

Review

Monoclonal gammopathies of renal significance[☆]

Fernando Caravaca-Fontán^{a,*}, Eduardo Gutiérrez^a, Ramón Delgado Lillo^b,
Manuel Praga^a

^a Servicio de Nefrología, Hospital Universitario 12 de Octubre, Madrid, Spain

^b Servicio de Nefrología, Hospital Ruber Juan Bravo, Madrid, Spain

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received 16 December 2016

Accepted 14 March 2017

Available online 27 September 2017

Keywords:

Chronic kidney disease

Glomerulonephritis

Monoclonal gammopathy of renal significance

Monoclonal protein

ABSTRACT

The term monoclonal gammopathy of renal significance (MGRS) comprises a group of diseases pathogenetically characterised by proliferation of a B-cell or plasma cell clone that synthesises and secretes a monoclonal immunoglobulin or its components (light and/or heavy chains), that may deposit and cause glomerular, tubular, interstitial and/or vascular damage. The importance of differentiating the term MGRS from other monoclonal gammopathies lies in the fact that diagnostic and therapeutic procedures aimed at controlling monoclonal protein synthesis and secretion can be indicated, irrespective of the classic criteria based on malignant tumour expansion. Renal pathology associated with MGRS is highly heterogeneous, and therefore renal biopsy should be considered a key diagnostic tool. A precise diagnostic approach, however, must also identify the monoclonal protein in plasma and/or in urine, together with a complete haematological study in order to determine the nature and extension of cell clones. Recent advances in the understanding of these entities have resulted in significant improvements in clinical course and survival in several forms of MGRS, although more studies and clinical experience are needed in order to delineate more effective therapeutic strategies. In this review, we summarise the main clinical and pathological features of MGRS, highlighting the most appropriate diagnostic approach and current therapeutic options.

© 2017 Sociedad Española de Nefrología. Published by Elsevier España, S.L.U. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

DOI of original article:

<http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.nefro.2017.03.012>.

* Please cite this article as: Caravaca-Fontán F, Gutiérrez E, Delgado Lillo R, Praga M. Gammopathías monoclonales de significado renal. Nefrología. 2017;37:465–477.

* Corresponding author.

E-mail address: fcaravacaf@gmail.com (F. Caravaca-Fontán).

2013-2514/© 2017 Sociedad Española de Nefrología. Published by Elsevier España, S.L.U. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Gammapatías monoclonales de significado renal

RESUMEN

Palabras clave:

Enfermedad renal crónica
Gammapatía monoclonal de significado renal
Glomerulonefritis
Proteína monoclonal

Bajo el término gammapatías monoclonales de significado renal (GMSR) se engloban un conjunto de enfermedades que se caracterizan patogénicamente por la proliferación de un clon de linfocitos B o células plasmáticas que sintetizan y segregan una inmunoglobulina monoclonal o uno de sus componentes (cadenas ligeras o pesadas), con capacidad para depositarse y producir daño a nivel glomerular, tubular, intersticial o vascular. La importancia de discriminar el término GMSR radica en poder indicar procedimientos diagnósticos y terapéuticos dirigidos al control de la síntesis y secreción de las proteínas monoclonales independientemente de los criterios clásicos vinculados con la expansión tumoral maligna. La patología renal asociada a las GMSR es muy heterogénea, lo que confiere a la biopsia renal una consideración de prueba diagnóstica clave. La correcta investigación diagnóstica de una GMSR debe incluir, además, la identificación en plasma u orina de la proteína monoclonal y un estudio hematológico completo que determine la naturaleza y extensión del clon celular. Los avances en el conocimiento de estas entidades han permitido mejorar el curso evolutivo y la supervivencia en varias formas de GMSR, aunque son necesarios más estudios y experiencia clínica para delinejar protocolos terapéuticos más efectivos. En la presente revisión se resumen las principales características clínico-patológicas de las GMSR, se detalla la aproximación diagnóstica más adecuada, así como las opciones terapéuticas disponibles en el momento actual.

