Deciphering autoantibody landscape of systemic sclerosis through systems-based

approach: insights from a B-cell depletion clinical trial

Kazuki M Matsuda, MD, PhD,[1] Satoshi Ebata, MD, PhD, [1] Kazuhiro Iwadoh, MD,

PhD,[1] Hirohito Kotani, MD, PhD,[1] Teruyoshi Hisamoto, MD, PhD,[1] Ai Kuzumi, MD,

PhD,[1] Takemichi Fukasawa MD, PhD,[1,2] Asako Yoshizaki-Ogawa, MD, PhD,[1] Shinichi

Sato, MD, PhD, [1] Ayumi Yoshizaki, MD, PhD[1,2#]

1. Department of Dermatology, The University of Tokyo Graduate School of Medicine,

Tokyo, Japan

2. Department of Clinical Cannabinoid Research, The University of Tokyo Graduate

School of Medicine, Tokyo, Japan

 # Corresponding author

Ayumi Yoshizaki, MD, PhD

Department of Dermatology and Department of Clinical Cannabinoid Research, The

University of Tokyo Graduate School of Medicine, 7-3-1, Hongo, Bunkyo-ku, Tokyo,

Japan, 1138655

Phone: +81-3-3815-5411

ORCID: 0000-0002-8194-9140

E-mail: ayuyoshi@me.com

____

Abstract

Systemic sclerosis (SSc) is a progressive fibrotic disorder with a high mortality

rate, characterized by extensive autoantibody production. Despite recent advancements,

effective treatments remain limited. Rituximab (RTX), a B-cell depleting agent, has

shown promise in clinical trials. The DESIRES trial highlighted the reduction in

modified Rodnan Skin Score (mRSS) and the association between serum

immunoglobulin levels and RTX responsiveness. We employed proteome-wide

autoantibody screening (PWAS) using wet protein arrays (WPAs) that display 13,455

human autoantigens to analyze serum samples from SSc patients in the DESIRES trial

and age- and sex-matched healthy controls (HCs). As a result, the sum of autoantibody

levels (SAL) was significantly higher in SSc patients compared to HCs. High

responders (HRs) to RTX showed a greater initial SAL and significant reductions

post-treatment, unlike low responders (LRs). Machine learning identified specific

autoantibodies linked to disease status, and 58 autoantibodies were identified as

clinically relevant. Some of those autoantibodies targeted membrane proteins including

G protein-coupled receptors, associated with better differentiation between HRs and

LRs. Our findings underscore the significance of autoantibodies in SSc pathogenesis

and their potential role in predicting RTX responsiveness. This comprehensive

autoantibody profiling could enhance diagnostic and therapeutic strategies, and

moreover, better understanding of the pathophysiology of SSc.

Introduction

Systemic sclerosis (SSc) is a progressive fibrotic disorder that affects both the skin and internal organs.[1] Among connective tissue diseases, it has the poorest prognosis, with an approximate 30% mortality rate within ten years.[2] Historically, treatment options for SSc have been limited. While the exact cause of SSc remains unclear, increasing evidence indicates that B cells play a significant role in the pathogenesis.[3–5] They contribute by producing autoantibodies, secreting unique cytokines, and activating other immune cells. Reflecting this understanding, various B-cell targeting therapeutic modalities, monoclonal antibodies,[6–8] Bruton's tyrosine kinase inhibitors,[9] and chimeric antigen receptor (CAR) T-cell therapies,[10–12] are emerging as promising treatments for SSc.

Rituximab (RTX) is a chimeric monoclonal antibody that depletes circulating B cells by targeting the B-cell specific antigen CD20. Previously, we conducted a double-blind, investigator-initiated, randomized, placebo-controlled trial, or the DESIRES trial,[13] which demonstrated significant superiority of RTX over placebo by the absolute reduction of modified Rodnan Skin Score (mRSS) 24 weeks after initiation of the study period. The open-label extension of this trial also revealed the long-term

efficacy and safety of RTX on SSc,[14] as well as the association between decrease in

serum immunoglobulins and greater clinical response to RTX.[15]

The emergence of autoantibodies is a prominent feature of SSc, highlighting its

nature as an autoimmune disorder. Anti-nuclear antibodies (ANAs), detected through

indirect immunofluorescence on HEp-2 cells, are present in more than 90% of patients

with SSc.[16] Several ANAs are specific to SSc or are closely associated with distinct

clinical subsets. For instance, anti-topoisomerase I antibodies (ATA) are strongly linked

to diffuse skin sclerosis and severe interstitial lung disease (ILD), while anti-centromere

antibodies (ACA) are primarily associated with limited skin and lung involvement.[17]

However, the pathogenicity of these ANAs is debated, as they cannot reach their targets

across the plasma and nuclear membranes *in vivo*. Additionally, the DESIRES trials

revealed that serum ATA levels did not decrease,[13,14] indicating that the relationship

between serum immunoglobulin levels and responsiveness to RTX cannot be explained

by ATA levels.

Herein, we employed our original technique for proteome-wide autoantibody

screening (PWAS) using wet protein arrays (WPAs) that cover approximately 90% of

the human transcriptome.[18,19] This technique has previously been used to develop

multiplex measurements for disease-related autoantibodies,[20,21] identify clinically

relevant novel autoantibodies,[22,23] and investigate inter- and intra-molecular epitope

spreading during the disease course. We applied PWAS to serum samples from SSc

patients who participated in the DESIRES trial, as well as sex- and age-matched healthy

controls (HCs). Our aim was to elucidate the autoantibody landscape in SSc and

investigate clusters of autoantibodies that contribute to the reduction of serum

immunoglobulin levels associated with a good response to RTX in SSc patients. This

research seeks to identify novel biomarkers and gain a better understanding of the

pathogenesis of SSc.

