1	Transplantation and old stem cell age independently increase the risk of clonal hematopoiesis in					
2	long-term survivors of pediatric HCT.					
3	Short title: Clonal hematopoiesis in survivors of pediatric HCT					
4						
5	K.F. Müskens, MD <sup>1</sup> , N. Wieringa, MD <sup>1</sup> , M. van Bergen, PhD <sup>2</sup> , J.E. Bense, MD PhD <sup>3</sup> , B.M. te Pas <sup>1</sup> , A.P.J.					
6	de Pagter, MD PhD <sup>3</sup> , PhD, A.C. Lankester, MD PhD <sup>3</sup> , M.B. Bierings, MD PhD <sup>1</sup> , D. Neuberg, ScD <sup>4</sup> , S.					
7	Haitjema, MD PhD <sup>5</sup> , L.C.M. Kremer, MD PhD <sup>1</sup> , G.A. Huls, MD PhD <sup>6</sup> , S. Nierkens, PhD <sup>1,7</sup> , J.H. Jansen,					
8	PhD <sup>2</sup> , C.A. Lindemans, MD PhD <sup>1</sup> , A. de Graaf, PhD <sup>2</sup> , M.E. Belderbos, MD PhD <sup>1</sup>					
9						
10	<sup>1</sup> Princess Máxima Center for Pediatric Oncology, Utrecht, The Netherlands					
11	<sup>2</sup> Laboratory of Hematology, Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, The Netherlands					
12	<sup>3</sup> Division of Stem cell Transplantation, Department of Pediatrics, Willem-Alexander Children's					
13	Hospital, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, Netherlands					
14	<sup>4</sup> Department of Data Science, Dana-Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, MA.					
15	<sup>5</sup> Central Diagnostic Laboratory, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands.					
16	<sup>6</sup> Department of Hematology, University Medical Center Groningen, Groningen, The Netherlands					
17	<sup>7</sup> Center for Translational Immunology, University Medical Center Utrecht, Utrecht, The Netherlands.					
18						
19	Corresponding author:					
20	M.E. Belderbos					
21	Princess Máxima Center for Pediatric Oncology					
22	Heidelberglaan 25, 3584 CS Utrecht, The Netherlands					
23	Phone: +31 6 26947687					
24	m.e.belderbos@prinsesmaximacentrum.nl					
25						
26	Data sharing statement: NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.					

27 Requests about publication-related data can be made via email to the corresponding author.

- 29 **Counts:**
- 30 Text word count: 2157
- 31 Abstract word count: 150
- 32 Number of tables: 1
- 33Number of figures:3
- 34 Number of references: 25
- 35
- 36 Number of supplementary tables: 1
- 37 Number of supplementary figures: 4

## Abstract

38	In pediatric hematopoietic cell transplantation (HCT) recipients, transplanted donor cells may need to
39	function far beyond normal human lifespan. Here, we investigated the risk of clonal hematopoiesis
40	(CH) in 144 pediatric long-term HCT survivors, compared to 115 healthy controls. CH was detected in
41	16% of HCT survivors, at variant allele frequencies (VAFs) of 0.01-0.31. Mutations were
42	predominantly in DNMT3A (80%) and TET2 (20%). Older stem cell age and the HCT procedure
43	independently increased the risk of CH (odds ratios 1.07 per year increase (p<0.001) and 2.61 for HCT
44	(p=0.02)), indicating both aging- and transplantation-induced effects. Large clones (VAF >0.10) were
45	found exclusively in HCT recipients. Notably, CH was also detected within 15 years after cord blood
46	HCT. Inflammatory processes around graft infusion were associated with CH presence. Future studies
47	are required to track the evolution of post-transplant CH and its impact on future cardiovascular
48	disease, second malignancies and overall survival.
49	
50	Significance statement

As the number of long-term HCT survivors continues to increase, so does the population at risk of
long-term effects. We demonstrate that pediatric HCT survivors are at increased risk of clonal
hematopoiesis compared to the general population. Given the young age of these recipients, our
data emphasize the need for prospective studies to assess the potential health consequences of
post-transplant CH.

## 56 Introduction

Clonal hematopoiesis (CH) refers to the detectable presence of a leukemia-associated mutation
without overt hematologic malignancy<sup>1-3</sup>. In the general population, CH is strongly age-dependent
and associated with an increased risk of developing myeloid malignancies, cardiovascular disease and
overall mortality<sup>1,2,4</sup>. Previously, we showed that clonal expansion rates depend on the mutated
gene<sup>5</sup>. Still, large variation exists in expansion rates, even in individuals with the same mutation<sup>5,6</sup>.
Which mutation-independent processes drive the expansion of mutant clones remains incompletely
understood.

64 Allogeneic hematopoietic cell transplantation (allo-HCT) provides a unique, controlled setting to study the impact of forced proliferation, inflammation and drug therapy on CH. Previous studies 65 66 have shown that 1) hematopoietic stem cell (HSC) clones with CH driver mutations can be present in HCT donors, even at very young age<sup>7,8</sup>; 2) donor-derived HSCs with CH mutations can engraft in the 67 recipient<sup>7-11</sup>; 3) clone size is generally increased in recipients compared to donors<sup>9,11</sup>; 4) the extent to 68 69 which donor-derived mutant clones expand upon transplantation varies largely between individuals<sup>7,8,10,11</sup>; and 5) forced proliferation of HSCs during hematopoietic regeneration results in 70 DNA damage and telomere shortening<sup>10</sup>, which may reduce long-term clonal diversity. While long-71 72 term effects are most relevant to HCT recipients transplanted at pediatric age given their long life-73 expectancy, most studies on post-transplant CH are limited to adults. Moreover, which transplant-74 related exposures facilitate the preferential outgrowth of CH-mutant over wildtype clones remains 75 unstudied.

Here, using a well-annotated cohort of 144 long-term survivors of pediatric HCT, we
investigated whether HCT at a young age increases the risk of developing CH and which extrinsic
factors may confer a proliferative advantage to CH mutant clones.