© 2017 Sociedad Española de Nefrología. Publicado por Elsevier España, S.L.U. Este es un artículo Open Access bajo la licencia CC BY-NC-ND (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>).

Introduction

Several clinical entities are grouped under the name monoclonal gammopathies (MGs). They share a clonal proliferation of B-cells or plasma cells with the capacity to produce and secrete large amounts of a unique type of immunoglobulin or a constituent part of it (monoclonal component). The monoclonal component may be constituted of a heavy chain (normally γ chain and, less frequently, α , μ , δ , ϵ chains) along with a light chain (κ or λ), isolated light chains and, in exceptional circumstances, only heavy chains.¹

The range of diseases, clinical manifestations and adverse health effects and persistence of entities is not only related to neoplastic cell proliferation, but also to the damage produced by the deposit of these monoclonal proteins in different organs, or through more complex pathogenic mechanisms, including autoimmunity, inflammation and fibrogenesis.²⁻⁴

In 2003, the International Myeloma Working Group² revised the criteria for the diagnosis and classification of the clinical entities that are grouped under the term MG. In accordance with these criteria, there are four different entities:

1. MG of undetermined significance (MGUS): monoclonal component $<30\text{ g/l}$, with proliferation of plasma cells in bone marrow ($<10\%$) and lack of clinical evidence of myeloma, lymphoma or amyloidosis.
2. Asymptomatic or quiescent myeloma: monoclonal component $\geq30\text{ g/l}$, with proliferation of bone marrow plasma cells $\geq10\%$, but without evidence of organs or tissues involvement and, absence of the typical tetrad of hypercalcaemia, renal involvement, anaemia and bone lesions.

3. Symptomatic myeloma which requires involvement of organs or tissues and which can also present as non-secretory (with no secretory component of monoclonal proteins). In 2014, the following additional criteria were incorporated: the presence of $\geq60\%$ plasma cells in bone marrow, a involved/uninvolved serum free light chain ratio ≥100 , or the existence of more than one focal lesion using advanced imaging techniques (computed tomography [CT], magnetic resonance imaging [MRI] or positron emission tomography with ^{18}F -fluorodeoxyglucose [PET-CT]).⁵
4. Solitary bone plasmacytoma, extramedullary plasmacytoma and multiple solitary plasmacytomas.

Approximately 60% of all MGs are MGUS.⁶ In MGUS, a clone of B-cells or plasma cells, which are generally not neoplastic, produces and secretes small quantities of a monoclonal immunoglobulin or its components (light or heavy chains).^{7,8}

This entity is a relatively common finding in the adult population (prevalence of 0.7% in the general population, increasing to 3% in those over the age of 50 and to 5% in those above the age of 70),⁸ with an annual standardised incidence of 4–15 cases per 100,000 according to different studies,^{9,10} but which may peak at 169 cases per 100,000 in individuals older than 80.¹⁰

It is estimated that in MGUSs there is neoplastic transformation (myeloma or lymphoma) in 1% annually.¹¹⁻¹³ The factors which have proven to be determinant risk factors for neoplastic transformation are the following¹¹⁻¹³: abnormal kappa (κ) to lambda (λ) free light chains ratio, different monoclonal immunoglobulin component (light or heavy chains) or of IgA type, and monoclonal protein concentration $\geq15\text{ g/l}$. If these three factors are present, the risk of neoplastic

progression reaches 58% in 20 years, while it is only 5% if none of these characteristics is present.¹³

In addition to the risk of neoplastic transformation, it has been demonstrated that these patients are also three to five times more likely to suffer from kidney diseases,¹⁴ and it has been observed in some studies that 23% of patients with light-chain MGUS have kidney disease.¹⁵

In the 1980s, there were already reports that the pathological scope of an MGUS was not only limited to neoplastic transformation, but that the synthesis and secretion of monoclonal (M) proteins could also cause other pathological processes with systemic effects which may develop by different pathogenic mechanisms.^{16–18} The kidney is one of the most commonly involved organs in the clinical course of an MGUS.

