

Dynamical Systems Modeling of Early-Term Immune Reconstitution with Different Anti-Thymocyte Globulin (ATG) Administration Schedules in Allogeneic Stem Cell Transplantation.

Viktoriya Zelikson,¹ Gary Simmons,¹ Natasha Raman,¹ Elizabeth Krieger,² Anatevka Rebiero,¹ Kelly Hawks,³ May Aziz,³ Catherine Roberts,¹ Jason Reed,⁴ Ronald Gress,⁵ Amir Toor.¹

Department of Medicine,¹ Massey Cancer Center, School of Pharmacy³ and Department of Physics,⁴ Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA; Department of Pediatrics,² University of Minnesota, Minneapolis, MN; Experimental Transplant and Immunology Branch,⁵ National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, MD.

Correspondence: Amir A. Toor, MD. Professor of Medicine, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA. Email: amir.toor@vcuhealth.org. Ph: 1-804-628-2389

Word count: Abstract, 235; Manuscript 5956; Figures 6; Table 1; Supplementary Tables 9; Supplementary Figures 5.

Highlights:

ATG given early (day -9 to -7) prior to HCT leads to improved survival and non-relapse mortality.

Improved monocyte counts as well as donor-derived T cell counts are seen in recipients of early ATG.

Improved clinical outcomes are observed in patients with enhanced monocyte and T cell recovery after HCT.

Abstract

Alloreactivity forms the basis of allogeneic hematopoietic cell transplantation (HCT), with donor derived T cell response to recipient antigens mediating clinical responses either in part or entirely. These encompass the different manifestations of graft vs. host disease (GVHD), infection risk as well as disease response. Whilst the latter is contingent upon disease biology and thus may be less predictable, the former two are more likely to be directly proportional to the magnitude of donor derived T cell recovery. Herein we explore the quantitative aspects of immune cell recovery following allogeneic HCT and clinical outcomes in two cohorts of HLA matched allograft recipients who received rabbit anti-thymocyte globulin (ATG) on different schedules (days -9 to -7 vs. -3 to -1). Monocyte as well as donor derived T cell (ddCD3) recovery was superior in those given ATG early in their course (days -9/-7). This difference was related to a more rapid rate of ddCD3 recovery, largely driven by CD3+/8+ cells in the first month following transplantation. Early monocyte recovery was associated with later T cell recovery, improved survival, and less chronic GVHD. In contrast rapid and early ddCD3 expansion out of proportion to monocyte recovery was associated with a high likelihood of acute GVHD and poor survival. This analytic methodology demonstrates that modelling 'early-term immune reconstitution' following HCT yields insights that may be useful in management of post-transplant immunosuppression and adaptive cellular therapy to optimize clinical outcomes.

Introduction

Adequate immune reconstitution following allogeneic hematopoietic cell transplantation (HCT) is critical to optimize clinical outcomes, particularly relapse, infection and graft versus host disease (GVHD). Recovery of adaptive immunity is crucial, as it represents the critical mechanism of protection against a variety of viral and fungal pathogens, as well as ensure relapse protection in the long run. Therefore, early T cell reconstitution is crucial to the long-term success of HCT. This is because of the versatility provided by the T cell receptor mediated identification of a wide variety of pathogen and tumor associated epitopes. However, among other factors, T cell recovery also carries with it the risk of GVHD through minor histocompatibility antigen (mHA) recognition.

A number of studies evaluating lymphocyte counts¹, total T cell and T cell subset recovery at different time points post-transplant have established this paradigm². However, numeric T cell recovery occurs as a continuous function of time, and the risk of transplant related adverse outcomes such as viral infections, GVHD, and relapse varies over the duration of the post-transplant course. In part this is due to variability of T cell recovery over this period. It is therefore important to understand the relationship between clinical events and the magnitude of T cell recovery over time in individual transplant recipients³. Further complicating matters is the critical dependence of T cells on antigen presenting cells (represented in the early post-transplant circulation by monocytes), which trigger their antigen specific responses⁴. Developing an understanding of the relationship between the recovery of these populations as a function of time in individual HCT recipients may therefore enhance the understanding of why post-transplant outcomes vary across patient populations, since in individual transplant donor-recipient pairs, HLA and mHA background is quite varied^{5, 6}.

In this paper, the relationship between monocyte, T cell and T cell subset recovery over time and their interaction, described using the phrase, early-term immune reconstitution (ETIR), is examined using simple mathematical methods that characterize these interactions as *dynamical systems*. Such systems may be described using differential equations, such as, donor derived T cells proliferating as a logistic function of time with an early exponential growth phase, followed by a later plateau⁷. T cell growth is preceded by an earlier proliferation of monocytes. The magnitude of growth in these populations is variable in different patients, therefore in this paper these parameters were analyzed in individuals. All patients examined received T cell replete grafts and were given rabbit anti-thymocyte globulin (ATG) for in vivo T cell depletion for GVHD prophylaxis. ATG has long been used for in vivo T cell

depletion of allografts and is associated with a reduction in the risk for chronic GVHD developing in a number of studies^{8,9}. This risk reduction is associated with increased risk of opportunistic infections, particularly Epstein-Barr Virus associated lymphoproliferative disorder¹⁰. The effect of ATG on transplant outcomes is dependent on both dose given and schedule of administration^{11, 12, 13, 14}. The differential effects observed with ATG dose and schedule variation will logically be dependent on the rate of T cell reconstitution that follows such regimens. In this paper outcomes following two different schedules of ATG administration are reported. Patients were treated with the same pretransplant conditioning regimen and supportive care. ETIR was studied as a function of time in the two cohorts of patients and its impact on clinical outcomes determined.

Methods

Patient characteristics and conditioning regimen

The records of 64 consecutive patients transplanted between 2012-2020, using a conditioning regimen of fludarabine and melphalan, were reviewed in a retrospective study approved by the Institutional Review Board at Virginia Commonwealth University Health System. Donors and recipients were matched at 8/8 or 7/8, HLA-A, B, C and DRB1 loci; for unrelated donors, the HLA matching was at the allele level. Conditioning regimen consisted of fludarabine 30 mg/m² administered intravenously (IV) daily from day -6 to -3 and melphalan 140 mg/m² IV on day -2. Total ATG (Thymoglobulin, Sanofi, Bridgewater, NJ) doses utilized were 5 mg/kg for HLA-matched unrelated donor (MUD) and 3 mg/kg for HLA-matched related donor (MRD) recipients. Study patients were given ATG in divided doses from day -9 to -7 (ATG -9/-7 cohort) and their outcomes were compared with a historical cohort given ATG from day -3 to -1 (ATG -3/-1 cohort). Tacrolimus was commenced on either day -3 or -2 and given for approximately 6 months post-transplant for GVHD prophylaxis in MUD recipients, and cyclosporine administered similarly was utilized for MRD transplants. Methotrexate (5mg/m² on day 1, 3, 6 and 11) or mycophenolate mofetil (15 mg/kg every 12 hours from day 0 to 30) were administered along with calcineurin inhibitors. Filgrastim (G-CSF 5 µg/kg/day) was given for post-transplant myeloid recovery. Herpes virus infection prophylaxis was administered, with acyclovir 400 mg twice daily, along with cytomegalovirus and Epstein-Barr virus monitoring.

Early-Term Immune Reconstitution

Circulating monocyte, CD3+, CD3+/8+, CD3+/4+, CD3-/56+ and CD19+ cell counts were determined on days 30, 60, and 90 post-transplant as a measure of early-term immune reconstitution (ETIR). Donor T cell chimerism was measured at these time points utilizing PCR for short tandem repeats on cell populations isolated using anti-CD3 immunomagnetic beads. T cell chimerism, expressed as a fraction was multiplied with the T cell and T cell subset counts (measured within one week of each other), to determine donor-derived T cell (ddCD3) counts. T cell reconstitution kinetics were studied by plotting ddCD3 cell counts for each patient as a function of time, starting with a count of 0 on day 0 (date of transplant) and plotting the counts through day 90. This was followed by fitting a cubic polynomial curve ($f(x)=ax^3+bx^2+cx+d$) to these data using MS Excel (Microsoft Corporation, Redmond, WA). In this equation, x represents the time t post-transplant, and $f(x)$ the T cell counts at time t . The

derivative of the cubic equation ($dy/dx=3ax^2+2bx+c$) represents an estimate of the rate of change of ddCD3 growth (dT/dt) at specific time points. Examples are given depicting this analysis for two patients (**Supplementary Figure 1**). The derivatives for ddCD3 (dT/dt) curves were calculated for days 15, 45, and 80 following HCT.

