

need for interventions and their effect on AVF patency and future interventions. Studies are required to not only help predict which patients will likely have AVFs that will mature but also, those that will require procedures to assist maturation and patency. There is currently a paucity of validated algorithms to help select vascular access, and prior prediction tools for AVFs that fail to mature are outdated. The energy, resources, and educational efforts put into the original nationwide Fistula First initiative were highly successful in moving the needle to create more AVFs. We now need to revitalize research in vascular access and redirect our energies, efforts, and resources to updating and educating nephrologists, interventionalists, surgeons, dialysis staff, and associated trainees on how to properly assess and individualize approaches to vascular access choice and appropriate management. The goal remains unchanged: to help each patient attain a reliable dialysis access that can provide the prescribed dialysis for each patient's individual circumstances with as few complications and interventions as possible.¹⁷

DISCLOSURES

None.

REFERENCES

1. US Renal Data System: *U.S. Renal Data System.USRDS 2008 Annual Data Report: Atlas of Chronic Kidney Disease and End-Stage Renal Disease in the United States*, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, 2008
2. US Renal Data System: Vascular access. In: *U.S. Renal Data System.USRDS 2018 Annual Data Report: Atlas of Chronic Kidney Disease and End-Stage Renal Disease in the United States*, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive and Kidney Diseases, 2018
3. Vascular Access 2006 Work Group: Clinical practice guidelines for vascular access. *Am J Kidney Dis* 48[Suppl 1]: S176–S247, 2006
4. Peters VJ, Clemons G, Augustine B: "Fistula First" as a CMS breakthrough initiative: Improving vascular access through collaboration. *Nephrol Nurs J* 32: 686–687, 2005
5. Lee TQJ, Zhang Y, Thamer M, Allon M: Long-term outcomes of arteriovenous fistulas with unassisted versus assisted maturation: A retrospective, National Hemodialysis Cohort Study. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 30: 2209–2218, 2019
6. Viecelli AK, Howell M, Tong A, Teixeira-Pinto A, O'Lone E, Ju A, et al.: Identifying critically important vascular access outcomes for trials in haemodialysis: An international survey with patients, caregivers and health professionals [published online ahead of print August 1, 2019]. *Nephrol Dial Transplant* doi: 10.1093/ndt/gfz148
7. Viecelli AK, Tong A, O'Lone E, Ju A, Hanson CS, Sautenet B, et al.: SONG-HD Vascular Access Workshop Investigators: Report of the Standardized Outcomes in Nephrology-Hemodialysis (SONG-HD) consensus workshop on establishing a core outcome measure for hemodialysis vascular access. *Am J Kidney Dis* 71: 690–700, 2018
8. Woo K, Lok CE: New insights into dialysis vascular access: What is the optimal vascular access type and timing of access creation in CKD and dialysis patients? *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol* 11: 1487–1494, 2016
9. Woo K, Ulloa J, Allon M, Carsten CG 3rd, Chemla ES, Henry ML, et al.: Establishing patient-specific criteria for selecting the optimal upper extremity vascular access procedure. *J Vasc Surg* 65: 1089–1103.e1, 2017
10. Robinson BM, Akizawa T, Jager KJ, Kerr PG, Saran R, Pisoni RL: Factors affecting outcomes in patients reaching end-stage kidney disease worldwide: differences in access to renal replacement therapy, modality use, and haemodialysis practices. *Lancet* 388: 294–306, 2016
11. Asano M, Thumma J, Oguchi K, Pisoni RL, Akizawa T, Akiba T, et al.: J-DOPPS Research Group: Vascular access care and treatment practices associated with outcomes of arteriovenous fistula: International comparisons from the Dialysis Outcomes and Practice Patterns Study. *Nephron Clin Pract* 124: 23–30, 2013
12. Pisoni RL, Zepel L, Fluck R, Lok CE, Kawanishi H, Süleymanlar G, et al.: International differences in the location and use of arteriovenous accesses created for hemodialysis: Results from the Dialysis Outcomes and Practice Patterns Study (DOPPS). *Am J Kidney Dis* 71: 469–478, 2018
13. Chang CJ, Ko PJ, Hsu LA, Ko YS, Ko YL, Chen CF, et al.: Highly increased cell proliferation activity in the restenotic hemodialysis vascular access after percutaneous transluminal angioplasty: Implication in prevention of restenosis. *Am J Kidney Dis* 43: 74–84, 2004
14. Lee T, Tindhi A, Roy-Chaudhury P: Improved cumulative survival in fistulas requiring surgical interventions to promote fistula maturation compared with endovascular interventions. *Semin Dial* 26: 85–89, 2013
15. Litchfield TF: Dialysis access coding essentials, recent changes, and location distinctions. *Endovascular Today* 18: 64–66, 2019
16. Tomlinson GDS, Garg AX, Lok CE: Choosing the right analysis of repeated events for clinical trials in dialysis. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 26: FR-PO743, 2015
17. KDOQI clinical practice guidelines for vascular access, 2018. *Am J Kidney Dis* 2019, in press

See related article, "Long-Term Outcomes of Arteriovenous Fistulas with Unassisted versus Assisted Maturation: A Retrospective National Hemodialysis Cohort Study," on pages 2209–2218.

