



(86) Date de dépôt PCT/PCT Filing Date: 2010/02/05
(87) Date publication PCT/PCT Publication Date: 2010/08/12
(85) Entrée phase nationale/National Entry: 2011/08/03
(86) N° demande PCT/PCT Application No.: US 2010/023297
(87) N° publication PCT/PCT Publication No.: 2010/091236
(30) Priorités/Priorities: 2009/02/06 (US61/150,395);
2009/03/23 (US61/162,415)

(51) Cl.Int./Int.Cl. *G01N 33/48* (2006.01)
(71) Demandeur/Applicant:
ASTUTE MEDICAL, INC., US
(72) Inventeurs/Inventors:
ANDERBERG, JOSEPH, US;
GRAY, JEFF, US;
MCPHERSON, PAUL, US;
NAKAMURA, KEVIN, US
(74) Agent: PERLEY-ROBERTSON, HILL & MCDOUGALL
LLP

(54) Titre : PROCEDES ET COMPOSITIONS POUR LE DIAGNOSTIC ET LE PRONOSTIC D'UNE LESION RENALE ET
D'UNE INSUFFISANCE RENALE
(54) Title: METHODS AND COMPOSITIONS FOR DIAGNOSIS AND PROGNOSIS OF RENAL INJURY AND FAILURE

(57) **Abrégé/Abstract:**

The present invention relates to methods and compositions for monitoring, diagnosis, prognosis, and determination of treatment regimens in subjects suffering from or suspected of having a renal injury. In particular, the invention relates to using assays that detect one or more markers selected from the group consisting of soluble Advanced glycosylation end product- specific receptor, Bactericidal permeability-increasing protein, Interleukin 12, Fibroblast growth factor 23, and Intestinal fatty acid-binding protein as diagnostic and prognostic biomarkers in renal injuries.



(12) INTERNATIONAL APPLICATION PUBLISHED UNDER THE PATENT COOPERATION TREATY (PCT)

CORRECTED VERSION

(19) World Intellectual Property Organization
International Bureau



PCT



(10) International Publication Number

WO 2010/091236 A9

(51) International Patent Classification:
G01N 33/48 (2006.01)

(21) International Application Number:
PCT/US2010/023297

(22) International Filing Date:
5 February 2010 (05.02.2010)

(25) Filing Language: English

(26) Publication Language: English

(30) Priority Data:
61/150,395 6 February 2009 (06.02.2009) US
61/162,415 23 March 2009 (23.03.2009) US

(71) Applicant (for all designated States except US): AS-
TUTE MEDICAL, INC. [US/US]; Blg 2, R. 645, 3550
General Atomics Court, San Diego, CA 92121 (US).

(72) Inventors; and

(75) Inventors/Applicants (for US only): ANDERBERG,
Joseph [US/US]; 470 Delage Court, Encinitas, CA 92024
(US). GRAY, Jeff [US/US]; 417 Bay Meadows Way,
Solana Beach, CA 92075 (US). MCPHERSON, Paul
[US/US]; 1449 Elva Court, Encinitas, CA 92024 (US).
NAKAMURA, Kevin [US/US]; 2409 Newcastle Ave,
Cardiff By The Sea, CA 92007 (US).

(74) Agents: WHITTAKER, Michael, A. et al.; Biotechnolo-
gy Law Group, 12707 High Bluff Drive, Suite 200, San
Diego, CA 92130 (US).

(81) Designated States (unless otherwise indicated, for every
kind of national protection available): AE, AG, AL, AM,

AO, AT, AU, AZ, BA, BB, BG, BH, BR, BW, BY, BZ,
CA, CH, CL, CN, CO, CR, CU, CZ, DE, DK, DM, DO,
DZ, EC, EE, EG, ES, FI, GB, GD, GE, GH, GM, GT,
HN, HR, HU, ID, IL, IN, IS, JP, KE, KG, KM, KN, KP,
KR, KZ, LA, LC, LK, LR, LS, LT, LU, LY, MA, MD,
ME, MG, MK, MN, MW, MX, MY, MZ, NA, NG, NI,
NO, NZ, OM, PE, PG, PH, PL, PT, RO, RS, RU, SC, SD,
SE, SG, SK, SL, SM, ST, SV, SY, TH, TJ, TM, TN, TR,
TT, TZ, UA, UG, US, UZ, VC, VN, ZA, ZM, ZW.

(84) Designated States (unless otherwise indicated, for every
kind of regional protection available): ARIPO (BW, GH,
GM, KE, LS, MW, MZ, NA, SD, SL, SZ, TZ, UG, ZM,
ZW), Eurasian (AM, AZ, BY, KG, KZ, MD, RU, TJ,
TM), European (AT, BE, BG, CH, CY, CZ, DE, DK, EE,
ES, FI, FR, GB, GR, HR, HU, IE, IS, IT, LT, LU, LV,
MC, MK, MT, NL, NO, PL, PT, RO, SE, SI, SK, SM,
TR), OAPI (BF, BJ, CF, CG, CI, CM, GA, GN, GQ, GW,
ML, MR, NE, SN, TD, TG).

Published:

- with international search report (Art. 21(3))
- with information concerning incorporation by reference
of missing parts and/or elements (Rule 20.6)

(48) Date of publication of this corrected version:
18 November 2010

(15) Information about Correction:
see Notice of 18 November 2010

(54) Title: METHODS AND COMPOSITIONS FOR DIAGNOSIS AND PROGNOSIS OF RENAL INJURY AND FAILURE

(57) Abstract: The present invention relates to methods and compositions for monitoring, diagnosis, prognosis, and determination of treatment regimens in subjects suffering from or suspected of having a renal injury. In particular, the invention relates to using assays that detect one or more markers selected from the group consisting of soluble Advanced glycosylation end product- specific receptor, Bactericidal permeability-increasing protein, Interleukin 12, Fibroblast growth factor 23, and Intestinal fatty acid-binding protein as diagnostic and prognostic biomarkers in renal injuries.



WO 2010/091236 A9

METHODS AND COMPOSITIONS FOR DIAGNOSIS AND PROGNOSIS OF RENAL INJURY AND FAILURE

[0001] The present invention claims priority from U.S. Provisional Patent Applications 61/150,395 filed February 6, 2009; and 61/162,415 filed March 23, 2009, each of which is hereby incorporated in its entirety including all tables, figures, and claims.

BACKGROUND OF THE INVENTION

[0002] The following discussion of the background of the invention is merely provided to aid the reader in understanding the invention and is not admitted to describe or constitute prior art to the present invention.

[0003] The kidney is responsible for water and solute excretion from the body. Its functions include maintenance of acid-base balance, regulation of electrolyte concentrations, control of blood volume, and regulation of blood pressure. As such, loss of kidney function through injury and/or disease results in substantial morbidity and mortality. A detailed discussion of renal injuries is provided in Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine, 17th Ed., McGraw Hill, New York, pages 1741-1830, which are hereby incorporated by reference in their entirety. Renal disease and/or injury may be acute or chronic. Acute and chronic kidney disease are described as follows (from Current Medical Diagnosis & Treatment 2008, 47th Ed, McGraw Hill, New York, pages 785-815, which are hereby incorporated by reference in their entirety): "Acute renal failure is worsening of renal function over hours to days, resulting in the retention of nitrogenous wastes (such as urea nitrogen) and creatinine in the blood. Retention of these substances is called azotemia. Chronic renal failure (chronic kidney disease) results from an abnormal loss of renal function over months to years".

[0004] Acute renal failure (ARF, also known as acute kidney injury, or AKI) is an abrupt (typically detected within about 48 hours to 1 week) reduction in glomerular filtration. This loss of filtration capacity results in retention of nitrogenous (urea and creatinine) and non-nitrogenous waste products that are normally excreted by the kidney, a reduction in urine output, or both. It is reported that ARF complicates about 5% of hospital admissions, 4-15% of cardiopulmonary bypass surgeries, and up to 30% of intensive care admissions. ARF may be categorized as prerenal, intrinsic renal, or

postrenal in causation. Intrinsic renal disease can be further divided into glomerular, tubular, interstitial, and vascular abnormalities. Major causes of ARF are described in the following table, which is adapted from the Merck Manual, 17th ed., Chapter 222, and which is hereby incorporated by reference in their entirety:

Type	Risk Factors
Prerenal	
ECF volume depletion	Excessive diuresis, hemorrhage, GI losses, loss of intravascular fluid into the extravascular space (due to ascites, peritonitis, pancreatitis, or burns), loss of skin and mucus membranes, renal salt- and water-wasting states
Low cardiac output	Cardiomyopathy, MI, cardiac tamponade, pulmonary embolism, pulmonary hypertension, positive-pressure mechanical ventilation
Low systemic vascular resistance	Septic shock, liver failure, antihypertensive drugs
Increased renal vascular resistance	NSAIDs, cyclosporines, tacrolimus, hypercalcemia, anaphylaxis, anesthetics, renal artery obstruction, renal vein thrombosis, sepsis, hepatorenal syndrome
Decreased efferent arteriolar tone (leading to decreased GFR from reduced glomerular transcapillary pressure, especially in patients with bilateral renal artery stenosis)	ACE inhibitors or angiotensin II receptor blockers
Intrinsic Renal	
Acute tubular injury	Ischemia (prolonged or severe prerenal state): surgery, hemorrhage, arterial or venous obstruction; Toxins: NSAIDs, cyclosporines, tacrolimus, aminoglycosides, foscarnet, ethylene glycol, hemoglobin, myoglobin, ifosfamide, heavy metals, methotrexate, radiopaque contrast agents, streptozotocin
Acute glomerulonephritis	ANCA-associated: Crescentic glomerulonephritis, polyarteritis nodosa, Wegener's granulomatosis; Anti-GBM glomerulonephritis: Goodpasture's syndrome; Immune-complex: Lupus glomerulonephritis, postinfectious glomerulonephritis, cryoglobulinemic glomerulonephritis
Acute tubulointerstitial nephritis	Drug reaction (eg, β -lactams, NSAIDs, sulfonamides, ciprofloxacin, thiazide diuretics, furosemide, phenytoin, allopurinol, pyelonephritis, papillary necrosis)
Acute vascular nephropathy	Vasculitis, malignant hypertension, thrombotic microangiopathies, scleroderma, atheroembolism
Infiltrative diseases	Lymphoma, sarcoidosis, leukemia
Postrenal	

Tubular precipitation	Uric acid (tumor lysis), sulfonamides, triamterene, acyclovir, indinavir, methotrexate, ethylene glycol ingestion, myeloma protein, myoglobin
Ureteral obstruction	Intrinsic: Calculi, clots, sloughed renal tissue, fungus ball, edema, malignancy, congenital defects; Extrinsic: Malignancy, retroperitoneal fibrosis, ureteral trauma during surgery or high impact injury
Bladder obstruction	Mechanical: Benign prostatic hyperplasia, prostate cancer, bladder cancer, urethral strictures, phimosis, paraphimosis, urethral valves, obstructed indwelling urinary catheter; Neurogenic: Anticholinergic drugs, upper or lower motor neuron lesion

[0005] In the case of ischemic ARF, the course of the disease may be divided into four phases. During an initiation phase, which lasts hours to days, reduced perfusion of the kidney is evolving into injury. Glomerular ultrafiltration reduces, the flow of filtrate is reduced due to debris within the tubules, and back leakage of filtrate through injured epithelium occurs. Renal injury can be mediated during this phase by reperfusion of the kidney. Initiation is followed by an extension phase which is characterized by continued ischemic injury and inflammation and may involve endothelial damage and vascular congestion. During the maintenance phase, lasting from 1 to 2 weeks, renal cell injury occurs, and glomerular filtration and urine output reaches a minimum. A recovery phase can follow in which the renal epithelium is repaired and GFR gradually recovers. Despite this, the survival rate of subjects with ARF may be as low as about 60%.

[0006] Acute kidney injury caused by radiocontrast agents (also called contrast media) and other nephrotoxins such as cyclosporine, antibiotics including aminoglycosides and anticancer drugs such as cisplatin manifests over a period of days to about a week. Contrast induced nephropathy (CIN, which is AKI caused by radiocontrast agents) is thought to be caused by intrarenal vasoconstriction (leading to ischemic injury) and from the generation of reactive oxygen species that are directly toxic to renal tubular epithelial cells. CIN classically presents as an acute (onset within 24-48h) but reversible (peak 3-5 days, resolution within 1 week) rise in blood urea nitrogen and serum creatinine.

[0007] A commonly reported criteria for defining and detecting AKI is an abrupt (typically within about 2-7 days or within a period of hospitalization) elevation of serum creatinine. Although the use of serum creatinine elevation to define and detect AKI is well established, the magnitude of the serum creatinine elevation and the time over which

it is measured to define AKI varies considerably among publications. Traditionally, relatively large increases in serum creatinine such as 100%, 200%, an increase of at least 100% to a value over 2 mg/dL and other definitions were used to define AKI. However, the recent trend has been towards using smaller serum creatinine rises to define AKI. The relationship between serum creatinine rise, AKI and the associated health risks are reviewed in Praught and Shlipak, *Curr Opin Nephrol Hypertens* 14:265-270, 2005 and Chertow et al, *J Am Soc Nephrol* 16: 3365-3370, 2005, which, with the references listed therein, are hereby incorporated by reference in their entirety. As described in these publications, acute worsening renal function (AKI) and increased risk of death and other detrimental outcomes are now known to be associated with very small increases in serum creatinine. These increases may be determined as a relative (percent) value or a nominal value. Relative increases in serum creatinine as small as 20% from the pre-injury value have been reported to indicate acutely worsening renal function (AKI) and increased health risk, but the more commonly reported value to define AKI and increased health risk is a relative increase of at least 25%. Nominal increases as small as 0.3 mg/dL, 0.2 mg/dL or even 0.1 mg/dL have been reported to indicate worsening renal function and increased risk of death. Various time periods for the serum creatinine to rise to these threshold values have been used to define AKI, for example, ranging from 2 days, 3 days, 7 days, or a variable period defined as the time the patient is in the hospital or intensive care unit. These studies indicate there is not a particular threshold serum creatinine rise (or time period for the rise) for worsening renal function or AKI, but rather a continuous increase in risk with increasing magnitude of serum creatinine rise.

[0008] One study (Lassnigg et al, *J Am Soc Nephrol* 15:1597-1605, 2004, hereby incorporated by reference in its entirety) investigated both increases and decreases in serum creatinine. Patients with a mild fall in serum creatinine of -0.1 to -0.3 mg/dL following heart surgery had the lowest mortality rate. Patients with a larger fall in serum creatinine (more than or equal to -0.4 mg/dL) or any increase in serum creatinine had a larger mortality rate. These findings caused the authors to conclude that even very subtle changes in renal function (as detected by small creatinine changes within 48 hours of surgery) seriously effect patient's outcomes. In an effort to reach consensus on a unified classification system for using serum creatinine to define AKI in clinical trials and in clinical practice, Bellomo *et al.*, *Crit Care*. 8(4):R204-12, 2004, which is hereby

incorporated by reference in its entirety, proposes the following classifications for stratifying AKI patients:

“Risk”: serum creatinine increased 1.5 fold from baseline OR urine production of <0.5 ml/kg body weight/hr for 6 hours;

“Injury”: serum creatinine increased 2.0 fold from baseline OR urine production <0.5 ml/kg/hr for 12 h;

“Failure”: serum creatinine increased 3.0 fold from baseline OR creatinine >355 $\mu\text{mol/l}$ (with a rise of >44) or urine output below 0.3 ml/kg/hr for 24 h or anuria for at least 12 hours;

And included two clinical outcomes:

“Loss”: persistent need for renal replacement therapy for more than four weeks.

“ESRD”: end stage renal disease—the need for dialysis for more than 3 months.

These criteria are called the RIFLE criteria, which provide a useful clinical tool to classify renal status. As discussed in Kellum, *Crit. Care Med.* 36: S141-45, 2008 and Ricci *et al.*, *Kidney Int.* 73, 538-546, 2008, each hereby incorporated by reference in its entirety, the RIFLE criteria provide a uniform definition of AKI which has been validated in numerous studies.

[0009] More recently, Mehta *et al.*, *Crit. Care* 11:R31 (doi:10.1186.cc5713), 2007, hereby incorporated by reference in its entirety, proposes the following similar classifications for stratifying AKI patients, which have been modified from RIFLE:

“Stage I”: increase in serum creatinine of more than or equal to 0.3 mg/dL (≥ 26.4 $\mu\text{mol/L}$) or increase to more than or equal to 150% (1.5-fold) from baseline OR urine output less than 0.5 mL/kg per hour for more than 6 hours;

“Stage II”: increase in serum creatinine to more than 200% (> 2 -fold) from baseline OR urine output less than 0.5 mL/kg per hour for more than 12 hours;

“Stage III”: increase in serum creatinine to more than 300% (> 3 -fold) from baseline OR serum creatinine ≥ 354 $\mu\text{mol/L}$ accompanied by an acute increase of at least 44 $\mu\text{mol/L}$ OR urine output less than 0.3 mL/kg per hour for 24 hours or anuria for 12 hours.

[0010] The CIN Consensus Working Panel (McCollough *et al.*, *Rev Cardiovasc Med.* 2006;7(4):177-197, hereby incorporated by reference in its entirety) uses a serum

creatinine rise of 25% to define Contrast induced nephropathy (which is a type of AKI). Although various groups propose slightly different criteria for using serum creatinine to detect AKI, the consensus is that small changes in serum creatinine, such as 0.3 mg/dL or 25%, are sufficient to detect AKI (worsening renal function) and that the magnitude of the serum creatinine change is an indicator of the severity of the AKI and mortality risk.

[0011] Although serial measurement of serum creatinine over a period of days is an accepted method of detecting and diagnosing AKI and is considered one of the most important tools to evaluate AKI patients, serum creatinine is generally regarded to have several limitations in the diagnosis, assessment and monitoring of AKI patients. The time period for serum creatinine to rise to values (e.g., a 0.3 mg/dL or 25% rise) considered diagnostic for AKI can be 48 hours or longer depending on the definition used. Since cellular injury in AKI can occur over a period of hours, serum creatinine elevations detected at 48 hours or longer can be a late indicator of injury, and relying on serum creatinine can thus delay diagnosis of AKI. Furthermore, serum creatinine is not a good indicator of the exact kidney status and treatment needs during the most acute phases of AKI when kidney function is changing rapidly. Some patients with AKI will recover fully, some will need dialysis (either short term or long term) and some will have other detrimental outcomes including death, major adverse cardiac events and chronic kidney disease. Because serum creatinine is a marker of filtration rate, it does not differentiate between the causes of AKI (pre-renal, intrinsic renal, post-renal obstruction, atheroembolic, etc) or the category or location of injury in intrinsic renal disease (for example, tubular, glomerular or interstitial in origin). Urine output is similarly limited. Knowing these things can be of vital importance in managing and treating patients with AKI.

[0012] These limitations underscore the need for better methods to detect and assess AKI, particularly in the early and subclinical stages, but also in later stages when recovery and repair of the kidney can occur. Furthermore, there is a need to better identify patients who are at risk of having an AKI.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

[0013] It is an object of the invention to provide methods and compositions for evaluating renal function in a subject. As described herein, measurement of one or more

markers selected from the group consisting of soluble Advanced glycosylation end product-specific receptor, Bactericidal permeability-increasing protein, Interleukin 12, Fibroblast growth factor 23, and Intestinal fatty acid-binding protein (collectively referred to herein as “kidney injury markers, and individually as a “kidney injury marker”) can be used for diagnosis, prognosis, risk stratification, staging, monitoring, categorizing and determination of further diagnosis and treatment regimens in subjects suffering or at risk of suffering from an injury to renal function, reduced renal function, and/or acute renal failure (also called acute kidney injury).

[0014] These kidney injury markers may be used, individually or in panels comprising a plurality of kidney injury markers, for risk stratification (that is, to identify subjects at risk for a future injury to renal function, for future progression to reduced renal function, for future progression to ARF, for future improvement in renal function, *etc.*); for diagnosis of existing disease (that is, to identify subjects who have suffered an injury to renal function, who have progressed to reduced renal function, who have progressed to ARF, *etc.*); for monitoring for deterioration or improvement of renal function; and for predicting a future medical outcome, such as improved or worsening renal function, a decreased or increased mortality risk, a decreased or increased risk that a subject will require renal replacement therapy (*i.e.*, hemodialysis, peritoneal dialysis, hemofiltration, and/or renal transplantation, a decreased or increased risk that a subject will recover from an injury to renal function, a decreased or increased risk that a subject will recover from ARF, a decreased or increased risk that a subject will progress to end stage renal disease, a decreased or increased risk that a subject will progress to chronic renal failure, a decreased or increased risk that a subject will suffer rejection of a transplanted kidney, *etc.*

[0015] In a first aspect, the present invention relates to methods for evaluating renal status in a subject. These methods comprise performing an assay method that is configured to detect one or more kidney injury markers of the present invention in a body fluid sample obtained from the subject. The assay result(s), for example a measured concentration of one or more markers selected from the group consisting of soluble Advanced glycosylation end product-specific receptor, Bactericidal permeability-increasing protein, Interleukin 12, Fibroblast growth factor 23, and Intestinal fatty acid-binding protein is/are then correlated to the renal status of the subject. This correlation to renal status may include correlating the assay result(s) to one or more of risk

stratification, diagnosis, prognosis, staging, classifying and monitoring of the subject as described herein. Thus, the present invention utilizes one or more kidney injury markers of the present invention for the evaluation of renal injury.

[0016] In certain embodiments, the methods for evaluating renal status described herein are methods for risk stratification of the subject; that is, assigning a likelihood of one or more future changes in renal status to the subject. In these embodiments, the assay result(s) is/are correlated to one or more such future changes. The following are preferred risk stratification embodiments.

[0017] In preferred risk stratification embodiments, these methods comprise determining a subject's risk for a future injury to renal function, and the assay result(s) is/are correlated to a likelihood of such a future injury to renal function. For example, the measured concentration(s) may each be compared to a threshold value. For a "positive going" kidney injury marker, an increased likelihood of suffering a future injury to renal function is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold. For a "negative going" kidney injury marker, an increased likelihood of suffering a future injury to renal function is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is below the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold.

[0018] In other preferred risk stratification embodiments, these methods comprise determining a subject's risk for future reduced renal function, and the assay result(s) is/are correlated to a likelihood of such reduced renal function. For example, the measured concentrations may each be compared to a threshold value. For a "positive going" kidney injury marker, an increased likelihood of suffering a future reduced renal function is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold. For a "negative going" kidney injury marker, an increased likelihood of future reduced renal function is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is below the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold.

[0019] In still other preferred risk stratification embodiments, these methods comprise determining a subject's likelihood for a future improvement in renal function, and the

assay result(s) is/are correlated to a likelihood of such a future improvement in renal function. For example, the measured concentration(s) may each be compared to a threshold value. For a “positive going” kidney injury marker, an increased likelihood of a future improvement in renal function is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is below the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold. For a “negative going” kidney injury marker, an increased likelihood of a future improvement in renal function is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold.

[0020] In yet other preferred risk stratification embodiments, these methods comprise determining a subject’s risk for progression to ARF, and the result(s) is/are correlated to a likelihood of such progression to ARF. For example, the measured concentration(s) may each be compared to a threshold value. For a “positive going” kidney injury marker, an increased likelihood of progression to ARF is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold. For a “negative going” kidney injury marker, an increased likelihood of progression to ARF is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is below the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold.

[0021] And in other preferred risk stratification embodiments, these methods comprise determining a subject’s outcome risk, and the assay result(s) is/are correlated to a likelihood of the occurrence of a clinical outcome related to a renal injury suffered by the subject. For example, the measured concentration(s) may each be compared to a threshold value. For a “positive going” kidney injury marker, an increased likelihood of one or more of: acute kidney injury, progression to a worsening stage of AKI, mortality, a requirement for renal replacement therapy, a requirement for withdrawal of renal toxins, end stage renal disease, heart failure, stroke, myocardial infarction, progression to chronic kidney disease, *etc.*, is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold. For a “negative going” kidney injury marker, an increased likelihood of one or more of: acute kidney injury, progression to a worsening stage of AKI, mortality, a requirement for renal replacement therapy, a requirement for withdrawal of renal toxins, end stage renal disease, heart failure, stroke, myocardial infarction, progression to chronic

kidney disease, *etc.*, is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is below the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold.

[0022] In such risk stratification embodiments, preferably the likelihood or risk assigned is that an event of interest is more or less likely to occur within 180 days of the time at which the body fluid sample is obtained from the subject. In particularly preferred embodiments, the likelihood or risk assigned relates to an event of interest occurring within a shorter time period such as 18 months, 120 days, 90 days, 60 days, 45 days, 30 days, 21 days, 14 days, 7 days, 5 days, 96 hours, 72 hours, 48 hours, 36 hours, 24 hours, 12 hours, or less. A risk at 0 hours of the time at which the body fluid sample is obtained from the subject is equivalent to diagnosis of a current condition.

[0023] In preferred risk stratification embodiments, the subject is selected for risk stratification based on the pre-existence in the subject of one or more known risk factors for prerenal, intrinsic renal, or postrenal ARF. For example, a subject undergoing or having undergone major vascular surgery, coronary artery bypass, or other cardiac surgery; a subject having pre-existing congestive heart failure, preeclampsia, eclampsia, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, coronary artery disease, proteinuria, renal insufficiency, glomerular filtration below the normal range, cirrhosis, serum creatinine above the normal range, or sepsis; or a subject exposed to NSAIDs, cyclosporines, tacrolimus, aminoglycosides, foscarnet, ethylene glycol, hemoglobin, myoglobin, ifosfamide, heavy metals, methotrexate, radiopaque contrast agents, or streptozotocin are all preferred subjects for monitoring risks according to the methods described herein. This list is not meant to be limiting. By “pre-existence” in this context is meant that the risk factor exists at the time the body fluid sample is obtained from the subject. In particularly preferred embodiments, a subject is chosen for risk stratification based on an existing diagnosis of injury to renal function, reduced renal function, or ARF.

[0024] In other embodiments, the methods for evaluating renal status described herein are methods for diagnosing a renal injury in the subject; that is, assessing whether or not a subject has suffered from an injury to renal function, reduced renal function, or ARF. In these embodiments, the assay result(s), for example a measured concentration of one or more markers selected from the group consisting of soluble Advanced glycosylation end product-specific receptor, Bactericidal permeability-increasing protein, Interleukin 12, Fibroblast growth factor 23, and Intestinal fatty acid-binding protein is/are correlated to

the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a change in renal status. The following are preferred diagnostic embodiments.

[0025] In preferred diagnostic embodiments, these methods comprise diagnosing the occurrence or nonoccurrence of an injury to renal function, and the assay result(s) is/are correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of such an injury. For example, each of the measured concentration(s) may be compared to a threshold value. For a positive going marker, an increased likelihood of the occurrence of an injury to renal function is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold (relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold); alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, an increased likelihood of the nonoccurrence of an injury to renal function may be assigned to the subject (relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold). For a negative going marker, an increased likelihood of the occurrence of an injury to renal function is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is below the threshold (relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold); alternatively, when the measured concentration is above the threshold, an increased likelihood of the nonoccurrence of an injury to renal function may be assigned to the subject (relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold).

[0026] In other preferred diagnostic embodiments, these methods comprise diagnosing the occurrence or nonoccurrence of reduced renal function, and the assay result(s) is/are correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of an injury causing reduced renal function. For example, each of the measured concentration(s) may be compared to a threshold value. For a positive going marker, an increased likelihood of the occurrence of an injury causing reduced renal function is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold (relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold); alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, an increased likelihood of the nonoccurrence of an injury causing reduced renal function may be assigned to the subject (relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold). For a negative going marker, an increased likelihood of the occurrence of an injury causing reduced renal function is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is below the threshold (relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration

is above the threshold); alternatively, when the measured concentration is above the threshold, an increased likelihood of the nonoccurrence of an injury causing reduced renal function may be assigned to the subject (relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold).

[0027] In yet other preferred diagnostic embodiments, these methods comprise diagnosing the occurrence or nonoccurrence of ARF, and the assay result(s) is/are correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of an injury causing ARF. For example, each of the measured concentration(s) may be compared to a threshold value. For a positive going marker, an increased likelihood of the occurrence of ARF is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold (relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold); alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, an increased likelihood of the nonoccurrence of ARF may be assigned to the subject (relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold). For a negative going marker, an increased likelihood of the occurrence of ARF is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is below the threshold (relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold); alternatively, when the measured concentration is above the threshold, an increased likelihood of the nonoccurrence of ARF may be assigned to the subject (relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold).

[0028] In still other preferred diagnostic embodiments, these methods comprise diagnosing a subject as being in need of renal replacement therapy, and the assay result(s) is/are correlated to a need for renal replacement therapy. For example, each of the measured concentration(s) may be compared to a threshold value. For a positive going marker, an increased likelihood of the occurrence of an injury creating a need for renal replacement therapy is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold (relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold); alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, an increased likelihood of the nonoccurrence of an injury creating a need for renal replacement therapy may be assigned to the subject (relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold). For a negative going marker, an increased likelihood of the occurrence of an injury creating a need for renal replacement therapy is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is below

the threshold (relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold); alternatively, when the measured concentration is above the threshold, an increased likelihood of the nonoccurrence of an injury creating a need for renal replacement therapy may be assigned to the subject (relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold).

[0029] In still other preferred diagnostic embodiments, these methods comprise diagnosing a subject as being in need of renal transplantation, and the assay result(s) is/are correlated to a need for renal transplantation. For example, each of the measured concentration(s) may be compared to a threshold value. For a positive going marker, an increased likelihood of the occurrence of an injury creating a need for renal transplantation is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold (relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold); alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, an increased likelihood of the nonoccurrence of an injury creating a need for renal transplantation may be assigned to the subject (relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold). For a negative going marker, an increased likelihood of the occurrence of an injury creating a need for renal transplantation is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is below the threshold (relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold); alternatively, when the measured concentration is above the threshold, an increased likelihood of the nonoccurrence of an injury creating a need for renal transplantation may be assigned to the subject (relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold).

[0030] In still other embodiments, the methods for evaluating renal status described herein are methods for monitoring a renal injury in the subject; that is, assessing whether or not renal function is improving or worsening in a subject who has suffered from an injury to renal function, reduced renal function, or ARF. In these embodiments, the assay result(s), for example a measured concentration of one or more markers selected from the group consisting of soluble Advanced glycosylation end product-specific receptor, Bactericidal permeability-increasing protein, Interleukin 12, Fibroblast growth factor 23, and Intestinal fatty acid-binding protein is/are correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a change in renal status. The following are preferred monitoring embodiments.

[0031] In preferred monitoring embodiments, these methods comprise monitoring renal status in a subject suffering from an injury to renal function, and the assay result(s) is/are correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a change in renal status in the subject. For example, the measured concentration(s) may be compared to a threshold value. For a positive going marker, when the measured concentration is above the threshold, a worsening of renal function may be assigned to the subject; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, an improvement of renal function may be assigned to the subject. For a negative going marker, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, a worsening of renal function may be assigned to the subject; alternatively, when the measured concentration is above the threshold, an improvement of renal function may be assigned to the subject.

[0032] In other preferred monitoring embodiments, these methods comprise monitoring renal status in a subject suffering from reduced renal function, and the assay result(s) is/are correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a change in renal status in the subject. For example, the measured concentration(s) may be compared to a threshold value. For a positive going marker, when the measured concentration is above the threshold, a worsening of renal function may be assigned to the subject; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, an improvement of renal function may be assigned to the subject. For a negative going marker, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, a worsening of renal function may be assigned to the subject; alternatively, when the measured concentration is above the threshold, an improvement of renal function may be assigned to the subject.

[0033] In yet other preferred monitoring embodiments, these methods comprise monitoring renal status in a subject suffering from acute renal failure, and the assay result(s) is/are correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a change in renal status in the subject. For example, the measured concentration(s) may be compared to a threshold value. For a positive going marker, when the measured concentration is above the threshold, a worsening of renal function may be assigned to the subject; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, an improvement of renal function may be assigned to the subject. For a negative going marker, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, a worsening of renal function may be assigned to the subject; alternatively, when the measured concentration is above the threshold, an improvement of renal function may be assigned to the subject.

[0034] In other additional preferred monitoring embodiments, these methods comprise monitoring renal status in a subject at risk of an injury to renal function due to the pre-existence of one or more known risk factors for prerenal, intrinsic renal, or postrenal ARF, and the assay result(s) is/are correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a change in renal status in the subject. For example, the measured concentration(s) may be compared to a threshold value. For a positive going marker, when the measured concentration is above the threshold, a worsening of renal function may be assigned to the subject; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, an improvement of renal function may be assigned to the subject. For a negative going marker, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, a worsening of renal function may be assigned to the subject; alternatively, when the measured concentration is above the threshold, an improvement of renal function may be assigned to the subject.

