

1 **Running Title:** Modern UNOS Data Reveals Septuagenarians have Inferior Heart Transplant

2 Survival

3

4 **Authors:**

5 Manish Suryapalam<sup>1</sup>, Jay Kanaparthi<sup>1</sup>, Mohammed Kashem MD-PhD<sup>1</sup>, Huaqing Zhao PhD<sup>1</sup>,

6 Yoshiya Toyoda MD-PhD<sup>1</sup>

7 \*\*\*\*(ORCID# for each Author)\*\*\*\*

8

9 **Institutions and Affiliations:**

10 <sup>1</sup>Lewis Katz School of Medicine at Temple University, 3500 N Broad Street, Philadelphia, PA,

11 19140 and Division of Cardiovascular Surgery, Temple University Medical Center, 3401 N

12 Broad Street, Suite 301 Zone C, Philadelphia, PA, 19140

13

14 **Corresponding Author:**

15 Manish Suryapalam, BS

16 1717 N 12<sup>th</sup> Street, Philadelphia, PA, 19335

17 484-633-6497

18 [manish.suryapalam@temple.edu](mailto:manish.suryapalam@temple.edu)

19

20 **Abbreviations: (only nontraditional abbreviations)**

21 **Word Count: 2038**

22

23

24 Abstract

25 **Background:** While heart transplantation is increasingly performed in the United States for  
26 elderly patients, survival outcomes have primarily been analyzed in single-center studies.  
27 The few existing long-term studies have indicated no difference in HTx outcomes between  
28 patients  $\geq 70$  years and 60-69 years age, but these studies only assessed to 5-years post-transplant  
29 and included data from the 1980-90s, introducing significant variance due to poorer outcomes in  
30 that era. We analyzed the UNOS database from 1987-2020, stratified by timeframe at 2000, to  
31 derive a more representative comparison of modern HTx survival outcomes.

32 **Methods:** All UNOS HTx recipients over 18 years of age (n=66,186) were divided into 3  
33 cohorts: 18-59, 60-69 and  $\geq 70$  years old. Demographic data as well as perioperative factors were  
34 evaluated for significance using Chi-Squared and H-Tests as appropriate. Kaplan-Meier Curve  
35 and cox regressions with log-rank tests were used to assess 5 through 10 year survival outcomes.

36 **Results:** 45,748 were 18-59 years old, 19,129 were 60-69 years old and 1,309 were  $\geq 70$  year old.  
37 The distribution of most demographic and perioperative factors significantly differed between  
38 cohorts. Pairwise survival analysis involving the 18-59 cohort always indicated significance.  
39 While there was no significance between the two older cohorts in the earlier timeframe, there  
40 was significance in the later timeframe from 6-10 years post-HTx ( $p < 0.05$ ). Cox regressions  
41 confirmed results.

42 **Conclusions:** The results indicate that since 2000, recipients 60-69 years of age have better 6  
43 through 10-year post-transplant survival than older recipients, a relationship previously obscured  
44 by worse outcomes in early data.

45

46

47 Introduction

48 Increasing age has long been considered a relative contraindication of heart transplant  
49 (HTx).<sup>1</sup> However, as the prevalence of heart failure increases among older patients, the potential  
50 role of heart transplant in this demographic demands further investigation.<sup>2</sup> The demand-supply  
51 disparity for heart transplantations necessitates careful consideration of the criteria that comprise  
52 adequate candidacy. Although heart transplantation has historically been limited for individuals  
53 over the age of seventy, since 2006 the International Society for Heart and Lung Transplant  
54 (ISHLT) issued guidelines have included greater candidacy consideration for these patients.<sup>3</sup>  
55 While heart transplantation is increasingly performed in the United States for elderly patients,  
56 survival outcome analysis has primarily been analyzed in single-center studies.<sup>4</sup> A single large-  
57 scale study has been published that analyzes HTx patients from the United Network for Organ  
58 Sharing (UNOS) Database from 1987-2014, but this study only examined survival outcomes to  
59 five years post-transplant, and did not determine the time at which significance in survival  
60 between the cohorts was reached.<sup>5</sup> A longer timeframe of analysis, incorporating new data from  
61 2014-2020, could yield a more thorough understanding of survival outcomes in elderly patients.

