

ve syndrome appears to be nonmal-
d reversible when immunosuppres-
py is withdrawn. Production of oligo-
develops at this phase. Whether the
ction intervenes early or after this
ent of restricted B-cell clones is spec-

, it may be noted that the T4+
te subset is dramatically decreased
ipheral blood of these patients dur-
to a degree comparable to findings
patients, and that correction of this
ity is slow (over 2 months) in the
patients.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

Pr. P. A. Bryon and Drs. G. Lenoir, F.
Bosshard, and O. Gentilhomme for several
performed. We are also grateful to Sandoz,
p throughout these studies.

ord DH, Thomas JA, Janosy G, et al: Lancet
0

P, Gordon-Smith EC: Lancet 2:1296, 1980

z report on the first 1500 patients treated with
ial communication)

BA, Bieder CP, Pennock JL: In White DJG
porin A. Amsterdam, Elsevier, 1982, p 317

Histiocytic Lymphoma in Renal Transplant Patients Receiving Cyclosporine

J. T. Rosenthal, S. Iwatsuki, T. E. Starzl, R. J. Taylor, and T. R. Hakala

THE higher incidence of cancer in immu-
nosuppressed patients over the general
population has long been recognized. A high
percentage of these cancers have been called
lymphomas. The first clinical trial of cyclo-
sporine for renal transplantation reported by
Calne et al.¹ included almost a 10% incidence
of lymphoma (3/32). Concern was expressed
for the ultimate utility of cyclosporine based
on this experience. We now have experience in
over 300 cases of cadaveric renal transplanta-
tion over a 3.5-year period. In this article we
present the experience with lymphoma in
these patients, documenting incidence, clinical
presentation, treatment, and outcome fol-
lowing cadaveric renal transplantation.

From December 1979 to September 1980,
66 patients underwent cadaveric renal trans-
plantation in Denver in the first trials with
cyclosporine and steroid combination. The
results of that trial have been reported in
detail by Starzl et al.^{2,3} From March 1981 to
1983 an additional 244 patients have under-
gone cadaveric renal transplantation in Pitts-
burgh, using the same immunosuppression
regimen. The results of this experience have
been reported.^{4,5} Immunosuppression con-
sisted of cyclosporine, 17.5 mg/kg/day,
begun by mouth pretransplant and daily
thereafter. Tapering occurred from 2 weeks to
6 months posttransplant. The average cyclo-
sporine dose at 1 year posttransplant was 6
mg/kg/day. Methylprednisolone, 1 g, was
given i.v. pretransplant. Prednisone was begun
by mouth on day 1 posttransplant and tapered
over 5 days to 20 mg/day. By 1 year, the
average prednisone dose was 10 mg/day.

Six patients of the 310 (1.9%) developed
"lymphoma" during the course of these trials.
Two of these have been reported in detail.^{2,6}
Four additional cases will be discussed here in
addition to these two. The clinical features of
the patients are shown in Table 1. These were

5 males and 1 female; age ranged from 16
years to 57 years. Five patients developed
bowel lesions, which were manifested by per-
foration and peritonitis. One patient devel-
oped a painless neck swelling. The time of
development of the lesion was 3-6 months
posttransplant. The first patient from the
Denver series was receiving 16 mg/kg/day of
cyclosporine at the time of development of
lymphoma at 6 months posttransplant. The
other 5 patients were receiving 6-11 mg/
kg/day cyclosporine 3-5 months posttrans-
plant at the time of development of lympho-
ma. Only one patient had been treated for
rejection; this consisted of recycling of oral
steroid to 200 mg/day, with a 5-day taper
again to 20 mg/day. Three patients had oral
herpes within 1-2 months of transplantation,
while 2 patients had elevated serum creatinine
indicative of cyclosporine nephrotoxicity.

The five patients with bowel lesions under-
went resection of the affected segment and
prompt reduction in the dose of cyclosporine.
Two of these patients received small doses of
cytotoxic drugs before the lesions were ade-
quately characterized. One patient received
small doses of acyclovir. The others had the
cyclosporine dose reduced, but received no
other treatment. The patient with the neck
mass received local radiation, primarily
because most of the lesion was necrotic and
could not adequately be characterized. No
systemic therapy was undertaken in this
patient, except to lower the cyclosporine dose.
Dose adjustment was in the range of 1-3
mg/kg/day cyclosporine.

