A panel of recognized experts in liver transplantation pathology, hepatology, and surgery was convened for the purpose of developing a consensus document for the grading of acute liver allograft rejection that is scientifically correct, simple, and reproducible and clinically useful. Over a period of 6 months pertinent issues were discussed via electronic communication media and a consensus conference was held in Banff, Canada in the summer of 1995. Based on previously published data and the combined experience of the group, the panel agreed on a common nomenclature and a set of histopathological criteria for the grading of acute liver allograft rejection, and a preferred method of reporting. Adoption of this internationally accepted, common grading system by scientific journals will minimize the problems associated with the use of multiple different local systems. Modifications of this working document to incorporate chronic rejection are expected in the future. (HEPATOLOGY 1997;25:658-663.)

The success of hepatic transplantation has resulted in its widespread use for treatment of many patients with end-stage liver disease; it is currently offered by more than 100 centers worldwide. One-year survival rates range from 70% to 90%; and long-term survival of 50% to 60% of patients is not uncommon. Therefore, an increasing number of physicians, including pathologists, many of whom have no specific training in transplantation biology, will become involved in the care of organ allograft recipients.

Despite the good short-term and acceptable long-term survival after hepatic transplantation, the morbidity associated with long-term immunosuppression is significant and rejection remains a persistent, but usually manageable, problem. Clinical research to improve patient survival and lessen morbidity is, therefore, inherent to the clinical practice of hepatic transplantation. Because patient follow-up and successful application of developments could be simplified by a common scale of recognizing, naming, and grading the severity of acute liver allograft rejection, members of an international consensus panel recently agreed upon a common nomenclature and set of definitions. The group next agreed to create an internationally acceptable grading system, which has already been developed for kidney, heart, and lung. At the Third Banff Conference on Allograft Pathology, a group of specialists in liver transplantation from North America, Europe, and Asia met for this purpose.

DEFINITION OF ACUTE REJECTION

In general, organ allograft rejection can be defined as, “an immunological reaction to the presence of a foreign tissue or organ, which has the potential to result in graft dysfunction and failure.” This report is specifically concerned with acute rejection, recently defined by the international consensus document on terminology for hepatic allograft rejection as, “inflammation of the allograft, elicited by a genetic disparity between the donor and recipient, primarily affecting interlobular bile ducts and vascular endothelia, including portal veins and hepatic venules and occasionally the hepatic artery and its branches.” Early rejection, cellular rejection, non-destructive rejection, rejection without duct loss, and reversible rejection are synonyms for acute rejection that appear in the literature, but their use is discouraged. The general clinical, laboratory, and histopathological abnormalities listed below were derived from the international consensus document.

CLINICAL AND LABORATORY FINDINGS

Viewed from a biological perspective, any recipient’s immune system will likely be perturbed after transplantation, resulting in immune activation. However, viewed from a clinical perspective, because of baseline immunosuppressive therapy only some recipients manifest clinical symptoms of allograft recognition with, in the case of liver transplantation, liver biochemical abnormalities (most often), or frank hepatic dysfunction. Therefore, it is important to distinguish between “biological” and “clinically relevant” rejection. The latter may require additional immunosuppressive treatment, although the distinction is not always achievable and treatment philosophies differ at various centers. This is particularly true for hepatic allografts, which are widely acknowledged to be unique. They are more resistant than others to humoral rejection, and are accepted without immunosuppressive therapy in some small and large experimental animal species. Of potential importance for human transplantation is the observation that in all animals in which a liver allograft is eventually accepted without drugs, the allograft undergoes a transient acute rejection crisis. Thus, it should be understood that the histopathological diagnosis of acute rejection may not automatically signal that treatment is indicated, particularly if it is low grade. Adoption of a standardized histopathological grading system possibly could help determine if, and at what point, the histopathological severity of rejection can predict the need for, and success of antirejection...
Biochemical evidence of liver damage manifests as increased glutamyl transpeptidase, and alkaline phosphatase. Leukocytosis and eosinophilia are also frequently present. The diagnosis is strengthened if fine-needle aspirates of the allograft are useful adjunct.

HISTOPATHOLOGIC FINDINGS

Most investigators have observed similar histopathological findings associated with acute rejection. Core needle biopsy specimens may show the following: 1) mixed but predominantly mononuclear portal inflammation, containing blastic (activated) lymphocytes, neutrophils, and frequently eosinophils; 2) bile duct inflammation/damage; and 3) subendothelial inflammation of portal veins or terminal hepatic venules. At least two of these three features are required for a histopathological diagnosis of acute rejection (Fig. 1). Biochemical evidence of liver damage manifests as increased results of tests for liver injury, usually elevation of serum γ-glutamyl transpeptidase and alkaline phosphatase activities, are also frequently present. The diagnosis is considered on clinical grounds and confirmed by examination of a core needle biopsy specimen. Some centers find that fine-needle aspirates of the allograft are useful adjunct.

