

1 **Everolimus and mycophenolate mofetil effectively prevent GvHD in children with severe acute**  
2 **kidney injury undergoing allogeneic HSCT**

3 Felix Zirngibl<sup>1†</sup>, Pimrapat Gebert<sup>2,3</sup>, Bianca Materne<sup>2,3</sup>, Michael Launspach<sup>1,2,4</sup>, Annette Künkele<sup>1,2,4,5</sup>,  
4 Patrick Hundsdoerfer<sup>1,6</sup>, Sandra Cyrull<sup>1</sup>, Hedwig E Deubzer<sup>1,2,4,5,7</sup>, Jörn-Sven Kühl<sup>8</sup>, Angelika Eggert<sup>1,2,4,5</sup>,  
5 Peter Lang<sup>9</sup>, Lena Oevermann<sup>1</sup>, Arend von Stackelberg<sup>1</sup> and Johannes H Schulte<sup>1,4,5,9</sup>

6 <sup>1</sup>Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin, corporate member of Freie Universität Berlin, Humboldt –  
7 Universität zu Berlin, and Berlin Institute of Health, Department of Pediatric Oncology and Hematology,  
8 Berlin, Germany, <sup>2</sup>Berlin Institute of Health at Charité - Universitätsmedizin Berlin, BIH Biomedical  
9 Innovation Academy, BIH Charité Clinician Scientist Program, Berlin, Germany, <sup>3</sup>Charité –  
10 Universitätsmedizin Berlin, corporate member of Freie Universität Berlin, Humboldt – Universität zu  
11 Berlin, and Berlin Institute of Health, Institute of Biometry and Clinical Epidemiology, Berlin, Germany,  
12 <sup>4</sup>German Cancer Consortium (DKTK), Heidelberg, Germany, <sup>5</sup>German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ),  
13 Heidelberg, Germany, <sup>6</sup>Department of Pediatrics, HELIOS Klinikum Berlin Buch, Berlin, Germany,  
14 <sup>7</sup>Neuroblastoma Research Group, Experimental and Clinical Research Center (ECRC) of the Charité and  
15 the Max-Delbrück-Center for Molecular Medicine (MDC) in the Helmholtz Association, Berlin,  
16 Germany, <sup>8</sup>Department of Pediatric Oncology, Hematology and Hemostaseology, University of Leipzig,  
17 Leipzig, Germany, <sup>9</sup>Department of Hematology and Oncology, University Children's Hospital, Eberhard  
18 Karls University Tuebingen, Tuebingen, Germany

19

20 Running heads: Everolimus as GVHD prophylaxis in children.

21 † Corresponding author:  
22 Felix Zirngibl, MD  
23 Charité - Universitätsmedizin Berlin  
24 Department of Pediatric Oncology and Hematology  
25 Augustenburger Platz 1  
26 13353 Berlin  
27 Germany  
28 E-mail: felix.zirngibl@charite.de

29

30 **ABSTRACT**

31 Allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation (HSCT) serves as a therapeutic intervention for  
32 various pediatric diseases. Acute kidney injury afflicts 21-84% of pediatric HSCT cases, significantly  
33 compromising clinical outcomes. This retrospective single-institution analysis scrutinized the practice  
34 of substituting nephrotoxic ciclosporin A with the everolimus/mycophenolate mofetil combination as  
35 graft-versus-host disease (GVHD) prophylaxis in 57 patients following first allogeneic matched donor  
36 HSCT. The control cohort comprised 74 patients not receiving everolimus during the same timeframe.  
37 Study endpoints encompassed the emergence of retention parameters subsequent to the switch to  
38 everolimus, overall survival, relapse incidence of the underlying disease and acute and chronic GVHD  
39 in both treatment groups. Our findings reveal a significant improvement in renal function, evidenced  
40 by reduced creatinine and cystatin C levels 14 days after ceasing ciclosporin A and initiating everolimus  
41 treatment. Crucially, the transition to everolimus did not adversely affect overall survival post-HSCT  
42 (HR 1.4; 95% CI: 0.64 – 3.1; p=0.39). Comparable incidences of grade 2-4 and grade 3-4 acute GVHD as  
43 well as severe chronic GVHD were observed in both groups. Patients with an underlying malignant  
44 disease exhibited similar event-free survival in both treatment arms (HR 0.87, 95% CI: 0.39 – 1.9,  
45 p=0.73). This study provides compelling real-world clinical evidence supporting the feasibility of  
46 replacing CsA with everolimus and for the use of the everolimus/mycophenolate mofetil combination  
47 to manage acute kidney injury following HSCT in children.

48

49 **KEY POINTS:**

50 • Everolimus with or without MMF restores kidney function in children with acute kidney  
51 injury after allogeneic HSCT.

52 • Everolimus with or without MMF effectively prevent acute and chronic GvHD and leads to  
53 similar overall survival compared to standard therapy.

## 54 INTRODUCTION

55 Allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation (HSCT) is a therapeutic option to treat malignant  
56 (leukemias and lymphomas) and non-malignant diseases (aplastic anemia, myelodysplastic syndrome,  
57 hemoglobinopathies, immunodeficiency disorders and inborn metabolic diseases).<sup>1</sup> Recently,  
58 allogeneic HSCT has emerged as a viable treatment approach for pediatric patients with solid tumors,  
59 such as neuroblastoma.<sup>2</sup> Transplant related mortality (TRM) has demonstrated substantial  
60 improvement over the last decades. The 5-year overall survival (OS) rate rose from 41.8% in the period  
61 1984-2001 to 79% in the years 2001 to 2009.<sup>3</sup> Specifically, among children aged 4-18 years with a high-  
62 risk acute lymphoblastic leukemia in complete remission prior to first allogeneic HSCT, reported TRM  
63 rates fell below 10%.<sup>4</sup> However, TRM is negatively influenced by patient age, donor type, and disease  
64 status<sup>5,6</sup> and remains a substantial issue. Thus, it is crucial to further improve management of HSCT  
65 complications.

66 Acute kidney injury (AKI) occurs in 21-84% of pediatric HSCT cases in the literature and continues to be  
67 a severe problem.<sup>7,8</sup> Patients requiring dialysis show a mortality rate of up to 77%.<sup>9,10</sup> This association  
68 also applies to earlier-stage AKI as demonstrated by Kizilbash *et al*, who showed that a reduced OS  
69 correlates with an increasing severity of AKI.<sup>8</sup> It remains therefore important, to prevent progression  
70 of AKI.

