Osteopontin As A Marker of Diabetic Nephropathy in Patients With Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus
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ABSTRACT

Background: Diabetic nephropathy is the most common cause of end stage renal disease (ESRD) that is associated with high rates of morbidity and mortality. Osteopontin (OPN) is a secreted phosphorylated glycoprotein that mediates diverse biological functions.

Objective: The study aimed to determine the relation between serum OPN and the progression of diabetic nephropathy in patients with type 2 DM. That may open a door for early prediction of diabetic nephropathy.

Patients and Methods: This case-control study was conducted in Internal Medicine, Endocrinology and Biochemistry Departments, Zagazig University Hospital. This study was carried out on 96 patients divided into: Group 1: 20 age and sex matched healthy volunteers (control group). Group 2: 38 patients with type 2 DM without nephropathy (DWN group). Group 3: 38 patients with type 2 DM with nephropathy (DN group).

Serum osteopontin concentrations was measured for all cases.

Results: HOMA-IR increased significantly in DN group (8.59 ± 1.34) compared to DWN group (4.73 ± 0.59) and control group (4.73 ± 0.59). Serum osteopontin level (ng/ml) increased significantly in the DN group (258.52 ± 46.93 ng/ml) compared to DWN group (159.12 ± 19.56 ng/ml) and control group (70.90 ± 20.47 ng/ml)(p value =0.000). There was a high significant correlation between S. OPN and HOMA-IR.

Conclusion: Type 2 diabetic patients with or without nephropathy showed increased osteopontin levels than control group. Serum osteopontin may be considered as an early prognostic marker for the risk of nephropathy in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus.
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INTRODUCTION

Diabetic nephropathy is the most common cause of end stage renal disease (ESRD) that is associated with high rates of morbidity and mortality. It is of utmost importance to emphasize the early identification and treatment of this chronic complication, which would reduce the medical and economic burden associated with it (1).

Although microalbuminuria remains the gold standard marker for early detection of DN, it is not a sufficiently accurate predictor of DN risk given some limitations. For example, not all diabetics with microalbuminuria will end up with ESKD and 30% of them may actually have normoalbuminuria, while several biomarkers of glomerular or tubular dysfunction can precede microalbuminuria, suggesting that microalbuminuria is present once significant renal injury has already occurred (3).

OPN is a secreted phosphorylated glycoprotein that mediates diverse biological functions originally isolated from bone. OPN was later shown to have a wider distribution. In adults, OPN expression is normally limited to the bone, kidney, and epithelial linings, and is secreted in body fluids including milk, blood and urine. In contrast to its restricted distribution in normal tissue, OPN is strikingly upregulated at sites of inflammation and tissue remodeling (4).

The study aimed to determine the relation between serum OPN and the progression of diabetic nephropathy in patients with type 2 DM. That may open a door for early prediction of diabetic nephropathy.

PATIENTS AND METHODS

This case-control study was conducted in Internal Medicine, Endocrinology Unit and Biochemistry Department, Zagazig University Hospitals during the period from October 2018 to April 2019.

Patients:

This study was carried out on 96 patients divided into:

- **Group 1:** 20 age and sex matched healthy volunteers (control group)
- **Group 2:** 38 patients with type 2 DM without nephropathy (DWN group).
- **Group 3:** 38 patients with type 2 DM with nephropathy (DN group).

Inclusion Criteria:

Age: 35-70 years old and diabetic patients with...
Normoalbuminuria when urinary albumin excretion (UAE) < 30 mg/24hr.

**Diabetic nephropathy patients with:** Microalbuminuria when the UAE in the range of 30–299 mg/24hr and macroalbuminuria when the UAE ≥ 300 mg/24 hr.

**Exclusion criteria:**
Conditions of obesity, gravis disease, liver cell failure and acute inflammatory illness (including a common cold, infections) as it can affect the serum OPN level. Autoimmune diseases as multiple sclerosis, rheumatoid arthritis, systemic lupus erythmatosis, malignancy as lung cancer, stomach cancer, inflammatory bowel disease (IBD), bone and muscle diseases as osteoarthritis. Duchenne muscular dystrophy and patients with end-stage renal disease or on dialysis.

All subjects were submitted to the following:
- Patient consent was obtained from all subjects.
- Full history taking: including age and sex,
- Anthropometric measurements: Weight in kilograms, height in meters and Body Mass Index [BMI = weight (kg) / height (m$^2$)].
- Laboratory investigations:

**Measurement of insulin resistance:** By homeostasis model assessment (HOMA IR) index was calculated by the following formula HOMA-IR calculated by this equation

$$\text{HOMA-IR} = \frac{\text{FBG (mg/dL) } \times \text{XFINS (mU/L)}}{405}$$

according to ADA

HOMA-B calculated by this equation

$$\text{HOMA-B} = \frac{360 \times \text{XFINS (mU/L)}}{\text{[FBG (mg/dL) − 63]}}$$

according to ADA.

