

Klinikum Bayreuth · Klinik Hohe Warte **KLINIKUM BAYREUTH GMBH**

1 Travere Therapeutics, San Diego, CA, USA 2 Mosaiques-Diagnostics GmbH, Hannover, Germany 5 Department of Nephrology, Angiology and Rheumatology, Klinikum Bayreuth GmbH, 95445 Bayreuth, Germany

BACKGROUND:

Focal segmental glomerulosclerosis (FSGS) is a descriptive renal histologic lesion with diverse causes and pathogenicities. FSGS includes primary (p) and secondary (s) forms. The subclasses differ in management and prognosis with differentiation often being challenging. We aimed to identify specific urine proteins/peptides significantly associated with pFSGS, distinguishing it from sFSGS, other chronic kidney disease (CKD) etiologies, and normal controls, and combining these using machine learning algorithm into a classifier.

METHODS:

Urine samples were collected in two different centers in Germany from CKD patients at the time of biopsy. Among these, 19 pFSGS and 44 sFSGS were identified based on biopsy assessment and clinical The urine samples were analysed using capillary electrophoresis coupled to mass presentation. spectrometry (CE-MS, Figure 1). For biomarker definition, urine samples of patients with other CKD etiologies from the above collection (CKD, n=100) were analysed. In addition, datasets of age/sex-matched normal controls with preserved kidney function (NC, n=98) were extracted from the urinary proteome database¹. The characterization of the cohort used for biomarker discovery is showed in **Table 1**. Biomarker definition was performed in three steps as shown in Figure 2.



TOF mass spectrometry

Figure 1: Schematic depiction of capillary electrophoresis coupled to mass spectrometer platform used for the analysis of peptides in urine. After electrophoretic separation, the peptides are ionized by application of high voltage and analyzed in the mass spectrometer.

Table 1: Characteristics of patients used for biomarker definition.

| | primary FSGS n=19 | secondary FSGS n=44 | p-value | normal control n=98 | p-value | CKD n=100 | p-value |
|---------------------------------|----------------------|------------------------|---------|------------------------|---------|------------------|---------|
| Sex, n male (%) | 13 (68.4) | 30 (68.2) | 0.7824 | 73 (74.5) | 0.7913 | 73 (73.0) | 0.8972 |
| Age (years) | 47. [33.1-30.3] | 57.5 [50.0-69.9] | 0.044 | 45 [42.3-49.2] | 0.6735 | 46.1 [42.3-49.4] | 0.8052 |
| BMI (kg/m2) | 31.0 [27.2-33.3] | 28.7 [27.1-30.4] | 0.1493 | na | na | na | na |
| BP syst. (mmHg) | 140 [134-145] | 140 [128-144] | 0.7549 | na | na | na | na |
| BP diast. (mmHg) | 85 [78-90] | 50 [75-85] | 0.6499 | na | na | na | na |
| eGFR (CKD-EPI) ml/min/1,73m² | 56.0 [40.1-89.9] | 31.1 [23.8-37.0] | 0.0008 | 88.7 [77.5-107.4] | 0.0054 | 40.7 [34.1-49.3] | 0.0414 |
| Uprot g/g Crea | 8.03 [6.00-10.28] | 2.56 [1.63-3.30] | <0.0001 | 0.012 [0.009-0.015] | <0.0001 | 2.00 [1.37-2.88] | <0.0001 |
| IFTA (%) | 7.5 [4.5-21.1] | 21.3 [17.6-35.0] | 0.0007 | na | na | 10.0 [5.0-15.0] | 0.9469 |
| No. Antihypertensives | 3 [1-4] | 3 [2-3] | 0.5597 | na | na | na | na |
| Diabetes, yes (%) | 4 (21) | 9 (20) | 0.7754 | 24 (24) | 0.978 | 15 (15) | 0.75 |

Differentiating primary and secondary FSGS using non-invasive urine biomarkers

Bruce Hendry¹, Justyna Siwy², Harald Mischak², Ralph Wendt³, Joachim Beige^{3,4}, Lorenzo Catanese^{5,6,7}, Ian Paterson⁸, Michael Wolf⁸, Harald Rupprecht^{5,6,7}

