

Application of Urinary Peptide-Biomarkers in Trauma Patients as a Predictive Tool for Prognostic Assessment, Treatment Interventions, and Intervention Timing: Prospective Nonrandomized Pilot Study

Gökmen Aktas^{1*}, Felix Keller², Justyna Siwy³, Agnieszka Latosinska³, Harald Mischak³, Jorge Mayor¹, Jan Clausen¹, Michaela Wilhelmi¹, Vesta Brauckmann¹, Stephan Sehmisch¹, Tarek Omar Pacha^{1†}

¹Department of Trauma Surgery, Hannover Medical School, Carl-Neuberg St. 1, Hannover, 30625, Lower Saxony, Germany

²Department of Internal Medicine IV (Nephrology and Hypertension), Medical University of Innsbruck, Anich St. 35, Innsbruck, A-6020, Austria

³ Mosaiques Diagnostics GmbH, Rotenburger St 20, Hannover, 30659, Lower Saxony, Germany

*Corresponding author: Aktas.Goekmen@mh-hannover.de;

Contributing authors: Felix.Keller@i-med.ac.at; siwy@mosaiques-diagnostics.com;

latosinska@mosaiques-diagnostics.com; mischak@mosaiques-diagnostics.com

MayorRamirez.Jorge@mh-hannover.de; Clausen.Jan-Dierk@mh-hannover.de;

Brauckmann.Vesta@mh-hannover.de; Wilhelmi.Michaela@mh-hannover.de;

Sehmisch.Stephan@mh-hannover.de; OmarPacha.Tarek@mh-hannover.de

†These authors contributed equally to this work.

Abstract

24 **Background:** Treatment of severely injured patients represents a major challenge, in part
 25 due to the unpredictable risk of major adverse events, including death. Preemptive
 26 personalized treatment aimed at preventing these events is a key objective of patient
 27 management; however, the currently available scoring systems provide only moderate
 28 guidance. Molecular biomarkers from proteomics/peptidomics studies hold promise for
 29 improving the current situation, ultimately enabling precision medicine based on individual
 30 molecular profiles.

31 **Methods:** To test the hypothesis that proteomics biomarkers could predict patient outcomes
 32 in severely injured patients, we initiated a pilot study involving consecutive urine sampling
 33 (on days 0, 2, 5, 10, and 14) and subsequent peptidome analysis using capillary
 34 electrophoresis coupled to mass spectrometry (CE-MS) of 14 severely injured patients and
 35 two additional ICU patients. The urine peptidomes of these patients were compared to the
 36 urine peptidomes of age- and sex-matched controls. Previously established urinary peptide-
 37 based classifiers, CKD274, AKI204, and CoV50, were applied to the obtained peptidome
 38 data, and the association of the scores with a combined endpoint (death and/or kidney failure
 39 and/or respiratory insufficiency) was investigated.

40 **Results:** CE-MS peptidome analysis identified 281 peptides that were significantly altered in
 41 severely injured patients. Consistent upregulation was observed for peptides from A1AT,
 42 FETUA, and MYG, while peptides derived from CD99, PIGR and UROM were consistently
 43 reduced. Most of the significant peptides were from different collagens, and the majority were
 44 reduced in abundance. Two of the predefined peptidomic classifiers, CKD273 and AKI204,
 45 showed significant associations with the combined endpoint, which was not observed for the
 46 routine scores generally applied in the clinics.

47 **Conclusions:** This prospective pilot study confirmed the hypothesis that urinary peptides
 48 provide information on patient outcomes and may guide personalized interventions based on
 49 individual molecular changes. The results obtained allow the planning of a well-powered
 50 prospective trial investigating the value of urinary peptides in this context in more detail.

Keywords: urine, biomarker, trauma, polytrauma, intensive care, critical care, proteomics, peptides, prediction

Background

Severe trauma patients represent a significant medical challenge, often requiring intensive care unit (ICU) admission due to the life-threatening nature of their injuries (1). These patients have sustained critical injuries, e.g., car accidents, high-energy trauma or falls from great heights(2). Managing severely injured patients in the ICU involves a multidisciplinary approach(3). The outcome of these patients can be unpredictable given the severity of their injuries(4). Often, despite intensive monitoring and intervention, their condition can deteriorate significantly, become unsustainable, and ultimately result in death due to multiple organ dysfunction syndrome (MODS)(5).

When referring to polytraumatized patients, the definition by Muhr and Tscherne is frequently applied (6). However, the term 'polytrauma' is used inconsistently. Therefore, a new definition of polytrauma was recently developed(7). Today, the widely accepted definition, the New Berlin Score, characterizes polytrauma as a significant injury in at least 2 body regions with an abbreviated injury scale (AIS) score of 3 or higher and at least one pathological value for one of the following parameters: age (above 70), hypotension (systolic blood pressure <90 mmHg), unconsciousness (Glasgow coma scale (GCS) at the scene ≤8), acidosis (base excess ≤-6), and coagulopathy (partial thromboplastin time (PTT) ≥40/INR ≥1.4)(7).

Similarly, the definition of 'multiorgan failure' (MOF) has evolved. MOF was redefined in 1992 through a consensus conference(8). MOF was no longer defined as a static condition but rather a dynamic and reversible process. Additionally, the classical MOF was replaced with MODS and comprehensively defined. In this definition, MODS is described as the dysfunction of organs in critically ill patients, which can only be resolved through therapeutic interventions(8).

76 Mortality rates for MODS have improved over time in the US, decreasing from 33-36% in
77 approximately 2010 to 22% in more recent studies(9,10). Of these deaths, 24% are due to
78 cardiovascular events within the first few days of ICU admission(10).

79 Various scoring systems, including the sequential organ failure assessment (SOFA) score
80 and the multiorgan dysfunction (MOD) score, which are common metrics in clinical studies of
81 intensive care medicine, have been developed to assess the severity of organ dysfunction
82 and predict mortality(11). Both systems meet the requirements for describing organ
83 dysfunction. Both SOFA and MOD assess the same six organ systems, but they have
84 practical differences in their calculations(11). The SOFA score is based on the most deviant
85 value within a 24-hour period, while the MOD score uses physiological values measured at
86 the same time every day to avoid capturing momentary physiological changes(11). The acute
87 physiology and chronic health evaluation II (APACHE II) score provides further metrics and is
88 commonly used complimentary to the SOFA score (1). In addition to parameters from
89 individual organ systems, it incorporates the patient's age, current clinical findings, and
90 medical history to make predictions about the likelihood of survival in an intensive care
91 setting(12).

92 The simplified acute physiology score II (SAPS II) allows for assessing the severity of
93 disease in a patient admitted to an ICU and provides information about morbidity(13).
94 Additionally, the score, in combination with the therapeutic intervention scoring system
95 (TISS), can be used to assess the progression of disease severity and the intensity of
96 treatment effort(13).

97 These scores help clinicians evaluate the severity of disease and the intensity of treatment
98 needed, although they do not always account for trauma as the underlying cause of ICU
99 admission.

