Small bowel transplantation: Current clinical status
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D SIGALET. Small bowel transplantation: Current clinical status. Can J Gastroenterol 1991;5(4):154-160. With recent refinements in immunosuppression techniques, the first successful reports of small bowel transplantation in humans have now been made, increasing interest in bowel transplantation among clinicians and patients alike. This article reviews recent developments in understanding of the functional capabilities and requirements for effective immune suppression in bowel transplantation. Both experimental and clinical experience with transplantation are discussed, as are the areas which appear to offer the most promise for future developments. Finally guidelines for consideration of patient selection for this procedure are reviewed.
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Transplantation de l'intestin grêle: État clinique présent

RESUME: Grâce aux tout derniers progrès des traitements immunosuppresseurs, on rapporte les premières transplantations réussies du grêle chez l'homme, et l'intérêt suscité par cette intervention augmente tant chez les cliniciens que chez les patients. Le présent article passe en revue l'évolution récente des connaissances portant sur les capacités fonctionnelles ainsi que les modalités d'une suppression immunitaire efficace dans la transplantation de l'intestin. L'auteur évoque l'expérience clinique et expérimentale à la fois, et présente les domaines qui semblaient les plus prometteurs. Finalement, certains critères de sélection des receveurs sont examinés.
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The short bowel syndrome that results from massive losses of small bowel continues to be a difficult problem despite the common use of long term total parenteral nutrition (TPN). TPN is expensive (1), limits the lifestyle of the patient and the patient's family (2), and requires continued long term venous access. Long term TPN in children is even more problematic, with increased nutrient requirements, difficulty with patient compliance, and the risk of associated liver damage, especially in the very young infant (3). Because of these factors, the lifelong mortality from direct complications of long term TPN in the pediatric age group exceeds 15% (4). In the neonate, massive resection of the small bowel most commonly results from such conditions as necrotizing enterocolitis, malrotation with volvulus, and strangulated abdominal wall defects (4). In the adult population, massive bowel resection most commonly results from mesenteric vascular accidents, inflammatory bowel disease and trauma (5,6). These conditions
result in a stable incidence of new patients who require long-term nutritional support.

Small bowel transplantation as a treatment for short bowel syndrome has been considered for many years, but only in the past year have successful attempts at bowel transplantation been reported (7,8). Inevitably, such results provoke inquiry from patients and families about the applicability of such new therapies to their own situation. Since the last major reviews of small bowel transplantation were published, much new information has been presented (9,10). This article will summarize the research which has led to the success of the cases reported, the current status of bowel transplantation for treatment of short bowel syndrome, and possible directions that future developments may take.

**EXPERIMENTAL TECHNIQUES AND MODELS**

Transplantation of vascularized organs, including the bowel, was first attempted by the French surgeon Alexis Carrel (11). The problem of rejection was soon recognized, and interest languished until the late 1950s, when Lillehei’s group (12) in Minnesota investigated the effects of ischemia on gut organs. They found that cooling and perfusion with heparinized saline would allow reliable preservation of the small bowel for 4 h; this preserved bowel could be re-implanted and would function indefinitely as an autograft (12). Their model consisted of a one-stage operation; the superior mesenteric vessels were isolated, clamped and divided, and the bowel was flushed and then revascularized using the mesenteric vessels of a similarly prepared recipient, re-establishing bowel continuity using end-to-end anastomosis of the native duodenum and ileum to the graft. They also used isolated loops of bowel placed in the neck, permitting the study of immunosuppressive agents and graft function in a controlled fashion such that rejection of the graft would not lead to the death of the animal (13). They had no success with allografts, and with others found minimal survival advantage using the immunosuppressants available at that time—azathioprine and steroids (14-16).

The dog model was used to evaluate the rejection process in detail, and after the introduction of cyclosporine in the 1970s, the orthotopic model of bowel transplantation in the dog was the first used to assess the effects of cyclosporine on small bowel transplantation (17,18). The significant prolongation of graft survival demonstrated by Renick et al (17,18) from Toronto in a landmark study was encouraging, but the overall success rate was low (further details are discussed in the section on immunosuppression).

The description of heterotopic bowel transplantation in the rat by Monchik and Russell in 1971 (19) greatly facilitated study in this field. The rat model has since served as the standard for initial investigations of immunosuppression, function and techniques. Technically, the procedure is similar to that described for larger animals, the main problem being the small size of the vessels. The aorta is used as the conduit for the superior mesenteric artery, and the graft is revascularized using the recipient’s inferior vena cava and aorta. The bowel is left as a Thiry-Villa fistula with proximal and distal stomas (heterotopic graft). Initial attempts to re-establish gastrointestinal continuity immediately using the graft were plagued with a high failure rate (20); however, with experience this improved (21,22). This model then became the standard for investigation of small bowel transplantation in rats. Within the rat model the availability of genetically defined strains of animals has greatly facilitated investigation of the immunological consequences of small bowel transplantation (18,23). The current availability of monoclonal antibodies to various cell populations in the rat should provide further valuable information.

