Age-Modulated Immuno-Metabolic Proteome Profiles of Deceased Donor Kidneys Predict 12-Month Posttransplant Outcome
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Abstract

Organ availability limits kidney transplantation, the best treatment for end-stage kidney disease. Deceased donor acceptance criteria have been relaxed to include older donors with higher risk of inferior posttransplant outcomes. More granular prediction models, based on deeper resolution organ assessment and understanding of damage processes, could substantially improve donor organ allocation and reduce graft dysfunction risk. Here, we profiled pre-implantation kidney biopsy proteomes from 185 deceased donors by high-resolution mass spectrometry and used machine learning to integrate and model these data, and donor and recipient clinical metadata to predict outcome. Our analysis and orthogonal validation on an independent cohort revealed 136
proteins predictive of outcome, 124 proteins of which showed donor-age modulated predictive effects. Observed associations with inflammatory, catabolic, lipid metabolism and apoptotic pathways may predispose donor kidneys to suboptimal posttransplant outcomes. Our work shows that integrating kidney proteome information with clinical metadata enhances the resolution of donor kidney quality stratification, and the highlighted biological mechanisms open new research directions in developing interventions during donor management or preservation to improve kidney transplantation outcome.

TRANSLATIONAL STATEMENT

We profiled the proteome of pre-implantation biopsies selected from donor kidneys on the basis of paired 12-month graft function. Our data reveal a signature of proteins which contribute to transplant outcomes, many of these show different strengths of association dependent on donor age. The biological themes of the identified candidates reinforce immuno-metabolic and catabolic mechanisms as potential contributors to donor kidney susceptibility that may reduce graft recovery after transplantation.

INTRODUCTION

Kidney transplantation is the optimal treatment for end-stage kidney disease. When compared to dialysis, transplantation profoundly increases life-expectancy, improves quality of life and is cost-effective. However, the lack of suitable donor organs for kidney transplantation limits the health benefits to patients with chronic kidney disease, and often prolongs dialysis treatment, with increased morbidity and mortality.
The shortage of organs, a decline in living donation in some countries and emerging ageing populations have driven an increased utilization of older donor kidneys \(^1\). More than half of all deceased donor kidneys now offered are from older donors \(^2\).

Ageing is associated with a time-dependent decline of organ function, which is especially evident in the kidney with the appearance of histologic lesions, such as tubular atrophy, interstitial fibrosis, glomerulosclerosis, and arteriosclerosis. Kidney function progressively declines with age, due to structural changes that cause a reduction of functioning glomeruli and renal mass, podocyte dysfunction, and malfunction of mechanisms important in cellular repair \(^3\).

Glomerular diseases are in turn more common and associated with worse outcomes in older patients \(^4\). Age accelerates the transition from Acute Kidney Injury (AKI) to chronic injury \(^5\) and is an independent risk factor of graft dysfunction and graft loss for deceased donor kidneys \(^6\), furthermore, older donors are more likely to suffer from additional co-morbidity risk factors such as diabetes, hypertension or cardiovascular disease.

Donor age has been incorporated in all clinical scoring algorithms to inform clinical decision of donor kidney allocation \(^7,8\). However, donor age alone is insufficient to consistently predict transplant outcomes. Current front-line models also include further clinical factors such as terminal serum creatinine, history of hypertension and diabetes \(^8,9\) and show consistent performance across demographic cohorts but still only have a predictive accuracy of around 65\% \(^10\). Factors commonly included in these models may not reflect the nuances of biological susceptibility to injury, subclinical trajectories of progression to dysfunction or capacity for renal recovery.

The use of pre-implantation biopsies to supplement standard clinical scoring algorithms has hitherto focused on histological scoring systems that assess evidence of chronic donor-
related damage, such as glomerulosclerosis or arteriolar changes \(^\text{11}\). Histology-based assessments are particularly vulnerable to biopsy reproducibility issues, even under codified protocols. Although small studies have suggested correlation with graft outcomes, there is only poor correlation with kidney function in the recipient \(^\text{12,13}\).

It is likely that molecular analyses could offer a clearer, higher resolution assessment of organ state; but this requires deeper understanding of molecular phenotypes specifically associated with poor outcomes rather than the immediate but potentially recoverable acute injury sustained during the donor management process and organ retrieval. For example, deceased donors are often assessed as having AKI based on serum creatinine levels \(^\text{14}\), which implies an inflammatory response, however AKI does not itself associate with longer term poor outcomes \(^\text{13-16}\), so we should not expect all inflammatory associated molecular signatures to be outcome-associated. A broad picture analysis at relevant molecular phenotype levels is necessary; an obvious first candidate is the proteome as this represents the end-state response associated with both changes in expression and post-translational regulation.

