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Chronic liver disease is the eighth leading cause of death in the United States. The most common causes of this disease include hepatitis C virus (HCV), alcohol, nonalcoholic fatty liver disease, and hepatitis B virus. Liver transplantation is the only treatment remaining for many patients with end-stage liver disease. There are currently more than 17,000 patients waiting for a liver transplant, but only 6,168 transplantation procedures were performed in 2004.

**INDICATIONS**

Liver transplantation is indicated in patients with (a) debilitating or life-threatening complications of liver disease, or (b) early-stage hepatocellular carcinoma when surgical resection is not an option because of concomitant liver disease or tumor location. The specific disease indications include noncholestatic cirrhosis (e.g., alcoholic liver disease), chronic active hepatitis (B, C, or autoimmune), cryptogenic, nonalcoholic steatohepatitis, cholestatic liver disease/cirrhosis (e.g., primary biliary cirrhosis, primary sclerosing cholangitis, Caroli disease, and biliary atresia); fulminant liver failure (e.g., acetaminophen overdose, hepatitis, ischemia, idiosyncratic drug toxicity); metabolic diseases (e.g., α1-antitrypsin deficiency, Crigler-Najjar disease, type I, Byler disease, glycogen storage disease, types I and IV, Wilson disease, hemochromatosis, tyrosinemia, ornithine transcarbamylase deficiency, and galactosemia); malignant neoplasms (e.g., hepatoblastoma, hemangioendothelioma, angiosarcoma, hepatocellular carcinoma); and other disease-induced liver diseases, such as Budd-Chiari syndrome, benign neoplasms, and total parental nutrition (Table 1).

**CONTRAINDICATIONS**

The contraindications to liver transplantation have decreased as our ability to perform transplants successfully has improved for patients who are more sicker and more complex. Absolute contraindications include advanced uncorrectable cardiac or pulmonary disease, severe irreversible pulmonary hypertension (>50 mm Hg), irreversible neurologic impairment, uncontrolled sepsis, and extrahepatic malignancy (with the exception of skin cancer and some neuroendocrine tumors). Protocols exist for a number of diseases that were previously thought to be absolute contraindications for transplantation. These diseases include human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), infection, advanced hepatocellular carcinoma, and cholangiocarcinoma (Table 2). There is currently a National Institutes of Health-sponsored trial of kidney and liver transplantation in selected HIV-positive patients.

**TIMING**

Prior to February 2002, allocation of deceased donor livers was heavily influenced by wait times of the intended recipient. In February 2002, the Model for End-stage Liver Disease (MELD) system was implemented by the United Network for Organ Sharing and de-emphasized waiting time and allocated deceased donor livers on the basis of severity of recipient disease. The MELD scoring system uses three objective laboratory values (serum creatinine, serum bilirubin, and international normalized ratio [INR]) that are entered into the regression equation to determine an individual's MELD score (range, 6 to 40):

MELD score = 9.57 × log Creatinine (mg/dL) + 3.78 × log Bilirubin (mg/dL) + log INR + 6.43 (disease constant)

This model was originally described to predict 3-month mortality rates in cirrhotic patients undergoing transjugular intrahepatic portal systemic shunts, but several studies have also shown that the MELD score predicts the risk of dying for patients awaiting liver transplantation. United Network for Organ Sharing allocates deceased donor livers first to status 1 patients and then patients according to their MELD score. A Pediatric End-Stage Liver Disease (PELD) system for pediatric patients has also been implemented that incorporates age, bilirubin, height/weight, INR, and bilirubin. Recent data suggest that mortality rates for patients with a MELD score of 15 to 17 are equivalent with or without transplant, mortality rates are less with transplant for patients with MELD scores of more than 17, and mortality rates for patients with MELD scores of less than 15 are lower on the waiting list compared with transplant.

Patients with hepatocellular carcinoma meeting the United Network for Organ Sharing listing criteria (single tumor, <5 cm; two or three tumors, the largest of which is <3.0 cm) are initially assigned a MELD score of 22 (equal to a 3-month mortality rate of 15%) and are given additional points equivalent to a 10% mortality until they receive a transplant. This policy was instituted in order to facilitate transplantation for patients with hepatocellular carcinoma before their tumors were too large or had metastasized, thereby precluding successful transplantation.

**PREOPERATIVE EVALUATION**

Potential liver transplant recipients undergo an evaluation that begins with a history, physical examination, routine laboratory studies, chest radiograph, and electrocardiogram. All patients require hepatitis serology (A, B, and C), viral serology (herpes simplex virus, cytomegalovirus, Epstein-Barr virus, HIV, and varicella-zoster virus), infectious serology (rapid plasma reagin, toxoplasmosis, and rubella), a-fetoprotein, carbohydrate antigen 19-9 (in patients with suspected cholangiocarcinoma or sclerosing cholangitis), computerized axial tomography (CAT) or magnetic resonance imaging of the abdomen (for vessel patency, liver volume, and to rule out hepatic tumors) with computerized reconstructions of the vasculature, upper gastrointestinal endoscopy, dental evaluation, Pap smear, mammogram (in women older than 40 years), and prostate-specific antigen (in men older than 40 years). Other studies that are obtained less frequently, depending on the patient's history and disease, include pulmonary function tests, colonoscopy (in patients older than 50 years), echocardiogram, dipyr-
diate stress thallium study, cardiac catheterization with coronary angiography, and psychiatric evaluation (for any patient with a history of substance abuse, alcohol abuse, or psychiatric illness). Appropriate consultations from cardiology, pulmonary disease, neurology, and infectious disease specialists are obtained as needed.

**TREATMENT OF PATIENTS WITH LIVER FAILURE**

**Acute Liver Failure**

Patients with acute fulminant hepatic failure or decompensation of chronic liver disease require urgent inpatient evaluation and consideration of listing for liver transplantation. The principles of management of patients with acute fulminant hepatic failure include (a) protection against and treatment of cerebral edema; (b) maintenance of other organ system function (e.g., cardiovascular, respiratory, and renal); (c) protection against complications of coagulopathy; (d) prevention of sepsis; and (e) prevention of hypoglycemia. Patients in stage III or IV coma are intubated when there is concern regarding respiratory insufficiency or as a risk of aspiration.

All patients undergo placement of a Swan-Ganz catheter, an arterial line, and a Foley catheter for appropriate fluid management. A CT scan of the head is obtained. The patient’s coagulopathy is corrected (INR, <1.5) and factor VII administration is particularly effective. An epidural, intraparenchymal, or subdural intracranial pressure monitor is placed to monitor intracranial pressure and cerebral perfusion pressure. Cerebral edema is managed by the use of hyperventilation, intravenous mannitol, and fluid restriction, maintaining the serum osmolality at approximately 325 mOsm/dL. The patient’s coagulopathy is closely monitored and treated as needed with fresh-frozen plasma, cryoprecipitate, factor VIII, and platelets. If the patient requires large amounts of blood products, diuretics are administered as necessary to avoid cerebral edema. Patients are treated with prophylactic antibiotics to prevent sepsis. Patients undergo very close neurologic monitoring and are aggressively treated for any evidence of an increase in intracranial pressure or a decrease in cerebral perfusion pressure (<60 mm Hg).

**Chronic Liver Failure**

The principles of managing patients with chronic liver failure require treating the manifestations of portal hypertension, including controlling ascites, prevention of infection and bleeding, treating hepatic encephalopathy, maintaining adequate nutrition, and symptomatic relief. For patients with hepatocellular carcinoma, local control with radiofrequency ablation or chemoembolization is important to prevent disease progression while they are waiting for transplantation. These individuals are followed closely with CT or magnetic resonance imaging at 3-month intervals to ensure that disease does not progress beyond established criteria.

**INTRAOPERATIVE MANAGEMENT**

Because patients undergo induction of general anesthesia, often with a full stomach, a rapid-sequence induction with cricoid pressure is used for intubation. Monitoring and infusion lines, nasogastric tube, and Foley catheter are placed, and continuous electrocardiography, pulse oximetry, capnography, and core temperature monitoring are performed. Transesophageal echocardiographic monitoring in individuals with pre-existing cardiac disease or in those with evidence of pretransplant pulmonary hypertension should be used. Intraoperatively, close monitoring of arterial blood pressure, central venous and pulmonary artery pressures, cardiac output, systemic vascular resistance, stroke volume, and urine output is critical during the recipient hepatectomy, when blood loss can be significant. Laboratory studies, including hemoglobin/hematocrit, platelet count, electrolytes, ionized calcium, prothrombin time, partial thromboplastin time, and INR, factor and fibrinogen levels, fibrin degradation products, and arterial blood gases, are measured at least hourly.

There are several major events that occur intraoperatively during liver transplantation that require attention. During the recipient hepatectomy, it is critical to replace ongoing blood loss carefully and to maintain normal fluid, electrolyte, and coagulation homeostasis. Overly rapid correction of coagulation abnormalities, however, may lead to intraoperative thrombosis, including pulmonary embolus, and right heart failure. During the anhepatic phase, careful attention to hemodynamic changes, electrolyte abnormalities, and coagulation abnormalities is important, and appropriate measures to correct any deviations from normal are taken as necessary. Before unclamping the liver, additional calcium, sodium bicarbonate, and fluid or blood products are administered. After
the liver is unclamped, there can be a brief period of hyperkalemia, hypocalcemia, metabolic acidosis, depressed cardiac output and hypotension, pulmonary hypertension and right ventricular dysfunction, and fibrinolysis that requires careful correction. Once the patient is stabilized and all bleeding is controlled, overcorrection of minor abnormalities in the INR or platelet count should be avoided to minimize the risk of subsequent intravascular, hepatic artery, or portal vein thrombosis.

