TITLE: Protocol for Bayesian combined multi-genotype and concentration informed tacrolimus dosing in paediatric solid organ transplantation (BRUNO-PIC)

Dhrita Khatri[1,2], Andreas Halman[1,3], Joshua Kausman[2,4,5], Jacob Mathew[6], Elizabeth Bannister[5,7], Tayla Stenta[1,2], Claire Moore[1,2], Elizabeth Williams[1,2], Roxanne Dyas[1,2], Julian Stolper[1,2], Cecilia Moore[2,8], Mark Pinese[9,10], Rishi S. Kotecha[11,12,13], Christopher Gyngell[2,5] Sebastian Lunke[3,5,14], John Christodoulou[2,3,5], Amanda Gwee[2,15,16], Rachel Conyers[1,2,17 ‡] and David Metz[5,6,18 ‡]

[‡]Equal final authors

1. Cancer Therapies Group, Murdoch Children's Research Institute, Parkville, Australia.
2. Department of Paediatrics, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, Australia.
3. Victorian Clinical Genetics Services, Melbourne, Australia
4. Department of Nephrology, The Royal Children's Hospital, Melbourne, Australia
5. Murdoch Children's Research Institute, Parkville, Victoria, Australia
6. Department of Cardiology, The Royal Children's Hospital, Melbourne, Australia
7. Department of Gastroenterology, The Royal Children's Hospital, Melbourne, Australia
8. Clinical Epidemiology and Biostatistics Unit, Murdoch Children's Research Institute, Parkville, Victoria, Australia
9. Children's Cancer Institute, Lowy Cancer Centre, UNSW Sydney, NSW, Australia
10. School of Clinical Medicine, UNSW, Medicine and Health, UNSW Sydney, NSW, Australia
11. Department of Clinical Haematology, Oncology, Blood and Marrow Transplantation, Perth Children's Hospital, Nedlands, Western Australia, Australia
12. Curtin Medical School, Curtin University, Bentley, Western Australia, Australia
13. Leukaemia Translational Research Laboratory, WA Kids Cancer Centre, The Kids Research Institute Australia, University of Western Australia, Nedlands, Western Australia, Australia
14. Department of Pathology, The University of Melbourne, Parkville, Australia.
15. Infectious Disease Department, The Royal Children's Hospital, Parkville, Australia
16. Antimicrobials Group, Murdoch Children's Research Institute, Parkville, Australia.
17. Children's Cancer Centre, The Royal Children's Hospital, Parkville, Australia.
18. Department of Paediatrics, Monash University, Melbourne, VIC, Australia

Corresponding Author

David Metz

Paediatric Nephrologist, Clinical Pharmacologist, Honorary Research Fellow

Murdoch Children's Research Institute

Email: david.metz@mcri.edu.au

KEY WORDS:

pharmacogenomics, solid organ transplantation, Bayesian dosing, tacrolimus, target concentration intervention, genotyping, paediatrics

SHORT RUNNING TITLE:

BRUNO-PIC study protocol

WORD COUNT: 6552

ABSTRACT (WORDS: 308)

Introduction: Tacrolimus is an immunosuppressant used extensively in solid organ transplantation. Whilst highly effective in preventing organ rejection, it has a narrow range of safe and effective concentrations and wide pharmacokinetic variability, which can lead to incomplete effectiveness, toxicities and suboptimal outcomes. Yet much is known about this pharmacokinetic variability. Tacrolimus is metabolised by cytochrome P450 (CYP) 3A4 and CYP3A5, with a clear link between pharmacogenetic variants and dose requirement. With additional patient covariates, more than 40% of tacrolimus' pharmacokinetic variability can be explained. Individualisation of initial dose can increase proportion of transplant recipients within the acceptable range of concentrations in the initial post-transplant week, and subsequent maximum *a posteriori* Bayesian dosing can increase time in acceptable range over time, with potential to improve patient outcomes.

Method and analysis: BRUNO-PIC is an open-label trial with a prospective intervention arm and a retrospective standard of care comparator arm. The prospective arm evaluates covariate-informed initial doses followed by Bayesian dose adjustment in children undergoing kidney, liver or heart transplant. A *CYP3A5* and *CYP3A4* genotype will be combined with allometric size scaling to predict initial tacrolimus doses. Post-transplant dose adjustment will be guided by NextDose, a Bayesian dosing platform that incorporates genotype, clinical characteristics, measured tacrolimus concentrations and a population pharmacokinetic model to maximally inform initial doses and dose adjustment recommendations over the first 8-weeks post-transplant. The co-primary outcome is the proportion of cohort with measured tacrolimus concentration within 80-125% of target, at post-

transplant dosing day 4 (Ctrough), and day 4 at week 3 and week 8 (Cavgss target) post-transplant. The secondary outcomes include median time to acceptable range and the time in the acceptable range over the first 8-weeks post-transplant.

Ethics and dissemination: The ethics approval of the trial has been obtained from the Sydney Children's Ethics Committee (2023/ETH02699). Findings will be disseminated through peer-reviewed publications and professional conference presentations.

Trial registration: ClinicalTrials.gov NCT 06529536

STRENGTHS AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

Strengths: This study integrates pre-transplant combined *CYP3A5/3A4* genotyping and post-transplant Bayesian individualised dosing in paediatric solid organ transplant recipients, using concentration guided dosing techniques to improve exposure control.

Use of a target concentration approach based on average steady state concentrations is expected to reduce underexposure in individuals with high relative tacrolimus clearance (e.g. CYP3A5 expressers).

Limitations: This paediatric solid organ transplant study may not be generalisable to all solid organ transplant patients.

Lack of randomised comparator arm precludes unconfounded determination of superiority over standard care.

ADMINISTRATIVE INFORMATION

Title: Protocol for Bayesian combined multi-genotype and concentration informed tacrolimus dosing in paediatric solid organ transplantation (BRUNO-PIC)

Trial Registration Number: ClinicalTrials.gov NCT 06529536

Protocol Version: This trial is approved Sydney Children's Ethics Committee (2023/ETH02699). The study is currently version 3, 08.10.2024 (Supplementary File 2)

Funding: BRUNO-PIC is funded by the 2023 Medical Research Future Fund – Genomics Health Future Mission (MARVEL-PIC (MRF/2024900). This funding source had no role in the design of this study and will not have any role during its execution, analyses, interpretation of the data, or decision to submit results.

Sponsorship: Murdoch Children's Research Institute

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1 Background

Patient outcomes from solid organ transplantation (SOT) undFcalcierwent major advances in the last two decades of the 20th century, with introduction of highly effective immunosuppressant drugs including tacrolimus, mycophenolate and anti-lymphocyte antibody induction [1]. However, despite leading to appreciable short-term gains, long-term graft and patient outcomes remain suboptimal [2 3].

Tacrolimus is a calcineurin inhibitor (CNI), a 23-membered macrolide produced by the bacterium *Streptomyces tsukubaensis* [4]. It is a core component of modern SOT immunosuppression, used in the majority of recipients since superiority over cyclosporine was demonstrated in the Elite-Symphony trial, published in 2007 [5].

Tacrolimus is a "narrow therapeutic index" drug, requiring therapeutic drug monitoring (TDM) to increase safety and effectiveness [6 7]. Yet current TDM practice - with empiric dose adjustment to attain trough (pre-dose) tacrolimus concentrations within a "therapeutic window" [8] - only partially compensates for tacrolimus dose-response variability. The consequences of suboptimal dosing – with treatment failure in some [9-14] and unacceptable toxicities in others [3 15 16] remain.

Initial dose

Whilst early acute rejection is uncommon with current immunological matching techniques and highly effective immunosuppression, acute rejection in the setting of low tacrolimus concentrations is still seen [17-21]. One predictable contributor to initial underexposure – if not accounted for - are individuals with *CYP3A5* expression, typically requiring 1.5 to 2-fold higher dose than nonexpressers (the predominant genotype) [17-21]. This is compounded by slow empiric dose titration, some recipients not reaching target for up to 3 weeks using standard TDM [22].

CYP3A5 genotype-guided initial dosing increases the proportion of recipients within the acceptable range in the first week post-transplant, along with reduction in median time to target, demonstrated in meta-analysis of randomised controlled trials (RCTs) [23]. The addition of clinical covariates to *CYP3A5* genotype can explain over 40% of tacrolimus' pharmacokinetic variability [24]. This would increase further with knowledge of *CYP3A4* genotype, more recent data supporting impact on tacrolimus clearance [25]. In that context it has been rightly suggested that future trials should look at "dosing algorithm that include demographic and clinical factors plus multiple genetic variants" [23].

'Time in range' of safe & effective tacrolimus concentrations

There is a clear association between the proportion of tacrolimus concentrations within the acceptable range in SOT recipient over the first 6-12 months and various negative outcomes. This includes association with acute rejection [9 26-28], donor-specific antibody formation [10 12-14 29] and post-transplant malignancy [30], as well as overall poorer long-term patient and graft outcomes [29 31-36].

Yet maintaining tacrolimus concentrations within the acceptable range can be challenging, particularly in the initial post-transplant months, with published experience of less than 60% of measurements within the therapeutic window [37]. This is in part due to substantial between-occasion variability in tacrolimus PK early post-transplant, with contribution from variability in body size, haematocrit (HCT), prednisolone dose, as well as time-post transplant (a surrogate for an as-yet unpredictable systemic change) [37-40]. In addition, empiric titration of TDM is both highly user-dependant and less accurate than more modern techniques [8].

Increasing time in range can be achieved through maximum *a posteriori* Bayesian estimation (Bayesian dosing), with superiority to TDM reported in two RCTs in adult kidney transplant recipients [41 42]. Bayesian dosing is a pharmaco-statistical technique that leverages prior population information of pharmacokinetic parameters and variability with an individual's characteristics and measured drug concentrations, to accurately predict the dose required to achieve the target concentration.

