Torque teno virus load predicts allograft rejection but not viral infection after kidney transplantation

Authors	ORCID iD
Aline L van Rijn ¹	0000-0003-0438-5350
Herman F Wunderink ^{1, *}	0000-0001-9491-0790
Igor A Sidorov ¹	0000-0001-6519-4983
Caroline S de Brouwer ¹	0000-0001-9117-6658
Aloysius CM Kroes ¹	0000-0002-9866-2461
Hein Putter ³	0000-0001-5395-1422
Aiko PJ de Vries ²	0000-0002-9284-3595
Joris I Rotmans ²	0000-0001-9682-6234
Mariet CW Feltkamp ¹	0000-0001-5993-9846

¹ *Department of Medical Microbiology, Leiden University Medical Center, The Netherlands*

² *Department of Internal Medicine, Leiden University Medical Center, The Netherlands*

³ *Department of Biomedical Data Sciences, Leiden University Medical Center, The Netherlands*

*Current address: *Department of Medical Microbiology, University Medical Center Utrecht, The Netherlands*

Corresponding author email: AL van Rijn, A.L.van_Rijn.MM@lumc.nl

Abbreviations

BKPyV	BK polyomavirus
CI	Confidence interval
CNI	Calcineurin inhibitor
ESDR	End stage renal disease
HR	Hazard ratio
IQR	Inter quartile range
KTx	Kidney transplantation
LOD	Limit of detection
LUMC	Leiden University Medical Center
qPCR	Quantitative PCR
SOTx	Solid organ transplantation
t	time
TTV	Torque teno virus

Authorship

AvR, JR, HW and MF designed cohort and the study. CdB performed the laboratory measurements. The biostatistical analysis was planned by IS and HP, and performed by AvR. AK, JR and MF provided resources. HW, IS, CdB and AdV provided critical feedback on the manuscript written by AvR under supervision of JI and MF.

Disclosure

The authors declare no conflicts of interest.

Funding

This study was supported in part by the Dutch Kidney Foundation, grant 13A1D302, and by an Excellent Student grant for Aline van Rijn by the Leiden University Medical Center.

Wordcount: 2499

Abstract

The main challenge of immunosuppressive therapy after solid organ transplantation is to create a new immunological balance that prevents organ rejection and does not promote opportunistic infection. Torque teno virus (TTV) a ubiquitous and non-pathogenic single-stranded DNA virus has been proposed as a marker of functional immunity in immunocompromised patients. Here we investigate whether TTV loads predict the risk of common viral infection and allograft rejection in kidney transplantation recipients.

In a retrospective cohort of 389 kidney transplantation recipients, individual TTV loads were measured by qPCR in consecutive plasma samples during one year follow-up. The endpoints were allograft rejection, BK polyomavirus (BKPyV) viremia and cytomegalovirus (CMV) viremia. Repeated TTV measurements and rejection and infection survival data were analysed in a joint model.

During follow-up, TTV DNA detection in the transplant recipients increased from 85 to 100%. The median viral load increased to 10^7 genome copies/ml within three months after transplantation.

Rejection, BKPyV viremia and CMV viremia occurred in 23%, 27% and 17% of the patients, respectively. With every 10-fold TTV load-increase, the risk of rejection decreased considerably (HR: 0.74, CI 95%: 0.71-0.76), while the risk of BKPyV and CMV viremia remained the same (HR: 1.03, CI 95%: 1.03-1.04 and HR: 1.01, CI 95%: 1.01-1.01).

In conclusion, TTV load kinetics predict allograft rejection in kidney transplantation recipients, but not the BKPyV and CMV infection. The potential use of TTV load levels as a guide for optimal immunosuppressive drug dosage to prevent allograft rejection deserves further validation.

21 Introduction

22 The optimum level of immunosuppression after solid organ transplant (SOTx) varies between
 23 individuals and optimal dosing of these essential drugs can be difficult. As a consequence, SOTx
 24 recipients experience a number of complications ranging from development of *de novo* donor
 25 specific antibodies and allograft rejection, due to insufficient immunosuppression, to infection as the
 26 result of over-immunosuppression. Monitoring individual therapeutic drug levels does not solve this
 27 issue, because immunosuppressive trough levels poorly correlate with development of rejection ^{1, 2}.
 28 Therefore, there is a call for a reliable biomarker of functional immunity in patients that receive
 29 immunosuppressive therapy. Such biomarker could provide assistance in balancing the individual
 30 immunosuppressive medication and anticipate the risk of both rejection and infection.

