Original Article A panel of biomarkers in the prediction for early allograft dysfunction and mortality after living donor liver transplantation

Hsin-I Tsai^{1,2*}, Chi-Jen Lo^{3*}, Chao-Wei Lee^{2,4}, Jr-Rung Lin⁵, Wei-Chen Lee^{4,6}, Hung-Yao Ho^{3,7,9}, Chia-Yi Tsai¹, Mei-Ling Cheng^{3,8,9†}, Huang-Ping Yu^{1,2†}

¹Department of Anesthesiology, Chang Gung Memorial Hospital, Taoyuan 333, Taiwan; ²College of Medicine, Chang Gung University, Taoyuan 333, Taiwan; ³Metabolomics Core Laboratory, Healthy Aging Research Center, Chang Gung University, Taoyuan 333, Taiwan; ⁴Department of General Surgery, Chang Gung Memorial Hospital, Taoyuan 333, Taiwan; ⁵Clinical Informatics and Medical Statistics Research Center and Graduate Institute of Clinical Medicine, Chang Gung University, Taoyuan 333, Taiwan; ⁶Department of Liver and Transplantation Surgery, Chang-Gung Memorial Hospital, Chang-Gung University College of Medicine, Taoyuan 333, Taiwan; ⁷Department of Biomedical Sciences, Chang Gung University, Taoyuan 333, Taiwan; ⁸Department of Medical Biotechnology and Laboratory Science, College of Medicine, Chang Gung University, Taoyuan, Taiwan; ⁹Clinical Metabolomics Core Laboratory, Chang Gung Memorial Hospital at Linkou, Taoyuan 333, Taiwan. *Equal contributors and co-first authors. [†]Equal contributors.

Received August 13, 2020; Accepted October 22, 2020; Epub January 15, 2021; Published January 30, 2021

Abstract: Early allograft dysfunction (EAD) is associated with graft failure and mortality after living donor liver transplantation (LDLT). In this study, we report biomarkers superior to other conventional clinical markers in the prediction of EAD and all-cause in-hospital mortality in LDLT patient cohort. Blood samples of living donor liver transplant recipients were collected on postoperative day 1 and analyzed by liquid chromatography coupled with mass spectrometry (LC-MS). Significant metabolites associated with the prediction of EAD were identified using orthogonal projection to latent structures-discriminant analysis (OPLS-DA). A few lipids, more specifically, lysoPC (16:0), PC (18:0/20:5), betaine and palmitic acid (C16:0) were found to effectively differentiate EAD from non-EAD on postoperative day 1. A combination of these four metabolites showed an AUC of 0.821, which was further improved to 0.846 by the addition of a clinical parameter, total bilirubin. The panel exhibits a high prognostic accuracy in prediction of all-cause in-hospital mortality and mortality within 7 postoperative days with AUCs of 0.843 and 0.954. These results show the combination of metabolomics-derived biomarkers and clinical parameters demonstrates the power of panels in diagnostic and prognostic evaluation of LDLT.

Keywords: Lipidomics, early allograft dysfunction, phosphatidylcholines, lysophosphatidylcholines, betaine, living donor liver transplantation

Introduction

Liver transplantation is a life-saving treatment for patients with end stage liver disease and an alternative therapy for patients with hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC); however, a shortage of liver donors has always been a major limitation for liver transplantation. The concept of living donor liver transplantation (LDLT) has recently become widely accepted with a oneyear survival rate approximately 90%, better than that of deceased donor liver transplantation (DDLT) [1, 2]. That said, primary graft dysfunction, a syndrome encompassing the milder, reversible form of early allograft dysfunction (EAD) to the more severe, irreversible form of primary non-function (PNF) can occur posttransplantation [3, 4]. Although no consensus in EAD definition is reached, clinically, EAD is recognized frequently based upon deranged liver function, such as elevated serum alanine aminotransferase (ALT), aspartate aminotransferase (AST) and bilirubin levels and the prolonged international normalized ratio (INR) within the first seven days postoperatively [5]. EAD develops at an incidence ranging from 5.2% to 36.3% [4] with an EAD-associated mortality reaching 18.8% [5, 6]. EAD is attributed by a number of factors including hepatic steatosis in donors [7], diagnosis of hepatocellular carcinoma and dialysis at transplant in recipients [8], intraoperative blood loss requiring blood transfusion [9] and long ischemia time [3]. Although age has long been recognized as a risk factor for the development of EAD, recent studies have shown more liberal results for both older donors and recipients [10, 11]. The literature has shown that disturbed lipid homeostasis may be related to the functional status of liver [12]. In the setting of EAD, our team has previously utilized ¹H-nuclear magnetic resonance (¹H-NMR) spectroscopy and liquid chromatography coupled with mass spectrometry (LC-MS) in identifying lipidomic profiles in association with EAD. Previously, we have demonstrated that on postoperative day 7, the changes in lipids serve as prognostic factors for short term outcomes [13]. In this study, we aim to identify novel metabolites that may predict the event of EAD on postoperative day 1 in the hope to initiate timely treatment after LDLT.

