

**Supplementary Information for** 

**Blood-based untargeted metabolomics in Relapsing-Remitting Multiple Sclerosis revealed the testable therapeutic target** 

Insha Zahoor,<sup>1\*</sup> Hamid Suhail,1\* Indrani Datta,<sup>2</sup> Mohammad Ejaz Ahmed,<sup>1</sup> Laila M Poisson,<sup>2</sup> Jeffrey Waters,<sup>1</sup> Faraz Rashid,<sup>1</sup> Rui Bin,<sup>1</sup> Jaspreet Singh,<sup>1</sup> Mirela Cerghet,<sup>1</sup> Ashok Kumar,<sup>3</sup> Md Nasrul Hoda,<sup>1</sup> Ramandeep Rattan,<sup>4</sup> Ashutosh K Mangalam,<sup>5</sup> and Shailendra Giri<sup>1\*</sup>

Paste corresponding author: Shailendra Giri Email: [sgiri1@hfhs.org](mailto:sgiri1@hfhs.org)





**Fig. S1.** Top canonical pathways identified in metabolomics of RRMS patients using Ingenuity Pathway Analysis.



Network 1 : Metabolon\_Serum\_Human\_HeVsUntRRMS\_IPABKG : Metabolon\_Serum\_Human\_HeVsUntRRMS : Metabolon\_Serum\_Human\_HeV<br>ntRRMS\_IPABKG



**Fig. S2**. Cell signaling, molecular transport, vitamin and mineral metabolism (score 33 with 13 focus molecules), top networks identified by IPA.

**Table S1**: Demographic information of healthy and RRMS patients



DMT, Disease modifying therapies; NA, Not applicable; RRMS, Relapsing-remitting multiple sclerosis.

**Table S2.** Significantly altered metabolites in serum of RRMS vs. healthy.









#### **Table S3: Casual Network List**





**Table S4**: Demographic information of healthy and RRMS patients used for qualitative polymerase chain reaction data for metabolic genes presented

in figure 2D.



DMTs, Disease modifying treatments; NA, not applicable; RRMS, Relapsing-remitting MS.

**Gene GSE21942\_ logFC GSE21942\_ AvgExpr GSE21942\_ Qvalue GSE26484\_ logFC GSE26484\_ AvgExpr GSE26484\_ Qvalue GSE43591\_ logFC GSE43591\_ AvgExpr GSE43591\_ Qvalue CYB5D1** 0.1287 5.9342 0.3118 -0.1821 6.4800 0.4786 0.0171 6.1754 0.9715 **LDHA** -0.2243 11.2197 0.0028 -0.2239 11.8842 0.3717 0.1504 10.9657 0.4022 **LDHB** 0.1770 11.9221 0.1848 -0.5430 12.7474 0.1904 0.2044 12.2186 0.6115 **SDHA** 0.1009 9.5232 0.1228 -0.1829 10.1952 0.3164 -0.0697 9.4656 0.7440 **SDHB** -0.0908 6.8039 0.4327 -0.1823 6.5173 0.4706 0.0234 6.7244 0.7664 **SDHC** -0.0333 6.8356 0.3964 -0.1477 6.5249 0.6292 -0.0566 6.3450 0.7589 **SDHD** 0.1338 7.6226 0.3704 0.0840 8.5492 0.3411 0.0082 6.3840 0.7806 **BDH1** 0.0933 5.4385 0.5021 -0.0723 5.5455 0.3093 -0.0321 5.8018 0.8171 **BDH2** 0.0766 5.7171 0.5809 -0.2550 5.7514 0.4140 0.1352 5.5083 0.6956 **MDH1** 0.0712 9.8286 0.4118 -0.4106 10.7235 0.1695 0.1930 10.1793 0.4996 **MDH2** -0.0854 8.5870 0.2267 -0.2279 8.9446 0.3660 -0.2095 8.2045 0.4655 **ME1** 0.0261 3.9952 0.8307 -0.0679 4.3624 0.6986 0.1270 3.5434 0.5635 **ME2** -0.1859 8.7873 0.4000 -0.2928 9.0185 0.4980 -0.0391 8.1776 0.8730 **ME3** 0.0340 4.8949 0.6025 -0.0545 4.4121 0.7521 0.0616 5.1616 0.7351 **ADSL** 0.1284 9.4334 0.2071 -0.1267 10.0444 0.6812 0.1021 9.5433 0.8034 **ASL** -0.2529 7.3667 0.0128 0.1420 7.5074 0.7265 -0.0517 6.2638 0.9272 **FAH** -0.2045 4.8803 0.4180 0.0638 5.0523 0.8346 -0.0575 5.0459 0.6740 **FH** -0.2252 7.1124 0.3832 -0.3020 6.3911 0.4514 0.0596 6.3813 0.8660 **LDHAL6A** -0.0882 3.9150 0.2246 0.3616 4.7898 0.1607 0.0382 4.5353 0.8929 **LDHAL6B** 0.0367 2.8984 0.7242 0.0431 3.7392 0.8489 0.0613 2.9996 0.8016

