Clinical validation of novel second-trimester preterm preeclampsia risk predictors combining clinical

variables and serum protein biomarkers

Louise C. LAURENT, MD, PhD[1*], George R. SAADE, MD[2], Glenn R. MARKENSON, MD[3], Kent D. HEYBORNE,

MD[4], Corina N. SCHOEN, MD[5], Jason K. BAXTER, MD[6], Sherri A. LONGO, MD[7], Leonardo M. PEREIRA,

MD[8], Emily J. SU, MD[9], Matthew K. HOFFMAN, MD[10], Garrett K. LAM, MD[11], Angela C. FOX, MS[12], Ashoka

D. POLPITIYA, D Sc[12], Md. Bahadur BADSHA, PhD[12], Tracey C. FLEISCHER, PhD[12], Thomas J. GARITE, MD[12],

J. Jay BONIFACE, PhD[12], Paul E. KEARNEY, PhD[12]

[1]Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology, and Reproductive Sciences, University of California, San Diego,

La Jolla, CA

[2]Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Eastern Virginia Medical School, Norfolk, VA

[3]Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, MA

[4]Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Denver Health and Hospital Authority, Denver, CO, and

Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Colorado Denver, Aurora, CO

[5]Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Massachusetts-Baystate, Springfield, MA

[6]Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Sidney Kimmel Medical College, Thomas Jefferson

University, Philadelphia, PA

[7]Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Ochsner Health, New Orleans, LA

[8]Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, Oregon Health & Science University, Portland, OR

[9]Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, University of Colorado School of Medicine, Aurora, CO

[10]Department of Obstetrics and Gynecology, ChristianaCare Health System, Wilmington DE

[11]Regional Obstetrical Consultants, Chattanooga, TN; Department of Obstetrics & Gynecology,

University of Tennessee Health Science Center and College of Medicine, Chattanooga, TN

[12]Sera Prognostics, Inc., Salt Lake City, UT

Conflict of Interest Statement

ACF, MBB, TCF, TJG, JJB, and PEK are employees of Sera Prognostics, Inc., and receive salary and stock

options. ADP is a paid consultant to Sera Prognostics, Inc. GKL was an employee of Sera Prognostics, Inc.,

but not during the research period for these analyses, nor during manuscript construction and

publication. MKH received an Investigator Initiated Grant from Sera Prognostics, Inc., to investigate

preterm birth risk stratification and treatment. The remaining authors report no conflict of interest.

Source of Funding

Sponsorship of the trial was provided by Sera Prognostics, Inc. The sponsor funded the study, generated

biomarker data and discovered and blindly validated the predictors.

*Corresponding Author

Louise C. LAURENT, MD, PhD

Professor and Vice-Chair for Clinical and Translational Research

University of California, San Diego

Department of Obstetrics, Gynecology, and Reproductive Sciences

Division of Maternal Fetal Medicine

The Sanford Consortium for Regenerative Medicine

2880 Torrey Pines Scenic Dr.

La Jolla, CA 92037-0695

Phone: 858-246-1405

FAX: 858-534-8329

llaurent@ucsd.edu

Word Count

Abstract: 395

Main Text: 3000

Condensation

Novel, high-performing predictors of preterm preeclampsia risk comprised of proteomic biomarkers

with a composite clinical variable.

Short title

Proteomic biomarker risk predictors for preterm preeclampsia

Conflict of Interest Statement

ACF, MBB, TCF, TJG, JJB, and PEK are employees of Sera Prognostics, Inc., and receive salary and stock

options. ADP is a paid consultant to Sera Prognostics, Inc. GKL was an employee of Sera Prognostics, Inc.,

but not during the research period for these analyses, nor during manuscript construction and

publication. MKH received an Investigator Initiated Grant from Sera Prognostics, Inc., to investigate

preterm birth risk stratification and treatment. The other authors have no conflict of interest to declare.

Source of Funding

Sponsorship of the trial was provided by Sera Prognostics, Inc. The sponsor funded the study, generated

biomarker data and discovered and blindly validated the predictors.

Keywords

Preeclampsia, preterm preeclampsia, protein biomarker risk predictor, hypertension, diabetes

Abstract

Background: Preeclampsia is associated with poor maternal and fetal outcomes. Preeclampsia

diagnosed prior to 37 weeks' gestational age (preterm preeclampsia) is more likely than term

preeclampsia to give rise to serious morbidities and complicate clinical decision making. Clinical risk

factors for preeclampsia, including preeclampsia in a previous pregnancy, chronic hypertension, and

diabetes, do not provide adequate predictive value. There remains an urgent need to develop an

accurate and practical risk predictor for preterm preeclampsia – particularly early preterm PE

(gestational age at delivery <34 weeks) – to help guide clinical management.

Objective(s): The objective of this study was to discover, verify, and validate mid-trimester preterm PE

predictors that employ both relevant clinical factors and maternal serum analytes.

Study Design: This was a secondary analysis of data from two large, multicenter studies (PAPR,

NCT01371019; TREETOP, NCT02787213). Eligible subjects had gestational ages at blood draw of $18^{0/7}$-

$22^{6/7}$ weeks (PAPR) and $18^{0/7}$-$20^{6/7}$weeks (TREETOP). PAPR subjects were assigned to a discovery cohort

(n=1352), and TREETOP subjects were randomly assigned to either a verification cohort (n=1217) or a

validation cohort (n=2289). Peptides were analyzed by liquid chromatography-multiple reaction

monitoring mass spectrometry measuring pregnancy-related and quality control proteins. Classifier

models combined one novel protein ratio with a composite clinical variable (Clin3, which was scored

positive if any of these was true: PE in a previous pregnancy; pre-existing hypertension; or

pregestational diabetes). Classifier performance was assessed via area under the receiver operating

characteristic curve at various gestational age at delivery cutoffs and threshold-based performance

metrics. Threshold-based performance was also assessed in a validation cohort subset that had more

accurate gestational age dating via early ultrasound.

Results: Nine of nine prespecified classifier models were validated for preterm preeclampsia, with areas

under the receiver operating characteristic curve ranging from 0.72-0.78 for PE with delivery <37 weeks.

Each exhibited greater predictive performance than did Clin3 alone (0.68). Under this condition, one

exemplified predictor, Clin3 + inhibin subunit beta C chain/sex hormone binding globulin, showed 76%

sensitivity for preterm PE prediction and 89% for early preterm PE (GAD <34 weeks), both at 75%

specificity.

Conclusion(s): A proteomic approach identified a profile predictive of preeclampsia that was validated in

an independent cohort as more predictive than clinical risk factors alone. This single blood test,

performed in the first half of pregnancy, may be the basis for future clinical intervention approaches to

prevent preeclampsia and improve maternal and perinatal outcomes.

Introduction

Preeclampsia (PE) occurs in 5-7% of pregnancies[1,2] and is implicated in 14% of maternal[3] and 10-25% of perinatal[4,5] deaths. It is associated with ~25% of all preterm births (PTB) and 50% of medically indicated PTBs.[6] The only cure for PE is delivery, with other therapies focused on preventing or delaying onset (low-dose aspirin [LDASA]),[7-9] preventing end-organ damage (antihypertensive medications to prevent strokes[10] and magnesium sulfate to prevent seizures),[8] and decreasing neonatal complications from prematurity (antenatal steroids).[8] Because PE-associated perinatal morbidity and mortality and healthcare costs correlate with prematurity,[11-13] accurate prediction of preterm PE (gestational age [GA] at delivery [GAD] <37 weeks), and particularly early preterm PE (GAD <34 weeks), holds greater clinical and economic value than does prediction of late preterm PE with GAD 34-37 weeks.

Until recently, PE prediction relied largely on clinical risk factors, including: PE in a previous pregnancy; high body mass index (BMI); maternal chronic hypertension, diabetes, renal disease, and autoimmune conditions; and obstetrical characteristics such as multiple gestation and use of assisted reproductive technologies.[8] Analysis of a Danish cohort of 597,492 pregnancies[14] showed that the clinical factors listed in National Institute of Health and Care Excellence (NICE) guidelines[15] would have predicted 47% of PE cases (at any GA) at a screen-positive rate (SPR) of 8.1% and a positive predictive value (PPV) of 5.4%, while those in American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists (ACOG) criteria[16] would have predicted 60.5% of PE cases at an SPR of 18.2% and a PPV of 5.6%. PE and gestational hypertension in a previous pregnancy are among the most predictive and commonly used risk factors but are irrelevant to nulliparous pregnancies. A predictor with adequate PPV could guide appropriate LDASA prophylaxis and surveillance of higher-risk cases, while a predictor with a high negative predictive value (NPV) (e.g., >99%) could identify lower-risk patients who might safely forgo or discontinue interventions.

