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I. Abstract

**Background:** Time-zero renal biopsies (T0-RBx) of living donor kidneys may reveal histological abnormalities at the time of organ recovery. The association between T0-RBx and long-term post-donation kidney function in living donors remains unclear.

**Methods:** We abstracted the extent of glomerulosclerosis, interstitial fibrosis, mesangial matrix increase, arteriolar hyalinosis, and intimal thickening from T0-RBx of 253 living donors at our institution. We then constructed a binary composite score, moderate/severe abnormality (MSA), from the factors abstracted and linked it to donor estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) obtained from post-donation medical records with median (interquartile range) follow-up time of 7.1 (4.2 – 9.2) years. We used multilevel mixed-effects linear regression to model the association between MSA and eGFR trajectory over time.

**Results:** 22.9% of donors had one or more MSAs. In an unadjusted model, there was no evidence of difference in post-donation eGFR between MSA and no MSA donors (difference in eGFR -7.10 -3.17 0.76 mL/min/1.73m², *p* = 0.1). The association was further attenuated after adjusting for donor age at transplant, sex, and race (difference in eGFR -3.57 0.04 3.64 mL/min/1.73m², *p* = 0.99).

**Conclusions:** There is no evidence of association between minor histological abnormalities at time of organ donation and post-donation eGFR in living donors. Among donors cleared to donate, biopsy results do not predict post-donation renal health.
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1. Introduction

The kidney is a vital organ in the human body. Among its many functions, it helps the body discard toxic wastes.\(^1\) Clinically healthy individuals sometimes choose to donate a kidney to patients with faulty kidneys. It is important to investigate how such donations impact the renal function of these living donors.

**Chronic kidney disease, end-stage renal disease, and therapies**

Chronic Kidney Disease (CKD) is a condition in which the kidneys’ function starts to deteriorate over a time period greater than 3 months.\(^2\) Many health complications may arise due to this gradual loss of kidney function.\(^3\) Based on a patient’s glomerular filtration rate (GFR) and albuminuria, which are measures of renal function, he/she is categorized into one of the five stages of CKD (Figure 1).\(^2\) Stage 5 CKD, also known as end-stage renal disease (ESRD), indicates renal failure. Once a patient reaches ESRD, renal replacement therapy is needed.\(^4\)
The two major types of renal replacement therapy are dialysis and kidney transplantation. In the United States (US), there were 114,813 newly reported cases in 2012. On December 1st, 2012, there were 636,905 prevalent cases of ESRD. From the newly reported cases, 108,129 were on dialysis and 2,803 received a kidney transplant. From the prevalent cases, 443,119 were on dialysis and 175,978 had a functioning graft.

**Living kidney donation**

There are two types of donors for kidney transplantation: deceased and living. In the US, 5,617 out of 17,305 kidney transplants performed in 2012 came from living donors.
Living donor kidney transplants have several advantages to the kidney recipient, including a relatively shorter time to transplant and better graft function. However, there is no benefit to the donor and the long-term risk of undergoing a living donor nephrectomy remains unclear.

In order to qualify for kidney donation, a living donor must be a consenting adult who is generally in good health and have normal kidney function. Individuals who have some form of kidney disease, diabetes, hypertension, cancer, heart disease, hepatitis, infectious disease, psychiatric problems, kidney stones, obese, or are ongoing drug abusers are usually ineligible for donation. Despite these clinical guidelines that are in place to ensure a healthy pool of donors, renal biopsies of the donated kidney reveal histological abnormalities at time of donation (time-zero renal biopsies, T0-RBx).7-10

Renal histological abnormalities

The four major morphological components of the kidney that can be affected by disease are: glomeruli, tubules, interstitium, and vasculature. The glomeruli respond to chronic injury mainly through basement membrane thickening; hyalinosis (deposition of hyalin, an extracellular amorphous material composed of plasma proteins, in the glomerular blood vessels); and glomerulosclerosis (deposition of an extracellular collagenous matrix). Moreover, abnormalities in the mesangium, a meshwork of cells and extracellular matrix that support glomeruli tufts, are also an indicator of renal pathogenesis. Thus, the presence of these histological abnormalities may suggest chronic renal injury.
Other indicators of renal abnormalities involve the tubules, interstitium, and vasculature. Progressive glomerular injury is usually followed by chronic injuries to the other components of the kidney, such as the tubules and the interstitium, commonly causing tubulointerstitial fibrosis (tubular damage and interstitial inflammation). Injury to the renal vasculature typically results in muscle cell proliferation, extracellular matrix deposition, and in turn, intimal thickening.