Although Bayesian dosing is used in clinical care by some transplanting centres [43], mainstream uptake has been slow [44 45]. Barriers to implementation of Bayesian dosing include (1) unclear regulatory framework, though guidance is emerging [46]; (2) clinician acceptance, including choice of Bayesian dosing platform and (3) lack of comparative clinical trial evidence for improvement in long-term outcomes [45]. On this final point, however, it is crucial to recognise the substantial challenge in proving clinical superiority by RCT in modern transplant cohorts, given low rates of short-term events (rejection, graft failure) [47-49]. Nevertheless, tacrolimus Bayesian dose adjustment has longstanding precedence for use in some parts of the world such as Europe and Asia [41 42], along with RCT evidence of significantly increased proportion within the acceptable concentration range in the first post-transplant week and over the subsequent 3 months [41 42]. Comparative trial evidence has not been published in children to date.

Tacrolimus pharmacokinetics and pharmacogenetics

Tacrolimus largely undergoes hepatic clearance, with metabolism by *CYP3A4*, and by *CYP3A5* in individuals who express this enzyme [50] [51]. Although these drug-metabolising enzymes reside predominantly in the liver, they are also present in enterocytes, where metabolism and P-glycoprotein-mediated efflux contribute to reduced bioavailability.

All individuals express *CYP3A4*, with minimal levels at birth, increasing throughout infancy and reaching full adult values by one year of age [52]. On the other hand, *CYP3A5* is only expressed in a proportion of the population. The expression of CYP3A5 is present in 10-15% of Caucasian populations, though much higher in African (40-50%) and Asian (50-70%) populations [53]. These individuals require higher initial tacrolimus dosing to achieve equivalent exposure early post-transplant [51], with the Clinical Pharmacogenetics Implementation Consortium (CPIC) and the French National Network of Pharmacogenetics (RNPGx) recommending a 1.5 to 2-fold increase in dose for both heterozygous and homozygous expressors, and the Dutch Pharmacogenetics Working Group (DPWG) recommending 1.5-fold increase for heterozygous expressors and 2.5-fold increase for homozygous *CYP3A5* expressors [54]. 0Pharmacogenetic variations in *CYP3A4* (specifically the *CYP3A4**22 polymorphism) are quantitatively less pronounced than in *CYP3A5*, but a significant impact is increasingly being recognised. The *CYP3A4**22 polymorphism is more common in European populations, with data from these cohorts supporting an impact on dose requirements [55].

In liver transplantation, the picture is more complex. Following transplantation, the recipient has donor CYP3A genotype in the liver (contributing to both first-pass metabolism and drug clearance), but their own CYP3A genotype in enterocytes (contributing to bioavailability). Furthermore, CYP3A activity in the liver is significantly reduced immediately post-transplant, followed by a gradual recovery as overall liver synthetic function improves over the initial days-weeks. In this context, published data consistently reports influence of recipient genotype in the initial post-transplant week, whereas donor genotype becomes influential somewhere between day 1 and day 21 post-transplant as phenotype matures [56].

Concentration target for dose titration: trough or exposure (AUC)

The long-accepted paradigm that dose adjustment to tacrolimus Ctrough is sufficient to optimise tacrolimus' safety and effectiveness is increasingly being challenged. Whilst Ctrough is a pragmatic target in clinical care [57], it is assumed only a surrogate for overall exposure (AUC). Such is well established for cyclosporine, the first CNI which used to be the predominant CNI but is now often replaced by tacrolimus in SOT [58]. For tacrolimus - with identical downstream pharmacodynamic

effect as cyclosporine - most of the available exposure-response data is based on Ctrough [58]. However, the exposure-response relationship based on AUC was demonstrated in early development [59]; real-world data shows substantial between-subject variability in AUC at a given trough concentration [60]; and more recently has been reported to better predict rejection risk than Ctrough in kidney transplantation [61]. Of note, substantial precedence exists for AUC-guided dosing as standard of care from over two decades of use in certain regions with interest/expertise [15 60-65], though mainstream acceptance lags.

Those likely to benefit most from dosing to the more precise AUC-guided dosing are pharmacokinetic 'outliers', i.e. CYP3A5 expressors or those with other cause for high tacrolimus clearance [53 64 66]. These individuals typically require substantially higher dose to achieve the same tacrolimus Csstrough [67 68], often translating to higher peak concentrations and higher overall tacrolimus systemic exposure (AUC) [53 64 69]. Higher tacrolimus exposure (AUC) despite Csstrough within acceptable range explain why these individuals see an increase toxicity including CNI nephrotoxicity [67 70-74], BK virus nephropathy [75-77] and other toxicities [53 78 79].

Thus, with current tacrolimus dosing practice, CYP3A5 expressors are at risk of rejection if they fail to achieve therapeutic exposure in the early post-transplant period, and toxicities over time due to chronic over-exposure, **Error! Reference source not found.**with overall inferior graft and patient survival [53 66 78 79].

Bayesian dosing and NextDose

Error! Reference source not found.0There are a range of platforms for clinical implementation of MAPBE [37 45]. NextDose is favoured for BRUNO-PIC due to published evidence supporting superiority of the tacrolimus model and platform, detailed below. Furthermore, the developer of NextDose being co-investigator enables iterative refinement of the underlying model should this be required e.g. for non-renal SOT recipients.

The tacrolimus model used by NextDose is the largest of its kind, excluding those where only Ctrough concentrations were available for analysis (a substantial limitation). The model was developed from a population of 242 kidney transplant recipients and 3100 tacrolimus whole blood concentrations, with 64 full PK profiles (> 8 concentrations per occasion), over 153 limited sampling profiles and 1546 trough concentrations [38]. It was developed by combining two separate populations, the pooled

model outperforming those from which it was developed in external validation [38].[41] The model aligns with principles of mechanistic modelling for both structure and covariate introduction [38] [80], a principle with clear basis in pharmacometrics (and statistical modelling more generally) to reduce bias and enhance external validity [81]. Finally, its superiority has been reported in a published systematic review and external validation, e.g. *"the model by Størset et al, which was comparatively the best of all 16 published models…"* [80].

Whilst the NextDose tacrolimus model was developed in an adult kidney transplant population, this is not a barrier to use in children who have reached an age when the clearance mechanisms are mature after which, from a PK perspective, children *are* "small adults" [82]. Full maturation of clearance mechanisms occurs before 1-2 years of age for tacrolimus. Therefore, application of allometric size scaling can be used to predict dose requirement in children using models developed with adult population pharmacokinetic (popPK) data [82] [83]. Further, research groups have developed separate popPK models in children and in adults (excluding infancy) and demonstrated similar PK parameters and concentration-time course (scaled for size) [47].

For use of NextDose in non-kidney transplantation, a further validation step will be required within BRUNO-PIC. Notably, however, whilst the tacrolimus popPK model for NextDose was developed in a kidney transplant population, there is published precedence for pooling of popPK models between kidney and non-kidney transplant recipients [49] [84] [85].

These population "meta-models" show relatively consistent PK between organ types *apart from liver transplant recipients*, where tacrolimus clearance is substantially lower in the initial weeks [84]. However, it has been shown that, by adding a parameter to account for reduced clearance in liver transplant recipients – or in the case of physiology-based PK models by specifying impaired hepatic function – models initially developed in kidney transplant recipients can accurately predict tacrolimus concentrations in liver transplant recipients [85]. This data will be used to add an additional parameter for reduced metabolic clearance in NextDose, to allow for first dose prediction in liver transplant recipients. [38] [41]

1.2 OBJECTIVES

Primary Objective

- In paediatric SOT recipients (kidney, heart and liver), to determine whether genotype-informed Bayesian dosing of tacrolimus leads to better achievement of tacrolimus

concentrations within the acceptable range compared with a retrospective arm, which is our historical control group using standard of care dosing over the first 8 weeks post-transplant.

Secondary objectives

- To determine the safety and efficacy of using a genotype-informed Bayesian dosing of tacrolimus in SOT within the initial 8-weeks post-transplant (prospective arm only, descriptive)
- To determine the impact of using a genotype-informed dosing of tacrolimus compared to a retrospective group using standard of care dosing in our paediatric SOT cohort in achieving and maintaining therapeutic concentrations.
- To evaluate the feasibility of using NextDose in the context of paediatric SOT.

1.3 TRIAL DESIGN

Overall design

BRUNO-PIC is a prospective, open-label single arm intervention trial, with retrospective cohort as standard of care comparator.

The retrospective cohort will consist of approximately 120 eligible paediatric recipients of liver, kidney, or heart transplants at the RCH over a 5-year period (January 2019 to April 2024). This cohort represents current tacrolimus dosing practice at the Royal Children's Hospital (RCH), which involves a standard mg/kg protocol followed by trough concentration measurement and empiric dose adjustment. This cohort will be compared to the prospective intervention arm of recruiting forty-five paediatric recipients undergoing kidney, liver or cardiac transplantation and have pre-emptive genotyping of CYP3A4 and CYP3A5. Their initial tacrolimus dose will be determined based on genotype and mechanistic body size scaling using free fat mass (FFM) and allometry, with subsequent dosing over the initial 8 weeks post-transplant to be guided using NextDose Bayesian estimation of tacrolimus PK using similar patient factors and observed tacrolimus concentrations.

The ability of this genotype-guided and Bayesian-informed approach to optimise tacrolimus exposure (concentrations within the acceptable range initially and over time) will be compared to the retrospective cohort.

Participant enrolment: phase 1 and 2

A total of 45 individuals will be recruited prospectively to the trial, with phased opening of cohorts based on SOT type:

Phase 1: Enrolling kidney transplant recipients, being the population in whom the popPK model used by NextDose was developed. Evaluation of the acceptability of using NextDose predicted doses.

Phase 2: Enrolling other SOT recipients (heart and liver).