Results

Subjects

In the DESIRES trial (NCT04274257), a total of 56 individuals diagnosed with

SSc were evenly randomized into two groups: 28 received RTX and 28 received a

placebo.[13] Serum samples were collected at the start and after 24 weeks of treatment

from participants who completed the term. These samples were reacted with WPAs for

PWAS (**Figure 1A**). After excluding samples that were not suitable for PWAS, such as

those containing anti-GST-tag antibodies, the study proceeded with 24 patients in the

RTX group and 21 patients in the placebo group. The baseline characteristics of the two

groups were comparable (**Table 1**). An equal number of age- and sex-matched healthy

controls (HCs) were also included in the study (**Figure 1B**).

The sum of autoantibody levels

We defined the sum of autoantibody levels (SAL) as the total serum

concentration of all autoantibodies assessed in our PWAS. SAL was significantly higher

in SSc patients compared to HCs at the baseline ($P < 0.0001$; **Figure 1C**). Subsequently,

we categorized the RTX treatment group into two subgroups based on their response to

treatment (**Figure 1D**): high responders (HRs; n = 11) and low responders (LRs; n = 13).

Initially, SAL was significantly greater in the HR group compared to the LR group (P <

0.05; **Figure 1E**). Additionally, SAL levels decreased significantly from week 0 to

week 24 in the HR group (P < 0.05), whereas changes in the LR group were not

statistically significant. This pattern persisted across all age groups (**Extended Figure**

1A). In contrast, serum levels of well-known SSc-related autoantibodies, including

anti-topoisomerase I antibodies (ATA), anti-centromere antibodies (ACA), and

anti-RNA polymerase III antibodies (ARA), did not follow this trend, as observed both

in clinical-standard ELISA tests (**Figure 1F**) and in our PWAS (**Extended Figure 1B**).

Machine learning

To determine which autoantibodies were driving the association between the

SAL and disease status, we firstly utilized nine machine learning frameworks. Notably,

Lasso regression, Ridge regression, SVM with normalization, XGBoost, and LightGBM

achieved an area under the receiver-operator characteristics curve (ROC-AUC)

exceeding 0.96, demonstrating an almost perfect ability to distinguish between SSc

patients and HCs (**Table 2**). We identified the top 10 features in these six models

(**Extended Figure 2A**), examined their inclusion relationships (**Extended Figure 2B**),

and explored the prevalence of highlighted autoantibodies across a broader range of

human disorders using the aUToAntiBody Comprehensive Database (UT-ABCD).[24]

Most of these autoantibodies were found to be non-specifically elevated in various

pathological conditions, except for well-known SSc-specific autoantibodies such as

ATA and ARA (**Extended Figure 2C**). Attempts to distinguish between HRs and LRs

based on pre-treatment autoantibody profiles did not yield satisfactory precision

(**Extended Table 1**).

Investigating clinically relevant autoantibodies

We next sought to identify autoantibodies significantly associated with the

clinical features of SSc using the trial data that included longitudinal changes. Initially,

we selected autoantibodies that were significantly elevated in SSc patients compared to

HCs at baseline (**Figure 2A**). Next, we chose autoantibodies that were significantly

higher in HRs compared to LRs (**Figure 2B**). Lastly, we focused on autoantibodies

whose serum concentrations significantly decreased from week 0 to week 24 in HRs

(**Figure 2C**). As a result, 58 autoantibodies were identified as candidates for clinically

relevant autoantibodies in SSc (**Figure 2D**). Principal component analysis (PCA)

indicated that these 58 autoantibodies appear to distinguish HRs at week 0 within the

dataset (**Figure 2E**). The sum of the serum levels of these autoantibodies displayed a

pattern like SAL, but in a more pronounced manner (**Figure 2F**). Consistently,

ROC-AUC analysis showed that these 58 autoantibodies provide better differentiation

between SSc patients and HCs compared to the complete autoantibody profile (**Figure**

2G), and moreover, distinguish between HRs and LRs with nearly perfect precision

(**Figure 2H**).

Profiling candidate autoantibodies

To explore the molecular features of the human proteins targeted by the

identified candidate autoantibodies, we conducted gene ontology enrichment analyses

utilizing Metascape.[25] Notably, whereas established SSc-related autoantibodies

primarily target intracellular antigens, our findings emphasized membrane proteins

associated with processes such as "import across plasma membrane" and "peptide G

protein-coupled receptors (GPCRs)" (**Figure 3A**). There were four autoantibodies

linked to each of the processes "import across plasma membrane" and "peptide GPCRs"

(**Figure 3B**). Autoantibodies associated with plasma membrane import included those

targeting presenilin 1 (PSEN1), solute carrier family 22 member 2 (SLC22A2), transient

receptor potential cation channel subfamily V member 5 (TRPV5), and solute carrier

family 46 member 1 (SLC46A1; **Figure 3C**). The group related to peptide GPCRs

comprised autoantibodies against chemokine receptor 8 (CCR8), formyl peptide

receptor 1 (FPR1), melanocortin 1 receptor (MC1R), and G protein-coupled receptor 63

(GPR63; **Figure 3E**). The associations between each autoantibody and the clinical

characteristics of SSc were detailed in **Figures 3D and 3F**, which highlighted positive

correlation between anti-TRPV5 and anti-CCR8 antibody levels and mRSS, as well as

negative correlation between anti-FPR1 antibody levels and forced lung capacity. We

also investigated the distribution of these highlighted autoantibodies in a broader

population, utilizing UT-ABCD. As a result, all the items were not specific to SSc

(**Extended Figure 3**).

The tissue specificity of the highlighted autoantigens was investigated using

publicly available databases. Analysis of multiple human tissues through bulk RNA

sequencing data from the Human Protein Atlas[26] revealed that *CCR8* and *FPR1* are

enriched in bone marrow and lymphoid tissues (**Extended Figure 4, A and B**).