62 This study compares the 5 to 10-year survival outcomes of patients  $\geq 70$ , 60-69, and 18-59  
63 of age at the time of heart transplantation using data obtained from the UNOS Database from  
64 1987-2020. The dataset was further split by timeframe into 1987-1999 and 2000-2020 for  
65 additional analysis as we believed there was greater variance and differing survival outcomes in  
66 earlier decades when compared to more recent years, which may mask patterns in modern  
67 survival outcomes. 2000 was chosen as the cutoff for the modern timeframe because UNOS  
68 launched its online database system UNet<sup>SM</sup> on October 25, 1999, just a few months prior. The

69 transition to UNet<sup>SM</sup> substantially increased the quality and quantity of organ donation and  
70 transplant event data available.<sup>6</sup>

## 71 Materials and Methods

### 72 Data Collection and Study Population

73 This study was a retrospective chart review performed using transplant data from the  
74 UNOS Database, a comprehensive database containing information on all cardiac transplantation  
75 patients in the United States. Temple University Institutional Review Board approved this study.  
76 This study is in strict compliance with the 2014 ISHLT ethics statement. The study population  
77 was comprised of 66,186 patients who underwent heart transplantation between October 1, 1987  
78 and March 31, 2020. Patients were divided into three different age groups based on recipient age,  
79 18-59, 60-69, and  $\geq 70$  years old. Patients who underwent combined heart-lung transplants were  
80 excluded from this analysis.

81

### 82 Outcomes

83 The primary outcome was mortality from 5 through 10-years post-transplant. Other  
84 outcomes investigated included retransplant, hospital length of stay, graft rejection rates, renal  
85 dysfunction (evaluated through dialysis), and ventricular assist device use.

86

### 87 Statistical analysis

88 All the data were analyzed using SPSS 26.0 (IBM Corp., Armonk, NY). Many  
89 demographic variables and baseline characteristics of heart transplant donors and recipients were  
90 noted and expressed in Table 1 and Table 2 respectively as mean  $\pm$  standard deviation or median  
91 as applicable. The nominal variables were evaluated for significance using Pearson's Chi-

92 Squared test. For continuous variables, a Shapiro-Wilk test was used to assess normality and a F  
93 test was used to assess homogeneity of variance. In cases of non-normality, a Kruskal-Wallis H-  
94 test was performed evaluate significance in distribution. Otherwise, an ANOVA test was  
95 performed. For further pairwise comparisons, a Mann-Whitney U-test was performed in cases of  
96 non-normality. Otherwise, a two-sample t-test was used. If the F-test showed non-significance,  
97 then the t-test was performed with an equal variance assumption. Otherwise, a two-sample t-test  
98 with unequal variances was used.

99 Survival outcomes were assessed using Kaplan-Meier Survival Curves with log-rank tests  
100 to assess significance at 5 through 10-years post-transplant by age cohort. Both overall  
101 significance and pairwise significance was assessed (Table 3). Survival outcomes were assessed  
102 over three timeframes. First, the entire time range was simultaneously analyzed. Second, only the  
103 transplants that occurred between 1987 and December 31, 1999 were analyzed. Third, the  
104 transplants that occurred between January 1, 2000 and 2020 were analyzed.

105 We also chose to perform regression modeling using stratified Cox proportional hazards  
106 to evaluate the impact covariates on survival by age cohort. Survival outcomes at 5 through 10-  
107 years post-transplant in the modern timeframe were evaluated, with the hazard ratios and  
108 confidence intervals for year 5 and 10 listed in Table 7. To avoid overfitting through excessive  
109 covariates, we performed dimensionality reduction through the univariate shrinkage method,  
110 where all covariates are initially assumed independent and then covariates that showed  
111 significance ( $p < 0.05$ ) or near significance ( $p < 0.10$ ) were incorporated into an initial multivariate  
112 Cox regression model. Near significant covariates were included due to the possibility that a  
113 multiple interaction model could lead to a significant relationship. We then excluded variables  
114 that showed nonsignificance in the initial multivariate model to create a final Cox model. The Cox

115 regression model assumes that the effects of covariates on survival outcomes are not time  
116 dependent. To test whether this assumption was met, a hierarchical regression strategy was used.  
117 First, a cox regression was individually performed with the original set of covariates. Then, a  
118 potential time dependent interaction with each covariate was modelled and the change in fit  
119 between the original model and interaction model was evaluated using a likelihood ratio test for  
120 statistical significance. If any covariate was found to be time-dependent, then the final survival  
121 model included both the original covariate and its time-dependent interaction term. This  
122 approach provides especially strong statistical evidence for derived conclusions on survival  
123 outcomes.