79

80 Methods

81 A total of 144 long-term survivors of allo-HCT (>5 years post-transplant), who underwent HCT during 82 childhood ( $\leq$ 18 years) between 1981 and 2018, were enrolled during post-HCT follow-up at the 83 Princess Máxima Center (PMC) from January 2022 to October 2023 (Supplementary Figure S1). 84 Inclusion criteria were having received an allo-HCT at least five years prior. Exclusion criteria were 85 inability to understand the patient informed consent forms. Patients had been transplanted at the 86 UMC Utrecht/PMC (n=80) or Leiden University Medical Center (n=64). The study was approved by 87 the local ethics committee (NedMec no. NL77721.041.21) in accordance with the declaration of 88 Helsinki. All patients or their caretakers provided written informed consent. Clinical characteristics 89 and demographics were extracted from medical charts. CH was assessed in whole blood collected at study enrolment using a panel targeting 27 myeloid and lymphoid malignancy driver genes, as 90 91 previously described<sup>5</sup>. Somatic variants were called at variant allele frequency (VAF)  $\geq 0.01$  and  $\geq 10$ 92 mutant unique reads. To prevent detection of germline variants, variants at VAF >0.40 were filtered. 93 Post-transplant CH was compared to CH within leftover graft material from healthy donors, 94 unrelated to our survivor cohort<sup>12</sup>. Both cohorts were processed and analyzed using the same 95 pipelines. Associations between clinical characteristics and CH were tested using Wilcoxon, Chi-96 squared or Fisher's exact tests as appropriate. Logistic and linear regression models were used to 97 identify risk factors for the prevalence of CH and VAF, respectively, correcting for potential 98 confounders. Post-transplant viral reactivations were defined as cytomegalovirus, Epstein-Barr-virus 99 and/or adenovirus loads >1000 copies/mL during pre-emptive screening. For patients transplanted in 100 the UMC Utrecht/PMC, historical laboratory data, including weekly pre-emptive C-reactive protein 101 (CRP) measurements around graft infusion, were available and extracted via the Utrecht Patient Oriented Database<sup>13</sup>. 102

103

## 104 Results

105 CH prevalence is higher in long-term survivors of pediatric HCT compared to healthy controls

106	A total of 144 HCT recipients were enrolled, at a median calendar age of 20.5 years (interquartile
107	range (IQR): 16.2-27.7, Table 1). HSC age (median: 32.1 years, IQR 15.6-43.7) was calculated by
108	summing the donor age at HCT (median: 13.5 years, IQR: 5.1-26.8) and the time between HCT and CH
109	assessment ("follow-up time", median: 10.4 years, IQR: 8-17.9). In total, we identified 30 CH
110	mutations with VAF ≥0.01 in 23 HCT recipients (16%; 95% confidence interval (CI): 10-23%, Figure
111	1B). Mutations were exclusively found in DNMT3A (24 mutations, 80%) or TET2 (6 mutations, 20%).
112	Most were single-base substitutions (23 mutations, 77%), of which 12 were cytosine-to-thymine
113	transitions (Supplementary Figure S2). VAFs ranged from 0.01 to 0.31, with a median of 0.02.
114	Chimerism analysis confirmed that post-transplant CH originated from donor cells in 20 out of 23
115	cases. In the remaining recipients, recipient origin of CH could not be excluded due to residual
116	patient chimerism exceeding the size of the CH clone.
117	To determine whether HCT affects the prevalence and characteristics of CH, we compared
118	our HCT cohort to 115 healthy, untransplanted controls (median age: 48.0 years, IQR: 34.0-56.5,
119	Supplementary Table S1, Supplementary Figure S3). In line with previous studies <sup>1,2,14,15</sup> , CH was
120	virtually absent in healthy individuals <40 years. In contrast, eight HCT recipients with HSC-ages <40
121	years had detectable CH (Figure 2A). In both cohorts, older HSC age was associated with increased
122	risk of CH (odds ratio 1.07 per year increase, p<0.001, Figure 2A-B and Supplementary Figure S3D).
123	When comparing individuals with similar HSC ages, the age-corrected prevalence of CH was
124	significantly higher in HCT recipients compared to controls (Figure 2A). In the HCT setting, HSC age
125	consists of donor age, reflecting the risk of CH-mutant HSCs being present in the graft, and follow-up,
126	reflecting the time during which mutant HSCs expand or arise in the recipient (Figure 2C-D).
127	Additionally, the calendar age of the recipient at HCT represents the age of the niche receiving the
128	donor HSCs (Figure 2E). In multivariable regression, both donor age and follow-up time were
129	significant predictors of CH (Figure 2F), whilst recipient age at HCT was not (p=0.68).
130	Most CH clones were small, both in HCT recipients and controls (median VAF 0.023 and 0.015
131	respectively, p=0.23, Figure 2G). Notably, very large clones with VAF >0.10 were exclusively detected

132 in HCT recipients. Although a trend of increased clone size at higher HSC age was observed for both 133 HCT recipients and controls (Figure 2H), this only explained part of the observed variation in clone 134 sizes. In particular, two HCT recipients carried DNMT3A-mutated clones with VAFs of 0.30 and 0.31, 135 at HSC ages of 14.5 and 30.0 years, respectively. Strikingly, the former of these two recipients was 136 transplanted with cord blood, suggesting that even cord blood grafts may contain HSCs with CH 137 driver mutations. Collectively, these data demonstrate that HCT recipients are at increased risk of CH at younger HSC age compared to controls, likely originating from mutant donor HSPCs which 138 139 preferentially expand in the context of HCT and persist into adulthood. 140