**Measurement of serum OPN by ELISA technique principle:** The kit uses a double-antibody sandwich enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) to assay the level of human osteopontin (OPN) in samples.

**Ethical and patients’ approval:**
An approval of the study was obtained from Zagazig University academic and ethical committee. Every patient signed an informed written consent for acceptance of the operation.

**Statistical Analysis:**
The data collected throughout history, basic clinical examination, laboratory investigations and outcome measures were coded, entered and analyzed using Microsoft Excel software.

Data were then imported into Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS version 20.0) software for analysis.

According to the type of data, qualitative were represented as number and percentage and quantitative were represented by mean ± SD. The following tests were used to test differences for significance; difference and association of qualitative variable by Chi square test ($X^2$), differences between quantitative independent groups by t test and correlation by Pearson's correlation or Spearman's test. P value was set at ≤ 0.05 for significant results & < 0.001 for high significant results and P-value > 0.05: Non-significant. All the following statistical tests and parameters were used: ONE Way ANOVA followed by post hoc analysis using LSD test. Receiver operating characteristic curve (ROC) was used to assess the best cut off point for predictors of severity with its sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value (PPV), negative predictive value (NPV) and area under curve (AUC). The confidence interval was set to 95% and the margin of error accepted was set to 5%.

**RESULTS**
Table (1) showed that, no significant difference between the studied groups regarding age and sex (p value > 0.05). On other hands shows highly significant difference regarding body mass index (BMI), systolic blood pressure, Diastolic blood pressure and duration of diabetes mellitus.

Table (2) and figure (1) showed highly significant difference regarding OPN (ng/ml) among all studied groups, which was more in DN group than the other groups and less in control group.

Table (3) showed that the best cut off point of serum OPN level was >137.3 between DN group and control group with sensitivity of 82.05% to detect diabetic patients with nephropathy and specificity of 85% to exclude diabetic patients without nephropathy:

Figure (2) showed higher HOMA-IR in DN group more than other groups and high HOMA-IR in DWN group more than control group.
Figure (3) showed a positive correlation between serum OPN and HOMA-IR ($r=0.855$, p=0.001).
Table (1): Comparison of demographic parameters among the different groups (ANOVA test and LSD)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control group</th>
<th>DWN group</th>
<th>DN group</th>
<th>Test value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Post Hoc analysis by LSD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age (years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean ± D</td>
<td>47.85 ± 7.88</td>
<td>45.53 ± 5.93</td>
<td>48.97 ± 5.14</td>
<td>3.114*</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>_ _ _</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>37 – 64</td>
<td>37 – 65</td>
<td>40 – 62</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Sex</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Females</td>
<td>10 (50%)</td>
<td>19 (50%)</td>
<td>19 (50%)</td>
<td>0.603*</td>
<td>0.740</td>
<td>NS</td>
<td>_ _ _</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Males</td>
<td>10 (50%)</td>
<td>19 (50%)</td>
<td>19 (50%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>BMI (kg/m²)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean ± SD</td>
<td>22.89 ± 1.57</td>
<td>30.29 ± 3.04</td>
<td>29.27 ± 3.00</td>
<td>49.700</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>0.001 0.001 0.115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>20.3 – 25.6</td>
<td>24.8 – 34.8</td>
<td>23.7 – 37.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Systolic BP (mmHg)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean ± SD</td>
<td>119.00 ± 3.08</td>
<td>134.03 ± 5.83</td>
<td>140.53 ± 8.14</td>
<td>72.845</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>0.001 0.001 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>110 – 120</td>
<td>128 – 150</td>
<td>130 – 160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Diastolic BP (mmHg)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean ± SD</td>
<td>76.00 ± 5.03</td>
<td>86.74 ± 4.71</td>
<td>87.82 ± 4.71</td>
<td>44.622</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>0.001 0.001 0.327</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>70 – 80</td>
<td>78 – 90</td>
<td>78 – 95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Duration of DM (years)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean ± SD</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>2.69 ± 1.82</td>
<td>15.58 ± 3.96</td>
<td>18.220</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>_ _ _</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>–</td>
<td>0.58 – 11</td>
<td>10 – 23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (2): Comparison among all studied groups regarding serum OPN by ANOVA test and LSD

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Control group</th>
<th>DWN group</th>
<th>DN group</th>
<th>Test value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
<th>Post Hoc analysis by LSD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>S.OPN (ng/ml)</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean ± SD</td>
<td>70.90 ± 20.47</td>
<td>159.12 ± 19.56</td>
<td>258.52 ± 46.93</td>
<td>219.4</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>HS</td>
<td>0.001 0.001 0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range</td>
<td>42.9 – 103.4</td>
<td>125.7 – 204.8</td>
<td>204.8 – 389.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure (1): Mean of serum OPN among all studied groups


Table (3) cut off point, sensitivity and specificity of serum OPN for detection of diabetic nephropathy between DN group and control group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>AUC</th>
<th>Cut off Point</th>
<th>Sensitivity</th>
<th>Specificity</th>
<th>PPV</th>
<th>NPV</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S.OPN (ng/ml)</td>
<td>0.895</td>
<td>&gt;137.3</td>
<td>82.05</td>
<td>85.00</td>
<td>97.0</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure (2): Mean value of HOMA-IR among all studied groups

Figure (3) Correlation between serum OPN and HOMA-IR.

