Rapid, Robust Method for Measuring Low Concentrations of Albumin in Urine

E. A. Medcalf,1 D. **J. Newman,'3 E. G. Gorman,2 and C. P.** PrIce1

We describe a rapid particle-enhanced turbidimetric immunoassay for albumin in urine. Intra- and interassay CVs were **<5% and <10%, respectively, the detection limit is 2 mg/L, and the working range extends to 200 mg/L. Mean analytical recovery of albumin added to centrifuged urines was 100% (SD 10.6%), and, when results were compared with those by the Pharmacia AlA, the correlation coefficient was 0.99. The working reagents are stable for at least six months; thus this assay is suited for both batch and urgent analysis.**

AddItIonal Keyphrases: *particle-enhanced* turbidimetric immunoassay \cdot "microalbuminuria" \cdot calibration stability \cdot diabetes

Measurement of proteins and enzymes in urine is becoming increasingly important in the detection ofrenal pathology *(1).* **The** appearance **of increased concentrations of** certain proteins **in** urine has been used to assess glomerular permeability and tubular damage *(2).* **Moreover, slightly increased excretion of albumin in urine ("paucialbuminuria")** has been recognized **as an early indicator of renal damage in diabetes** (3)-a situation that can be **reversed if** detected **and** treated **sufficiently early (4).**

Heretofore, methods for measuring low concentrations of albumin have been confined **to heterogeneous immunoassays involving various labels such as radioisotopes** *(5),* enzymes (6), **and fluorophores** (7). More recently, homoge neous immunoturbidimetric methods have been described *(8,* 9). Here we describe the development and validation of **a rapid latex particle-enhanced immunoturbidimetric as say (PE'rhA),** that can be adapted for use **with most automated** instruments in the clinical laboratory.

MaterIals and Methods

Materials

The latex particles were from E.I. du Pont de Nemours, Wilmington, DE. Human albumin was from **Behring, Somerville, NJ. Antiserum, raised in goats against** human **albumin, was obtained as the** IgG **fraction** from **Atlantic Antibodies, Scarborough, ME 04074.**

The latex particle-antibody **conjugate was** produced with 40-nm (diameter) latex particles, based **on the** polyvinyl **naphthalene core** described **by** Litchfield **et al.** *(10).* **The** chemically reactive shell was **prepared with a** mixture **of 2-vinylnaphthalene and chloromethylstyrene (90/10 by vol). The** IgG **fraction of the** antiserum **wasmixed** with the latex particle suspension to yield a final immunoglobulin concentration of 4 g/L in phosphate buffer $(15 \text{ mmol/L}, \text{pH})$ **7.5) containing, per liter, 0.5 mL of GAFAC RE61O, surfac**tant **(GAF** Corp., Wythenshaw, **Manchester, U.K.) and 5 g of particles. The mixture was incubated at37#{176}Covernight,**

and free IgG was **then removed by washing the antibodycoated particles four times in 50** mmolJL glycine solution (pH 7.5), then centrifuging at 40 000 \times g for 50 min to sediment **the particles. The antibody-particle complex was** finally **resuspended in half the original volume of glycine solution (200** mmol/L, **pH 7.5) for storage. Before use, the** particles **were** sonicated **twice for 1 mm at** full power **in a "Soniprep" (MSE Instruments, Sussex, U.K.).**

Instrumentation. **All reactions were monitored with a Multistat Ill** microcentrifugal analyzer **(Instrumentation** Laboratory, Lexington, MA (11) at 340 nm and 30 $^{\circ}C$, in a **0.5-cm (pathlength) cuvette.**

Procedures

The assay protocol **for all the experiments is similar to the final protocol described below, with appropriate variation of the conditions.**

Final assay protocol. **Into the** inner **compartment of the** Multistat rotor dispense $5 \mu L$ of urine plus 89 μL of **phosphate** buffer $(340 \text{ mmol/L}, \text{pH } 7.5)$ and $4 \mu \text{L}$ of water. Into the outer compartment dispense $200 \mu L$ of particle **reagent, diluted to give an initial absorbance of 0.7 in the reaction** cuvette, and $10 \mu L$ of water. Incubate at 30 °C , then centrifuge **to** mix **the reactants. Measure the absorbance at 340 nm immediately (3 s)and 240 s** after this mixing.