Proteomic studies in donor kidneys have heretofore lacked the sample size to be representative across donor age and demographic ranges \(^\text{17}\), but advances in proteomic technology such as data independent acquisition (DIA) mass spectrometry \(^\text{18}\) now allow the sensitivity and depth required for analysis of hundreds of samples to be practical. Larger analyses are central towards taking the next steps toward precision medicine, and permit higher-dimensional analysis (through the integration of proteomic profiles with clinical and demographic phenotypes) to address the heterogenous demographic factors affecting patient outcomes \(^\text{19}\). Machine learning approaches in particular offer powerful tools to extract the maximum amount of knowledge from experimental cohorts given practical and cost limitations.
of sample acquisition and analysis, and have been applied to disease staging, prediction of
disease recurrence, monitoring treatment response, and the identification of diagnostic,
prognostic, and predictive biomarkers. Here, we benefit from the granularity provided by our MS-based proteomics profiling to
report age- and immunometabolism-related proteomic signatures in pre-implantation kidney
biopsies that are associated with suboptimal transplant outcomes against a clinical and
demographic variability background.

METHODS

Study Design

Deceased donor pre-transplantation kidney biopsies (n=186; 1 sample was later removed
during data QC) were obtained from the Quality in Organ Donor (QUOD) biobank, a national
multi-center UK wide bioresource of deceased donor clinical samples procured during donor
management and organ procurement.

Selection of biopsies of donor kidneys was based on paired 12-month post-transplant outcomes.
To minimize the impact of recipient factors on outcomes we only included kidneys for which the
contralateral kidney was transplanted and had similar 12-month post-transplant outcome. Donor
kidneys were selected to include the continuum of transplant outcomes i.e. the full range of
estimated Glomerular Filtration Rate (eGFR; specified throughout in units of ml/min/1.73 m²)
from primary non-function to eGFR > 80) and, where possible, to exclude extreme demographic
or clinical factors. All clinical samples were linked to corresponding donor and recipient
demographic and clinical metadata, provided by NHS Blood and Transplant National Registry.

Detailed clinical and demographic data are summarized in Table 1.

Study Approval and Ethics statement

Informed consent from donor families was obtained prior to sample procurement.

Collection of QUOD samples and the research ethics approval was provided by QUOD (NW/18/0187).

Experimental Protocols and Statistical Analysis

Please see Supplementary Methods.

RESULTS

Donor clinical and demographic variable relevance for eGFR at 12-month posttransplant

Kidney biopsies were obtained from Donation after Brain Death (DBD) donors and Donation after Circulatory Death (DCD donors) at the back table immediately after kidney procurement. To minimize the impact of factors related to post-procurement and recipient characteristics, donors were selected on the basis of paired 12-month posttransplant outcomes.

For the purposes of exploratory analysis, we considered eGFR values in two ways. Firstly, for comparison of clinical factors, we grouped 12 months posttransplant outcomes into tertiles; Suboptimal Outcome (SO; eGFR ≤ 39), Intermediate Outcome (IO; 40 < eGFR ≤ 59), and Good Outcome (GO; eGFR ≥ 60) (Figure 1). We refer to this henceforth as ‘stratified eGFR’. Secondly, all eGFR values (both recipient and donor) were rank-transformed so that, where possible, we could test/model against a continuum of outcomes while mitigating against
factors introducing extreme values or values recorded as 0 due to graft failure. We refer to ‘ranked eGFR’ henceforth to indicate ranked recipient eGFR at 12 months posttransplant.

Clinical metadata confirmed that the selected donor groups were representative of the donor population in the UK (UK Renal Registry, 2022) (Table 1). Further, we found no significant association between donor type and ranked eGFR (t-test; p = 0.2028). We then investigated associations between clinical variables and stratified eGFR subgroups within DBD and DCD, and between DBD and DCD within stratified eGFR subgroups (Supplementary Table 1). In DBD as in DCD, donor age was significantly different between the subgroups with SO being older (Fisher’s exact test; DBD: p = 4.285e-7; DCD: p = 2.080e-8). Among both DBD and DCD donors there was a significant difference in UKKDRI between outcome groups (ANOVA F-test; DBD: p = 1.515e-5; DCD: p = 7.006e-7). Histories of hypertension were different between outcome subgroups (ANOVA F-test; DBD: p = 0.0010; DCD: p = 0.0336), but histories of diabetes were not significantly different (ANOVA F-test; p = 0.1408; DCD: p = 0.2083).

Terminal serum creatinine levels were similar across outcome subgroups (ANOVA F-test; DBD: p = 0.8601; DCD: p = 0.1755), although within the GO group it was higher in DBD than in DCD (t-test; p = 0.0149).

After imputation of missing values, we examined the associations between clinical variables common to both DBD and DCD donors, calculating a composite association score (see methods) and then clustering by single linkage on association subtracted from 1 as a distance measure (Figure 2). The strongest associations with ranked eGFR were donor age (Pearson’s $r = 0.52$), and recipient age ($r = 0.28$). Donor history of hypertension and cardiological disease also clustered closely using a single-linkage approach due to correlation with donor age ($r = 0.35$ and
(r = 0.33 respectively) but had a weaker direct correlation with outcome (r = 0.30 and r = 0.23 respectively).