Numerous PE-associated molecular biomarkers have been reported,[17-29] including soluble fms-

like tyrosine kinase 1 (sFlt-1) and placental growth factor (PlGF). In patients with clinically suspected PE,

sFlt-1 and PlGF enable earlier diagnosis and/or modestly decrease adverse maternal outcomes.[30-33]

However, they do not adequately predict PE in pre-symptomatic pregnancies, which is a substantial

limitation, as LDASA is most effective when initiated early in pregnancy.[34] Pre-symptomatic prediction

strategies incorporating combinations of serum analytes, patient history, blood pressure, and uterine

artery pulsatility index are accurate but not widely used, as they require sophisticated equipment with

highly trained sonographers along with molecular analyses.[35-38] Also, studies of these predictors have

focused on late-onset PE; included only cases conforming to classical definitions; or grouped PE cases

across all GAs and/or severities together. PE is highly heterogeneous[39-42] and at minimum should be

divided into early- and late-onset cases[11,43,44] in biomarker studies to enable separate predictive

performance assessments.

There is an urgent need for accurate, safe, and practical preterm PE risk predictors that can be

employed early in gestation to guide clinical management. This study aimed to develop a mid-trimester

predictor comprising molecular biomarkers and relevant clinical factors, with validation across

demographically, geographically, and temporally diverse populations.

Materials and Methods

Study design

Biomarker development was based on U.S. National Academy of Medicine guidelines.[45] This was a

secondary analysis using data from two large, multicenter U.S. cohort studies to discover, verify, and

validate risk predictors for preterm PE. The Proteomic Assessment of Preterm Risk (PAPR,

NCT01371019)[46] and the Multicenter Assessment of a Spontaneous Preterm Birth Risk Predictor

(TREETOP, NCT02787213)[47] studies were prospective, observational studies aimed at developing a

proteomic biomarker for PTB risk stratification. Study approvals were provided by site IRBs, and

participants provided written informed consent.

Participants

PAPR and TREETOP enrolled gravidas ≥18 years of age with singleton pregnancies from $17^{0/7}$-$28^{6/7}$ or

$17^{0/7}$-$21^{6/7}$ weeks' gestation, respectively, and excluded pregnancies with planned delivery <$37^{0/7}$ weeks'

gestation, major anomalies or chromosomal disorders, or planned cervical cerclage. GA was determined

according to ACOG criteria[48,49]. In TREETOP, progesterone use >$13^{6/7}$ weeks' gestation was an exclusion

criterion. Demographic, medical and pregnancy history, medication, and post-delivery maternal and

infant outcome information was collected. Adjudication of PE and PTB cases was blinded, occurring prior

to database lockdown and analyses.

Selection of cases and controls

Discovery was performed in a PAPR-derived cohort that was distinct from the TREETOP-derived

verification and validation cohorts (**Figure 1**). The discovery and verification/validation cohorts included

blood samples drawn $18^{0/7}$-$22^{6/7}$ and $18^{0/7}$-$20^{6/7}$ weeks' gestation, respectively. The discovery cohort

used a broader GA at blood draw (GABD) window to increase sample size. TREETOP subjects were

randomly assigned by an independent third-party statistician to blinded verification (one-third) or

validation (two-thirds) cohorts.[47] The validation cohort included four sites and six months of enrollment

not represented in the verification cohort.

178   Candidate classifier features were ascertained in discovery, with parameters confirmed and

tuned in verification to account for temporal changes in care and population. Cases were defined as

subjects with PE who delivered <37 weeks' gestation; controls were defined as noncases.

Prespecified classifier models were validated by a third-party statistician. Each classifier was

validated using AUC, then by *P*-value, for three score thresholds distinguishing higher from lower risk.

Thresholds were predefined based on discovery performance to allow for sensitivity and specificity

tradeoffs and to enable use in varied clinical settings. Better estimation of test performance is obtained

in more precisely GA-dated individuals,[50] and crown-rump length is more precise when determined prior

to $9^{0/7}$ weeks' gestation.[49] Thus, following validation on the full cohort, post-validation performance was

assessed on a sub-cohort comprising subjects dated by ultrasound prior to $9^{0/7}$-weeks' gestation (early

GA dating). Performance metrics were calculated for GA cutoffs of <37, <34, and <32 weeks in all

subjects and <37 and <34 weeks in nulliparas, for whom low case numbers precluded a <32-week

performance calculation. Performance was measured without gapping;[50] i.e., controls included subjects

delivering before GA cutoffs without a PE diagnosis plus subjects delivering after the cutoffs, including

those with PE. This ensured applicability of classifiers across the intended use population while avoiding

gapping-associated predictive performance inflation.[50]

Sample processing

Maternal blood was collected, processed and stored as described previously.[46,47]Serum samples were

depleted of abundant proteins, reduced, alkylated, and digested with trypsin. Stable isotope standard

(SIS) peptides were added post-digest, and peptides were analyzed by a liquid chromatography-multiple

reaction monitoring mass spectrometry assay measuring quality control and pregnancy-related

proteins.[46,51] Quantification was based on peptide response ratios, wherein the area of each

endogenous peptide was divided by that of its corresponding SIS.

Discovery and verification of risk predictors

Proteins for classifier model building were prefiltered using analytical performance criteria, including

mass spectrometry peak area cutoffs, coefficients of variance from replicate quality control samples,

and preanalytic stability. Models included one novel two-protein ratio and a composite clinical variable.

Based on strong predictive performance in nulliparas during discovery, the log ratio of insulin-like

growth factor-binding protein 4 (IBP4) to sex hormone-binding globulin (SHBG) was also included in

models as a second two-protein ratio unless SHBG was part of the novel ratio. Models were ranked in

discovery by a combination of area under the receiver operating characteristic curve (AUC) and

correlation with GAD amongst preeclamptic subjects, then filtered further for specificity at 75%

sensitivity in all subjects and nulliparas. Based on discovery performance, three clinical factors specified

in practice guidelines,[8,15,52-55] previous PE, pre-existing hypertension, and pregestational diabetes, were

combined into one variable (Clin3), deemed positive if any was true. This simple, fixed approach reduced

overfitting, leveraged prior biomarker knowledge, and produced classifiers that followed two model

structures:

1. $\log(\text{IBP4/SHBG}) + \text{Clin3} + \log(X/Y)$ or

2. $\text{Clin3} + \log(X/\text{SHBG})$

where X and Y are protein analytes.

Analysis

Prevalence was calculated on the TREETOP validation cohort and aligned with the broader U.S.

population, as represented by National Vital Statistics System (NVSS) reporting[56] and Lisonkova et al.

(2013)[11] (e.g., for PE <34 weeks: TREETOP, 1.13%; Lisonkova, 1.24%; *P*=0.78).

Analyses followed prespecified protocols. Laboratory personnel and statisticians were blinded to clinical

data. Data linked to classifier scores were analyzed by an independent third-party statistician. Type I

error was controlled by fixed sequence hypothesis testing.[57,58] The sample size of the validation sub-

cohort was shown to have 84% power at 5% alpha to detect by Fisher's exact test an enrichment of

spontaneous PTB cases above a predictor score threshold associated with two-fold increased risk.[59] For

the purpose of validating preterm PE classifiers, this sub-cohort was estimated to show >90% power at

5% alpha to detect by regression test a significant enrichment above a 75% sensitivity threshold. At such

a threshold, the sub-cohort sample size was estimated to produce a 95% CI width for sensitivity of <25%

and for specificity of <5%.

All statistical tests were 2-tailed, unless specified, at significance <0.05 and performed in R

v3.5.1 or higher.[60] Count differences in categorical variables were assessed using the chi-squared test,

and median differences in continuous variables were assessed with the Wilcoxon test.[61] Comparison

across cohorts was performed using the Kruskal-Wallis test. Overall predictive performance was

assessed via AUC with direction of effect prespecified, significance assessed with a 1-sided Wilcoxon

test, and confidence intervals (CI) calculated using DeLong's method.[62] Clinical validity was assessed

using predictive performance and statistically significant stratification of preterm PE subjects above vs

below threshold scores. Following validation, sensitivity, specificity, PPV, NPV, SPR, likelihood ratios

(LR+, LR-), and odds ratios (OR) were calculated. Calculation of prevalence-dependent predictor

performance used the prevalence of the analysed outcome in the TREETOP-based validation cohort,

subset by early GA dating.

Results

Characteristics of the discovery, verification, and validation cohorts are summarized in **Table 1**. The

proportion of PE across all GAs ranged from 7.0%-7.7%, similar to the U.S. population prevalence. As

expected, subjects delivering with preterm PE were more likely than controls to have higher BMI, prior

PE, chronic hypertension, pregestational diabetes, and longer neonatal hospital stays.

No significant differences were seen across cohorts for chronic hypertension and pregestational

diabetes, but prior PE was increased among validation cohort controls (**Table 2**). Significant differences

were seen among cohorts in race, ethnicity, parity, educational attainment, maternal age, BMI, and

GAD. Maternal age and BMI did not contribute independently to preterm PE risk by regression. The

GABD difference reflected the broader collection window in the discovery cohort.