T cell and monocyte interaction analysis

To understand the interaction between recovering monocytes and T cells, these cell populations at different time points were regarded as vector components in a Euclidean *immune phase-space*, together giving the vector \overline{MT} . Variation in magnitude of the two cell components over time, change the overall vector magnitude and angle providing a composite estimate of the interaction between these two cell populations and a measure of immune recovery. To accomplish this, monocyte counts on a given day were graphed on the x-axis, against ddCD3 cell count on the same day on the y-axis, with magnitude and angle of the resulting vector as its properties (**Supplementary Figure 2**).

Statistical Analysis

Clinical outcomes studied were, overall survival (OS), relapse free survival (RFS), relapse, non-relapse mortality (NRM), aGVHD grades 2-4 and grades 3-4, and cGVHD moderate to severe and severe. Relapsing patients were censored in the NRM analysis at the time of relapse and *vice versa*. Acute and chronic GVHD were determined and graded based on NIH consensus criteria. Those who experienced relapse or received donor lymphocyte infusion (DLI) prior to GVHD diagnosis were censored in the GVHD analysis. Clinical outcomes were studied using Cox proportional hazards modeling using both unadjusted and adjusted analyses. Variables included in the multivariate analysis for clinical outcomes included were, age of recipient (continuous variable), recipient sex, type of disease (myeloid vs lymphoid), at risk status for CMV (defined as IgM or IgG seropositive donor or recipient), donor type (MUD vs MRD), HLA match (either 8/8 or lower), Karnofsky performance status at transplant (either ≥ 90 or below). Cumulative incidence curves were used to compare relapse, NRM, and chronic GVHD.

For immune cell analysis, Wilcoxon-Rank Sum test was used when comparing cell count recovery by cohort. For determining the prognostic impact of ETIR, the two ATG cohorts were combined and cell counts analyzed as categorical variables using cut offs based on ROC-AUC analysis for each cell type, for each time point measured, with OS as the outcome of interest. Univariate and multivariate Cox proportional hazards analysis were performed to assess impact on clinical outcomes. Multivariate

analysis for immune cell parameters included type of disease, at risk status for CMV, donor type, HLA match, and ATG timing (ATG -9/-7 vs. ATG -3/-1). This cutoff was applied to calculate Cox proportional hazards for OS, relapse, NRM and GVHD. Statistical analyses were performed using the R Studio (Interface)- V 1.3.1093,2009-202 RStudio, PBC & R -platform V 4.0.3 (2020-10-10).

Results

Clinical outcomes with ATG administration early or late in conditioning

Patient characteristics are given in Table 1. The groups were largely comprised of unrelated donor transplant recipients and were comparable, except for a larger proportion of myeloid malignancies in the ATG -9/-7 group. Median follow up in the ATG -9/-7 cohort was 15 months, while it was 47 months in the historical ATG -3/-1 cohort. In unadjusted analysis there was a trend toward improved overall survival in the ATG -9/-7 cohort (Figure 1A). When adjusted for donor type, HLA match grade, disease type, patient age and sex, CMV risk, and KPS, the survival difference between ATG -9/-7 and ATG -3/-1 arms was significant (HR=0.25, p=0.027), and likely attributable to reduced NRM in the ATG -9/-7 cohort (HR=0.14, p=0.027) (Figure 1D & Supplementary Table 1). No difference was observed in relapse (HR=0.77, p=0.73) or RFS (HR=0.40, p=0.11) (Figure 1B & C), or in acute or chronic GVHD (Supplementary Table 1).

Therapy was tolerated well, with two instances of day 100 treatment-related mortality in each group, due to sepsis (2) in the ATG -9/-7 group, and sepsis (1) and liver failure (1) in the ATG -3/-1 group. There was no difference in acute GVHD (grade 2-4, HR=1.75, p=0.35; grade 3-4, HR=0.27, p=0.23) and chronic GVHD (moderate-severe, HR=1.47, p=0.69; severe, HR=0.54, p=0.62) (Supplementary Figure 3). DLI were utilized for mixed chimerism, relapse, or persistent disease; ATG day -9/-7 (8%) and ATG day -3/-1(14%) (P=NS). Epstein Barr Virus and CMV reactivation were also similar between the groups (Supplementary Table 2). Of note, viral titers became undetectable in the ATG -9/-7 group in almost half the time compared to the ATG -3/-1 cohort, consistent with superior functional immune recovery in this group.

Early-term Immune Reconstitution and ATG schedule

To determine the impact of ATG timing on ETIR, immune cell subset recovery and donor-recipient chimerism were compared between the two groups. There was no difference in donor chimerism between the groups (Supplementary Table 3). The ATG -9/-7 group consistently showed superior monocyte recovery throughout the first 90 days following transplantation (Supplementary Table 4). The ddCD3 cell subsets also showed statistically significant divergence by day 60, with ATG -9/-7 group having greater magnitude (Figure 2). The NK cell and CD19+ cell populations showed no difference in recovery between the groups for the time points studied. Early monocyte recovery had a

significant impact on later T cell growth (Supplementary figure 5), with monocyte counts on day 30 correlating with ddCD3 cell count on day 60 (Srho: 0.4293, p=0.001), when data from the two cohorts was combined.

Early-term Immune Reconstitution and Clinical Outcomes

Monocytes and ddCD3 cell count recovery were analyzed for their impact on clinical outcome. To determine the effect of ETIR on clinical outcomes, data from the two cohorts were combined. The optimal cut-offs for analyzing the impact of monocytes on outcomes were determined utilizing ROC-AUC analysis. The monocyte counts associated with OS on days 30, 60 and 90 were 650/mm³, 250/mm³, and 50/mm³ respectively (Supplementary Figure 5). Univariate and multivariate analysis showed that monocyte count >650/mm³ on day 30 was associated with improved OS (univariate HR 0.37, p=0.016; multivariate HR 0.27, p=0.018), as was monocyte count of >250/mm³ on day 60 (univariate HR 0.27, p=0.004; multivariate HR 0.34, p=0.056). High monocyte counts were also associated with lower chronic GVHD risk and NRM risk (Figure 3 & Supplementary Table 5A). Similar ROC-AUC analyses for ddCD3+ cell count yielded optimal values of 580/mm³, 204/mm³, and 278/mm³ respectively by day 30, 60 and 90 following HCT. Notably, ddCD3 count >580/mm³ on day 30 was associated with increased risk of aGVHD grade 2-4 (univariate HR 3.75, p=0.008; multivariate HR 5.06, p=0.005), and aGVHD grade 3-4 (univariate HR 5.59, p=0.02; multivariate HR 6.3132, p=0.03). A ddCD3 count >204/mm³ on day 60 was associated with reduced risk for relapse (univariate HR 0.23, p=0.009; multivariate HR 0.17, p=0.005) (Figure 3 & Supplementary Table 5B).

T cell Growth Kinetics, ATG schedule and clinical outcomes

The rate of change of ddCD3 was calculated to study the effect of T cell growth kinetics on clinical outcomes. Discrete values of the derivative were calculated for day 15, 45, and 80. There was a significant difference in the *calculated* rate of change (dT/dt) on day 15 between the ATG -9/-7 and ATG -3/-1 cohort (16.71 cells.mL⁻¹.day⁻¹ vs. 8.16, P=0.03, Wilcoxon Rank) (Supplementary Table 6) (Figure 4). This suggests that the different ATG schedule impacts the rate of T cell recovery very early following transplantation, probably driven by monocyte secreted cytokines, and this may contribute to the aforementioned superior T cell recovery observed at the succeeding time points.

Clinical outcome correlations for ddCD3 kinetics (dT/dt) were determined, once again utilizing ROC-AUC analysis for OS, which were optimal at 18.43 cells.mL⁻¹.day⁻¹, 0.17, and 4.81 for the time points

studied (Supplementary Figure 5). Consistent with the adverse impact of high donor derived T cell counts at day 30 post HCT, there was a significant effect of $dT/dt > 18.43 \text{ cells.mL}^{-1}.\text{day}^{-1}$ on day 15 on both, increased risk of mortality (univariate HR 8.94, $p=0.02$; bivariate corrected for ATG schedule HR 14.72, $p=0.01$), as well as aGVHD grade 2-4 (HR 3.23, $p=0.048$; multivariate HR 4.98, $p=0.04$). Conversely, consistent with the benefit associated with ddCD3 counts at day 60 post-transplant, there was a significant effect of $dT/dt > 0 \text{ cells.mL}^{-1}.\text{day}^{-1}$ on day 45, with reduced risk of mortality observed (univariate HR 0.09, $p=0.03$; bivariate corrected for ATG schedule HR 0.1, $p=0.04$) (Supplementary Table 7), suggesting that ongoing expansion of donor derived T cells beyond day 30 following HCT may confer clinical benefit.

