Nucleosomes and histones are present in glomerular deposits in human lupus nephritis
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Abstract

Background. Recently we showed that antinuclear autoantibodies complexed to nucleosomes can bind to heparan sulphate (HS) in the glomerular basement membrane (GBM) via the histone part of the nucleosome. Histones have been identified in glomerular deposits in human and murine lupus nephritis. In addition, a decreased HS staining in the GBM was found, most probably due to masking by deposition of antibodies complexed to nucleosomes.

Methods. In this study we first investigated whether histones or nucleosomes could be identified in glomerular deposits in human lupus nephritis, and secondly whether the presence of these nuclear components was correlated with absence of HS staining. Kidney biopsies of SLE patients (11 with diffuse proliferative glomerulonephritis (DPGN) and six with membranous glomerulonephritis (MGN)) and of non-SLE glomerular diseases were stained for histones, DNA, nucleosomes, IgG and HS.

Results. Using a polyclonal anti-H3 1–21 antiserum, histones were detected in all patients with DPGN and in two of six patients with SLE-MGN (P < 0.01). Using a monoclonal antihistone antibody, histones were stained in three patients with DPGN, but in none of the biopsies with MGN. Using nucleosome specific monoclonal antibodies, nucleosomes were detected in five patients with DPGN, in two patients with MGN, but in none of the biopsies with non-SLE glomerulonephritis. HS staining was nearly absent in DPGN, whereas staining was only moderately reduced in patients with MGN and controls (P = 0.001).

Conclusion. Using polyclonal and monoclonal antihistone antisera, histones were identified in all patients with DPGN and their presence was associated with a decrease of HS staining. Nucleosomes were identified in five of 11 patients with DPGN and in two of six patients with MGN. This is the first demonstration of nucleosomes in glomerular deposits in SLE nephritis.
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Introduction

In systemic lupus erythematosus (SLE) about 50% of patients develop renal disease [1]. Antinuclear antibodies and more specifically anti-dsDNA antibodies are regarded as a hallmark of the disease [2]. Since a rise in titre of anti-dsDNA antibodies often precedes a renal exacerbation [3–5] and renal eluates of patients with lupus nephritis are enriched for anti-dsDNA antibodies [6,7], these antibodies are thought to play a pathogenic role in the initiation of the glomerular disease. Some years ago we showed that certain anti-dsDNA antibodies are able to bind to heparan sulphate (HS), an intrinsic constituent of the glomerular basement membrane (GBM). [8]. In subsequent experiments we showed that this HS cross-reactivity was a property of antibodies complexed to nucleosomal antigens (i.e. DNA and histones) [9] and that antinucleosome antibodies complexed to nucleosomal antigens were able to bind to HS in the GBM, whereas pure antibodies did not bind [10].

In the meantime it was reported that histones are present in immune deposits of both human [11] and murine [12] lupus nephritis, whereas in murine lupus an association between histone deposits and albuminuria was found [12].

Recently we found that in the majority of patients with lupus nephritis HS staining was absent, whereas staining for the heparan sulphate proteoglycan (HSPG) core protein was intact [13]. In subsequent studies in MRL/l mice we found that HS staining disappeared in albuminuric mice, and that there was
an inverse correlation between HS staining and albuminuria as well as between HS staining and GBM Ig deposits. Since glomerular HS content was not decreased in mice in which GBM-HS staining was absent, we suggested that HS was masked by nucleosome-containing immune complexes [14]. Although other investigators showed histones [11,12] or DNA [15] in glomerular deposits in lupus nephritis, nucleosomes were never identified.

In the present study we first tested whether nucleosomes were present in the glomerular immune deposits in human lupus nephritis and secondly whether presence of histones or nucleosomes correlated with loss of GBM-HS staining. Since we investigated the interaction between immune deposits and HS in the GBM, SLE patients with diffuse proliferative (DPGN) and membranous glomerulonephritis (MGN) were selected.

**Subjects and methods**

**Renal biopsies**

Renal biopsies of 11 SLE patients with DPGN and of six SLE patients with MGN were selected (Table 1). All patients fulfilled at least four ARA criteria for SLE. From all renal biopsies 2-μm cryostat sections were cut. As controls renal biopsies of four patients with non-SLE mesangiocapillary glomerulonephritis and of five patients with non-SLE MGN were evaluated.

**Immunohistology**

All sections were stained in direct immunofluorescence (IF) for IgG deposits and in indirect IF for HS, HSPG core protein, histones, DNA, and nucleosomes. The characteristics of the antisera used are given in Table 2. After the staining procedure, the sections were embedded in Aquamount (BDH Ltd. Poole, UK) and examined with a Zeiss fluorescence microscope.