The pig is an excellent model of human bowel physiology, with a more defined genetic lineage than the dog (24). Although earlier attempts had been made (25), Ricour and colleagues (26) were the first to perform successful small bowel transplantation in the pig and achieve allograft survival. The techniques used paralleled those used in the dog.

In reviewing reports of experimental models of small bowel transplantation, one must remember that rejection responses and function vary considerably depending on the model. Inbred strains of rats have varying rejection responses, while outbred larger animals generally undergo a more vigorous reaction (13,19,25). Similarly, different models within the same species may exhibit different rejection responses: grafts drained via the portal circulation of the recipient may have a survival advantage, while caval drainage permits more vigorous rejection (27,28). This may be due to an effect of the liver on soluble antigen processing: liver transplantation has long been known to permit the survival of subsequent grafts from the same

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Immunosuppression</th>
<th>Outcome (reference)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rat: Syngeneic</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Indefinite survival (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat: Fully allogeneic</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Rejection, death at day 14 (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat: GVHD only possible</td>
<td>CsA 15 mg/kg/day</td>
<td>GVHD, death at day 14 (40)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rat: Fully allogeneic</td>
<td>CsA 15 mg/kg/day</td>
<td>Indefinite survival (22)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs: Fully allogeneic</td>
<td>Nil</td>
<td>Rejection, death at day 12 (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dogs: Fully allogeneic</td>
<td>CsA 25 mg/kg/day</td>
<td>91 days average survival (only three of 11 survived longer than 60 days) (17)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pig: Fully allogeneic</td>
<td>CsA 15 mg/kg/day</td>
<td>121 days average survival (indefinite survival in seven of 16) (39)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CsA Cyclosporine; GVHD Graft-versus-host disease
donor, with normal rejection of 'third party' grafts (29,30). Finally, graft survival in heterotopic models does not imply that the graft is necessarily capable of supporting the animal nutritionally.

**REJECTION AND GRAFT-VERSUS-HOST DISEASE**

The histology of small bowel allograft rejection has been well described, and can be divided into three phases (19,31). In the rat at day 3, there is no change detectable with routine light microscopy, but at days 6 and 7, lymphocytes and plasma cells begin to infiltrate the lamina propria. In phase II, over days 8 and 9, the infiltrate intensifies and extends to the muscularis propria. There is associated shortening and blunting of the villi and scattered epithelial sloughing. In phase III, which occurs after the 10th day, there is complete mucosal destruction and transmural infiltration with lymphocytes and polymorphonuclear leukocytes. Rejection is similar in dogs and pigs, but has an accelerated time course; rejection is complete by days 7 to 9 (12-14,26).

The small bowel is unique among transplanted vascularized organs because of the large population of immunocompetent cells which can become activated following transplantation into a non-major histocompatibility complex (MHC) identical recipient. This leads to a phenomenon known as 'graft-versus-host disease', initially described following bone marrow transplantation. This problem was recognized by the early investigators of small bowel transplantation (12), and examined in detail using inbred strains of rats (19). When both rejection and graft-versus-host disease are possible, rejection is the dominant response; however, when animals are treated with potent immunosuppressants such as cyclosporine, graft-versus-host disease becomes important. This results in an activation of graft-derived T cells directed against cell surface antigens of host epidermal cells (possibly primitive stem cell markers [32]). The disease complex seen after small bowel transplantation is a phase of poor appetite, red ears and snout, diarrhea, weight loss and hunched posture, from which most animals recover spontaneously (33).

There may be differences in the intestinal manifestations of the graft-versus-host disease seen after small bowel versus bone marrow transplantation (34); this possibility requires further investigation.

**REJECTION MONITORING**

In the clinical setting it is important to monitor for rejection. The non-specific nature of the early stages of acute rejection noted above were found to limit the usefulness of suction biopsy in monitoring for rejection in the one clinical case that has been well documented (35,36). This problem, coupled with the difficulty and possible hazards of obtaining biopsy material, have prompted investigators to search for alternate methods of monitoring for rejection. The functional capacity of the bowel has been exploited; the best characterized of these markers is the maltose absorption test (37). This test measures the ability of the bowel mucosa to split maltose into glucose and then transport it across the enterocyte into the circulation, where it is detected by monitoring of serum glucose levels. The resulting rise is diminished when rejection is in the initial stages.

