

Coexisting autoantibodies against transcription factor Sp4 are associated with decreased cancer risk in dermatomyositis patients with anti-TIF1 γ autoantibodies

Yuji Hosono[#], Brandon Sie[#], Iago Pinal-Fernandez[#], Katherine Pak[#], Christopher A. Mecoli, Maria Casal-Dominguez, Blake M. Warner, Mariana J. Kaplan, Jemima Albayda, Sonye K. Danoff, Thomas E. Lloyd, Julie Paik, Eleni Tiniakou, Jose C. Milisenda, Josep M. Grau-Junyent, Albert Selva-O'Callaghan, Lisa Christopher-Stine, H. Benjamin Larman*, and Andrew L. Mammen*

^{#,*}These authors contributed equally to this project.

Yuji Hosono, M.D., Iago Pinal-Fernandez, M.D., Ph.D., Ph.D., Katherine Pak, M.D., Maria Casal-Dominguez, M.D., Ph.D., Andrew L. Mammen, M.D., Ph.D.: Muscle Disease Unit, Laboratory of Muscle Stem Cells and Gene Regulation, National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases, National Institutes of Health (NIH), Bethesda, MD.

Andrew L. Mammen, M.D., Ph.D., Iago Pinal-Fernandez, M.D., Ph.D., Maria Casal-Dominguez, M.D., Ph.D., Thomas E. Lloyd, M.D., Ph.D., and Lisa Christopher-Stine, M.D., M.P.H.: Department of Neurology, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD.

H. Benjamin Larman, Ph.D. and Brandon Sie, B.S., Department of Pathology, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD.

Mariana J. Kaplan, M.D., Ph.D., Systemic Autoimmunity Branch, Intramural Research Program, National Institute of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Disease, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA.

Blake M. Warner, D.D.S., Ph.D., M.P.H.: Salivary Disorders Unit, National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA.

Blake M. Warner, D.D.S., Ph.D., M.P.H.: Sjogren's Clinic, National Institute of Dental and Craniofacial Research, National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD, USA.

Andrew L. Mammen, M.D., Ph.D., Jemima Albayda, M.D., Sonye Danoff, M.D., Ph.D., Christopher A. Mecoli, M.D., Julie Paik, M.D., Eleni Tiniakou, M.D., and Lisa Christopher-Stine, M.D., M.P.H.: Department of Medicine, Johns Hopkins University School of Medicine, Baltimore, MD.

Iago Pinal-Fernandez: Faculty of Health Sciences and Faculty of Computer Science, Multimedia and Telecommunications, Universitat Oberta de Catalunya, Barcelona, Spain.

Jose C Milisenda M.D. and Josep M Grau-Junyent M.D., Ph.D.: Clinic Hospital and the University of Barcelona, Barcelona, Spain.

Albert Selva-O'Callaghan M.D., Ph.D.: Vall d'Hebron Hospital and Autonomous University of Barcelona, Spain.

Running Title: Anti-SP4 autoantibodies in dermatomyositis.

Key words: dermatomyositis, autoantibodies, cancer, inflammatory myopathy.

Address correspondence to: Andrew L. Mammen, M.D., Ph.D., Muscle Disease Unit, Laboratory of Muscle Stem Cells and Gene Expression, National Institute of Arthritis and

Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases, National Institutes of Health, 50 South Drive, Room 1141, Building 50, MSC 8024, Bethesda, MD 20892. E-mail: andrew.mammen@nih.gov.
Phone: 301-451-1199. Fax: 301-594-0305.

Manuscript word count:

KEY MESSAGES

What is already known about this subject?

- Dermatomyositis patients with anti-TIF1 γ autoantibodies have an increased risk of cancer.

What does this study add?

- Anti-Sp4 autoantibodies are enriched in dermatomyositis patients with anti-TIF1 γ autoantibodies.
- Anti-Sp4 autoantibodies are only found in dermatomyositis patients without cancer.
- Muscle strength is greater in dermatomyositis patients with anti-Sp4 autoantibodies.
- Anti-Sp4 autoantibodies are not present in patients with antisynthetase syndrome, immune-mediated necrotizing myopathy, or inclusion body myositis.
- Autoantibodies against Sp4 are absent in those with systemic lupus erythematosus or Sjogren's syndrome and present in 8% of those with rheumatoid arthritis.

How might this impact on clinical practice?

Testing for anti-Sp4 autoantibodies may define a population of anti-TIF1 γ -positive dermatomyositis patients without a substantially increased risk of cancer.

Acknowledgments: This work was supported, in part, by the Intramural Research Program of the National Institutes of Arthritis and Musculoskeletal and Skin Diseases of the National Institutes of Health. The Johns Hopkins Rheumatic Diseases Research Core Center, where some of the autoantibodies were assayed, is supported by NIH P30-AR070254.

ABSTRACT

Objectives: In dermatomyositis (DM), different autoantibodies are associated with unique clinical phenotypes. For example, anti-TIF1 γ autoantibodies are associated with a substantially increased risk of cancer. The purpose of this study was to discover novel DM autoantibodies.

