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a more restrictive pattern. The prevalence of CLAD did not change after COVID-19 infection. Further follow-up is required to obtain more detailed information about CLAD.

Table 1 Transplant function pre- and post-COVID-19 infection

| Number of patients | Pre-COVID | 3 months post-COVID | 6 months post-COVID | p-value |
|--------------------|-----------|---------------------|---------------------|---------|
| FEV1, L            | 2.62 ± 0.80 | 2.49 ± 0.86 | 2.51 ± 0.75 | 0.077 |
| P/VC               | 3.68 ± 1.06 | 3.44 ± 1.17 | 3.52 ± 1.00 | 0.033 |
| FEV1/FVC ratio     | 0.72 ± 0.13 | 0.73 ± 0.15 | 0.82 ± 0.076 | 0.876 |
| CLAD, n (%)        | 22 (37)    | 13 (23) |          |         |

Continuous variables are expressed as mean and standard deviation; CLAD = chronic lung allograft dysfunction.
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SARS-CoV-2 Vaccine Response in Lung Transplant Recipients: A French Multicenter Study
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Purpose: Many scientific societies recommend SARS-CoV-2-specific immune responses are diminished in lung transplant recipients (LTR), probably due to immunosuppression (IS). There is currently no marker of IS that can be used to predict vaccination responses. Here, we study if torque tenovirus (TTV) can be used as a predictive marker.

Methods: The humoral response to the mRNA-1273 vaccine was assessed in 103 LTR, who were vaccinated 4 to 237 months after Lung transplantation. Spike (S)-specific IgG levels were measured at baseline, 28 days after the second vaccination. TTV loads at baseline correlated late serological responses to TTV load. Conclusion: This study shows an association between baseline TTV load and mRNA-1273-induced S-specific antibodies. If the TTV load is indeed a predictor of vaccination responses, this can be used in the future as a potential guidance for optimizing vaccination regimens. Therefore, we recommend that TTV load measurements are included in further vaccination efficacy studies in immunocompromised cohorts.
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Purpose: Although the currently approved COVID-19 vaccines are highly effective, SARS-CoV-2-specific immune responses are diminished in lung transplant recipients (LTR), probably due to immunosuppression (IS). Here, we will seek to identify risk factors for a poor antibody response.
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Purpose: Solid organ transplant recipients are lacking an adequate immune response to SARS-CoV-2 vaccination. Therefore, these patients are still at risk and potentially in need of booster vaccinations. Furthermore, it is important to differentiate between the recipients of distinct organs. The efficacy of SARS-CoV-2 vaccination is usually examined via antibodies specific for the spike protein with assays containing the S1 and receptor-binding-domains (RBD) and rather rarely the S2 domain. To gain information about the humoral response in Tx recipients, it is feasible to compare the immunogenicity of these three domains. To address this, we compared the IgG antibody levels specific for the three spike protein domains in heart (HTx) vs lung (LTx) transplant recipients.

Methods: Blood plasma 4-6 weeks after the second dose of SARS-CoV-2 vaccination (85% mRNA) of n=100 LTx and n=40 HTx patients was analysed for S1, S2 and RBD-specific IgG antibodies by Luminex-based multiplex assays. The threshold for positive antibody responses was set separately for each spike domain based on the median MFI + 2σ in an unexposed pre-pandemic control group.

Results: For all three spike protein domains, HTx patients showed a significantly higher rate of positive IgG responses than the LTx patients (73% vs 43%). The comparison of MFI values for S1-, S2- and RBD-specific IgG further underlines the superior antibody response by HTx patients with higher MFI values for S1 (p = 0.0001), S2 p = 0.008, RBD p &lt; 0.0001). In the LTx cohort, MFI values for S2- (p &lt; 0.0001) as well as for RBD-specific IgG (p &lt; 0.0001) were higher than for S1. The same applies for S2 vs S1 (p &lt; 0.0001) and RBD vs S1 (p = 0.0018) in the HTx cohort. Comparing the MFI of S2 vs RBD, the levels of domain-specific IgG were higher for S2 than RBD in both LTx (p &lt; 0.0001) and HTx patients (p = 0.0914).