100 Specifically, the injury severity score (ISS) and the trauma and injury severity score (TRISS)
101 are widely used. The ISS is calculated by adding the three highest body area values of the
102 abbreviated injury scale (AIS) squared together(14). The TRISS, introduced in 1981, is a

combined index based on the revised trauma score (RTS), ISS, and patient age to predict survival probabilities(14). The results indicate that the TRISS aligns well with expected outcomes and performs favourably compared to other indices, such as the ISS(14). However, these variables may not capture the full complexity of a patient's condition.

The revised injury severity classification (RISC) score, introduced in 2003, included not only anatomical injury descriptions but also physiological indicators (e.g., base deficit, haemoglobin, and cardiopulmonary resuscitation)(15). To address some remaining issues, accompanied by the RISC score, the RISC II was developed(15). In addition to other changes, it includes new predictors such as pupil size and reactivity . The RISC-II model outperforms the original RISC, particularly in terms of discrimination, precision, and calibration. It can be used to estimate the risk of death in severely injured patients more effectively. The integration of RISC II into daily intensive care practice, especially as a tool for monitoring patient progress, is challenging due to its complex calculation and the collection of numerous parameters(15,16).

In the context of ICU management, advanced laboratory testing and monitoring are crucial. Parameters such as N-terminal pro B-Type natriuretic peptide (NT-proBNP) and troponin are used to assess cardiac function(17). However, there is a known mutual influence of these parameters in cases of concurrent kidney failure, prompting more recent literature to emphasize more recent, independent markers such as B-type natriuretic peptide.

The emergence of "-omics" approaches, including proteomics and genomics, has potential for improved prediction and treatment strategies in trauma care. Changes in urine peptide patterns can provide valid insights into several organ systems (18,19). Biomarkers such as AKI204, which is useful for predicting acute kidney injury (AKI) in ICU patients (20), and CKD273, which is a biomarker for the detection of chronic kidney disease (CKD), can predict worsening of kidney function (21) or cardiovascular outcome (22) and may be good biomarkers for both predicting kidney damage in polytraumatized patients and providing the time to start renal replacement therapy early (23,24). The COV50 classifier, developed

during the COVID-19 pandemic was able to predict the incidence of death and disease progression in infected patients (25). It also demonstrated significant prediction of mortality in patients without SARS-CoV-2 infection in the ICU but also in the general population (25,26). These results support the hypothesis that urinary peptide-based biomarker classifiers represent a significant advancement in the ability to monitor and manage complex pathophysiological processes in polytraumatized patients. Therefore, the aims of this pilot study were to examine whether trauma-specific peptides can be identified in urine samples and whether urinary peptide-based classifiers may predict patient outcomes and organ failure.

Methods

Cohort description

In this prospective nonrandomized pilot study, urinary proteomic data from 16 severely injured patients recruited between January and July 2023 were examined. All adult patients aged ≥ 18 years of both genders who had experienced primary trauma and were admitted to our level 1 trauma center were included. Patients with direct traumatic consequences to the urinary tract, bladder, or kidneys were excluded due to unpredictable analysis failure. Treatment followed the current state of medical practice, in accordance with guidelines and international standards.


Each patient was informed about the study and the procedure either immediately or after regaining consciousness and capacity. In the case of a caregiver situation, the caregiver was provided with appropriate information. Informed consent was obtained retrospectively once a caregiver was available or the capacity for consent was established. If retrospective inclusion in the study was undesirable, the patient's collected data were excluded. All participants provided written consent, and the study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Hannover Medical School (No: 10415_BO_S_2022).

The study was conducted in accordance with Good Clinical Practice and the Declaration of Helsinki. According to the New Berlin score, 14 of the 16 patients met the criteria for polytrauma (19). These multiple-injury patients had an ISS $\geq$ 16, at least two injuries with an AIS of $\geq$ 3 and an indication for intensive care monitoring or surgery. The other two patients had a single injury requiring a longer hospital stay (e.g. vacuum sealing, external fixator, extensive soft tissue damage) ensuring that the entire monitoring period was completed.

Urine sample and data collection

For all 16 patients, urine samples and data were collected in the department of Trauma Surgery, Medical School of Hanover, Hanover, Germany. If a urinary catheter was inserted in the emergency room, the first urine sample was collected, as shown in the flow diagram (**Figure 1**). Blood was also sampled according to polytrauma standards. If patients were directly admitted to the intensive care unit following admission to the emergency room, the first urine sample was collected. According to the study design, urine was sampled on days 0, 2, 5, 10, and 14 using a urine monovette containing boric acid (Sarstedt, Nümbrecht, Germany) and stored frozen at -20°C.

Figure 1: Collection of urine and blood samples and scoring



Parameters

On the days of urine collection, the patients were assessed using current intensive care scores. On the day of admission, the ISS, TRISS, RISC II, APACHE-II, SAPS-II, and TIPS scores were recorded. Since the extent of injury did not change, the ISS and TRISS were only recorded at admission. APACHE-II was scored analogously on all sampling days, while SAPS-II and TIPS were assessed once upon admission.

Blood samples were also taken on the sampling days. The samples were investigated for electrolytes, lactate, CRP, complete blood count with haemoglobin and leukocytes, coagulation parameters (INR, PTT), and kidney retention parameters.

Furthermore, the following events were recorded: Long-term ventilation, tracheotomy, prone position, acute respiratory distress syndrome (ARDS), acute kidney failure, dialysis, cardiovascular events, resuscitation, death, emergency surgery, extracorporeal membrane oxygenation (ECMO), and early discharge from the ICU (**Supplementary Table 1**). The

combined endpoint was defined as death and/or kidney failure and/or respiratory insufficiency.

Proteomic analysis and data processing

Urine sample preparation was performed as previously described (27). Briefly, the urine samples were thawed immediately before use, and 0.1 ml of urine was diluted with 0.7 ml of 2 M urea and 10 mM NH₄OH containing 0.02% SDS. The samples were ultrafiltered and desalted using a PD-10 column (GE Healthcare, Danderyd, Sweden) equilibrated with 0.01% NH₄OH. The filtrate was lyophilized and stored at 4°C until Capillary electrophoresis–mass spectrometry (CE-MS) analysis was performed. CE-MS analyses were performed on a P/ACE MDQ capillary electrophoresis system (Beckman Coulter, Brea, California) coupled on-line to a microTOF II mass spectrometer (Bruker Daltonic, Bremen, Germany) as previously described (28).

The mass spectral peaks were deconvoluted using MosaFinder software (29). Normalization was performed using a linear regression algorithm with internal standard peptides as references. The detected peptides were deposited, matched, and annotated in the Microsoft SQL database (Microsoft, Redmond, Washington, USA).

The amino acid sequences were obtained by performing MS/MS analysis using a P/ACE CE coupled to a Q Exactive™ Plus Hybrid Quadrupole-Orbitrap™ MS instrument (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, Massachusetts, USA). The mass spectrometer was operated in data-dependent mode to automatically switch between MS and MS/MS acquisition. The data files were searched against the UniProt human nonredundant database using Proteome Discoverer 2.4 and the SEQUEST search engine without enzyme specification (activation type: HCD; precursor mass tolerance: 5 ppm) ; fragment mass tolerance: 0.05 Da). The false discovery rate (FDR) was set to 1%. For further validation of the obtained peptide sequences, the correlation between peptide charge at a working pH of 2 and CE migration time was used to minimize false-positive derivation rates (30). The calculated CE migration

times of the sequence candidates based on their peptide sequences (number of basic amino acids) were compared to the experimental migration times.