31 Kidney transplantation (KTx) recipients may experience multiple infections of diverse origin. A large
 32 proportion is caused by viruses that cause persistent, asymptomatic infection in the general
 33 population, but start replicating freely destroying tissues in the absence of functional immunity. BK
 34 polyomavirus (BKPyV) for instance, found in blood (viremia) in approximately 30% of KTx recipients,
 35 causes BKPyV-associated nephropathy (BKPyVAN) and loss of allograft function in up to 10% ³.
 36 Furthermore, without prophylaxis cytomegalovirus (CMV) infection occurs in ~20% of KTx recipients,
 37 causing invasive disease involving multiple organs with substantial morbidity and mortality, if left
 38 untreated ⁴.

39 Infection and rejection frequently require adjustment of immunosuppressive medication to
 40 compensate for the overimmunosuppression and underimmunosuppression ^{3, 5-7}. Unfortunately, a
 41 valid biomarker that indicates overimmunosuppression and underimmunosuppression is lacking.
 42 Torque teno virus (TTV) load has been proposed as a surrogate marker of functional immunity that
 43 might be useful by predicting the risk of rejection and infection in SOTx recipients ⁸.

44 TTVs are small, single-stranded DNA-viruses that infect everyone without causing documented
 45 disease⁹⁻¹¹. Thus far twenty-nine species described by the International Committee on Taxonomy of
 46 Viruses (ICTV)¹². In immune competent individuals, the adaptive cellular immune responses control
 47 TTV infection¹³. TTV blood levels might therefore mirror the efficacy of the immune system in
 48 immunosuppressed SOTx patients, with high TTV DNA loads indicating too much
 49 immunosuppression and concomitant risk of infection, and low TTV loads indicating too little
 50 immunosuppression and risk of rejection.

51 Several studies have investigated the association between TTV load and infection and rejection in
 52 SOTx patients. While some indicated an association between infection and high/increasing TTV load
 53¹⁴⁻¹⁸, and some between rejection and low/decreasing TTV load^{14, 15, 19-23}, others were unable to
 54 confirm these associations²⁴⁻²⁶. The ambiguity of these results calls for more systematic study into
 55 these associations.

56 In the present study, we determined TTV load kinetics in blood from KTx recipients drawn before
 57 and after KTx, and explored its association with development of kidney rejection and of two
 58 common post-KTx viral infections (BKPyV and CMV). A joint model was built to analyse these
 59 longitudinal endpoints with the repeated TTV load measurements. With the help of this integrated
 60 approach analysing TTV loads against clinical endpoints at opposite ends of the immunosuppression
 61 spectrum, the potential use of TTV as a universal biomarker of functional immunity was assessed.

62

63 **Materials and Methods**

64 **Cohort and sampling**

65 This study uses a pre-existing retrospective KTx cohort of 407 adult KTx donor and recipient pairs,
 66 extensively described by Wunderink *et al.* ^{3, 27, 28}, transplanted between 2003-2013 in the Leiden
 67 University Medical Center (LUMC) in the Netherlands. In the current study, only recipients of living
 68 donors were included. Blood samples used for TTV DNA detection were collected pre-
 69 transplantation, and 1.5, 3, 6, 9 and 12 months after transplantation. If no pre-transplantation
 70 sample or less than two post-transplantation samples were available, the recipient was excluded
 71 (**Supplement 1**). As a result, 389 KTx recipients with a total of 1663 samples were included.
 72 Recorded baseline characteristics are age, sex, underlying renal condition, dialysis vintage and type
 73 of maintenance immunosuppressive treatment.

74 The study protocol was approved by the local scientific committee and submitted to the medical
 75 ethics committee of the LUMC, who declared no objection. We adhered to the STROBE statement
 76 for reporting observational studies ²⁹.

77

78 **TTV load (Predictor)**

79 For TTV load detection DNA was extracted from 200 µL of each blood serum and plasma sample, as
 80 described previously ³. A detailed description of TTV load detection by qPCR can be found in
 81 **Supplement 2**. Measured TTV loads were log₁₀-transformed, as per general convention for viral load.
 82 Determined TTV loads below the LOD were set to LOD/ $\sqrt{2}$ to approximate the assumed normal
 83 distribution of very weakly positive and negative loads ³³.

84

85 BKPyV viremia and CMV viremia (Infection endpoints)

86 The first and second endpoint of this study were the development of BKPyV and CMV viremia,
87 respectively, defined as the first day after transplantation on which viral DNA is detected in the
88 blood. The presence of BKPyV DNA in the samples was determined by qPCR in a previous study ³.
89 CMV load data were obtained from blood plasma samples previously collected based on clinical
90 suspicion and analysed by qPCR for the presence of CMV DNA ³⁴. The median follow-up was 9.36
91 months for BKPyV viremia and 12 months for CMV viremia, calculated with the reverse Kaplan Meier
92 method ³⁵, because participants without BKPyV viremia were censored on the day of their last BKPyV
93 screening. From 2008 onwards, all recipients received CMV prophylaxis for 90 days except for
94 seronegative recipients with a seronegative donor. (Table 2).