[0035] In still other embodiments, the methods for evaluating renal status described herein are methods for classifying a renal injury in the subject; that is, determining whether a renal injury in a subject is prerenal, intrinsic renal, or postrenal; and/or further subdividing these classes into subclasses such as acute tubular injury, acute glomerulonephritis acute tubulointerstitial nephritis, acute vascular nephropathy, or infiltrative disease; and/or assigning a likelihood that a subject will progress to a particular RIFLE stage. In these embodiments, the assay result(s), for example a measured concentration of one or more markers selected from the group consisting of soluble Advanced glycosylation end product-specific receptor, Bactericidal permeability-increasing protein, Interleukin 12, Fibroblast growth factor 23, and Intestinal fatty acid-binding protein is/are correlated to a particular class and/or subclass. The following are preferred classification embodiments.

[0036] In preferred classification embodiments, these methods comprise determining whether a renal injury in a subject is prerenal, intrinsic renal, or postrenal; and/or further subdividing these classes into subclasses such as acute tubular injury, acute glomerulonephritis acute tubulointerstitial nephritis, acute vascular nephropathy, or infiltrative disease; and/or assigning a likelihood that a subject will progress to a particular RIFLE stage, and the assay result(s) is/are correlated to the injury classification for the subject. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and when the measured concentration is above the threshold, a particular

classification is assigned; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, a different classification may be assigned to the subject.

[0037] A variety of methods may be used by the skilled artisan to arrive at a desired threshold value for use in these methods. For example, the threshold value may be determined from a population of normal subjects by selecting a concentration representing the 75th, 85th, 90th, 95th, or 99th percentile of a kidney injury marker measured in such normal subjects. Alternatively, the threshold value may be determined from a “diseased” population of subjects, e.g., those suffering from an injury or having a predisposition for an injury (e.g., progression to ARF or some other clinical outcome such as death, dialysis, renal transplantation, *etc.*), by selecting a concentration representing the 75th, 85th, 90th, 95th, or 99th percentile of a kidney injury marker measured in such subjects. In another alternative, the threshold value may be determined from a prior measurement of a kidney injury marker in the same subject; that is, a temporal change in the level of a kidney injury marker in the subject may be used to assign risk to the subject.

[001] The foregoing discussion is not meant to imply, however, that the kidney injury markers of the present invention must be compared to corresponding individual thresholds. Methods for combining assay results can comprise the use of multivariate logistical regression, loglinear modeling, neural network analysis, n-of-m analysis, decision tree analysis, calculating ratios of markers, *etc.* This list is not meant to be limiting. In these methods, a composite result which is determined by combining individual markers may be treated as if it is itself a marker; that is, a threshold may be determined for the composite result as described herein for individual markers, and the composite result for an individual patient compared to this threshold.

[0038] The ability of a particular test to distinguish two populations can be established using ROC analysis. For example, ROC curves established from a “first” subpopulation which is predisposed to one or more future changes in renal status, and a “second” subpopulation which is not so predisposed can be used to calculate a ROC curve, and the area under the curve provides a measure of the quality of the test. Preferably, the tests described herein provide a ROC curve area greater than 0.5, preferably at least 0.6, more preferably 0.7, still more preferably at least 0.8, even more preferably at least 0.9, and most preferably at least 0.95.

[0039] In certain aspects, the measured concentration of one or more kidney injury markers, or a composite of such markers, may be treated as continuous variables. For example, any particular concentration can be converted into a corresponding probability of a future reduction in renal function for the subject, the occurrence of an injury, a classification, etc. In yet another alternative, a threshold that can provide an acceptable level of specificity and sensitivity in separating a population of subjects into “bins” such as a “first” subpopulation (e.g., which is predisposed to one or more future changes in renal status, the occurrence of an injury, a classification, etc.) and a “second” subpopulation which is not so predisposed. A threshold value is selected to separate this first and second population by one or more of the following measures of test accuracy:

an odds ratio greater than 1, preferably at least about 2 or more or about 0.5 or less, more preferably at least about 3 or more or about 0.33 or less, still more preferably at least about 4 or more or about 0.25 or less, even more preferably at least about 5 or more or about 0.2 or less, and most preferably at least about 10 or more or about 0.1 or less;

a specificity of greater than 0.5, preferably at least about 0.6, more preferably at least about 0.7, still more preferably at least about 0.8, even more preferably at least about 0.9 and most preferably at least about 0.95, with a corresponding sensitivity greater than 0.2, preferably greater than about 0.3, more preferably greater than about 0.4, still more preferably at least about 0.5, even more preferably about 0.6, yet more preferably greater than about 0.7, still more preferably greater than about 0.8, more preferably greater than about 0.9, and most preferably greater than about 0.95;

a sensitivity of greater than 0.5, preferably at least about 0.6, more preferably at least about 0.7, still more preferably at least about 0.8, even more preferably at least about 0.9 and most preferably at least about 0.95, with a corresponding specificity greater than 0.2, preferably greater than about 0.3, more preferably greater than about 0.4, still more preferably at least about 0.5, even more preferably about 0.6, yet more preferably greater than about 0.7, still more preferably greater than about 0.8, more preferably greater than about 0.9, and most preferably greater than about 0.95;

at least about 75% sensitivity, combined with at least about 75% specificity;

a positive likelihood ratio (calculated as sensitivity/(1-specificity)) of greater than 1, at least about 2, more preferably at least about 3, still more preferably at least about 5, and most preferably at least about 10; or

a negative likelihood ratio (calculated as $(1 - \text{sensitivity}) / \text{specificity}$) of less than 1, less than or equal to about 0.5, more preferably less than or equal to about 0.3, and most preferably less than or equal to about 0.1.

The term “about” in the context of any of the above measurements refers to $\pm 5\%$ of a given measurement.

[0040] Multiple thresholds may also be used to assess renal status in a subject. For example, a “first” subpopulation which is predisposed to one or more future changes in renal status, the occurrence of an injury, a classification, etc., and a “second” subpopulation which is not so predisposed can be combined into a single group. This group is then subdivided into three or more equal parts (known as tertiles, quartiles, quintiles, etc., depending on the number of subdivisions). An odds ratio is assigned to subjects based on which subdivision they fall into. If one considers a tertile, the lowest or highest tertile can be used as a reference for comparison of the other subdivisions. This reference subdivision is assigned an odds ratio of 1. The second tertile is assigned an odds ratio that is relative to that first tertile. That is, someone in the second tertile might be 3 times more likely to suffer one or more future changes in renal status in comparison to someone in the first tertile. The third tertile is also assigned an odds ratio that is relative to that first tertile.

[0041] In certain embodiments, the assay method is an immunoassay. Antibodies for use in such assays will specifically bind a full length kidney injury marker of interest, and may also bind one or more polypeptides that are “related” thereto, as that term is defined hereinafter. Numerous immunoassay formats are known to those of skill in the art. Preferred body fluid samples are selected from the group consisting of urine, blood, serum, saliva, tears, and plasma.

[0042] The foregoing method steps should not be interpreted to mean that the kidney injury marker assay result(s) is/are used in isolation in the methods described herein. Rather, additional variables or other clinical indicia may be included in the methods described herein. For example, a risk stratification, diagnostic, classification, monitoring, etc. method may combine the assay result(s) with one or more variables measured for the subject selected from the group consisting of demographic information (e.g., weight, sex, age, race), medical history (e.g., family history, type of surgery, pre-existing disease such as aneurism, congestive heart failure, preeclampsia, eclampsia, diabetes mellitus,

hypertension, coronary artery disease, proteinuria, renal insufficiency, or sepsis, type of toxin exposure such as NSAIDs, cyclosporines, tacrolimus, aminoglycosides, foscarnet, ethylene glycol, hemoglobin, myoglobin, ifosfamide, heavy metals, methotrexate, radiopaque contrast agents, or streptozotocin), clinical variables (e.g., blood pressure, temperature, respiration rate), risk scores (APACHE score, PREDICT score, TIMI Risk Score for UA/NSTEMI, Framingham Risk Score), a glomerular filtration rate, an estimated glomerular filtration rate, a urine production rate, a serum or plasma creatinine concentration, a urine creatinine concentration, a fractional excretion of sodium, a urine sodium concentration, a urine creatinine to serum or plasma creatinine ratio, a urine specific gravity, a urine osmolality, a urine urea nitrogen to plasma urea nitrogen ratio, a plasma BUN to creatinine ratio, a renal failure index calculated as urine sodium / (urine creatinine / plasma creatinine), a serum or plasma neutrophil gelatinase (NGAL) concentration, a urine NGAL concentration, a serum or plasma cystatin C concentration, a serum or plasma cardiac troponin concentration, a serum or plasma BNP concentration, a serum or plasma NTproBNP concentration, and a serum or plasma proBNP concentration. Other measures of renal function which may be combined with one or more kidney injury marker assay result(s) are described hereinafter and in Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine, 17th Ed., McGraw Hill, New York, pages 1741-1830, and Current Medical Diagnosis & Treatment 2008, 47th Ed, McGraw Hill, New York, pages 785-815, each of which are hereby incorporated by reference in their entirety.

[0043] When more than one marker is measured, the individual markers may be measured in samples obtained at the same time, or may be determined from samples obtained at different (e.g., an earlier or later) times. The individual markers may also be measured on the same or different body fluid samples. For example, one kidney injury marker may be measured in a serum or plasma sample and another kidney injury marker may be measured in a urine sample. In addition, assignment of a likelihood may combine an individual kidney injury marker assay result with temporal changes in one or more additional variables.

[0044] In various related aspects, the present invention also relates to devices and kits for performing the methods described herein. Suitable kits comprise reagents sufficient for performing an assay for at least one of the described kidney injury markers, together with instructions for performing the described threshold comparisons.

[0045] In certain embodiments, reagents for performing such assays are provided in an assay device, and such assay devices may be included in such a kit. Preferred reagents can comprise one or more solid phase antibodies, the solid phase antibody comprising antibody that detects the intended biomarker target(s) bound to a solid support. In the case of sandwich immunoassays, such reagents can also include one or more detectably labeled antibodies, the detectably labeled antibody comprising antibody that detects the intended biomarker target(s) bound to a detectable label. Additional optional elements that may be provided as part of an assay device are described hereinafter.

[0046] Detectable labels may include molecules that are themselves detectable (e.g., fluorescent moieties, electrochemical labels, ecl (electrochemical luminescence) labels, metal chelates, colloidal metal particles, *etc.*) as well as molecules that may be indirectly detected by production of a detectable reaction product (e.g., enzymes such as horseradish peroxidase, alkaline phosphatase, *etc.*) or through the use of a specific binding molecule which itself may be detectable (e.g., a labeled antibody that binds to the second antibody, biotin, digoxigenin, maltose, oligohistidine, 2,4-dinitrobenzene, phenylarsenate, ssDNA, dsDNA, *etc.*).

[0047] Generation of a signal from the signal development element can be performed using various optical, acoustical, and electrochemical methods well known in the art. Examples of detection modes include fluorescence, radiochemical detection, reflectance, absorbance, amperometry, conductance, impedance, interferometry, ellipsometry, *etc.* In certain of these methods, the solid phase antibody is coupled to a transducer (e.g., a diffraction grating, electrochemical sensor, etc) for generation of a signal, while in others, a signal is generated by a transducer that is spatially separate from the solid phase antibody (e.g., a fluorometer that employs an excitation light source and an optical detector). This list is not meant to be limiting. Antibody-based biosensors may also be employed to determine the presence or amount of analytes that optionally eliminate the need for a labeled molecule.

BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF THE FIGURES

[0048] Fig. 1 provides data tables determined in accordance with Example 6 for the comparison of marker levels in urine samples collected for Cohort 1 (patients that did not progress beyond RIFLE stage 0) and in urine samples collected from subjects at 0, 24 hours, and 48 hours prior to reaching stage R, I or F in Cohort 2. Tables provide

descriptive statistics, AUC analysis, and sensitivity, specificity and odds ratio calculations at various threshold (cutoff) levels for the various markers.

[0049] Fig. 2 provides data tables determined in accordance with Example 7 for the comparison of marker levels in urine samples collected for Cohort 1 (patients that did not progress beyond RIFLE stage 0 or R) and in urine samples collected from subjects at 0, 24 hours, and 48 hours prior to reaching stage I or F in Cohort 2. Tables provide descriptive statistics, AUC analysis, and sensitivity, specificity and odds ratio calculations at various threshold (cutoff) levels for the various markers.

[0050] Fig. 3 provides data tables determined in accordance with Example 8 for the comparison of marker levels in urine samples collected for Cohort 1 (patients that reached, but did not progress beyond, RIFLE stage R) and in urine samples collected from subjects at 0, 24 hours, and 48 hours prior to reaching stage I or F in Cohort 2. Tables provide descriptive statistics, AUC analysis, and sensitivity, specificity and odds ratio calculations at various threshold (cutoff) levels for the various markers.

[0051] Fig. 4 provides data tables determined in accordance with Example 9 for the comparison of marker levels in urine samples collected for Cohort 1 (patients that did not progress beyond RIFLE stage 0) and in urine samples collected from subjects at 0, 24 hours, and 48 hours prior to reaching stage F in Cohort 2. Tables provide descriptive statistics, AUC analysis, and sensitivity, specificity and odds ratio calculations at various threshold (cutoff) levels for the various markers.

[0052] Fig. 5 provides data tables determined in accordance with Example 6 for the comparison of marker levels in plasma samples collected for Cohort 1 (patients that did not progress beyond RIFLE stage 0) and in plasma samples collected from subjects at 0, 24 hours, and 48 hours prior to reaching stage R, I or F in Cohort 2. Tables provide descriptive statistics, AUC analysis, and sensitivity, specificity and odds ratio calculations at various threshold (cutoff) levels for the various markers.

[0053] Fig. 6 provides data tables determined in accordance with Example 7 for the comparison of marker levels in plasma samples collected for Cohort 1 (patients that did not progress beyond RIFLE stage 0 or R) and in plasma samples collected from subjects at 0, 24 hours, and 48 hours prior to reaching stage I or F in Cohort 2. Tables provide descriptive statistics, AUC analysis, and sensitivity, specificity and odds ratio calculations at various threshold (cutoff) levels for the various markers.

[0054] Fig. 7 provides data tables determined in accordance with Example 8 for the comparison of marker levels in plasma samples collected for Cohort 1 (patients that reached, but did not progress beyond, RIFLE stage R) and in plasma samples collected from subjects at 0, 24 hours, and 48 hours prior to reaching stage I or F in Cohort 2. Tables provide descriptive statistics, AUC analysis, and sensitivity, specificity and odds ratio calculations at various threshold (cutoff) levels for the various markers.

[0055] Fig. 8 provides data tables determined in accordance with Example 9 for the comparison of marker levels in plasma samples collected for Cohort 1 (patients that did not progress beyond RIFLE stage 0) and in plasma samples collected from subjects at 0, 24 hours, and 48 hours prior to reaching stage F in Cohort 2. Tables provide descriptive statistics, AUC analysis, and sensitivity, specificity and odds ratio calculations at various threshold (cutoff) levels for the various markers.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION

[0056] The present invention relates to methods and compositions for diagnosis, differential diagnosis, risk stratification, monitoring, classifying and determination of treatment regimens in subjects suffering or at risk of suffering from injury to renal function, reduced renal function and/or acute renal failure through measurement of one or more kidney injury markers. In various embodiments, a measured concentration of one or more markers selected from the group consisting of soluble Advanced glycosylation end product-specific receptor, Bactericidal permeability-increasing protein, Interleukin 12, Fibroblast growth factor 23, and Intestinal fatty acid-binding protein, or one or more markers related thereto, are correlated to the renal status of the subject.

[0057] For purposes of this document, the following definitions apply:

As used herein, an “injury to renal function” is an abrupt (within 14 days, preferably within 7 days, more preferably within 72 hours, and still more preferably within 48 hours) measurable reduction in a measure of renal function. Such an injury may be identified, for example, by a decrease in glomerular filtration rate or estimated GFR, a reduction in urine output, an increase in serum creatinine, an increase in serum cystatin C, a requirement for renal replacement therapy, *etc.* “Improvement in Renal Function” is an abrupt (within 14 days, preferably within 7 days, more preferably within 72 hours, and still more preferably within 48 hours) measurable increase in a measure of renal function. Preferred methods for measuring and/or estimating GFR are described hereinafter.

As used herein, “reduced renal function” is an abrupt (within 14 days, preferably within 7 days, more preferably within 72 hours, and still more preferably within 48 hours) reduction in kidney function identified by an absolute increase in serum creatinine of greater than or equal to 0.1 mg/dL ($\geq 8.8 \mu\text{mol/L}$), a percentage increase in serum creatinine of greater than or equal to 20% (1.2-fold from baseline), or a reduction in urine output (documented oliguria of less than 0.5 ml/kg per hour).

As used herein, “acute renal failure” or “ARF” is an abrupt (within 14 days, preferably within 7 days, more preferably within 72 hours, and still more preferably within 48 hours) reduction in kidney function identified by an absolute increase in serum creatinine of greater than or equal to 0.3 mg/dl ($\geq 26.4 \mu\text{mol/l}$), a percentage increase in serum creatinine of greater than or equal to 50% (1.5-fold from baseline), or a reduction in urine output (documented oliguria of less than 0.5 ml/kg per hour for at least 6 hours). This term is synonymous with “acute kidney injury” or “AKI.”

[0058] In this regard, the skilled artisan will understand that the signals obtained from an immunoassay are a direct result of complexes formed between one or more antibodies and the target biomolecule (*i.e.*, the analyte) and polypeptides containing the necessary epitope(s) to which the antibodies bind. While such assays may detect the full length biomarker and the assay result be expressed as a concentration of a biomarker of interest, the signal from the assay is actually a result of all such “immunoreactive” polypeptides present in the sample. Expression of biomarkers may also be determined by means other than immunoassays, including protein measurements (such as dot blots, western blots, chromatographic methods, mass spectrometry, *etc.*) and nucleic acid measurements (mRNA quantitation). This list is not meant to be limiting.

[0059] As used herein, the term “Lysozyme C” refers to one or polypeptides present in a biological sample that are derived from the Lysozyme C precursor (Swiss-Prot P61626 (SEQ ID NO: 1)).

```

      10           20           30           40           50           60
MKALIVLGLV LLSVTVQGKV FERCELARTL KRLGMDGYRG ISLANWMCLA KWESGYNTRA

      70           80           90          100          110          120
TNYNAGDRST DYGIFQINSR YWCNDGKTPG AVNACHLSCS ALLQDNIADA VACA KRVVRD

      130          140
PQGIRAWVAW RNRCQNRDVR QYVQGCGV

```

[0060] The following domains have been identified in Lysozyme C:

Residues	Length	Domain ID
1-18	18	Signal sequence
19-148	130	Lysozyme C

[0061] Ferritin is an oligomer of 24 subunits which may comprise heavy chain, light chain, or both. As used herein, the term “Ferritin” refers to one or more polypeptides present in a biological sample that are derived from a Ferritin precursor (Swiss-Prot P02792 (light chain) (SEQ ID NO: 2)):

```

      10      20      30      40      50      60
MSSQIRQNYST DVEAAVNSL VNLYLQASYT YLSLGFYFDR DDVALEGVSH FFRELAEKR
      70      80      90     100     110     120
EGYERLLKMQ NQRGGRALFQ DIKKPAEDEW GKTPDAMKAA MALEKKLNQA LLDLHALGSA
     130     140     150     160     170
RTDPHLCDFL ETHFLDEEVK LIKKMGDHLT NLHRLGGPEA GLGEYLFERL TLKHD

```

(and Swiss-Prot P02794 (heavy chain) (SEQ ID NO: 3)):

```

      10      20      30      40      50      60
MTTASTSQVR QNYHQDSEAA INRQINLELY ASYVYLSMSY YFDRDDVALK NFAKYFLHQS
      70      80      90     100     110     120
HEEREHAEKL MKLQNQRGGR IFLQDIKKPD CDDWESGLNA MECALHLEKN VNQSLLELHK
     130     140     150     160     170     180
LATDKNDPHL CDFIETHYLN EQVKAIKELG DHVTNLRKMG APESGLAEYL FDKHTLGDS

```

NES

[0062] The following domains have been identified in Ferritin light chain:

Residues	Length	Domain ID
1	1	Initiator methionine
2-175	174	Ferritin light chain

[0063] The following domains have been identified in Ferritin heavy chain:

Residues	Length	Domain ID
1	1	Initiator methionine
2-183	182	Ferritin heavy chain

[0064] In this regard, the skilled artisan will understand that the signals obtained from an immunoassay are a direct result of complexes formed between one or more antibodies and the target biomolecule (*i.e.*, the analyte) and polypeptides containing the necessary epitope(s) to which the antibodies bind. An assay of the invention may detect Ferritin heavy chain, Ferritin light chain, or only oligomers containing both heavy and light chains. For example, a sandwich assay may be formulated with two antibodies that bind to Ferritin heavy chain, two antibodies that bind to Ferritin light chain, or one antibody that binds to the heavy chain and one that binds to the light chain. While such assays may detect the respective full length Ferritin molecule(s) and the assay result be expressed as a concentration of Ferritin, the signal from the assay is actually a result of all such “immunoreactive” polypeptides present in the sample.

[0065] As used herein, the term “relating a signal to the presence or amount” of an analyte reflects this understanding. Assay signals are typically related to the presence or amount of an analyte through the use of a standard curve calculated using known concentrations of the analyte of interest. As the term is used herein, an assay is “configured to detect” an analyte if an assay can generate a detectable signal indicative of the presence or amount of a physiologically relevant concentration of the analyte. Because an antibody epitope is on the order of 8 amino acids, an immunoassay configured to detect a marker of interest will also detect polypeptides related to the marker sequence, so long as those polypeptides contain the epitope(s) necessary to bind to the antibody or antibodies used in the assay. The term “related marker” as used herein with regard to a biomarker such as one of the kidney injury markers described herein refers to one or more fragments, variants, etc., of a particular marker or its biosynthetic parent that may be detected as a surrogate for the marker itself or as independent biomarkers. The term also refers to one or more polypeptides present in a biological sample that are derived from the biomarker precursor complexed to additional species, such as binding proteins, receptors, heparin, lipids, sugars, *etc.*

[0066] The term “positive going” marker as that term is used herein refer to a marker that is determined to be elevated in subjects suffering from a disease or condition, relative to subjects not suffering from that disease or condition. The term “negative going” marker as that term is used herein refer to a marker that is determined to be reduced in subjects suffering from a disease or condition, relative to subjects not suffering from that disease or condition.

[0067] The term “subject” as used herein refers to a human or non-human organism. Thus, the methods and compositions described herein are applicable to both human and veterinary disease. Further, while a subject is preferably a living organism, the invention described herein may be used in post-mortem analysis as well. Preferred subjects are humans, and most preferably “patients,” which as used herein refers to living humans that are receiving medical care for a disease or condition. This includes persons with no defined illness who are being investigated for signs of pathology.

[0068] Preferably, an analyte is measured in a sample. Such a sample may be obtained from a subject, or may be obtained from biological materials intended to be provided to the subject. For example, a sample may be obtained from a kidney being evaluated for possible transplantation into a subject, and an analyte measurement used to evaluate the kidney for preexisting damage. Preferred samples are body fluid samples.

[0069] The term “body fluid sample” as used herein refers to a sample of bodily fluid obtained for the purpose of diagnosis, prognosis, classification or evaluation of a subject of interest, such as a patient or transplant donor. In certain embodiments, such a sample may be obtained for the purpose of determining the outcome of an ongoing condition or the effect of a treatment regimen on a condition. Preferred body fluid samples include blood, serum, plasma, cerebrospinal fluid, urine, saliva, sputum, and pleural effusions. In addition, one of skill in the art would realize that certain body fluid samples would be more readily analyzed following a fractionation or purification procedure, for example, separation of whole blood into serum or plasma components.

[0070] The term “diagnosis” as used herein refers to methods by which the skilled artisan can estimate and/or determine the probability (“a likelihood”) of whether or not a patient is suffering from a given disease or condition. In the case of the present invention, “diagnosis” includes using the results of an assay, most preferably an immunoassay, for a kidney injury marker of the present invention, optionally together with other clinical characteristics, to arrive at a diagnosis (that is, the occurrence or nonoccurrence) of an acute renal injury or ARF for the subject from which a sample was obtained and assayed. That such a diagnosis is “determined” is not meant to imply that the diagnosis is 100% accurate. Many biomarkers are indicative of multiple conditions. The skilled clinician does not use biomarker results in an informational vacuum, but rather test results are used together with other clinical indicia to arrive at a diagnosis. Thus, a measured biomarker level on one side of a predetermined diagnostic threshold indicates a greater likelihood of

the occurrence of disease in the subject relative to a measured level on the other side of the predetermined diagnostic threshold.

[0071] Similarly, a prognostic risk signals a probability (“a likelihood”) that a given course or outcome will occur. A level or a change in level of a prognostic indicator, which in turn is associated with an increased probability of morbidity (e.g., worsening renal function, future ARF, or death) is referred to as being “indicative of an increased likelihood” of an adverse outcome in a patient.

[0072] Marker Assays

[0073] In general, immunoassays involve contacting a sample containing or suspected of containing a biomarker of interest with at least one antibody that specifically binds to the biomarker. A signal is then generated indicative of the presence or amount of complexes formed by the binding of polypeptides in the sample to the antibody. The signal is then related to the presence or amount of the biomarker in the sample. Numerous methods and devices are well known to the skilled artisan for the detection and analysis of biomarkers. *See, e.g.*, U.S. Patents 6,143,576; 6,113,855; 6,019,944; 5,985,579; 5,947,124; 5,939,272; 5,922,615; 5,885,527; 5,851,776; 5,824,799; 5,679,526; 5,525,524; and 5,480,792, and *The Immunoassay Handbook*, David Wild, ed. Stockton Press, New York, 1994, each of which is hereby incorporated by reference in its entirety, including all tables, figures and claims.

[0074] The assay devices and methods known in the art can utilize labeled molecules in various sandwich, competitive, or non-competitive assay formats, to generate a signal that is related to the presence or amount of the biomarker of interest. Suitable assay formats also include chromatographic, mass spectrographic, and protein “blotting” methods. Additionally, certain methods and devices, such as biosensors and optical immunoassays, may be employed to determine the presence or amount of analytes without the need for a labeled molecule. *See, e.g.*, U.S. Patents 5,631,171; and 5,955,377, each of which is hereby incorporated by reference in its entirety, including all tables, figures and claims. One skilled in the art also recognizes that robotic instrumentation including but not limited to Beckman ACCESS®, Abbott AXSYM®, Roche ELECSYS®, Dade Behring STRATUS® systems are among the immunoassay analyzers that are capable of performing immunoassays. But any suitable immunoassay may be

utilized, for example, enzyme-linked immunoassays (ELISA), radioimmunoassays (RIAs), competitive binding assays, and the like.

[0075] Antibodies or other polypeptides may be immobilized onto a variety of solid supports for use in assays. Solid phases that may be used to immobilize specific binding members include those developed and/or used as solid phases in solid phase binding assays. Examples of suitable solid phases include membrane filters, cellulose-based papers, beads (including polymeric, latex and paramagnetic particles), glass, silicon wafers, microparticles, nanoparticles, TentaGels, AgroGels, PEGA gels, SPOCC gels, and multiple-well plates. An assay strip could be prepared by coating the antibody or a plurality of antibodies in an array on solid support. This strip could then be dipped into the test sample and then processed quickly through washes and detection steps to generate a measurable signal, such as a colored spot. Antibodies or other polypeptides may be bound to specific zones of assay devices either by conjugating directly to an assay device surface, or by indirect binding. In an example of the later case, antibodies or other polypeptides may be immobilized on particles or other solid supports, and that solid support immobilized to the device surface.

[0076] Biological assays require methods for detection, and one of the most common methods for quantitation of results is to conjugate a detectable label to a protein or nucleic acid that has affinity for one of the components in the biological system being studied. Detectable labels may include molecules that are themselves detectable (*e.g.*, fluorescent moieties, electrochemical labels, metal chelates, *etc.*) as well as molecules that may be indirectly detected by production of a detectable reaction product (*e.g.*, enzymes such as horseradish peroxidase, alkaline phosphatase, *etc.*) or by a specific binding molecule which itself may be detectable (*e.g.*, biotin, digoxigenin, maltose, oligohistidine, 2,4-dinitrobenzene, phenylarsenate, ssDNA, dsDNA, *etc.*).

[0077] Preparation of solid phases and detectable label conjugates often comprise the use of chemical cross-linkers. Cross-linking reagents contain at least two reactive groups, and are divided generally into homofunctional cross-linkers (containing identical reactive groups) and heterofunctional cross-linkers (containing non-identical reactive groups). Homobifunctional cross-linkers that couple through amines, sulfhydryls or react non-specifically are available from many commercial sources. Maleimides, alkyl and aryl halides, alpha-haloacyls and pyridyl disulfides are thiol reactive groups. Maleimides, alkyl and aryl halides, and alpha-haloacyls react with sulfhydryls to form thiol ether

bonds, while pyridyl disulfides react with sulfhydryls to produce mixed disulfides. The pyridyl disulfide product is cleavable. Imidoesters are also very useful for protein-protein cross-links. A variety of heterobifunctional cross-linkers, each combining different attributes for successful conjugation, are commercially available.

[0078] In certain aspects, the present invention provides kits for the analysis of the described kidney injury markers. The kit comprises reagents for the analysis of at least one test sample which comprise at least one antibody that a kidney injury marker. The kit can also include devices and instructions for performing one or more of the diagnostic and/or prognostic correlations described herein. Preferred kits will comprise an antibody pair for performing a sandwich assay, or a labeled species for performing a competitive assay, for the analyte. Preferably, an antibody pair comprises a first antibody conjugated to a solid phase and a second antibody conjugated to a detectable label, wherein each of the first and second antibodies that bind a kidney injury marker. Most preferably each of the antibodies are monoclonal antibodies. The instructions for use of the kit and performing the correlations can be in the form of labeling, which refers to any written or recorded material that is attached to, or otherwise accompanies a kit at any time during its manufacture, transport, sale or use. For example, the term labeling encompasses advertising leaflets and brochures, packaging materials, instructions, audio or video cassettes, computer discs, as well as writing imprinted directly on kits.

[0079] Antibodies

[0080] The term "antibody" as used herein refers to a peptide or polypeptide derived from, modeled after or substantially encoded by an immunoglobulin gene or immunoglobulin genes, or fragments thereof, capable of specifically binding an antigen or epitope. *See, e.g.* Fundamental Immunology, 3rd Edition, W.E. Paul, ed., Raven Press, N.Y. (1993); Wilson (1994); J. Immunol. Methods 175:267-273; Yarmush (1992) J. Biochem. Biophys. Methods 25:85-97. The term antibody includes antigen-binding portions, i.e., "antigen binding sites," (e.g., fragments, subsequences, complementarity determining regions (CDRs)) that retain capacity to bind antigen, including (i) a Fab fragment, a monovalent fragment consisting of the VL, VH, CL and CH1 domains; (ii) a F(ab')₂ fragment, a bivalent fragment comprising two Fab fragments linked by a disulfide bridge at the hinge region; (iii) a Fd fragment consisting of the VH and CH1 domains; (iv) a Fv fragment consisting of the VL and VH domains of a single arm of an antibody, (v) a dAb fragment (Ward et al., (1989) Nature 341:544-546), which consists of a VH domain;

and (vi) an isolated complementarity determining region (CDR). Single chain antibodies are also included by reference in the term "antibody."

[0081] Antibodies used in the immunoassays described herein preferably specifically bind to a kidney injury marker of the present invention. The term "specifically binds" is not intended to indicate that an antibody binds exclusively to its intended target since, as noted above, an antibody binds to any polypeptide displaying the epitope(s) to which the antibody binds. Rather, an antibody "specifically binds" if its affinity for its intended target is about 5-fold greater when compared to its affinity for a non-target molecule which does not display the appropriate epitope(s). Preferably the affinity of the antibody will be at least about 5 fold, preferably 10 fold, more preferably 25-fold, even more preferably 50-fold, and most preferably 100-fold or more, greater for a target molecule than its affinity for a non-target molecule. In preferred embodiments, Preferred antibodies bind with affinities of at least about 10^7 M^{-1} , and preferably between about 10^8 M^{-1} to about 10^9 M^{-1} , about 10^9 M^{-1} to about 10^{10} M^{-1} , or about 10^{10} M^{-1} to about 10^{12} M^{-1} .

[0082] Affinity is calculated as $K_d = k_{\text{off}}/k_{\text{on}}$ (k_{off} is the dissociation rate constant, K_{on} is the association rate constant and K_d is the equilibrium constant). Affinity can be determined at equilibrium by measuring the fraction bound (r) of labeled ligand at various concentrations (c). The data are graphed using the Scatchard equation: $r/c = K(n-r)$: where r = moles of bound ligand/mole of receptor at equilibrium; c = free ligand concentration at equilibrium; K = equilibrium association constant; and n = number of ligand binding sites per receptor molecule. By graphical analysis, r/c is plotted on the Y-axis versus r on the X-axis, thus producing a Scatchard plot. Antibody affinity measurement by Scatchard analysis is well known in the art. See, e.g., van Erp *et al.*, *J. Immunoassay* 12: 425-43, 1991; Nelson and Griswold, *Comput. Methods Programs Biomed.* 27: 65-8, 1988.