Effect of buffer type, concentration, and pH. **The effect of pH on the** rate **of aggregation** was **assessed by** using various buffers in the pH range 6.0 to 10.0. The reaction was monitored by using antibody-coupled particles in the presence and absence of urine sample. The maximum aggregation in the presence of urine was noted at pH 7.4, none was noted in the absence of urine. Nonspecific aggre**gation did not occur at any point within the pH** range studied.

Effect of polyethylene glycol. **We investigated the effect of** PEG 8000 (Union Carbide Corp., Danbury, CT) on the rate **of reaction, using concentrations ranging from 0 to 40** g/L **in the** final **reaction** mixture. **The 10** g/L **concentration** finally chosen was a **compromise** between **the turbidity produced with added sample and the speed ofthe reaction.**

Antibody loading on particle. **Antibody was coupled to particles in a series of** experiments covering a **protein: particle ratio ranging from 0.5 to 4.0** g of antibody per **5 g of particle per liter of reagent. Each antibody**particle **reagent was then** used **to establish a calibration** curve **in the assay. The detection** limit was lowest and the **equivalence point highest with 4 g ofantibody per liter loaded onto the particle reagent.**

Results

Precision. **We assessed within-run precision by analyzing 19 aliquots of each of** three **different urine specimens. We** assessed **between-day precision by analyzing one aliquot of each of the three pooled specimens of urine on 20** consecu**tive** working days. Aliquots of the urine were stored at 4 °C **until use. We calculated the CVs by using a calibration** curve **prepared on the first day of the month and also by**

^{&#}x27;Department of Clinical **Biochemistry. The London Hospital Medical College, Turner Street, London, El 2AD, U.K.**

² E. **I. du Pont de** Nemours **& Co., Building 700, Glasgow Site,** Wilmington, DE 19898.

^{&#}x27; Address correspondence to this author.

Received August 16, 1989; accepted December 11, 1989.

using a curve prepared **on each of the 20 days (Table 1).**

Calibration range, stability, and detection limit. Isotonic **saline containing** 1000 g **ofhuman albumin per liter was serially diluted with saline and assayed. Figure 1 indicates an equivalence point of approximately 200 mg/L, but shows that a concentration of 300 mg/L still gives an** absorbance **change exceeding that given by the** 100 mgfL standard.

A series of albumin calibrators covering the range 5 to 200 mg/L were analyzed over six **months. Figure 2 shows the absorbance changes during this time. The calibrators were prepared** in **isotonic saline containing** 10μ **L** of Brij 35 **surfactant (Sigma Chemical Co., St.** Louis, MO) **per liter, and then stored at 4 #{176}C in small plastic** tubes **until use.**

The detection limit, defined as 3 x the SD **for the reagent blank** signal, was 2 mg/L, but could be improved to ≤ 0.5 mg/L by increasing the sample volume to 50 μ L.

Method comparison. **Urine specimens** collected **from a** series **of patients were assayed for** albumin **by the proposed** and **by the** Pharmacia radioimmunoassay methods (Phar**macia** Diagnostics, **Uppsala, Sweden). The results are** shown **in** Figure **3.**

Recovery of albumin. **A** stock **of pure human** albumin, **prepared** in **isotonic saline containing** 10 μ **L** of Brij per **liter, was** used **to supplement 10** urine **samples with three concentrations of albumin. On assay the mean analytical** recovery was 100% (SD 10.6%) when the samples were centrifuged **before analysis and 96% (SD 33.4%) when they were not.**

Comparison with nonenhanced turbidimetric immunoassay. **Using the same antiserum, we developed a direct immunoturbidimetric assay based on conventional criteria** *(12).* **A 20-uL sample was needed to give an acceptable** signal when the sample was mixed with $125 \mu L$ of antise**rum** diluted **50-fold in phosphate** buffer (100 mmolJL, **pH 7.4)** containing **40 g of PEG** 6000 **per liter. The calibration** curve **is compared with that of the particle-enhanced assay in** Figure **4,** and demonstrates **the improvement in signal** and **larger assay range that the latex-enhanced assay provides.**

Discussion

The use **of particles as labels in the design ofhomoge neous immunoassays is well described. Various particles have been used for this purpose, including** erythrocytes *(13),* **bacteria** *(14),* **gold sols** *(15),* **and latex** *(16).* **Despite the** large amount of literature on this subject that has appeared during several decades, only **relatively recently have light**scattering immunoassays **been introduced for the quanti-**

Fig. 1. Urinary albumin standard curve, measured over 4 min **An** absorbance change **greater than that** for **the** 100 mg/L standard is **obtained, even with a sample concentration of** 300 m/L

Fig. 2. Variation in the change of absorbance **for each calibrant** during six months (0 0, **#{149} 20, 50, #{149}** 200 **mg/L)** For all calibrants CVs of absorbance changes were <10%

1.6 2.6 Regressionanalysis showed PETIA **⁼** 1.04 **AlA** - **1.25** (r **⁼**0.99) **Fig.** 3. Method comparison for urinary albumin concentration as **measured by PETIA and Pharmacia RIA**

tative assay of constituents in serum and urine.