**Unsupervised analysis of pretransplant kidney proteomes**

The proteomic analysis quantified 2984 protein groups with 50% or less missing values (out of 7790 identified protein groups in total) over 185 samples and the 20 pool sample runs (Supplementary Figure 1A). Analysis of the pool runs showed minimal technical variance over the course of sample acquisition with a squared mean pairwise Z-corrected Pearson correlation coefficient (a multi-way R-squared) of 0.94. Furthermore, six samples were paired biopsies from the left and right kidneys of three donors. These samples showed high concordance in quantified protein intensity values between pairs, with R-squared values of 0.71, 0.92 and 0.91 for each of the three pair donors (Supplementary Figure 1B).

We performed an exploratory analysis of the proteomics data by Principal Component Analysis (PCA) to look for underlying data trends. Most of the variance observed in the samples was concentrated in the first two principal components (PC1: 20.01%; PC2: 13.38%; Figure 3A) and K-means clustering identified 4 distinct clusters (Figure 3A).

Cluster membership associated with donor type, with a preponderance of DBD samples towards Cluster 2 and a preponderance of DCD samples towards Cluster 4 (Figure 3B, upper left panel; p = 0.0235). Sample clustering did not associate strongly with recipient eGFR at 12 months post transplantation (p = 0.4134), nor with donor eGFR (p = 0.1684), or donor age (p = 0.7907) (Figure 3B, upper middle and right and lower left panels). There was a weakly significant association between cluster membership and donor BMI (p = 0.0350) and similarly with serum creatinine (p = 0.0326) (Figure 3B, lower middle and right panels).
Integration of kidney proteomes with clinical metadata enhances the resolution of donor kidney quality stratification

To identify possible clinical variable-protein interaction effect relationships with stratified outcomes, we used a machine learning approach (Prediction Rule Ensembles \(^{23}\), PRE) to analyze the set of all donor type-independent clinical variables and all quantified proteins, followed by multivariate adaptive regression spline modelling\(^{24}\) to assess individual protein relationships.

We first split our data into a training and test sets, excluding the six paired kidneys, and sampling equally across stratified eGFR using a 2/3:1/3 train:test split. Feature selection and predictive model training was performed on the training set only. The six paired kidneys were reserved as a second ‘biological duplicates’ test set.

PRE modelling finds a minimal (but not necessarily the only minimal) set of predictors for outcome in the form of decision tree, linear regression and multivariate adaptive regression spline\(^{25}\) rules. A single application of PRE does not yield an exhaustive list of predictive candidates. We performed PRE in an iterative manner to ‘mine’ for candidate proteins, whereby proteins, but not clinical variables, identified in the final ensemble of any previous model were excluded from the dataset for future models. We performed 2000 iterations of PRE, generating 3282 rules across all ensembles. An immediate observation was that the primary contributor to the rule cohort was donor age, featuring as a term in 3154 (~96.1\%) rules; in comparison, protein terms (collectively) featured in 198 (~6.0\%) rules, while no other non-protein term yielded a meaningful contribution – the next largest non-protein term was donor group, featuring in 5 (~0.1\%) rules (Figure 4A). This process generated 195 selected proteins. As iterations passed 1000, the selection process became increasingly inefficient, in terms of iterations required to identify another candidate protein. However new hits were still generated up to termination at
iteration 2000, suggesting there was more to find. Rather than continue with further iterations, we supplemented the list of selected proteins with all other proteins that had high correlation (Pearson’s r > 0.65) with any of the 195 already selected proteins; this brought the list up to 255 selected protein features.

Regression spline modelling reveals protein associations with posttransplant outcome are modulated by donor age.

Next, we tested each of the 255 protein features for individual association with outcome, beyond the effect of donor age alone. Since rank transformation is cohort specific, in order to generate results which could be generalized to other cohorts we modelled against a specific outcome binary, calibrated against a population-level threshold. Based on UK Renal Registry Reports, UK median eGFR at 12 months posttransplant was approximately ~50.25 ml/min (±0.24 standard error) across the weighted average for median DBD and DCD eGFR at 12 months posttransplant since 2013; for simplicity we used a threshold of 50 (eGFR units ml/min/1.73 m²). We refer to ‘sub-median outcome’ henceforth to refer to recipient eGFR at 12 months posttransplant less than 50. Using multivariate adaptive regression spline modelling, we generated predictive models for sub-median outcome using each protein, donor age, and any potential age:protein interactions. This was performed in a regularized framework such that only a minimal set of terms predictive of outcome were retained in each model. We then discarded any protein that either did not feature in any term in its corresponding model, or whose model gave a worse overall prediction error (Brier score) than donor age alone.