**Table S5 Expression of glycolytic and TCA pathways.**

We used 3 datasets from the National Center for Biotechnology Information (NCBI) Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) database, including GSE21942, GSE26484, and GSE43591, and the raw data of each dataset was preprocessed with the Robust Multiarray Average (RMA) algorithm. Using Limma (or geo2R) differential expression analysis was performed on each dataset. Genes with an adjusted P-value lower than 0.05 considered as significant.

# **Animals**

Female B6, SJL (10-12 weeks old) and 2D2 TCR (MOG<sub>35-55</sub> specific TCR transgenic mice (Stock 006912) were purchased from the Jackson Laboratory (Bar Harbor, ME). Animals were housed in the pathogen-free animal facility of Henry Ford Hospital, Detroit, MI, according to the animal protocols approved by the Animal Care and Use Committee of Henry Ford Hospital.

### **EAE induction and recall response**

B6, 2D2 and SJL mice (10-12 weeks old) were immunized on day 0 by subcutaneous injections in the flank region with a total 200 μl of emulsion containing antigen MOG35-55 or PLP139-151 peptide (100 μg/mouse), along with killed Mycobacterium tuberculosis H37Ra (400 μg) in CFA as described previously (1-3). Pertussis toxin at the dose of 300 ng/mouse in PBS was given to B6 or 2D2 immunized mice on day 0 and 2 post-immunization in the volume of 200 μl. Pertussis toxin was not injected in SJL mice. One set of mice were injected with CFA/pertussis toxin without antigen/peptide named as control. Clinical disease was monitored daily in a blinded fashion by measuring paralysis according to the conventional grading system as described previously (1-3). Furthermore, cells (4x10<sup>6</sup>/ml) isolated from spleens were cultured in the presence or absence of antigen (20 μg/ml). Cell proliferation and the production of various cytokines (IFNγ, GM-CSF, and IL17) were examined as described before (1-3).

## **Histopathology and Luxol fast blue staining**

Hematoxylin and eosin and Luxol fast blue staining methods and histopathological analyses protocols were adopted from our reports (2, 4, 5). Mice were anesthetized with isoflurane and transcardially perfused with 0.9% chilled 1X PBS followed by 4% paraformaldehyde. Mouse spinal cord tissues were harvested and fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde for 24 hours at 4°C and later embedded in paraffin. Briefly, 5-um spinal cord sections were obtained and stained with hematoxylin and eosin to check the infiltration of immune cells and the analysis of lesion size. Loss in white matter content and subsequent demyelination was visualized with Luxol fast blue staining. Brightfield images were captured using a light microscope, the demyelinated area was selected, measured and expressed as percentage of total area ([demyelinated area/total spinal cord area] x 100). Immunohistochemistry was performed on paraffin embedded spinal cord sections. Briefly, sections were deparaffinized, blocked and incubated with specific primary antibody (to CD4 and F4/80) overnight at 4°C. Sections were then washed 3 times with 0.1% PBST followed by incubation with an appropriate secondary antibody for 2 hours at room temperature. Thereafter, sections were rinsed, incubated with ABC reagent for 2 hours and visualized with 3,3′ diaminobenzidine. Images were acquired using a bright field microscope, converted into 8-bit images, threshold filtered and quantified using ImageJ software (National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, MD).