124 **Results:**

125 Of the 66,186 patients analyzed, 45,748 (69.1%) were 18-60, 19,129 (28.9%) were 60-69,  
126 and 1,309 (2.0%) were  $\geq 70$ . The number of heart transplants performed annually has remained  
127 relatively constant (or even slightly decreased when accounting for population growth), but the  
128 proportion of heart transplants performed on elderly patients has continued to increase,  
129 especially in recent years. Between the three cohorts, the demographic variables age, height,  
130 weight, BMI, donor age, recipient ethnicity, recipient gender, cigarette use, HIV, EBV, donor  
131 ethnicity, donor gender, and donor heavy alcohol consumption showed significance (Table 1).  
132 The clinical variables ischemic time, previous dialysis, defibrillator, LVAD, RVAD, Other  
133 VAD, and acute rejection were significant (Table 2).

134 In the oldest cohort, the median age was 71 and the oldest patient was 79. Across all three  
135 age cohorts, the majority of patients were male and Caucasian. Far more patients were supported  
136 with an LVAD than any other type of ventricular device before transplant, and a much larger  
137 proportion of the older patients suffered an acute rejection post-transplant. Older patients also

138 had a much higher graft incidence rate, although graft failure rates were more evenly distributed  
139 amongst the three cohorts.

140 Figures 1-3 indicate Kaplan-Meier Survival Curves to evaluate outcomes between the  
141 three cohorts across the overall timeframe, 1987-1999, and 2000-2020 respectively. Table 3  
142 highlights a survival breakdown by timeframe and Table 4 indicates significance by years post-  
143 transplant. As shown by Figure 1, the entire dataset showed overall significance when evaluated  
144 for 5 through 10-year survival outcomes ( $p=0.000$ ). This significance was driven almost entirely  
145 by the improved survival outcomes of the 18-59 cohort, while pairwise comparisons revealed no  
146 significance between the 60-69 and  $\geq 70$  cohort in the overall timeframe. Survival at the 5-year  
147 end point, was just above 75% and at the 10-year endpoint approximately 50% for all three  
148 cohorts. However, further Kaplan-Meier split cohort analysis revealed a statistical difference in  
149 the survival outcomes of modern heart transplant patients. For the cohort transplanted between  
150 1987-1999 (Figure 2), there was similarly no significance between the 60-69 and  $\geq 70$  cohort at  
151 any endpoint analyzed, but in the 2000-2020 time range (Figure 3), there was near significance at  
152 5 years post-transplant ( $p=0.095$ ) and significance at every year thereafter with a 10 year  
153 significance of  $p=0.003$ . Overall, modern survival outcomes are improved over older survival  
154 outcomes, with an average survival of just under 60% in the modern group, but an average  
155 survival under 50% in the older group over 10 years.

156 Figure 4 shows a cox regression model of the modern cohort, with many conventionally  
157 added covariates. The Cox proportional hazards regression model created to assess the impact of  
158 significant covariates on transplant type in the 2000-2020 timeframe showed overall significance  
159 in survival outcomes for all 5-10 years post-transplant and pairwise significance of the 60-69 and  
160  $\geq 70$  cohorts. The covariates that showed significance in a multivariate model included recipient

161 age, height, cigarette use, LOS, ischemic time, donor heavy alcohol use, dialysis, defibrillator,  
162 ventilator, acute rejection, transfusion. The Cox model itself showed a statistically significant  
163 improvement in evaluating survival outcomes when compared to its related Kaplan Meier curve  
164 when evaluated by the Chi-Squared Omnibus Tests of Model Coefficients ( $p=0.000$ ), and every  
165 individual covariate except for height had a significant effect on survival outcomes. The hazard  
166 ratios at 5 and 10-years post-transplant for each tested covariate are listed in Table 5, as well as  
167 the significance and confidence interval of each covariate.