Tracking HLA Antibody Changes among Kidney Waitlist Candidates: One Protocol May Not Fit All

Annette M. Jackson ¹ and Miriam Manook^{1,2}

¹Department of Surgery, Duke University, Durham, North Carolina; and ²Renal and Transplant Department, Guy's and St Thomas' National Health Service Foundation Trust, London, United Kingdom

JASN 30: 2042–2044, 2019.

doi: <https://doi.org/10.1681/ASN.2019090946>

Kidney transplantation remains the treatment of choice for ESRD; however, in the absence of a compatible living donor, patients may wait years or decades for a transplant opportunity.^{1,2} HLA sensitization can prolong a candidate's waiting time even further by reducing donor offers to only those

Published online ahead of print. Publication date available at www.jasn.org.

Correspondence: Dr. Annette M. Jackson, Department of Surgery, Duke University, DUMC Box 2645, Durham, NC 27710. Email: amj@duke.edu

Copyright © 2019 by the American Society of Nephrology

with compatible HLA mismatches. Currently, the composition of most kidney waiting lists includes >35% sensitized candidates and, in the United States, the breadth of HLA sensitization among sensitized candidates is evenly dispersed between low (calculated panel reactive antibody [CPRA] 1%–19%), moderate (CPRA 20%–79%), and high (CPRA >80%) categories. Sharing of donor organs across larger geographic regions increases the donor pool size and the likelihood of finding a compatible donor for sensitized candidates.^{3,4} Furthermore, providing additional allocation points according to HLA sensitization breadth ensures that these compatible donors are offered first to sensitized candidates.^{2–4} These strategies have increased transplant rates for sensitized candidates in the United States and Europe with the goal of providing greater equity among candidates and reducing waiting list mortality.

Successful execution of these complex allocation algorithms relies on accurately matching candidates with the appropriate donor organ in a time-efficient manner. Thus, transplant centers must develop sustainable protocols for screening and managing growing waiting lists so that each candidate is medically ready and eligible to accept the optimal donor offer. Managing sensitized waiting list candidates requires regular serum screening to monitor changes in HLA antibody breadth and strength. When waitlist candidates are exposed to foreign HLAs through pregnancy or transfusion, this can initiate or broaden HLA sensitization.^{5,6} In presensitized candidates, HLA antibody breadth and strength can also change in response to inflammatory events such as infections, surgical procedures, or vaccines.^{7,8} Thus, HLA sensitization is dynamic and adequate monitoring is crucial for ensuring compatibility when a donor organ for a sensitized candidate is finally identified.

Transplant centers differ in their algorithms for test frequency and initiation of HLA antibody screening to maintain cost effectiveness. Regions with longer wait times may activate a candidate on the waitlist, but not begin screening for HLA antibodies until they have accumulated sufficient waiting time to receive donor offers. Other centers may determine testing frequency by the candidate's sensitization status and still others may use a one-size-fits-all algorithm testing all candidates with the same frequency. There are few studies examining optimal waitlist management and no published data examining whether the common practice of monitoring HLA antibodies at quarterly intervals is most effective. Although growing a center's waiting list may facilitate higher transplant numbers, it must be balanced with the cost and effort of managing large waiting lists given the proportion of candidates who are HLA sensitized and/or medically complex due to comorbidities associated with ESRD.

In this issue of *JASN*, Togninalli *et al.*⁹ examine HLA class I and class II antibody levels for 627 candidates on the University Hospital Zurich deceased donor kidney waiting list. The goal of their study was to investigate the kinetics of HLA antibodies over time, as measured by median fluorescence

intensity (MFI) on a single antigen bead assay, in an effort to find the optimal time interval between testing to improve the accuracy and efficacy of monitoring protocols. They examined changes in MFI between consecutive measurements for individual patients and tracked this in relation to the time interval between measurements. Surprisingly, the authors found no correlation between mean MFI change and the time interval between testing (range, 3–12 months). Next, they examined the effect of testing frequency on the ability to detect HLA antibody changes relative to published clinical thresholds used for HLA antibody detection and unacceptable HLA antigen assignment (1000 and 5000 MFI), but were still unable to pinpoint an optimal screening frequency. Nevertheless, the data did reveal differences in HLA antibody kinetics among candidates stratified by the route of HLA alloimmune exposure. Candidates with previous transplants showed greater fluctuations in their HLA antibody levels compared with candidates with a history of pregnancy or transfusions. This finding correlates with other studies showing that HLA sensitization stemming from failed transplants elicits stronger and broader HLA antibody levels and a higher prevalence of HLA-specific B memory cells that can be reactivated during times of inflammation.¹⁰ The study was unable to cluster candidates on the basis of statistical properties related to the HLA antibody kinetics, thus illuminating the high degree of complexity and individual variability in HLA-directed humoral responses.