Single-cell RNA sequencing data from the Tabula Sapiens project[27] showed that *CCR8*

expression is enhanced in regulatory T cells (Tregs; **Extended Figure 4C**), while *FPR1*

expression is elevated in neutrophils (**Extended Figure 4D**). Meanwhile, *TRPV5*

expression was localized in the kidney, and *MC1R* expression appeared to be relatively

ubiquitous across different tissues.

Weighted correlation network analysis

We utilized weighted correlated network analysis (WGCNA)[28] to delve deeper

into the correlations between autoantibodies in SSc. Our study included 135 specimens

from SSc patients at weeks 0 and 24, as well as HCs. We constructed a correlation

network for all autoantibodies evaluated in our PWAS and identified 57 distinct

modules (**Figure 4A**). The "turquoise" module, which contained ATA, also included

half of the candidate autoantibodies: anti-TRPV5, CCR8, MC1R, and GPR63

antibodies (**Figure 4B**). The "darkmagenta" module included ARA. The "tan" module

included ACA. The other candidate autoantibodies did not appear in either the

"darkmagenta" or "tan" modules. We also conducted gene ontology analyses on the

gene lists encoding proteins targeted by autoantibodies within these three modules

(**Extended Table 2**). The Enrichment score was the highest for "mitochondrion

organization" in the "turquoise" module (**Figure 4C**). The enrichment scores for

"regulation of cellular response to stress" were highest in the "turquoise" module,

moderate in the "darkmagenta" module, and lowest in the "tan" module. This pattern

aligns with the clinical severity associated with ATA, ARA, and ACA.

We also reviewed the associations between each module and clinical traits

(**Figure 4D**). The "turquoise" module was positively linked to ATA, a higher modified

Rodnan Skin Score (mRSS) – the primary endpoint of the DESIRES trial – as well as to

lower patient-reported quality of life, evidenced by higher Health Assessment

Questionnaire (HAQ) scores and lower 36-Item Short Form Health Survey (SF-36)

scores. The "darkmagenta" module was associated with ARA positivity and higher

forced vital capacity of the lungs, indicating a lower degree of ILD. The "tan" module

was correlated with the ACA profile but did not show any significant associations with

other clinical traits

Discussion

In this study, we applied our original PWAS technique subjecting serum

samples from SSc patients who participated in the DESIRES trial, along with sex and

age-matched HCs. Our findings revealed a significant elevation in the overall amount of

autoantibodies in SSc patients compared to HCs (**Figure 1**). We identified 58

autoantibodies as clinically relevant candidates in SSc, which showed a strong response

to B-cell depletion therapy (**Figure 2**). Gene ontology analysis highlighted

autoantibodies targeting membranous proteins, including transmembrane transporters

and GPCRs (**Figure 3**). Most of them were clustered in the same module identified by

WGCNA, which was significantly associated with ATA positivity, higher mRSS, and

lower patient-reported quality of life (**Figure 4**). We demonstrated the nearly perfect

distinction between SSc and HC samples achieved through machine learning (**Table 2**),

and SSc patients who show good response to RTX treatment engaging the clinically

relevant autoantibodies highlighted in our analyses (**Figure 2H**). These results

underscore the effectiveness of our integrating systems-based comprehensive

autoantibody screening and bioinformatic analyses, which could be called as

"autoantigenomics."[29]

Our machine learning analysis confirmed the prominence of well-known

SSc-specific ANAs such as ATA and ARA (**Extended Figure 2**). However, these

autoantibodies did not exhibit longitudinal changes during the clinical trial nor

differences between HRs and LRs to RTX treatment (**Figure 1F and Extended Figure**

1B), consistent with our previous findings.[13,14] In contrast, we observed that changes in

the overall levels of autoantibodies were significantly correlated with RTX efficacy

(**Figure 1, C and E**). This discrepancy led us to investigate autoantibodies that exhibit

significant associations with the time course and drug response to RTX therapy. While

predictive factors for RTX responsiveness have been limited to clinical indicators such

as CD19-positive cell counts, mRSS, and serum levels of SP-D,[30] the clinically relevant

autoantibodies we identified were able to discriminate between HRs and LRs with high

accuracy (**Figure 2H**). Interestingly, some of these autoantibodies targeted membranous

antigens (**Figure 3**), suggesting that they are not only useful as biomarkers but also

could play a direct role in the pathogenesis of SSc.

Accumulating evidence has unveiled the relevance of autoantibodies targeting

GPCRs in immune-related human disorders, including SSc.[31,32] Notably, previous

studies have indicated the relationship between GPCRs targeted by the candidate

autoantibodies and the pathogenesis of SSc. CCR8 is primarily expressed on Tregs

(**Extended Figure 4C**), which suppress autoimmune responses.[33] CC Chemokine 1

(CCL1) acts as a chemoattractant, recruiting Tregs to peripheral tissues by binding to

CCR8.[34] While direct evidence linking the CCR8-CCL1 axis to SSc pathogenesis is

lacking, blocking CCR8 could exacerbate autoimmune responses in SSc by inhibiting

Treg homing to target tissues. FPR1, which is abundantly expressed on neutrophils

(**Extended Figure 4D**), induces inflammation when bound by its cognate ligands.[35]

One such endogenous agonist is N-formyl-methionine (fMet), a mitochondrial

protein-derived molecule that serves as a damage-associated molecular pattern.[36] Lurley

R et al. have shown in SSc, elevated serum fMet levels and fMet-induced activation of

neutrophils through FPR1-dependent mechanisms.[37] Consistent with these findings, our

enrichment analysis highlighted mitochondrion-associated antigens targeted by

autoantibodies in SSc (**Figure 4C**), suggesting mitochondrial destruction, which has

also been reported in other autoimmune conditions such as systemic lupus

erythematosus and rheumatoid arthritis. MC1R is expressed on various cell types

(**Extended Figure 4B**), including melanocytes, inflammatory cells, endothelial cells,[38]

and skin fibroblasts from SSc patients.[39] Its endogenous ligand,

α-melanocyte-stimulating hormone, induces melanin production in melanocytes and

promotes anti-inflammatory responses, such as inhibition of nuclear factor-κB and

suppression of pro-inflammatory cytokines.[40] Kondo M et al. demonstrated that

dersimelagon (MT-7117), an oral MC1R agonist, has favorable effects on inflammation,

vascular dysfunction, and fibrosis, which are key pathologies in preclinical SSc

models.[41] This prompted a phase 2 clinical trial to evaluate the efficacy and tolerability

of MT-7117 in patients with early, progressive diffuse cutaneous SSc (NCT04440592).