## 168 Discussion

169 The results of this study, using a large patient data sample from the UNOS database to  
170 evaluate long term survival outcomes, with data stratified by time, challenge the conclusions of  
171 prior studies by demonstrating patients  $\geq 70$  show inferior survival to patients 60-69 when  
172 assessing the UNOS data over the last two decades rather than over the entirety of its existence.

173 Amongst studies that assessed heart transplant survival using the UNOS database, Weiss  
174 et al. used data from 1999 to 2006 patients to demonstrate that patient over 60 showed acceptable  
175 5-year survival but understandably inferior survival to patients 18-60 years of age.<sup>7</sup> Similarly,  
176 George et al. studied the UNOS database from 2005-2011 to show that patient over the age of 70  
177 had inferior survival to patients 18-70 years of age.<sup>8</sup> The last major UNOS study on the elderly  
178 heart transplant recipient population done in 2015 by Cooper et al. who assessed the database  
179 from 1987 to 2014 and showed that patients 70 years of age or older had similar outcomes to  
180 recipients in their 60s. Our results using the UNOS data from 1987 to 2020 and 1987 to 2020  
181 corroborate their results, showing significant overlap in survival outcomes of patients 60-69 and  
182  $\geq 70$  years of age. However, when we assessed the patient cohort from 2000-2020, eliminating  
183 significant variance from poorer outcomes in all age groups from the 1980s and 1990s, we



184 identified a significant difference in survival between the patients age 60-69 and  $\geq 70$  years of  
185 age.

186         The year 2018 marked the 50<sup>th</sup> year anniversary of heart transplantation, and over those  
187 decades we have seen remarkable improvement in technology and transplant technique.<sup>9</sup> Our  
188 results clearly demonstrate improved survival in all age group in the 2000-2020 cohort compared  
189 to the 1987-1999 cohort. Per UNOS, the 2019 1-year survival after lung transplantation is nearly  
190 90%, and this may be partly attributed to advancements in organ procurement,<sup>10</sup> mechanical  
191 circulatory support device usage,<sup>10</sup> improved organ rejection surveillance<sup>12</sup>, and newer  
192 immunosuppressive agents.<sup>13</sup> However, amongst the overall improved survival rates of the  
193 modern era, we have unmasked that survival in patients over 70 is inferior to those 60-69. Since  
194 the Cooper et al. study in 2015, the number of patients who have undergone heart transplantation  
195 has nearly doubled. As such, this study offers considerable evidence to reinvestigate the  
196 hypothesis that patients in their seventies have comparable survival outcomes to younger patients  
197 as well as further exploration into causes of this survival difference.

198         This study has several limitations. One is the substantial timeframe this study takes into  
199 consideration. As noted earlier, there were several advancements in surgical technology and  
200 technique between 1987 and 2020 as well as advances in mitigating complications that arise  
201 post-transplant. While we mitigate some of these confounders by performing a two-cohort  
202 analysis by time, there still remains many surgical improvements between 2000 and 2020. In  
203 addition, the selection bias that was likely used in selecting older patients, which would have  
204 contributed to increased survival. Furthermore, the analysis of survival outcomes did not  
205 consider the rate of complications post-transplant between the two cohorts or any other related  
206 “quality of life” assessment. Finally, this study was limited in accuracy by the data within the

207 UNOS database and does not account for variation in treatment of patients between various  
208 centers.

209 Our results demonstrate inferior survival in patients over the age of 70, challenging  
210 results from the last large study of this kind and warranting further research into this survival  
211 disparity.

212

213 **Author Contributions:**

214 Manish Suryapalam performed the analysis of the UNOS Database and wrote the preliminary  
215 version of the manuscript with input from all authors. Jay Kanaparthi assisted in the statistical  
216 analysis, verified results, and co-authored the preliminary manuscript. Abul Kashem conceived  
217 of the presented idea, verified all results, and finalized the manuscript for submission. Huaqing  
218 Zhao verified all analytical data and verified the suitability of various statistical tests. Norihisa  
219 Shigemura and Yoshiya Toyoda provided critical feedback and helped shape the research,  
220 analysis, and manuscript. All authors reviewed the manuscript prior to submission.