Monocyte-ddCD3 cell vectors, ATG schedule and clinical outcomes

To examine the interaction of innate (antigen presenting cells) and adaptive (T cells) immune systems, immune reconstitution vectors were constructed using monocyte and ddCD3 cell recovery data (\overline{MT}). The vector magnitude was greater at all the times examined for the ATG -9/-7 cohort, consistent with superior immune cell recovery. The angle of this vector however was not different at any time between the two cohorts, suggesting the relative magnitude of recovery of the two cell populations was similar in both populations (Figure 5 & Supplementary Table 8).

Cutoffs for optimal clinical outcome associations for the \overline{MT} vectors were established through ROC-AUC analysis using OS, and were 955 cells/mm³, 619, and 643 for vector magnitude on days 30, 60, and 90 respectively (Supplementary Figure 5). Consistent with the survival benefit observed with T cell and monocyte recovery at day 60, there was a significant difference found with higher vector magnitudes at this time (>619) and improved OS (univariate HR 0.09, $p=0.02$; multivariate HR 0.08, $p=0.03$) (Supplementary Table 9). Cut offs for the angle of the vector were established in the same manner, and were 35°, 50°, and 55° for day 30, 60, and 90 respectively. There was a significant difference with an angle $>34.65^\circ$ on day 30 and increased risk of overall mortality (univariate HR 8.15, $p=0.001$; multivariate HR 10, $p=0.007$), aGVHD grade 2-4 (univariate HR 3.96, $p=0.006$; multivariate HR 4.5, $p=0.006$) and grade 3-4 (univariate HR 11.37, $p=0.004$; multivariate HR 16.38, $p=0.01$), as well as cGVHD, both moderate-severe (univariate HR 7.24, $p=0.005$; multivariate HR 9.15, $p=0.006$) and severe (univariate HR 175.96, $p=0.004$) (Supplementary Table 9). These were all associated with greater NRM in these individuals (univariate HR 10, $p=0.008$; multivariate HR 12, $p=0.019$). These findings are consistent with the effects of higher dT/dt at the early day 15 time point, and high ddCD3, as well as relatively low

monocyte counts at this time, pointing to possible rapid, perhaps oligoclonal expansion of alloreactive oligoclonal T cell populations in patients who eventually develop severe GVHD with its adverse impact on survival.

Discussion

In this paper early-term immune reconstitution (ETIR) following HCT is studied in patients with hematological malignancies, transplanted using two different schedules of ATG. Clinical outcomes are used as a metric for restoration of functional immunity. It is observed that ETIR was more robust, and faster in the patients administered ATG early on (day -9 through -7) in the conditioning regimen. In this small, admittedly varied cohort of patients examined, the related metrics of monocyte and T cell recovery were associated with superior clinical outcomes. This study supports the notion that immune recovery post-transplant functions as a dynamical system, which may be mathematically modeled. This means that a measured intervention (ATG schedule change), produces a measurable impact on a critical variable (ETIR), which may in turn influence the clinical outcomes in a predictable manner (survival, GVHD).

In this study, recipients of ATG early in the course of conditioning had superior monocyte count and a higher rate of donor derived T cell recovery in the first weeks following transplant, which translated to higher T cell counts in the subsequent months. There are several observations to be made which represent areas of future investigative interest. First, robust monocyte recovery was uniformly associated with an improved outlook, with respect to survival and chronic GVHD. Second, higher than average donor derived T cell counts in the first 30 days and very rapid rate of recovery (dT/dt) were associated with acute GVHD and diminished survival prospects. However, in the ensuing weeks, likely, as the initial cytokine mediated proliferative surge ebbed, donor derived T cells being above a modest threshold were protective from relapse and associated with improved survival. Finally, when the relative proportion of monocytes and T cells, favored the latter very early on (high \overline{MT} vector angle at day 30), increased alloreactivity with acute and chronic GVHD and worse survival was seen, as noted above, however the salutary effect of vector magnitude mitigated this effect by the second month. These observations suggest that a very early burst of expansion in donor derived T cells accompanied by poor monocyte recovery, is associated with GVHD and impaired survival, while a more tempered growth in accompaniment of robust innate immune recovery (represented by monocytes) leads to improved outcomes (Figure 6). The former scenario may represent a situation where effector memory T cells in the graft encounter disparate antigens and proliferate, whilst the latter may represent polyclonal T cell reconstitution. This creates a picture of a dynamic process unfolding over time as T cells interact with antigen presenting cells, leading to very different outcomes during different time windows in the early-term following transplantation. Further, this process was influenced in a predictable manner by the ATG

schedule, with a longer time between ATG and hematopoietic cell infusion resulting in more robust cellular immune recovery.

A variety of different studies have reported the salutary impact of early T cell reconstitution on post allograft outcomes. The association of T cell recovery kinetics calculated using derivatives of the T cell counts plotted over time, giving the instantaneous rate of change as described here, with transplant relevant clinical outcomes has been reported before¹⁵. T cell recovery kinetics in that study were associated with GVHD, and survival as in this study. The main mechanism for relapse prevention in RIC allografts is donor immune mediated graft vs. malignancy effect. Historically those who experienced acute & chronic GVHD have had the lowest likelihood of disease relapse¹⁶, and more recently Grade 2 acute GVHD, but not grade 3-4, has been associated with improved survival and freedom from relapse in both the haploidentical and HLA matched setting^{17, 18}. Therefore, in the cohorts presented here, early and intermediate T cell recovery shows strong association with clinical outcomes and may be used to help make decisions about the intensity of immunosuppression employed at different time intervals post-transplant. For example, prolonged immunosuppression in those with very rapid T cell recovery, in the absence of monocyte recovery and *vice versa*, closely following T cell recovery kinetics.

ATG dosing has been evaluated based on AUC achieved following administration¹⁹. Patients with supra-optimal dosing of ATG in this instance had a higher risk of relapse, while suboptimal exposure led to worsening NRM and worse survival in both groups. In general, lower dose ATG yields superior outcomes following allogeneic transplantation²⁰. More intense immunosuppression with alemtuzumab also increases the risk of relapse, with higher mortality seen in these patients²¹. The finding that ATG administered early in the course of conditioning leads to more robust ETIR is consistent with these observations, and indicates that along with dose, optimization of the schedule of administration of ATG is important.

Post-transplant cyclophosphamide (PT-CY) is becoming widely adopted for GVHD prophylaxis following HLA matched²² and haploidentical transplantation^{23 24}. This modality is associated with significant immune modulation, with different mechanisms of GVHD control proposed²⁵. These include an alteration of the Treg-Tcon ratio, delayed T cell recovery kinetics and selective depletion of alloreactive T cell clones²⁶. Infections following PT-CY are common, albeit, non-lethal²⁷. ATG when compared with PT-CY retrospectively yields equivalent outcomes in MUD recipients²⁸. Prospective study of ATG vs. PT-CY have failed to identify significant differences in clinical outcomes in single locus HLA

mismatched unrelated donor transplants²⁹. Despite the success of PT-CY in expanding the donor pool for patients with hematological malignancy, relapse remains an ongoing problem due to high rates of recurrence of disease in patients thus treated. This may be related to the effective control of alloreactivity, through either T cell clonal deletion or Treg mediated effects. Administration of ATG on a different schedule than the conventional time window of pre-graft infusion is one way to allow adequate immune reconstitution without adversely impacting chronic GVHD risk, and allow dose de-escalation of PT-CY. Indeed, rabbit ATG 2.5 mg/kg given on day -8 thru -5 when added to PT-CY leads to reliable engraftment with no GVHD risk³⁰. Similarly, the ATG schedule reported here leads to improved ETIR without a noticeable impact on overall GVHD risk and with a trend towards improved survival and relapse in the two patient groups studied.

Clinical utility of studying ETIR kinetics aside, this analysis helps understand the physiology at hand. Transplant outcomes are generally modelled as a stochastic process, with probabilities of outcomes varying as a function of certain variables such as conditioning intensity, T cell depletion and GVHD prophylaxis. Modeling immune reconstitution using simple mathematical techniques, and the association of model outputs with clinical outcomes supports the notion that, in aggregate, the immune system behaves as a dynamical system. In dynamical systems, the components of the HCT system, such as, T cells, and antigen presenting cells (monocytes), behave according to predetermined laws. The immune response being proportional to physical properties of the antigen library at hand, such as the number of antigens and their HLA binding affinities, may be one such law. The data here describe the population-wide behavior of classes of immune cells, and likely represents the aggregate T cell clonal behavior, if considered from the molecular, minor histocompatibility antigen-driven perspective. Further in each individual these dynamical T cell responses will be modulated by different cytokine milieu encountered in different individuals. With the expansion in genomic sciences, it is a matter of time before it becomes possible to study these dynamics at the molecular level. The work presented here reinforces the principles identified previously^{31, 32} that post-transplant immune reconstitution may be mathematically described, and this description may be used to understand the differential impact of different immunosuppressive regimens. This quantitative understanding may also help understand the varying pathophysiology of different GVHD prophylaxis regimens. Thus, while in ATG based regimens, the magnitude of T cell recovery may determine the probability of alloreactivity developing, in PT-CY based regimens this may be a more qualitative relationship, depending on the T cell clonal repertoire specificity, rather than being a simple T cell-magnitude-based association.

