Short Report

Annals of Thoracic Surgery

Even in Difficult Lung Recovery Situations, a National Resource Sharing Program Is Doable

Jol C. Boudraux, MD,[1] Marin Urbn, MD, PhD,[2]

College of Medicine, University of Nebraska Medical Center,Omaha, Nebraska

***Corresponding author**

Jol C. Boudraux,
College of Medicine, University of Nebraska Medical Center, Omaha, Nebraska

Received Date: June 06 2024
Accepted Date: June 08 2024
Published Date: July 08 2024

ABSTRACT

Background : Transporting lung allografts while preserving breathing and perfusion is possible with mobile ex vivo lung perfusion (mEVLP), which has shown to be safe and effective and may increase organ use. In addition to mEVLP, a nationwide organ recovery service has been established to offer surgical competence for recovery.services related to transportation.

Methods : We examined individuals at our facility who received donor lungs through this program in order to do lung transplants. Features of donors and recipients, procurement information, and results were gathered and descriptively examined. Consent from each patient was sought.

Results : One patient received a unilateral lung transplant using allografts obtained from the recovery service, while three patients underwent bilateral lung transplants. One graft was from a brain-dead donor, while the other three came from donors who had circulatory death (DCD). One DCD donor in particular required resternotomy due to their difficult nature. Everybody Recovered allografts were of a satisfactory caliber and were eventually transplanted. Adverse effects were rare, and every patient made it to discharge.

Conclusions : Even in difficult procurements, a new national mEVLP procurement service is secure and efficient.A method like this might help boost organ use by utilizing more lung donors overall and DCD donors specifically. Additional research is necessary to determine the effects on organ usage, transplant program resources,and results.

INTRODUCTION

In lung transplantation, the discrepancy between the number of transplants received and the need for organs is well-documented.Ex vivo lung perfusion (mEVLP) 1 enables allograft transfer while preserving perfusion and breathing and may increase organ usage.2. But logistical and structural issues keep this technology from being widely used. Utilizing non-implant center teams to recover lungs in conjunction with mEVLP technology may lead to a higher rate of donor lung use. In this article, we talk aboutour experience with the National Organ Care System Program (NOP; TransMedics Inc.), a cutting-edge national resource-sharing program that permits local recovery teams to obtain and transport donor lungs using mEVLP.

METHODS AND PATIENTS

We looked back at patients at our facility who had lung transplants using donor lungs obtained through the NOP program between September 2021 and the present.and August 2022. With the Organ Care System device, the program offers the technical assistance and knowledge of a procurement surgeon along with EVLP conveyance. We've already covered how to use the Organ Care System and how to recover your lungs.3. Our institution uses the program primarily for geographically distant donors who have circulatory death (DCD) and a low probability of progressing to asystole within a reasonable time frame (120 minutes after life support is withdrawn).We use both quantitative and descriptive terms to describe the transplanting results. The main outcome of concern was the patient's survival till thirty days. Acute rejection, respiratory failure, significant lung infection, bronchial anastomotic complications, and early graft function with primary graft dysfunction at 72 hours were secondary outcomes of interest related to safety. Comparative statistics were not possible due to the minimal number of transplants.Every patient examined in this study gave their individual consent.

RESULTS

Characteristics of the donor, recipient, and recuperation:One patient received a unilateral lung transplant, while three recipients underwent bilateral lung transplantation. After DCD, three received lungs, and one following brain death (gift

following brain death). Three of the recipients were 65 years of age or older, and all had restricted lung physiology and interstitial lung disease diagnoses.The main justification for utilizing the NOP service was logistical in nature. The three DCD cases all involved a lengthy distance between the donor and receiver as well as a The service was mobilized because to the perception of a low probability of development to asystole. Since it was deemed extremely unlikely that case 3 would reach asystole in a reasonable amount of time, no other reliable organ transplant surgical team was present. In the fourth instance, using the recovery service was influenced by both geographic distance and the availability of the procurement surgeon at the implant facility. One DCD recovery in particular (case 1)Discusses the extra surgical and technical difficulty of a resternotomy on a donor who had a childhood septal defect corrected. Three of the donors were older than 55. Everybody With the exception of case 2, whose right lung was used for a single transplant due to contralateral infiltrates, all donors had acceptable P/F ratios. All of the lungs were moved using mEVLP and were judged to be in good enough condition for a subsequent transplant.

Outcomes

There was a minimal frequency of major adverse events associated with grafts (Table 2). Acute rejection was experienced by one patient (case 2), which was successfully administered corticosteroids. Of the 4 patients, 1 had primary graft dysfunction grade 3 at 72 hours. At the most recent follow-up, every recipient had made it through hospital discharge and was still living. The recovery resources that were employed could not be directly linked to any adverse events.