221

222

223 **Financial Disclosure Statement:** The authors report no proprietary or commercial interest in  
224 any product mentioned or concept discussed in this article.

225

226

227

228

229

230 **Tables and Figures:**

231 Table 1: Demographic Characteristics

Continuous Demographic Characteristics				
Demographic Characteristics	Median	Mean	Standard Deviation	Significance
Age (yrs)	50.0	46.7	10.7	0.000
	63.0	63.7	2.7	
	71.0	71.4	1.6	
Height (cm)	175.0	173.5	10.0	0.000
	175.3	174.3	9.3	
	175.3	174.6	11.7	
Weight (kg)	79.4	80.3	17.7	0.000
	79.4	80.4	15.7	
	78.4	78.9	15.1	
BMI	26.1	26.6	4.9	0.000
	26.0	26.4	4.3	
	25.4	25.7	3.9	
Donor Age (yrs)	28.0	30.3	11.6	0.000
	31.0	35.8	13.3	
	35.0	32.5	12.4	
Categorical Demographic Characteristics				
Demographic Characteristics	18-59	60-69	≥70	Significance
Frequency	45748	19129	1309	
Recipient Ethnicity				0.000
Caucasian	32376	15312	1095	
African American	8466	2217	123	
Latino	3264	1051	54	
Hispanic	3350	1072	54	
Recipient Gender				0.000
Male	33706	15512	1150	
Recipient Cigarette Use	9061	6067	538	0.000
Recipient Disease				
HIV	60	23	1	0.000
EBV	20504	10496	903	0.000
Donor Ethnicity				0.000
Caucasian	32513	13343	868	
African American	6073	2511	178	

Latino	5969	2755	221	
Donor Gender				0.000
Male	32333	13471	878	
Donor Heavy Alcohol Consumption	3395	1993	216	0.000
Donor Cardiac Death	31	9	0	0.540


232

233

Table 3: Clinical Characteristics

Continuous Clinical Characteristics				
Baseline Characteristics	Median	Mean	Standard Deviation	Significance
Length of Stay (days)	14.00	20.6	25.3	0.662
	15.0	22.0	25.2	
	15.0	22.2	32.1	
Ischemic Time (hrs)	3.0	3.0	1.0	0.000
	3.1	3.1	1.0	
	3.2	3.2	1.1	
Creatine	1.1	1.3	1.2	0.085
	1.2	1.3	0.9	
	1.1	1.3	1.3	
Serum Albumin	3.7	3.6	0.7	0.123
	3.7	3.7	0.7	
	3.7	3.7	0.7	
Categorical Clinical Characteristics				
Demographic Characteristics	18-59	60-69	≥70	Significance
Previous Dialysis	1678	584	20	0.000
Defibrillator	18528	10853	947	0.000
LVAD	6122	3161	213	0.000
RVAD	591	129	4	0.000
Other VAD	3013	1202	62	0.013
Ventilator	1139	400	28	0.008
Inhaled Nitrous Oxide	50	19	1	0.889
Acute Rejection	22306	11689	1076	0.000
Transfusion	8042	3386	173	0.000
Graft	29380	14187	1139	0.000
Graft Fail	23091	9331	496	0.000

234 Figure 1: Full Dataset, 10 years; Overall:  $p=0.000$




235  
236 Figure 2: 1987-1999, 10 years; Overall:  $p=0.000$



237

238 Figure 3: 2000-2020, 10 years; Overall: p=0.000



239

240 Table 3: Survival Breakdown by Timeframe

Survival by Timeframe	Age Cat.	Years Post-Transplant									
		1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
1987-2020	18-59	0.881	0.842	0.810	0.780	0.747	0.713	0.678	0.641	0.604	0.568
	60-69	0.859	0.824	0.794	0.763	0.729	0.688	0.643	0.596	0.552	0.503
	≥70	0.865	0.815	0.790	0.758	0.722	0.667	0.628	0.560	0.503	0.444
1987-1999	18-59	0.850	0.809	0.776	0.743	0.706	0.670	0.630	0.589	0.551	0.512
	60-69	0.814	0.772	0.737	0.702	0.667	0.622	0.574	0.525	0.483	0.437
	≥70	0.828	0.778	0.736	0.703	0.654	0.596	0.554	0.487	0.420	0.360
2000-2020	18-59	0.901	0.864	0.834	0.805	0.776	0.746	0.717	0.686	0.652	0.622
	60-69	0.877	0.844	0.817	0.788	0.755	0.718	0.676	0.634	0.588	0.541
	≥70	0.869	0.819	0.796	0.764	0.732	0.678	0.640	0.573	0.522	0.465