[0083] The term "epitope" refers to an antigenic determinant capable of specific binding to an antibody. Epitopes usually consist of chemically active surface groupings of molecules such as amino acids or sugar side chains and usually have specific three dimensional structural characteristics, as well as specific charge characteristics. Conformational and nonconformational epitopes are distinguished in that the binding to the former but not the latter is lost in the presence of denaturing solvents.

[0084] Numerous publications discuss the use of phage display technology to produce and screen libraries of polypeptides for binding to a selected analyte. See, e.g, Cwirla *et*

al., *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. USA* 87, 6378-82, 1990; Devlin *et al.*, *Science* 249, 404-6, 1990, Scott and Smith, *Science* 249, 386-88, 1990; and Ladner *et al.*, U.S. Pat. No. 5,571,698. A basic concept of phage display methods is the establishment of a physical association between DNA encoding a polypeptide to be screened and the polypeptide. This physical association is provided by the phage particle, which displays a polypeptide as part of a capsid enclosing the phage genome which encodes the polypeptide. The establishment of a physical association between polypeptides and their genetic material allows simultaneous mass screening of very large numbers of phage bearing different polypeptides. Phage displaying a polypeptide with affinity to a target bind to the target and these phage are enriched by affinity screening to the target. The identity of polypeptides displayed from these phage can be determined from their respective genomes. Using these methods a polypeptide identified as having a binding affinity for a desired target can then be synthesized in bulk by conventional means. *See, e.g.*, U.S. Patent No. 6,057,098, which is hereby incorporated in its entirety, including all tables, figures, and claims.

[0085] The antibodies that are generated by these methods may then be selected by first screening for affinity and specificity with the purified polypeptide of interest and, if required, comparing the results to the affinity and specificity of the antibodies with polypeptides that are desired to be excluded from binding. The screening procedure can involve immobilization of the purified polypeptides in separate wells of microtiter plates. The solution containing a potential antibody or groups of antibodies is then placed into the respective microtiter wells and incubated for about 30 min to 2 h. The microtiter wells are then washed and a labeled secondary antibody (for example, an anti-mouse antibody conjugated to alkaline phosphatase if the raised antibodies are mouse antibodies) is added to the wells and incubated for about 30 min and then washed. Substrate is added to the wells and a color reaction will appear where antibody to the immobilized polypeptide(s) are present.

[0086] The antibodies so identified may then be further analyzed for affinity and specificity in the assay design selected. In the development of immunoassays for a target protein, the purified target protein acts as a standard with which to judge the sensitivity and specificity of the immunoassay using the antibodies that have been selected. Because the binding affinity of various antibodies may differ; certain antibody pairs (*e.g.*, in sandwich assays) may interfere with one another sterically, *etc.*, assay performance of an

antibody may be a more important measure than absolute affinity and specificity of an antibody.

Assay Correlations

[0087] The term “correlating” as used herein in reference to the use of biomarkers refers to comparing the presence or amount of the biomarker(s) in a patient to its presence or amount in persons known to suffer from, or known to be at risk of, a given condition; or in persons known to be free of a given condition. Often, this takes the form of comparing an assay result in the form of a biomarker concentration to a predetermined threshold selected to be indicative of the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a disease or the likelihood of some future outcome.

[0088] Selecting a diagnostic threshold involves, among other things, consideration of the probability of disease, distribution of true and false diagnoses at different test thresholds, and estimates of the consequences of treatment (or a failure to treat) based on the diagnosis. For example, when considering administering a specific therapy which is highly efficacious and has a low level of risk, few tests are needed because clinicians can accept substantial diagnostic uncertainty. On the other hand, in situations where treatment options are less effective and more risky, clinicians often need a higher degree of diagnostic certainty. Thus, cost/benefit analysis is involved in selecting a diagnostic threshold.

[0089] Suitable thresholds may be determined in a variety of ways. For example, one recommended diagnostic threshold for the diagnosis of acute myocardial infarction using cardiac troponin is the 97.5th percentile of the concentration seen in a normal population. Another method may be to look at serial samples from the same patient, where a prior “baseline” result is used to monitor for temporal changes in a biomarker level.

[0090] Population studies may also be used to select a decision threshold. Receiver Operating Characteristic (“ROC”) arose from the field of signal detection theory developed during World War II for the analysis of radar images, and ROC analysis is often used to select a threshold able to best distinguish a “diseased” subpopulation from a “nondiseased” subpopulation. A false positive in this case occurs when the person tests positive, but actually does not have the disease. A false negative, on the other hand, occurs when the person tests negative, suggesting they are healthy, when they actually do have the disease. To draw a ROC curve, the true positive rate (TPR) and false positive

rate (FPR) are determined as the decision threshold is varied continuously. Since TPR is equivalent with sensitivity and FPR is equal to 1 - specificity, the ROC graph is sometimes called the sensitivity vs (1 - specificity) plot. A perfect test will have an area under the ROC curve of 1.0; a random test will have an area of 0.5. A threshold is selected to provide an acceptable level of specificity and sensitivity.

[0091] In this context, “diseased” is meant to refer to a population having one characteristic (the presence of a disease or condition or the occurrence of some outcome) and “nondiseased” is meant to refer to a population lacking the characteristic. While a single decision threshold is the simplest application of such a method, multiple decision thresholds may be used. For example, below a first threshold, the absence of disease may be assigned with relatively high confidence, and above a second threshold the presence of disease may also be assigned with relatively high confidence. Between the two thresholds may be considered indeterminate. This is meant to be exemplary in nature only.

[0092] In addition to threshold comparisons, other methods for correlating assay results to a patient classification (occurrence or nonoccurrence of disease, likelihood of an outcome, *etc.*) include decision trees, rule sets, Bayesian methods, and neural network methods. These methods can produce probability values representing the degree to which a subject belongs to one classification out of a plurality of classifications.

[0100] Measures of test accuracy may be obtained as described in Fischer *et al.*, *Intensive Care Med.* 29: 1043-51, 2003, and used to determine the effectiveness of a given biomarker. These measures include sensitivity and specificity, predictive values, likelihood ratios, diagnostic odds ratios, and ROC curve areas. The area under the curve (“AUC”) of a ROC plot is equal to the probability that a classifier will rank a randomly chosen positive instance higher than a randomly chosen negative one. The area under the ROC curve may be thought of as equivalent to the Mann-Whitney U test, which tests for the median difference between scores obtained in the two groups considered if the groups are of continuous data, or to the Wilcoxon test of ranks.

[0101] As discussed above, suitable tests may exhibit one or more of the following results on these various measures: a specificity of greater than 0.5, preferably at least 0.6, more preferably at least 0.7, still more preferably at least 0.8, even more preferably at least 0.9 and most preferably at least 0.95, with a corresponding sensitivity greater than 0.2, preferably greater than 0.3, more preferably greater than 0.4, still more preferably at

least 0.5, even more preferably 0.6, yet more preferably greater than 0.7, still more preferably greater than 0.8, more preferably greater than 0.9, and most preferably greater than 0.95; a sensitivity of greater than 0.5, preferably at least 0.6, more preferably at least 0.7, still more preferably at least 0.8, even more preferably at least 0.9 and most preferably at least 0.95, with a corresponding specificity greater than 0.2, preferably greater than 0.3, more preferably greater than 0.4, still more preferably at least 0.5, even more preferably 0.6, yet more preferably greater than 0.7, still more preferably greater than 0.8, more preferably greater than 0.9, and most preferably greater than 0.95; at least 75% sensitivity, combined with at least 75% specificity; a ROC curve area of greater than 0.5, preferably at least 0.6, more preferably 0.7, still more preferably at least 0.8, even more preferably at least 0.9, and most preferably at least 0.95; an odds ratio different from 1, preferably at least about 2 or more or about 0.5 or less, more preferably at least about 3 or more or about 0.33 or less, still more preferably at least about 4 or more or about 0.25 or less, even more preferably at least about 5 or more or about 0.2 or less, and most preferably at least about 10 or more or about 0.1 or less; a positive likelihood ratio (calculated as sensitivity/(1-specificity)) of greater than 1, at least 2, more preferably at least 3, still more preferably at least 5, and most preferably at least 10; and or a negative likelihood ratio (calculated as (1-sensitivity)/specificity) of less than 1, less than or equal to 0.5, more preferably less than or equal to 0.3, and most preferably less than or equal to 0.1

[0102] Additional clinical indicia may be combined with the kidney injury marker assay result(s) of the present invention. These include other biomarkers related to renal status. Examples include the following, which recite the common biomarker name, followed by the Swiss-Prot entry number for that biomarker or its parent: Actin (P68133); Adenosine deaminase binding protein (DPP4, P27487); Alpha-1-acid glycoprotein 1 (P02763); Alpha-1-microglobulin (P02760); Albumin (P02768); Angiotensinogenase (Renin, P00797); Annexin A2 (P07355); Beta-glucuronidase (P08236); B-2-microglobulin (P61679); Beta-galactosidase (P16278); BMP-7 (P18075); Brain natriuretic peptide (proBNP, BNP-32, NTproBNP; P16860); Calcium-binding protein Beta (S100-beta, P04271); Carbonic anhydrase (Q16790); Casein Kinase 2 (P68400); Cathepsin B (P07858); Ceruloplasmin (P00450); Clusterin (P10909); Complement C3 (P01024); Cysteine-rich protein (CYR61, O00622); Cytochrome C (P99999); Epidermal growth factor (EGF, P01133); Endothelin-1 (P05305); Exosomal Fetuin-A (P02765);

Fatty acid-binding protein, heart (FABP3, P05413); Fatty acid-binding protein, liver (P07148); Ferritin (light chain, P02793; heavy chain P02794); Fructose-1,6-biphosphatase (P09467); GRO-alpha (CXCL1, (P09341); Growth Hormone (P01241); Hepatocyte growth factor (P14210); Insulin-like growth factor I (P01343); Immunoglobulin G; Immunoglobulin Light Chains (Kappa and Lambda); Interferon gamma (P01308); Lysozyme (P61626); Interleukin-1alpha (P01583); Interleukin-2 (P60568); Interleukin-4 (P60568); Interleukin-9 (P15248); Interleukin-12p40 (P29460); Interleukin-13 (P35225); Interleukin-16 (Q14005); L1 cell adhesion molecule (P32004); Lactate dehydrogenase (P00338); Leucine Aminopeptidase (P28838); Meprin A-alpha subunit (Q16819); Meprin A-beta subunit (Q16820); Midkine (P21741); MIP2-alpha (CXCL2, P19875); MMP-2 (P08253); MMP-9 (P14780); Netrin-1 (O95631); Neutral endopeptidase (P08473); Osteopontin (P10451); Renal papillary antigen 1 (RPA1); Renal papillary antigen 2 (RPA2); Retinol binding protein (P09455); Ribonuclease; S100 calcium-binding protein A6 (P06703); Serum Amyloid P Component (P02743); Sodium/Hydrogen exchanger isoform (NHE3, P48764); Spermidine/spermine N1-acetyltransferase (P21673); TGF-Beta1 (P01137); Transferrin (P02787); Trefoil factor 3 (TFF3, Q07654); Toll-Like protein 4 (O00206); Total protein; Tubulointerstitial nephritis antigen (Q9UJW2); Uromodulin (Tamm-Horsfall protein, P07911).

[0103] For purposes of risk stratification, Adiponectin (Q15848); Alkaline phosphatase (P05186); Aminopeptidase N (P15144); CalbindinD28k (P05937); Cystatin C (P01034); 8 subunit of F1FO ATPase (P03928); Gamma-glutamyltransferase (P19440); GSTa (alpha-glutathione-S-transferase, P08263); GSTpi (Glutathione-S-transferase P; GST class-pi; P09211); IGFBP-1 (P08833); IGFBP-2 (P18065); IGFBP-6 (P24592); Integral membrane protein 1 (Itm1, P46977); Interleukin-6 (P05231); Interleukin-8 (P10145); Interleukin-18 (Q14116); IP-10 (10 kDa interferon-gamma-induced protein, P02778); IRPR (IFRD1, O00458); Isovaleryl-CoA dehydrogenase (IVD, P26440); I-TAC/CXCL11 (O14625); Keratin 19 (P08727); Kim-1 (Hepatitis A virus cellular receptor 1, O43656); L-arginine:glycine amidinotransferase (P50440); Leptin (P41159); Lipocalin2 (NGAL, P80188); MCP-1 (P13500); MIG (Gamma-interferon-induced monokine Q07325); MIP-1a (P10147); MIP-3a (P78556); MIP-1beta (P13236); MIP-1d (Q16663); NAG (N-acetyl-beta-D-glucosaminidase, P54802); Organic ion transporter (OCT2, O15244); Osteoprotegerin (O14788); P8 protein (O60356); Plasminogen activator inhibitor 1 (PAI-1, P05121); ProANP(1-98) (P01160); Protein phosphatase 1-

beta (PPI-beta, P62140); Rab GDI-beta (P50395); Renal kallikrein (Q86U61); RT1.B-1 (alpha) chain of the integral membrane protein (Q5Y7A8); Soluble tumor necrosis factor receptor superfamily member 1A (sTNFR-I, P19438); Soluble tumor necrosis factor receptor superfamily member 1B (sTNFR-II, P20333); Tissue inhibitor of metalloproteinases 3 (TIMP-3, P35625); uPAR (Q03405) may be combined with the kidney injury marker assay result(s) of the present invention.

[0104] Other clinical indicia which may be combined with the kidney injury marker assay result(s) of the present invention includes demographic information (e.g., weight, sex, age, race), medical history (e.g., family history, type of surgery, pre-existing disease such as aneurism, congestive heart failure, preeclampsia, eclampsia, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, coronary artery disease, proteinuria, renal insufficiency, or sepsis, type of toxin exposure such as NSAIDs, cyclosporines, tacrolimus, aminoglycosides, foscarnet, ethylene glycol, hemoglobin, myoglobin, ifosfamide, heavy metals, methotrexate, radiopaque contrast agents, or streptozotocin), clinical variables (e.g., blood pressure, temperature, respiration rate), risk scores (APACHE score, PREDICT score, TIMI Risk Score for UA/NSTEMI, Framingham Risk Score), a urine total protein measurement, a glomerular filtration rate, an estimated glomerular filtration rate, a urine production rate, a serum or plasma creatinine concentration, a renal papillary antigen 1 (RPA1) measurement; a renal papillary antigen 2 (RPA2) measurement; a urine creatinine concentration, a fractional excretion of sodium, a urine sodium concentration, a urine creatinine to serum or plasma creatinine ratio, a urine specific gravity, a urine osmolality, a urine urea nitrogen to plasma urea nitrogen ratio, a plasma BUN to creatinine ratio, and/or a renal failure index calculated as $\text{urine sodium} / (\text{urine creatinine} / \text{plasma creatinine})$. Other measures of renal function which may be combined with the kidney injury marker assay result(s) are described hereinafter and in Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine, 17th Ed., McGraw Hill, New York, pages 1741-1830, and Current Medical Diagnosis & Treatment 2008, 47th Ed, McGraw Hill, New York, pages 785-815, each of which are hereby incorporated by reference in their entirety.

[0105] Combining assay results/clinical indicia in this manner can comprise the use of multivariate logistical regression, loglinear modeling, neural network analysis, n-of-m analysis, decision tree analysis, etc. This list is not meant to be limiting.

[0106] Diagnosis of Acute Renal Failure

[0107] As noted above, the terms “acute renal (or kidney) injury” and “acute renal (or kidney) failure” as used herein are defined in part in terms of changes in serum creatinine from a baseline value. Most definitions of ARF have common elements, including the use of serum creatinine and, often, urine output. Patients may present with renal dysfunction without an available baseline measure of renal function for use in this comparison. In such an event, one may estimate a baseline serum creatinine value by assuming the patient initially had a normal GFR. Glomerular filtration rate (GFR) is the volume of fluid filtered from the renal (kidney) glomerular capillaries into the Bowman's capsule per unit time. Glomerular filtration rate (GFR) can be calculated by measuring any chemical that has a steady level in the blood, and is freely filtered but neither reabsorbed nor secreted by the kidneys. GFR is typically expressed in units of ml/min:

$$GFR = \frac{\text{Urine Concentration} \times \text{Urine Flow}}{\text{Plasma Concentration}}$$

[0108] By normalizing the GFR to the body surface area, a GFR of approximately 75–100 ml/min per 1.73 m² can be assumed. The rate therefore measured is the quantity of the substance in the urine that originated from a calculable volume of blood.

[0109] There are several different techniques used to calculate or estimate the glomerular filtration rate (GFR or eGFR). In clinical practice, however, creatinine clearance is used to measure GFR. Creatinine is produced naturally by the body (creatinine is a metabolite of creatine, which is found in muscle). It is freely filtered by the glomerulus, but also actively secreted by the renal tubules in very small amounts such that creatinine clearance overestimates actual GFR by 10-20%. This margin of error is acceptable considering the ease with which creatinine clearance is measured.

[0110] Creatinine clearance (CCr) can be calculated if values for creatinine's urine concentration (U_{Cr}), urine flow rate (V), and creatinine's plasma concentration (P_{Cr}) are known. Since the product of urine concentration and urine flow rate yields creatinine's excretion rate, creatinine clearance is also said to be its excretion rate (U_{Cr}×V) divided by its plasma concentration. This is commonly represented mathematically as:

$$C_{Cr} = \frac{U_{Cr} \times V}{P_{Cr}}$$

[0111] Commonly a 24 hour urine collection is undertaken, from empty-bladder one morning to the contents of the bladder the following morning, with a comparative blood test then taken:

$$C_{Cr} = \frac{U_{Cr} \times 24\text{-hour volume}}{P_{Cr} \times 24 \times 60\text{mins}}$$

[0112] To allow comparison of results between people of different sizes, the CCr is often corrected for the body surface area (BSA) and expressed compared to the average sized man as ml/min/1.73 m². While most adults have a BSA that approaches 1.7 (1.6-1.9), extremely obese or slim patients should have their CCr corrected for their actual BSA:

$$C_{Cr\text{-corrected}} = \frac{C_{Cr} \times 1.73}{BSA}$$

[0113] The accuracy of a creatinine clearance measurement (even when collection is complete) is limited because as glomerular filtration rate (GFR) falls creatinine secretion is increased, and thus the rise in serum creatinine is less. Thus, creatinine excretion is much greater than the filtered load, resulting in a potentially large overestimation of the GFR (as much as a twofold difference). However, for clinical purposes it is important to determine whether renal function is stable or getting worse or better. This is often determined by monitoring serum creatinine alone. Like creatinine clearance, the serum creatinine will not be an accurate reflection of GFR in the non-steady-state condition of ARF. Nonetheless, the degree to which serum creatinine changes from baseline will reflect the change in GFR. Serum creatinine is readily and easily measured and it is specific for renal function.

[0114] For purposes of determining urine output on a mL/kg/hr basis, hourly urine collection and measurement is adequate. In the case where, for example, only a cumulative 24-h output was available and no patient weights are provided, minor modifications of the RIFLE urine output criteria have been described. For example, Bagshaw *et al.*, *Nephrol. Dial. Transplant.* 23: 1203–1210, 2008, assumes an average patient weight of 70 kg, and patients are assigned a RIFLE classification based on the following: <35 mL/h (Risk), <21 mL/h (Injury) or <4 mL/h (Failure).

[0115] Selecting a Treatment Regimen

[0116] Once a diagnosis is obtained, the clinician can readily select a treatment regimen that is compatible with the diagnosis, such as initiating renal replacement therapy, withdrawing delivery of compounds that are known to be damaging to the kidney, kidney transplantation, delaying or avoiding procedures that are known to be damaging to the kidney, modifying diuretic administration, initiating goal directed therapy, *etc.* The skilled artisan is aware of appropriate treatments for numerous diseases discussed in relation to the methods of diagnosis described herein. See, e.g., Merck Manual of Diagnosis and Therapy, 17th Ed. Merck Research Laboratories, Whitehouse Station, NJ, 1999. In addition, since the methods and compositions described herein provide prognostic information, the markers of the present invention may be used to monitor a course of treatment. For example, improved or worsened prognostic state may indicate that a particular treatment is or is not efficacious.

[0117] One skilled in the art readily appreciates that the present invention is well adapted to carry out the objects and obtain the ends and advantages mentioned, as well as those inherent therein. The examples provided herein are representative of preferred embodiments, are exemplary, and are not intended as limitations on the scope of the invention.

[0118] Example 1: Contrast-induced nephropathy sample collection

[0119] The objective of this sample collection study is to collect samples of plasma and urine and clinical data from patients before and after receiving intravascular contrast media. Approximately 250 adults undergoing radiographic/angiographic procedures involving intravascular administration of iodinated contrast media are enrolled. To be enrolled in the study, each patient must meet all of the following inclusion criteria and none of the following exclusion criteria:

Inclusion Criteria

males and females 18 years of age or older;

undergoing a radiographic / angiographic procedure (such as a CT scan or coronary intervention) involving the intravascular administration of contrast media;

expected to be hospitalized for at least 48 hours after contrast administration.

able and willing to provide written informed consent for study participation and to comply with all study procedures.

Exclusion Criteria

renal transplant recipients;

acutely worsening renal function prior to the contrast procedure;

already receiving dialysis (either acute or chronic) or in imminent need of dialysis at enrollment;

expected to undergo a major surgical procedure (such as involving cardiopulmonary bypass) or an additional imaging procedure with contrast media with significant risk for further renal insult within the 48 hrs following contrast administration;

participation in an interventional clinical study with an experimental therapy within the previous 30 days;

known infection with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) or a hepatitis virus.

[0120] Immediately prior to the first contrast administration (and after any pre-procedure hydration), an EDTA anti-coagulated blood sample (10 mL) and a urine sample (10 mL) are collected from each patient. Blood and urine samples are then collected at 4 (± 0.5), 8 (± 1), 24 (± 2), 48 (± 2), and 72 (± 2) hrs following the last administration of contrast media during the index contrast procedure. Blood is collected via direct venipuncture or via other available venous access, such as an existing femoral sheath, central venous line, peripheral intravenous line or hep-lock. These study blood samples are processed to plasma at the clinical site, frozen and shipped to Astute Medical, Inc., San Diego, CA. The study urine samples are frozen and shipped to Astute Medical, Inc.

[0121] Serum creatinine is assessed at the site immediately prior to the first contrast administration (after any pre-procedure hydration) and at 4 (± 0.5), 8 (± 1), 24 (± 2) and 48 (± 2), and 72 (± 2) hours following the last administration of contrast (ideally at the same time as the study samples are obtained). In addition, each patient's status is evaluated through day 30 with regard to additional serum and urine creatinine measurements, a need for dialysis, hospitalization status, and adverse clinical outcomes (including mortality).

[0122] Prior to contrast administration, each patient is assigned a risk based on the following assessment: systolic blood pressure < 80 mm Hg = 5 points; intra-arterial balloon pump = 5 points; congestive heart failure (Class III-IV or history of pulmonary edema) = 5 points; age > 75 yrs = 4 points; hematocrit level $< 39\%$ for men, $< 35\%$ for

women = 3 points; diabetes = 3 points; contrast media volume = 1 point for each 100 mL; serum creatinine level >1.5 g/dL = 4 points OR estimated GFR 40–60 mL/min/1.73 m² = 2 points, 20–40 mL/min/1.73 m² = 4 points, < 20 mL/min/1.73 m² = 6 points. The risks assigned are as follows: risk for CIN and dialysis: 5 or less total points = risk of CIN - 7.5%, risk of dialysis - 0.04%; 6–10 total points = risk of CIN - 14%, risk of dialysis - 0.12%; 11–16 total points = risk of CIN - 26.1%, risk of dialysis - 1.09%; >16 total points = risk of CIN - 57.3%, risk of dialysis - 12.8%.

[0123] Example 2: Cardiac surgery sample collection

[0124] The objective of this sample collection study is to collect samples of plasma and urine and clinical data from patients before and after undergoing cardiovascular surgery, a procedure known to be potentially damaging to kidney function. Approximately 900 adults undergoing such surgery are enrolled. To be enrolled in the study, each patient must meet all of the following inclusion criteria and none of the following exclusion criteria:

Inclusion Criteria

males and females 18 years of age or older;

undergoing cardiovascular surgery;

Toronto/Ottawa Predictive Risk Index for Renal Replacement risk score of at least 2 (Wijeysundera *et al.*, *JAMA* 297: 1801-9, 2007); and

able and willing to provide written informed consent for study participation and to comply with all study procedures.

Exclusion Criteria

known pregnancy;

previous renal transplantation;

acutely worsening renal function prior to enrollment (e.g., any category of RIFLE criteria);

already receiving dialysis (either acute or chronic) or in imminent need of dialysis at enrollment;

currently enrolled in another clinical study or expected to be enrolled in another clinical study within 7 days of cardiac surgery that involves drug infusion or a therapeutic intervention for AKI;

known infection with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) or a hepatitis virus.

[0125] Within 3 hours prior to the first incision (and after any pre-procedure hydration), an EDTA anti-coagulated blood sample (10 mL), whole blood (3 mL), and a urine sample (35 mL) are collected from each patient. Blood and urine samples are then collected at 3 (± 0.5), 6 (± 0.5), 12 (± 1), 24 (± 2) and 48 (± 2) hrs following the procedure and then daily on days 3 through 7 if the subject remains in the hospital. Blood is collected via direct venipuncture or via other available venous access, such as an existing femoral sheath, central venous line, peripheral intravenous line or hep-lock. These study blood samples are frozen and shipped to Astute Medical, Inc., San Diego, CA. The study urine samples are frozen and shipped to Astute Medical, Inc.

[0126] Example 3: Acutely ill subject sample collection

[0127] The objective of this study is to collect samples from acutely ill patients. Approximately 900 adults expected to be in the ICU for at least 48 hours will be enrolled. To be enrolled in the study, each patient must meet all of the following inclusion criteria and none of the following exclusion criteria:

Inclusion Criteria

males and females 18 years of age or older;

Study population 1: approximately 300 patients that have at least one of:

shock (SBP < 90 mmHg and/or need for vasopressor support to maintain MAP > 60 mmHg and/or documented drop in SBP of at least 40 mmHg); and
sepsis;

Study population 2: approximately 300 patients that have at least one of:

IV antibiotics ordered in computerized physician order entry (CPOE) within 24 hours of enrollment;

contrast media exposure within 24 hours of enrollment;

increased Intra-Abdominal Pressure with acute decompensated heart failure; and

severe trauma as the primary reason for ICU admission and likely to be hospitalized in the ICU for 48 hours after enrollment;

Study population 3: approximately 300 patients

expected to be hospitalized through acute care setting (ICU or ED) with a known risk factor for acute renal injury (*e.g.* sepsis, hypotension/shock (Shock = systolic BP < 90 mmHg and/or the need for vasopressor support to maintain a MAP > 60 mmHg and/or a documented drop in SBP > 40 mmHg), major trauma, hemorrhage, or major surgery); and/or expected to be hospitalized to the ICU for at least 24 hours after enrollment.

Exclusion Criteria

known pregnancy;

institutionalized individuals;

previous renal transplantation;

known acutely worsening renal function prior to enrollment (*e.g.*, any category of RIFLE criteria);

received dialysis (either acute or chronic) within 5 days prior to enrollment or in imminent need of dialysis at the time of enrollment;

known infection with human immunodeficiency virus (HIV) or a hepatitis virus;

meets only the SBP < 90 mmHg inclusion criterion set forth above, and does not have shock in the attending physician's or principal investigator's opinion.

[0128] After providing informed consent, an EDTA anti-coagulated blood sample (10 mL) and a urine sample (25-30 mL) are collected from each patient. Blood and urine samples are then collected at 4 ($\pm$ 0.5) and 8 ($\pm$ 1) hours after contrast administration (if applicable); at 12 ($\pm$ 1), 24 ($\pm$ 2), and 48 ($\pm$ 2) hours after enrollment, and thereafter daily up to day 7 to day 14 while the subject is hospitalized. Blood is collected via direct venipuncture or via other available venous access, such as an existing femoral sheath, central venous line, peripheral intravenous line or hep-lock. These study blood samples are processed to plasma at the clinical site, frozen and shipped to Astute Medical, Inc., San Diego, CA. The study urine samples are frozen and shipped to Astute Medical, Inc.

[0129] Example 4. Immunoassay format

[0130] Analytes are is measured using standard sandwich enzyme immunoassay techniques. A first antibody which binds the analyte is immobilized in wells of a 96 well polystyrene microplate. Analyte standards and test samples are pipetted into the appropriate wells and any analyte present is bound by the immobilized antibody. After washing away any unbound substances, a horseradish peroxidase-conjugated second antibody which binds the analyte is added to the wells, thereby forming sandwich complexes with the analyte (if present) and the first antibody. Following a wash to remove any unbound antibody-enzyme reagent, a substrate solution comprising tetramethylbenzidine and hydrogen peroxide is added to the wells. Color develops in proportion to the amount of analyte present in the sample. The color development is stopped and the intensity of the color is measured at 540 nm or 570 nm. An analyte concentration is assigned to the test sample by comparison to a standard curve determined from the analyte standards.

[0131] Concentrations are expressed in the following examples as follows: soluble Advanced glycosylation end product-specific receptor – pg/mL, Bactericidal permeability-increasing protein – pg/mL, Interleukin 12 – pg/mL, Fibroblast growth factor 23 – ng/mL, and Intestinal fatty acid-binding protein – pg/mL.

[0132] Example 5. Apparently Healthy Donor and Chronic Disease Patient Samples

[0133] Human urine samples from donors with no known chronic or acute disease (“Apparently Healthy Donors”) were purchased from two vendors (Golden West Biologicals, Inc., 27625 Commerce Center Dr., Temecula, CA 92590 and Virginia Medical Research, Inc., 915 First Colonial Rd., Virginia Beach, VA 23454). The urine samples were shipped and stored frozen at less than -20° C. The vendors supplied demographic information for the individual donors including gender, race (Black /White), smoking status and age.

[0134] Human urine samples from donors with various chronic diseases (“Chronic Disease Patients”) including congestive heart failure, coronary artery disease, chronic kidney disease, chronic obstructive pulmonary disease, diabetes mellitus and hypertension were purchased from Virginia Medical Research, Inc., 915 First Colonial Rd., Virginia Beach, VA 23454. The urine samples were shipped and stored frozen at less than -20 degrees centigrade. The vendor provided a case report form for each individual

donor with age, gender, race (Black/White), smoking status and alcohol use, height, weight, chronic disease(s) diagnosis, current medications and previous surgeries.

[0135] Example 6. Kidney injury markers for evaluating renal status in patients at RIFLE Stage 0

[0136] Patients from the intensive care unit (ICU) were classified by kidney status as non-injury (0), risk of injury (R), injury (I), and failure (F) according to the maximum stage reached within 7 days of enrollment as determined by the RIFLE criteria.

[0137] Two cohorts were defined as (Cohort 1) patients that did not progress beyond stage 0, and (Cohort 2) patients that reached stage R, I, or F within 10 days. To address normal marker fluctuations that occur within patients at the ICU and thereby assess utility for monitoring AKI status, marker levels were measured in urine samples collected for Cohort 1. Marker concentrations were measured in urine samples collected from a subject at 0, 24 hours, and 48 hours prior to reaching stage R, I or F in Cohort 2. In the following tables, the time “prior max stage” represents the time at which a sample is collected, relative to the time a particular patient reaches the lowest disease stage as defined for that cohort, binned into three groups which are +/- 12 hours. For example, 24 hr prior for this example (0 vs R, I, F) would mean 24 hr (+/- 12 hours) prior to reaching stage R (or I if no sample at R, or F if no sample at R or I).

[0138] Each marker was measured by standard immunoassay methods using commercially available assay reagents. A receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve was generated for each marker and the area under each ROC curve (AUC) was determined. Patients in Cohort 2 were also separated according to the reason for adjudication to stage R, I, or F as being based on serum creatinine measurements (sCr), being based on urine output (UO), or being based on either serum creatinine measurements or urine output. That is, for those patients adjudicated to stage R, I, or F on the basis of serum creatinine measurements alone, the stage 0 cohort may have included patients adjudicated to stage R, I, or F on the basis of urine output; for those patients adjudicated to stage R, I, or F on the basis of urine output alone, the stage 0 cohort may have included patients adjudicated to stage R, I, or F on the basis of serum creatinine measurements; and for those patients adjudicated to stage R, I, or F on the basis of serum creatinine measurements or urine output, the stage 0 cohort contains only patients in stage 0 for both serum creatinine measurements and urine output. Also, for those patients

adjudicated to stage R, I, or F on the basis of serum creatinine measurements or urine output, the adjudication method which yielded the most severe RIFLE stage was used.

[0139] The ability to distinguish cohort 1 (subjects remaining in RIFLE 0) from Cohort 2 (subjects progressing to RIFLE R, I or F) was determined using ROC analysis. SE is the standard error of the AUC, n is the number of sample or individual patients (“pts,” as indicated). Standard errors were calculated as described in Hanley, J. A., and McNeil, B.J., The meaning and use of the area under a receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. Radiology (1982) 143: 29-36; p values were calculated with a two-tailed Z-test. An AUC < 0.5 is indicative of a negative going marker for the comparison, and an AUC > 0.5 is indicative of a positive going marker for the comparison.