95

96 Kidney allograft rejection (Rejection endpoint)

97 Allograft rejection was the third endpoint in this study. Allograft rejection was defined as the first
98 initiation of rejection treatment after transplantation. In some patients, rejection treatment was
99 initiated without prior histological confirmation of allograft rejection if clinical suspicion was high
100 and alternative explanations were excluded. Suspicion of rejection included increased serum
101 creatinine levels, low concentration of immunosuppressive medications and allograft biopsy with
102 histological evidence of rejection. First rejection treatment consisted of 1000 mg
103 methylprednisolone intravenously for three days. The median follow-up for rejection was 12
104 months, calculated with the reverse Kaplan Meier method ³⁵, meaning that every participant
105 completed the full follow-up period if they did not develop rejection.

106

107 Statistical analysis

108 Statistical software R version 3.5.3 was used for all statistics³⁶. The figures, survival analyses and
 109 joint models were made with the appropriate R packages³⁷⁻⁴¹. The baseline characteristics were
 110 compared with chi-squared or two-tailed Student's *t*-test.

111 A linear mixed effects model was fitted on the TTV loads. This model models the mean progression
 112 of the TTV load over time, using effects that are the same for every individual – the fixed effects –
 113 and effects that are unique for every individual – the random effects. A detailed description of the
 114 linear mixed effects model can be found in **Supplement 3**. The model was combined with a survival
 115 analysis for the endpoints, in a so-called joint model analysis⁴⁰. This model estimates the risk rate of
 116 the events in cox-proportional hazards model, based on the modelled TTV loads. Three joint model
 117 analyses were performed, to accommodate the survival analysis for each endpoint - BKPyV viremia,
 118 CMV viremia and rejection. The association between a 1 log change in TTV load and the time-to-
 119 event is reported as hazard ratio (HR).

Results

Incidence of viremia, and relation to population baseline characteristics

During follow-up, 105 out of 389 KTx recipients (27%) developed BKPyV viremia and 77 (20%) developed CMV viremia within one year after transplantation (**Table 1, Figure 1**). Baseline characteristics were comparable across BKPyV viremia and non-BKPyV viremia groups. CMV viremia was observed less often after 2008 (**Table 2**), which could be related to the start of CMV prophylaxis use⁴². Also, in 2008, the use tacrolimus was initiated (11% before, 97% during and after 2008). This explains why the non-CMV viremia group had received tacrolimus more often (**Table 1**).

Incidence of rejection, and relation to population baseline characteristics

Allograft rejection developed in 88 KTx recipients (23%) within one year after KTx (**Figure 1**). Nineteen percent (58/300) of patients who received tacrolimus developed rejection, opposed to 34% (30/89) of patients receiving cyclosporine A, which is probably related to the larger immunosuppressive potential of tacrolimus over cyclosporine A (**Table 1**)⁴³. Furthermore, 72% (63/88) of the recipients with rejection had a history of dialysis, compared to 57% (171/301) of the recipients without rejection. This association was also found in the joint model analysis discussed below. This association might have been confounded by a lower degree of HLA mismatch, since pre-emptive transplantations often involve family members.

TTV load kinetics

TTV DNA load was determined in 1663 samples from 389 eligible patients, with 2-5 measurements per patient. A visualisation of the measured TTV loads over time is shown in **Figure 2**. The median TTV load at baseline was the equivalent of 5012 genome copies/ml which is 3.7 log (Inter quartile range (IQR) 2.6-4.7). TTV loads below the LOD were observed in 15% of the subjects. During one year

follow-up after transplantation, detectable TTV loads were obtained in all recipients. The median TTV load detected was 5.2 log copies/ml (IQR 3.9-6.5) at 1.5 months, 7.4 (IQR 5.9-8.9) at 3 months, 6.1 (IQR 4.5-7.8) at 6 months, and 5.2 (IQR 4.0-6.4) at 12 months.

TTV load model

For further analysis, the TTV loads were modelled in a linear mixed effects model (**Table 3**). The final model contained the baseline TTV load (β_0), and fixed coefficients β_1 , β_2 , β_3 , β_4 and β_5 , written in formula as: $y_{ij} = \beta_0 + \beta_1 * t_{ij} + \beta_2 * t_{ij}^2 + \beta_3 * t_{ij}^3 + \beta_4 * tacrolimus_i + \beta_5 * dialysis_i + b_{i0} + b_{i1} * t_{ij} + b_{i2} * t_{ij}^2 + \varepsilon_{ij}$. The other tested covariates (sex, age, and underlying condition; **Table 1**) did not improve the prediction of the progression of the TTV load over time. Receiving tacrolimus instead of cyclosporine A and having a history of dialysis both correspond to a higher TTV load (β_4 : 0.51, 95% confidence interval (CI): 0.16-0.86, β_5 : 0.46, 95% CI: 0.16-0.76). The variation in the random effects per individual, b_{i0} , b_{i1} and b_{i2} , and the residual variation over all individuals and time points, ε_{ij} , is reported as standard deviation (σ) around the mean (**Table 3**). To illustrate the individualized predictions of the linear mixed model, three example patients with their observed and predicted TTV loads are shown in **Figure 2**.