71 Biology of the underlying disease and infections, along with acute and chronic graft versus host disease  
72 (GVHD) are decisive determinants for the success of allogeneic HSCT.<sup>11,12</sup> Patients experiencing  
73 advanced GVHD exhibit poorer OS.<sup>13,14</sup> Consequently, GVHD prophylaxis is a primary challenge in  
74 clinical HSCT, particularly for patients with benign underlying diseases. A common strategy for GVHD  
75 prophylaxis involves a combination of ciclosporin A (CsA) and a short course of methotrexate (MTX),  
76 primarily used for myeloablative conditioning regimens. Nonmalignant diseases are often treated with  
77 a nonmyeloablative reduced intensity conditioning (RIC) regimen and a combination of CsA and  
78 mycophanolate mofetil (MMF).<sup>15</sup> Additionally, serotherapy with anti-thymocyte globulin (ATG) is

79 applied to further reduce the risk of acute and, especially, chronic GVHD.<sup>16,17</sup> CsA is known to be a  
80 nephrotoxic drug, with nephrotoxicity attributed to vasoconstriction of the afferent arterioles.<sup>18</sup> This  
81 vascular malfunction results from an increase in vasoconstrictive factors including thromboxane,  
82 endothelin, renin-angiotensin system activation, as well as a reduction of vasodilators like nitric oxide,  
83 prostacyclin and prostaglandin E2 (reviewed in *Naesens et al*<sup>19</sup>). Tacrolimus, another calcineurin  
84 inhibitor (CNI) besides CsA, less frequently used in pediatrics, also harbors nephrotoxic properties  
85 similar to those of CsA.<sup>20,21</sup> Consequently, alternative immunosuppressive drug combinations must  
86 be found for patients with either preexisting or therapy-induced kidney injury.

87 Sirolimus (rapamycin), named after its discovery site, the Easter Island (*Rapa Nui*), is a naturally  
88 occurring compound isolated from a soil saprophyte. It inhibits the mammalian target of rapamycin  
89 (mTOR), an essential regulator of cell cycle in proliferating T cells. As an immunosuppressant,  
90 everolimus has been successfully used after solid organ transplantation in a combinatorial approach  
91 with CsA to prevent allograft rejection.<sup>22</sup> Everolimus is a hydroxyethylester derivative of sirolimus with  
92 a shorter half-life (22 vs 72 hours), making everolimus serum levels better manageable in daily clinical  
93 practice. Orally bioavailable everolimus is rapidly absorbed, reaching maximum drug concentrations  
94 after 1 and 2 hours.<sup>23</sup> Metabolization primarily occurs in the gut and liver by cytochrome P450 (CYP)  
95 3A4, 3A5, and 2C8.<sup>23</sup> Major class-effect toxicities in cancer patients were stomatitis, infections,  
96 noninfectious pneumonitis, fatigue, rash and diarrhea.<sup>24</sup> On the other hand, everolimus lacks  
97 nephrotoxicity.<sup>25</sup> Patients who converted early after kidney transplantation from CsA to everolimus  
98 showed greater improvement of renal function compared to CsA-treated controls.<sup>26</sup> In this  
99 retrospective single center analysis we evaluated the practice at our institution to substitute CsA with  
100 the combination everolimus/MMF as GVHD-prophylaxis after first allogeneic HSCT in patients with  
101 severe AKI. To date, it is still unclear whether the immunosuppressive capacity of everolimus alone or  
102 in combination with MMF, without the use of calcineurin inhibitors, is sufficient to prevent GVHD, and  
103 so far, no studies exist to prove GVHD prophylaxis efficacy of everolimus in pediatric HSCT.

104

105 **PATIENTS AND METHODS**

106 *Study design, setting and participants*

107 This retrospective cohort study includes all patients treated with everolimus as GVHD prophylaxis after  
108 first allogeneic stem cell transplantation at Charité University Medicine Berlin between August 16,  
109 2016 and September 29, 2020. The control cohort consisted of patients who underwent their first HSCT  
110 within the same timeframe but did not receive everolimus at any point post-transplantation. Patients  
111 who underwent mismatched family donor transplantation without subsequent CN1 treatment for  
112 GVHD prophylaxis were excluded. This work only contains routinely acquired data, presented in an  
113 anonymous form. The study was ethically approved by the institutional review board, *Charité's Ethics*  
114 *Committee*, under the reference EA2/144/15. This study adheres to the Strengthening the Reporting  
115 of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (STROBE) principles.

116 *Variables*

117 The primary outcomes were incidence of acute and chronic GVHD, OS and relapse of the underlying  
118 malignant disease. Additional variables included in the analysis were demographic features, transplant  
119 type, conditioning type, plasma creatinine levels, plasma cystatin C levels and plasma everolimus  
120 levels.

121 *Data sources/ measurement*

122 The medical records of all patients were evaluated for demographic features, dates of treatment and  
123 disease progression, received treatment, conditioning regimens used for HSCT, plasma creatinine and  
124 plasma cystatin C, occurrence of acute renal failure, everolimus plasma levels, occurrence of death,  
125 occurrence of acute and chronic GVHD and last follow-up. All data analyzing the incidence of acute or  
126 chronic GVHD were censored at the date of underlying disease relapse or death. Staging and grading  
127 of acute GvHD were based on Glucksberg *et al* in accordance with the European Society for Blood and  
128 Marrow Transplantation (EBMT) recommendations.<sup>27</sup> Relapse was defined as the recurrence of the  
129 underlying malignant disease (morphologic, cytogenetic or molecular). The OS was defined where

130 death from any cause was considered an event. The Jaffé-method was employed for creatinine  
131 measurement. Everolimus plasma levels were determined by enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay.

### 132 *Bias*

133 The replacement of standard immunosuppression (CsA) with the combination everolimus/MMF was  
134 only performed in patients with AKI or with severe neurotoxicity. This fact represents a selection bias  
135 for patients with a significant complication in in their HSCT course.