GRADING OF ACUTE LIVER ALLOGRAFT REJECTION (CRITIQUE OF CURRENTLY POPULAR SYSTEMS)

The panel reviewed each system and agreed that the consensus scheme should fulfill the following criteria: scientific correctness, clinical relevance, simplicity, and reproducibility. They also recognized the need for flexibility and future modifications and therefore proposed a working formulation for the current document.

The grading system used in Pittsburgh is derived from those developed for kidney allograft. It is based on the concept that serious injury from rejection is related to vascular compromise and ischemia, which can morphologically manifest as inflammatory or necrotizing arteritis and/or parenchymal necrosis and hemorrhage. The grading system developed in Minnesota by Snover et al. is more specific to the liver and is based on a combination of an estimate of the severity of the inflammation and the presence and severity of damage or loss of key structures targeted for injury, such as the arterial vasculature or bile ducts. The above two systems have the advantage of simplicity and rely on pathophysiological concepts validated in renal transplantation. Prognostic significance has been shown at a single center. Unfortunately, some of the features used in these schemes to define severe rejection are rarely found, poorly reproducible, or present so frequently in nonrejection complications that their usefulness in grading scheme is limited. For example, while inflammatory or necrotizing arteritis represents a serious injury to the allograft, reproducibly identifying it in core needle biopsies is problematic. In contrast, ballooning of perivenular hepatocytes is frequently present in nonrejection graft syndromes and may not imply serious graft injury from an immunological insult. Bile duct loss, which has also been used to identify severe acute rejection more accurately reflects chronic rejection and possibly, a stage rather than a grade of rejection.

Ko et al. have devised a scheme similar to those mentioned above. However, increased emphasis is placed on precise numerical estimates of lobular injury, such as the percentage of necrosis, which may be difficult to reproduce and may not necessarily reflect rejection-related injury. Moreover, none of the systems was tested for reproducibility.

The European grading system for acute liver allograft rejection, developed by Hubscher and Dousset et al. at Birmingham, is based on a semiquantitative analysis of the diagnostic triad of Snover et al. In this system, portal inflammation, bile duct damage, and venous endothelial inflammation are each graded semiquantitatively on a scale of 0 (absent) to 3 (severe). The individual scores are then added to produce an overall rejection score of 0 to 9, which is then converted to a rejection grade as follows: 0 to 2 = no rejection, 3 = borderline (consistent with), 4 to 5 = mild, 6 to 7 = moderate, and 8 to 9 = severe acute rejection. This system offers the attractive feature of quantifying the necro-inflammatory activity, as has recently become popular in the reporting and follow-up of patients with chronic hepatitis. It also shows a good correlation between histological severity and clinical biochemical signs of graft dysfunction. However, no obvious prognostic value has been shown.
The Royal Free Hospital, London (RFH) grading system34 consists of a semiquantitative assessment of the diagnostic features of rejection, defined as immunosuppression responsive inflammation of rejection type, and identified by discriminant analysis. Mixed portal inflammation, eosinophils, endothelitis, and bile duct damage were found to be independent, statistically significant contributors to the histological diagnosis of acute rejection. Each of the features are scored on a scale of 0 to 3, as in the European grading system, and a total score is derived by adding the individual scores together. Apart from the inclusion of eosinophils, which are of known diagnostic35,36 and pathophysiological significance37,38 as a separate variable in the RFH scheme, it is virtually identical to the European grading system. Like the European system, the RFH system offers a quantitative scale for the rejection-related activity, and is reproducible at the home institution.34 However, neither the European system, nor the RFH system has been shown to have prognostic significance and the numerical cutoff points corresponding to the different degrees of rejection (and consequent therapeutic thresholds) need to be validated. In addition, there are no studies of inter-institutional scoring reproducibility.

The recently published scheme by the National Institute of Diabetes and Digestive Diseases and Kidney Diseases39 had the advantages of being reproducible with prognostic significance documented at several centers. Unfortunately, the imprecise language used to explain the cutoffs for moderate and severe rejection makes the system difficult to follow, even for those experienced in the field.

INTERNATIONAL GRADING SYSTEM FOR ACUTE LIVER ALLOGRAFT REJECTION (RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE PANEL)

Grading of Rejection. The grading of rejection, as with hepatitis, is a measure of the severity of the necro-inflammatory process. In addition, because rejection is more vascocentric and vasculodestructive than hepatitis, some estimate of vascular or ischemic damage is needed to assess the full extent of the insult. This can be accomplished either by a global assessment of the biopsy using a “gestalt” approach, or semiquantitatively with the assignment of numerical scores to different histopathological parameters. No data support one approach over the other, and in practice the two methods yield similar results (see below). Moreover, the semiquantitative approach could complement the global assessment by offering a greater degree of precision, by forcing the pathologist to critically evaluate important histopathological features. Conversely, the global approach can temper the semiquantitative analysis in cases where the inflammation and high scores, in which there is little architectural damage.