Renal involvement is very common in symptomatic myeloma, while the main pathogenic mechanism of myeloma-associated nephropathy is intratubular precipitation of monoclonal proteins produced by neoplastic cells ("cylinder nephropathy").^{19–22} In this case, the secretion of large quantities of the M-protein are required to produce a massive precipitation, and the pathogenic key in this nephropathy is conditioned by the high burden and aggressiveness of the tumour.^{21,22}

Descriptions of different pathological renal processes related to MGs have been increasingly reported. This led to the term MG of renal significance (MGRS)^{1,23–28} being adopted in order to distinguish and remove the uncertainty that exists on the benign progression of other MGs.

The importance of differentiating the term MGRS lies mainly in indicating targeted diagnostic and therapeutic procedures to control the synthesis and secretion of M-proteins — if it is confirmed that these are pathogenically linked to the nephropathy — irrespective of the classic haematological criteria which are more closely linked to the spread of the malignant tumour.^{3,4,22,26}

In this review, the main clinical-pathological characteristics of MGRSs are described, the most appropriate diagnostic approach is detailed and the therapeutic advances and future perspectives are also discussed.

Kidney disease associated with monoclonal gammopathies

Kidney disease associated with MGRSs is highly heterogeneous, which means that the renal biopsy is considered a key diagnostic test.^{1,22,25–28} However, the concomitant presence of kidney disease of another aetiology may make the correct histological interpretation difficult in some cases and be a confounding factor.²⁵

For a correct investigation and interpretation of the findings, the optical microscopy must be accompanied of immunofluorescence with a panel of antibodies against light chains and immunoglobulin isotypes, electron microscopy (EM), must also be performed as well.^{4,22,25,29} In some cases, more sensitive but complex techniques should also be used, such as immunolectron microscopy (IEM),³⁰ or laser microdissection followed by proteomic mass spectrometry,^{31–34} to confirm the composition of the deposits and where they are located.

Immunofluorescence is crucial in the diagnosis to establish the pathogenic link to blood dyscrasia and, therefore, the use of anti- (κ and λ) light-chain antibodies should be compulsory practice in the histological study of any renal biopsy.²⁵

In cases in which there is no usable kidney tissue in the frozen sample for immunofluorescence, it is possible to carry out "rescue" techniques of the sample in paraffin (Pronase treatment) with a high likelihood of success for the immunohistochemical detection of light chains.³⁵

Different methods to classify the MGRSs have been proposed.^{1,4} One method considers the predominant location of the kidney damage (glomerular, tubular or mixed),¹ although in practice it is not uncommon for more than one entity to overlap in the same biopsy.^{36–39} In Tables 1–3, the main clinical entities and their histological findings are summarised according to the extent of the damage.

The most accepted classification of lesions associated with MGRS is based on the distinction of the structure of deposits or inclusions according to whether these show an "organised" or "non-organised" configuration^{4,25} (Table 4).

"Organised" deposits are subdivided into: fibrils, microtubules and crystals or inclusions.

The pathological processes associated with fibrils are: immunoglobulin-related amyloidosis (of light chains, heavy chains or mixtures of light and heavy chains)^{4,25,40–43} and fibrillary glomerulonephritis.^{4,33,44,45}

When the microstructure of the deposits adopts a microtubular structure, two entities can be distinguished^{4,25}: immunotactoid glomerulonephritis, also known as glomerulonephritis with organised microtubules and monoclonal immunoglobulin deposits,^{33,44,46} and type 1 cryoglobulinaemia-associated glomerulonephritis.^{33,47–51}

The crystal and inclusion deposits^{4,25} produce a predominantly tubular and interstitial disease, and two subtypes can be distinguished: proximal tubulopathy (with or without Fanconi syndrome)^{52–54} and histiocytosis with crystals stores,^{51,55–59} in which the crystal deposits are not found in the tubular epithelial cells, but instead inside the histiocytes.¹ Cases of acute interstitial nephritis unrelated to the crystal deposits or intratubular precipitation of cylinders have also been reported, but with light chain deposits shown in the tubular basement membranes.⁶⁰