Application of urine peptide-based biomarker classifiers

In this study, predefined urinary peptide-based classifiers for predicting the onset and progression of CKD, AKI, and ARDS were used. For testing the endpoints, the classifiers CKD273, AKI204, and Cov50 were applied. previously(19,20,31).

Statistics

Statistical analysis was performed using SPSS computer software (SPSS 28, IBM, Armonk, New York, USA). Demographics, clinical variables, and proteomics classification scores are summarized as the means±SDs, and categorical variables are presented as frequencies (%). Group means were compared using the Wilcoxon rank sum exact test, Fisher's exact test and Wilcoxon rank sum test.

The CE-MS-based data of 14 trauma patients and 14 sex- and age-matched healthy controls extracted from the human urinary databasewere used to identify urinary peptides potentially associated with trauma (29). The statistical analysis was performed using R-based statistical software. Only peptides with a frequency threshold of at least 70% in one of the groups were considered. P values were obtained using the Wilcoxon signed-rank test, followed by Benjamini–Hochberg false discovery rate adjustment.

Results

Cohort characteristics

The patient characteristics of the whole cohort (n=16) are shown in **Table 1**. The average age of the study population was 46 ± 21 years. The mean ISS was 27 ± 15, the average TRISS was 56 ± 39, and the average RISC II score was 11±14. In **Table 2** mean AIS, systolic blood pressure and ASA score (classification of patients regarding their physical

condition, American Society of Anesthesiologists) of the 14 polytraumatized patients are shown. The mean AIS for the head, face, thorax, abdomen, extremities with pelvic injuries and external injuries were 2.00 ± 1.24 , 0.64 ± 0.84 , 2.64 ± 1.65 , 2.00 ± 1.74 , 2.50 ± 1.40 and 0.93 ± 0.83 , respectively, at admission. The mean systolic blood pressure was $133.93 \text{ mmHg} \pm 17.67$ at admission. The average preclinical ASA score was 1.43. Upon admission, the average SAPS II score was $32 (\pm 13)$, and the average TIPS score was $17.54 (\pm 9.46)$.

Table 1: Mean values for baseline cohort characteristics of all 16 patients included (14 polytrauma patients),

EP EP = Endpoint, *Wilcoxon rank sum exact test; Fisher's exact test; Wilcoxon rank sum test

Characteristic	N	Overall, N = 16	no EP, N = 9	EP, N = 7	p value*
Age (years), mean $\pm$ SD	16	46 ± 21	43 ± 15	49 ± 28	0.8
Female gender, n (%)		$8 \pm 50\%$	$5 \pm 56\%$	$3 \pm 43\%$	>0.9
Lactate (mmol/l), mean $\pm$ SD	14	2.76 ± 1.91	2.19 ± 1.59	3.33 ± 2.15	0.12
C-reactive protein (mg/dl), mean $\pm$ SD	16	3.1 ± 4.7	1.2 ± 0.8	5.5 ± 6.5	0.3
Haemoglobin (g/dl), mean $\pm$ SD	16	11.76 ± 2.54	11.83 ± 2.88	11.66 ± 2.24	>0.9
CKD273, mean $\pm$ SD	15	0.13 ± 0.64	-0.27 ± 0.61	0.58 ± 0.25	0.004
AKI_204, mean $\pm$ SD	15	-0.14 ± 0.92	-0.65 ± 0.91	0.45 ± 0.51	0.029
Cov50, mean $\pm$ SD	15	-0.14 ± 1.30	-0.80 ± 1.46	0.61 ± 0.45	0.094
APACHE 1.day, mean $\pm$ SD	14	12 ± 8	10 ± 10	14 ± 6	0.4
RISC II, mean $\pm$ SD	14	11 ± 14	7 ± 10	15 ± 16	0.4
ISS, mean $\pm$ SD	16	27 ± 15	22 ± 12	34 ± 17	0.3
TRISS, mean $\pm$ SD	15	56 ± 39	65 ± 39	45 ± 38	0.2
SAPS II, mean $\pm$ SD	14	32 ± 13	29 ± 16	35 ± 11	0.7
TIPS, mean $\pm$ SD	14	17 ± 10	12 ± 7	21 ± 10	0.13

243

Table 2: Mean values for AIS, systolic bloodpressure and ASA of all 14 polytraumatized patients

Characteristics	N	mean	SD
Abbreviated Injury Scale (AIS)	14	2,00	1,24

Head	14	0,64	0,84
Face	14	2,64	1,65
Thorax	14	2,00	1,74
Abdomen	14	2,50	1,40
Extremities, pelvis	14	0,93	0,83
External			
Systolic bloodpressure on admission (mmHg)	14	133,93	17,67
ASA	14	1,43	0,65

Trauma patient outcomes

Supplementary Table 1 lists the frequencies of injuries and recorded events during the 14-day monitoring period in the polytrauma patients (n=14). Eleven patients suffered from traumatic brain injury (n=11), while one patients had spinal cord injury. Thoracic trauma was present in 71% of the patients (n=10), and half of the patients had both abdominal trauma (n=7) and pelvic injuries (n=7). The following events were observed during the study: 1 patient did not survive the study (7%). Four patients developed respiratory insufficiency (29%), and an equal number of patients suffered acute kidney failure (29%), with 1 patient requiring dialysis. ECMO support was necessary for one patient (7%). Additionally, one patient needed to be placed in the prone position during intensive care (7%). ARDS developed in 1 patient (7%). **Supplementary Table 2** shows the frequencies of successful probe collection, score and bloodsample trends over the whole monitoring period of 14 days. During the monitoring period, not all urine samples could be collected due to early discharge. Eight patients completed the entire study in 14 days (57%). Despite early discharge and the reduction in the number of patients from the third sampling point (Day 5), the average APACHE II score showed no consistent trend over time (12.3 ± 7.6 , 11.2 ± 6.0 , 10.9 ± 6.2 , 12.1 ± 6.2 , 12.6 ± 6.6). In the laboratory results corresponding to the sampling days, the highest average lactate levels were observed on the day of admission ($2.8 \text{ mmol/l} \pm 1.9$). Subsequently, there was a successive decrease, with normalization of the lactate levels on the following sampling days ($1.6 \text{ mmol/l} \pm 1.6$, $1.0 \text{ mmol/l} \pm 0.4$, $0.8 \text{ mmol/l} \pm 0.3$, $0.7 \text{ mmol/l} \pm 0.1$).

On average, all included patients had normal CRP levels at admission (3.2 mg/dl $\pm$ 1.9). At sampling days 2 and 4, increases in the average values of 1695 mg/dl $\pm$ 99.46 and 139.0 mg/dl $\pm$ 166.64, respectively, were observed.

