

## OPEN

# Reply to: Balancing Cost and Efficiency in Screening Potential Organ Donors With Whole Body CT

Jacobus W. Mensink, MD,<sup>1,2</sup> Robert A. Pol, MD, PhD,<sup>3</sup> Willemijn N. Nijboer, MD, PhD,<sup>1</sup> Kirsten M. de Vries, MSc,<sup>2</sup> Ian P.J. Alwayn, MD, PhD,<sup>1</sup> and Andries E. Braat, MD, PhD<sup>1</sup>

Dear Editor,

We appreciate the comments of Lormans et al regarding our recently published article “Whole Body CT Imaging in Deceased Donor Screening for Malignancies” on the screening of organ donors and thank them for the opportunity to respond and clarify a few points.<sup>1,2</sup>

We agree with the authors that selection criteria are necessary for future organ donor screening, with emphasis on detection of malignancies in the extended age criteria donors. However, for assessment of (vascular) anatomy and anomalies in multiorgan donors, no age limit or other selection criteria applies. This underlines the importance to develop uniform screening protocols to optimize organ donor screening.

Based on Tables 4 and 5 of our recently published article, Lormans et al suggested that in our series, only 3 unnecessary procurements were prevented in contrast to the 7 preventable procurements mentioned in the last paragraph of the discussion.<sup>1,2</sup> We would like to clarify that the number of approximately 7 procurements in 5 years of the previously mentioned article is based on a 0.44% absolute risk reduction of malignancies found during procurement (Table 3).<sup>2</sup> In fact, in the chest radiograph, group 2 malignancies and, in the abdominal ultrasound group, 15 malignancies were

missed (1 lesion turned out to be benign), whereas none in the thoracic computed tomography (CT) group and only 3 in the abdominal CT group were missed (Table 5). If all reported donors would have been screened by CT scan, approximately 7 (0.44% \* 1644)<sup>a</sup> procurements could have been prevented.<sup>2</sup>

As stated by Lormans et al, there is an indication to perform a CT scan in many potential donors, independent of the goal of excluding an undiagnosed malignancy. Subsequently, these CT scans should not be included in the cost analysis. Furthermore, aside from ethical considerations, an organ procurement procedure that does not result in transplantation is an expensive procedure, and these costs should also be taken into account. Interestingly, the a priori chance of finding a malignancy in potential donors seems much higher in the authors' setting (4/25 = 16%) compared with the Dutch situation (26/1644 = 2%) and provides food for thought.

As correctly pointed out by the authors, a CT scan has become a standard procedure and is readily available for the majority of intensive care unit patients. No exceptions should be made for the lifesaving procedures of organ donation and transplantation. To further improve donor screening by CT scan, selection criteria, and screening protocols must be evaluated and further developed. We fully agree with the authors that selective and applied screening by CT scan may substantially reduce costs and avoid unnecessary procurements. Furthermore, it increases the safety of transplantation by detecting undiagnosed malignancies and providing anatomic information for procuring and transplanting surgeons.

$$^a(((2/966 - 0/274) + (15/1197 - 3/296)) * 1644)$$

## REFERENCES

1. Lormans P, Monbaliu D, Ferdinande P. Balancing cost and efficiency in screening potential organ donors with whole body CT. *Transplant Direct*. 2020.
2. Mensink JW, Pol RA, Nijboer WN, et al. Whole body CT imaging in deceased donor screening for malignancies. *Transplant Direct*. 2019;5:e509.

Received 9 September 2020. Revision received 10 September 2020.

Accepted 12 September 2020.

<sup>1</sup> Department of Surgery, Division of Transplantation, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden University, Leiden, The Netherlands.

<sup>2</sup> Department of Organ and Tissue Donation, Dutch Transplant Foundation, Leiden, The Netherlands.

<sup>3</sup> Department of Surgery, Division of Transplantation, University Medical Center Groningen, Groningen University, Groningen, The Netherlands.

The authors declare no funding or conflicts of interest.

All authors participated in construction and critical revision of the reply. All authors approved this version to be published.

Correspondence: Jacobus W. Mensink, MD, Department of Surgery, Division of Transplantation, Leiden University Medical Center, Albinusdreef 2, 2333 ZA Leiden, The Netherlands. (j.w.mensink@lumc.nl).

Copyright © 2020 The Author(s). *Transplantation Direct*. Published by Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial-No Derivatives License 4.0 (CCBY-NC-ND), where it is permissible to download and share the work provided it is properly cited. The work cannot be changed in any way or used commercially without permission from the journal.

ISSN: 2373-8731

*Transplantation Direct* 2020;6: e623; doi: 10.1097/TXD.0000000000001070. Published online 23 October, 2020.