The panel agreed that existing grading systems for acute liver allograft rejection are conceptually similar, and that like chronic hepatitis, frequent monitoring and reporting of disease activity is an important function of biopsy analysis.30,33 Therefore, in coming to a consensus, the panel drew upon the strengths, hopefully avoided the pitfalls, and corrected the weaknesses of the currently available grading systems. Portal inflammation, bile duct damage, subendothelial inflammation of portal veins, and terminal hepatic venules, strictly defined inflammatory or necrotizing arteritis and eosinophils (in the proper context) are features that the panel members regard as diagnostic of acute rejection. Portal inflammation, bile duct damage, strictly defined arteritis, and possibly confluent perivenular necrosis associated with perihepatocytic necrosis that extends into the hepatic parenchyma is associated with perivenular hepatitis C (see Complicating Conditions). After the global assessment, three specific features, portal inflammation, bile duct inflammation/damage, and venular inflammation, can be more critically evaluated and semiquantitatively scored on a 0 to 3 (mild, moderate, and severe) scale, according to the criteria listed in Table 2. The three are then added together to arrive at a final Rejection Activity Index (RAI) (Table 2), similar to the scoring developed for chronic hepatitis.30-33 Modifications of the above system 39 were made to arrive at a consensus scheme, so that features given the highest scores on the semi-quantitative analysis were the same as those shown to be of prognostic significance using the overall approach.

Potential problems using this method however, include: 1) the global assessment of rejection may under or overestimate the severity based on a semi-quantitative analysis and 2) the greater degree of “precision” achieved semiquantitatively may occur at the expense of reproducibility. We think that these pitfalls are unlikely to occur because both processes measure the same parameters or endpoints. Moreover, evaluation of a series of 50 posttransplantation liver allograft biopsy specimens using both methods by one of us (AJD) showed no significant differences between the systems. The reproducibility of the semiquantitative analysis will be the subject of future study by this group. The RAI, like other semiquantitative assessments of necro-inflammatory activity, is particularly attractive when evaluating new drugs or other treatment protocols and for comparison with previous biopsy specimens. Thus, it will be most valuable at academic centers involved with new developments in the field. Although strongly recommended for routine patient care, it is not required for day-to-day use if the pathologist chooses otherwise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 1. Grading of Acute Liver Allograft Rejection</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Global Assessment</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indeterminate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mild</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Severe</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Verbal description of mild, moderate, or severe acute rejection could also be labeled as Grade I, II, and III, respectively.
Fig. 2. (A) Low power photomicrograph of a failed liver allograft with severe acute rejection. Note the prominent portal tract (PT) and central vein (CV) inflammation, associated with confluent perivenular necrosis, which is shown at a higher magnification in (B). These findings would elicit a diagnosis of severe acute rejection. (C) In the same liver allograft, the bile duct inflammation and damage was widespread, and there was focal lumenal disruption, eliciting an RAI score of 3 for bile duct damage (Table 2). Both the portal and venous endothelial inflammation were also scored as severe, or “3,” resulting in a total RAI score of 9/9. (D) Sections from the hilum of this failed allograft also revealed clear cut necrotizing arteritis (arrow), which is rarely detected with certainty in needle biopsies.

**Staging of Rejection.** Staging of a biological phenomenon is performed in an attempt to codify a process that is largely unidirectional and evolves in a predictable pattern over a relevant period of time. Acute liver allograft rejection is, for the most part, widely considered to be a completely reversible phenomenon. In the uncommon event of allograft failure from acute rejection, the evolution is relatively rapid. Therefore, acute rejection is not readily amenable to staging. Chronic rejection on the other hand, usually evolves more slowly and is often, but not always, unidirectional or irreversible. At this time it is not clear whether acute and chronic rejection represent the ends of a spectrum of alloreactivity, or if they are completely different biological processes. Considerable data suggest the former, because both processes appear to be triggered by alloreactivity, and persistent or severe acute rejection can result in allograft failure from chronic rejection.