**DECEASED DONOR SELECTION**

Donor selection and liver procurement are critical to prevent primary nonfunction or delayed primary function of the transplanted liver, and to prevent disease transmission. Donor factors that must be considered include ABO and size compatibility, age, cause of death, hemodynamic stability, other medical conditions, social history, laboratory values, and viral serology. Primary nonfunction occurs in 5% to 10% of transplants and requires urgent retransplantation. Donor risk factors for primary nonfunction include advanced age (>60 years), macrovesicular steatosis (>30%), prolonged cold and warm ischemia, hypotension and vasopressor use, and the use of donors after cardiac death. Donors with one or more of these factors have been termed expanded criteria donors and, in the past, livers from these donors have been discarded. Because of the marked increase in the number of patients on the waiting list, many centers have expanded their use of these donors. In most instances, the presence of one factor alone will not have an impact on posttransplant organ function, but the presence of multiple factors may lead to initial poor function or primary nonfunction and must be considered. In addition to donor factors, recipient factors also can contribute to initial poor function or primary nonfunction.

HCV remains the most frequent indication for liver transplantation in this country and, because of the universal recurrence of the virus after transplant, HCV-positive donors have been used in HCV-positive recipients with equivalent patient and graft survival rates compared with HCV-negative donors. The use of steatotic livers and livers from older donors has been shown to increase the rate and progression of recurrent HCV after transplant and should be avoided.

**Surgical Technique**

**DECEASED DONOR HEPATECTOMY**

**Standard Technique**

A midline incision is made from the suprasternal notch to the symphysis pubis (Fig 1). This includes a sternotomy. In obese patients, a transverse abdominal incision at the level of the umbilicus can facilitate exposure. The abdomen is thoroughly examined to exclude any unsuspected infections, malignancies, or other disease processes that would preclude organ retrieval. The dissection can proceed in one of several ways, depending on the surgeon's preference. In the standard technique, most of the dissection is performed “warm,” while the heart is still beating. It is important to gain early control of both the supraceliac (Fig 2) and infrarenal aorta in case the donor becomes unstable; this allows for rapid cannulation and aortic cross-clamping should the need arise. The right-sided peritoneal reflection is incised and the cecum, ascending colon, and small bowel mesentery are mobilized toward the left. The aorta can now be dissected and looped just proximal to its bifurcation. Next, the supraceliac aorta is controlled; the left coronary and triangular ligaments are incised and the left lobe of the liver is retracted toward the right. The peritoneum overlying the gastroesophageal junction is divided and the esophagus is retracted toward the left. The diaphragmatic crura can then be divided to expose the supraceliac aorta, which is looped.

The dissection then continues in the gastrohepatic ligament. A replaced left hepatic artery arising from the left gastric artery occurs in approximately 17% of donors, usually passes through the superior portion of the gastrohepatic ligament to the liver, and must be carefully preserved by tracing it to its junction with the left gastric artery. The left gastric artery is then traced to its origin at the celiac trunk, identifying and ligating any arterial branches to the stomach. The dissection then continues in the hepatoduodenal ligament. The tissue of the hepatoduodenal ligament is incised close to the duodenum, the common bile duct is identified inferiorly, and the proper hepatic artery is identified at the superior aspect of the porta hepatis. The proper hepatic artery is dissected free and followed proximally along the superior border of the pancreas, and the gastroduodenal and right hepatic arteries are ligated. The splenic artery is identified and preserved if the pancreas is being retrieved and ligated, and divided if it is not. The common

---

**Fig. 1.** Incision for deceased donor operation from the suprasternal notch (A) (B) to the pubic bone and which can be "cruciated" if required.
The hepatic artery is then freed to the level of the celiac axis. The tissue between the hepatic artery and common bile duct overlying the portal vein is incised, and the anterior surface of the portal vein is exposed. The portal vein is mobilized and isolated. A replaced right hepatic artery, arising from the superior mesenteric artery, occurs in 19% of donors. It is located lateral and deep to the common bile duct and is traced to its origin with the superior mesenteric artery. In most cases, the replaced right hepatic artery can be separated from the head of the pancreas, allowing preservation of the pancreas for transplant if necessary. The proximal part of the superior mesenteric artery trunk is kept with the replaced right hepatic artery, and the distal part of the superior mesenteric artery is preserved with the pancreas. The portal vein is separated from the common bile duct, which is then incised distal to the entry of the cystic duct while preserving the periportal tissue, which contains its blood supply, ligating the left gastric (coronary) vein along its superior aspect, and ligating the pancreaticoduodenal vein branch that is usually on the anterior or inferior aspect of the portal vein. The common bile duct is then ligated distally, adjacent to the pancreas, and divided. An incision is made in the fundus of the gallbladder, and the biliary tree is irrigated with cold saline. This prevents necrosis of the biliary tract mucosa, which is caused by bile remaining in contact with the mucosa during cold storage.

Next, a site is selected for placement of the portal infusion catheter. This can be placed either directly into the portal vein itself, into the superior mesenteric vein, or into the inferior mesenteric vein. The superior mesenteric vein can be easily isolated at the root of the small bowel mesentery. The inferior mesenteric vein can be found just to the left of the ligament of Trietz. The infrahepatic vena cava is mobilized above the level of the renal veins. If easily visualized, the right adrenal vein can be ligated and divided at this time. Any remaining ligamentous attachments to the right lobe of the liver are then divided.

The patient is then systemically heparinized with 30,000 units, intravenously, and the distal aorta is ligated with an umbilical tape. The aorta is compressed against the vertebral column by the assistant, an aortotomy is made, and a perfusion catheter is inserted into the portal vein and secured with an umbilical tape. A No. 10-14 French catheter is inserted into the portal system, either through the inferior mesenteric vein, superior mesenteric vein, or directly into the portal vein. The suprahepatic aorta is cross-clamped and the vena cava is vented in the right chest by incising the inferior vena cava-right atrium junction. Alternatively, the venting may take place through a cannula placed in the distal vena cava. Surface cooling of the liver, pancreas, and kidneys is achieved by placing cold slush solution in the abdomen.

Usually, 3 L (500 to 1,000 mL in children) of University of Wisconsin (UW) preservation solution is infused into the aorta, and 2 L (100 to 250 mL in children) are infused into the portal vein during a period of approximately 10 minutes (Fig. 3). The liver edges should be carefully observed for signs of overperfusion, manifested by a liver that is tense to palpation and rounded at the edges.

The liver is excised by dividing the aorta proximal to the celiac axis and distal to either the celiac axis or superior mesenteric artery, depending on whether a replaced right hepatic artery is present. If the pancreas is being removed, then the portal vein is divided to provide an adequate length of vein for the liver and for the pancreas. The inferior vena cava is divided proximal to the renal veins. The suprahepatic vena cava will have been divided above the diaphragm by the cardiac surgeon. The diaphragm is divided around the suprahepatic vena cava, and the liver is taken to the back table and placed in cold UW solution. An additional 250 to 500 mL of UW solution is infused into the hepatic artery, 500 to 750 mL is infused into the portal vein, and a small amount into the common bile duct. The effluent from the hepatic veins should be clear. The liver is then packaged in UW solution for transport. The iliac veins and arteries are excised and stored in cold UW in the event that vascular reconstruction is required in the recipient.

Before transplantation into the recipient, the deceased donor liver must be prepared on the back table. The diaphragm left on the liver is dissected free, and the suprahepatic vena cava is isolated. The three phrenic veins entering the suprahepatic vena cava must be identified, and must be suture-ligated to prevent bleeding after unclamping. The infrahepatic vena cava is cleaned of its attachments, the right adrenal
vein is ligated, and any other small branches that were divided during retrieval are ligated. If the transplant is being performed as a piggyback the infrahepatic vena cava must be stapled with a vascular stapler or oversewn. The portal vein and hepatic artery are isolated, and the gallbladder is removed after ligation of the cystic artery and duct. UW solution is infused into the hepatic artery, portal vein, and vena cava to check for leaks. A portal vein cannula is secure in the portal vein for portal vein infusion during performance of the suprahepatic vena cava anastomosis.

Rapid Flush Technique

The “rapid flush” technique minimizes the amount of dissection before flushing with preservation solution. Although some surgeons use this technique or a variant routinely, it is most applicable in an unstable donor, from whom the expeditious removal of the liver is necessary, or in donors after cardiac death. The key steps involve division of the gastrohepatic ligament and isolation and preservation of a right or left hepatic artery, if present; incision and irrigation of the gallbladder; placement of a portal perfusion cannula in the inferior mesenteric vein; placement of an aortic perfusion cannula in the distal aorta; and isolation of the suprahepatic aorta for cross-clamping. The proximal aorta is clamped, and infusion of cold UW through the portal cannula and aortic catheter is begun. The liver, and often the pancreas, are then removed in a bloodless field. The common bile duct is divided. The right gastric artery and gastro-duodenal artery are ligated on the side going to the liver, and divided. The left gastric artery and splenic artery are divided. The portal vein is dissected back to the junction of the splenic vein and superior mesenteric vein, which are divided once the portal flush has been completed. A patch of aorta incorporating the celiac axis is incised. The infrahepatic vena cava is divided just above the renal veins. The remaining peritoneal and diaphragmatic attachments are divided, and the liver and pancreas are removed en bloc and taken to the back table, where they are flushed as previously described. The liver and pancreas are then separated on the back table.

Donors after Cardiac Death

Liver transplantation using livers from donors after cardiac death or nonheart-beating donors is being performed more frequently. Withdrawal of support usually takes place in an intensive care unit setting or in the operating room after consent is obtained. After withdrawal of life support, if the potential donor does not proceed to asystole within 1 hour, the procedure is usually abandoned. Incision is made only after 5 minutes of confirmed asystole and declaration of death by the patient’s physi- cian. A standard midline incision is made and the abdominal cavity is immediately packed with cold slush solution. The distal aorta is quickly cannulated with a large-bore cannula and perfusion begun with UW solution. It is usually easiest to vent through the distal vena cava. The suprahepatic aorta is then cross-clamped. The organs and abdominal contents are carefully inspected during the flushing procedure. On completion of flushing, the procurement can then proceed using one of the techniques already described. This technique has not achieved widespread acceptance because of the logistics of retrieving organs from donors after cardiac death, concerns about long warm ischemia times leading to an increased risk of primary nonfunction, and bile necrosis. With greater experience, however, donors after cardiac death could be an important source of viable livers, increasing the donor pool by 5% to 10%.

In Situ Splitting

A deceased donor liver may be split along anatomic planes allowing transplantation into two separate recipients.