On the day of admission, the patients had an average Hb level of 11.7 g/dl $\pm$ 2.7, which showed the greatest decrease at sampling day 2 (9.1 g/dl $\pm$ 2.2) and then a successive mild decline at the remaining sampling days (9.0 g/dl $\pm$ 1.7, 8.3 g/dl $\pm$ 1.3, 8.9 g/dl $\pm$ 0.9). During the monitoring period, 3 patients did not require any packed red blood cells (PRBC) (21%), 1 patient received 4 PRBCs (7%), 4 patients each received 5 (29%), 2 patients required 7 (14%), another 2 patients received 12 (14%), and one patient required 36 while another needed 57 PRBCs (7%).

Definition of urinary peptides specific for polytrauma patients

For the definition of urinary peptides significantly associated with trauma, the urinary peptide data of 14 polytraumatized patients and 14 age- and sex-matched healthy controls from the Human Urinary Peptide Database were used(32). This comparison revealed that 281 peptides were significantly affected ($p < 0.05$, Wilcoxon test followed by adjustment for multiple comparisons by Benjamini and Hochberg). All the identified peptides are listed in **Supplementary Table 3**. We observed consistent upregulation of the expression of the peptides Alpha-1-antitrypsin (A1AT) (n=3), Fetuin (FETUA) (n=3), and Myoglobin (MYG) (n=2), which is in line with expectations and downregulation of the expression of fragments of CD99 (n=9), PIGR (n=9) and UROM (n=6). One highly upregulated ProSAAS fragment was also detected. Most of the significant peptides were fragments of different collagens (n=205), 118 of which were downregulated.


Application of urinary peptide-based classifiers and their association with established severity scores

On the obtained CE-MS data, the previously developed classifiers CKD273, AKI204 and CoV50 were applied. For each classifier and patient, the numeric classification score was calculated.

The classifier for CKD prediction, CKD273, demonstrated a significant correlation with the ISS ($p=0.034$) and the APACHE-II score ($p<0.001$). The APACHE-II score was the only severity score that was obtained not only at baseline but also at every follow-up timepoint.

The AKI204 classifier correlated significantly ($p=0.031$) with the SAPS and APACHE-II score ($p<0.001$). The Cov50 classifier was significantly correlated with the ISS ($p=0.042$), the RISC II ($p=0.040$) and the APACHE-II score ($p<0.001$). A chart of the correlation statistics is shown in **Figure 2**.

Figure 2: Chart of correlation statistics between the clinical parameters, severity scores and peptide-based classifiers.




302

303 **Associations of the parameters with the combined endpoint**

In the next step, the associations of clinical parameters, severity scores, and the obtained peptide-based classification scores at baseline with the combined endpoint were investigated. The results are listed in **Table 1** and shown in the form of box-whisker plots in **Figure 3**. Significant differences between the patients who reached the combined endpoint and those who did not were observed for CKD273 and AKI204 ($p = 0.004$ and $p = 0.029$), where the Cov50 classifier showed only a trend ($p = 0.094$). The clinical parameters and severity scores did not significantly differ between the groups. **Figure 4** displays the classification scores of the peptide-based classifiers throughout the entire study period.


Figure 3: Association of the parameters with the combined endpoint.



Box-whisker plots of the baseline parameters and their associations with the prediction of the combined endpoint (EP) are shown.

318

319 **Figure 4:** Distribution of classification scores obtained using the urinary peptide-based classifiers AKI204,
320 CKD273, and Cov50 between patients who reached the combined endpoint and those who did not throughout the
321 entire study duration.



322

323 Discussion

324 The aim of this study was to investigate whether

- 325 a) severely injured trauma patients exhibit significant deregulation of urinary peptides, and
- 326 b) such changes can be used to predict outcomes and guide treatment.

327 The combined endpoints of the patients in this study were defined as death and/or kidney
328 failure and/or respiratory insufficiency.

329 As hypothesized, our data demonstrated a highly significant deregulation of urinary proteom
330 levels in trauma patients. A significant change was observed in CKD273 ($p = 0.004$) and in
331 AKI_204 ($p = 0.029$). Cov50 showed a weak trend ($p = 0.094$).

332 These urine proteomes were initially used for predicting acute or acute-on-chronic kidney
333 failure (AKI_207, CKD237) and the development of adverse outcomes in COVID-19 patients
334 (Cov50) (20-22,33-35). Only one patient (7,1%) developed ARDS in this small cohort, which
335 could explain the non-significant trend in Cov50 ($p = 0.094$). In contrast, four patients
336 experienced acute kidney failure, and one patient required dialysis

Overall, 281 deregulated peptides were observed among the polytrauma patients. Among the measured peptides, the most notable changes were observed in collagen peptides (**Supplementary Table 3**). This was expected, as collagen peptides are the most abundant peptides in urine and are influenced by several pathologies, including kidney and cardiovascular diseases, as well as death (30). As shown here, the effect on collagen peptides was inconsistent across these pathologies; some peptides were significantly upregulated, while others were highly significantly and consistently reduced(**Supplementary Table 3**). Although these peptides are very common, the molecular mechanisms underlying their regulation and their connection to (patho)physiology remain unknown.

Kidney failure:

Alpha-1-antitrypsin and Fetuin showed significant deregulations (**Supplementary Table 3**). Similar changes have been observed previously in patients with chronic or acute kidney diseases, likely indicating severe renal stress in trauma patients (22,28,33). Stress or damage to the kidney is further indicated by the consistent reduction of uromodulin fragments (36). Additional consistent and prominent changes include the reduction of fragments of CD99 and the polymeric immunoglobulin receptor (37). Such changes have also been observed in connection with severe/lethal courses of COVID-19 and have been interpreted as possible indications of endothelial damage (30,34-37).

There are numerous efforts to predict acute kidney injury in both medically ill and severely injured patients(38). Many functional tests aim to make predictions not through the quantification of laboratory chemical parameters, but through the performance of urine output after stress tests, such as the furosemide stress test or renal functional reserve(38). The standardized furosemide stress test has a good predictive probability (AUC 0.87, $p = 0.001$) in a limited test group, but the testing requires a coordinated timing of furosemide administration and documentation of time and urine output(39). This must be accommodated within the time-intensive care of critically ill patients(40).

363 Genetic variations as determinants for both risk and outcome are not well defined(41).
364 Association studies have identified a large number of genetic polymorphisms that are
365 capable of predicting different and variable kidney responses to the same type of injury(41).
366 However, identifying these individual genetic susceptibilities for AKI plays no role in
367 managing acute courses in previously healthy, severely injured patients, or in prognostic
368 assessment and therapy timing. Overall, the results of such models are variable and often
369 inconsistent. The lack of robust and reproducible associations with AKI is not surprising given
370 the complex, multifactorial nature of chronic and acute renal insufficiency(38). None of these
371 studies combined the prognostic information from potential genetic polymorphisms with
372 existing prediction models(38). Ideal models for such clinical studies continue to be applied in
373 elective cardiac surgery(42). The reason for this is that cardiac surgical procedures not only
374 represent a large surgical population but also have a well-studied epidemiology of AKI in this
375 context, due to the use of heart-lung machines and the resultant potential ischemia-
376 reperfusion injury to the kidney(42). However, this population cannot in any way reflect
377 patients who suffer not only massive musculoskeletal damage but also direct injuries to the
378 kidney

379 Severely injured patients with preclinical shock due to hemorrhage and extensive extremity
380 trauma with muscle damage often suffer from kidney damage, which frequently leads to
381 acute renal failure requiring dialysis (43). The need for a predictive tool is substantial, as the
382 prediction and estimation of interventions such as dialysis in the daily routine of intensive
383 care are not currently predicted by injury or mortality scores (ISS, TRISS, RISC II) or by
384 progression assessments such as the APACHE II score. These outcomes still depend on the
385 rapid detection of the condition and the continuous, rigorous monitoring of patients (44).