Collectively, accumulating experimental and clinical evidence suggests that modulating

these GPCRs, either through stimulation or blockade, could potentially alter SSc disease

severity.

Meanwhile, it is important to note that the serum levels of the candidate

autoantibodies we identified were relatively modest compared to conventional

SSc-specific autoantibodies like ATA (**Extended Figure 1B**). Moreover, the presence

of these candidate autoantibodies did not appear to be specific to SSc, as indicated by

data from UT-ABCD (**Extended Figure 3A and 3B**). These suggest that the

pathogenesis of SSc may not be attributed to a single unique autoantibody that shows

strong cross-reactivity with conventional SSc-specific autoantibodies, but rather to a

collaboration of multiple autoantibodies. This hypothesis aligns with several

observations that suggest that SSc is a multifactorial disease, involving a combination

of various autoantibodies and other factors rather than a single causative factor. First,

genome-wide association studies have not identified a single gene mutation strongly

linked to SSc.[42] Second, the disease concordance in twins is modest and similar

between monozygotic and dizygotic twins, further supporting the notion that SSc is not

caused only by genetic factors.[43] Finally, and most importantly, the clinical

manifestations of SSc are highly heterogeneous.[1]

Alternatively, a cluster of several autoantibodies, with combinations that vary

among patients, might explain the heterogeneity of clinical manifestations in SSc.[44]

Co-localization of ATA and candidate autoantibodies within the same module identified

by WGCNA, as well as the distribution of ATA, ARA, and ACA among different

modules (**Figure 4**), support this hypothesis. Such clustering of autoantibodies might

result from cross reaction with a single specific exogenous antigen such as viruses,[45,46]

or intermolecular epitope spreading, a phenomenon we have recently demonstrated to

be involved in SSc progression using the same WPA system.[47] Further research is

needed to unravel the relationships among these autoantibodies and their collective

contribution to SSc development. This research should include comparisons of

structural similarity and epitope mapping for the relevant antigens, and longitudinal

serological monitoring in each case. Understanding these interactions will be crucial for

comprehensively elucidating the mechanisms underlying the autoimmune aspect of SSc

and potentially identifying new therapeutic targets.

Our study has several notable strengths. Firstly, the data presented is derived

from a prospective, randomized, placebo-controlled clinical trial, which includes two

time points (before and after RTX therapy). This adherence to good clinical practice

ensures high data accuracy. Secondly, the use of the wheat-germ *in vitro* protein

synthesis system and the manipulation technique for WPAs enabled high-throughput

expression of a variety of human proteins, including membranous proteins, on a single

platform.[18] As a result, our autoantibody measurement could encompass a wider range

of antigens at an almost proteome-wide level, allowing for the application of

omics-based bioinformatics approaches to interpret the data.[24] Meanwhile, one major

limitation is the lack of functional assays both *in vitro* and *in vivo*. Further investigation

is needed to determine whether the candidate autoantibodies we identified act as

agonists or antagonists to their target proteins, and whether they influence the

pathophysiology of SSc. Moreover, the value of autoantibodies we identified for

predicting treatment response to RTX should be validated in external cohorts in

real-world clinical settings.

References

1.   Allanore, Y. *et al.* Systemic sclerosis. *Nat. Rev. Dis. Prim.* **1**, 1–21 (2015).

2.   Rubio-Rivas, M., Royo, C., Simeón, C. P., Corbella, X. & Fonollosa, V.

Mortality and survival in systemic sclerosis: Systematic review and

meta-analysis. *Semin. Arthritis Rheum.* **44**, 208–219 (2014).

3.   Hasegawa, M. *et al.* B-lymphocyte depletion reduces skin fibrosis and

autoimmunity in the tight-skin mouse model for systemic sclerosis. *Am. J. Pathol.*

169, 954–66 (2006).

4.   Numajiri, H. *et al.* B Cell Depletion Inhibits Fibrosis via Suppression of

Profibrotic Macrophage Differentiation in a Mouse Model of Systemic Sclerosis.

Arthritis Rheumatol. **73**, 2086–2095 (2021).

5.   Fukasawa, T. *et al.* Single-cell-level protein analysis revealing the roles of

autoantigen-reactive B lymphocytes in autoimmune disease and the murine

model. doi:10.7554/eLife.

6.   Daoussis, D. *et al.* A multicenter, open-label, comparative study of B-cell

depletion therapy with Rituximab for systemic sclerosis-associated interstitial

lung disease. *Semin. Arthritis Rheum.* **46**, 625–631 (2017).

7.   Sircar, G., Goswami, R. P., Sircar, D., Ghosh, A. & Ghosh, P. Intravenous

cyclophosphamide vs rituximab for the treatment of early diffuse scleroderma

lung disease: Open label, randomized, controlled trial. *Rheumatol. (United*

Kingdom) **57**, 2106–2113 (2018).

8.   Ebata, S. *et al.* Rituximab therapy is more effective than cyclophosphamide

therapy for Japanese patients with anti-topoisomerase I-positive systemic

sclerosis-associated interstitial lung disease. *J. Dermatol.* **46**, 1006–1013 (2019).