TTV load and development of infection and rejection

To compare the TTV load kinetics with the study endpoints, three joint models were built; for BKPyV viremia, CMV viremia and rejection, respectively. The joint model analyses for BKPyV and CMV showed no association between changing TTV loads and development of viremia, with hazard ratios close to one (1.03 95% CI: 1.03-1.04 and 1.01 95% CI: 1.00-1.01 respectively; **Table 4**). For rejection a significant, inverse association was found between increasing TTV load and the time-to-rejection: with every 10-fold (1 log) TTV load-increase, the risk of rejection decreased with a HR of 0.74 (95% CI: 0.71-0.76) (**Table 4**).

Discussion

With the help of joint modelling of KTx cohort data, we analysed TTV load kinetics after KTx and explored the association between TTV load and frequent complications of immunosuppression. We showed that an increase of TTV load corresponds to a lower risk of rejection and an equal risk of CMV and BKPyV infection. This observation partially supports the hypothesis that the TTV load reflects the functional immune status of KTx patients. Furthermore, it puts TTV forward as a useful biomarker of functional immunity in SOTx patients, to predict allograft rejection.

The observed effect of TTV load on the risk of developing rejection was quite strong (HR of 0.74 per log TTV load increase), especially if one considers the median TTV load-increase of 3 log observed after transplantation. This implies that patients with substantial TTV load increase, like Patient 1 in Figure 2, have a much lower chance of developing rejection than Patients 2 and 3 who displayed a limited TTV load increase. More detailed study is needed to pinpoint the period after KTx that offers the biggest power to predict the chance of rejection.

Our results are in line with findings from earlier, smaller studies that reported an inverse association between TTV load and rejection^{23, 44}, and the absence of association between TTV load and BKPyV and CMV infection²⁶. However, some studies did show an association between TTV load-increase and infectious complications. This discrepancy may be due to differences in study population, start and duration of follow-up, pathogens studied and/or modelling method⁴⁵⁻⁴⁷.

Our observation that the risk of BKPyV viremia was not related with TTV-load nor with any of the other covariates, fits with findings from one of our previous studies aimed at identifying risk factors for BKPyV infection³. In that study performed within the same cohort, we showed that the risk of BKPyV viremia is primarily governed by the BKPyV infection risk imposed by the donor, which can be estimated based on pre-KTx donor BKPyV IgG seroreactivity, and much less dependent on the immune status of the recipient.

Comparable to BKPyV, we did not find an association between the incidence of CMV viremia and TTV load. However, in the case of CMV, the lack of such an association is more difficult to interpret, since it could be partially masked by the use of anti-viral prophylaxis (**Table 2**). Prophylaxis-stratified analyses were attempted but the model failed to converge due to insufficient observations^{48, 49}. Additional stratified analyses with larger sample sizes are advisable for future research.

When analysing the TTV load kinetics with the help of a mixed model, it is clear that the variation in random effects largely explains the interpatient variability in TTV load. This is because the variability is not explained by the covariates we tested, except for type of immune suppression and dialysis vintage. This promotes the potential value of TTV as a biomarker even more, because interpatient variability in TTV loads signifies high-risk and low-risk patients on top of the known risk factors.

Our study has several strengths that increase the validity of the findings. First of all, the used PCR primer set targets several TTV species at once, which is favourable since a recent study shows the interindividual variability in TTV species is large⁵⁰. Second, the use of a joint model allows the longitudinal TTV measurements to be used as predictor of time to viremia and to rejection. A common pitfall of analysing this type of data is introducing ‘immortal time’ bias, which is circumvented by the joint model approach.

Regarding potential weaknesses, our study might have overestimated the actual number of rejection episodes. Of 88 patients with high clinical suspicion of a rejection episode, 80 had undergone a biopsy, and in 68% of them there was clear histological evidence for rejection, which may cause an underestimation of the true effect. Future study with biopsy-confirmed rejection is needed for a more precise approximation of the predictive effect of the TTV load.

In conclusion, while TTV load changes fail to predict the risk of BKPyV and CMV infection within the first year after KTx, they strongly predict the development of allograft rejection. Hence, the use of TTV loads as a predictive biomarker for allograft rejection and optimal immunosuppressive dosage

217 deserves further exploration, in KTx patients and in SOTx patients in general, as it could improve
218 patient care and allograft survival.