Studies have reported sporadic correlations between renal histological abnormalities and pre-donation clinical living donor characteristics. However, donor age and blood pressure were reported to be independently associated with renal histological abnormalities.

Several studies have investigated the association of histological abnormalities in the donated kidney and post-transplant renal graft function in kidney recipients. For deceased donor kidneys, there appears to be a consensus that histological abnormalities impact post-transplant graft function, and are reported to be a better predictor of graft survival in comparison to donor clinical characteristics. For living donor kidneys, a study by Ma et al. analyzing 72 living donor kidneys reported that histological abnormalities did impact post-transplant graft function. However, a study by Lee et al., investigating 146 living donor kidney transplant recipients, found no evidence of association between minor subclinical histological abnormalities detected in T0-RBx and post-transplant graft function. Both studies performed a retrospective analysis of data collected at their institution.

A few studies have investigated the association of renal histological abnormalities in the donated kidney and short-term post-donation function of the sister
kidney in the living donors. These studies have reported that minor renal histological abnormalities at time of organ donation did not impact short-term post-donation estimated glomerular filtration rate (eGFR) in living donors (a maximum mean follow-up time of 3.5 years).\textsuperscript{12,13} However, the impact of histological abnormalities on long-term post-donation eGFR remains unclear. Moreover, these studies have looked at post-donation eGFR at particular time points and not eGFR trajectories over time. Therefore, a study looking at long-term post-donation eGFR trajectories over time is much needed.

**Measuring renal function**

A common measure of renal function is eGFR. Creatinine in the patient’s blood, a muscle metabolic waste product, obtained through tests such as a comprehensive metabolic panel (CMP), basic metabolic panel (BMP), or renal function panel, is used in eGFR calculations.\textsuperscript{20} There are different equations used to calculate eGFR using a combination of serum creatinine and other patient characteristics.\textsuperscript{21-24} eGFR calculations assume a stable creatinine level and therefore, might not be suitable for certain groups of people such as pregnant women, patients with acute illness, obese patients, and/or patients with extremes of muscle mass.\textsuperscript{21}
**Objective**

The objective of this study is to investigate the association between histological abnormalities in T0-RBx and post-donation eGFR in living kidney donors.

**Public health significance**

Evidence of association between histological abnormalities in T0-RBx and changes in post-donation renal function in living donors would inform treatment decisions for current living donors and future potential donors, especially when renal biopsies are thought of as a safe diagnostic tool.\(^{25,26}\) First, for those living donors who already donated a kidney, T0-RBx results may inform post-transplant preventative care. Second, for future potential living donors, a pre-donation biopsy may inform the decision to donate. Conversely, a lack of association between T0-RBx abnormalities and post-donation renal function would reassure donors who had such abnormalities, and inform future donors and healthcare providers that mild pre-donation histological abnormalities need not be a contraindication for transplantation.
2. Methods

Study Design

We adopted a retrospective cohort study design. Upon Institutional Review Board approval, we attempted to contact participants over the phone or through mail to survey them about their donation, and obtain consent to abstract their medical records. We used information reported in the T0-RBx, reported in their medical records, to obtain our exposure of interest and details about the biopsies and laboratory techniques used. Information regarding our outcome of interest was also extracted from these medical records.

Study population

Our source population consisted of 1,678 individuals who underwent living donor nephrectomy at the Johns Hopkins Hospital (JHH) between August 1970 and October 2014. 847 of these individuals consented to medical record abstraction. Our inclusion criterion was living kidney donors who had a T0-RBx. 297 out of 847 had a T0-RBx, between February 1997 and June 2012. We excluded T0-RBx with fewer than 10 glomeruli (n = 44), since ascertainment of histological abnormalities may not be reliable in these biopsies.