[0140] Various threshold (or “cutoff”) concentrations were selected, and the associated sensitivity and specificity for distinguishing cohort 1 from cohort 2 were determined. OR is the odds ratio calculated for the particular cutoff concentration, and 95% CI is the confidence interval for the odds ratio.

[0141] The results of these three analyses for various markers of the present invention are presented in Fig. 1.

[0142] Example 7. Kidney injury markers for evaluating renal status in patients at RIFLE Stages 0 and R

[0143] Patients were classified and analyzed as described in Example 6. However, patients that reached stage R but did not progress to stage I or F were grouped with patients from non-injury stage 0 in Cohort 1. Cohort 2 in this example included only patients that progressed to stage I or F. Marker concentrations in urine samples were included for Cohort 1. Marker concentrations in urine samples collected within 0, 24, and 48 hours of reaching stage I or F were included for Cohort 2.

[0144] The ability to distinguish cohort 1 (subjects remaining in RIFLE 0 or R) from Cohort 2 (subjects progressing to RIFLE I or F) was determined using ROC analysis.

[0145] Various threshold (or “cutoff”) concentrations were selected, and the associated sensitivity and specificity for distinguishing cohort 1 from cohort 2 were determined. OR is the odds ratio calculated for the particular cutoff concentration, and 95% CI is the confidence interval for the odds ratio.

[0146] The results of these three analyses for various markers of the present invention are presented in Fig. 2.

[0147] Example 8. Kidney injury markers for evaluating renal status in patients progressing from Stage R to Stages I and F

[0148] Patients were classified and analyzed as described in Example 6, but only those patients that reached Stage R were included in this example. Cohort 1 contained patients that reached stage R but did not progress to stage I or F within 10 days, and Cohort 2 included only patients that progressed to stage I or F. Marker concentrations in urine samples collected within 12 hours of reaching stage R were included in the analysis for both Cohort 1 and 2.

[0149] The ability to distinguish cohort 1 (subjects remaining in RIFLE R) from Cohort 2 (subjects progressing to RIFLE I or F) was determined using ROC analysis.

[0150] Various threshold (or “cutoff”) concentrations were selected, and the associated sensitivity and specificity for distinguishing cohort 1 from cohort 2 were determined. OR is the odds ratio calculated for the particular cutoff concentration, and 95% CI is the confidence interval for the odds ratio.

[0151] The results of these three analyses for various markers of the present invention are presented in Fig. 3.

[0152] Example 9. Kidney injury markers for evaluating renal status in patients at RIFLE Stage 0

[0153] Patients were classified and analyzed as described in Example 6. However, patients that reached stage R or I but did not progress to stage F were eliminated from the analysis. Patients from non-injury stage 0 are included in Cohort 1. Cohort 2 in this example included only patients that progressed to stage F. The maximum marker concentrations in urine samples were included for each patient in Cohort 1. The maximum marker concentrations in urine samples collected within 0, 24, and 48 hours of reaching stage F were included for each patient in Cohort 2.

[0154] The ability to distinguish cohort 1 (subjects remaining in RIFLE 0 or R) from Cohort 2 (subjects progressing to RIFLE I or F) was determined using ROC analysis.

[0155] Various threshold (or “cutoff”) concentrations were selected, and the associated sensitivity and specificity for distinguishing cohort 1 from cohort 2 were

determined. OR is the odds ratio calculated for the particular cutoff concentration, and 95% CI is the confidence interval for the odds ratio.

[0156] The results of these three analyses for various markers of the present invention are presented in Fig. 4.

[0157] Example 10. Kidney injury markers for evaluating renal status in patients at RIFLE Stage 0

[0158] Patients from the intensive care unit (ICU) were classified by kidney status as non-injury (0), risk of injury (R), injury (I), and failure (F) according to the maximum stage reached within 7 days of enrollment as determined by the RIFLE criteria.

[0159] Two cohorts were defined as (Cohort 1) patients that did not progress beyond stage 0, and (Cohort 2) patients that reached stage R, I, or F within 10 days. To address normal marker fluctuations that occur within patients at the ICU and thereby assess utility for monitoring AKI status, marker levels were measured in the plasma component of blood samples collected for Cohort 1. Marker concentrations were measured in the plasma component of blood samples collected from a subject at 0, 24 hours, and 48 hours prior to reaching stage R, I or F in Cohort 2. In the following tables, the time “prior max stage” represents the time at which a sample is collected, relative to the time a particular patient reaches the lowest disease stage as defined for that cohort, binned into three groups which are +/- 12 hours. For example, 24 hr prior for this example (0 vs R, I, F) would mean 24 hr (+/- 12 hours) prior to reaching stage R (or I if no sample at R, or F if no sample at R or I).

[0160] Each marker was measured by standard immunoassay methods using commercially available assay reagents. A receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve was generated for each marker and the area under each ROC curve (AUC) was determined. Patients in Cohort 2 were also separated according to the reason for adjudication to stage R, I, or F as being based on serum creatinine measurements (sCr), being based on urine output (UO), or being based on either serum creatinine measurements or urine output. That is, for those patients adjudicated to stage R, I, or F on the basis of serum creatinine measurements alone, the stage 0 cohort may have included patients adjudicated to stage R, I, or F on the basis of urine output; for those patients adjudicated to stage R, I, or F on the basis of urine output alone, the stage 0 cohort may have included patients adjudicated to stage R, I, or F on the basis of serum creatinine

measurements; and for those patients adjudicated to stage R, I, or F on the basis of serum creatinine measurements or urine output, the stage 0 cohort contains only patients in stage 0 for both serum creatinine measurements and urine output. Also, for those patients adjudicated to stage R, I, or F on the basis of serum creatinine measurements or urine output, the adjudication method which yielded the most severe RIFLE stage was used.

[0161] The ability to distinguish cohort 1 (subjects remaining in RIFLE 0) from Cohort 2 (subjects progressing to RIFLE R, I or F) was determined using ROC analysis. SE is the standard error of the AUC, n is the number of sample or individual patients (“pts,” as indicated). Standard errors were calculated as described in Hanley, J. A., and McNeil, B.J., The meaning and use of the area under a receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve. Radiology (1982) 143: 29-36; p values were calculated with a two-tailed Z-test. An AUC < 0.5 is indicative of a negative going marker for the comparison, and an AUC > 0.5 is indicative of a positive going marker for the comparison.

[0162] Various threshold (or “cutoff”) concentrations were selected, and the associated sensitivity and specificity for distinguishing cohort 1 from cohort 2 were determined. OR is the odds ratio calculated for the particular cutoff concentration, and 95% CI is the confidence interval for the odds ratio.

[0163] The results of these three analyses for various markers of the present invention are presented in Fig. 5.

[0164] Example 11. Kidney injury markers for evaluating renal status in patients at RIFLE Stages 0 and R

[0165] Patients were classified and analyzed as described in Example 10. However, patients that reached stage R but did not progress to stage I or F were grouped with patients from non-injury stage 0 in Cohort 1. Cohort 2 in this example included only patients that progressed to stage I or F. Marker concentrations in the plasma component of blood samples were included for Cohort 1. Marker concentrations in the plasma component of blood samples collected within 0, 24, and 48 hours of reaching stage I or F were included for Cohort 2.

[0166] The ability to distinguish cohort 1 (subjects remaining in RIFLE 0 or R) from Cohort 2 (subjects progressing to RIFLE I or F) was determined using ROC analysis.

[0167] Various threshold (or “cutoff”) concentrations were selected, and the associated sensitivity and specificity for distinguishing cohort 1 from cohort 2 were

determined. OR is the odds ratio calculated for the particular cutoff concentration, and 95% CI is the confidence interval for the odds ratio.

[0168] The results of these three analyses for various markers of the present invention are presented in Fig. 6.

[0169] Example 12. Kidney injury markers for evaluating renal status in patients progressing from Stage R to Stages I and F

[0170] Patients were classified and analyzed as described in Example 10, but only those patients that reached Stage R were included in this example. Cohort 1 contained patients that reached stage R but did not progress to stage I or F within 10 days, and Cohort 2 included only patients that progressed to stage I or F. Marker concentrations in the plasma component of blood samples collected within 12 hours of reaching stage R were included in the analysis for both Cohort 1 and 2.

[0171] The ability to distinguish cohort 1 (subjects remaining in RIFLE R) from Cohort 2 (subjects progressing to RIFLE I or F) was determined using ROC analysis.

[0172] Various threshold (or “cutoff”) concentrations were selected, and the associated sensitivity and specificity for distinguishing cohort 1 from cohort 2 were determined. OR is the odds ratio calculated for the particular cutoff concentration, and 95% CI is the confidence interval for the odds ratio.

[0173] The results of these three analyses for various markers of the present invention are presented in Fig. 7.

[0174] Example 13. Kidney injury markers for evaluating renal status in patients at RIFLE Stage 0

[0175] Patients were classified and analyzed as described in Example 10. However, patients that reached stage R or I but did not progress to stage F were eliminated from the analysis. Patients from non-injury stage 0 are included in Cohort 1. Cohort 2 in this example included only patients that progressed to stage F. The maximum marker concentrations in the plasma component of blood samples were included from each patient in Cohort 1. The maximum marker concentrations in the plasma component of blood samples collected within 0, 24, and 48 hours of reaching stage F were included from each patient in Cohort 2.

[0176] The ability to distinguish cohort 1 (subjects remaining in RIFLE 0 or R) from Cohort 2 (subjects progressing to RIFLE I or F) was determined using ROC analysis.

[0177] Various threshold (or “cutoff”) concentrations were selected, and the associated sensitivity and specificity for distinguishing cohort 1 from cohort 2 were determined. OR is the odds ratio calculated for the particular cutoff concentration, and 95% CI is the confidence interval for the odds ratio.

[0178] The results of these three analyses for various markers of the present invention are presented in Fig. 8.

[0179] While the invention has been described and exemplified in sufficient detail for those skilled in this art to make and use it, various alternatives, modifications, and improvements should be apparent without departing from the spirit and scope of the invention. The examples provided herein are representative of preferred embodiments, are exemplary, and are not intended as limitations on the scope of the invention. Modifications therein and other uses will occur to those skilled in the art. These modifications are encompassed within the spirit of the invention and are defined by the scope of the claims.

[0180] It will be readily apparent to a person skilled in the art that varying substitutions and modifications may be made to the invention disclosed herein without departing from the scope and spirit of the invention.

[0181] All patents and publications mentioned in the specification are indicative of the levels of those of ordinary skill in the art to which the invention pertains. All patents and publications are herein incorporated by reference to the same extent as if each individual publication was specifically and individually indicated to be incorporated by reference.

[0182] The invention illustratively described herein suitably may be practiced in the absence of any element or elements, limitation or limitations which is not specifically disclosed herein. Thus, for example, in each instance herein any of the terms “comprising”, “consisting essentially of” and “consisting of” may be replaced with either of the other two terms. The terms and expressions which have been employed are used as terms of description and not of limitation, and there is no intention that in the use of such terms and expressions of excluding any equivalents of the features shown and described or portions thereof, but it is recognized that various modifications are possible within the

scope of the invention claimed. Thus, it should be understood that although the present invention has been specifically disclosed by preferred embodiments and optional features, modification and variation of the concepts herein disclosed may be resorted to by those skilled in the art, and that such modifications and variations are considered to be within the scope of this invention as defined by the appended claims.

[0183] Other embodiments are set forth within the following claims.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

[0011] It is an object of the invention to provide methods and compositions for evaluating renal function in a subject. As described herein, measurement of Lysozyme C (human precursor Swiss-Prot P61626 can be used for diagnosis, prognosis, staging, monitoring, categorizing and determination of further diagnosis and treatment regimens in subjects suffering or at risk of suffering from an injury to renal function, reduced renal function, and/or acute renal failure (also called acute kidney injury).

[0012] This biomarker may be used for risk stratification (that is, to identify subjects at risk for a future injury to renal function, for future progression to reduced renal function, for future progression to ARF, for future improvement in renal function, *etc.*); for diagnosis of existing disease (that is, to identify subjects who have suffered an injury to renal function, who have progressed to reduced renal function, who have progressed to ARF, *etc.*); for monitoring for deterioration or improvement of renal function; and for predicting a future medical outcome, such as improved or worsening renal function, a decreased or increased mortality risk, a decreased or increased risk that a subject will require dialysis, a decreased or increased risk that a subject will require renal transplantation, a decreased or increased risk that a subject will recover from an injury to renal function, a decreased or increased risk that a subject will recover from ARF, a decreased or increased risk that a subject will progress to end stage renal disease, a decreased or increased risk that a subject will suffer rejection of a transplanted kidney, *etc.*

[0013] In a first aspect, the present invention relates to methods for evaluating renal status in a subject. These methods comprise performing an assay method that is configured to detect Lysozyme C in a body fluid sample obtained from the subject. The assay result, for example a measured concentration of Lysozyme C, is then correlated to the renal status of the subject. This correlation to renal status may include correlating the assay result to one or more of risk stratification, diagnosis, staging, classifying and monitoring of the subject as described herein. Thus, the present invention utilizes Lysozyme C for the evaluation of renal injury.

[0014] In certain embodiments, the methods for evaluating renal status described herein are methods for risk stratification of the subject; that is, assigning a likelihood of one or more future changes in renal status to the subject. In these embodiments, the assay result is correlated to one or more such future changes. The following are preferred risk stratification embodiments.

[0015] In preferred risk stratification embodiments, these methods comprise determining a subject's risk for a future injury to renal function, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Lysozyme C, is correlated to a likelihood of such a future injury to renal function. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and an increased likelihood of suffering a future injury to renal function is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold.

[0016] In other preferred risk stratification embodiments, these methods comprise determining a subject's risk for future reduced renal function, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Lysozyme C, is correlated to a likelihood of such reduced renal function. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and an increased likelihood of future reduced renal function is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold.

[0017] In still other preferred risk stratification embodiments, these methods comprise determining a subject's likelihood for a future improvement in renal function, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Lysozyme C, is correlated to a likelihood of such a future improvement in renal function. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and an increased likelihood of a future improvement in renal function is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is below the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold.

[0018] In yet other preferred risk stratification embodiments, these methods comprise determining a subject's risk for progression to ARF, and the assay result, for example a

measured concentration of Lysozyme C, is correlated to a likelihood of such progression to ARF. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and an increased likelihood of progression to ARF is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold.

[0019] And in other preferred risk stratification embodiments, these methods comprise determining a subject's outcome risk, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Lysozyme C, is correlated to a likelihood of the occurrence of a clinical outcome related to a renal injury suffered by the subject. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and an increased likelihood of mortality, a requirement for dialysis, a requirement for renal transplantation, a requirement for withdrawal of renal toxins, an increased likelihood of end stage renal disease, an increased likelihood of heart failure, an increased likelihood of stroke, an increased likelihood of mortality, an increased likelihood of myocardial infarction, *etc.*, is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold.

[0020] In such risk stratification embodiments, preferably the likelihood or risk assigned is that an event of interest is more or less likely to occur within 180 days of the time at which the body fluid sample is obtained from the subject. In particularly preferred embodiments, the likelihood or risk assigned relates to an event of interest occurring within a shorter time period such as 120 days, 90 days, 60 days, 45 days, 30 days, 21 days, 14 days, 7 days, 5 days, 96 hours, 72 hours, 48 hours, 36 hours, 24 hours, 12 hours, or less.

[0021] In preferred risk stratification embodiments, the subject is selected for risk stratification based on the pre-existence in the subject of one or more known risk factors for prerenal, intrinsic renal, or postrenal ARF. For example, a subject undergoing or having undergone major vascular surgery, coronary artery bypass, or other cardiac surgery; a subject having pre-existing congestive heart failure, preeclampsia, eclampsia, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, coronary artery disease, proteinuria, renal insufficiency, glomerular filtration below the normal range, cirrhosis, serum creatinine above the

normal range, or sepsis; or a subject exposed to NSAIDs, cyclosporines, tacrolimus, aminoglycosides, foscarnet, ethylene glycol, hemoglobin, myoglobin, ifosfamide, heavy metals, methotrexate, radiopaque contrast agents, or streptozotocin are all preferred subjects for monitoring risks according to the methods described herein. This list is not meant to be limiting. By “pre-existence” in this context is meant that the risk factor exists at the time the body fluid sample is obtained from the subject. In particularly preferred embodiments, a subject is chosen for risk stratification based on an existing diagnosis of injury to renal function, reduced renal function, or ARF.

[0022] A variety of methods may be used by the skilled artisan to arrive at a desired threshold value for use in these methods. For example, the threshold value may be determined from a population of normal subjects by selecting a concentration representing the 75th, 85th, 90th, 95th, or 99th percentile of Lysozyme C measured in such normal subjects. Alternatively, the threshold value may be determined from a population of subjects suffering from an injury to renal function or reduced renal function, but which do not progress to ARF (or some other clinical outcome such as death, dialysis, renal transplantation, *etc.*) by selecting a concentration representing the 75th, 85th, 90th, 95th, or 99th percentile of Lysozyme C measured in such subjects. In another alternative, the threshold value may be determined from a prior measurement of Lysozyme C in the same subject; that is, a temporal change in the level of Lysozyme C in the subject may be used to assign risk to the subject. That is, an increasing concentration of Lysozyme C over time may be used to identify subjects at increased risk for future injury or progression of an existing renal injury; relative to a risk assigned when the concentration is stable or decreasing.

[0023] The ability of a particular test to distinguish two populations can be established using ROC analysis. For example, ROC curves established from a “first” subpopulation which is predisposed to one or more future changes in renal status, and a “second” subpopulation which is not so predisposed can be used to calculate a ROC curve, and the area under the curve provides a measure of the quality of the test. Preferably, the tests described herein provide a ROC curve area greater than 0.5, preferably at least 0.6, more preferably 0.7, still more preferably at least 0.8, even more preferably at least 0.9, and most preferably at least 0.95.

[0024] In certain aspects, the measured concentration of Lysozyme C is treated as a continuous variable. For example, any particular concentration can be converted into a probability of a future reduction in renal function for the subject. In yet another alternative, a threshold that can provide an acceptable level of specificity and sensitivity in separating a population of subjects into a “first” subpopulation which is predisposed to one or more future changes in renal status, and a “second” subpopulation which is not so predisposed. A threshold value is selected to separate this first and second population by one or more of the following measures of test accuracy:

an odds ratio greater than 1, preferably at least about 2 or more or about 0.5 or less, more preferably at least about 3 or more or about 0.33 or less, still more preferably at least about 4 or more or about 0.25 or less, even more preferably at least about 5 or more or about 0.2 or less, and most preferably at least about 10 or more or about 0.1 or less;

a specificity of greater than 0.5, preferably at least 0.6, more preferably at least 0.7, still more preferably at least 0.8, even more preferably at least 0.9 and most preferably at least 0.95, with a corresponding sensitivity greater than 0.2, preferably greater than 0.3, more preferably greater than 0.4, still more preferably at least 0.5, even more preferably 0.6, yet more preferably greater than 0.7, still more preferably greater than 0.8, more preferably greater than 0.9, and most preferably greater than 0.95;

a sensitivity of greater than 0.5, preferably at least 0.6, more preferably at least 0.7, still more preferably at least 0.8, even more preferably at least 0.9 and most preferably at least 0.95, with a corresponding specificity greater than 0.2, preferably greater than 0.3, more preferably greater than 0.4, still more preferably at least 0.5, even more preferably 0.6, yet more preferably greater than 0.7, still more preferably greater than 0.8, more preferably greater than 0.9, and most preferably greater than 0.95;

at least 75% sensitivity, combined with at least 75% specificity;

a positive likelihood ratio (calculated as sensitivity/(1-specificity)) of greater than 1, at least 2, more preferably at least 3, still more preferably at least 5, and most preferably at least 10; or

a negative likelihood ratio (calculated as $(1 - \text{sensitivity}) / \text{specificity}$) of less than 1, less than or equal to 0.5, more preferably less than or equal to 0.3, and most preferably less than or equal to 0.1.

The term “about” in the context of any of the above measurements refers to $\pm 5\%$ of a given measurement.

[0025] Multiple thresholds may also be used to assess renal status in a subject. For example, a “first” subpopulation which is predisposed to one or more future changes in renal status, and a “second” subpopulation which is not so predisposed can be combined into a single group. This group is then subdivided into three or more equal parts (known as tertiles, quartiles, quintiles, etc., depending on the number of subdivisions). An odds ratio is assigned to subjects based on which subdivision they fall into. If one considers a tertile, the lowest or highest tertile can be used as a reference for comparison of the other subdivisions. This reference subdivision is assigned an odds ratio of 1. The second tertile is assigned an odds ratio that is relative to that first tertile. That is, someone in the second tertile might be 3 times more likely to suffer one or more future changes in renal status in comparison to someone in the first tertile. The third tertile is also assigned an odds ratio that is relative to that first tertile.

[0026] In certain embodiments, the assay method is an immunoassay. Antibodies for use in such assays will specifically bind the full length Lysozyme C protein, and may also bind one or more polypeptides that are “related” thereto, as that term is defined hereinafter. Numerous immunoassay formats are known to those of skill in the art. Preferred body fluid samples are selected from the group consisting of urine, blood, serum, and plasma.

[0027] The foregoing method steps should not be interpreted to mean that the Lysozyme C assay result is used in isolation for risk stratification of a subject. Rather, additional variables or other clinical indicia may be included in the methods described herein. For example, a risk stratification method may combine the assay result with one or more variables measured for the subject selected from the group consisting of demographic information (e.g., weight, sex, age, race), medical history (e.g., family history, type of surgery, pre-existing disease such as aneurism, congestive heart failure,

preeclampsia, eclampsia, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, coronary artery disease, proteinuria, renal insufficiency, or sepsis, type of toxin exposure such as NSAIDs, cyclosporines, tacrolimus, aminoglycosides, foscarnet, ethylene glycol, hemoglobin, myoglobin, ifosfamide, heavy metals, methotrexate, radiopaque contrast agents, or streptozotocin), clinical variables (e.g., blood pressure, temperature, respiration rate), risk scores (APACHE score, PREDICT score, TIMI Risk Score for UA/NSTEMI, Framingham Risk Score), a glomerular filtration rate, an estimated glomerular filtration rate, a urine production rate, a serum or plasma creatinine concentration, a urine creatinine concentration, a fractional excretion of sodium, a urine sodium concentration, a urine creatinine to serum or plasma creatinine ratio, a urine specific gravity, a urine osmolality, a urine urea nitrogen to plasma urea nitrogen ratio, a plasma BUN to creatinine ratio, a renal failure index calculated as $\text{urine sodium} / (\text{urine creatinine} / \text{plasma creatinine})$, a serum or plasma neutrophil gelatinase (NGAL) concentration, a urine NGAL concentration, a serum or plasma cystatin C concentration, a serum or plasma BNP concentration, a serum or plasma NTproBNP concentration, and a serum or plasma proBNP concentration. Other measures of renal function which may be combined with the Lysozyme C assay result are described hereinafter and in Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine, 17th Ed., McGraw Hill, New York, pages 1741-1830, and Current Medical Diagnosis & Treatment 2008, 47th Ed, McGraw Hill, New York, pages 785-815, each of which are hereby incorporated by reference in their entirety.

[0028] Such additional variables may be measured in samples obtained at the same time as the sample used to determine the Lysozyme C assay result, or may be determined at an earlier or later time. The additional variables may also be measured on the same or different body fluid samples. For example, Lysozyme C may be measured in a serum or plasma sample and another biomarker may be measured in a urine sample. In addition, assignment of a likelihood may combine the Lysozyme C assay result with temporal changes in one or more such additional variables.

[0029] In other embodiments, the methods for evaluating renal status described herein are methods for diagnosing a renal injury in the subject; that is, assessing whether or not a subject has suffered from an injury to renal function, reduced renal function, or ARF. In these embodiments, the assay result is correlated to the occurrence or

nonoccurrence of a change in renal status. The following are preferred diagnostic embodiments.

[0030] In preferred diagnostic embodiments, these methods comprise diagnosing the occurrence or nonoccurrence of an injury to renal function, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Lysozyme C, is correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of such an injury. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and when the measured concentration is above the threshold, an increased likelihood of the occurrence of an injury to renal function is assigned to the subject relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, a decreased likelihood of the nonoccurrence of an injury to renal function is assigned to the subject relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold. As noted hereinafter, a “diagnosis” using the Lysozyme C assay result can take into consideration of other clinical indicia.

[0031] In other preferred diagnostic embodiments, these methods comprise diagnosing the occurrence or nonoccurrence of reduced renal function, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Lysozyme C, is correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of an injury causing reduced renal function. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and when the measured concentration is above the threshold, an increased likelihood of the occurrence of an injury causing reduced renal function is assigned to the subject relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, a decreased likelihood of the nonoccurrence of an injury causing reduced renal function is assigned to the subject relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold.

[0032] In yet other preferred diagnostic embodiments, these methods comprise diagnosing the occurrence or nonoccurrence of ARF, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Lysozyme C, is correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of an injury causing ARF. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to

a threshold value, and when the measured concentration is above the threshold, an increased likelihood of the occurrence of an injury causing ARF is assigned to the subject relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, a decreased likelihood of the nonoccurrence of an injury causing ARF is assigned to the subject relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold.

[0033] In still other preferred diagnostic embodiments, these methods comprise diagnosing a subject as being in need of dialysis, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Lysozyme C, is correlated to a need for dialysis. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and when the measured concentration is above the threshold, an increased likelihood of a present need for dialysis is assigned to the subject relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, a decreased likelihood of a present need for dialysis is assigned to the subject relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold.

[0034] In still other preferred diagnostic embodiments, these methods comprise diagnosing a subject as being in need of renal transplantation, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Lysozyme C, is correlated to a need for renal transplantation. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and when the measured concentration is above the threshold, an increased likelihood of a present need for renal transplantation is assigned to the subject relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, a decreased likelihood of a present need for renal transplantation is assigned to the subject relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold.

[0035] A variety of methods may be used by the skilled artisan to arrive at a desired threshold value. For example, the threshold value may be determined from a population

of normal subjects by selecting a concentration representing the 75th, 85th, 90th, 95th, or 99th percentile of Lysozyme C measured in such normal subjects. In another alternative, the threshold value may be determined from a prior measurement of Lysozyme C in the same subject; that is, a temporal change in the level of Lysozyme C in the subject may be used to assign a diagnosis to the subject.

[0036] In yet another alternative, a threshold that can provide an acceptable level of specificity and sensitivity in separating a combined population of subjects into a “first” subpopulation having a disease of interest, and a “second” subpopulation not having a disease of interest. A threshold value is selected to separate this first and second population by one or more of the following measures of test accuracy:

an odds ratio greater than 1, preferably at least about 2 or more or about 0.5 or less, more preferably at least about 3 or more or about 0.33 or less, still more preferably at least about 4 or more or about 0.25 or less, even more preferably at least about 5 or more or about 0.2 or less, and most preferably at least about 10 or more or about 0.1 or less;

a specificity of greater than 0.5, preferably at least 0.6, more preferably at least 0.7, still more preferably at least 0.8, even more preferably at least 0.9 and most preferably at least 0.95, with a corresponding sensitivity greater than 0.2, preferably greater than 0.3, more preferably greater than 0.4, still more preferably at least 0.5, even more preferably 0.6, yet more preferably greater than 0.7, still more preferably greater than 0.8, more preferably greater than 0.9, and most preferably greater than 0.95;

a sensitivity of greater than 0.5, preferably at least 0.6, more preferably at least 0.7, still more preferably at least 0.8, even more preferably at least 0.9 and most preferably at least 0.95, with a corresponding specificity greater than 0.2, preferably greater than 0.3, more preferably greater than 0.4, still more preferably at least 0.5, even more preferably 0.6, yet more preferably greater than 0.7, still more preferably greater than 0.8, more preferably greater than 0.9, and most preferably greater than 0.95;

at least 75% sensitivity, combined with at least 75% specificity;

a positive likelihood ratio (calculated as sensitivity/(1-specificity)) of greater than 1, at least 2, more preferably at least 3, still more preferably at least 5, and most preferably at least 10; or

a negative likelihood ratio (calculated as (1-sensitivity)/specificity) of less than 1, less than or equal to 0.5, more preferably less than or equal to 0.3, and most preferably less than or equal to 0.1.

The term “about” in this context refers to +/- 5% of a given measurement.

[0037] Multiple thresholds may also be used to assess renal status in a subject. For example, a “first” subpopulation of individuals having a condition of interest, and a “second” subpopulation which does not can be combined into a single group. This group is then subdivided into three or more equal parts (known as tertiles, quartiles, quintiles, etc., depending on the number of subdivisions). An odds ratio is assigned to subjects based on which subdivision they fall into. If one considers a tertile, the lowest or highest tertile can be used as a reference for comparison of the other subdivisions. This reference subdivision is assigned an odds ratio of 1. The second tertile is assigned an odds ratio that is relative to that first tertile. That is, someone in the second tertile might be 3 times more likely to have the condition in comparison to someone in the first tertile. The third tertile is also assigned an odds ratio that is relative to that first tertile.

[0038] In certain embodiments, the assay method is an immunoassay. Antibodies for use in such assays will specifically bind the full length Lysozyme C protein, and may also bind one or more polypeptides that are “related” thereto, as that term is defined hereinafter. Numerous immunoassay formats are known to those of skill in the art. Preferred body fluid samples are selected from the group consisting of urine, blood, serum, and plasma.

[0039] The foregoing method steps should not be interpreted to mean that the Lysozyme C assay result is used in isolation for diagnosis of a subject. Rather, additional variables may be included in the methods described herein. For example, a diagnosis may combine the assay result with one or more variables measured for the subject selected from the group consisting of demographic information (e.g., weight, sex, age, race), medical history (e.g., family history, type of surgery, pre-existing disease such as

aneurism, congestive heart failure, preeclampsia, eclampsia, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, coronary artery disease, proteinuria, renal insufficiency, or sepsis, type of toxin exposure such as NSAIDs, cyclosporines, tacrolimus, aminoglycosides, foscarnet, ethylene glycol, hemoglobin, myoglobin, ifosfamide, heavy metals, methotrexate, radiopaque contrast agents, or streptozotocin), clinical variables (e.g., blood pressure, temperature, respiration rate), risk scores (APACHE score, PREDICT score, TIMI Risk Score for UA/NSTEMI, Framingham Risk Score), a glomerular filtration rate, an estimated glomerular filtration rate, a urine production rate, a serum or plasma creatinine concentration, a urine creatinine concentration, a fractional excretion of sodium, a urine sodium concentration, a urine creatinine to serum or plasma creatinine ratio, a urine specific gravity, a urine osmolality, a urine urea nitrogen to plasma urea nitrogen ratio, a plasma BUN to creatinine ratio, a renal failure index calculated as $\text{urine sodium} / (\text{urine creatinine} / \text{plasma creatinine})$, a serum or plasma neutrophil gelatinase (NGAL) concentration, a urine NGAL concentration, a serum or plasma cystatin C concentration, a serum or plasma BNP concentration, a serum or plasma NTproBNP concentration, and a serum or plasma proBNP concentration. Other measures of renal function which may be combined with the Lysozyme C assay result are described hereinafter and in Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine, 17th Ed., McGraw Hill, New York, pages 1741-1830, and Current Medical Diagnosis & Treatment 2008, 47th Ed, McGraw Hill, New York, pages 785-815, each of which are hereby incorporated by reference in their entirety.

[0040] Such additional variables may be measured in samples obtained at the same time as the sample used to determine the Lysozyme C assay result, or may be determined at an earlier or later time. The additional variables may also be measured on the same or different body fluid samples. For example, Lysozyme C may be measured in a serum or plasma sample and another biomarker may be measured in a urine sample. In addition, a diagnostic method may combine the Lysozyme C assay result with temporal changes in one or more such additional variables.

[0041] In still other embodiments, the methods for evaluating renal status described herein are methods for monitoring a renal injury in the subject; that is, assessing whether or not renal function is improving or worsening in a subject who has suffered from an

injury to renal function, reduced renal function, or ARF. In these embodiments, the assay result is correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a change in renal status. The following are preferred monitoring embodiments.

[0042] In preferred monitoring embodiments, these methods comprise monitoring renal status in a subject suffering from an injury to renal function, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Lysozyme C, is correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a change in renal status in the subject. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and when the measured concentration is above the threshold, a worsening of renal function may be assigned to the subject; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, an improvement of renal function may be assigned to the subject.

[0043] In other preferred monitoring embodiments, these methods comprise monitoring renal status in a subject suffering from reduced renal function, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Lysozyme C, is correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a change in renal status in the subject. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and when the measured concentration is above the threshold, a worsening of renal function may be assigned to the subject; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, an improvement of renal function may be assigned to the subject.

[0044] In yet other preferred monitoring embodiments, these methods comprise monitoring renal status in a subject suffering from acute renal failure, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Lysozyme C, is correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a change in renal status in the subject. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and when the measured concentration is above the threshold, a worsening of renal function may be assigned to the subject; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, an improvement of renal function may be assigned to the subject.

