University of Groningen

Hypothermic oxygenated machine perfusion reduces bile duct reperfusion injury after transplantation of donation after circulatory death livers

van Rijn, Rianne; van Leeuwen, Otto B; Matton, Alix P M; Burlage, Laura C; Wiersema-Buist, Janneke; van den Heuvel, Marius C; de Kleine, Ruben H J; de Boer, Marieke T; Gouw, Annette S H; Porte, Robert J

Link to publication in University of Groningen/UMCG research database

Hypothermic Oxygenated Machine Perfusion Reduces Bile Duct Reperfusion Injury After Transplantation of Donation After Circulatory Death Livers

Rianne van Rijn,[1,2] Otto B. van Leeuwen,[1,2] Alix P. M. Matton,[1,2] Laura C. Burlage,[1,2] Janneke Wiersema-Buist,[2] Marius C. van den Heuvel,[3] Ruben H. J. de Kleine,[1] Marieke T. de Boer,[1] Annette S. H. Gouw,[3] and Robert J. Porte[1]

[1]Section of Hepatobiliary Surgery and Liver Transplantation, [2]Surgical Research Laboratory, Department of Surgery, and [3]Pathology, University Medical Center Groningen, University of Groningen, the Netherlands

Dual hypothermic oxygenated machine perfusion (DHOPE) of the liver has been advocated as a method to reduce ischemia/reperfusion injury (IRI). This study aimed to determine whether DHOPE reduces IRI of the bile ducts in donation after circulatory death (DCD) liver transplantation. In a recently performed phase 1 trial, 10 DCD livers were preserved with DHOPE after static cold storage (SCS; www.trialregister.nl NTR4493). Bile duct biopsies were obtained at the end of SCS (before DHOPE; baseline) and after graft reperfusion in the recipient. Histological severity of biliary injury was graded according to an established semiquantitative grading system. Twenty liver transplantations using DCD livers not preserved with DHOPE served as controls. Baseline characteristics and the degree of bile duct injury at baseline (end of SCS) were similar between both groups. In controls, the degree of stroma necrosis ($P = 0.002$) and injury of the deep peribiliary glands (PBG; $P = 0.02$) increased after reperfusion compared with baseline. In contrast, in DHOPE-preserved livers, the degree of bile duct injury did not increase after reperfusion. Moreover, there was less injury of deep PBG ($P = 0.04$) after reperfusion in the DHOPE group compared with controls. In conclusion, this study suggests that DHOPE reduces IRI of bile ducts after DCD liver transplantation.

The worldwide shortage of donor livers for transplantation has led to efforts to increase the number of available grafts. In countries such as the Netherlands, Spain, and the United Kingdom, this has led to a more frequent use of donation after circulatory death (DCD) livers for transplantation.[1,2] Unfortunately, DCD liver grafts have a 3-fold higher risk of developing nonanastomotic biliary strictures (NAS) after transplantation compared with donation after brain death (DBD) liver grafts. The reported incidence of NAS ranges between 16% and 31% in DCD versus 3%-13% in DBD liver grafts.[3-5] This type of biliary complication is regarded as a major complication after DCD liver transplantation because it often requires multiple endoscopic interventions and leads to retransplantation in 16% of patients and death in 6%.[6,7]

Although the etiology of NAS is not fully understood, the duration of cold and warm ischemia during transplantation has been recognized as a major risk factor for NAS.[8-10] Ischemic conditions lead to a complex cascade of events resulting in ischemia/reperfusion injury (IRI).[11] Three independent clinical studies

Abbreviations: ALT, alanine aminotransferase; ATP, adenosine triphosphate; BMI, body mass index; DBD, donation after brain death; DCD, donation after circulatory death; DHOPE, dual hypothermic oxygenated machine perfusion; ET-DRI, Eurotransplant donor risk index; GGT, gamma-glutamyltransferase; HMP, hypothermic machine perfusion; HTK, histidine tryptophan ketoglutarate; IRI, ischemia/reperfusion injury; MELD, Model for End-Stage Liver Disease; NAS, nonanastomotic biliary strictures; NASH, nonalcoholic steatohepatitis; PBG, peribiliary glands; PVP, peribiliary vascular plexus; ROS, reactive oxygen species; SCS, static cold storage; UW, University of Wisconsin.