Materials and methods

Patients

The study received prior approval from the Institutional Review Board of Chang Gung Memorial Hospital (IRB 1805230007) and registered under The Australian New Zealand Clinical Trials Registry (ACTRN12619000386134). All subjects gave their informed consent for inclusion before they participated in the study. After applying exclusion criteria, including concurrent septic shock status, a preoperative measured pulmonary wedge pressure greater than 35 mmHg, or refusal to give informed consent, 74 recipients undergoing LDLT between May 2015 and February 2018 were recruited to the study.

General anesthesia was conducted for LDLT [14]. Within 7 days postoperatively, the primary allograft function was assessed based on Ol-thoff's criteria: international normalized ratio (INR) \geq 1.6 or bilirubin \geq 10 mg/dL on postoperative day 7 or aspartate (AST) or alanine (ALT) aminotransferaess >2000 IU/mL within the first 7 postoperative days [5, 15]. Grafts meet-

ing one or more of the aforementioned criteria was characterized as EAD. The short-term mortality was also assessed as secondary outcomes.

Blood samples

A peripherally indwelling arterial catheter was inserted in the recipient perioperatively, from which the blood samples were collected on postoperative day 1. The blood was centrifuged immediately to obtain plasma. The biochemistry was sent to the central clinical laboratory for analysis.

LC-MS-lipidomic analysis

The plasma sample and precooling isopropanol (IPA) was mixed. The mixture was vortexed for 60 seconds and then stand on ice for 30 min. After incubation, the mixture was centrifuged at 12,000 rpm at 4°C for 30 min. The supernatant was transferred to glass tube. Finally, the clear supernatant was collected for LC-MS analysis [16].

Statistical analysis

The continuous variables data were presented as the mean ± standard deviation (SD). The categorical data were presented as frequencies and compared using the chi-square test or the Fisher's exact test. To identify an independent predictor of postoperative EAD, linear logistic regression analysis was performed. A receiver operator characteristic curve (ROC) was created to compare the predictive accuracy of the identified variables. A p-value <0.05 was considered to be significantly different. Analyses were performed in SAS 9.4 and R 3.3.2 [17]. Several software programs were utilized to analyze metabolomic data. The orthogonal projection to latent structures-discriminant analysis (OPLS-DA) model was performed. Each variable in the model was given a variable importance in the projection (VIP) value.

Results

Patient characteristics

74 patients received LDLT and 22 developed EAD on postoperative day 7 whereas the other 51 had uneventful recovery. **Table 1** summarized the preoperative demographics, intraoperative parameters and postoperative second-

Table 1. A summary of the child			n-value
	EAD ($N = 23$)	NOII-EAD(IN - SL)	p value
Ago	50 10 ± 10 00	56 /5 ± 710	0 1001
Age	52.46 ± 10.20	56.45 ± 7.10	0.1004
Height	1.65 ± 0.09	1.62 ± 0.08	0.1383
weight	68.74 ± 13.59	66.77 ± 11.34	0.5178
BMI	25.18 ± 3.77	25.39 ± 3.33	0.8153
MELD	21.22 ± 11.19	16.41 ± 8.37	0.0438
Gender (F/M)	6/17	25/26	0.0657
Gender Mismatch	16	23	0.0520
Female to Male	11	15	0.1281
Blood Type			0.9577
A	8	18	
В	5	11	
0	9	20	
AB	1	2	
ABO Incompatibility	3	8	0.7712
Etiology			
HBV	11	23	0.8303
HCV	6	18	0.4405
Alcoholism	7	14	0.7956
HCC	6	23	0.1244
INTRA-OPERATIVE PARAMETERS			
Blood Loss (mL)	2547.83 ± 1806.71	1712.16 ± 1552.97	0.0455
RBC (units)	11.61 ± 7.83	7.57 ± 7.16	0.0324
FFP (units)	15.48 ± 10.72	10.82 ± 10.34	0.0806
Platelets (units)	9.39 ± 8.83	8.24 ± 9.14	0.6124
Graft Size (mg)	626.78 ± 127.62	637.25 ± 140.63	0.7614
GRWR (%)	0.94 ± 0.18	0.98 ± 0.29	0.4050
CIT (minutes)	43.39 ± 30.07	51.49 ± 32.82	0.3171
WIT (minutes)	45.09 ± 26.66	50.02 ± 39.31	0.5307
POST-OPERATIVE OUTCOMES			
Mortality within 7 days	2	0	N/A
Mortality within 30 days	5	1	0.0380
Mortality within 60 days	7	1	0.0090
Mortality within 90 days	8	2	0.0070
In hospital Mortality	8	3	0.0117

Table 1. A summary of the clinical parameters of LDLT recipients

Abbreviations: EAD, early allograft dysfunction; BMI, body mass index; MELD, model for end-stage liver disease; HBV, hepatitis B virus; HCV, hepatitis C virus; HCC, hepatocellular carcinoma; PRBC, packed red blood cell; FFP, fresh frozen plasma; GRWR, graft recipient weight ratio; CIT, cold ischemia time; WIT, warm ischemia time; ICU, intensive care unit.