**Human IgG**

Deposits of human IgG were studied by incubating sections with FITC-labelled F(ab)₂, rabbit anti-human IgG (CLB, Amsterdam, the Netherlands) 5 mg/ml diluted 1:400 in PBS containing 1% (wt/vol) BSA (PBS/BSA) for 30 min at room temperature.

**HS and HSPG core protein**

HS was stained by incubating the sections with a mouse anti-rat HS monoclonal antibody (mAb, JM 403) that only recognizes HS in basement membranes and cross-reacts with human HS [16] (Table 2). HSPG core protein was stained by incubating with a mouse monoclonal anti-human HSPG-core protein (JM-72, [16], Table 2). HS and HSPG-core protein were stained simultaneously on the same slide using double-staining as described before [16].

**Histones**

Histones were stained by incubating the sections with a polyclonal rabbit antiserum raised against the N-terminal 1–21 peptide of histone H3 [17] and with mAb KM2 against histones derived from a lupus prone mouse (Table 2). mAb KM2 is directed against H2A and H4. It reacts equally well with the N-terminal peptides 1–20 of H2A and 1–29 of H4 which have a large sequence homology. The IF using the polyclonal rabbit antiserum was performed as described before [11,12]. The IF using the mAb was performed by incubating the sections with mAb KM2 (10 ng/ml) in PBS/BSA for 30 min at room temperature. Next, sections were incubated with FITC-labelled F(ab)₂ sheep anti-mouse Ig (Cappel, Organon Technika, Turnhout, Belgium) 10 mg/ml, diluted 1:750 in PBS/BSA for 30 min at room temperature. In addition, sections of all biopsies were incubated with an irrelevant mouse IgG (IgG2a or IgG2b) antibody (as a primary antibody control) and with FITC-labelled F(ab)₂ sheep anti-mouse Ig without the primary antibodies (as a conjugate control).

**DNA and nucleosomes**

DNA and nucleosomes were stained by incubating the sections with mAbs derived from lupus-prone mice. The anti-dsDNA mAb (#42) was derived from a panel of anti-dsDNA mAbs described previously [18]. The antinucleosome mAbs (LG8–1 and LG10–1) (Table 2) only recognize the intact nucleosome and not DNA or histones separately as described before [19]. The antinucleosome mAb #34 shows strong reactivity with nucleosomes [10] and for this mAb the nucleosomal epitope is primarily located on (H3-H4)/DNA (Kramers et al., in press). For IF the sections were incubated with mAb #42, mAb #34, mAb LG8–1 or mAb LG10–1 (10 ng/ml) in PBS/BSA for 30 min at room temperature. Further procedures were identical to the procedure described for mAb KM2.

We also performed a double staining for IgG and nucleosomes using FITC-labelled F(ab)₂, rabbit anti-human IgG followed by antinucleosome mAb LG 10–1 with TRITC-labelled anti-mouse IgG2b as secondary antibody to compare the localization of the IgG and nucleosome deposits.

Attempts were made to elute Ig from the sections, which might improve the detection of nucleosomes, histones and DNA. To this end sections were incubated with either pepsin (Sigma) 10 mg/ml in 0.1M acetate pH4.5, 0.1M glycine or 2M NaCl for 1 h or overnight at 37°C. These procedures failed to remove Ig from the sections and no improvement of the detection of nucleosomes, histones, and DNA was observed.

Staining of histones using the polyclonal rabbit antiserum and HS-staining was scored semiquantitatively on a 0–4+ scale on coded sections by two independent investigators (regression analysis yielded a good correlation between the scores of both investigators, P < 0.0001).

Importantly, all MAbs used were purified to remove bound nucleosomal antigens, since this may produce spurious binding reactions [10].