recently demonstrated that the majority of donor livers have histological evidence of extensive biliary IRI at the time of transplantation.[12-14] In particular, the degree of biliary epithelial loss, mural necrosis, and injury of the deep peribiliary glands (PBG) and peribiliary vascular plexus (PVP) at the time of transplantation has been associated with the development of NAS after transplantation.[12-14] The PBG contain biliary stem/progenitor cells that are involved in the regeneration and repair of the bile duct epithelium after severe injury.[15-17] Therefore, it has been hypothesized that reduced regenerative capacity of the bile ducts due to damage of the PBG plays an important role in the development of NAS after transplantation.[14,18]

A short period of hypothermic machine perfusion (HMP) after conventional static cold storage (SCS) has been shown to reduce IRI of donor livers.[19,20] End-ischemic HMP results in a reduction of hepatocyte apoptosis and necrosis, mitochondrial and nuclear injury, endothelial injury, Kupffer cell activation, and the subsequent host immune response.[19-23] Furthermore, animal studies have suggested that HMP reduces IRI of the bile ducts, as indicated by an improved biliary epithelial cell function, reduced biliary injury markers, and less histological bile duct wall necrosis, epithelial cell loss, and arteriolonecrosis of the PVP, compared with SCS alone.[24-26] The first clinical series of end-ischemic HMP have demonstrated that this method is safe and may lead to a lower incidence of biliary complications after transplantation.[27-31] However, formal proof for such a protective effect of HMP should come from prospective randomized trials that are currently ongoing (ClinicalTrials.gov, NCT02584283).

Address reprint requests to Robert J. Porte, M.D., Ph.D., Section of Hepatobiliary and Liver Transplantation, Department of Surgery, University Medical Center Groningen, HPC BA33, P.O. Box 30.001, 9700 RB Groningen, the Netherlands. Telephone: +31 50 361 2896; FAX: +31 50 361 4873; E-mail address: r.j.porte@umcg.nl

Despite the recognized beneficial effect of HMP on IRI and a suggested reduced risk of NAS after transplantation, there are no studies that have examined the effect of HMP on IRI of human bile ducts. In the present study, we aimed to determine whether dual hypothermic oxygenated machine perfusion (DHOPE) reduces reperfusion injury of the bile ducts in DCD liver transplantation, by performing a systematic histological comparison of donor bile ducts before and after graft reperfusion.

Patients and Methods

STUDY POPULATION

A recently performed phase 1 study in our center included 10 consecutive patients who underwent DCD liver transplantation between April and November 2014.[31] The donor livers were preserved with DHOPE for 2 hours after conventional SCS. Informed consent for DHOPE was obtained. The study protocol conformed to the ethical guidelines of the 1975 Declaration of Helsinki and was approved by the medical ethics committee of the University Medical Center Groningen (approval number METc2014.100).

A control group consisted of patients who underwent DCD liver transplantation in our center between February 2012 and September 2015. During this period, bile duct biopsies were routinely obtained when the bile duct was long enough. All patients in whom bile duct biopsies were obtained were included in the control group without application of exclusion criteria.

STUDY PROTOCOL

All DCD livers were procured by 1 of the regional multiorgan recovery teams using a rapid procurement protocol with aortic cold flush-out and additional portal vein flush on the back table, followed by SCS. Upon arrival in our center, the liver was inspected and prepared for perfusion by placement of cannulas in the portal vein and aorta. The cannulas were connected to the disposable tubing set of the Liver Assist device (Organ Assist, Groningen, the Netherlands). The livers were perfused for at least 2 hours with 4 L of University of Wisconson (UW) machine perfusion solution (Bridge-to-Life, Ltd., Norfolk, UK) at a temperature of 10°C-12°C. Two rotary pumps enabled pressure-controlled perfusion with pulsatile mean arterial pressure of 25 mm Hg and a continuous portal pressure of 5 mm Hg. The perfusion solution was oxygenated by 2 hollow fiber membrane oxygenators with

100% fraction of inspired oxygen at 500 mL/minute per oxygenator.

BILE DUCT BIOPSIES

Bile duct biopsies were obtained from the common bile duct, as described previously.[14] The biopsies were at the end of SCS (baseline) and after graft reperfusion in the recipient, shortly before constructing the bile duct anastomosis. Baseline biopsies were collected after SCS during the back-table procedure, which was followed by DHOPE. All samples were fixed in 4% formalin, subsequently embedded in paraffin, and 4-μm thick slides were stained with hematoxylin-eosin. The slides were examined using light microscopy and scanned with a Hamamatsu device.

HISTOLOGICAL GRADING OF BILIARY INJURY

Biliary injury was graded according to an established semiquantitative histological grading system described by Hansen et al. and modified by Op den Dries et al.[13,14] (Table 1). Biopsies were scored without knowledge of the clinical data by 2 investigators separately (R.v.R. and O.B.v.L.) under supervision of 2 dedicated liver pathologists (A.S.H.G. and M.C.v.d.H.). In case of discordant results, slides were examined by a third investigator.