After filtering we had identified 136 proteins which predicted sub-median outcome. We performed a network analysis of shared Reactome pathways (Figure 4) and, using walktrap clustering, found that these relationships were characterized by 4 major clusters; Immune

For 124 proteins, the prediction included an age:protein interaction term where the predictive effect of protein abundance was modulated by age, independent of the effect of age alone or protein abundance alone (Figure 5). To visualize these effects, we used each model to simulate the effect of increasing donor age with a high (90\textsuperscript{th} percentile), median and low (10\textsuperscript{th} percentile) abundance value for the protein (Figure 5A and Supplementary Figure 2). In all cases, the chance of sub-median outcome was (unsurprisingly) driven primarily by donor age, with a plateau at high donor age as a result of the low frequency of high-donor age, above-median outcomes in both our data (<5% above age 60 in our training set) but also in the general population. The difference in the modelled effect of changing protein abundance was striking; the majority of proteins were positively associated with the chance of sub-median outcome (simplistically, more protein = worse outcome), with the effect appearing to increase up to around donor age 45-55. These included representative proteins for all four major clusters including the known markers Cystatin-C (CST3; nephron function) and Vitronectin (VTN; fibrosis) as well as a protein notorious for age-modulated associations with other diseases, Apolipoprotein E (APOE). In contrast, several proteins were negatively associated with the chance of sub-median outcome (simplistically more protein = better outcome), with the largest
effects shown by MAP2K1 and SLC27A2, with the latter in particular being modelled as having minimal effect in donors younger than 40.

The full list of all 136 proteins, including a summary of age modulation effect, is given in Supplementary Table 2. The selection and filtering steps are summarized in Figure 5B.

Orthogonal validation confirms model performance, including age-modulated immunometabolic impact on transplant outcomes

We adopted two orthogonal approaches to validate our results. Firstly, we assessed the performance of each model on test data. Going from train to test data, the models showed a small increase in accuracy (Brier score; mean square error) and a small decrease in overall predictive performance as measured by the area under the curve (AUC) (Figure 6A), indicating that the models are generalizable. Most of the models (~110/136) showed high levels of accuracy with negligible differences between test and train model performance.

Secondly, we selected several cluster-representative proteins (VTN, APOE, CST3 and Prolactin Regulatory Element Binding; PREB) with well characterized available antibodies that had good (AUC > 0.75) predicted outcome performance on our test data set (Figure 6B). We investigated the predicted pattern of associations between protein abundance and outcome (Figure 6C), by performing western blot validation of our results (Figure 6D). We selected samples with remaining material from our cohort from the Good and Suboptimal Outcome tertiles of our sample set, to compare protein abundance between younger (oldest sample 49) and older (youngest sample 58) donors. Our western blot results were broadly consistent with the associations anticipated by our modelling. For VTN, our model suggests a strong (and strengthening with age) association between protein abundance and outcome in younger donors, and we observed a significant difference in abundance between GO and SO outcome strata (t-
test; p=2.107e-9). In older donors, the model suggests a weaker (and weakening with age) association, and we observed a mildly significant difference between abundance and outcome (t-test; p=0.2450). For PREB, the model suggests a weaker association in younger donors than in VTN since the age of maximum difference is shifted towards older donors. We did not observe any significant difference by western (t-test; p=0.4530) in young donors. At older ages, the model suggests a larger association in the older age range, weakening at an older age than VTN; we observe a corresponding significant difference in PREB abundance by western blot (t-test, p=8.800e-5). For APOE, the model suggests that the strongest association is over the middle of the age range, where outcome changes rapidly with donor age. Younger donor samples did not provide good coverage of the age range region of expected difference, and none was observed (t-test, p=0.3719). In older donors, the effect of APOE difference weakens but remains present, and consistent with that we saw a mildly significant difference in APOE abundance between outcomes (t-test, p=0.0323). For CST3, the model again predicted a strong association in young donors, which was consistent with the significant difference observed by western blot (t-test, p=0.0084). In older donors the model actually predicts the association to weaken and even reverse, such that GO samples would tend to have higher CST3 than SO samples; by western blot, we saw a nonsignificant difference, but (in contrast to the prediction) still with a positive median protein abundance difference from GO to SO. As a final check, we compared the predicted outcome for each of the six paired kidneys from the second ‘biological duplicates’ test set against their actual recipient eGFR at 12 months posttransplant (Figure 6E). All three kidney pairs in this dataset had very consistent outcomes across pairs; two pairs with sub-median outcome (15 and 36 ml/min; 23 and 27 ml/min) and one pair with much better outcome (72 and 81 ml/min). All four models assigned the four kidneys from two of the donors that went on to
have a sub-median outcome a probability of sub-median outcome greater than 0.5 (save in one case for PREB, where the probability was ~0.48), and likewise assigned both kidneys from the pair which both went on to have a good outcome a low probability of sub-median outcome.

**DISCUSSION**

Increasingly, kidneys from older donors are utilized for transplantation to expand the deceased donor organ supply. The shortage of optimal organs, combined with increased utilization of organs from older donors, increases risks of graft failure or functional decline. For any individual donor organ, post-transplant outcomes remain hard to predict at the point of organ acceptance. Here, we show that age-modulated kidney proteomic profiles improve risk stratification of donor kidney quality, revealing clinically relevant age-protein interaction effects.