T0-RBx histological evaluation

Surgical pathologists at JHH evaluated the T0-RBx for histological abnormalities within a short time after biopsy collection (typically one pathologist per biopsy). The types of biopsies performed were either needle (commonly) or wedge biopsies. Light
microscopy was used to analyze all samples using the following stains: hematoxylin and
eosin, periodic acid-Schiff (PAS), Mallory trichrome, and Jones’ silver methenamine.

Exposure of interest

Since these were time-zero biopsies, the identification and scoring of histological
abnormalities overlapped with the Banff criteria.27-29 Five variables were abstracted
from the surgical pathology laboratory reports of the T0-RBx: glomerulosclerosis (GS),
interstitial fibrosis (IF), mesangial matrix increase (MI), arteriolar hyalinosis (AH), and
intimal thickening (IT).

GS was quantified as the percentage of observed glomeruli that were globally
sclerotic. IF was assessed as a visual estimate of the percentage of cortical area that had
IF and categorized as: IF in \( \leq 5\% \) of cortical area (minimal), 6-25\% (mild), 26-50\%
(moderate), or \( > 50\% \) (severe). MI was quantified as the presence (moderate/severe) or
absence of MI.

AH was categorized into four groups: No PAS-positive hyaline thickening, mild-
to-moderate PAS-positive hyaline thickening in at least one arteriole, moderate-to-
severe PAS-positive hyaline thickening in more than one arteriole, or severe PAS-
positive hyaline thickening in many arterioles. IT was also categorized into four groups:
no chronic vascular changes, vascular narrowing of up to 25\% of luminal area by
fibrointimal thickening of arteries (mild), increased severity of changes with 26-50\%
narrowing of vascular luminal area (moderate), or severe vascular changes with \( > 50\% \)
narrowing of vascular luminal area (severe). If the pathology report did not mention the
presence of vasculature, we assumed that there were none observed in the sample.
We then constructed a binary composite score, moderate/severe abnormality (MSA). A biopsy was considered to have MSA if it had at least one moderate/severe abnormality in any of: IF, MI, AH, IT, or GS ≥ 15%.

Post-donation eGFR

We obtained post-donation serum creatinine from the patient medical records. We used the CKD-EPI creatinine equation to calculate eGFR using the donor’s serum creatinine level obtained from the medical records, age at measurement, sex, and race.22

Statistical analysis

For continuous variables, the median and interquartile range (IQR) were reported. For categorical variables, the percentage was reported. We compared our study population to kidney living donors at the JHH who did not have a T0-RBx. Within our study population, we looked at donor characteristics stratified by MSA status. Unpaired t-tests and Fisher exact tests were used to make statistical comparisons.

We used scatterplots and non-parametric lowess to visualize eGFR trajectories over time, stratified by exposure of interest. We then used multilevel mixed-effects linear (MMEL) regression to perform longitudinal data analysis. A variety of MMEL regression models were constructed, including models with spline terms for time, allowing for random intercepts, and/or allowing for random slopes. Based on the AIC values and likelihood ratio tests, the optimal model was selected. The selected model was then used to model the unadjusted and adjusted relationship between the exposure
of interest and eGFR over time. Adjusted models were controlled for donor age at
donation, sex, and race.

Statistical significance was established at a $p$-value less than 0.05. All analyses
were performed using STATA 13.0 for Mac (College Station, TX). Confidence
intervals are reported as per the Louis and Zeger method.$^{30}$
3. **Results**