STATISTICAL ANALYSES

Continuous variables were presented as median (interquartile range) or mean (standard deviation) when appropriate and were compared between groups with the 2-tailed Mann-Whitney U test. Categorical variables were presented as n (%) and compared between groups with the Pearson chi-square test or the Fisher's exact test where appropriate. P values < 0.05 were defined as significant. Statistical analyses were performed using SPSS for Windows, version 22.0 (IBM, Armonk, NY).

Results

DONOR AND RECIPIENT CHARACTERISTICS

Between April and November 2014, 10 patients were included in the DHOPE phase 1 trial. Detailed clinical results have been reported previously.[31] The control group consisted of 20 patients in whom bile duct biopsies were obtained, out of a total of 69 patients who underwent a DCD liver transplantation in our center between February 2012 and September 2015.

TABLE 1. Histological Grading of Bile Duct Injury

Item	Histological Characteristic	Grading
1. Biliary epithelium loss	Absence of epithelial cells lining the bile duct lumen	0: no loss 1: ≤50% of the bile duct with absent epithelial lining 2: >50%
2. Mural stroma necrosis	Necrosis of the bile duct wall	0: no necrosis 1: ≤25% of the wall necrotic 2: >25% and ≤50% 3: >50% and ≤75% 4: >75%
3. PVP damage	Damage to the vessels such as subendothelial edema	0: no vascular lesions 1: ≤50% of the vessels damaged 2: >50%
4. Arteriolonecrosis	Loss of endothelial nuclei of arterioles and media degeneration	0: no arteriolonecrosis 1: ≤50% of the arteries necrotic 2: >50%
5. Thrombosis	Presence of microthrombi	0: no microthrombi 1: microthrombi present
6. Intramural bleeding	Presence of erythrocytes in the bile duct wall	0: no bleeding 1: ≤50% of the bile duct wall 2: >50%
7. Periluminal PBG loss	Absence of epithelial cells in the PBG close to the lumen	0: no loss 1: ≤50% loss 2: >50% loss
8. Deep PBG loss	Absence of epithelium in the PBG located deep in the bile duct wall	0: no loss 1: ≤50% loss 2: >50% loss

TABLE 2. Donor and Recipient Characteristics

Characteristic	DHOPE Group (n = 10)	Control Group (n = 20)	P Value
Donor characteristics			
Eurotransplant donor risk index*	2.30 (1.81-2.53)	2.22 (1.67-2.54)	0.98
Age, years	53 (47-57)	49 (34-55)	0.18
BMI, kg/m^2	23.0 (19.9-24.1)	23.6 (22.0-26.0)	0.25
Latest ALT, U/L	72 (39-125)	29 (19-46)	0.008
Peak ALT, U/L	121 (42-271)	33 (20-46)	0.004
Latest GGT, U/L	50 (19-102)	39 (17-70)	0.75
Preservation characteristics			
Preservation fluid (UW versus HTK)	10 (100)	18 (90)	0.54
Asystole time, minutes[†]	15 (13-17)	15 (12-19)	0.95
Donor warm ischemia time, minutes[‡]	26 (23-42)	33 (29-41)	0.35
Cold ischemia time, minutes[§]	358 (314-398)	426 (402-485)	0.002
Total preservation time, minutes[‖]	521 (469-592)	430 (407-485)	0.002
Anastomosis time, minutes[¶]	34 (30-49)	33 (31-43)	0.88
Recipient characteristics			
Age, years	57 (54-62)	55 (47-63)	0.50
Sex, male	6 (60)	9 (45)	> 0.99
MELD score[#]	16 (15-22)	20 (13-24)	0.56
Underlying disease			0.08
Alcoholic cirrhosis	3 (30)	3 (15)	
NASH	5 (50)	3 (15)	
Primary sclerosing cholangitis	1 (10)	4 (20)	
Primary biliary cirrhosis	0	0	
Autoimmune hepatitis	0	3 (15)	
Hepatitis B or C	1 (10)	1 (5)	
Hepatocellular carcinoma	0	0	
Cryptogenic	0	3 (15)	
Other	0	4 (20)	

NOTE: Data are given as n (%) or median (interquartile range).
*ET-DRI is a validated tool to assess the risk of liver graft failure.[37]
[†]Asystole time was defined as time between circulatory arrest and in situ aortic cold flush.
[‡]Donor warm ischemia time was defined as the time interval between withdrawal of donor life support and initiation of in situ aortic cold flush.
[§]Cold ischemia time was defined as the interval between start aortic cold flush and end of SCS excluding the duration of DHOPE.
[‖]Total preservation time was defined as the interval between start aortic cold flush in the donor and portal reperfusion in the recipient.
[¶]Anastomosis time was defined as the interval between donor liver out of ice and revascularization.
[#]MELD score was defined as the highest of laboratory derived MELD score or the (non) standard exception MELD score.

