# An observational study of Donor Ex Vivo Lung Perfusion in UK lung transplantation: DEVELOP-UK

Andrew Fisher, 1,2\* Anders Andreasson, 1,2
Alexandros Chrysos, 3 Joanne Lally, 3
Chrysovalanto Mamasoula, 3 Catherine Exley, 3
Jennifer Wilkinson, 4 Jessica Qian, 4 Gillian Watson, 4
Oli Lewington, 5 Thomas Chadwick, 3 Elaine McColl, 3,4
Mark Pearce, 3 Kay Mann, 3 Nicola McMeekin, 3
Luke Vale, 3 Steven Tsui, 6 Nizar Yonan, 7 Andre Simon, 8
Nandor Marczin, 8 Jorge Mascaro 9 and John Dark 1,2

<sup>1</sup>Newcastle upon Tyne Hospitals NHS Foundation Trust, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK <sup>2</sup>Institute of Cellular Medicine, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK <sup>3</sup>Institute of Health and Society, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK <sup>4</sup>Clinical Trials Unit, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, UK <sup>5</sup>Service user and lay member of study research team <sup>6</sup>Papworth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Cambridge, UK <sup>7</sup>University Hospital of South Manchester NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester, UK <sup>8</sup>Royal Brompton and Harefield Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, London, UK <sup>9</sup>Queen Elizabeth Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Birmingham, UK

### \*Corresponding author

**Declared competing interests of authors:** Andrew Fisher is deputy director of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Blood and Transplant Research Unit in Organ Donation and Transplantation, has received grants from the NIHR Health Technology Assessment (HTA) programme and Cystic Fibrosis Trust, and received non-financial support in the form of a loan of perfusion machines to study centres from Vivoline Medical. Catherine Exley is a member of the NIHR Programme Grants for Applied Research (PGfAR) panel and acknowledges the contribution of the NIHR HTA programme. Elaine McColl is a member of the NIHR PGfAR panel and was previously an editor for the NIHR PGfAR journals series. Luke Vale is a member of the NIHR PGfAR panel and the NIHR HTA panel. He is also the Director of the NIHR Research Design Service in the North East. Andreas Andreasson, Thomas Chadwick, Steven Tsui, Nizar Yonan, Andre Simon, Nandor Marczin, Jorge Mascaro and John Dark acknowledge the contribution of the NIHR HTA programme, the Cystic Fibrosis Trust and Vivoline Medical. Mark Pearce acknowledges the contribution of the NIHR HTA programme and also leads the radiation epidemiology theme of the NIHR-funded Health Protection Research Unit on radiation and chemicals in Newcastle.

**Disclaimer:** This report contains transcripts of interviews conducted in the course of research and contains language that may offend some readers.

Published November 2016

DOI: 10.3310/hta20850

# **Plain English summary**

## Ex-vivo lung perfusion for lung transplant

Health Technology Assessment 2016; Vol. 20: No. 85

DOI: 10.3310/hta20850

NIHR Journals Library www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

# **Plain English summary**

Donor lungs are frequently found to be unsuitable for transplantation. Ex vivo lung perfusion, known as EVLP, is a process that involves circulating a nutrient solution through the lungs, and attaching them to a ventilator machine once they have been removed from the donor. EVLP allows unsuitable donor lungs to be assessed outside the body to see if their function can be improved to make them suitable for transplantation.

The Donor Ex Vivo Lung Perfusion in UK lung transplantation study was designed to test if EVLP could safely increase lung transplant activity at an acceptable cost to the NHS. The aim was to find out if patients transplanted with a perfused donor lung were as likely to survive for 1 year after surgery as those receiving standard donor lungs. A total of 53 donor lungs were assessed ex vivo and 18 were transplanted. Twelve patients (67%) were alive after 1 year, compared with 80% of 184 patients who received standard donor lungs.

Patients who received an EVLP transplant had longer intensive care stays and needed more specialist support of the lungs, but recovered at a similar time to the standard transplant group. A lung transplant performed using perfused lungs costs about £35,000 more than a standard transplant. In addition to the type of transplant, an important determinant of cost was quality of life when an individual joined the waiting list. Those who received perfused lungs waited less time for a transplant, and patients felt that this was an acceptable technology to use. An exploratory model estimated the cost-effectiveness, and the results suggested that incorporating EVLP lung transplants into the NHS lung transplant service would not be cost-effective, as we found that the rate of converting lungs from unsuitable to suitable for transplant was low and that the rate of complications after transplantation was high.

The deaths that occurred after EVLP were not directly related to the perfusion process; they were due to recognised complications that can occur in any lung transplant patient. The small number of patients transplanted with perfused lungs compared with the number who received standard lungs limits conclusions, but the technique did improve access to lung transplant at an increased cost.

Further research is needed to improve the way in which suitability of donor lungs for EVLP reconditioning is decided and to assess why there is higher risk after transplanting EVLP donor lungs.

#### HTA/HTA TAR

# **Health Technology Assessment**

ISSN 1366-5278 (Print)

ISSN 2046-4924 (Online)

Impact factor: 4.058

Health Technology Assessment is indexed in MEDLINE, CINAHL, EMBASE, The Cochrane Library and the ISI Science Citation Index.

This journal is a member of and subscribes to the principles of the Committee on Publication Ethics (COPE) (www.publicationethics.org/).

