Unmasking Hidden Systemic Effects of Neurodegenerative Diseases: A Two-Pronged

Approach to Biomarker Discovery

Sandra I. Anjo[1,2,3,4,*,†], Miguel Rosado[1,2,3,5,*], Inês Baldeiras[1,2,6], Andreia Gomes[7], Diana Pires[7], Cátia

Santa[1,2,3], Joana Pinto[1,2], Cristina Januário[6], Isabel Santana[1,2,6], Ana Verdelho[8,9], Alexandre de

Mendonça[9], Miguel Castelo-Branco[7,#], Bruno Manadas[1,2,3#,†]

[1] CNC - Centro de Neurociências e Biologia Celular, Universidade de Coimbra, Rua Larga - Faculdade de

Medicina, 1ºandar - POLO I, 3004-504 Coimbra, Portugal.

[2] CIBB - Centre for Innovative Biomedicine and Biotechnology, University of Coimbra, Rua Larga -

Faculdade de Medicina, 1ºandar - POLO I, 3004-504 Coimbra, Portugal.

[3] Instituto de Investigação Interdisciplinar, Universidade de Coimbra (IIIUC), Casa Costa Alemão, R. Dom

Francisco de Lemos, 3030-789 Coimbra, Portugal.

[4] Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade de Coimbra, Azinhaga de Santa Comba, 3000-548 Coimbra,

Portugal.

[5] - University of Coimbra, Institute for Interdisciplinary Research, Doctoral Programme in Experimental

Biology and Biomedicine (PDBEB), Portugal

[6] Serviço de Neurologia, Centro Hospitalar e Universitário de Coimbra, Praceta Professor Mota Pinto,

3004-561 Coimbra, Portugal.

[7] Coimbra Institute for Biomedical Imaging and Translational Research (CIBIT), Azinhaga de. Santa

Comba, 3000-548 Coimbra, Portugal.

[8] Department of Neurosciences and Mental Health, Santa Maria Hospital - CHLN, ISAMB, University of

Lisbon, Av. Prof. Egas Moniz MB, 1649-028 Lisboa, Portugal.

[9] Instituto de Medicina Molecular e Faculdade de Medicina, Universidade de Lisboa, Av. Prof. Egas

Moniz, 1649-028 Lisboa, Portugal.

* - Equal contribution

# - Senior equal contribution

† - Corresponding authors: Bruno Manadas (bmanadas@cnc.uc.pt, +351231249170) and Sandra Anjo

(sandra.anjo@cnc.uc.pt, +351231249170), Center for Neuroscience and Cell Biology – University of

Coimbra, UC Biotech - Parque Tecnológico de Cantanhede, Núcleo 04, Lote 8, 3060-197 Cantanhede –

Portugal

E-mail addresses: Miguel Rosado - mmva.rosado@gmail.com; Ines Baldeiras - ibaldeiras@cnc.uc.pt;

Andreia Gomes - andmaggomes@gmail.com; Diana Pires - diana.santos.pires@gmail.com; Cátia Santa -

catiajmsanta@gmail.com; Joana Pinto - joana.amaralpinto@gmail.com; Cristina Januário -

cristinajanuario@gmail.com; Isabel Santana - isabeljsantana@gmail.com; Ana Verdelho -

averdelho@medicina.ulisboa.pt; Alexandre de Mendonça - mendonca@medicina.ulisboa.pt; Miguel

Castelo-Branco   -   mcbranco@fmed.uc.pt.

Abstract

Background: The identification of reliable blood biomarkers for neurodegenerative Diseases (NDs) has

been of pivotal importance in translational/clinical research. However, conventional omics struggle with

the complexity of blood samples, which makes it difficult to achieve the desired goal. To address this, in

this work the potential of High Molecular Weight (HMW) fractionation under non-denaturing conditions

as a complementary approach to the conventional proteomics for identifying serum biomarkers in NDs

was explored.

Methods: A cohort of 58 serum samples of Alzheimer's disease (AD), Parkinson's disease (PD) patients

and control (CT) individuals was used to compare the two proteomics strategies: i) direct analysis of

whole serum and ii) non-denaturing fractionation using 300 kDa cut-off filters (HMW serum). Univariate

analysis was applied to the proteins quantified by each approach to identify the subset of proteins

altered among the different groups (AD, PD and CT). Subsequently, linear discriminant analysis was

performed using each subset of differently altered proteins, either individually or in combination, to

construct the predictive models for the diseases under study and to identify a panel of potential

biomarkers that could aid in the diagnosis of AD and PD.

Results: Although both approaches quantified a similar set of proteins, it was observed that each

approach capture a distinct subset of differentially altered proteins, suggesting that HMW fractionation

is capable of identifying additional types of alterations beyond conventional protein level changes. The

discriminant model created by combining altered proteins from both datasets demonstrated an

impressive efficacy in distinguishing between the three groups (AUC = 0.999 and, median sensitivity and

specificity of 97.4% and 91.7%, respectively). Importantly, this performance surpassed that of any model

created using each method individually.

Conclusions: Altogether, this work demonstrated that HMW fractionation can be a valuable

complementary method to direct serum analysis and could enhance biomarker discovery. The 10

proteins included in the model (5 from each strategy), comprise clear evidence for the contribution of

apolipoproteins for the diagnosis of NDs, revealing potential changes within lipid metabolism and the

organization of macromolecules and their complexes, thereby uncovering effects that remain hidden

from a conventional serum proteome analysis.

Keywords

Serum Proteomics

High Molecular Weight Fractionation

Neurodegenerative Diseases

SWATH-MS/DIA

Protein complexes/Proteoforms

Apolipoproteins

Lipoproteins

Background

Proteins can be directly or indirectly related to a myriad of diseases, thereby being important targets of biomarker research, which remains a pivotal aspect of clinical research. However, biomarker discovery based on conventional proteomics strategies has not yet yielded substantial practical applications. Blood and its fractions are the most studied samples for biomarker identification, not only due to easy accessibility but also because of its interactions with most tissues in the body, potentially reflecting disease-related alterations (1, 2). However, both plasma and serum proteomes have a large dynamic range of protein concentrations (1), with the detection of those least abundant being masked by the most abundant. Despite all the technical developments in proteomics quantification by mass spectrometry (MS) (3), the high dynamic range still precludes the complete characterization of these samples, which may be one of the reasons why the identification of relevant biomarkers in plasma/serum by MS remains challenging (4). Therefore, it is essential to have alternative approaches to the direct analysis of these highly demanding biofluids. Several approaches have been developed to reduce sample complexity (5), such as size exclusion chromatography and electrophoretic separation methods. When dealing with numerous samples, a more straightforward approach that could serve as an alternative to direct sample analysis is centrifugal ultrafiltration (5). This approach relies on the separation of sample components based on size exclusion, which is correlated to molecular weight (MW). This method has typically been used to study the low molecular weight proteome of serum and plasma samples, using filters between 20 kDa and 40 kDa (6, 7), but it may also be used to study other proteome fractions. Alzheimer's Disease (AD) and Parkinson's Disease (PD) are inherently linked to protein aggregation (8) and, therefore, to the formation of high molecular weight (HMW) protein complexes. Fractionation of peripheral fluid samples from patients with these diseases, focused on the HMW proteome, could be useful to eliminate high abundance proteins and to study protein aggregates that may be present in circulation. In this study, we propose using centrifugal ultrafiltration focused on the HMW proteome, not as an alternative but as a complementary analysis to the investigation of unfractionated samples, to potentially assess the restructuring of molecular complexes as a distinctive feature of disease. To evaluate our hypothesis, the same set of samples was subjected to the proteomics analysis of the whole serum and fractionation using centrifugal ultrafiltration with 300 kDa

molecular weight cut-off (MWCO) filters in a non-denaturing environment (henceforth referred to as

HMW fractionation). The data obtained from both approaches were directly compared and merged to

identify potential biomarkers. This study used a cohort consisting of patients with neurodegenerative

disorders, specifically Alzheimer's and Parkinson's disease patients, and healthy controls (CT) to test the

significance of using HMW fractionation as a complementary tool for biomarker discovery. These

disorders were chosen as they are considered as potential proteinopathies, making them promising

targets for this research.

Methods

Participants

A total of 58 serum samples were used in this study, comprising 3 groups of individuals: AD (n = 22), PD (n = 24), and CT (n = 12). The PD patients were recruited at the Movement Disorders Units of the Neurological Department of the CHUC, where they were assessed by a movement disorders specialist and were diagnosed according to the criteria defined by the UK Parkinsons's Disease Society Brain Bank (9). The exclusion criteria for these patients consisted of severe dementia (as indicated by a Mini-Mental State Exam score below 15), any psychiatric disorder, or other forms of Parkinsonism. The clinical group of individuals with AD diagnosis was recruited and prospectively evaluated by two experienced neurologists at Memoclínica and the Neurology Department of the CHUC. The standard criteria for the diagnosis of AD were the Diagnostic and Statistical Manual of Mental Disorders—fourth edition (DSM-IV-TR) (10) and the National Institute on Aging and the Alzheimer's Association Workgroup (11). To ensure the homogeneity of the sample, only patients who met the following criteria were included: they were in a stable condition, did not sustain recent changes in medication, and did not have ophthalmological or neurological/psychiatric conditions other than AD. The CT group was composed of age- and gender-matched individuals from the community with no history of cognitive deterioration, neurological or acquired central nervous system (CNS) disorders, traumatic brain injury, or psychiatric disorders. The CT group was also submitted to a brief cognitive assessment to exclude the presence of cognitive impairment.

Serum processing for proteomics analysis

Two different strategies were used to obtain a more comprehensive proteomic characterization of serum samples, namely: i) direct analysis of whole serum and ii) HMW fractionation through ultrafiltration using 300 kDa cut-off filters (HMW serum).

For each sample, 5 µL were used for direct serum analysis and 82.5 µL for HMW serum fractionation. Additionally, three sample pools were prepared by combining aliquots of all the samples, for the AD pool, PD pool, and CT pool, respectively. Pooled samples were used for Data-dependent acquisition

(DDA) experiments to build a specific protein library to be used in data-independent acquisition (DIA)

analysis and were subjected to the same sample processing as the individual samples. Before

processing, all samples were spiked with the same amount of an internal standard (IS) to account for

sample loss (12). Different internal standards were used depending on the type of analysis: MBP-GFP

(12) in the case of the whole serum approach, while equine ferritin, commonly available as one of the

standards in the Gel Filtration Calibrants Kit for High Molecular Weight proteins (GE28-4038-42), for the

HMW fractionation approach.