ary outcomes. EAD and non-EAD groups had a mean age of 53.33 ± 9.03 and 56.45 ± 7.10 years, respectively. The incidence of EAD was 29.7%. Of the pre-operative parameters, no statistical significance was observed for patient age, height, weight, body mass index (BMI), gender and the etiologies of liver transplantations except for the preoperative MELD scores, which were statistically higher in the EAD group $(21.22 \pm 11.19$ versus 16.41 ± 8.37 , *p*-value 0.0438). Although donor-to-recipient gender mismatch and ABO incompatibility appeared to be risk factors for poor graft survival after liver transplantation [18, 19], no statistical significance of either in the event of EAD was recognized in our study. Intraoperatively, the EAD group, compared to non-EAD group, had slightly shorter cold ischemia time (43.39 ± 30.07 ver-

sus 51.49 ± 32.82 minutes, respectively) and warm ischemia time (45.09 ± 26.66 versus 50.02 ± 39.31 minutes, respectively) with no statistical significance. Clinically, the EAD group appeared to endure more blood loss than non-EAD group (2547.83 ± 1806.71 versus 1712.16 ± 1552.97 mL, respectively, p-value 0.0455) and required more red blood cell transfusions intraoperatively. Among the 74 recipients, the difference in mortality within 7 postoperative days between EAD and non-EAD groups within 7 days was not computed as no mortality was observed in the non-EAD group. More mortality was observed in the EAD group within 30 days, 60 days and 90 days postoperatively with statistical significance (p-value 0.0380, 0.0090 and 0.0070, respectively). Eighteen patients had a graft recipient weight ratio (GRWR) less than 0.8%, satisfying the definition for small for graft syndrome (SFGS) [20, 21].

Preoperatively, the majority of lab data showed no difference except for glomerular filtration rate (GFR), total protein and bilirubin levels (**Table 2**). On postoperative day 1 (T2), EAD group showed significantly worse coagulation, renal and liver function and electrolyte imbalance. Similarly, on postoperative day 7 (T3), EAD group demonstrated significantly poorer coagulation profiles and liver function than non-EAD group, in support of the diagnosis of EAD.

Circulatory lipid profiles in recipients using LC-MS

Ultra performance liquid chromatography-time of flight mass spectrometry (UPLC-TOFMS) was performed with the plasma samples collected from EAD and non-EAD recipients on postoperative day 1. Figure 1A shows the OPLS-DA score plot for EAD (red) and non-EAD (blue) datasets collected in electrospray positive ion mode endowed with $R_2X = 0.793$, $R_2Y = 0.843$, $Q_{2} = 0.664$, representing the explanation, fitness and prediction power of the model. Additionally, Figure 1B shows OPLS-DA score plot for EAD (red) and non-EAD (blue) datasets collected in electrospray negative ion mode endowed with $R_{a}X = 0.666$, $R_{a}Y = 0.735$ and $Q_{a} =$ 0.529. Heatmap analysis (Figure 1C) and OPLS-DA demonstrated a separation of metabolites distinguishing EAD from non-EAD. Twenty-nine metabolites were selected and shown in Table **3.** They included betaine, free fatty acids, such as palmitic acid, linoleic acid, oleic acid, lysophosphatidylcholines (lysoPC (16:0)), and phosphatidylcholines (PCs). The levels of betaine, free fatty acids and PC (32:0 and 32:1) appeared to be elevated whereas other PC species were lowered in the EAD group as compared to non-EAD group.

Discriminative abilities of betaine, LysoPC (16:0), PC (38:5) and palmitic acid (C16:0) as predictors for EAD and short-term mortality

Betaine, palmitic acid, lysoPC (16:0) and PC (18:0/20:5) were tested for their discriminative ability as potential biomarkers for the early prediction of EAD. The area under the curve (AUC) of ROC curve of the 4 selected metabolites and five other parameters including lactate dehydrogenase (LDH), ALT, AST, bilirubin, and INR were calculated (Table 4). Individual metabolites betaine, palmitic acid, lysoPC (16:0) and PC (18:0/20:5) per se showed AUCs of 0.6855, 0.6406, 0.6806 and 0.6304, respectively. The AUC for a combination of the aforementioned metabolites increased to 0.8210 (Figure 2A), suggesting a potential of these lipidomics-derived biomarkers in predicting EAD after LDLT as early as postoperative day 1. As a panel to predict EAD, four metabolites in addition to total bilirubin further augmented AUC to 0.846. Models for other secondary outcomes were similarly constructed as shown in Figure 2B and 2C.

Discussion

As LDLT has become widely accepted, the early identification of poor function of liver allograft is of imminent importance for the transplant surgeons as EAD is often associated with allograft loss or mortality [22]. Previously, we have identified biomarkers that may be associated with early allograft dysfunction on postoperative day 7. In the present study, we have evaluated the metablomics using LC-MS between EAD and non-EAD recipients as early as postoperative day 1. Lipidomic analysis may provide clinicians information on the function and cellular state of a graft. The ROC analysis revealed that a combination of these plasma lipid molecules and clinically available parameters may serve as an excellent early predictor panel