241


242 Table 4: Kaplan-Meier Significance by Years Post-Transplant

Age Cohort by Timeframe	Years Post-Transplant Significance					
	5-Years	6-Years	7-Years	8-Years	9-Years	10-Years
1987-2020						
18-59 vs. 60-69	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000

18-59 vs. $\geq 70$	0.050	0.006	0.004	0.000	0.000	0.000
60-69 vs $\geq 70$	0.796	0.439	0.542	0.236	0.143	0.084
1987-1999						
18-59 vs. 60-69	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
18-59 vs. $\geq 70$	0.203	0.091	0.087	0.027	0.006	0.002
60-69 vs $\geq 70$	0.815	0.643	0.721	0.501	0.277	0.179
2000-2020						
18-59 vs. 60-69	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
18-59 vs. $\geq 70$	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000	0.000
60-69 vs $\geq 70$	0.095	0.031	0.041	0.009	0.007	0.004

243

244 Figure 4: 2000-2020, 10 years- Cox Regression Model (p=0.000)



245

246 Table 5: Cox Proportional Hazards Regression Model Results

Covariate	5-Year Hazard Ratio	Confidence Interval		Sig.	10-Year Hazard Ratio	Confidence Interval		Sig.
Age Cohort								
60-69	Baseline			0.000	Baseline			0.000
18-59	0.773	0.725	0.825	0.000	0.761	0.720	0.803	0.000
$\geq 70$	1.167	1.021	1.334	0.023	1.171	1.046	1.310	0.006

Donor Heavy Alcohol								
Yes	Baseline			0.093	Baseline			
No	1.025	0.955	1.099	0.497	0.987	0.929	1.048	0.662
Unknown	1.180	1.016	1.370	0.030	0.109	0.977	1.258	0.109
Previous Dialysis								
Yes	Baseline			0.000	Baseline			0.000
No	0.633	0.579	0.692	0.000	0.683	0.631	0.740	0.000
Unknown	0.499	0.397	0.627	0.000	0.574	0.480	0.680	0.000
Previous Defibrillator								
Yes	Baseline			0.094	Baseline			0.006
No	1.050	0.998	1.104	0.062	1.069	1.025	1.115	0.002
Unknown	1.139	0.937	1.383	0.190	1.103	0.937	1.297	0.240
Ventilator								
Yes	Baseline			0.000	Baseline			0.000
No	0.489	0.435	0.549	0.000	0.610	0.548	0.680	0.000
Acute Rejection								
None	Baseline			0.000	Baseline			0.000
AR	0.897	0.743	1.083	0.258	0.903	0.772	1.056	0.201
CR/A	1.189	1.017	1.391	0.030	1.143	1.005	1.299	0.041
PNF	1.257	1.060	1.491	0.009	1.257	1.092	1.447	0.001
Transfusion								
Yes	Baseline			0.000	Baseline			0.000
No	0.845	0.802	0.891	0.000	0.896	0.856	0.937	0.000
Unknown	0.956	0.847	1.080	0.470	0.959	0.868	1.059	0.406
Cigarette Use								
Yes	Baseline			0.000	Baseline			0.000
No	0.857	0.813	0.904	0.000	0.813	0.776	0.851	0.000
Unknown	1.212	1.073	1.370	0.002	1.162	1.055	1.279	0.002
Continuous Variables								
Age	0.992	0.990	0.825	0.000	0.996	0.993	0.998	0.000
Height	0.992	1.021	1.334	0.000	0.994	0.992	0.996	0.000
LOS	1.005	1.005	1.006	0.000	1.005	1.004	1.005	0.000
Ischemic Time	1.108	1.086	1.132	0.000	1.075	1.057	1.094	0.000
Donor Age	1.011	1.009	1.013	0.000	1.010	1.009	1.012	0.000