For the direct analysis of whole serum, the samples were diluted in Laemmli buffer, followed by

denaturation for 5 min at 95°C and cysteine alkylation with acrylamide, and the total volume in all

samples was subjected to in-gel digestion using the Short-GeLC for subsequent quantitative analysis by

LC-MS/MS-DIA (13).

Samples subjected to HMW fractionation were ultrafiltrated using 300 kDa cut-off filters (Vivaspin® 500

Polyethersulfone, 300 kDa (Sartorius)) pre-conditioned to PBS. Serum samples were diluted into 200 µL

of PBS and subjected to 20 min centrifugation at 14,500× g at 4 °C followed by an additional washing

step with another 200 µL of PBS. In some cases, the washing step was repeated until the retentate

volume did not exceed 50 µL. The resulting retentates, the HMW fraction, were collected into a new

LoBind® microcentrifuge tube and precipitated with ice-cold acetone (14). The precipitated pellets were

resuspended into 30 µL of a solution containing 2% SDS (v/v) and 1 M of Urea, always aided by

sonication (VibraCell 750 watt-Sonics ®) with ice in the cup horn (2 min. pulse duration, at 1 second

intervals, and with 40% amplitude). Afterward, concentrated Laemmli Buffer was added to the samples,

followed by a 30 min incubation to reduce the samples and a 20 min incubation with iodoacetamide for

cysteine alkylation (15). The total volume in all samples was subjected to in-gel digestion as previously

specified (13).

Mass spectrometry data acquisition

Samples were analyzed on a NanoLC™ 425 System (Eksigent®) couple to a TripleTOF™ 6600 System

(Sciex®) using DDA for each fraction of the pooled samples for protein identification and SWATH-MS

acquisition of each sample for protein quantification. Peptides were resolved by micro-flow liquid

chromatography on a MicroLC column ChromXP™ C18CL (300 μm ID × 15 cm length, 3 μm particles, 120

Å pore size, Eksigent®) at 5 μL/min. The liquid chromatography program was performed as follows with

a multistep gradient: 2 % to 5 % mobile phase B (0-2 min), 5 % to 28 % B (2-50 min), 28% to 35% B (50-

51 min), 35 to 98% of B (50–52 min), 98% of B (52-61 min), 98 to 2% of B (61–62 min), 2% of B (68 min).

Mobile phase A was composed of 0.1 % formic acid (FA) with 5% dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO), and mobile

phase B was composed of 0.1 % FA and 5% DMSO in acetonitrile. Peptides were eluted into the mass

spectrometer using an electrospray ionization source (DuoSpray™ Source, ABSciex®) with a 25 μm

internal diameter hybrid PEEKsil/stainless steel emitter (ABSciex®). The ionization source was operated

in the positive mode set to an ion spray voltage of 5 500 V, 25 psi for nebulizer gas 1 (GS1) and 25 psi for

the curtain gas (CUR).

For DDA experiments, the mass spectrometer was set to scan full spectra (m/z 350-1250) for 250 ms,

followed by up to 100 MS/MS scans (m/z 100–1500) per cycle to maintain a cycle time of 3.309 s. The

accumulation time of each MS/MS scan was adjusted in accordance with the precursor intensity

(minimum of 30 ms for precursor above the intensity threshold of 1000). Candidate ions with a charge

state between +2 and +5 and counts above a minimum threshold of 10 counts per second were isolated

for fragmentation and one MS/MS spectrum was collected before adding those ions to the exclusion list

for 25 seconds (mass spectrometer was operated by Analyst® TF 1.7, ABSciex®). The rolling collision

energy (CE) was used with a collision energy spread (CES) of 5.

For SWATH-MS-based experiments, the mass spectrometer was operated in a looped product ion mode

(16) and the same chromatographic conditions were used as in the DDA experiments described above. A

set of 60 windows of variable width (containing 1 m/z for the window overlap) was constructed,

covering the precursor mass range of m/z 350-1250. A 250 ms survey scan (m/z 350-1500 m/z) was

acquired at the beginning of each cycle for instrument calibration and SWATH-MS/MS spectra were

collected from the precursors ranging from *m/z* 350 to 1250 for *m/z* 100–1500 for 20 ms resulting in a

cycle time of 3.304 s. The CE for each window was determined according to the calculation for a charge

+2 ion centered upon the window with variable CES according to the window.

Mass spectrometry data processing

A specific library of precursor masses and fragment ions was created by combining all files from the DDA

experiments and used for subsequent SWATH processing. Libraries were obtained using ProteinPilot™

software (v5.1, ABSciex®), using the following parameters: i) search against a database from SwissProt

composed by Homo Sapiens (released in March 2019), and MBP-GFP (15) and horse ferritin light and

heavy chains sequences ii) acrylamide or iodoacetamide alkylated cysteines, for whole serum or HMW

respectively, as fixed modification; iii) trypsin as digestion enzyme and iv) urea denaturation as a special

factor in the case of the HMW samples. An independent False Discovery Rate (FDR) analysis using the

target-decoy approach provided with Protein Pilot software was used to assess the quality of the

identifications, and positive identifications were considered when identified proteins and peptides

reached a 5% local FDR (17, 18).

Data processing was performed using the SWATH™ processing plug-in for PeakView™ (v2.0.01, AB

Sciex®) (19). After adjustment of retention time using a combination of IS and endogenous peptides, up

to 15 peptides, with up to 5 fragments each, were chosen per protein, and quantitation was attempted

for all proteins in the library file identified from ProteinPilot™ searches.

Protein levels were estimated based on peptides that met the 1% FDR threshold with at least 3

transitions in at least six samples in a group, and the peak areas of the target fragment ions of those

peptides were extracted across the experiment using an extracted-ion chromatogram (XIC) window of 5

minutes with 100 ppm XIC width. Protein levels were estimated by summing all the transitions from all

the peptides for a given protein (an adaptation of (20) and further normalized to the levels of the IS

(15)).

Statistical analysis and biological interpretation

Pearson's Chi-squared Test for Count Data was performed in R version 4.2.1, using the chisq.test

function available in the native stats package in R to determine if there were significant differences in

the gender proportion of the groups within the studied cohort.

To assess the variation of the serum proteins (either Whole serum or the HMW fraction of the serum)

among the three groups, a Kruskal–Wallis H test was followed by the Dunn's Test for pairwise

comparison. Dunn's p-values were corrected using the Benjamini-Hochberg FDR adjustment, and

statistical significance was considered for p-values below 0.05.

Stepwise Linear Discriminant Analysis (LDA) was performed to select the proteins responsible for the

best separation of the groups being studied. LDA was performed using IBM® SPSS® Statistics Version 22

(Trial). LDA was attempted considering the proteins only altered at the Whole Serum or HMW Serum,

and for the combination of both results. The evaluation of the models obtained from each analysis was

performed by comparison of the Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves obtained using each

model. A comparison of the ROC curves was performed using MedCalc Statistical Software version

20.106 (MedCalc Software Ltd;(21); Trial). The Delong et al. (1988) (22) method was used for the

calculation of the Standard Error (SE) of the Area Under the Curve (AUC) and of the difference between

two AUCs, and the Confidence Interval (CI) for the AUCs were calculated using the exact Binomial

Confidence Intervals which are calculated as the following AUC ± 1.96 SE.

Violin plots were used to present the distribution of the individual protein levels among each condition,

and Pearson's correlation analysis was performed to evaluate the similarity between the profiles of the

proteins highlighted in the study. Violin plots were generated using GraphPad Prism 8.0.1 (Trial) and the

Pearson's correlation was performed using Morpheus software (23). Heatmap and hierarchical

clustering analyses were computed using PermutMatrix version 1.9.3 (24, 25) using the Euclidean

distance and McQuitty's criteria.

Physical protein-protein interactions between the highlighted analytes were predicted by GeneMANIA

webserver (Gene Function Prediction using a Multiple Association Network Integration Algorithm; (26,

27) together with a gene ontology (GO) analysis of the formed network. In addition to the proteins

imported from this study, 28 additional related genes were allowed to create the interaction network

using equal weighting by network. An additional GO enrichment analysis considering the term

"biological process" was also performed. On the other hand, functional protein association networks

were evaluated using the Search Tool for Retrieval of Interacting Genes/Proteins (STRING) version 11.5

(28) with a medium confidence of 0.4 (29).

Pathway enrichment analyses were performed using the FunRich software (version 3.1.3) (30),

considering two different databases: the FunRich or the Reactome database. In both instances, a

statistical analysis employing a hypergeometric test was conducted, using the FunRich human genome

database as the background. Enriched pathways were considered for a non-corrected or a Bonferroni-

corrected p-value below 0.05 for Funrich or Reactome database, respectively.

Results

High molecular weight fractionation as a reproducible method for biomarker discovery

To explore the potential of HMW fractionation in peripheral biomarker research, serum samples

underwent either ultrafiltration using a 300 kDa MWCO filter followed by protein precipitation of the

retentate (referred to as HMW serum), before protein digestion and MS analysis, or were directly

analyzed (whole serum) (see Figure 1). In the proposed pipeline, the HMW fractionation was performed

under non-denaturing conditions, such that the filter would retain native HMW protein complexes and

large molecular structures.

Figure 1: Pipeline of sample preparation, data acquisition and data analysis.

As previously reported, employing an appropriate IS is crucial for delineating effective proteome

changes among different groups (12). Given the nature of the fractionation proposed in this study, an

ideal IS for this procedure would be a HMW protein that remains retained by the filter and bears no

similarity to other human proteins. In this context, equine globular protein Ferritin (~440 kDa size)

emerged as a suitable IS for several reasons: it lacks similarity with any other protein from the human

proteome (Additional File 1: Supplementary Figure 1a), the peptides monitored in the SWATH-MS

analysis are easily distinguishable from the matrix (the human serum proteome; Additional File 1:

Supplementary Figure 1b), and it exhibits a coefficient of variation similar to the one obtained by the

MBP-GFP used in the unfractionated analysis and previously characterized (12) (Additional File 1:

Supplementary Figure 1c). Additionally, the overall reproducibility of the fractionation was also

inspected. Similarly, to what was observed for the IS (Additional File 1: Supplementary Figure 1c), the

overall coefficient of variation of the proteins quantified using technical replicates (Additional File 1:

Supplementary Figure 1d) revealed that this procedure did not induce an appreciable increase in the

variability of the quantification when compared with the conventional protocol (unfractionated

samples). Moreover, the variation caused by the sample processing steps may be reverted by the

normalization of the values to the IS since the coefficient of variation of the IS is similar to the one

observed for the majority of the proteins, indicating that the selected IS is a good predictor of the

alterations induced by the method.