Adult/Pediatric Split

In this technique, a left lateral segment graft is split from the main liver for use in a pediatric recipient, similar to a living donor left lateral segmentectomy (discussed later in this chapter and in Figure 6). The operation follows the principles of segmental liver anatomy as described by Couinaud. The split may be performed in situ or ex situ. Although in situ splitting is more time-consuming and requires careful coordination with the other procurement teams, it results in less biliary complications, less bleeding from the cut surface of the liver, and less risk of warm ischemic injury to the liver as it avoids back table manipulation of the allograft.

Standard principles of liver procurement are initially followed. The suprahepatic vena cava is exposed and the left hepatic vein is identified. The left hepatic vein is isolated separately from the middle hepatic vein. If there is a long common
trunk, the left hepatic vein may be isolated during subsequent hepatic parenchymal transection. Dissection is then continued in the left hepatic hilum. This is best identified by following the umbilical ligament into the umbilical fissure. The left portal venous branches to segment 4 of the liver may be transected and ligated at this point. The left hepatic artery is also dissected. The segment 4 arterial branch is identified and preserved. Transection of the hepatic artery must be at a point distal to the origin of the segment 4 branch. Anatomic variations may be encountered and are dealt with accordingly. For example, a replaced left hepatic artery may be present, and this is kept with the lateral segment graft. Hepatic transection then begins in a plane just toward the right of the falciform ligament. Once parenchymal transection is complete, the vascular structures are left intact for the time being. The aorta is cross-clamped and flushing proceeds in the standard fashion. The liver is then removed and the final separation takes place on the back table.

There are several variations in the splitting of the vascularity. Typically, the main portal vein is kept with the right-sided graft because of the longer portal vein (Figs. 4 and 5). The celiac trunk, proper hepatic artery, and left hepatic artery are kept with the left-sided graft. This allows preservation of the segment 4 artery with the left-sided graft. The common bile duct is usually kept with the right-sided graft, with the division taking place at the left hepatic duct just beyond the bifurcation. The vena cava can be kept with either side (Figs. 4 and 5). Maintaining the cava with the right graft allows small and large hepatic veins draining the right to be kept intact (Fig. 5). The final result is a rightsided graft consisting of segments 5, 6, 7, and 8, and a left-sided graft consisting of segments 4, 3, and 2. Part of the caudate lobe may go to each side, depending on where the cava is preserved. Vascular structures may require reconstruction on the back table prior to implantation.

**LIVING DONOR HEPATECTOMY**

**Left Lateral Segmentectomy**

The left hepatic artery, left portal vein, and left hepatic duct are isolated far to the left of the porta hepatis at the base of the falciform ligament (Fig. 6). A segment 4 branch arising from the left hepatic artery is identified and preserved on the donor side. Similarly, any obvious portal venous branches supplying segment 4 should also be preserved. The left lateral segment hepatic vein is also identified and looped. Parenchymal transection takes place in a plane just to the right of the falciform ligament. The vessels are divided after systemic heparinization and the liver is flushed on the back table with cold UW solution. If necessary, a segment of recipient saphenous
vein may be used to lengthen the hepatic artery. Portal vein grafts are avoided if possible.

**Right Donor Hepatectomy**

Dissection begins in the hepatoduodenal ligament (Fig. 7). The proper hepatic artery and its left and right bifurcation are identified. Occasionally, a segment 4 hepatic artery may arise from the right hepatic artery; this should be identified and preserved on the donor side. The gallbladder is excised and an intraoperative cholangiogram is obtained through the stump of the cystic duct. It is of paramount importance to carefully delineate biliary anatomy as anatomic variations are common. If there is an early division of the right hepatic duct into anterior and posterior sectoral branches, it may not be possible to obtain a single duct, and two separate biliary anastomoses will have to be performed in the recipient. After cholangiography, the common bile duct is circumferentially dissected and the left and right hepatic ducts are exposed. This usually involves taking down the hilar plate. The portal vein and its left and right divisions can be exposed by retracting the freed hepatic artery toward the left side. Next, the right hepatic vein is identified and controlled. The right lobe of the liver is completely mobilized. The hepatocaval ligament is divided and small venous branches from the caudate lobe are ligated. Intraoperative ultrasound is particularly helpful in identifying the course of the middle hepatic vein, which guides parenchymal transection. Parenchymal transection is usually performed in a plane just toward the right of the middle hepatic vein. However, others prefer to transect the liver just to the left of the middle hepatic vein, keeping that structure with the graft.

On completion of parenchymal transection, the vessels are divided and the liver is flushed on the back table with cold UW solution. The liver is carefully inspected. Large segmental veins (draining segment 5 or 8) may require separate implantation, either directly into the recipient's vena cava or via a saphenous vein graft. Early bifurcation of the right portal vein may result in two separate portal venous branches. These can sometimes be spatulated together or, if this is not possible, reconstructed using a Y graft taken from explanted recipient portal vein.

**RECIPIENT HEPATECTOMY**

In this procedure, a bilateral subcostal skin incision with a midline extension to the xiphoid process is made (Fig. 8). The falciiform ligament is divided cephalad until the anterior surface of the suprahepatic vena cava is identified. The left lobe of the liver is mobilized by dividing the left triangular and coronary ligaments and the gastrohepatic ligament. The hilar dissection begins by dividing the cystic duct and cystic artery. The left and right hepatic arteries are located along the superior border of the hilum and divided close to the liver to provide adequate length for a branch-patch anastomosis to the donor hepatic artery. The hepatic arteries are then dissected free proximally to the bifurcation, and a length of the common hepatic artery is cleared sufficiently to allow a clamp to be placed later. In some cases, neither the right and left hepatic arteries nor the common hepatic artery is suitable for anastomosis, and further dissection to or beyond the takeoff of the gastro-duodenal artery may be necessary.

The tissue posterior to the hepatic artery is then divided, exposing the anterior aspect of the portal vein, which is mobilized distally to its bifurcation and proximally to the head of the pancreas. The
To remove the liver once the patient is on venovenous bypass support, the infrahepatic vena cava and suprahepatic vena cava are clamped and the liver is removed. If the retrohepatic vena cava has not been isolated, the vena cava is incised anteriorly, leaving the posterior wall of the vena cava intact. Suture ligation of back-bleeding lumbar veins and the right adrenal vein is then accomplished.

VENOVENOUS BYPASS

The primary advantage of venovenous bypass is the maintenance of venous return and splanchic venous drainage during the anhepatic phase, with improved hemodynamic stability and a reduction in mesenteric edema. Other benefits include improved renal perfusion as a consequence of lowered renal venous hypertension and the provision of additional time to obtain hemostasis in the retroperitoneum for placement of vascular grafts, when necessary, and for performance of the vascular anastomoses. Venovenous bypass can be performed by the percutaneous placement of heparin-bonded cannulae into the subclavian and femoral veins. The portal vein is cannulated with a Gott shunt and the portal, femoral, and subclavian lines are connected to the Biomedicus pump (Fig. 9).

DECEASED DONOR LIVER TRANSPLANT

Orthotopic Technique

The suprahepatic vena caval anastomosis is performed first as an end-to-end anastomosis (Fig. 10). The donor infrahepatic vena caval anastomosis is then performed while infusing 1 L of cold lactated Ringer’s solution through the portal vein cannula. This clears the liver of UW solution, which is high in potassium and contains heparin. It also flushes air from the liver and reduces the risk of air emboli. The portal vein venovenous bypass cannula is clamped and removed from the recipient portal vein, which is clamped. The portal vein anastomosis is completed end-to-end with a loosely tied corner (“growth stitch”) to allow expansion of the portal vein after unclamping. If the portal vein is thrombosed, a long donor iliac vein graft can be sewn end-to-side to the superior mesenteric vein, which is isolated in the mesentery of the transverse colon. Two sutures are placed in the corners of the free end of the donor vein to maintain its orientation as it is tunneled retrocolic, posterior to the antrum.
and anterior to the pancreas, for anastomosis to the portal vein (Fig. 11). After completion of the vascular anastomoses, the clamps are removed sequentially. First, the portal vein clamp is removed and the liver perfused, followed by the suprahepatic vena cava clamp, and inferior vena cava clamp. Hemostasis is obtained and the patient is taken off venovenous bypass.

There are several techniques for performing the arterial anastomosis, depending on the size of the vessels and the arterial anatomy. It can be performed as an end-to-end anastomosis between the recipient proper hepatic artery and the donor common hepatic artery. Alternatively, the recipient right and left hepatic artery branches are opened longitudinally using Potts-Smith scissors to create a branch patch. An end-to-end anastomosis of the branch patch to the donor celiac axis with a Carrel patch is completed (Fig. 12). The donor common hepatic artery can also be sown end-to-side to the junction of the common hepatic artery and the gastroduodenal artery. When there is a replaced right hepatic artery from the superior mesenteric artery, a cuff of superior mesenteric artery can be sown end-to-end to the stump of the splenic artery, or, if the replaced right hepatic artery has been divided, it is sewn directly to the splenic artery stump. Alternatively, if a cuff of aorta with the orifices of the celiac axis and superior mesenteric artery is preserved, the aortic patch can be folded, the edges can be sewn together, and the distal superior mesenteric artery can be used for anastomosis to the recipient hepatic artery. If there is inadequate inflow via the recipient hepatic artery or celiac axis, a donor iliac artery graft can be placed to the supraceliac or infrarenal aorta as an end-to-side anastomosis.

The bile duct is usually reconstructed as an end-to-end choledochojunostomy using interrupted 5-0 monofilament absorbable sutures. Two sutures between the donor and recipient bile ducts are initially placed, one in the center of the posterior duct and one opposite this anteriorly. The posterior suture is tied, and unslurted sutures are placed superiorly and then inferiorly, leaving the anterior half of the anastomosis open. If a T tube is to be used, a No. 8-French T tube can be brought out through a separate choledochojunosmotomy in the recipient common bile duct with one limb crossing the anastomosis. The choledochojunosmotomy is repaired around the T tube with interrupted 5-0 monofilament absorbable sutures. The anterior row of sutures is then completed. The T tube is injected with saline to identify and allow repair of any leaks. An intraoperative cholangiogram is obtained. The bile duct anastomosis is then covered with saline and air is injected into the T tube to further identify any leaks.