### 136 *Statistical methods*

137 Since a patient's everolimus covariate status changes over time, the Simon-Makuch method<sup>28</sup> was  
138 employed to depict the probability of OS and event-free survival (EFS).incidence of GVHD and relapse.  
139 The Simon-Makuch method generates survival curves for different levels of a time-dependent  
140 covariate. This method appropriately aligns the number of patients at risk as events (everolimus  
141 started yes/no) develop after HSCT. Cox proportional hazards analysis, incorporating a time-dependent  
142 covariate, was applied for OS and EFS. Cumulative incidence for competing events were conducted to  
143 evaluate the incidence of relapse and acute and chronic GVHD, using cause-specific approach. The  
144 effect of switch to everolimus as GVHD prophylaxis on survival was tested using the Mantel-Byar test.  
145 A 2-tailed P-value < 0.05 was considered statistically significant. Computations were performed using  
146 GraphPad prism (LaJolla, CA, USA), Stata IC15 (StataCorp, 2017, College Station, TX, USA) and the  
147 statistical software 'EZR' (Easy R), which is based on R and R commander.<sup>29,30</sup>

148 **RESULTS**

149 Patients' characteristics

150 A total of 57 patients received everolimus with or without MMF during their clinical course after their  
151 first allogeneic HSCT as GVHD prophylaxis. Four patients (7.0%, #2, #20, #41 and #46) switched from  
152 Ciclosporin A to everolimus due to neurotoxicity. Patients #5 and #54 had an impaired renal function  
153 already before HSCT and did not receive CsA but started with everolimus/MMF. The remaining 51  
154 (89.5%) patients received everolimus ± MMF because of escalating retention parameters and  
155 subsequent acute renal failure (**Figure 1**). The everolimus cohort is older compared to the control  
156 cohort, representing their higher susceptibility to develop AKI. The everolimus cohort comprises a  
157 diverse range of malignant (n=18, 31.6%) and nonmalignant (n=39, 68.4%) underlying diseases. The  
158 most frequent diagnoses were acute lymphoblastic leukemia (ALL) (n=15, 26.3%) and sickle cell disease  
159 (n=13, 22.8%). One ALL patient (#14) had trisomy 21. The median time of follow up was 36.9 months  
160 (range: 0.6-71.7). One patient (#42) is lost to follow up from day 201, but still alive. A cohort of 74  
161 patients undergoing first allogeneic HSCT, receiving a standard calcineurin inhibitor-based GVHD  
162 prophylaxis and never received everolimus, served as a control. One patient with a malignant  
163 underlying disease of the CsA group was lost to follow up on day 211 without further information.  
164 Patients' and control group's characteristics are shown in **Table 1**.

165 Descriptive Data

166 The median time of initiating Everolimus was 22 days (d) after HSCT ranging from -2 to 98. Median  
167 duration of everolimus treatment was 47 d (range: 11-128) for patients with a malignant underlying  
168 disease (#1-18) and 128 d (range: 11-355) for patients with a benign underlying disease (#19-57). The  
169 Median duration of MMF treatment was 29 d (range: 0-364) for patients with a malignant underlying  
170 disease (#1-18) and 64 d (range: 0-364) for patients with a benign underlying disease (#19-57).  
171 Everolimus was started at 1.6 mg/m<sup>2</sup>/d orally in two divided doses and dosing was subsequently  
172 adjusted to maintain blood concentrations between 3 and 8 ng/ml. Blood through levels for



173 everolimus, measured by ELISA, are presented in **Figure 2** and were within the target range in most  
174 cases. If started, MMF was administered at a dose of 600 mg/m<sup>2</sup> twice daily. The immunosuppressive  
175 drugs used during the clinical course of the everolimus cohort is illustrated in **Figure 3**. Everolimus had  
176 to be discontinued in one patient who developed interstitial pneumonitis (#27) and in two patients  
177 who developed painful oral ulcers (#16, #56). Otherwise, we did not observe any toxicities  
178 necessitating discontinuation, including proteinuria, development of sinusoidal obstruction syndrome  
179 (SOS) or severe hepatotoxicity, although very high plasma levels were measured in some cases (**Figure**  
180 **2**).

### 181 Renal function

182 Renal function was evaluated by measuring plasma creatinine (Jaffé-method) and plasma cystatin C  
183 relative to baseline at the day of transplantation. The decision to switch from standard CNI treatment  
184 to everolimus ± MMF was based on the development and the dynamics of acute renal failure and  
185 increasing retention parameters in the context of the patient's general condition. When feasible,  
186 essential co-medication was dose-adjusted to the glomerular filtration rate or substituted with less  
187 nephrotoxic drugs, otherwise nephrotoxic medication was halted. For instance, amphotericin B was  
188 replaced by an azole and in some cases vancomycin was replaced by linezolid. If these interventions  
189 proved insufficient, ciclosporin A was stopped and everolimus was started. Everolimus plasma  
190 concentrations were monitored up to thrice a week, and the dose of everolimus was subsequently  
191 adjusted to achieve target trough levels (**Figure 2**). The median blood through levels were 5.46 ng/mL  
192 ranging from 1.01 to 23.97 ng/mL. After everolimus was started, plasma creatinine significantly  
193 decreased from a mean of 294 % (±158) relative to baseline, measured on the day of HSCT to 158 %  
194 (±67) 14d later (**Figure 4A**), plasma cystatin C decreased from 210 % (±68) of baseline to 135 % (±50)  
195 (**Figure 4B**). Patients #5 and #54 were excluded from this analysis as they initially started with  
196 everolimus. For patients #2, #14, #34, #40, #41, #42 and #46 no reasonable data for cystatin C were  
197 collected, leading to their exclusion from the analysis. Therefore, 55 patients could be included for  
198 creatinine analysis and 48 patients could be included for cystatin C analysis. Our data demonstrate that

199 changing immunosuppression from CsA to everolimus with or without MMF, significantly improves  
200 renal function of pediatric patients post-HSCT.