141 Systemic inflammation is associated with post-transplant CH

142 To identify HCT-related exposures that may contribute to the development of CH, we compared 143 clinical characteristics between HCT recipients with and without CH. No differences were observed in 144 underlying disease, stem cell source, CD34 dose or donor-recipient relation (Figure 3A). Remarkably, 145 we identified various post-transplant exposures associated with presence of CH. First, CH prevalence 146 was higher in recipients who had received serotherapy as part of their conditioning regimen. After 147 serotherapy administration (usually day -9 to -5 before graft infusion), T-cell lysis can result in an inflammatory response marked by fever and increased C-reactive protein (CRP)<sup>16</sup>. To investigate 148 149 whether HCT recipients with long-term CH had experienced such an inflammatory response, we 150 investigated CRP values around time of graft infusion. Hereto, we extracted CRP values, obtained 151 during pre-emptive monitoring, for all HCT recipients transplanted at the UMC Utrecht/PMC (n=80, Figure 3B-C, Supplementary Figure S4). Within this subset, all HCT recipients that later developed CH 152 153 had received serotherapy. As expected, serotherapy was associated with a transient CRP rise 154 (Supplementary Figure S4B). Strikingly, CRP levels before and shortly after graft infusion were higher 155 for HCT recipients with subsequent CH compared to those without, both in the overall cohort and 156 within those who had received serotherapy. This difference was not observed at later timepoints. In 157 addition, post-transplant viral reactivations, defined as cytomegalovirus, Epstein-Barr-virus and/or

adenovirus loads >1000 copies/mL during pre-emptive screening, were associated with CH in
univariable analysis (Figure 3D). Whether this is the consequence of serotherapy or an independent
inflammatory event could not be established. We did not observe a significant association between
acute graft-versus-host disease (aGvHD) and CH (Figure 3E). None of the HCT recipients in our cohort
had developed a secondary hematologic malignancy at time of enrollment.

163

### 164 Discussion

165 Due to the increasing use of HCT as a treatment and improvements in supportive care protocols, the 166 number of long-term HCT survivors continues to increase. While much research has focused on the non-hematopoietic late effects after HCT<sup>17</sup>, the long-term effects on the hematopoietic system – the 167 168 only organ not directly exposed to chemotherapy - remain unclear. Long-term complications are 169 particularly relevant for pediatric recipients, who have a life expectancy of several decades after 170 successful HCT. Here, we demonstrate that long-term survivors of pediatric HCT are at increased risk 171 of CH compared to the general population. Importantly, older HSC age and the HCT procedure itself 172 were independently associated with post-transplant CH, suggesting the involvement of both aging-173 and transplantation-induced effects. Furthermore, consistent with existing pre-clinical data indicating that inflammation promotes clonal expansion<sup>18</sup>, we found an association between post-transplant CH 174 175 and (serotherapy-induced) inflammation around graft infusion. This supports the hypothesis that 176 systemic inflammation might promote the selection and/or preferential expansion of mutant HSCs, 177 resulting in detectable CH years later.

178

Our findings are in line with previous studies in adult HCT cohorts, demonstrating that the prevalence
 of CH is higher in HCT recipients compared to their donors<sup>19</sup>. Using sensitive backtracking studies,
 most cases of adult post-transplant CH could be traced back to the donor graft, even in very young
 donors<sup>7</sup>. Furthermore, donor-derived CH clones were more likely to engraft and/or expand after HCT,
 resulting in an increased clone size in recipients compared to donors<sup>9,11</sup>. While residual graft material

184 was not available for our study cohort, these transplant donors would be very unlikely to harbor 185 detectable CH clones given their young age. It is important to note that the detection of CH is highly dependent on the sequencing thresholds used, and that CH-negative individuals may still harbor 186 187 small CH clones below the lower limit of detection. Accordingly, the absence of detectable CH in the 188 HCT donor does not rule out the possibility of mutated HSCs already being present in the graft and 189 becoming detectable in the recipient after HCT. In line with this notion, we found a positive 190 association between donor age and the risk of post-transplant CH. Notably, we also observed CH 191 within 15 years after UCB HCT, which is amongst the youngest cases of CH reported thus far. This is consistent with previous single-cell lineage-tracing<sup>20</sup> and twin studies<sup>21</sup>, suggesting that HSCs carrying 192 leukemia-associated mutations might already be present at birth, and only grow out to become 193 194 detectable clones upon HCT, which creates an environment favoring the selective expansion of 195 mutant HSCs.

196

197 The clinical impact of post-transplant CH remains to a large part unknown. Long-term HCT survivors 198 are confronted with various potential late effects, including second malignancies and cardiovascular disease<sup>22,23</sup>, which may be affected by or related to the presence of CH<sup>24,25</sup>. In our cohort, we did not 199 200 observe any individuals with donor-derived myelodysplasia or secondary hematologic malignancies. 201 Yet, the detection of these complications is better addressed in prospective rather that cross-202 sectional studies. Notably, we have recently shown that the risk of malignant transformation of CH 203 depends on the mutated gene as well as its growth dynamics<sup>5</sup>. While the observed prevalence of 204 post-transplant CH in young HSCs indicates either a transient or persistent increase in clonal growth, 205 discriminating between these two may identify clones with different risk of malignant progression. 206 Future research should focus on longitudinal monitoring of CH in allo-HCT recipients to investigate 207 growth dynamics and better assess the long-term clinical consequences, including cardiovascular disease, second malignancies and overall survival. 208

209

210 Our study has several limitations, including heterogeneity in the patient population and time of 211 sampling, and the unavailability of pre-transplant graft material. Additionally, by focusing on very 212 long-term survivors, HCT recipients with severe post-HCT complications may be underrepresented in 213 our study cohort, as these complications may impact their long-term survival and/or ability to enroll. 214 Accordingly, the lack of association between CH and aGvHD needs to be interpreted with caution. 215 Yet, from a clinical perspective, our findings remain relevant, since long-term HCT related effects are 216 only relevant for those who survive. Finally, the association between CH, serotherapy, CRP and post-217 HCT viral reactivations does not indicate causality. In fact, many of these processes are linked, for 218 example, serotherapy-induced T-cell depletion is associated with increased risk of viral reactivations. 219 In addition, the presence of CH itself may affect the HCT-associated inflammatory processes. Future 220 studies, including longitudinal sampling of both donor and recipient, may help understand how 221 different aspects of HCT (e.g., mobilization, engraftment, forced proliferation, inflammation) affect 222 the prevalence and dynamics of post-transplant CH. 223

In summary, pediatric HCT recipients are at increased risk of CH at a young age, emphasizing the
 importance of prospective screening. Insight into the longitudinal dynamics of CH post-HCT will be
 crucial to understanding the underlying mechanisms and to determine its potential impact on post transplant health.