If the recipient bile duct is not usable secondary to disease (e.g., sclerosing cholangitis and large periductal varices) or a marked size discrepancy with the donor duct, an end-to-side Roux-en-Y choledochojunostomy should be performed. A 60-cm Roux-en-Y loop is created. The jejunum is divided using a GIA stapler, and the end is oversewn with 4-0 interrupted silk sutures. Intestinal continuity is re-established with a two-layer end-to-side jejunojunostomy 60 cm from the end of the Roux-en-Y loop. The inner layer is completed using a running 3-0 monofilament absorbable suture with a Connell stitch anteriorly. The outer layer is completed using 4-0 silk interrupted stitches. The Roux-en-Y loop is brought retrocolic. An end-to-side choledochojunostomy is performed in a single layer using interrupted 5-0 Maxon sutures over a No. 5 French feeding tube as a biliary stent. Two enterotomies are made near the end of the Roux-en-Y loop, and a No. 5 French feeding tube is passed and secured to the bowel with a 5-0 Maxon purse-string suture. Interrupted 4-0 silk sutures are placed to create a tunnel for the feeding tube to prevent any leakage of intestinal contents. Two corner sutures of 5-0 Maxon are placed between the common bile duct and the bowel, and they are left untied. A posterior row of stitches is then placed inside-out on the bowel and outside-in on the common bile duct, with the knots tied on the inside for simplicity. The knots can be also tied on the outside by placing the sutures outside-in on both the bile duct and bowel using double-armed sutures, but it is unnecessary. The anterior row of sutures is then placed outside-in on the bowel and inside-out on the bile duct, with the knots tied on the outside. The anastomosis is checked as noted previously, and an intraoperative cholangiogram is obtained.

After hemostasis has been obtained, all anastomoses are again examined and the abdomen is irrigated with antibiotic-containing saline solution. Two Jackon-Pratt drains are placed, one subhepatically and posterosilateral to the right lobe of the liver with the end adjacent to the suprahepatic vena cava, and one subhepatically posterior to the porta hepatis and anterior to the infrahepatic vena cava. The drains and T tube or biliary stent are brought out through separate stab incisions in the abdominal wall and secured to the skin with 5-0 nylon horizontal mattress sutures. The abdominal incision is closed.
Fig. 10. Orthotopic deceased donor liver transplant. Suprahepatic and infrahepatic cavae (IVC) are separately anastomosed. Corresponding donor and recipient hepatic arteries (HA), portal vein (PV), and bile ducts are anastomosed end-to-end. CBD, common bile duct.

Fig. 11. Donor iliac vein graft from the recipient superior mesenteric vein (SMV) to the donor portal vein (PV).
Fig. 12. Branch-patch technique for hepatic arterial anastomosis. The donor hepatic artery is procured with the celiac trunk and a surrounding aortic cuff. The recipient right and left hepatic arteries are incised at the bifurcation to create the branch patch; this is anastomosed to the aortic cuff.

Piggyback Technique

An alternative method for liver transplantation is the piggyback technique. This technique involves leaving the recipient vena cava in situ and mobilizing the liver off the inferior vena cava by dividing all the hepatic veins entering the posterior aspect of the liver. Only the left, middle, and right hepatic veins are left in place. A clamp is placed across the hepatic veins, and the confluence of the veins is opened (Fig. 13). The donor infrarenal vena cava is oversewn or stapled with a vascular stapler on the back table, eliminating one anastomosis, and the donor suprahepatic vena cava is sewn end-to-end to the confluence of the recipient hepatic veins (Fig. 14). Venovenous bypass is not required. In addition, there is significantly less blood loss as a result of avoiding dissection posterior to the vena cava, where bleeding from retroperitoneal collaterals can be encountered.

Split Liver Transplantation

The surgical techniques for split liver implantation are similar to those described for living donor transplants. Generally, left lateral segments are transplanted into pediatric recipients (Fig. 15). The right lobe can be transplanted into an adult recipient via orthotopic (Fig. 16) or piggyback placement (Fig. 17). The left lobe can be transplanted into a small adult orthotopically (Fig. 18) or piggyback (Fig. 19), depending on how the split was performed. Donor iliac vessels are used as extension grafts if necessary. Recipient and graft survival rates are similar to those reported for whole-organ transplants, but biliary complications are in the 20% to 30% range.

LIVING DONOR TRANSPLANTS

Left Lateral Segment Grafts

The graft is procured and prepared as previously described (Fig. 6). The recipient hepatectomy is similar to that described for the piggyback technique, with preservation of the entire vena cava, and as much length as possible on the left portal vein and hepatic artery. The donor left hepatic vein is sewn to the confluence of the left and middle hepatic veins in the recipient (Fig. 15). Attention to graft orientation within the abdomen and construction of a widely patent venous outflow is important to avoid postoperative congestion. The donor hepatic artery is anastomosed to the

Fig. 13. Confluence of the main hepatic veins for piggyback liver transplantation.
Fig. 14. Piggyback deceased donor liver transplant. The distal donor inferior vena cava (IVC) is oversewn, and the suprahepatic end is piggybacked onto the recipient IVC, usually at the orifices of the hepatic veins. Donor and recipient hepatic arteries (HA), portal veins (PV) and bile ducts are anastomosed end-to-end. CBD, common bile duct.

Fig. 15. Living donor left lateral segment transplant. The bile duct is anastomosed to a Roux-en-Y limb over a stent. Extension grafts may be used for vascular reconstruction. HA, hepatic artery; PV, portal vein.
Recipient hepatic artery if length allows. A saphenous vein graft may be used to anastomose the hepatic artery directly to the aorta, and the use of a surgical microscope has led to a significant reduction in arterial complications. Not all arterial branches need to be revascularized so long as pulsatile back-bleeding is noted following anastomosis of the largest trunk. The graft portal vein can generally be sewn to the recipient left (or main) portal vein. Roux-en-Y biliary reconstruction is performed in some cases to separate segment 2 and 3 ducts.

**Right Lobe Grafts**

The recipient hepatectomy is performed in a similar manner. The right and left hepatic ducts are individually ligated beyond the common duct bifurcation. As much length as possible is maintained on the right hepatic artery. The right lobe graft is procured and prepared as previously described (Fig. 7). The donor right hepatic vein is anastomosed to the orifice of the recipient right hepatic vein (Fig. 17). Accessory hepatic veins draining segments V or VIII that are larger than 5 mm should be reimplanted, either directly into the cava or through saphenous vein grafts. The donor portal vein is sewn to the recipient right (or main) portal vein. The donor and recipient right hepatic arteries undergo end-to-end anastomosis.

Several innovative variations in arterial reconstruction have been described, including Y grafts from the recipient hepatic artery bifurcation, if there are two donor arteries (ex situ reconstruction). Biliary reconstruction can be performed as an end-to-end anastomosis. Often, two separate anastomoses to anterior and posterior sectoral ducts have to be performed and in this situation, the donor right and left ducts may be used separately. Alternatively, Roux-en-Y biliary reconstruction may be employed.

**INFECTION PROPHYLAXIS**

A variety of infectious complications occur after liver transplantation. Many of these infectious complications can be prevented or their severity reduced by appropriate prophylaxis. At the time a liver transplant candidate is listed for transplantation, he or she is prescribed Myceler Troche (clotrimazole) three times per day to reduce fungal colonization in the gastrointestinal tract. After liver transplantation, our anti-infective prophylactic regimen includes (a) ampicillin/subbactam, 5.0 g preoperatively and 1.5 g intravenously every 6 hours for 5 days postoperatively; (b) ganciclovir, 5 mg/kg intravenously twice a day for 14 days, followed by valganciclovir 900 mg/d for 3 months; (c) fluconazole, 400 mg by mouth once a day for 3 months; and (d) Bactrim SS, one tablet by mouth every day indefinitely.

**IMMUNOSUPPRESSIVE PROTOCOL AND RESULTS**

Our current induction immunosuppressive protocol includes the intraoperative use of mycophenolate mofetil (Cellcept, 5000 mg intravenously, and methylprednisolone, 1 g intravenously. Postoperatively, patients receive mycophenolate mofetil (2 g/d), Solu-Medrol intravenously, changed to prednisone that is tapered to 0.3 mg/kg by 1 month posttransplant and discontinued by 3 months. On the first postoperative day, tacrolimus (0.07 mg/kg/d in two divided doses by mouth) is started, and the dosage is adjusted to maintain level of 8 to 10 ng/mL for the first 3 months posttransplant. Patients with acute renal failure or hepatorenal...
third rejection episodes is 15% and 11%, respectively. Approximately 81% of rejection episodes respond to antirejection therapy with steroids.

OUTCOMES

Liver transplantation has made significant progress in the last decade. This progress has come from the development of new immunosuppressive agents, improved surgical techniques, improved patient selection, and the recent implementation of an allocation system based on the severity of disease. Data from the The U.S. Organ Procurement and Transplantation Network and the Scientific Registry of Transplant Recipients demonstrate that, for deceased donor liver transplant recipients, overall patient survival rates at 3 months, 1 year, and 3 years are 92%, 87%, and 79%, respectively. Corresponding overall graft survival rates for the same periods are 88%, 81%, and 72%. Overall patient survival for living donor recipients at 3 months, 1 year, and 3 years are 92%, 87%, and 79%, respectively, with graft survival rates for the same time periods of 86%, 80%, and 70%.

Severity of illness at the time of transplant continues to play an important role in determining outcomes. Several notable factors have been found to have a negative impact on patient survival, including hospitalization at the time of transplant (83% 1-year survival) and being an intensive care unit patient at the time of transplant (79% 1-year survival). A MELD score more than 30 at the time of transplant was associated with 86% and 76% patient survival at 3 months and 1 year, respectively, as compared with 89% patient survival at 1 year for patients with a MELD score of 11 to 30.

