

Comparative evaluation of biological human leukocyte antigen DPB1 mismatch models for survival and graft-versus-host disease prediction after unrelated donor hematopoietic cell transplantation

Francesca Lorentino,¹ Nicoletta Sacchi,² Elena Oldani,³ Valeria Miotti,⁴ Alessandra Picardi,^{5,6} Anna Maria Gallina,² Pietro Crivello,⁷ Paolo Bernasconi,⁸ Riccardo Saccardi,⁹ Lucia Farina,¹⁰ Fabio Benedetti,¹¹ Michela Cerno,⁴ Anna Grassi,³ Benedetto Bruno,^{12,13} Francesca Patriarca,⁴ Fabio Ciceri,^{1,14} Katharina Fleischhauer,^{7,15,#} Luca Vago^{1,16,#} and Francesca Bonifazi^{17,#}

[#]are co-senior authors

¹Hematology and Bone Marrow Transplantation Unit, IRCCS San Raffaele Scientific Institute, Milano, Italy; ²Italian Bone Marrow Donor Registry, E.O. Galliera, Genova, Italy; ³Hematology and BMT Unit, Ospedale Papa Giovanni XXIII, Bergamo, Italy; ⁴Azienda Sanitaria Universitaria Integrata di Udine, Udine, Italy; ⁵Biomedicine and Prevention Department, Tor Vergata University, Roma, Italy; ⁶Hematology with Stem Cell Transplant Unit, AORN A. Cardarelli, Napoli, Italy; ⁷Institute for Experimental Cellular Therapy, Essen University Hospital, Essen, Germany; ⁸Bone Marrow Transplant Unit, Fondazione IRCCS Policlinico San Matteo, Pavia, Italy; ⁹Azienda Ospedaliero-Universitaria Careggi, Firenze, Italy; ¹⁰Hematology Department, Fondazione IRCCS Istituto Nazionale dei Tumori, Milano, Italy; ¹¹Department of Medicine, Section of Hematology and Bone Marrow Transplant Unit, University of Verona, Verona, Italy; ¹²Department of Oncology, AOU Città della Salute e della Scienza, Torino, Italy; ¹³Department of Molecular Biotechnology and Health Sciences, University of Torino, Torino, Italy; ¹⁴Vita-Salute San Raffaele University, Milano, Italy; ¹⁵German Cancer Consortium, Heidelberg, Germany; ¹⁶Unit of Immunogenetics, Leukemia Genomics and Immunobiology, IRCCS San Raffaele Scientific Institute, Milano, Italy and ¹⁷Institute of Hematology "L. and A. Seràgnoli", University Hospital S. Orsola-Malpighi, Bologna, Italy

Correspondence: KATHARINA FLEISCHAUER - katharina.fleischhauer@uk-essen.de

doi:10.3324/haematol.2019.225177

Clinical endpoints definitions and statistical methods.

Acute GvHD (aGvHD) and chronic GvHD (cGvHD) were defined and scored according to the Glucksberg and Seattle criteria, respectively¹⁻². NRM was defined as death from any cause while in continuous remission of the primary disease. OS was defined as the interval from HSCT to death from any cause. GRFS events were defined as grade 3–4 acute GVHD, extensive chronic GVHD, disease relapse, or death from any cause after HSCT³. Actuarial probabilities were determined at 3 years. Baseline characteristics among groups were compared using the Chi-square test for categorical variables, while the distribution of continuous variables was compared using the Mann-Whitney U test. The probabilities of OS and GRFS were estimated using the Kaplan-Meier estimator and groups were compared by the log-rank test⁴⁻⁵. Cumulative incidences (CI) were estimated for GvHD, NRM and relapse to accommodate competing risks, and tests of equality across groups were performed according to Gray⁶⁻⁷. Relapse was a competing risk for NRM, death from any cause was a competing risk for relapse. Both relapse and death from any causes were competing risks for GvHD. Multivariate analysis were built to test the independent prognostic value of DPB1 mismatch permissiveness: each DPB1 mismatch model was the main effect term and was held in all steps of model building. Cox proportional hazard models were adopted for OS and GRFS⁸, while Fine-Gray proportional hazard regression models for competing events were adopted for aGvHD, cGvHD, relapse and NRM. Covariates included: patient age, disease phase, HCT-CI, female donor to male recipient, host-donor CMV serostatus, conditioning intensity, stem cell source, ATG use, HLA-matching on 5 loci (HLA-A, -B, -C, -DRB1 and -DQB1), center effect (>10 HSCT performed each year Vs ≤10). Interactions between each covariate and each DPB1 mismatch model were tested and not found. In particular, no interaction was found between HLA matching on 5 loci and each model. The proportional hazard assumption was met for all variables. The type I error was fixed at 0.05. Statistical analyses were performed with R version 3.3.3 (R Development Core Team, Vienna, Austria).