There were no differences in donor and recipient characteristics between the 20 control patients and the remaining 49 recipients of a DCD graft (data not shown). Baseline clinical characteristics of the DHOPE group and the control group are summarized in Table 2. The Eurotransplant donor risk index (ET-DRI) was similar in the DHOPE and the control groups. The donors in the DHOPE group had a higher latest serum alanine aminotransferase (ALT) and peak serum ALT concentration, compared with the donors in the control group: latest ALT 72 U/L (39-125 U/L) versus 29 U/L (19-46 U/L), respectively (P = 0.008); peak ALT 121 U/L (42-271 U/L) versus 33 U/L (20-46 U/L), respectively (P = 0.004). The cold ischemia time was shorter in the DHOPE group, but the total preservation time in the DHOPE group was longer than in the control group: 521 minutes (469-592 minutes) versus 430 minutes (407-485 minutes), respectively (P = 0.002).

HISTOLOGICAL EVIDENCE OF BILE DUCT INJURY

The results of bile duct injury scorings based on the semiquantitative histological grading system are summarized in Table 3. There were no discordant results between the 2 investigators. As expected, there were no significant differences at baseline between the 2 groups for any item of the histological grading system (Fig. 1). In the control group, the histological bile duct damage after reperfusion was more severe than at baseline. In particular, the degree of mural stroma necrosis

TABLE 3. Comparison of Histological Bile Duct Injury

Bile Duct Wall Component	DHOPE Group			Control Group		
	Baseline	After Reperfusion	P Value	Baseline	After Reperfusion	P Value
Biliary epithelium loss			>0.99			—
Grade 0	—	—		—	—	
Grade 1	10%	14%		—	—	
Grade 2	90%	86%		100%	100%	
Mural stroma necrosis			0.25			0.002
Grade 0	90%	57%		50%	9%	
Grade 1	—	—		43%	9%	
Grade 2	10%	29%		—	36%	
Grade 3	—	14%		7%	46%	
PVP damage			0.38			0.72
Grade 0	50%	57%		43%	36%	
Grade 1	50%	29%		43%	36%	
Grade 2	—	14%		14%	28%	
Arteriolonecrosis			>0.99			0.57
Grade 0	90%	100%		93%	82%	
Grade 1	10%	—		—	—	
Grade 2	—	—		7%	18%	
Thrombosis			>0.99			>0.99
Grade 0	90%	100%		93%	91%	
Grade 1	10%	—		7%	9%	
Intramural bleeding			—			0.11
Grade 0	100%	100%		100%	73%	
Grade 1	—	—		—	18%	
Grade 2	—	—		—	9%	
Periluminal PBG loss			0.24			0.23
Grade 0	—	14%		—	—	
Grade 1	30%	29%		21%	—	
Grade 2	70%	57%		79%	100%	
Deep PBG loss			0.64			0.02
Grade 0	40%	43%		36%	—	
Grade 1	40%	43%		64%	73%	
Grade 2	20%	14%		—	27%	

and the degree of deep PBG injury increased after reperfusion ($P = 0.002$ and $P = 0.02$, respectively). In contrast to the control group, there was no increase in the severity of histological biliary injury after reperfusion in the DHOPE group (Table 3).

When comparing the severity of postreperfusion bile duct injury between the 2 study groups, livers in the DHOPE group displayed significantly less injury and loss of cells in the periluminal ($P = 0.04$) and the deep PBG ($P = 0.04$), compared with controls (Figs. 1–3). No differences were observed in the severity of arteriolonecrosis, stroma necrosis, or injury of the PVP between the 2 groups after reperfusion.

CLINICAL OUTCOMES

The overall clinical outcome after transplantation of the patients in the DHOPE group has been described in detail previously.[31] Complete 1-year follow-up was available in all patients. The incidence of NAS within 1 year after transplantation was 10% in the DHOPE group and 35% in the control group ($P = 0.15$). NAS was defined as bile duct stenosis at any location in the biliary tree (intrahepatic or extrahepatic, but not at the site of the anastomosis) as detected by endoscopic retrograde or magnetic resonance cholangiography, with cholestatic manifestations such as jaundice, cholangitis, or elevated laboratory tests, and in the presence of a patent hepatic artery. One recipient of a DHOPE-preserved liver developed local NAS in segment 2 and 3 of the liver 5 months after transplantation, which was successfully treated with endoscopic stenting. None of the patients in the DHOPE group required retransplantation for NAS. In contrast, 4 (20%) in the control group required retransplantation for NAS at a median of 9 (6-12) months after transplantation.