DISCUSSION

In our study, we found a significant difference in the duration of DM between groups as the patients with diabetic nephropathy showed longer duration of DM (15.58 ± 3.96 years) than patients with type 2 diabetes without nephropathy (2.69 ± 1.82 years).

In our study, BMI significantly increased among DWN group (30.29 ± 3.04 kg/m²) compared to DN group (29.27 ± 3.00 kg/m²) and control group (22.89 ± 1.57 kg/m²) (p value is < 0.001). The present result support previous findings, which showed that patients with high BMI are more risky for insulin resistance and diabetic nephropathy than those patients with low BMI. This is consistent with the results of Dennis et al. (4) who reported that obesity (BMI ≥30 kg/m²) is significant risk for insulin resistance thus obese patients are more risky for insulin resistance than those patients with low BMI. In addition, Kim and Park (5)
showed that body mass index (BMI) has been widely used as a significant predictor for diabetes mellitus, hypertension, and dyslipidemia. In the United States. The National Health and Nutrition Examination Survey (NHANES) from 2003 to 2006 showed that the BMI was positively associated with the prevalence of metabolic syndrome based on the National Cholesterol Education Program’s Adult Treatment Panel III (NCEP/ATP III) criteria. Lotta et al. (6) showed that the decreased capacity of adipocytes to store and retain triglyceride in obesity, causing ectopic fat accumulation and ‘lipotoxicity’ in the liver and muscle. This result in the disruption of beneficial factors secreted from adipocytes, which is postulated to trigger insulin secretion, and thereby cause hyperinsulinemia and hypert pracygicidemia that support obesity as a strong risk factor and a potential cause of the primary insulin resistance.

In our study, there was no significant difference between all groups regarding gender that disagree with Qiu et al. (7) who found that women before menopause, have a lower incidence of insulin resistance than men of similar age. However, this protective effect disappears after menopause, with the incidence of insulin resistance becoming similar in men and women, which suggests that estrogen could have a protective effect. That may indicate that 17β-oestradiol protects pro-opiomelanocortin (POMC) neurons from developing insulin resistance.

In the current study, HOMA-IR increased significantly in DN group (8.59 ± 1.34) compared to DWN group (4.73 ± 0.59) and control group (0.90 ± 0.18). These findings cope with Silva et al. (8) who reported that HOMA-IR is increased in patients with diabetic nephropathy and it was reported that increased HOMA-IR index predicted insulin resistance.

In the present study, there was a highly statistically significant difference between study groups regarding HOMA-IR as DN group had a higher level than other groups. The mean value of HOMA-IR in DN group was 8.59 ± 1.34, in DWN group was 4.73 ± 0.59 and the mean value of HOMA-IR in control group was 0.90 ± 0.18 (p < 0.001). This is in agreement with Purohit and Tiwari (9) who revealed statistical significant increase of of HOMA-IR score in diabetic nephropathy group with mean value of 4.15 ± 3.56 and the group without diabetic nephropathy was 2.03 ± 0.64 (p < 0.0001).

In our study, serum osteopontin level (ng/ml) increased significantly in the DN group (258.52 ± 46.93 ng/ml) compared to DWN group (159.12 ± 19.56 ng/ml) and control group (70.90 ± 20.47 ng/ml) (p value =0.000). This is in agreement with Yan et al. (10) who showed that plasma levels of OPN was significantly higher in patients with T2DM compared to control and there was a significant correlation between OPN and the severity of nephropathy. Rubeaean et al. (11) also investigated the diagnostic profile of pro-inflammatory cytokines among them was serum osteopontin, which proved that the most important cytokine that were found to have significant diagnostic value was serum osteopontin, which showed excellent diagnostic value for patients with microalbuminuria and good diagnostic value for patients with microalbuminuria. These findings are consistent with what had been earlier reported among both type 1 and type 2 diabetic patients for osteopontin and in the study among Japanese type 2 diabetic patients for IL-18 (12). Previous studies showed that advanced glycation end-products and angiotensin II can stimulate OPN synthesis by a variety of cells, including mesangial cells and podocytes and initiate local effects of cell spreading, adhesion, and proliferation (13).

In our study, there was a high significant correlation between S. OPN and HOMA-IR. This is in agreement with Al-Rubeaean et al. (11) who found a positive correlation between S.OPN and HOMA-IR (r= 0.174;p= 0.002).

CONCLUSION

Type 2 diabetic patients with or without nephropathy showed increased osteopontin levels than control group. Serum osteopontin may be considered as an early prognostic marker for the risk of nephropathy in patients with type 2 diabetes mellitus.
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