### 201 Graft versus host disease

202 Changing the immunosuppressive strategy during the post-HSCT course may result in the undesirable  
203 complication of acute or chronic GVHD. The cumulative incidence of competing events of grade II-IV  
204 aGVHD is shown in **Figure 5A**. In the everolimus group 10.0 % of patients develop grade II-IV aGVHD  
205 vs 18.2 % in the control cohort with a hazard ratio (HR) of 0.88 (95% CI: 0.29 – 2.7; p=0.82). The  
206 cumulative incidence of competing events of grade III-IV aGVHD is presented in **Figure 5A**. In the  
207 everolimus group 7.5 % of patients develop grade III-IV aGVHD, as opposed to 7.0 % in the control  
208 cohort with a HR of 1.82 (95% CI: 0.45 – 7.4; p=0.40) showing no significant difference. Consequently,  
209 patients that develop no signs of aGVHD until they switch to everolimus have a low risk of developing  
210 severe GVHD after this transition. Out of the everolimus cohort, 6 patients developed any signs of  
211 grade III-IV aGVHD, 3 (50 %) out of these patients had first GVHD symptoms before everolimus was  
212 started. Only one of the everolimus patients showed a relapse of mild GVHD symptoms (#14) after  
213 everolimus was started. Overall, most aGVHD symptoms in patients receiving everolimus were mild,  
214 and no severe relapses of preexisting GVHD were observed after the switch to everolimus. The  
215 incidence of severe chronic GVHD (cGVHD) was slightly higher in the everolimus cohort as depicted in  
216 **Figure 5C**. In the everolimus group 12.2 % of patients developed severe cGVHD and all had severe  
217 intestinal cGVHD, whereas 2 % of patients of the control cohort developed severe cGVHD (**Figure 5C**).  
218 This difference, however, was not statistically significant (HR 2.76, 95% CI: 0.69 – 11.0; p=0.15).  
219 Furthermore, we assessed possible confounders on GVHD incidence. Underlying diseases differed  
220 slightly in our study groups. However, ALL and sickle cell disease, the most prevalent underlying disease  
221 in our study, did not alter the HR of developing acute or chronic GVHD (**Table 2**). No events for grade  
222 3-4 aGVHD were recorded for sickle cell disease in the everolimus group (**Table 2**). Furthermore, the  
223 graft source differed between the everolimus group and the CsA group. Patients who received  
224 everolimus were more frequently transplanted with a manipulated peripheral blood stem cell graft

225 containing a defined amount of T-cells. Manipulated peripheral blood stem cell grafts did not lead to  
226 higher rates of acute or chronic GVHD compared to bone marrow grafts. Thus, we could rule out the  
227 graft source as a confounding variable.

#### 228 Overall and event-free survival

229 The OS did not show a significant difference between the two groups (HR 1.4; 95% CI: 0.64 – 3.1;  
230  $p=0.39$ ). The 100-day and 2-year OS were 92.3% and 79.8% for the everolimus group and 95.3% and  
231 84.1% in the control cohort, respectively (**Figure 6**). However, patients with a malignant underlying  
232 disease exhibited a significantly lower OS compared to the control cohort (HR 2.7, 95% CI: 1.1 – 6.9,  
233  $P=0.04$ ) (**Figure 7A**). The 2-year OS for this cohort was 58.6% in the everolimus group versus 83.7% in  
234 the control group. On the contrary, the relapse incidence after 2 years was higher in patients of the  
235 control cohort at 52.8% compared to 28.2% for everolimus patients (HR=0.55; 95% CI: 0.19 - 1.6;  
236  $p=0.27$ ), although this difference was not statistically significant (**Figure 7B**). Taken together, these  
237 findings result in an equivalent EFS (HR 0.84, 95% CI: 0.43 – 2.0,  $P=0.88$ ) (**Figure 7C**). In conclusion, we  
238 demonstrate a non-inferiority in OS for patients receiving everolimus as GVHD prophylaxis, conversely,  
239 we observe a trend suggesting that everolimus might be beneficial for relapse-free survival in patients  
240 with a malignant disease.

## 241 **DISCUSSION**

242 The aim of this retrospective analysis was to evaluate the feasibility of using everolimus in combination  
243 with or without MMF as GVHD prophylaxis when CNI had to be discontinued in a pediatric cohort of  
244 patients after their first allogeneic stem cell transplantation. The patients were treated at the  
245 Department of Pediatric Oncology and Hematology at the Charité – Universitätsmedizin Berlin  
246 between 2016 and 2019. The primary reasons for CNI discontinuation were nephrotoxicity and  
247 neurotoxicity. We show that, following the switch from ciclosporin A to everolimus ± MMF, retention  
248 parameters significantly decreased. The use of everolimus was not associated with a significantly  
249 higher overall incidence of acute or chronic GVHD. Despite AKI being considered a serious complication  
250 during post-transplant course, patients receiving everolimus exhibited a similar OS compared to the  
251 control cohort. Additionally, everolimus patients with a malignant underlying disease had a similar EFS  
252 compared to the control cohort. Subgroup analyses did not reveal any risk factors for the occurrence  
253 of GVHD or death. Here, we provide the first proof of concept, that everolimus in combination with  
254 MMF is a feasible immunosuppressive strategy in pediatric patients with AKI after allogeneic HSCT.

255 Our study significantly extends the existing data for the use of everolimus or mTOR inhibition in  
256 allogeneic HSCT. In adult transplantation, the addition of Sirolimus to standard CsA plus MTX for GVHD  
257 prophylaxis resulted in improved relapse-free and OS, with similar rates of advanced GVHD in a  
258 multicentre, randomised, phase 3 trial.<sup>31</sup> Pidala *et al* demonstrated a lower incidence of acute and  
259 chronic GVHD in patients treated with sirolimus/tacrolimus than with MTX/tacrolimus in a randomized  
260 phase 2 trial.<sup>32</sup> Everolimus was evaluated as GVHD prophylaxis in combination with tacrolimus in adults  
261 and appeared to be effective for the prevention of GVHD, however, the trial had to be terminated  
262 prematurely due to the development of sinusoidal obstruction syndrome in 25% of patients.<sup>33</sup> In  
263 contrast to these results, we did not observe any life-threatening toxicity attributable to everolimus in  
264 our study. In three cases however, everolimus treatment had to be discontinued because of adverse  
265 events, such as stomatitis and interstitial pneumonitis. These adverse events were mild to moderate  
266 and in each case the ameliorated renal function allowed a re-conversion to CNI-treatment. A single-

267 center phase I/II trial investigated the combination of everolimus and MMF as calcineurin inhibitor-  
268 free GVHD prophylaxis for 24 patients with hematologic malignancies and resulted in high rates of  
269 acute and chronic GVHD rates.<sup>34</sup> The main difference to this study is that our patients converted from  
270 CNI-treatment to everolimus only after a median time of 22 days after HSCT. Only two patients  
271 received exclusively everolimus/MMF. The first (#53) suffered from severe aGVHD beginning on day  
272 40 after HSCT and ultimately died due to severe cGVHD involving gut and lungs. The second patient  
273 (#15) is still alive three years after HSCT and shows no signs of cGVHD. Considering the literature and  
274 these cases, it appears that the very early stage after HSCT is critical for the development of acute and  
275 chronic GVHD. Therefore, it might be important to initiate CNI-based GVHD prophylaxis before safely  
276 incorporating everolimus/MMF. Supporting this hypothesis, other studies have identified the  
277 importance of sufficient CsA-levels during the first days after HSCT. Bianchi *et al* strongly recommend  
278 maintaining sufficient CsA levels during the initial 10 days after HSCT to reduce aGVHD.<sup>35</sup> Additional  
279 studies demonstrate that a higher CsA starting dose of 5 mg/kg/day is independently associated with  
280 a lower risk for aGVHD<sup>36</sup> or that lower CsA through levels lead to a higher incidence of grade II-IV  
281 aGVHD in the first four weeks after HSCT.<sup>37</sup>