228

## 229 Acknowledgements

This study was financially supported by a VENI grant of the Netherlands Organization for Scientific Research (NWO) (grant number VI.Veni.202.021 to MEB), a physician scientist grant of the European Hematology Association (to MEB), a John Hansen research grant from the DKMS and a KiKa project grant (project number 418). The KiKa project grant supported the salary of KFM. The funders had no role in the design, execution or writing of this work, nor in the decision to submit results. We would

235 like to thank M.C.H. de Groot for extracting historical laboratory data from the Utrecht Patient

236 Oriented Database.

237

# 238 Authorship Contributions

- 239 Conceptualization: All authors. Data analysis and figures: KFM, MvB, AdG, MEB. Writing (original
- 240 draft): KFM and MEB. Writing (review and editing): All authors. All authors have read and agreed to
- the published version of the manuscript.

242

# 243 Disclosure of conflicts of interest

- 244 DSN has stocks in Madrigal Pharmaceuticals. SN was advisor for Sobi. CAL is on a data and safety
- 245 monitoring board for ExCellThera and was medical advisor for Sobi and Orchard Therapeutics.

### 246 Reference list

1. Jaiswal, S. et al. Age-Related Clonal Hematopoiesis Associated with Adverse Outcomes. N.

248 Engl. J. Med. **371**, 2488–2498 (2014).

- 249 2. Genovese, G. et al. Clonal Hematopoiesis and Blood-Cancer Risk Inferred from Blood DNA
- 250 Sequence. N. Engl. J. Med. **371**, 2477–2487 (2014).
- Jaiswal, S. & Ebert, B. L. Clonal hematopoiesis in human aging and disease. *Science (80-. ).* 366,
   (2019).
- 253 4. Zink, F. *et al.* Clonal hematopoiesis, with and without candidate driver mutations, is common
  254 in the elderly. *Blood* 130, 742–752 (2017).
- 255 5. van Zeventer, I. A. *et al.* Evolutionary landscape of clonal hematopoiesis in 3,359 individuals
- from the general population. *Cancer Cell* **41**, 1017-1031.e4 (2023).
- 257 6. Fabre, M. A. *et al.* The longitudinal dynamics and natural history of clonal haematopoiesis.
- 258 Nat. 2022 6067913 **606**, 335–342 (2022).
- 259 7. Wong, W. H., Bhatt, S. & Trinkaus, K. Engraftment of rare, pathogenic donor hematopoietic
- 260 mutations in unrelated hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. *Sci. Transl. Med.* **12**, (2020).
- 8. Gibson, C. J. *et al.* Donor Clonal Hematopoiesis and Recipient Outcomes After Transplantation.
- 262 J. Clin. Oncol. 40, 189 (2022).
- 263 9. Boettcher, S. et al. Clonal hematopoiesis in donors and long-term survivors of related
- allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. *Blood* **135**, 1548–1559 (2020).
- 265 10. Campbell, P., Chapman, M. S., Wilk, M. & Boettcher, S. Clonal dynamics after allogeneic
- 266 haematopoietic cell transplantation using genome-wide somatic mutations.
- 267 doi:10.21203/rs.3.rs-2868644/v1.
- 268 11. Frick, M. *et al.* Role of donor clonal hematopoiesis in allogeneic hematopoietic stem-cell
  269 transplantation. *J. Clin. Oncol.* **37**, 375–385 (2019).
- 270 12. van Bergen, M. G. J. M. *et al.* Characterization of a genomic region 8 kb downstream of GFI1B
- associated with myeloproliferative neoplasms. *Biochim. Biophys. Acta Mol. Basis Dis.* **1867**,

- 272 166259 (2021).
- 273 13. Ten Berg, M. J. et al. Linking laboratory and medication data: New opportunities for
- pharmacoepidemiological research. *Clin. Chem. Lab. Med.* **45**, 13–19 (2007).
- 275 14. Xie, M. *et al.* Age-related cancer mutations associated with clonal hematopoietic expansion.
- 276 Nat. Med. 20, 1472 (2014).
- 277 15. Abelson, S. *et al.* Prediction of acute myeloid leukaemia risk in healthy individuals. *Nature* 559,
  278 400–404 (2018).
- 279 16. Brodska, H. *et al.* Marked increase of procalcitonin after the administration of anti-thymocyte
- 280 globulin in patients before hematopoietic stem cell transplantation does not indicate sepsis: a
- 281 prospective study. *Crit. Care* **13**, R37–R37 (2009).
- 282 17. Baker, K. S., Bresters, D. & Sande, J. E. The burden of cure: Long-term side effects following
- Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation (HSCT) in children. *Pediatric Clinics of North America*vol. 57 323–342 at https://doi.org/10.1016/j.pcl.2009.11.008 (2010).
- 18. Florez, M. A. *et al.* Clonal hematopoiesis: Mutation-specific adaptation to environmental
  change. *Cell Stem Cell* 29, 882–904 (2022).
- 287 19. Kim, K. H. *et al.* Clonal hematopoiesis in the donor does not adversely affect long-term
- outcomes following allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation: result from a 13-year
  follow-up. *Haematologica* 108, 1817–1826 (2023).
- 290 20. Williams, N. *et al.* Life histories of myeloproliferative neoplasms inferred from phylogenies.
  291 *Nature* 602, 162–168 (2022).
- 292 21. Ford, A. M., Colman, S. & Greaves, M. Covert pre-leukaemic clones in healthy co-twins of
- 293 patients with childhood acute lymphoblastic leukaemia. *Leuk. 2022 371* **37**, 47–52 (2022).
- 294 22. Carreras, E., Dufour, C., Mohty, M. & Kröger, N. The EBMT Handbook: Hematopoietic Stem
- 295 Cell Transplantation and Cellular Therapies [Internet]. *EBMT Handb. Hematop. Stem Cell*
- 296 Transplant. Cell. Ther. 1–702 (2019) doi:10.1007/978-3-030-02278-5.
- 297 23. Armenian, S. H. & Chow, E. J. Cardiovascular disease in survivors of hematopoietic cell

298 transplantation. *Cancer* **120**, 469 (2014).