Methods: Phage ImmunoPrecipitation Sequencing using sera from 67 DM patients suggested that transcription factor Sp4 is a novel autoantigen; this was confirmed by showing that patient sera immunoprecipitated full-length Sp4 protein. Sera from 371 Johns Hopkins myositis patients (255 with DM, 28 with antisynthetase syndrome [ASyS], 40 with immune-mediated necrotizing myopathy [IMNM], 29 with inclusion body myositis [IBM], and 19 with polymyositis [PM]), 75 rheumatologic disease controls (25 with Sjogren's syndrome, 25 with systemic lupus erythematosus, and 25 with rheumatoid arthritis), and 200 healthy comparators were screened for anti-SP4 autoantibodies by an enzyme-linked immune absorption assay. Serum from 23 Spanish TIF1 γ -positive DM patients was also screened for anti-Sp4 autoantibodies

Results: Anti-Sp4 autoantibodies were present in 11.4% of DM and 8% of rheumatoid arthritis patients but not in any other clinical group. Among DM patients, 90% of anti-Sp4 autoantibodies were detected in patients with anti-TIF1 γ autoantibodies. Among anti-TIF1 γ -positive DM patients from Johns Hopkins and Spain, those with coexisting anti-Sp4 autoantibodies had a decreased risk of cancer (0% vs. 31%; $p=0.001$, Chi-squared test).

Conclusions: Anti-Sp4 autoantibodies are enriched in anti-TIF1 γ -positive DM patients without cancer, suggesting that the development of an anti-Sp4 immune response may correlate with a relatively low risk of cancer in these patients.

INTRODUCTION

The idiopathic inflammatory myopathies (IIM) are a heterogeneous family of diseases that includes dermatomyositis (DM), immune-mediated necrotizing myopathy (IMNM), the antisynthetase syndrome (ASyS), and inclusion body myositis (IBM)¹. Most patients with IIM have a myositis-specific autoantibody (MSA). Among those with DM, approximately 70% have an MSA recognizing either TIF1 γ , NXP2, Mi2, or MDA5. Importantly, each MSA is associated with a unique clinical phenotype. For instance, DM patients with anti-TIF1 γ autoantibodies have a substantially increased risk of cancer² whereas those with anti-Mi2 autoantibodies do not³. Although MSAs are usually mutually exclusive, there are exceptions. For example, some anti-MDA5-positive DM patients develop a second MSA recognizing splicing factor proline/glutamine-rich (SFPQ); these patients have a decreased risk of arthritis compared to anti-MDA5-positive patients without anti-SFPQ autoantibodies⁴.

Here we utilized Phage ImmunoPrecipitation Sequencing (PhIP-Seq)^{5, 6} to identify novel autoantibodies in DM patients. This approach revealed that autoantibodies recognizing transcription factor Sp4 are a novel MSA in DM patients with co-existing anti-TIF1 γ autoantibodies. Furthermore, we show that anti-Sp4 autoantibodies are associated with the subset of TIF1 γ -positive DM patients who do not have cancer. These findings raise the possibility that an immune response directed at Sp4 may correlate with a greatly reduced risk of cancer in this patient population.

PATIENTS AND METHODS

Patients and serum samples

The discovery cohort consisted of 67 patients enrolled in the Johns Hopkins Myositis Center Longitudinal study between 2002 and 2016 with a diagnosis of DM based on the criteria of Bohan and Peter^{7, 8} whose serum tested negative for all MSAs by line blot (EUROLINE myositis profile).

The screening cohort included myositis patients enrolled in the Johns Hopkins Myositis Center Longitudinal Cohort study between 2002 and 2018. This included patients with DM based on the criteria of Bohan and Peter^{7, 8}, ASyS defined by the presence of anti-Jo1 autoantibodies, IMNM defined by the presence of anti-SRP or anti-HMGCR autoantibodies, IBM defined by the Lloyd and Greenberg criteria, as well as PM patients defined as those who fulfilled the criteria of Bohan and Peter for PM but who did not have ASyS or IMNM. Patients were considered positive for autoantibodies recognizing Mi2, NXP2, TIF1 γ , MDA5, Jo1, SRP, HMGCR, SAE, or PmScl if they tested positive by at least two immunologic techniques from among the following: ELISA (including the MBL anti-TIF1 γ ELISA, RG-7854R), *in vitro* transcription and translation immunoprecipitation, line blotting (EUROLINE myositis profile), Phip-seq,⁹ immunoprecipitation from S35-labeled HeLa cell lysates, or immunoprecipitation blotting.¹⁰⁻¹²

A validation cohort included serum from 23 DM patients from Spain who tested positive for anti-TIF1 γ autoantibodies by both an in-house line blot as well as the EUROLINE myositis profile line blot.

Serum from 25 patients with rheumatoid arthritis, 25 patients with systemic lupus erythematosus, 25 patients with Sjögren's syndrome, and 200 healthy controls, all enrolled in

studies at the National Institutes of Health, were also screened by ELISA for anti-Sp4 autoantibodies. Additional healthy control samples used for the analysis of peptidome data were from subjects self-reported to be free of autoimmune disease.