Nine of nine classifiers developed in discovery showed acceptable predictive performance in

verification, using a threshold of 75% sensitivity for preterm PE with GAD <37 weeks. In validation, all

nine exhibited significant AUCs (0.72-0.78) for preterm PE prediction, significant stratification for

preterm PE at three threshold scores, and significant Pearson correlations between predictor score and

GAD in PE subjects (**Supplemental Table 1**). Clin3 alone exhibited an AUC of 0.68 for preterm PE, falling

below the lower 95% CI of most classifiers.

Figure 2 shows ROC curves for the predictor with the largest AUC (0.78), Clin3 + inhibin beta c

chain [INHBC]/SHBG) in the full validation cohort for all parity (A) and nulliparas (B). **Table 3** details its

performance in various testing scenarios for validation cohort subjects with early GA dating, and

Supplemental Table 2 shows its performance in the full validation cohort. In the early GA dating sub-

cohort, sensitivity and specificity for predicting preterm PE (GAD <37 weeks) were 76% and 75%,

respectively. For early preterm PE (GAD <34 weeks), sensitivity increased (89%) with specificity

unchanged (75%), while using a GAD cutoff of <32 weeks improved specificity (98%) with sensitivity at

50%. Restricting the analysis to nulliparas resulted in a slightly lower sensitivity (75%) and higher

specificity (83%) at the <34-week cutoff. NPV under all clinical testing scenarios ranged from 98-100%.

PPVs ranged from 4-18%, depending on the outcome predicted and the population, consistent with the

low prevalence of these conditions in all cohorts. The ORs ranged from approximately 10 to almost 60,

demonstrating large increases in relative risk over background risk. Performance in the full validation

cohort was strong but slightly decreased for certain performance metrics (**Supplemental Table 2**).

Structured Discussion/Comment

Principal findings

Nine classifier models predictive of preterm PE risk were validated, with the Clin3 + INHBC/SHBG

predictor showing the best overall performance.

Results

Requiring simplicity (one or two bivariate protein biomarkers and a composite clinical variable)

and using large, diverse, and temporally divergent cohorts mitigated overfitting and enabled validation

in an independent population. Three clinical features that differed significantly between cases and

controls in the discovery cohort (prior PE, pre-existing hypertension, and pregestational diabetes)

comprised the composite clinical variable. A fourth, BMI, was excluded as it did not contribute

independently to preterm PE risk, perhaps due to strong associations between BMI and both diabetes

and SHBG.[63,64] Emphasizing strong predictive performance in both nulliparous and multiparous

pregnancies during discovery ensures broad applicability. In the two source cohorts, Black (17.8–19.0%)

and Hispanic (37.3– 41.2%) subjects were represented at proportions higher than those in the general

U.S. birthing population (14.1-15.2% Black; 23.7-24.2% Hispanic).[56,65]

Inhibin and activin, members of the transforming growth factor beta (TGFβ) family, are

dysregulated in pregnancy disorders. Elevated maternal serum Inhibin A was first reported as a

biomarker of fetal aneuploidy[66] but is also associated with PE,[67,68] including preclinical PE.[69] However,

Inhibin A, alone or in combination with other aneuploidy and fetal anomaly biomarkers, demonstrates

insufficient predictive performance for clinical use.[70,71] INHBC, a less well-characterized inhibin family

member comprised of activin C homodimers, was recently reported to function through activin

receptor-like kinase 7 (ALK7), which participates in angiogenesis, cytokine activity, pituitary and gonadal

hormone signaling, and embryonic development.[72] Expressed in villous and extravillous trophoblasts,

ALK7 is dysregulated in placentas from patients with PE[73] and is a mediator of hypoxia-induced

impairment of trophoblast invasion.[74] A potential role for INHBC in extravillous trophoblast

development and function may help explain its predictive value for preterm PE (**Figure 3**).

SHBG regulates biologically-active free steroid hormone levels,[75] increases up to 10-fold in the

maternal circulation during pregnancy, and is expressed by placental trophoblasts.[76-78] SHBG

transcription is suppressed by pro-inflammatory cytokines, such as tumor necrosis factor-alpha (TNF-

α),[79] which is relevant because inflammation, along with increased placental[80] and circulating[80,81] TNF-α,

is associated with PE (**Figure 3**). Dysregulation of maternal circulating SHBG in PE has been reported by

some[82] and disputed by others[76,77,83-85], perhaps due to variability in PE phenotype and GABD among

studies. Even in studies associating SHBG with PE, its predictive performance is poor.[82] In non-pregnant

adults, low serum SHBG has been associated with insulin resistance,[86] Type 2 diabetes,[87] and endothelial

dysfunction.[88] In one study, gravidas with low first-trimester SHBG and PlGF were at highest risk of

developing PE, leading authors to conclude that dysregulated angiogenesis and insulin resistance

exerted additive effects on PE risk.[86] Similarly, these results suggest that SHBG is an independent PE

predictor due to potential effects on insulin resistance and endothelial function, and predictive

performance improves markedly when combined with an angiogenic factor such as INHBC.

Clinical implications

Since these predictors allow for early risk assessments of multiple outcomes (PE with GAD <37,

<34, and <32 weeks) for a given pregnancy and account for parity, they enable individualized clinical

management. Patients identified as low risk can safely avoid unnecessary interventions. High-risk

patients can be assigned to increased surveillance for early detection of PE and associated

complications.

As exemplified with Clin3 + INHBC/SHBG, these predictors provide excellent stratification of

subjects at elevated risk for early-onset PE (<34 weeks), an outcome with a large clinical burden and

unmet need. Historically, 34 weeks has been an important GA landmark for PE, as ACOG recommends

delivery ≥34 weeks and expectant management with close observation for those below this GA.[8] Clark

et al. (2023)[89] recently recommended changes to classification of different PE subtypes to better reflect

the type and degree of associated organ dysfunction. We acknowledge that, if adopted, such

recommendations may alter clinical decision-making relevant to timing of delivery for PE. In addition,

new interventions for prevention or treatment may be discovered. Any of these developments may

require us to reassess predictor performance in the appropriate contexts. In regard to a more

immediate scenario, determining whether the predictors will be useful for decision-making regarding

LDASA prophylaxis requires more study, to establish LDASA efficacy among patients for whom guideline

criteria and the predictors produce discordant risk assessments.

Clinical practice guidelines include expectations for test performance, including high PPV, to

limit overtreatment.[8] However, PPV is impacted by a condition's prevalence. This study validated

predictive algorithms for a clinically important yet low-prevalence PE phenotype –

preterm PE in a cohort with a PE rate similar to the overall U.S. prevalence. This contrasts with a recent

study[90] that interrogated PE at any GA in a high-risk population (PE rate of 13.6%). Importantly,

according to the current standard of care, PE risk is assessed using a range of clinical algorithms, all of

which are inferior to the predictors validated in this study, with PPVs of 5.4% (NICE) and 5.6% (ACOG),

despite the use of an outcome with higher prevalence and lower clinical relevance (PE at any GA)[14].

Research implications

These predictors can be used to select high-risk pregnancies for interventional studies of prophylactic or

therapeutic agents. Determining whether preventive or therapeutic interventions alter maternal

biomarker levels is also of interest. Clinical application of a screening test is a two-step process: The first

step, reported here, is validation of predictive ability. The second, demonstrating clinical utility – i.e.,

improved outcomes, cost effectiveness, and ease of implementation – requires additional work.

Strengths and limitations

Strengths include the large, diverse, and temporally distinct datasets used for discovery, verification,

and validation. The composite clinical variable uses readily ascertained factors, and biomarkers were

prefiltered for excellent performance in ambient temperature sample transport conditions. These

properties support practicality for clinical use. Limitations include the modest number of early preterm

PE cases due to low prevalence and a mid-second-trimester blood draw that might not align optimally

with intervention timing.

Conclusions

Nine mid-trimester preterm PE risk predictors, designed to assess both proteomic biomarkers and

clinical risk factors from 18-20 weeks' gestation, demonstrated predictive ability superior to clinical

factors alone. The Clin3 + INHBC/SHBG predictor includes biomarkers with functional relevance to

pregnancy. All show promise for detecting risk of PE <34 weeks' GA and identifying pre-symptomatic

individuals who can benefit from increased surveillance, LDASA prophylaxis, and future therapies.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: TJG, JJB, PEK; data curation: ACF, ADP, MBB, TCF; formal analysis: LCL, ADP, MBB;

funding acquisition: JJB, PEK; investigation: LCL, GRS, GRM, KDH, CNS, JKB, SAL, LMP, EJS, MKH,ACF, TCF;

methodology: ACF, TCF, TJG. JJB, PEK; project administration: JJB, PEK; resources: LCL, GRS, GRM, KDH,

CNS, JKB, SAL, LMP, MKH, JJB, PEK; supervision: JJB, PEK; validation: JJB, PEK; visualization: LCL, JJB, PEK;

writing – original draft: LCL, JJB, PEK; writing – review and editing: all authors. All authors have read and

agreed to the published version of the manuscript.