1. Glucksberg H, Storb R, Fefer A et al. Clinical manifestations of graft versus host disease in human recipients of marrow from HLA matched sibling donors. *Transplantation*. 1974 Oct;18(4):295-304.
2. Lee SJ, Vogelsang G, Flowers ME. Chronic graft versus host disease. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2003 Apr;9(4):215-33.
3. Ruggeri A, Labopin M, Ciceri F, Mohty M, Nagler A. Definition of GvHD-free, relapse-free survival for registry-based studies: an ALWP-EBMT analysis on patients with AML in remission. *Bone Marrow Transplant*. 2016;51(4):610–611.
4. Kaplan EL, Meier P. Nonparametric Estimation from Incomplete Observations. *J Am Stat Assoc*. 1958;53:457–481.
5. Mantel N. Evaluation of survival data and two new rank order statistics arising in its consideration. *Cancer Chemother Rep*. 1966;50(3):163–170.
6. Gooley TA, Leisenring W, Crowley J, Storer BE. Estimation of failure probabilities in the presence of competing risks: new representations of old estimators. *Stat Med*. 1999;18(6):695–706.
7. Gray RJ. A class of K-sample tests for comparing the cumulative incidence of a competing risk. *Ann Stat*. 1988;16:1141–1154.
8. Cox DR. Regression Models and Life-Tables. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society. Series B (Methodological)*. 1972;34(2):187–220.

Supplemental Table 1a. Patient, donor and transplant characteristics in DPB1 typed or non-typed cases.

	Non-DPB1 typed (N=582)	DPB1 typed (N=422)	p
Median follow-up for survivors, years (range)	3.1 (0.3-6.1)	3.2 (0.3-6.2)	0.7
H SCT year, median (range)	2014 (2012-2015)	2013 (2012-2015)	0.001
Patient age, years, median (range)	51 (18-69)	49 (18-71)	0.003
Patient gender, male, n	345	245	0.7
Type of diagnosis, n			0.2
AML or ALL	308	232	
MDS or MPN	127	69	
Lymphoma or Myeloma	138	109	
CLL	9	12	
Disease status at HSCT, n			0.3
Early	293	191	
Intermediate	135	114	
Advanced	145	105	
HCT-CI score, median (range)	1 (0-7)	1 (0-7)	0.1
Karnofsky PS, median (range)	90% (40-100)	90% (50-100)	0.4
Donor age, years, median (range)	28 (18-57)	29 (18-57)	0.6
Donor gender, male, n	415	306	0.7
Female donor/male recipient, n	97	61	0.3
Host/donor CMV serostatus, n			0.3
Pos/pos	206	156	
Pos/neg	266	167	
Neg/pos	38	36	
Neg/neg	72	53	
Type of conditioning, n			0.3
MAC	390	296	
RIC	192	126	
Source of stem cells, n			0.1
PB	492	342	
BM	90	80	
ATG-based GvHD prophylaxis, n	476	350	0.6

Supplemental Table 1b. Univariate analysis for transplant outcomes in DPB1 typed or non-typed cases.¹

	3-y OS	3-y GRFS	3-y Relapse	3-y NRM	100-d aGvHD\geq2	100-d aGvHD\geq3	3-y cGvHD	3-y ext cGvHD
DPB1 typing								
DPB1 typed (n=422)	52 (46-56)	32 (27-36)	30 (25-35)	27 (23-31)	21 (17-25)	7 (5-10)	28 (24-32)	9 (6-12)
Non-DPB1 typed (N=582)	56 (52-61)	35 (31-39)	34 (30-38)	23 (20-29)	22 (18-25)	7 (5-10)	27 (23-30)	9 (6-11)
p	0.15	0.45	0.08	0.08	0.60	0.85	0.68	0.80

¹shown are mean percentages (range in parenthesis) for each outcome.