219 **References**

- 220 1. Bouamar R, Shuker N, Hesselink DA, et al. Tacrolimus predose concentrations do not predict
221 the risk of acute rejection after renal transplantation: a pooled analysis from three randomized-
222 controlled clinical trials(dagger). *Am J Transplant.* May 2013;13(5):1253-61. doi:10.1111/ajt.12191
- 223 2. Percy C, Hassoun Z, Mourad M, et al. Impact of Acute Infection Requiring Hospitalization on
224 Tacrolimus Blood Levels in Kidney Transplant Recipients. *Transplant Proc.* Nov 2017;49(9):2065-
225 2069. doi:10.1016/j.transproceed.2017.09.019
- 226 3. Wunderink HF, van der Meijden E, van der Blij-de Brouwer CS, et al. Pretransplantation
227 Donor-Recipient Pair Seroreactivity Against BK Polyomavirus Predicts Viremia and Nephropathy
228 After Kidney Transplantation. *Am J Transplant.* Jan 2017;17(1):161-172. doi:10.1111/ajt.13880
- 229 4. Brennan DC. Cytomegalovirus in renal transplantation. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* Apr
230 2001;12(4):848-55.
- 231 5. Razonable RR, Humar A, Practice ASTIDCo. Cytomegalovirus in solid organ transplantation.
232 *Am J Transplant.* Mar 2013;13 Suppl 4:93-106. doi:10.1111/ajt.12103
- 233 6. Bohl DL, Brennan DC. BK virus nephropathy and kidney transplantation. *Clin J Am Soc*
234 *Nephrol.* Jul 2007;2 Suppl 1:S36-46. doi:10.2215/CJN.00920207
- 235 7. van Rijn AL, Wunderink HF, de Brouwer CS, van der Meijden E, Rotmans JI, Feltkamp MCW.
236 Impact of HPyV9 and TSPyV coinfection on the development of BK polyomavirus viremia and
237 associated nephropathy after kidney transplantation. *J Med Virol.* Jan 9 2019;doi:10.1002/jmv.25397
- 238 8. Reza Hosseini O, Drabe CH, Sorensen SS, et al. Torque-Teno virus viral load as a potential
239 endogenous marker of immune function in solid organ transplantation. *Transplant Rev (Orlando).* Jul
240 2019;33(3):137-144. doi:10.1016/j.trre.2019.03.004
- 241 9. Vu DL, Kaiser L. The concept of commensal viruses almost 20 years later: redefining borders
242 in clinical virology. *Clin Microbiol Infect.* Oct 2017;23(10):688-690. doi:10.1016/j.cmi.2017.03.005
- 243 10. Griffiths P. Time to consider the concept of a commensal virus? *Rev Med Virol.* Apr-Jun
244 1999;9(2):73-4.
- 245 11. Cossart Y. TTV a common virus, but pathogenic? *Lancet.* Jul 18 1998;352(9123):164.
246 doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(05)77802-8
- 247 12. Walker PJ, Siddell SG, Lefkowitz EJ, et al. Changes to virus taxonomy and the International
248 Code of Virus Classification and Nomenclature ratified by the International Committee on Taxonomy
249 of Viruses (2019). *Arch Virol.* Sep 2019;164(9):2417-2429. doi:10.1007/s00705-019-04306-w
- 250 13. Haloschan M, Bettesch R, Gorzer I, Weseslindtner L, Kundi M, Puchhammer-Stockl E. TTV
251 DNA plasma load and its association with age, gender, and HCMV IgG serostatus in healthy adults.
252 *Age (Dordr).* 2014;36(5):9716. doi:10.1007/s11357-014-9716-2
- 253 14. Jaksch P, Michael K, Irene G, et al. Torque Teno Virus as a novel biomarker targeting the
254 efficacy of immunosuppression after lung transplantation. *J Infect Dis.* Jul 20
255 2018;doi:10.1093/infdis/jiy452
- 256 15. Frye BC, Bierbaum S, Falcone V, et al. Kinetics of Torque Teno Virus-DNA Plasma Load Predict
257 Rejection in Lung Transplant Recipients. *Transplantation.* Sep 17
258 2018;doi:10.1097/TP.0000000000002436
- 259 16. Fernandez-Ruiz M, Albert E, Gimenez E, et al. Monitoring of alphatorquevirus DNA levels for
260 the prediction of immunosuppression-related complications after kidney transplantation. *Am J*
261 *Transplant.* Oct 22 2018;doi:10.1111/ajt.15145
- 262 17. Beland K, Dore-Nguyen M, Gagne MJ, et al. Torque Teno virus in children who underwent
263 orthotopic liver transplantation: new insights about a common pathogen. *J Infect Dis.* Jan 15
264 2014;209(2):247-54. doi:10.1093/infdis/jit423
- 265 18. Strassl R, Schiemann M, Doberer K, et al. Quantification of Torque Teno Virus Viremia as a
266 Prospective Biomarker for Infectious Disease in Kidney Allograft Recipients. *J Infect Dis.* Sep 8
267 2018;218(8):1191-1199. doi:10.1093/infdis/jiy306

