

= Abstract =

Cadaveric Donor Renal Transplantation; Review of 39 Cases

Wonhyun Cho, M.D., Hyoungtae Kim, M.D., Changyong Sohn, M.D. Sinhyun Joo, R.N., Sungbae Park, M.D.1 and Hyunchul Kim, M.D.1

Departments of Surgery, IInternal Medicine and Transplant Office Keimyung University School of Medicine

To improve the graft survival in cadaveric donor renal transplantation, various factors that affect the results of allograft function has been analysed and reported. From January 1994 through December 1998, 39 cases of renal transplantation were performed using 20 cadaver donor. Thirty five of them were from brain dead donor and four from cardiac arrest donor. The most frequent cause of brain death was head injury by traffic accident, mostly autobicycle accident. Male donor ratio was 85.0% and their mean age were 29.3 years old. Mean cold ischemic time was 347.5 minutes and warm ischemic time of 4 cardiac arrest cases were 55 60 minutes. The number of HLA mismatch more than 4 were 64.1%. There were 8 cases of multiple renal arteries and 4 cases of double ureter. Donor hypotension during and before kidney procurement and warm ischemic time were factors that cause the delayed graft function in our cases. The number of HLA mismatch and use of Cellcept as immunosuppressant were two factors that affected the development of acute rejection during 6 months after renal allograft. Among the 39 kidneys of 20 donors, 12 paired kidneys showed different graft result in each recipient. Recipient age, number of HLA mismatch, cold ischemic time, duration of hemodialysis before transplantation, and level of hemoglobin were factors that cause the different result in paired kidney. One and two year graft survival rate were 89.6% and 76.5% respectively. In summary, the early results of our cadaver donor renal transplantation was comparable to living donor transplantation. Adequate donor management and HLA matching between donor and recipient are factors that can improve the graft result.

Key Words: Cadaveric renal transplantation, Delayed graft function, Cardiac arrest donor

가 가

가

가

가

marginal donor



pearson Chi-square

1) 18 가 20 , 2 . 15 가 , 가 17 (89.5%) 10 (42.1%) 20 (26.3%) . 67 . , 347.5 , 3 가 14 , 3 25 , (Table 1). 8 4 , 3 back table , 3 patch 2 가 3 . 1 , . 2) 39

.

Table 1. Demography of cadaveric donor(39 kidneys from 20 donors)

Causes of brain death				
CVA (4): Traffic accident (13): others (3)			
Age of donor (mean and range)	29.3 (18 67)			
Male sex ratio	85.0%			
Cold ischemic time (minutes)	347 ± 186			
HLA mismatching (A, B, DR)	0 3 14 kidneys			
	4 6 25 kidneys			
Anatomical anomaly				
Multiple renal artery	8 kidneys			
Patch graft	3 kidneys			
Reconstruction at back	table 3 kidneys			
Polar artery ligation	2 kidneys			
Double ureter	4 kidneys			
Made a single stoma	3 kidneys			
Separate anastomosis	1 kidney			



Table 2. Facto	or analysis	tor	delaved	graft	function
----------------	-------------	-----	---------	-------	----------

_

Hypotension	.038
WIT	.045
Donor age	.238
Recipient age	.717
Donor SCr	.751
HLA mismatch	.829
CIT	.839
Donor sex	.898
Use of MMF	.912

WIT: warm ischemic time, CIT: cold ischemic time MMF: mycophenolate mofetil

Table 3. Factor analysis for acute rejection

Use of MMF	.007
HLA mismatch	.017
Recipient age	.151
Hypotension	.231
Donor age	.509
Donor sex	.553
Donor SCr	.829
CIT	.837
WIT	.973



Table 4. Result of delayed graft function kidney

Resumed graft function	Kidneys
within 1 week	1
within 2 weeks	3
within 3 weeks	3
within 4 weeks	2
Never recovered	1
Total	10