386 In our patient cohort, 4 patients (29%) showed acute kidney injury. This pilot study showed a
387 significant prediction probability for the development of acute kidney injury in polytraumatized
388 patients [CKD273 ($p = 0.004$) and AKI_204 ($p = 0.029$)].

389 **ARDS:**

390 Regarding ARDS and estimating interventions such as prone positioning or ECMO, we face
 391 a similar peptide deregulations to AKI (Supplementary Table 3). Papurica et al. and Cao et
 392 al. demonstrated a wide range of ARDS-relevant genes and factors (45,46). Cao et al.
 393 developed a promising prediction model that could improve early clinical management and
 394 intervention in the development of ARDS (46). However, one of the main problems in
 395 analyzing genes and microRNAs as predictive tools is the lack of standardization of methods
 396 for extraction, quantification, and data analysis (46). In contrast, the handling of urinary
 397 samples does not present major challenges, as it is an excretory product without special
 398 demands in terms of purity and concentration, making it easily obtainable (22,33,37).

399 In clinical practice, the Berlin Definition is currently used as the gold standard for ARDS
 400 treatment (47). It relies on various criteria that must be fulfilled to make a diagnosis (47). The
 401 severity of ARDS is determined based on the ratio of arterial oxygen partial pressure to
 402 fractional inspired oxygen (PaO_2/FiO_2), with different levels established depending on the
 403 measured values (47). The appearance of these criteria and the rise in the required oxygen
 404 partial pressure can sometimes occur days later (47). Often, clinicians are confronted with
 405 the clinical picture of ARDS unexpectedly. The silent period before onset can lead to an
 406 irreversible spiral, and interventions may be decided too late as a response (47).

407 ARDS is characterized by severe hypoxemia due to non-cardiogenic pulmonary edema (48).
 408 Both COVID-19 and ARDS frequently exhibit diffuse alveolar damage, which is marked by
 409 the destruction of the alveolar-capillary barrier (48). The presence of non-cardiogenic
 410 pulmonary edema is a hallmark of ARDS and is also observed in severe COVID-19 cases
 411 (49-51). Both conditions involve a hyperactive inflammatory response (48). In COVID-19, this
 412 is often referred to as a "cytokine storm," where excessive inflammatory cytokines cause
 413 extensive lung damage, similar to what is seen in ARDS(48). Although there are similar

414 expressions in both diseases, the pathophysiology of COVID-19 differs from ARDS due to its
415 diverse complexity(48,49).

416 Some severe COVID-19 cases develop classical ARDS, but a considerable portion of severe
417 cases do not conform to the classical ARDS characteristics of "reduced lung volume and
418 decreased compliance"(48-52). In these patients, pulmonary compliance is nearly normal,
419 which is not consistent with the severity of hypoxemia(53). Furthermore, ARDS-related
420 hypoxemia is mainly caused by intrapulmonary shunts, supplemented by dead space
421 ventilation(54). COVID-19-related hypoxemia may be explained by a dysfunction of hypoxic
422 pulmonary vasoconstriction, leading to a loss of lung perfusion regulation and pulmonary
423 microthrombi(53,55).

424 Although the courses of Covid-19 and classical ARDS differ in some pathophysiological
425 aspects, they do have similarities. Especially through the development of ARDS in severe
426 Covid cases, these adverse outcomes can be identified by the urinary proteomic COV50
427 marker. In our study, out of 10 (71,4%) patients with thoracic trauma, 4 developed respiratory
428 insufficiency (28,6%), of which only one patient manifested ARDS (7,1). The COV50 showed
429 only a trend in predicting these endpoint ($p = 0.094$). To better assess the suitability of this
430 urinary proteome, a larger number of patients need to be included compared to this pilot
431 study.

432 Due to the small number of patients and low manifestation of ARDS at the time of the pilot
433 study, no reliable statements could be made for prognostic assessment, treatment
434 interventions, and intervention timing, such as determining when ECMO (7,1%) or prone
435 positioning (7,1%) is temporally indicated. Nevertheless, considering the trend of COV50
436 alongside other proteomic results, it appears to be a promising avenue to address these
437 exact issues in the management of severe ARDS cases.

438 **Scores:**

The ISS is calculated by squaring the three highest values of the AIS and then adding them together (56). It is used to quantify and assess the overall injury severity of a patient based on injuries in different body regions (56). However, the ability to determine injury severity based on the discriminative abilities of an ISS threshold depends on a reproducible definition of "severe" (57). The ISS is highly dependent on the person collecting the data (58). Experienced individuals have recorded significantly higher values (58). This inter-observer variability often makes the score's interpretation challenging and less explicit. Evaluating the severity of an injury (i.e., direct acute impact, excluding effects of comorbidities, complications, and treatments) depends on the specific aspects of the illness being considered (57). This evaluation can involve various parameters, such as the likelihood of death, the complexity and extent of required treatments and resources, the probability and degree of permanent impairment, and the impact on the patient's quality of life (57). Accordingly, in this study, we see no significant prediction of an endpoint by the ISS ($p = 0.3$). The TRISS optimizes the prediction probability and, as a combination score of the RTS and ISS, provides a probability of survival (59). Although historical literature shows alignment with expected predictions, our study found no significance in predicting any endpoint ($p = 0.2$). There is also criticism of the score, as the variables may not capture the full complexity of the patient's condition (60).

Another approach to improving the prediction of survival probability in polytraumatized patients is the RISC II, which includes not only anatomical injury descriptions but also (patho)physiological indicators (26,57). By incorporating these discriminators, the score aims to estimate the risk of death in severely injured patients more effectively (26). Integrating the RISC II into daily intensive care practice, especially as a tool for monitoring the course of the disease, is significantly challenging due to its difficult accessibility and determination, as the score is primarily designed for initial survival probability assessment (26). Table 1 also shows no significant prediction probability for the endpoints with the RISC II ($p = 0,4$).

Scores specifically designed and expanded for the intensive care unit promise better predictive accuracy for critical courses. The APACHE II score, in addition to parameters from individual organ systems, incorporates age, current clinical findings, and medical history to provide a scoring system for assessing critically ill patients, allowing daily predictions about survival probability (1,17,60). Neither on the first day nor throughout the entire sampling period did the APACHE II score show a significant predictive accuracy for any endpoint in this study ($p = 0.4$) (Table 1, Figure 3).