247

248

249

250



251 **References:**

- 252 1. Miller, L W. “Listing Criteria for Cardiac Transplantation: Results of an American  
253 Society of Transplant Physicians-National Institutes of Health Conference.”  
254 *Transplantation*, U.S. National Library of Medicine, 15 Oct. 1998,  
255 [www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9798715](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/9798715). DOI: 10.1097/00007890-199810150-0003
- 256 2. Savarese, G, and Lars HL. “Global Public Health Burden of Heart Failure.” *Cardiac*  
257 *Failure Review*, Radcliffe Cardiology, Apr. 2017,  
258 [www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5494150/](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC5494150/). DOI: 10.15420/cfr.2016:25:2
- 259 3. Mehra, MR, et al. “The 2016 International Society for Heart Lung Transplantation  
260 Listing Criteria for Heart Transplantation: A 10-Year Update.” *The Journal of Heart and*  
261 *Lung Transplantation : the Official Publication of the International Society for Heart*  
262 *Transplantation*, U.S. National Library of Medicine, Jan. 2016,  
263 [www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26776864](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/26776864). DOI: 10.1016/j.healun.2015.10.023
- 264 4. Yeom, SY, et al. “Heart Transplantation in the Elderly Patients: Midterm Results.” *The*  
265 *Korean Journal of Thoracic and Cardiovascular Surgery*, Korean Society for Thoracic  
266 and Cardiovascular Surgery, Apr. 2013,  
267 [www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3631784/](http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC3631784/). DOI: 10.5090/kjtcs.2013.46.2.111
- 268 5. Cooper, LB, et al. “Cardiac Transplantation for Older Patients: Characteristics and  
269 Outcomes in the Septuagenarian Population.” *The Journal of Heart and Lung*  
270 *Transplantation : the Official Publication of the International Society for Heart*  
271 *Transplantation*, U.S. National Library of Medicine, Mar. 2016, DOI:  
272 10.1016/j.healun.2015.10.028

- 273 6. Gramham WK. UNet Goes Live. Organ procurement and Transplantation Network.  
274 <https://optn.transplant.hrsa.gov/news/unet-goes-live/>. Published October 22, 1999.  
275 Accessed April 7, 2021.
- 276 7. Weiss ES, Nwakanma LU, Patel ND, Yuh DD. Outcomes in patients older than 60 years  
277 of age undergoing orthotopic heart transplantation: an analysis of the UNOS database. *J*  
278 *Heart Lung Transplant* 2008;27(2):184-91.
- 279 8. George TJ, Kilic A, Beaty CA, Conte JV, Mandal K, Shah AS. Septuagenarians bridged  
280 to heart transplantation with a ventricular assist device have outcomes similar to younger  
281 patients. *Ann Thorac Surg*. 2013; 95(4):1251-61.
- 282 9. Stehlik J, Kobashigawa J, Hunt SA, Reichenspurner H, Kirklin JK. Honoring 50 years of  
283 clinical heart transplantation in *Circulation*: in-depth state-of-the-art-review. *Circulation*.  
284 2018;137(1):71- 87
- 285 10. Page A, Messer S, Large SR. Heart transplantation from donation after circulatory  
286 determined death. *Ann Cardiothorac Surg*. 2018;7 (1):75-81
- 287 11. Hanff TC, Harhay MO, Kimmel SE, et al. Trends in mechanical support use as a bridge  
288 to adult heart transplantation under new allocation rules. *JAMA Cardiol* 2020;5(6):728-  
289 729
- 290 12. Dolan RS, Rahsepar AA, Blaisdell J, et al. Multiparametric cardiac magnetic resonance  
291 imaging can detect acute cardiac allograft rejection after heart transplantation. *JACC*  
292 *Cardiovasc Imaging* 2019;12(8):1632-1641
- 293 13. Richmond ME, Zangwill SD, Kindel SJ, et al. Donor fraction cell-free DNA and  
294 rejection in adult and pediatric heart transplantation. *J Heart Lung Transplant*  
295 2020;39(5): 454-63.