A simpler method monitors changes in the permeability of the bowel wall by measuring the urinary excretion of chromium-51 EDTA instilled in the lumen of the graft. The bowel is normally impervious to this compound; an increase in absorption occurs with early graft rejection (38). This test has been used clinically and has been found to correlate well with biopsy evidence of rejection (7).

**METHODS OF IMMUNOSUPPRESSION**

At present, the factor which limits the use of small bowel transplantation clinically is the lack of a reliable protocol for immunosuppression. After the description of the surgical techniques required for successful small bowel transplantation in dogs, a number of different immunosuppressants were used, with limited success. These included steroids, azathioprine, antilymphocyte globulin and graft irradiation (14-16,39). It was not until the introduction of cyclosporine in the late 1970s that a significant prolongation of small bowel allograft survival was achieved (17). The average survival in 11 dogs treated with cyclosporine (25 mg/kg/day, intramuscular injection for the first 28 days, then oral administration) was 91 days, while untreated controls survived an average of 12.5 days. However, it is important to note that only three dogs survived more than 60 days, and two of these succumbed to rejection at 210 days. The importance of using parenteral cyclosporine was demonstrated in a follow-up study from the same group, in which a third set of animals was given oral cyclosporine: seven of 10 died of acute rejection an average of 30 days post transplant (18).

Once it had been shown that cyclosporine prolonged the survival of intestinal allografts in dogs, a series of studies in the more controlled rat model appeared. A dosage of cyclosporine of 15 mg/kg/day allowed indefinite survival of grafts in unidirectional and two-way rejection and graft-versus-host disease models (22). A similar dosage of cyclosporine was also shown to control graft-versus-host disease (40).

The model of bowel transplantation available which most closely resembles the situation in humans is the pig. Monotherapy with high dosage intravenous cyclosporine (15 mg/kg/day) for 10 days post transplant, followed by continued high dosage oral therapy (30 mg/kg/day), has allowed successful transplantation in this model (41). These high dosages seem necessary; protocols using lower doses have an increased rate of animal death, although this has not been shown to be due to rejection (42). In the pig, combined steroid and cyclosporine use increased the rate of infectious complications and did not reduce the rate of rejection (41), while graft irradiation was not useful (43). It is interesting to note that stopping cyclosporine after two to three months of continuous therapy did not lead to allograft rejection (41). The
recipient may develop tolerance to the bowel allograft in a fashion similar to that described for liver transplants (29).

A tremendous effort is underway to improve methods of immunosuppression (44). These methods have in large part focused on pharmacological control of rejection post transplantation. The new drugs FK506, rapamycin and 15-deoxyspergualin have already been shown to allow successful small bowel transplantation in rat models, and are currently being reviewed in large animal and human studies (45-47). Alternative strategies, such as pretreatment of graft with monoclonal antibodies (48) or of host with donor-specific transfusion, are also useful experimentally (49). The challenge at present will be to develop effective combined strategies which optimize both pretreatment of donor and recipient, and post transplantation immunosuppression.

FUNCTION OF TRANSPLANTED BOWEL

In the first studies of small bowel transplantation Lillehei and co-workers (12) showed that animals could survive indefinitely following autotransplantation. No specific study of nutrient absorption was performed, but gross malabsorption of fat was evident for two to three weeks, and then subsided. They were also able to demonstrate regeneration of severed lymphatics after three weeks (50). More detailed studies demonstrated that, following transplantation of the small bowel, dogs had a period of two to three weeks of diarrhea, weight loss and abnormal motility with steatorrhea. These changes reversed over the ensuing months; by six months function had normalized (51). An identical pattern of changes could be produced by denervating the bowel and dividing the lymphatics; it was concluded that the functional alterations of transplantation observed were due to denervation and lymphatic disruption, and were reversible.

Several investigators have shown that the transplanted bowel becomes electrically autonomous, and that this may result in a reduction in glucose, glycine, water and sodium absorption (52,53). Chloride is most significantly affected, with a net secretion in some instances, possibly due to a loss of the normal inhibition of crypt chloride secretion by the autonomic nervous system following small bowel transplantation. Limited studies of bowel function at the enterocyte level have been published: the electrophysiological parameters of the bowel seem normal at nine days post transplant but deteriorate rapidly if rejection occurs (23).