In the screening cohort, muscle strength was evaluated by the examining physician using the Medical Research Council scale. This scale was transformed to Kendall's 0-10 scale for analysis purposes as previously described.¹³ Serial strength measurements for each patient were made by the same physician but more than 10 different physicians contributed to the measurements. For the purposes of analyses, right- and left-side measurements for arm abduction and hip flexion strength were combined and the average was used for calculations (possible range 0–10). Serum creatine kinase (CK) levels were included for the longitudinal analysis if obtained within a period of 6 weeks before or after strength testing. Skin manifestations (i.e., heliotrope rash or Gottron's sign), weakness, symptoms of esophageal involvement, antisynthetase syndrome-associated clinical features (e.g. mechanic hands, Raynaud's phenomenon, arthritis, fever), and other clinical features were documented both retrospectively at the onset of the disease (by asking patients about features present at the onset of disease) and prospectively at each visit. Interstitial lung disease was defined through a multidisciplinary approach as recommended by the American Thoracic Society.¹⁴ Cancer-associated myositis was defined as a malignancy occurring within 3 years either before or after the onset of myositis symptoms.

Standard protocol approvals and patient consents

This study was approved by the Institutional Review Boards at Johns Hopkins, the National Institutes of Health, and the Vall d'Hebron and Clinic Hospitals; written informed consent was obtained from each participant.

Screening for autoantibodies by PhIP-Seq

The standard PhIP-Seq procedure⁹ was used to profile sera from 67 DM patients that were seronegative for Mi2, NXP2, TIF1 γ or MDA5 by EUROLINE line blot (discovery cohort). Briefly, the IgG concentration of each serum sample was measured via ELISA assay, which allowed normalization of the IgG input (2 μ g per reaction) into the PhIP-Seq assay. Serum antibody was mixed with the 90-aa human peptidome library¹⁵ and incubated overnight. Antibody and antibody-bound phage were captured using protein A and protein G coated Dynal magnetic beads (Invitrogen #10002D & #10004D). The immunoprecipitated phage DNA library was then amplified using PCR, with sample-specific DNA barcodes added during a second PCR reaction. Pooled amplicons were sequenced using an Illumina NextSeq instrument. An informatics pipeline was used for sample demultiplexing and alignment. Data normalization was performed by comparison of each sample against a set of mock immunoprecipitations as described previously¹⁶. Finally, the normalized PhIP-Seq profiles were compared against a previously established PhIP-Seq database of healthy volunteers using a custom case-control analysis script to identify reactivities specifically associated with DM (<https://brandonsie.github.io/philpcc/>).

Immunoprecipitation using ³⁵S-labeled *in vitro* transcription/translated (IVTT) Sp4

DNA encoding full-length human Sp4 was purchased (Origene) and used in IVTT reactions (Promega), generating ³⁵S-labeled Sp4 protein. Immunoprecipitation of radiolabeled Sp4 was performed using patient serum or a mouse monoclonal anti-Sp4 positive control antibody (sc-515738, Santa Cruz Biotechnology), as previously described¹⁷.

Immunoprecipitates were reduced, boiled, subjected to electrophoresis on 10% sodium dodecyl sulfated-polyacrylamide gels, and visualized by fluorography.

Anti-Sp4 ELISA

ELISA plates (96-well) were coated overnight at 4°C with 100 ng of human recombinant Sp4 protein (H00006671-P01, Abnova Corporation, Taipei, Taiwan) diluted in 100 µL of phosphate-buffered saline (PBS). After washing the plates with PBS including 0.05% Tween-20 (PBS-T) and blocking with 300 µl of 5% bovine serum albumin (BSA) in PBS-T for 1 hour at 37°C, the plates were washed with PBS-T. 100 µl of diluted human serum samples (1:400 with 1% BSA/PBS-T) was added to each well and incubated for 1 hour at 37°C. After washing with PBS-T, 100 µl of HRP-labeled goat anti-human antibody (1:10,000, catalog# 109-036-088, Jackson ImmunoResearch Lab, PA, USA) was added and incubated for 30 minutes at 37°C in the dark. After washing the plate with PBS-T and PBS, 100 µl of SureBlue TMB microwell peroxidase enzyme substrate kit (95059-286, KPL, MA, USA) was added. Reactions were stopped after 8 minutes. The absorbance at 450 nm was determined. Test sample absorbances were normalized to the sera of an arbitrary positive control sample, a reference sample included in every ELISA. The cutoff for a normal anti-Sp4 autoantibody titer (0.29 arbitrary units) was defined as the mean plus two standard deviations of the normalized absorbances of the 200 healthy comparators. This cutoff was determined to be optimal based on a graphical analysis of the normalized absorbances.

Statistical analysis

Dichotomous variables were expressed as percentages and absolute frequencies, and continuous features were reported as means and standard deviations (SD). Pairwise comparisons for categorical variables between groups were made using the chi-square test or Fisher's exact test, as appropriate. Student's t-test was used to compare continuous variables among groups and paired t-test was used to compare the level of weakness of different muscle groups. CK, a highly positively skewed variable, was expressed as median, first, and third quartile for descriptive purposes, and was transformed through a base-10 logarithm for regression analysis.