High molecular weight fractionation increases the detection of proteomic alterations in NDs

As proof of concept, this procedure was applied to serum samples of a cohort comprised of 3 different

groups: AD (n = 22), PD (n = 24), and CT (n = 12). No statistically significant differences were found in the

gender distribution between the three groups; however, differences were observed concerning age

distribution, with PD individuals being slightly younger, on average, than both other groups (Table 1).

Patients with neurodegenerative diseases, both AD and PD, were selected for this study. These

conditions are frequently associated with the development of abnormal protein complexes and protein

aggregation. Hence, they offer a fitting context to evaluate the fractionation approach's effectiveness in

exploring potentially altered protein interactions—an aspect frequently neglected in conventional

proteomics analyses.

Table 1. Study population distribution across age and sex.

	AD (n = 22)	PD (n = 24)	CT (n = 12)	p-value				
				CT vs. Diseases	CT vs. AD vs. PD	AD vs. PD	CT vs. PD	CT vs. AD
Male (n)	9	11	3	0.197[*]	-	0.643[*]	0.148[*]	0.262[*]
Female (n)	13	13	9					
Age (mean ± SD)	68.4 ± 8.2	60.3 ± 10.4	67.5 ± 7.2	-	0.014[$]	0.009[#]	0.033[#]	0.396[#]

[*] Determined by χ^2 test according to each group's male/female proportions. [$] Determined by Kruskal-Wallis rank

sum test to compare age between all groups. [#] Determined by Dunn's test (Benjamini-Hochberg correction) to

compare age between group pairs. Diseases refer to AD and PD grouped together.

A total of 203 and 186 proteins were quantified in whole serum and HMW serum, respectively (Figure

2a, solid lines; Additional File 2: Supplementary Tables 1 and 2 for detailed information). A large overlap

was observed between both sample preparation procedures (168 proteins were shared, which

corresponds to more than 70% of all the quantified proteins). Additionally, quantification in the whole

serum of the proteins identified in the HMW serum library did not lead to a discernible increase in

proteome coverage (Figure 2a, dashed line; Additional File 2: Supplementary Table 3). Altogether, these

results indicate that there are no major differences in terms of the proteins being quantified in the two

approaches, revealing that the main aim of the HMW fractionation presented in this work –

fractionation under non-denaturing condition – is not the overall improvement of the proteome

coverage but the possibility of interrogating the samples considering protein

interactions/macromolecular organization.

Figure 2 – Comparative differential proteomic analysis of whole and HMW serum of AD and PD

patients. (a) Venn diagram comparing the number of quantified proteins in each sample type using

sample-specific libraries (solid lines; Additional File 2: Supplementary Tables 1-2). In addition,

quantification in whole serum was also performed for the proteins identified in the HMW-specific library

(dashed line; Serum&HMWLib condition; Additional File 2: Supplementary Table 3) to evaluate the

possible use of HMW fractionation as a tool to improve the proteome coverage of serum samples. A

total of 224 proteins were quantified in the serum samples using the three strategies referred above;

from those, 162 proteins were commonly quantified independently of the strategy, corresponding to

nearly three-quarters of all the quantified proteins (72.3%). Only three new proteins were quantified in

whole serum using the HMW-specific library. **(b)** Venn diagram comparing the total number of proteins

considered altered among the three experimental groups using the two different serum-processing

strategies used in this work (Additional File 1: Supplementary Figure 2 and Additional File 2:

Supplementary Tables 1-2). A total of 69 proteins were considered altered among the three

experimental groups; of those, only 11 proteins (the respective gene names are indicated) were

consistently considered altered independently of the strategy used. **(c)** Comparison of the levels of the

11 proteins commonly considered altered in both whole serum and HMW-fractionated serum. The

proteins were arranged considering the group comparison where the statistical differences were

observed (Additional File 1: Supplementary Figure 3), and the alterations were presented as the median

fold change observed in each sample type. Proteins considered altered in more than one group are

indicated in italic and with a grey shadow. Only one protein, the beta-2-glycoprotein 1 (indicated in

bold), presented a divergent tendency when considering its values in the whole serum versus after the

HMW fractionation of the samples. # - non-statistically significant difference.

This was further confirmed by the fact that only 14.7% of all the proteins considered altered in this study

(11 out of 69 proteins) were consistently altered in the fractionated and unfractionated samples (Figure

2b; Additional File 2: Supplementary Tables 1-2). Moreover, taking into consideration the changes of

those 11 commonly altered proteins, it is possible to observe that all proteins, except for the protein

beta-2-glycoprotein 1 (Figure 2c, bold), presented the same tendency in both fractionated and

unfractionated samples (Figure 2c). These results, in combination with the previous observations,

demonstrate that, although the two approaches quantified the same set of proteins, each method

interrogated the samples in a particular context, resulting in the identification of a different set of

altered proteins and the possibility to identify different regulatory mechanisms: while the direct analysis

of the serum mainly represents the alteration at the protein level, the HMW fractionation under non-

denaturing conditions may allow the evaluation of the physical interaction of the proteins.

These results are further supported by the analysis of the MW distribution of the proteins being studied,

which reveals a similar profile between both approaches (Additional File 1: Supplementary Figure 4a, 4b,

and 4c), with most of the proteins detected in HMW serum presenting a MW below 150 kDa. Moreover,

a similar distribution is observed for the proteins altered exclusively in the HMW approach (Additional

File 1: Supplementary Figure 4d), indicating that this strategy is not biased towards only the HMW

proteins and supporting the idea that those proteins altered in this fraction may correspond to proteins

being organized into different complexes.

High molecular weight fractionation revealed differences in the macromolecular organization of the

serum proteome

To test the hypothesis that the HMW approach is capable of evaluating the re-organization of protein

complexes, the nature of the 28 proteins altered exclusively in HMW serum was evaluated. This analysis

revealed that most of those proteins had been described to interact physically either with each other or

with other proteins (Figure 3a). Upon immediate observation of the GeneMania network, which

primarily evaluates the interactions between the proteins under study (Additional File 2: Supplementary

Table 4), it becomes apparent that the majority of the proteins participate in established physical

interactions. Moreover, it can be observed that these proteins form a large and interconnected network

comprising 20 of the 28 altered proteins centered around the interactions between the apolipoproteins

and lecithin-cholesterol acyltransferase (encoded by the *LCAT* gene). Although not participating in any

known interactions with another protein from the 28 altered proteins, the proteins Glutathione

peroxidase 3 (*GPX3*), Pigment epithelium-derived factor (*SERPINF1*), Thyroxine-binding globulin

(*SERPINA7*), and Alpha-1B-glycoprotein (*A1BG*) are also known to establish physical interactions

including with the proteins identified in this analysis. Only four of the 28 altered proteins, namely SRR1-

like protein (*SRRD*), carnosine dipeptidase 1 (*CNDP1*), peptidoglycan recognition protein 2 (*PGLYRP2*),

and serum amyloid A-4 protein (*SAA4*), were found to have no disclosed interactions in this particular

analysis. However, interactors for those proteins have already been pointed out in some screening

assays, as confirmed in BioGRID (Biological General Repository for Interaction Datasets, Additional File 2:

Supplementary Table 5). Furthermore, as revealed by the functional analysis, several of these 28

proteins are involved in the formation of complexes with lipids and platelet components (Additional File

2: Supplementary Table 6), indicating that those proteins can form complexes not only via the

interaction with other proteins but also with other molecules, and thus be organized in large complexes.

This involvement in the potential formation of macromolecular complexes is even more evident when

the functional pathways enriched in each of the two lists of proteins (30 and 28 altered proteins

exclusively in the whole serum or HMW serum, respectively) are directly compared (Figure 3b). This

comparison highlights the fact that all the pathways that are either only, or at least more, enriched in

the HMW dataset in comparison to the whole serum dataset (pathways indicated in bold) are related to

the formation/regulation of large complexes/macrostructures, namely amyloids, fibrin clot formation

and dissolution pathways and lipoprotein-related metabolism. On the other hand, the pathways that are

particularly enriched or unique in the whole serum dataset are mainly related to transcription factor

networks (Additional File 2: Supplementary Table 7).

Figure 3 – Characterization of the proteins exclusively altered in whole serum or HMW serum. (a)

GeneMania Network of the 28 proteins altered only at the HMW serum sample (listed in larger circles).

The analysis was performed with network weighting equal by network, allowing a maximum of 28 extra

resultant genes (non-listed small circles). The seven most enriched GeneMania Functions were

highlighted in the network (color code; complete results in Additional File 2: Supplementary Table 4).

Only protein-protein physical interactions (red edges) were considered in this analysis, demonstrating

that most of these 28 altered proteins have known interactors and can be involved in the formation of

large protein-protein complexes. **(b)** FunRich Biological Pathways enriched in the whole serum (30

proteins; Additional File 2: Supplementary Table 5) and HMW serum (28 proteins; Additional File 2:

Supplementary Table 6) proteomes. All GO analyses considered a p <0.05. Pathways uniquely enriched

at the HMW serum or particularly enriched in this type of sample when compared to the whole serum

are indicated in bold.

Evaluation of the potential of this combined strategy for biomarker discovery

The previous set of results demonstrates that both approaches can provide complementary information. In line with this evidence, the potential to use this combined strategy for biomarker discovery was also evaluated. In general, both approaches result in nearly 40 proteins altered in at least one pair of comparisons (Figure 4a-b; Additional File 1: Supplementary Figure 3 for details regarding each pair of comparisons), with a tendency to have more proteins altered in the comparisons involving the AD group (at least 20 proteins were altered compared to CT against a maximum of 14 altered proteins in PD vs. CT, Additional File 1: Supplementary Figure 2a-b) and only a small subset of proteins altered in only one comparison (15/41 in the whole serum and 11/39 in HMW serum, Figure 4a and 4b, respectively). Besides those similarities, different profiles of altered proteins were observed depending on the approach used. Hence, it can also be highlighted that while the whole serum strategy (Figure 4a) mainly found proteins altered between the two disease groups (39 proteins in AD vs. PD compared to 20 and 12 proteins in AD vs. CT and PD vs. CT, respectively), the HMW approach (Figure 4b) captured more differences between AD and CT samples (36 out of the 39 altered proteins). Due to this complementarity, the combination of results from both approaches resulted in a more comprehensive profile (Additional File 1: Supplementary Figure 2a-c), with a general increase in the number of altered proteins per group (total of 69 altered proteins, Figure 4c). This improvement is particularly evident in the case of proteins altered between PD and CT samples, for which only one protein was considered commonly altered in the two approaches (Figure 2c and Additional File 1: Supplementary Figure 2b), thus resulting in the duplication of the list of proteins with the potential to serve as biomarkers for PD versus CT individuals. Common to all mapped profiles was the low number of proteins altered between all three groups (4, 1, and 6 for Whole serum, HMW serum and the combination of both, Figure 4a-c, respectively) and the absence of proteins altered exclusively between PD and CT samples.