- This second phase will commence following successful evaluation of NextDose acceptability of predicted doses for non-kidney SOT recipients. Using published popPK literature to inform PK parameter quantitative differences (and any other necessary changes), appropriate parameter adjustments for application of the NextDose tacrolimus model to liver and cardiac transplant recipients.
- External evaluation of NextDose for use with cardiac and liver recipients will be performed using retrospective data from the prior 5 years in RCH liver and cardiac transplant recipients.
- The most important characteristic in validation will be superior predictive performance than achieved in clinical practice. In addition, precision and bias in the transplant-organ specific model to predict the next tacrolimus concentration will be assessed by mean prediction error (MPE%) and mean absolute percentage error (MAPE)[86], where $Conc_{pred}$ is the model predicted concentration and $Conc_{obs}$ is the observed concentration:

$$MPE\% = median\left(100\% \times \left(\frac{Conc_{pred} - Conc_{Obs}}{Conc_{Obs}}\right)\right)$$

Equation 1

$$MAPE = median\left(100\% \times ABS\left(\frac{Conc_{pred} - Conc_{Obs}}{Conc_{Obs}}\right)\right)$$

Equation 2

In clinical practice, broadly proposed measures of bias and precision deemed clinically acceptable for TDM are MPE% ±15-20% and MAPE ≤20%, respectively [87] .

2. METHODS: PARTICIPANTS, INTERVENTIONS, OUTCOMES

2.1. STUDY SETTING

BRUNO-PIC will be conducted at a single tertiary institute in Victoria, Australia, enrolling children undergoing SOT (either kidney, liver or heart) at the RCH.

2.2. ELIGIBILITY CRITERIA

Inclusion criteria

- Age 1-18 years of age
- Heart OR Liver OR Kidney Transplant recipients
- Amenable to venepuncture and blood draw (for prospective arm only)
- Participant and/or parent consent to the study (for prospective arm only)

Exclusion criteria

- Previous liver transplant.
- Lung OR Intestinal transplant.
- Insufficient time before transplant for pharmacogenomic analysis (for prospective arm only)
- Immunosuppressant regimen not containing tacrolimus or using slow-release tacrolimus (e.g. Advagraf XL Brand).
- Participant has a known hypersensitivity to tacrolimus and/or its formulation.

2.3. INTERVENTIONS

Initial dose

Initial dose in BRUNO-PIC will use allometric size scaling from adult dose. Subsequently, the effect of genotype will be multiplied by the allometric scaled dose. The effect of genotype was derived from CPIC and from a review of popPK literature (see below subheading, justification for initial dose size and Supplementary File 2).

For size scaling, with FFM as size descriptor[88 89] size scaling from adult dose is calculated as follows:

$$DoseRate_{Child} = DoseRate_{Adult} \times \left({FFM_{child}}/{FFM_{STD}} \right)^{3/4}$$

where FFM_{STD} is 56.1 kg, based on a 70 kg 176 cm male adult[38 89].

The CYP3A4 and CYP3A5 variants will be used to calculate differences in tacrolimus clearance and bioavailability, used with other patient factors, to predict doses to achieve the desired target. Based

on the literature for CYP3A5 [38] and CYP3A4 [22 90], the differences in tacrolimus clearance and drug dose are as follows:

- CYP3A4 no *22 allele present & CYP3A5 non-expressor: No change
- CYP3A4 homozygous or heterozygous for *22: Dose x 0.742
- CYP3A5 expressor (normal or intermediate metaboliser): Dose x 1.585 (fCL/F=1.3/0.82)
- CYP3A4 homozygous or heterozygous for *22 allele with CYP3A5 expressor (normal or intermediate metaboliser): Dose x 1.176 (fCL=1.5850.742)

*where fCL is the fractional change in clearance relative to CYP3A4 no *22 allele present with CYP3A5 non-expressor*

Tacrolimus is administered twice daily, around 8am and 8pm. The BRUNO-PIC first dose should commence following transplantation as soon as able and/or consistent with clinical unit guidelines. In living donor kidney transplantation tacrolimus commences on day-3, and thus if available the BRUNO-PIC first dose may commence earlier (note the dose immediately prior to transplant is 50% of maintenance dose, given the known concentration-dependent vasoconstrictive effect of tacrolimus on renal microvasculature[91].

Justification for initial dose size

Allometric scaling more accurately describes the relationship between size and drug clearance compared to e.g. linear functions (mg/kg), as well as having robust theoretic underpinnings[88 92]. For tacrolimus, FFM is the best size descriptor used with allometric scaling[38].

The initial dose will then be proportionally adjusted based on CYP3A4 and CYP3A5 genotype. NextDose offers these choices for genotype which are relevant to tacrolimus:

- CYP3A4 Homozygous or heterozygous for *22 (e.g. *1/*22, *22/*22)
- CYP3A4 No *22 allele (e.g. *1/*1)
- CYP3A5 Normal or intermediate metaboliser (e.g. *1/*1, *1/*3)
- CYP3A5 Poor metaboliser (e.g. *3/*3, *6/*7)

Of note, although both *CYP3A5**6 and *7 is rare in the population, they result in nonfunctional protein, and their impact on tacrolimus clearance and dose-adjusted trough concentrations is therefore presumed to be equivalent to *3 [51], therefore treated here as functionally equivalent to *3 for dose adjustments.

Subsequent dosing

Subsequent dosing will be by Bayesian estimation using NextDose. Bayesian forecasting of individual PK is a statistical process that leverages an individual's characteristics, measured concentrations and dosing schedule with a previously developed popPK model that describes the drugs compartmental kinetics and quantifies PK parameter variability and the covariates that influence them. Maximum likelihood estimation is used to determine the "best fit" concentration time course to observed concentrations and thus predict the individuals drug clearance. This allows determination of the dose required to achieve target concentration.

For BRUNO-PIC, DD0 refers to the *first day* of tacrolimus dosing, excluding any tacrolimus dosing prior to the day of transplantation. In kidney transplantation, DTX0 is refers to the day of transplantation. This difference is stipulated as post-transplant tacrolimus dosing (DD0) is delayed for several days post day of transplant (DTX0) in liver transplant recipients.

Tacrolimus concentrations will be measured in routine biochemistry samples per clinical unit protocol. On DD4, BRUNO-PIC dose adjustment in the individual based on drug concentration measurements will commence. On this day there will also be additional samples for NextDose individualisation: immediately pre-dose, then, 1 h, 2 h, and 3 h after the morning dose. The time of sampling (to the closest minute) should be recorded. Samples should be sent to the lab for measurement after each sample is taken. These additional samples for AUC estimation, taken DD4, week 3 and week 8, are the only blood samples taken outside of standard of care, falling within bounds of acceptable sampling volume for clinical research [93].

A unique patient identifier, date of birth (or current age), sex and genotype along with time associated dose and observations (such as weight, concomitant steroid use, transplant date) are recorded in NextDose. The predicted dose as per NextDose will be communicated with the transplant treatment team via phone, secure chat with confirmation of receipt, or in-person. Predicted doses, along with graphs of predicted and observed concentrations, and dosing recommendations, will be documented in the electronic medical record (EMR).

Target concentration

The NextDose target concentration will be to an average steady state concentration *(Cssavg).* The proposed concentration target for *Cssavg* is obtained by dividing AUC_{ssDI} by the dosing interval, e.g. 12 h for twice daily dosing. The acceptable range for Cssavg is 80-125% of *Cssavg*.

The *Cssavg* target is derived from the unit-specific therapeutic window. The derivation of this conversion is expanded upon in subsequent section.

An example conversion of Csstrough target to Cssavg target is outlined in Table 1 below, for kidney transplant recipients.

Kidney Tx	**HCT non-standardized**					**HCT45**		
Post month	**Ctrough low**	**Ctrough target**	**Ctrough high**	**Equiv. AUC_{0-12h}[a]**	**Equiv. Cavgss[b]**	**Trough target[c]**	**AUC_{0-12h} target**	**Cavgss target[c]**
M1	8	10	12	175	14.6	13.6	240	20
M2	6	8	10	140	11.7	10.9	180	15
M3	6	7	8	122.5	10.2	9	158	13.125

[a]See Suppl File 2 for determination AUC from Ctrough

[b]Equal to AUC0-12h/12

[c]HCTnonstd multiplied by 45/33 (month 1) or 45/35 (month 2)

Table 1: *Conversion from protocol Ctrough target to Cavgss.* Abbreviations: AUC: area under curve; C: concentration; M:month; Tx: transplant.

Justification for tacrolimus concentration target

Bayesian uses a 'target concentration intervention' [8] approach to maximise time within the acceptable concentration range. The target concentration for time-post transplant will be derived from the mid-point of the unit-specific therapeutic window for Csstrough concentration. It will then be converted to the equivalent Cssavg (the latter equal to the AUC_{ssDI} divided by the dosing interval). Mechanistically this should reduce the risk of adverse effects in CYP3A5 expressers due to unnecessary overexposure [53 79].

To determine the appropriate AUC (and *Cssavg* target), we looked to available exposure-response data and consensus statements. However, this was supplemented by targeted literature review to strengthen empiric evidence supportive of exposure targets, which proved consistent with consensus exposure targets.

Specifically, we extracted studies with substantial datasets including both Csstrough and AUC concentrations to assess the relationship between the central tendency of the two parameters, using weighted average to determine typical AUC and thus Cssavg at target Css_0 concentrations. This represents the exposure (AUCssDI) seen in the average individual when dose is adjusted to target Css_0, i.e. the AUCss measured in current practice.

Table 2 shows weighted average values (not standardised to HCT-45) indicating that a "raw" AUC_{0-12} value of 175.6 mcg/L.h is the typical exposure associated with a "raw" Ctrough of 10 mcg/L. This aligns well with published expert opinion (175 mcg/L.h being the mid-point of proposed window of 150-200 mcg/L.h) [15]) and published precedence e.g. Meziyerh et al [61] with 10-year experience of AUC-guided dosing in 968 adult kidney transplant recipients (tacrolimus AUC_{0-12h} goal of 160-180 mcg/L.h (mid-point 170 mcg/L.h).

Finally, these HCT45 AUC values are divided by 12 to estimate the equivalent HCT45 Cssavg. The table value of 19.96 mcg/L is used to propose a target HCT45 Cssavg of 20 mcg/L.