Supplemental Table 2. Patient, donor and transplant characteristics in permissive and non permissive DPB1 mismatched pairs according to the **TCE3 model**

	Permissive (N=208)	Non-permissive (N=174)	p
Median follow-up for survivors, years (range)	3.4 (0.3-6)	3.1 (0.3-6)	0.28
HSCT year, median (range)	2013 (2012-2015)	2013 (2012-2015)	0.12
Patient age, years, median (range)	48 (18-71)	50 (19-66)	0.49
Patient gender, male, n	101	117	0.72
Type of diagnosis, n			0.16
AML or ALL	121	85	
MDS or MPN	35	32	
Lymphoma and Myeloma	52	57	
Disease status at HSCT, n			0.43
Early	100	74	
Intermediate	54	45	
Advanced	54	55	
HCT-CI score, median (range)	0 (0-7)	1 (0-5)	0.97
Karnofsky PS, median (range)			0.39
Donor age, years, median (range)	27 (19-55)	30 (20-56)	0.23
Donor gender, male, n	149	126	0.87
Female donor/male recipient, n	28	29	0.38
Host/donor CMV serostatus, n	90% (60-100)	90% (50-100)	0.35
Pos/pos	71	71	
Pos/neg	81	71	
Neg/pos	19	11	
Neg/neg	31	19	
Type of conditioning, n			0.58
MAC	150	121	
RIC	58	53	
Source of stem cells, n			0.01
PB	179	132	
BM	29	42	
ATG-based GvHD prophylaxis, n	189	156	0.69

Supplemental Table 3. Patient, donor and transplant characteristics in in permissive and non permissive DPB1 mismatched pairs according to the **TCE4 model**

	Permissive (N=135)	Non-permissive (N=247)	p
Median follow-up for survivors, years (range)	3.4 (0.3-6)	3.3 (0.3-6)	0.17
H SCT year, median (range)	2014 (2012-2015)	2013 (2012-2015)	0.45
Patient age, years, median (range)	48 (18-68)	49 (19-71)	0.46
Patient gender, male, n	80	138	0.52
Type of diagnosis, n			0.86
AML or ALL	75	131	
MDS or MPN	22	45	
Lymphoma or Myeloma	38	71	
Disease status at HSCT, n			0.80
Early	62	112	
Intermediate	37	62	
Advanced	36	73	
HCT-CI score, median (range)	0 (0-7)	1 (0-5)	0.96
Karnofsky PS, median (range)	90% (70-100)	90% (50-100)	0.77
Donor age, years, median (range)	29 (19-55)	28 (19-56)	0.68
Donor gender, male, n	94	181	0.45
Female donor/male recipient, n	23	34	0.39
Host/donor CMV serostatus, n			0.35
Pos/pos	50	92	
Pos/neg	51	101	
Neg/pos	15	15	
Neg/neg	16	34	
Type of conditioning, n			0.86
MAC	95	176	
RIC	40	71	
Source of stem cells, n			0.03
PB	118	193	
BM	17	54	
ATG-based GvHD prophylaxis, n	127	230	0.13

Supplemental Table 4. Patient, donor and transplant characteristics in in permissive and non-permissive DPB1 mismatched pairs according to the **ΔFD model**¹

	<2.665 (N=259)	≥2.665 (N=123)	p
Median follow-up for survivors, years (range)	3.5 (0.3-6)	2.9 (0.3-5)	0.12
HSCT year, median (range)	2013 (2012-2015)	2014 (2012-2015)	0.97
Patient age, years, median (range)	48 (18-71)	52 (19-66)	0.48
Patient gender, male, n	155	63	0.11
Type of diagnosis, n			0.59
AML or ALL	144	62	
MDS or MPN	45	22	
Lymphoma or Myeloma	70	39	
Disease status at HSCT, n			0.78
Early	120	54	
Intermediate	68	31	
Advanced	71	38	
HCT-CI score, median (range)	0 (0-7)	1 (0-6)	0.38
Karnofsky PS, median (range)	90% (60-100)	90% (50-100)	0.25
Donor age, years, median (range)	28 (19-56)	30 (20-52)	0.98
Donor gender, male, n	184	91	0.55
Female donor/male recipient, n	40	17	0.68
Host/donor CMV serostatus, n			0.60
Pos/pos	93	49	
Pos/neg	105	47	
Neg/pos	23	7	
Neg/neg	32	18	
Type of conditioning, n			0.59
MAC	186	85	
RIC	73	38	
Source of stem cells, n			0.15
PB	216	95	
BM	43	28	
ATG-based GvHD prophylaxis, n	233	112	0.74