**Clinicopathological Correlation and Treatment of Acute Rejection.** As alluded to in the introductory sections, the histopathological diagnosis of acute rejection does not necessarily imply that the rejection is clinically significant or requires treatment with increased immunosuppression. In fact, Schlitt et al.\(^4^2\) have shown that up to 40% of patients in whom a biopsy shows acute rejection, according to the criteria of Snover et al.\(^1^8,1^9\) did not have clinically apparent graft malfunction or significant elevations of results of liver injury tests, and did not require additional immunosuppressive therapy. Similar conclusions were also reached in a study from Birmingham, in which 70% of histologically mild rejection episodes received no additional immunosuppression, without any adverse outcome.\(^2^8,2^9\)

A survey of the panel members showed no clear-cut consensus on the therapeutic approach to mild acute rejection (RAI \(\leq 4\)) as defined in this report. In contrast, most centers report that patients with histopathological moderate or severe rejection (RAI \(\geq 6\)) experience significant elevations of liver injury tests and the vast majority probably should, and usually are treated with additional immunosuppression. At present, no therapeutic recommendations can be inferred from the mild acute rejection grade, although some centers have exercised the option of routinely obtaining a follow-up biopsy after 1 to 2 weeks.

**Complicating Conditions.** Liver allografts are frequently affected by more than one condition. In the first few weeks after transplantation, preservation-related changes and mechanical problems with the vascular and/or biliary tree are the conditions that most commonly co-exist with acute rejection. Separation of the necro-inflammatory and ischemic damage of rejection from the same type of nonrejection results is at times problematic, but achievable for the most part. For example, perivenular necrosis can occur in both preservation injury and severe rejection. However, the concomitant presence of mononuclear perivenular inflammation, portal changes of rejection, and absence of perivenular necrosis in a prior biopsy, are features that help to distinguish between the two. In contrast, more than several months after
transplantation, chronic viral hepatitis and recurrence of autoimmune chronic inflammatory disorders pose considerable difficulties in differential diagnosis and with grading or scoring of rejection related activity.

The problem of differentiating duct damage associated with complicating conditions such as viral hepatitis C from that seen in acute rejection can be minimized by applying strict diagnostic criteria: damage of more than an occasional bile duct, the presence of unequivocal endotheliitis, and absence of significant lobular disarray and necro-inflammatory activity favor a diagnosis of acute rejection. However, problematic cases will still be encountered, and implicit in any grading scheme for acute rejection (including this one), is the notion that grading can be reliably applied to biopsies only when rejection is thought to be the sole or predominant cause of graft damage. Therefore, in cases where other causes of cellular infiltration are suspected, neither the overall grade nor the scores can be reliably applied. In such cases, it is left to the judgment of the pathologist whether apportioning the necro-inflammatory activity to rejection or other concurrent conditions is appropriate.

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATION

Although the adequacy of any particular biopsy is ultimately left to the judgment of the pathologist, the panel recommends that at least two hematoxylin and eosin stained sections from at least two different levels, of a core needle biopsy containing at least five triads be examined. The adequacy of the biopsy in the absence of any diagnostic findings when fewer than five portal tracts are identified, is again left to the pathologist’s judgment.

The following format for the grading and reporting of acute liver allograft rejection is recommended, although all of this information is not needed in every case. The type of specimen and time after transplantation, if available, should be listed first. This is followed by the histopathological diagnosis(es). Although not necessary, some pathologists may prefer to list first the diagnosis perceived to be of greatest significance, followed by the second most important, and so forth. However, a comment on the presence or absence of acute rejection should be given for every biopsy, either in the diagnosis or comment section. This is followed by reporting of an RAI. The presence of chronic injury, such as bile duct loss or obliterative arteriopathy should also be listed. Lastly, a comparison with the most recent previous biopsy should be made if the pathologist feels that such a comparison is warranted. The following are several examples:

1. Liver allograft, needle biopsy (7 days posttransplantation)
   (a) Moderate preservation injury
   (b) No evidence of rejection (RAI = 0)
   (c) No previous biopsy for comparison

2. Liver allograft, needle biopsy (10 days posttransplantation)
   (a) acute rejection, moderately active (RAI = 7)
   (b) Significantly worse than previous biopsy (S95-999 of 02/06/95[RAI = 2])

3. Liver allograft, needle biopsy (10 weeks posttransplantation)
   (a) Acute hepatitis, viral type C
   (b) No rejection (RAI = 0)

4. Liver allograft, needle biopsy (18 months posttransplantation)
   (a) Chronic hepatitis, viral type B, moderately active (HAI = 14)
   (b) Acute rejection, mildly active (RAI = 4)
   (c) Duct loss in 5/9 portal triads, suggestive of chronic rejection

We believe that this system will be easy to use and useful for physicians caring for allograft recipients. There already are data available to suggest that it will be both reproducible and have prognostic significance, yet flexible enough to incorporate future development like the inclusion of chronic rejection or staging of rejection. We urge scientific journals to adopt this reporting system, classification, and grading of liver allograft rejection, to overcome the obstacles presented by the multiple schemes that currently exist and facilitate comparisons among different centers.
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