Source	N (profiles)	Csstrough	Csstrough (HCT45)	AUC0-12	AUC at Csstrough 10 mcg/L	Cssavg (HCT45)
Saint-Marcoux 2013 [48]	113	7.5	10.2	152.0	202.7	23.0
Saint-Marcoux 2013 [48]	95	12.5	17.0	218.0	174.4	19.8
Scholten 2005 [62]	33	11.9	16.2	181.0	152.1	17.3
Braun 2001 [94]	20	9.3	12.7	159.3	171.3	19.5
Kuypers 2004 [95]	100	10.3	14.0	168.5	163.6	18.6
Kuypers 2004 [95]	100	9.0	12.3	154.7	171.9	19.5
Wlodarczyk 2009 [96]	32	10.1	13.8	180.7	178.6	20.3
Wlodarczyk 2009 [96]	32	10.0	13.7	171.8	171.5	19.5
Wlodarczyk 2009 [96]	32	12.1	16.4	191.3	158.6	18.0
Niokka 2012 [97]	47	9.3	12.7	164.8	177.2	20.1
Sum or weighted average	**604**	**10.2**	**13.9**	**174.2**	**175.6**	
Weighted average, HCT45					**239.5**	**19.96**

Table 2: Literature values and weighted average Cavgss target. Abbreviations: AUC: area under curve; C: concentration; HCT: haematocrit; ss: steady state.

Finally, the target concentration was standardised to a haematocrit of 45% (HCT45) to account for changes in whole blood concentration with HCT at the same unbound tacrolimus concentration. Therapeutic target concentrations have typically been derived from whole blood tacrolimus

concentrations unstandardised for HCT. The HCT seen in the early post-kidney transplant period of 33% [38] may be used to standardise literature value to a HCT of 45%. This source of between-occasion variability also applies to an individual's HCT and can be accounted for in NextDose by using the measured HCT to interpret measured concentrations. The use of tacrolimus standardised concentrations has been shown to improve target attainment [41].

Retrospective cohort ('standard of care' tacrolimus dosing)

The retrospective cohort represent standard of care dosing. This involves linear weight-based dosing (mg/kg) followed by empiric dose adjustment to achieve *Csstrough* concentrations within a 'therapeutic window' [8].

2.4. OUTCOMES

Co-primary outcome

- Proportion of cohorts with tacrolimus concentration within 80-125% of concentration target:
  - On post-transplant dosing day 4 (DD4) - within 80-125% of Csstrough target
  - On DD4, Wk 3 & Wk 8 - within 80-125% of Cavgss target (Cavgss predicted based on Ctrough within the retrospective cohort)

Secondary outcomes

- Median time to acceptable range (80-125% of Ctrough target and Cssavg) in the immediate post-transplant period.
- Time within therapeutic range (80-125% of Cssavg) in the first 8-weeks post-transplant
- Number of dose adjustments of tacrolimus based on TDM and/or Bayesian.
- Safety of genotype-informed Bayesian dosing, including description of number of clinical outcomes: rejection, donor-specific antibody formation; tacrolimus toxicities of new onset diabetes after transplantation.
- Feasibility of genotype-informed Bayesian dosing and barriers to implementation

Justification for outcome measures

Highly effective immunosuppression in the early post-transplant period has led to low rates of hard outcomes early post-transplant (acute rejection, graft loss, death), albeit with suboptimal long-term outcomes. In addition, despite short-term gains, the low prevalence of hard endpoints has made testing of new interventions difficult, with very large numbers required for power to detect superiority[3 16]. This has led to academic and now regulatory calls [98] for innovative approaches including surrogate biomarkers of long-term outcome [98].

However, as outlined in **Error! Reference source not found.**0background, robust data links tacrolimus underexposure and acute rejection, as well as time not in acceptable range in the first 6 months post-transplant and negative short and long-term outcomes (rejection, *de novo* DSA formation, graft loss), with clear and causal mechanistic explanation. Thus, evidence for superior tacrolimus concentration control, with increased time in acceptable range, can reasonably be extrapolated to better long-term outcomes.

2.5. PARTICIPANT TIMELINE

Once the eligibility of the participant is confirmed and they can enrol to the study, a blood sample will be sent for genotyping via a targeted gene panel looking at *CYP3A4* and *CYP3A5* as described in 3.1. A report is generated and made available at least 24 hours before transplant to be eligible to participate in the study. The assessments and data collection will be taken at set time points over an 8-week period post-transplantation (Table 3). The flow diagram for BRUNO-PIC study is shown in Figure 1.

Evaluation	Screening and Eligibility	Consent and Enrolment	DTO	DT1	DT4	DT21	DT56
TIME POINT at Week	**-4 to -12**	**-4 to -1**		**1**	**1**	**3**	**8**
Eligibility criteria	**X**						
Informed Consent		**X**					
Baseline Data		**X**					
Medication History		**X**	At all timepoints				
Blood Test for PGx testing*		**X**					

Add new participant to NextDose and enter details as specified in 2.3 and Sup File 4. Add new participant to REDCap Database and enter details as described in Supp File 4		**X**					
Additional* Tacrolimus concentrations on D4, W3 and W8: 4-point AUC; trough, +1h, +2h, +3h post tacrolimus dose					**X**	**X**	**X**
Record observations and tacrolimus dose and concentration#				Daily from DT0 to DT56			
Use NextDose to predict tacrolimus dose *					Daily from DD4 to DD56		

Table 3: Overview of BRUNO-PIC study visits and timepoints

#For Retrospective arm: Tacrolimus doses, adjustments and concentrations will be taken from the EMR. If data is missing on D4, D21 or D56 timepoints, +2day (on D4) or ±7days (from D4 to D56) will be used. Any time points not within this range will be deemed as "lost to follow-up".

*For Prospective arm: Tacrolimus doses, adjustments and concentrations will be recorded from the EMR at set time points and as per transplant policy. This includes daily tacrolimus concentrations in the early post-transplant weeks.

NOTE: DT0: Day post-transplant 0 (day 0 is the day of transplant), DD0 is the first dosing day of tacrolimus -. For kidney transplantation, DD0 will be same as DT0.



Figure 1: BRUNO-PIC study flow diagram. Abbreviations: CYP: cytochrome P450; DD0: Day of first tacrolimus dose where day 0 is the day of the first post-transplant dose; EMR: electronic medical record; SOT: solid-organ transplant.

* For Retrospective arm: Tacrolimus doses, adjustments and concentrations will be taken from the EMR. If data is missing on D4, D21 or D56 timepoints, +2day (on D4) or ±7days (from D4 to D56) will be used. Any time points that are missing will be deemed as "lost to follow-up".

For Prospective arm: Tacrolimus doses, adjustments and concentrations will be recorded from the EMR at set time points and as per transplant policy.

2.6. SAMPLE SIZE ESTIMATION

The sample size was calculated based on comparing proportion of participants within each group with a Ctrough concentration within therapeutic range on day 4 post transplantation. Prior studies in adult kidney transplant recipients have shown 54% vs 24%[99], 54.8% vs 20.8% [42] and 58% vs 37.4% [22], of patients had a tacrolimus Ctrough within target range on Day 3-5 when treated with the standard, bodyweight-based dosing vs a dosing algorithm. We assumed 27% of the retrospective control cohort would have a tacrolimus Ctrough within target range on DD4. 165 participants (120 control and 45 intervention participants) would provide us 80% power to detect a risk difference of 24% assuming a two-sided alpha of 0.05.

2.7. RECRUITMENT

Clinical trial assistants or academic pharmacists will screen eligible participants in the outpatient or inpatient departments who are approaching the need for kidney, liver or heart transplantation. No financial incentives will be provided to trial investigators or participants for enrolment in the recruitment period.

For the retrospective cohort, eligible individuals who underwent a SOT – liver, kidney, or heart – over a 5-year period will be extracted from the EMR.

3. METHODS: DATA COLLECTION, MANAGEMENT, ANALYSIS

3.1. DATA COLLECTION

Data will be collected in an identifiable manner. Participants will then be allocated a unique individual identifier prior to their de-identified data being added to the database. If any data is removed from the REDCap database, the patient's identifiable information will be removed, and the unique individual identifier will be applied to the data prior to extraction. Although stored information will be de-identified it will be re-identifiable to delegated members of the study team for data entry and integrity purposes.

Pharmacogenomic sequencing and diplotype interpretation.

Genotyping: Participants in the prospective (intervention) arm will undergo genotyping using Illumina's genome-wide genotyping array (Infinium Global Screening Array). Pre-transplant genotyping will test for *CYP3A5* *3, *6, *7, *8 and *9 alleles, and will test for *CYP3A4**22 only (with *CYP3A4**1 reported if no variant corresponding to *22 was present). The results for *CYP3A4* and *CYP3A5* will be automatically extracted from the array data using an in-house program. The determined diplotype for *CYP3A5* will be matched with the predicted phenotype using the CPIC proposed genotype-to-phenotype translation table. The assignment of the phenotype is outlined in the CPIC guidelines[51]. In addition, influence of *CYP3A4* will be incorporated based on recent literature and interventional trials, see section 2.3 and Supplementary File 2 for detail.

3.2. DATA MANAGEMENT

On-site storage.

All data is protected within Murdoch Children's Research Institute (MCRI) using the REDCap database by a triple encryption process between the remote user, the server and the REDCap Database. No data can leave the database in an identifiable format. All data extraction is de-identified for all users at all times; thus privacy and confidentiality will be maintained.

All data stored on the REDCap database will be archived for at least 15-years post-trial completion or until child aged 25 years (whichever is later). Following that time, all information that was collected will be securely destroyed.

All paper files and consents will be kept locked securely in a research office.

Data imported into NextDose

The NextDose server and database are located at the University of Otago, New Zealand. The server cybersecurity and information privacy have been approved by the University of Otago as being suitable for storing identifiable personal and clinical information. By design, there is no expiry date for patient data because it may be used for patient care after the clinical study is completed.