Discussion

In the current study, we aimed to determine whether end-ischemic oxygenated hypothermic machine perfusion (DHOPE) of human DCD liver grafts reduces

FIG. 1. Degree of injury of the bile ducts of DCD livers treated with DHOPE versus controls after SCS and after reperfusion in the recipient. (A) The degree of mural stroma necrosis increased after reperfusion compared with baseline in the control group ($P < 0.001$), but not in the DHOPE group. (B) No differences were observed for the degree of injury of the PVP. (C) The periluminal PBG of livers treated with DHOPE demonstrated less injury after reperfusion than in the control group ($P = 0.04$). Additionally, the injury of the deep PBG in the control group increased after reperfusion compared with baseline ($P = 0.02$). (D) The deep PBG in the livers treated with DHOPE demonstrated less damage after reperfusion than in the control group ($P = 0.04$). *P value < 0.05.

IRI of the bile ducts after transplantation. The results of this study clearly demonstrated a reduction in biliary IRI of DHOPE-preserved DCD livers, compared with DCD livers that did not undergo DHOPE. These findings provide important new insight in the protective mechanism of end-ischemic DHOPE and are in line with the clinically observed reduction in the incidence of NAS after DCD liver transplantation when DHOPE is applied.[27-31]

In accordance with previous reports,[12,14] all DCD livers included in this study displayed histological signs of substantial bile duct injury at the end of SCS. As expected, the degree of bile duct injury after SCS (baseline) was not different between livers that underwent DHOPE or not. In control livers that were not treated with DHOPE, the degree of biliary injury worsened after graft reperfusion in the recipient, a phenomenon that was not observed in DHOPE-preserved livers. Especially, the severity of mural stroma necrosis and injury of the deep PBG increased after reperfusion

of the control livers, but not of the DHOPE-preserved livers. When comparing postreperfusion biopsies of bile ducts of DHOPE-preserved livers and controls, significantly less histological injury of both the periluminal and deep PBG was found in the DHOPE group.

In a large clinical study including 128 liver transplant recipients, we have previously shown that the severity of bile duct injury at the end of SCS is a strong risk factor for the development of NAS after transplantation.[14] Upon reperfusion of a liver graft in the recipient, the degree of biliary injury increases further and this may result in irreversible damage of essential components of the bile duct wall, such as the mural stroma, and peribiliary vasculature.[12,14] Obviously, end-ischemic DHOPE cannot have a protective effect on biliary injury that is already present after SCS. However, the current study indicates that DHOPE does prevent further worsening of bile duct injury after graft reperfusion.

FIG. 2. Representative histologic examples of periluminal PBG in the common bile duct. (A) Bile duct at baseline of a DCD liver in the DHOPE group. (B) Bile duct after reperfusion of a DCD liver in the DHOPE group. (C) Bile duct at baseline of a DCD liver in the control group. (D) Bile duct after reperfusion of a DCD liver in the control group. The insert represents a higher magnification of the periluminal PBG (400×). Bile ducts of livers preserved with DHOPE displayed significantly less epithelial cell loss of the periluminal PBG, compared with control livers. Original magnification was 200×. Arrows indicate periluminal PBG. *Lumen of the bile duct.

It is well-known that the majority of tissue damage due to IRI occurs in the reperfusion period after restoration of blood flow to the graft.[11] Some of the key factors in IRI are the depletion of cellular energy content (especially intracellular adenosine triphosphate [ATP]) and the formation of reactive oxygen species (ROS) due to mitochondrial dysfunction.[11,32] Although ROS formation results in oxidative damage of cellular structures, such as cell membranes and nuclear DNA, depletion and insufficient restoration of ATP results in cell death due to insufficient metabolic function. Although the conditions for IRI are generated during cold ischemia preservation, the sequelae of events that lead to full-blown IRI is not activated until after warm reperfusion.[11] Experimental and clinical studies have demonstrated that 1 of the key protective mechanisms of hypothermic oxygenated machine perfusion is a full restoration of cellular ATP content and "resuscitation" of mitochondria, resulting in a significant reduction of ROS production after subsequent warm graft reperfusion in the recipient.[21,22,33,34] In addition, and downstream of this, oxygenated HMP results in a reduction of Kupffer cell activation and less secondary activation of the innate immune system.[21,22,33,34] Altogether, these protective effects have been shown to result in a reduction of hepatocellular IRI. Our data on the reduction of biliary IRI are in line with these previous studies and demonstrate that not only hepatocellular IRI but also IRI of the bile ducts is attenuated by oxygenated HMP.