Figure 4 – Identification of potential circulating biomarkers of AD and PD. (a-c) Venn diagrams representing the distribution of the altered proteins among the different comparisons (AD vs. CT; PD vs. CT; AD vs. PD) considering the whole serum, HMW serum and the combination of the two (Whole +

HMW serum) types of samples, respectively. **(d-f)** LDA using all altered proteins per sample type or the

combination of the two. The number of proteins used in each model is indicated above the graphic, and

for each model it is indicated their specificity (percentage of healthy individuals correctly identified;

indicated in black) and the sensitivity per disease condition (percentage of AD or PD patients correctly

identified; indicated in red and blue, respectively). Specificity and sensitivity values were also

summarized in Additional File 2: Supplementary Table 7, and the generated LDA discriminant functions

and their respective statistical confidence were summarized in Table 2. **(g-h)** Comparative ROC curves of

the discriminant functions generated using all altered proteins per sample type or a combination of the

two. An independent evaluation was performed for each disease group being studied. The AUC of the

ROC curves, their 95% CI and the pairwise comparisons are summarized in **(i)**. CI was calculated as

follows AUC ± 1.96 SE. n.s., non-significant alterations. * and # indicate a p < 0.05 for statistically

significant differences in comparison to the Whole Serum or HMW+Whole Serum in comparison to

HMW Serum, respectively, using the method of Delong et al. (1988) (22).

To further confirm the biomarker potential of the altered proteins from the three strategies presented

above, they were used as input to build discriminant models that could differentiate between the

studied groups (Figure 4d-f). From each dataset, candidates whose combination resulted in the best

possible discriminant model were automatically selected (detailed information regarding the methods in

Table 2), resulting in three distinct and statistically valid models (all with p < 0.0032) capable of

discriminating the three groups being studied. The whole serum dataset resulted in a reasonable model

composed of 4 proteins (Figure 4d), with a median sensitivity (the capacity to classify the individuals

from each disease group correctly) of 86.95% (sensitivity and specificity are summarized in Additional

File 1: Supplementary Table 8). On the other hand, the model created with six proteins from the HMW

approach (Figure 4e) had lower performance, with a median sensitivity of only 80.3% (corresponding to

83.3% predicting capacity for PD samples and 77.3% for AD samples). Moreover, neither of the models

was particularly good in the classification of CT samples, resulting in a specificity of only 66.7% and 75%

in the whole serum and HMW serum models, respectively. Remarkably, the combined model (created

from the dataset containing the altered proteins from both approaches - Figure 4f) clearly outperformed

the two models based only on proteins from a single approach. For this combined model, 10 proteins

were selected and integrated, creating a discriminant model capable of correctly classifying more than

96% of all tested samples (93% in a cross-validation test; Table 2). This included the correct classification

of 100% of samples from the PD group (Figure 4f), which encompassed samples from younger patients

compared to the other studied groups (Table 1). However, it was confirmed that this age difference did

not interfere with the classification of samples when employing the discriminant model since: i) age by

itself did not yield good classification performance (Additional File 1: Supplementary Figure 5) and ii)

none of the 10 proteins included in the combined model were strongly correlated with age (Additional

File 1: Supplementary Figure 6). Altogether, this combined method presented a median sensitivity of

97.75% and a specificity of 91.7%.

The diagnostic capacity of these models was further assessed by ROC curves, which measured their

ability to accurately classify AD and PD patients from among all other samples (Figure 4g-i). This analysis

confirmed that the best model is the one created with the combination of proteins from both

approaches and that, in general, the model using only proteins from the whole serum approach is better

than the model from the HMW approach. The respective statistics (Figure 4i) further support that the

whole serum model performed better than the HMW serum model but without statistically significant

differences between the two ROC curves. Additionally, the statistical analysis also confirmed that the

combined model (AUC = 0.999 for the classification of AD and PD patients) is the best model and that it

performed significantly better ($p < 0.05$) than both other models for PD classification (HMW serum, AUC

= 0.888; whole serum, AUC = 0.960) and better than the HMW serum model (AUC = 0.919) in the case of

AD classification. The robustness of the combined model is further evidenced by the confidence interval

(CI) of the AUC, which has a lower limit above 0.93 for both diseases, in contrast with the values

achieved for the other two methods, whose lower limits are all below 0.9.

Table 2. Linear Discriminant models, respective statistical analysis and classification results.

	Gene Name	Protein name	MW (KDa)	Whole Serum		HMW serum		Whole + HMW serum	
				Dis 1	Dis 2	Dis 1	Dis 2	Dis 1	Dis 2
#	**FOXM1**	**Forkhead box protein M1**	**84.283**	---	---	---	---	**245.36**	**-10.93**
#	PROC	Vitamin K-dependent protein C	52.071	-1133.77	1212.34	---	---	-1557.39	623.28
#	HBB	Hemoglobin subunit beta (Beta-globin)	15.998	1.49	0.58	-0.06	-0.13	0.42	-1.50
#	APOA1	Apolipoprotein A1 (Apo-AI)	30.778	3.63	0.53	---	---	-0.16	-3.08
#	**IGLV3-19**	**Immunoglobulin lambda variable 3-19**	**12.042**	---	---	---	---	**62.89**	**52.70**
§	SRRD	SRR1-like protein	38.573	---	---	20.37	7.55	16.69	11.52
§	APOC1	Apolipoprotein C1 (Apo-CI)	9.332	---	---	-9.74	19.21	-15.77	1.33
§	APOE	Apolipoprotein E (Apo-E)	36.154	---	---	1.46	-0.42	0.84	0.53
§	**SERPINF1**	**Pigment epithelium-derived factor (PEDF)**	**46.312**	---	---	---	---	**6.85**	**2.63**
§	KRT9	Keratin, type I cytoskeletal 9	62.064	---	---	-8.80	5.05	-12.73	-4.91
	PPBP	**Platelet basic protein (PBP)**	**13.894**	---	---	**8.89**	**-7.88**	---	---
	TF	Serotransferrin (Transferrin)	77.050	**-0.99**	**-1.66**	---	---	---	---
		(Constant)		2.11	-0.81	-1.11	-2.82	3.34	-1.10
	Statistics (Wilks' Lambda, Chi-square and p-value)		$\lambda=$ $\chi2=$ $p<$	0.253 73.473 9.97×10^{-13}	0.773 13.473 3.23×10^{-03}	0.242 74.458 4.65×10^{-11}	0.629 24.361 1.85×10^{-04}	0.058 143.675 1.01×10^{-20}	0.292 62.244 4.94×10^{-10}
	Overall classification results (% of cases correctly classified)		Original Cross-validation	82.8 81.0		79.3 72.4		96.6 93.1	

selected from the data from the Whole serum approach for the Whole + HMW serum model; § selected from the data from the HMW serum approach for the Whole + HMW serum model;

Dis – discriminant function; Note that proteins are sorted by order of inclusion into the Whole + HMW serum discriminant model. Proteins exclusive to one of the models appear in bold.

By looking at the proteins selected to build the different methods (Table 2), it was observed that the

combined method is not the simple combination of the proteins previously selected from each of the

individual methods. The combined model is built by the combination of 10 proteins, five from each

dataset, including three [forkhead box protein M1 (*FOXM1*), immunoglobulin lambda variable 3-19

(*IGLV3-19*) and pigment epithelium-derived factor (*SERPINF1*)] that were not selected on the database-

specific models. On the other hand, some previously selected proteins [serotransferrin (*TF*) and platelet

basic protein (*PPBP*)] were not included in the combined model. Finally, the Hemoglobin subunit beta

(*HBB*) was selected in both approach-specific models, although only data from the whole serum dataset

was used in the combined model. These results demonstrate that the increase in the initial amount of

data provided for the discriminant analysis has an important impact on the generated model by making

it possible to test different combinations of proteins and, thus, allowing for the identification of better

combinations than those highlighted in the analysis of individual datasets. Interestingly, all ten proteins

selected in the combined model have a MW below 90 kDa (Table 2). This finding confirms that all the

proteins selected from the HMW approach have a MW below the theoretical cut-off of the filters used

for fractionation. This observation supports the hypothesis that this approach might effectively assess

the remodeling of molecular complexes. By plotting the individual values of each of the ten proteins

selected in the combined model (Figure 5a), it is possible to observe that, as expected, those values

present some variation characteristic of the individuality of each patient. Nevertheless, considering that

the model was able to correctly classify more than 90% of all the patients (Figure 4f), it is possible to

infer that the combinations performed in the model could diminish the impact of the biological

variability, proving that the combination of different markers can overcome their individual weaknesses.

The analysis of these results immediately reveals that i) only three proteins from the model (the

proteins encoded by the genes *FOXM1, HBB,* and *SRRD*) are significantly altered between all three

groups and ii) only one protein, the apolipoprotein C1 (Apo-CI, encoded by the *APOC1* gene), is altered

between a single comparison, in this case between AD and PD which may indicate that this protein may

have a particularly important role in this model for distinguishing AD from PD patients. Among the

remaining 6 proteins: i) three, apolipoprotein E, pigment epithelium-derived factor and KRT9, are

altered between both disease groups and control sample (all three found in the HMW fraction); ii) two,

apolipoprotein A1 and immunoglobulin lambda variable 3-19, are altered in AD in comparison to both

PD and CT, and one, the Vitamin K-dependent protein C (encoded by the PROC gene), is altered in PD

patients in comparison to the other two groups. Moreover, it is noteworthy that while there was a

tendency to incorporate proteins that were increased in AD compared to CT from the whole serum

approach (three out of the five proteins from the whole serum model, encoded by the genes *FOXM1*,

HBB, and *APOA1*), the opposite trend was observed in the case of proteins from the HMW approach.

Specifically, three out of the five proteins (the proteins encoded by the genes *SRRD, APOE*, and

SERPINF1) were found to be decreased in the AD vs. CT comparison. On the contrary, for the PD vs. CT

comparison, there were no major differences in terms of tendencies when considering the proteins

captured in the whole serum or the HMW serum.

Finally, all proteins from the whole serum dataset, in addition to SRR1-like protein (encoded by the

SRRD gene) and Apo-CI from the HMW dataset, were significantly altered between both disease groups.

From these, three proteins [the protein Forkhead box protein M1 (encoded by the *FOXM1* gene),

hemoglobin subunit beta (encoded by *HBB* gene), and apolipoprotein A1 (Apo-AI, encoded by the

APOA1 gene)] are less abundant in PD samples than in AD samples, while the remaining four are

increased.