Data will be extracted from the NextDose database in a patient non-identifiable format. There is a numeric key in the extracted data that can be used to link data to a specific patient in the NextDose database if required if there are data inconsistencies or missing data. The extracted data will be

transferred to a University of Auckland research server for data analysis using the Globus encrypted file transfer system.

Governance for Data Management and reporting

The Principal Investigators are responsible for the design and conduct of the trial, preparation of protocol and revisions, preparation of case report forms (CRF) within REDCap, organising steering committee meetings, managing the clinical trials office, publishing study reports and membership of the trial management group (TMG).

TMG consists of the Principal Investigators (RC and DM), academic Pharmacist/study coordinator (DK) and associate investigators (TS, JK, JM, EB, NH). The TMG will contribute to the organisation of Pharmacogenomic Steering Committee (PSC) meetings and will provide annual risk reports to Human Research Ethics Committee (HREC) and Melbourne Clinical Trials Committee (MCTC) and will assess adverse events and serious unexpected adverse events (SUSAR) with appropriate reporting to HREC and MCTC. They are also responsible for maintenance of the database, budget administration, HREC updates and amendments.

Data Endpoints and Databank Guidelines

Data endpoints to be recorded in the BRUNO-PIC study database are described in Supplemental File 4 as well as databank guidelines.

3.3. STATISTICS

Outcomes

Comparison between the intervention prospective arm and the control group (retrospective historical comparator) will be utilised for analyses where comparable data is available (primary outcomes a, b; secondary outcomes a, b, c). We will use a stabilised inverse probability weighting (IPW) approach with robust standard errors to control for potential bias between the “exposure” groups (i.e. NextDose (intervention) vs retrospective control cohort). IPW is an extension of the propensity score method used to summarise the conditional probability of assignment to an exposure. The weights are the inverse probability of assigning an exposure derived from a logistic model with group as the dependent variable and observed patient-level characteristics as the independent variables. These will include factors that may influence tacrolimus concentrations,

including demographic variables (age, sex), use of drugs known to interact with tacrolimus, presence of comorbidities known to influence transplant outcomes, presence of liver dysfunction, height, weight, prednisolone dose in mg, and HCT levels (all measured on day of transplant D0). We will stratify by type of solid organ transplant (heart, liver or kidney). Stabilisation is accomplished by multiplying the "exposure" weights (separately) by a constant, equal to the expected value of being in the intervention or control groups. Each child is weighted by the inverse of the estimated probability of the exposure received. We will then use IPW regression models weighted with exposure to estimate the adjusted associations between exposure and each outcome.

The co-primary outcome analysis will compare:

1. the proportion of participants with a Ctrough concentration within acceptable range on DD4 between groups will be made using a risk difference, estimated using IPW logistic regression with marginalisation, adjusted for SOT type and other factors known to influence tacrolimus concentrations presented with its 95% confidence interval (CI) and p-value.
2. the proportion of participants with a Cssavg concentration within acceptable range at DD4, week 3 and week 8 will be made using a risk difference estimated using a marginalised IPW mixed-effects logistic regression model including a random effect for the intercept (to allow for clustering of repeated measures within participants), and a fixed effect for dosing type (control vs intervention), time-period (DD4, week3, week8), SOT type (stratification factor) and other factors known to influence tacrolimus concentrations. Ctrough concentrations are only available in the control group, thus Cssavg will be calculated using a maximum *a posteriori* (MAP) approach, using the 4-point tacrolimus concentration profile on days DD4, week3 and week8, participant clinical covariate information and the published popPK model within NextDose.

For secondary outcomes, time to an acceptable Ctrough target and time to an acceptable Cssavg target we will compare groups using a hazard ratio and 95% confidence interval estimated similarly to primary outcomes via a IPW adjusted Cox proportional hazards model. Between-group difference in mean percentage time within therapeutic range over the first 8-weeks will be compared using IPW adjusted linear regression. For secondary outcomes where Cssavg is used, in the control group Cssavg will be calculated using Ctrough concentration by MAP estimation as above.

4. Methods: Monitoring

4.1. DATA MONITORING

Trial Management Group (TMG)

The Principal Investigator is responsible for supervising any individual or party to whom they have delegated tasks at the trial site. They must provide continuous supervision and documentation of their oversight. To meet this GCP requirement, a small group will be responsible for the day-to-day management of the trial and will include at a minimum a PI, and the Academic Pharmacist and Research Assistant. The group will closely review all aspects of the conduct and progress of the trial, ensuring that there is a forum for identifying and addressing issues. Meetings must be minuted with attendees listed, pertinent emails retained, and phone calls documented.

Pharmacogenomic Steering Committee (PSC)

The PSC comprising of the Study PI, Academic Pharmacist, Clinical Pharmacologist (as required) and Clinical Bioinformatician will meet fortnightly to support study progression. The meeting will focus on enrolment numbers, pharmacogenomic results, scheduling of upcoming transplants and study assessments of enrolled participants. To ensure data quality and regulatory compliance, the PSC will review any discrepancies identified during routine data quality completeness. These checks are conducted fortnightly to assess the accuracy and completeness of data entered into the REDCap and NextDose databases. They serve to identify missing or incomplete study timepoints and data entry errors, helping to maintain protocol adherence and overall data integrity.

4.2. DATA SAFETY MONITORING

An adverse event will be defined as any untoward medical occurrence in a subject without regard to the possibility of a causal relationship. For the purposes of this study, the following occurrences will be regarded as an AE; Bruising due to having blood test performed, vomiting or spitting out of tacrolimus (within 2 hours of administration), Allergic reaction to tacrolimus (within 2 hours of administration), measured tacrolimus concentrations above or below the upper end of the acceptable range, signs of rejection and/or toxicity (signs or symptoms) as a result of the prescribed dose.

Signs of toxicity can include nephrotoxicity, nausea, tremor, and elevated liver enzyme levels.

Safety monitoring will be coordinated by TMG chaired by PIs and the study research assistant. Reported adverse events, assessed and classified individually and in consultation, will be subject to

clinical and scientific judgment as per the TMG. These reports should be submitted using the trial Expedited Safety Report Form, Supplementary File 2.

4.3. AUDITING

Auditing is performed fortnightly. Auditing ensures compliance with enrolment, release of pharmacogenomic report, completion of all timepoints, and completion of study endpoints. Reports on study progress are due yearly to the Ethics Committee of The Sydney Children's Hospital.

5. Ethics and dissemination

5.1. RESEARCH ETHICS APPROVAL

The ethics approval of the trial has been obtained from the Sydney Children's Ethics Committee (2023/ETH02699). A letter of authorisation has been obtained from the RGO, from the Royal Children's hospital (SSA/105019/RCHM-2024).

5.2. PROTOCOL AMENDMENTS

This study will be conducted in compliance with the current version of the protocol. Any change to the protocol document or participant information and consent form that affects the scientific intent, study design, participant safety, or may affect a participant's willingness to continue participation in the study is considered an amendment and therefore will be written and filed as an amendment to the protocol and/or informed consent form. All such amendments will be submitted to the HREC, for approval prior to being implemented and notification sent to RCH, for site specific approval.

5.3. CONSENT

The study coordinator will identify potential participants from EMR and transplant team meetings. Eligible participants and their parents/caregivers will be approached during appointments or hospital stays. The coordinator will explain the study in detail, answer any questions, and, if interest is expressed, conduct an eligibility screen. Parents or caregivers of participants who meet the inclusion criteria will then receive the Participant/Parent Guardian Information Sheet and Consent Form (Supplementary Files 3) to review.

Waiver of consent has been granted for the retrospective cohort, per the National Statement on Ethical Conduct in Human Research

5.4. CONFIDENTIALITY

Participant identity and clinical information, along with all trial-related documents and data, will be strictly confidential and accessible only to the PI, research staff, MCRI, and its authorised agents. No information concerning the trial, or the data will be released to any unauthorised third party, without prior written approval of the sponsoring institution. MCRI may inspect participant medical and pharmacy records with hospital consent. All evaluation forms will use Participant IDs for anonymity.

5.5. DECLARATION OF INTERESTS

There are no identified financial or other competing interest for any investigators participating in this trial.

5.6. ACCESS TO DATA

The PI and steering committee will oversee the intra-study sharing process, at the end of the trial. The statistician will be given access to cleaned data and complete the analysis of the primary endpoint.

5.7. DISSEMINATION POLICY

Trial results

At the conclusion of the trial, participants will be emailed the trial results to provide an overview of the findings.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

RC is supported by the Kids Cancer Project, The Royal Children's Hospital Foundation, Victorian Paediatric Cancer Consortium, Medical Research Future Fund and holds a Murdoch Children's Research Institute (MCRI) Clinician Scientist Tier 2 Fellowship and VESKI FAIR Fellowship. D.A.E is a member of the Novo Nordisk Foundation Center for Stem Cell Medicine, supported by a Novo Nordisk Foundation grant number NNF21C073729 and is supported by National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia, and The Medical Research Future Fund. MCRI is supported by the Victorian Government's Operational Infrastructure Support Program. DK is supported by Medical Research Future Fund (MRF/2024900). CM is supported by a Melbourne University Research Training Program Strategic Scholarship. RSK is supported by a Fellowship from the National Health and Medical Research Council of Australia (APP2033152). The Chair in Genomic Medicine awarded to

JC is generously supported by The Royal Children's Hospital Foundation. NextDose is hosted by the University of Otago. New Zealand.

CONTRIBUTUTORS

DK, DM and RC wrote the main manuscript text; DK prepared the figures and DK and DM prepared the tables. All authors contributed to refinement of the study protocol and approved the final manuscript.

FUNDING

BRUNO-PIC is funded by the 2023 Medical Research Future Fund – Genomics Health Future Mission (MARVEL-PIC (MRF/2024900). This funding source had no role in the design of this study and will not have any role during its execution, analyses, interpretation of the data, or decision to submit results.

