



Prevalence and treatment of Acute Antibody Mediated Rejection in Renal transplantation recipients: A single center study

Esmat Abdollahpour

Assistant professor, department of nephrology, shariati hospital, TUMS

Anti body mediated rejection (AMR)



- AMR is the most common cause of allograft failure after kidney transplantation
- aAMR occurs in up to 7% of Pts
- as high as 50% of Pts with HLA-incompatible transplantation
- Kidney recipients with aAMR experience a significantly worse graft prognosis compared to those with TCMR or no rejection
- French study showed three and nine-fold increased risks of graft loss in patients with aAMR with and without a vascular component respectively, compared to those with TCMR (Lefaucheur C et al, Lancet 2013;381:313–9)
- May ccount for over half of all death-censored graft loss over time



Risk factors for AMR

- One or more HLA mismatch
- Younger recipient and older donor age
- PRA greater than 0 percent
- Presence of DSA
- BG incompatibility
- Delayed onset of graft function
- Cold ischemia time greater than 24 hours
- Patients with a previous episode of rejection
- Those receiving a second or greater transplant



Pathophysiology

host recognition of donor HLA, non-HLA Ag



Shifting complement to a potent proinflammatory effector mechanism through the classical pathway (MAC)

Development of donor specific anti-HLA Ab (DSA) and Ag 2 type 1 receptor Ab

antibody subsequently binding to its respective target on the graft endothelial cell

Mechanism of DSA mediated Endothelial injury in Renal Allograft







Revised (Banff 2013) classification of acute antibody-mediated rejection (all three criteria must be present)

1. Presence of donor-specific antibodies, including HLA or other antibodies

2. Evidence of recent donor-specific antibodies with the vascular endothelium, evidenced by at least one of the following:

- a. Linear C4d staining in the peritubular capillaries
- b. Moderate microvascular inflammation ($[g + ptc \ge 2]$)
- c. Increased expression of gene transcripts associated with endothelial injury in biopsy tissue, if thoroughly validated

3. Histologic evidence of acute tissue injury, including one of the following:

- a. Microvascular inflammation (g > 0 and/or ptc > 0)
- b. Intimal or transmural arteritis (v > 0)
- c. Acute thrombotic microangiopathy, in absence of any other cause
- d. Acute tubular injury, in the absence of any other cause



peritubular capillary C4d staining by immunohistochemistry



microvascular inflammation with peritubular capillaritis (arrows)



vascular endotheliitis (V-lesion, arrow)



Treatment Options for Acute Antibody Mediated Rejection

-			
۶. ۱	Therapeutic Target	Therapy	Mechanism
	Immunomodulation	Corticosteroids	Inhibition of cytokine transcription and production, with multiple downstream effects on lymphocyte function
		IVIG	Proposed mechanisms include inhibition of dendritic cells and macrophages, apoptosis of plasma cells, stimulation of regulatory T cells, clearance of pathogenic antibodies, and modulation of cytokines and cellular receptors
	B Lymphocytes	Splenectomy	Removal of memory B cells
		Rituximab	Chimeric murine antibody that specifically inhibits CD20, a glycoprotein involved in B- cell activation and maturation, leading to depletion of B lymphocytes
	Plasma Cells	Bortezomib	Proteasome inhibition causing plasma cell apoptosis
	Antibodies	Therapeutic Plasma Exchange	Removal of pathogenic antibodies
	Complement	Eculizumab	Anticomplement C5-antibody that inhibits the proinflammatory effects of the terminal complement components and formation of the membrane attack complex



1972-	1977-	1982-	1987-	1992-	1997-	2002-	2007-
1976	198 1	1986	1991	1996	200 1	2006	2011
	1972- 1976	1972- 1977- 1976 1981	1972- 1977- 1982- 1976 1981 1986 I I IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	1972- 1977- 1982- 1987- 1976 1981 1986 1991 I I I I IIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIIII	1972- 1977- 1982- 1987- 1992- 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 1976 1981 1986 1986 1991 1996 1976 1981 1986 1986 1991 1996 1976 1981 1986 1986 1986 1996 1976 1986 1986 1986 1986 1996 1976 1986 </td <td>1972- 1977- 1982- 1987- 1992- 1997- 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 2001 I I I I I I I I I</td> <td>1972- 1977- 1982- 1987- 1992- 1997- 2002- 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 2001 2006 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 2001 2006 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 2001 2006 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 2001 2006 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 2001 2006 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 2001 2006 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 2001 2006 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 2001 2006 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 1996 1997 1997 1976 1987 1986 1991 1996 1996 1997 1997 1997 1997 1976 1987 1987 1987 1987 1997 1997 1997 1997 <td< td=""></td<></td>	1972- 1977- 1982- 1987- 1992- 1997- 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 2001 I I I I I I I I I	1972- 1977- 1982- 1987- 1992- 1997- 2002- 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 2001 2006 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 2001 2006 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 2001 2006 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 2001 2006 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 2001 2006 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 2001 2006 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 2001 2006 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 2001 2006 1976 1981 1986 1991 1996 1996 1997 1997 1976 1987 1986 1991 1996 1996 1997 1997 1997 1997 1976 1987 1987 1987 1987 1997 1997 1997 1997 <td< td=""></td<>



Transplantation 2012;94: 775-783, Darren M. Roberts (10388 citations were identified)

Trends in the use of treatments for AMR over time, Using a gray scale, black represents the most commonly used

Prevalence and treatment of Acute Antibody Mediated Rejection in Renal transplantation recipients: A single center study