#### **Flow cytometry**

Surface markers of CNS-infiltrating or spleen cells were stained by incubating the cells with fluorochrome-labeled antibodies against Ly6C, F4/80, CD38 and EGR2 for 30 minutes at 4°C. MOG<sub>35-55</sub>-specific activation of Th1 and Th17 from CNS-infiltrating lymphocytes were analyzed by stimulating the cells with the MOG<sub>35-55</sub> peptide (20 ug/ml) for 18 hours followed by treatment with GolgiPlug at  $37^{\circ}$ C. After 5-hours of incubation, cells were processed for cell surface markers staining (CD3, CD4 and CD45) followed by intracellular markers staining by incubation with monoclonal antibodies against IFNγ and IL17 and GM-CSF as described before (2, 3).

**Metabolomic analysis of RRMS and HS serum -** Metabolomic profiling analysis was performed by Metabolon Inc. (Durham, NC).

*Sample accessioning:* Each sample received was accessioned into the Metabolon LIMS system and was assigned by the LIMS, a unique identifier that was associated with the original source identifier only. This identifier was used to track all sample handling, tasks, and results. The samples (and all derived aliquots) were tracked by the LIMS system. All portions of any sample were automatically assigned their own unique identifiers by the LIMS when a new task was created; these samples' relationship was also tracked. All samples were maintained at -80°C until processed.

**Sample preparation**: Samples were prepared using the automated MicroLab STAR system from Hamilton Company. A recovery standard was added prior to the first step in the extraction process for QC purposes. To remove protein, dissociate small molecules bound to protein or trapped in the precipitated protein matrix, and to recover chemically diverse metabolites, proteins were precipitated with methanol under vigorous shaking for 2 minutes (Glen Mills GenoGrinder 2000) followed by centrifugation. The resulting extract was divided into 5 fractions: one for analysis by ultraperformance liquid chromatography-mass spectroscopy (UPLC-MS/MS) with positive ion mode electrospray ionization, one for analysis by UPLC-MS/MS with negative ion mode electrospray ionization, one for analysis by UPLC-MS/MS polar platform (negative ionization), one for analysis by gas chromatography-mass spectroscopy (GC-MS), and one sample was reserved for backup. Samples were placed briefly on a TurboVap (Zymark) to remove the organic solvent. For LC, the samples were stored overnight under nitrogen before preparation for analysis. For GC, each sample was dried under vacuum overnight before preparation for analysis.

*Ultrahigh performance liquid chromatography-tandem mass spectroscopy (UPLC-MS/MS):* The LC/MS portion of the platform was based on a Waters ACQUITY UPLC, and a Thermo Scientific Q-Exactive high resolution/accurate mass spectrometer interfaced with a heated electrospray ionization (HESI-II) source and Orbitrap mass analyzer operated at 35,000 mass resolution. The sample extract was dried then reconstituted in acidic or basic LC-compatible solvents, each of which contained 8 or more injection standards at fixed concentrations to ensure injection and chromatographic consistency. One aliquot was analyzed using acidic positive ion optimized conditions and the other using basic negative ion optimized conditions in 2 independent injections using separate dedicated columns (Waters UPLC BEH C18-2.1x100 mm, 1.7 µm). Extracts reconstituted in acidic conditions were gradient eluted from a C18 column using water and methanol containing 0.1% formic acid. The basic extracts were similarly eluted from C18 using methanol and water, however, with 6.5mM Ammonium Bicarbonate. The third aliquot was analyzed via negative ionization following elution from a HILIC column (Waters UPLC BEH Amide 2.1x150 mm, 1.7 µm) using a gradient consisting of water and acetonitrile with 10mM Ammonium Formate. The MS analysis alternated between MS and data-dependent MS<sup>2</sup> scans using dynamic exclusion, and the scan range was from 80-1000 *m/z*. Raw data files are archived and extracted as described below.

*Gas chromatography-mass spectroscopy (GC-MS):* The samples destined for analysis by GC-MS were dried under vacuum for a minimum of 18 h prior to being derivatized under dried nitrogen using bistrimethyl-silyltrifluoroacetamide. Derivatized samples were separated on a 5% diphenyl/95% dimethyl polysiloxane fused silica column (20 m x 0.18 mm ID; 0.18 um film thickness) with helium as a carrier gas and a temperature ramp from 60° to 340°C in a 17.5 min period. Samples were analyzed on a Thermo-Finnigan Trace DSQ fast-scanning single-quadrupole mass spectrometer using electron impact ionization (EI) and operated at unit mass resolving power. The scan range was from 50–750 m/z. Raw data files are archived and extracted as described below.