282 Interestingly, we did not see a difference in OS between both patient groups, despite an increased  
283 mortality for pediatric patients with AKI being described in the literature.<sup>7-10</sup> This observation might  
284 suggest that the conversion to everolimus/MMF could also have a beneficial effect on patient  
285 outcome, potentially counteracting the negative impact of AKI. One possible explanation might be a  
286 favorable effect on immune reconstitution. The role of everolimus and MMF in immune reconstitution,  
287 especially on CD4<sup>+</sup> T cells, is not yet fully understood. Stable renal transplant recipients treated with  
288 an mTOR inhibitor, but not with CNI showed higher levels of circulating Tregs.<sup>38</sup> In a murine GVHD  
289 model, treatment with rapamycin led to decreased activity of alloreactive conventional T cells, while  
290 regulatory T cells retained their immunosuppressive function, providing GVHD protection.<sup>39</sup> In contrast  
291 to these results, Schaefer *et al* showed a protracted overall, regulatory and naïve CD4<sup>+</sup> T cell  
292 reconstitution of adult patients that received everolimus/MMF after HSCT in a prospective single-

293 center study compared with historical CNI-receiving controls.<sup>34</sup> Furthermore, a beneficial effect could  
294 be explained by the direct anti-tumor efficacy of everolimus.<sup>40,41</sup> The phosphatidylinositol-3-kinase  
295 (PI3K)/Akt and the mTOR signaling pathway, are hyperactivated in 50-80 % of AML patients<sup>42</sup> and  
296 mTOR inhibition might be a possible therapeutic target. Everolimus monotherapy showed only limited  
297 therapeutic success.<sup>43</sup> However, when combined with the hypomethylating agent azacitidine,  
298 everolimus led to promising results in OS and overall response rates in advanced AML.<sup>44</sup> Also, for  
299 relapsed pediatric ALL, everolimus has been shown to be associated with favorable rates of complete  
300 remission and low end-reinduction MRD in a combination with a four-drug reinduction  
301 chemotherapy.<sup>45</sup> In both combinations, everolimus seems to work as a sensitizer. However, whether  
302 this effect also contributes to the graft-versus-leukemia effect after HSCT remains to be shown.

303 With 131 patients, we were able to analyze a considerably large pediatric HSCT cohort. However, a  
304 larger group of patients would further increase the statistical interpretability. The underlying diseases  
305 and the used conditioning regimens varied substantially in our cohort, making it hard to identify  
306 specific subgroups that might benefit or be adversely affected by the conversion to everolimus/MMF.  
307 Along with the retrospective nature of the study, this diminishes the impact of our findings. In ongoing  
308 and future studies, it will be crucial to prospectively validate these results. Additionally, more detailed  
309 data on infectious complications and immune reconstitution should be collected.

310 In conclusion, our data represent the first clinical evidence that a conversion from CNI-based GVHD  
311 prophylaxis to everolimus/MMF during the clinical course after HSCT appears safe and feasible in  
312 pediatric patients across various underlying diseases. The earliest appropriate starting time of  
313 everolimus/MMF has yet to be defined but should probably not be during the first week post-HSCT.  
314 The duration of immunosuppressive treatment with everolimus/MMF strongly depends on the specific  
315 patient's clinical course. Based on our data and in-house experience, we would generally recommend  
316 a duration of everolimus until day +180 after HSCT for benign underlying diseases and until day +80  
317 for malignant underlying diseases in the absence of clinical evidence of acute or chronic GVHD.

318 Acknowledgements: The authors thank Kathy Astrahantseff for editorial advice.

319 Authorship contributions: FZ conceptualized the study, collected and analyzed data and prepared the  
320 manuscript. PL and JHS established the concept of CsA substitution by everolimus/MMF. ML, LO, JSK,  
321 AvS, SC, PH, AK, AE, & PL participated in the treatment of patients, in designing the study, discussing  
322 the data and reviewed the manuscript. BM and PG performed the cumulative incidence with  
323 competing events, gave input on statistical aspects and possible sources of bias and reviewed the  
324 manuscript. JHS co-conceptualized the study and reviewed the data, results and manuscript. All  
325 authors have read and agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