Table 5. Factors affecting the fate of paired kidney

	R-age	HLAmm	CIT	HD	Hb	DRG*	MMF
Group 1	36.9	3.9	367	31.0	7.9	ND	11/20
Group 2**	30.9	4.6	334	33.2	7.1	ND	
Group 2a	27.8	4.3	316	26.6	7.4	ND	3/5
Group 2b	34.0	4.8	351	39.8	6.7	ND	3/5
Group 3	37.3	5.1	367	26.5	6.8	ND	0/4

*DRG: donor recipient gender difference, ND means no difference

**Group 1: both paired kidneys with good result (n=22)

Group 2: paired kidney with different result (n=12), 2a means kidney with good result and 2b poor result kidney Group 3: both paired kidneys with poor result (n=4)

82	:	13 1 19	99						
	2 3	. 4 2 (Table 4). 2 12		1997					
			,	176			가 10),	
,			(p < 0.05)		,	13	,	1996	61
(Table 5).						가		,	
5)							가		
				가 _					
19	1			7	ŀ,				가
가, 가	1					7	'F		
21			가			-	1		가
			·					20	
,	55 4	60	3 4			,			
		, 2	3 가				•		
									가
. 12	14	4 (Table 6).		80%					75
		(14010-0).		8070	10%			.5	7)
6)				가					.,
	1	33							
89.6%,	2		76.5%						가
(Table 7).						가			
				1.50/	가	•			
Table 6.	Transplantation	n from cardiac a	rrest donor	15%					
Cause of	death:					가			
Hea	d injury by tra	uffic accident (2 p	patients)						
Warm ischemic time: 55minutes (2 kidneys) 60 minutes (2 kidneys)							,		
	f renal function		2 Klulleys)						
	week of graft week of graft						patch		
		r post-transplant:							
1.2	1.6 mg/dl		<u> </u>			17.7%	,8)		
				39				9 (23.)	
Table 7. G	raft survival ra	te of cadaveric r	enal allograft			911)		가	•
	graft survival		6% (26/29)						가

1 Year graft survival	89.6% (26/29)
2 Year graft survival	76.5% (13/17)

가 .

5 : ; 39 1) 가 . .12 13) 가 가 가 patch . 가 8 patch

83

.

.

.

3 .

가 가 shared kidney local kidney . 6 가 가

가 가 가 4 가 .2,3) 가 가 . 15, 16) 가

가 가 . . 가

가 가 . 가 HLA-A, B, DR 6 3 , 4

.

가 가 14) . . 가 가 가 , PRA 가 가 .

> PRA 가 가 가 가 ,



 15%
 .20)
 ,
 ,
 ,

 15%
 .20)
 ,
 ,
 ,

 ,
 ,
 ,
 ,
 (DST),

 ,
 ,
 ,
 (donor specific BMT),

 ,
 ,
 .
 .
 (M

 ,
 preformed antibody
 type II),
 (FSGS), IgA

 ,
 .
 .
 MPGN, FSGS

가

(MPGN

 71
 1
 2

 89.6%, 76.5%
 .31)

1994 1 1998 12 39 . 20 . 4 71 64.1% . 71 64.1%

7 12 , , , , , 1 2 89.6% 76.5% . 5 : ; 39

REFERENCES

- Shapiro R, Vivas C, Scantlebury VP, et al: Suboptimal kidney donors-the experience with tacrolimus based immunosuppression. Transplantation 62: 1242-1246, 1996
- Greenstein SM, Schechner RS, Louis P, et al: Evidence that zero antigen matched cyclosporin-treated renal transplant recipients have graft survival equal to that of matched recipients. Transplantation 49: 332-336, 1990

 Kahan BD, Van Buren CT, Flechner SM, et al: Cyclosporine immunosuppression mitigates immunologic risk factors in renal allotransplantation. Transplant Proc 17: 1194-1195, 1985