The DHOPE-preserved livers in the present study demonstrated significantly less severe injury of the deep and periluminal PBG after reperfusion compared with the control livers that did not undergo DHOPE. This histological finding is clinically relevant because the PBG have been identified as a local niche of biliary progenitor cells that contribute to the regeneration of biliary epithelium after injury.[15-17,35] Severe injury of the deep PBG at the time of transplantation is a significant risk factor for the development of NAS.[14] Therefore, the protective effect of DHOPE on PBG may lead to better preserved regenerative biliary capacity followed by a reduction of the incidence of NAS. This is supported by the (nonsignificant) low incidence

FIG. 3. Representative histologic examples of deep PBG in the common bile duct of DCD liver grafts. (A) Bile duct at baseline of a DCD liver in the DHOPE group. (B) Bile duct after reperfusion of a DCD liver in the DHOPE group. (C) Bile duct at baseline of a DCD liver in the control group. (D) Bile duct after reperfusion of a DCD liver in the control group. The insert represents a higher magnification of the deep PBG (400×). Arrows indicate deep PBG. *Lumen of the bile duct. Bile ducts of livers preserved with DHOPE displayed significantly less epithelial cell loss of the deep PBG compared with control livers. Original magnification was 200×.

of NAS observed after transplantation of DCD livers preserved with HMP in the first clinical series.[27-31] However, formal evidence that oxygenated HMP reduces the incidence of NAS should come from an adequately powered randomized controlled trial. Such a multicenter trial has recently been initiated in transplant centers in the Netherlands, Belgium, and United Kingdom (ClinicalTrials.gov NCT02584283).

Bile duct biopsies in this study were obtained from the extrahepatic bile ducts, whereas NAS mainly occurs in the intrahepatic bile ducts. However, previous studies have shown that the degree of injury of the extrahepatic bile duct correlates well with the degree of injury of the intrahepatic bile ducts[36] and histological assessment of the extrahepatic bile duct can predict the development of NAS.[14]

In contrast to a previous study on DHOPE using a porcine DCD liver model, we did not find a reduction in the degree of injury of the PVP and arteriolonecrosis in the human liver bile ducts after DHOPE.[24] In fact, we did not find a significant increase in the degree of PVP injury and arteriolonecrosis after reperfusion

compared with baseline in both groups. In the current study, the postreperfusion bile duct biopsy was taken 1-2 hours after graft reperfusion, and this time interval may have been too short for histologically detectable vascular injury to develop.

Limitations of this study are the sample size and the use of historical controls. The controls used in this histological study were slightly different from the ones used in our previous report on clinical outcome after transplantation of DHOPE-preserved DCD livers[31] because the control group consisted of all available paraffin-embedded bile duct biopsies from DCD liver grafts without application of exclusion criteria. Although most baseline characteristics such as ET-DRI were similar between the 2 study groups, the donors in the DHOPE group had significantly higher serum ALT levels compared with donors in the control group. Because ALT is a marker for hepatocellular injury, the DHOPE group consisted of livers with slightly more preexisting injury than the control group. Therefore, the observed beneficial effects of DHOPE might have been more pronounced if the ALT levels

would have been equivalent between the groups. As expected, the preservation method DHOPE affected the length of preservation periods in the study groups: the total preservation time was longer but the cold ischemia time was shorter in the DHOPE group compared with the control group. In the intervention group, the donor liver is machine perfused while the recipient surgery is performed. In the control group, the donor liver remains in the ice box during this period. The shorter cold ischemia time in the DHOPE group may have caused an advantage, whereas the longer total preservation time may have caused a disadvantage. However, the median difference in cold ischemia time was only 30 minutes, and baseline levels of bile duct injury were similar between the groups.

In conclusion, this study demonstrates that DHOPE attenuates IRI of the bile ducts after transplantation of DCD liver grafts. In particular, DHOPE contributed to a better preservation of the PBG and, as such, may preserve the regenerative capacity of the donor bile ducts leading to a reduced risk of biliary complications after transplantation.