Whilst the findings reported here are thought provoking, they need to be confirmed in larger, uniform cohorts of patients. The cohort reported here is relatively small, and varied, as well as the study being retrospective. However, the detailed evaluation of immune reconstitution parameters, from many different, but related angles utilizing a logic-based systematic approach gives confidence in the robustness of the results. In conclusion, quantitative immunobiology of transplantation is reviewed in this paper, by exploring how modification of the schedule of immunosuppressive therapy may modify immune recovery post HCT and effect clinical outcomes. This demonstrates that one may through a deeper understanding of post-transplant immune recovery dynamics be able to ‘fine-tune’ and adjust therapeutic intensity to optimize clinical outcomes.

Acknowledgements & author contributions: AT was supported by research funding from the NIH-NCI Cancer Center Support Grant (P30-CA016059; PI: Gordon Ginder, MD). VZ- Designed study, collected and analyzed data, wrote the manuscript; GS- Designed study collected and analyzed data, wrote the manuscript; NR- Collected data, wrote the manuscript; EK- Analyzed data, wrote the manuscript; KH; Critically reviewed and wrote the manuscript; MA- Critically reviewed and wrote the manuscript; JR- Critically reviewed and wrote the manuscript; RG- Critically reviewed and wrote the manuscript; AT- Designed study, directed data analysis, wrote the manuscript.

Conflict-of-Interest Disclosure: The authors have no relevant conflicts of interest to disclose.

Table 1. Demographic characteristics of the patients in the two cohorts.

N	ATG -9/-7	ATG -3/-1	P-value
	36	28	
Age (Median)	56 (27-69)	57 (17-67)	0.20
Karnofsky PS (90-100)	17 (57%)	18 (67%)	0.59
Transplant Type (MRD)	7 (19%)	10 (36%)	0.17
GVHD Ppx: MTX+Tacrolimus	22	12	0.20
MMF+Cyclosporin	9	10	0.41
MTX+Cyclosporin	4	4	0.72
MMF+Tacrolimus	1	1	1.00
HLA Match (8/8, 10/10)	28 (78%)	22 (79%)	1.00
Disease Type (Myeloid)	30 (83%) ¹	10 (36%) ²	0.0002
Patient Sex (F)	19 (53%)	7 (25%)	0.04
CD34+ cell dose (mean) (E6/kg)	4.81 ± 1.16	4.87 ± 1.43	0.86

Diagnoses: 1- ALL (2), AML (13), CML (1), MDS (8), MF (8), MM (1), NHL (1), T cell ALL (2); 2- ALL (1), AML (4), CLL (2), CMML (1), CTCL (1), MF (5), MM (1), NL (10), PCL (1), T cell ALL (2).

Figure 1 A & B: Unadjusted survival (Log Rank $p=0.05$) and relapse free survival ($P=0.2$) following HCT in the study, ATG -9/-7 and historical control, ATG -3/-1 cohorts, unadjusted.




Figure 1 C & D. Unadjusted cumulative incidence for relapse (Gray's test $P=0.53$) and NRM ($P=0.3$), unadjusted, for relapse and 0.3 for NRM.




Figure 2. Average immune cell reconstitution on day 30, 60, and 90 post HCT comparing the ATG -9/-7 to ATG -3/-1 cohorts (Mean \pm S.E.).




Figure 3. KM curves displaying association of immune cells and outcome.




Figure 4. Comparing average ddCD3 rate of change on d15, 45, and 80 between the two cohorts (Mean ± S.E.).




Figure 5. \overline{MT} vector magnitude and angle over time in the two patient cohorts (Mean \pm S.E.).







Figure 6. Model of how ATG schedule impacts monocyte (green lines) and T cell (red lines) recovery. Dashed lines indicate rapid uncontrolled T cell growth and poor monocyte recovery, leading to worse outcome. Solid lines the opposite situation.




Supplementary Figure 1. Two patient examples of ddCD3 reconstitution plots. The solid blue line represents the ddCD3 cell count fit to a cubic polynomial and the dotted blue line is its derivative. The solid orange line represents the rate of change at a specific point in time. The two graphs next to each other highlight that while the cell counts on a specific day may be similar, day 45 here, for example, however the rate of recovery may be quite different at that time in the individual patient's course.

Patient 1

Patient 2




Supplementary Figure 2. Calculating Monocyte (x-axis) - T cell (y-axis) interaction vector in immune recovery phase space, vector \overline{MT} . v and θ represent vector properties.




Supplementary Figure 3: Cumulative Incidence for cGVHD (Grey's test P=0.63 for moderate to severe and 0.44 for severe). Competing event relapse.


Cumulative Incidence; cGVHD mod-sev and Relapse




Cumulative Incidence; cGVHD sev and Relapse




Supplementary Figure 4. Data separated by ATG cohort, average monocytes on day30 and ddCD3 cells on day 60 (Mean \pm S.E.).




Supplementary Figure 5. ROC-AUC curves used to determine cutoff for cell counts. Overall survival was used at the outcome in each calculation to determine the value of the cutoff for each day; d30, 60 and 90.






A. Monocytes and OS






B. ddCD3 and OS



C. ddCD3 Kinetics and OS



D. Vector Magnitude and OS



E. Vector Angle and OS

Supplementary Table 1. Effect of ATG schedule on clinical outcomes.

Outcome	Analysis Type	Variable	HR	Lower 95% CI	Upper 95% CI	P
OS	Multivariate	ATG timing (-9 vs. -3)	0.2508	0.0736	0.855	0.027
		At risk for CMV (Y vs. N)	0.9672	0.2423	3.86	0.962
		MRD vs. MUD	1.0905	0.287	4.144	0.899
		Disease Type. Myeloid vs. Lymphoid	1.8405	0.7228	4.686	0.201
		HLA Match (8/8 vs. 7/8)	0.3822	0.1293	1.13	0.082
		KPS (100-90 vs. <90)	0.4788	0.1539	1.489	0.203
		Age at Tx (Recipient)	1.0556	0.9987	1.116	0.056
		Sex (F vs. M)	3.3613	1.1418	9.895	0.028
	Univariate	ATG timing (-9 vs. -3)	0.518	0.232	1.16	0.11
NRM	Multivariate	ATG timing (-9 vs. -3)	0.1442	0.0259	0.804	0.027
		At risk for CMV (Y vs. N)	0.367	0.0596	2.259	0.28
		MRD vs. MUD	0.9678	0.137	6.835	0.974
		Disease Type. Myeloid vs. Lymphoid	0.9002	0.203	3.992	0.89
		HLA Match (8/8 vs. 7/8)	0.1712	0.0299	0.981	0.047
		KPS (100-90 vs. <90)	0.3703	0.0755	1.815	0.221
		Age at Tx (Recipient)	1.1457	1.0316	1.272	0.011
		Sex (F vs. M)	4.2914	0.9282	19.841	0.062
	Univariate	ATG timing (-9 vs. -3)	0.505	0.16	1.59	0.24
Relapse	Multivariate	ATG timing (-9 vs. -3)	0.7773	0.181	3.35	0.735
		At risk for CMV (Y vs. N)	2.2464	0.44	11.48	0.331
		MRD vs. MUD	1.3161	0.282	6.13	0.727
		Disease Type. Myeloid vs. Lymphoid	2.9903	0.945	9.47	0.062
		HLA Match (8/8 vs. 7/8)	0.5521	0.143	2.13	0.388
		KPS (100-90 vs. <90)	0.4811	0.14	1.65	0.245
		Age at Tx (Recipient)	1.0267	0.96	1.1	0.446
		Sex (F vs. M)	1.6159	0.442	5.9	0.468
	Univariate	ATG timing (-9 vs. -3)	0.658	0.258	1.68	0.38
aGVHD 2-4.	Multivariate	ATG timing (-9 vs. -3)	1.755	0.544	5.67	0.35