In animals that are nutritionally dependent on a small bowel transplant, long term reductions in fat, protein and carbohydrate absorption have been demonstrated (54-56). Cyclosporine itself may also affect nutrient absorption. Preliminary evidence suggests that cyclosporine reduces glucose, alanine and fatty acid uptake in normal rats, and in autografted bowel in dogs (56,57). Overall, these findings suggest that both the transplantation process itself and rejection (if it occurs) significantly affect the motility, neural and transport functions of small bowel. When the major portion of the small bowel is transplanted, recipient growth is near normal in most models (22,41); however, the length required to sustain the recipient post transplant has not been determined. Given the present interest in trials of bowel transplantation in humans, this area requires further investigation.

CLINICAL EXPERIENCE

All attempts at small bowel transplantation in humans prior to the introduction of cyclosporine were unsuccessful. The longest survivor lived for 76 days; even with a human lymphocyte antigen (HLA) identical donor and (delayed) treatment with steroids, azathioprine and antilymphocyte globulin, rejection and overwhelming sepsis from enteric flora proved fatal (58). Other attempts were equally disappointing (8,59,60). Following the success of small bowel transplantation using cyclosporine in dogs and pigs, a number of attempts at human transplantation have been reported (8,35,61-63). The results have been poor. Typically, rejection is seen in graft biopsies four to 10 days post transplant. Bowel fluid losses increase tremendously. Steroids and antilymphocyte globulin have diminished the rejection response (35,61), but rejection has usually progressed, necessitating graft removal around the 15th day post transplant. Pretreatment of the graft with OKT3 antibody has not reduced the apparent immunogenicity of the bowel (8,35). Rejection has occurred despite portal drainage of the graft, but most patients requiring bowel transplantation have either a thrombosed portal vein or multiple previous operations prohibiting an anastomosis to the portal circulation (8-10). Cyclosporine regimens reported have included intermittent and continuous infusion (35,61-63) with levels of cyclosporine that are therapeutic for kidney and liver transplants (200 to 400 ng/mL in whole blood immunoassay [64]). Toxicity of immunosuppression has been a common problem; cyclosporine has resulted in renal toxicity (8,61), while combined therapy (steroid, antilymphocyte globulin and azathioprine) has resulted in infectious complications (8,35,62). Children receiving bowel as part of a graft of multiple viscera have developed lymphoproliferative disorders (65,66). Clearly, these case reports demonstrate that, with the current state of immune therapy, immune suppression following isolated small bowel transplantation remains a difficult problem. If a very close HLA match can be achieved, it may be possible to control rejection more effectively (58); however, this has not been demonstrated in an animal model.

As noted earlier, in consideration of the possible advantages of portal drainage, liver transplantation reduces rejection of co-transplanted grafts. This may be by nonself antigen processing by the liver or release of soluble MHC antigens which then block cytotoxic antibodies (30). In clinical transplantation, improved survival of renal grafts following liver transplantation has been clearly documented, even in the presence of preformed antibodies to the
graft (67). In addition to this, anatomical considerations had defined the concept of a multivisceral transplant or 'cluster operation' for combined liver and pancreaticoduodenal pathology (65,66). A complete visceral transplant - including stomach, liver, pancreas and various lengths of bowel - can be performed for extensive celiac pathology. In this situation, standard immunosuppressive therapy with cyclosporine, prednisone and antilymphocyte globulin have allowed prolonged survival of the associated bowel (65,66). It seemed logical to extend this to include a combined small bowel and liver graft for short bowel syndrome with associated primary liver disease, as reported by Grant (7). Grant described a typical immunosuppressive protocol for isolated liver transplantation which has prevented rejection in the associated bowel in three patients to date (7, personal communication).

Although initial experience with the cluster operation was entirely clinical and no major problem with rejection of the associated bowel was reported, an experimental study in rats has shown that the cluster operation does not 'protect' the associated bowel (68). However, there are no experimental data dealing specifically with the issue of combined small bowel and liver transplantation. Clinical success already achieved certainly justifies continued interest in this area. Whether or not a person with short bowel syndrome and no associated liver disease should receive a combined liver-small bowel graft, in hopes that the liver will reduce the immunogenicity of the bowel graft, remains to be seen. The survival of patients receiving an isolated liver graft for primary liver disease (over 70% five year survival [69]) demonstrates that the liver transplant portion of a combined liver-small bowel transplantation would be unlikely to harm the recipient. Selected patients with life-threatening complications of short bowel syndrome and primary liver disease can ethically be considered for such therapy (70). With short bowel syndrome alone (and life-threatening complications which prevent combined support with TPN), isolated small bowel transplantation could be considered (8). Given the complexities of the technical and immunological aspects of the procedure, the preliminary work should be concentrated in a few experienced centres. Ongoing evaluation of the results will permit an accurate assessment of the risk/benefit ratio of this procedure (70).
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