Statistical analyses related to clinical variables were performed using Stata/MP 14.1. A 2-sided p-value of 0.05 or less was considered statistically significant with no adjustment for multiple comparisons.

Patient and Public Involvement statement

Patients and the public were not involved in the design, conduct, reporting, or dissemination plans of the present research.

Data availability statement.

All data relevant to the study are either included in the article or will be shared upon request.

RESULTS

Identification of Sp4 as a novel autoantigen

In an effort to discover novel DM-associated autoantibodies, we assembled a cohort of sera from DM patients who were negative for MSAs by EUROIMMUN line blot, which tests for DM-specific autoantibodies including anti-TIF1 γ , anti-NXP2, anti-Mi2, anti-MDA5, and anti-SAE. These 67 serum samples were used in the PhIP-Seq assay with a T7 phage display library spanning all open reading frames in the human genome as overlapping 90 amino acid peptides¹⁵. While PhIP-Seq does not detect antibodies directed against conformational or post-translational epitopes, the approach is unbiased and provides a higher resolution map of autoantibody binding specificities¹⁸. Among the 67 serum samples analyzed, 13 recognized from 1 to 4 peptides corresponding to Transcription factor Sp4 (Table 1). Recognition of non-overlapping epitopes is indicative of a polyclonal antibody response that is more likely to be antigen-driven.

To determine which sera had immunoreactivity against native Sp4, we generated full-length radiolabeled Sp4 protein by IVTT and used human serum or a rabbit anti-Sp4 positive control antibody to immunoprecipitate the protein. The positive control anti-Sp4 antibody and each of the 6 serum samples that recognized 3 or 4 distinct Sp4 peptides by PhIP-Seq (lanes 3-8) efficiently immunoprecipitated full-length Sp4 protein. In contrast, serum samples that recognized just 1 or 2 Sp4 peptides only weakly immunoprecipitated full-length Sp4 protein (lanes 9-15).

Unexpectedly, since they had each tested negative for anti-TIF1 γ autoantibodies by EUROIMMUN line blot, we noted that all 6 serum samples that efficiently immunoprecipitated full-length Sp4 protein also recognized a peptide corresponding to TIF1 γ by the PhIP-Seq assay (data not shown). This demonstrates the high sensitivity of PhIP-Seq and suggests that

the line blot test may not be a sufficiently sensitive assay for detecting anti-TIF1 γ autoantibodies. Indeed, a recent report showed that the EUROIMMUN line blot has good specificity but poor sensitivity for detecting anti-TIF1 γ autoantibodies compared to immunoprecipitation detection methods¹⁹.

Screening for anti-Sp4 autoantibodies in patients with IIM, other rheumatologic conditions, and healthy controls

To screen patients rapidly for anti-Sp4 autoantibodies, we developed an ELISA. We defined a serum sample as being positive for anti-Sp4 autoantibodies if the relative absorbance was two standard deviations or higher than the mean value of 200 healthy control subjects. Using this method, we found that 6 of the 13 samples recognizing Sp4 peptides by PhIP-Seq were also ELISA positive; these were the same 6 samples that recognized 3 or 4 Sp4 peptides and which most efficiently immunoprecipitated full-length Sp4 protein (Figure 1, lanes 3-8). In contrast, among the 54 samples that did not recognize Sp4 peptides by PhIP-Seq, 50 were available for further testing and each of these was negative for anti-Sp4 autoantibodies by ELISA.

The screening cohort consisted of an additional 321 serum samples from myositis patients seen at the Johns Hopkins Myositis Center. Taken together, the discovery and screening cohorts included sera from 371 myositis patients (255 with DM, 28 with ASyS, 40 with IMNM, 19 with PM, and 29 with IBM). Among these, 29 (7.8%) sera samples were anti-Sp4-positive by ELISA (Figure 2) and all of them had DM. 90% of the anti-SP4-positive DM were TIF1 γ -positive (n=26). Out of 39 DM patients with anti-NXP2 autoantibodies and 55 DM patients with anti-Mi2 autoantibodies, 2 (5.1%) and 1 (1.8%) were anti-SP4-positive,

respectively. In contrast, no patient with anti-MDA5, anti-SAE, or anti-PMScl autoantibodies also had anti-Sp4 autoantibodies.

We also tested for anti-Sp4 autoantibodies in 25 patients with Sjogren's syndrome, 25 patients with systemic lupus erythematosus, and 25 patients with rheumatoid arthritis. Two (8%) of the rheumatoid arthritis patients were anti-Sp4-positive whereas the rest of the patients with other rheumatologic conditions were negative for these autoantibodies (Figure 2). Taken together, these results indicate that anti-Sp4 autoantibodies can be considered relatively specific for anti-TIF1 γ -positive DM.

The clinical features of TIF1 γ -positive DM patients with and without co-existing anti-Sp4 autoantibodies.