REFERENCES

1) NHS Blood and Transplant. Organ Donation and Transplantation; Activity Report 2015-2016. https://nhsbtdbe.blob.core.windows.net/umbraco-assets-corp/4662/activity_report_2015_16.pdf.
2) Dutch Transplant Foundation. Annual report 2015. http://www.transplantatiestichting.nl/winkel/nts-jaarverslag-2015. Accessed February 26, 2018.
3) den Dulk AC, Sebib Korkmaz K, de Rooij BJ, Sutton ME, Braat AE, Inderson A, et al. High peak alanine aminotransferase determines extra risk for nonanastomotic biliary strictures after liver transplantation with donation after circulatory death. Transpl Int 2015;28:492-501.
4) Dubbeld J, Hoekstra H, Farid W, Ringers J, Porte RJ, Metselaar HJ, et al. Similar liver transplantation survival with selected cardiac death donors and brain death donors. Br J Surg 2010;97:744-753.
5) O'Neill S, Roebuck A, Khoo E, Wigmore SJ, Harrison EM. A meta-analysis and meta-regression of outcomes including biliary complications in donation after cardiac death liver transplantation. Transpl Int 2014;27:1159-1174.
6) Blok JJ, Detry O, Putter H, Rogiers X, Porte RJ, van Hoek B, et al. Long-term results of liver transplantation from donation after circulatory death. Liver Transpl 2016;22:1107-1114.
7) Verdonk RC, Buis CI, Porte RJ, van der Jagt EJ, Limburg AJ, van den Berg AP, et al. Anastomotic biliary strictures after liver transplantation: causes and consequences. Liver Transpl 2006;12:726-735.
8) Detry O, Donckier V, Lucidi V, Ysebaert D, Chapelle T, Lerut J, et al. Liver transplantation from donation after cardiac death donors: initial Belgian experience 2003-2007. Transpl Int 2010;23:611-618.
9) Gilbo N, Jochmans I, Sainz M, Pirenne J, Meurisse N, Monbaliu D. Reducing non-anastomotic biliary strictures in donation after circulatory death liver transplantation: cold ischemia time matters! Ann Surg 2017;266:e118-e119.
10) Taner CB, Bulatao IG, Perry DK, Sibulesky L, Willingham DL, Kramer DJ, Nguyen JH. Asystole to cross-clamp period predicts development of biliary complications in liver transplantation using donation after cardiac death donors. Transpl Int 2012;25:838-846.
11) van Golen RF, van Gulik TM, Heger M. The sterile immune response during hepatic ischemia/reperfusion. Cytokine Growth Factor Rev 2012;23:69-84.
12) Brunner SM, Junger H, Ruemmele P, Schnitzbauer AA, Doenecke A, Kirchner GI, et al. Bile duct damage after cold storage of deceased donor livers predicts biliary complications after liver transplantation. J Hepatol 2013;58:1133-1139.
13) Hansen T, Hollemann D, Pitton MB, Heise M, Hoppe-Lotichius M, Schuchmann M, et al. Histological examination and evaluation of donor bile ducts received during orthotopic liver transplantation–a morphological clue to ischemic-type biliary lesion? Virchows Arch 2012;461:41-48.
14) op den Dries S, Westerkamp AC, Karimian N, Gouw AS, Bruinsma BG, Markmann JF, et al. Injury to peribiliary glands and vascular plexus before liver transplantation predicts formation of non-anastomotic biliary strictures. J Hepatol 2014;60:1172-1179.
15) Carpino G, Cardinale V, Onori P, Franchitto A, Berloco PB, Rossi M, et al. Biliary tree stem/progenitor cells in glands of extrahepatic and intraheptic bile ducts: an anatomical in situ study yielding evidence of maturational lineages. J Anat 2012;220:186-199.
16) DiPaola F, Shivakumar P, Pfister J, Walters S, Sabla G, Bezerra JA. Identification of intramural epithelial networks linked to peribiliary glands that express progenitor cell markers and proliferate after injury in mice. Hepatology 2013;58:1486-1496.
17) Nakanuma Y, Hoso M, Sanzen T, Sasaki M. Microstructure and development of the normal and pathologic biliary tract in humans, including blood supply. Microsc Res Tech 1997;38:552-570.
18) Karimian N, Op den Dries S, Porte RJ. The origin of biliary strictures after liver transplantation: is it the amount of epithelial injury or insufficient regeneration that counts? J Hepatol 2013;58:1065-1067.
19) Dutkowski P, Graf R, Clavien PA. Rescue of the cold preserved rat liver by hypothermic oxygenated machine perfusion. Am J Transplant 2006;6(pt 1):903-912.
20) Guarrera JV, Estevez J, Boykin J, Boyce R, Rashid J, Sun S, Arrington B. Hypothermic machine perfusion of liver grafts for transplantation: technical development in human discard and miniature swine models. Transplant Proc 2005;37:323-325.
21) Schlegel A, Kron P, Graf R, Dutkowski P, Clavien PA. Warm vs. cold perfusion techniques to rescue rodent liver grafts. J Hepatol 2014;61:1267-1275.
22) Schlegel A, de Rougemont O, Graf R, Clavien PA, Dutkowski P. Protective mechanisms of end-ischemic cold machine perfusion in DCD liver grafts. J Hepatol 2013;58:278-286.
23) Westerkamp AC, Karimian N, Matton AP, Mahboub P, van Rijn R, Wiersema-Buist J, et al. Oxygenated hypothermic machine perfusion after static cold storage improves hepatobiliary function of extended criteria donor livers. Transplantation 2016;100:825-835.
24) Op den Dries S, Sutton ME, Karimian N, de Boer MT, Wiersema-Buist J, Gouw AS, et al. Hypothermic oxygenated machine perfusion prevents arteriolonecrosis of the peribiliary