Many latex-enhanced immunoassays have been described for both large and small molecules, involving use of particles of varying size, **core material, and shell chemistry. Litchfield etal.** *(10)* **described a** 40-nm-diameter **particle with a polyvinylnaphthalene core and chloromethyl-**

Albumin (mg/L)

Fig. 4. Comparison **of (#{149})** latex-enhanced and (0) **nonenhanced immunoturbidimetricassays for urinaryalbumin,utilizingthe same** antibody

styrene shell. This **core material** possesses a **higher refractive index than that of many previous latex particles,** providing an opportunity **for** enhanced sensitivity. **The chloromethylstyrene shell enables proteins to be covalently coupled to the latex particles** simply **and reproducibly, with** 40-nm particles giving a **lower** detection limit than larger **particles. The smaller** size also favors **the** maintenance **of a homogeneous reagent mixture** that does **not sediment or** self-aggregate.

The stability of covalent coupling of antibody to particle was demonstrated **by Price et al.** *(17)* **in a rapid** assay **for** C-reactive protein; **the** working reagent, and hence calibra**tion** curve, were found **to be stable for at least 16** weeks. Our **albumin** assay confirms this, because precision and **calibration curve stability were easily maintained during the** six months studied. **Most** analyzer systems are **now** capable **of storing** calibration-curve data **and therefore this** stability has many practical **benefits, including** decreased reagent and calibration material usage together with faster delivery **of results.**

The assay presented here **for** albumin **in** urine **is** precise, and results compare **well with those by an** established RIA. **The detection limit in the** presented assay **is 2** mg/L, **but it** can be decreased further **to 0.5** mg/L **or** less **by increasing the sample volume and** re-optimizing **the** assay. This assay covers a **wide** range **of** albumin concentrations, 5 to 200 mg/L, and achieves a far greater signal **than does the direct** (nonenhanced) immunoturbidimetric assay (Figure **4).** This increased sensitivity results **in superior precision** and the opportunity to maintain good analytical performance **with** use **of less-sophisticated photometric equipment.** This type **of assay** can therefore be readily adapted for use outside the laboratory-for example, **with use of a hand-held** microti**ter-well** strip **reader.**

Viberti **and Vergani** *(18)* described a simple direct latexagglutination assay **that they claimed gave a "positive** answer" **in the range 25-166** mgJL. **Paoli et al.** *(19)* **de**scribed an indirect **latex-agglutination assay designed to** give a cutoff **(negative result) at an** albumin concentration **of s40 mg/L. Paoli et al.** used **simple** visual detection **of** agglutination **and** argued **that, by use of** an indirect method **in which** albumin **was coupled to latex** beads, **the possible** error **due to antigen excess** was eliminated. **How-** **ever, these authors were unable to produce a quantitative** result **with their method.**

Samples **with** albumin concentrations **>200 mg/L can** readily be detected with a **simple stick test (e.g.,** Albustix; **Miles-Ames, Elkhart,** IN) so **that** necessary dilutions can **be made before analysis with** our immunoassay. Addition**ally,** most automated instruments **for which this** assay **is** appropriate **have** algorithms **for detecting antigen excess to** circumvent **this problem.**

We calculated **recoveries for** both centrifuged **and non** centrifuged **urine samples** stored **at 4#{176}C, because the** literature **seems** confused as **to the effect, if any, of** centrifuga**tion on the measurable** albumin concentration after **storage** at 4 or -20 °C for any substantial interval $(20, 21)$. We **found a** limited advantage with centrifugation, and we recommend **it to** ensure removal **of any endogenous** matter **that may be** present after **cold storage of** samples.

In **an** assessment **of** immunochemical methods **for the** determination **of** albumin **in** urine, Watts **et al.** *(22)* stated that **the** preferred method must be sensitive, specific, **and** practicable. Practicality can be extended **beyond the** re quirements **of the laboratory to** encompass **use in the** outpatient clinic. If an assay **is sufficiently rapid** and robust **such that an** accurate result **can be** produced **in 5 mimi by** nontechnical personnel, **then the** screening **of all diabetics** during a **clinic visit** becomes attractive and cost-effective.