Although the findings of this study are enlightening, a number of limitations within the available dataset prevented detailed guidance for optimizing the screening of sensitized waitlist candidates. Protocol testing data were not available to examine HLA antibody variability within a ≤ 30 -day testing interval. Many centers follow a quarterly monitoring protocol, but require a serum drawn within 30 days for crossmatch assessments to determine final transplant eligibility. Determining the optimal testing interval for candidates with the greatest HLA antibody variability is essential for facilitating efficient kidney allocation across greater distances with fewer unexpected crossmatch results. Commonly used tools such as CPRA or calculated reaction frequency (cRF), which reflect the breadth of HLA sensitization as it relates to deceased donor HLA haplotype frequencies, were not available to inform whether a certain threshold of CPRA results in greater HLA antibody fluctuation, independent of mode of sensitization. Given that rejection of a previous allograft and removal from immunosuppression likely elicit the strongest alloimmune response, candidates with previous transplants in this study may also possess higher CPRAs. Therefore, it is unclear whether stratification by CPRA alone may identify female candidates sensitized *via* pregnancy that also show complex HLA antibody kinetics. Furthermore, the study was not able to examine the specific clinical events associated with changes in HLA antibody levels such as hospitalizations, infections, or vaccinations, or the optimal timing of testing after these clinical events.

Overall, this study advocates for a stratified protocol for HLA antibody screening and highlights the importance of

obtaining detailed medical histories surrounding allosensitization and proinflammatory events at time of listing, while maintaining candidates on the waiting list, and at the time of transplantation. These points are important and timely given that centers are moving away from “real-time” crossmatch testing at time of donor offer and toward virtual crossmatch assessments that use retrospective HLA antibody testing data.

DISCLOSURES

Dr. Jackson serves on a Speaker Bureau for One Lambda, Thermo Fisher and as a scientific consultant for Hansa Biopharma. Dr. Manook has no conflicts of interest to disclose.

REFERENCES

1. OPTN/SRTR annual report, 2017. Available at: <http://optn.transplant.hrsa.gov>. Accessed September 20, 2019
2. Wu DA, Watson CJ, Bradley JA, Johnson RJ, Forsythe JL, Oniscu GC: Global trends and challenges in deceased donor kidney allocation. *Kidney Int* 91: 1287–1299, 2017
3. Stewart DE, Wilk AR, Toll AE, Harper AM, Lehman RR, Robinson AM, et al.: Measuring and monitoring equity in access to deceased donor kidney transplantation. *Am J Transplant* 18: 1924–1935, 2018
4. Eurotransplant annual report, 2018. Available at: <https://www.eurotransplant.org>. Accessed September 20, 2019
5. Scornik JC, Bromberg JS, Norman DJ, Bhandari M, Gitlin M, Petersen J: An update on the impact of pre-transplant transfusions and allosensitization on time to renal transplant and on allograft survival. *BMC Nephrol* 14: 217, 2013
6. Leffell MS, Kim D, Vega RM, Zachary AA, Petersen J, Hart JM, et al.: Red blood cell transfusions and the risk of allosensitization in patients awaiting primary kidney transplantation. *Transplantation* 97: 525–533, 2014
7. Locke JE, Zachary AA, Warren DS, Segev DL, Houp JA, Montgomery RA, et al.: Proinflammatory events are associated with significant increases in breadth and strength of HLA-specific antibody. *Am J Transplant* 9: 2136–2139, 2009
8. Katerinis I, Hadaya K, Duquesnoy R, Ferrari-Lacraz S, Meier S, van Delden C, et al.: De novo anti-HLA antibody after pandemic H1N1 and seasonal influenza immunization in kidney transplant recipients. *Am J Transplant* 11: 1727–1733, 2011
9. Togninalli M, Yoneoka D, Kolios AGA, Borgwardt K, Nilsson J: Pretransplant kinetics of anti-HLA antibodies in patients on the waiting list for kidney transplantation. *J Am Soc Nephrol* 30: 2262–2274, 2019
10. Snanoudj R, Claas FH, Heidt S, Legendre C, Chatenoud L, Candon S: Restricted specificity of peripheral alloreactive memory B cells in HLA-sensitized patients awaiting a kidney transplant. *Kidney Int* 87: 1230–1240, 2015

See related article, “Pretransplant Kinetics of Anti-HLA Antibodies in Patients on the Waiting List for Kidney Transplantation,” on pages 2262–2274.