¹shown are data for cut-off 2.665; data for cut-off 1.64 were not significantly different.

Supplemental Table 5. Patient, donor and transplant characteristics in in low risk and high risk DPB1 mismatched pairs according to the **Expression model**

	Low risk (N=153)	High risk (N=76)	p
Median follow-up for survivors, years (range)	3.5 (0.3-6)	3.3 (0.3-6)	0.59
HSCT year, median (range)	2013 (2012-2015)	2013 (2012-2015)	0.31
Patient age, years, median (range)	49 (18-71)	49 (19-68)	0.98
Patient gender, male, n	93	45	0.82
Type of diagnosis, n			0.68
AML or ALL	80	44	
MDS or MPN	27	13	
Lymphoma or Myeloma	46	19	
Disease status at HSCT, n			0.94
Early	71	37	
Intermediate	39	19	
Advanced	43	20	
HCT-CI score, median (range)	1 (0-6)	0 (0-7)	0.26
Karnofsky PS, median (range)	90% (50-100)	90% (70-100)	0.49
Donor age, years, median (range)	28 (19-56)	29 (19-54)	0.19
Donor gender, male, n	105	53	0.86
Female donor/male recipient, n	28	12	0.64
Host/donor CMV serostatus, n			0.47
Pos/pos	62	24	
Pos/neg	53	33	
Neg/pos	13	5	
Neg/neg	21	12	
Type of conditioning, n			0.73
MAC	112	54	
RIC	41	22	
Source of stem cells, n			0.09
PB	129	57	
BM	24	19	
ATG-based GvHD prophylaxis, n	136	72	0.15

Supplemental Table 6. Patient, donor and transplant characteristics in low risk or high risk DPB1 mismatched pairs according to the **DP2/DP5 model**

	DP2 (N=118)	DP5 (N=31)	p
Median follow-up for survivors, years (range)	3.4 (0.3-6.2)	2.8 (0.3-6.1)	0.39
H SCT year, median (range)	2013 (2012-2015)	2013 (2012-2015)	0.74
Patient age, years, median (range)	49 (18-69)	45 (19-66)	0.16
Patient gender, male, n	74	20	0.85
Type of diagnosis, n			0.67
AML or ALL	58	18	
MDS or MPN	22	5	
Lymphoma or Myeloma	38	8	
Disease status at HSCT, n			0.83
Early	57	14	
Intermediate	28	9	
Advanced	33	8	
HCT-CI score, median (range)	1 (0-6)	1 (0-5)	0.58
Karnofsky PS, median (range)	90% (50-100)	90% (70-100)	0.98
Donor age, years, median (range)	28 (19-56)	29 (23-54)	0.09
Donor gender, male, n	84	22	0.98
Female donor/male recipient, n	20	4	0.41
Host/donor CMV serostatus, n			0.35
Pos/pos	48	8	
Pos/neg	37	14	
Neg/pos	11	2	
Neg/neg	18	6	
Type of conditioning, n			0.07
MAC	91	19	
RIC	27	12	
Source of stem cells, n			0.39
PB	96	24	
BM	22	7	
ATG-based GvHD prophylaxis, n	104	29	0.39

Supplemental Table 7. Univariate analysis for transplant outcomes and different models of DPB1 mismatch permissivity.¹