19. Gorzer I, Jaksch P, Strassl R, Klepetko W, Puchhammer-Stockl E. Association between plasma Torque teno virus level and chronic lung allograft dysfunction after lung transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant*. Mar 2017;36(3):366-368. doi:10.1016/j.healun.2016.10.011
20. Ruiz P, Martinez-Picola M, Santana M, et al. Torque Teno Virus is associated with the state of immune suppression early after liver transplantation. *Liver Transpl*. Oct 30 2018;doi:10.1002/lt.25374
21. Simonetta F, Pradier A, Masouridi-Levrat S, et al. Torque Teno Virus Load and Acute Rejection After Orthotopic Liver Transplantation. *Transplantation*. Jul 2017;101(7):e219-e221. doi:10.1097/TP.0000000000001723
22. De Vlaminc I, Khush KK, Strehl C, et al. Temporal response of the human virome to immunosuppression and antiviral therapy. *Cell*. Nov 21 2013;155(5):1178-87. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2013.10.034
23. Strassl R, Doberer K, Rasoul-Rockenschaub S, et al. Torque Teno Virus for Risk Stratification of Acute Biopsy-proven Alloreactivity in Kidney Transplant Recipients. *J Infect Dis*. Jan 18 2019;doi:10.1093/infdis/jiz039
24. Norden R, Magnusson J, Lundin A, et al. Quantification of Torque Teno Virus and Epstein-Barr Virus Is of Limited Value for Predicting the Net State of Immunosuppression After Lung Transplantation. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. Apr 2018;5(4):ofy050. doi:10.1093/ofid/ofy050
25. Takemoto AY, Okubo P, Saito PK, et al. Torque teno virus among dialysis and renal-transplant patients. *Braz J Microbiol*. Mar 2015;46(1):307-11. doi:10.1590/S1517-838246120131195
26. Handala L, Descamps V, Morel V, et al. No correlation between Torque Teno virus viral load and BK virus replication after kidney transplantation. *J Clin Virol*. Jul 2019;116:4-6. doi:10.1016/j.jcv.2019.03.018
27. Wunderink HF, Haasnoot GW, de Brouwer CS, et al. Reduced Risk of BK Polyomavirus Infection in HLA-B51-positive Kidney Transplant Recipients. *Transplantation*. Mar 2019;103(3):604-612. doi:10.1097/TP.0000000000002376
28. Wunderink HF, De Brouwer CS, Gard L, et al. Source and Relevance of the BK Polyomavirus Genotype for Infection After Kidney Transplantation. *Open Forum Infect Dis*. Mar 2019;6(3):ofz078. doi:10.1093/ofid/ofz078
29. von Elm E, Altman DG, Egger M, et al. Strengthening the Reporting of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) statement: guidelines for reporting observational studies. *BMJ*. Oct 20 2007;335(7624):806-8. doi:10.1136/bmj.39335.541782.AD
30. Niesters HG. Quantitation of viral load using real-time amplification techniques. *Methods*. Dec 2001;25(4):419-29. doi:10.1006/meth.2001.1264
31. Maggi F, Pifferi M, Fornai C, et al. TT virus in the nasal secretions of children with acute respiratory diseases: relations to viremia and disease severity. *J Virol*. Feb 2003;77(4):2418-25.
32. Okamoto H, Nishizawa T, Ukita M, et al. The entire nucleotide sequence of a TT virus isolate from the United States (TUS01): comparison with reported isolates and phylogenetic analysis. *Virology*. Jul 5 1999;259(2):437-48. doi:10.1006/viro.1999.9769
33. Hornung R, Reed L. Estimation of Average Concentration in the Presence of Non-detectable Values. *App Occup Environ Hyg*. 1990;5:46-51.
34. Kalpoe JS, Kroes AC, de Jong MD, et al. Validation of clinical application of cytomegalovirus plasma DNA load measurement and definition of treatment criteria by analysis of correlation to antigen detection. *J Clin Microbiol*. Apr 2004;42(4):1498-504. doi:10.1128/jcm.42.4.1498-1504.2004
35. Schemper M, Smith TL. A note on quantifying follow-up in studies of failure time. *Control Clin Trials*. Aug 1996;17(4):343-6.
36. R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing. Version 3.5.2. R Foundation for Statistical Computing; 2018. <https://www.R-project.org/>
37. Wickham H. *ggplot2: Elegant Graphics for Data Analysis*. Springer-Verlag; 2016.
38. Kassambara A, Kosinski M. survminer: Drawing Survival Curves using 'ggplot2'. 2018; <https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=survminer>