Disease entities with "non-organised" deposits include: Randall-type monoclonal immunoglobulin deposit disease (disease caused by deposits of light chains, heavy chains or a combination of both)^{25,61–63}; proliferative glomerulonephritis with monoclonal immunoglobulin deposits^{17,25,64–68} and monoclonal gammopathy-associated C3 glomerulopathy (C3G).^{69–74} In the case of proliferative glomerulonephritis with monoclonal immunoglobulin deposits, involvement is limited to the glomerulus, while in monoclonal immunoglobulin deposit disease there is extraglomerular and, frequently, extrarenal involvement.⁴

In addition to these processes, there are reports suggesting a possible pathogenic involvement of MG in other glomerulopathies, such as membranous GN,^{75,76} focal segmental glomerulosclerosis,⁷⁷ pauci-immune extracapillary glomerulonephritis,⁷⁸ C4 proliferative glomerulonephritis⁷⁹ and in thrombotic microangiopathies.^{79–83}

Table 1 – Histological patterns of glomerular damage.

Glomerular disease	Clinical manifestations	Optical microscopy	Immunofluorescence	Electron microscopy
Proliferative glomerulonephritis with monoclonal Ig deposits	Proteinuria, variable microhaematuria, hypertension. Kidney disease. Frequent C3 hypocomplementaemia	MPGN. Less common: mesangial proliferative, crescentic, sclerosing or diffuse proliferative	IgG (G3 > G1 > G2) with restriction of κ or λ light chains in mesangium and capillary wall. Less common: IgM or IgA. C3 or C1q deposits.	Double image of glomerular capillaries' profile. Mesangial and subendothelial electron-dense deposits. Less common: subepithelial or intramembranous
Type 1 cryoglobulinaemia-associated glomerulonephritis	Arthralgia, arthritis, purpura, neuropathy. Proteinuria, microhaematuria, kidney disease. Frequent hypertension. Frequent C3 and C4 hypocomplementaemia	MPGN or endocapillary proliferative glomerulonephritis. PAS+ intraluminal deposits	Granular deposits in mesangium and capillaries. Monoclonal IgG, IgM or IgA deposits (more common with κ chains). C3, C4 or C1q deposits.	Subendothelial and intracapillary deposits. Frequently organised in fibrils, microtubules or "in fingerprint".
Fibrillary glomerulonephritis	Nephrotic proteinuria, microhaematuria and kidney disease. Rarely a rapidly progressive course	Mesangial proliferation or MPGN. Sometimes presence of crescents. Congo red negative	IgG (G4 and G1) most commonly polyclonal	10–30 nm fibrils with random orientation in mesangium and capillaries
Immunotactoid glomerulopathy	Nephrotic proteinuria, microhaematuria and kidney disease. Often associated with chronic lymphocytic leukaemia or lymphocytic lymphoma	MPGN or membranous glomerulonephritis. Less common: proliferative endocapillary	IgG (most common IgG1) with restriction of κ or λ light chains. C3 deposits.	30–90 nm microtubules with subendothelial or subepithelial deposits
C3 glomerulopathy/atypical haemolytic uraemic syndrome associated with monoclonal gammopathy	By indirect deregulation of the complement system's alternative pathway. Proteinuria, nephrotic syndrome, microhaematuria, kidney disease, thrombotic microangiopathy	MPGN, proliferative endocapillary, mesangial or crescentic glomerulonephritis. Arterial thrombosis or glomerular capillaries	Intense deposits of C3 in mesangium and capillaries. Absence or lack of other reactants. Pronase treatment may be required to detect monoclonal Ig.	Mesangial, intramembranous and subendothelial deposits in C3GN, and mesangial and intramembranous in DDD

C3GN: C3 glomerulonephritis; DDD: dense deposit disease; Ig: immunoglobulin; MPGN: membranoproliferative glomerulonephritis; PAS: periodic acid-Schiff.

