CTOT 08 Study Design 24-month Multi-Center Observational Study Surveillance Biopsies at 2-6, 12 and 24 months

Figure S2

Sample-level Disposition Discovery and Validation of Gene Expression Profile

Figure S3 A

Subject-level Disposition

Prevalence of Clinical Phenotype and Gene Expression Profile, and Impact on Month 24 Graft Outcome

Figure S5A

Figure S5B

Figure S6

Supplemental Table ST2A-D. Impact on the Clinical Phenotype (CP) on 24-month Transplant Outcome (2A) and Association between *dn***DSA and the CP (2B). Impact of the Gene Expression Profile (GEP) on 24-month Transplant Outcome (2C) and Association between** *dn***DSA and the CP (2D).**

Contract

Supporting Information

Additional Supporting Information may be found online in the supporting information tab for this article.

Figure SF1 – CTOT 08 study design: Subjects had serial blood sampling (red arrows) coupled with periodic surveillance kidney biopsies (upper blue arrows). If subjects were diagnosed with subclinical acute rejection (subAR), they had more frequent blood sampling (lower red arrows) and a follow up biopsy 8 weeks later (skinny blue arrows). If subjects presented with renal dysfunction, they underwent "for cause" biopsies. Episodes of clinical acute rejection also had more frequent blood sampling for 8 weeks, but no follow up biopsy. All patients were scheduled for a biopsy at 24 months post-transplant as part of the clinical composite endpoint (CCE).

Figure SF2: Workflow for biomarker discovery. Peripheral blood collected in PAXGene tubes was processed in batches using correction and normalization parameters. Following ComBat (17) adjustment for batch effect using surrogate variable analysis (18), differential gene expression (DGE) analysis was performed (Linear Models for Microarray data – LIMMA) using False Discovery Rate (FDR) <0.05 (19, 20). To test for and validate biologic relevance of differential gene expression data, we performed comparative analyses of gene pathway mapping of the DGE in both cohorts using: 1) Ingenuity Pathway Analysis (21), 2) Database for Annotation, Visualization and Integrated Discovery (DAVID) (22), and 3) Gene Set Enrichment Analysis (GSEA) (23). DGE were then used to populate Random Forests models. Gini importance metrics were used to select the top model optimized for AUC. Bootstrap resampling (24) was used to test for overfitting of the final model.

Figure SF3A illustrates the *sample-level* Of 307 subjects enrolled in CTOT-08, 283 with stable renal function had centrally-read surveillance biopsies and serial clinical data, and 253/283 had sufficient data to define the clinical phenotype of either subAR or Transplant eXcellent (TX) (i.e. no subAR) for each paired (surveillance biopsy and peripheral blood) sample used for biomarker discovery. During the 24-month observational period, these 253 subjects underwent 742 centrallyread biopsies; 191 were 'for cause' (associated with acute renal dysfunction) and were therefore not considered as surveillance biopsies, performed only in the setting of stable renal function. The remaining 551 were classified as having the clinical phenotypes of either subAR (n= 136 [24.7%]; 79% 'borderline changes', 21% \geq 1A rejection) or TX (no rejection or other histologic findings; n=415 [75.3%]). 530 surveillance biopsies with available paired peripheral blood samples were used for biomarker discovery. Despite meeting the more general definition of either rejection or no rejection on a surveillance biopsy, the remaining 21 paired samples did not meet the strict criteria for either TX or subAR based on the pre-defined phenotype algorithm and were excluded. Of note, there were no instances of BK virus nephropathy among the 530 biopsies. In contrast to the CTOT-08 discovery cohort, patients contributing to the Northwestern University (NU) Biorepository did not undergo serial sampling. Instead, these paired samples, used for validation of the biomarker were obtained at the time of surveillance biopsies performed at the NU transplant center and represent single time points within 24 months following KT.

Figure SF3B illustrates the subject-level disposition for both the clinical phenotype and the gene expression profile (GEP) used to assess the impact of each on the clinical endpoints. Of 307 subjects, 283 with stable renal function had centrally-read surveillance biopsies and serial clinical data. At 24 months, 253/283 had sufficient data to determine the clinical phenotype of either subAR or TX according to the predetermined algorithm, and 250/283 had sufficient gene expression data to define a positive versus a negative molecular profile according to the predetermined test threshold (0.375). At 12 months post-transplant, 243 and 239 had sufficient data to define the clinical phenotype and gene expression profile respectively. The 12-month data were used to determine the association with each component of the CCE according to the subject-level classification. Thirty-five, 162, and 46 subjects were respectively classified as clinical phenotypes of subAR only, TX only, and subAR or TX. Similarly, 34, 148, and 57 were classified respectively as positive only, negative only and positive or negative for the biomarker. We then determined that overall, 76 patients classified for the clinical phenotypes within these groups met the CCE, 107 did not, and 60 patients were not evaluable due to missing data required for all components of the CCE. Similarly, 76 patients classified according to the biomarker met the CCE and 106 did not have sufficient data to determine all 3 components. Associations in these patients, however, were determined for each individual component.