**Statistical analysis**

Comparison of the presence of histones in kidney biopsies of patients with DPGN or MGN was done with the Fisher exact test. HS staining (scored semiquantitatively on a 0–4+ scale) was compared between kidney biopsies of patients
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient no.</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Duration of disease</th>
<th>Non-renal disease manifestations</th>
<th>F/R</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Creat. (umol/l)</th>
<th>Urinary protein (g/24 h)</th>
<th>C3 (mg/l)</th>
<th>C4 (mg/l)</th>
<th>anti-dsDNA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>Thrombopenia</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Prednisone 60 mg</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>&lt;1 year(^d)</td>
<td>Leukopenia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Prednisone 128 mg 8.8</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>670</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>&lt;1 year</td>
<td>Thrombopenia, anaemia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Prednisone 117 mg 5.4</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Prednisone 95 mg 9.8</td>
<td>95</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6 years</td>
<td>Pericarditis, pleuritis</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Chloroquine 250 mg</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>&gt;320</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>15 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Chloroquine 90 mg 8.6</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>8 years</td>
<td>Leukopenia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Chloroquine 81 mg 3.2</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>390</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>2 months</td>
<td>Leukopenia, thrombopenia, arthralgia, fever</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Prednisone 172 mg 12.0</td>
<td>172</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>464</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>11 years</td>
<td>Arthralgia, fever, xerostomia, xerophthalmia, butterfly rash, leukopenia, anaemia</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Prednisone 84 mg 5.9</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>510</td>
<td>174</td>
<td>neg.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>1 month</td>
<td>Arthritis, anaemia</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Prednisone 81 mg 0.8</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>1420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10 years</td>
<td>Butterfly rash, arthritis, pleuritis</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Prednisone 116 mg 10.3</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2340</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Diffuse proliferative glomerulonephritis (DPGN)**

**Membranous glomerulonephritis (MGN)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient no.</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Duration of disease</th>
<th>Non-renal disease manifestations</th>
<th>F/R</th>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Creat. (umol/l)</th>
<th>Urinary protein (g/24 h)</th>
<th>C3 (mg/l)</th>
<th>C4 (mg/l)</th>
<th>anti-dsDNA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>&lt;1 year</td>
<td>Discoild skin lesions, oral ulcers, alopecia, thrombopenia discoid skin lesions, oral ulcers, arthritis, psychosis, thrombopenia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Prednisone 60 mg and chloroquine</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>&lt;1 year</td>
<td>Discoild skin lesions, oral ulcers, alopecia, thrombopenia discoid skin lesions, oral ulcers, arthritis, psychosis, thrombopenia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Prednisone 57 mg 2.5</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>580</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>&lt;1 year</td>
<td>Discoild skin lesions, oral ulcers, alopecia, thrombopenia discoid skin lesions, oral ulcers, arthritis, psychosis, thrombopenia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Prednisone 85 mg 1.3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>520</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>&lt;1 year</td>
<td>Discoild skin lesions, oral ulcers, alopecia, thrombopenia discoid skin lesions, oral ulcers, arthritis, psychosis, thrombopenia</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>Prednisone 82 mg 200 mg</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>720</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9 years</td>
<td>Thrombopenia, anaemia, cerebral infarction</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Prednisone 94 mg 0.3</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>683</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>14 years</td>
<td></td>
<td>R</td>
<td>Prednisone 279 mg 2.3</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>375</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\) F, first manifestation; \(^b\) R, relapse; \(^c\) U/ml or titre; \(^d\) titre; \(^d\) renal disease at presentation.
Table 2. Characteristics of the monoclonal and polyclonal antisera used

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antiserum</th>
<th>Subclass</th>
<th>Specificity</th>
<th>Origin</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Monoclonal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG8-1</td>
<td>IgG2b</td>
<td>α-nucleosome (H2A-H2B/DNA)</td>
<td>MRL/lpr</td>
<td>[19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LG10-1</td>
<td>IgG2b</td>
<td>α-nucleosome (H3-H4/DNA)</td>
<td>MRL/lpr</td>
<td>[19]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>IgG2a</td>
<td>α-nucleosome (H3-H4/DNA)</td>
<td>NZB/W</td>
<td>[10]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KM2</td>
<td>IgG2a</td>
<td>α-histone (1–20 H2A;1–29 H4)</td>
<td>MRL/lpr</td>
<td>This manuscript</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>IgG2a</td>
<td>α-dsDNA</td>
<td>NZB/W</td>
<td>[18]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JM403</td>
<td>IgM</td>
<td>α-HS-GAG</td>
<td></td>
<td>[16]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JM72</td>
<td>IgG1</td>
<td>α-HSPG core protein</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Polyclonal</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oostende</td>
<td>IgG</td>
<td>α-histone (1–21 H3)</td>
<td>Rabbit</td>
<td>[11,12,17]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

with DPGN and MGN using the Mann–Whitney U test. The correlation between HS staining and staining of histones with the polyclonal rabbit antiserum was tested by Spearman’s correlation test.