Adapted from: Sethi et al.¹ and Bridoux et al.⁴

Clinical presentation

MGRSs may show a wide range of manifestations, depending on the underlying pathogenic mechanism and the primary site of involvement.^{1,3,4} In the majority of cases, the deposit of M-proteins is responsible for the kidney disease, while in other cases it is caused indirectly through a deregulation of the complement system's alternative pathway, resulting in C3G,^{1,3,4,71} or, more rarely, in atypical haemolytic uraemic syndrome.⁸¹ Thus, the monoclonal component would be able to interfere with the regulatory proteins of the complement system, acting as miniautoantibodies against factor H,^{73,74} or as a C3 nephritic factor, which stabilises the C3 convertase of the alternative pathway and maintains its hyperactivation.^{1,70,71}

The structural and chemical characteristics of each specific M-protein, and the inflammatory response of each individual,

seem to be key to determine the type of kidney damage being produced.^{18,84} High-molecular-weight proteins, such as immunoglobulins (formed by heavy and light chains), do not cross the filtration barrier and are deposited in the glomerulus which triggers an inflammatory processes. In contrast, light chains are able to cross the filtration barrier and generate a variety of tubular damage.

Renal involvement is often the first manifestation of blood dyscrasias.²⁶ According to the different series, the age of diagnosis tends to be over 50. The disease of monoclonal immunoglobulin deposits is more common in males and proliferative glomerulonephritis with monoclonal immunoglobulin deposits is more common in women.^{63,66,85}

Within the clinical manifestations of MGRSs, it is common to find different degrees of proteinuria, which may reach the nephrotic range, together with microhaematuria and hypertension in certain cases. Renal failure is detected in a high

Table 2 – Histological patterns of tubular damage.

Tubular disease	Clinical manifestations	Optical microscopy	Immunofluorescence	Electron microscopy
Cylinder nephropathy	Associated with MM in 90% of cases. Acute deterioration of kidney function or progressive course. Presence of light chains in blood or urine	Presence of eosinophilic cylinders in H&E stain, negative in PAS, with intense surrounding inflammatory reaction (neutrophils, lymphocytes). More common in distal tubule	Intense staining for a light chain (κ or λ)	Intratubular electron-dense material
Light chain proximal tubulopathy	Proteinuria and deterioration of kidney function. Fanconi syndrome sometimes associated with glycosuria, aminoaciduria and phosphaturia	Cytoplasmic inclusions in proximal tubular epithelium (crystalline or non-crystalline). Normal glomeruli. May be associated with tubular atrophy and interstitial fibrosis	Restriction for κ light chain in crystalline forms. Pronase treatment is sometimes required to detect light chains	Rectangular or rhomboidal crystals in lysosomes or free in the cytoplasm. In the non-crystalline forms, increased lysosomes with mottled appearance
Crystal-storing histiocytosis	Non-nephrotic proteinuria or complete nephrotic syndrome. Kidney disease. There may also be medullary, pulmonary or corneal deposits. Associated most frequently with MM and lymphoproliferative processes	Predominantly interstitial infiltration of histiocytes with eosinophilic inclusions. Sometimes also in tubular epithelium and podocytes	Monoclonal Ig with restriction of κ light chain. Pronase treatment is sometimes required to detect light chains	Interstitial histiocytes filled with crystals. Less common in tubular epithelium and podocytes

H&E: haematoxylin and eosin; Ig: immunoglobulin; MM: multiple myeloma; MPGN: membranoproliferative glomerulonephritis; PAS: periodic acid-Schiff.

Adapted from: Sethi et al.¹ and Bridoux et al.⁴

Table 3 – Histological patterns of mixed glomerular and tubular damage.