- 299 24. Rhee, J. W. et al. Clonal Hematopoiesis and Cardiovascular Disease in Patients with Multiple
- 300 Myeloma Undergoing Hematopoietic Cell Transplant. *JAMA Cardiol.* **9**, 16–24 (2024).
- 301 25. Kato, M. et al. Donor cell-derived hematological malignancy: A survey by the Japan Society for
- 302 Hematopoietic Cell Transplantation. *Leukemia* **30**, 1742–1745 (2016).
- 303

#### 305 Tables

#### 306 Table 1

Determinant         (n = 144)         (n = 23)         (n = 121)         value           Recipient sex         Male         83<(58%)         13         (57%)         70         (58%)         1           Recipient age at Inclusion; (years, median, IQR)         20.5         16.2-27.7         28.3         (19.4-33.2)         20.2         (15.9-25.7)         0.03           Recipient age at Inclusion; (years, median, IQR)         80.4         40-12.3         7.3         (3.6-15.3)         8.0         (4.1-6.7)         0.59           HSC age; (years, median, IQR)         32.1         15.6-43.7         44.0         (34.7-51.4)         29.6         (14.2-42.0)         <0.01           Donor age at HCT; (years, median, IQR)         13.5         5.1-26.8         30.2         (19.6-36.4)         11.6         (4.3-25.1)         <0.01           Ponor age at HCT; (years, median, IQR)         11.6         (81%)         21         (91%)         95         (79%)         0.07           Underlying disease           0.91         (98)         22         (18%)         0.07           Bone marrow failure syndromes         24         (17%)         2         (9%)         32         (26%)         0.1           Bone marrow         1		1	Гotal	СН		No CH		Р
Recipient sex Male         83         (58%)         13         (57%)         70         (58%)         1           Recipient age at Inclusion; (years, median, IQR)         20.5         16.2-27.7         28.3         (19.4-33.2)         20.2         (15.9-25.7)         0.03           Recipient age at HCT; (years, median, IQR)         8.0         4.0-12.3         7.3         (3.6-15.3)         8.0         (4.1-6.7)         0.59           MSC age; (years, median, IQR)         13.5         5.1-26.8         30.2         (19.6-36.4)         11.6         (4.3-24.2.0)         <0.01           Donor age at HCT; (years, median, IQR)         12.1         8.0-17.9         18.4         (8.5-22.8)         11.6         (7.9-16.1)         0.07           Underlying disease         0.33         0         (0%)         4         (3%)         0         (0%)         4         (3%)           Immunodeficiency         4         (3%)         0         (0%)         4         (3%)         0         0.01           Bone marrow failure syndromes         24         (17%)         2         (9%)         22         (18%)           Cord blood         33         (23%)         1         (4%)         32         (26%)           Periph	Determinant		(n = 144)		(n = 23)		(n = 121)	
Male         83         (58%)         13         (57%)         70         (58%)         1           Recipient age at Inclusion; (years, median, IQR)         20.5         16.2-27.7         28.3         (19.4-33.2)         20.2         (15.9-25.7)         0.03           Recipient age at HCT; (years, median, IQR)         32.1         15.6-43.7         44.0         (14.7-51.4)         29.6         (14.2-42.0)         <0.01           Donor age at HCT; (years, median, IQR)         13.5         5.1-26.8         30.2         (19.6-36.4)         11.6         (4.3-25.1)         <0.01           Donor age at HCT; (years, median, IQR)         13.5         5.1-26.8         30.2         (19.6-36.4)         11.6         (4.3-25.1)         <0.01           Follow-up time; (years, median, IQR)         12.1         8.0-17.9         18.4         (8.5-22.8)         11.6         (7.9+)         0.07           Bone marrow failure syndromes         24         (17%)         2         (9%)         22         (18%)         0         0.01           Bone marrow failure syndromes         24         (17%)         2         (9%)         22         (18%)         0         0.01           Bone marrow         101         (70%)         18         (78%)         33 <th>Recipient sex</th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th> <th></th>	Recipient sex							
Recipient age at Inclusion; (years, median, IQR) Recipient age at HCT; (years, median, IQR) Bone age; (years, median, IQR) $20.5$ $16.2-27.7$ $3.2.1$ $28.3$ $(19.4-33.2)$ $3.2.1$ $20.2$ $(15.9-25.7)$ 	Male	83	(58%)	13	(57%)	70	(58%)	1
Recipient age at Inclusion; (years, median, IQR)       20.5 $16.2-27.7$ 28.3 $19.4-33.2$ )       20.2 $115.9-25.7$ )       0.03         Recipient age at Inclusion; (years, median, IQR)       8.0 $4.0-12.3$ 7.3 $(3.6-15.3)$ 8.0 $(4.1-6.7)$ $0.59$ HSC age; (years, median, IQR)       32.1 $15.6-43.7$ $44.0$ $(34.7-51.4)$ $29.6$ $(14.2-42.0)$ $<0.01$ Donor age at HCT; (years, median, IQR)       13.5 $5.1-26.8$ $30.2$ $(19.6-36.4)$ $11.6$ $(4.3-25.1)$ $<0.01$ Follow-up time; (years, median, IQR)       12.1 $8.0-17.9$ $18.4$ $(8.5-22.8)$ $11.6$ $(7.9-16.1)$ $0.07$ Underlying disease       0.33         Hemato-oncology       116 $(81\%)$ $21$ $(91\%)$ $95$ $(79\%)$ Bone marrow failure syndromes       24 $(17\%)$ $18$ $(78\%)$ $83$ $(69\%)$ $0.01$ Bone marrow       101 $(70\%)$ $18$ $(78\%)$ $32$ $(26\%)$ $0.21$ Unrelated       84 $(58\%)$ $16$ $(77\%)$ $68$ $(56\%$								
Recipient age at HCT; (years, median, IQR)       8.0       4.0-12.3       7.3       3.6-15.3)       8.0       (4.1-6.7)       0.59         HSC age; (years, median, IQR)       32.1       15.6-43.7       44.0       (34.7-51.4)       29.6       (14.2-4.0)       <0.01	Recipient age at Inclusion; (years, median, IQR)	20.5	16.2-27.7	28.3	(19.4-33.2)	20.2	(15.9-25.7)	0.03