Figure 5 – Characterization of the protein panel selected by the combined LDA model. (a) Violin plots

representing the protein level distribution of the ten proteins from the model. The dashed lines indicate

the first, second (median) and third quartiles. *, **, and *** indicate a p < 0.05, p<0.01, and p<0.001

for statistically significant differences. * denotes the comparison to control and # the differences

between disease groups. Statistical analysis was performed using the Kruskal–Wallis H test followed by

the Dunn's Test for pairwise comparison. **(b)** Pearson's correlation analysis between the overall

regulation profile of the proteins included in the model. **(c)** Heatmap and hierarchical clustering analysis

of the proteins from the model. Clustering was performed for both proteins and individuals. Three

different clusters (Cluster PD, CT and AD) containing the large majority of the individuals from a given

group can be highlighted from the analysis. The average profile of each cluster is indicated on the right

and can be considered as the profile of expression of those proteins within the groups considered in this

study. **(d)** Interaction network of these proteins carried out with STRING with a medium confidence (0.4)

score. The color of the edges indicates the type of evidence that supports the interaction, while the

color of the nodes represents the categorization of the proteins considering UniProt Keywords. The

calculated PPI enrichment p-value is 2.07e-05. Three clusters (Cluster 1 to 3) can be identified within the

network, with the dashed edges indicating the separation between clusters. Cluster 1 corresponds to

proteins whose interactions are experimentally confirmed, cluster 2 is composed of theoretically related

proteins, and cluster 3 corresponds to non-related proteins. **(e)** Reactome pathways enrichment analysis

using the proteins from the model. The red line indicates Bonferroni's corrected p-value with the

corrected $p < 0.05$, meaning a significant enrichment. The grey dashed line indicates the reference line

($p = 0.05$).

The correlation analysis of the protein abundances among groups confirmed that, in general, there is no

particularly evident correlation between the profiles and the magnitude of regulation of these proteins

(Figure 5b). There were, however, some observed exceptions, including a strong positive correlation

between the proteins encoded by the genes *APOA1* and *FOXM1* (r = 0.8) and, to a lesser extent, the

proteins encoded by *APOC1, APOE and SERPINF1* (r = 0.5-0.6). Interestingly, the proteins showing a

positive correlation originated from the same approach, the gene products of *APOA1* and *FOXM1* were

both highlighted in the whole serum approach, suggesting that the overall levels of these two proteins

were similarly altered. Meanwhile, the products of the *APOC1, APOE,* and *SERPINF1* genes were

identified as altered in the HMW fractionation strategy, which may indicate that these proteins might be

part of the same complex and thus regulated in a similar manner. No remarkable negative correlations

were found, with the strongest correlation observed between the proteins encoded by the *APOA1* and

SRRD genes, which indicates that none of the proteins in the model present a completely opposite

regulation profile. Additionally, an unsupervised clustering analysis using these ten proteins (Figure 5c)

confirmed their capacity to partially distinguish the three groups being studied, revealing that, besides

the existence of individual variability, it was possible to identify three independent clusters composed

exclusively or mainly of samples from one of the three groups. This analysis also demonstrates that this

set of proteins is particularly efficient in isolating the AD patients from the remaining individuals from

the study: the AD cluster was composed exclusively of AD patients, and only 6 out of the 22 AD patients

were not included in this cluster. On the other hand, a slightly lower separation capacity was observed

for both PD and CT samples. These two clusters contained few samples that did not belong to their

respective groups, resulting in a higher percentage of individuals not properly grouped (10 out of 24 and

4 out of 12 samples for PD and CT, respectively). The discrepancies observed between the clustering

analysis and the discriminant model results, where the latter correctly classified over 90% of the

samples, can be attributed to the fact that the clustering analysis relied solely on the individual protein

distribution profiles across the samples. In contrast, the discriminant analysis employed equations with

different weightings for each protein, resulting in a single model that effectively reduces the intragroup

variability while promoting a better separation between the analyzed groups. Despite that, the

clustering analysis remains an important approach for understanding how the proteins are modulated

within the samples. Thus, from the three different clusters highlighted in the analysis, it was possible to

infer the median protein abundance profile of these proteins among the three groups. For instance, the

gene products of *SERPINF1*, *APOE* and *APOC1* tend to be less abundant in both disease groups compared

to CT samples. Furthermore, some proteins are more abundant in each disease group, namely the gene

products of *PROC* and *KRT9* in PD samples and the gene products of *HBB*, *APOA1* and *FOXM1* in AD

samples. Another disease-specific observation was the smaller amount of immunoglobulin lambda

variable 3-19 (*IGLV3-19*) in AD samples compared to both other groups. Overall, these tendencies

characterize the unique profiles determined for each disease group, which may be a precursor to a

potential future biomarker panel that could be more informative than the analysis based on any single

protein.

Finally, STRING analysis (Figure 5d and Additional File 2: Supplementary Table 9) revealed that these ten

proteins have more interactions among themselves than what would be expected for a random set of

proteins of the same size and degree of distribution, indicating that this set of proteins is, at least

partially, biologically connected (PPI enrichment p = 2.07×10^{-5}). This result may be mainly due to the

strong network involving apolipoproteins and Hemoglobin subunit beta (cluster 1). Again, two out of the

ten proteins selected for the discriminant method revealed to be associated with high-density

lipoproteins (HDL) and chylomicron (ultra-low-density lipoproteins particles) remodeling and assembly

(Figure 5e and Additional File 2: Supplementary Table 10), highlighting the potential importance of these

mechanisms in the neurodegenerative process, and confirming that the proteins related with these

mechanisms could be good biomarker candidates for their diagnosis.

Given the central role that apolipoproteins appear to play in this model, a discriminant analysis was

performed using data from ten altered proteins involved in apolipoprotein-related mechanisms to

investigate if the diagnostic model could be limited to this set of functionally related proteins (Additional

File 1: Supplementary Figure 7). However, the generated model exhibited lower diagnostic capacity

compared to the combined approach, with only 82.75% of the samples being correctly classified. The

model demonstrated a specificity of 66.7%, and a sensitivity of 86.4% and 87.5% for AD and PD,

respectively, yielding ROC curves with AUCs equal to or below 0.955. Thus, besides the importance of

apolipoproteins, the results from these proteins alone are not enough to distinguish the three groups,

emphasizing the importance of having diagnostic models based on several complementary candidates

instead of a single or just a few candidates. Nonetheless, the identification of this robust core of

functionally related proteins underscores the significance of the combined approach for identifying new

potential biomarkers. For instance, while the dysregulation of Apo-C1 and Apolipoprotein E (Apo-E,

encoded by the *APOE* gene) was discovered using the HMW fractionation approach, the dysregulation of

Apo-AI was identified using the whole serum approach.

Discussion

The present study presents a proof of concept of a novel two-pronged approach to biomarker discovery

in complex peripheral biological fluids. More specifically, it was demonstrated that through the

combination of two complementary proteomics strategies, the direct analysis of whole serum and the

analysis of serum HMW fraction (above 300 kDa) in non-denaturing conditions, another level of

proteome characterization of the samples could be achieved. This resulted in more robust diagnostic

models and insights into disease mechanisms. In this sense, when applied to serum samples from a

cohort of control individuals and individuals afflicted by neurodegenerative diseases, this strategy

allowed for a strong discriminant model to be built, able to distinguish all studied groups more

effectively than the models generated from a single proteomics analysis. The most noticeable findings

from this model showed that several, otherwise overlooked, proteins may yet serve as potential

biomarkers of disease, in this case, AD and PD, particularly when analyzed together in a model created

using the two different approaches. Thus, these results confirm the importance of having a panel of

potential candidates rather than a single protein biomarker. Furthermore, they also demonstrate that

the biomarker discovery field will benefit from combining data from the sample obtained through

different sample processing strategies. While not individually sufficient to be considered as biomarkers,

the significant influence of apolipoproteins, particularly Apo-AI, Apo-CI, and Apo-E, in the

aforementioned discriminant model, suggests a potential disease-specific dysregulation of lipoprotein

metabolism in AD and PD patients.

High molecular weight fractionation may reveal a potentially altered macromolecular and

macromolecular-complex organization

In this work, it was demonstrated that interrogating serum samples with the HMW fractionation

method adds an extra layer of information capable of bringing new insight into the behavior of the

serum proteins, particularly regarding their potential macromolecular organization. Because the

fractionation procedure took place under non-denaturing conditions and since aberrant protein

aggregation (8) is a common hallmark of both AD and PD, it was hypothesized that macromolecular

complexes, potentially altered between the studied groups, could be captured through the HMW

fractionation approach.

The present results confirmed this premise, as evidenced by the fact that although no variation was

observed in the overall serum protein captured by both strategies, proteins exclusively altered in the

HMW fraction accounted for 40% of the total list of altered proteins. Furthermore, with the exception of

one protein (Centrosome-associated protein CEP250), all proteins had a MW below 90 kDa, which is

considerably lower than the 300 kDa cut-off filter used. It is worth noting that 72% of proteins altered in

the HMW fraction did not exhibit alterations in their total levels. This supports the possibility that

different regulatory mechanisms of these proteins, apart from expression and degradation, are being

revealed and studied using this approach.

Moreover, the results show that most of these proteins have several reported interactors and thus may

be involved in the formation of large complexes. An illustration of this phenomenon is found in the

protein clusterin (CLU gene), also known as apolipoprotein J, which has been implicated in the

metabolism of aggregation-prone proteins, including those associated with NDs (31-33). Notably,

clusterin's interaction with Aβ42 has been demonstrated to enhance its clearance from the brain

through the blood-brain barrier (BBB) (31). Furthermore, clusterin has been implicated in various stages

of PD, potentially exerting a neuroprotective effect through its interaction with α-synuclein aggregates

(32). Additionally, the interaction between clusterin and α-synuclein has been detected in plasma

samples (33). Beyond this specific example, the generic functional analysis of altered proteins,

particularly those from the HMW serum strategy, suggests their close association with amyloids and clot

formation, which may involve large structures.

On the other hand, some of these proteins may instead, or additionally, be present in large biological

structures not composed exclusively of proteins, like exosomes or lipoproteins, which would not only

likewise justify their presence in this HMW serum fraction but also give further understanding of the

potentially altered mechanisms related to the diseases being studied. Such may be the case of the

proteins clusterin and serum amyloid A-4 (*SAA4* gene), which were found to be altered in serum neuron-

derived exosomes of AD patients (34). Additionally, exosomal clusterin was found to be altered in

patients at different stages of PD when compared to controls (35). Thus, although the presence of

exosomes in the HMW fraction was not confirmed, given the MWCO of the filters used in this work, it is

feasible that some of the proteins being analyzed in the HMW fraction may correspond to proteins

linked to the extracellular vesicles.