Acknowledgments

The authors wish to acknowledge the following co-investigators on the original PAPR and/or TREETOP

studies: Kim A. Boggess, MD (University of North Carolina School of Medicine); Dean V. Coonrod, MD

(University of Arizona College of Medicine); Larry M. Cousins, MD (San Diego Perinatal Center; Rady

Children's Specialists of San Diego); Amy H. Crockett, MD (University of South Carolina School of

Medicine Greenville and Prisma Health-Upstate); M. Sean Esplin, MD (Intermountain Healthcare);

William A. Grobman, MD, MBA (The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center); David M. Haas, MD

(Indiana University School of Medicine); Angela F. Hawk, MD (Regional Obstetrical Consultants); Jay D.

Iams, MD (The Ohio State University Wexner Medical Center); Carol A. Major, MD (University of

California Irvine School of Medicine); Scott A. Sullivan, MD (Medical University of South Carolina); and

Sarahn M. Wheeler, MD (Duke University School of Medicine). The authors also thank the study

coordinators and research personnel at the study sites, the clinical study participants, and the Sera

Prognostics, Inc. research and development, clinical laboratory and clinical operations teams. Babak

Shahbaba, PhD (University of California Irvine), conducted independent validation hypothesis testing.

Jennifer Logan, PhD (Sera Prognostics, Inc.), contributed to the writing of this article.

Ethics statement

The ethics committees/IRBs of all institutions participating in the original published studies upon which

this work is based gave ethical approval for this work. The following is a listing of PAPR (NCT01371019)

IRBs: IRB Intermountain Healthcare; IRB for Human Research, Medical University of South Carolina; IRB

The University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; IRB Maricopa Integrated Health System; IRB Baystate

Medical Center; IRB Oregon Health & Science University; IRB University of Texas Medical Branch; IRB

Christiana Care; WCG IRB (previously Western IRB, used by The Ohio State University, San Diego

Perinatal Center, and Regional Obstetrical Consultants). The following is a listing of TREETOP

(NCT02787213) IRBs: IRB for Human Research, Medical University of South Carolina; IRB The University

of North Carolina at Chapel Hill; IRB Maricopa Integrated Health System; IRB Oregon Health & Science

University; IRB University of Texas Medical Branch; IRB Boston Medical Center; IRB Ochsner Clinic

Foundation; IRB University of California San Diego; Human Research Protections Program Northwestern

University; IRB Indiana University; IRB Duke Medicine; IRB for Clinical Investigations, Greenville Health

System; WCG IRB (previously Western IRB, used by Denver Health & Hospital Authority, University of

Colorado-Denver, UC-Irvine, Thomas Jefferson University, Regional Obstetrical Consultants, and

Baystate Medical Center).

Glossary

BMI, body mass index

CI, confidence interval

Early preterm PE, preeclampsia diagnosed with GAD<34 weeks

GA, gestational age

GAD, gestational age at delivery

IBP4, insulin-like growth factor-binding protein 4

INHBC, inhibin subunit beta c

IQR, interquartile range

LDASA, low-dose aspirin (acetylsalicylic acid)

LR, likelihood ratio

NPV, negative predictive value

PE, preeclampsia

Preterm PE, preeclampsia diagnosed with GAD <37 weeks

PPV, positive predictive value

PTB, preterm birth

SHBG, sex hormone-binding globulin

SPR, screen positive rate

TGFβ, transforming growth factor beta

TNFα, tumor necrosis factor-alpha

References

References

1.   Rana S, Lemoine E, Granger JP, Karumanchi SA. Preeclampsia: Pathophysiology, Challenges, and

Perspectives. *Circ Res*. Mar 29 2019;124(7):1094-1112. doi:10.1161/CIRCRESAHA.118.313276

2.   Kuklina EV, Ayala C, Callaghan WM. Hypertensive disorders and severe obstetric morbidity in the

United States. *Obstet Gynecol*. Jun 2009;113(6):1299-1306. doi:10.1097/AOG.0b013e3181a45b25

3.   Say L, Chou D, Gemmill A, et al. Global causes of maternal death: a WHO systematic analysis.

Lancet Glob Health. Jun 2014;2(6):e323-33. doi:10.1016/S2214-109X(14)70227-X

4.   Vogel JP, Souza JP, Mori R, et al. Maternal complications and perinatal mortality: findings of the

World Health Organization Multicountry Survey on Maternal and Newborn Health. *BJOG*. Mar 2014;121

Suppl 1:76-88. doi:10.1111/1471-0528.12633

5.   Ngoc NT, Merialdi M, Abdel-Aleem H, et al. Causes of stillbirths and early neonatal deaths: data

from 7993 pregnancies in six developing countries. *Bull World Health Organ*. Sep 2006;84(9):699-705.

doi:10.2471/blt.05.027300

6.   Ananth CV, Vintzileos AM. Medically indicated preterm birth: recognizing the importance of the

problem. *Clin Perinatol*. Mar 2008;35(1):53-67, viii. doi:10.1016/j.clp.2007.11.001

7.   American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists' Committee on Practice Bulletins-

Obstetrics. Chronic Hypertension in Pregnancy: ACOG Practice Bulletin No. 203. *Obstet Gynecol*. Jan

2019;133(1):e26-e50. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000003020

8.   American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. Gestational Hypertension and

Preeclampsia: ACOG Practice Bulletin, Number 222. *Obstet Gynecol*. Jun 2020;135(6):e237-e260.

doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000003891

9.   Henderson JT, Vesco KK, Senger CA, Thomas RG, Redmond N. Aspirin Use to Prevent

Preeclampsia and Related Morbidity and Mortality: Updated Evidence Report and Systematic Review for

the US Preventive Services Task Force. *JAMA*. Sep 28 2021;326(12):1192-1206.

doi:10.1001/jama.2021.8551

10.   American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. ACOG Practice Bulletin No. 203: Chronic

Hypertension in Pregnancy. *Obstet Gynecol*. Jan 2019;133(1):e26-e50.

doi:10.1097/aog.0000000000003020

11.   Lisonkova S, Joseph KS. Incidence of preeclampsia: risk factors and outcomes associated with

early- versus late-onset disease. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. Dec 2013;209(6):544 e1-544 e12.

doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2013.08.019

12.   Hao J, Hassen D, Hao Q, et al. Maternal and Infant Health Care Costs Related to Preeclampsia.

Obstet Gynecol. Dec 2019;134(6):1227-1233. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000003581

13.   Stevens W, Shih T, Incerti D, et al. Short-term costs of preeclampsia to the United States health

care system. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. Sep 2017;217(3):237-248 e16. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2017.04.032

14.   Rode L, Ekelund CK, Riishede I, Rasmussen S, Lidegaard O, Tabor A. Prediction of preterm pre-

eclampsia according to NICE and ACOG criteria: descriptive study of 597 492 Danish births from 2008 to

2017. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. Oct 2021;58(4):561-567. doi:10.1002/uog.23693

15.   National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE). Hypertension in pregnancy: diagnosis

and management (NICE Guideline, NG 133). Accessed November 22, 2022,

https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK546004/

16.   American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists' Committee on Practice Bulletins-

Obstetrics. Gestational Hypertension and Preeclampsia: ACOG Practice Bulletin, No. 202: . *Obstet*

Gynecol. Jan 2019;133(1):1. doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000003018

17.   Acar N, Ustunel I. Expression of 52-kDa FK506-binding protein (FKBP52) in human placenta

complicated by preeclampsia and intrauterine growth restriction. *Anal Quant Cytopathol Histpathol*. Apr

2015;37(2):87-95.

18.   Anand S, Bench Alvarez TM, Johnson WE, Esplin MS, Merrell K, Porter TF, Graves SW. Serum

biomarkers predictive of pre-eclampsia. *Biomark Med*. 2015;9(6):563-75. doi:10.2217/bmm.15.21

19.   Bahado-Singh RO, Syngelaki A, Akolekar R, et al. Validation of metabolomic models for

prediction of early-onset preeclampsia. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. Oct 2015;213(4):530 e1-530 e10.

doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2015.06.044

20.   Garces MF, Sanchez E, Cardona LF, et al. Maternal Serum Meteorin Levels and the Risk of

Preeclampsia. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(6):e0131013. doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0131013

21.   Karakus S, Bozoklu Akkar O, Yildiz C, Sancakdar E, Cetin M, Cetin A. Serum levels of ET-1, M30,

and angiopoietins-1 and -2 in HELLP syndrome and preeclampsia compared to controls. *Arch Gynecol*

Obstet. Feb 2016;293(2):351-9. doi:10.1007/s00404-015-3803-1

22.   Koster MP, Vreeken RJ, Harms AC, et al. First-Trimester Serum Acylcarnitine Levels to Predict

Preeclampsia: A Metabolomics Approach. *Dis Markers*. 2015;2015:857108. doi:10.1155/2015/857108

23.   Salvianti F, Inversetti A, Smid M, et al. Prospective evaluation of RASSF1A cell-free DNA as a

biomarker of pre-eclampsia. *Placenta*. Sep 2015;36(9):996-1001. doi:10.1016/j.placenta.2015.07.003

24.   Teoh SS, Zhao M, Wang Y, Chen Q, Nie G. Serum HtrA1 is differentially regulated between early-

onset and late-onset preeclampsia. *Placenta*. Sep 2015;36(9):990-5. doi:10.1016/j.placenta.2015.07.001

25.   Maynard SE, Min JY, Merchan J, et al. Excess placental soluble fms-like tyrosine kinase 1 (sFlt1)

may contribute to endothelial dysfunction, hypertension, and proteinuria in preeclampsia. *J Clin Invest*.