326 Funding: No funding was received.

327 Disclosure of Conflicts of Interest: The authors have nothing to declare.

328

- 330 1. Ljungman P, Urbano-Ispizua A, Cavazzana-Calvo M, et al. Allogeneic and autologous  
331 transplantation for haematological diseases, solid tumours and immune disorders: definitions and  
332 current practice in Europe. *Bone Marrow Transplant*. Mar 2006;37(5):439-49.  
333 doi:10.1038/sj.bmt.1705265
- 334 2. Illhardt T, Toporski J, Feuchtinger T, et al. Haploidentical Stem Cell Transplantation for  
335 Refractory/Relapsed Neuroblastoma. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. May 2018;24(5):1005-1012.  
336 doi:10.1016/j.bbmt.2017.12.805
- 337 3. Mateos MK, O'Brien TA, Oswald C, et al. Transplant-related mortality following allogeneic  
338 hematopoietic stem cell transplantation for pediatric acute lymphoblastic leukemia: 25-year  
339 retrospective review. *Pediatr Blood Cancer*. Sep 2013;60(9):1520-7. doi:10.1002/pbc.24559
- 340 4. Peters C, Dalle JH, Locatelli F, et al. Total Body Irradiation or Chemotherapy Conditioning in  
341 Childhood ALL: A Multinational, Randomized, Noninferiority Phase III Study. *J Clin Oncol*. Feb 1  
342 2021;39(4):295-307. doi:10.1200/jco.20.02529
- 343 5. Zaucha-Prazmo A, Gozdzik J, Debski R, Drabko K, Sadurska E, Kowalczyk JR. Transplant-related  
344 mortality and survival in children with malignancies treated with allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell  
345 transplantation. A multicenter analysis. *Pediatr Transplant*. May 2018;22(3):e13158.  
346 doi:10.1111/petr.13158
- 347 6. Matthes-Martin S, Pötschger U, Bergmann K, et al. Risk-adjusted outcome measurement in  
348 pediatric allogeneic stem cell transplantation. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. Mar 2008;14(3):335-43.  
349 doi:10.1016/j.bbmt.2007.12.487
- 350 7. Raina R, Herrera N, Krishnappa V, et al. Hematopoietic stem cell transplantation and acute  
351 kidney injury in children: A comprehensive review. *Pediatr Transplant*. Jun  
352 2017;21(4)doi:10.1111/petr.12935
- 353 8. Kizilbash SJ, Kashtan CE, Chavers BM, Cao Q, Smith AR. Acute Kidney Injury and the Risk of  
354 Mortality in Children Undergoing Hematopoietic Stem Cell Transplantation. *Biol Blood Marrow  
355 Transplant*. Jul 2016;22(7):1264-1270. doi:10.1016/j.bbmt.2016.03.014
- 356 9. Rajpal JS, Patel N, Vogel RI, Kashtan CE, Smith AR. Improved survival over the last decade in  
357 pediatric patients requiring dialysis after hematopoietic cell transplantation. *Biol Blood Marrow  
358 Transplant*. Apr 2013;19(4):661-5. doi:10.1016/j.bbmt.2012.12.012
- 359 10. Lane PH, Mauer SM, Blazar BR, Ramsay NK, Kashtan CE. Outcome of dialysis for acute renal  
360 failure in pediatric bone marrow transplant patients. *Bone Marrow Transplant*. May 1994;13(5):613-  
361 7.
- 362 11. Zeiser R, Blazar BR. Acute Graft-versus-Host Disease - Biologic Process, Prevention, and  
363 Therapy. *N Engl J Med*. Nov 30 2017;377(22):2167-2179. doi:10.1056/NEJMra1609337
- 364 12. Zeiser R, Blazar BR. Pathophysiology of Chronic Graft-versus-Host Disease and Therapeutic  
365 Targets. *N Engl J Med*. Dec 28 2017;377(26):2565-2579. doi:10.1056/NEJMra1703472
- 366 13. Akpek G, Zahurak ML, Piantadosi S, et al. Development of a prognostic model for grading  
367 chronic graft-versus-host disease. *Blood*. Mar 1 2001;97(5):1219-26. doi:10.1182/blood.v97.5.1219
- 368 14. Cahn J-Y, Klein JP, Lee SJ, et al. Prospective evaluation of 2 acute graft-versus-host (GVHD)  
369 grading systems: a joint Société Française de Greffe de Moëlle et Thérapie Cellulaire (SFGM-TC),  
370 Dana Farber Cancer Institute (DFCI), and International Bone Marrow Transplant Registry (IBMTR)  
371 prospective study. *Blood*. 2005;106(4):1495-1500. doi:10.1182/blood-2004-11-4557
- 372 15. Lawitschka A, Lucchini G, Strahm B, et al. Pediatric acute graft-versus-host disease  
373 prophylaxis and treatment: surveyed real-life approach reveals dissimilarities compared to published  
374 recommendations. *Transpl Int*. Jul 2020;33(7):762-772. doi:10.1111/tri.13601
- 375 16. Finke J, Bethge WA, Schmoor C, et al. Standard graft-versus-host disease prophylaxis with or  
376 without anti-T-cell globulin in haematopoietic cell transplantation from matched unrelated donors: a  
377 randomised, open-label, multicentre phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol*. Sep 2009;10(9):855-64.  
378 doi:10.1016/s1470-2045(09)70225-6



- 379 17. Kröger N, Solano C, Wolschke C, et al. Antilymphocyte Globulin for Prevention of Chronic  
380 Graft-versus-Host Disease. *N Engl J Med*. Jan 7 2016;374(1):43-53. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1506002
- 381 18. Dieperink H, Starklint H, Leyssac PP, Kemp E. Glomerulotubular function in cyclosporine-  
382 treated rats. A lithium clearance, occlusion time/transit time and micropuncture study. *Proc Eur Dial*  
383 *Transplant Assoc Eur Ren Assoc*. 1985;21:853-9.
- 384 19. Naesens M, Kuypers DRJ, Sarwal M. Calcineurin Inhibitor Nephrotoxicity. *Clin J Am Soc*  
385 *Nephrol*. 2009;4(2):481-508. doi:10.2215/cjn.04800908
- 386 20. Woo M, Przepiorka D, Ippoliti C, et al. Toxicities of tacrolimus and cyclosporin A after  
387 allogeneic blood stem cell transplantation. *Bone Marrow Transplant*. Dec 1997;20(12):1095-8.  
388 doi:10.1038/sj.bmt.1701027
- 389 21. Ratanatharathorn V, Nash RA, Przepiorka D, et al. Phase III Study Comparing Methotrexate  
390 and Tacrolimus (Prograf, FK506) With Methotrexate and Cyclosporine for Graft-Versus-Host Disease  
391 Prophylaxis After HLA-Identical Sibling Bone Marrow Transplantation. *Blood*. 1998;92(7):2303-2314.  
392 doi:10.1182/blood.V92.7.2303
- 393 22. Eisen HJ, Tuzcu EM, Dorent R, et al. Everolimus for the Prevention of Allograft Rejection and  
394 Vasculopathy in Cardiac-Transplant Recipients. *N Engl J Med*. 2003;349(9):847-858.  
395 doi:10.1056/NEJMoa022171
- 396 23. Kirchner GI, Meier-Wiedenbach I, Manns MP. Clinical Pharmacokinetics of Everolimus. *Clin*  
397 *Pharmacokinet*. 2004/02/01 2004;43(2):83-95. doi:10.2165/00003088-200443020-00002
- 398 24. Aapro M, Andre F, Blackwell K, et al. Adverse event management in patients with advanced  
399 cancer receiving oral everolimus: focus on breast cancer. *Ann Oncol*. Apr 2014;25(4):763-773.  
400 doi:10.1093/annonc/mdu021
- 401 25. Pascual J. Everolimus in clinical practice--renal transplantation. *Nephrol Dial Transplant*. Jul  
402 2006;21 Suppl 3:iii18-23. doi:10.1093/ndt/gfl300
- 403 26. Mjörnstedt L, Sørensen SS, von Zur Mühlen B, et al. Improved renal function after early  
404 conversion from a calcineurin inhibitor to everolimus: a randomized trial in kidney transplantation.  
405 *Am J Transplant*. Oct 2012;12(10):2744-53. doi:10.1111/j.1600-6143.2012.04162.x
- 406 27. Glucksberg H, Storb R, Fefer A, et al. Clinical manifestations of graft-versus-host disease in  
407 human recipients of marrow from HL-A-matched sibling donors. *Transplantation*. Oct  
408 1974;18(4):295-304. doi:10.1097/00007890-197410000-00001
- 409 28. Simon R, Makuch RW. A non-parametric graphical representation of the relationship  
410 between survival and the occurrence of an event: application to responder versus non-responder  
411 bias. *Stat Med*. Jan-Mar 1984;3(1):35-44. doi:10.1002/sim.4780030106
- 412 29. Kanda Y. Investigation of the freely available easy-to-use software 'EZ' for medical statistics.  
413 *Bone Marrow Transplant*. 2013/03/01 2013;48(3):452-458. doi:10.1038/bmt.2012.244
- 414 30. Team RC. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for  
415 Statistical Computing. <https://www.R-project.org/>. Accessed 3rd Nov, 2020.
- 416 31. Sandmaier BM, Kornblit B, Storer BE, et al. Addition of sirolimus to standard cyclosporine plus  
417 mycophenolate mofetil-based graft-versus-host disease prophylaxis for patients after unrelated non-  
418 myeloablative haemopoietic stem cell transplantation: a multicentre, randomised, phase 3 trial. *The*  
419 *Lancet Haematology*. Aug 2019;6(8):e409-e418. doi:10.1016/s2352-3026(19)30088-2
- 420 32. Pidala J, Kim J, Jim H, et al. A randomized phase II study to evaluate tacrolimus in  
421 combination with sirolimus or methotrexate after allogeneic hematopoietic cell transplantation.  
422 *Haematologica*. Dec 2012;97(12):1882-9. doi:10.3324/haematol.2012.067140
- 423 33. Platzbecker U, von Bonin M, Goekkurt E, et al. Graft-versus-host disease prophylaxis with  
424 everolimus and tacrolimus is associated with a high incidence of sinusoidal obstruction syndrome  
425 and microangiopathy: results of the EVTAC trial. *Biol Blood Marrow Transplant*. Jan 2009;15(1):101-8.  
426 doi:10.1016/j.bbmt.2008.11.004
- 427 34. Schafer H, Blumel-Lehmann J, Ihorst G, et al. A prospective single-center study on CNi-free  
428 GVHD prophylaxis with everolimus plus mycophenolate mofetil in allogeneic HCT. *Ann Hematol*. Aug  
429 2021;100(8):2095-2103. doi:10.1007/s00277-021-04487-y