39. Thernau T, Gramsch P. *Modeling Survival Data: Extending the Cox Model*. Springer; 2000.
40. Rizopoulos D. JM: An R Package for the Joint Modelling of Longitudinal and Time-to-Event Data. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2010;35(9):1-33.
41. *nlme: Linear and Nonlinear Mixed Effects Model*. 2018.
42. van der Beek MT, Berger SP, Vossen AC, et al. Preemptive versus sequential prophylactic-preemptive treatment regimens for cytomegalovirus in renal transplantation: comparison of treatment failure and antiviral resistance. *Transplantation*. Feb 15 2010;89(3):320-6. doi:10.1097/TP.0b013e3181bc0301
43. Kamel M, Kadian M, Srinivas T, Taber D, Posadas Salas MA. Tacrolimus confers lower acute rejection rates and better renal allograft survival compared to cyclosporine. *World J Transplant*. Dec 24 2016;6(4):697-702. doi:10.5500/wjt.v6.i4.697
44. Solis M, Velay A, Gantner P, et al. Torquetenovirus viremia for early prediction of graft rejection after kidney transplantation. *J Infect*. Jul 2019;79(1):56-60. doi:10.1016/j.jinf.2019.05.010
45. Fernandez-Ruiz M, Albert E, Gimenez E, et al. Early kinetics of Torque Teno virus DNA load and BK polyomavirus viremia after kidney transplantation. *Transpl Infect Dis*. Dec 28 2019:e13240. doi:10.1111/tid.13240
46. Maggi F, Focosi D, Statzu M, et al. Early Post-Transplant Torquetenovirus Viremia Predicts Cytomegalovirus Reactivations In Solid Organ Transplant Recipients. *Sci Rep*. Oct 19 2018;8(1):15490. doi:10.1038/s41598-018-33909-7
47. Doberer K, Schiemann M, Strassl R, et al. Torque Teno virus for risk stratification of graft rejection and infection in kidney transplant recipients - A prospective observational trial. *Am J Transplant*. Feb 7 2020;doi:10.1111/ajt.15810
48. Matuschek H, Kliegl R, Vasisht S, Baayen H, Bates D. Balancing Type I error and power in linear mixed models. *J Mem Lang*. Jun 2017;94:305-315. doi:10.1016/j.jml.2017.01.001
49. Barr DJ, Levy R, Scheepers C, Tily HJ. Random effects structure for confirmatory hypothesis testing: Keep it maximal. *J Mem Lang*. Apr 2013;68(3):255-278. doi:10.1016/j.jml.2012.11.001
50. Bal A, Sarkozy C, Josset L, et al. Metagenomic Next-Generation Sequencing Reveals Individual Composition and Dynamics of Anelloviruses during Autologous Stem Cell Transplant Recipient Management. *Viruses*. Nov 14 2018;10(11)doi:10.3390/v10110633

Figure Legends

Figure 1: Development of BKPyV viremia, CMV viremia and allograft rejection after KTx

Survival curves are shown for BKPyV viremia (A), CMV viremia (B), and allograft rejection (C) after KTx.

Figure 2: Observed and modelled TTV loads after KTx

Individual TTV DNA load measurements are depicted in blue, shown for each individual sample by the dots connected by a line. The red, orange and blue labels and lines depict the observed and TTV loads predicted by the linear mixed model of three example patients. Taking into account their individual random effects, the individual linear progression trajectories can be predicted with the formula described in Materials and Methods, the coefficient values of the fixed effects in **Table 3**, and their unique random effects:

Patient 1 (red): tacrolimus = yes, dialysis vintage = yes, $\beta_0 = 1.58$, $\beta_1 = 0.43$, $\beta_2 = 0.03$

Patient 2 (yellow): tacrolimus = no, dialysis vintage = yes, $\beta_0 = 0.18$, $\beta_1 = 0.19$, $\beta_2 = 0.01$

Patient 3 (green): tacrolimus = yes, dialysis vintage = no, $\beta_0 = 1.35$, $\beta_1 = 0.52$, $\beta_2 = 0.04$

Description of supporting information

Supplement 1: Flowchart for inclusion and exclusion of kidney transplantation recipients.