Mar 2003;111(5):649-58. doi:10.1172/JCI17189

26.   Levine RJ, Maynard SE, Qian C, et al. Circulating angiogenic factors and the risk of preeclampsia.

N Engl J Med. Feb 12 2004;350(7):672-83. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa031884

27.   Dugoff L, Hobbins JC, Malone FD, et al. First-trimester maternal serum PAPP-A and free-beta

subunit human chorionic gonadotropin concentrations and nuchal translucency are associated with

obstetric complications: a population-based screening study (the FASTER Trial). *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. Oct

2004;191(4):1446-51. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2004.06.052

28.   Dugoff L, Hobbins JC, Malone FD, et al. Quad screen as a predictor of adverse pregnancy

outcome. *Obstet Gynecol*. Aug 2005;106(2):260-7. doi:10.1097/01.AOG.0000172419.37410.eb

29.   Srinivasan S, Treacy R, Herrero T, et al. Discovery and Verification of Extracellular miRNA

Biomarkers for Non-invasive Prediction of Pre-eclampsia in Asymptomatic Women. *Cell Rep Med*. May

19 2020;1(2)doi:10.1016/j.xcrm.2020.100013

30.   Zeisler H, Llurba E, Chantraine F, et al. Predictive Value of the sFlt-1:PlGF Ratio in Women with

Suspected Preeclampsia. *N Engl J Med*. Jan 7 2016;374(1):13-22. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1414838

31.   Cerdeira AS, O'Sullivan J, Ohuma EO, et al. Randomized Interventional Study on Prediction of

Preeclampsia/Eclampsia in Women With Suspected Preeclampsia: INSPIRE. *Hypertension*. Oct

2019;74(4):983-990. doi:10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.119.12739

32.   Duhig KE, Myers J, Seed PT, et al. Placental growth factor testing to assess women with

suspected pre-eclampsia: a multicentre, pragmatic, stepped-wedge cluster-randomised controlled trial.

Lancet. May 4 2019;393(10183):1807-1818. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(18)33212-4

33.   McCarthy FP, Gill C, Seed PT, Bramham K, Chappell LC, Shennan AH. Comparison of three

commercially available placental growth factor-based tests in women with suspected preterm pre-

eclampsia: the COMPARE study. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. Jan 2019;53(1):62-67.

doi:10.1002/uog.19051

34.   Roberge S, Nicolaides K, Demers S, Hyett J, Chaillet N, Bujold E. The role of aspirin dose on the

prevention of preeclampsia and fetal growth restriction: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Am J*

Obstet Gynecol. Feb 2017;216(2):110-120 e6. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2016.09.076

35.   Di Lorenzo G, Ceccarello M, Cecotti V, et al. First trimester maternal serum PIGF, free beta-hCG,

PAPP-A, PP-13, uterine artery Doppler and maternal history for the prediction of preeclampsia. *Placenta*.

Jun 2012;33(6):495-501. doi:10.1016/j.placenta.2012.03.003

36.   Poon LC, Syngelaki A, Akolekar R, Lai J, Nicolaides KH. Combined Screening for Preeclampsia and

Small for Gestational Age at 11-13 Weeks. *Fetal Diagn Ther*. Sep 13 2012;doi:000341712 [pii]

10.1159/000341712

37.   Poon LC, Lesmes C, Gallo DM, Akolekar R, Nicolaides KH. Prediction of small for gestational age

neonates: screening by biophysical and biochemical markers at 19-24 weeks. *Ultrasound in obstetrics &*

gynecology : the official journal of the International Society of Ultrasound in Obstetrics and Gynecology.

May 18 2015;doi:10.1002/uog.14904

38.   Lesmes C, Gallo DM, Gonzalez R, Poon LC, Nicolaides KH. Prediction of small-for-gestational-age

neonates: screening by maternal serum biochemical markers at 19-24 weeks. *Ultrasound in obstetrics &*

gynecology : the official journal of the International Society of Ultrasound in Obstetrics and Gynecology.

May 13 2015;doi:10.1002/uog.14899

39.   Leavey K, Benton SJ, Grynspan D, Kingdom JC, Bainbridge SA, Cox BJ. Unsupervised Placental

Gene Expression Profiling Identifies Clinically Relevant Subclasses of Human Preeclampsia. *Hypertension*.

Jul 2016;68(1):137-47. doi:10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.116.07293

40.   Leavey K, Bainbridge SA, Cox BJ. Large scale aggregate microarray analysis reveals three distinct

molecular subclasses of human preeclampsia. *PLoS One*. 2015;10(2):e0116508.

doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0116508

41.   Thomsen LC, Melton PE, Tollaksen K, et al. Refined phenotyping identifies links between

preeclampsia and related diseases in a Norwegian preeclampsia family cohort. *J Hypertens*. Nov

2015;33(11):2294-302. doi:10.1097/HJH.0000000000000696

42.   Roberts JM, Rich-Edwards JW, McElrath TF, Garmire L, Myatt L, Global Pregnancy C. Subtypes of

Preeclampsia: Recognition and Determining Clinical Usefulness. *Hypertension*. May 5 2021;77(5):1430-

1441. doi:10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.120.14781

43.   Robillard PY, Dekker G, Scioscia M, Saito S. Progress in the understanding of the pathophysiology

of immunologic maladaptation related to early-onset preeclampsia and metabolic syndrome related to

late-onset preeclampsia. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. Feb 2022;226(2S):S867-S875.

doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2021.11.019

44.   Masini G, Foo LF, Tay J, Wilkinson IB, Valensise H, Gyselaers W, Lees CC. Preeclampsia has two

phenotypes which require different treatment strategies. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. Feb 2022;226(2S):S1006-

S1018. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2020.10.052

45.   Committee on the Review of Omics-Based Tests for Predicting Patient Outcomes in Clinical

Trials, Board on Health Care Services, Board on Health Sciences Policy, Institute of Medicine. In: Micheel

CM, Nass SJ, Omenn GS, eds. *Evolution of Translational Omics: Lessons Learned and the Path Forward*.

National Academies Press (US)

Copyright 2012 by the National Academy of Sciences. All rights reserved.; 2012.

46.   Saade GR, Boggess KA, Sullivan SA, et al. Development and validation of a spontaneous preterm

delivery predictor in asymptomatic women. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. May 2016;214(5):633 e1-633 e24.

doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2016.02.001

47.   Markenson GR, Saade GR, Laurent LC, et al. Performance of a proteomic preterm delivery

predictor in a large independent prospective cohort. *Am J Obstet Gynecol MFM*. Aug 2020;2(3):100140.

doi:10.1016/j.ajogmf.2020.100140

48.   American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. Committee Opinion No 611: Methods for

Estimating Due Date. *Obstet Gynecol*. Oct 2014;124(4):863-866.

doi:10.1097/01.AOG.0000454932.15177.be

49.   American College of Obstetricians and Gynecologists. Committee Opinion No 700: Methods for

Estimating the Due Date. *Obstet Gynecol*. May 2017;129(5):e150-e154.

doi:10.1097/AOG.0000000000002046

50.   Burchard J, Saade GR, Boggess KA, et al. Better Estimation of Spontaneous Preterm Birth

Prediction Performance through Improved Gestational Age Dating. *J Clin Med*. May 19

2022;11(10)doi:10.3390/jcm11102885

51.   Bradford C, Severinsen R, Pugmire T, et al. Analytical validation of protein biomarkers for risk of

spontaneous preterm birth. *Clinical Mass Spectrometry*. 2017/01/01/ 2017;3:25-38.

doi:10.1016/j.clinms.2017.06.002

52.   Lowe SA, Bowyer L, Lust K, et al. SOMANZ guidelines for the management of hypertensive

disorders of pregnancy 2014. *Aust N Z J Obstet Gynaecol*. Oct 2015;55(5):e1-29. doi:10.1111/ajo.12399

53.   Magee LA, Smith GN, Bloch C, et al. Guideline No. 426: Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy:

Diagnosis, Prediction, Prevention, and Management. *J Obstet Gynaecol Can*. May 2022;44(5):547-571

e1. doi:10.1016/j.jogc.2022.03.002

54.   World Health Organization. *WHO Recommendations for Prevention and Treatment of Pre-*

Eclampsia and Eclampsia. Geneva: World Health Organization; 2011.

55.   Brown MA, Magee LA, Kenny LC, et al. Hypertensive Disorders of Pregnancy: ISSHP

Classification, Diagnosis, and Management Recommendations for International Practice. *Hypertension*.

Jul 2018;72(1):24-43. doi:10.1161/HYPERTENSIONAHA.117.10803

56.   Osterman MJK, Hamilton BE, Martin, J.A., Driscoll AKV, C.P. Births: Final Data for 2020. Division

of Vital Statistics, National Center for Health Statistics, U.S. Centers for Disease Control and Prevention.