11(2): 191-196, 1997

8) , , , , , , , ,

11(2), 253-262, 1997

- Reis RH, Esenther G: Variations in the pattern of renal vessels and their relation to the type of posterior vena cava in man. Am J Anat 104: 295, 1959
- Roza AM, Perloff LJ, Naji A, Grossman RA, Barker CF: Living-related donors with bilateral multiple renal arteries. Transplantation 47: 397-399, 1989
- Pollak R, Prusak BF, Mozes MF: Anatomic abnormalities of cadaver kidneys procured for purpose of transplantation. Am Surg 52: 233-235, 1986
- 12) , , : . 11: 81-93, 1997

13) , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,

- . 6: 75-82, 1992.
- 14) Takiff H: Donor factors. In: Terasaki PI. ed. Clinical Transplants 1989. Los Angeles, UCLA Tissue Typing Laboratory, pp417-424, 1990
- 15) Terasaki PI, Cecka JM, Gjertson DW, et al: A ten-year

85

prediction for kidney transpplant survival. In Terasaki PI, Cecka JM. eds. Clinical transplants 1992. Los Angeles, UCLA Tissue Typing Laboratory, pp501-508, 1993

- 16) Opelz G, Wujciak T, Mytillineous J, Scherere S: Revisiting HLA matching for kidney transplantation. Transplant Proc 25: 173-175, 1993
- 17) Cerilli J, Brasile I, Galouzis T, et al: The vascular endothelial cell antigen system. Transplantation 39: 286-289, 1985
- 18) Opelz G: The influence of ischemic times and HLA-DR matching on cyclosporine-treated cadaver kidney grafts. Transplant Proc 17: 1478-1482, 1985
- Belzer FO: Perfusion preservation versus cold storage. Transplant Proc 17: 1515-1517, 1985
- 20) Shapiro R, et al: The superiority of tacrolimus in renal transplant recilients-the Pittsburgh experience. In: Terasaki PL(ed), Clinical Transplants 1995, Los Angeles, UCLA Tissue Typing Laboratory, pp199-205, 1996
- Toledo-Pereyra LH, Kaplan MP, et al: Relation between multiple organ procurement and postoperation ATN. Transplant Proc 20: 839-840, 1988
- 22) Vaughn WK, Peters TG, Spees EK: Multiple organ procurement is not detrimental to cadaveric kidney allograft function and survival. Transplant Proc 20: 835-838, 1988
- 23) Cecka JM, Young WC, Terasaki PI: Analyses of the UNOS scientific renal transplant registry at three years: early events affecting transplant success. Trans-

plantation 53: 59-64, 1992

- 24) Koyama H, Cecka JM: Rejection episodes. In:Terasaki PI. ed, Clinical Transplants 1992. Los Angeles, UCLA Tissue Typing Laboratory, pp391-395, 1993
- 25) Gulanikar AC, MacDonald AS, Sungurtekin U, Belitsky P: The incidence and impact of early rejection episodes on grafft outcome in recipients of first cadaver kidney transplantation. Transplantation 53: 323-328, 1992
- 26) Cho WH, Park CH, Lee SH, Park SB, Kim HC: Acute rejection after living donor renal transplantation. Transplant Proc 26: 1995-1996, 1994
- 27) Tejani A, Stablein DH: Recurrence of focal segmental glomerulosclerosis post-transplantation. J Am Soc Nephrol 2(suppl 3): S258-S263, 1992
- 28) Glicklich D, Mata AJ, Sablay LB et al: Recurrent membranoproliferative glomerulonephritis type I in successive renal transplants. Am J Nephrol 7: 143-149, 1987
- 29) Oberkircher OR, Enama M, West JC, et al: Regression of recurrent membranoproliferative glomerulonephritis type II in a transplanted kidney after plasmapheresis therapy. Transplant Proc 20: 418-423, 1988
- 30) . , , : IgA . 1999
- 31) Cho YW, Terasaki PI, Graver B: Fifteen-year kidney graft survival.. In: Terasaki PI. ed. Clinical Transplants 1989. Los Angeles, UCLA Tissue Typing Laboratory, pp325-334, 1990