Prediction of early allograft dysfunction after liver transplantation

	T1			T2			ТЗ		
	EAD (N = 23)	Non-EAD (N = 51)	p-value	EAD (N = 23)	Non-EAD (N = 51)	p-value	EAD (N = 23)	Non-EAD (N = 51)	p-value
Hemoglobin (g/dL)	9.72 ± 2.33	10.73 ± 2.40	0.0971	10.88 ± 3.02	10.91 ± 3.17	0.9661	11.1 ± 2.2	10.3 ± 1.3	0.1065
Hematocrit (%)	28.91 ± 6.90	31.64 ± 6.75	0.1142	31.35 ± 8.42	31.14 ± 6.59	0.9067	32.1 ± 5.7	30.0 ± 3.9	0.14603
Platelet (1000/dL)	77.35 ± 58.34	84.44 ± 43.94	0.5644	53.96 ± 37.78	68.06 ± 38.60	0.1476	47.5 ± 30.3	70.0 ± 37.0	0.0163
INR (seconds)	1.79 ± 0.65	1.63 ± 0.68	0.3448	2.11 ± 0.59	1.71 ± 0.31	0.0053	1.5 ± 0.4	1.2 ± 0.1	0.0016
BUN (mg/dL)	32.88 ± 33.86	17.80 ± 17.41	0.0535	34.75 ± 25.33	24.63 ± 15.29	0.0861	56.7 ± 44.1	23.8 ± 13.4	0.0029
Creatinine (mg/dL)	1.69 ± 1.75	1.02 ± 1.33	0.0732	1.95 ± 1.23	1.13 ± 0.76	0.0056	1.9 ± 1.4	0.8 ± 0.5	0.0008
GFR (mL/mL/m/1.73 min/1.73 m ²)	79.74 ± 51.46	112.25 ± 51.34	0.0140	47.36 ± 35.01	86.43 ± 49.78	0.0011	64.6 ± 64.3	116.7 ± 45.3	0.0021
Total protein (g/dL)	6.11 ± 1.17	6.62 ± 0.88	0.0444	4.17 ± 0.85	4.74 ± 0.65	0.0026	4.1 ± 0.7	4.4 ± 0.5	0.0476
Albumin (g/dL)	3.03 ± 0.64	3.09 ± 0.71	0.7544	2.36 ± 0.38	2.55 ± 0.41	0.0579	2.5 ± 0.5	2.7 ± 0.4	0.2575
Na (mEq/L)	140.22 ± 5.66	138.43 ± 3.92	0.1794	142.17 ± 5.90	139.00 ± 4.31	0.0111	130.6 ± 27.5	137.4 ± 3.4	0.2698
K (mEq/L)	3.58 ± 0.54	3.75 ± 0.55	0.2230	3.71 ± 0.56	3.71 ± 0.57	0.9842	3.8 ± 0.7	3.6 ± 0.5	0.2033
Ca (mEq/L)	8.26 ± 0.51	8.27 ± 0.70	0.9678	7.38 ± 0.65	7.48 ± 0.70	0.5628	7.9 ± 0.7	7.4 ± 0.9	0.0284
Sugar	129.70 ± 42.22	138.59 ± 52.99	0.4807	214.83 ± 76.18	282.67 ± 102.53	0.0059	184.1 ± 72.1	178.5 ± 55.9	0.7300
Bilirubin total (mg/dL)	13.17 ± 15.68	4.61 ± 6.43	0.0183	12.34 ± 9.25	4.55 ± 3.42	0.0006	12.1 ± 7.8	2.7 ± 2.1	<0.0001
Bilirubin direct (mg/dL)	7.65 ± 9.81	2.17 ± 3.24	0.0152	6.00 ± 5.29	1.99 ± 1.77	0.0016	7.0 ± 4.8	1.5 ± 1.4	<0.0001
AST (U/L)	103.78 ± 141.52	68.75 ± 51.87	0.2600	720.35 ± 923.72	295.69 ± 220.09	0.0399	147.2 ± 191.9	110.4 ± 77.0	0.40391119
ALT (U/L)	54.70 ± 34.37	38.82 ± 22.45	0.0513	764.17 ± 1059.86	304.41 ± 228.64	0.0510	273.7 ± 289.6	201.3 ± 162.9	0.2916

Table 2. Biochemical data preoperatively (T1) on postoperative day 1 (T2) and day 7 (T3)

Abbreviations: EAD, early allograft dysfunction; INR, internationalized ratio; BUN, blood urea nitrogen; GFR, glomerular filtration rate; Na, sodium; K, potassium; Ca, calcium; LDH, lactate dehydrogenase; AST, aspartate aminotransferase; ALT, alanine aminotransferase.



Figure 1. Metabolomic analysis of the plasma samples from EAD and non-EAD recipients. A. The OPLS-DA score plot for EAD (red) and Non-EAD (blue) datasets collected in electrospray positive ion mode (with parameters $R_2X = 0.793$, $R_2Y = 0.843$, $Q_2 = 0.664$). B. The OPLS-DA score plot for EAD (red) and Non-EAD (blue) datasets collected in electrospray negative ion mode (with parameters $R_2X = 0.666$, $R_2Y = 0.735$, $Q_2 = 0.529$). C. Heatmap analysis distinguishing EAD from non-EAD recipients. Abbreviations: EAD, early allograft dysfunction; OPLS-DA, orthogonal projection to latent structures-discriminant analysis.

for EAD and early mortality, which may become applicable to clinical practice.