Figure SF4 illustrates the Ingenuity Pathway Analysis results for the CTOT-08 and NU Biorepository (129/138) cohorts respectively. DGE data (LIMMA; FDR <0.01) from paired samples with the clinical phenotype of either subAR vs. TX, were subjected to molecular pathway mapping in both the discovery and validation cohorts using Ingenuity Pathway Analysis (IPA), of data from the 530 CTOT-08 paired samples that were used to populate the Random Forests models. We identified 46 significant canonical pathways (Benjamini-Hochberg corrected p-value <0.05), several linked to T and B-cell immunity. A bar graph of the 46 pathways ranked by their -log BH corrected p-values is shown in **Supplemental Figure SF4A**. IPA mapping of data from the 129/138 NU validation set identified 15 shared pathways with sets of shared genes that were also directionally validated (up or downregulated in both cohorts). The comparative bar graph (dark blue – discovery cohort; light blue – validation cohort) of the 15 shared pathways ranked by their -log BH corrected p-values is shown in **Supplemental Figure SF4B**.

Table ST1A: Pre-ranked GSEA - CTOT-8 Differentially Expressed Genes. Differential gene expression data, ranked based on fold-change, were tested against the Hallmark gene sets

(which represent specific well-defined biological states or processes and display most coherent expression) of GSEA. Among the positively enriched gene sets, the Allograft Rejection gene set is identified as the only significant candidate (q value <0.019), with 60 of its genes present in our list of CTOT differentially expressed genes.

Figure SF5A: Hallmark Allograft Rejection – CTOT-08 GSEA Enrichment Plot (n= 60, ES= 0.24, NES= 2.22, p-value= 0.002, q-value= 0.019). Gene set enrichment analysis (GSEA) for Allograft Rejection genes in the 530 paired sample CTOT-08 discovery cohort confirms that the Allograft Rejection gene set containing up-regulated differentially expressed genes is significantly enriched in subAR. The enrichment plot shows the distribution of genes in the Allograft Rejection gene set that are correlated with the subAR or TX clinical phenotypes.

Table ST1B: Pre-ranked GSEA - NU Biorepository Differentially Expressed Genes. Differential gene expression data, ranked based on fold-change, were tested against the Hallmark gene sets of GSEA. It identified TNFα-signaling and Allograft Rejection gene sets as top two positively enriched candidates.

Figure SF5B: Hallmark Allograft Rejection – NU Biorepository GSEA Enrichment Plot: $(n=11, ES=0.41, NES= 1.64, p-value= 0.04, q-value= 0.35)$. Gene set enrichment analysis (GSEA) for Allograft Rejection genes in the 129 paired sample NU Biorepository validation cohort confirms that the Allograft Rejection gene set containing up-regulated differentially expressed genes is significantly enriched in subAR. The enrichment plot shows the distribution of genes in the Allograft Rejection gene set that are correlated with the subAR or TX phenotypes.

Figure SF6 - Gene expression Profile Classifiers: The top Random Forests model selected 61 probe sets that mapped to 57 genes. Of these 38 were up-regulated and 19 down-regulated. Only 7 genes linked to the top 10 Ingenuity immune/inflammatory pathways relevant to rejection. Of these, 2 were up-regulated 5/7 genes were significant at FDR <5%. Of interest, 38/57 (67%) genes were up-regulated for subAR vs. TX (19 down-regulated), and only 7/57 mapped to known allo-inflammatory pathways (Ingenuity) in both discovery and validation cohorts except for PKM and IFNAR1, who had FDR>5% in the validation cohort. Of the 7 genes that mapped to alloinflammatory pathways, only 2/7 were up-regulated in subAR and 5 (except PKM and KFNAR1) were down-regulated.

Table ST2A-D. Clinical validity: We divided CTOT-08 subjects into 3 distinct groups of subjects who met the following criteria either within the first year or the study period (2 years) following KT: 1) subAR or positive biomarker only; 2) no subAR (TX) or negative biomarker only; and 3) >1 instance of subAR or a positive biomarker with at least 1 TX or negative biomarker. We assessed the clinical significance using either the composite clinical endpoint (CCE) or the gene expression profile (GEP) biomarker test result. This table shows the clinical significance of both the clinical phenotype (CP) and the gene expression profile (GEP) of subAR within the first 12 months on the composite clinical endpoint (CCE), as well as the association between the CP and GEP both within 12 and 24 months following transplantation and the development of *de novo* DSA (*dn*DSA) by the end of the study period (24 months).

Statistically significant differences (p-value <0.05) are highlighted: **A.** Impact of the Clinical Phenotype (CP) within the first 12 months on the clinical composite endpoint (CCE) (**ST2A**); **B.** Association between the CP within the first 12 months and at 24 months following KT on the development of *dn*DSA at 24 months (**ST2B**). **C.** Impact of the Gene Expression Profile (GEP) in the first 12 months following KT on the CCE (**ST2C**); **D.** Association between the GEP within the first 12 months and 24 months following KT on the development of *dn*DSA at 24 months (**ST2D**).