DISCLAIMER

The funding source had no role in the design of this study and will not have any role during its execution, analysis, interpretation of the data, or decision to submit results.

COMPETING INTEREST

None declared.

PATIENT CONSENT FOR PUBLICATION

Not applicable.

PATIENT AND PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT

Patients or the public were not involved in the design, or conduct, or reporting, or dissemination plans of our research.

6.0 SUPPLEMENTARY

Supplementary 1: SPIRIT checklist

Supplementary 2: Protocol

Supplementary 3: Informed Consent Forms (PICFS)- Participant and Parent/Guardian

Supplementary 4: Data Endpoint and Databank Guidelines

REFERENCES

1. Cooper JE. Evaluation and Treatment of Acute Rejection in Kidney Allografts. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 2020;15(3):430-38. doi: 10.2215/cjn.11991019 [published Online First: 2020/02/19]
2. Neuberger JM, Bechstein WO, Kuypers DR, et al. Practical Recommendations for Long-term Management of Modifiable Risks in Kidney and Liver Transplant Recipients: A Guidance Report and Clinical Checklist by the Consensus on Managing Modifiable Risk in Transplantation (COMMIT) Group. *Transplantation* 2017;101(4S Suppl 2):S1-S56. doi: 10.1097/TP.0000000000001651
3. O'Connell PJ, Kuypers DR, Mannon RB, et al. Clinical Trials for Immunosuppression in Transplantation: The Case for Reform and Change in Direction. *Transplantation* 2017;101(7):1527-34. doi: 10.1097/tp.0000000000001648 [published Online First: 2017/02/17]
4. Abdel-Kahaar E, Winter S, Tremmel R, et al. The impact of CYP3A4* 22 on tacrolimus pharmacokinetics and outcome in clinical practice at a single kidney transplant center. *Frontiers in genetics* 2019;10:871.
5. Ekberg H, Tedesco-Silva H, Demirbas A, et al. Reduced exposure to calcineurin inhibitors in renal transplantation. *The New England journal of medicine* 2007;357(25):2562-75. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa067411 [published Online First: 2007/12/21]
6. Riva N, Woillard JB, Distefano M, et al. Identification of Factors Affecting Tacrolimus Trough Levels in Latin American Pediatric Liver Transplant Patients. *Liver Transpl* 2019;25(9):1397-407. doi: 10.1002/lt.25495 [published Online First: 2019/05/19]
7. Barbarino JM, Staatz CE, Venkataramanan R, et al. PharmGKB summary: cyclosporine and tacrolimus pathways. *Pharmacogenetics and genomics* 2013;23(10):563.
8. Holford N, Ma G, Metz D. TDM is dead. Long live TCI! *British Journal of Clinical Pharmacology*;n/a(n/a) doi: 10.1111/bcp.14434
9. Israni AK, Riad SM, Leduc R, et al. Tacrolimus trough levels after month 3 as a predictor of acute rejection following kidney transplantation: a lesson learned from DeKAF Genomics. *Transplant international : official journal of the European Society for Organ Transplantation* 2013;26(10):982-9. doi: 10.1111/tri.12155 [published Online First: 2013/07/25]
10. Wiebe C, Rush DN, Nevins TE, et al. Class II Eplet Mismatch Modulates Tacrolimus Trough Levels Required to Prevent Donor-Specific Antibody Development. *Journal of the American Society of Nephrology : JASN* 2017;28(11):3353-62. doi: 10.1681/ASN.2017030287 [published Online First: 2017/07/20]
11. Beland MA, Lapointe I, Noel R, et al. Higher calcineurin inhibitor levels predict better kidney graft survival in patients with de novo donor-specific anti-HLA antibodies: a cohort study. *Transplant international : official journal of the European Society for Organ Transplantation* 2017;30(5):502-09. doi: 10.1111/tri.12934 [published Online First: 2017/02/12]
12. Wadström J, Ericzon B-G, Halloran PF, et al. Advancing Transplantation: New Questions, New Possibilities in Kidney and Liver Transplantation. *Transplantation* 2017;101(2):S1-S42. doi: 10.1097/tp.0000000000001563
13. Davis S, Gralla J, Klem P, et al. Lower tacrolimus exposure and time in therapeutic range increase the risk of de novo donor-specific antibodies in the first year of kidney transplantation. *Am J Transplant* 2018;18(4):907-15. doi: 10.1111/ajt.14504 [published Online First: 2017/09/20]
14. Girerd S, Schikowski J, Girerd N, et al. Impact of reduced exposure to calcineurin inhibitors on the development of de novo DSA: a cohort of non-immunized first kidney graft recipients between 2007 and 2014. *BMC nephrology* 2018;19(1):232-32. doi: 10.1186/s12882-018-1014-2

15. Brunet M, van Gelder T, Åsberg A, et al. Therapeutic Drug Monitoring of Tacrolimus-Personalized Therapy: Second Consensus Report. *Ther Drug Monit* 2019;41(3):261-307. doi: 10.1097/ftd.0000000000000640 [published Online First: 2019/05/03]
16. Neuberger JM, Bechstein WO, Kuypers DR, et al. Practical recommendations for long-term management of modifiable risks in kidney and liver transplant recipients: a guidance report and clinical checklist by the consensus on managing modifiable risk in transplantation (COMMIT) group. *Transplantation* 2017;101(4S):S1-S56.
17. Barraclough KA, Staatz CE, Johnson DW, et al. Kidney transplant outcomes are related to tacrolimus, mycophenolic acid and prednisolone exposure in the first week. *Transplant International* 2012;25(11):1182-93.
18. Hu R, Barratt DT, Coller JK, et al. Is There a Temporal Relationship Between Trough Whole Blood Tacrolimus Concentration and Acute Rejection in the First 14 Days After Kidney Transplantation? *Therapeutic Drug Monitoring* 2019;41(4)
19. Cheng F, Li Q, Cui Z, et al. Tacrolimus Concentration Is Effectively Predicted Using Combined Clinical and Genetic Factors in the Perioperative Period of Kidney Transplantation and Associated with Acute Rejection. *J Immunol Res* 2022;2022:3129389. doi: 10.1155/2022/3129389 [published Online First: 2022/09/20]
20. Nguyen TVA, Nguyen HD, Nguyen TLH, et al. Higher tacrolimus trough levels and time in the therapeutic range are associated with the risk of acute rejection in the first month after r enal transplantation. *BMC Nephrology* 2023;24(1) doi: 10.1186/s12882-023-03188-0
21. D J, D S, N L, et al. Faster Time-to-Therapeutic Tacrolimus Level is Associated with Lower R isk of Cellular Rejection Early after Heart Transplantation. *The Journal of Heart and Lung Transplantation* 2020 doi: 10.1016/j.healun.2020.01.101
22. Francke MI, Andrews LM, Le HL, et al. Avoiding Tacrolimus Underexposure and Overexposure with a Dosing Algorithm for Renal Transplant Recipients: A Single Arm Prospective Intervention Trial. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 2021;110(1):169-78. doi: 10.1002/cpt.2163 [published Online First: 2021/01/17]
23. Yang H, Sun Y, Yu X, et al. Clinical Impact of the Adaptation of Initial Tacrolimus Dosing to the CYP3A5 Genotype After Kidney Transplantation: Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis of Randomized Controlled Trials. *Clin Pharmacokinet* 2021;60(7):877-85. doi: 10.1007/s40262-020-00955-2 [published Online First: 2021/03/23]
24. Cheng F, Li Q, Cui Z, et al. Tacrolimus Concentration Is Effectively Predicted Using Combined Clinical and Genetic Factors in the Perioperative Period of Kidney Transplantation and Associated with Acute Rejection. *Journal of Immunology Research* 2022
25. !!! INVALID CITATION !!! 24 27-30
26. Leino AD, Park JM, Pasternak AL. Impact of CYP3A5 phenotype on tacrolimus time in therapeutic range and clinical outcomes in pediatric renal and heart transplant recipients. *Pharmacotherapy* 2021;41(8):649-57. doi: 10.1002/phar.2601 [published Online First: 2021/06/16]
27. Song W, Lao Q, Hu J, et al. Lower tacrolimus time in therapeutic range is associated with inferior outcomes in adult liver transplant recipients. *Basic Clin Pharma Tox* 2022;132(1):51-59. doi: 10.1111/bcpt.13803
28. Katada Y, Nakagawa S, Itohara K, et al. Association between time in therapeutic range of tacrolimus blood conc entration and acute rejection within the first three months after lung transplantation. *J Pharm Health Care Sci* 2022;8(1) doi: 10.1186/s40780-022-00256-9
29. Davis S, Gralla J, Klem P, et al. Tacrolimus Intrapatient Variability, Time in Therapeutic Range, and Risk of De Novo Donor-Specific Antibodies. *Transplantation* 2020;104(4):881-87. doi: 10.1097/tp.0000000000002913 [published Online First: 2020/04/01]
30. Lichtenberg S, Rahamimov R, Green H, et al. The incidence of post-transplant cancer among kidney transplant recipients is associated with the level of tacrolimus exposure during the