Betaine is a stable and natural substance existing in biological systems. The original betaine trimethylglycine, a derivative of choline, is involved in transmethylation reactions, and is mainly present in kidneys and liver. In kidneys, betaine serves as an osmolyte that balances the high extracellular osmolarity and maintains normal cell volume. In liver, via betainehomocysteine methytransferase (BHMT), betaine transfers a methyl group to homocysteine to form methionine, which in turn can form S-adenosylmethionine (SAM), another methylating agent critical to maintenance of the integrity of the liver. A schematic illustration of metabolomic disturbances associated with liver function after LDLT is depicted in Figure 3. SAM converts phosphatidylethanolamine (PE) to phosphatidylcholine (PC), which is an integral component of lipoproteins. Betaine increases the transmethylation rate of methionine. homocvsteine re-methylation and oxidation of methionine in healthy adults [23]. In humans, decreased betaine levels were associated with non-alcoholic steatohepatitis [24]. On the other hand, increased betaine levels secondary to a diminished SAM level has been observed in individuals with chronic alcohol abuse, as the hepatocytes cannot replenish SAM via the BHMT pathway [25]. Dietary betaine treatment appears to alleviate the fatty liver in such patients [26]. Impairment of BHMT pathways may increase homocysteine, which contributes to the development of liver steatosis and injury, suggesting the importance of the betaine/BHMT system in maintenance of the homeostasis of

homocysteine and methionine [27]. In animal studies, *bhmt*^{-/-} mice had an elevated plasma homocysteine concentration and a reduced hepatic methionine to homocysteine ratio. Deletion of *bhmt* gene also led to an accumulation of betaine and diminishment of choline, phosphocholine and phosphatidylcholines in tissues. Additionally, histopathological analysis of these *bhmt*^{-/-} mice developed hepatocellu-

ID	Adduct	EAD (N = 23)	Non-EAD (N = 51)	p-value	VIP
Betaine	M+H	7286.22 ± 5287.27	4738.75 ± 1738.33	0.0002	4.57
Palmitic acid (C16:0)	M-H	458.96 ± 297.70	297.00 ± 231.01	0.0001	2.18
Oleic acid (C18:1)	M-H	2470.17 ± 1959.52	1555.71 ± 1783.92	0.0007	4.60
LysoPC (16:0)	M+H	861.00 ± 683.70	1454.67 ± 721.06	<0.0001	2.28
PC (16:0/16:1)	M+H	4029.76 ± 1719.00	2850.05 ± 1237.37	<0.0001	3.22
PC (16:0/16:0)	M+H	10269.97 ± 4303.20	6959.97 ± 2268.48	<0.0001	5.99
PC (16:0/20:5)	M+H	1903.41 ± 980.02	2906.62 ± 1996.07	<0.0001	2.50
PC (16:0/20:4)	M+H	43859.61 ± 13800.01	52715.85 ± 19138.16	0.0001	6.96
PC (16:0/22:6)	M+H	19410.38 ± 5771.54	27480.17 ± 12769.92	<0.0001	7.90
PC (18:0/20:5)	M+H	499.05 ± 424.38	1065.36 ± 997.00	<0.0001	2.00
PC (16:0/22:5)	M+H	5017.37 ± 1245.70	5773.87 ± 1391.83	0.0001	2.15
PC (18:0/22:6)	M+H	5048.24 ± 1735.41	6283.42 ± 2299.50	<0.0001	2.78

Table 3. A summary of metabolites distinguishing the EAD from the non-EAD group on postoperative day 1 (VIP >1 and p-value <0.05)

Abbreviations: EAD, early allograft dysfunction; lysoPC, lysophosphatidylcholines; PC, phosphatidylcholine.

Table 4. Receiver	operating cl	haracteristic	(ROC) curv	e analysis for	r individual	metabolites i	n the pre-
diction of EAD							

	AUC	Standard error
Betaine	0.686	0.0394
PC (18:0/20:5)	0.630	0.0392
LysoPC (16:0)	0.681	0.0404
Palmitic acid (C16:0)	0.641	0.0401
Combination of betaine, PC (18:0/20:5), palmitic acid and lysoPC (16:0)	0.821	0.0336
Total bilirubin	0.754	0.0438
Combination of metabolites and total bilirubin	0.846	0.0314

Abbreviations: EAD, early allograft dysfunction; PC, phosphatidylcholine; lysoPC, lysophosphatidylcholine; LDH, lactate dehydrogenase; AST, aspartate aminotransferase; ALT, alanine aminotransferase; INR, internationalized ratio.

lar carcinoma or carcinoma precursors [28]. In this study, betaine level is elevated in the EAD group. Further investigation is needed to elucidate whether this betaine level is related to abnormal BHMT expression owing to recipients' liver status.