**Results**

**Staining of IgG, histones, nucleosomes and DNA in glomerular deposits**

Using the polyclonal anti-H3 (1–21) peptide antiserum, histones were detected in all kidney biopsies of patients with DPGN and in two of six patients (patient no 12 and 17) with SLE-MGN ($P < 0.01$) (Table 3). Histone deposits were present in the walls of the capillary loops and followed the pattern of IgG deposition (Figure 2a, b). Using the antihistone mAb KM2, histones were identified in the immune deposits in three kidney biopsies of DPGN patients (patients no. 2, 4 and 6) and in none of the MGN patients (Table 3). Nucleosomes were identified in immune deposits of five renal biopsies of patients with DPGN (Figures 1, 2c) and in two of the biopsies with SLE-MGN (Table 3). The two positive MGN biopsies (stained by mAb #34) were also positive with the polyclonal anti-H3 peptide antiserum. MAb LG10-1 stained deposits in four renal biopsies of DPGN patients (patients no. 2, 5, 6 and 10), mAb LG8–1 in two biopsies of DPGN patients (patients no. 1 and 2) and mAb #34 in five biopsies of DPGN patients (patients no. 1, 2, 5, 6 and 10). In some biopsies IgG deposits were observed without positive staining of histones and nucleosomes (Figure 2d–f), indicating that the positive staining in the DPGN and SLE-MGN biopsies is not due to aspecific binding of the antibodies to deposited Ig. In kidneys with nucleosome staining we found that nucleosome deposits were present in 20–80% of the Ig positive glomeruli. The localization of the nucleosome deposits was the same as the IgG deposition (as assessed by double staining). In the IF analysis with the antihistone or antinucleosome mAbs, staining in the walls of capillary loops was focal and segmental. Furthermore, the antihistone and antinucleosome mAbs showed bright nuclear staining. Due to this bright staining, the staining in the capillary

Table 3. Immunofluorescence findings in renal biopsies of SLE patients with either diffuse proliferative glomerulonephritis (DPGN; WHO class IV) or membranous glomerulonephritis (MGN; WHO class V) and non-SLE controls with either mesangiocapillary glomerulonephritis (MCGN) or idiopathic MGN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Antibodies</th>
<th>SLE nephritis</th>
<th>Non-SLE nephritis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>DPGN class IV</td>
<td>MGN class V</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mAbsa</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-nucleosome</td>
<td>5/11 4</td>
<td>2/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anti-dsDNA</td>
<td>0/11</td>
<td>0/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antihistone</td>
<td>3/11</td>
<td>0/6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Polyclonalb</td>
<td>11/11</td>
<td>2/6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Polyclonalb | Anti-H3(1–21) | 11/11 | 2/6  | 1/4 | 0/5 |

a, Staining of nucleosomes in glomerular deposits using mAbs #34, LG8–1 or LG10–1. Staining of histones using mAb KM2; staining of DNA using mAb #42. b, Staining of histones using a polyclonal rabbit anti-H3 1–21 serum. c, Number of positive biopsies/number of biopsies tested. d, $P < 0.01$ (Fisher exact test) for SLE-MGN compared to DPGN.

Fig. 1. Immunofluorescence of a kidney biopsy of an SLE patient with DPGN stained with a mouse antinucleosome mAb (LG10–1). Besides staining of the capillary loops and the mesangium, prominent nuclear staining can be seen (×300).
Fig. 2. Immunofluorescence of kidney biopsies of SLE patients. Staining for immunoglobulins (with an anti-Ig antiserum (A and D)), histones (with a polyclonal rabbit anti-H3 1–21 serum (B and E)), and nucleosomes (with a mouse antinucleosome mAb (LG10–1) (E and F)) in the same glomerulus on consecutive sections. Fig. 2a–c show positive staining. Ig deposits are located along the glomerular capillary walls and in the mesangium. Histone and nucleosome deposits are seen in a similar distribution to Ig. Fig. 2D–F show a glomerulus positive for Ig but negative for nucleosomes and histones, ruling out an aspecific binding of the probing antibodies to Ig in the immune deposits (× 300).
loops is less prominent (weaker than that obtained with the polyclonal antihistone antiserum, which gave no nuclear staining). Anti-dsDNA antibodies (mAb #42) did not stain deposits in any of the biopsies (Table 3) (Figure 3). Also with other anti-dsDNA antibodies (mAbs #36 and #56) we were not able to detect glomerular DNA deposits (data not shown).

There was no correlation between the presence of nuclear deposits and sex, duration of disease, primary manifestation, or flare of glomerulonephritis, serology or proteinuria.