first year after transplantation. *European journal of clinical pharmacology* 2017;73(7):819-26. doi: 10.1007/s00228-017-2234-2 [published Online First: 2017/03/28]
31. Barreda P, Cañamero L, Boya M, et al. Lower Time in Therapeutic Range Relates to a Worse Kidney Graft Outcome. *Transplant Proc* 2022;54(9):2446-49. doi: 10.1016/j.transproceed.2022.09.013 [published Online First: 20221020]
32. Song W, Lao Q, Hu J, et al. Lower tacrolimus time in therapeutic range is associated with inferior outcomes in adult liver transplant recipients. *Basic Clin Pharmacol Toxicol* 2023;132(1):51-59. doi: 10.1111/bcpt.13803 [published Online First: 20221017]
33. Han A, Jo AJ, Kwon H, et al. Optimum tacrolimus trough levels for enhanced graft survival and safety in kidney transplantation: a retrospective multicenter real-world evidence study. *Int J Surg* 2024;110(10):6711-22. doi: 10.1097/js9.0000000000001800 [published Online First: 20241001]
34. Yin S, Huang Z, Wang Z, et al. Early Monitoring and Subsequent Gain of Tacrolimus Time-In-Therapeutic Range May Improve Clinical Outcomes After Living Kidney Transplantation. *Ther Drug Monit* 2021;43(6):728-35. doi: 10.1097/ftd.0000000000000881
35. Ensor CR, Iasella CJ, Harrigan KM, et al. Increasing tacrolimus time-in-therapeutic range is associated with sup erior one-year outcomes in lung transplant recipients. *American Journal of Transplantation* 2018;18(6):1527-33. doi: 10.1111/ajt.14723
36. Song T, Yin S, Jiang Y, et al. Increasing Time in Therapeutic Range of Tacrolimus in the First Year Predicts Better Outcomes in Living-Donor Kidney Transplantation. *Front Immunol* 2019;10:2912. doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2019.02912 [published Online First: 20191220]
37. Woillard JB, Saint-Marcoux F, Debord J, et al. Pharmacokinetic models to assist the prescriber in choosing the best tacrolimus dose. *Pharmacol Res* 2018;130:316-21. doi: 10.1016/j.phrs.2018.02.016 [published Online First: 2018/02/17]
38. Størset E, Holford N, Hennig S, et al. Improved prediction of tacrolimus concentrations early after kidney transplantation using theory-based pharmacokinetic modelling. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 2014;78(3):509-23. doi: 10.1111/bcp.12361 [published Online First: 2014/10/04]
39. Ekberg H, Mamelok RD, Pearson TC, et al. The challenge of achieving target drug concentrations in clinical trials: experience from the Symphony study. *Transplantation* 2009;87(9):1360-6. doi: 10.1097/TP.0b013e3181a23cb2 [published Online First: 2009/05/09]
40. Leino AD, Park JM, Pasternak AL. Impact of CYP3A5 phenotype on tacrolimus time in therapeutic range and clinical outcomes in pediatric renal and heart transplant recipients. *Pharmacotherapy: The Journal of Human Pharmacology and Drug Therapy* 2021;41(8):649-57. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/phar.2601
41. Størset E, Åsberg A, Skauby M, et al. Improved Tacrolimus Target Concentration Achievement Using Computerized Dosing in Renal Transplant Recipients--A Prospective, Randomized Study. *Transplantation* 2015;99(10):2158-66. doi: 10.1097/tp.0000000000000708 [published Online First: 2015/04/19]
42. Lloberas N, Grinyó JM, Colom H, et al. A prospective controlled, randomized clinical trial of kidney transplant recipients developed personalized tacrolimus dosing using model-based Bayesian Prediction. *Kidney Int* 2023;104(4):840-50. doi: 10.1016/j.kint.2023.06.021 [published Online First: 2023/07/01]
43. !!! INVALID CITATION !!! 30 46
44. Neely M, Jelliffe R. Practical, individualized dosing: 21st century therapeutics and the clinical pharmacometrician. *J Clin Pharmacol* 2010;50(7):842-7. doi: 10.1177/0091270009356572 [published Online First: 2010/02/16]
45. Darwich AS, Polasek TM, Aronson JK, et al. Model-Informed Precision Dosing: Background, Requirements, Validation, Implementation, and Forward Trajectory of Individualizing Drug Therapy. *Annual Review of Pharmacology and Toxicology* 2021;61(1):225-45. doi: 10.1146/annurev-pharmtox-033020-113257

46. Administration TG. Consultation: Proposed clarification of how Clinical Decision Support System software is regulated 2024 [cited 2025 15/04/2025]. Available from: https://consultations.tga.gov.au/tga/clarification-of-how-clinical-decision-support-sys/supporting_documents/Consultation%20Paper%20%20Regulatory%20Clarification%20of%20Clinical%20Decision%20Support%20System%20CDSS%20software%20FINAL.pdf.
47. Marquet P, Cros F, Micallef L, et al. Tacrolimus Bayesian Dose Adjustment in Pediatric Renal Transplant Recipients. *Ther Drug Monit* 2021;43(4):472-80. doi: 10.1097/ftd.0000000000000828 [published Online First: 2020/11/06]
48. Saint-Marcoux F, Woillard JB, Jurado C, et al. Lessons from routine dose adjustment of tacrolimus in renal transplant patients based on global exposure. *Ther Drug Monit* 2013;35(3):322-7. doi: 10.1097/FTD.0b013e318285e779
49. Woillard JB, Debord J, Monchaud C, et al. Population Pharmacokinetics and Bayesian Estimators for Refined Dose Adjustment of a New Tacrolimus Formulation in Kidney and Liver Transplant Patients. *Clin Pharmacokinet* 2017;56(12):1491-98. doi: 10.1007/s40262-017-0533-5 [published Online First: 2017/04/09]
50. Staatz CE, Tett SE. Clinical pharmacokinetics and pharmacodynamics of tacrolimus in solid organ transplantation. *Clin Pharmacokinet* 2004;43(10):623-53. doi: 10.2165/00003088-200443100-00001 [published Online First: 2004/07/13]
51. Birdwell KA, Decker B, Barbarino JM, et al. Clinical Pharmacogenetics Implementation Consortium (CPIC) Guidelines for CYP3A5 Genotype and Tacrolimus Dosing. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 2015;98(1):19-24. doi: 10.1002/cpt.113 [published Online First: 2015/03/25]
52. Aranda JavdA, JN. Yaffe and Aranda's Neonatal and Pediatric Pharmacology: Therapeutic Principles in Practice. 5 ed. Lippincott Williams & Wilkins Wolters Kluwer 2021.
53. van Gelder T, Meziyerh S, Swen JJ, et al. The Clinical Impact of the C0/D Ratio and the CYP3A5 Genotype on Outcome in Tacrolimus Treated Kidney Transplant Recipients. *Frontiers in Pharmacology* 2020;11(1142) doi: 10.3389/fphar.2020.01142
54. Abdullah-Koolmees H, van Keulen AM, Nijenhuis M, et al. Pharmacogenetics Guidelines: Overview and Comparison of the DPWG, CPIC, CPNDS, and RNPGx Guidelines. *Front Pharmacol* 2020;11:595219. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2020.595219 [published Online First: 2021/02/12]
55. Woillard JB, Mourad M, Neely M, et al. Tacrolimus Updated Guidelines through popPK Modeling: How to Benefit More from CYP3A Pre-emptive Genotyping Prior to Kidney Transplantation. *Front Pharmacol* 2017;8:358. doi: 10.3389/fphar.2017.00358 [published Online First: 20170608]
56. Dong Y, Xu Q, Li R, et al. CYP3A7, CYP3A4, and CYP3A5 genetic polymorphisms in recipients rather than donors influence tacrolimus concentrations in the early stages after liver transplantation. *Gene* 2022;809:146007. doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.gene.2021.146007
57. Undre NA. Pharmacokinetics of tacrolimus-based combination therapies. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* 2003;18 Suppl 1:i12-5. doi: 10.1093/ndt/gfg1029 [published Online First: 2003/05/10]
58. Mahalati K, Belitsky P, Sketris I, et al. Neoral monitoring by simplified sparse sampling area under the concentration-time curve: its relationship to acute rejection and cyclosporine nephrotoxicity early after kidney transplantation. *Transplantation* 1999;68(1):55-62. doi: 10.1097/00007890-199907150-00011 [published Online First: 1999/07/31]
59. Undre NA, van Hooff J, Christiaans M, et al. Low systemic exposure to tacrolimus correlates with acute rejection. *Transplant Proc* 1999;31(1-2):296-8. doi: 10.1016/s0041-1345(98)01633-9 [published Online First: 1999/03/20]
60. van Rossum HH, Press RR, den Hartigh J, et al. Point: A call for advanced pharmacokinetic and pharmacodynamic monitoring to guide calcineurin inhibitor dosing in renal transplant recipients. *Clinical chemistry* 2010;56(5):732-5. doi: 10.1373/clinchem.2009.141135 [published Online First: 2010/03/09]