Conclusion: HTx patients exhibit a moderately good IgG response to vaccination while LTx recipients show lower antibody responses. Based on the more efficient antibody production against S2 as opposed to the RBD and especially S1-domain, the S2-specific IgG response should be taken into consideration when evaluating the general immune response and the resulting protection after SARS-CoV-2 vaccination in transplant recipients. Both groups of patients might benefit from booster vaccinations.
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Purpose: The development of de novo donor-specific anti-HLA antibodies (DSA) is associated with worse outcomes in lung transplant recipients (LTXR). The purpose of this study is to evaluate IVIG monotherapy for de novo DSA in the absence of allograft dysfunction or clinical antibody-mediated rejection (AMR).

Methods: Adult LTXR between 2/2013 and 3/2021 treated with IVIG monotherapy for de novo DSA with no evidence of AMR were included. IVIG was initiated at 2g/kg followed by 1g/kg monthly for a minimum of 3 months or until clearance (up to 6 months). HLA Ab is routinely checked by Luminex SAB post-transplant at day 14, months 1, 3, 6, 9, 12, and 18, and monthly during IVIG treatment. Primary outcome was change in DSA after IVIG therapy. DSA clearance was defined as sum MFI less than 1000.

Results: 32 LTXR developed de novo DSA at a median of 33 days (18,143) post-transplant and were treated with IVIG. Mean follow-up time was 1330 days (861-1910). The median sum MFI for DSA at baseline was 4782 (2927,7490). DQ was the immunodominant DSA in 24 (75%) and only 2 (6%) patients had isolated class I DSA. MFI of sum DSA decreased by a median of 2993 (2051, 6358) after IVIG therapy; p &lt; 0.0001. Eighteen (56%) cleared de novo DSA (Group 1) versus 14 (44%) did not clear (Group 2) at the end of IVIG therapy. There was no significant difference in age, gender, race, transplant indication or type, cPRA, HLA mismatch, or PGD. ACR and AMR tended to be more frequent in Group 2: ACR: 92.9% vs 61.1%, p=0.053; and AMR: 35.7% vs 5.6%, p=0.063. Overall survival for the entire cohort at 1, 3 and 5 years was 100%, 86%, and 60%, respectively.

Conclusion: In LTXR, IVIG monotherapy is associated with significant reduction in de novo DSA. DSA clearance may result in less acute rejection. Randomized controlled trials are needed to determine the optimal strategy for managing de novo DSA.

| Variable | Total Cohort (n=32) | Group 1: DSA Cleared (n=18) | Group 2: DSA Not Cleared (n=14) | p-value |
|----------|-------------------|-----------------------------|---------------------------------|---------|
| Time from transplant to DSA development, days | 33 (16, 143) | 32 (19, 36) | 105 (36, 362) | 0.021 |
| DSA sum MFI, start | 4782 (2927,7490) | 3832 (3055, 6148) | 5461 (3060, 7790) | 0.119 |
| DSA sum MFI change | 2903 (1058, 2051) | 3832 (3055, 6148) | 2576 (1375, 2955) | &lt;0.0001 |
| Immunodominant DSA MFI, start | 3512 (2575,6081) | 3219 (2595, 4469) | 4508 (2675, 9550) | 0.224 |
| Immunodominant DSA MFI change | -1849 (-4439,-1164) | -3239 (-4489,-2396) | -1723 (-2348,-295) | &lt;0.0001 |
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Purpose: De novo donor-specific antibodies (DSA) increase the risk of chronic lung allograft dysfunction (CLAD) in lung transplant recipients (LTRs). Both carfilzomib (CFZ) and rituximab (RTX) lower the mean
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Purpose: De novo donor-specific antibodies (DSA) increase the risk of chronic lung allograft dysfunction (CLAD) in lung transplant recipients (LTRs). Both carfilzomib (CFZ) and rituximab (RTX) lower the mean