		At risk for CMV (Y vs. N)	0.6511	0.208	2.04	0.46
		MRD vs. MUD	0.6294	0.122	3.25	0.58
		Disease Type. Myeloid vs. Lymphoid	0.8815	0.279	2.79	0.83
		HLA Match (8/8 vs. 7/8)	0.4621	0.15	1.42	0.18
		KPS (100-90 vs. <90)	1.0661	0.394	2.88	0.9
		Age at Tx (Recipient)	1.0584	0.985	1.14	0.12
		Sex (F vs. M)	0.7317	0.26	2.06	0.55
	Univariate	ATG timing (-9 vs. -3)	1.579	0.669	3.73	0.3
aGVHD 3-4.	Multivariate	ATG timing (-9 vs. -3)	0.2754	0.0329	2.31	0.234
		At risk for CMV (Y vs. N)	0.4898	0.0573	4.19	0.514
		MRD vs. MUD	0.718	0.0631	8.16	0.789
		Disease Type. Myeloid vs. Lymphoid	2.3229	0.425	12.7	0.331
		HLA Match (8/8 vs. 7/8)	0.353	0.0559	2.23	0.268
		KPS (100-90 vs. <90)	0.3209	0.0501	2.06	0.23
		Age at Tx (Recipient)	1.0887	0.9875	1.2	0.088
	Sex (F vs. M)	3.9771	0.6438	24.57	0.137	
Univariate	ATG timing (-9 vs. -3)	0.629	0.192	2.06	0.44	
cGVHD sev	Multivariate	ATG timing (-9 vs. -3)	0.5379	0.0468	6.18	0.619
		At risk for CMV (Y vs. N)	2.3815	0.1442	39.33	0.544
		MRD vs. MUD	0.426	0.0432	4.2	0.465
		Disease Type. Myeloid vs. Lymphoid	2.1644	0.2785	16.82	0.46
		HLA Match (8/8 vs. 7/8)	0.1399	0.0172	1.14	0.066
		KPS (100-90 vs. <90)	3.7189	0.2875	48.1	0.315
		Age at Tx (Recipient)	1.0045	0.8898	1.13	0.942
	Sex (F vs. M)	3.3451	0.3614	30.96	0.288	
Univariate	ATG timing (-9 vs. -3)	0.513	0.115	2.3	0.38	
cGVHD mod-sev	Multivariate	ATG timing (-9 vs. -3)	1.46612	0.2219	9.69	0.691
		At risk for CMV (Y vs. N)	1.3259	0.2217	7.93	0.757
		MRD vs. MUD	0.49051	0.0725	3.32	0.465
		Disease Type. Myeloid vs. Lymphoid	1.0089	0.1852	5.5	0.992
		HLA Match (8/8 vs. 7/8)	0.2428	0.0535	1.1	0.067
		KPS (100-90 vs. <90)	2.5949	0.4736	14.22	0.272

		Age at Tx (Recipient)	1.01878	0.918	1.13	0.726
		Sex (F vs. M)	1.36454	0.2849	6.54	0.697
	Univariate	ATG timing (-9 vs. -3)	1.296	0.379	4.44	0.68
RFS	Multivariate	ATG timing (-9 vs. -3)	0.40818	0.133	1.25	0.117
		At risk for CMV (Y vs. N)	1.00529	0.304	3.33	0.993
		MRD vs. MUD	1.12848	0.34	3.74	0.843
		Disease Type. Myeloid vs. Lymphoid	1.78473	0.73	4.36	0.204
		HLA Match (8/8 vs. 7/8)	0.37128	0.128	1.08	0.068
		KPS (100-90 vs. <90)	0.45771	0.176	1.19	0.109
		Age at Tx (Recipient)	1.06889	1.007	1.13	0.029
	Sex (F vs. M)	2.57274	0.967	6.84	0.058	
Univariate	ATG timing (-9 vs. -3)	0.591	0.268	1.22	0.16	

Supplementary Table 2. EBV and CMV reactivation in the two cohorts. Patients receiving Letermovir (n=4) removed from this analysis. In the analysis of ‘Total Days with + Titers’, a cut off of 180 days of follow-up was used, and patients without clinically significant reactivation (CMV >500/EBV >100 copies) included.

		ATG -9/-7	ATG d -3/-1	P-value (FET)
N		36	28	
CMV	N Reactivation Potential	23 (64%)	18 (61%)	1
	N Reactivations	13 (56%)	11 (61%)	1
	Total Days with + Titer (Mean)	6 ± 12	17 ± 3	0.1
EBV	N Reactivation Potential	35 (97%)	25(89%)	0.3
	N Reactivations	11 (31%)	7 (28%)	1
	Total Days with + Titer (Mean)	4 ± 11	8 ± 24	0.4

Supplementary Table 3. T cell Chimerism following SCT at days 30, 60, 90.

T cell chimerism		Day 30	Day 60	Day 90
ATG -9/-7	N	31	33	27
	Average	97 (36-100)	97 (6-100)	95 (6-100)
ATG -3/-1	N	17	21	16
	Average	100	99 (93-100)	96 (56-100)
P		0.3	0.5	0.8

Supplementary Table 4. Absolute cell count recovery following allogeneic HCT in the two cohorts

	Day	ATG -9/-7	ATG -3/-1	P (Wilcoxon Signed Rank) Test
Monocytes	30	1086 ± 824	478 ± 377	0.00004
	60	483 ± 301	232 ± 192	0.0003
	90	518 ± 332	261 ± 191	0.0005
ddCD3	30	479 ± 616	322 ± 413	0.2
	60	818 ± 857	252 ± 179	0.0003
	90	673 ± 524	264 ± 248	0.004
ddCD4	30	130 ± 128	136 ± 222	0.2
	60	220 ± 409	78 ± 61	0.005
	90	184 ± 155	96 ± 93	0.02
ddCD8	30	341 ± 530	180 ± 268	0.1
	60	505 ± 571	165 ± 150	0.002
	90	486 ± 598	168 ± 184	0.008
NK	30	341 ± 184	301 ± 219	0.1
	60	234 ± 147	207 ± 158	0.1
	90	161 ± 102	180 ± 113	0.6
CD19	30	17 ± 33	6 ± 12	0.06
	60	143 ± 428	37 ± 62	0.06
	90	70 ± 81	64 ± 112	0.2

Supplementary Table 5A. Impact of monocyte count recovery on clinical outcomes

Monocytes	Survival		Relapse		aGVHD 2-4		aGVH 3-4		cGVH mod-sev		cGVHD sev		NRM	
	HR	P	HR	P	HR	P	HR	P	HR	P	HR	P	HR	P
Multivariate D30 (>650/microL)	0.27	0.018	0.55	0.35	0.91	0.87	1.01	0.99	0.17	0.03	0.02	0.009	0.26	0.08
Bivariate (ATG) D30 (>650/microL)	0.41	0.05	0.91	0.86	1.00	0.99	1.3	0.68	0.32	0.10	0.21	0.09	0.35	0.12
Univariate D30 (>650/microL)	0.37	0.016	1.00	0.19	1.25	0.59	0.98	0.97	0.47	0.22	0.22	0.07	0.32	0.06
Multivariate D60 (>250/microL)	0.34	0.056	0.33	0.11	0.51	0.23	0.49	0.38	0.52	0.47	0.21	0.21	0.12	0.04
Bivariate (ATG) D60 (>250/microL)	0.33	0.016	0.39	0.06	0.67	0.40	0.67	0.55	1.00	0.81	0.81	0.81	0.22	0.04
Univariate D60 (>250/microL)	0.29	0.004	0.38	0.04	0.89	0.79	0.59	0.39	0.86	0.80	0.62	0.53	0.20	0.02
Multivariate D90 (>50/microL)	0.50	0.44	*		0.49	0.52	*		0.14	0.16	0.15	0.23	*	
Bivariate (ATG) D90 (>50/microL)	0.11	0.001	*		0.64	0.67	*		0.05	0.01	0.05	0.02	*	
Univariate D90 (>50/microL)	0.084	0.0002	*		0.68	0.70	*		0.07	0.02	0.04	0.009	*	

*	No convergence due to the chosen cut off
---	--

Supplementary Table 5B. Impact of donor derived T cell recovery on clinical outcomes.

ddCD3	Survival		Relapse		aGVHD 2-4		aGVHD 3-4		cGVHD mod-sev		cGVHD sev		NRM	
	HR	P	HR	P	HR	P	HR	P	HR	P	HR	P	HR	P
Multivariate D30 (>580/microL)	3.8	0.05	**		5.06	0.005	6.31	0.03	3.06	0.20	5.06	0.20	4.00	0.11
Bivariate (ATG) D30 (>580/microL)	4.64	0.02	2.42	0.32	3.71	0.008	5.91	0.02	2.74	0.17	5.00	0.1	4.62	0.06
Univariate D30 (>580/microL)	4.15	0.02	1.00	0.25	3.75	0.008	5.59	0.02	3.05	0.12	4.52	0.11	4.50	0.07
Multivariate D60. (>204/microL)	0.35	0.08	0.17	0.005	1.14	0.84	3.80	0.27	5.06	0.21	1.55	0.73	0.58	0.48
Bivariate (ATG) D60 (>204microL)	0.33	0.04	0.21	0.007	0.80	0.72	2.59	0.40	1.00	0.81	0.99	0.99	0.44	0.24
Univariate D60 (>204/microL)	0.28	0.01	0.23	0.009	1.22	0.72	2.21	0.46	1.99	0.52	0.94	0.96	0.32	0.09
Multivariate D90 (>278/microL)	** ***		**		0.27	0.05	*		1.55	0.60	0.43	0.47	** , ***	
Bivariate (ATG) D90 (>278/microL)	0.35	0.22	0.31	0.12	0.44	0.16	*		1.24	0.78	0.42	0.39	1.37	0.76
Univariate D90 (>278/microL)	0.28	0.12	0.38	0.18	0.72	0.56	*		1.56	0.53	0.46	0.40	0.74	0.76

*	No convergence due to chosen cut off
**	No convergence due to HLA match variable
***	No convergence due to at risk for CMV variable

Supplementary Table 6. Rate of change of T cell recovery between the two cohorts (cells/ $\mu\text{L}\cdot\text{day}^{-1}$).