The SAPS II provides an assessment of the risk of death and is a tool for predicting the intensive care trajectory of critically ill patients (13). The primary admission diagnosis does not need to be entered (13). The severity of multiple injuries does not influence the predictive accuracy (13). This is confirmed in our research question. The SAPS II score shows no significance in predicting the endpoint ($p = 0.7$). These results are in line to other retrospective multicenter studies, stating the APACHE II score and the SAPS II score did not show acceptable performance in predicting outcomes for intensive care trauma patients (60). Only the APACHE III score was reliable and is still frequently used in daily intensive care medicine (61). However, the score requires additional software support that compares the entered data with historical benchmark data from U.S. hospitals (61).

In our pilot study, none of the established scores showed a significant association with the combined endpoint. This is likely due to the limited power of the study. However, two of the urinary peptide classifiers, AKI204 and CKD273, significantly predicted the outcome ($p = 0.029$, $p = 0.004$).

Nevertheless, these scores are a gold standard in their respective areas of use and are employed daily in the assessment and care of severely injured and critically ill intensive care patients. In addition to predicting acute kidney injury, CKD273 significantly correlates with the ISS and its associated assessment of the severity of patients' injuries ($p = 0.034$). Likewise, CKD273 shows a correlation with the APACHE II-Score, which was the only score collected

at all sampling points and provides an estimate of the progression ($p < 0.001$). AKI₂₀₇ also showed a significant correlation with scores for the assessment of intensive care patients and their progression. The classifier correlated with the SAPS II ($p = 0.031$) and the APACHE II score ($p < 0.001$) and could provide an outlook on the intensive care course and care requirements. Similar to CKD273, Cov50 also showed a significant correlation with the ISS ($p = 0.042$), as well as with the RISC II ($p = 0.040$) and the APACHE II-Score ($p < 0.001$). Thus, Cov50 could also serve as a classifier for the primary assessment of injury severity and the resulting mortality risk.

Limitations:

This study has several limitations. First, the sample size was small, with a total of 16 patients and only 14 with polytrauma; thus, this study was designed as a pilot study. Additionally, the complete set of samples (14 days, 5 samples per patient) could only be collected from 8 patients. Furthermore, there were some heterogeneous samples. Due to the small number of patients, the study population exhibited a highly heterogeneous pattern of injuries and injury severity. Furthermore, not all relevant laboratory values could be collected on all sampling days. Additionally, there are challenges in data collection once patients are transferred from the ICU to the general ward.

Conclusion

The prediction of severe organ damage/organ failure and their critical courses in severely injured patients is still associated with high uncertainty due to individual patterns of injury and progression. The prediction of these events is frequently based on the expertise and experience of the intensivist, with frequent laboratory tests and close monitoring of important organ systems, such as the liver, kidneys, heart, and lungs, required to prepare for unexpected courses and indications for interventions. Nonetheless, intensive care physicians are often faced with unforeseen developments.

516 This pilot study should serve as a proof of concept for applying proteome analysis in
517 traumatology, paving the way for a multicenter study, as a significantly greater number of
518 cases is required for a conclusive evaluation of the investigated biomarkers.

519 *List of abbreviations*

520 AIS Abbreviated injury scale

521 AKI acute kidney injury

522 APACHE II acute physiology and chronic health evaluation II

523 ARDS acute respiratory distress syndrome

524 CE-MS Capillary electrophoresis–mass spectrometry

525 CKD Chronic kidney disease

526 CRP C-Reactive Protein

527 ECMO extracorporeal membrane oxygenation

528 FDR false discovery rate

529 GCS Glasgow coma scale

530 Hb Haemoglobin

531 ICU intensive care unit

532 ISS injury severity score

533 MODS multiple organ dysfunction syndrome

534 MOD multiorgan dysfunction

535 MOF multiorgan failure

536 SOFA sequential organ failure assessment

537 NT-proBNP N-terminal prohormone of brain natriuretic peptide

538 PRBCs packed red blood cells

539 PTT partial thromboplastin time

540 RISC revised injury severity classification

541 RTS revised trauma score

542 SAPS II simplified acute physiology score

543 TISS therapeutic intervention scoring system

544 TRISS trauma and injury severity score

545

546 **References**

547 (1) Lambden S, Laterre PF, Levy MM, Francois B. The SOFA score—development, utility
548 and challenges of accurate assessment in clinical trials. Critical Care 2019 Nov
549 27,;23(1):374.

550 (2) Balogh ZJ. Polytrauma: It is a disease. Injury 2022 Jun;53(6):1727-1729.

551 (3) Rossaint R, Afshari A, Bouillon B, Cerny V, Cimpoesu D, Curry N, et al. The European
552 guideline on management of major bleeding and coagulopathy following trauma: sixth
553 edition. Critical care (London, England) 2023 Mar 1,;27(1):80.

554 (4) van Breugel JMM, Niemeyer MJS, Houwert RM, Groenwold RHH, Leenen LPH, van
555 Wessem KJP. Global changes in mortality rates in polytrauma patients admitted to the ICU-a
556 systematic review. World journal of emergency surgery 2020 Sep 30,;15(1):55.

557 (5) Hutchings L, Watkinson P, Young JD, Willett K. Defining multiple organ failure after major
558 trauma: A comparison of the Denver, Sequential Organ Failure Assessment, and Marshall
559 scoring systems. The journal of trauma and acute care surgery 2017 Mar;82(3):534-541.

- 560 (6) Kroupa J. Definition of "polytrauma" and "polytraumatism". Acta chirurgiae orthopaedicae
561 et traumatologiae Čechoslovaca 1990 July;57(4):347-360.
- 562 (7) Lichte P, Lefering R, Marzi I, Bouillon B, Peitzman A, Balogh Z, et al. Neudefinition des
563 Polytraumas ("Berlin Definition") anhand des Traumaregister DGU® - Ergebnis eines
564 internationalen Konsensprozesses. 2014 Oct 13,.
- 565 (8) Cohen IL. Definitions for Sepsis and Organ Failure: The ACCP/SCCM Consensus
566 Conference Committee Report. 1993 Feb 1,;103(2):656.
- 567 (9) Sauaia A, Moore EE, Johnson JL, Chin TL, Banerjee A, Sperry JL, et al. Temporal trends
568 of postinjury multiple-organ failure: still resource intensive, morbid, and lethal. 2014
569 Mar;76(3):582-593.
- 570 (10) Cole E, Gillespie S, Vulliamy P, Brohi K, Akkad H, Apostolidou K, et al. Multiple organ
571 dysfunction after trauma. 2020 Mar;107(4):402-412.
- 572 (11) ZYGUN DA, LAUPLAND KB, FICK GH, SANDHAM JD, DOIG CJ. Limited ability of
573 SOFA and MOD scores to discriminate outcome : a prospective evaluation in 1,436 patients.
574 2005 Mar 1,;52(3):302-308.
- 575 (12) KNAUS WA, DRAPER EA, WAGNER DP, ZIMMERMAN JE. APACHE II: A severity of
576 disease classification system. 1985 Oct;13(10):818-829.
- 577 (13) Le Gall JR. A new Simplified Acute Physiology Score (SAPS II) based on a
578 European/North American multicenter study. 1993 Dec 22,;270(24):2957-2963.
- 579 (14) Singh J, Gupta G, Garg R, Gupta A. Evaluation of trauma and prediction of outcome
580 using TRISS method. 2011 Oct;4(4):446-449.