Most demographic (Table 2) and clinical (Tables 3 and 4) features were similar between TIF1 γ -positive DM patients with and without anti-Sp4 autoantibodies. However, patients with anti-Sp4 autoantibodies had measures of muscular strength that were significantly higher than those who were anti-Sp4-negative (Table 4). We also noted that among 26 TIF1 γ -positive patients from Johns Hopkins with anti-Sp4 autoantibodies, none had cancer. In contrast, among 35 TIF1 γ -positive patients without anti-Sp4 autoantibodies, 5 (14%) had cancer ($p=0.04$). To confirm that anti-Sp4 autoantibodies are associated with absence of cancer in anti-TIF1 γ -positive DM patients, we screened an additional cohort of 23 TIF1 γ -positive DM patients from Spain for anti-Sp4 autoantibodies, 13 of whom had cancer. From among 84 total TIF1 γ -positive patients, 18 had cancer and none (0%) of these had anti-Sp4 autoantibodies. In contrast, from among 66 patients without cancer, 26 (39%) had anti-

Sp4 autoantibodies. Thus, anti-Sp4 autoantibodies are associated with a reduced risk of cancer in anti-TIF1 γ -positive DM patients ($p=0.001$).

We next analyzed the evolution of anti-Sp4 autoantibody titers during the disease course by analyzing longitudinally collected serum samples. We found that titers decreased in many patients but did not normalize after treatment of the DM (data not shown). Finally, to determine whether anti-TIF1 γ -positive patients without anti-Sp4 autoantibodies at their initial visit to the Johns Hopkins Myositis Center might develop them during the course of the disease, we screened the most recently collected serum samples from 24 TIF1 γ -positive and anti-Sp4-negative patients. During an average of 4.7 years (SD 2.3) between the collection of the first and most recent serum samples, only 2 (8.3%) of these became positive for anti-Sp4 autoantibodies.

DISCUSSION

The association between DM and malignancy has been appreciated for over a century^{20, 21}. In more recent years, the presence of autoantibodies against TIF1 γ has been recognized to be associated with an especially high risk of malignancy in DM patients. Indeed, one recent meta-analysis including a total of 312 patients showed that 80% of patients with cancer-associated DM had anti-TIF1 γ autoantibodies whereas only 10% without cancer were anti-TIF1 γ -positive². Overall, the presence of anti-TIF1 γ autoantibodies had a positive predictive value of 58% and a negative predictive value of 93% for diagnosing cancer-associated DM². Interestingly, it now appears that anti-TIF1 γ autoantibodies of different IgG subclasses have variable cancer risks. Specifically, a recent study revealed that the IgG2 subclass is closely associated with malignancy and 100% of patients with high titer anti-TIF1 γ IgG2 autoantibodies developed cancer within 24 months of the DM diagnosis²².

Although the nature of the relationship between malignancy and autoantibodies recognizing TIF1 γ is incompletely understood, several lines of evidence raise the possibility that anti-TIF1 γ autoimmunity may be induced by the tumor. First, tumors from anti-TIF1 γ -positive patients have an increased prevalence of somatic mutations and/or loss of heterozygosity in their TIF1 genes when compared with tumors from TIF1 γ -negative patients²³. The loss of heterozygosity is consistent with immunoediting due to an immune response directed against tumor cells with mutations in TIF1 γ . Second, TIF1 γ protein levels appear to be increased in tumors from anti-TIF1 γ -positive DM patients compared to tumors from non-myositis patients²³, suggesting that that increased expression of the protein in the tumor may play a role in breaking immune tolerance. Third, in anti-TIF1 γ -positive DM patients who have undergone successful treatment of their malignancy, the autoantibodies can become undetectable, and their DM may enter remission²⁴.

Despite the strong link between anti-TIF1 γ autoantibodies and cancer, a malignancy never emerges in approximately 40% of DM patients with this autoantibody². Recently, autoantibodies against cell division cycle and apoptosis regulator 1 (CCAR1) protein were found to be associated with decreased cancer prevalence among anti-TIF1 γ -positive DM patients; they were present in 36% of those without cancer and in 22% of those with cancer²⁵. In the current study, we discovered novel autoantibodies against Sp4 protein that appear to have a markedly stronger association with the absence of cancer in anti-TIF1 γ -positive DM patients. Among the TIF1 γ -positive DM patients in the current study, anti-Sp4 autoantibodies were present in 39% without cancer and in 0% of those with cancer. Sp4 is a transcription factor that is not only important for early development but, like TIF1 γ , is also expressed at high levels in various tumors²⁶. Future experiments will determine if TIF1 γ and Sp4 are components of a molecular complex or otherwise interact biochemically. If so, it may be that Sp4 antibodies serve as a surrogate for epitope spreading during a more vigorous anti-tumor immune response.

