

#RESEARCHNEVERSTOPS

Development and validation of a bioanalytical microLC-MS/MS bottom-up approach method to quantify Semaphorin-3A protein in human plasma samples



- 2. Semaphorin 3A
- 3. Development & Validation
- 4. Summary & conclusion
- 5. Reflections & Questions





Introduction Proteomics





... it refers to the large number of biomolecular disciplines, as genomics or proteomics ... it refers to the interpretation of genes and protein activities in response to toxic substances, drugs or diseases ... The 1990s marked the emergence of genome sequencing and DNA technologies, giving rise to the "omics" era of research.



but ... new area to be discovered full of new challenging methods to be implemented ... to identify, characterize and quantify proteins



Proteomics Assays

Starting from the beginning – Discovery vs. Development

Proteomics Assay

Discovery phase

- End 1990s
- The sensitivity of the overall proteomic workflow was a major challenge
- Static nano-ESI (without prior LC separation) – no Automation was allowed
- nano-LC coupled with HRMS
- Target identification

Bioanalytical Assay

Development phase

- 2018 micro-LC
- Lower sensitivity
- Excellent reproducibility in both retention time and peak area
- Target quantification



Extraction Procedures

Top-down vs Bottom-up

Top-down

- Enables the quantification of modified and unmodified protein species
- Allows introduction of intact proteins into the mass spectrometer and analysis of both intact and fragment ions masses
- Allows up to 100% sequence coverage and full characterization of proteoforms



Bottom-up

- Enables high-throughput analysis and allows identification and quantification of proteins in complex samples
- Enzymatically or chemically cleavage into peptides
- Complex peptide mixture is fractionated using reversed phase chromatographic separation

But

- Low efficiency of ionization and detection
- Reproducible and accurate protein quantification remains challenging
- Pre-immunoprecipitation increases the ionization efficiency

But

- Biological interpretation of the data is needed digestion discards connectivity peptides vs proteins
- Proteotypic peptides are needed to perform accurate quantification



- 2. Semaphorin 3A
- 3. Development & Validation
- 4. Summary & conclusion
- 5. Reflections & Questions





Semaphorin-3A

Background information

- Semaphorin-3A is protein that is encoded by the Sema3A human gene.
- This protein is vital for the development of normal neuronal pattern and also for new blood vessels.
- Semaphorin-3A is highly expressed in scar tissue after traumatic central nervous system injuries and contributes to the failure of neuronal regeneration.
- Increased expression of semaphorin-3A is associated with schizophrenia, with the progression of Alzheimer's disease, to the ALS progression.
- Increased Sema3A signaling leads to albuminuria and tubular injury resulting in a progressive loss of kidney function.





- 2. Semaphorin 3A
- 3. Development & Validation
- 4. Summary & conclusion
- 5. Reflections & Questions





Method Development & Validation Design

Thoughts

Starting point

- Biomarkers are not covered by the ICHM10
- Endogenous levels

Restrictions

- SP should be proteotypic
- Sensitivity and selectivity could be assessed as first step
- Sample preparation duration and run time should be balanced with lab productivity

Technical approach

- 2 signature peptides
- Surrogate matrix
- Bottom-up
- µLC-MS/MS platform

Features

- Matrix should be evaluated behavior issue?
- SIL could minimize method variability & increases the method robustness



Validation design

- CoU validation
- 3 P&A in surrogate
- Surrogate vs plasma matrix equivalence
- Matrix Effect
- Stabilities (both matrices)



Matrix and SP Selection

Endogenous molecule

Matrices

Possible approach to be followed for endogenous molecules

- Surrogate matrix
- Surrogate analyte
- Background subtraction
- Standard addition





Calibration range \rightarrow 50-10,000 ng/mL

Signature Peptides

- Only three proteotypic peptides were available, and only two with enough mass spec response
- **TFGGFDSTK** → quantifier
- **DLPDDVITFAR** → qualifier
- **ENAIDGEHSGK** → poor sensitivity



GTAADFMGRDFAIFRTLGHHHPIRTEQHDSRWLNDPKFISAHLIS GTAADFMGRDFAIFRTLGHHHPIRTEQHDSRWLNDPKFISAHLIS ENAIDGEHSGKATHARIGQICKNDFGGHRSLVNKWTTFLKA .QDVFLMNFKDPKNPVVYGVFTTSSNIFKGSAVCMYSMSDVRRVFL 'YQGRVPYPRPGTCPSK**TFGGFDSTKDLPDDVITFAR**S IYQFTQIVVDRVDAEDGQYDVMFIGTDVGTVLKVVSIPKETWYDLE .ISAMELSTKOOOLYIGSTAGVAOLPLHRCDIYGKACAECCLARDP