Cause of disease also plays a significant role in patient outcomes. Best results are seen in patients with metabolic liver disease (91% 1-year survival) and cholestatic liver disease (90% 1-year survival). Patients with fulminant hepatic disease fared worse, with a 1-year survival of 81%. Hepatitis C deserves additional attention because it remains the most prevalent indication for liver transplantation. The universal recurrence of hepatitis C after transplant and its potential to cause cirrhosis in up to 30% of recipients at 5 years begs for improved medical management of pretransplant and posttransplant disease, as well as improved patient and donor selection, to optimize outcomes for this difficult group.
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SUGGESTED READING


EDITOR'S COMMENT

Mechanism-Based Immunosuppression

Despite a reasonable rate of 1-, 3-, and 5-year survival after liver transplantation, a steady mortality rate during the first 5 years and beyond is exemplified by the statistics cited in this fine chapter. The delayed losses have been largely the result of the ravages of long-term immunosuppression. Specific principles of immunotherapy will have to be applied if improvement in late survival is to be achieved. These principles derive from two features of the alloimmune response that were exposed in 1962–1963 with kidney transplantation and have since been demonstrated with all other kinds of organ grafts, and under all regimens of immunosuppression. In the pioneer patients of 1962–1963, renal rejections that developed under azathioprine were easily reversed with the addition of large doses of prednisone. More importantly, successful rejection reversal frequently was succeeded by a greatly reduced requirement for maintenance immunosuppression. Histocompatibility matching was not a prerequisite for success. There was little threat of graft-versus-host disease, and perpetuation of organ graft survival almost always depended on lifetime drug treatment. Because of these striking differences from bone marrow transplantation (Table 1), organ engraftment was considered for many years to involve fundamentally different immunologic mechanisms. This misconception was challenged in 1992 by our discovery of small numbers of multilineage donor hematolymphopoietic cells (microchimerism) in long-surviving human liver and kidney recipients.

Organ engraftment then could be defined as a variable form of tolerance that resulted from "... responses of coexisting donor and recipient immune cells, each to the other, causing reciprocal clonal expansion followed by peripheral clonal deletion" (Fig. 1A). The graft-versus-host arm of the double immune reaction usually was clinically inapparent. The prerequisite for the variable donor-specific tolerance was migration of the graft's passenger leukocytes to host lymphoid organs and induction there of the host- versus-graft response. Exhaustion and deletion of this response explained the characteristic rejection reversal and subsequent decline in need for immunosuppression in organ recipients.

Cytoablation of bone marrow, but not of organ recipients, was the apparent reason for essentially all of the differences between the two kinds of transplantation. This unified view of transplantation was not controversial, in part because it was incomparable to dogmas that made up much of the foundation of transplantation immunology. However, the paradigm was upheld in principle when Zinkernagel (Nobel Laureate 1996) formally proved in mouse infection models that the antigen-specific T-cell response against noncyclosporine micro-organisms could be exhausted and deleted, and concluded that this was the explanation for the carrier state that may develop after infection with intracellular viruses (e.g., hepatitis viruses, cytomegalovirus, and Epstein-Barr virus). The clinical outcomes after an infection were determined by the balance between the amount of viral antigen and the number of induced virus-specific cytotoxic T lymphocytes.

In this context, the objective of transplant immunosuppression is not merely to prevent rejection, but also to aid in the establishment of a beneficial balance between mobile donor antigen (the passenger leukocytes) and the donor-specific T-cell response. The best chance to establish a balance favoring stable deletional tolerance is during the first few posttransplant weeks, during which the maximal donor leukocyte migration provides the optimal conditions for reciprocal exhaustion-deletion of the double immune response (Fig. 1A). It was obvious that this one-time-only window of opportunity could be narrowed and closed by so much pre-emptive immunosuppression that clinical activation was subverted (Fig. 1B). To the extent that this would occur, later reduction of the primary overtreatment predictably would lead to recovery of the ineffectively deleted clone with the clinical consequence of delayed rejection (Fig. 1B).

Yet, the penalty of too little immunosuppression during the critical early period may be irreversible rejection. In 2001, we suggested that the dilemma could be addressed by application of one or both of the two therapeutic principles depicted in Figure 1C. The first principle is to administer no more posttransplant immunosuppression than would be needed to prevent irreversible immunemediated damage. Because of histocompatibility and other confounding parameters in the human population, simple mono-therapeutic immunosuppression (Fig. 1A) cannot be safely used. The second principle (recipient pretreatment) consists of reducing host immune responsiveness by nonmyeloablative conditioning before arrival of donor antigen, thereby bringing the anticipated antedone
immune response into a more easily controllable and deleterable range and making monotherapeutic immunosuppression (e.g., with tacrolimus) routinely feasible. The two principles have been combined at our center, using a single large dose of an antilymphoid antibody before transplantation (Thymoglobulin or Campath), followed by minimal posttransplant tacrolimus monotherapy with the intent of eventual weaning.

Using the strategy, satisfactory results in organ recipients with reduced overall exposure to immunosuppression have been obtained, with the striking exception of liver recipients whose chronic end-stage hepatic failure was caused by hepatitis C virus (HCV). Because the mechanisms of immunologic responsiveness or nonresponsiveness to allograft and to HCV are the same, it is not difficult to understand why liver transplant immunosuppression in the HCV-infected patient has been fraught with difficulty. Suffice it to say, elucidation of the effects of immunosuppression on these mechanisms has made it possible to formulate therapeutic protocols that reduce HCV disease recurrence. This has been particularly important because HCV-associated hepatic disease accounts for almost half of the liver transplants currently being done in the United States.

The implications of the coherent view of immune function and governance that have emerged from studies in transplantation and infection are too vast to describe here. Those interested in the development and details of the "new immunology" are urged to consult the articles for Suggested Reading that follow this commentary (particularly the liver-specific references).

Fig. 1. Organ-induced tolerance. The upright curves depict the host versus graft (HVG) response. The inverted curves depict the usually silent graft-versus-host (GVH) reaction. A: Immunosuppression-aided tolerance in organ transplant models in which the recipient response that normally would cause rejection (dashed line) is reduced into a deleterable range (continuous thin line) with a short course of early posttransplant immunosuppression. Lifetime tolerance may be present after stopping immunosuppression. This was the first convincingly demonstrated canine liver recipients. B: A self-defeating consequence of excessive prophylactic overimmunosuppression with which clonal exhaustion-deletion is impaired. This antitolerogenic effect of overtreatment was not recognized until 2001. The initially overtreated recipient may be committed to unnecessarily high-maintenance immunosuppression. Multiple agents are depicted as layered bars. C: Protocol of "tolerance friendly" immunosuppression introduced at the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center. Antilymphoid antibody infusion prior to arrival of an allograft reduces the anticipated antidonor response into a more readily deleterable range and allows maintenance treatment to begin with daily monotherapy, to which other agents are added only for rejection. Variable weaning from the monotherapy may be possible later. Tx, transplantation.

COMMENTARY SUGGESTED READING


Special Comment: The Unfinished Legacy of Liver Transplantation
THOMAS E. STARZL AND FADI G. LAKKIS

"Legacy: Something immaterial, as a style or philosophy, that is passed from one generation to another. Anything handed down from, or as from, an ancestor."

During the past quarter century, the philosophy and practice of hepatology were dramatically transformed by the wide acceptance of orthotopic liver transplantation. Numerous milestones in the development and use of this procedure had been reached between 1955 and 1980 (Table 1). The prodigious task that lay ahead 25 years ago was diffusion of the complex new multidisciplinary enterprise into the national and international health care systems (Table 1). The extent to which this was accomplished is evident in the 2004 Action Plan for Liver Disease Research designed to "...coordinate research efforts [to treat hepatic and biliary disease] across the NIH."

RESEARCH AND DEVELOPMENT OPPORTUNITIES

The National Institutes of Health (NIH) plan was divided into 16 chapters, one of which was devoted exclusively to liver transplantation, with primary emphasis on clinical research. The liver transplant chapter began with the simple declarative sentence, "Liver transplantation is now the standard of care for patients with end stage liver disease or acute liver failure." It was a proud statement from the government agency whose unfailing support had made this possible. But, had liver transplantation matured so completely that there is nothing left to do but fine tuning? This view is negated by links to liver transplantation in almost all of the 15 other chapters of the NIH prospectus. Most of these links were to targets of research opportunity that already had been enriched by, or even owed their provenance to, liver transplantation.

For example, techniques of liver procurement, preservation, and replacement are currently being adapted in nontransplant circumstances (e.g., for subtotal hepatic resections). The discovery that portal venous blood contains substances important for maintenance of liver size, function, and the capacity for regeneration was the beginning of the still-evolving special field of hepatotrophic physiology that is concerned with the functional and hormonal interrelationships of the different splanchnic organs. The hepatotrophic studies ultimately led to the cure or palliation with liver replacement of numerous hepatic-based inborn errors of metabolism, providing the first examples of what might be accomplished in the future with gene therapy and the application of stem cell biology. Finally, religious beliefs, concerns about medical ethics, and public policy or legal issues that surfaced decades ago with the first attempts of liver transplantation remain as unresolved agenda items in the NIH master plan of 2004.

However, the most frequently identified potential research initiatives in the NIH strategic plan of 2004 concerned the immune response and/or the manifold consequences of modifying it, not just for transplantation but also in the context of hepatitis, human immunodeficiency virus (HIV), and oncology (to which separate chapters of the plan were devoted). Using today's sophisticated tools (particularly those of molecular biology), it now may be possible to expand the sphere of immunology in new directions, fill in knowledge gaps, explain long-standing enigmas, and contribute ultimately to better patient care. With this in mind, the following discussion will consider specific issues of immunology that are central to the further development of liver transplantation and to improvement of treatment under multiple nontransplant circumstances.

THE RELATION OF ALLOENGRFTMENT TO ACQUIRED IMMUNE TOLERANCE

The Historical View

Bone Marrow Transplantation

Transplantation immunology was brought to its present state by a series of events that began in 1943-1944 with Medawar's demonstration that rejection is an immune response. A year later, Owen discovered mixed blood cell chimerism in freemartin cattle whose fused placentas had permitted fetal cross-circulation; such animals were subsequently shown to be mutually tolerant. Then, in 1953-1955, the strong association of donor leukocyte chimerism and acquired donor-specific tolerance was demonstrated in experiments in which allogeneic spleen and bone marrow cells were transplanted without immunosuppression into immunologically immune mice and into irradiated adult mouse recipients. After hematolymphopoitetic cell engraftment, the recipients could accept all other donor tissues and organs. The mouse tolerance models escalated during the ensuing 15 years to clinical bone marrow transplantation in immunodeficient and irradiated patients. However, success depended on the use of HLA-matched donors. Otherwise, the penalty for engraftment was lethal graft-versus-host disease (GVHD): that is, rejection of the host by the graft.