In the control experiments (non-SLE glomerulonephritis) none of the mAbs stained glomerular deposits, whereas the polyclonal rabbit anti-H3 (1–21) serum stained glomerular immune deposits in one patient with non-SLE mesangiocapillary glomerulonephritis (Table 3).

In all biopsies tested, no staining was observed with conjugated secondary antibodies alone or after incubation with non-relevant mouse IgG mAbs and conjugate.

**Staining of glomerular HS and HSPG core protein**

Staining of HSPG core protein was normal in all kidney biopsies studied (Figure 4a,d,g). GBM-HS staining was normal (Figure 4b) or only moderately reduced (Figure 4e) in renal biopsies of patients with SLE-MGN, whereas staining was strongly reduced or nearly absent (Figure 4h) in patients with DPGN (P = 0.001). When GBM-HS staining was normal, no staining for histones was observed (Figure 4c). The appearance of histone deposits (Figure 4f,i) is paralleled by the disappearance of GBM-HS staining. There was a significant inverse correlation between HS staining and histone deposition as found by the polyclonal rabbit anti-H3 1–21 antiserum (r = −0.77, P < 0.0001, Figure 5).

**Discussion**

In recent years evidence has emerged that nucleosomes may play an important role in the initiation of lupus nephritis [20], by interaction of the histone part of the nucleosome with the GBM [21]. Histones are positively charged (pI = 10) and most probably interact with the negatively charged HS in the GBM. We showed that after subsequent renal perfusion in the rat of histones, DNA and anti-dsDNA mAbs, these antibodies bind to the GBM, whereas subsequent perfusion of DNA and anti-dsDNA leads to limited mesangial binding of antibody, and anti-dsDNA antibodies perfused alone do not bind at all [22]. An interaction with HS in the GBM was suggested by the finding that anti-dsDNA antibodies complexed to DNA and histones were able to bind to HS in ELISA [9,10]. Subsequently we showed in the same rat kidney perfusion model that antinucleosome antibodies complexed to nucleosomes are also able to bind to the GBM. When HS was removed from the GBM by prior perfusion with the HS-degrading enzyme heparinase, the binding of subsequently perfused complexed antinucleosome antibodies was greatly reduced [10]. Taken together, these experiments show that HS in the GBM is an important ligand for the binding of these nucleosome complexed antibodies. It is assumed that histones in these complexes interact with HS, based on charge.

Although histones have been found in the sera of humans [23], it is not very likely that they exist as separate molecules devoid of DNA. In the nucleus, histones are bound to DNA, within the nucleosome. These nucleosomes have been found in the circulation of lupus patients [24]. It is assumed that they are released from apoptotic cells, since apoptosis leads to release of oligonucleosomes [25,26], whereas necrosis yields less well-defined histone/DNA complexes. It is presently unknown what happens with nuclear material after release in the circulation. DNase and proteinases are present in plasma [27] so partial degradation of the nucleosome particle is possible.

In the present study we analysed in more detail whether nuclear material was present in glomerular deposits in human lupus nephritis by staining for histones, DNA, and nucleosomes. Using the polyclonal anti-H3 1–21, antiserum deposits were found in all kidney biopsies of patients with DPGN and in two of six patients with MGN. This is in accordance with the findings of Stöckl et al. who also found glomerular staining with this anti-H3 1–21 antiserum in SLE patients [11]. However, in Stöckl’s study deposits were found in 69% of the biopsies with DPGN and in 77% of the MGN biopsies, whereas we found deposits in 100% of the DPGN and in 33% of the MGN patients. Using the antihistone mAb KM2, histone deposits were found in three renal biopsies of patients with DPGN and in none of the patients with MGN. Because of a
Fig. 4. Representative examples of double staining of a kidney biopsy of two patients with MGN (Fig. 4A, 4B and 4D, 4E) and of a patient with DPGN (Fig. 4G, 4H), with the mouse anti-HS mAb JM-403 and with the mouse anti-HSPG core protein mAb JM-72. In Fig. 4A, 4D and 4G the biopsies are stained with JM-72, showing intact HSPG-staining. In Fig. 4B, 4E and 4H the same biopsies are stained with JM-403, showing normal (4B) or moderately reduced (4E) GBM-HS staining in the MGN patients, and almost absent GBM-HS staining in the patient with DPGN (4H). Same glomeruli (successive sections) are stained with polyclonal rabbit anti-H3 1–21 serum (Fig. 4C, 4F and 4I). The appearance of histone deposits (Fig. 4F and 4I) is paralleled by the disappearance of GBM-HS staining (Fig. 4E and 4H) (×300).
Fig. 5. Correlation between HS staining and staining of histone deposits (as assessed with the polyclonal rabbit anti H3(1–21) serum) in the walls of the capillary loops. Staining was scored on a 0–4 scale. DPGN (§), SLE-MGN (+).