	3-y OS	3-y GRFS	3-y Relapse	3-y NRM	100-d aGvHD≥2	100-d aGvHD≥3	3-y cGvHD	3-y ext cGvHD
DPB1 allele matching status								
Matched (n=40)	43 (26-59)	34 (20-49)	38 (23-54)	26 (13-40)	0	0	18 (8-31)	5 (1-16)
Mismatched (n=382)	53 (47-58)	32 (27-37)	29 (24-34)	27 (22-31)	23 (19-27)	8 (6-11)	29 (24-33)	9 (7-13)
p	0.81	0.68	0.16	0.81	<0.01	0.05	0.10	0.35
TCE3								
Permissive mismatch (n= 208)	53 (46-60)	33 (26-40)	30 (24-37)	26 (20-32)	22 (16-28)	7 (4-11)	27 (21-33)	6 (4-10)
Non Permissive mismatch (n=174)	52 (44-60)	30 (23-38)	27 (20-34)	28 (21-35)	24 (18-31)	9 (6-14)	31 (24-38)	13 (8-19)
p	0.50	0.35	0.64	0.43	0.48	0.57	0.31	0.03
TCE4								
Permissive mismatch (n=135)	60 (51-68)	36 (28-45)	30 (22-38)	21 (15-29)	21 (15-29)	7 (3-12)	26 (19-34)	4 (2-9)
Non Permissive mismatch (n=247)	49 (42-55)	29 (24-35)	28 (22-34)	30 (24-36)	24 (19-29)	9 (5-12)	30 (25-37)	12 (8-17)
p	0.05	0.04	0.96	0.09	0.56	0.58	0.3	0.01
ΔFD								
<2.65 (n=259)	54 (47-60)	31 (26-38)	28 (23-34)	27 (22-33)	23 (18-28)	8 (5-12)	28 (23-34)	9 (6-13)
≥2.65 (n=123)	51 (41-60)	32 (24-41)	30 (22-39)	25 (18-33)	23 (16-31)	7 (4-13)	29 (21-38)	10 (6-17)
p	0.83	0.71	0.57	0.71	0.90	0.65	0.88	0.75
Expression model								
low risk (n=153)	56 (47-63)	27 (20-35)	34 (26-42)	23 (17-30)	16 (10-22)	5 (2-9)	29 (22-36)	9 (5-14)
high risk (n=76)	57 (45-68)	39 (28-50)	23 (14-34)	26 (16-36)	32 (22-43)	9 (4-17)	34 (24-45)	12 (6-20)
p	0.95	0.23	0.23	0.81	<0.01	0.32	0.30	0.42
DP2/DP5 model								
low risk (n=118)	59 (49-67)	29 (21-38)	27 (19-36)	25 (17-33)	15 (9-22)	4 (2-9)	32 (24-41)	11 (6-17)
high risk (n=31)	62 (42-77)	39 (21-56)	31 (15-49)	23 (10-40)	43 (25-60)	20 (8-36)	26 (12-42)	16 (6-31)
p	0.76	0.47	0.62	0.80	0.001	0.01	0.67	0.32

¹shown are mean percentages (range in parenthesis) for each outcome.

Supplemental Table 8. Multivariate analysis of clinical factors associated with HCT outcomes.