plexus in pig livers donated after circulatory death. PLoS One 2014;9:e88521.

25) Schlegel A, Graf R, Clavien PA, Dutkowski P. Hypothermic oxygenated perfusion (HOPE) protects from biliary injury in a rodent model of DCD liver transplantation. J Hepatol 2013;59: 984-991.

26) Westerkamp AC, Mahboub P, Meyer SL, Hottenrott M, Ottens PJ, Wiersema-Buist J, et al. End-ischemic machine perfusion reduces bile duct injury in donation after circulatory death rat donor livers independent of the machine perfusion temperature. Liver Transpl 2015;21:1300-1311.

27) Dutkowski P, Polak WG, Muiesan P, Schlegel A, Verhoeven CJ, Scalera I, et al. First comparison of hypothermic oxygenated perfusion versus static cold storage of human donation after cardiac death liver transplants: an international-matched case analysis. Ann Surg 2015;262:764-770.

28) Dutkowski P, Schlegel A, de Oliveira M, Müllhaupt B, Neff F, Clavien PA. HOPE for human liver grafts obtained from donors after cardiac death. J Hepatol 2014;60:765-772.

29) Guarrera JV, Henry SD, Samstein B, Odeh-Ramadan R, Kinkhabwala M, Goldstein MJ, et al. Hypothermic machine preservation in human liver transplantation: the first clinical series. Am J Transplant 2010;10:372-381.

30) Guarrera JV, Henry SD, Samstein B, Reznik E, Musat C, Lukose TI, et al. Hypothermic machine preservation facilitates successful transplantation of "orphan" extended criteria donor livers. Am J Transplant 2015;15:161-169.

31) van Rijn R, Karimian N, Matton APM, Burlage LC, Westerkamp AC, van den Berg AP, et al. Dual hypothermic oxygenated machine perfusion in liver transplants donated after circulatory death. Br J Surg 2017;104:907-917.

32) Schlegel A, Kron P, Dutkowski P. Hypothermic oxygenated liver perfusion: basic mechanisms and clinical application. Curr Transplant Rep 2015;2:52-62.

33) Henry SD, Nachber E, Tulipan J, Stone J, Bae C, Reznik L, et al. Hypothermic machine preservation reduces molecular markers of ischemia/reperfusion injury in human liver transplantation. Am J Transplant 2012;12:2477-2486.

34) Schlegel A, Kron P, Graf R, Clavien PA, Dutkowski P. Hypothermic oxygenated perfusion (HOPE) downregulates the immune response in a rat model of liver transplantation. Ann Surg 2014;260:931-937.

35) Irie T, Asahina K, Shimizu-Saito K, Teramoto K, Arii S, Teraoka H. Hepatic progenitor cells in the mouse extrahepatic bile duct after a bile duct ligation. Stem Cells Dev 2007;16:979-987.

36) Karimian N, Weeder PD, Bomfati F, Gouw AS, Porte RJ. Preservation injury of the distal extrahepatic bile duct of donor livers is representative for injury of the intrahepatic bile ducts. J Hepatol 2015;63:284-287.

37) Braat AE, Blok JJ, Putter H, Adam R, Burroughs AK, Rahmel AO, et al.; for European Liver and Intestine Transplant Association (ELITA) and Eurotransplant Liver Intestine Advisory Committee (ELIAC). The Eurotransplant donor risk index in liver transplantation: ET-DRI. Am J Transplant 2012;12:2789-2796.