Organ Transplantation

In contrast to the "bench to bedside" chronology of bone marrow transplantation, organ transplantation (initially of the kidney) was accomplished in humans before proof of feasibility was demonstrated in an animal model and in the apparent absence of leukocyte chimerism. The first six kidney recipients with prolonged graft survival (1959-1962) were preconditioned with sublethal total-body irradiation, but were not infused with donor bone marrow cells. In 1960-1961, daily posttransplant azathioprine was shown to prolong kidney survival in dogs, and taken to clinical trials. Used alone or with other cytotoxic agents, azathioprine was only marginally effective. However, its combination with prednisone made renal transplantation a practical service by exposing two features of the immune response that later were demonstrated with liver and all other kinds of organ transplantation and under all other regimens of immunosuppression.
TABLE 1. MILESTONES OF LIVER TRANSPLANTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1955</td>
<td>First article in the literature on auxiliary liver transplantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1956</td>
<td>Concept of liver replacement first mentioned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1958–1960</td>
<td>Results reported of canine total hepatectomy and liver replacement without immunosuppression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1960</td>
<td>Abdominal multivisceral transplantation described in nonimmunosuppressed dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Azathioprine-prednisone cocktail introduced (kidneys first, then livers) and recognition of organ-induced tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>Description of in situ preservation and procurement of cadaveric organs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1963</td>
<td>First attempts to transplant the human liver</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1964–1965</td>
<td>Evidence reported of hepatotropic (liver-supporting) factor(s) in portal venous blood</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1965</td>
<td>Liver-induced tolerance under a short course of azathioprine reported in dogs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>First liver xenotransplantation on July 15, 1966 (chimpanzee donor)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966</td>
<td>Clinical introduction of ALG for kidney, then liver recipients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1966–1970</td>
<td>Evidence that HLA matching would not be a major factor in cadaveric organ transplantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967</td>
<td>First 1-year survivals after human liver replacements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967–1968</td>
<td>Acceptance of brain death concept</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1967–1969</td>
<td>Liver-induced tolerance in pigs without immunosuppression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>First textbook of liver transplantation based on 25 Denver cases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1969</td>
<td>First palliation (or cure) of inborn error of metabolism with liver transplantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973–1983</td>
<td>Evidence accrued that the liver controls cholesterol homeostasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973</td>
<td>Description of the liver’s resistance to antibody-mediated rejection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1973–1975</td>
<td>Principal portal blood hepatotropic factor identified as insulin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Causes of failure analyzed in first 93 Colorado cases of liver transplantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1976</td>
<td>Improved slush liver preservation permitted long-distance procurement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Systematic use of arterial and venous grafts for cadaveric liver revascularization</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1979</td>
<td>Cyclosporine introduced for organ transplantation including two liver recipients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1980</td>
<td>Cyclosporine-steroid cocktail introduced clinically</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1981</td>
<td>80% 1-year liver recipient survival reported using cyclosporine-prednisone</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1982</td>
<td>Review of progress in liver transplantation generates widespread interest of hepatologists</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983</td>
<td>Introduction of pump-driven venovenous bypass without anticoagulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1983–1995</td>
<td>USA consensus development conference conclusion that liver transplantation is a service (1983) is followed by rapid proliferation of transplant centers worldwide</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Standardization of in situ preservation-procurement techniques for cadaveric multiple organ donors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Reversibility reported of B-cell malignancies (PTLD) in liver and other organ recipients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Reports of reduced-size liver grafts for pediatric recipients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1984</td>
<td>Liver transplantation of patient with hypercholesterolemia verified hypothesis that the liver is the site of cholesterol homeostasis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987–1989</td>
<td>First successful transplantation of liver-containing multivisceral grafts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>University of Wisconsin (UW) solution improves preservation of liver and other organs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1987</td>
<td>Successful extensive use of livers from “marginal” donors reported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1988</td>
<td>National adoption of Pittsburgh point system for cadaveric kidney and liver distribution complies with Organ Transplant Act of 1984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Popularization of the “piggy back” variation of liver transplantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>Clinical introduction of FK 506 (tacrolimus)-based immunosuppression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1989</td>
<td>First report of split cadaveric liver for transplantation into two recipients</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1990</td>
<td>First use of live liver donors (left-side fragments)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1992–1993</td>
<td>Discovery of donor leukocyte microchimerism in liver (and other organ) recipients, placing organ and bone marrow cell transplantation on common ground</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1998</td>
<td>Delineation of analogies between transplantation and infection immunology</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1994–1999</td>
<td>Live donor transplantation of right-side liver fragments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2001</td>
<td>Mechanism-based tolerogenic immunosuppression proposed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Double knockout of porcine a1, 3GT gene, revitalizing hopes of clinical xenotransplantation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2003</td>
<td>Clinical use of tolerogenic immunosuppression</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Mechanisms of recurrent hepatitis under transplant immunosuppression elucidated</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*ALG, antilymphocyte globulin; PTLD, posttransplant lymphoproliferative disorders.

The first unexplained observation was that rejections that developed under azathioprine were easily reversed with the addition of large doses of prednisone other than being inexorable, as previously thought. Secondly, a successful rejection eversal frequently was succeeded by a greatly reduced requirement for maintenance immunosuppression (Fig. 1), suggesting that the graft was inherently tolerogenic. It also was learned that histocompatibility matching was not a prerequisite for success, that there was little threat of GVHD, and that perpetuation of organ graft survival almost always depended on lifetime drug treatment. In addition to these striking differences from bone marrow transplantation, none of the organ recipients were thought to have donor leukocyte chimerism (Table 2).

Because of these striking disparities, organ engraftment and successful bone marrow transplantation were considered for many years to involve fundamentally different mechanisms. Experimental therapeutic strategies were empirically developed with the objective of ending organ recipients...
with the donor leukocyte chimerism-associated mechanisms of the bone marrow recipient while avoiding the penalty of GVHD. These strategies had in common the infusion of donor hematolymphopoietic cells into organ recipients that had been immunologically weakened by irradiation, antilymphoid antibody preparations, or other means (i.e., nonmyelotoxic cytoreduction). Although encouraging experimental results have been reported, such protocols have not found a significant niche in clinical organ transplantation practice because of their complexity, risks, and unpredictable consequences.

Nevertheless, this body of experimental work demonstrated that the establishment of a hematolymphopoietic population composed of donor and recipient cells was possible in some models with a reasonably low risk of GVHD and could result in donor-specific tolerance, providing the donor cell contribution was at least 1% to 2% (“microchimerism”). Levels below this (“macrochimerism”) were generally interpreted as either negative findings or artifacts. By so doing, the historical paradigm that attributed bone marrow and organ engraftment to different mechanisms required no substantive revision.

A Unification of Bone Marrow and Organ Transplantation

The historical paradigm was not challenged until 1992. When small numbers of multilineage donor hematolymphopoietic cells (microchimerism) were found in animal and human recipients of long-surviving kidney and liver allografts, it was postulated that the mechanisms of organ engraftment differed only in degree from the leukocyte chimerism-dependent one of successful bone marrow transplantation. Organ engraftment was now defined as a variable form of tolerance that resulted from “...responses of coexisting donor and recipient immune cells, each to the other, causing reciprocal clonal expansion followed by peripheral clonal deletion.” The graft-versus-host arm of the double-immune reaction (the inverted curve in Fig. 1) usually was clinically apparent.

The prerequisite for the donor-specific tolerance was migration of the graft’s passenger leukocytes to host lymphoid organs and induction there of the host-versus-graft response. Because the multilineage passenger leukocytes of an organ are of bone marrow origin, their hematogenous migration into the recipient was, in essence, the equivalent of a bone marrow cell infusion. Exhaustion and deletion of the antidonor response explained the characteristic rejection reversal and subsequent decline in need for immunosuppression in organ recipients (Fig. 1). Cytoablation of bone marrow, but not of organ recipients, was the apparent reason for essentially all of the differences between the two kinds of transplantation, including the high risk to the bone marrow recipient of GVHD, and the need to restrict marrow donors to those with a histocompatibility match (Table 2). Importantly, essentially all cytoablated bone marrow recipients have a small residual population of their own hematolymphopoietic cells (i.e., mirror image microchimerism) rather than complete bone marrow replacement.

This unified view of transplantation was controversial, in part because it was incompatible with dogmas that made up much of the foundation of transplantation immunology. One point of contention was our view that historically rooted alternative engraftment mechanisms (listed in Table 3) were either epiphenomena or “variants or stages” of the clonal exhaustion-deletion that followed the key event of leukocyte migration. In addition, the role of small numbers of persistent cells (the microchimerism) in perpetuation of long-term graft survival was not yet clear. Finally, the crucial mechanism of clonal exhaustion-deletion was still generally considered to be only a theory. Although we did not know it at the time, precisely these issues were being addressed independently.

---

### TABLE 2. DIFFERENCES BETWEEN CLINICAL ORGAN TRANSPLANTATION AND BONE MARROW TRANSPLANTATION

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Organ Transplantation</th>
<th>Bone Marrow Transplantation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Host cytoablation</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HLA matching</td>
<td>Not essential</td>
<td>Critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Principal complication</td>
<td>Rejection</td>
<td>Graft-versus-host disease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Immunosuppression-free</td>
<td>Uncommon</td>
<td>Common</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Term for success</td>
<td>Acceptance</td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leukocyte chimerism</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*This therapeutic step allows a relatively unopposed graft-versus-host reaction and accounts for the other differences.
TORDL FROM THE INFECTION PERSPECTIVE

The major histocompatibility complex-restricted mechanisms of T-cell recognition of, and response to, noncytopathic microorganisms, and to allografts, had been elucidated by Zinkernagel and Doughtery in the 1970s, but the mechanisms of acquired immune nonreactivity remained a puzzle. During the early 1990s, Zinkernagel and his associates in Zurich formally proved in mouse infection models that the antipathogen T-cell response could be exhausted and deleted, and concluded that this was the explanation for the carrier state that may develop after infection with noncytopathic (intracellular) viruses. As with transplantation, the critical step was migration of the pathogen or its peptide to host lymphoid organs. The presence of virus that failed to reach these destinations was not recognized by the host. This was termed immune indifference (now called immune ignorance). In essence, Zinkernagel et al. had clarified the interrelationship of immunity and tolerance to pathogens, and had defined tolerance in terms of two essential mechanisms: immune ignorance and clonal exhaustion-deletion. Moreover, they placed these mechanisms in the same dynamic context of antigen migration that of transplantation.