9.   Einhaus, J. *et al.* Inhibition of effector B cells by ibrutinib in systemic sclerosis.

Arthritis Res. Ther. **22**, 1–8 (2020).

10.   Bergmann, C. *et al.* Treatment of a patient with severe systemic sclerosis (SSc)

using CD19-targeted CAR T cells. *Ann. Rheum. Dis.* **82**, 1117–1120 (2023).

11.   Merkt, W. *et al.* Third-generation CD19.CAR-T cell-containing combination

therapy in Scl70+ systemic sclerosis. *Ann. Rheum. Dis.* **83**, 543 LP – 546 (2024).

12.   Fabian, M. *et al.* CD19 CAR T-Cell Therapy in Autoimmune Disease — A Case

Series with Follow-up. *N. Engl. J. Med.* **390**, 687–700 (2024).

13.   Ebata, S. *et al.* Safety and efficacy of rituximab in systemic sclerosis

(DESIRES): a double-blind, investigator-initiated, randomised,

placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet Rheumatol.* **3**, e489–e497 (2021).

14.   Ebata, S. *et al.* Safety and efficacy of rituximab in systemic sclerosis

346   (DESIRES): open-label extension of a double-blind, investigators-initiated,

347   randomised, placebo-controlled trial. *Lancet Rheumatol.* **4**, e546–e555 (2022).

348   15.   Kuzumi, A. *et al.* Long-term Outcomes After Rituximab Treatment for Patients

349   With Systemic Sclerosis: Follow-up of the DESIRES Trial With a Focus on

350   Serum Immunoglobulin Levels. *JAMA Dermatology* **159**, 374–383 (2023).

351   16.   Okano, Y. Antinuclear antibody in systemic sclerosis (scleroderma). *Rheum Dis*

352   *Clin North Am* **22**, 709–35 (1996).

353   17.   Nihtyanova, S. I. & Denton, C. P. Autoantibodies as predictive tools in systemic

354   sclerosis. *Nat. Rev. Rheumatol.* **6**, 112–116 (2010).

355   18.   Goshima, N. *et al.* Human protein factory for converting the transcriptome into

356   an in vitro-expressed proteome. *Nat. Methods* **5**, 1011–1017 (2008).

357   19.   Fukuda, E. *et al.* Identification and characterization of the antigen recognized by

358   the germ cell mAb TRA98 using a human comprehensive wet protein array.

359   *Genes to Cells* **26**, 180–189 (2021).

360   20.   Matsuda, K. M. *et al.* Autoantibody Landscape Revealed by Wet Protein

361   Array□: Sum of Autoantibody Levels Re fl ects Disease Status. *Front. Immunol.*

362   **13**, 1–14 (2022).

21.   Kuzumi, A. *et al.* Comprehensive autoantibody profiling in systemic

autoimmunity by a highly-sensitive multiplex protein array. *Front. Immunol.* **14**,

(2023).

22.   Matsuda, K. M., Kotani, H., Yamaguchi, K., Okumura, T. & Fukuda, E.

Significance of anti-transcobalamin receptor antibodies in cutaneous arteritis

revealed by proteome-wide autoantibody screening. *J. Autoimmun.* **135**, 102995

(2023).

23.   Matsuda, K. M. *et al.* Autoantibodies to nuclear valosin-containing protein-like

protein: systemic   sclerosis-specific antibodies revealed by in vitro human

proteome. *Rheumatology (Oxford).* (2024) doi:10.1093/rheumatology/keae063.

24.   Matsuda, K. M. *et al.* Proteome-wide autoantibody screening and holistic

autoantigenomic analysis unveil COVID-19 signature of autoantibody landscape.

medRxiv 2024.06.07.24308592 (2024).

25.   Zhou, Y. *et al.* Metascape provides a biologist-oriented resource for the analysis

of systems-level datasets. *Nat. Commun.* **10**, 1523 (2019).

26.   Fagerberg, L. *et al.* Analysis of the human tissue-specific expression by

genome-wide integration of transcriptomics and antibody-based proteomics. *Mol.*

Cell. Proteomics **13**, 397–406 (2014).

27. The Tabula Sapiens Consortium. The Tabula Sapiens: A multiple-organ,

single-cell transcriptomic atlas of humans. *Science (80-.).* **376**, eabl4896 (2022).

28. Langfelder, P. & Horvath, S. WGCNA: An R package for weighted correlation

network analysis. *BMC Bioinformatics* **9**, (2008).

29. Moritz, C. P. *et al.* Autoantigenomics: Holistic characterization of autoantigen

repertoires for a better understanding of autoimmune diseases. *Autoimmun. Rev.*

19, 102450 (2020).

30. Matsuda, K. M. *et al.* Development of a prediction model of treatment response

in patients with cutaneous arteritis □: Insights from a cohort of 33 patients. *J.*

Dermatol. **48**, 1021–1026 (2021).

31. Cabral-Marques, O. *et al.* GPCR-specific autoantibody signatures are associated

with physiological and pathological immune homeostasis. *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 5224

(2018).

32. Akbarzadeh, R., Müller, A., Humrich, J. Y. & Riemekasten, G. When natural

antibodies become pathogenic: autoantibodies targeted against G

protein-coupled receptors in the pathogenesis of systemic sclerosis. *Front.*

Immunol. **14**, 1213804 (2023).

33.   Barsheshet, Y. *et al.* CCR8+FOXp3+ Treg cells as master drivers of immune

399   regulation. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **114**, 6086–6091 (2017).

400   34.   Tiffany, H. L. *et al.* Identification of CCR8: a human monocyte and thymus

401   receptor for the CC chemokine   I-309. *J. Exp. Med.* **186**, 165–170 (1997).