Updated 2022 Feb 7. Accessed cited 2022 Feb 9, https://www.cdc.gov/nchs/nvss/births.htm

57.   Dmitrienko A, Tamhane A, Bretz F, eds. *Multiple Testing Problems in Pharmaceutical Statistics*.

CRC Press; 2009.

58. Dmitrienko A, D'Agostino RB, Sr., Huque MF. Key multiplicity issues in clinical drug development.

Stat Med. Mar 30 2013;32(7):1079-111. doi:10.1002/sim.5642

59. Burchard J, Polpitiya AD, Fox AC, et al. Clinical Validation of a Proteomic Biomarker Threshold for

Increased Risk of Spontaneous Preterm Birth and Associated Clinical Outcomes: A Replication Study. *J*

Clin Med. Oct 29 2021;10(21):5088. doi:10.3390/jcm10215088

60. R Foundation. The R Project for Statistical Computing. Accessed August 1, 2022, https://www.r-

project.org/

61. Yoshida K, Bartel A. tableone: Create 'Table 1' to Describe Baseline Characteristics with or

without Propensity Score Weights; R package version 0.13.2. Accessed November 21, 2022,

https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/tableone/index.html

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

receiver operating characteristic curves: a nonparametric approach. *Biometrics*. Sep 1988;44(3):837-45.

63. Cooper LA, Page ST, Amory JK, Anawalt BD, Matsumoto AM. The association of obesity with sex

hormone-binding globulin is stronger than the association with ageing--implications for the

interpretation of total testosterone measurements. *Clin Endocrinol (Oxf)*. Dec 2015;83(6):828-33.

doi:10.1111/cen.12768

64. Birkebaek NH, Lange A, Holland-Fischer P, et al. Effect of weight reduction on insulin sensitivity,

sex hormone-binding globulin, sex hormones and gonadotrophins in obese children. *Eur J Endocrinol*.

Dec 2010;163(6):895-900. doi:10.1530/EJE-10-0538

65. March of Dimes Peristats. Births. Accessed July 1, 2023,

https://www.marchofdimes.org/peristats/data?reg=99&top=2&stop=10&lev=1&slev=1&obj=3

66. Aitken DA, Wallace EM, Crossley JA, et al. Dimeric inhibin A as a marker for Down's syndrome in

early pregnancy. *N Engl J Med*. May 9 1996;334(19):1231-6. doi:10.1056/NEJM199605093341904

67.   Muttukrishna S, Knight PG, Groome NP, Redman CW, Ledger WL. Activin A and inhibin A as

possible endocrine markers for pre-eclampsia. *Lancet*. May 3 1997;349(9061):1285-8.

doi:10.1016/s0140-6736(96)09264-1

68.   Fraser RF, 2nd, McAsey ME, Coney P. Inhibin-A and pro-alpha C are elevated in preeclamptic

pregnancy and correlate with human chorionic gonadotropin. *Am J Reprod Immunol*. Jul 1998;40(1):37-

42. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0897.1998.tb00386.x

69.   Muttukrishna S, North RA, Morris J, et al. Serum inhibin A and activin A are elevated prior to the

onset of pre-eclampsia. *Hum Reprod*. Jul 2000;15(7):1640-5. doi:10.1093/humrep/15.7.1640

70.   Morris RK, Cnossen JS, Langejans M, et al. Serum screening with Down's syndrome markers to

predict pre-eclampsia and small for gestational age: systematic review and meta-analysis. *BMC*

Pregnancy Childbirth. Aug 4 2008;8:33. doi:10.1186/1471-2393-8-33

71.   Huang T, Bedford HM, Rashid S, et al. Modified multiple marker aneuploidy screening as a

primary screening test for preeclampsia. *BMC Pregnancy Childbirth*. Mar 8 2022;22(1):190.

doi:10.1186/s12884-022-04514-4

72.   Goebel EJ, Ongaro L, Kappes EC, et al. The orphan ligand, activin C, signals through activin

receptor-like kinase 7. *Elife*. Jun 23 2022;11doi:10.7554/eLife.78197

73.   Nadeem L, Munir S, Fu G, et al. Nodal signals through activin receptor-like kinase 7 to inhibit

trophoblast migration and invasion: implication in the pathogenesis of preeclampsia. *Am J Pathol*. Mar

2011;178(3):1177-89. doi:10.1016/j.ajpath.2010.11.066

74.   Hu M, Wang Y, Meng Y, et al. Hypoxia induced-disruption of lncRNA TUG1/PRC2 interaction

impairs human trophoblast invasion through epigenetically activating Nodal/ALK7 signalling. *J Cell Mol*

Med. Jul 2022;26(14):4087-4100. doi:10.1111/jcmm.17450

75.   Hammond GL. Diverse roles for sex hormone-binding globulin in reproduction. *Biol Reprod*. Sep

2011;85(3):431-41. doi:10.1095/biolreprod.111.092593

76.   Anderson DC. Sex-hormone-binding globulin. *Clin Endocrinol (Oxf)*. Jan 1974;3(1):69-96.

doi:10.1111/j.1365-2265.1974.tb03298.x

77.   Sun L, Jin Z, Teng W, Chi X, Zhang Y, Ai W, Wang P. Expression changes of sex hormone binding

globulin in GDM placental tissues. *J Perinat Med*. Nov 19 2011;40(2):129-35. doi:10.1515/JPM.2011.128

78.   Larrea F, Diaz L, Carino C, Larriva-Sahd J, Carrillo L, Orozco H, Ulloa-Aguirre A. Evidence that

human placenta is a site of sex hormone-binding globulin gene expression. *J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol*.

Oct 1993;46(4):497-505. doi:10.1016/0960-0760(93)90104-5

79.   Simó R, Saez-Lopez C, Barbosa-Desongles A, Hernandez C, Selva DM. Novel insights in SHBG

regulation and clinical implications. *Trends Endocrinol Metab*. Jul 2015;26(7):376-83.

doi:10.1016/j.tem.2015.05.001

80.   Rinehart BK, Terrone DA, Lagoo-Deenadayalan S, Barber WH, Hale EA, Martin JN, Jr., Bennett

WA. Expression of the placental cytokines tumor necrosis factor alpha, interleukin 1beta, and interleukin

10 is increased in preeclampsia. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. Oct 1999;181(4):915-20. doi:10.1016/s0002-

9378(99)70325-x

81.   Conrad KP, Miles TM, Benyo DF. Circulating levels of immunoreactive cytokines in women with

preeclampsia. *Am J Reprod Immunol*. Aug 1998;40(2):102-11. doi:10.1111/j.1600-0897.1998.tb00398.x

82.   Yu CK, Papageorghiou AT, Bindra R, Spencer K, Nicolaides KH. Second-trimester sex hormone-

binding globulin and subsequent development of pre-eclampsia. *J Matern Fetal Neonatal Med*. Sep

2004;16(3):158-62. doi:10.1080/14767050400013297

83.   Nevalainen J, Korpimaki T, Kouru H, Sairanen M, Ryynanen M. Performance of first trimester

biochemical markers and mean arterial pressure in prediction of early-onset pre-eclampsia. *Metabolism*.

Oct 2017;75:6-15. doi:10.1016/j.metabol.2017.07.004

84.   Sharifzadeh F, Kashanian M, Fatemi F. A comparison of serum androgens in pre-eclamptic and

normotensive pregnant women during the third trimester of pregnancy. *Gynecol Endocrinol*. Oct

2012;28(10):834-6. doi:10.3109/09513590.2012.683061

85.   Tuutti EK, Hamalainen EK, Sainio SM, Hiilesmaa VK, Turpeinen UL, Alfthan HV, Stenman UH.

Serum testosterone levels during early pregnancy in patients developing preeclampsia. *Scand J Clin Lab*

Invest. Sep 2011;71(5):413-8. doi:10.3109/00365513.2011.580858

86.   Thadhani R, Ecker JL, Mutter WP, et al. Insulin resistance and alterations in angiogenesis:

additive insults that may lead to preeclampsia. *Hypertension*. May 2004;43(5):988-92.

doi:10.1161/01.HYP.0000124460.67539.1d

87.   Wallace IR, McKinley MC, Bell PM, Hunter SJ. Sex hormone binding globulin and insulin

resistance. *Clin Endocrinol (Oxf)*. Mar 2013;78(3):321-9. doi:10.1111/cen.12086

88.   Maggio M, Cattabiani C, Lauretani F, et al. SHBG and endothelial function in older subjects. *Int J*

Cardiol. Oct 3 2013;168(3):2825-30. doi:10.1016/j.ijcard.2013.03.083

89.   Clark SL, Saade GA, Tolcher MC, et al. Gestational hypertension and "severe" disease: time for a

change. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. May 2023;228(5):547-552. doi:10.1016/j.ajog.2022.11.1280

90.   Rasmussen M, Reddy M, Nolan R, et al. RNA profiles reveal signatures of future health and

disease in pregnancy. *Nature*. Jan 2022;601(7893):422-427. doi:10.1038/s41586-021-04249-w

Table 1. Demographic and clinical characteristics of preterm preeclampsia (PE) cases and noncases in the discovery, verification, and validation cohorts.