*From the Division of Urology, Department of Surgery,
University of Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA.*

*Address reprint requests to Dr. J. T. Rosenthal, Divi-
sion of Urology, Department of Surgery, University of
Pittsburgh, Pittsburgh, PA 15261.*

© 1983 by Grune & Stratton, Inc.

0041-1345/83/1505-0113\$01.00/0

~~530~~ 530

Table 1. Clinical Features

Patient	Age/Sex	Cyclosporine Dose (mg/kg/Day)	Site	Time After Transplant
L.P.	25F	16	Bowel	6 Months
S.C.	21M	10	Bowel	5 Months
A.L.	49M	6	Neck	3 Months
P.L.	57M	8	Bowel, prostate	4 Months
E.F.	30M	10	Bowel	4 Months
L.S.	16M	8	Bowel	3 Months

All 6 patients so treated are alive and well 3 months to 4 years after treatment (Table 2). Two patients suffered irreversible rejection of the graft when immunosuppression was decreased. The other 4 patients have normal renal function.

Interpretation of the histopathology in each case was histiocytic lymphoma. Four lesions were subsequently characterized as polyclonal B-cell masses by immunoperoxidase staining. The neck mass tissue was mostly necrotic, precluding characterization. The tumor mass from one patient showed no immunoglobulin. Most of the tissue resected from the bowel was necrotic also, so that EBNA was identified in only one tumor. This also prevented DNA hybridization studies for Epstein-Barr virus (EBV) genome. Serology to EBV disclosed evidence of primary infection in one patient (L.P.) previously reported² and reinfection in another (E.F.), manifested by a threefold rise

in antibody titer to viral capsid antigen (Table 3).

DISCUSSION

Because of the high incidence of lymphoma in the early experience with cyclosporine, it was feared that the drug itself was more tumorigenic than conventional immunosuppression regimens and that its use would be severely limited by this fact. Two issues are of concern; one is the incidence, and the other is the clinical significance of these lesions. Overall incidence of lymphoma reported here is 1.9%, considerably less than the feared 10% and comparable to the 2.5% reported by Bird⁷ in cyclosporine-treated cases and comparable to the incidence reported in cadaveric renal transplantation under conventional immunosuppression.⁸ Evidence that the development of these lesions is related to the general level of immunosuppression comes from the higher incidence of tumors reported from cardiac transplantation,⁹ where immunosuppression may be maintained at a higher level out of necessity.

The role of Epstein-Barr virus in the development of these lymphomas has been well described.¹⁰ Epstein-Barr virus is implicated directly or indirectly in 3 of the 6 patients reported here. The majority of these lesions

Table 2. Treatment and Outcome

Patient	Treatment	Patient Survival	Graft Survival
L.P.	Bowel resection Decrease cyclosporine	Yes	Yes
S.C.	Bowel resection Decrease cyclosporine	Yes	Yes
A.L.	Local radiation Decrease cyclosporine	Yes	Yes
P.L.	Bowel resection Decrease cyclosporine Chemo Rx	Yes	Yes
E.F.	Bowel resection Decrease cyclosporine Chemo Rx	Yes	No
L.S.	Bowel resection Decrease cyclosporine	Yes	No

Table 3. Immunologic Studies

Patient	Immunologic Study	Result
L.P.	Polyclonal B cell	Primary EBV infection
S.C.	No immunoglobulin	EBNA positive
A.L.	—	—
P.L.	Polyclonal B cell	—
E.F.	Polyclonal B cell	Reactivation EBV infection
L.S.	Polyclonal B cell	Pending

have been found to monoclonal. Whether or not morphology of our six cases is lymphoma or not. When polyclonal lymphoproliferation is appropriate, or as described by others than academic enthusiasm when the clinical picture appears to be a high incidence in the first group, as reported by B-cell proliferation under immunosuppression would be common to three patients on immunosuppression only. Patients received similar treatment, the exact details were not discerned. Reactions in immunosuppressed patients immediately after all patients:

1. Calne J. *Transplantation* 1979;23:1033, 1979
2. Starzl T. *Gynecol Obs*
3. Starzl T. *Transplant Proc* (t)
4. Hakala *Transplant Proc* 1979
5. Rosent (in press)
6. Starzl *Gynecol Obs*