In our study, a few lipids, more specifically, palmitic acid (C16:O), IysoPC (16:O) and PC (18:O/20:5), were found to effectively differentiate EAD from non-EAD on postoperative day 1. Free fatty acids (FFA), derived from catabolism of triglyceride, play important roles in the synthesis of signalling molecules and complex lipids [29]. Serum FFA levels are elevated in obese patients. Palmitic acid (PA) is more hepato-toxic than other saturated and unsaturated FFA, and is implicated in the pathogenesis of non-alcoholic fatty liver disease and liver fibrosis [30-32]. Lysophosphatidylcholine is another species of lipids that are associated with

the progression of liver disease [33] and inflammation status [34]. A relationship between the decrease in abundance of long chain lysoPC species and the progression of HBV-associated liver disease has also been established [35]. Consistent with such findings, lysoPC (16:0) and (18:0) may have a role in signalling liver tissue damage and early allograft dysfunction in patients undergoing liver transplantation [36].

Phosphatidycholine is synthesized by the two pathways, namely the CDP-choline pathway and the conversion from phosphatidylethanolamine (PE). In CDP-choline pathway, choline entering the cell is rapidly phosphorylated to phosphocholine via choline kinase, followed by the conversion of phosphocholine to CDPcholine via CTP: phosphocholine cytidylyltransferase (CT). Phosphocholine is transferred from CDP-choline to diacylglycerol (DAG) by CDP-choline: 1,2-diacylglycerol cholinephosph-



Figure 2. Prediction of (A) EAD, (B) the all-cause inhospital mortality and (C) the mortality within 7 days after LDLT. (A) A combination of betaine, PC (18:0), lysoPC (16:0) and palmitic acid (C16:0) gives an AUC of 0.821 in the prediction of EAD. A panel consisting

of the metabolites and total bilirubin gives an AUC of 0.846. (B) A combination of betaine, PC (18:0), lysoPC (16:0) and palmitic acid (C16:0) gives an AUC of 0.786 in the prediction of in-hospital mortality. A panel consisting of the metabolites and total bilirubin gives an AUC of 0.843. (C) A combination of betaine, PC (18:0), lysoPC (16:0) and palmitic acid (C16:0) gives an AUC of 0.958 in the prediction of 7-day mortality. A panel consisting of the metabolites and total bilirubin gives an AUC of 0.954. Abbreviations: LDLT, living donor liver transplantation; PC, phosphatidylcholine; lysoPC, lysophosphatidylcholines; AUC, the area under the receiver operator characteristic curve.



Figure 3. Schematic illustration of metabolomic disturbances associated with liver function after living donor liver transplantation. A decrease in PC and lysoPC species with an increase in FFA and betaine were associated with EAD and mortality. Abreviations: EAD, early allograft dysfunction; PC, phosphatidylcholine; FFA, free fatty acid; DMG, dimethylglycine; SAM, S-adenosylmethionine.

atransferase (CPT) to form phosphatidylcholine. This reaction occurs essentially only in hepatocytes in mammals. PCs have been proposed as a risk and prognostic biomarkers for different liver disease. For example, PC (16:0/ 16:0) and PC (16:0/18:0) were elevated in liver cirrhosis patients with and without HCC [36]. However, PEMT that preferentially synthesizes long chain polyunsaturated PC is downregulated in expression in HCC patients, leading to a specific decrease in such phospholipid species. Consistent with this, we have found that patients of the EAD group had higher level of palmitic acid and lower levels of lysoPC (16:0) and long chain PC than those of non-EAD group, suggesting that such changes can be used as early predictors for the development of EAD. As previously mentioned, EAD is diagnosed on postoperative day 7 based on live function and coagulation profiles. We have demonstrated that, as early as postoperative day 1, both clinical

parameters and metabolomic biomarkers may be adequate in predicting EAD on postoperative day 7; however, a panel consisting of metabolites and bilirubin performs more superior than either alone. Limitations still apply to the study. The small number of patients can be the potential limitation and validation in a larger data set is warranted. Additional research is also required to pursue the mechanisms of these identified biomarkers in association with the dysfunction and mortality after LDLT.

Conclusions

The combination of abovementioned four metabolites in patients on postoperative day 1 is highly predictive of EAD with AUCs of 0.8210, better than the other clinically available markers. The predictive power of metabolites is further improved when total bilirubin is added to the calculation as a panel. In addition, this panel exhibits a high prognostic accuracy in the prediction of all-cause in-hospital mortality and mortality within 7 postoperative days with AUCs of 0.843 and 0.954. The panel consisting of betaine, palmitic acid, PC and lysoPC species and total bilirubin demonstrates the power in in diagnostic and prognostic evaluation of LDLT.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by Chang Gung Memorial Hospital (CMRPG3H1191-3).

Disclosure of conflict of interest

None.

Address correspondence to: Dr. Huang-Ping Yu, Department of Anesthesiology, Chang Gung Memorial Hospital, 5 Fu-Shin Street, Kwei-Shan, Taoyuan 333, Taiwan. Tel: +886-3-3281200 Ext. 2324; E-mail: yuhp2001@adm.cgmh.org.tw; Dr. Mei-Ling Cheng, Department of Biomedical Sciences, College of Medicine, Chang Gung University, 259, Wenhua 1st Rd, Kwei-Shan, Taoyuan 333, Taiwan. Tel: +886-3-2118800 Ext. 3811; E-mail: chengm@mail. cgu.edu.tw

References

[1] Goldaracena N, Gorgen A, Doyle A, Hansen BE, Tomiyama K, Zhang W, Ghanekar A, Lilly L, Cattral M, Galvin Z, Selzner M, Bhat M, Selzner N, McGilvray I, Greig PD, Grant DR and Sapisochin G. Live donor liver transplantation for patients with hepatocellular carcinoma offers increased survival vs. deceased donation. J Hepatol 2019; 70: 666-673.