Cases and noncases	Discovery (PAPR)			Verification (TREETOP)			Validation (TREETOP)		
	Preterm PE <37 weeks' gestation	No PE or PE ≥37 weeks' gestation	P value	Preterm PE <37 weeks' gestation	No PE or PE ≥37 weeks' gestation	P value	Preterm PE <37 weeks' gestation	No PE or PE ≥37 weeks' gestation	P value
Number of subjects (n, %)	45 (3.3)	1307 (96.7)		34 (2.7)	1217 (97.3)		62 (2.7)	2227 (97.3)	
Maternal age (y)			0.586			0.640			0.705
Median	26	27		28.5	30		30	29	
IQR	24–31	23–32		27–32	25–33		25–34	25–33	
Unknown (n)	0	0		0	0		0	0	
BMI			0.003			0.027			<0.001
Median	29.6	26.6		28.3	26.1		30.9	25.8	
IQR	26.17–38.0	22.7–32.4		25.7–32.9	22.6–31.0		25.9–35.5	22.3–31.1	
Unknown (n)	1	23		1	14		1	25	
Maternal race (n, %)			0.114			0.838			0.579
Black	13 (28.9)	224 (17.1)		5 (14.7)	233 (19.1)		14 (22.6)	393 (17.6)	
White	29 (64.4)	952 (72.8)		21 (61.8)	757 (62.2)		34 (54.8)	1411 (63.4)	
Other	3 (6.7)	131 (10.0)		7 (20.6)	205 (16.8)		12 (19.4)	370 (16.6)	
Unknown (n)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)		1 (2.9)	22 (1.8)		2 (3.2)	53 (2.4)	
Maternal ethnicity (n, %)			0.180			0.104			0.243
Hispanic	12 (26.7)	492 (37.6)		20 (58.8)	495 (40.7)		30 (48.4)	895 (40.2)	
Non-Hispanic	33 (73.3)	815 (62.4)		14 (41.2)	720 (59.2)		32 (51.6)	1332 (59.8)	
Unknown (n)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)		0 (0.0)	2 (0.2)		0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Maternal education level (n, %)			0.131			0.329			0.194
No high school graduation	17 (37.8)	338 (25.9)		4 (11.8)	192 (15.8)		10 (16.1)	317 (14.2)	
High school degree/GED	21 (46.7)	635 (48.6)		21 (61.8)	558 (45.9)		35 (56.5)	1033 (46.4)	
College degree	6 (13.3)	323 (24.7)		9 (26.5)	463 (38.0)		16 (25.8)	861 (38.7)	
Unknown (n)	1 (2.2)	11 (0.8)		0 (0.0)	4 (0.3)		1 (1.6)	16 (0.7)	
Parity (n, %)			0.591			0.838			0.307
Nulliparous (P=0)	18 (40.0)	457 (35.0)		13 (38.2)	505 (41.5)		31 (50.0)	950 (42.7)	
Multiparous (P≥1)	27 (60.0)	850 (65.0)		21 (61.8)	712 (58.5)		31 (50.0)	1277 (57.3)	
Unknown	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)		0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)		0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Previous PE (preterm + term) (n, %)			<0.001			<0.001			<0.001
No	13 (48.1)	777 (91.4)		11 (52.4)	653 (91.7)		18 (58.1)	1102 (86.3)	
Yes	14 (51.9)	73 (8.6)		10 (47.6)	59 (8.3)		13 (41.9)	175 (13.7)	
Unknown	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)		0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)		0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Chronic hypertension (n, %)			<0.001			<0.001			<0.001
No	35 (77.8)	1229 (94.0)		26 (76.5)	1154 (94.8)		37 (59.7)	2124 (95.4)	
Yes	10 (22.2)	78 (6.0)		8 (23.5)	63 (5.2)		25 (40.3)	103 (4.6)	
Unknown (n)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)		0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)		0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Pregestational diabetes mellitus (n, %)			<0.001			0.001			<0.001

No	31 (68.9)	1250 (95.6)		28 (82.4)	1166 (95.8)		47 (75.8)	2118 (95.1)	
Yes	14 (31.1)	57 (4.4)		6 (17.6)	51 (4.2)		15 (24.2)	109 (4.9)	
Unknown (n)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)		0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)		0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Gestational age at blood draw (d)			0.233			0.854			0.600
Median	137	140		137	136		136.5	137	
IQR	133–143	132–148		134–140	132–141		130–141	133–141	
Unknown (n)	0	0		0	0		0	0	
Gestational age at delivery (d)			<0.001			<0.001			<0.001
Median	248	274		243.5	275		240	275	
IQR	236–254	267–279		224–253	269–281		226–252	270–280	
Unknown (n)	0	0		0	0		0	0	
Neonatal length of hospital stay (d)			<0.001			<0.001			<0.001
Median	5	3		13.5	2		11	2	
IQR	3-13	2-3		6-28	2-3		4-28	2-3	
Unknown (n)	0	12		0	6		2	7	
Neonatal gender (n, %)			0.920			0.809			0.676
Female	23 (51.1)	643 (49.2)		15 (44.1)	603 (49.5)		34 (54.8)	1100 (49.4)	
Male	22 (48.9)	664 (50.8)		19 (55.9)	613 (50.4)		28 (45.2)	1124 (50.5)	
Ambiguous	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)		0 (0.0)	1 (0.1)		0 (0.0)	3 (0.1)	
Unknown	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)		0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)		0 (0.0)	3 (0.1)	

Categorical variables are shown with counts and percentages, and continuous variables are shown with medians and interquartile ranges. Comparisons between cases (PE <37 weeks' gestation) and noncases (no PE or PE ≥37 weeks' gestation) were performed using Wilcoxon or chi squared tests as appropriate. Collection of neonatal hospital stay was capped at 28 days according to the PAPR[46] and TREETOP[47] study protocols. BMI, body mass index; IQR, interquartile range; GED, general education diploma; NA, not applicable; PE, preeclampsia; PTB, preterm birth.

Table 2. Comparison of demographic and clinical characteristics across the discovery, verification, and

validation cohorts.

	Discovery (PAPR)	Verification (TREETOP)	Validation (TREETOP)	*P* value
Number of subjects	1352	1251	2289	
Maternal age				<0.001
Median	27	30	29	
IQR	23–32	25–33	25–33	
Unknown (n)	0	0	0	
BMI				0.005
Median	26.6	26.3	26.0	
IQR	22.7–32.6	22.6–31.0	22.3–31.2	
Unknown (n)	24	15	26	
Maternal race (n, %)				<0.001
Black	237 (17.5)	238 (19.0)	407 (17.8)	
White	981 (72.6)	778 (62.2)	1445 (63.1)	
Other	134 (9.9)	212 (16.9)	382 (16.7)	
Unknown (n)	0 (0.0)	23 (1.8)	55 (2.4)	
Maternal ethnicity (n, %)				0.028
Hispanic	504 (37.3)	515 (41.2)	925 (40.4)	
Non-Hispanic	848 (62.7)	734 (58.7)	1364 (59.6)	
Unknown (n)	0 (0.0)	2 (0.2)	0 (0.0)	
Maternal education level (n, %)				<0.001
No high school graduation	355 (26.3)	196 (15.7)	327 (14.3)	
High school degree/GED	656 (48.5)	579 (46.3)	1068 (46.7)	
College degree	329 (24.3)	472 (37.7)	877 (38.3)	
Unknown (n)	12 (0.9)	4 (0.3)	17 (0.7)	
Parity (n, %)				<0.001
Nulliparous (*P*=0)	475 (35.1)	518 (41.4)	981 (42.9)	
Multiparous (*P*≥1)	877 (64.9)	733 (58.6)	1308 (57.1)	
Unknown	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Previous PE (preterm + term) (n, %)				<0.001
No	790 (90.1)	664 (90.6)	1120 (85.6)	
Yes	87 (9.9)	69 (9.4)	188 (14.4)	
Unknown	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Chronic hypertension (n, %)				0.495
No	1264 (93.5)	1180 (94.3)	2161 (94.4)	
Yes	88 (6.5)	71 (5.7)	128 (5.6)	
Unknown (n)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Pregestational diabetes mellitus (n, %)				0.531
No	1281 (94.7)	1194 (95.4)	2165 (94.6)	
Yes	71 (5.3)	57 (4.6)	124 (5.4)	
Unknown (n)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Gestational age at blood draw (d)				<0.001
Median	140	136	137	
IQR	132–147	132–141	133–141	
Unknown (n)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Gestational age at delivery (d)				<0.001
Median	273	275	274	
IQR	266–278	268–281	269–280	
Unknown (n)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	
Neonatal length of hospital stay (d)				<0.001
Median	3	2	2	
IQR	2–3	2–3	2–3	
Unknown (n)	12	6	9	
Neonatal gender (n, %)				0.384
Female	666 (49.3)	618 (49.4)	1134 (49.5)	
Male	686 (50.7)	632 (50.5)	1152 (50.3)	
Ambiguous	0 (0.0)	1 (0.1)	0 (0.0)	
Unknown	0 (0.0)	0 (0.0)	3 (0.1)	

Categorical variables are shown with counts and percentages, and continuous variables are shown with medians and interquartile ranges. Comparison among the three cohorts was performed using Kruskal-

Wallis or chi squared tests as appropriate. Collection of neonatal hospital stay was capped at 28 days according to the PAPR[46] and TREETOP[47] study protocols.