- 430 35. Bianchi M, Heim D, Lengerke C, et al. Cyclosporine levels > 195 µg/L on day 10 post-  
431 transplant was associated with significantly reduced acute graft-versus-host disease following  
432 allogeneic hematopoietic stem cell transplantation. *Ann Hematol.* Apr 2019;98(4):971-977.  
433 doi:10.1007/s00277-018-3577-1
- 434 36. Héritier J, Medinger M, Heim D, et al. Optimized cyclosporine starting dose may reduce risk  
435 of acute GvHD after allogeneic hematopoietic cell transplantation: a single-center cohort study. *Bone*  
436 *Marrow Transplant.* 2022/04/01 2022;57(4):613-619. doi:10.1038/s41409-022-01598-6
- 437 37. de Kort EA, de Lil HS, Bremmers MEJ, et al. Cyclosporine A trough concentrations are  
438 associated with acute GvHD after non-myeloablative allogeneic hematopoietic cell transplantation.  
439 *PLoS ONE.* 2019;14(3):e0213913. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0213913
- 440 38. Segundo DS, Ruiz JC, Izquierdo M, et al. Calcineurin Inhibitors, but not Rapamycin, Reduce  
441 Percentages of CD4+CD25+FOXP3+ Regulatory T Cells in Renal Transplant Recipients.  
442 *Transplantation.* 2006;82(4):550-557. doi:10.1097/01.tp.0000229473.95202.50
- 443 39. Zeiser R, Nguyen VH, Beilhack A, et al. Inhibition of CD4+CD25+ regulatory T-cell function by  
444 calcineurin-dependent interleukin-2 production. *Blood.* Jul 1 2006;108(1):390-9. doi:10.1182/blood-  
445 2006-01-0329
- 446 40. Xu Q, Simpson S-E, Scialla TJ, Bagg A, Carroll M. Survival of acute myeloid leukemia cells  
447 requires PI3 kinase activation. *Blood.* 2003;102(3):972-980. doi:10.1182/blood-2002-11-3429
- 448 41. Récher C, Beyne-Rauzy O, Demur Cc, et al. Antileukemic activity of rapamycin in acute  
449 myeloid leukemia. *Blood.* 2005;105(6):2527-2534. doi:10.1182/blood-2004-06-2494
- 450 42. Bertacchini J, Guida M, Accordi B, et al. Feedbacks and adaptive capabilities of the  
451 PI3K/Akt/mTOR axis in acute myeloid leukemia revealed by pathway selective inhibition and  
452 phosphoproteome analysis. *Leukemia.* Nov 2014;28(11):2197-205. doi:10.1038/leu.2014.123
- 453 43. Nepstad I, Hatfield KJ, Grønningsæter IS, Reikvam H. The PI3K-Akt-mTOR Signaling Pathway in  
454 Human Acute Myeloid Leukemia (AML) Cells. *Int J Mol Sci.* Apr 21  
455 2020;21(8)doi:10.3390/ijms21082907
- 456 44. Tan P, Tiong IS, Fleming S, et al. The mTOR inhibitor everolimus in combination with  
457 azacitidine in patients with relapsed/refractory acute myeloid leukemia: a phase Ib/II study.  
458 *Oncotarget.* Aug 8 2017;8(32):52269-52280. doi:10.18632/oncotarget.13699
- 459 45. Place AE, Pikman Y, Stevenson KE, et al. Phase I trial of the mTOR inhibitor everolimus in  
460 combination with multi-agent chemotherapy in relapsed childhood acute lymphoblastic leukemia.  
461 *Pediatr Blood Cancer.* Jul 2018;65(7):e27062. doi:10.1002/pbc.27062