Glomerular and tubular disease	Clinical manifestations	Optical microscopy	Immunofluorescence	Electron microscopy
Ig-related amyloidosis (AL, AH, AHL)	Proteinuria and nephrotic syndrome, with varying degrees of renal failure. Rare microhaematuria	PAS and silver-negative deposits in glomeruli, vessels and interstitium. Congo red positive	AL more common with λ or κ light chains. Heavy chains (γ), or heavy and light chains less common	10–30 nm fibrils with random orientation in glomeruli, vessels and interstitium
Monoclonal Ig deposition disease (disease from deposits of light or heavy chains or a mixture of both)	Proteinuria, nephrotic syndrome and kidney disease. Presence of light chains and albumin in urine. Variable extrarenal manifestations due to Ig deposits in other organs	MPGN pattern, mesangial proliferative or nodular sclerosis. Thickened glomerular and tubular basement membranes. Congo red negative	Diffuse linear staining for light chain, heavy chain or both in glomerular and tubular basement membrane. Most common light chain: κ ; Most common heavy chain: γ	Granular deposits in mesangium and glomerular and tubular basement membranes

AH: heavy-chain amyloidosis; AHL: heavy- and light-chain amyloidosis; AL: light-chain amyloidosis; Ig: immunoglobulin; MPGN: membranoproliferative glomerulonephritis; PAS: periodic acid-Schiff.

Adapted from: Sethi et al.¹ and Bridoux et al.⁴

percentage of patients at the time of diagnosis, which may progress to end-stage kidney disease.^{4,63,66,86} This is of particular importance given that the recurrence of some of these diseases in transplanted kidneys is very common.^{87–92} This fact illustrate the need for a correct diagnosis, even when it is unlikely to preserve the function of the native kidneys.

Extrarenal manifestations may also be presented, especially in cases of amyloidosis, monoclonal immunoglobulin deposition disease and type 1 cryoglobulinaemia, with involvement predominantly of the heart, liver, skin and

joints.^{1,4,93} The possibility of the disease spreading to other organs and tissues in patients diagnosed with amyloidosis should be investigated,⁴³ due to the common nature of cardiac involvement, which tends to be the main determinant of mortality.⁴³

Cases of osteomalacia secondary to Fanconi syndrome have also been reported.⁵²

Other systemic manifestations of an MG may be related to endothelial damage and systemic thrombotic microangiopathy associated with the secretion of vascular endothelial

Table 4 – Classification scheme of MGRS-associated disease according to the presence of organised or non-organised deposits.

Organised deposits	Fibrils	Ig-related amyloidosis (AL, AH, AHL) Fibrillary glomerulonephritis
	Microtubules	Immunotactoid glomerulonephritis Type 1 cryoglobulinaemic glomerulonephritis
	Crystals or inclusions	Proximal tubulopathy (with or without Fanconi syndrome) Crystal-storing histiocytosis
Non-organised deposits	Monoclonal Ig deposition disease (light or heavy chains or a mixture of both)	
	Proliferative glomerulonephritis with monoclonal Ig deposits	
	Monoclonal Ig-associated C3 glomerulonephritis	

AH: heavy-chain amyloidosis; AHL: heavy- and light-chain amyloidosis; AL: light-chain amyloidosis; Ig: immunoglobulin.

Source: A modified version of the original scheme by Bridoux et al.⁴

growth factor (VEGF), as occurs in POEMS syndrome (polyneuropathy, organomegaly, endocrinopathy, MG and skin lesions)⁹⁴ and scleromyxoedema.⁹⁵

Diagnosis of monoclonal gammopathies of renal significance

The appropriate diagnostic procedure of an MGRS should include, in addition to a renal biopsy, the demonstration and identification of MG in plasma or urine, a haematological study which determines the nature and extent of the cell clone causing the MG and, in some processes (e.g. amyloidosis), extension of the study to determine the spreading of the disease to other organs.^{4,25,26} The main techniques for the haematological and histological diagnosis are summarised in Table 5.