[0045] In other additional preferred monitoring embodiments, these methods comprise monitoring renal status in a subject at risk of an injury to renal function due to the pre-existence of one or more known risk factors for prerenal, intrinsic renal, or

postrenal ARF, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Lysozyme C, is correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a change in renal status in the subject. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and when the measured concentration is above the threshold, a worsening of renal function may be assigned to the subject; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, an improvement of renal function may be assigned to the subject.

[0046] A variety of methods may be used by the skilled artisan to arrive at a desired threshold value. For example, the threshold value may be determined from a population of normal subjects by selecting a concentration representing the 75th, 85th, 90th, 95th, or 99th percentile of Lysozyme C measured in such normal subjects. In another alternative, the threshold value may be determined from a prior measurement of Lysozyme C in the same subject; that is, a temporal change in the level of Lysozyme C in the subject may be used to assign a diagnosis to the subject.

[0047] In yet another alternative, a threshold that can provide an acceptable level of specificity and sensitivity in separating a combined population of subjects into a “first” subpopulation having a disease of interest and whose renal function worsens, and a “second” subpopulation having a disease of interest and whose renal function improves. A threshold value is selected to separate this first and second population by one or more of the following measures of test accuracy:

an odds ratio greater than 1, preferably at least about 2 or more or about 0.5 or less, more preferably at least about 3 or more or about 0.33 or less, still more preferably at least about 4 or more or about 0.25 or less, even more preferably at least about 5 or more or about 0.2 or less, and most preferably at least about 10 or more or about 0.1 or less;

a specificity of greater than 0.5, preferably at least 0.6, more preferably at least 0.7, still more preferably at least 0.8, even more preferably at least 0.9 and most preferably at least 0.95, with a corresponding sensitivity greater than 0.2, preferably greater than 0.3, more preferably greater than 0.4, still more preferably at least 0.5, even more preferably 0.6, yet more preferably greater than 0.7, still more preferably greater than 0.8, more preferably greater than 0.9, and most preferably greater than 0.95;

a sensitivity of greater than 0.5, preferably at least 0.6, more preferably at least 0.7, still more preferably at least 0.8, even more preferably at least 0.9 and most preferably at least 0.95, with a corresponding specificity greater than 0.2, preferably greater than 0.3, more preferably greater than 0.4, still more preferably at least 0.5, even more preferably 0.6, yet more preferably greater than 0.7, still more preferably greater than 0.8, more preferably greater than 0.9, and most preferably greater than 0.95;

at least 75% sensitivity, combined with at least 75% specificity;

a positive likelihood ratio (calculated as sensitivity/(1-specificity)) of greater than 1, at least 2, more preferably at least 3, still more preferably at least 5, and most preferably at least 10; or

a negative likelihood ratio (calculated as (1-sensitivity)/specificity) of less than 1, less than or equal to 0.5, more preferably less than or equal to 0.3, and most preferably less than or equal to 0.1.

The term “about” in this context refers to +/- 5% of a given measurement.

[0048] Multiple thresholds may also be used to monitor renal status in a subject. For example, a “first” subpopulation of individuals in which renal function is improving (or worsening), and a “second” subpopulation of individuals which do not can be combined into a single group. This group is then subdivided into three or more equal parts (known as tertiles, quartiles, quintiles, etc., depending on the number of subdivisions). An odds ratio is assigned to subjects based on which subdivision they fall into. If one considers a tertile, the lowest or highest tertile can be used as a reference for comparison of the other subdivisions. This reference subdivision is assigned an odds ratio of 1. The second tertile is assigned an odds ratio that is relative to that first tertile. That is, someone in the second tertile might be 3 times more likely to improve (or worsen) in comparison to someone in the first tertile. The third tertile is also assigned an odds ratio that is relative to that first tertile.

[0049] In certain embodiments, the assay method is an immunoassay. Antibodies for use in such assays will specifically bind the full length Lysozyme C protein, and may also bind one or more polypeptides that are “related” thereto, as that term is defined

hereinafter. Numerous immunoassay formats are known to those of skill in the art.

Preferred body fluid samples are selected from the group consisting of urine, blood, serum, and plasma.

[0050] The foregoing method steps should not be interpreted to mean that the Lysozyme C assay result is used in isolation for monitoring a subject. Rather, additional variables may be included in the methods described herein. For example, a monitoring may combine the assay result with one or more variables measured for the subject selected from the group consisting of demographic information (e.g., weight, sex, age, race), medical history (e.g., family history, type of surgery, pre-existing disease such as aneurism, congestive heart failure, preeclampsia, eclampsia, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, coronary artery disease, proteinuria, renal insufficiency, or sepsis, type of toxin exposure such as NSAIDs, cyclosporines, tacrolimus, aminoglycosides, foscarnet, ethylene glycol, hemoglobin, myoglobin, ifosfamide, heavy metals, methotrexate, radiopaque contrast agents, or streptozotocin), clinical variables (e.g., blood pressure, temperature, respiration rate), risk scores (APACHE score, PREDICT score, TIMI Risk Score for UA/NSTEMI, Framingham Risk Score), a glomerular filtration rate, an estimated glomerular filtration rate, a urine production rate, a serum or plasma creatinine concentration, a urine creatinine concentration, a fractional excretion of sodium, a urine sodium concentration, a urine creatinine to serum or plasma creatinine ratio, a urine specific gravity, a urine osmolality, a urine urea nitrogen to plasma urea nitrogen ratio, a plasma BUN to creatinine ratio, a renal failure index calculated as $\text{urine sodium} / (\text{urine creatinine} / \text{plasma creatinine})$, a serum or plasma neutrophil gelatinase (NGAL) concentration, a urine NGAL concentration, a serum or plasma cystatin C concentration, a serum or plasma BNP concentration, a serum or plasma NTproBNP concentration, and a serum or plasma proBNP concentration. Other measures of renal function which may be combined with the Lysozyme C assay result are described hereinafter and in Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine, 17th Ed., McGraw Hill, New York, pages 1741-1830, and Current Medical Diagnosis & Treatment 2008, 47th Ed, McGraw Hill, New York, pages 785-815, each of which are hereby incorporated by reference in their entirety.

[0051] Such additional variables may be measured in samples obtained at the same time as the sample used to determine the Lysozyme C assay result, or may be determined at an earlier or later time. The additional variables may also be measured on the same or different body fluid samples. For example, Lysozyme C may be measured in a serum or plasma sample and another biomarker may be measured in a urine sample. In addition, a monitoring method may combine the Lysozyme C assay result with temporal changes in one or more such additional variables.

[0052] In still other embodiments, the methods for evaluating renal status described herein are methods for classifying a renal injury in the subject; that is, determining whether a renal injury in a subject is prerenal, intrinsic renal, or postrenal; and/or further subdividing these classes into subclasses such as acute tubular injury, acute glomerulonephritis acute tubulointerstitial nephritis, acute vascular nephropathy, or infiltrative disease. In these embodiments, the assay result is correlated to a particular class and/or subclass. The following are preferred classification embodiments.

[0053] In preferred classification embodiments, these methods comprise determining whether a renal injury in a subject is prerenal, intrinsic renal, or postrenal; and/or further subdividing these classes into subclasses such as acute tubular injury, acute glomerulonephritis acute tubulointerstitial nephritis, acute vascular nephropathy, or infiltrative disease, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Lysozyme C, is correlated to the injury classification for the subject. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and when the measured concentration is above the threshold, a particular classification is assigned; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, a different classification may be assigned to the subject.

[0054] A variety of methods may be used by the skilled artisan to arrive at a desired threshold value. For example, the threshold value may be determined from a population of subjects not having a particular classification (e.g., a “control” group) by selecting a concentration representing the 75th, 85th, 90th, 95th, or 99th percentile of Lysozyme C measured in such control subjects. In another alternative, the threshold value may be determined from a prior measurement of Lysozyme C in the same subject; that is, a

temporal change in the level of Lysozyme C in the subject may be used to assign a classification to the subject.

[0055] In yet another alternative, a threshold that can provide an acceptable level of specificity and sensitivity in separating a combined population of subjects into a “first” subpopulation having a particular classification, and a “second” subpopulation having a different classification. A threshold value is selected to separate this first and second population by one or more of the following measures of test accuracy:

an odds ratio greater than 1, preferably at least about 2 or more or about 0.5 or less, more preferably at least about 3 or more or about 0.33 or less, still more preferably at least about 4 or more or about 0.25 or less, even more preferably at least about 5 or more or about 0.2 or less, and most preferably at least about 10 or more or about 0.1 or less;

a specificity of greater than 0.5, preferably at least 0.6, more preferably at least 0.7, still more preferably at least 0.8, even more preferably at least 0.9 and most preferably at least 0.95, with a corresponding sensitivity greater than 0.2, preferably greater than 0.3, more preferably greater than 0.4, still more preferably at least 0.5, even more preferably 0.6, yet more preferably greater than 0.7, still more preferably greater than 0.8, more preferably greater than 0.9, and most preferably greater than 0.95;

a sensitivity of greater than 0.5, preferably at least 0.6, more preferably at least 0.7, still more preferably at least 0.8, even more preferably at least 0.9 and most preferably at least 0.95, with a corresponding specificity greater than 0.2, preferably greater than 0.3, more preferably greater than 0.4, still more preferably at least 0.5, even more preferably 0.6, yet more preferably greater than 0.7, still more preferably greater than 0.8, more preferably greater than 0.9, and most preferably greater than 0.95;

at least 75% sensitivity, combined with at least 75% specificity;

a positive likelihood ratio (calculated as sensitivity/(1-specificity)) of greater than 1, at least 2, more preferably at least 3, still more preferably at least 5, and most preferably at least 10; or

a negative likelihood ratio (calculated as $(1 - \text{sensitivity}) / \text{specificity}$) of less than 1, less than or equal to 0.5, more preferably less than or equal to 0.3, and most preferably less than or equal to 0.1.

The term “about” in this context refers to $\pm 5\%$ of a given measurement.

[0056] Multiple thresholds may also be used to classify a renal injury in a subject. For example, a “first” subpopulation of individuals having a particular classification, and a “second” subpopulation having a different classification, can be combined into a single group. This group is then subdivided into three or more equal parts (known as tertiles, quartiles, quintiles, etc., depending on the number of subdivisions). An odds ratio is assigned to subjects based on which subdivision they fall into. If one considers a tertile, the lowest or highest tertile can be used as a reference for comparison of the other subdivisions. This reference subdivision is assigned an odds ratio of 1. The second tertile is assigned an odds ratio that is relative to that first tertile. That is, someone in the second tertile might be 3 times more likely to have a particular classification in comparison to someone in the first tertile. The third tertile is also assigned an odds ratio that is relative to that first tertile.

[0057] In certain embodiments, the assay method is an immunoassay. Antibodies for use in such assays will specifically bind the full length Lysozyme C protein, and may also bind one or more polypeptides that are “related” thereto, as that term is defined hereinafter. Numerous immunoassay formats are known to those of skill in the art. Preferred body fluid samples are selected from the group consisting of urine, blood, serum, and plasma.

[0058] The foregoing method steps should not be interpreted to mean that the Lysozyme C assay result is used in isolation for classification of an injury in a subject. Rather, additional variables may be included in the methods described herein. For example, a classification may combine the assay result with one or more variables measured for the subject selected from the group consisting of demographic information (e.g., weight, sex, age, race), medical history (e.g., family history, type of surgery, pre-existing disease such as aneurism, congestive heart failure, preeclampsia, eclampsia, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, coronary artery disease, proteinuria, renal insufficiency,

or sepsis, type of toxin exposure such as NSAIDs, cyclosporines, tacrolimus, aminoglycosides, foscarnet, ethylene glycol, hemoglobin, myoglobin, ifosfamide, heavy metals, methotrexate, radiopaque contrast agents, or streptozotocin), clinical variables (e.g., blood pressure, temperature, respiration rate), risk scores (APACHE score, PREDICT score, TIMI Risk Score for UA/NSTEMI, Framingham Risk Score), a glomerular filtration rate, an estimated glomerular filtration rate, a urine production rate, a serum or plasma creatinine concentration, a urine creatinine concentration, a fractional excretion of sodium, a urine sodium concentration, a urine creatinine to serum or plasma creatinine ratio, a urine specific gravity, a urine osmolality, a urine urea nitrogen to plasma urea nitrogen ratio, a plasma BUN to creatinine ratio, a renal failure index calculated as $\text{urine sodium} / (\text{urine creatinine} / \text{plasma creatinine})$, a serum or plasma neutrophil gelatinase (NGAL) concentration, a urine NGAL concentration, a serum or plasma cystatin C concentration, a serum or plasma BNP concentration, a serum or plasma NTproBNP concentration, and a serum or plasma proBNP concentration. Other measures of renal function which may be combined with the Lysozyme C assay result are described hereinafter and in Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine, 17th Ed., McGraw Hill, New York, pages 1741-1830, and Current Medical Diagnosis & Treatment 2008, 47th Ed, McGraw Hill, New York, pages 785-815, each of which are hereby incorporated by reference in their entirety.

[0059] Such additional variables may be measured in samples obtained at the same time as the sample used to determine the Lysozyme C assay result, or may be determined at an earlier or later time. The additional variables may also be measured on the same or different body fluid samples. For example, Lysozyme C may be measured in a serum or plasma sample and another biomarker may be measured in a urine sample. In addition, a monitoring method may combine the Lysozyme C assay result with temporal changes in one or more such additional variables.

[0060] In various related aspects, the present invention also relates to devices and kits for performing the methods described herein. Suitable kits comprise reagents sufficient for performing at least one of the described Lysozyme C assays, together with instructions for performing the described threshold comparisons.

[0061] In certain embodiments, reagents for performing such assays are provided in an assay device, and such assay devices may be included in such a kit. Preferred reagents can comprise one or more solid phase antibodies, the solid phase antibody comprising antibody that detects the intended biomarker target(s) bound to a solid support. In the case of sandwich immunoassays, such reagents can also include one or more detectably labeled antibodies, the detectably labeled antibody comprising antibody that detects the intended biomarker target(s) bound to a detectable label. Additional optional elements that may be provided as part of an assay device are described hereinafter.

[0062] Detectable labels may include molecules that are themselves detectable (e.g., fluorescent moieties, electrochemical labels, ecl (electrochemical luminescence) labels, metal chelates, colloidal metal particles, *etc.*) as well as molecules that may be indirectly detected by production of a detectable reaction product (e.g., enzymes such as horseradish peroxidase, alkaline phosphatase, *etc.*) or through the use of a specific binding molecule which itself may be detectable (e.g., a labeled antibody that binds to the second antibody, biotin, digoxigenin, maltose, oligohistidine, 2,4-dinitrobenzene, phenylarsenate, ssDNA, dsDNA, *etc.*).

[0063] Generation of a signal from the signal development element can be performed using various optical, acoustical, and electrochemical methods well known in the art. Examples of detection modes include fluorescence, radiochemical detection, reflectance, absorbance, amperometry, conductance, impedance, interferometry, ellipsometry, *etc.* In certain of these methods, the solid phase antibody is coupled to a transducer (e.g., a diffraction grating, electrochemical sensor, *etc.*) for generation of a signal, while in others, a signal is generated by a transducer that is spatially separate from the solid phase antibody (e.g., a fluorometer that employs an excitation light source and an optical detector). This list is not meant to be limiting. Antibody-based biosensors may also be employed to determine the presence or amount of analytes that optionally eliminate the need for a labeled molecule.

BRIEF SUMMARY OF THE INVENTION

[0012] It is an object of the invention to provide methods and compositions for evaluating renal function in a subject. As described herein, measurement of Ferritin (human precursor Swiss-Prot P02792 (light chain) and P02794 (heavy chain)) can be used for diagnosis, prognosis, staging, monitoring, categorizing and determination of further diagnosis and treatment regimens in subjects suffering or at risk of suffering from an injury to renal function, reduced renal function, and/or acute renal failure (also called acute kidney injury).

[0013] This biomarker may be used for risk stratification (that is, to identify subjects at risk for a future injury to renal function, for future progression to reduced renal function, for future progression to ARF, for future improvement in renal function, *etc.*); for diagnosis of existing disease (that is, to identify subjects who have suffered an injury to renal function, who have progressed to reduced renal function, who have progressed to ARF, *etc.*); for monitoring for deterioration or improvement of renal function; and for predicting a future medical outcome, such as improved or worsening renal function, a decreased or increased mortality risk, a decreased or increased risk that a subject will require dialysis, a decreased or increased risk that a subject will require renal transplantation, a decreased or increased risk that a subject will recover from an injury to renal function, a decreased or increased risk that a subject will recover from ARF, a decreased or increased risk that a subject will progress to end stage renal disease, a decreased or increased risk that a subject will suffer rejection of a transplanted kidney, *etc.*

[0014] In a first aspect, the present invention relates to methods for evaluating renal status in a subject. These methods comprise performing an assay method that is configured to detect Ferritin in a body fluid sample obtained from the subject. The assay result, for example a measured concentration of Ferritin, is then correlated to the renal status of the subject. This correlation to renal status may include correlating the assay result to one or more of risk stratification, diagnosis, staging, classifying and monitoring of the subject as described herein. Thus, the present invention utilizes Ferritin for the evaluation of renal injury.

[0015] In certain embodiments, the methods for evaluating renal status described herein are methods for risk stratification of the subject; that is, assigning a likelihood of one or more future changes in renal status to the subject. In these embodiments, the assay result is correlated to one or more such future changes. The following are preferred risk stratification embodiments.

[0016] In preferred risk stratification embodiments, these methods comprise determining a subject's risk for a future injury to renal function, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Ferritin, is correlated to a likelihood of such a future injury to renal function. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and an increased likelihood of suffering a future injury to renal function is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold.

[0017] In other preferred risk stratification embodiments, these methods comprise determining a subject's risk for future reduced renal function, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Ferritin, is correlated to a likelihood of such reduced renal function. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and an increased likelihood of future reduced renal function is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold.

[0018] In still other preferred risk stratification embodiments, these methods comprise determining a subject's likelihood for a future improvement in renal function, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Ferritin, is correlated to a likelihood of such a future improvement in renal function. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and an increased likelihood of a future improvement in renal function is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is below the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold.

[0019] In yet other preferred risk stratification embodiments, these methods comprise determining a subject's risk for progression to ARF, and the assay result, for example a

measured concentration of Ferritin, is correlated to a likelihood of such progression to ARF. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and an increased likelihood of progression to ARF is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold.

[0020] And in other preferred risk stratification embodiments, these methods comprise determining a subject's outcome risk, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Ferritin, is correlated to a likelihood of the occurrence of a clinical outcome related to a renal injury suffered by the subject. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and an increased likelihood of mortality, a requirement for dialysis, a requirement for renal transplantation, a requirement for withdrawal of renal toxins, an increased likelihood of end stage renal disease, an increased likelihood of heart failure, an increased likelihood of stroke, an increased likelihood of mortality, an increased likelihood of myocardial infarction, *etc.*, is assigned to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold.

[0021] In such risk stratification embodiments, preferably the likelihood or risk assigned is that an event of interest is more or less likely to occur within 180 days of the time at which the body fluid sample is obtained from the subject. In particularly preferred embodiments, the likelihood or risk assigned relates to an event of interest occurring within a shorter time period such as 120 days, 90 days, 60 days, 45 days, 30 days, 21 days, 14 days, 7 days, 5 days, 96 hours, 72 hours, 48 hours, 36 hours, 24 hours, 12 hours, or less.

[0022] In preferred risk stratification embodiments, the subject is selected for risk stratification based on the pre-existence in the subject of one or more known risk factors for prerenal, intrinsic renal, or postrenal ARF. For example, a subject undergoing or having undergone major vascular surgery, coronary artery bypass, or other cardiac surgery; a subject having pre-existing congestive heart failure, preeclampsia, eclampsia, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, coronary artery disease, proteinuria, renal insufficiency, glomerular filtration below the normal range, cirrhosis, serum creatinine above the

normal range, or sepsis; or a subject exposed to NSAIDs, cyclosporines, tacrolimus, aminoglycosides, foscarnet, ethylene glycol, hemoglobin, myoglobin, ifosfamide, heavy metals, methotrexate, radiopaque contrast agents, or streptozotocin are all preferred subjects for monitoring risks according to the methods described herein. This list is not meant to be limiting. By “pre-existence” in this context is meant that the risk factor exists at the time the body fluid sample is obtained from the subject. In particularly preferred embodiments, a subject is chosen for risk stratification based on an existing diagnosis of injury to renal function, reduced renal function, or ARF.

[0023] A variety of methods may be used by the skilled artisan to arrive at a desired threshold value for use in these methods. For example, the threshold value may be determined from a population of normal subjects by selecting a concentration representing the 75th, 85th, 90th, 95th, or 99th percentile of Ferritin measured in such normal subjects. Alternatively, the threshold value may be determined from a population of subjects suffering from an injury to renal function or reduced renal function, but which do not progress to ARF (or some other clinical outcome such as death, dialysis, renal transplantation, *etc.*) by selecting a concentration representing the 75th, 85th, 90th, 95th, or 99th percentile of Ferritin measured in such subjects. In another alternative, the threshold value may be determined from a prior measurement of Ferritin in the same subject; that is, a temporal change in the level of Ferritin in the subject may be used to assign risk to the subject. That is, an increasing concentration of Ferritin over time may be used to identify subjects at increased risk for future injury or progression of an existing renal injury; relative to a risk assigned when the concentration is stable or decreasing.

[0024] The ability of a particular test to distinguish two populations can be established using ROC analysis. For example, ROC curves established from a “first” subpopulation which is predisposed to one or more future changes in renal status, and a “second” subpopulation which is not so predisposed can be used to calculate a ROC curve, and the area under the curve provides a measure of the quality of the test. Preferably, the tests described herein provide a ROC curve area greater than 0.5, preferably at least 0.6, more preferably 0.7, still more preferably at least 0.8, even more preferably at least 0.9, and most preferably at least 0.95.

[0025] In certain aspects, the measured concentration of Ferritin is treated as a continuous variable. For example, any particular concentration can be converted into a probability of a future reduction in renal function for the subject. In yet another alternative, a threshold that can provide an acceptable level of specificity and sensitivity in separating a population of subjects into a “first” subpopulation which is predisposed to one or more future changes in renal status, and a “second” subpopulation which is not so predisposed. A threshold value is selected to separate this first and second population by one or more of the following measures of test accuracy:

an odds ratio greater than 1, preferably at least about 2 or more or about 0.5 or less, more preferably at least about 3 or more or about 0.33 or less, still more preferably at least about 4 or more or about 0.25 or less, even more preferably at least about 5 or more or about 0.2 or less, and most preferably at least about 10 or more or about 0.1 or less;

a specificity of greater than 0.5, preferably at least 0.6, more preferably at least 0.7, still more preferably at least 0.8, even more preferably at least 0.9 and most preferably at least 0.95, with a corresponding sensitivity greater than 0.2, preferably greater than 0.3, more preferably greater than 0.4, still more preferably at least 0.5, even more preferably 0.6, yet more preferably greater than 0.7, still more preferably greater than 0.8, more preferably greater than 0.9, and most preferably greater than 0.95;

a sensitivity of greater than 0.5, preferably at least 0.6, more preferably at least 0.7, still more preferably at least 0.8, even more preferably at least 0.9 and most preferably at least 0.95, with a corresponding specificity greater than 0.2, preferably greater than 0.3, more preferably greater than 0.4, still more preferably at least 0.5, even more preferably 0.6, yet more preferably greater than 0.7, still more preferably greater than 0.8, more preferably greater than 0.9, and most preferably greater than 0.95;

at least 75% sensitivity, combined with at least 75% specificity;

a positive likelihood ratio (calculated as sensitivity/(1-specificity)) of greater than 1, at least 2, more preferably at least 3, still more preferably at least 5, and most preferably at least 10; or

a negative likelihood ratio (calculated as $(1 - \text{sensitivity}) / \text{specificity}$) of less than 1, less than or equal to 0.5, more preferably less than or equal to 0.3, and most preferably less than or equal to 0.1.

The term “about” in the context of any of the above measurements refers to $\pm 5\%$ of a given measurement.

[0026] Multiple thresholds may also be used to assess renal status in a subject. For example, a “first” subpopulation which is predisposed to one or more future changes in renal status, and a “second” subpopulation which is not so predisposed can be combined into a single group. This group is then subdivided into three or more equal parts (known as tertiles, quartiles, quintiles, etc., depending on the number of subdivisions). An odds ratio is assigned to subjects based on which subdivision they fall into. If one considers a tertile, the lowest or highest tertile can be used as a reference for comparison of the other subdivisions. This reference subdivision is assigned an odds ratio of 1. The second tertile is assigned an odds ratio that is relative to that first tertile. That is, someone in the second tertile might be 3 times more likely to suffer one or more future changes in renal status in comparison to someone in the first tertile. The third tertile is also assigned an odds ratio that is relative to that first tertile.

[0027] In certain embodiments, the assay method is an immunoassay. Antibodies for use in such assays will specifically bind the full length Ferritin protein, and may also bind one or more polypeptides that are “related” thereto, as that term is defined hereinafter. Numerous immunoassay formats are known to those of skill in the art. Preferred body fluid samples are selected from the group consisting of urine, blood, serum, and plasma.

[0028] The foregoing method steps should not be interpreted to mean that the Ferritin assay result is used in isolation for risk stratification of a subject. Rather, additional variables or other clinical indicia may be included in the methods described herein. For example, a risk stratification method may combine the assay result with one or more variables measured for the subject selected from the group consisting of demographic information (e.g., weight, sex, age, race), medical history (e.g., family history, type of surgery, pre-existing disease such as aneurism, congestive heart failure, preeclampsia, eclampsia, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, coronary artery disease, proteinuria, renal

insufficiency, or sepsis, type of toxin exposure such as NSAIDs, cyclosporines, tacrolimus, aminoglycosides, foscarnet, ethylene glycol, hemoglobin, myoglobin, ifosfamide, heavy metals, methotrexate, radiopaque contrast agents, or streptozotocin), clinical variables (e.g., blood pressure, temperature, respiration rate), risk scores (APACHE score, PREDICT score, TIMI Risk Score for UA/NSTEMI, Framingham Risk Score), a glomerular filtration rate, an estimated glomerular filtration rate, a urine production rate, a serum or plasma creatinine concentration, a urine creatinine concentration, a fractional excretion of sodium, a urine sodium concentration, a urine creatinine to serum or plasma creatinine ratio, a urine specific gravity, a urine osmolality, a urine urea nitrogen to plasma urea nitrogen ratio, a plasma BUN to creatinine ratio, a renal failure index calculated as $\text{urine sodium} / (\text{urine creatinine} / \text{plasma creatinine})$, a serum or plasma neutrophil gelatinase (NGAL) concentration, a urine NGAL concentration, a serum or plasma cystatin C concentration, a serum or plasma BNP concentration, a serum or plasma NTproBNP concentration, and a serum or plasma proBNP concentration. Other measures of renal function which may be combined with the Ferritin assay result are described hereinafter and in Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine, 17th Ed., McGraw Hill, New York, pages 1741-1830, and Current Medical Diagnosis & Treatment 2008, 47th Ed, McGraw Hill, New York, pages 785-815, each of which are hereby incorporated by reference in their entirety.

[0029] Such additional variables may be measured in samples obtained at the same time as the sample used to determine the Ferritin assay result, or may be determined at an earlier or later time. The additional variables may also be measured on the same or different body fluid samples. For example, Ferritin may be measured in a serum or plasma sample and another biomarker may be measured in a urine sample. In addition, assignment of a likelihood may combine the Ferritin assay result with temporal changes in one or more such additional variables.

[0030] In other embodiments, the methods for evaluating renal status described herein are methods for diagnosing a renal injury in the subject; that is, assessing whether or not a subject has suffered from an injury to renal function, reduced renal function, or ARF. In these embodiments, the assay result is correlated to the occurrence or

nonoccurrence of a change in renal status. The following are preferred diagnostic embodiments.

[0031] In preferred diagnostic embodiments, these methods comprise diagnosing the occurrence or nonoccurrence of an injury to renal function, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Ferritin, is correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of such an injury. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and when the measured concentration is above the threshold, an increased likelihood of the occurrence of an injury to renal function is assigned to the subject relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, a decreased likelihood of the nonoccurrence of an injury to renal function is assigned to the subject relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold. As noted hereinafter, a “diagnosis” using the Ferritin assay result can take into consideration of other clinical indicia.

[0032] In other preferred diagnostic embodiments, these methods comprise diagnosing the occurrence or nonoccurrence of reduced renal function, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Ferritin, is correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of an injury causing reduced renal function. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and when the measured concentration is above the threshold, an increased likelihood of the occurrence of an injury causing reduced renal function is assigned to the subject relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, a decreased likelihood of the nonoccurrence of an injury causing reduced renal function is assigned to the subject relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold.

[0033] In yet other preferred diagnostic embodiments, these methods comprise diagnosing the occurrence or nonoccurrence of ARF, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Ferritin, is correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of an injury causing ARF. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a

threshold value, and when the measured concentration is above the threshold, an increased likelihood of the occurrence of an injury causing ARF is assigned to the subject relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, a decreased likelihood of the nonoccurrence of an injury causing ARF is assigned to the subject relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold.

[0034] In still other preferred diagnostic embodiments, these methods comprise diagnosing a subject as being in need of dialysis, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Ferritin, is correlated to a need for dialysis. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and when the measured concentration is above the threshold, an increased likelihood of a present need for dialysis is assigned to the subject relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, a decreased likelihood of a present need for dialysis is assigned to the subject relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold.

[0035] In still other preferred diagnostic embodiments, these methods comprise diagnosing a subject as being in need of renal transplantation, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Ferritin, is correlated to a need for renal transplantation. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and when the measured concentration is above the threshold, an increased likelihood of a present need for renal transplantation is assigned to the subject relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, a decreased likelihood of a present need for renal transplantation is assigned to the subject relative to the likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold.

[0036] A variety of methods may be used by the skilled artisan to arrive at a desired threshold value. For example, the threshold value may be determined from a population

of normal subjects by selecting a concentration representing the 75th, 85th, 90th, 95th, or 99th percentile of Ferritin measured in such normal subjects. In another alternative, the threshold value may be determined from a prior measurement of Ferritin in the same subject; that is, a temporal change in the level of Ferritin in the subject may be used to assign a diagnosis to the subject.

[0037] In yet another alternative, a threshold that can provide an acceptable level of specificity and sensitivity in separating a combined population of subjects into a “first” subpopulation having a disease of interest, and a “second” subpopulation not having a disease of interest. A threshold value is selected to separate this first and second population by one or more of the following measures of test accuracy:

an odds ratio greater than 1, preferably at least about 2 or more or about 0.5 or less, more preferably at least about 3 or more or about 0.33 or less, still more preferably at least about 4 or more or about 0.25 or less, even more preferably at least about 5 or more or about 0.2 or less, and most preferably at least about 10 or more or about 0.1 or less;

a specificity of greater than 0.5, preferably at least 0.6, more preferably at least 0.7, still more preferably at least 0.8, even more preferably at least 0.9 and most preferably at least 0.95, with a corresponding sensitivity greater than 0.2, preferably greater than 0.3, more preferably greater than 0.4, still more preferably at least 0.5, even more preferably 0.6, yet more preferably greater than 0.7, still more preferably greater than 0.8, more preferably greater than 0.9, and most preferably greater than 0.95;

a sensitivity of greater than 0.5, preferably at least 0.6, more preferably at least 0.7, still more preferably at least 0.8, even more preferably at least 0.9 and most preferably at least 0.95, with a corresponding specificity greater than 0.2, preferably greater than 0.3, more preferably greater than 0.4, still more preferably at least 0.5, even more preferably 0.6, yet more preferably greater than 0.7, still more preferably greater than 0.8, more preferably greater than 0.9, and most preferably greater than 0.95;

at least 75% sensitivity, combined with at least 75% specificity;

a positive likelihood ratio (calculated as sensitivity/(1-specificity)) of greater than 1, at least 2, more preferably at least 3, still more preferably at least 5, and most preferably at least 10; or

a negative likelihood ratio (calculated as (1-sensitivity)/specificity) of less than 1, less than or equal to 0.5, more preferably less than or equal to 0.3, and most preferably less than or equal to 0.1.

The term “about” in this context refers to +/- 5% of a given measurement.

[0038] Multiple thresholds may also be used to assess renal status in a subject. For example, a “first” subpopulation of individuals having a condition of interest, and a “second” subpopulation which does not can be combined into a single group. This group is then subdivided into three or more equal parts (known as tertiles, quartiles, quintiles, etc., depending on the number of subdivisions). An odds ratio is assigned to subjects based on which subdivision they fall into. If one considers a tertile, the lowest or highest tertile can be used as a reference for comparison of the other subdivisions. This reference subdivision is assigned an odds ratio of 1. The second tertile is assigned an odds ratio that is relative to that first tertile. That is, someone in the second tertile might be 3 times more likely to have the condition in comparison to someone in the first tertile. The third tertile is also assigned an odds ratio that is relative to that first tertile.