QC 3,000 ng/mL



Extraction Procedure

Bottom-up

Extraction step	Condition	I was		
Aliquot 2µL sample	Reduce & Alkylate	Lyse		
+ 10µL ISTD + iST kit	for 10 min at 95°C			
Digestion	Enzymatic:		Digest	
	180 min at 37°C		_	
Desalting (Kit SPE)	Mild centrifugation at RT	3		Purify
	(30 min)			
Injection onto LC-MS/MS	Dry down and reconstitution (100 mJ) with 0.1% formin	i vy		
	acid in water	e ^v ⁰		
Extraction pro	ocedure → about 4.5 hrs	OF		



LC-MS/MS Parameters

microLC-MS/MS

LC Parameter

LC system	Waters UPLC M-Class	
Column	Waters CSH C18 (50x0.3 mm, 1.7 µm) at 60°C	
Mobile phases	A: Water + 0.02% formic acid B: Acetonitrile + 0.02% formic acid Gradient elution	
Flow	14 μL/min	
Injection volume	5 μL	
Gradient	From 2 to 21% B in 9 mins	
Run time	10.5 min	

MS/MS Parameter

MS System	QTrap-6500+
Operating mode	MRM
MS Conditions	IS= 5000 – CUR=30 – CAD=9 TEMP=350 GS1=30 – GS2=50
Ionization	Positive
Signature peptide (quantifier)	TFGGFDSTK (m/z 480 \rightarrow 711)
Qualifier	DLPDDVITFAR (m/z $632 \rightarrow 517$)
ISTD	TFGGFDST K (m/z 484 \rightarrow 719) DLPDDVITFA R (m/z 637 \rightarrow 522)

Preliminary experiment on HRMS to identify SP candidates



Performances



Calibration range
→ 50-10,000 ng/mL

• QC levels → 50,150, 3,000 and 7,500 ng/mL

- Acceptance criteria
 - Accuracy: ±15% (±20% @LLOQ)
 - Precision: <15% (<20% @LLOQ)
 - R: >0.99

Number of replicates

- Surrogate (6 replicates for each QC level, 3 runs)
- Plasma (6 replicates for each QC level, single run)

Matrix	Accuracy	Precision
Surrogate	89.2% to 107.0%	<14.7% (@LLOQ)
Plasma	97.9% to 115.7% (@LLOQ)	<14.2%



DLPDDVITFAR

TFGGFDSTK

Matrix	Accuracy	Precision
Surrogate	83.9% to 118.6% (@LLOQ)	<20.0% (@LLOQ)
Plasma	85.7% to 118.8% (@LLOQ)	<14.1%





- 2. Semaphorin 3A
- 3. Development & Validation
- 4. Summary & conclusion
- 5. Reflections & Questions





Summary & Conclusions

General overview

- Micro-LC seems to be the most promising chromatographic platform; it is very easy to adapt the proteomic analysis method to the method for quantification of the selected protein/s.
- The method developed allows to delivery results with a reasonable timelines ... the optimized extraction procedure was a key element in reducing the analysis time.



- CoU statement
 - Biology and pharmacology effect
 - Expected data and variability
 - Reason of data needed
 - Scientific & safety decision
- CoU assay validation should be implemented and customized based on available safety and pharmacology information
- CoU assay should be "adjusted" based on the data generated during the assay development





- 2. Semaphorin 3A
- 3. Development & Validation
- 4. Summary & conclusion
- 5. Reflections & Questions



Reflection & Questions



- How should we validate a protein assay such as the Semaphorin molecule?
- If the biomarker is a primary/secondary endpoint and kinetic evaluation is needed ... how should we consider the validation?
- But ... primary/secondary/exploratory endpoints ... Is this information really crucial?
- CoU validation could be enough? ...
- Specific biomarker guideline could be useful? ...





Acknowledgments Thank You

- Alberto Vezzelli
- Alessia Cavaliere
- Eloi Haudebourg
- Yvan Eb-Levadoux
- Francois Autelitano
- Nicole Padovani





#RESEARCHNEVERSTOPS

Thank you for your attention!

Alessandro Greco VP, Head of ADMET and Bioanalytical Sciences

+39.(0).45.821 8698 (Direct) + 39 348 9124116 (Mobile) alessandro.greco@evotec.com