- [2] Wong TCL, Ng KKC, Fung JYY, Chan AAC, Cheung TT, Chok KSH, Dai JWC and Lo CM. Long-term survival outcome between living donor and deceased donor liver transplant for hepatocellular carcinoma: Intention-to-treat and propensity score matching analyses. Ann Surg Oncol 2019; 26: 1454-1462.
- [3] Neves DB, Rusi MB, Diaz LG and Salvalaggio P. Primary graft dysfunction of the liver: definitions, diagnostic criteria and risk factors. Einstein (Sao Paulo) 2016; 14: 567-572.
- [4] Chen XB and Xu MQ. Primary graft dysfunction after liver transplantation. Hepatobiliary Pancreat Dis Int 2014; 13: 125-137.
- [5] Olthoff KM, Kulik L, Samstein B, Kaminski M, Abecassis M, Emond J, Shaked A and Christie JD. Validation of a current definition of early allograft dysfunction in liver transplant recipients and analysis of risk factors. Liver Transpl 2010; 16: 943-949.
- [6] Deschenes M. Early allograft dysfunction: causes, recognition, and management. Liver Transplant 2013; 19: S6-S8.
- [7] Alvarez-Mercado Al, Gulfo J, Gomez MR, Jimenez-Castro MB, Gracia-Sancho J and Peralta C. Use of steatotic grafts in liver transplantation: current status. Liver Transpl 2019; 25: 771-786.
- [8] Olthoff KM, Smith AR, Abecassis M, Baker T, Emond JC, Berg CL, Beil CA, Burton JR Jr, Fisher RA, Freise CE, Gillespie BW, Grant DR, Humar A, Kam I, Merion RM, Pomfret EA, Samstein B and Shaked A. Defining long-term outcomes with living donor liver transplantation in North America. Ann Surg 2015; 262: 465-475.
- [9] Tomescuand D, Popescu M and Dima SO. Rotational thromboelastometry (ROTEM) 24 hours post liver transplantation predicts early allograft dysfunction. Rom J Anaesth Intensive Care 2018; 25: 117-122.
- [10] Haugen CE, Holscher CM, Luo X, Bowring MG, Orandi BJ, Thomas AG, Garonzik-Wang J, Massie AB, Philosophe B, McAdams-DeMarco M and Segev DL. Assessment of trends in transplantation of liver grafts from older donors and outcomes in recipients of liver grafts from older donors, 2003-2016. JAMA Surg 2019; 154: 441-449.
- [11] Durand F, Levitsky J, Cauchy F, Gilgenkrantz H, Soubrane O and Francoz C. Age and liver transplantation. J Hepatol 2019; 70: 745-758.
- [12] Safaei A, Arefi Oskouie A, Mohebbi SR, Rezaei-Tavirani M, Mahboubi M, Peyvandi M, Okhovatian F and Zamanian-Azodi M. Metabolomic analysis of human cirrhosis, hepatocellular

carcinoma, non-alcoholic fatty liver disease and non-alcoholic steatohepatitis diseases. Gastroenterol Hepatol Bed Bench 2016; 9: 158-173.

- [13] Tsai HI, Lo CJ, Zheng CW, Lee CW, Lee WC, Lin JR, Shiao MS, Cheng ML and Yu HP. A lipidomics study reveals lipid signatures associated with early allograft dysfunction in living donor liver transplantation. J Clin Med 2018; 8: 30.
- [14] Chan KM, Eldeen FZ, Lee CF, Wu TJ, Chou HS, Wu TH, Soong RS and Lee WC. "Left at right" adult liver transplantation: the feasibility of heterotopic implantation of left liver graft. Am J Transplant 2012; 12: 1511-1518.
- [15] Croome KP, Wall W, Quan D, Vangala S, Mc-Alister V, Marotta P and Hernandez-Alejandro R. Evaluation of the updated definition of early allograft dysfunction in donation after brain death and donation after cardiac death liver allografts. Hepatobiliary Pancreat Dis Int 2012; 11: 372-376.
- [16] Sarafian MH, Gaudin M, Lewis MR, Martin FP, Holmes E, Nicholson JK and Dumas MC. Objective set of criteria for optimization of sample preparation procedures for ultra-high throughput untargeted blood plasma lipid profiling by ultra performance liquid chromatography-mass spectrometry. Anal Chem 2014; 86: 5766-5774.
- [17] Jacquenod P, Wallon G, Gazon M, Darnis B, Pradat P, Virlogeux V, Farges O and Aubrun F. Incidence and risk factors of coagulation profile derangement after liver surgery: implications for the use of epidural analgesia-A retrospective cohort study. Anesth Analg 2018; 126: 1142-1147.
- [18] Lai Q, Giovanardi F, Melandro F, Larghi Laureiro Z, Merli M, Lattanzi B, Hassan R, Rossi M and Mennini G. Donor-to-recipient gender match in liver transplantation: a systematic review and meta-analysis. World J Gastroenterol 2018; 24: 2203-2210.
- [19] Lee EC, Kim SH and Park SJ. Outcomes after liver transplantation in accordance with ABO compatibility: a systematic review and metaanalysis. World J Gastroenterol 2017; 23: 6516-6533.
- [20] Dahm F, Georgiev P and Clavien PA. Small-forsize syndrome after partial liver transplantation: definition, mechanisms of disease and clinical implications. Am J Transplant 2005; 5: 2605-2610.
- [21] Goldaracena N, Echeverri J and Selzner M. Small-for-size syndrome in live donor liver transplantation-pathways of injury and therapeutic strategies. Clin Transplant 2017; 31: e12885.
- [22] Lee DD, Croome KP, Shalev JA, Musto KR, Sharma M, Keaveny AP and Taner CB. Early al-