the IF analysis with the anti-dsDNA, antihistone and antinucleosome mAbs, nuclear staining was observed in all biopsies since the epitopes these mAbs recognize are exposed in the nuclei. However, using the polyclonal antiserum, no nuclear staining was observed, suggesting that the H3 1–21 epitope is not exposed in the nucleus in vivo.

Localization of autoantibodies in the GBM can arise along two different mechanisms. First, they can deposit from the circulation as complexes. Localization via this mechanism leads mainly to subendothelial or mesangial deposits, as is found mainly in DPGN. The other possibility is an in situ immune complex formation in which the antibody reacts with an intrinsic GBM antigen or an exogenous planted antigen. This mechanism takes mainly place in the formation of subepithelial deposits as seen in MGN. It is unlikely that the nucleosome binds to the GBM in free non-complexed form and acts as a planted antigen, since renal perfusion of intact nucleosomes leads mainly to mesangial and not to GBM localization [20,28]. This is due to the pI of the native nucleosome which is about 7. Furthermore, the negatively charged DNA is located on the outside of the nucleosome which reduces the possibility that native nucleosomes interact with the negatively charged GBM. Such a direct binding can only be envisaged if nuclear material is enzymatically modified by plasma or tissue DNase and proteinases which creates a nuclear particle with less DNA and relatively more histones. Such a particle is theoretically able to bind to the GBM leading to in situ-immune complex formation. Such a mechanism could explain the higher frequency of histone deposits that we observed.

Another, more likely, possibility is that DNA or nucleosome-specific epitopes of the nucleosome are masked by anti-dsDNA or nucleosome specific autoantibodies. When nucleosomes are released in the circulation of lupus patients they will bind to these antibodies and form nucleosome-antibody complexes. Only when
these antibodies cover the negatively charged DNA in the nucleosome, the complex is able to bind to the GBM. In this view the overall pI and thus the nephritogenicity of the complex is determined by the antigen specificity of the bound antibody. This view is confirmed by the fact that glomerular eluates are greatly enriched for anti-dsDNA and anti-nucleosome antibodies [6,7,29].

In contrast, antihistone antibodies would cover the histone part of the nucleosome, thereby reducing the positive charge which prevents it from binding to the GBM. Interestingly, in drug induced lupus, in which antihistone antibodies are abundantly present and anti-dsDNA antibodies are absent, nephritis is seldom seen [30]. Antihistone Abs are found in glomerular eluates of lupus mice [29,31]. However, in our experience, the eluates contain only small quantities of antihistone antibodies which show no correlation with albuminuria [29]. The mechanism of in vivo masking of nucleosome and DNA specific epitopes with a relative preservation of histone-specific epitopes could explain the lower frequency of nucleosome specific staining and the higher incidence of histone specific staining that we observed.

Formal proof for this assumption could have come from elution studies on kidney sections, which could lead to uncovering of these nucleosome specific epitopes. However, attempts to achieve this were, for technical reasons, unsuccessful as we have described previously [14].

The second aim of our study was to find out whether loss of GBM-HS staining in human lupus nephritis was associated with histone or nucleosome deposition. In a recent study we found in murine lupus a decrease of glomerular HS staining without loss of HS content. In-vitro experiments showed that histones, nucleosomes and antinucleosome antibodies complexed to nucleosomes were all able to mask HS in ELISA [14]. In the present study this in vitro finding was extended since the loss of HS staining correlated with histone deposition. Very interestingly, histone deposition was only found in two of six kidney biopsies of SLE-MGN patients, and in these patients HS staining was not or only moderately reduced. This may be due to quantitative differences in glomerular IgG deposition between DPGN and MGN patients, since in DPGN heavier IgG deposits are present. This is in line with our observation in murine lupus nephritis, where an inverse correlation between IgG deposition and GBM-HS staining was found [14].

In conclusion, we show for the first time that nucleosomes can be identified in immune deposits of patients with SLE nephritis. This finding underlines the importance of nucleosomes for the pathogenesis of SLE [20,32]. Histones are present in all lupus patients with DPGN and their presence correlates with a loss of GBM-HS staining, which is probably due to masking of HS.
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