Once the viral antigen reached lymphoid destinations and induced a cytolytic T-lymphocyte (CTL) response, the outcomes in the highly controlled models of lymphocytic choriomeningitis virus infection were determined by the balance between the amount of virus antigen and the number of induced antigen-specific CTLs. Analogous to the maximal flood of passenger leukocytes migrating from a transplanted organ, the critical period was during the first few days or weeks of viral replication. If the CTLs were induced in sufficient numbers, the result was disease control; if not, the result was clonal exhaustion-deletion and a carrier syndrome that ranged from asymptomatic to progressively more serious disease states. No matter what balance was established acutely, perpetuation of this balance (whether immunity, deletional tolerance, or some stage in between) depended on persistence of antigen with access to host lymphoid organs. The ability of small amounts of persistent virus to survive was attributed to its relocation in nonlymphoid sites that were inaccessible to host immune effector mechanisms. From these protected niches, the virus migrated secondarily to host lymphoid organs and could sustain immunity or, alternatively, maintain tolerance. Thus, persistent antigen was a two-edged sword.

THE BOUNDARY BETWEEN IMMUNITY AND TOLERANCE

The analogies between transplantation and infection were summarized in 1998 and generalized to other branches of immunology in the following statement: "...Migration and localization are the governing factors in immunologic responsiveness or unresponsiveness against infections, tumors, and self, and against xenografts and allografts. All of the clinical scenarios of transplantation, and those resulting from infection by noncytopathic pathogens, could be correlated with the routes of migration and the ultimate localization of the respective antigens. The "gray area" between unequivocal immunity and durable tolerance included a diversity of transplant outcomes short of outright acute irreversible rejection, as well as a panoply of analogous virus carrier states, all represented different degrees of partial tolerance. Such immunologic "compromises" included chronic allograft rejection and its analogue, chronic hepatitis.

The Rejection Option

Organ Transplantation

The antigen migration is essentially the same with transplantation of the liver and any other surgically revascularized whole organ (Fig. 2A). Movement of the passenger leukocytes is selective at first to host lymphoid organs, where a clonal antigen donor T-cell response is induced. The CTL then target the transplanted organ as well as the peripheralized cells of the source graft (Fig. 2A).

Infection

The migratory principles after infection by noncytopathic microorganisms are the same as those of passenger leukocytes, but the details differ as both the pathways of microorganism migration and the targets of the CTL response are dictated by the tropism of the various pathogens (Fig. 2B-D). For example, because of the liver tropism of the hepatitis viruses, the quantity of viral antigen that migrates to host lymphoid organs is small compared with that homing to the liver (Fig. 2B). At the lymphoid organs, virus-specific CTLs are induced by infected antigen-presenting cells displaying complexes of major histocompatibility complex molecules plus peptides derived from the pathogen. Because the induced CTLs then destroy infected host cells no matter where these "nonselves" are located, the principal disease expression is hepatic (Fig. 2B).

The Tolerance Option without Immunosuppression

Organ Transplantation

Exceptions to the outcome of immunity (i.e., rejection) in untreated transplant recipients are rare. However, lifetime tolerance to liver allografts occurs without therapeutic manipulation in about 20% of outbred pig recipients, and with near 100% regularity using selected donor-recipients strain combinations, and the majority of mouse strain combinations. Less well leukocyte-endowed mouse heart and kidney allografts also reliably self-induce tolerance, although in far fewer strain combinations. These models of spontaneous transplantation tolerance demonstrate that graft-induced immune nonreactivity is a normal potential option of the immune response (Fig. 3A). Importantly, the "spontaneous tolerance" may be abrogated in some of these models by administering immunosuppression.

Infection

After most infections by noncytopathic parasites, the balance between antigen and antigen-specific CTL tilts within a few weeks to immunity. The exceptions in which protective immunity frequently does

---

TABLE 3. MECHANISMS OF IMMUNE NONREACTIVITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Essential</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Clonal exhaustion-deletion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Immune ignorance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Special recipient cells: T-regulatory, suppressor, veto</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Antibodies: idioptic, &quot;enhancing&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Cytokines: self-perpetuating combinations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Inhibitory molecules: down regulation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Graft secretions: soluble HLA antigens</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Antigen presentation: defective or deviant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Anergy: absence of second signal, or cytokine exhaustion</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Zurich but in the context of immune responsiveness and unresponsiveness to noncytopathic microorganisms (see later discussion).
not develop constitute a collection of some of the world’s most difficult-to-treat diseases (e.g., acquired immunodeficiency syndrome [AIDS], hepatitis, and malaria).

**THERAPEUTIC IMPLICATIONS**

**Infections with Nonlymphatic Microorganisms**

In 1994, Zinkernagel and Hengartner discussed the comparative pathophysiology of HIV (a retrovirus) and hepatitis B virus (HBV), a DNA virus, in the context largely developed with their studies of the lymphocytic choriomeningitis virus (an RNA virus). The authors argued that the consequences of HIV were caused primarily by virus-specific cytoytic T-cell-mediated immunopathology rather than by direct cytolytic effects or any other mechanism. The essence of their argument is shown in Figure 2C. After HIV antigen delivery to lymphoid organs by infected dendritic cells or other antigen-presenting cells, a CTL response is induced that targets CD4 (T helper) and all other infected cells. With the selective destruction of infected CD4 cells and eventual decimation of the infected antigen-presenting cell population, the inadequately renewed HIV-specific CTL clone is easily exhausted and deleted, and eventually the entire CTL population dwindles. Thus, the immunodectivity of AIDS may be prevented at the outset by a strong CTL response, or alternatively, the response may cause immunodeficiency. The outcome from the events shown in Figure 2C depends on the balance established at an early time between the amount and localization of the virus versus the CTL response. A similar pathogenesis, but with variable targets and outcomes, pertains with all noncytopathic microorganisms (e.g., hepatitis [Fig. 2B] and cytomegalovirus [Fig. 2D]).

From this point of view, Zinkernagel and Hengartner had suggested in 1994 that the foremost therapeutic objective under most circumstances is to limit the extent of the infected cell targets, or in clinical terms, to reduce the viral load and restrict its spread. This has since been accomplished in HIV patients with zidovudine and protease inhibitors. It also was pointed out that once a large target is established, the deliberate reactivation of a strong CTL response could have the disastrous consequence of widespread host cell killing. It was suggested that a better option under these circumstances might be the administration of T-cell–directed immunosuppression in just the right amount to prevent the CTL-mediated destruction of massive numbers of host cells, but so much that runaway viremia would merely expand the target for attack from a recovering CTL clone. Thus, the therapeutic aims in an intractable noncytopathic pathogen infection would be to predict, monitor, and equilibrate beneficial balances between pathogen distribution and
the absence of an immunopathologic T-cell response.

The Organ Engraftment Objective

Comparable antigen/CTL balances must be found and kept stable for successful transplantation. The best chance to establish a balance selectively favoring tolerance is during the first few posttransplant weeks, during which the maximal donor leukocyte migration provides the optimal conditions for reciprocal exhaustion-deletion of the double-immune response (Figs. 1 and 3B). It was obvious that this one-time-only window of opportunity could be narrowed or closed by so much prophylactic immunosuppression that clonal activation is subverted. To the extent this were to occur, later reduction of the primary overtreatment predictably would lead to recovery of the ineffectively deleted clone with the clinical consequence of delayed rejection (Fig. 3C). Yet, the penalty of too little immunosuppression during the critical early period may be irreversible rejection. In 2001, it was suggested that this dilemma could be addressed by application of one or both of the therapeutic principles depicted in combination in Figure 4.

The first principle (shown alone in Fig. 3B) consists of administration of no more posttransplant immunosuppression than the amount needed to prevent irreversible immune-mediated damage. Because of histocompatibility and other confounding parameters in the human population, such ideal immunosuppression in individual patients cannot be accurately predicted. With the second principle (recipient pretreatment), host global immune responsiveness can be reduced by nonmyeloablative conditioning before arrival of donor antigen, thereby bringing the anticipated donor-specific immune response into a more easily controllable and deletable range (Fig. 4). The two principles have been combined in a practical regimen using a single large dose of an antilymphoid antibody before transplantation followed by minimalistic posttransplant tacrolimus monotherapy with the intent of eventual weaning (Fig. 5). Satisfactory results in liver (Fig. 6) and other kinds of organ recipients with reduced overall exposure to immunosuppression have been obtained with the striking exception of liver recipients, whose chronic end-stage hepatic failure was caused by hepatitis C virus ([HCV] discussion follows).

The frequency and extent to which drug weaning can be accomplished in hepatitis-free liver recipients with such tolerance-facilitating immunosuppression
Current protocol

- Prednisone
- Tacrolimus

**Irreversible rejection**

**Pretransplant depleting antibodies**

**Posttransplant immunosuppression**

**More donorspecific clonal deletion**

**Tx**

**Time**

Fig. 4. Protocol of "tolerance friendly" immunosuppression introduced at the University of Pittsburgh Medical Center. An antilymphoid antibody infusion prior to arrival of an allograft reduces the anticipated antedoe response into a more readily deletable range and allows maintenance treatment to begin with daily monotherapy to which other agents are added only for rejection. Weaning from the monotherapy may be possible later. The inverted curve is at the bottom shows the usually silent graft versus host reaction shown more clearly in figure 1. Tx, transplantation.