The diagnosis of a suspected MGRS is almost always established by associating renal involvement (deterioration of function, proteinuria, Fanconi syndrome or other metabolic abnormalities associated with tubulointerstitial dysfunction) together with the presence of a monoclonal peak in the electrophoretic spectrum.^{4,96,97}

In most cases, the diagnosis of MG is performed using conventional electrophoresis on plasma or urine.^{4,96} The presence of monoclonal immunoglobulins is usually identified by a tall narrow peak in the beta or gamma region, unlike polyclonal increase, which tends to create a wide band in the gamma region.⁹⁶

However, in some cases the concentration of monoclonal protein in plasma or urine is so small that electrophoresis is unable to detect it. In fact, some cases of renal involvement in MG are diagnosed mainly by the findings in the renal biopsy (immunohistochemistry), without being suspected when the biopsy was indicated.

In addition to conventional electrophoresis, plasma and urine immunofixation must be performed in all cases to identify the type of M-protein, as this is more sensitive than electrophoresis in detecting the M-protein.^{4,96,98}

Table 5 – Techniques for the haematological and renal histology diagnosis of MGRSs.

Diagnosis	Haematological	Renal histology
Recommended procedures	- Electrophoresis on plasma or urine - Immunofixation on plasma or urine - Free light chains in blood and urine - Bone marrow aspiration/biopsy	- Optical microscopy - Immunofluorescence with staining of light chains (κ and λ) and Pronase treatment in selected cases - Electron microscopy - Immunoelectron microscopy - Laser microdissection and mass spectrometry
Additional diagnostic procedures ^a	- Western blot technique for detection of IgG subclasses - Imaging test: CT, MRI or PET-CT - Lymph node biopsy	

CT: computed tomography; IgG: immunoglobulin G; MRI: magnetic resonance imaging; PET-CT: positron emission tomography with 18F-fluorodeoxyglucose.

^a Depending on the diagnostic suspicion and clinical course, as well as availability in the centre.

Another diagnostic method is the determination of free light chains (FLCs) in blood and urine.^{96,98–102} The concentration of these proteins can be measured by a nephelometric immunoassay using polyclonal antibodies targeting light chain epitopes, which are exposed when the chain is in its free form but hidden when the chain is bound, creating the structure of the Ig.⁹⁹

These measurements of FLCs are very sensitive, but the drawback is that they are not able to demonstrate the monoclonality of FLCs. This possibility is suggested indirectly by the ratio between the concentrations of the κ and λ chains.^{98,100}

An abnormal ratio of κ and λ concentrations should be interpreted more carefully in patients with deterioration of kidney function.^{4,102} There is a strong correlation between the FLC concentration and kidney function; as the glomerular filtration rate decreases, the polyclonal FLC concentrations, of both κ and λ increase. Furthermore, in patients with normal kidney function, the greater physiological production of polyclonal κ FLC is masked by the more rapid clearance of monomeric forms of κ FLC, compared to the larger dimeric λ forms. This is how a change is produced in the ratio of κ and λ FLC concentrations in the case of renal failure.^{4,102} When kidney function is normal, the range of this ratio ranges from 0.26 to 1.65, while when kidney failure is present, the ratio accepted as normal ranges between 0.37 and 3.17, however a range for each stage of kidney failure has not been established.¹⁰²

The difference in concentrations between FLCs is very useful not only for diagnosis, but also for follow-up and as a measure of the response to treatment. It is therefore recommended that it is monitored frequently.¹⁰³

FLCs are also currently included in the treatment response criteria for AL amyloidosis.¹⁰⁴ Therefore, a normalisation of the ratio of κ and λ concentrations, together with a negative result in the blood and urine immunofixation, is needed to be certain of a complete remission.

Using the FLCs measurement as an isolated test for detecting an MG is subject to debate¹⁰⁵ and, although it may be

useful to support the diagnosis of MG in myeloma, macroglobulinaemia and amyloidosis, the current recommendations state that electrophoresis (EP) and blood and urine immunofixation should be used for the diagnosis of MG.