Interestingly, patients with both anti-TIF1 γ and anti-Sp4 autoantibodies do not appear to have more severe or advanced DM compared with patients harboring anti-TIF1 γ autoantibodies in isolation. Indeed, patients with both autoantibodies exhibited significantly better arm strength than those with just TIF1 γ autoantibodies. Of note, an analogous phenomenon has been observed in systemic sclerosis, where patients with autoantibodies against RNA polymerase III have an increased risk of cancer, but those with co-existing anti-RNA polymerase I autoantibodies do not²⁷. And similar to what was observed in DM, systemic sclerosis patients with both autoantibodies had no evidence of more severe autoimmune disease than those with anti-RNA polymerase III autoantibodies alone.

Future prospective studies will be required to determine whether DM patients with both anti-TIF1 γ and anti-Sp4 autoantibodies require less aggressive malignancy screening. Moreover, additional studies will be required to demonstrate whether or not the anti-Sp4 immune response directly damages tumor cells and, if so, whether this effect might be harnessed to therapeutic advantage in non-myositis patients with cancer.

FIGURE LEGENDS

Figure 1. Human serum samples from DM patients immunoprecipitate full-length Sp4 protein. Sera from DM patients that recognized at least one Sp4 peptide by PhIP-Seq were used to immunoprecipitate radiolabeled full-length Sp4 protein. The Sp4 peptides recognized by each serum using PhIP-Seq are indicated below each lane. Those serum samples recognizing 3-4 distinct Sp4 peptides (lanes 3-8) by PhIP-Seq immunoprecipitated full-length Sp4 protein more-efficiently than those serum samples that only recognized 1-2 Sp4 peptides by PhIP-Seq (lanes 9-15). The input Sp4 protein used for immunoprecipitation is shown in lane 1. A commercial rabbit anti-Sp4 autoantibody was used to immunoprecipitate radiolabeled Sp4 in lane 2. Healthy control sera did not immunoprecipitate full-length Sp4 protein (lanes 16-19).

Figure 2. The prevalence of anti-Sp4 autoantibodies in patients with myositis, other rheumatologic conditions, and healthy comparators. Sera from 371 adult myositis patients, 25 lupus patients, 25 Sjogren's syndrome patients, 25 rheumatoid arthritis patients, and 200 healthy comparators were used in an anti-Sp4 ELISA assay. The dotted line indicates the cut-off used to define anti-Sp4 positive sera.

REFERENCES

1. Selva-O'Callaghan A, Pinal-Fernandez I, Trallero-Araguas E, Milisenda JC, Grau-Junyent JM, Mammen AL. Classification and management of adult inflammatory myopathies. *Lancet Neurol* 2018;17:816-828.
2. Trallero-Araguas E, Rodrigo-Pendas JA, Selva-O'Callaghan A, et al. Usefulness of anti-p155 autoantibody for diagnosing cancer-associated dermatomyositis: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Arthritis and Rheumatism* 2012;64:523-532.
3. Pinal-Fernandez I, Mecoli CA, Casal-Dominguez M, et al. More prominent muscle involvement in patients with dermatomyositis with anti-Mi2 autoantibodies. *Neurology* 2019.
4. Kochi Y, Kamatani Y, Kondo Y, et al. Splicing variant of WDFY4 augments MDA5 signalling and the risk of clinically amyopathic dermatomyositis. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2018;77:602-611.
5. Larman HB, Laserson U, Querol L, et al. PhIP-Seq characterization of autoantibodies from patients with multiple sclerosis, type 1 diabetes and rheumatoid arthritis. *J Autoimmun* 2013;43:1-9.
6. Larman HB, Zhao Z, Laserson U, et al. Autoantigen discovery with a synthetic human peptidome. *Nat Biotechnol* 2011;29:535-541.
7. Bohan A, Peter JB. Polymyositis and dermatomyositis (first of two parts). *The New England journal of medicine* 1975;292:344-347.
8. Bohan A, Peter JB. Polymyositis and dermatomyositis (second of two parts). *The New England journal of medicine* 1975;292:403-407.
9. Mohan D, Wansley DL, Sie BM, et al. PhIP-Seq characterization of serum antibodies using oligonucleotide-encoded peptidomes. *Nat Protoc* 2018;13:1958-1978.