**Study population**

Our study population did not differ much from the general living donor pool at JHH. There was no difference between donors who had a T0-RBx and those who did not with regards to race \((p = 0.3)\), gender \((p = 0.8)\), post-donation follow-up time \((p = 0.6)\), and mean post-donation eGFR per donor \((p = 0.7)\) (Table 1). Age was marginally statistically significant \((p = 0.046)\); biopsied donors being slightly older [median (IQR) age is 46.9 (39.4 – 54.1) years for biopsied, and 45.5 (36.5 – 53.4) years for not biopsied]. The number of post-donation eGFR measurements per donor was higher in biopsied donors (3) as compared to non-biopsied donors (1) \((p < 0.001)\). The majority of our study participants were white and female (90.2% and 64.3%, respectively). The overall median (IQR) follow up time was 7.1 (4.2 – 9.2) years and the median (IQR) mean post-donation eGFR per donor was 62.0 (52.7 – 71.0) mL/min/1.73m² (Figure 2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>Biopsied ((N=253))</th>
<th>Not Biopsied ((N=550))</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age, years (\text{median (IQR)})</td>
<td>46.9 (39.4 - 54.1)</td>
<td>45.5 (36.5 – 53.4)</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race, %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>90.2%</td>
<td>84.7%</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
<td>4.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender, %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>64.3%</td>
<td>63.6%</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
<td>36.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up time, years (\text{median (IQR)})</td>
<td>7.1 (4.2 – 9.2)</td>
<td>5.3 (2.3 – 11.8)</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean post-donation eGFR per person, mL/min/1.73m²</td>
<td>62.0 (52.7 – 71.0)</td>
<td>62.3 (54.3 – 71.8)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of post-donation eGFR measurements per donor (\text{median (IQR)})</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Bolded p-value statistically significant at \(\alpha = 0.05\).

**Table 1.** Living kidney donor characteristics stratified by time-zero biopsy availability.
Donors with MSA were older than donors with no MSA at time of organ donation. The median (IQR) age for MSA donors was 52.7 (46.2 – 57.6) years, and the median (IQR) age for no MSA donors was 46.5 (38.5 – 53.1) years ($p < 0.001$). Race, gender, post-donation follow-up time, mean post-donation eGFR per donor, and number of post-donation eGFR measurements per donor did not differ by MSA status (Table 2).

**Figure 2.** Distribution of post-donation follow-up time.
Table 2. Living kidney donor characteristics stratified by exposure of interest, moderate/severe histological abnormality (MSA) in time-zero biopsies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characteristics</th>
<th>MSA (N=47)</th>
<th>No MSA (N=158)</th>
<th>p-value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Age, years median (IQR)</td>
<td>52.7 (46.2 – 57.6)</td>
<td>46.4 (38.5 – 53.1)</td>
<td>&lt;0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race, %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>93.6%</td>
<td>92.4%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>6.4%</td>
<td>5.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gender, %</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>61.7%</td>
<td>66.5%</td>
<td>0.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>38.3%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Follow-up time, years median (IQR)</td>
<td>6.7 (4.3 – 8.7)</td>
<td>7.7 (4.7 – 9.4)</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean post-donation eGFR per donor, mL/min/1.73m² median (IQR)</td>
<td>60.0 (51.8 – 73.0)</td>
<td>62.6 (55.0 – 72.0)</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of post-donation eGFR measurements per donor median (IQR)</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Bolded p-value statistically significant at $\alpha = 0.05$.

**Exposure of interest**

The majority of living donors had no or minor histological abnormalities indicated by their T0-RBx. However, a significant percentage of living donors had MSA, 22.9%.

Specifically, the majority of the donors had GS < 15% (85.5%), minimal IF (73.0%), no MI (95.3%), no HA (64.0%), and no IT (68.0%) (Table 3). 77% of MSA donors scored moderate/severe in only one category and 23% of MSA donors scored moderate/severe in two or more categories.
A scatterplot of post-donation eGFR stratified by MSA status indicated that initial post-donation eGFR was lower for MSA donors compared to no MSA donors. However, this difference appeared to attenuate over time. For both MSA and no MSA donors, post-donation eGFR trajectory appeared to gradually increase over time until 10 years, after which the trajectory appeared to decrease slightly (Figure 3).

**Table 3.** Histological abnormalities detected via time-zero biopsies.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Histological abnormalities</th>
<th>No MSA</th>
<th>MSA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Glomerulosclerosis (GS)</td>
<td>85.5%</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>≥ 15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interstitial fibrosis (IF)</td>
<td>73.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>25.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>1.6%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mesangial increase (MI)</td>
<td>95.3%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No MI</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hyalinosis (HA)</td>
<td>64.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No HA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>35.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intimal thickening (IT)</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No IT</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild</td>
<td>29.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate/severe abnormalities (MSA)</td>
<td>77.1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No MSA</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Statistical analysis**