- 581 (15) Lefering R, Huber-Wagner S, Nienaber U, Maegele M, Bouillon B. Update of the trauma
582 risk adjustment model of the TraumaRegister DGU™: the Revised Injury Severity
583 Classification, version II. 2014 Sep 5;18(5):476.
- 584 (16) Rau C, Wu S, Kuo P, Chen Y, Chien P, Hsieh H, et al. Polytrauma Defined by the New
585 Berlin Definition: A Validation Test Based on Propensity-Score Matching Approach. 2017
586 Sep 01;14(9).
- 587 (17) Sudhakaran S, McCullough PA. Common laboratory parameters as indicators of
588 multi-organ dysfunction in acute heart failure. 2019 Jun;21(6):751-753.
- 589 (18) Bannaga AS, Metzger J, Kyrou I, Voigtländer T, Book T, Melgarejo J, et al. Discovery,
590 validation and sequencing of urinary peptides for diagnosis of liver fibrosis—A multicentre
591 study. 2020 Dec 1;62:103083.
- 592 (19) Wendt R, Thijs L, Kalbitz S, Mischak H, Siwy J, Raad J, et al. A urinary peptidomic
593 profile predicts outcome in SARS-CoV-2-infected patients. 2021 Jun 01;36:100883.
- 594 (20) Piedrafita A, Siwy J, Klein J, Akkari A, Amaya-Garrido A, Mebazaa A, et al. A universal
595 predictive and mechanistic urinary peptide signature in acute kidney injury. 2022 Nov
596 7;26(1):344.
- 597 (21) Rodríguez-Ortiz ME, Pontillo C, Rodríguez M, Zürlbig P, Mischak H, Ortiz A. Novel
598 Urinary Biomarkers For Improved Prediction Of Progressive eGFR Loss In Early Chronic
599 Kidney Disease Stages And In High Risk Individuals Without Chronic Kidney Disease. 2018
600 Oct 29;8(1):15940-11.
- 601 (22) Verbeke F, Siwy J, Van Biesen W, Mischak H, Pletinck A, Schepers E, et al. The urinary
602 proteomics classifier chronic kidney disease 273 predicts cardiovascular outcome in patients
603 with chronic kidney disease. 2021 Apr 26;36(5):811-818.

- 604 (23) Pontillo C, Zhang Z, Schanstra JP, Jacobs L, Zürbig P, Thijs L, et al. Prediction of
605 Chronic Kidney Disease Stage 3 by CKD273, a Urinary Proteomic Biomarker. 2017 Nov
606 1,;2(6):1066-1075.
- 607 (24) Critselis E, Lambers Heerspink H. Utility of the CKD273 peptide classifier in predicting
608 chronic kidney disease progression. 2016 Feb 1,;31(2):249-254.
- 609 (25) Latosinska A, Siwy J, Cherney DZ, Perkins BA, Mischak H, Beige J. SGLT2□ Inhibition
610 reverts urinary peptide changes associated with severe COVID□19: An in□silico
611 proof□of□principle of proteomics□based drug repurposing. 2021 Oct;21(20):e2100160-n/a.
- 612 (26) Nkuipou-Kenfack E, Latosinska A, Yang W, Fournier M, Blet A, Mujaj B, et al. A novel
613 urinary biomarker predicts 1-year mortality after discharge from intensive care. 2020 Jan
614 9,;24(1):10.
- 615 (27) Mischak H, Vlahou A, Ioannidis JPA. Technical aspects and inter-laboratory variability in
616 native peptide profiling: The CE–MS experience. 2013 Apr;46(6):432-443.
- 617 (28) Theodorescu D, Wittke S, Ross MM, Walden M, Conaway M, Just I, et al. Discovery and
618 validation of new protein biomarkers for urothelial cancer: a prospective analysis. *Lancet*
619 *Oncol*. 2006 Mar;7(3):230-240.
- 620 (29) Latosinska A, Siwy J, Mischak H, Frantzi M. Peptidomics and proteomics based on
621 CE□MS as a robust tool in clinical application: The past, the present, and the future. 2019
622 Sep;40(18-19):2294-2308.
- 623 (30) Zürbig P, Renfrow MB, Schiffer E, Novak J, Walden M, Wittke S, et al. Biomarker
624 discovery by CE-MS enables sequence analysis via MS/MS with platform-independent
625 separation. 2006 Jun 1,;27(11):2111-2125.

- 626 (31) Good DM, Zürbig P, Argilés À, Bauer HW, Behrens G, Coon JJ, et al. Naturally
627 Occurring Human Urinary Peptides for Use in Diagnosis of Chronic Kidney Disease. 2010
628 Nov 1,;9(11):2424-2437.
- 629 (32) Latosinska A, Frantzi M, Siwy J. Peptides as "better biomarkers"? Value, challenges,
630 and potential solutions to facilitate implementation. 2023 Jun 26,.
- 631 (33) Tofte N, Lindhardt M, Adamova K, Bakker SJL, Beige J, Beulens JWJ, et al. Early
632 detection of diabetic kidney disease by urinary proteomics and subsequent intervention with
633 spironolactone to delay progression (PRIORITY): a prospective observational study and
634 embedded randomised placebo-controlled trial. Lancet Diabetes Endocrinol. 2020
635 Apr;8(4):301-312.
- 636 (34) Batra R, Uni R, Akchurin OM, Alvarez-Mulett S, Gómez-Escobar LG, Patino E, et al.
637 Urine-based multi-omic comparative analysis of COVID-19 and bacterial sepsis-induced
638 ARDS. 2022 Aug 10,.
- 639 (35) Li Y, Wang Y, Liu H, Sun W, Ding B, Zhao Y, et al. Urine proteome of COVID-19
640 patients. 2020;2:1-8.
- 641 (36) LaFavers K, Garimella PS. Uromodulin: more than a marker for chronic kidney disease
642 progression. 2023 May 1,;32(3):271-277.
- 643 (37) Øvrehus MA, Zürbig P, Vikse BE, Hallan SI. Urinary proteomics in chronic kidney
644 disease: diagnosis and risk of progression beyond albuminuria. 2015 Aug 7,;12(1):21.
- 645 (38) Simona Pozzoli, Marco Simonini, Paolo Manunta. Predicting acute kidney injury: current
646 status and future challenges. 2017 -06-17;31(2):209-223.
- 647 (39) Chawla LS, Davison DL, Brasha-Mitchell E, Koyner JL, Arthur JM, Shaw AD, et al.
648 Development and standardization of a furosemide stress test to predict the severity of acute
649 kidney injury. 2013;17:1-9.

650 (40) Koyner JL, Davison DL, Brasha-Mitchell E, Chalikonda DM, Arthur JM, Shaw AD, et al.
651 Furosemide stress test and biomarkers for the prediction of AKI severity. 2015;26(8):2023-
652 2031.

653 (41) Lu JC, Coca SG, Patel UD, Cantley L, Parikh CR. Searching for genes that matter in
654 acute kidney injury: a systematic review. 2009;4(6):1020-1031.

655 (42) Emerging concepts in acute kidney injury following cardiac surgery. Seminars in
656 cardiothoracic and vascular anesthesia: SAGE Publications Sage CA: Los Angeles, CA;
657 2008.