HSC age: (years, median, IQR)       32.1       15.6-43.7       44.0       (34.7-51.4)       29.6       (14.2-42.0)       <0.01	Recipient age at HCT; (years, median, IQR)	8.0	4.0-12.3	7.3	(3.6-15.3)	8.0	(4.1-6.7)	0.59
Donor age at HCT; (years, median, IQR)13.55.1-26.830.2(19.6-36.4)11.6(4.3-25.1)<0.01Follow-up time; (years, median, IQR)12.18.0-17.918.4(8.5-22.8)11.6(7.9-16.1)0.07Underlying disease	HSC age; (years, median, IQR)	32.1	15.6-43.7	44.0	(34.7-51.4)	29.6	(14.2-42.0)	<0.01
Follow-up time; (years, median, IQR)       12.1       8.0-17.9       18.4       (8.5-22.8)       11.6       (7.9-16.1)       0.07         Underlying disease	Donor age at HCT; (years, median, IQR)	13.5	5.1-26.8	30.2	(19.6-36.4)	11.6	(4.3-25.1)	<0.01
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	Follow-up time; (years, median, IQR)	12.1	8.0-17.9	18.4	(8.5-22.8)	11.6	(7.9-16.1)	0.07
Hemato-oncology Bone marrow failure syndromes116 $(81\%)$ 21 $(91\%)$ 95 $(79\%)$ Bone marrow failure syndromes24 $(17\%)$ 2 $(9\%)$ 22 $(18\%)$ Immunodeficiency4 $(3\%)$ 0 $(0\%)$ 4 $(3\%)$ Stem cell source0.01Bone marrow101 $(70\%)$ 18 $(78\%)$ 83 $(69\%)$ Cord blood33 $(23\%)$ 1 $(4\%)$ 32 $(26\%)$ Peripheral blood10 $(7\%)$ 4 $(17\%)$ 6 $(5\%)$ Relation to donor0.21Unrelated84 $(58\%)$ 16 $(70\%)$ 68 $(56\%)$ Family60 $(42\%)$ 7 $(30\%)$ 53 $(44\%)$ Sibling53 $(37\%)$ 5 $(22\%)$ 44 $(40\%)$ Parent7 $(5\%)$ 2 $(9\%)$ 5 $(4\%)$ ConditioningCCCCCMyeloablative134 $(93\%)$ 20 $(87\%)$ 114 $(94\%)$ 1Non-myeloablative10 $(7\%)$ 3 $(13\%)$ 7 $(6\%)$ No54 $(38\%)$ 3 $(13\%)$ 53 $(24\%)$	Underlying disease							0.33
Bone marrow failure syndromes Immunodeficiency24 $(17\%)$ 2 $(9\%)$ 22 $(18\%)$ Immunodeficiency4 $(3\%)$ 0 $(0\%)$ 4 $(3\%)$ 0.01Stem cell source Bone marrow Cord blood33 $(23\%)$ 1 $(4\%)$ 32 $(26\%)$ Peripheral blood10 $(7\%)$ 4 $(17\%)$ 6 $(5\%)$ 0.21Unrelated Family Sibling84 $(58\%)$ 16 $(70\%)$ 68 $(56\%)$ Parent7 $(5\%)$ 2 $(9\%)$ 5 $(44\%)$ Sibling Parent53 $(37\%)$ 5 $(22\%)$ 48 $(40\%)$ Conditioning TBI-based112 $(78\%)$ 18 $(78\%)$ 99 $(78\%)$ 1Myeloablative Non-myeloablative134 $(93\%)$ 20 $(87\%)$ 114 $(94\%)$ 1Serotherapy Yes No87 $(60\%)$ 20 $(87\%)$ 68 $(56\%)$	Hemato-oncology	116	(81%)	21	(91%)	95	(79%)	
Immunodeficiency4 $(3\%)$ 0 $(0\%)$ 4 $(3\%)$ Stem cell source0.01Bone marrow101 $(70\%)$ 18 $(78\%)$ 83 $(69\%)$ Cord blood33 $(23\%)$ 1 $(4\%)$ 32 $(26\%)$ Peripheral blood10 $(7\%)$ 4 $(17\%)$ 6 $(5\%)$ Relation to donor0.21Unrelated84 $(58\%)$ 16 $(70\%)$ 68 $(56\%)$ Family60 $(42\%)$ 7 $(30\%)$ 53 $(44\%)$ Sibling53 $(37\%)$ 5 $(22\%)$ 48 $(40\%)$ Parent7 $(5\%)$ 2 $(9\%)$ 5 $(4\%)$ ConditioningTTTTChemotherapy-based112 $(78\%)$ 18 $(78\%)$ 99 $(78\%)$ 1TBI-based32 $(22\%)$ 5 $(22\%)$ 114 $(94\%)$ 1SerotherapyTTTTTYes87 $(60\%)$ 20 $(87\%)$ 68 $(56\%)$ No97634 $(13\%)$ 3 $(13\%)$ 53 $(44\%)$	Bone marrow failure syndromes	24	(17%)	2	(9%)	22	(18%)	
Stem cell source0.01Bone marrow101(70%)18(78%)83(69%)Cord blood33(23%)1(4%)32(26%)Peripheral blood10(7%)4(17%)6(5%)Relation to donorUrrelated84(58%)16(70%)68(56%)Family60(42%)7(30%)53(44%)Sibling53(37%)5(22%)48(40%)Parent7(5%)2(9%)5(4%)Conditioning7(5%)2(9%)5(4%)Chemotherapy-based112(78%)18(78%)99(78%)1TBi-based32(22%)5(22%)11Myeloablative134(93%)20(87%)114(94%)1Non-myeloablative10(7%)3(13%)76(%)0.01Yes87(60%)20(87%)68(56%)0.01	Immunodeficiency	4	(3%)	0	(0%)	4	(3%)	
Conditional         101         (70%)         18         (78%)         83         (69%)           Cord blood         33         (23%)         1         (4%)         32         (26%)           Peripheral blood         10         (7%)         4         (17%)         6         (5%)           Relation to donor         0.21           Unrelated         84         (58%)         16         (70%)         68         (56%)           Family         60         (42%)         7         (30%)         53         (44%)           Sibling         53         (37%)         5         (22%)         48         (40%)           Parent         7         (5%)         2         (9%)         5         (4%)           Conditioning           Chemotherapy-based         112         (78%)         18         (78%)         99         (78%)         1           TBI-based         32         (22%)         5         (22%)         1            Myeloablative         134         (93%)         20         (87%)         144         (94%)         1           Serotherapy         0.01	Stem cell source							0.01
Definition101 (100)101 	Bone marrow	101	(70%)	18	(78%)	83	(69%)	0.01
Conditional3.3 $(23\%)$ 1 $(4\%)$ $3.2$ $(20\%)$ Peripheral blood10 $(7\%)$ 4 $(17\%)$ 6 $(5\%)$ Relation to donor0.21Unrelated84 $(58\%)$ 16 $(70\%)$ 68 $(56\%)$ Family60 $(42\%)$ 7 $(30\%)$ 53 $(44\%)$ Sibling53 $(37\%)$ 5 $(22\%)$ 48 $(40\%)$ Parent7 $(5\%)$ 2 $(9\%)$ 5 $(4\%)$ ConditioningChemotherapy-based112 $(78\%)$ 18 $(78\%)$ 99 $(78\%)$ 1TBI-based122 $(22\%)$ 5 $(22\%)$ 27 $(22\%)$ 1Myeloablative134 $(93\%)$ 20 $(87\%)$ 114 $(94\%)$ 1Serotherapy $\mathbf{V}$ $\mathbf{S7}$ $(60\%)$ $20$ $(87\%)$ $68$ $(56\%)$ No54 $(38\%)$ $3$ $(13\%)$ $53$ $(44\%)$ $1$	Cord blood	22	(73%)	10	(1%)	32	(26%)	
Relation to donor0.21Unrelated84(58%)16(70%)68(56%)Family60(42%)7(30%)53(44%)Sibling53(37%)5(22%)48(40%)Parent7(5%)2(9%)5(4%)ConditioningChemotherapy-based112(78%)18(78%)99(78%)1TBI-based32(22%)5(22%)27(22%)1Myeloablative134(93%)20(87%)114(94%)1Non-myeloablative10(7%)3(13%)7(6%)Yes87(60%)20(87%)68(56%)	Peripheral blood	10	(7%)	4	(17%)	6	(5%)	
Unrelated       84       (58%)       16       (70%)       68       (56%)         Family       60       (42%)       7       (30%)       53       (44%)         Sibling       53       (37%)       5       (22%)       48       (40%)         Parent       7       (5%)       2       (9%)       5       (4%)         Conditioning         Chemotherapy-based       112       (78%)       18       (78%)       99       (78%)       1         TBI-based       32       (22%)       5       (22%)       27       (22%)       1         Myeloablative       134       (93%)       20       (87%)       114       (94%)       1         Non-myeloablative       10       (7%)       3       (13%)       7       (6%)       0.01         Yes       87       (60%)       20       (87%)       68       (56%)       0.01	Relation to donor							0.21