- Descriptive-comparative cross sectional study
- The study population: all patients who had received kidney transplantation in Shariati Hospital between 2014 to 2017 (374 patients)
- Prevalence of aAMR (increase more than 20% of baseline Cr, kidney biopsy)
- Risk factors for aAMR incidence
- Rate of response to treatment (in 6 months)





Frequency distribution of age in patients who were undergone kidney transplantation

age	frequency	percent
<18	29	7.75
18-45	149	39.84
>45	196	52.41
total	374	100







Frequency distribution of gender of kidney allograft recipients





Frequency distribution of the ESRD causes





■ AMR ■ control





Frequency distribution of dialysis duration



■ AMR ■ control





■ Male ■ Female





■ living ■ deceased





Type of treatment	Number of patients
IVIG	5
IVIG + plasma exchange	1
IVIG + plasma exchange + Rituximab	12



Response to treatment





Type of treatment had no effect on response





- Other studies
- Lefaucheur C et al reported superior outcomes in patients with aAMR treated with combination plasma exchange, IVIG, and rituximab compared to patients treated with high dose IVIG alone (Am J Transplant 2009;9:1099–107)
- These data suggest a proof of concept that IVIG monotherapy is insufficient in the treatment of aAMR.







- Sautenet et al, reported that adding rituximab to plasmapheresis, IVIg and corticosteroids did not significantly improve allograft function or survival at day 12 and at 1 year (Transplantation. 2015;100:391–399)
- Kaposztas Z, showed a better 2-year graft survival with plasmapheresis and rituximab compared with plasmapheresis alone (Clin Transplant. 2009;23:63–73)

Review



The Treatment of Antibody-Mediated Rejection in Kidney Transplantation: An Updated Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis

Susan S. Wan, MMed (Clin Epi), FRACP,^{1,2} Tracey D. Ying, MMed (Clin Epi), FRACP,^{1,2} Kate Wyburn, FRACP, PhD,^{1,2} Darren M. Roberts, FRACP, PhD,^{3,4} Melanie Wyld, MBA, MPH,^{1,5} and Steven J. Chadban, FRACP, PhD^{1,2}

Background. Current treatments for antibody-mediated rejection (AMR) in kidney transplantation are based on low-quality data from a small number of controlled trials. Novel agents targeting B cells, plasma cells, and the complement system have featured in recent studies of AMR. **Methods.** We conducted a systematic review and meta-analysis of controlled trials in kidney transplant recipients using Medline, EMBASE, and CENTRAL from inception to February 2017. **Results.** Of 14380 citations, we identified 21 studies, including 10 randomized controlled trials, involving 751 participants. Since the last systematic review conducted in 2011, we found nine additional studies evaluating plasmapheresis + intravenous immunoglobulin (IVIG) (two), rituximab (two), bortezomib (two), C1 inhibitor (two), and eculizumab (one). Risk of bias was serious or unclear overall and evidence quality was low for the majority of treatment strategies. Sufficient RCTs for pooled analysis were available only for antibody removal, and here there was no significant difference between groups for graft survival (HR 0.76; 95% CI 0.35-1.63; *P* = 0.475). Studies showed important heterogeneity in treatments, definition of AMR, quality, and follow-up. Plasmapheresis and IVIG were used as standard-of-care in recent studies, and to this combination, rituximab seemed to add little or no benefit. Insufficient data are available to assess the efficacy of bortezomib and complement inhibitors. **Conclusion.** Newer studies evaluating rituximab showed little or no difference to early graft survival, and the efficacy of bortezomib and complement inhibitors for the treatment of AMR remains unclear. Despite the evidence uncertainty, plasmapheresis and IVIG have become standard-of-care for the treatment of acute AMR.

(Transplantation 2018;102: 557-568)



Variables		Response	No response	P-value	
PRA	< 20%	78.6%	21.4%	P=0.1	
	≥ 20%	75.0%	25.0%		
Recipient gender	Female	84.6%	15.4%	P=2.1	
	Male	60.0%	40.0%		
Dialysis duration	preemptive	0.0%	100.0%	P=0.18	
	< 6m	100.0%	0.0%		
	6-24m	81.8%	18.2%		
	> 24m	100.0%	0.0%		
Age	< 18	100.0%	0.0%	P=0.35	
	18-45	75.0%	25.0%		
	> 45	77.8%	22.2%		
Donor	Living	100.0%	0.0%	P=0.12	
	Deceased	73.3%	26.7%		







Varia	ables	Response	No response	P-value
ESRD causes	DM	100.0%	0.0%	P=3.12
	HTN	66.7%	33.3%	
	ADPKD	100.0%	0.0%	
	GN	66.7%	33.3%	
	Others	60.0%	40.0%	
Donor gender	Female	80.0%	20.0%	P=0.58
	Male	72.7%	27.3%	
Cyclosporine	+	100.0%	0.0%	P=0.46
	-	76.5%	23.5%	
Tacrolimus	+	76.5%	23.5%	P=0.55
	-	100.0%	0.0%	
ATG	+	73.3%	26.7%	P=2.22
	-	100.0%	0.0%	





variables		Response	No response	P-value
Time of kidney	1	86.7%	13.3%	P=0.039
transplantation	2	0.0%	100.0%	
	3	100.0%	0.0%	





Limitations of our study

- Most important limitation of our study was the sample size, which was not large enough to draw solid and definite conclusions
- Unfortunately we didn't have DSA







- It is well known that if not rapidly diagnosed and properly treated, acute AMR carries a high risk of allograft loss or of residual chronic allograft dysfunction
- Early diagnosis and precise treatment would reduce morbidity, mortality, and economic costs





More clinical studies, ideally RCTs, are required to optimize the treatment of AMR and given the low incidence of AMR this is likely to require multicenter involvement