**Quality assurance/quality control:** Several types of controls were analyzed in concert with the experimental samples: a pooled matrix sample generated by taking a small volume of each experimental sample (or alternatively, use of a pool of well-characterized human plasma) served as a technical replicate throughout the data set; extracted water samples served as process blanks; and a cocktail of QC standards that were carefully chosen not to interfere with the measurement of endogenous compounds were spiked into every analyzed sample, allowed instrument performance monitoring and aided chromatographic alignment. Instrument variability was determined by calculating the median relative standard deviation (RSD) for the standards that were added to each sample prior to injection into the mass spectrometers. Overall process variability was determined by calculating the median RSD for all endogenous metabolites (i.e., non-instrument standards) present in 100% of the pooled matrix samples. Experimental samples were randomized across the platform run with QC samples spaced evenly among the injections.

*Data extraction and compound identification:* Raw data was extracted, peak-identified, and QC processed using Metabolon's hardware and software. These systems are built on a web-service platform utilizing Microsoft's.NET technologies, which run on high-performance application servers and fiber-channel storage arrays in clusters to provide active failover and load-balancing. Compounds were identified by comparison to library entries

of purified standards or recurrent unknown entities. Metabolon maintains a library based on authenticated standards that contain the retention time/index (RI), mass to charge ratio (*m/z)*, and chromatographic data (including MS/MS spectral data) on all molecules present in the library. Furthermore, biochemical identifications are based on 3 criteria: retention index within a narrow RI window of the proposed identification, accurate mass match to the library +/- 0.005 amu, and the MS/MS forward and reverse scores between the experimental data and authentic standards. The MS/MS scores are based on a comparison of the ions present in the experimental spectrum to the ions present in the library spectrum. While there may be similarities between these molecules based on one of these factors, the use of all 3 data points can be utilized to distinguish and differentiate biochemicals. More than 3300 commercially available purified standard compounds have been acquired and registered into LIMS for distribution to both the LC-MS and GC-MS platforms for the determination of their analytical characteristics. Additional mass spectral entries have been created for structurally unnamed biochemicals, which have been identified by virtue of their recurrent nature (both chromatographic and mass spectral). These compounds have the potential to be identified by the future acquisition of a matching purified standard or by classical structural analysis.

*Curation:* A variety of curation procedures were carried out to ensure that a high-quality data set was made available for statistical analysis and data interpretation. The QC and curation processes were designed to ensure accurate and consistent identification of true chemical entities and to remove those representing system artifacts, misassignments, and background noise. Metabolon data analysts use proprietary visualization and interpretation software to confirm the consistency of peak identification among the various samples. Library matches for each compound were checked for each sample and corrected if necessary.

*Metabolite quantification and data normalization:* Peaks were quantified using area-under-the-curve. For studies spanning multiple days, a data normalization step was performed to correct variation resulting from instrument inter-day tuning differences. Essentially, each compound was corrected in run-day blocks by registering the medians to equal one (1.00) and normalizing each data point proportionately (termed the "block correction"). For studies that did not require more than one day of analysis, no normalization is necessary, other than for purposes of data visualization. In certain instances, biochemical data may have been normalized to an additional factor (e.g., cell counts, total protein as determined by Bradford assay, osmolality, etc.) to account for differences in metabolite levels due to differences in the amount of material present in each sample.

# **Methodology for the quantitation of 2-DG-6P using LC-MS/MS**

**Chemicals and reagents:** 2-deoxy-D-Glucose-6-phosphate (sodium salt)standard was obtained from Cayman [\(Ann Arbor, MI\)](https://www.google.com/search?rlz=1C1JZAP_enIN937IN938&sxsrf=APq-WBugRiF5kPxGTk5UIlh7AgJ7cgOB7g:1645367800833&q=Ann+Arbor&stick=H4sIAAAAAAAAAOPgE-LSz9U3KE_KMUo2UmIHszOMtYwyyq30k_NzclKTSzLz8_Tzi9IT8zKrEkGcYquM1MSUwtLEopLUomKFnPxksPAiVk7HvDwFx6Kk_KIdrIwA-WvIT1oAAAA&sa=X&ved=2ahUKEwi3_qvawI72AhUgFzQIHYovAXMQmxMoAHoECBoQAg) and isotopically labeled 2-deoxy-D-[UL-13C6]glucose-6-phosphate, used as an internal standard (ISTD), were purchased from Omicron Biochemicals Inc (South Bend, IN). Acetonitrile (HPLC-grade), Formic acid, Hexane, MS grade water and Methanol were purchased from Sigma Aldrich (St Louis, MO).