Family       60       (42%)       7       (30%)       53       (44%)         Sibling       53       (37%)       5       (22%)       48       (40%)         Parent       7       (5%)       2       (9%)       5       (4%)         Conditioning         Chemotherapy-based       112       (78%)       18       (78%)       99       (78%)       1         TBI-based       32       (22%)       5       (22%)       27       (22%)       1         Myeloablative       134       (93%)       20       (87%)       114       (94%)       1         Non-myeloablative       10       (7%)       3       (13%)       7       (6%)       0.01         Yes       87       (60%)       20       (87%)       68       (56%)         No       54       (38%)       3       (13%)       53       (44%)		84	(58%)	16	(70%)	68	(56%)	0.21
Sibling       53       (37%)       5       (22%)       48       (40%)         Parent       7       (5%)       2       (9%)       5       (4%)         Conditioning         Chemotherapy-based       112       (78%)       18       (78%)       99       (78%)       1         TBI-based       32       (22%)       5       (22%)       27       (22%)       1         Myeloablative       134       (93%)       20       (87%)       114       (94%)       1         Non-myeloablative       10       (7%)       3       (13%)       7       (6%)       0.01         Yes       87       (60%)       20       (87%)       68       (56%)         No       54       (38%)       3       (13%)       53       (44%)	Eamily	60	(33%)	10	(20%)	52	(30%)	
Stolling       33       (37%)       3       (22%)       46       (40%)         Parent       7       (5%)       2       (9%)       5       (4%)         Conditioning         Chemotherapy-based       112       (78%)       18       (78%)       99       (78%)       1         TBI-based       32       (22%)       5       (22%)       27       (22%)       1         Myeloablative       134       (93%)       20       (87%)       114       (94%)       1         Non-myeloablative       10       (7%)       3       (13%)       7       (6%)       0.01         Yes       87       (60%)       20       (87%)       68       (56%)         No       54       (38%)       3       (13%)       53       (44%)	Sibling	50 E 2	(42%)	/ E	(30%)	10	(44%)	
Conditioning         Chemotherapy-based       112       (78%)       18       (78%)       99       (78%)       1         TBI-based       32       (22%)       5       (22%)       27       (22%)       1         Myeloablative       134       (93%)       20       (87%)       114       (94%)       1         Non-myeloablative       10       (7%)       3       (13%)       7       (6%)       0.01         Yes       87       (60%)       20       (87%)       68       (56%)       0.01	Parent	55	(5%)	2	(22%)	40	(40%)	
$\begin{array}{c c} \mbox{Conditioning} \\ \mbox{Chemotherapy-based} & 112 & (78\%) & 18 & (78\%) & 99 & (78\%) & 1 \\ \mbox{TBI-based} & 32 & (22\%) & 5 & (22\%) & 27 & (22\%) \\ \mbox{Myeloablative} & 134 & (93\%) & 20 & (87\%) & 114 & (94\%) & 1 \\ \mbox{Non-myeloablative} & 10 & (7\%) & 3 & (13\%) & 7 & (6\%) \\ \mbox{Serotherapy} & & & & & & & \\ \mbox{Yes} & 87 & (60\%) & 20 & (87\%) & 68 & (56\%) \\ \mbox{No} & 54 & (38\%) & 3 & (13\%) & 53 & (44\%) \\ \end{array}$	i di citt	,	(370)	2	(378)	5	(470)	
Chemotherapy-based       112       (78%)       18       (78%)       99       (78%)       1         TBI-based       32       (22%)       5       (22%)       27       (22%)       1         Myeloablative       134       (93%)       20       (87%)       114       (94%)       1         Non-myeloablative       10       (7%)       3       (13%)       7       (6%)       0.01         Serotherapy       0.01         Yes       87       (60%)       20       (87%)       68       (56%)         No       54       (38%)       3       (13%)       53       (44%)	Conditioning							
TBI-based       32       (22%)       5       (22%)       27       (22%)         Myeloablative       134       (93%)       20       (87%)       114       (94%)       1         Non-myeloablative       10       (7%)       3       (13%)       7       (6%)       0.01         Serotherapy       0.01         Yes       87       (60%)       20       (87%)       68       (56%)         No       54       (38%)       3       (13%)       53       (44%)	Chemotherapy-based	112	(78%)	18	(78%)	99	(78%)	1
Myeloablative         134         (93%)         20         (87%)         114         (94%)         1           Non-myeloablative         10         (7%)         3         (13%)         7         (6%)         1           Serotherapy         0.01           Yes         87         (60%)         20         (87%)         68         (56%)           No         54         (38%)         3         (13%)         53         (44%)	TBI-based	32	(22%)	5	(22%)	27	(22%)	
Non-myeloablative         10         (7%)         3         (13%)         7         (6%)           Serotherapy         0.01           Yes         87         (60%)         20         (87%)         68         (56%)           No         54         (38%)         3         (13%)         53         (44%)	Myeloablative	134	(93%)	20	(87%)	114	(94%)	1
Serotherapy         0.01           Yes         87 (60%)         20 (87%)         68 (56%)           No         54 (38%)         3 (13%)         53 (44%)	Non-myeloablative	10	(7%)	3	(13%)	7	(6%)	
Yes         87 (60%)         20 (87%)         68 (56%)           No         54 (38%)         3 (13%)         53 (44%)	Serotherapy							0.01
No 54 (38%) 3 (13%) 53 (44%)	Yes	87	(60%)	20	(87%)	68	(56%)	0.01
	No	54	(38%)	20	(13%)	53	(44%)	