402   35.   Mcdonald, B. *et al.* Intravascular Danger Signals Guide Neutrophils to Sites of

403   Sterile Inflammation. *Science (80-.).* **330**, 362–367 (2011).

404   36.   Zhang, Q. *et al.* Circulating mitochondrial DAMPs cause inflammatory responses

405   to injury. *Nature* **464**, 104–107 (2010).

406   37.   Kuley, R. *et al.* N-Formyl Methionine Peptide- Mediated Neutrophil Activation

407   in Systemic Sclerosis. *Front. Immunol.* **12**, 1–12 (2022).

408   38.   Getting, S. J. Targeting melanocortin receptors as potential novel therapeutics.

409   *Pharmacol. Ther.* **111**, 1–15 (2006).

410   39.   Kokot, A. *et al.* α-melanocyte–stimulating hormone suppresses

411   bleomycin-induced collagen synthesis and reduces tissue fibrosis in a mouse

412   model of scleroderma: Melanocortin peptides as a novel treatment strategy for

413   scleroderma? *Arthritis Rheum.* **60**, 592–603 (2009).

414   40.   Wang, W., Guo, D.-Y., Lin, Y.-J. & Tao, Y.-X. Melanocortin Regulation of

415   Inflammation. *Front. Endocrinol. (Lausanne).* **10**, (2019).

416   41.   Kondo, M. *et al.* Dersimelagon, a novel oral melanocortin 1 receptor agonist,

417   demonstrates disease-modifying effects in preclinical models of systemic

418   sclerosis. *Arthritis Res. Ther.* **24**, 1–17 (2022).

419   42.   Ishikawa, Y. *et al.* GWAS for systemic sclerosis identifies six novel

420   susceptibility loci including one in the Fcγ receptor region. *Nat. Commun.* **15**,

421   319 (2024).

422   43.   Feghali-Bostwick, C., Medsger, T. A. J. & Wright, T. M. Analysis of systemic

423   sclerosis in twins reveals low concordance for disease and   high concordance

424   for the presence of antinuclear antibodies. *Arthritis Rheum.* **48**, 1956–1963

425   (2003).

426   44.   Kuzumi, A., Norimatsu, Y. & Matsuda, K. M. Comprehensive autoantibody pro

427   fi ling in systemic autoimmunity by a highly- sensitive multiplex protein array.

428   1–14 (2023) doi:10.3389/fimmu.2023.1255540.

429   45.   Lunardi, C. *et al.* Systemic sclerosis immunoglobulin G autoantibodies bind the

430   human cytomegalovirus late protein UL94 and induce apoptosis in human

431   endothelial cells. *Nat. Med.* **6**, 1183–1186 (2000).

432   46.   Ohtsuka, T. & Yamazaki, S. Increased prevalence of human parvovirus B19

433   DNA in systemic sclerosis skin. *Br. J. Dermatol.* **150**, 1091–1095 (2004).

434   47.   Kotani, H. *et al.* Diversity and epitope spreading of anti-RNA polymerase ▯

435   antibodies in systemic sclerosis: a potential biomarker for skin and lung

436   involvement. *Arthritis Rheumatol.* **in press**, (2024).

437   48.   Ho, D., Imai, K., King, G. & Stuart, E. A. MatchIt: Nonparametric Preprocessing

438   for Parametric Causal Inference. *J. Stat. Softw.* **42**, 1–28 (2011).

439   49.   Khanna, D. *et al.* Standardization of the modified Rodnan skin score for use in

440   clinical trials of systemic sclerosis. *J. Scleroderma Relat. Disord.* **2**, 11–8 (2017).

441   50.   Khanna, D. *et al.* Minimally important difference in diffuse systemic sclerosis:

442   results from the D-penicillamine study. *Ann. Rheum. Dis.* **65**, 1325–1329 (2006).

Acknowledgements

445   We thank Ms. Maiko Enomoto and her colleagues for their secretarial work.

447   We appreciate K. Yamaguchi, T. Okumura, C. Ono, A. Sato, A. Miya, and N. Goshima

448   from ProteoBridge Corporation for preparing the WPAs. We also acknowledge R.

449   Uchino, Y. Murakami, and H. Matsunaka from TOKIWA Pharmaceuticals Co. Ltd. for

450   providing technical assistance with autoantibody measurement.

Author Contributions

KM Matsuda primarily engaged in autoantibody measurement, clinical data

collection, data analysis, visualization, and writing the first draft of the manuscript. K

Iwadoh participated in machine learning analysis. S Ebata was primarily engaged in the

management of SSc patients participated in the DESIRES trial. H Kotani, A Kuzumi, T

Fukasawa, A Yoshizaki-Ogawa took part in the sample collection of SSc. S Sato

conceptualized and supervised the study. A Yoshizaki conceptualized, launched, and

supervised this study, and was involved in revising the manuscript.

Conflict-of-interest statement

T Fukasawa and A Yoshizaki belong to the Social Cooperation Program, Department of Clinical Cannabinoid Research, The University of Tokyo Graduate School of Medicine, Tokyo, Japan, supported by Japan Cosmetic Association and Japan Federation of Medium and Small Enterprise Organizations. The remaining authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.

468 **Funding**

469   The DESIRES trial was funded by Japan Agency for Medical Research and

470 Development (AMED, grant number JP19ek0109299) and Zenyaku Kogyo Co, Ltd,

471 Japan. As the trial was an investigator-initiated clinical trial, the funders were not

472 involved in any way in the designing, analysis, interpretation, or drafting of the study.