	OS		GRFS		Relapse		NRM		aGvHD \geq 2		aGvHD \geq 3		cGvHD		Ext cGvHD	
	HR (95% CI)	p	HR (95% CI)	p	HR (95% CI)	p	HR (95% CI)	p	HR (95% CI)	p	HR (95% CI)	p	HR (95% CI)	p	HR (95% CI)	p
TCE4¹: NP Vs P	1.7 (1.1-2.4)	0.008	1.4 (1.1-1.9)	0.01	1.1 (0.7-1.7)	0.7	1.9 (1.1-3.2)	0.01	1.3 (0.8-2.1)	0.2	1.5 (0.7-3.2)	0.3	1.7 (1.1-2.6)	0.02	3.6 (1.4-9.5)	0.01
Matched Vs P	2.1 (1.2-3.7)	0.01	1.5 (0.9-2.4)	0.09	2 (1.1-3.7)	0.03	2 (0.9-4.8)	0.09	Not applicable ²		Not applicable ²		0.8 (0.3-2)	0.6	0.9 (0.1-7.5)	0.9
Disease status: Intermediate Vs Early	1.4 (0.9-2.1)	0.09	1.3 (0.9-1.8)	0.1	1.5 (0.9-2.5)	0.09	1.6 (0.9-2.7)	0.09	1.1 (0.6-1.9)	0.7	0.7 (0.3-1.7)	0.4	1.1 (0.7-1.8)	0.6	2.4 (0.9-5.5)	0.09
Advanced Vs early	2.3 (1.6-3.3)	<10⁻³	1.5 (1.1-2)	0.01	2 (1.2-3.2)	0.005	1.9 (1.2-3.3)	0.01	0.7 (0.4-1.3)	0.3	0.6 (0.2-1.6)	0.3	1 (0.6-1.7)	0.9	1.2 (0.4-3.2)	0.7
Patient age	1 (0.9-1.1)	0.2	1 (0.9-1.1)	0.2	1 (0.9-1.1)	0.3	1 (0.9-1.1)	0.2	1 (0.9-1.1)	0.4	1 (0.9-1.1)	0.9	1 (0.9-1.1)	0.1	1 (0.9-1.1)	0.9
HCTI-Score: \geq1 Vs 0	1.3 (0.9-1.9)	0.09	1.4 (1.1-1.9)	0.008	1.1 (0.7-1.6)	0.7	1.6 (1.1-2.5)	0.04	1.2 (0.7-1.9)	0.5	1.5 (0.7-3.1)	0.3	2.2 (1.4-3.4)	<10⁻³	2.2 (1-5)	0.05
Female donor to male recipient	1.1 (0.7-1.8)	0.6	1.3 (0.9-1.1)	0.2	1.1 (0.6-2.1)	0.6	1.1 (0.6-2)	0.8	0.6 (0.3-1.3)	0.2	0.8 (0.3-2.3)	0.6	1.2 (0.7-2.1)	0.4	2.4 (1.1-5.4)	0.04
CMV status: neg/neg Vs other	0.7 (0.4-1.2)	0.2	0.9 (0.6-1.4)	0.7	0.6 (0.3-1.3)	0.2	0.8 (0.4-1.7)	0.6	1.1 (0.5-2.1)	0.9	1.3 (0.5-3.6)	0.6	1 (0.5-2)	0.9	1 (0.4-2.8)	0.9
Conditioning: MAC Vs RIC	1.3 (0.9-1.9)	0.1	1.1 (0.8-1.5)	0.5	1 (0.6-1.6)	0.9	1.3 (0.8-2.1)	0.4	1.4 (0.8-2.4)	0.2	1.9 (0.7-5.1)	0.2	1.1 (0.7-1.7)	0.8	0.5 (0.2-1.1)	0.08
Stem cell source: PB Vs BM	1.1 (0.7-1.6)	0.8	1.1 (0.8-1.6)	0.6	1 (0.6-1.7)	0.9	1.1 (0.6-1.9)	0.8	1.4 (0.7-2.7)	0.3	2.4 (0.7-8.4)	0.2	0.8 (0.4-1.3)	0.3	0.6 (0.2-1.7)	0.4
ATG use	1.2 (0.5-2.7)	0.7	0.9 (0.5-1.7)	0.8	2.6 (0.6-11)	0.2	1 (0.3-2.8)	0.9	0.5 (0.2-1.4)	0.2	0.4 (0.1-1.4)	0.1	1 (0.4-2.4)	0.9	0.9 (0.2-3.2)	0.8
Overall HLA-matching: 9/10 Vs 10/10	1.8 (1-3.3)	0.06	1.1 (0.7-1.7)	0.6	2 (0.9-4.2)	0.07	1.5 (0.7-3.3)	0.3	1.4 (0.6-3)	0.5	1.2 (0.4-4.1)	0.8	0.8 (0.4-1.4)	0.4	1.5 (0.3-6.6)	0.6
Center effect: \geq10 HCT/year Vs <10	0.9 (0.7-1.3)	0.7	1 (0.7-1.3)	0.8	0.8 (0.5-1.3)	0.4	0.9 (0.5-1.4)	0.6	0.9 (0.6-1.6)	0.9	0.7 (0.3-1.5)	0.3	1.1 (0.7-1.7)	0.7	1.9 (0.8-4.6)	0.2

¹TCE4 NP, P and matched: N= 247, 135 and 40, respectively.²Not applicable since no cases of aGvHD occurred in the DPB1 matched cohort.

Shown are the data for the TCE4 functional model as main effect term and covariates as described in Statistical methods.