462

463

465 TABLE 1. Patients' characteristics.

Characteristics	Everolimus group (n=57)		CsA group (n=74)	
Median age at HSCT, y (range)	11.4 (0.2-19.6)		6.3 (0.2-26.3)	
Sex, n (%)				
Female	23	(40.4)	32	41,6
Male	34	(59.6)	45	58,4
Underlying disease, n (%)				
Acute myeloid leukemia	2	(3.5)	9	(12.2)
Fanconi anemia	4	(7.0)	1	(1.4)
Acute lymphoblastic leukemia	15	(26.3)	30	(40.5)
Myelodysplastic syndrome	6	(10.5)	3	(4.1)
Severe aplastic anemia	3	(5.3)	0	(0.0)
Non-hodgkin lymphoma	1	(1.8)	4	(5.4)
Sickle-cell disease	13	(22.8)	10	(13.5)
Thalassemia	0	(0.0)	5	(6.8)
Severe combined immunodeficiency	2	(3.5)	2	(2.7)
Chronic granulomatous disease	1	(1.8)	5	(6.8)
Diamond blackfan anemia	2	(3.5)	0	(0.0)
X-linked adrenoleukodystrophy	1	(1.8)	0	(0.0)
other	7	(12.3)	5	(6.8)
Donor, n (%)				
Matched unrelated donor	29	(50.9)	50	(67.6)
Matched sibling donor	23	(40.4)	23	(27.0)
Mismatched donor	5	(8.8)	1	(1.4)
Source of graft, n (%)				
Bone marrow	23	(40.4)	47	(63.5)
Peripheraal blood stem cells	33	(57.9)	27	(36.5)
Cord blood + bone marrow	1	(1.8)	0	(0.0)
Conditioning regimen, n (%)				
TBI/VP16	10	(17.5)	14	(18.9)
Flu/TT/Treo	23	(40.4)	33	(44.6)
Flu/Cy	5	(8.8)	1	(1.4)
Flu/Bu/Cy	1	(1.8)	1	(1.4)
Bu/Cy/Mel	1	(1.8)	4	(5.4)
Flu/Treo	5	(8.8)	0	(0.0)
Flu/Bu/TT	4	(7.0)	1	(1.4)
Treo/Cy/TT	1	(1.8)	0	(0.0)
Flu/Bu	2	(3.5)	6	(8.1)
Flu/TT	1	(1.8)	2	(2.7)
Flu/TT/Mel	3	(5.3)	5	(6.8)
Flu/VP16	1	(1.8)	0	(0.0)
Flu/Bu/TT/Cy	0	(0.0)	2	(2.7)
Bu/TT/Cy	0	(0.0)	1	(1.4)
Flu/TT/Carboplatin/Paclitaxel/Mitoxantron	0	(0.0)	3	(4.1)
Amsacrine/Flu/Cy/Ara-C	0	(0.0)	1	(1.4)

467 **TABLE 2.** Adjusted Hazard ratios for graft source and underlying disease status “acute lymphoblastic  
 468 leukemia”.

Characteristics	Acute Graft versus Host Disease Grade 2-4			Acute Graft versus Host Disease Grade 3-4			Severe chronic Graft versus Host Disease		
	Hazard ratio	[95% confidence interval]	P value	Hazard ratio	[95% confidence interval]	P value	Hazard ratio	[95% confidence interval]	P value
Stem cell source: Bone marrow versus manipulated peripheral blood stem cells	0.96	0.43–2.1	0.92	1.88	0.60–5.9	0.28	3.37	0.82–13.9	0.09
Diagnosis: Acute lymphoblastic leukemia	1.0	0.43–2.5	0.92	0.96	0.30–3.06	0.9	0.57	0.14–2.36	0.43
Sickle cell disease	0.65	1.86–2.3	0.50				0.39	0.05–2.85	0.36

469

470 **FIGURE LEGENDS**

471 **Figure 1. Study flow chart.**

472 **Figure 2. Everolimus plasma levels.** The everolimus target ranges were 3 to 8 ng/ml (dashed lines).  
473 The solid line is a spline-smoothing curve.

474 **Figure 3. Timeline of immunosuppressive drugs used in patients that received everolimus ±**  
475 **mycophenolate mofetil.** Each of the 57 pediatric patients that received everolimus at any time during  
476 their clinical course after hematopoietic stem cell transplantation is shown individually. Different colors  
477 indicate different immunosuppressive drugs. Patients #1 – 18 have malignant and patients #19 – 57  
478 have benign underlying diseases.

479 **Figure 4. Development of retention parameters after the switch to everolimus ± mycophenolate**  
480 **mofetil (MMF).** The grouped blood levels of creatinine **(A)** and cystatine C **(B)** of pediatric patients that  
481 developed acute renal failure during their post-HSCT course is shown at the time they were switched  
482 to the combination of everolimus ± MMF. Data is normalized to the creatinine and cystatine C level on  
483 the day of the HSCT, respectively, which is considered as baseline level. \*: p<0.05, \*\*\*: p<0.001, \*\*\*\*:  
484 p<0.0001 using the mixed-effects model with Dunnet's multiple comparisons test. HSCT: hematopoietic  
485 stem cell transplantation.

486 **Figure 5. Cumulative incidence of acute and chronic graft versus host disease (GVHD).** The cumulative  
487 incidence of **(A)** grade 2-4 acute (a)GVHD and grade 3-4 aGVHD and **(C)** severe chronic (c)GVHD is  
488 shown for all patients. Incidence curves are generated using a competing events model to reflect the  
489 time dependent covariate of switch to everolimus. P-value is determined using the Mantel-Byar test.  
490 CsA: Cyclosporin A

491 **Figure 6. Overall survival (OS).** The OS is shown by a Simon and Makuch plot to reflect the time  
492 dependent covariate of switch to everolimus. P-value is determined using the Mantel-Byar test.

493 **Figure 7. Overall survival (OS), incidence of relapse and event free survival (EFS) of patients with**  
494 **malignant underlying diseases.** The patients of our cohort with malignant underlying diseases were  
495 selected and analyzed for their **(A)** OS, **(B)** incidence of relapse and **(C)** EFS with the time dependent  
496 covariate of switch to everolimus ± MMF. A and C show Simon and Makuch plots and B show a  
497 cumulative incidence using a competing events model. P-value is determined using the Mantel-Byar  
498 test.

499

**Figure 1**




Figure 2




Figure 3

- Everolimus
- Mycophenolate Mofetil
- Ciclosporin A
- Prednisolone
- Tacrolimus









Figure 4




A



B




**Figure 5**



— CsA group  
— Everolimus group

**Figure 6**




Number at risk

CsA: 129	64	49	33	5
Everolimus: 2	45	27	12	1

**Figure 7**


**A**



Number at risk

CsA: 60	36	25	17	1
Everolimus: 1	11	5	1	0


**B**



Number at risk

CsA: 60	34	29	20	20	19	17	15
Everolimus: 1	13	8	7	7	7	7	7

**C**



Number at risk

CsA: 60	19	13	8	1
Everolimus: 1	10	5	1	0

— CsA group  
— Everolimus group