Donor age remains a key contributor in these clinical decisions and is rightfully one of the most strongly weighted terms in extant scoring systems to determine kidney allocation. In our analysis, we found no obvious difference according to age when comparing donor kidney proteomes by unbiased PCA. However, looking specifically at outcomes, it was the single most important factor. PCA considers only a linear combination of variables and is ill-suited to exploring nonlinear effects or interaction between variables. When we explored our data with our iterative PRE feature selection approach, a substantial number of proteins were revealed to be relevant.

The effect of donor age is not a novel finding, but it is particularly interesting to note that pretransplant kidney proteomes were the second most powerful contributor to outcomes; and that integration of the age and proteomic information resulted in enhanced prediction of 12 month sub-median function. One factor often described as relevant to transplant outcome is donor type.
circulatory death is considered an adverse factor for transplant outcome in the US \(^7\) (although not in the UK \(^8,29\)). Our initial PCA analysis found that non-supervised clustering of the sample proteomes did partially separate samples by type. However, these differences did not extend to association with outcome in our cohort. Not only did we fail to observe any direct association between donor type and outcome, but donor type did not feature as an interaction term with any protein identified by our iterative modelling. It is possible that such association may be obscured by other sample characteristics associated with the overwhelming effect of donor age, especially if the effect is relatively small. However, without disputing different donor type-specific mechanisms for how kidney injury may be sustained \(^30\), our data are consistent with previous reports that the level of injury (rather than the cause) is the primary contributor towards the potential for recovery \(^31\).

Within our final list of 136 proteins associated with outcome there is a common theme of implication in immune response to kidney injury (including both chronic injury, and acute injury) particularly as a result of ischemic metabolic disruption. Our analysis of proteins associated with outcome revealed that most (124/136 candidates) showed evidence of age-moderated differences in their effect; in most cases, that as donor age increases, higher levels of the protein become more negatively associated with outcome. The effect of second-order age interactions, where the weightings of other terms are themselves age dependent, has not (to our knowledge) been explored in terms of transplant outcome. Many of the proteins we find to be age-moderated have known relevance, which is reassuring, however several have not previously been reported in the context of transplant outcome or kidney dysfunction; it is possible the effect of age modulation is key to fully understanding the links between molecular predictors and transplant outcomes.
A prominent age-modulated example of a chronic injury associated marker in our candidate list is VTN, a primary component of the extracellular matrix involved in cell adhesion, enhancing the activity of plasminogen activator inhibitor-1 (PAI-1), and inhibition of the terminal complement pathway. Vitronectin has been suggested as a biomarker of kidney fibrosis although the mode of its multifaced action needs further investigation. In addition, examples for known acute injury associated markers include several complement components, including two components of the membrane attack complex, C5 (in the form of C5b cleavage product) and C8A, which has been associated with tissue injury resulting from ischemia/reperfusion. Complement Component 1r (C1R), part of the activation complex for the classical complement pathway, and Complement Factor B (CFB), a component of the alternative pathway. Another candidate associated with immune regulation is Maltase Glucoamylase (MGAM), characterized as an intestinal enterocyte but with expression in several tissues including kidney, and whose presence in urinary exosomes been cited as a marker of AKI in cirrhosis patients. Finally, Mitogen-activated protein kinase 1 (MAP2K1, aka MEK1), as a key component of the MAP kinase signal transduction pathway and therefore closely involved in both cellular control and immune regulation (as part of TNFα signaling response), is notable as one of the few proteins for which higher abundance was associated with a reduced probability of sub-median outcome, indicating resilience to injury. Increased TNFα is more usually associated with renal injury, so this result is counterintuitive. The MAPK/ERK cascade impacts many regulatory pathways so it is reasonable to assume such intuition may oversimplify the effect of increased MEK1 abundance.

Several proteins in the age-modulated group are characterized as markers of protein regulation and proteasomal activity. These may indicate alterations within the proteostasis
network that increase susceptibility of donor grafts to subsequent injury and reduce capacity for recovery. CST3 is particularly noteworthy as, measured in serum, it is a known and effective general biomarker for kidney function and has previously been reported as having predictive power for outcomes in transplant recipients \(^{40-42}\). Our evidence indicates a further association between CST3 levels in the donor kidney tissue and outcome; moreover, that this effect is age dependent, starting around age 40. Interestingly, serum CST3 is relatively independent of age in children and young adults \(^{43}\), but numerous studies have demonstrated an increase in later years, as summarized by Edinga-Melenge et al. \(^{44}\). These two age related effects may be interconnected.