**Experiments:** Concentrated stock solutions of 2-deoxy-D-Glucose-6-phosphate (2DG-6P)(10 μg/mL) and the ISTD (250 μg/mL) were prepared in a 1:1 water:acetonitrile solution. Working solutions were prepared in matrix ranged from 4–1000 ng/mL for 2 DG-6P. An ISTD working solution (0.625 ng/mL) was prepared in the extraction solvent 1:1 Water: acetonitrile containing 1% formic acid. Calibration curve standards were prepared in duplicate for absolute concentration, while QC and blank (non-spiked) samples were prepared in Triplicates.

**Sample Preparation and extraction:** Sample preparation for Quantitation of 2-DG-6P from Spinal cord sample [25mg each] for performed using the following in-house method for extraction. Liquid nitrogen frozen samples were crushed with Mini Mortar and Pestle to a fine powder, followed by addition 300 ul of 1:1 Water: Acetonitrile solution and vigorous vertexing for 60 seconds twice. 10 ul of ISTD (<sup>13</sup>C-2DG-6P) stock (1ug/mL) was added in the above mixture for recovery and matrix effect. Samples were further sonicated in water bath for 30 seconds followed by centrifugation for 15 minutes at 15,000g at 4°C. The upper phase (~250 µl) containing the extracted matrix was transferred into fresh tubes, followed by addition of an equal amount of LCMS grade Hexane, followed by collection of aqueous layer (~200 µl) into fresh tubes. Collected liquid were dried completely by

nitrogen gas at 37°C. The dried residue was resuspended in 100 µl diluent (Waters: Acetonitrile), vortexed and centrifuge (15 minutes at 15,000g at 4°C), and placed in an autosampler vial for LC-MS analysis.

**LC-MS/MS instrumentation and conditions:** Waters UPLC connected to Acquity TQD mass spectrometry was employed for method development including the LC method optimization, ionization, and fragmentation tests. UPLC was configured with a binary pump, a thermostatted column compartment, and a temperature controlled autosampler. The binary pump was used to transport mobile phase A (Water 5mM ammonium acetate + 0.1% liquid ammonia) and B (Methanol +0.1% liquid ammonia) at a flow rate of 0.3 ml/min in gradient mode. Best separation of 2-DG-6P was achieved using UPLC with auto sampler with reversed-phase waters XBridge BEH Amide Column, 130Å, 3.5 µm, 4.6 mm X 150 mm with in-line filter and guard kept at 50 °C. Mobile phase linear gradient A and B was programed and described in Table 2 for 2DG-6P separation. The flowrate was set to 500 ul/min with an overall runtime of 6 minutes. The autosampler was maintained at  $4^{\circ}$ C, and the injection volume was 5 ul with total running time of 7 minutes.

TQD mass spectrometry was operated at Electrospray Ionization mode. The column effluent was monitored by negative ion electrospray (ESI- ) using multiple reaction monitoring (MRM). The primary and confirmatory MRM transitions used for 2DG-6P and its ISTD, with their respective optimized settings, are listed in Table 1. The parameters for TQD mass spectrometry equipped with a ESI probe: Capillary: voltage, 3.5 kV for negative mode: Source temp : 120 °C :Desolvation temp: 450 °C; Cone gas flow: 150 L/Hr : Desolvation gas flow:1000 L/Hr Collision gas flow: 0.25 mL/min and Nebulizer gas flow: 7 Bar. For 2DG-6P quantification, peak area ratios (PARs) of the analyte peak area to the ISTD peak were calculated. The calibration curve, prepared in control matrix, was constructed using PARs of the calibration samples by applying a one/concentration weighting (1/x) linear regression model. All QC sample concentrations were then calculated from their PARs against the calibration curve.

**Method validation: Limit of detection (LOD) and Lower Limit of Quantification (LLOQ):** Nine calibration standards ranging from 4-1000ng/ml was subjected to the full extraction procedure three times before analysis. The limit of detection (LOD) was defined as the 2DG6P concentration corresponding to the lowest calibration point, where signal to noise ratio (s/n) was three times greater than from the blank signal and lower limit of quantification was signal 10 times more compared to s/n with blank.