[0039] In certain embodiments, the assay method is an immunoassay. Antibodies for use in such assays will specifically bind the full length Ferritin protein, and may also bind one or more polypeptides that are “related” thereto, as that term is defined hereinafter. Numerous immunoassay formats are known to those of skill in the art. Preferred body fluid samples are selected from the group consisting of urine, blood, serum, and plasma.

[0040] The foregoing method steps should not be interpreted to mean that the Ferritin assay result is used in isolation for diagnosis of a subject. Rather, additional variables may be included in the methods described herein. For example, a diagnosis may combine the assay result with one or more variables measured for the subject selected from the group consisting of demographic information (e.g., weight, sex, age, race), medical history (e.g., family history, type of surgery, pre-existing disease such as aneurism, congestive heart failure, preeclampsia, eclampsia, diabetes mellitus, hypertension,

coronary artery disease, proteinuria, renal insufficiency, or sepsis, type of toxin exposure such as NSAIDs, cyclosporines, tacrolimus, aminoglycosides, foscarnet, ethylene glycol, hemoglobin, myoglobin, ifosfamide, heavy metals, methotrexate, radiopaque contrast agents, or streptozotocin), clinical variables (e.g., blood pressure, temperature, respiration rate), risk scores (APACHE score, PREDICT score, TIMI Risk Score for UA/NSTEMI, Framingham Risk Score), a glomerular filtration rate, an estimated glomerular filtration rate, a urine production rate, a serum or plasma creatinine concentration, a urine creatinine concentration, a fractional excretion of sodium, a urine sodium concentration, a urine creatinine to serum or plasma creatinine ratio, a urine specific gravity, a urine osmolality, a urine urea nitrogen to plasma urea nitrogen ratio, a plasma BUN to creatinine ratio, a renal failure index calculated as $\text{urine sodium} / (\text{urine creatinine} / \text{plasma creatinine})$, a serum or plasma neutrophil gelatinase (NGAL) concentration, a urine NGAL concentration, a serum or plasma cystatin C concentration, a serum or plasma BNP concentration, a serum or plasma NTproBNP concentration, and a serum or plasma proBNP concentration. Other measures of renal function which may be combined with the Ferritin assay result are described hereinafter and in Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine, 17th Ed., McGraw Hill, New York, pages 1741-1830, and Current Medical Diagnosis & Treatment 2008, 47th Ed, McGraw Hill, New York, pages 785-815, each of which are hereby incorporated by reference in their entirety.

[0041] Such additional variables may be measured in samples obtained at the same time as the sample used to determine the Ferritin assay result, or may be determined at an earlier or later time. The additional variables may also be measured on the same or different body fluid samples. For example, Ferritin may be measured in a serum or plasma sample and another biomarker may be measured in a urine sample. In addition, a diagnostic method may combine the Ferritin assay result with temporal changes in one or more such additional variables.

[0042] In still other embodiments, the methods for evaluating renal status described herein are methods for monitoring a renal injury in the subject; that is, assessing whether or not renal function is improving or worsening in a subject who has suffered from an injury to renal function, reduced renal function, or ARF. In these embodiments, the assay

result is correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a change in renal status. The following are preferred monitoring embodiments.

[0043] In preferred monitoring embodiments, these methods comprise monitoring renal status in a subject suffering from an injury to renal function, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Ferritin, is correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a change in renal status in the subject. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and when the measured concentration is above the threshold, a worsening of renal function may be assigned to the subject; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, an improvement of renal function may be assigned to the subject.

[0044] In other preferred monitoring embodiments, these methods comprise monitoring renal status in a subject suffering from reduced renal function, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Ferritin, is correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a change in renal status in the subject. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and when the measured concentration is above the threshold, a worsening of renal function may be assigned to the subject; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, an improvement of renal function may be assigned to the subject.

[0045] In yet other preferred monitoring embodiments, these methods comprise monitoring renal status in a subject suffering from acute renal failure, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Ferritin, is correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a change in renal status in the subject. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and when the measured concentration is above the threshold, a worsening of renal function may be assigned to the subject; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, an improvement of renal function may be assigned to the subject.

[0046] In other additional preferred monitoring embodiments, these methods comprise monitoring renal status in a subject at risk of an injury to renal function due to the pre-existence of one or more known risk factors for prerenal, intrinsic renal, or postrenal ARF, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Ferritin, is

correlated to the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a change in renal status in the subject. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and when the measured concentration is above the threshold, a worsening of renal function may be assigned to the subject; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, an improvement of renal function may be assigned to the subject.

[0047] A variety of methods may be used by the skilled artisan to arrive at a desired threshold value. For example, the threshold value may be determined from a population of normal subjects by selecting a concentration representing the 75th, 85th, 90th, 95th, or 99th percentile of Ferritin measured in such normal subjects. In another alternative, the threshold value may be determined from a prior measurement of Ferritin in the same subject; that is, a temporal change in the level of Ferritin in the subject may be used to assign a diagnosis to the subject.

[0048] In yet another alternative, a threshold that can provide an acceptable level of specificity and sensitivity in separating a combined population of subjects into a “first” subpopulation having a disease of interest and whose renal function worsens, and a “second” subpopulation having a disease of interest and whose renal function improves. A threshold value is selected to separate this first and second population by one or more of the following measures of test accuracy:

an odds ratio greater than 1, preferably at least about 2 or more or about 0.5 or less, more preferably at least about 3 or more or about 0.33 or less, still more preferably at least about 4 or more or about 0.25 or less, even more preferably at least about 5 or more or about 0.2 or less, and most preferably at least about 10 or more or about 0.1 or less;

a specificity of greater than 0.5, preferably at least 0.6, more preferably at least 0.7, still more preferably at least 0.8, even more preferably at least 0.9 and most preferably at least 0.95, with a corresponding sensitivity greater than 0.2, preferably greater than 0.3, more preferably greater than 0.4, still more preferably at least 0.5, even more preferably 0.6, yet more preferably greater than 0.7, still more preferably greater than 0.8, more preferably greater than 0.9, and most preferably greater than 0.95;

a sensitivity of greater than 0.5, preferably at least 0.6, more preferably at least 0.7, still more preferably at least 0.8, even more preferably at least 0.9 and most preferably at least

0.95, with a corresponding specificity greater than 0.2, preferably greater than 0.3, more preferably greater than 0.4, still more preferably at least 0.5, even more preferably 0.6, yet more preferably greater than 0.7, still more preferably greater than 0.8, more preferably greater than 0.9, and most preferably greater than 0.95;

at least 75% sensitivity, combined with at least 75% specificity;

a positive likelihood ratio (calculated as sensitivity/(1-specificity)) of greater than 1, at least 2, more preferably at least 3, still more preferably at least 5, and most preferably at least 10; or

a negative likelihood ratio (calculated as (1-sensitivity)/specificity) of less than 1, less than or equal to 0.5, more preferably less than or equal to 0.3, and most preferably less than or equal to 0.1.

The term “about” in this context refers to +/- 5% of a given measurement.

[0049] Multiple thresholds may also be used to monitor renal status in a subject. For example, a “first” subpopulation of individuals in which renal function is improving (or worsening), and a “second” subpopulation of individuals which do not can be combined into a single group. This group is then subdivided into three or more equal parts (known as tertiles, quartiles, quintiles, etc., depending on the number of subdivisions). An odds ratio is assigned to subjects based on which subdivision they fall into. If one considers a tertile, the lowest or highest tertile can be used as a reference for comparison of the other subdivisions. This reference subdivision is assigned an odds ratio of 1. The second tertile is assigned an odds ratio that is relative to that first tertile. That is, someone in the second tertile might be 3 times more likely to improve (or worsen) in comparison to someone in the first tertile. The third tertile is also assigned an odds ratio that is relative to that first tertile.

[0050] In certain embodiments, the assay method is an immunoassay. Antibodies for use in such assays will specifically bind the full length Ferritin protein, and may also bind one or more polypeptides that are “related” thereto, as that term is defined hereinafter. Numerous immunoassay formats are known to those of skill in the art. Preferred body fluid samples are selected from the group consisting of urine, blood, serum, and plasma.

[0051] The foregoing method steps should not be interpreted to mean that the Ferritin assay result is used in isolation for monitoring a subject. Rather, additional variables may be included in the methods described herein. For example, a monitoring may combine the assay result with one or more variables measured for the subject selected from the group consisting of demographic information (e.g., weight, sex, age, race), medical history (e.g., family history, type of surgery, pre-existing disease such as aneurism, congestive heart failure, preeclampsia, eclampsia, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, coronary artery disease, proteinuria, renal insufficiency, or sepsis, type of toxin exposure such as NSAIDs, cyclosporines, tacrolimus, aminoglycosides, foscarnet, ethylene glycol, hemoglobin, myoglobin, ifosfamide, heavy metals, methotrexate, radiopaque contrast agents, or streptozotocin), clinical variables (e.g., blood pressure, temperature, respiration rate), risk scores (APACHE score, PREDICT score, TIMI Risk Score for UA/NSTEMI, Framingham Risk Score), a glomerular filtration rate, an estimated glomerular filtration rate, a urine production rate, a serum or plasma creatinine concentration, a urine creatinine concentration, a fractional excretion of sodium, a urine sodium concentration, a urine creatinine to serum or plasma creatinine ratio, a urine specific gravity, a urine osmolality, a urine urea nitrogen to plasma urea nitrogen ratio, a plasma BUN to creatinine ratio, a renal failure index calculated as $\text{urine sodium} / (\text{urine creatinine} / \text{plasma creatinine})$, a serum or plasma neutrophil gelatinase (NGAL) concentration, a urine NGAL concentration, a serum or plasma cystatin C concentration, a serum or plasma BNP concentration, a serum or plasma NTproBNP concentration, and a serum or plasma proBNP concentration. Other measures of renal function which may be combined with the Ferritin assay result are described hereinafter and in Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine, 17th Ed., McGraw Hill, New York, pages 1741-1830, and Current Medical Diagnosis & Treatment 2008, 47th Ed, McGraw Hill, New York, pages 785-815, each of which are hereby incorporated by reference in their entirety.

[0052] Such additional variables may be measured in samples obtained at the same time as the sample used to determine the Ferritin assay result, or may be determined at an earlier or later time. The additional variables may also be measured on the same or different body fluid samples. For example, Ferritin may be measured in a serum or plasma sample and another biomarker may be measured in a urine sample. In addition, a

monitoring method may combine the Ferritin assay result with temporal changes in one or more such additional variables.

[0053] In still other embodiments, the methods for evaluating renal status described herein are methods for classifying a renal injury in the subject; that is, determining whether a renal injury in a subject is prerenal, intrinsic renal, or postrenal; and/or further subdividing these classes into subclasses such as acute tubular injury, acute glomerulonephritis acute tubulointerstitial nephritis, acute vascular nephropathy, or infiltrative disease. In these embodiments, the assay result is correlated to a particular class and/or subclass. The following are preferred classification embodiments.

[0054] In preferred classification embodiments, these methods comprise determining whether a renal injury in a subject is prerenal, intrinsic renal, or postrenal; and/or further subdividing these classes into subclasses such as acute tubular injury, acute glomerulonephritis acute tubulointerstitial nephritis, acute vascular nephropathy, or infiltrative disease, and the assay result, for example a measured concentration of Ferritin, is correlated to the injury classification for the subject. For example, the measured concentration may be compared to a threshold value, and when the measured concentration is above the threshold, a particular classification is assigned; alternatively, when the measured concentration is below the threshold, a different classification may be assigned to the subject.

[0055] A variety of methods may be used by the skilled artisan to arrive at a desired threshold value. For example, the threshold value may be determined from a population of subjects not having a particular classification (e.g., a “control” group) by selecting a concentration representing the 75th, 85th, 90th, 95th, or 99th percentile of Ferritin measured in such control subjects. In another alternative, the threshold value may be determined from a prior measurement of Ferritin in the same subject; that is, a temporal change in the level of Ferritin in the subject may be used to assign a classification to the subject.

[0056] In yet another alternative, a threshold that can provide an acceptable level of specificity and sensitivity in separating a combined population of subjects into a “first” subpopulation having a particular classification, and a “second” subpopulation having a

different classification. A threshold value is selected to separate this first and second population by one or more of the following measures of test accuracy:

an odds ratio greater than 1, preferably at least about 2 or more or about 0.5 or less, more preferably at least about 3 or more or about 0.33 or less, still more preferably at least about 4 or more or about 0.25 or less, even more preferably at least about 5 or more or about 0.2 or less, and most preferably at least about 10 or more or about 0.1 or less;

a specificity of greater than 0.5, preferably at least 0.6, more preferably at least 0.7, still more preferably at least 0.8, even more preferably at least 0.9 and most preferably at least 0.95, with a corresponding sensitivity greater than 0.2, preferably greater than 0.3, more preferably greater than 0.4, still more preferably at least 0.5, even more preferably 0.6, yet more preferably greater than 0.7, still more preferably greater than 0.8, more preferably greater than 0.9, and most preferably greater than 0.95;

a sensitivity of greater than 0.5, preferably at least 0.6, more preferably at least 0.7, still more preferably at least 0.8, even more preferably at least 0.9 and most preferably at least 0.95, with a corresponding specificity greater than 0.2, preferably greater than 0.3, more preferably greater than 0.4, still more preferably at least 0.5, even more preferably 0.6, yet more preferably greater than 0.7, still more preferably greater than 0.8, more preferably greater than 0.9, and most preferably greater than 0.95;

at least 75% sensitivity, combined with at least 75% specificity;

a positive likelihood ratio (calculated as sensitivity/(1-specificity)) of greater than 1, at least 2, more preferably at least 3, still more preferably at least 5, and most preferably at least 10; or

a negative likelihood ratio (calculated as (1-sensitivity)/specificity) of less than 1, less than or equal to 0.5, more preferably less than or equal to 0.3, and most preferably less than or equal to 0.1.

The term “about” in this context refers to +/- 5% of a given measurement.

[0057] Multiple thresholds may also be used to classify a renal injury in a subject.

For example, a “first” subpopulation of individuals having a particular classification, and a “second” subpopulation having a different classification, can be combined into a single

group. This group is then subdivided into three or more equal parts (known as tertiles, quartiles, quintiles, etc., depending on the number of subdivisions). An odds ratio is assigned to subjects based on which subdivision they fall into. If one considers a tertile, the lowest or highest tertile can be used as a reference for comparison of the other subdivisions. This reference subdivision is assigned an odds ratio of 1. The second tertile is assigned an odds ratio that is relative to that first tertile. That is, someone in the second tertile might be 3 times more likely to have a particular classification in comparison to someone in the first tertile. The third tertile is also assigned an odds ratio that is relative to that first tertile.

[0058] In certain embodiments, the assay method is an immunoassay. Antibodies for use in such assays will specifically bind the full length Ferritin protein, and may also bind one or more polypeptides that are “related” thereto, as that term is defined hereinafter. Numerous immunoassay formats are known to those of skill in the art. Preferred body fluid samples are selected from the group consisting of urine, blood, serum, and plasma.

[0059] The foregoing method steps should not be interpreted to mean that the Ferritin assay result is used in isolation for classification of an injury in a subject. Rather, additional variables may be included in the methods described herein. For example, a classification may combine the assay result with one or more variables measured for the subject selected from the group consisting of demographic information (e.g., weight, sex, age, race), medical history (e.g., family history, type of surgery, pre-existing disease such as aneurism, congestive heart failure, preeclampsia, eclampsia, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, coronary artery disease, proteinuria, renal insufficiency, or sepsis, type of toxin exposure such as NSAIDs, cyclosporines, tacrolimus, aminoglycosides, foscarnet, ethylene glycol, hemoglobin, myoglobin, ifosfamide, heavy metals, methotrexate, radiopaque contrast agents, or streptozotocin), clinical variables (e.g., blood pressure, temperature, respiration rate), risk scores (APACHE score, PREDICT score, TIMI Risk Score for UA/NSTEMI, Framingham Risk Score), a glomerular filtration rate, an estimated glomerular filtration rate, a urine production rate, a serum or plasma creatinine concentration, a urine creatinine concentration, a fractional excretion of sodium, a urine sodium concentration, a urine creatinine to serum or plasma creatinine ratio, a urine specific gravity, a urine osmolality, a urine urea nitrogen to plasma urea nitrogen ratio, a

plasma BUN to creatinine ratio, a renal failure index calculated as urine sodium / (urine creatinine / plasma creatinine), a serum or plasma neutrophil gelatinase (NGAL) concentration, a urine NGAL concentration, a serum or plasma cystatin C concentration, a serum or plasma BNP concentration, a serum or plasma NTproBNP concentration, and a serum or plasma proBNP concentration. Other measures of renal function which may be combined with the Ferritin assay result are described hereinafter and in Harrison's Principles of Internal Medicine, 17th Ed., McGraw Hill, New York, pages 1741-1830, and Current Medical Diagnosis & Treatment 2008, 47th Ed, McGraw Hill, New York, pages 785-815, each of which are hereby incorporated by reference in their entirety.

[0060] Such additional variables may be measured in samples obtained at the same time as the sample used to determine the Ferritin assay result, or may be determined at an earlier or later time. The additional variables may also be measured on the same or different body fluid samples. For example, Ferritin may be measured in a serum or plasma sample and another biomarker may be measured in a urine sample. In addition, a monitoring method may combine the Ferritin assay result with temporal changes in one or more such additional variables.

[0061] In various related aspects, the present invention also relates to devices and kits for performing the methods described herein. Suitable kits comprise reagents sufficient for performing at least one of the described Ferritin assays, together with instructions for performing the described threshold comparisons.

[0062] In certain embodiments, reagents for performing such assays are provided in an assay device, and such assay devices may be included in such a kit. Preferred reagents can comprise one or more solid phase antibodies, the solid phase antibody comprising antibody that detects the intended biomarker target(s) bound to a solid support. In the case of sandwich immunoassays, such reagents can also include one or more detectably labeled antibodies, the detectably labeled antibody comprising antibody that detects the intended biomarker target(s) bound to a detectable label. Additional optional elements that may be provided as part of an assay device are described hereinafter.

[0063] Detectable labels may include molecules that are themselves detectable (e.g., fluorescent moieties, electrochemical labels, ecl (electrochemical luminescence) labels,

metal chelates, colloidal metal particles, *etc.*) as well as molecules that may be indirectly detected by production of a detectable reaction product (*e.g.*, enzymes such as horseradish peroxidase, alkaline phosphatase, *etc.*) or through the use of a specific binding molecule which itself may be detectable (*e.g.*, a labeled antibody that binds to the second antibody, biotin, digoxigenin, maltose, oligohistidine, 2,4-dinitrobenzene, phenylarsenate, ssDNA, dsDNA, *etc.*).

[0064] Generation of a signal from the signal development element can be performed using various optical, acoustical, and electrochemical methods well known in the art. Examples of detection modes include fluorescence, radiochemical detection, reflectance, absorbance, amperometry, conductance, impedance, interferometry, ellipsometry, *etc.* In certain of these methods, the solid phase antibody is coupled to a transducer (*e.g.*, a diffraction grating, electrochemical sensor, *etc.*) for generation of a signal, while in others, a signal is generated by a transducer that is spatially separate from the solid phase antibody (*e.g.*, a fluorometer that employs an excitation light source and an optical detector). This list is not meant to be limiting. Antibody-based biosensors may also be employed to determine the presence or amount of analytes that optionally eliminate the need for a labeled molecule.

DETAILED DESCRIPTION OF THE INVENTION

[0065] The present invention relates to methods and compositions for diagnosis, differential diagnosis, risk stratification, monitoring, classifying and determination of treatment regimens in subjects suffering or at risk of suffering from injury to renal function, reduced renal function and/or acute renal failure through measurement of Ferritin.

[0066] For purposes of this document, the following definitions apply:

As used herein, an “injury to renal function” is an abrupt (within 14 days, preferably within 7 days, more preferably within 72 hours, and still more preferably within 48 hours) measurable reduction in a measure of renal function. Suitable measures include a decrease in glomerular filtration rate or estimated GFR, a reduction in urine output, an increase in serum creatinine, an increase in serum cystatin C, a requirement for dialysis,

We claim:

1. A method for evaluating renal status in a subject, comprising:

performing one or more assays configured to detect a kidney injury marker selected from the group consisting of soluble Advanced glycosylation end product-specific receptor, Bactericidal permeability-increasing protein, Interleukin 12, Fibroblast growth factor 23, and Intestinal fatty acid-binding protein on a body fluid sample obtained from the subject to provide one or more assay results; and

correlating the assay result(s) to one or more of risk stratification, staging, prognosis, classifying and monitoring of the renal status of the subject.
2. A method according to claim 1, wherein said correlating step comprises assigning a likelihood of one or more future changes in renal status to the subject based on the assay result(s).
3. A method according to claim 2, wherein said one or more future changes in renal status comprise one or more of a future injury to renal function, future reduced renal function, future improvement in renal function, and future acute renal failure (ARF).
4. A method according to claim 3, wherein said assay result(s) comprise one or more of:
 - (i) a measured concentration of soluble Advanced glycosylation end product-specific receptor,
 - (ii) a measured concentration of Bactericidal permeability-increasing protein,
 - (iii) a measured concentration of Interleukin 12,
 - (iv) a measured concentration of Fibroblast growth factor 23, or
 - (v) a measured concentration of Intestinal fatty acid-binding protein,and said correlation step comprises, for each assay result, comparing said measure concentration to a threshold concentration, and

for a positive going marker, assigning an increased likelihood of suffering a future injury to renal function, future reduced renal function, future ARF, or a future improvement in renal function to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold or assigning a decreased likelihood of suffering a future injury to renal function, future

reduced renal function, future ARF, or a future improvement in renal function to the subject when the measured concentration is below the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold, or

for a negative going marker, assigning an increased likelihood of suffering a future injury to renal function, future reduced renal function, future ARF, or a future improvement in renal function to the subject when the measured concentration is below the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold or assigning a decreased likelihood of suffering a future injury to renal function, future reduced renal function, future ARF, or a future improvement in renal function to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold.

5. A method according to claim 2, wherein said one or more future changes in renal status comprise a clinical outcome related to a renal injury suffered by the subject.

6. A method according to claim 1, wherein said assay result(s) comprise one or more of:

- (i) a measured concentration of soluble Advanced glycosylation end product-specific receptor,
- (ii) a measured concentration of Bactericidal permeability-increasing protein,
- (iii) a measured concentration of Interleukin 12,
- (iv) a measured concentration of Fibroblast growth factor 23, or
- (v) a measured concentration of Intestinal fatty acid-binding protein,

and said correlation step comprises, for each assay result, comparing said measure concentration to a threshold concentration, and

for a positive going marker, assigning an increased likelihood of subsequent acute kidney injury, worsening stage of AKI, mortality, need for renal replacement therapy, need for withdrawal of renal toxins, end stage renal disease, heart failure, stroke, myocardial infarction, or chronic kidney disease to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold, or assigning a decreased likelihood of subsequent acute kidney injury, worsening stage of AKI, mortality, need for renal replacement therapy, need for withdrawal of renal toxins, end stage renal disease, heart failure, stroke, myocardial

infarction, or chronic kidney disease to the subject when the measured concentration is below the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold, or

for a negative going marker, assigning an increased likelihood of subsequent acute kidney injury, worsening stage of AKI, mortality, need for renal replacement therapy, need for withdrawal of renal toxins, end stage renal disease, heart failure, stroke, myocardial infarction, or chronic kidney disease to the subject when the measured concentration is below the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold, or assigning a decreased likelihood of subsequent acute kidney injury, worsening stage of AKI, mortality, need for renal replacement therapy, need for withdrawal of renal toxins, end stage renal disease, heart failure, stroke, myocardial infarction, or chronic kidney disease to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold.

7. A method according to claim 2, wherein the likelihood of one or more future changes in renal status is that an event of interest is more or less likely to occur within 30 days of the time at which the body fluid sample is obtained from the subject.

8. A method according to claim 7, wherein the likelihood of one or more future changes in renal status is that an event of interest is more or less likely to occur within a period selected from the group consisting of 21 days, 14 days, 7 days, 5 days, 96 hours, 72 hours, 48 hours, 36 hours, 24 hours, and 12 hours.

9. A method according to claim 1, wherein the subject is selected for evaluation of renal status based on the pre-existence in the subject of one or more known risk factors for prerenal, intrinsic renal, or postrenal ARF.

10. A method according to claim 1, wherein the subject is selected for evaluation of renal status based on an existing diagnosis of one or more of congestive heart failure, preeclampsia, eclampsia, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, coronary artery disease, proteinuria, renal insufficiency, glomerular filtration below the normal range, cirrhosis, serum creatinine above the normal range, sepsis, injury to renal function, reduced renal function, or ARF, or based on undergoing or having undergone major vascular surgery, coronary artery bypass, or other cardiac surgery, or based on exposure to NSAIDs, cyclosporines, tacrolimus, aminoglycosides, foscarnet, ethylene glycol, hemoglobin,

myoglobin, ifosfamide, heavy metals, methotrexate, radiopaque contrast agents, or streptozotocin.

11. A method according to claim 1, wherein said correlating step comprises assigning a diagnosis of the occurrence or nonoccurrence of one or more of an injury to renal function, reduced renal function, or ARF to the subject based on the assay result(s).

12. A method according to claim 1, wherein said correlating step comprises assessing whether or not renal function is improving or worsening in a subject who has suffered from an injury to renal function, reduced renal function, or ARF based on the assay result(s).

13. A method according to claim 12, wherein said assay result(s) comprise one or more of:

- (i) a measured concentration of soluble Advanced glycosylation end product-specific receptor,
- (ii) a measured concentration of Bactericidal permeability-increasing protein,
- (iii) a measured concentration of Interleukin 12,
- (iv) a measured concentration of Fibroblast growth factor 23, or
- (v) a measured concentration of Intestinal fatty acid-binding protein,

and said correlation step comprises, for each assay result, comparing said measure concentration to a threshold concentration, and

for a positive going marker, assigning a worsening of renal function to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, or assigning an improvement of renal function when the measured concentration is below the threshold, or

for a negative going marker, assigning a worsening of renal function to the subject when the measured concentration is below the threshold, or assigning an improvement of renal function when the measured concentration is above the threshold.

14. A method according to claim 1, wherein said method is a method of assigning a risk of the future occurrence or nonoccurrence of an injury to renal function in said subject.

15. A method according to claim 1, wherein said method is a method of assigning a risk of the future occurrence or nonoccurrence of reduced renal function in said subject.

16. A method according to claim 1, wherein said method is a method of assigning a risk of the future occurrence or nonoccurrence of acute renal failure in said subject.
17. A method according to claim 1, wherein said method is a method of assigning a risk of the future occurrence or nonoccurrence of a need for renal replacement therapy in said subject.
18. A method according to claim 1, wherein said method is a method of assigning a risk of the future occurrence or nonoccurrence of a need for renal transplantation in said subject.
19. A method according to claim 4, wherein said one or more future changes in renal status comprise one or more of a future injury to renal function, future reduced renal function, future improvement in renal function, and future acute renal failure (ARF) within 72 hours of the time at which the body fluid sample is obtained.
20. A method according to claim 4, wherein said one or more future changes in renal status comprise one or more of a future injury to renal function, future reduced renal function, future improvement in renal function, and future acute renal failure (ARF) within 48 hours of the time at which the body fluid sample is obtained.
21. A method according to claim 4, wherein said one or more future changes in renal status comprise one or more of a future injury to renal function, future reduced renal function, future improvement in renal function, and future acute renal failure (ARF) within 72 hours of the time at which the body fluid sample is obtained.
22. A method according to claim 4, wherein said one or more future changes in renal status comprise one or more of a future injury to renal function, future reduced renal function, future improvement in renal function, and future acute renal failure (ARF) within 48 hours of the time at which the body fluid sample is obtained.
23. A method according to claim 4, wherein said one or more future changes in renal status comprise one or more of a future injury to renal function, future reduced renal function, future improvement in renal function, and future acute renal failure (ARF) within 24 hours of the time at which the body fluid sample is obtained.
24. Use of one or more kidney injury markers selected from the group consisting of soluble Advanced glycosylation end product-specific receptor, Bactericidal permeability-increasing protein, Interleukin 12, Fibroblast growth factor 23, and Intestinal fatty acid-

binding protein for one or more of risk stratification, staging, prognosis, classifying and monitoring of the renal status of a subject.

25. Use of one or more kidney injury markers selected from the group consisting of soluble Advanced glycosylation end product-specific receptor, Bactericidal permeability-increasing protein, Interleukin 12, Fibroblast growth factor 23, and Intestinal fatty acid-binding protein for one or more of risk stratification, staging, prognosis, classifying and monitoring of the renal status of a subject suffering from an acute renal injury.

26. A method according to claim 6, wherein the increased or decreased likelihood of subsequent acute kidney injury, worsening stage of AKI, mortality, need for renal replacement therapy, need for withdrawal of renal toxins, end stage renal disease, heart failure, stroke, myocardial infarction, or chronic kidney disease assigned to the subject is a likelihood that an event of interest is more or less likely to occur within 30 days of the time at which the body fluid sample is obtained from the subject.

27. A method according to claim 6, wherein the increased or decreased likelihood of subsequent acute kidney injury, worsening stage of AKI, mortality, need for renal replacement therapy, need for withdrawal of renal toxins, end stage renal disease, heart failure, stroke, myocardial infarction, or chronic kidney disease assigned to the subject is a likelihood that an event of interest is more or less likely to occur within 72 hours of the time at which the body fluid sample is obtained from the subject.

28. A method according to claim 6, wherein the increased or decreased likelihood of subsequent acute kidney injury, worsening stage of AKI, mortality, need for renal replacement therapy, need for withdrawal of renal toxins, end stage renal disease, heart failure, stroke, myocardial infarction, or chronic kidney disease assigned to the subject is a likelihood that an event of interest is more or less likely to occur within 24 hours of the time at which the body fluid sample is obtained from the subject.

We claim:

1. A method for evaluating renal status in a subject, comprising performing an assay method configured to detect Lysozyme C on a body fluid sample obtained from the subject to provide an assay result; and correlating the assay result to the renal status of the subject.
2. A method according to claim 1, wherein said correlation step comprises correlating the assay result to one or more of risk stratification, diagnosis, staging, classifying and monitoring of the renal status of the subject.
3. A method according to claim 1, wherein said correlating step comprises assigning a likelihood of one or more future changes in renal status to the subject based on the assay result.
4. A method according to claim 3, wherein said one or more future changes in renal status comprise one or more of a future injury to renal function, future reduced renal function, future improvement in renal function, and future acute renal failure (ARF).
5. A method according to claim 4, wherein said assay result is a measured concentration of Lysozyme C, and said correlation step comprises comparing said concentration to a threshold concentration, and performing one or both of the following steps based on the comparison:
 - (i) assigning an increased likelihood of suffering a future injury to renal function, future reduced renal function, future ARF, or a future improvement in renal function to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold; or
 - (ii) assigning a decreased likelihood of suffering a future injury to renal function, future reduced renal function, future ARF, or a future improvement in renal function to the subject when the measured concentration is below the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold
6. A method according to claim 3, wherein said one or more future changes in renal status comprise a clinical outcome related to a renal injury suffered by the subject.

7. A method according to claim 1, wherein said assay result is a measured concentration of Lysozyme C, and said correlation step comprises comparing said concentration to a threshold concentration, and performing one or both of the following steps based on the comparison:

(i) assigning an increased likelihood of suffering mortality, a requirement for dialysis, a requirement for renal transplantation, an increased likelihood of end stage renal disease, an increased likelihood of heart failure, an increased likelihood of stroke, or an increased likelihood of myocardial infarction to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold; or

(ii) assigning a decreased likelihood of suffering mortality, a requirement for dialysis, a requirement for renal transplantation, a decreased likelihood of end stage renal disease, a decreased likelihood of heart failure, a decreased likelihood of stroke, or a decreased likelihood of myocardial infarction to the subject when the measured concentration is below the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold.

8. A method according to claim 3, wherein the likelihood of one or more future changes in renal status is that an event of interest is more or less likely to occur within 30 days of the time at which the body fluid sample is obtained from the subject.

9. A method according to claim 8, wherein the likelihood of one or more future changes in renal status is that an event of interest is more or less likely to occur within a period selected from the group consisting of 21 days, 14 days, 7 days, 5 days, 96 hours, 72 hours, 48 hours, 36 hours, 24 hours, and 12 hours.

10. A method according to claim 1, wherein the subject is selected for evaluation of renal status based on the pre-existence in the subject of one or more known risk factors for prerenal, intrinsic renal, or postrenal ARF.

11. A method according to claim 1, wherein the subject is selected for evaluation of renal status based on an existing diagnosis of one or more of congestive heart failure, preeclampsia, eclampsia, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, coronary artery disease,

proteinuria, renal insufficiency, glomerular filtration below the normal range, cirrhosis, serum creatinine above the normal range, sepsis, injury to renal function, reduced renal function, or ARF, or based on undergoing or having undergone major vascular surgery, coronary artery bypass, or other cardiac surgery, or based on exposure to NSAIDs, cyclosporines, tacrolimus, aminoglycosides, foscarnet, ethylene glycol, hemoglobin, myoglobin, ifosfamide, heavy metals, methotrexate, radiopaque contrast agents, or streptozotocin.