10. Mammen AL, Chung T, Christopher-Stine L, et al. Autoantibodies against 3-hydroxy-3-methylglutaryl-coenzyme A reductase in patients with statin-associated autoimmune myopathy. *Arthritis Rheum* 2011;63:713-721.
11. Amici DR, Pinal-Fernandez I, Mazala DA, et al. Calcium dysregulation, functional calpainopathy, and endoplasmic reticulum stress in sporadic inclusion body myositis. *Acta Neuropathol Commun* 2017;5:24.
12. Targoff IN, Mamyrova G, Trieu EP, et al. A novel autoantibody to a 155-kd protein is associated with dermatomyositis. *Arthritis Rheum* 2006;54:3682-3689.
13. Rider LG, Werth VP, Huber AM, et al. Measures of adult and juvenile dermatomyositis, polymyositis, and inclusion body myositis: Physician and Patient/Parent Global Activity, Manual Muscle Testing (MMT), Health Assessment Questionnaire (HAQ)/Childhood Health Assessment Questionnaire (C-HAQ), Childhood Myositis Assessment Scale (CMAS), Myositis Disease Activity Assessment Tool (MDAAT), Disease Activity Score (DAS), Short Form 36 (SF-36), Child Health Questionnaire (CHQ), physician global damage, Myositis Damage Index (MDI), Quantitative Muscle Testing (QMT), Myositis Functional Index-2 (FI-2), Myositis Activities Profile (MAP), Inclusion Body Myositis Functional Rating Scale (IBMFRS), Cutaneous Dermatomyositis Disease Area and Severity Index (CDASI), Cutaneous Assessment Tool (CAT), Dermatomyositis Skin Severity Index (DSSI), Skindex, and Dermatology Life Quality Index (DLQI). *Arthritis Care Res (Hoboken)* 2011;63 Suppl 11:S118-157.
14. Travis WD, Costabel U, Hansell DM, et al. An official American Thoracic Society/European Respiratory Society statement: Update of the international multidisciplinary classification of the idiopathic interstitial pneumonias. *Am J Respir Crit Care Med* 2013;188:733-748.

15. Xu GJ, Shah AA, Li MZ, et al. Systematic autoantigen analysis identifies a distinct subtype of scleroderma with coincident cancer. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2016;113:E7526-E7534.
16. Mohan D, Wansley DL, Sie BM, et al. Publisher Correction: PhIP-Seq characterization of serum antibodies using oligonucleotide-encoded peptidomes. *Nat Protoc* 2019;14:2596.
17. Mammen AL, Chung T, Christopher-Stine L, et al. Autoantibodies against 3-hydroxy-3-methylglutaryl-coenzyme A reductase in patients with statin-associated autoimmune myopathy. *Arthritis and Rheumatism* 2011;63:713-721.
18. Larman HB, Salajegheh M, Nazareno R, et al. Cytosolic 5'-nucleotidase 1A autoimmunity in sporadic inclusion body myositis. *Annals of Neurology* 2013;73:408-418.
19. Espinosa-Ortega F, Holmqvist M, Alexanderson H, et al. Comparison of autoantibody specificities tested by a line blot assay and immunoprecipitation-based algorithm in patients with idiopathic inflammatory myopathies. *Ann Rheum Dis* 2019;78:858-860.
20. Stertz G. Polymyositis. *Berl Klin Wochenschr* 1916;53:489.
21. Tiniakou E, Mammen AL. Idiopathic Inflammatory Myopathies and Malignancy: a Comprehensive Review. *Clin Rev Allergy Immunol* 2017;52:20-33.
22. Aussy A, Freret M, Gallay L, et al. The IgG2 isotype of anti-transcription intermediary factor 1-gamma autoantibodies is a biomarker of mortality in adult dermatomyositis. *Arthritis Rheumatol* 2019.
23. Pinal-Fernandez I, Ferrer-Fabregas B, Trallero-Araguas E, et al. Tumour TIF1 mutations and loss of heterozygosity related to cancer-associated myositis. *Rheumatology (Oxford)* 2018;57:388-396.
24. Dani L, Holmqvist M, Martinez MA, et al. Anti-transcriptional intermediary factor 1 gamma antibodies in cancer-associated myositis: a longitudinal study. *Clin Exp Rheumatol* 2019.

25. Fiorentino DF, Mecoli CA, Rosen MC, et al. Immune responses to CCAR1 and other dermatomyositis autoantigens are associated with attenuated cancer emergence. *J Clin Invest* 2022;132.
26. Safe S, Abbruzzese J, Abdelrahim M, Hedrick E. Specificity Protein Transcription Factors and Cancer: Opportunities for Drug Development. *Cancer Prev Res (Phila)* 2018;11:371-382.
27. Shah AA, Laiho M, Rosen A, Casciola-Rosen L. Protective Effect Against Cancer of Antibodies to the Large Subunits of Both RNA Polymerases I and III in Scleroderma. *Arthritis Rheumatol* 2019;71:1571-1579.

Table 1. Sp4 peptides identified by PhIP-Seq.

Peptide name	Amino acid position	Sequence
6	226-315	NQTPVQIRPGVSIPLQLQLPGTQAQVVTLPINIGGVTLALPVINNVAAGGGTGQVGGQPAATADSGTSNGNQLVSTPTNTTTSASTMP
10	406-495	QIQIQPQQQIIQAIPPSFQLQSGQTIQTIQQQLQNVQLQAVNPTQVLIRAPTLTPSGQISWQTVQVQNIQSLNLQVQNAGLSQQLT
11	451-540	PTQVLIRAPTLTPSGQISWQTVQVQNIQSLNLQVQNAGLSQQLTITPVSSSGGTTLAQIAPVAVAGAPITLNTAQLASVNLQTVSVAN
16	676-765	PFICNWMFCGKRFRSDELQRHRRHTGKRFECPECKRFMRSDHLSKHVKTHQNKKGGGTALAIVTSGELDSSVTEVLGSPRIVTAA

Table 2: General features of anti-TIF1 γ patients with and without anti-Sp4 autoantibodies.