61. Meziyerh S, van Gelder T, Kers J, et al. Tacrolimus and Mycophenolic Acid Exposure Are Associated with Biopsy-Proven Acute Rejection: A Study to Provide Evidence for Longer-Term Target Ranges. *Clinical Pharmacology & Therapeutics* 2023;114(1):192-200. doi: https://doi.org/10.1002/cpt.2915
62. Scholten EM, Cremers SC, Schoemaker RC, et al. AUC-guided dosing of tacrolimus prevents progressive systemic overexposure in renal transplant recipients. *Kidney Int* 2005;67(6):2440-7. doi: 10.1111/j.1523-1755.2005.00352.x [published Online First: 2005/05/11]
63. Villeneuve C, Humeau A, Monchaud C, et al. Better Rejection-Free Survival at Three Years in Kidney Transplant Recipients With Model-Informed Precision Dosing of Mycophenolate Mofetil. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 2024 doi: 10.1002/cpt.3206 [published Online First: 20240219]
64. Haverals L, Roosens L, Wouters K, et al. Does the Tacrolimus Trough Level Adequately Predict Drug Exposure in Patients Requiring a High Tacrolimus Dose? *Transplant Direct* 2023;9(4):e1439. doi: 10.1097/TXD.0000000000001439 [published Online First: 20230329]
65. Woillard JB, Monchaud C, Saint-Marcoux F, et al. Can the Area Under the Curve/Trough Level Ratio Be Used to Optimize Tacrolimus Individual Dose Adjustment? *Transplantation* 2023;107(1):e27-e35. doi: 10.1097/tp.0000000000004405 [published Online First: 2022/12/13]
66. van Gelder T, Gelinck A, Meziyerh S, et al. Therapeutic drug monitoring of tacrolimus after kidney transplantation: trough concentration or area under curve-based monitoring? *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 2024 doi: 10.1111/bcp.16098 [published Online First: 20240606]
67. Rojas L, Neumann I, Herrero MJ, et al. Effect of CYP3A5*3 on kidney transplant recipients treated with tacrolimus: a systematic review and meta-analysis of observational studies. *Pharmacogenomics J* 2015;15(1):38-48. doi: 10.1038/tpj.2014.38 [published Online First: 2014/09/10]
68. Schutte-Nutgen K, Tholking G, Steinke J, et al. Fast Tac Metabolizers at Risk (-) It is Time for a C/D Ratio Calculation. *J Clin Med* 2019;8(5) doi: 10.3390/jcm8050587 [published Online First: 2019/05/01]
69. Trofe-Clark J, Brennan DC, West-Thielke P, et al. Results of ASERTAA, a Randomized Prospective Crossover Pharmacogenetic Study of Immediate-Release Versus Extended-Release Tacrolimus in African American Kidney Transplant Recipients. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2018;71(3):315-26. doi: 10.1053/j.ajkd.2017.07.018 [published Online First: 2017/11/23]
70. Tholking G, Siats L, Fortmann C, et al. Tacrolimus Concentration/Dose Ratio is Associated with Renal Function After Liver Transplantation. *Annals of transplantation* 2016;21:167-79. doi: 10.12659/aot.895898 [published Online First: 2016/03/24]
71. Tholking G, Fortmann C, Koch R, et al. The tacrolimus metabolism rate influences renal function after kidney transplantation. *PloS one* 2014;9(10):e111128. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0111128 [published Online First: 2014/10/24]
72. Egeland EJ, Reisaeter AV, Robertsen I, et al. High tacrolimus clearance - a risk factor for development of interstitial fibrosis and tubular atrophy in the transplanted kidney: a retrospective single-center cohort study. *Transplant international : official journal of the European Society for Organ Transplantation* 2019;32(3):257-69. doi: 10.1111/tri.13356 [published Online First: 2018/09/27]
73. Kwiatkowska E, Kwiatkowski S, Wahler F, et al. C/D Ratio in Long-Term Renal Function. *Transplant Proc* 2019;51(10):3265-70. doi: 10.1016/j.transproceed.2019.08.030 [published Online First: 20191113]
74. Chamoun B, Torres IB, Gabaldón A, et al. Progression of Interstitial Fibrosis and Tubular Atrophy in Low Immuno logical Risk Renal Transplants Monitored by Sequential Surveillance Bi opsies: The Influence of TAC Exposure and Metabolism. *JCM* 2021;10(1):141. doi: 10.3390/jcm10010141

75. Tholking G, Schmidt C, Koch R, et al. Influence of tacrolimus metabolism rate on BKV infection after kidney transplantation. *Scientific reports* 2016;6:32273. doi: 10.1038/srep32273 [published Online First: 2016/08/31]
76. Thölking G, Tosun-Koç F, Jehn U, et al. Improved Kidney Allograft Function after Early Conversion of Fast IR-Tac Metabolizers to LCP-Tac. *J Clin Med* 2022;11(5) doi: 10.3390/jcm11051290 [published Online First: 2022/03/11]
77. Langone A, Steinberg SM, Gedaly R, et al. Switching STudy of Kidney TRansplant PAtients with Tremor to LCP-TacrO (STRATO): an open-label, multicenter, prospective phase 3b study. *Clin Transplant* 2015;29(9):796-805. doi: 10.1111/ctr.12581 [published Online First: 2015/06/27]
78. Taber DJ, Gebregziabher MG, Srinivas TR, et al. African-American race modifies the influence of tacrolimus concentrations on acute rejection and toxicity in kidney transplant recipients. *Pharmacotherapy* 2015;35(6):569-77. doi: 10.1002/phar.1591 [published Online First: 2015/05/27]
79. Schütte-Nütgen K, Thölking G, Steinke J, et al. Fast Tac Metabolizers at Risk ¯ It is Time for a C/D Ratio Calculation. *J Clin Med* 2019;8(5) doi: 10.3390/jcm8050587 [published Online First: 2019/05/01]
80. Zhao CY, Jiao Z, Mao JJ, et al. External evaluation of published population pharmacokinetic models of tacrolimus in adult renal transplant recipients. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 2016;81(5):891-907. doi: 10.1111/bcp.12830 [published Online First: 2015/11/18]
81. Aarons L. Physiologically based pharmacokinetic modelling: a sound mechanistic basis is needed. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 2005;60(6):581-3. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2125.2005.02560.x [published Online First: 2005/11/25]
82. Anderson BJ, Holford NH. Understanding dosing: children are small adults, neonates are immature children. *Archives of disease in childhood* 2013;98(9):737-44. doi: 10.1136/archdischild-2013-303720
83. Germovsek E, Barker CI, Sharland M, et al. Scaling clearance in paediatric pharmacokinetics: All models are wrong, which are useful? *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 2017;83(4):777-90. doi: 10.1111/bcp.13160 [published Online First: 20161202]
84. Nanga TM, Doan TTP, Marquet P, et al. Toward a robust tool for pharmacokinetic-based personalization of treatment with tacrolimus in solid organ transplantation: A model-based meta-analysis approach. *Br J Clin Pharmacol* 2019;85(12):2793-823. doi: 10.1111/bcp.14110 [published Online First: 2019/09/01]
85. Itohara K, Yano I, Nakagawa S, et al. Extrapolation of physiologically based pharmacokinetic model for tacrolimus from renal to liver transplant patients. *Drug Metab Pharmacokinet* 2022;42:100423. doi: 10.1016/j.dmpk.2021.100423 [published Online First: 2021/12/14]
86. Sheiner LB, Beal SL. Some suggestions for measuring predictive performance. *J Pharmacokinet Biopharm* 1981;9(4):503-12. doi: 10.1007/bf01060893 [published Online First: 1981/08/01]
87. Ting LS, Villeneuve E, Ensom MH. Beyond cyclosporine: a systematic review of limited sampling strategies for other immunosuppressants. *Ther Drug Monit* 2006;28(3):419-30. doi: 10.1097/01.ftd.0000211810.19935.44 [published Online First: 2006/06/17]
88. Anderson BJ, Holford NH. Mechanistic basis of using body size and maturation to predict clearance in humans. *Drug Metab Pharmacokinet* 2009;24(1):25-36. doi: 10.2133/dmpk.24.25 [published Online First: 2009/03/03]
89. Janmahasatian S, Duffull SB, Ash S, et al. Quantification of lean bodyweight. *Clin Pharmacokinet* 2005;44(10):1051-65. doi: 10.2165/00003088-200544100-00004 [published Online First: 2005/09/24]
90. Pallet N, Jannot AS, El Bahri M, et al. Kidney transplant recipients carrying the CYP3A4*22 allelic variant have reduced tacrolimus clearance and often reach supratherapeutic tacrolimus concentrations. *Am J Transplant* 2015;15(3):800-5. doi: 10.1111/ajt.13059 [published Online First: 20150114]

91. Textor SC, Wiesner R, Wilson DJ, et al. Systemic and renal hemodynamic differences between FK506 and cyclosporine in liver transplant recipients. *Transplantation* 1993;55(6):1332-9. doi: 10.1097/00007890-199306000-00023 [published Online First: 1993/06/01]
92. Holford NHG, Anderson BJ. Allometric size: The scientific theory and extension to normal fat mass. *Eur J Pharm Sci* 2017;109s:S59-s64. doi: 10.1016/j.ejps.2017.05.056 [published Online First: 2017/05/30]
93. Peplow C, Assfalg R, Beyerlein A, et al. Blood draws up to 3% of blood volume in clinical trials are safe in children. *Acta Paediatr* 2019;108(5):940-44. doi: 10.1111/apa.14607 [published Online First: 2018/10/07]
94. Braun F, Schütz E, Peters B, et al. Pharmacokinetics of tacrolimus primary immunosuppression in kidney transplant recipients. *Transplant Proc* 2001;33(3):2127-8. doi: 10.1016/s0041-1345(01)01970-4 [published Online First: 2001/05/30]
95. Kuypers DR, Claes K, Evenepoel P, et al. Clinical efficacy and toxicity profile of tacrolimus and mycophenolic acid in relation to combined long-term pharmacokinetics in de novo renal allograft recipients. *Clin Pharmacol Ther* 2004;75(5):434-47. doi: 10.1016/j.clpt.2003.12.009 [published Online First: 2004/04/30]
96. Wlodarczyk Z, Squifflet JP, Ostrowski M, et al. Pharmacokinetics for once- versus twice-daily tacrolimus formulations in de novo kidney transplantation: a randomized, open-label trial. *Am J Transplant* 2009;9(11):2505-13. doi: 10.1111/j.1600-6143.2009.02794.x [published Online First: 2009/08/18]
97. Niioka T, Satoh S, Kagaya H, et al. Comparison of pharmacokinetics and pharmacogenetics of once- and twice-daily tacrolimus in the early stage after renal transplantation. *Transplantation* 2012;94(10):1013-9. doi: 10.1097/TP.0b013e31826bc400 [published Online First: 2012/10/18]
98. Administration' USFaD. Endpoints and trial designs to advance drug development in kidney transplantation 2023 [Available from: https://www.fda.gov/drugs/news-events-human-drugs/endpoints-and-trial-designs-advance-drug-development-kidney-transplantation-11092023 accessed March 11 2025.
99. Raj TY, Fernando ME, Srinivasa Prasad ND, et al. Efficacy and Outcomes of CYP3A5 Genotype-Based Tacrolimus Dosing Compared to Conventional Body Weight-based Dosing in Living Donor Kidney Transplant Recipients. *Indian J Nephrol* 2022;32(3):240-46. doi: 10.4103/ijn.IJN_278_20 [published Online First: 2022/07/12]
100. Min S, Papaz T, Lafreniere-Roula M, et al. A randomized clinical trial of age and genotype-guided tacrolimus dosing after pediatric solid organ transplantation. *Pediatr Transplant* 2018;22(7):e13285. doi: 10.1111/petr.13285 [published Online First: 2018/09/05]