12. A method according to claim 1, wherein said correlating step comprises assigning a diagnosis of the occurrence or nonoccurrence of one or more of an injury to renal function, reduced renal function, or ARF to the subject based on the assay result.

13. A method according to claim 12, wherein said assay result is a measured concentration of Lysozyme C, and said correlation step comprises comparing said concentration to a threshold concentration, and performing one or both of the following steps based on the comparison:

- (i) assigning the occurrence of an injury to renal function, reduced renal function, or ARF to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, or
- (ii) assigning the nonoccurrence of an injury to renal function, reduced renal function, or ARF to the subject when the measured concentration is below the threshold.

14. A method according to claim 1, wherein said correlating step comprises assessing whether or not renal function is improving or worsening in a subject who has suffered from an injury to renal function, reduced renal function, or ARF based on the assay result.

15. A method according to claim 14, wherein said assay result is a measured concentration of Lysozyme C, and said correlation step comprises comparing said concentration to a threshold concentration, and performing one or both of the following steps based on the comparison:

- (i) assigning a worsening of renal function to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, or

(ii) assigning an improvement of renal function when the measured concentration is below the threshold.

16. A method according to one of claims 5, 7, 13, or 15, wherein the threshold is a concentration of Lysozyme C obtained from the subject at an earlier time point.

17. A method according to one of claims 5, 7, 13, or 15, wherein the threshold is a concentration of Lysozyme C obtained from a normal subject population.

18. A method according to claim 5, wherein the threshold is a concentration of Lysozyme C selected to distinguish from a population of subjects a first subpopulation having an increased likelihood of suffering a future injury to renal function, future reduced renal function, future ARF, or a future improvement in renal function, relative to a second subpopulation.

19. A method according to claim 7, wherein the threshold is a concentration of Lysozyme C selected to distinguish from a population of subjects a first subpopulation having an increased likelihood of suffering mortality, a requirement for dialysis, a requirement for renal transplantation, an increased likelihood of end stage renal disease, an increased likelihood of heart failure, an increased likelihood of stroke, or an increased likelihood of myocardial infarction, relative to a second subpopulation.

20. A method according to claim 13, wherein the threshold is a concentration of Lysozyme C selected to distinguish from a population of subjects a first subpopulation having a disease of interest selected from the group consisting of an injury to renal function, reduced renal function, or ARF, from a second subpopulation that does not have the disease of interest.

21. A method according to claim 15, wherein the threshold is a concentration of Lysozyme C selected to distinguish from a population of subjects having an injury to renal function, reduced renal function, or ARF a first subpopulation having an increased likelihood of suffering worsening of renal function, relative to a second subpopulation.

22. A method according to claim 1, wherein said method is a method of diagnosing the occurrence or nonoccurrence of an injury to renal function in said subject.

23. A method according to claim 1, wherein said method is a method of diagnosing the occurrence or nonoccurrence of reduced renal function in said subject.
24. A method according to claim 1, wherein said method is a method of diagnosing the occurrence or nonoccurrence of acute renal failure in said subject.
25. A method according to claim 1, wherein said method is a method of diagnosing the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a need for dialysis in said subject.
26. A method according to claim 1, wherein said method is a method of diagnosing the occurrence or nonoccurrence of a need for renal transplantation in said subject.
27. A method according to claim 1, wherein said method is a method of assigning a risk of the future occurrence or nonoccurrence of an injury to renal function in said subject.
28. A method according to claim 1, wherein said method is a method of assigning a risk of the future occurrence or nonoccurrence of reduced renal function in said subject.
29. A method according to claim 1, wherein said method is a method of assigning a risk of the future occurrence or nonoccurrence of acute renal failure in said subject.
30. A method according to claim 1, wherein said method is a method of assigning a risk of the future occurrence or nonoccurrence of a need for dialysis in said subject.
31. A method according to claim 1, wherein said method is a method of assigning a risk of the future occurrence or nonoccurrence of a need for renal transplantation in said subject.
32. Lysozyme C for the evaluation of renal injury.

We claim:

1. A method for evaluating renal status in a subject, comprising performing an assay method configured to detect soluble Ferritin on a body fluid sample obtained from the subject to provide an assay result; and

correlating the assay result to the renal status of the subject.
2. A method according to claim 1, wherein said correlation step comprises correlating the assay result to one or more of risk stratification, staging, classifying and monitoring of the renal status of the subject.
3. A method according to claim 1, wherein said correlating step comprises assigning a likelihood of one or more future changes in renal status to the subject based on the assay result.
4. A method according to claim 3, wherein said one or more future changes in renal status comprise one or more of a future injury to renal function, future reduced renal function, future improvement in renal function, and future acute renal failure (ARF).
5. A method according to claim 4, wherein said assay result is a measured concentration of soluble Ferritin, and said correlation step comprises comparing said concentration to a threshold concentration, and performing one or both of the following steps based on the comparison:
 - (i) assigning an increased likelihood of suffering a future injury to renal function, future reduced renal function, future ARF, or a future improvement in renal function to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold; or
 - (ii) assigning a decreased likelihood of suffering a future injury to renal function, future reduced renal function, future ARF, or a future improvement in renal function to the subject when the measured concentration is below the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold
6. A method according to claim 3, wherein said one or more future changes in renal status comprise a clinical outcome related to a renal injury suffered by the subject.

7. A method according to claim 1, wherein said assay result is a measured concentration of soluble Ferritin, and said correlation step comprises comparing said concentration to a threshold concentration, and performing one or both of the following steps based on the comparison:
- (i) assigning an increased likelihood of suffering mortality, a requirement for dialysis, a requirement for renal transplantation, an increased likelihood of end stage renal disease, an increased likelihood of heart failure, an increased likelihood of stroke, or an increased likelihood of myocardial infarction to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is below the threshold; or
 - (ii) assigning a decreased likelihood of suffering mortality, a requirement for dialysis, a requirement for renal transplantation, a decreased likelihood of end stage renal disease, a decreased likelihood of heart failure, a decreased likelihood of stroke, or a decreased likelihood of myocardial infarction to the subject when the measured concentration is below the threshold, relative to a likelihood assigned when the measured concentration is above the threshold.
8. A method according to claim 3, wherein the likelihood of one or more future changes in renal status is that an event of interest is more or less likely to occur within 30 days of the time at which the body fluid sample is obtained from the subject.
9. A method according to claim 8, wherein the likelihood of one or more future changes in renal status is that an event of interest is more or less likely to occur within a period selected from the group consisting of 21 days, 14 days, 7 days, 5 days, 96 hours, 72 hours, 48 hours, 36 hours, 24 hours, and 12 hours.
10. A method according to claim 1, wherein the subject is selected for evaluation of renal status based on the pre-existence in the subject of one or more known risk factors for prerenal, intrinsic renal, or postrenal ARF.
11. A method according to claim 1, wherein the subject is selected for evaluation of renal status based on an existing diagnosis of one or more of congestive heart failure, preeclampsia, eclampsia, diabetes mellitus, hypertension, coronary artery disease,

proteinuria, renal insufficiency, glomerular filtration below the normal range, cirrhosis, serum creatinine above the normal range, sepsis, injury to renal function, reduced renal function, or ARF, or based on undergoing or having undergone major vascular surgery, coronary artery bypass, or other cardiac surgery, or based on exposure to NSAIDs, cyclosporines, tacrolimus, aminoglycosides, foscarnet, ethylene glycol, hemoglobin, myoglobin, ifosfamide, heavy metals, methotrexate, radiopaque contrast agents, or streptozotocin.

12. A method according to claim 1, wherein said correlating step comprises assessing whether or not renal function is improving or worsening in a subject who has suffered from an injury to renal function, reduced renal function, or ARF based on the assay result.

13. A method according to claim 12, wherein said assay result is a measured concentration of soluble Ferritin, and said correlation step comprises comparing said concentration to a threshold concentration, and performing one or both of the following steps based on the comparison:

- (i) assigning a worsening of renal function to the subject when the measured concentration is above the threshold, or
- (ii) assigning an improvement of renal function when the measured concentration is below the threshold.

14. A method according to one of claims 5, 7, or 13, wherein the threshold is a concentration of soluble Ferritin obtained from the subject at an earlier time point.

15. A method according to one of claims 5, 7, or 13, wherein the threshold is a concentration of soluble Ferritin obtained from a normal subject population.

16. A method according to claim 5, wherein the threshold is a concentration of soluble Ferritin selected to distinguish from a population of subjects a first subpopulation having an increased likelihood of suffering a future injury to renal function, future reduced renal function, future ARF, or a future improvement in renal function, relative to a second subpopulation.

17. A method according to claim 7, wherein the threshold is a concentration of soluble Ferritin selected to distinguish from a population of subjects a first subpopulation having an increased likelihood of suffering mortality, a requirement for dialysis, a requirement for renal transplantation, an increased likelihood of end stage renal disease, an increased likelihood of heart failure, an increased likelihood of stroke, or an increased likelihood of myocardial infarction, relative to a second subpopulation.
18. A method according to claim 13, wherein the threshold is a concentration of soluble Ferritin selected to distinguish from a population of subjects having an injury to renal function, reduced renal function, or ARF a first subpopulation having an increased likelihood of suffering worsening of renal function, relative to a second subpopulation.
19. A method according to claim 1, wherein said method is a method of assigning a risk of the future occurrence or nonoccurrence of an injury to renal function in said subject.
20. A method according to claim 1, wherein said method is a method of assigning a risk of the future occurrence or nonoccurrence of reduced renal function in said subject.
21. A method according to claim 1, wherein said method is a method of assigning a risk of the future occurrence or nonoccurrence of acute renal failure in said subject.
22. A method according to claim 1, wherein said method is a method of assigning a risk of the future occurrence or nonoccurrence of a need for dialysis in said subject.
23. A method according to claim 1, wherein said method is a method of assigning a risk of the future occurrence or nonoccurrence of a need for renal transplantation in said subject.
24. Soluble Ferritin for the evaluation of future renal injury.

Ferritin

sCr or UO

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	34.350	41.300	34.350	44.350	34.350	45.200
average	97.959	100.261	97.959	156.546	97.959	111.000
stdev	185.485	190.594	185.485	277.824	185.485	182.600
p (t-test)		0.935		0.047		0.729
min	0.107	0.217	0.107	0.290	0.107	0.416
max	997.000	997.000	997.000	1174.000	997.000	894.000
n (Samp)	248	53	248	62	248	27
n (Pat)	103	53	103	62	103	27

sCr only

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	40.500	32.550	40.500	63.750	40.500	88.000
average	109.743	99.098	109.743	155.644	109.743	121.287
stdev	198.027	167.815	198.027	264.077	198.027	125.722
p (t-test)		0.813		0.261		0.829
min	0.107	0.428	0.107	0.290	0.107	0.416
max	1174.000	689.000	1174.000	1174.000	1174.000	433.000
n (Samp)	440	20	440	26	440	14
n (Pat)	169	20	169	26	169	14

UO only

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	31.950	51.300	31.950	42.000	31.950	45.200
average	97.101	117.587	97.101	147.104	97.101	113.561
stdev	184.655	198.637	184.655	261.427	184.655	186.735
p (t-test)		0.498		0.111		0.674
min	0.107	0.217	0.107	2.380	0.107	0.614
max	997.000	997.000	997.000	997.000	997.000	894.000
n (Samp)	212	47	212	52	212	25
n (Pat)	85	47	85	52	85	25

sCr or UO

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.51	0.044	248	53	0.744
24 hours	0.56	0.042	248	62	0.137
48 hours	0.54	0.060	248	27	0.519

sCr only

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.46	0.064	440	20	0.485
24 hours	0.55	0.060	440	26	0.372
48 hours	0.60	0.081	440	14	0.235

UO only

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.59	0.047	212	47	0.068
24 hours	0.58	0.045	212	52	0.079
48 hours	0.56	0.063	212	25	0.346

sCr or UO

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	19.4	72%	34%	1			
	8.84	81%	20%	2	0.8	0.5	1.2
	3.66	91%	9%	3	1.4	1.0	2.0
	71.8	32%	70%	4	1.3	0.9	1.8
	109	19%	80%				
	258	11%	90%				

FIG. 1 - 1

24 hours	23.4	71%	37%	1			
	10.6	81%	23%	2	0.9	0.6	1.3
	4.23	90%	10%	3	1.2	0.8	1.7
	71.8	39%	70%	4	1.9	1.4	2.6
	109	27%	80%				
	258	15%	90%				
48 hours	17.7	70%	32%	1			
	9.56	81%	21%	2	0.5	0.2	1.2
	5.7	93%	14%	3	1.0	0.5	1.8
	71.8	37%	70%	4	1.3	0.7	2.3
	109	26%	80%				
	258	11%	90%				

sCr only

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	13.2	70%	24%	1			
	6.92	80%	13%	2	0.8	0.3	2.0
	3.98	90%	7%	3	0.8	0.3	2.0
	84.7	25%	70%	4	1.4	0.7	2.9
	123	20%	80%				
	265	15%	90%				
24 hours	17.3	73%	28%	1			
	13.2	85%	24%	2	0.6	0.3	1.5
	2.08	92%	4%	3	1.2	0.6	2.2
	84.7	46%	70%	4	1.5	0.9	2.7
	123	27%	80%				
	265	15%	90%				
48 hours	55.5	71%	60%	1			
	9.56	86%	18%	2	0.0	0.0	na
	7.59	93%	15%	3	1.3	0.5	3.2
	84.7	50%	70%	4	1.3	0.5	3.1
	123	36%	80%				
	265	14%	90%				

UO only

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	33.4	70%	52%	1			
	19	81%	34%	2	0.8	0.5	1.5
	5.17	91%	13%	3	1.9	1.2	3.0
	71.6	43%	70%	4	2.7	1.7	4.1
	109	28%	81%				
	258	13%	90%				
24 hours	26.9	71%	44%	1			
	19.4	81%	35%	2	1.0	0.6	1.6
	9.56	90%	20%	3	1.5	1.0	2.3
	71.6	37%	70%	4	2.1	1.4	3.1
	109	25%	81%				
	258	13%	90%				
48 hours	17.7	72%	33%	1			
	13.9	80%	28%	2	1.0	0.4	2.4
	7.35	92%	16%	3	1.2	0.6	2.7
	71.6	40%	70%	4	1.9	1.0	3.8
	109	28%	81%				
	258	12%	90%				

FIG. 1 - 2

Lysozyme C

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	22.461	26.381	22.461	27.494	22.461	28.300
average	20.833	24.456	20.833	26.558	20.833	24.027
stdev	12.090	10.450	12.090	9.250	12.090	13.028
p (t-test)		0.065		0.002		0.232
min	1.029	0.594	1.029	0.656	1.029	0.806
max	57.487	40.257	57.487	43.342	57.487	42.657
n (Samp)	116	51	116	57	116	26
n (Pat)	98	51	98	57	98	26

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	24.628	30.527	24.628	27.343	24.628	31.678
average	22.161	24.218	22.161	27.076	22.161	30.479
stdev	11.240	13.336	11.240	12.980	11.240	12.049
p (t-test)		0.471		0.048		0.008
min	0.594	0.998	0.594	0.894	0.594	4.049
max	57.487	39.333	57.487	42.841	57.487	44.761
n (Samp)	257	17	257	23	257	14
n (Pat)	158	17	158	23	158	14

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	23.243	26.213	23.243	27.460	23.243	28.675
average	21.978	25.096	21.978	27.228	21.978	24.968
stdev	12.400	8.600	12.400	6.901	12.400	12.427
p (t-test)		0.127		0.008		0.297
min	1.029	0.594	1.029	0.656	1.029	0.806
max	57.487	40.257	57.487	43.342	57.487	39.968
n (Samp)	105	45	105	46	105	23
n (Pat)	84	45	84	46	84	23

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.61	0.049	116	51	0.025
24 hours	0.66	0.045	116	57	0.000
48 hours	0.60	0.064	116	26	0.124

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.60	0.075	257	17	0.198
24 hours	0.63	0.065	257	23	0.038
48 hours	0.72	0.079	257	14	0.006

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.59	0.052	105	45	0.094
24 hours	0.64	0.051	105	46	0.007
48 hours	0.59	0.068	105	23	0.187

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	21.130618	71%	47%	1			
	14.977273	80%	35%	2	1.7	1.0	3.1
	10.035971	90%	28%	3	3.0	1.7	5.1
	27.564576	47%	71%	4	3.3	1.9	5.6
	30.105337	29%	80%				
	36.478149	10%	91%				

FIG. 1 - 3

24 hours	24.630996	70%	59%	1			
	23.279494	81%	55%	2	2.4	1.3	4.4
	8.3125	91%	22%	3	4.9	2.8	8.6
	27.564576	47%	71%	4	5.1	2.9	9.0
	30.105337	32%	80%				
	36.478149	9%	91%				
48 hours	22.106274	73%	50%	1			
	9.1025641	81%	23%	2	0.3	0.1	1.2
	2.040264	92%	3%	3	1.7	0.8	3.3
	27.564576	58%	71%	4	1.6	0.8	3.2
	30.105337	31%	80%				
	36.478149	15%	91%				

sCr only

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	14.977273	71%	28%	1			
	13.729017	82%	27%	2	1.0	0.3	3.9
	1.0289116	94%	3%	3	0.3	0.0	4.7
	28.763298	59%	70%	4	3.7	1.5	9.1
	31.107011	47%	80%				
	34.550129	18%	90%				
24 hours	22.106274	74%	40%	1			
	15.147472	83%	29%	2	0.7	0.2	2.5
	4.4785714	91%	9%	3	1.3	0.5	3.3
	28.763298	48%	70%	4	3.1	1.5	6.4
	31.107011	48%	80%				
	34.550129	39%	90%				
48 hours	27.845745	71%	65%	1			
	24.526248	86%	50%	2	0.5	0.0	9.7
	9.1025641	93%	19%	3	2.0	0.4	9.4
	28.763298	64%	70%	4	3.7	1.0	14.0
	31.107011	50%	80%				
	34.550129	43%	90%				

UO only

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	21.299157	71%	43%	1			
	19.058577	80%	40%	2	4.3	2.0	9.3
	13.729017	91%	33%	3	7.0	3.3	15.0
	28.807531	33%	70%	4	3.4	1.5	7.5
	31.987448	18%	80%				
	38.856089	2%	90%				
24 hours	24.375	72%	53%	1			
	23.417553	80%	51%	2	9.1	2.6	32.2
	22.106274	91%	46%	3	17.5	5.1	60.6
	28.807531	37%	70%	4	8.1	2.3	28.9
	31.987448	17%	80%				
	38.856089	7%	90%				
48 hours	23.279494	74%	51%	1			
	9.5016611	83%	23%	2	0.4	0.1	1.6
	2.040264	91%	2%	3	2.1	1.0	4.6
	28.807531	43%	70%	4	1.5	0.7	3.4
	31.987448	22%	80%				
	38.856089	13%	90%				

FIG. 1 - 4

Ferritin

sCr or UO

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	33.200	57.400	33.200	70.500	33.200	77.450
average	98.814	116.972	98.814	170.717	98.814	118.590
stdev	187.253	191.717	187.253	288.327	187.253	199.036
p (t-test)		0.626		0.036		0.662
min	0.107	2.440	0.107	2.860	0.107	7.030
max	1174.000	997.000	1174.000	1174.000	1174.000	894.000
n (Samp)	419	27	419	36	419	18
n (Pat)	164	27	164	36	164	18

sCr only

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	37.950	119.000	37.950	66.400	37.950	88.800
average	106.640	102.282	106.640	223.407	106.640	118.956
stdev	193.149	95.260	193.149	376.494	193.149	109.736
p (t-test)		0.960		0.079		0.866
min	0.107	4.050	0.107	2.860	0.107	9.590
max	1174.000	225.000	1174.000	1174.000	1174.000	356.000
n (Samp)	518	5	518	9	518	7
n (Pat)	199	5	199	9	199	7

UO only

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	34.000	64.850	34.000	70.500	34.000	64.100
average	100.927	149.219	100.927	173.464	100.927	122.721
stdev	186.665	251.858	186.665	291.899	186.665	211.280
p (t-test)		0.216		0.053		0.650
min	0.107	2.440	0.107	7.960	0.107	7.030
max	1174.000	997.000	1174.000	997.000	1174.000	894.000
n (Samp)	352	26	352	30	352	16
n (Pat)	133	26	133	30	133	16

sCr or UO

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.62	0.059	419	27	0.039
24 hours	0.64	0.051	419	36	0.007
48 hours	0.64	0.072	419	18	0.048

sCr only

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.56	0.134	518	5	0.674
24 hours	0.63	0.101	518	9	0.210
48 hours	0.68	0.113	518	7	0.118

UO only

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.63	0.060	352	26	0.028
24 hours	0.62	0.057	352	30	0.031
48 hours	0.63	0.076	352	16	0.098

sCr or UO

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	38	70%	54%	1			
	29.5	81%	47%	2	1.3	0.4	4.3
	9.17	93%	21%	3	3.6	1.5	8.7
	71.8	48%	70%	4	3.5	1.5	8.6
	116	30%	81%				
	263	7%	90%				

FIG. 2 - 1

24 hours	36.8	72%	53%	1			
	22.3	81%	39%	2	1.5	0.6	3.6
	9.75	92%	22%	3	3.5	1.8	6.9
	71.8	47%	70%	4	3.5	1.8	6.9
	116	33%	81%				
	263	14%	90%				
48 hours	36.1	72%	53%	1			
	29	83%	47%	2	1.5	0.3	8.0
	9.56	94%	22%	3	2.6	0.6	10.5
	71.8	50%	70%	4	4.2	1.2	14.8
	116	17%	81%				
	263	6%	90%				

sCr only

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	9.17	80%	18%	1			
	9.17	80%	18%	2	0.0	0.0	na
	3.99	100%	8%	3	0.0	0.0	na
	84.1	60%	70%	4	1.5	0.3	7.9
	125	40%	80%				
	265	0%	90%				
24 hours	32.8	78%	45%	1			
	19.7	89%	32%	2	2.0	0.1	39.0
	2.82	100%	6%	3	2.0	0.1	39.0
	84.1	44%	70%	4	4.1	0.3	48.5
	125	22%	80%				
	265	22%	90%				
48 hours	84.7	71%	70%	1			
	77.2	86%	68%	2	0.0	0.0	na
	9.56	100%	19%	3	4.1	0.3	48.9
	84.1	71%	70%	4	2.0	0.1	39.0
	125	14%	80%				
	265	14%	90%				

UO only

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	38	73%	53%	1			
	30	81%	46%	2	2.6	0.6	10.5
	16.4	92%	30%	3	5.5	1.6	18.6
	73.6	46%	70%	4	4.8	1.4	16.7
	117	31%	80%				
	265	12%	90%				
24 hours	36.8	73%	52%	1			
	22.2	80%	37%	2	1.3	0.5	3.2
	9.75	90%	20%	3	3.0	1.5	6.1
	73.6	43%	70%	4	2.6	1.3	5.5
	117	30%	80%				
	265	13%	90%				
48 hours	29.4	75%	45%	1			
	29	81%	45%	2	4.1	0.3	50.1
	19.7	94%	34%	3	4.1	0.3	50.1
	73.6	44%	70%	4	7.5	0.8	73.6
	117	25%	80%				
	265	6%	90%				

FIG. 2 - 2

Lysozyme C

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	24.631	23.681	24.631	27.494	24.631	26.736
average	22.074	23.415	22.074	26.699	22.074	23.860
stdev	11.565	10.512	11.565	10.821	11.565	13.261
p (t-test)		0.593		0.027		0.532
min	0.656	0.813	0.656	0.594	0.656	0.806
max	57.487	41.051	57.487	42.952	57.487	42.841
n (Samp)	242	23	242	35	242	18
n (Pat)	158	23	158	35	158	18

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	24.794	34.763	24.794	34.993	24.794	39.315
average	22.553	34.763	22.553	27.804	22.553	33.770
stdev	11.406	2.037	11.406	15.251	11.406	13.611
p (t-test)		0.132		0.203		0.011
min	0.594	33.323	0.594	3.314	0.594	4.049
max	57.487	36.204	57.487	40.240	57.487	42.841
n (Samp)	314	2	314	8	314	7
n (Pat)	187	2	187	8	187	7

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	25.397	23.681	25.397	27.501	25.397	26.736
average	23.056	23.425	23.056	27.304	23.056	22.671
stdev	11.321	10.689	11.321	9.425	11.321	10.874
p (t-test)		0.881		0.051		0.896
min	0.656	0.813	0.656	0.594	0.656	0.806
max	57.487	41.274	57.487	42.952	57.487	34.512
n (Samp)	208	23	208	30	208	16
n (Pat)	131	23	131	30	131	16

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.52	0.064	242	23	0.704
24 hours	0.61	0.053	242	35	0.034
48 hours	0.55	0.072	242	18	0.491

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.88	0.159	314	2	0.018
24 hours	0.68	0.106	314	8	0.096
48 hours	0.81	0.100	314	7	0.002

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.49	0.063	208	23	0.913
24 hours	0.60	0.058	208	30	0.081
48 hours	0.50	0.075	208	16	0.989

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	18.391854	74%	34%	1			
	12.697595	83%	26%	2	2.1	1.0	4.8
	10.035971	91%	22%	3	1.3	0.5	3.3
	28.807531	30%	70%	4	1.5	0.6	3.7
	31.316489	22%	80%				
	34.926199	17%	90%				

FIG. 2 - 3

24 hours	24.257362	71%	48%	1			
	22.172237	80%	41%	2	2.4	1.1	5.3
	4.4785714	91%	9%	3	2.8	1.3	5.8
	28.807531	40%	70%	4	3.4	1.6	6.9
	31.316489	34%	80%				
	34.926199	20%	90%				
48 hours	21.93118	72%	40%	1			
	8.3125	83%	18%	2	0.6	0.2	1.8
	4.0313953	94%	8%	3	0.8	0.3	2.0
	28.807531	39%	70%	4	1.2	0.6	2.7
	31.316489	33%	80%				
	34.926199	17%	90%				

sCr only

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	33.031915	100%	84%	1			
	33.031915	100%	84%	2	na	na	na
	33.031915	100%	84%	3	na	na	na
	28.866837	100%	70%	4	na	na	na
	31.517286	100%	80%				
	34.98155	50%	90%				
24 hours	27.343096	75%	61%	1			
	4.4785714	88%	9%	2	0.0	0.0	na
	3.2642053	100%	7%	3	0.5	0.0	9.8
	28.866837	63%	70%	4	2.6	0.6	10.6
	31.517286	63%	80%				
	34.98155	50%	90%				
48 hours	34.926199	71%	90%	1			
	32.669654	86%	83%	2	0.0	0.0	na
	4.0313953	100%	8%	3	0.0	0.0	na
	28.866837	86%	70%	4	6.3	0.6	65.5
	31.517286	86%	80%				
	34.98155	57%	90%				

UO only

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	18.391854	74%	31%	1			
	12.697595	83%	23%	2	1.0	0.4	2.4
	10.035971	91%	19%	3	1.7	0.8	3.5
	29.267352	26%	71%	4	1.0	0.4	2.4
	31.440461	17%	80%				
	35.514139	17%	90%				
24 hours	24.526248	70%	46%	1			
	22.413572	80%	37%	2	5.7	1.6	19.9
	19.023876	93%	32%	3	4.5	1.2	16.4
	29.267352	37%	71%	4	5.7	1.6	19.9
	31.440461	33%	80%				
	35.514139	20%	90%				
48 hours	21.93118	75%	36%	1			
	9.5016611	81%	18%	2	0.7	0.2	2.5
	4.0642857	94%	7%	3	1.3	0.5	3.3
	29.267352	31%	71%	4	1.0	0.3	2.9
	31.440461	25%	80%				
	35.514139	0%	90%				

FIG. 2 - 4

9 / 27

Lysozyme C

sCr or UO

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	25.257	29.614	25.257	29.614	25.257	29.614
average	22.261	27.507	22.261	27.507	22.261	27.507
stdev	11.216	9.713	11.216	9.713	11.216	9.713
p (t-test)		0.056		0.056		0.056
min	0.998	0.594	0.998	0.594	0.998	0.594
max	43.339	40.683	43.339	40.683	43.339	40.683
n (Samp)	52	23	52	23	52	23
n (Pat)	52	23	52	23	52	23

sCr only

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	26.381	31.613	26.381	31.613	26.381	31.613
average	22.583	31.390	22.583	31.390	22.583	31.390
stdev	14.327	3.191	14.327	3.191	14.327	3.191
p (t-test)		0.243		0.243		0.243
min	0.998	27.427	0.998	27.427	0.998	27.427
max	43.339	34.909	43.339	34.909	43.339	34.909
n (Samp)	19	4	19	4	19	4
n (Pat)	19	4	19	4	19	4

UO only

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	25.765	30.582	25.765	30.582	25.765	30.582
average	22.873	27.273	22.873	27.273	22.873	27.273
stdev	8.941	10.671	8.941	10.671	8.941	10.671
p (t-test)		0.103		0.103		0.103
min	2.658	0.594	2.658	0.594	2.658	0.594
max	37.749	40.372	37.749	40.372	37.749	40.372
n (Samp)	43	18	43	18	43	18
n (Pat)	43	18	43	18	43	18

sCr or UO

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.65	0.072	52	23	0.041
24 hours	0.65	0.072	52	23	0.041
48 hours	0.65	0.072	52	23	0.041

sCr only

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.68	0.160	19	4	0.250
24 hours	0.68	0.160	19	4	0.250
48 hours	0.68	0.160	19	4	0.250

UO only

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.67	0.080	43	18	0.038
24 hours	0.67	0.080	43	18	0.038
48 hours	0.67	0.080	43	18	0.038

sCr or UO

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	22.413572	74%	38%	1			
	20.313808	83%	38%	2	3.7	0.8	17.9
	18.391854	91%	37%	3	3.7	0.8	17.9
	28.967697	52%	71%	4	7.2	1.6	32.8
	31.107011	39%	81%				
	34.98155	17%	90%				

FIG. 3 - 1

10 / 27

24 hours	22.413572	74%	38%	1			
	20.313808	83%	38%	2	3.7	0.8	17.9
	18.391854	91%	37%	3	3.7	0.8	17.9
	28.967697	52%	71%	4	7.2	1.6	32.8
	31.107011	39%	81%				
	34.98155	17%	90%				
48 hours	22.413572	74%	38%	1			
	20.313808	83%	38%	2	3.7	0.8	17.9
	18.391854	91%	37%	3	3.7	0.8	17.9
	28.967697	52%	71%	4	7.2	1.6	32.8
	31.107011	39%	81%				
	34.98155	17%	90%				

UO only

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	21.299157	72%	35%	1			
	18.391854	89%	30%	2	2.4	0.4	14.3
	6.302521	94%	9%	3	1.6	0.2	11.4
	28.763298	61%	72%	4	8.4	1.6	42.6
	29.612546	56%	81%				
	31.107011	50%	91%				
24 hours	21.299157	72%	35%	1			
	18.391854	89%	30%	2	2.4	0.4	14.3
	6.302521	94%	9%	3	1.6	0.2	11.4
	28.763298	61%	72%	4	8.4	1.6	42.6
	29.612546	56%	81%				
	31.107011	50%	91%				
48 hours	21.299157	72%	35%	1			
	18.391854	89%	30%	2	2.4	0.4	14.3
	6.302521	94%	9%	3	1.6	0.2	11.4
	28.763298	61%	72%	4	8.4	1.6	42.6
	29.612546	56%	81%				
	31.107011	50%	91%				

FIG. 3 - 2

Ferritin

sCr or UO

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	49.300	213.000	49.300	171.500	49.300	161.000
average	140.417	316.412	140.417	292.172	140.417	208.546
stdev	239.822	308.409	239.822	314.501	239.822	168.133
p (t-test)		0.008		0.026		0.383
min	0.816	27.200	0.816	4.050	0.816	2.860
max	997.000	997.000	997.000	997.000	997.000	441.000
n (Samp)	103	17	103	16	103	10
n (Pat)	103	17	103	16	103	10

sCr only

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	66.300	189.500	66.300	95.400	66.300	102.000
average	167.793	215.713	167.793	185.006	167.793	198.132
stdev	260.408	167.984	260.408	183.157	260.408	189.231
p (t-test)		0.607		0.854		0.797
min	0.816	27.200	0.816	4.050	0.816	2.860
max	1174.000	441.000	1174.000	441.000	1174.000	441.000
n (Samp)	169	8	169	8	169	5
n (Pat)	169	8	169	8	169	5

UO only

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	56.100	213.000	56.100	269.500	56.100	213.000
average	145.667	372.555	145.667	363.950	145.667	219.943
stdev	242.314	355.233	242.314	357.596	242.314	155.893
p (t-test)		0.007		0.012		0.429
min	0.816	78.000	0.816	25.700	0.816	24.600
max	997.000	997.000	997.000	997.000	997.000	433.000
n (Samp)	85	11	85	10	85	7
n (Pat)	85	11	85	10	85	7

sCr or UO

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.77	0.070	103	17	0.000
24 hours	0.70	0.077	103	16	0.009
48 hours	0.68	0.097	103	10	0.062

sCr only

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.66	0.107	169	8	0.130
24 hours	0.57	0.108	169	8	0.510
48 hours	0.60	0.136	169	5	0.462