BMI, body mass index; IQR, interquartile range; GED, general education diploma; NA, not applicable; PE, preeclampsia; PTB, preterm birth.

Table 3. Performance of the Clin3 + INHBC/SHBG classifier model for prediction of preterm preeclampsia by gestational age cutoff, risk score thresholds, and parity in the validation cohort restricted by early gestational age at ultrasound.

Cohort	Tested population	Preterm preeclampsia GA (weeks)	Cases/ Controls (%)	AUC (95% CI)	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV	SPR	LR+	LR-	OR
Validation cohort with early GA ultrasound	All parity	<37	29/883 (3.3)	0.82 (0.74 – 0.89)	76%	75%	9%	99%	26%	3.06	0.32	9.53
		<34	9/903 (1.0)	0.87 (0.80 – 0.93)	89%	75%	3%	100%	26%	3.54	0.15	23.82
		<32	4/908 (0.4)	0.89 (0.78 – 1.00)	50%	98%	12%	100%	2%	30.27	0.51	59.53
	Nulliparas	<37	15/361 (4.2)	0.81 (0.71 – 0.92)	53%	90%	8%	99%	12%	5.35	0.52	10.32
		<34	4/372 (1.1)	0.90 (0.81 – 0.98)	75%	83%	2%	100%	18%	4.29	0.30	14.17

CI, confidence interval; Clin3, composite clinical variable including preeclampsia in a previous pregnancy, pregestational hypertension, and pregestational diabetes; GA, gestational age; INHBC, inhibin subunit beta C chain; SHBG, sex hormone-binding globulin.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Distribution of subjects in the discovery, verification, and validation cohorts.

GA, gestational age.

Figure 2. Receiver operating characteristic performance for the preterm preeclampsia (PE) classifier Clin3 + INHBC/SHBG in the full validation cohort. The plots graph sensitivity (true positive rate) vs 1-specificity (false positive rate) for (A) all preterm PE cases with gestational age at delivery (GAD) <37 weeks, and (B) nulliparous subjects with preterm PE with GAD <37 and early preterm PE with GAD <34 weeks.

AUC, area under the receiver operating characteristic curve; CI, confidence interval; Clin3, composite clinical variable including preeclampsia in a previous pregnancy, pregestational hypertension, and pregestational diabetes; INHBC, inhibin subunit beta c; SHBG, sex hormone binding globulin.

Figure 3. Potential roles of INHBC and SHBG in placentation. (A) Activin C, a homodimer of INHBC, signals through the ALK7 receptor, which is itself dysregulated in preeclampsia. (B) SHBG expression has been demonstrated to be downregulated by pro-inflammatory cytokines in hepatocytes, and its extra-hepatic expression has been shown to include trophoblasts. (C) A model illustrating the association of INHBC, ALK7 and SHBG with abnormal placentation and aberrant spiral artery remodeling.

ActC, activin C, an INHBC homodimer; ACTRII, activin receptor type 2A; ALK7, activin A receptor type 1C; AMPK, AMP-activated protein kinase; c-Jun, Jun proto-oncogene, AP-1 transcription factor subunit; HNF-4α, hepatocyte nuclear factor 4 alpha; IκBα, NFκB inhibitor alpha; IL1β, interleukin 1 beta; IL1β, interleukin 1 beta receptor; INHBC, inhibin subunit beta c; JNK, mitogen-activated protein kinase 8; MEK1/2, mitogen-activated protein kinase kinases 1 and 2; MMP2/9, matrix metalloproteinases 2 and 9; NFκB, nuclear factor kappa B; SHBG, sex hormone binding globulin; SMAD2/3, SMAD family members 2 and 3; TIMP-1, TIMP metallopeptidase inhibitor 1; TNFα, tumor necrosis factor alpha; TNFRα, tumor necrosis factor alpha receptor.

SUPPLEMENTAL DATA

Supplemental Table 1. Summary of validation performance of each of the nine candidate classifier models. Score thresholds are specific to each classifier and differentiate subjects predicted to be at higher risk for preterm preeclampsia, defined as preeclampsia <37 weeks' gestation, from those predicted to be at lower risk. Three score thresholds were validated for each classifier to assess classification performance. The linear relationship between the gestational age at delivery and classifier prediction was assessed by the Pearson correlation coefficient. Validation performance is reported across the nine classifiers without protein specific batch calibration.

Classifier	AUC [95% CI]	1° threshold P value	2° threshold P value	3° threshold P value	Pearson correlation coefficient r	Pearson correlation coefficient P value
Clin3 + INHBC/SHBG	0.78 [0.73-0.84]	7.26×10^{-13}	2.69×10^{-12}	3.64×10^{-11}	-0.275	2.20×10^{-04}
Clin3 + IBP4/SHBG + AFAM/PRG2	0.77 [0.71-0.83]	4.13×10^{-12}	1.30×10^{-11}	2.26×10^{-11}	-0.29	1.19×10^{-04}
Clin3 + AFAM/SHBG	0.76 [0.69-0.82]	7.36×10^{-11}	7.46×10^{-11}	4.22×10^{-13}	-0.24	1.25×10^{-03}
Clin3 + CD14/SHBG	0.76 [0.70-0.82]	5.27×10^{-12}	1.24×10^{-10}	3.03×10^{-10}	-0.26	4.44×10^{-04}
Clin3 + IBP4/SHBG + AFAM/CSH†	0.76 [0.69-0.82]	6.04×10^{-12}	4.61×10^{-11}	4.22×10^{-11}	-0.25	9.17×10^{-04}
Clin3 + IBP4/SHBG + CD14/PRG2	0.76 [0.70-0.83]	4.61×10^{-11}	2.47×10^{-13}	1.25×10^{-11}	-0.29	7.53×10^{-05}
Clin3 + IBP4/SHBG + PEDF/CSH†	0.76 [0.70-0.82]	1.89×10^{-11}	1.63×10^{-11}	1.51×10^{-11}	-0.26	4.32×10^{-04}
Clin3 + IBP4/SHBG + PEDF/CBPN	0.73 [0.67-0.80]	1.20×10^{-11}	2.00×10^{-11}	4.22×10^{-10}	-0.24	1.16×10^{-03}
Clin3 + IBP4/SHBG + CD14/CBPN	0.72 [0.66-0.79]	1.60×10^{-10}	3.08×10^{-11}	1.28×10^{-10}	-0.25	9.96×10^{-04}

†Represents CSH1 and CSH2. The two proteins differ by one amino acid residue, which is not included in the peptide fragment measured by the predictor.

AFAM, afamin; AUC, area under the receiver operating characteristic curve; CBPN, carboxypeptidase N catalytic chain; CD14, monocyte differentiation antigen CD14; CI, confidence interval; Clin3, composite clinical variable including preeclampsia in a previous pregnancy, pregestational hypertension, and pregestational diabetes; CSH, chorionic somatomammotropin hormone 1/2; IBP4, insulin-like growth factor-binding protein 4; PEDF, pigment epithelium-derived factor; PRG2, bone marrow proteoglycan; SHBG, sex hormone-binding globulin.

Supplemental Table 2. Performance of the Clin3 + INHBC/SHBG classifier model for prediction of

preterm preeclampsia by gestational age cutoff, risk score threshold, and parity in the full validation

cohort.

Cohort	Tested population	Preterm preeclampsia GA (weeks)	Cases/Controls (%)	AUC (95% CI)	Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV	SPR	LR+	LR-	OR
Full validation cohort	All parity	<37	62/2261 (2.7)	0.79 (0.74 − 0.85)	71%	74%	7%	99%	27%	2.77	0.39	7.10
		<34	26/2261 (1.1)	0.83 (0.78 − 0.89)	81%	74%	4%	100%	26%	3.14	0.26	12.13
		<32	12/2261 (0.5)	0.83 (0.73 − 0.93)	25%	98%	8%	100%	2%	15.62	0.76	20.49
	Nulliparas	<37	31/969 (3.1)	0.76 (0.68 − 0.85)	45%	88%	5%	99%	13%	3.7	0.62	6
		<34	13/969 (1.3)	0.81 (0.73 − 0.90)	62%	81%	3%	99%	20%	3.23	0.48	6.80

CI, confidence interval; Clin3, composite clinical variable including preeclampsia in a previous pregnancy, pregestational hypertension, and pregestational diabetes; GA, gestational age; INHBC, inhibin subunit beta C chain; SHBG, sex hormone-binding globulin.