Altogether, these findings support the notion that the HMW fractionation approach can provide a new

level of information that may offer new insights into how proteins are organized within a given sample.

Altered lipoprotein metabolism can be a peripherical marker of AD and PD

The combination of the two approaches in this study led to a robust and promising potential biomarker

panel composed of ten proteins quantified in whole serum or HMW serum. A major finding revealed by

this model was the involvement of several lipoproteins in discriminating between the studied groups.

Among the ten proteins used in the best discriminant model, three are apolipoproteins: Apo-AI from

whole serum, and Apo-CI and Apo-E from HMW serum. Besides those three proteins, other altered

apolipoproteins were observed in this study but not included in the model, namely: i) the Apo-AII, Apo-

LI and clusterin highlighted in the HMW serum strategy; ii) the Apo-AIV from the whole serum; and, iii)

beta-2-glycoprotein 1 in both approaches. Furthermore, a lipoprotein-related enzyme, lecithin-

cholesterol acyltransferase, was also altered in HMW serum. This is further supported by the functional

enrichment analysis of the altered proteins discovered in both strategies that highlight the involvement

of those proteins in lipoprotein metabolism and HDL-mediated lipid transport pathways. Cumulatively,

all these findings point to the relevance of lipoproteins in the context of NDs and, although not

absolutely clear, the link between these diseases, in particularly AD, and apolipoproteins has been the

focus of many studies (31, 33, 36-46).

Apo-AI and Apo-E have an established relation to toxic species clearance from the brain in AD and PD

(31, 33, 37, 47-50). Additionally, regarding AD, our findings for both proteins contradict what can be

found in the literature (38, 43). For Apo-AI, we found an increase in abundance in AD patients as

opposed to the decrease reported for most studies (38). However, in another study where no significant

alterations in total serum Apo-AI content of AD patients were reported, further investigation revealed

that some proteoforms of this protein were significantly increased compared to the levels observed in

the controls (39). This has been suggested as a possible explanation for the different observations

regarding this protein in the context of AD, which might be related to the use of different detection

methods within different studies (38). Regarding this protein's connection to clearance mechanisms,

evidence suggests that for HDLs containing Apo-AI (APOA1-HDL), the structure seems to influence not

only the disaggregation of Aβ fibrils but also its ability to cross the BBB, with lipid-poor discoidal APOA1-

HDL having the best performance when compared to APOA1-HDL in other lipidation states (37).

Moreover, in the present study, phosphatidylcholine-sterol acyltransferase, an enzyme known to affect

HDL structure through lipidation of Apo-AI in plasma (45), was also found to be altered in AD patients.

As this enzyme participates in HDL maturation in plasma (51), this result could reflect the dysregulation

of lipoproteins in AD. For Apo-E, we found a decrease in abundance in AD patients as opposed to the

increase reported for MCI patients in a previous study (43). Isoform and lipidation status of Apo-E is also

crucial for the Aβ clearance, with the Apo-E4 isoform, the genetic risk factor most associated with the

onset of AD (31, 48), and higher lipidation having detrimental effects on the process (31, 48). Further

investigation using the combined approach presented in this study, particularly in the context of AD,

should also involve a lipid profile analysis and APOE genotyping of the participants to enable a more

comprehensive characterization of serum HDLs and Apo-E content, respectively.

Although systemic lipid abnormalities have also been implicated in PD, there are fewer findings

connecting it to HDL-related proteins, as compared to AD (32). Nonetheless, a previous report observed

significantly decreased values of Apo-AI in mild PD patients compared to healthy controls, but much like

what we observed for this protein, a less impactful and non-significant decrease was observed in

moderate/severe PD patients (52). In fact, most research indicates that Apo-AI may have a protective

role in PD (32) and it has been hypothesized that APOA1-HDL could take part in the efflux of α-synuclein

from the brain (33). Additionally, both Apo-AI and Apo-E have been reported to interact with α-

synuclein (33).

Finally, HDL size and plasma levels have been shown to be dependent on the levels of Apo-CI (53),

another apolipoprotein included in the best diagnostic model generated in this study. Besides that, a

previous study also shows that the dysregulation of this protein can lead to impaired memory processes

in mice (54). This suggests that the regulation of Apo-CI can be pivotal in the brain and that a systemic

disruption of this process could have effects detectable beyond the CNS, particularly in lipoprotein

metabolism, that could be observable in peripheral biofluids. Interestingly, this study found that Apo-CI

significantly decreased in the HMW serum fraction of AD compared to PD patients, but only a slight and

non-significant decrease was observed when compared to CT patients. Similarly, only a small non-

significant decrease in HMW serum Apo-CI was observed for controls in comparison to PD patients,

which is in accordance to what was already reported for whole plasma (40). Given that memory

impairment is a hallmark of AD and not a predominant feature among PD patients (55), these results

may be influenced, at least in part, by the age disparities observed between the PD group and the other

two groups. In fact, PD patients are, on average, younger than those in the other two groups, with

similar age distributions. Additionally, the results regarding Apo-CI may also be affected by individual

Apo-CI and Apo-E isoforms. Notably, the *APOE* and *APOC1* genes are in linkage disequilibrium (56), and

carriers of the *APOE(ε4)* and *APOC1(H2)* alleles have been demonstrated to have an increased risk of

developing AD (46). This was further confirmed in a study using human *APOE*-carrying mice, which

demonstrated that those animals carrying the *APOE(ε4)* allele were found to have decreased serum

Apo-CI content when compared to those carrying the *APOE(ε3)* allele (57). However, Apo-CI has also

been suggested to potentially play a modulatory role in the development of AD, with reported effects

on mice cognitive function independent of Apo-E expression (58). Again, these observations strengthen

the importance of combining these results with further characterization of the individuals, including

genotyping of the apolipoproteins' isoforms.

Although these three apolipoproteins have been linked to AD and PD, as evidenced by previously

mentioned studies, and their relevance for the discriminant model, their use alone or in combination

with other proteins associated with apolipoprotein-related mechanisms did not result in a robust

diagnostic model capable of effectively distinguishing between the studied groups (as shown in

Additional File 1: Supplementary Figure 7). This indicates that these three apolipoproteins had to be

combined with other seemingly unrelated proteins to be used as potential biomarkers. Further studies

should be directed towards elucidating this potential relationship to understand: i) the importance of

the identified proteins/mechanisms for the pathophysiology of the studied NDs, and ii) to which extent

these mechanisms are differently altered between the two diseases.

Conclusion

In summary, this work demonstrated that combining two complementary sample processing approaches is a more effective strategy to reach potential biomarkers than a single approach. Besides that, the strategies used here, which combine the analysis of the whole serum and the HMW fractionation of non- denaturing serum, can also identify proteins being differentially modulated besides the conventional alteration in their total levels. In this work, this new strategy was applied to a cohort of NDs patients and respective CT individuals, being able to build a good predictive model capable of distinguishing all the three groups studied (AD, PD and CT). This predictive model highlighted the linkage of the apolipoprotein family and NDs, with three out of the ten proteins included in this model being apolipoproteins. Nevertheless, further validation in a larger and independent cohort is needed to confirm the robustness and reliability of the model, as well as more studies to link the alterations observed and these pathologies. Controlling the lipid profile in future studies is also advised, as altered lipid metabolism was a major finding of the present work. Another aspect to be further explored would be the identification of protein complexes in the HMW fraction to better understand the origin of the protein alterations observed.

Overall, the results of this study demonstrate that HMW fractionation under non-denaturing conditions could be a valuable addition to routine biofluid analysis, particularly regarding the detection of changes in macromolecular organization. Furthermore, this study highlights the importance of exploring the involvement of apolipoproteins and lipid metabolism in greater detail within the context of NDs.

List of abbreviations

AD, Alzheimer's Disease; APOA1-HDL, High-Density Lipoproteins containing Apolipoprotein A1; AUC,

Area Under the Curve; Aβ, Amyloid-β; BBB, Blood-Brain Barrier; BioGRID, Biological General Repository

for Interaction Datasets; CE, Collision Energy; CES, Collision Energy Spread; CHUC, Centro Hospitalar e

Universitário de Coimbra; CI, Confidence Interval; CNS, Central Nervous System; CT, Healthy Controls;

DDA, Data-dependent Acquisition; DMSO, Dimethyl Sulfoxide; FA Formic Acid; FDR, False Discovery

Rate; GO, Gene Ontology; HDL, High-Density Lipoproteins; HMW, High Molecular Weight; IS, Internal

Standard; LDA, Linear Discriminant Analysis; MCI, Mild Cognitive Impairment; MS, Mass Spectrometry;

MW, Molecular Weight; MWCO, Molecular Weight Cut-Off; NDs, Neurodegenerative Diseases; PD,

Parkinson's Disease; ROC, Receiver Operating Curve; SE, Standard Error; STRING, Search Tool for

Retrieval of Interacting Genes/Proteins; XIC, Extracted Ion Chromatogram.

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Faculty of Medicine of the University of Coimbra (reference CE_010.2017) and the Ethics Committee of the Centro Hospitalar e Universitário de Coimbra (CHUC) (reference 34 /CES-CHUC-024-18) and was conducted according to the principles stated in the Declaration of Helsinki (59). Written informed consent was obtained from all participants.

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Availability of data and materials

The MS proteomics data have been deposited to the ProteomeXchange Consortium (60) via the PRIDE (61) partner repository with the dataset identifier PXD034077.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests

Funding

The authors would like to thank the financial support of the European Regional Development Fund (ERDF), through the COMPETE 2020 - Operational Programme for Competitiveness and Internationalisation and Portuguese national funds via FCT – Fundação para a Ciência e a Tecnologia, I.P., under projects: MEDPersyst - POCI-01-0145-FEDER-016428 (ref.: SAICTPAC/0010/2015), POCI-01-0145-FEDER-30943 (ref.: PTDC/MEC-PSQ/30943/2017), PTDC/MED-NEU/27946/2017, POCI-01-0145-FEDER-016795 (ref.: PTDC/NEU-SCC/7051/2014), POCI-01-0145-FEDER-029311 (ref.: PTDC/BTM-TEC/29311/2017); EXPL/BTM-TEC/1407/2021, and, UIDB/04539/2020, UIDP/04539/2020, UIDB&P/4950/2020 and LA/P/0058/2020, and the National Mass Spectrometry Network (RNEM) [POCI-01-0145-FEDER-402-022125 Ref. ROTEIRO/0028/2013). SIA was supported by the CEEC grant 2021.04378.CEECIND and MR was supported by Ph.D. fellowship 2020.07749.BD.