References

1. Carone FA, Peterson DR, Oparil S, Pullman TN. Renal tubular transport and catabolism **of** proteins and **peptides. Kidney** mt **1979;16:271-8.**

2. Sumpio BE, Hayslett JP. Renal handling of proteins **in** normal and disease states [Review]. *Q* **J** Med **1985;57:611-35.**

3. Mogensen CE, Christensen CK. Predicting diabetic nephrop**athy in insulin dependent patients. N EngI J** Med 1984;311:89-93. **4.** Viberti CC, **Pickup JC,** Jarrett RI, Keen H. Effect **of** control **of** blood glucose on urinary excretion of albumin and β_2 -microglob**ulin in** insulin-dependent **diabetics. N Engi J** Med **1979;300:638- 41.**

5. Woo **J, Floyd M, Cannon DC,** Kahan B. Radioimmunoassay **for urinary** albumin. **Clin Chem** 1978;24:1464-7.

6. Fielding BA, Price DA, Houlton **CA.** Enzyme immunoassay **for** urinary albumin. **Clin Chem** 1983;29:355-7.

7. **Silver A,** Dawnay A, Landon **J,** Cattell WR. Immunoassay **for low concentration of** albumin **in** urine.**Clin** Chem 1986;32: 1303-B. 8. Teppo AM. Immunoturbidimetry **of** albumin and immunoglobulin G in urine. **Clin** Chem 1982;28:1359-61.

9. Harmoinen A, Vuorinen P, Jokela H. Turbidimetric measure ment of microalbuminuria. **Clin** Chim Acta**1987;166:85-9.**

10. Litchfleld **WJ,** Craig AR, Frey **WA, Leflar CC,** Looney **CE, Luddy MA. Novel shell/core particles for** automated turbidimetric immunoassays. **Clin Chem** 1984;30:1489-93.

11. Price CP, Spencer K,eds. Centrifugal analysers in clinical chemistry. Eastbourne, **U.K.:** Praeger, 1980.

12. Price CP, Spencer K, Whicher **J. Light** scattering imniunoassay **of** specific **proteins: a review. Ann** Clin Biochem 1983;20:1-14. 13. Cooper **AG,** Brown MC.Automated **hemagglutination inhibition. In:** Ritchie RF, ed. Automated immunoanalysis, Part 2. **New York** and Basel: Marcel Dekker **Inc., 1978:471-SOB.**

14. Lamont-Havers RW. Nature of serum factors causing **agglu**tination **of** sensitized **sheep cells and group A hemolytic** streptococci. Proc Soc Exp **Biol** Med 1955;88:35-8.

15. Leuvering JWH, Thal PHJM, **Van der** Waart M, Schusso AHWM. Sol particle immunoassay (SPIA). **J** Iminunoassay **1980;1:77-91.**

16. Galvin **JP.**Particle enhanced immunoassays-a **review. In:** Diagnostic immunology: technology assessment **and quality assur ance.** Skokie, **IL: College of** American Pathologists, 1983:18-30.

17. Price CP, Trull **AK,** Berry D,Gorman **EG. Development and** validation of a particle-enhanced immunoassay **for C-reactive** protein. **J** Immunol Methods **1987;99:205-11.**

18. Viberti CC, Vergani D. Detection **of potentially reversible**

diabetic albuminuria: a three drop agglutination test for urinary albumin at low concentration. Diabetes 1982;31:973-5.
19. Paoli C, Bardelli F, Tarli P, Gragnoli G, Tanganelli I, Signorini AM. A simple latex agglutination test for urinary albumin
screening [Brief Tech Note]. Clin Chim Acta 1987;166:67-71. 20. Townsend JC. Specimen preparation for microalbuminuria

 \ddotsc

 \overline{a}

 \sim l. assay [Tech Brief]. Clin Chem 1986;32:559.

21. Silver AC, Dawney A, Landon J. Specimen preparation for
assay of albumin in urine [Letter]. Clin Chem 1987;33:199-200. 22. Watts GF, Bennett JE, Rowe DJ, et al. Assessment of immunochemical methods for determining low concentrations of albumin in urine. Clin Chem 1986;32:1544-8.

 \ddotsc

i.

 $\ddot{}$

 $\ddot{}$

 \sim \sim

٠.,