![Graph showing levels of TAC and other parameters over time](image)

Fig. 5. An example of the strategy shown in figure 4. A woman with a hepatic hemangioendothelioma who was infused with 5 mg/kg antithymocyte globulin (Thymoglobulin) prior to liver allograft revascularization. Tacrolimus (TAC) monotherapy was reduced from daily to every other day at 100 days, and to once per week by 10 months. Treatment was stopped at 22 months. She has been immunosuppression-free for 13 years. Serum bilirubin and measures of hepatic parenchymal function have been normal throughout. Although enzyme levels have been stable, these have lowered at a high normal range or slightly above since a rejection at 6 months, which was treated with 1 g methylprednisolone. SGOT, serum glutamic-oxaloacetic transaminase; GGTP, gamma-glutamyl transpeptidase.
has yet to be determined. Complete stoppage of treatment has been attempted only in a few of these recent cases. However, the feasibility of liberation from immunosuppressive drugs is evident from observations of our first 210 liver recipients: 184 at the University of Colorado (between 1963 and 1980) and 26 at the University of Pittsburgh (in early 1981). Thirty-five (17%) of the 210 patients have now reached or passed their posttransplant liver anniversary (Fig. 7). Thirty-two patients (15%) are still alive from 24.5 to 35.7 posttransplant years (mean, 27.1 ± 31 SD) and three died after 25 years from lung disease (no. 42 in Fig. 7), widespread metastases from colon carcinoma (no. 82) and de novo HCV infection (no. 93).

Importantly, 16 of the 35 quarter-century survivors had periods of 3 to 31 years off immunosuppression, as indicated by the green portion of the horizontal bars in Figure 7. In 5 of these 16 recipients, immunosuppression was resumed, but not because of breakthrough rejection in any case. The reason for treatment reinitiation in two patients was liver retransplantation necessitated by intractable biliary tract complications (no. 202 in Fig. 7) or because of HCV hepatitis (no. 125). A third recipient, whose cyclosporine-based immunosuppression was stopped after 11 years, was returned to treatment 6 years later because of cadaveric kidney transplantation (no. 192). The other two recipients, who were asymptomatic and had rejection-free biopsies, were restarted on treatment because of patient and physician anxiety (nos. 64 and 105 in Fig. 7).

The Price of Chronic Immunosuppression

The consequences of a decision to resume immunosuppression without a clear justification may not be evaluable for years, or decades. When a detailed account of our 210 first recipients was published in the June 1993 issue of *Hepatology*, 50 (23%) of the patients had survived for at least a decade (maximum, 23 years). However, 7 had died from 1 to 11 years after their 10th anniversary, leaving 43 (20.5%) survivors. Rejection had not caused any of the late deaths. Instead, the most common lethal etiologies were hepatitis, other infections, malignant neoplasms, and drug-specific side effects. The same pattern has been apparent in the further shrinkage of survivors between 1993 and 2005 (from 43 to 32) for reasons other than rejection. Chronic immunosuppression clearly has been the principal direct or indirect cause of late mortality.

Organ Engraftment in HCV-Infected Patients

Although the importance of reducing or eliminating long-term immunosuppres
tion is clear, when the tolerogenic strategy depicted in Figure 5 was applied in HCV-infected liver recipients, the results fulfilled the 1994 prophecy of Zinkernagel and Hengartner. First, the lymphoid depletion caused viremia. Then, when later attempts were made to wean from tacrolimus monotherapy, the heavily infected liver graft was targeted by recovering CTL, resulting in early and severe recurrent HCV disease. With recognition by Eghtesad and Fung et al. of what had happened, the explanation also was apparent for the worldwide epidemic of HCV recurrence that was associated with the various regimens of viremia-inducing heavy multiple drug immunosuppression. Because strong prophylactic immunosuppression cannot be administered indefinitely without fatal consequences, such treatment eventually must be reduced. The consequent CTL recovery was leading to widespread destruction of infected allograft cells in the same way as with the weaning of our lymphoid-depleted patients.

In contrast, light but continuous double-drug immunosuppression with tacrolimus and prednisone has allowed the systematic development of a relatively asymptomatic carrier state: a stable equilibrium between HCV and HCV-specific CTL. Thus, treatment protocols that minimize disease recurrence in HCV-infected liver allograft recipients must balance the desire to reduce immunosuppression or induce allopresen
tance with the need to prevent antiviral immunopathology. Curtailment of the epidemiologic implications of producing HCV-carrier recipients, and of the probability of insidious disease recurrence, will depend on containment of the viral load with yet to be developed HCV-specific drugs. One candidate is the protease inhibitor recently described in *Hepatology* by Reiser et al.

Tumor Surveillance

By the late 1960s, there was convincing evidence that immunosuppression in organ recipients could result in accidental engraftment of donor malignancies, accelerated growth of tumor metastases, or the development of new malignancies. Because the highest risk from these consequences has been in liver recipients, liver transplant centers have become hot beds of oncology research. Two tumors have been of particular interest because of their etiologic association with intracellular microorganisms: posttransplant lymphoproliferative disorders with the Epstein-Barr
virus and hepatocellular carcinoma with HBV. The posttransplant lymphoproliferative disorders, most of which are B-cell lymphomas, provided the first unequivocal proof of immune surveillance of a human malignancy when they disappeared after withdrawal of T-cell-directed immunosuppression.

The possibility of preventing virus-associated tumors with vaccines was demonstrated by Hilleman with proof of principle studies in primates of the simian virus 40 (SV40) virus, and extended to humans 20 years later with the recombinant HBV vaccine trials. The HBV-associated hepatoma scourge was virtually eliminated in immunized Asian populations. How the anti-HBV-induced antibodies produced by the vaccine interrelate with T-cell immunity has been thoroughly studied with lymphocytic choriomeningitis virus and explained by Kleneman. The research and therapeutic opportunities opened by these and other observations is too vast to dwell on here, beyond emphasizing that the mechanisms of immune reactivity and nonreactivity to tumors are the same as those of transplantation.

**Autoimmunity**

The chimerism-dependent mechanism of nonreactivity to allografts, all of which depend on mobile leukocytes, can be identified in a continuum of classic tolerance models that began with the observation by Owen of mixed blood cell chimerism in freemartin cattle, and ended in 1992 with the discovery of microchimerism in liver and other kinds of organ recipients (Fig. 8). Of historical interest, Paul Ehrlich recognized more than a century ago that a patient’s tissues could be destroyed by an immune system run amuck. Ehrlich’s term of *horror autotoxicus* is today’s autoimmune disease. He postulated that there must be mechanisms to prevent this by “...a regulatory contrivance as yet undescribed.” In the context of immunology described here, the contrivance that Ehrlich envisioned consisted of the mechanisms that have made transplantation feasible.

**A Need for Closure**

A coherent profile of immune function and governance has emerged from the studies of transplantation and infection summarized here. However, mechanisms of nonresponsiveness other than the essential ones of immune ignorance and clonal deletion (listed in Table 1) have generated a large body of historical and recent publications. In turn, these model-specific and poorly understood alternative mechanisms have become elements of recurring immunologic dogmas and theories. It may be asked if assigning them essential roles in transplantation tolerance is justifiable. Evidence of their existence derives from phenomena observed in experimental models in which the immune system is drastically perturbed (e.g., under conditions of lymphopenia) or the antigenic barriers to transplantation are significantly weakened (e.g., transplantation across minor histocompatibility mismatches). To complete the picture, it will be necessary to definitively determine the conditions for the development of these phenomena and to accurately assess their functional significance.

**Conclusion**

The article entitled “The Evolution of Liver Transplantation” published in 1982 in *Hepatology* concluded with the statement that “...what was inconceivable yesterday, and barely achievable today, often becomes routine tomorrow.” Liver trans-
planted to be a prime example. But the accomplishment was more than the addition of the crucial centerpiece for the treatment of otherwise lethal end-stage hepatic disease. Liver transplantation was from the beginning, and will continue to be, an instrument of scientific discovery in multiple fields, and above all in immunology.

Note: The contents of this chapter were first published as an article in * Hepatology* (2006;43(2 suppl 1):S151-163). It is reprinted with permission and slight modifications.

**SUGGESTED READING**


[EDITOR'S COMMENT](#)
makes one wonder why the National Institutes for Health and National Research Policy continue to favor nonsurgeons. They get the overwhelming bulk of the money and yet have produced very little, compared with what surgery has done for the welfare of patients. I believe that since Congress has doubled the budget of the NIH twice in the past decade and has seen very little for their efforts and the amount of money expended, especially including those benefits to rural constituencies, Congress has then begun to take a more careful look at the lack of interest of the general research community in the health of patients. They are more interested in their own egos, their own accomplishments, and their own advancements. It is, in fact, for this reason that the budget has been cut and will continue to be cut for the foreseeable future, until the research community wakes up to the fact that they must show an interest in the health of patients in exchange for their support from the federal government.

Tom Starzl carried out his great work at the beginning without much in the way of NIH support. He did this seemingly directed by himself, with enormous focus on what was an almost maniacal desire to perfect liver transplantation. The early years were not easy and required enormous expenditures of energy, people, time, and devotion to a goal that at that time seemed distant. Yet, it was accomplished and tens of thousands of patients all over the world owe their lives to Dr. Starzl and his group, initially at the University of Colorado.

Allotolerance has been the “holy grail” of transplantation. The argument in this wonderfully conceived and written chapter, meticulously documented, is the proposal that perhaps less is more; in other words, in order to induce allotolerance, what is needed is not the type of immunosuppression that devastates all the immune mechanisms in the organism, but some type of balanced chimism, if you will, in which the proposal of a pretransplant, antilymphocytic agent given in high dosage is then combined with a more moderate single-agent immunosuppression, in this case tacrolimus, with the ultimate hope of winning tolerance. This proposal alters the way in which we have traditionally done immunosuppression. The exception seems to be HCV-infected patients. Here, the goal is somewhat different: to induce allotolerance with the implications of the need to prevent autoimmune immunopathology. This is the balance that Dr. Starzl seeks. As usual, the particle point is meticulously documented and seeks a global resolution to an issue. This is the legacy of Dr. Starzl’s immense contributions to this field.

J.E.F