UO only

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.81	0.082	85	11	0.000
24 hours	0.77	0.090	85	10	0.003
48 hours	0.72	0.112	85	7	0.046

sCr or UO

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	123	71%	75%	1			
	82.9	82%	68%	2	na	na	na
	27.2	94%	31%	3	na	na	na
	108	71%	71%	4	na	na	na
	155	53%	81%				
	376	29%	90%				

FIG. 4 - 1

24 hours	77.2	75%	64%	1			
	58.1	81%	55%	2	0.5	0.0	10.1
	16.9	94%	25%	3	2.7	0.6	12.4
	108	56%	71%	4	4.9	1.2	19.6
	155	50%	81%				
	376	31%	90%				
48 hours	91	70%	70%	1			
	77.2	80%	64%	2	1.0	0.0	58.3
	23.6	90%	28%	3	3.2	0.2	51.4
	108	60%	71%	4	5.6	0.5	69.0
	155	50%	81%				
	376	20%	90%				

sCr only

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	86.6	75%	59%	1			
	27.2	88%	27%	2	na	na	na
	26.8	100%	27%	3	na	na	na
	123	63%	71%	4	na	na	na
	228	38%	80%				
	510	0%	91%				
24 hours	59.7	75%	49%	1			
	16.9	88%	20%	2	0.5	0.0	10.1
	3.98	100%	4%	3	1.0	0.1	7.8
	123	38%	71%	4	1.5	0.3	8.4
	228	38%	80%				
	510	0%	91%				
48 hours	86.6	80%	59%	1			
	86.6	80%	59%	2	0.0	0.0	na
	2.68	100%	2%	3	2.0	0.1	42.6
	123	40%	71%	4	2.0	0.1	41.5
	228	40%	80%				
	510	0%	91%				

FIG. 4 - 2

Lysozyme C

sCr or UO

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	23.177	33.974	23.177	32.281	23.177	29.347
average	22.194	31.439	22.194	30.708	22.194	27.033
stdev	11.732	10.603	11.732	10.547	11.732	14.188
p (t-test)		0.011		0.018		0.272
min	3.057	4.562	3.057	4.562	3.057	4.562
max	57.487	43.342	57.487	43.342	57.487	43.342
n						
(Samp)	98	12	98	12	98	8
n (Pat)	98	12	98	12	98	8

sCr only

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	25.931	38.732	25.931	38.168	25.931	41.530
average	24.240	33.707	24.240	32.244	24.240	32.741
stdev	11.058	14.649	11.058	14.787	11.058	18.807
p (t-test)		0.043		0.087		0.138
min	0.806	4.562	0.806	4.562	0.806	4.562
max	57.487	43.342	57.487	43.342	57.487	43.342
n						
(Samp)	158	6	158	6	158	4
n (Pat)	158	6	158	6	158	4

UO only

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	23.190	32.281	23.190	32.281	23.190	29.347
average	22.573	32.261	22.573	32.261	22.573	28.059
stdev	12.299	6.880	12.299	6.880	12.299	11.241
p (t-test)		0.031		0.031		0.292
min	3.497	24.670	3.497	24.670	3.497	9.514
max	57.487	41.799	57.487	41.799	57.487	41.799
n						
(Samp)	84	8	84	8	84	6
n (Pat)	84	8	84	8	84	6

sCr or UO

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.75	0.084	98	12	0.003
24 hours	0.73	0.086	98	12	0.007
48 hours	0.63	0.110	98	8	0.240

sCr only

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.79	0.112	158	6	0.010
24 hours	0.73	0.119	158	6	0.058
48 hours	0.73	0.145	158	4	0.106

UO only

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.76	0.102	84	8	0.011
24 hours	0.76	0.102	84	8	0.011
48 hours	0.65	0.126	84	6	0.224

sCr or UO

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	25.461255	75%	61%	1			
	25.041841	83%	58%	2	0.0	0.0	na
	24.630996	92%	55%	3	3.3	0.2	51.9
	28.062731	67%	70%	4	10.4	1.0	112.2

FIG. 4 - 3

	31.195373	67%	81%				
	39.188192	25%	91%				
24 hours	25.461255	75%	61%	1			
	25.041841	83%	58%	2	0.0	0.0	na
	24.630996	92%	55%	3	4.5	0.3	61.5
	28.062731	58%	70%	4	8.7	0.8	96.4
	31.195373	58%	81%				
	39.188192	25%	91%				
48 hours	23.279494	75%	52%	1			
	9.5016611	88%	19%	2	0.0	0.0	na
	4.0642857	100%	4%	3	1.0	0.1	8.4
	28.062731	50%	70%	4	2.1	0.4	10.7
	31.195373	50%	81%				
	39.188192	25%	91%				

sCr only

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	34.98155	83%	89%	1			
	34.98155	83%	89%	2	0.0	0.0	na
	4.0642857	100%	4%	3	0.0	0.0	na
	30.096031	83%	70%	4	5.6	0.5	64.7
	32.737789	83%	80%				
	36.478149	50%	91%				
24 hours	27.207447	83%	54%	1			
	27.207447	83%	54%	2	0.0	0.0	na
	4.0642857	100%	4%	3	1.0	0.0	55.6
	30.096031	67%	70%	4	4.3	0.3	55.5
	32.737789	67%	80%				
	36.478149	50%	91%				
48 hours	41.050532	75%	96%	1			
	4.0642857	100%	4%	2	0.0	0.0	na
	4.0642857	100%	4%	3	0.0	0.0	na
	30.096031	75%	70%	4	3.1	0.2	46.5
	32.737789	75%	80%				
	36.478149	75%	91%				

UO only

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	25.461255	75%	60%	1			
	25.041841	88%	58%	2	na	na	na
	24.630996	100%	56%	3	na	na	na
	28.807531	63%	70%	4	na	na	na
	31.987448	50%	81%				
	39.354244	25%	90%				
24 hours	25.461255	75%	60%	1			
	25.041841	88%	58%	2	na	na	na
	24.630996	100%	56%	3	na	na	na
	28.807531	63%	70%	4	na	na	na
	31.987448	50%	81%				
	39.354244	25%	90%				
48 hours	23.279494	83%	52%	1			
	23.279494	83%	52%	2	0.0	0.0	na
	9.5016611	100%	19%	3	2.1	0.1	48.1
	28.807531	50%	70%	4	3.2	0.2	52.0
	31.987448	50%	81%				
	39.354244	17%	90%				

FIG. 4 - 4

Ferritin

sCr or UO

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	323.000	415.000	323.000	428.000	323.000	382.000
average	514.265	777.091	514.265	842.798	514.265	737.488
stdev	608.844	1044.843	608.844	1024.707	608.844	1106.933
p (t-test)		0.012		0.001		0.106
min	27.300	9.790	27.300	12.800	27.300	14.100
max	3989.000	4694.000	3989.000	4694.000	3989.000	4694.000
n (Samp)	255	56	255	61	255	26
n (Pat)	111	56	111	61	111	26

sCr only

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	332.000	578.000	332.000	586.000	332.000	527.000
average	613.482	835.543	613.482	922.065	613.482	709.336
stdev	830.231	925.554	830.231	1002.737	830.231	724.953
p (t-test)		0.214		0.069		0.670
min	27.300	9.790	27.300	12.800	27.300	14.100
max	4694.000	3989.000	4694.000	3989.000	4694.000	2720.000
n (Samp)	457	23	457	26	457	14
n (Pat)	179	23	179	26	179	14

UO only

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	350.000	407.000	350.000	357.000	350.000	371.000
average	513.157	772.794	513.157	776.085	513.157	754.204
stdev	539.675	1062.965	539.675	1047.881	539.675	1171.216
p (t-test)		0.014		0.011		0.081
min	27.300	45.800	27.300	35.100	27.300	44.700
max	3989.000	4694.000	3989.000	4694.000	3989.000	4694.000
n (Samp)	213	51	213	53	213	23
n (Pat)	89	51	89	53	89	23

sCr or UO

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.58	0.043	255	56	0.057
24 hours	0.59	0.042	255	61	0.036
48 hours	0.55	0.061	255	26	0.406

sCr only

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.59	0.064	457	23	0.174
24 hours	0.60	0.060	457	26	0.093
48 hours	0.59	0.081	457	14	0.294

UO only

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.57	0.046	213	51	0.155
24 hours	0.53	0.045	213	53	0.491
48 hours	0.52	0.064	213	23	0.775

sCr or UO

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	261	71%	42%	1			
	159	80%	20%	2	0.6	0.4	0.9
	111	91%	12%	3	1.1	0.8	1.5
	472	45%	70%	4	1.8	1.3	2.5
	608	34%	80%				
	1150	16%	90%				

FIG. 5 - 1

24 hours	244	70%	38%	1			
	189	80%	27%	2	1.1	0.8	1.6
	96.8	90%	11%	3	1.0	0.7	1.5
	472	43%	70%	4	2.4	1.8	3.3
	608	39%	80%				
	1150	20%	90%				
48 hours	205	73%	29%	1			
	182	85%	26%	2	1.8	0.8	4.2
	117	92%	13%	3	1.5	0.6	3.7
	472	35%	70%	4	2.4	1.1	5.2
	608	35%	80%				
	1150	8%	90%				

sCr only

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	205	74%	28%	1			
	150	83%	18%	2	0.5	0.2	1.3
	105	91%	10%	3	0.5	0.2	1.3
	517	57%	70%	4	1.9	1.1	3.3
	771	35%	80%				
	1300	22%	90%				
24 hours	254	73%	38%	1			
	171	81%	22%	2	0.6	0.3	1.5
	107	92%	10%	3	0.5	0.2	1.3
	517	50%	70%	4	2.3	1.4	3.8
	771	38%	80%				
	1300	23%	90%				
48 hours	293	71%	44%	1			
	224	86%	30%	2	2.0	0.4	9.1
	49.3	93%	2%	3	1.0	0.1	7.3
	517	57%	70%	4	3.1	0.8	11.8
	771	36%	80%				
	1300	14%	90%				

UO only

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	276	71%	40%	1			
	223	80%	28%	2	1.1	0.7	1.7
	117	90%	12%	3	1.4	0.9	2.1
	503	41%	71%	4	1.9	1.3	2.9
	732	27%	80%				
	1140	18%	90%				
24 hours	217	72%	27%	1			
	148	81%	18%	2	0.8	0.6	1.2
	94.7	91%	11%	3	0.7	0.4	1.0
	503	36%	71%	4	1.3	0.9	1.8
	732	30%	80%				
	1140	17%	90%				
48 hours	204	74%	24%	1			
	181	83%	23%	2	0.5	0.2	1.3
	160	91%	19%	3	0.7	0.3	1.5
	503	30%	71%	4	1.0	0.5	1.9
	732	30%	80%				
	1140	9%	90%				

FIG. 5 - 2

Lysozyme C

sCr or UO	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	610.231	697.406	610.231	536.254	610.231	na
average	696.712	852.317	696.712	591.920	696.712	na
stdev	295.433	390.758	295.433	229.336	295.433	na
p (t-test)		0.236		0.233		na
min	159.835	443.750	159.835	257.551	159.835	na
max	1271.182	1524.784	1271.182	1036.599	1271.182	na
n (Samp)	26	8	26	16	26	0
n (Pat)	25	8	25	16	25	0

sCr only	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	627.666	1133.285	627.666	510.417	627.666	159.835
average	698.468	1133.285	698.468	618.042	698.468	811.527
stdev	286.954	553.663	286.954	339.614	286.954	na
p (t-test)		0.047		0.477		na
min	159.835	741.787	159.835	347.917	159.835	811.527
max	1277.522	1524.784	1277.522	1394.813	1277.522	811.527
n (Samp)	48	2	48	8	48	1
n (Pat)	46	2	46	8	46	1

UO only	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	614.986	653.026	614.986	662.536	614.986	159.835
average	684.754	868.108	684.754	668.048	684.754	802.017
stdev	282.391	419.301	282.391	236.187	282.391	na
p (t-test)		0.176		0.859		na
min	159.835	443.750	159.835	257.551	159.835	802.017
max	1271.182	1524.784	1271.182	1036.599	1271.182	802.017
n (Samp)	27	7	27	12	27	1
n (Pat)	25	7	25	12	25	1

sCr or UO	Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
	0 hours	0.60	0.119	26	8	0.398
	24 hours	0.39	0.089	26	16	0.222
	48 hours	nd	nd	26	0	nd

sCr only	Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
	0 hours	0.82	0.184	48	2	0.080
	24 hours	0.36	0.099	48	8	0.158
	48 hours	0.71	0.297	48	1	0.483

UO only	Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
	0 hours	0.61	0.126	27	7	0.388
	24 hours	0.51	0.102	27	12	0.939
	48 hours	0.70	0.301	27	1	0.499

sCr or UO	Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
	0 hours	570.60519	75%	42%	1			
		493.75	88%	23%	2	0.4	0.0	12.6
		439.58333	100%	19%	3	1.0	0.1	13.6
		836.88761	38%	73%	4	1.5	0.2	14.8
		893.94813	38%	81%				
		1210.951	25%	92%				

FIG. 5 - 3

24 hours	389.58333	75%	12%	1			
	385.41667	81%	12%	2	1.8	0.3	9.9
	310.41667	94%	8%	3	1.0	0.2	6.0
	836.88761	19%	73%	4	4.0	0.7	22.2
	893.94813	19%	81%				
	1210.951	0%	92%				
48 hours	na	na	na	1			
	na	na	na	2	na	na	na
	na	na	na	3	na	na	na
	na	na	na	4	na	na	na
	na	na	na				
	na	na	na				

sCr only

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	716.42651	100%	65%	1			
	716.42651	100%	65%	2	na	na	na
	716.42651	100%	65%	3	na	na	na
	802.01729	50%	71%	4	na	na	na
	935.1585	50%	81%				
	1210.951	50%	92%				
24 hours	389.58333	75%	13%	1			
	381.25	88%	13%	2	1.0	0.0	68.1
	310.41667	100%	6%	3	3.5	0.2	67.2
	802.01729	13%	71%	4	3.5	0.2	67.2
	935.1585	13%	81%				
	1210.951	13%	92%				
48 hours	802.01729	100%	71%	1			
	802.01729	100%	71%	2	na	na	na
	802.01729	100%	71%	3	na	na	na
	802.01729	100%	71%	4	na	na	na
	935.1585	0%	81%				
	1210.951	0%	92%				

UO only

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	570.60519	71%	41%	1			
	514.58333	86%	30%	2	2.0	0.1	66.2
	439.58333	100%	22%	3	1.0	0.0	88.2
	767.14697	43%	70%	4	3.5	0.1	87.6
	893.94813	43%	81%				
	1210.951	29%	93%				
24 hours	535.41667	75%	37%	1			
	385.41667	83%	11%	2	0.5	0.1	4.5
	381.25	92%	11%	3	1.3	0.2	8.0
	767.14697	33%	70%	4	0.9	0.1	5.8
	893.94813	25%	81%				
	1210.951	0%	93%				
48 hours	767.14697	100%	70%	1			
	767.14697	100%	70%	2	na	na	na
	767.14697	100%	70%	3	na	na	na
	767.14697	100%	70%	4	na	na	na
	893.94813	0%	81%				
	1210.951	0%	93%				

FIG. 5 - 4

Ferritin

sCr or UO

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	314.000	417.500	314.000	417.500	314.000	445.000
average	562.233	823.718	562.233	799.942	562.233	1109.611
stdev	744.471	1075.871	744.471	1036.699	744.471	1362.510
p (t-test)		0.081		0.076		0.004
min	9.790	73.100	9.790	49.900	9.790	153.000
max	4694.000	4694.000	4694.000	4694.000	4694.000	4694.000
n (Samp)	434	28	434	36	434	18
n (Pat)	173	28	173	36	173	18

sCr only

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	339.000	974.500	339.000	469.500	339.000	372.000
average	602.726	1332.667	602.726	1059.600	602.726	750.000
stdev	809.221	1406.402	809.221	1224.188	809.221	979.360
p (t-test)		0.030		0.081		0.633
min	9.790	251.000	9.790	175.000	9.790	142.000
max	4694.000	3989.000	4694.000	3989.000	4694.000	2920.000
n (Samp)	542	6	542	10	542	7
n (Pat)	208	6	208	10	208	7

UO only

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	325.500	417.000	325.500	336.000	325.500	445.000
average	567.186	793.967	567.186	751.247	567.186	1085.500
stdev	737.311	1080.573	737.311	1057.808	737.311	1359.758
p (t-test)		0.139		0.195		0.009
min	27.300	73.100	27.300	49.900	27.300	153.000
max	4694.000	4694.000	4694.000	4694.000	4694.000	4694.000
n (Samp)	356	27	356	32	356	16
n (Pat)	138	27	138	32	138	16

sCr or UO

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.63	0.058	434	28	0.025
24 hours	0.59	0.052	434	36	0.083
48 hours	0.66	0.071	434	18	0.023

sCr only

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.73	0.118	542	6	0.052
24 hours	0.65	0.095	542	10	0.120
48 hours	0.57	0.113	542	7	0.544

UO only

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.61	0.059	356	27	0.064
24 hours	0.55	0.055	356	32	0.328
48 hours	0.65	0.076	356	16	0.052

sCr or UO

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	305	71%	48%	1			
	261	82%	43%	2	4.2	1.2	14.8
	174	93%	27%	3	3.7	1.0	13.4
	486	46%	70%	4	5.9	1.8	19.5
	732	29%	80%				
	1260	18%	90%				

FIG. 6 - 1

24 hours	261	72%	43%	1			
	201	81%	30%	2	2.3	1.3	4.2
	141	92%	20%	3	1.9	1.0	3.6
	486	42%	70%	4	2.3	1.3	4.2
	732	31%	80%				
	1260	19%	90%				
48 hours	317	72%	50%	1			
	290	83%	47%	2	5.2	0.5	56.5
	184	94%	29%	3	4.1	0.3	49.3
	486	44%	70%	4	8.5	0.9	80.2
	732	44%	80%				
	1260	28%	90%				

sCr only

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	332	83%	50%	1			
	332	83%	50%	2	na	na	na
	250	100%	37%	3	na	na	na
	530	50%	70%	4	na	na	na
	771	50%	80%				
	1260	50%	90%				
24 hours	320	70%	47%	1			
	311	80%	47%	2	3.0	0.2	42.8
	240	90%	34%	3	2.0	0.1	39.2
	530	40%	70%	4	4.1	0.3	48.8
	771	30%	80%				
	1260	30%	90%				
48 hours	293	71%	44%	1			
	260	86%	39%	2	2.0	0.1	39.2
	141	100%	18%	3	2.0	0.1	39.2
	530	29%	70%	4	2.0	0.1	38.9
	771	29%	80%				
	1260	14%	90%				

UO only

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	305	70%	47%	1			
	272	81%	43%	2	2.4	0.9	6.4
	174	93%	26%	3	2.0	0.7	5.7
	503	44%	71%	4	4.0	1.7	9.5
	777	19%	80%				
	1230	11%	90%				
24 hours	250	72%	39%	1			
	198	81%	28%	2	2.1	1.1	4.0
	141	91%	20%	3	1.7	0.8	3.3
	503	34%	71%	4	1.9	1.0	3.6
	777	22%	80%				
	1230	16%	90%				
48 hours	311	75%	48%	1			
	290	81%	46%	2	5.2	0.5	57.4
	181	94%	27%	3	3.1	0.2	43.7
	503	44%	71%	4	7.5	0.8	73.5
	777	44%	80%				
	1230	31%	90%				

FIG. 6 - 2

Lysozyme C

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	605.476	na	605.476	653.026	605.476	159.835
average	688.611	na	688.611	704.637	688.611	802.017
stdev	307.412	na	307.412	257.021	307.412	na
p (t-test)		na		0.857		na
min	159.835	na	159.835	347.917	159.835	802.017
max	1524.784	na	1524.784	1277.522	1524.784	802.017
n (Samp)	45	0	45	15	45	1
n (Pat)	42	0	42	15	42	1

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	640.346	na	640.346	665.706	640.346	na
average	699.974	na	699.974	886.551	699.974	na
stdev	293.532	na	293.532	441.424	293.532	na
p (t-test)		na		0.297		na
min	159.835	na	159.835	599.135	159.835	na
max	1524.784	na	1524.784	1394.813	1524.784	na
n (Samp)	59	0	59	3	59	0
n (Pat)	55	0	55	3	55	0

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	614.986	na	614.986	653.026	614.986	733.862
average	695.803	na	695.803	707.385	695.803	733.862
stdev	313.618	na	313.618	256.795	313.618	96.387
p (t-test)		na		0.899		0.866
min	159.835	na	159.835	347.917	159.835	665.706
max	1524.784	na	1524.784	1277.522	1524.784	802.017
n (Samp)	39	0	39	15	39	2
n (Pat)	36	0	36	15	36	2

	Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
	0 hours	nd	nd	45	0	nd
	24 hours	0.54	0.088	45	15	0.630
	48 hours	0.71	0.297	45	1	0.477

	Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
	0 hours	nd	nd	59	0	nd
	24 hours	0.66	0.177	59	3	0.379
	48 hours	nd	nd	59	0	nd

	Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
	0 hours	nd	nd	39	0	nd
	24 hours	0.53	0.089	39	15	0.708
	48 hours	0.62	0.219	39	2	0.577

	Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
	0 hours	na	na	na	1			
		na	na	na	2	na	na	na
		na	na	na	3	na	na	na
		na	na	na	4	na	na	na
		na	na	na				
		na	na	na				

FIG. 6 - 3

24 hours	570.60519	73%	47%	1			
	535.41667	80%	40%	2	1.0	0.2	5.1
	381.25	93%	13%	3	2.7	0.7	10.4
	767.14697	33%	71%	4	1.0	0.2	5.1
	922.47839	13%	80%				
	1210.951	7%	91%				
48 hours	767.14697	100%	71%	1			
	767.14697	100%	71%	2	na	na	na
	767.14697	100%	71%	3	na	na	na
	767.14697	100%	71%	4	na	na	na
	922.47839	0%	80%				
	1210.951	0%	91%				

UO only

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	na	na	na	1			
	na	na	na	2	na	na	na
	na	na	na	3	na	na	na
	na	na	na	4	na	na	na
	na	na	na				
	na	na	na				
24 hours	570.60519	73%	44%	1			
	535.41667	80%	38%	2	1.3	0.3	6.2
	381.25	93%	13%	3	2.1	0.5	9.2
	836.88761	20%	72%	4	0.9	0.2	4.9
	935.1585	13%	82%				
	1242.6513	7%	92%				
48 hours	659.36599	100%	54%	1			
	659.36599	100%	54%	2	na	na	na
	659.36599	100%	54%	3	na	na	na
	836.88761	0%	72%	4	na	na	na
	935.1585	0%	82%				
	1242.6513	0%	92%				

FIG. 6 - 4

23 / 27

Lysozyme C

sCr or UO

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	741.787	659.366	741.787	659.366	741.787	659.366
average	825.064	780.954	825.064	780.954	825.064	780.954
stdev	431.623	268.470	431.623	268.470	431.623	268.470
p (t-test)		0.813		0.813		0.813
min	377.083	547.917	377.083	547.917	377.083	547.917
max	1524.784	1277.522	1524.784	1277.522	1524.784	1277.522
n (Samp)	7	8	7	8	7	8
n (Pat)	7	8	7	8	7	8

sCr only

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	862.248	741.787	862.248	741.787	862.248	741.787
average	997.767	665.706	997.767	665.706	997.767	665.706
stdev	359.286	na	359.286	na	359.286	na
p (t-test)		na		na		na
min	741.787	665.706	741.787	665.706	741.787	665.706
max	1524.784	665.706	1524.784	665.706	1524.784	665.706
n (Samp)	4	1	4	1	4	1
n (Pat)	4	1	4	1	4	1

UO only

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	522.917	632.421	522.917	632.421	522.917	632.421
average	822.237	796.651	822.237	796.651	822.237	796.651
stdev	524.721	312.835	524.721	312.835	524.721	312.835
p (t-test)		0.922		0.922		0.922
min	377.083	547.917	377.083	547.917	377.083	547.917
max	1524.784	1277.522	1524.784	1277.522	1524.784	1277.522
n (Samp)	5	6	5	6	5	6
n (Pat)	5	6	5	6	5	6

sCr or UO

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.54	0.154	7	8	0.816
24 hours	0.54	0.154	7	8	0.816
48 hours	0.54	0.154	7	8	0.816

sCr only

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.00	0.000	4	1	nd
24 hours	0.00	0.000	4	1	nd
48 hours	0.00	0.000	4	1	nd

UO only

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.63	0.174	5	6	0.442
24 hours	0.63	0.174	5	6	0.442
48 hours	0.63	0.174	5	6	0.442

FIG. 7 - 1

Ferritin

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	377.000	1000.000	377.000	881.000	377.000	706.500
average	688.095	1566.176	688.095	1518.353	688.095	1327.600
stdev	794.022	1467.713	794.022	1499.851	794.022	1435.373
p (t-test)		0.000		0.001		0.026
min	37.500	175.000	37.500	142.000	37.500	299.000
max	3989.000	4694.000	3989.000	4694.000	3989.000	4694.000
n (Samp)	111	17	111	17	111	10
n (Pat)	111	17	111	17	111	10

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	416.000	781.000	416.000	781.000	416.000	532.000
average	749.559	1442.250	749.559	1442.250	749.559	1019.200
stdev	914.106	1401.667	914.106	1401.667	914.106	1108.989
p (t-test)		0.042		0.042		0.518
min	37.500	175.000	37.500	175.000	37.500	142.000
max	4694.000	3989.000	4694.000	3989.000	4694.000	2920.000
n (Samp)	179	8	179	8	179	5
n (Pat)	179	8	179	8	179	5

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	444.000	881.000	444.000	532.000	444.000	532.000
average	681.930	1435.818	681.930	1361.909	681.930	1264.857
stdev	707.931	1530.011	707.931	1571.690	707.931	1589.484
p (t-test)		0.005		0.013		0.065
min	37.500	175.000	37.500	142.000	37.500	299.000
max	3989.000	4694.000	3989.000	4694.000	3989.000	4694.000
n (Samp)	89	11	89	11	89	7
n (Pat)	89	11	89	11	89	7

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.73	0.073	111	17	0.002
24 hours	0.70	0.075	111	17	0.008
48 hours	0.69	0.096	111	10	0.043

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.68	0.107	179	8	0.095
24 hours	0.68	0.107	179	8	0.095
48 hours	0.61	0.136	179	5	0.433

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.68	0.093	89	11	0.058
24 hours	0.62	0.095	89	11	0.194
48 hours	0.63	0.117	89	7	0.267

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	520	71%	62%	1			
	382	82%	52%	2	4.4	0.3	58.6
	309	94%	42%	3	3.2	0.2	49.9
	608	59%	70%	4	12.1	1.2	124.2
	1000	47%	80%				
	1650	35%	90%				

FIG. 8 - 1

24 hours	382	71%	52%	1			
	320	82%	42%	2	4.4	0.3	58.6
	309	94%	42%	3	4.4	0.3	58.6
	608	53%	70%	4	10.3	1.0	108.3
	1000	47%	80%				
	1650	35%	90%				
48 hours	451	70%	57%	1			
	382	80%	52%	2	na	na	na
	309	90%	42%	3	na	na	na
	608	50%	70%	4	na	na	na
	1000	40%	80%				
	1650	30%	90%				

sCr only

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	525	75%	60%	1			
	309	88%	40%	2	1.0	0.0	53.7
	174	100%	18%	3	2.0	0.1	41.3
	681	50%	70%	4	4.2	0.3	53.0
	1130	38%	82%				
	1840	38%	91%				
24 hours	525	75%	60%	1			
	309	88%	40%	2	1.0	0.0	53.7
	174	100%	18%	3	2.0	0.1	41.3
	681	50%	70%	4	4.2	0.3	53.0
	1130	38%	82%				
	1840	38%	91%				
48 hours	463	80%	56%	1			
	463	80%	56%	2	0.0	0.0	na
	136	100%	12%	3	2.0	0.1	42.3
	681	40%	70%	4	2.0	0.1	42.3
	1130	20%	82%				
	1840	20%	91%				

UO only

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	418	73%	47%	1			
	382	82%	47%	2	3.3	0.2	53.0
	325	91%	38%	3	2.1	0.1	46.6
	730	55%	71%	4	6.0	0.5	75.4
	1130	36%	82%				
	1650	27%	91%				
24 hours	325	73%	38%	1			
	320	82%	36%	2	4.6	0.3	63.1
	308	91%	36%	3	2.1	0.1	46.6
	730	45%	71%	4	4.6	0.3	63.1
	1130	36%	82%				
	1650	27%	91%				
48 hours	382	71%	47%	1			
	308	86%	36%	2	na	na	na
	290	100%	33%	3	na	na	na
	730	43%	71%	4	na	na	na
	1130	29%	82%				
	1650	29%	91%				

FIG. 8 - 2

Lysozyme C

sCr or UO

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	605.476	665.706	605.476	665.706	605.476	811.527
average	693.894	773.297	693.894	773.297	693.894	704.361
stdev	301.168	320.983	301.168	320.983	301.168	281.123
p (t-test)		0.548		0.548		0.955
min	159.835	385.417	159.835	385.417	159.835	385.417
max	1271.182	1394.813	1271.182	1394.813	1271.182	916.138
n						
(Samp)	25	7	25	7	25	3
n (Pat)	25	7	25	7	25	3

sCr only

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	627.666	599.135	627.666	599.135	627.666	159.835
average	700.791	550.086	700.791	550.086	700.791	385.417
stdev	291.902	146.441	291.902	146.441	291.902	na
p (t-test)		0.383		0.383		na
min	159.835	385.417	159.835	385.417	159.835	385.417
max	1277.522	665.706	1277.522	665.706	1277.522	385.417
n						
(Samp)	46	3	46	3	46	1
n (Pat)	46	3	46	3	46	1

UO only

	0 hr prior to AKI stage		24 hr prior to AKI stage		48 hr prior to AKI stage	
	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2	Cohort 1	Cohort 2
median	614.986	811.527	614.986	811.527	614.986	811.527
average	688.266	829.648	688.266	829.648	688.266	704.361
stdev	291.355	374.298	291.355	374.298	291.355	281.123
p (t-test)		0.351		0.351		0.928
min	159.835	385.417	159.835	385.417	159.835	385.417
max	1271.182	1394.813	1271.182	1394.813	1271.182	916.138
n						
(Samp)	25	5	25	5	25	3
n (Pat)	25	5	25	5	25	3

sCr or UO

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.60	0.127	25	7	0.430
24 hours	0.60	0.127	25	7	0.430
48 hours	0.53	0.182	25	3	0.855

sCr only

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.38	0.155	46	3	0.426
24 hours	0.38	0.155	46	3	0.426
48 hours	0.13	0.124	46	1	0.003

UO only

Time prior AKI stage	AUC	SE	nCohort 1	nCohort 2	p
0 hours	0.62	0.146	25	5	0.395
24 hours	0.62	0.146	25	5	0.395
48 hours	0.53	0.182	25	3	0.855

sCr or UO

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	614.98559	71%	56%	1			
	570.60519	86%	44%	2	1.0	0.0	88.2
	381.25	100%	12%	3	4.2	0.2	112.2
	836.88761	29%	72%	4	2.3	0.1	81.0

FIG. 8 - 3

	893.94813	29%	80%				
	1210.951	14%	92%				
24 hours	614.98559	71%	56%	1			
	570.60519	86%	44%	2	1.0	0.0	88.2
	381.25	100%	12%	3	4.2	0.2	112.2
	836.88761	29%	72%	4	2.3	0.1	81.0
	893.94813	29%	80%				
	1210.951	14%	92%				
48 hours	381.25	100%	12%	1			
	381.25	100%	12%	2	0.0	0.0	na
	381.25	100%	12%	3	1.0	0.0	96.9
	836.88761	33%	72%	4	1.0	0.0	96.9
	893.94813	33%	80%				
	1210.951	0%	92%				

UO only

Time prior AKI stage	Cutoff value	sens	spec	Quartile	OR	95% CI of OR	
0 hours	614.98559	80%	52%	1			
	614.98559	80%	52%	2	0.9	0.0	79.2
	381.25	100%	12%	3	1.0	0.0	96.9
	836.88761	40%	72%	4	2.0	0.1	72.7
	893.94813	40%	80%				
	1210.951	20%	92%				
24 hours	614.98559	80%	52%	1			
	614.98559	80%	52%	2	0.9	0.0	79.2
	381.25	100%	12%	3	1.0	0.0	96.9
	836.88761	40%	72%	4	2.0	0.1	72.7
	893.94813	40%	80%				
	1210.951	20%	92%				
48 hours	381.25	100%	12%	1			
	381.25	100%	12%	2	0.0	0.0	na
	381.25	100%	12%	3	1.0	0.0	96.9
	836.88761	33%	72%	4	1.0	0.0	96.9
	893.94813	33%	80%				
	1210.951	0%	92%				

FIG. 8 - 4