<sup>307</sup> 

#### 309 **Table Legends**

310 Table 1. HCT characteristics for study cohort. P values calculated from Chi-squared test or Fisher-exact test if expected count <5

311 (categorical variables) or Wilcoxon rank-sum test (continuous variables). Serotherapy consisted of either anti-thymocyte globulin or

312 alemtuzumab (Campath). Abbreviations: CH: clonal hematopoiesis; IQR: interquartile range; HCT: Hematopoietic stem cell transplantation;

313 HSC: hematopoietic stem cell; TBI: Total body irradiation.

<sup>308</sup> 

#### 314 Figure Legends

315

Figure 1. CH is common after HCT at pediatric age. A) Study design. B) Oncoprint of all HCT recipients,
sorted by identified CH mutation (red) and variant allele frequency (VAF, orange bars). A darker shade
indicates multiple mutations in the same gene. Relation to donor (blue) and stem cell source (yellow)
are indicated.

Abbreviations: HCT: hematopoietic cell transplantation; NGS: next generation sequencing; CH: clonal
 hematopoiesis; VAF: variant allele frequency; MUD: matched unrelated donor; BM: bone marrow;
 PBSC: peripheral blood stem cells; CB: cord blood.

323

324 Figure 2. Comparison of CH in HCT recipients and controls. A) Cumulative prevalence of CH plotted 325 against HSC age, split by cohort. P values are derived from a multivariable logistic regression model with cohort (HCT recipient versus control) and HSC age as determinants and CH status as outcome. B) 326 327 Bar plot of HSC age in individuals with and without CH for both cohorts. C-E) Bar plots of donor age, 328 follow-up time and recipient age in HCT recipients with and without CH. F) Forest plot depicting the 329 effect of timespans from C-E on CH prevalence in logistic regression models with CH status as outcome. 330 The multivariate model includes all three timespans. G) Violin plot of variant allele frequencies (VAF) 331 of CH clones in controls and HCT recipients. H) Scatterplot of VAF of largest CH clone per individual 332 versus HSC age. Linear regression is calculated for each cohort separately, excluding the outliers with 333 VAF >0.30 in the HCT Recipient cohort. P values in B-E and G are calculated using Wilcoxon rank-sum 334 test.

Abbreviations: HCT: hematopoietic cell transplantation; HSC: hematopoietic stem cell; CH: clonal
hematopoiesis.

337

Figure 3. Clinical factors associated with prevalence of CH. A) Forest plot showing the effect of clinical
 characteristics on CH prevalence of univariable and multivariable logistic regression models. Stem cell

340 source was corrected for donor age, CD34 dose was corrected for stem cell source and serotherapy 341 was corrected for relation to donor. B) CRP measurements around HCT in individuals with and without 342 CH. Lines indicate LOESS regression with 95% confidence interval. C) Box plots demonstrating the 343 highest CRP measured within 5-day intervals around graft infusion, split by serotherapy (yes/no) and 344 CH status. P values are calculated using Wilcoxon rank-sum test. D-E) Prevalence of CH in individuals 345 with and without viral reactivations, including CMV, EBV and adenovirus reactivation (D) and with and 346 without severe acute graft-versus-host disease (E). P values are calculated using Chi-squared test. 347 Abbreviations: CH: clonal hematopoiesis; CB: cord blood; BM: bone marrow; PBSC: peripheral blood 348 stem cells; MUD: matched unrelated donor; TBI: total body irradiation; aGvHD: acute graft-versus

349 *host-disease; HSC: hematopoietic stem cell; CRP: C-reactive protein; HCT: hematopoietic cell* 

350 transplantation; CMV: cytomegalovirus; EBV: Epstein-Barr virus; ADV: adenovirus.

















