: differentially expressed genes.

Figure 3: Gene set enrichment analysis and gene count association with histological scores

(A) Gene set scores of three selected pathways in cABMR and clinTCMR. *: p <0.05, **: p <0.01; Student's t-test. (**B)** Association between the unique DEGs expression and three different histological scores. Log_{10}(FDR) on the y-axis is signed by the correlation fold change, while DEGs are ranked on the x axis by the association t-stat value. clinTCMR: clinical T cell-mediated rejection; cABMR: chronic antibody-mediated rejection; subTCMR: subclinical T cell-mediated rejection; NHR: no histological rejection, DEGs: differentially expressed genes.

Figure 4: Validation of DEGs and functional pathways: (A) Validation of rejection vs NHR DEGs. DEGs with nominal significance (p <0.05) in the validation cohort are plotted**.** (**B)** Over-represented pathways out of DEGs in panel A. clinTCMR: clinical T

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

cell-mediated rejection; cABMR: chronic antibody-mediated rejection; subTCMR: subclinical T cell-mediated rejection; NHR: no histological rejection, DEGs: differentially expressed genes.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

Main figures

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

(A)

	cABMR	clinTCMR	subTCMR	NGF
DISCOVERY	16	11	26	18
VALIDATION	6	12	20	20



(B)



(C)



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

(A)



(B)



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.02.08.24302515; this version posted February 8, 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-NC-ND 4.0 International license .

(A)



(B)