3 Department of Infectious Diseases/Tropical Medicine, Nephrology/KfH Renal Unit and Rheumatology, St. Georg Hospital Leipzig, Leipzig, Germany 4 Martin-Luther-University Halle-Wittenberg, Halle and er Saale, Germany 6 Kuratorium for Dialysis and Transplantation (KfH) Bayreuth, 95445 Bayreuth, Germany, 7 Friedrich-Alexander-University Erlangen-Nürnberg, Medizincampus Oberfranken, Bayreuth, Germany 8 Travere Therapeutics, Dublin, Ireland

Biomarker definition and generation of the classifier

RESULTS:

pFSGS vs sFSGS and pFSGS vs CKD were considered (n=163)



| Figure 2: Definition of pFSGS specific biomarkers. pFSGS specifi |
|---|
| MS data of pFSGS were compared to NC. For further analysis or |
| were considered (n=1179). These potential biomarkers were in |
| change (up- or downregulated) in two additional comparisons |
| This resulted in a final list of 163 pFSGS specific peptide biom |
| using support vector machine. For training of the classifier pFSG |
| a take-one-out procedure which resulted in exclusion of 70 pep |

The statistical analysis performed in three steps (Figure 2) resulted in 163 biomarkers candidates. The generation of the classifier resulted in further reduction of the number of biomarkers to 93. These peptides were combined in the FSGS93 classifier. Defined biomarkers are at large fragments of different collagens (49%). Identified were also fragments of alpha-1-antitrypsin, apolipoprotein, complement C3, polymeric immunoglobulin receptor, uromodulin etc.



fic biomarkers were defined in 3 steps. In the first step, the CEnly peptides with a p-value < 0.05 (adjusted for multiple testing) nvestigated for significant differences and identical directional s: pFSGS versus sFSGS, and pFSGS versus other CKD etiologies. markers that were combined into a high-dimensional classifier GS vs. sFSGS data were used. The classifier was optimized using otides. The final classifier, pFSGS93, consisted of 93 peptides.

Classifier validation

Total cross validation of the pFSGS93 classifier resulted in discrimination between the pFSGS and sFSGS groups in an area under the curve (AUC) of the receiving operating characteristic (ROC) of 0.95 (Figure 3A). The diagnosis threshold of -0.001 defined by Youden index resulted in sensitivity of 84.2% and specificity of 100%.



Figure 3: ROC-analysis of the cross validated training data (pFSGS vs. sFSGS) is shown in Figure A. Comparison of the ROC based on the FSGS93, proteinuria (Uprot) and nomogram of FGSG93 and proteinuria of the training data together with the 100 additional CKD patients.

Analysis of covariables and nomogram generation

Multiple regression was used to estimate whether additional parameters are associated with the diagnosis of pFSGS. Used were the data of pFSGS, sFSGS and additional 100 CKD patients. The following parameters were analysed: FSGS93, sex, age, proteinuria (Uprot), eGFR and IFTA. Only FSGS93 and Uprot remained significant. These two parameters were combined in a nomogram. The comparison of the ROC analysis is shown in Figure 3B. The pFSGS93 resulted in significant higher AUC than Uprot. The combination of pFSGS93 and Uprot resulted in significant highest AUC.

Specificity analysis in independent cohort

Independent specificity assessment was performed in additional data of NC (n=110) and CKD (n=170). For this purpose, data were extracted from the human urinary database¹. Using the before defined cut-off of -0.001 only nine of the patients with other CKD etiologies (spec. 94.7%) and one of the NC (spec. 99.1%) were not correctly classified as no pFSGS.

CONCLUSIONS:

A urine peptide-based classifier that selectively detects pFSGS could be developed. Specificity of 95-99% could be assessed in independent samples. The data indicate that differentiation of pFSGS can be facilitated by urinary peptide analysis and our classifier can provide helpful information for therapeutic decisions where biopsy findings and clinical presentation are inconclusive.

Acknowledgments: This study was funded by Travere Therapeutics, Inc. Disclosures

BH, IP, MW: Employees, Travere Therapeutics, Inc. HM: Founder and co-owner of Mosaigues Diagnostics GmbH; JS: Employee of Mosaiques Diagnostics GmbH; RW, JB, LC, HR: Nothing to disclose

References

1. Latosinska A et al, *Electrophoresis*. 2019 Sep;40(18-19):2294-2308.





Klinikum **St.GEORG**

o obtain a PDF of this poster: Scan the QR code OR visit www.traverepublications.com/ASN2022/ Charges may ap

No personal information is s