Authors' contributions

SIA and BM conceived and designed the study. SIA and MR performed all the experiments, data analysis,

and wrote the manuscript. IB, AG, DP, CS, JP, CJ, IS, AV, AM, and MCB were involved in the selection and

collection of the plasma samples used in this study. MCB and BM were responsible for funding. The

author(s) read and approved the final manuscript.

Acknowledgements

Not applicable

Authors' information (optional)

Not applicable

Additional files

Additional File 1 (.docx) – Supplementary Figure 1: Internal standard proteins and ultrafiltration reproducibility; Supplementary Figure 2: Altered proteins quantified using the whole serum dataset and HMW serum dataset; Supplementary Figure 3: Volcano plots comparing all proteins quantified across the three different experimental groups using the two different serum-processing strategies; Supplementary Figure 4: Mass distribution of proteins identified or quantified using different approaches; Supplementary Figure 5: Linear discriminant analysis using patient's age; Supplementary Figure 6: Correlation between quantification of the 10 proteins included in the combined model and patient age; Supplementary Figure 7: Linear discriminant analysis using 10 altered proteins associated with apolipoprotein related mechanisms; Supplementary Table 8 – Summary of the specificity and sensitivity of the LDA methods obtained using all the altered proteins per sample type (whole serum or HMW serum) or the combination of the two (Whole + HMW serum).

Additional File 2 (.xlsx) – Supplementary Table 1 - Evaluation of the total levels of proteins at the unfractionated serum (Whole Serum) of Control and Alzheimer's and Parkinson's Disease patients; Supplementary Table 2 - Evaluation of the total levels of proteins at the high molecular fraction of the serum (HMW Serum) of Control and Alzheimer's and Parkinson's Disease patients; Supplementary Table 3 - Evaluation of the total levels of proteins at the unfractionated serum (Whole Serum) of Control and Alzheimer's and Parkinson's Disease patients; Supplementary Table 4 - Descriptive table of the GeneMania functional enrichment analysis of the 28 proteins exclusively quantified in the HMW serum samples; Supplementary Table 5 - Descriptive table of protein physical interactions reported in BioGRID for the four proteins (marked in yellow) with no reported interactions according to the GeneMania network (Figure 3a); Supplementary Table 6 - Descriptive table of the Funrich Biological Pathway Analysis of the 30 proteins exclusively quantified in Whole serum samples; Supplementary Table 7 - Descriptive table of the Funrich Biological Pathway Analysis of the 30 proteins exclusively quantified in HMW serum samples; Supplementary Table 9 - Descriptive table of the String Enrichment Analysis of the 10 proteins used in the LDA combined model; Supplementary Table 10 - Descriptive table of the Reactome Pathway enrichment analysis of the 10 proteins used in the LDA combined model.

References

1.   Anderson NL, Anderson NG. The Human Plasma Proteome: History, Character, and Diagnostic

Prospects*. Molecular & Cellular Proteomics. 2002;1(11):845-67.

2.   Antoranz A, Sakellaropoulos T, Saez-Rodriguez J, Alexopoulos LG. Mechanism-based biomarker

discovery. Drug Discovery Today. 2017;22(8):1209-15.

3.   Anjo SI, Santa C, Manadas B. SWATH-MS as a tool for biomarker discovery: From basic research

to clinical applications. PROTEOMICS. 2017;17(3-4):1600278.

4.   Anjo SI, Manadas B. A translational view of cells' secretome analysis - from untargeted

proteomics to potential circulating biomarkers. Biochimie. 2018;155:37-49.

5.   Rosado M, Silva R, G. Bexiga M, G. Jones J, Manadas B, Anjo SI. Chapter Four - Advances in

biomarker detection: Alternative approaches for blood-based biomarker detection. In: Makowski GS,

editor. Advances in Clinical Chemistry. 92: Elsevier; 2019. p. 141-99.

6.   Greening DW, Simpson RJ. A centrifugal ultrafiltration strategy for isolating the low-molecular

weight (≤25K) component of human plasma proteome. Journal of Proteomics. 2010;73(3):637-48.

7.   Greening DW, Simpson RJ. Low-Molecular Weight Plasma Proteome Analysis Using Centrifugal

Ultrafiltration. In: Simpson RJ, Greening DW, editors. Serum/Plasma Proteomics: Methods and

Protocols. Totowa, NJ: Humana Press; 2011. p. 109-24.

8.   Espay AJ, Vizcarra JA, Marsili L, Lang AE, Simon DK, Merola A, et al. Revisiting protein

aggregation as pathogenic in sporadic Parkinson and Alzheimer diseases. Neurology. 2019;92(7):329-37.

9.   Hughes AJ, Daniel SE, Kilford L, Lees AJ. Accuracy of clinical diagnosis of idiopathic Parkinson's

disease: a clinico-pathological study of 100 cases. Journal of Neurology, Neurosurgery & Psychiatry.

1992;55(3):181-4.

10.   American Psychiatric Association A, Association AP. Diagnostic and statistical manual of mental

disorders: DSM-IV: American psychiatric association Washington, DC; 1994.

11.   McKhann GM, Knopman DS, Chertkow H, Hyman BT, Jack Jr CR, Kawas CH, et al. The diagnosis

of dementia due to Alzheimer's disease: Recommendations from the National Institute on Aging-

Alzheimer's Association workgroups on diagnostic guidelines for Alzheimer's disease. Alzheimer's &

dementia. 2011;7(3):263-9.

12.   Anjo SI, Simoes I, Castanheira P, Graos M, Manadas B. Use of recombinant proteins as a simple

and robust normalization method for untargeted proteomics screening: exhaustive performance

assessment. Talanta. 2019;205:120163.

13.   Anjo SI, Santa C, Manadas B. Short GeLC-SWATH: a fast and reliable quantitative approach for

proteomic screenings. Proteomics. 2015;15(4):757-62.

14.   Santa C, Anjo SI, Manadas B. Protein precipitation of diluted samples in SDS-containing buffer

with acetone leads to higher protein recovery and reproducibility in comparison with TCA/acetone

approach. Proteomics. 2016;16(13):1847-51.

15.   Anjo SI, Melo MN, Loureiro LR, Sabala L, Castanheira P, Grãos M, et al. oxSWATH: An integrative

method for a comprehensive redox-centered analysis combined with a generic differential proteomics

screening. Redox biology. 2019;22:101130.

16.   Gillet LC, Navarro P, Tate S, Röst H, Selevsek N, Reiter L, et al. Targeted data extraction of the

MS/MS spectra generated by data-independent acquisition: a new concept for consistent and accurate

proteome analysis. Molecular & Cellular Proteomics. 2012;11(6).

17.   Tang WH, Shilov IV, Seymour SL. Nonlinear fitting method for determining local false discovery

rates from decoy database searches. Journal of proteome research. 2008;7(9):3661-7.

18.   Sennels L, Bukowski-Wills JC, Rappsilber J. Improved results in proteomics by use of local and

peptide-class specific false discovery rates. BMC Bioinformatics. 2009;10:179.

19.   Lambert J-P, Ivosev G, Couzens AL, Larsen B, Taipale M, Lin Z-Y, et al. Mapping differential

interactomes by affinity purification coupled with data-independent mass spectrometry acquisition.

Nature methods. 2013.

20.   Collins BC, Gillet LC, Rosenberger G, Röst HL, Vichalkovski A, Gstaiger M, et al. Quantifying

protein interaction dynamics by SWATH mass spectrometry: application to the 14-3-3 system. Nature

methods. 2013.

21.   MedCalc. https://www.medcalc.org. Accessed 19 April 2022

22.   DeLong ER, DeLong DM, Clarke-Pearson DL. Comparing the areas under two or more correlated

receiver operating characteristic curves: a nonparametric approach. Biometrics. 1988:837-45.

23.   MORPHEUS. https://software.broadinstitute.org/morpheus/. Accessed 24 May 2022

24.   Caraux G, Pinloche S. PermutMatrix: a graphical environment to arrange gene expression

profiles in optimal linear order. Bioinformatics. 2005;21(7):1280-1.

25.   PermutMatrix. http://www.atgc-montpellier.fr/permutmatrix/. Accessed 24 May 2022

26.   Warde-Farley D, Donaldson SL, Comes O, Zuberi K, Badrawi R, Chao P, et al. The GeneMANIA

prediction server: biological network integration for gene prioritization and predicting gene function.

Nucleic Acids Research. 2010;38(suppl_2):W214-W20.

27.   GeneMANIA. https://genemania.org/. Accessed 18 May 2022

28.   STRING. http://string-db.org. Accessed 22 June 2022

29.   Szklarczyk D, Morris JH, Cook H, Kuhn M, Wyder S, Simonovic M, et al. The STRING database in

2017: quality-controlled protein-protein association networks, made broadly accessible. Nucleic Acids

Res. 2017;45(D1):D362-d8.

30.   Pathan M, Keerthikumar S, Ang CS, Gangoda L, Quek CY, Williamson NA, et al. FunRich: An open

access standalone functional enrichment and interaction network analysis tool. Proteomics.

2015;15(15):2597-601.

31.   Bell RD, Sagare AP, Friedman AE, Bedi GS, Holtzman DM, Deane R, et al. Transport pathways for

clearance of human Alzheimer's amyloid beta-peptide and apolipoproteins E and J in the mouse central

nervous system. Journal of cerebral blood flow and metabolism : official journal of the International

Society of Cerebral Blood Flow and Metabolism. 2007;27(5):909-18.

32.   Berdowska I, Matusiewicz M, Krzystek-Korpacka M. HDL Accessory Proteins in Parkinson's

Disease—Focusing on Clusterin (Apolipoprotein J) in Regard to Its Involvement in Pathology and

Diagnostics—A Review. Antioxidants. 2022;11(3).

33.   Emamzadeh FN, Allsop D. α-Synuclein Interacts with Lipoproteins in Plasma. Journal of

Molecular Neuroscience. 2017;63(2):165-72.

34.   Arioz BI, Tufekci KU, Olcum M, Durur DY, Akarlar BA, Ozlu N, et al. Proteome profiling of

neuron-derived exosomes in Alzheimer's disease reveals hemoglobin as a potential biomarker.

Neuroscience Letters. 2021;755:135914.

35.   Kitamura Y, Kojima M, Kurosawa T, Sasaki R, Ichihara S, Hiraku Y, et al. Proteomic Profiling of

Exosomal Proteins for Blood-based Biomarkers in Parkinson's Disease. Neuroscience. 2018;392:121-8.