658 (43) Muhamedhussein MS, Manji M, Nungu KS, Ruggajo P, Khalid K. Prevalence and risk
659 factors of acute kidney injury in polytrauma patients at Muhimbili Orthopedic Institute,
660 Tanzania. 2021 Mar 1;11(1):74-78.

661 (44) Ivan MV, Rogobete AF, Bedreag OH, Papurica M, Popovici SE, Dinu A, et al. New
662 Molecular and Epigenetic Expressions as Novel Biomarkers in Critically Ill Polytrauma
663 Patients with Acute Kidney Injury (AKI). 2018 Jan 1;64(5):663-668.

664 (45) Papurica M, Rogobete AF, Cradigati CA, Sarandan M, Dumache R, Bratu LM, et al.
665 Using the Expression of miRNAs as Biomarkers for the Evaluation Acute Respiratory
666 Distress Syndrome in the Critically Ill Polytrauma Patient. 2016 Jan 1;62(8):1405-1411.

667 (46) Cao S, Li H, Xin J, Jin Z, Zhang Z, Li J, et al. Identification of genetic profile and
668 biomarkers involved in acute respiratory distress syndrome. Intensive Care Med
669 2024;50(1):46-55.

670 (47) Ranieri VM, Rubenfeld GD, Thompson BT, Ferguson ND, Caldwell E, Fan E, et al.
671 Acute Respiratory Distress Syndrome: The Berlin Definition. 2012 Jun 20;307(23):2526-
672 2533.

673 (48) Lu S, Huang X, Liu R, Lan Y, Lei Y, Zeng F, et al. Comparison of COVID-19 Induced
674 Respiratory Failure and Typical ARDS: Similarities and Differences. 2022 May 27,;9:829771.

675 (49) Gattinoni L, Coppola S, Cressoni M, Busana M, Rossi S, Chiumello D. COVID-19 does
676 not lead to a "typical" acute respiratory distress syndrome. 2020;201(10):1299-1300.

677 (50) Xie Y, Wang X, Yang P, Zhang S. COVID-19 complicated by acute pulmonary
678 embolism. 2020;2(2):e200067.

679 (51) Maiolo G, Collino F, Vasques F, Rapetti F, Tonetti T, Romitti F, et al. Reclassifying acute
680 respiratory distress syndrome. 2018;197(12):1586-1595.

681 (52) Maunder RJ, Shuman WP, McHugh JW, Marglin SI, Butler J. Preservation of normal
682 lung regions in the adult respiratory distress syndrome: analysis by computed tomography.
683 JAMA 1986;255(18):2463-2465.

684 (53) Gattinoni L, Chiumello D, Caironi P, Busana M, Romitti F, Brazzi L, et al. COVID-19
685 pneumonia: different respiratory treatments for different phenotypes? Intensive Care Med.
686 2020;46:1099-1102.

687 (54) Marini JJ, Gattinoni L. Management of COVID-19 respiratory distress. JAMA
688 2020;323(22):2329-2330.

689 (55) Xie Y, Wang X, Yang P, Zhang S. COVID-19 complicated by acute pulmonary
690 embolism. 2020;2(2):e200067.

691 (56) BAKER S, O'NEILL B, HADDON W, LONG W. THE INJURY SEVERITY SCORE: A
692 METHOD FOR DESCRIBING PATIENTS WITH MULTIPLE INJURIES AND EVALUATING
693 EMERGENCY CARE. 1974 Mar;14(3):187-196.

694 (57) Palmer C. Major trauma and the injury severity score--where should we set the bar?
695 Annu.Proc.Assoc.Adv.Automot Med. 2007;51:13-29.

- 696 (58) Waydhas C, Nast-Kolb D, Trupka A, Kerim-Sade C, Kanz G, Zoller J, et al. Trauma
697 scores: reproducibility and reliability. 1992 Feb;95(2):67-70.
- 698 (59) Martens DS, Thijs L, Latosinska A, Trenson S, Zhang Z, Wang C, et al. SSRN-
699 id3854583.
- 700 (60) Vassar MJ, Lewis FR, Chambers JA, Mullins RJ, O'Brien PE, Weigelt JA, et al.
701 Prediction of Outcome in Intensive Care Unit Trauma Patients: A Multicenter Study of Acute
702 Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation (APACHE), Trauma and Injury Severity Score
703 (TRISS), and a 24-Hour Intensive Care Unit (ICU) Point System. 1999 Aug;47(2):324-329.
- 704 (61) Markgraf R, Deutschinoff G, Pientka L, Scholten T, Lorenz C. Performance of the score
705 systems Acute Physiology and Chronic Health Evaluation II and III at an interdisciplinary
706 intensive care unit, after customization. 2001 Jan 1;;5(1):31-36.

707

708 **Supplementary Data**

709 ***Supplementary Table 1: Frequencies of injuries and events in the 14 polytrauma patients in the***
710 ***cohort during the 14-day monitoring period***

Characteristics	Frequency (N)	Percentage
		711
		712
Traumatic brain injurie	11	78.6
Spinal cord injurie	1	7.1
Thoracic injurie	10	71.4
Abdominal injurie	7	50
Pelvic injurie	7	50
Respiratory insufficiency	4	28.6
ARDS	1	7.1
Prone position	1	7.1
ECMO	1	7.1
Akute kidney injurie	4	28.6
Dialysis	1	7.1
Cardiovascular Event	0	0
Resuscitation	0	0
Death	1	7.1
Monitoring of 14 days completed	8	57.1
Early discharge	6	42.9

728

729 **Supplementary Table 2: Frequencies of successful sample collection, score and blood**
730 **sample trends during the monitoring period of 14 days**

Characteristics	Total	Frequency	Percentage
1. Sample collection on admission	14	14	100
2. Sample collection on day 2	14	14	100
3. Sample collection on day 5	14	12	85,7
4. Sample collection on day 10	14	9	64,3
5. Sample collection on day 14	14	8	57,1
Characteristics	Total	Mean	SD
1. APACHE II score on admission	14	12,29	7,64
2. APACHE II score on day 2	14	11,21	6,02
3. APACHE II score on day 5	12	10,92	6,24
4. APACHE II score on day 10	9	12,11	6,21
5. APACHE II score on day 14	8	12,57	7,66
1. Lactate on admission	14	2,76	1,91
2. Lactate on day 2	13	1,59	1,59
3. Lactate on day 5	10	0,96	0,35
4. Lactate on day 10	5	0,82	0,27
5. Lactate on day 14	3	0,73	0,12
1. CRP on admission	14	3,20	5,02
2. CRP on day 2	14	169,48	99,46
3. CRP on day 5	13	104,01	90,20
4. CRP on day 10	9	138,98	166,64
5. CRP on day 14	7	56,39	38,97
1. Hb on admission	14	11,69	2,66
2. Hb on day 2	14	9,06	2,18
3. Hb on day 5	13	9,02	1,71
4. Hb on day 10	9	8,32	1,32
5. Hb on day 14	7	8,89	0,88

731

732 **Supplementary Table 3: Urinary peptides significantly different in abundance between**
733 **healthy controls and trauma patients (N=16 each) (.xls)**