A scatterplot of post-donation eGFR stratified by MSA status indicated that initial post-donation eGFR was lower for MSA donors compared to no MSA donors. However, this difference appeared to attenuate over time. For both MSA and no MSA donors, post-donation eGFR trajectory appeared to gradually increase over time until 10 years, after which the trajectory appeared to decrease slightly (Figure 3).
Based on the AIC values, we selected MMEL models that allowed for random intercepts and slopes, with no spline term for time at 10 years. In an unadjusted MMEL, at any given time point, MSA did not appear to be associated with post-donation eGFR – a difference of $-7.10 - 3.17 + 0.76$ mL/min/1.73m² between MSA versus no MSA ($p = 0.1$). This association was attenuated and remained statistically insignificant after adjusting for donor age, sex, and race ($-3.57 + 0.04 + 3.64$ mL/min/1.73m², $p = 0.99$) (Table 4). There was no evidence of interaction between MSA and time following donation ($p = 0.5$).
Table 4. Multilevel mixed-effects linear regression models of post-donation eGFR over time.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Change in eGFR (mL/min/1.73m²)</th>
<th>Unadjusted model</th>
<th>Adjusted model&lt;sup&gt;A&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Per year</td>
<td>0.54 0.81 1.08</td>
<td>0.49 0.76 1.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MSA (vs no MSA)</td>
<td>-7.10 -3.17 0.76</td>
<td>-3.57 0.04 3.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age (per 10y)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-7.03 -5.55 -4.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sex (vs Male)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-2.51 0.60 3.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Race (vs White)</td>
<td></td>
<td>-0.74 5.77 12.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Black</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-13.07 -2.15 8.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Others</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes: Bolded p-value statistically significant at α = 0.05.
<sup>A</sup>Model adjusted for donor age, sex and race.

4. Discussion

The majority of our study population did not have moderate/severe renal abnormalities at time of organ donation. Among those who did have moderate/severe renal abnormalities, the majority scored moderate/severe in only one of the five categories. Our results indicate that after adjusting for donor age at donation, sex, and race, there is no association between those moderate/severe histological abnormalities and post-donation eGFR over time in living kidney donors.

These results are consistent with previous findings that studied short-term post-donation eGFR. Chauhan et al. reported that eGFR was similar in donors with and without moderate/severe changes in T0-RBx (mean follow-up time of 3.5 years). In addition, a prospective study by Choi et al. reported that 1-year post-donation eGFR (n = 121) was not affected by histological abnormalities at T0-RBx.

There are a few limitations to our study. One limitation is small sample size; not all living donors at JHH had a T0-RBx. The majority of the biopsied donors were done so for research purposes on incompatible kidney transplantations (which do not bias our
results). Another limitation is potential ascertainment bias in post-donation eGFR. eGFR values were obtained from the medical records. If this was indeed a bias in our results, then it would likely be in the non-null direction, assuming that less healthy donors were seeking healthcare more often than healthy donors. Despite this potential bias, our results are null.

The strengths of our study include relatively longer post-donation follow-up time compared to previous studies. Our median post-donation follow-up was about 7 years, whereas other studies reported a maximum mean follow-up time of 3.5 years. Another strength of our study is that we investigated post-donation eGFR over time, not at a specific post-donation time point.

It must be noted that the findings of this study cannot be generalized to the general population. This study population consisted of clinically healthy individuals with relatively minor renal histological abnormalities. Therefore, it would be inappropriate to make inferences about the association between renal histological abnormalities and renal function in the general population based on these study findings.

Although our study had a relatively longer post-donation follow-up time than previous studies, we cannot make inferences beyond 7 years. Therefore, future studies are needed to investigate the association between histological abnormalities at time-zero and post-donation eGFR over a longer follow-up period, and using a larger sample size. Moreover, it will be useful to investigate each category separately (e.g.: the association between IF and post-donation eGFR) rather than a composite exposure, to aid in the understanding of the underlying biology.
In conclusion, there was no evidence of an association between histological abnormalities detected at time of organ donation and post-donation eGFR in living kidney donors. Future studies are needed to confirm these findings. However, these findings serve to reassure living donors, at least in the short-term. Moreover, among donors clinically cleared for donation, there is no evidence suggesting that T0-RBx further informs donor selection.
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