Summary

The safety and viability of a novel national resource-sharing program for lung procurements with mEVLP are demonstrated by this small clinical series. The series consists of the application of recovery services in a particularly difficult donor who needs resternotomy. Due to the additional surgical intricacy involved, a donor's history of sternotomy is generally contraindicated in thoracic transplantation; nevertheless, in this case, the donor's lungs were successfully recovered.The staff from our institution attended nine lung offers in the same year. Among these was DCD, which all required transplants and had no injuries associated with recovery.a receiver passed away within 30 days, as was reported. Furthermore, we asked the NOP staff to attend two lung offers that did not result in organ recovery during this time. In the case of DCD, the organ was rejected at the donor hospital due to functional deterioration; in the case of donation after brain death, the potential donor did not arrest within ninety minutes.In the US, the usage of donor lungs is still quite low and falls behind the utilization of other solid organs, especially those from donors with chronic kidney disease.4 Recent modifications to policy enhance the logistical difficulties associated with the use of donor organs since they have led to an increase in the cost, time, and distance of organ transit.5.Ex situ lung perfusion has the potential to increase organ utilization and has shown to be safe and effective.Two Nonetheless, logistical issues such the need for additional resources, training, and an initial investment in resources At the moment, personnel and expense prohibit its broad use.The logistical load and geographic limitations to organ allocation may be lessened by pooling local resources through a scheme such as NOP. Analysis of Transplant Science's Scientific Registry Using a "different team" to recover lung allografts does not appear to significantly impair results, according to the recipients database.6. But using these teams hasn't always dropped over time, indicating a lack of trust in letting new teams retrieve thoracic organs, maybe due to reservations about their level of experience or a decision to accept the organ based solely on the assessment of another team.6. By making sure that all staff members are properly trained and knowledgeable and by fostering a positive relationship between a reliable recovery team and the implant center, the NOP service may allay worries over recovery by alternative procurement teams.Furthermore, the service employs mEVLP technology in conjunction with this local surgical skill in an effort to maximize the potential benefits of ex situ greater tolerance to ischemia period, reconditioning, and perfusion in serial evaluation of the donor organ. Because of these circumstances, transplant teams may be more inclined to accept organs via a shared service when recovery would provide a logistical challenge for their own teams.ous in DCD. Logistical issues and the unpredictability of asystole progression have been previously noted as obstacles to DCD transplantation.4 These were the exact factors that made this series' utilization of the NOP service necessary. The biggest risk associated with DCD recoveries is a "negative run," where a recovery team is mobilized without any further action. transplanting. A good prediction of the transition to asystole is commonly made, however this can happen with an incidence of up to 40%.timing.7 The use of DCD lung transplantation is currently restricted to facilities that have the financial capacity to sustain a DCD program due to resource commitments. The discrepancy between transplant programs and the reduction of equality within the transplant system is caused by the diversity in DCD adoption throughout programs. This difference may be somewhat mitigated by using community resources through recovery services.Our experience highlights the benefits of the NOP service, especially in DCD, as well as the surgical prowess of the recuperation team. The originality of our the key to the presented experience is the integration of EVLP technology with different-team procurement, which enables difficult

recoveries to be completed even in situations where it would not be financially or logistically viable for a program to send its own teams. However, evidence of cost-utility and clinical outcome equivalency would be necessary for this service to be widely adopted. According to our scant experience thus far, posttransplantation results are comparable to those obtained by conventional recovery.While this could allay worries to some extent, further clinical data are needed and will be available eventually. Olaso and It has recently been shown by colleagues8 that diverse team recoveries are advantageous for institutions. This wasespecially true when the distance between the facilities increases.Regretfully, the study's utilization of DCD donors and EVLP was restricted. In this brief series, we were unable to analyze the service's cost-utility ratio. Consequently, the Extensive research is necessary to determine the precise cost consequences of utilizing the NOP service.In conclusion, even in difficult procurements, a revolutionary national mEVLP recovery service is secure and efficient. A program like this might help increase organ use by using more lung donors overall and DCD donors specifically.The effects on organ consumption, resources allocated to transplant programs, and program outcomes call for more research.

REFERENCES

1. Valapour M, Lehr CJ, Skeans MA, et al. OPTN/SRTR 2019 Annual Data Report: Lung. Am J Transplant. 2021;21(suppl 2):441-520.

2. Loor G, Warnecke G, Villavicencio MA, et al. Portable normothermic ex-vivo lung perfusion, ventilation, and functional assessment with the Organ Care System on donor lung use for transplantation from extended-criteria donors(EXPAND): a single-arm, pivotal trial. Lancet Respir Med. 2019;7:975-984.

3. Warnecke G, Van Raemdonck D, Smith MA, et al. Normothermic ex-vivo preservation with the portable Organ Care System Lung device for bilateral lung transplantation (INSPIRE): a randomised, open-label, non-inferiority,phase 3 study. Lancet Respir Med. 2018;6:357-367.

4. Siddique A, Urban M, Strah H, et al. Controlled DCD lung transplantation:circumventing imagined and real barriers—time for an international task-force? J Heart Lung Transplant. 2022;41:1198-1203.

5. Lehr CJ, Skeans MA, Lease ED, et al. Effects of broader geographic distribution of donor lungs on travel mode and estimated costs of organ procurement. Am J Transplant. 2021;21:4012-4022.

6. Yang Z, Gerull WD, Shepherd HM, et al. Different-team procurements: apotential solution for the unintended consequences of change in lung allocation policy. Am J Transplant. 2021;21:3101-3111.

7. Costa J, Shah L, Robbins H, et al. Use of lung allografts from donation after cardiac death donors: a single-center experience. Ann Thorac Surg.2018;105:271-278.

8. Olaso DG, Halpern SE, Krischak MK, et al. Same-teams versus different teams for long distance lung procurement: a cost analysis. J Thorac Cardiovasc Surg. 2023;165:908-919.e3. https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jtcvs.2022.05.040