Methods

Study Design

The study design for the DESIRES trial has been previously reported

(NCT04274257).[13] The full protocol of the trial is available at

https://clinicaltrials.gov/study/NCT04274257. Briefly, the DESIRES trial was a

randomized, double-blind, placebo-controlled trial of 24 weeks. The primary endpoint

of the double-blind phase was the absolute change in mRSS 24 weeks after [13]

intervention initiation compared to the baseline. In total, 56 patients were randomized to

receive either intravenous rituximab (375 mg/m^2) or matching placebo once per week

for 4 weeks, based on the allocation factors of 4 disease duration (≤6 years or >6 years),

mRSS (≥20 or <20), and concomitant ILD (present or absent) by the minimization

method. Of these, 49 patients completed the double-blind phase. Serum samples were

collected and served for PWAS at the beginning and the end of the double-blind phase

(**Fig. 1A**). After excluding 4 cases due to their serum unsuitable for PWAS, data of 45

patients were included in our analysis. Age and sex matched HCs were selected from a

cohort of healthcare providers on annual checkups without any medical history (**Fig.**

1B), using "matchIt" R package.[48] This study was approved by the ethics committee of

the University of Tokyo Graduate School of Medicine and conducted in accordance

with the Declaration of Helsinki. Written informed consent was obtained from all

patients.

Assessments

Clinical and laboratory assessments were performed at baseline and at 24

weeks after the first infusion of rituximab. Skin sclerosis was assessed by mRSS.[49]

Lung function was evaluated by pulmonary function tests. Serum levels of Krebs von

den Lungen-6 (KL-6; normal range: 0-500 U/mL) and surfactant protein-D (SP-D;

normal range: 0-110 ng/mL), which are glycoproteins mainly produced by type II

pneumocytes, were measured as established markers of ILD in patients with SSc.

Laboratory examinations included white blood cell count, lymphocyte count, the

number of $CD19^+$ and $CD20^+$ cells, and serum levels of IgG (normal range: 700-1600

mg/dL), IgM (normal range: 40-250 mg/dL), and IgA (normal range: 70-400 mg/dL).

Patients with mRSS improvement of 7 or higher and 6 or lower were classified as HRs

and LRs, respectively, based on the previous study on minimally important differences

for mRSS.[50] This classification resulted in 16 high responders and 13 LRs (**Fig. 1C**).

Autoantibody measurement

WPAs were arranged as previously described.[20] First, proteins were

synthesized *in vitro* utilizing a wheat germ cell-free system from 13,455 clones of the

HuPEX.[18] Second, synthesized proteins were plotted onto glass plates (Matsunami

Glass, Osaka, Japan) in an array format by the affinity between the GST-tag added to

the N-terminus of each protein and glutathione modified on the plates. The WPAs were

treated with human serum diluted by 3:1000 in the reaction buffer containing 1x

Synthetic block (Invitrogen), phosphate-buffered saline (PBS), and 0.1% Tween 20.

Next, the WPAs were washed, and goat anti-Human IgG (H+L) Alexa Flour 647

conjugate (Thermo Fisher Scientific, San Jose, CA, USA) diluted 1000-fold was added

to the WPAs and reacted for 1 hour at room temperature. Finally, the WPAs were

washed, air-dried, and fluorescent images were acquired using a fluorescence imager

(Typhoon FLA 9500, Cytiva, Marlborough, MA, USA). Fluorescence images were

analyzed to quantify serum levels of autoantibodies targeting each antigen, following

the formula shown below:

$$Autoantibody\ level\ [AU] = \frac{F_{autoantigen} - F_{negative\ control}}{F_{positive\ control} - F_{negative\ control}} \times 100$$

AU: arbitrary unit

$F_{autoantigen}$: fluorescent intensity of autoantigen spot

$F_{negative\ control}$: fluorescent intensity of negative control spot

$F_{positive\ control}$: fluorescent intensity of positive control spot

Machine learning

We applied supervised machine learning techniques using the Python code

with the scikit-learn library to analyze the autoantibody measurement data. With the

random forest model, decision trees were built and trained in parallel on subsets of

sampled instances and features. Meanwhile, with the XGBoost model, decision trees

were built sequentially to improve each other. The final prediction of the random forest

was based on the majority of its decision trees, while that of XGBoost was derived from

their weighted average. The performance of the classifiers was evaluated using the area

under the operator-receiver characteristics curve (AUC), accuracy, precision, recall, and

F1-score, with the higher the scores indicating the better classification performance. The

accuracy is the ratio of the correct positive and negative prediction, the precision is the

ratio of the correct positive prediction, the recall (or sensitivity) is the ratio of the

correct positive prediction among all true positive instances, and F1-score is the

harmonic mean of precision and sensitivity.

WGCNA analysis

The weighted gene co-expression network was constructed using the

"WGCNA" R package.[28] We calculated each gene pair's Pearson correlation coefficient,

measured how similarly their expressions were expressed, and created a correlation

matrix. Scale-free topology requirements were used to compute the "soft" threshold

power to build biologically meaningful scale-free networks. Based on the adjacency

matrix, dynamic tree cuts and at least 100 genes per module were utilized to generate a

topological overlap matrix for co-expression modules. In addition, we assessed gene

significance, module membership, and correlated modules with clinical characteristics

and mapped signature genes.

Statistical analysis

Fisher exact test was performed to compare categorical variables.

Mann-Whitney U test or Wilcoxon signed-rank test as appropriate was performed to

compare continuous variables. Spearman correlation test was used for correlation

analysis. P values of < 0.05 were considered statistically significant. Gene Ontology

Analysis using web-based tools targeted the list of the entry clones coding the

differentially highlighted autoantigens was performed for gene-list enrichment analysis,

gene-disease association analysis, and transcriptional regulatory network analysis with

Metascape.[25] Data analyses were conducted using R (v4.2.1).