Supplement 2: A detailed description of TTV detection

Supplement 3: A detailed description of the linear mixed effects model

372 **Table 1:** Baseline characteristics of the study population

	Total	BKPyV viremia			CMV viremia			Rejection		
		Without	With	P value	Without	With	P value	Without	With	P value
Total, n(%)	389 (100)	284 (100)	105 (100)		312 (100)	77 (100)		301 (100)	88 (100)	
<i>Sex, n(%)</i>				0.44			0.87			0.68
Female	151(39)	114(40)	37(35)		120(38)	31(40)		119(40)	32(36)	
Male	238(61)	170(60)	68(65)		192(62)	46(60)		182(60)	56(64)	
<i>Mean age in years (σ)</i>	50.8 (13.6)	50.1 (13.4)	52.6 (14.4)	0.13	50.7 (13.3)	51.3 (15.1)	0.77	51.2 (13.6)	49.5 (13.9)	0.31
<i>Underlying condition, n(%)</i>				0.13			0.48			0.51
Inherited,	92(24)	68(24)	24(23)		77(25)	15(19)		73(24)	19(22)	
Glomerular	101(26)	79(28)	22(21)		85(27)	16(21)		76(25)	25(28)	
Vascular	84(22)	52(18)	32(30)		65(21)	19(25)		70(23)	14(16)	
Obstructive	31(8)	24(8)	7(7)		24(8)	7(9)		23(8)	8(9)	
Other	81(21)	61(21)	20(19)		61(20)	20(26)		59(20)	22(25)	
<i>History of dialysis, n(%)</i>				0.88			0.41			0.018
No	155(40)	112(39)	43(41)		128(41)	27(35)		130(43)	25(28)	
Yes	234(60)	172(61)	62(59)		184(59)	50(65)		171(57)	63(72)	
<i>Mean duration in months (σ)</i>	11.3 (17.0)	11.8 (18.5)	9.7 (12.3)	0.18	11.1 (17.4)	12.0 (15.5)	0.64	13.6 (16.0)	13.9 (20.1)	0.11
<i>Immunosuppression, n(%)</i>				0.89			<0.0001			0.007
Cyclosporine	89(23)	66(23)	23(22)		55(18)	34(44)		59(20)	30(34)	
Tacrolimus	300(77)	218(77)	82(78)		257(82)	43(56)		242(80)	58(66)	

Table 2: CMV serostatus of donor and recipient

CMV serostatus	Total	Before 2008		After 2008 ^a	
		No CMV viremia	CMV viremia	No CMV viremia	CMV viremia
	389	59 (66%)	31 (34%)	265 (89%)	34 (11%)
R-/D-	86	20 (100%)	0 (0%)	66 (100%)	0 (0%)
R+/D+	155	25 (64%)	14 (36%)	105 (91%)	11 (9%)
R-/D+	84	11 (52%)	10 (48%)	42 (67%)	21 (33%)
R+/D-	64	3 (30%)	7 (70%)	52 (96%)	2 (4%)

R: recipient, D: donor. ^a: After 2008, all except R-/D- received valganciclovir CMV prophylaxis for 90 days after transplantation.

Table 3: Fixed and random effects from the linear mixed effects model for estimating the mean TTV load over time (t)

Fixed Effects	β -coefficients	95% CI		P value	Random effects	σ
β_0 <i>Intercept</i>	3.39	3.07	3.70	<0.001	b_{i0} <i>Intercept</i>	0.87
β_1 t	1.471	1.34	1.60	<0.001	b_{i1} t	0.52
β_2 t^2	-0.24	-0.27	-0.21	<0.001	b_{i2} t^2	0.04
β_3 t^3	0.01	0.01	0.01	<0.001	ε_{ij} <i>Residual</i>	1.43
β_4 <i>Tacrolimus vs. Cyclosporine A</i>	0.45	0.15	0.74	0.0034		
β_5 <i>History of dialysis</i>	0.36	0.10	0.60	0.0062		

Table 4: Estimated hazard rate for BKPyV viremia and rejection based on changes in TTV load after KTx

		HR*	95% CI		P value
BKPyV viremia	<i>TTV load 1 log increase</i>	1.03	1.03	1.04	<0.001
CMV viremia	<i>TTV load 1 log increase</i>	1.01	1.01	1.01	<0.001
Rejection episode	<i>TTV load 1 log increase</i>	0.74	0.71	0.76	<0.001

* HR: hazard rate

Torque teno virus load predicts allograft rejection but not viral infection after kidney transplantation

The problem	Hypothesis	Method	Results
<p>Too much immune suppression causes viral infection</p> <p>Too little immune suppression causes allograft rejection</p>	<p>Both rejection and infection may be predicted by TTV load kinetics</p> <p>TTV infects everyone, is non-pathogenic and it's blood load is controlled by the immune system</p>	<p>Kidney transplantation cohort, n=389</p> <p>Predictor:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Repeated TTV ● load measurements <p>Endpoints:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - BKV ● and CMV ● infection - Allograft rejection ▼ <p>Joint modelling analysis:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Mixed effects model - Cox regression 	<p>With every 10-fold TTV load increase:</p> <p>The risk of allograft rejection decreased HR 0.74, CI 0.71 – 0.76</p> <p>The risk of BK infection and CMV infection remained the same HR 1.03, CI 1.03 – 1.04 HR 1.01, CI 1.01 – 1.01</p>

Conclusions

TTV load could serve as a predictor of allograft rejection but not of infection

Figure 1

Figure 2