<i>Rate of change (day)</i>	ATG -9/-7 (N=26)	ATG -3/-1 (N=13)	P (Wilcoxon)
dT/dt (15)	16.7 \pm 21.9	8.2 \pm 10.8	0.03
dT/dt (45)	14.2 \pm 38.8	0.5 \pm 10.6	0.3
dT/dt (80)	-4.3 \pm 10.5	0.2 \pm 3.6	1

Supplementary Table 7. The T cell kinetics analyses, looking at OS, relapse, and GVHD.

<i>ddCD3 Kinetics (cells/mL.d⁻¹)</i>	Survival		Relapse		aGVHD 2-4		aGVHD 3-4		cGVHD mod-sev		cGVHD sev	
	HR	p	HR	p	HR	p	HR	p	HR	p	HR	p
Multivariate D15 (>18.43)	** , ***		**		4.98	0.04	~		3.31	0.23	7.86	0.15
Bivariate (ATG) D15 (>18.43)	14.72	0.01	1.62	0.68	2.77	0.09	*		2.47	0.22	4.81	0.11
Univariate D15 (>18.43)	8.94	0.02	1.76	0.63	3.21	0.049	*		2.81	0.15	4.12	0.13
Multivariate D45 (>0)	** , ***		**		0.23	0.03	~		0.79	0.79	1.04	0.97
Bivariate (ATG) D45 (>0)	0.1	0.04	0.27	0.07	0.48	0.22	*		1.41	0.67	1.49	0.72
Univariate D45 (>0)	0.09	0.03	0.27	0.07	0.54	0.30	*		1.38	0.69	1.48	0.72
Multivariate D80 (3.87)	** , ***		**		0.43	0.17	~		0.27	0.09	0.03	0.01
Bivariate (ATG) D80 (3.87)	0.09	0.02	1.58	0.68	0.44	0.17	*		0.34	0.14	0.10	0.03
Univariate D80 (3.87)	0.19	0.07	1.31	0.80	0.37	0.09	*		0.30	0.08	0.15	0.04

The limitation of the ROC when paired cox proportional hazards is the inability to address a comparison when one group has no events. Cut offs for days 45 and 80 ran into such a problem, and the cutoff for day 45 and 80 were moved to, 0 and 3.87 cells.mL⁻¹.day⁻¹ respectively. NRM not computable.

*	No convergence due to chosen cut off
**	No convergence due to HLA match variable
***	No convergence due to at risk for CMV variable
~	No convergence due to infinite iterations

Supplementary Table 8. Monocyte-T cell immune recovery vector (\overline{MT}) in the two ATG cohorts.

<i>Vector Component</i>	Day	ATG -9/-7	ATG -3/-1	p-value (Wilcoxon)
Magnitude	30	1218 ± 601	717 ± 519	0.005
	60	1087 ± 809	343 ± 184	<0.0001
	90	887 ± 476	365 ± 238	<0.0001
Angle	30	23 ± 24	27 ± 25	0.7
	60	48 ± 27	48 ± 23	0.5
	90	48 ± 24	44 ± 25	0.3

Supplementary Table 9. Immune vectors properties and clinical outcomes. The vector (\overline{MT}) analyses, looking at OS, relapse, and GVHD.

Vector Magnitude	Survival		Relapse		aGVHD 2-4		aGVHD 3-4		cGVHD mod-sev		cGVHD sev		NRM	
	HR	p	HR	p	HR	p	HR	p	HR	p	HR	p	HR	p
Multivariate D30 (>955.25)	2.53	0.25	**		1.33	0.64	3.52	0.23	2.12	0.41	0.32	0.31	2.87	0.38
Bivariate (ATG) D30 (>955.25)	3.38	0.11	7.90	0.06	1.30	0.65	3.65	0.15	1.71	0.51	0.61	0.64	3.20	0.24
Univariate D30 (>955.25)	1.91	0.35	1.76	0.63	1.35	0.56	1.75	0.50	2.0	0.33	0.60	0.58	1.61	0.58
Multivariate D60 (>619)	0.08	0.03	0.43	0.35	0.83	0.78	*, ***		1.48	0.70	0.26	0.40	0.14	0.12
Bivariate (ATG) D60 (>619)	0.09	0.03	0.47	0.37	0.9	0.86	*		1.00	0.81	0.63	0.69	0.17	0.14
Univariate D60 (>619)	0.09	0.02	0.59	0.45	1.346	0.55	*		2.15	0.28	0.67	0.66	0.13	0.05
Multivariate D90 (>643.05)	**, ***		**		0.94	0.93	*		0.87	0.87	0.04	0.07	1.02	0.99
Bivariate (ATG) D90 (>643.05)	0.17	0.11	0.41	0.24	1.18	0.79	*		0.86	0.84	0.16	0.12	0.57	0.66
Univariate D90 (>643.05)	0.14	0.07	0.50	0.32	1.87	0.27	*		1.18	0.80	0.21	0.17	0.30	0.30
Vector Angle														
Multivariate D30 (>34.65)	9.96	0.007	**		4.52	0.006	16.38	0.01	9.15	0.006	*, **, ***		12.05	0.019
Bivariate (ATG) D30 (>34.65)	8.72	0.001	3.14	0.20	4.00	0.005	11.02	0.004	6.79	0.007	18.34	0.004	9.7	0.009
Univariate D30 (>34.65)	8.15	0.001	1.76	0.63	4.00	0.006	11.37	0.004	7.24	0.006	15.00	0.005	10.02	0.008
Multivariate D60 (>49.7)	2.28	0.21	0.15	0.03	0.90	0.83	3.35	0.28	2.15	0.31	1.73	0.57	3.60	0.13
Bivariate (ATG) D60 (>49.7)	1.95	0.27	0.40	0.19	0.85	0.75	3.25	0.29	1.00	0.81	1.31	0.77	2.87	0.19
Univariate D60 (>49.7)	2.05	0.23	0.40	0.19	0.82	0.70	3.56	0.26	1.83	0.39	1.29	0.78	3.10	0.16
Multivariate D90 (>55)	**, ***		~		0.5774	0.35	**, ***		1.53	0.59	4.07	0.24	0.65	0.71
Bivariate (ATG) D90 (>55)	0.47	0.36	*		0.68	0.50	1.40	0.81	1.25	0.74	1.75	0.55	1.40	0.74
Univariate D90 (>55)	0.42	0.29	*		0.80	0.69	1.30	0.85	1.39	0.62	1.68	0.57	1.16	0.88

*	No convergence due to chosen cut off
**	No convergence due to HLA match variable
***	No convergence due to at risk for CMV variable
~	No convergence due to infinite iterations

References:

- ¹ Kim HT, Armand P, Frederick D, Andler E, Cutler C, Koreth J, Alyea EP 3rd, Antin JH, Soiffer RJ, Ritz J, Ho VT. Absolute lymphocyte count recovery after allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation predicts clinical outcome. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2015 May;21(5):873-80. doi: 10.1016/j.bbmt.2015.01.019. Epub 2015 Jan 23. PMID: 25623931.
- ² Yew PY, Alachkar H, Yamaguchi R, Kiyotani K, Fang H, Yap KL, Liu HT, Wickrema A, Artz A, van Besien K, Imoto S, Miyano S, Bishop MR, Stock W, Nakamura Y. Quantitative characterization of T-cell repertoire in allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplant recipients. *Bone Marrow Transplant*. 2015 Sep;50(9):1227-34. doi: 10.1038/bmt.2015.133. Epub 2015 Jun 8. PMID: 26052909; PMCID: PMC4559843.
- ³ Toor AA, Sabo RT, Roberts CH, Moore BL, Salman SR, Scalora AF, Aziz MT, Shubar Ali AS, Hall CE, Meier J, Thorn RM, Wang E, Song S, Miller K, Rizzo K, Clark WB, McCarty JM, Chung HM, Manjili MH, Neale MC. Dynamical System Modeling of Immune Reconstitution after Allogeneic Stem Cell Transplantation Identifies Patients at Risk for Adverse Outcomes. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2015 Jul;21(7):1237-45. doi: 10.1016/j.bbmt.2015.03.011. Epub 2015 Apr 4. PMID: 25849208; PMCID: PMC4836381.
- ⁴ Jakubick CV, Randolph GJ, Henson PM. Monocyte differentiation and antigen-presenting functions. *Nat Rev Immunol*. 2017 Jun;17(6):349-362. doi: 10.1038/nri.2017.28. Epub 2017 Apr 24. PMID: 28436425.
- ⁵ Sampson JK, Sheth NU, Koparde VN, Scalora AF, Serrano MG, Lee V, Roberts CH, Jameson-Lee M, Ferreira-Gonzalez A, Manjili MH, Buck GA, Neale MC, Toor AA. Whole exome sequencing to estimate alloreactivity potential between donors and recipients in stem cell transplantation. *Br J Haematol*. 2014 Aug;166(4):566-70. doi: 10.1111/bjh.12898. Epub 2014 Apr 18. PMID: 24749631; PMCID: PMC4964978.
- ⁶ Abdul Razzaq B, Scalora A, Koparde VN, Meier J, Mahmood M, Salman S, Jameson-Lee M, Serrano MG, Sheth N, Voelkner M, Kobulnicky DJ, Roberts CH, Ferreira-Gonzalez A, Manjili MH, Buck GA, Neale MC, Toor AA. Dynamical System Modeling to Simulate Donor T Cell Response to Whole Exome Sequencing-Derived Recipient Peptides Demonstrates Different Alloreactivity Potential in HLA-Matched and -Mismatched Donor-Recipient Pairs. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2016 May;22(5):850-61. doi: 10.1016/j.bbmt.2015.11.1103. Epub 2015 Dec 11. PMID: 26688192; PMCID: PMC4955725.
- ⁷ Kobulnicky DJ, Sabo RT, Sharma S, Shubar Ali AS, Kobulnicky KM, Roberts CH, Clark WB, Chung HM, McCarty JM, Toor AA. The influence of lymphoid reconstitution kinetics on clinical outcomes in allogeneic stem cell transplantation. *Leuk Lymphoma*. 2018 Dec;59(12):2973-2981. doi: 10.1080/10428194.2018.1452216. Epub 2018 Apr 4. PMID: 29616870.
- ⁸ Kröger N, Solano C, Wolschke C, Bandini G, Patriarca F, Pini M, Nagler A, Selleri C, Risitano A, Messina G, Bethge W, Pérez de Oteiza J, Duarte R, Carella AM, Cimminiello M, Guidi S, Finke J, Mordini N, Ferra C, Sierra J, Russo D, Petrini M, Milone G, Benedetti F, Heinzlmann M, Pastore D, Jurado M, Terruzzi E, Narni F, Völp A, Ayuk F, Ruutu T, Bonifazi F. Antilymphocyte Globulin for Prevention of Chronic Graft-versus-Host Disease. *N Engl J Med*. 2016 Jan 7;374(1):43-53. doi: 10.1056/NEJMoa1506002. PMID: 26735993.
- ⁹ Chang YJ, Wu DP, Lai YR, Liu QF, Sun YQ, Hu J, Hu Y, Zhou JF, Li J, Wang SQ, Li W, Du X, Lin DJ, Ren HY, Chen FP, Li YH, Zhang X, Huang H, Song YP, Jiang M, Hu JD, Liang YM, Wang JB, Xiao Y, Huang XJ. Antithymocyte Globulin for Matched Sibling Donor Transplantation in Patients With Hematologic Malignancies: A Multicenter, Open-Label, Randomized Controlled Study. *J Clin Oncol*. 2020 Oct 10;38(29):3367-3376. doi: 10.1200/JCO.20.00150. Epub 2020 Jul 10. PMID: 32650683.
- ¹⁰ Gao XN, Lin J, Wang LJ, Li F, Li HH, Wang SH, Huang WR, Gao CJ, Yu L, Liu DH. Risk factors and clinical outcomes of Epstein-Barr virus DNAemia and post-transplant lymphoproliferative disorders after haploidentical and matched-sibling PBSCT in patients with hematologic malignancies. *Ann Hematol*. 2019 Sep;98(9):2163-2177. doi: 10.1007/s00277-019-03742-7. Epub 2019 Jun 26. PMID: 31243569.
- ¹¹ Spinner MA, Kennedy VE, Tamaresis JS, Lavori PW, Arai S, Johnston LJ, Meyer EH, Miklos DB, Muffly LS, Negrin RS, Rezvani AR, Shizuru JA, Weng WK, Hoppe RT, Strober S, Lowsky R. Nonmyeloablative TLI-ATG conditioning for allogeneic transplantation: mature follow-up from a large single-center cohort. *Blood Adv*. 2019 Aug 27;3(16):2454-2464. doi: 10.1182/bloodadvances.2019000297. PMID: 31427277; PMCID: PMC6712526.
- ¹² Bonifazi F, Rubio MT, Bacigalupo A, Boelens JJ, Finke J, Greinix H, Mohty M, Nagler A, Passweg J, Rambaldi A, Socie G, Solano C, Walker I, Barosi G, Kröger N. Rabbit ATG/ATLG in preventing graft-versus-host disease after allogeneic stem cell transplantation: consensus-based recommendations by an international expert panel. *Bone Marrow Transplant*. 2020 Jun;55(6):1093-1102. doi: 10.1038/s41409-020-0792-x. Epub 2020 Jan 22. PMID: 31969678; PMCID: PMC7269907.
- ¹³ Binkert L, Medinger M, Halter JP, Heim D, Gerull S, Holbro A, Lengerke C, Weisser M, Passweg JR. Lower dose anti-thymocyte globulin for GvHD prophylaxis results in improved survival after allogeneic stem cell transplantation. *Bone Marrow Transplant*. 2015 Oct;50(10):1331-6. doi: 10.1038/bmt.2015.148. Epub 2015 Jun 29. PMID: 26121111.