Editorial contact: nihredit@southampton.ac.uk

The full HTA archive is freely available to view online at www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/hta. Print-on-demand copies can be purchased from the report pages of the NIHR Journals Library website: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk

#### Criteria for inclusion in the Health Technology Assessment journal

Reports are published in *Health Technology Assessment* (HTA) if (1) they have resulted from work for the HTA programme, and (2) they are of a sufficiently high scientific quality as assessed by the reviewers and editors.

Reviews in *Health Technology Assessment* are termed 'systematic' when the account of the search appraisal and synthesis methods (to minimise biases and random errors) would, in theory, permit the replication of the review by others.

#### HTA programme

The HTA programme, part of the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), was set up in 1993. It produces high-quality research information on the effectiveness, costs and broader impact of health technologies for those who use, manage and provide care in the NHS. 'Health technologies' are broadly defined as all interventions used to promote health, prevent and treat disease, and improve rehabilitation and long-term care.

The journal is indexed in NHS Evidence via its abstracts included in MEDLINE and its Technology Assessment Reports inform National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidance. HTA research is also an important source of evidence for National Screening Committee (NSC) policy decisions.

For more information about the HTA programme please visit the website: http://www.nets.nihr.ac.uk/programmes/hta

#### This report

The research reported in this issue of the journal was funded by the HTA programme as project number 10/82/01. The contractual start date was in January 2012. The draft report began editorial review in February 2016 and was accepted for publication in May 2016. The authors have been wholly responsible for all data collection, analysis and interpretation, and for writing up their work. The HTA editors and publisher have tried to ensure the accuracy of the authors' report and would like to thank the reviewers for their constructive comments on the draft document. However, they do not accept liability for damages or losses arising from material published in this report.

This report presents independent research funded by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR). The views and opinions expressed by authors in this publication are those of the authors and do not necessarily reflect those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health. If there are verbatim quotations included in this publication the views and opinions expressed by the interviewees are those of the interviewees and do not necessarily reflect those of the authors, those of the NHS, the NIHR, NETSCC, the HTA programme or the Department of Health.

© Queen's Printer and Controller of HMSO 2016. This work was produced by Fisher et al. under the terms of a commissioning contract issued by the Secretary of State for Health. This issue may be freely reproduced for the purposes of private research and study and extracts (or indeed, the full report) may be included in professional journals provided that suitable acknowledgement is made and the reproduction is not associated with any form of advertising. Applications for commercial reproduction should be addressed to: NIHR Journals Library, National Institute for Health Research, Evaluation, Trials and Studies Coordinating Centre, Alpha House, University of Southampton Science Park, Southampton SO16 7NS, UK.

Published by the NIHR Journals Library (www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk), produced by Prepress Projects Ltd, Perth, Scotland (www.prepress-projects.co.uk).

## Health Technology Assessment Editor-in-Chief

**Professor Hywel Williams** Director, HTA Programme, UK and Foundation Professor and Co-Director of the Centre of Evidence-Based Dermatology, University of Nottingham, UK

## **NIHR Journals Library Editor-in-Chief**

Professor Tom Walley Director, NIHR Evaluation, Trials and Studies and Director of the EME Programme, UK

### **NIHR Journals Library Editors**

**Professor Ken Stein** Chair of HTA Editorial Board and Professor of Public Health, University of Exeter Medical School, UK

Professor Andree Le May Chair of NIHR Journals Library Editorial Group (EME, HS&DR, PGfAR, PHR journals)

Dr Martin Ashton-Key Consultant in Public Health Medicine/Consultant Advisor, NETSCC, UK

**Professor Matthias Beck** Chair in Public Sector Management and Subject Leader (Management Group), Queen's University Management School, Queen's University Belfast, UK

**Professor Aileen Clarke** Professor of Public Health and Health Services Research, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

Dr Tessa Crilly Director, Crystal Blue Consulting Ltd, UK

Dr Eugenia Cronin Senior Scientific Advisor, Wessex Institute, UK

Ms Tara Lamont Scientific Advisor, NETSCC, UK

Professor William McGuire Professor of Child Health, Hull York Medical School, University of York, UK

**Professor Geoffrey Meads** Professor of Health Sciences Research, Health and Wellbeing Research Group, University of Winchester, UK

Professor John Norrie Chair in Medical Statistics, University of Edinburgh, UK

Professor John Powell Consultant Clinical Adviser, National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE), UK

**Professor James Raftery** Professor of Health Technology Assessment, Wessex Institute, Faculty of Medicine, University of Southampton, UK

Dr Rob Riemsma Reviews Manager, Kleijnen Systematic Reviews Ltd, UK

Professor Helen Roberts Professor of Child Health Research, UCL Institute of Child Health, UK

Professor Jonathan Ross Professor of Sexual Health and HIV, University Hospital Birmingham, UK

**Professor Helen Snooks** Professor of Health Services Research, Institute of Life Science, College of Medicine, Swansea University, UK

**Professor Jim Thornton** Professor of Obstetrics and Gynaecology, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, University of Nottingham, UK

**Professor Martin Underwood** Director, Warwick Clinical Trials Unit, Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, UK

Please visit the website for a list of members of the NIHR Journals Library Board: www.journalslibrary.nihr.ac.uk/about/editors

Editorial contact: nihredit@southampton.ac.uk