Time After Transplant
6 Months
5 Months
3 Months
4 Months
4 Months
3 Months

viral capsid antigen (Table

DISCUSSION

High incidence of lymphoma incidence with cyclosporine, it the drug itself was more conventional immunosuppression and that its use would be this fact. Two issues are of incidence, and the other is of these lesions. Over-lymphoma reported here is less than the feared 10% the 2.5% reported by Bird⁷ at cases and comparable reported in cadaveric renal under conventional immunosuppression that the development related to the general level of comes from the higher rates reported from cardiac where immunosuppression led at a higher level out of

stein-Barr virus in the development of lymphomas has been well documented. stein-Barr virus is implicated directly in 3 of the 6 patients in the majority of these lesions

Immunologic Studies

II	Primary EBV infection
bulin	EBNA positive
	—
III	—
III	Reactivation EBV infection
III	Pending

have been found to be polyclonal, as opposed to monoclonality of killing lymphoma. Whether or not they can be distinguished by morphology is not clear.¹¹ All the material in our six cases was interpreted as histiocytic lymphoma prior to immunologic examination. When polyclonality is determined, the term lymphoproliferative disorder is more appropriate, or perhaps pseudolymphoma, as described by Iwatsuki.¹² The issue is of more than academic interest, since there is great enthusiasm for the use of cytotoxic drugs when the clinical diagnosis of histiocytic lymphoma appears on the chart. Previously, there was a high mortality, two of three in Calne's first group,¹ and five of six in the cases reported by Hanto.¹⁰ If this is a virally induced B-cell proliferation, maintenance of immunosuppression and the use of cytotoxic drugs would be counterproductive. Iwatsuki treated three patients by reduction of immunosuppression only, with good outcome in all three patients.¹² In our six patients, only two received small doses of cytotoxic drugs before the exact nature of their lesions could be discerned. In all six cases, significant reductions in immune suppression were carried out immediately. Prompt resolution occurred in all patients so treated. The effectiveness of

this maneuver was vividly documented in one patient who required repeat laparotomy for persistent GI bleeding. This was found to be suture line bleeding and was corrected by repeat resection. At the time of this repeat resection, 1 month following his original operation, large bowel lesions that had been seen at the first operation and left in place were entirely resolved. The question of transformation from polyclonal to monoclonal cannot be answered from the clinical data presently available. It has been suggested that monoclonal lesions in transplant patients are killing cancer and associated with development of chromosomal abnormalities in the B cells so transformed by virus.¹³

CONCLUSION

Incidence of lymphoma using cyclosporine and steroid is no different than in transplantation under conventional immunosuppression. Most of these lesions are more appropriately called lymphoproliferative disorders despite their histologic appearance. When the masses are polyclonal, prompt reduction in immunosuppression should result in excellent survival. The role for additional antiviral agents for treatment is unclear, but played no role here. Cytotoxic drugs should be avoided.

REFERENCES

1. Calne RY, Rolles K, White DJG, et al: *Lancet* 2:1033, 1979
2. Starzl TE, Klintmalm GBB, Wile R, et al: *Surg Gynecol Obstet* 153:486, 1981
3. Starzl TE, Hakala TR, Rosenthal JT, et al: *Transplant Proc* (this issue)
4. Hakala TR, Starzl TE, Rosenthal JT, et al: *Transplant Proc* 15:465, 1983
5. Rosenthal JT, Hakala TR, Starzl TE, et al: *J Urol* (in press)
6. Starzl TE, Hakala TR, Rosenthal JT, et al: *Surg Gynecol Obstet* 154:819, 1982
7. Bird AG: In White DJG (ed): *Cyclosporin A*. Amsterdam, Elsevier Biomedical, 1982
8. Penn I: *Transplant Proc* 13:736, 1981
9. Lanza RP, Cooper DKC, Cassidy MJD, et al: *JAMA* 249:1746, 1983
10. Hanto DW, Frizzera G, Purtilo DT, et al: *Cancer Res* 41:4253, 1981
11. Frizzera G, Hanto DW, Gajl-Peczalska KJ, et al: *Cancer Res* 41:4262, 1981
12. Iwatsuki S, Geis WP, Molnar Z, et al: *J Surg Res* 24:428, 1978
13. Klein G: *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA* 76:2442, 1979