We found the age-modulated candidate PREB (Prolactin Regulatory Element Binding protein) biologically interesting for three reasons. Firstly, there is a well characterized relationships between kidney dysfunction (in the form of CKD), cardiovascular disease and prolactinemia\(^{45}\), with CKD patients being associated with elevated prolactinemia. Secondly, it is a regulator of glucose homeostasis in the liver and therefore a plausible key node for metabolic regulation in kidneys as well\(^{46}\), acknowledging the large emphasis in our pathway analysis on metabolic functions. Thirdly, it has a predicted\(^{47}\) role in exit from the endoplasmic reticulum and the unfolded protein response, which has an association with CKD via NFκB -mediated inflammation\(^{48}\).

Another age-modulated protein, APOE stands out as having previously reported age-related associations with disease and organ dysfunction, in both cases including Alzheimer’s Disease (AD). APOE plays an important role in lipid metabolism to regulate the growth and survival of mesangial cells and preserve kidney function \(^{49}\), not only is APOE protein a marker for outcome in transplant recipients \(^{50-52}\), there is also evidence for particular APOE genetic
alleles being associated with dysfunction risk, possibly manifested directly by lipidomic differences between allelic profiles. APOE alleles are further implicated in a host of disorders including age-moderated association with AD risk (with the strongest effect manifesting around age 65), macular dysfunction, atherosclerosis and pulmonary scarring. There is also evidence of allele risk association between disparate pathologies. Interestingly, we have previously observed small (not statistically significant) increases in APOE due to ischemic reperfusion injuries which may be explained by a recently description of the role of APOE in mediating senescence. Such evidence suggests cause for further investigation of the APOE genotype with respect to donor kidneys of varying age. Indeed, the lipoprotein genetic background in general, with the close links between lipidome status and kidney function, may be associated with outcome. There is evidence of at least one similar allele dependent effects in another apolipoprotein (APOL1) associated with transplant outcome.

Organ allocation algorithms impose a close link between donor and recipient age in the sample cohort, so these two variables cannot be conclusively separated. It is difficult to assess whether the age-moderated effects we observe represent a tendency for greater damage in older donors, or alternatively a greater ability to repair a given level of damage in younger recipients. Our analysis considers only chronological donor age, rather than a more nuanced representation of the epigenomic biological clock, which is likely to account for some variation observed with respect to both donors and recipients.

Our list of outcome-associated candidates, controlling for the effect of donor age, including those for which we further report an additional age-moderated effect, is almost certainly not exhaustive. Practicalities of sample acquisition limited sampling of a range of outcomes for donors outside the 30-60 age range. In our dataset, as in the general population,
there is a trend towards lower eGFR (fewer good outcome events) at high donor age (Table 1). In
the vast majority of proteins, the modelling suggests a plateauing effect at high donor age where
the differences in outcome due to both protein and age are smaller. This effect may be an artifact
of the distribution of sub-median outcomes. It is also immediately clear from our results that the
strength of the donor age factor is enormous relative to any one protein effect; this must be borne
in mind when interpreting model fits; at high donor age, the age effect is liable to dominate any
prediction weighting and reduce the accuracy of estimated protein contribution. Both of these
considerations should ideally be explored in a much larger cohort. High-throughput proteomics
techniques continue to advance rapidly and larger cohort sizes are ever more feasible but
fundamental limitations on organ acquisition remain. Archiving at scale of clinical samples in
bioresources such as the Quality in Organ Donation (QUOD) biobank to parallel advancements
in big data analysis and interpretation platforms will improve the granularity in evidence-based
decision making and accelerate the translation and application to clinical practice.

In our orthogonal validation of selected proteins, the expected protein abundance
difference between extremes of the eGFR continuum across donor age distribution tails, and the
plateauing/narrowing of outcome differences at high donor age were broadly consistent with the
western blot results. In younger donors the predicted strengths of association were very
consistent with the observed differences in protein abundance in selected samples by western
blot. In older donors, the western blot results were still broadly consistent (relative to the effect at
in younger donors) in terms of a much weaker association, but the differences in both VTN and
PREB were larger than might be expected by examination of the prediction curves (Figure 6B,
upper panel) and the prediction for CST3 of a small reversal of the effect is both unexpected and
biologically counterintuitive. A better explanation is that the model fit is impacted by the
(unavoidable) lack of outcome diversity at high age ranges, with the CST3 ‘flip’ in terms of protein effect likely being artefactual.

In this work, we profiled the proteome of pre-implantation biopsies selected from donor kidneys on the basis of paired 12-month graft function, limiting potential surgical and post-transplant biases on transplant outcomes. Using machine learning and multivariate adaptive spline regression models, we identified 136 candidate proteins associated with sub-median outcomes, suggesting molecular signatures which may refine models of graft dysfunction based on clinical and demographic factors alone. We also found that most (124) of these candidates furthermore show different strengths of association dependent on the age of the donor. The biological themes of the identified candidates reinforce known immuno-metabolic mechanisms of kidney injury but raise interesting possibilities for further work, especially with regard to donor genetic background. Furthermore, our results strongly suggest that for any studies of subclinical molecular indicators with regard to kidney transplant outcomes, the possibility of donor age-moderated weighting should be considered as a matter of course.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIALS

Supplementary Methods

Supplementary Table 1: Clinical variable p-values for association with donor type and outcome

Supplementary Table 2: Summary of results for all candidate proteins

Supplementary Figure 1: Protein Quantification Missingness

A: Missingness comparison: Proteins are shown ranked by the number of missing values across all samples and the twenty standard pools, excluding one run which was removed due to low signal. 2984 proteins had missing values in 50% or less runs.
B: Paired Kidney Comparison: Protein abundance values from paired kidneys (left/right) from 3 individual donors were compared, as these are effectively biological replicates. x axes: value in left kidney. y axes: value in right kidney. Inset: R-squared value

Supplementary Figure 2: Prediction of sub-median outcome differences between high and low protein across donor age, for all shortlisted proteins with a predicted age modulation effect

Black traces: prediction at median protein abundance. Purple trace: prediction at 90th percentile of protein abundance. Orange traces: prediction at 10th percentile of protein abundance. The corresponding point on the main figure thus indicates the age at which the difference between orange and purple lines is greatest.
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The mass spectrometry proteomics data have been deposited to the ProteomeXchange Consortium via the PRIDE partner repository with the dataset identifier PXD033428.

DISCLOSURE AND FUNDING

This study was funded by NHS Blood and Transplant WP15-07 awarded to MK & RJP. SF was supported by Kidney Research UK, grant reference KS_RP_002_20210111 awarded to MK. PDC was supported by a Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences 2018-I2M-2-002 awarded to BMK. Authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Author contributions:

- Conceptualization: MK
- Methodology: PDC, SF, RV, SD, RF, BMK, AS, ES, RJP, MK
Investigation: PDC, SF, RV, PJ, SD, IV, KT, AS
Visualization: PDC
Funding acquisition: BMK, RJP, MK
Project administration: MK
Supervision: RF, AS, MK
Writing – original draft: PDC, ES, MK
Writing – review & editing: All authors

REFERENCES


ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the UK QUOD Consortium and NHS Blood and Transplant UK Registry; in particular Sheba Ziyenge, Lewis Simmonds and Dr Sarah Cross for the clinical samples and metadata analyzed in this study. We thank Dr Sergei Maslau and Mr Tomas Surik for their support on the QUOD sample selection.

We thank members of the Discovery Proteomics Facility within the TDI Mass Spectrometry Laboratory for expert help with mass spectrometry analysis.
Figure 1: Experimental design to discover donor kidney proteome associations with transplant outcome

One kidney from each donor pair was biopsied at the back table. Donor kidney samples were selected randomly from pairs where both recipients had similar outcomes. The biopsy samples were subjected to proteomic analysis to yield a snapshot of the organ proteome before transplantation. We analyzed donor characteristics and clinical variables, recipient characteristics and protein abundances in a combined model against outcome.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Donor Type</th>
<th>DBD</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Outcome Tertile</td>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;st&lt;/sup&gt;, Suboptimal (eGFR≤39)</td>
<td>2&lt;sup&gt;nd&lt;/sup&gt;, Intermediate (40≤eGFR&lt;59)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>n</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Age, y</td>
<td>56.84 ± 12.29</td>
<td>51.32 ± 12.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>15 (48.4%)</td>
<td>16 (51.6%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16 (51.6%)</td>
<td>15 (48.4%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>30 (96.8%)</td>
<td>30 (96.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1 (3.2%)</td>
<td>1 (3.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Weight, kg</td>
<td>82.53 ± 18.20</td>
<td>76.61 ± 18.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor Height, cm</td>
<td>168.42 ± 9.37</td>
<td>169.52 ± 7.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor S-Cr terminal, µmol/l</td>
<td>86.54 ± 40.81</td>
<td>82.57 ± 49.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor CIT, h</td>
<td>15.80 ± 3.88</td>
<td>14.20 ± 4.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor COD Trauma</td>
<td>1 (3.2%)</td>
<td>3 (9.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>30 (96.8%)</td>
<td>28 (90.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donor UKKDRI</td>
<td>1.41 ± 0.52</td>
<td>1.10 ± 0.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient Age, y</td>
<td>53.03 ± 12.21</td>
<td>52.10 ± 14.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient Sex</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>15 (48.4%)</td>
<td>8 (25.8%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>16 (51.6%)</td>
<td>23 (74.2%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient Ethnicity</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>24 (77.4%)</td>
<td>21 (67.7%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7 (22.6%)</td>
<td>10 (32.3%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recipient Posttransplant Kidney Function (mean eGFR, mL/min per 1.73 m&lt;sup&gt;2&lt;/sup&gt;)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 months</td>
<td>29.71 ± 12.06</td>
<td>50.32 ± 17.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 months</td>
<td>26.58 ± 11.98</td>
<td>49.58 ± 6.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1: Donor and recipient clinical and demographic variables