Data visualization

Box plots, scatter plots, hierarchical clustering, and correlation matrix were

visualized by using R (v4.2.1). Box plots were defined as follows: the middle line

corresponds to the median; the lower and upper hinges correspond to the first and third

quartiles; the upper whisker extends from the hinge to the largest value no further than

1.5 times the interquartile range (IQR) from the hinge; and the lower whisker extends

from the hinge to the smallest value at most 1.5 times the IQR of the hinge.

Figure legends

Figure 1. Overview of the study. (A) The study design of the DESIRES trial. **(B)** The flow chart of sample acquisition in the present study. (C) The sum of autoantibody levels (SAL) in SSc at the baseline and HCs. (D) Absolute change of mRSS in SSc patients during the DESIREs trial. HR: high responder, LR: low responder. (E) SAL before and after the study period of the DESIRES trial by the treatment arm. (F) Serum levels of SSc-related autoantibodies before and after the study period of the DESIRES trial by the treatment arm. ATA: anti-topoisomerase I antibody, ACA: anti-centromere antibody, ARA: anti-RNA polymerase III antibody. *: $P < 0.05$, ****: $P < 0.0001$, NS: $P > 0.05$. P values were calculated by Mann-Whitney's U test.

Figure 2. Selection of autoantibodies of clinical relevance.

(A) Volcano plot that shows autoantibodies differentially elevated in SSc before treatment compared to HCs. The vertical dash line indicates P = 0.05. **(B)** Volcano plot that shows autoantibodies differentially increased in HRs than in LRs. **(C)** Volcano plot that shows autoantibodies significantly reduced in HRs during RTX therapy. **(D)** Heat map that shows the serum levels of 58 candidate autoantibodies of clinical relevance.

(E) Principal component analysis of 58 candidate autoantibodies of clinical relevance. In the scatter plot, individual subjects as points. The loading diagram illustrates the contributions to PC1 and PC2. **(F)** SAL focused on 58 candidate autoantibodies of clinical relevance. ***: $P < 0.001$, ****: $P < 0.0001$, NS: $P > 0.05$. P values were calculated by Mann-Whitney's U test. **(G)** The receiver-operator characteristics (ROC) curve demonstrating the discrimination between SSc and HCs by all the measured autoantibodies (green) and by 58 candidate autoantibodies of clinical relevance (yellow).

(H) The ROC curve demonstrating the discrimination between HRs and LRs by all the measured autoantibodies (green) and by 58 candidate autoantibodies of clinical relevance (yellow).

Figure 3. Proteins targeted by the candidate autoantibodies of clinical relevance.

(A) Gene ontology analysis encompassing the genes coding proteins targeted the candidate autoantibodies. **(B)** The table represents the inclusion relationship between each gene ontology and the candidate autoantibodies. **(C)** Serum levels of candidate autoantibodies associated with "import across plasma membrane." **(D)** The heatmap illustrates correlation between the candidate autoantibodies associated with "import across plasma membrane" and clinical traits of SSc. **(E)** Serum levels of autoantibodies associated with "peptide GPCRs." **(F)** The heatmap illustrates correlation between the candidate autoantibodies associated with "peptide GPCRs" and clinical traits of SSc. *: $P < 0.05$, **: $P < 0.01$, ***: $P < 0.001$. P values were calculated by Spearman's correlation test.

Figure 4. WGCNA analysis. **(A)** Network heatmap plot. Branches in the hierarchical clustering dendrograms correspond to modules. Color-coded module membership is displayed in the color bars below and to the right of the dendrograms. In the heatmap, high co-expression interconnectedness is indicated by progressively more saturated yellow and red colors. **(B)** The table represents the inclusion relationship between autoantibodies and modules identified by WGCNA analysis. **(C)** Gene ontology analysis encompassing the genes coding proteins targeted by autoantibodies included in the "turquoise," "darkmagenta," and "tan" modules. **(D)** The heatmap shows the correlation between each module and clinical trait. *: P < 0.05, **: P < 0.01, ***: P < 0.001. P values were calculated by Spearman's correlation test.

Extended Figure 1. Additional results of PWAS. (A) The sum of autoantibody levels

(SAL) by age groups. **(B)** Serum levels of SSc-related autoantibodies before and after

the DESIRES trial by the treatment arm and responsiveness.

Extended Figure 2. Autoantibodies highlighted in each machine learning model.

(A) Autoantibodies that were mostly highlighted according to feature importance by Lasso regression, Ridge regression, SVM with normalization, Random Forest, XGBoost, and LightGBM. **(B)** The inclusion relationship of autoantibodies highlighted by the six machine learning frameworks illustrated by an UpSet plot. **(C)** The box plots describe the serum levels of autoantibodies highlighted by more than two frameworks in COVID-19, atopic dermatitis (AD), anti-neutrophil cytoplasmic antibody-associated vasculitis (AAV), systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE), systemic sclerosis (SSc), and healthy controls (HCs). The data derives from the UT-ABCD.

Extended Figure 3. Distribution of the candidate autoantibodies among various disorders. The box plots describe the serum levels of the candidate autoantibodies associated with "import across plasma membrane" **(A)** and "peptide GPCRs" **(B)** in COVID-19, atopic dermatitis (AD), anti-neutrophil cytoplasmic antibody-associated vasculitis (AAV), systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE), systemic sclerosis (SSc), and healthy controls (HCs). The data derives from the UT-ABCD.

Extended Figure 4. Expression of highlighted autoantigens in human tissues and single cells. Expression of autoantigens associated with "import across plasma membrane" **(A)** or with "peptide GPCRs" **(B)** in multiple human tissues, as measured by bulk RNA-sequencing from the Human Protein Atlas. Expression of CCR8 **(C)** or FPR1 **(D)** in immune cells from multiple human tissues, as measured by single-cell RNA-sequencing from the Tabula Sapiens project.

Matsuda KM et al.
Figure 1

Matsuda KM et al.
Figure 2

Matsuda KM et al.
Figure 3

Matsuda KM et al.

Figure 4