lograft dysfunction after liver transplantation: an intermediate outcome measure for targeted improvements. Ann Hepatol 2016; 15: 53-60.

- [23] Storch KJ, Wagner DA and Young VR. Methionine kinetics in adult men: effects of dietary betaine on L-[2H3-methyl-1-13C]methionine. Am J Clin Nutr 1991; 54: 386-394.
- [24] Sookoian S, Puri P, Castaño GO, Scian R, Mirshahi F, Sanyal AJ and Pirola CJ. Nonalcoholic steatohepatitis is associated with a state of betaine-insufficiency. Liver Int 2017; 37: 611-619.
- [25] Ascha M, Wang Z, Ascha MS, Dweik R, Zein NN, Grove D, Brown JM, Maeshall S, Lopez R and Hanouneh IA. Metabolomics studies identify novel diagnostic and prognostic indicators in patients with alcoholic hepatitis. World J Hepatol 2016; 8: 499-508.
- [26] Yang W, Huang L, Gao J, Wen S, Tai Y, Chen M, Huang Z, Liu R, Tang C and Li J. Betaine attenuates chronic alcoholinduced fatty liver by broadly regulating hepatic lipid metabolism. Mol Med Rep 2017; 16: 5225-5234.
- [27] Finkelstein JD. Methionine metabolism in liver diseases. In: Oxford University Press; 2003.
- [28] Teng YW, Mehedint MG, Garrow TA and Zeisel SH. Deletion of betaine-homocysteine S-methyltransferase in mice perturbs choline and 1-carbon metabolism, resulting in fatty liver and hepatocellular carcinomas. J Biol Chem 2011; 286: 36258-36267.
- [29] Di Pasquale MG. The essentials of essential fatty acids. J Diet Suppl 2009; 6: 143-161.
- [30] Ricchi M, Odoardi MR, Carulli L, Anzivino C, Ballestri S, Pinetti A, Fantoni Ll, Marra F, Bertolotti M, Banni S, Lonardo A, Carulli N and Loria P. Differential effect of oleic and palmitic acid on lipid accumulation and apoptosis in cultured hepatocytes. J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2009; 24: 830-840.
- [31] Cansancao K, Silva Monteiro L, Carvalho Leite N, Davalos A, Tavares do Carmo MDG and Peres WAF. Advanced liver fibrosis is independently associated with palmitic acid and insulin levels in patients with non-alcoholic fatty liver disease. Nutrients 2018; 10: 1586.
- [32] Ogawa Y, Imajo K, Honda Y, Kessoku T, Tomeno W, Kato S, Fujita K, Yoneda M, Saito S, Saigusa Y, Hyogo H, Sumida Y, Itoh Y, Eguchi K, Yamanka T, Wada K and Nakajima A. Palmitate-induced lipotoxicity is crucial for the pathogenesis of nonalcoholic fatty liver disease in cooperation with gut-derived endotoxin. Sci Rep 2018; 8: 11365.
- [33] Karen Cotte A, Cottet V, Aires V, Mouillot T, Rizk M, Vinault S, Binquet C, de Barros JPP, Hillon P and Delmas D. Phospholipid profiles and hepatocellular carcinoma risk and prognosis in cir-

rhotic patients. Oncotarget 2019; 10: 2161-2172.

- [34] Taylor LA, Arends J, Hodina AK, Unger C and Massing U. Plasma lyso-phosphatidylcholine concentration is decreased in cancer patients with weight loss and activated inflammatory status. Lipids Health Dis 2007; 6: 17.
- [35] Wu T, Zheng X, Yang M, Zhao A, Li M, Chen T, Panee J, Jia W and Ji G. Serum lipid alterations identified in chronic hepatitis B, hepatitis B virus-associated cirrhosis and carcinoma patients. Sci Rep 2017; 7: 42710.
- [36] Xu J, Casas-Ferreira AM, Ma Y, Sen A, Kim M, Proitsi P, Shkodra M, Tena M, Srinivasan P, Heaton N, Jassem W and Legido-Quigley C. Lipidomics comparing DCD and DBD liver allografts uncovers lysophospholipids elevated in recipients undergoing early allograft dysfunction. Sci Rep 2015; 5: 17737.