Donor kidney associated metadata. Samples are subdivided by donor type and by final assigned outcome tertile. Numerical variables are given ± standard deviation. Categorial variables are given alongside percentage of total cohort.
Figure 2: Donor and recipient clinical and demographic data association with recipient 12 month eGFR rank

Single-linkage hierarchical clustering of curated, imputed clinical variables by relative association strength (taking distance as 1-association). The outcome variable (ranked recipient eGFR at 12 months post-transplantation) is highlighted in red.
Figure 3: Unbiased analysis of pretransplant kidney proteomes and cluster associations

A: Unbiased analysis of proteomic data by k-means clustering. Sample separation by Principal Component Analysis. Top Left: Samples were assigned to four clusters by k-means. Bottom & Right: There was a difference in the distribution of DBD and DCD donors across clusters, with the DBD donors being more heavily concentrated in Cluster 2 (‘+’ symbol; orange shading), and DCD in Cluster 4 (‘x’ symbol; pink shading).

B: There were no associations between proteome clusters and most donor and recipient factors, except for mildly significant differences in donor BMI and creatinine (selected comparisons shown; left-right, top-bottom: donor type, recipient 12-month posttransplant eGFR (outcome), donor eGFR, donor age, donor BMI, donor creatinine at retrieval).
Figure 4: Age and combined age:protein related associations link to construction of age-modulated immune metabolic biological networks

A: Prediction Rule Ensemble (PRE) modelling was performed in an iterative manner to select protein and clinical variable associations with ranked eGFR. At each iteration, only proteins not previously featured in a model were considered. The rules found across all iterations were dominated by donor age terms.

B: Cumulative protein features identified at each iteration. Black line: all features identified by feature selection approach. Blue line: features passing the secondary filter for predictive power and accuracy.

C: Shared Reactome pathway membership network analysis of filtered features. Nodes are colored by assigned cluster, and the clusters are annotated according to the top three most enriched pathways within each cluster.
Figure 5: Modelled associations between proteins and kidney transplant outcome change with donor age

A: Ages at which the predicted probability of sub-median outcome is most different between the 10th percentile and 90th percentile of protein abundance. x axis: age at which difference is greatest (i.e. when protein has greatest effect). y axis: greatest difference.

Proteins above x=0 are modelled as having a more negative association with outcome when the protein abundance is high, at that donor age. Proteins below x=0 are modelled to have a more positive association with outcome when protein abundance is high, at that donor age.

Proteins with absolute net difference > 0.5 are labelled, as well as the selected proteins VTN, PREB, APOE and CST3.

The inset graphs indicate how the prediction of sub-median outcome (“P(S-M outcome)”; y axes) changes with donor age (x axes) for labelled proteins. Black trace: prediction at median protein abundance. Purple trace: prediction at 90th percentile of protein abundance. Orange trace: prediction at 10th percentile of protein abundance.

The corresponding point on the main figure thus indicates the age at which the difference between orange and purple lines is greatest.

B: Summary of feature selection and modelling analysis
Figure 6: Orthogonal validation confirms age-modulated immuno-metabolic proteins predict 12-month transplant outcomes

A: Validation of models in test dataset. Models are plotted in order of decreasing Brier score (mean squared prediction error) difference between test and train data along the x axis. The lower two traces indicate the Brier score in train (purple) and test (green) data. The upper two traces indicate the AUC from the corresponding ROC analyses in train (orange) and test (blue) data.

B-E: Validation of four selected proteins. Left-Right: VTN, PREB, APOE, CST3.

B: Final ROC curves and AUC values for models trained on each protein (and donor age) against test data. The dotted line indicates the original performance against training data.

C: Change in the prediction of sub-median outcome (“P(S-M Outcome)”; y axes) with donor age (x axes) for each protein. Black trace: prediction at median protein abundance. Purple trace: prediction at 90th percentile of protein abundance. Orange trace: prediction at 10th percentile of protein abundance. (These are the same as the inset graphs in Figure 5). The light grey and dark grey lines, respectively, indicate the corresponding sampled ages for the western blots below.

D: Western blots comparing younger (age ≤ 49) and older (age ≥ 58) donors between Good Outcome (GO; eGFR ≥ 60) and Suboptimal Outcome (SO; eGFR ≤ 40) outcome tertiles. Top row: representative western blots (n=5 per group) from comparison of younger donors. Middle row: representative western blots (n=5 per group) from comparison of older donors. Bottom row: result values for all quantified samples relative to the GO mean. Error bars indicate ±1 standard deviation; the central wider bar indicates mean. Significance stars indicate t-test comparison p-values (***, < 0.001, *: < 0.05).

E: Predicted outcome for six paired Left (L) and Right (R) kidneys from three donors. x axes: recipient eGFR at 12 months (i.e. actual outcome). y axes: predicted probability of sub-median outcome (“P(S-M Outcome)”) using models trained on each protein with donor age. Vertical dotted line indicated median outcome (eGFR = 50). Horizontal dotted line indicates P(Sub-Median Outcome) = 0.5