36.   Berdowska I, Matusiewicz M, Krzystek-Korpacka M. HDL Accessory Proteins in Parkinson's

Disease—Focusing on Clusterin (Apolipoprotein J) in Regard to Its Involvement in Pathology and

Diagnostics—A Review. Antioxidants. 2022;11(3).

37.   Dal Magro R, Simonelli S, Cox A, Formicola B, Corti R, Cassina V, et al. The Extent of Human

Apolipoprotein A-I Lipidation Strongly Affects the β-Amyloid Efflux Across the Blood-Brain Barrier in

vitro. Frontiers in neuroscience. 2019;13:419.

38.   Endres K. Apolipoprotein A1, the neglected relative of Apolipoprotein E and its potential role in

Alzheimer's disease. Neural Regeneration Research. 2021;16(11).

39.   Fania C, Arosio B, Capitanio D, Torretta E, Gussago C, Ferri E, et al. Protein signature in

cerebrospinal fluid and serum of Alzheimer's disease patients: The case of apolipoprotein A-1

proteoforms. PLOS ONE. 2017;12(6):e0179280.

40.   Paslawski W, Zareba-Paslawska J, Zhang X, Hölzl K, Wadensten H, Shariatgorji M, et al. α-

synuclein–lipoprotein interactions and elevated ApoE level in cerebrospinal fluid from Parkinson's

disease patients. Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences. 2019;116(30):15226-35.

41.   Paula-Lima AC, Tricerri MA, Brito-Moreira J, Bomfim TR, Oliveira FF, Magdesian MH, et al.

Human apolipoprotein A–I binds amyloid-β and prevents Aβ-induced neurotoxicity. The International

Journal of Biochemistry & Cell Biology. 2009;41(6):1361-70.

42.   Qiang JK, Wong YC, Siderowf A, Hurtig HI, Xie SX, Lee VM-Y, et al. Plasma apolipoprotein A1 as a

biomarker for Parkinson disease. Annals of Neurology. 2013;74(1):119-27.

43.   Song F, Poljak A, Crawford J, Kochan NA, Wen W, Cameron B, et al. Plasma Apolipoprotein

Levels Are Associated with Cognitive Status and Decline in a Community Cohort of Older Individuals.

PLOS ONE. 2012;7(6):e34078.

44.   Swanson CR, Berlyand Y, Xie SX, Alcalay RN, Chahine LM, Chen-Plotkin AS. Plasma

apolipoprotein A1 associates with age at onset and motor severity in early Parkinson's disease patients.

Movement Disorders. 2015;30(12):1648-56.

45.   van der Vorst EPC. High-Density Lipoproteins and Apolipoprotein A1. In: Hoeger U, Harris JR,

editors. Vertebrate and Invertebrate Respiratory Proteins, Lipoproteins and other Body Fluid Proteins.

Cham: Springer International Publishing; 2020. p. 399-420.

46.   Zhou Q, Zhao F, Lv Z-p, Zheng C-g, Zheng W-d, Sun L, et al. Association between APOC1
Polymorphism and Alzheimer's Disease: A Case-Control Study and Meta-Analysis. PLOS ONE.
2014;9(1):e87017.

47.   Castellano JM, Kim J, Stewart FR, Jiang H, DeMattos RB, Patterson BW, et al. Human apoE
Isoforms Differentially Regulate Brain Amyloid-β Peptide Clearance. Science Translational Medicine.
2011;3(89):89ra57-89ra57.

48.   Deane R, Sagare A, Hamm K, Parisi M, Lane S, Finn MB, et al. apoE isoform-specific disruption of
amyloid beta peptide clearance from mouse brain. The Journal of clinical investigation.
2008;118(12):4002-13.

49.   Merino-Zamorano C, Fernández-de Retana S, Montañola A, Batlle A, Saint-Pol J, Mysiorek C, et
al. Modulation of Amyloid-β 1–40 Transport by ApoA1 and ApoJ Across an in vitro Model of the Blood-
Brain Barrier. Journal of Alzheimer's Disease. 2016;53:677-91.

50.   Verghese PB, Castellano JM, Garai K, Wang Y, Jiang H, Shah A, et al. ApoE influences amyloid-β
(Aβ) clearance despite minimal apoE/Aβ association in physiological conditions. Proceedings of the
National Academy of Sciences. 2013;110(19):E1807-E16.

51.   Rye K-A, Clay MA, Barter PJ. Remodelling of high density lipoproteins by plasma factors.
Atherosclerosis. 1999;145(2):227-38.

52.   Zhang X, Yin X, Yu H, Liu X, Yang F, Yao J, et al. Quantitative proteomic analysis of serum
proteins in patients with Parkinson's disease using an isobaric tag for relative and absolute
quantification labeling, two-dimensional liquid chromatography, and tandem mass spectrometry.
Analyst. 2012;137(2):490-5.

53.   de Haan W, Out R, Berbée JFP, van der Hoogt CC, Dijk KWv, van Berkel TJC, et al. Apolipoprotein
CI inhibits scavenger receptor BI and increases plasma HDL levels in vivo. Biochemical and Biophysical
Research Communications. 2008;377(4):1294-8.

54.   Berbée JFP, Vanmierlo T, Abildayeva K, Blokland A, Jansen PJ, Lütjohann D, et al. Apolipoprotein
CI Knock-Out Mice Display Impaired Memory Functions. Journal of Alzheimer's Disease. 2011;23:737-47.

55.   Albert AD, Brad R. Parkinson disease and cognitive impairment. Neurology: Clinical Practice.
2016;6(5):452.

56.   Fuior EV, Gafencu AV. Apolipoprotein C1: Its Pleiotropic Effects in Lipid Metabolism and

Beyond. International Journal of Molecular Sciences. 2019;20(23):5939.

57.   Cudaback E, Li X, Yang Y, Yoo T, Montine KS, Craft S, et al. Apolipoprotein C-I is an APOE

genotype-dependent suppressor of glial activation. Journal of Neuroinflammation. 2012;9(1):192.

58.   Abildayeva K, Berbée JFP, Blokland A, Jansen PJ, Hoek FJ, Meijer O, et al. Human apolipoprotein

C-I expression in mice impairs learning and memory functions. Journal of Lipid Research.

2008;49(4):856-69.

59.   Association GAotWM. World Medical Association Declaration of Helsinki: ethical principles for

medical research involving human subjects. The Journal of the American College of Dentists.

2014;81(3):14.

60.   Deutsch EW, Bandeira N, Perez-Riverol Y, Sharma V, Carver Jeremy J, Mendoza L, et al. The

ProteomeXchange consortium at 10 years: 2023 update. Nucleic Acids Research. 2022;51(D1):D1539-

D48.

61.   Perez-Riverol Y, Bai J, Bandla C, García-Seisdedos D, Hewapathirana S, Kamatchinathan S, et al.

The PRIDE database resources in 2022: a hub for mass spectrometry-based proteomics evidences.

Nucleic Acids Research. 2021;50(D1):D543-D52.

(a) Whole Serum (203 quantified proteins); HMW Serum (186 quantified proteins); Serum&HMWLib (183 quantified proteins); 32; 3; 162 (72.3% shared proteins); 6; 3; 3; 15; Total: 224 quantified proteins

(b) Whole Serum (41 altered proteins); HMW Serum (39 altered proteins); 30; 11 (14.7%); 28; PRDX2, KLKB1, APOH, IGHM, HBB, TF, CA1, IGLV1-47, SERPINA1, IGLV2-08, IGKV1D-12; Total: 69 altered proteins

(c)

Group comparison	Gene Name	Protein Name	Fold Change Serum	Fold Change HMW
AD vs CT	*APOH*	Beta-2-glycoprotein 1 (APC inhibitor)	1.008[#]	0.676
	CA1	Carbonic anhydrase 1	2.467	2.397
	IGKV1D-12	Immunoglobulin kappa variable 1D-12	0.799	0.762
	IGLV1-47	*Immunoglobulin lambda variable 1-47*	0.767	0.786
	IGHM	Immunoglobulin heavy constant mu	0.372	0.692
	TF	Serotransferrin	0.856	0.792
	KLKB1	Plasma kallikrein	0.807	0.707
	PRDX2	*Peroxiredoxin-2*	2.691	2.979
	HBB	*Hemoglobin subunit beta*	3.958	3.129
PD vs CT	*SERPINA1*	Alpha-1-antitrypsin	0.877	0.752
AD vs PD	*APOH*	Beta-2-glycoprotein 1 (APC inhibitor)	1.238	0.803[#]
	CA1	Carbonic anhydrase 1	1.977	1.943
	IGLV1-47	*Immunoglobulin lambda variable 1-47*	0.894	0.785
	IGLV2-8	Immunoglobulin lambda variable 2-8	0.777	0.788
	PRDX2	*Peroxiredoxin-2*	1.749	2.568
	HBB	*Hemoglobin subunit beta*	2.622	2.094

Max~4.00 Min~0.300

(a)

Proteins (nodes)

⬚ Proteins from the study

◯ Related proteins

Networks (edges)

— Physical Interactions

Functions

🟥 Lipoprotein particle
🟦 Plasma lipoprotein particle
🟧 Protein-lipid complex
🟪 Platelet alpha granule
🟩 Triglyceride-rich plasma lipoprotein particle
🟪 Protein-lipid complex remodeling
🟦 Plasma lipoprotein particle remodeling

(b)

FunRich Biological Pathway Analysis

Amyloids
Intrinsic Pathway
Chylomicron-mediated lipid transport
Dissolution of Fibrin Clot
Classical ab-mediated complement activation
Cell surface interactions at the vascular wall
Angiopoietin receptor Tie2-mediated signaling
Lipid digestion, mobilization, and transport
Formation of Fibrin Clot (Clotting Cascade)
Lipoprotein metabolism
Common Pathway
HDL-mediated lipid transport
PTM: ɣ-carboxylation and hypusine formation
Regulation of IGF Activity by IGFBPs
ɣ-carboxylation, transport, and amino-terminal cleavage
Hemostasis
Removal of aminoterminal propeptides from ɣ-carboxylated proteins
ɣ-carboxylation of protein precursors
Transport of ɣ-carboxylated protein precursors from the ER to the Golgi
FOXA2 and FOXA3 transcription factor networks
FOXA transcription factor networks

Whole   HMW

$-Log_{10}$(p-value)

% of genes

Abbreviations:
ab - antibody
PTM - Post-translational modification
IGF - Insulin-like Growth Factor
IGFBPs - Insulin-like Growth Factor Binding Proteins
ER - endoplasmic reticulum