-
- ¹⁴ Remberger M, Ringdén O, Hägglund H, Svahn BM, Ljungman P, Uhlin M, Mattsson J. A high antithymocyte globulin dose increases the risk of relapse after reduced intensity conditioning HSCT with unrelated donors. *Clin Transplant*. 2013 Jul-Aug;27(4):E368-74. doi: 10.1111/ctr.12131. Epub 2013 May 22. PMID: 23701240.
- ¹⁵ Toor AA, Sabo RT, Roberts CH, Moore BL, Salman SR, Scalora AF, Aziz MT, Shubar Ali AS, Hall CE, Meier J, Thorn RM, Wang E, Song S, Miller K, Rizzo K, Clark WB, McCarty JM, Chung HM, Manjili MH, Neale MC. Dynamical System Modeling of Immune Reconstitution after Allogeneic Stem Cell Transplantation Identifies Patients at Risk for Adverse Outcomes. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2015 Jul;21(7):1237-45. doi: 10.1016/j.bbmt.2015.03.011. Epub 2015 Apr 4. PMID: 25849208; PMCID: PMC4836381.
- ¹⁶ Horowitz MM, Gale RP, Sondel PM, Goldman JM, Kersey J, Kolb HJ, Rimm AA, Ringdén O, Rozman C, Speck B, et al. Graft-versus-leukemia reactions after bone marrow transplantation. *Blood*. 1990 Feb 1;75(3):555-62. PMID: 2297567.
- ¹⁷ McCurdy SR, Kanakry CG, Tsai HL, Gojo I, Smith BD, Gladstone DE, Bolaños-Meade J, Borrello I, Matsui WH, Swinnen LJ, Huff CA, Brodsky RA, Ambinder RF, Fuchs EJ, Rosner GL, Jones RJ, Luznik L. Development of Grade II Acute Graft-versus-Host Disease Is Associated with Improved Survival after Myeloablative HLA-Matched Bone Marrow Transplantation using Single-Agent Post-Transplant Cyclophosphamide. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2019 Jun;25(6):1128-1135. doi: 10.1016/j.bbmt.2018.12.767. Epub 2018 Dec 30. PMID: 30599208; PMCID: PMC6559825.
- ¹⁸ McCurdy SR, Kanakry CG, Tsai HL, Kasamon YL, Showel MM, Bolaños-Meade J, Huff CA, Borrello I, Matsui WH, Brodsky RA, Ambinder RF, Bettinotti MP, Fuchs EJ, Rosner GL, Jones RJ, Luznik L. Grade II Acute Graft-versus-Host Disease and Higher Nucleated Cell Graft Dose Improve Progression-Free Survival after HLA-Haploidentical Transplant with Post-Transplant Cyclophosphamide. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2018 Feb;24(2):343-352. doi: 10.1016/j.bbmt.2017.10.023. Epub 2017 Oct 18. PMID: 29055682; PMCID: PMC6464126.
- ¹⁹ Admiraal R, Nierkens S, de Witte MA, Petersen EJ, Fleurke GJ, Verrest L, Belitser SV, Bredius RGM, Raymakers RAP, Knibbe CAJ, Minnema MC, van Kesteren C, Kuball J, Boelens JJ. Association between anti-thymocyte globulin exposure and survival outcomes in adult unrelated haemopoietic cell transplantation: a multicentre, retrospective, pharmacodynamic cohort analysis. *Lancet Haematol*. 2017 Apr;4(4):e183-e191. doi: 10.1016/S2352-3026(17)30029-7. Epub 2017 Mar 16. Erratum in: *Lancet Haematol*. 2017 May;4(5):e201. PMID: 28330607.
- ²⁰ Binkert L, Medinger M, Halter JP, Heim D, Gerull S, Holbro A, Lengerke C, Weisser M, Passweg JR. Lower dose anti-thymocyte globulin for GvHD prophylaxis results in improved survival after allogeneic stem cell transplantation. *Bone Marrow Transplant*. 2015 Oct;50(10):1331-6. doi: 10.1038/bmt.2015.148. Epub 2015 Jun 29. PMID: 26121111.
- ²¹ Willemsen L, Jol-van der Zijde CM, Admiraal R, Putter H, Jansen-Hoogendijk AM, Ostaijen-Ten Dam MM, Wijnen JT, van Kesteren C, Waaijer JL, Lankester AC, Bredius RG, van Tol MJ. Impact of serotherapy on immune reconstitution and survival outcomes after stem cell transplantations in children: thymoglobulin versus alemtuzumab. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. 2015 Mar;21(3):473-82. doi: 10.1016/j.bbmt.2014.11.674. Epub 2014 Dec 5. PMID: 25485863.
- ²² Lorentino F, Labopin M, Ciceri F, Vago L, Fleischhauer K, Afanasyev B, Kröger N, Cornelissen JJ, Lovira M, Meijer E, Vitek A, Elmaagacli A, Blaise D, Ruggeri A, Chabannon C, Nagler A, Mohty M; Acute Leukemia Working Party (ALWP) and Cellular Therapy and Immunobiology Working Party (CTIWP) of the European Society for Blood and Marrow Transplantation (EBMT). Post-transplantation cyclophosphamide GvHD prophylaxis after hematopoietic stem cell transplantation from 9/10 or 10/10 HLA-matched unrelated donors for acute leukemia. *Leukemia*. 2020 May 14. doi: 10.1038/s41375-020-0863-4. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 32409688.
- ²³ Kanakry CG, Fuchs EJ, Luznik L. Modern approaches to HLA-haploidentical blood or marrow transplantation. *Nat Rev Clin Oncol*. 2016 Feb;13(2):132. doi: 10.1038/nrclinonc.2015.234. Epub 2015 Dec 31. Erratum for: *Nat Rev Clin Oncol*. 2016 Jan;13(1):10-24. PMID: 26718103.
- ²⁴ Williams L, Cirrone F, Cole K, Abdul-Hay M, Luznik L, Al-Homsi AS. Post-transplantation Cyclophosphamide: From HLA-Haploidentical to Matched-Related and Matched-Unrelated Donor Blood and Marrow Transplantation. *Front Immunol*. 2020 Apr 9;11:636. doi: 10.3389/fimmu.2020.00636. PMID: 32373119; PMCID: PMC7177152.
- ²⁵ Nakamae H, Fujii K, Nanno S, Okamura H, Nakane T, Koh H, Nakashima Y, Nakamae M, Hirose A, Teshima T, Hino M. A prospective observational study of immune reconstitution following transplantation with post-transplant reduced-dose cyclophosphamide from HLA-haploidentical donors. *Transpl Int*. 2019 Dec;32(12):1322-1332.
- ²⁶ Fuchs EJ. HLA-haploidentical blood or marrow transplantation with high-dose, post-transplantation cyclophosphamide. *Bone Marrow Transplant*. 2015 Jun;50 Suppl 2(0 2):S31-6. doi: 10.1038/bmt.2015.92. PMID: 26039204; PMCID: PMC4634886.
- ²⁷ Irene GC, Albert E, Anna BV, Rahinatu A, Silvana N, Silvana S, Ana G, Jordi L, Carolina CA, Miquel G, Carolina M, Javier B, Jorge S, Rodrigo M. Patterns of infection and infectious-related mortality in patients receiving post-transplant high dose cyclophosphamide as graft-versus-host-disease prophylaxis: impact of HLA donor matching. *Bone Marrow Transplant*. 2020 Oct 26:1-10. doi: 10.1038/s41409-020-01092-
- ²⁸ Brissot E, Labopin M, Moiseev I, Cornelissen JJ, Meijer E, Van Gorkom G, Rovira M, Ciceri F, Griskevicius L, Blaise D, Forcade E, Mistrik M, Mielke S, Bulabois CE, Niittyvuopio R, Deconinck E, Ruggeri A, Sanz J, Spyridonidis A, Savani B, Giebel S, Nagler A, Mohty M. Post-transplant cyclophosphamide versus antithymocyte globulin in patients with acute myeloid leukemia in first complete remission undergoing allogeneic stem cell transplantation from 10/10 HLA-matched unrelated donors. *J Hematol Oncol*. 2020 Jul 3;13(1):87. doi: 10.1186/s13045-020-00923-0. PMID: 32620146; PMCID: PMC7333262.

²⁹ Bailén R, Kwon M, Pascual-Cascón MJ, Ferrà C, Sanz J, Gallardo-Morillo A, García-Sola A, Torrent A, Jiménez-Lorenzo MJ, Piñana JL, Montoro J, Oarbeascoa G, Dorado N, Gómez-Centurión I, Muñoz C, Martínez-Laperche C, Anguita J, Buño I, Díez-Martín JL; Grupo Español de Trasplante Hematopoyético y Terapia Celular (GETH). Post-transplant cyclophosphamide for GVHD prophylaxis compared to ATG-based prophylaxis in unrelated donor transplantation. *Ann Hematol.* 2020 Nov 2. doi: 10.1007/s00277-020-04317-7.

³⁰ Osumi T, Yoshimura S, Sako M, Uchiyama T, Ishikawa T, Kawai T, Inoue E, Takimoto T, Takeuchi I, Yamada M, Sakamoto K, Yoshida K, Kimura Y, Matsukawa Y, Matsumoto K, Imadome KI, Arai K, Deguchi T, Imai K, Yuza Y, Matsumoto K, Onodera M, Kanegane H, Tomizawa D, Kato M. Prospective Study of Allogeneic Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation with Post-Transplantation Cyclophosphamide and Antithymocyte Globulin from HLA-Mismatched Related Donors for Nonmalignant Diseases. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant.* 2020 Nov;26(11):e286-e291. doi: 10.1016/j.bbmt.2020.08.008. Epub 2020 Aug 14. PMID: 32798657.

³¹ Koparde V, Abdul Razzaq B, Suntum T, Sabo R, Scalora A, Serrano M, Jameson-Lee M, Hall C, Kobulnicky D, Sheth N, Feltz J, Contaifer D Jr, Wijesinghe D, Reed J, Roberts C, Qayyum R, Buck G, Neale M, Toor A. Dynamical system modeling to simulate donor T cell response to whole exome sequencing-derived recipient peptides: Understanding randomness in alloreactivity incidence following stem cell transplantation. *PLoS One.* 2017 Dec 1;12(12):e0187771. doi: 10.1371/journal.pone.0187771. PMID: 29194460; PMCID: PMC5711034.

³² Meier JA, Haque M, Fawaz M, Abdeen H, Coffey D, Towleron A, Abdeen A, Toor A, Warren E, Reed J, Kanakry CG, Keating A, Luznik L, Toor AA. T Cell Repertoire Evolution after Allogeneic Bone Marrow Transplantation: An Organizational Perspective. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant.* 2019 May;25(5):868-882. doi: 10.1016/j.bbmt.2019.01.021. Epub 2019 Jan 21. PMID: 30677510; PMCID: PMC6645918.