	Anti-Sp4+ (n=26)	Anti-Sp4- (n=35)	p-value	Total (n=61)
Female sex	81% (21)	89% (31)	0.5	85% (52)
Race				
White	85% (22)	86% (30)	1.0	85% (52)
Black	0% (0)	11% (4)	0.1	7% (4)
Other races	15% (4)	3% (1)	0.2	8% (5)
Age of onset (years)	43.0 (13.8)	50.6 (15.3)	0.05	47.4 (15.1)
Time of follow-up (years)	7.1 (4.3)	4.8 (2.7)	0.01	5.8 (3.7)
Number of visits per participant	10.2 (7.7)	10.9 (6.7)	0.7	10.6 (7.1)
Cancer associated myositis	0% (0)	14% (5)	0.07	8% (5)
Death during follow-up	0% (0)	9% (3)	0.3	5% (3)
Anti-Ro52	15% (4)	17% (6)	1.0	16% (10)
Treatments				
Corticosteroids	81% (21)	71% (25)	0.4	75% (46)
Azathioprine	27% (7)	29% (10)	0.9	28% (17)
Methotrexate	62% (16)	54% (19)	0.6	57% (35)
Mycophenolate	46% (12)	46% (16)	1.0	46% (28)
IVIG	38% (10)	57% (20)	0.1	49% (30)
Rituximab	12% (3)	17% (6)	0.7	15% (9)

Dichotomous variables were expressed as percentage (count) and continuous variables as mean (SD). Bivariate comparisons of continuous variables were made using Student's t-test while bivariate comparisons of dichotomous variables were made either using chi-squared test or Fisher's exact test, as appropriate.

Table 3: Clinical features of anti-TIF1 γ patients with and without anti-Sp4 autoantibodies.

	Anti-Sp4+ (n=26)	Anti-Sp4- (n=35)	p-value	Total (n=61)
Muscle involvement				
Muscle weakness	85% (22)	80% (28)	0.7	82% (50)
Skin involvement				
DM-specific skin involvement	100% (26)	100% (35)	1	100% (61)
Raynaud's phenomenon	38% (10)	17% (6)	0.06	26% (16)
Mechanics hands	23% (6)	26% (9)	0.8	25% (15)
Calcinosis	8% (2)	17% (6)	0.4	13% (8)
Subcutaneous edema	8% (2)	17% (6)	0.4	13% (8)
Lung involvement				
Interstitial lung disease	4% (1)	0% (0)	0.4	2% (1)
Esophageal involvement				
Gastroesophageal reflux disease	27% (7)	34% (12)	0.5	31% (19)
Dysphagia	42% (11)	54% (19)	0.4	49% (30)
Joint involvement				
Arthritis	19% (5)	17% (6)	1.0	18% (11)
Arthralgia	58% (15)	57% (20)	1.0	57% (35)
Systemic involvement				
Fever	12% (3)	9% (3)	1.0	10% (6)

Chi-squared or Fisher's exact tests were used to compare each one of the clinical groups with the anti-Mi2 patients.

Table 4. Weakness pattern at first visit of anti-TIF1 γ patients with and without anti-Sp4 autoantibodies.

	Anti-Sp4+ (n=26)	Anti-Sp4- (n=35)	p-value	Total (n=61)
Neck flexors	10.0 (0.0)	9.0 (2.0)	0.04	9.4 (1.6)
Neck extensors	10.0 (0.0)	9.9 (0.2)	0.2	10.0 (0.2)
Arm abductors	9.7 (0.7)	8.9 (1.5)	0.02	9.2 (1.3)
Elbow flexors	9.9 (0.3)	9.0 (1.5)	0.004	9.4 (1.2)
Elbow extensors	9.7 (0.7)	8.7 (1.7)	0.006	9.1 (1.5)
Wrist flexors	10.0 (0.2)	9.7 (0.7)	0.10	9.8 (0.5)
Wrist extensors	10.0 (0.2)	9.6 (0.7)	0.04	9.8 (0.6)
Finger flexors	9.9 (0.5)	9.8 (0.8)	0.5	9.8 (0.6)
Finger extensors	9.9 (0.4)	9.8 (0.7)	0.5	9.8 (0.6)
Hip flexors	9.5 (0.7)	8.8 (1.8)	0.07	9.1 (1.5)
Hip extensors	9.8 (0.4)	9.7 (0.7)	0.3	9.8 (0.6)
Knee flexors	10.0 (0.0)	9.9 (0.3)	0.1	10.0 (0.2)
Knee extensors	10.0 (0.0)	9.8 (0.5)	0.06	9.9 (0.4)
Ankle flexors	10.0 (0.0)	9.9 (0.4)	0.2	9.9 (0.3)
Ankle extensors	9.9 (0.4)	9.9 (0.3)	0.8	9.9 (0.4)

Strength values were expressed as means (SD) and bivariate comparisons were made using Student's t-test.

Figure 2. The prevalence of anti-Sp4 autoantibodies in patients with myositis, other rheumatologic conditions, and healthy comparators.