**Selected 2DG6P MRM transitions with parameters and chromatographic retention**.



**UPLC separation of DG6Pand its isotopically labeled internal standard (ISTD), using aXBridge BEH Amide Column, 130Å, 3.5 µm, 4.6 mm X 150 mm**



## **Optimized gradient run for separation and quantitation of 2-DG-6P in MRM mode**

**Data analysis:** Mass spectrometric data was acquired by MassLynx v4.2software. Quantification software: TargetLynxsoftware was used for preparing the calibration curve and absolute quantitation of 2DG6P in the samples. Analyte concentrations were calculated using a 1/x weighted linear regression analysis of the standard curve.

**Quantitative Performance:** The quantitative performance using this sample preparation and LC-MS method was excellent, achieving a LLOQ of 4 ng/mL for 2DG6P. Calibration curves were linear (r2 > 0.996) from 4.–1000 ng/mL with accuracies between 85–115% with CVs.

#### **Mouse and human primers sequences for qPCR** :

mGlut1 -F CAGTTCGGCTATAACACTGGTG mGlut1 -R GCCCCCGACAGAGAAGATG mHK2 -F CTTACCGTCTGGCTGACCAACAC mHK2 -R CTCCATTTCCACCTTCATCCTTCT mTPI -F CCAGGAAGTTCTTCGTTGGGG mTPI -R CAAAGTCGATGTAAGCGGTGG mPKM -F GCCGCCTGGACATTGACTC mPKM -R CCATGAGAGAAATTCAGCCGA mLDHA -F CATTGTCAAGTACAGTCCACACT mLDHA -R TTCCAATTACTCGGTTTTTGGGA mMCT1 -F GACCATTGTGGAATGCTGCCCT mMCT1 -R CGATGATGAGGATCACGCCACA

hSDHA -F GAGATGTGGTGTCTCGGTCCAT hSDHA -R GCTGTCTCTGAAATGCCAGGCA hSDHB -F GCAGTCCATAGAAGAGCGTGAG hSDHB -R TGTCTCCGTTCCACCAGTAGCT hSDHC -F GGTTCAAACCGTCCTCTGTCTC hSDHC -R CGACATGCCAAAAAGAGAGACCC hSDHD -F GCAGCACATACACTTGTCACCG hSDHD -R GGGAATAGTCCATCGCAGAGCA hLDHA -F GGATCTCCAACATGGCAGCCTT hLDHA -R AGACGGCTTTCTCCCTCTTGCT hLDHB -F GGACAAGTTGGTATGGCGTGTG hLDHB -R AAGCTCCCATGCTGCAGATCCA hME1 -F GGAGTTGCTCTTGGTGTTGTGG hME1 -R GGATAAAGCCGACCCTCTTCCA hME2 -F ATCCTACAGCACAGGCAGAGTG hME2 -R TGACCTGGTGTAAAGACTCGCC hME3 -F AATGCCTTCCGCCTGCTCAACA hME3 -R TGGTGATTCGCAGAGCAGCCAA hMDH1 -F CGGTGTCCTAATGGAACTGCAAG hMDH1 -R CATCCAGGTCTTTGAAGGCAACG hMDH2 -F CTGGACATCGTCAGAGCCAACA hMDH2 -R GGATGATGGTCTTCCCAGCATG

#### **References:**

- 1. Mangalam A*, et al.* (2013) Profile of circulatory metabolites in a relapsing-remitting animal model of multiple sclerosis using global metabolomics. *J. Clin. Cell. Immunol.* 4: 1000150.
- 2. Mangalam AK*, et al.* (2016) AMP-Activated Protein Kinase Suppresses Autoimmune Central Nervous System Disease by Regulating M1- Type Macrophage-Th17 Axis. *J Immunol* 197(3):747-760.
- 3. Poisson LM*, et al.* (2015) Untargeted Plasma Metabolomics Identifies Endogenous Metabolite with Drug-like Properties in Chronic Animal Model of Multiple Sclerosis. *The Journal of biological chemistry* 290(52):30697-30712.
- 4. Khan MB*, et al.* (2015) Remote ischemic postconditioning: harnessing endogenous protection in a murine model of vascular cognitive impairment. *Transl Stroke Res* 6(1):69-77.
- 5. Vaibhav K*, et al.* (2018) Remote ischemic post-conditioning promotes hematoma resolution via AMPK-dependent immune regulation. *J Exp Med* 215(10):2636-2654.