More complex tests (western blot or electrotransfer) on blood and urine are required for the detection of some subclasses of immunoglobulins (IgG) or circulating monoclonal incomplete heavy chains. These tests are able to detect very small concentrations of monoclonal proteins with a high sensitivity,¹⁰⁶ unfortunately these techniques are not routinely available.

In order to confirm the diagnosis of MGRS, it is not only necessary to prove the pathogenic involvement of MG in the kidney, but, in addition, myeloma must be ruled out and the cell clone producing the M-protein must be characterised because its relevance in the design of the therapeutic strategy. The support of a Haematology Department is needed for this.^{3,4,107}

In cases of MGRS in which the renal biopsy shows IgG, IgA or LC, the bone marrow aspiration and biopsy use to be sufficient to demonstrate the clone using flow cytometry and immunohistochemical techniques.⁴ In addition, the spread of the bone tumour or the presence of solitary plasmacytoma should be ruled out with imaging techniques (CT, MRI or PET-CT).^{4,5} MRI is the technique with the greatest sensitivity in the detection of bone marrow infiltration, although it is laborious.⁵ PET-CT, on the other hand, is able to identify changes in the lesions throughout the follow up and avoids the use of intravenous contrast. However, it exposes patients to high levels of radiation and is more expensive.⁵

The possibility that a clone is from B-cells instead of from plasma cells should be suspected in patients with IgM MGRS. Then, the imaging study include areas suspected of hosting lymphadenopathies for biopsy.³

Treatment

The treatment strategies for MGRSs are based on chemotherapy that must be adapted to the nature of the cell clone, both for lymphocytes and plasma cells, to the kidney function and to the presence or non-presence of extrarenal involvement.^{22,107}

The rapid suppression of nephrotoxic monoclonal immunoglobulin has proven to be a treatment with satisfactory results on kidney function and patient survival in several forms of MGRS.¹⁰⁷ However, as will be emphasised later, more studies and clinical experience are required to obtain therapeutic protocols based on solid evidence.

The fundamental objective of treatment, except for the case of light chain amyloidosis, must be aimed at preserving kidney function.^{26,91,107,108} This means that patients with irreversible kidney damage would not be candidates to receive chemotherapy treatment, unless there is a desire to obtain complete haematological remission to prevent recurrence in a kidney transplant.¹⁰⁷

In 2013, the International Kidney and Monoclonal Gammopathy Working Group published a consensus document on the treatment regimens recommended for MGRSs, based on the clinical experience of the treatment of malignant

blood dyscrasias.¹⁰⁷ Table 6 summarises the group's main recommendations. However, given the heterogeneity of MGRS-associated diseases, there is uncertainty regarding the optimal treatment for some more complex presentations with a clinical experience that is limited to isolated case reports or small series of cases.^{53,64,70,71,77,109} Thus, different regimens have been used for fibrillary glomerulonephritis, including cyclophosphamide, mycophenolate mofetil, cyclosporine, melphalan, lenalidomide and rituximab, with limited results.^{44,45,110} Furthermore, treatment regimens similar to those used for proliferative glomerulonephritis with monoclonal immunoglobulin deposits have been used for monoclonal gammopathy-associated C3 glomerulopathy.^{70,71,107} However, the information available on the long-term prognosis of these processes using the current therapies is insufficient.²⁶

Due to the growing importance of MGRSs in clinical nephrology, it is essential to be aware of the main therapeutic agents which are currently used, their tolerance and the most common side effects. Many of these treatments are administered in a combined form due to the synergistic effect on the B-cells and plasma cells.¹¹¹ The main combinations include^{107,111,112}: bortezomib, cyclophosphamide and dexamethasone; bendamustine and rituximab, and immunomodulatory agents, such as thalidomide and lenalidomide.

Bortezomib has a pivotal role within the therapeutic arsenal because of its safety profile and the possibility of being administered in full doses to patients with advanced kidney disease.¹¹²⁻¹¹⁴ The mechanism of action is based on the inhibition of proteasome activity, which produces apoptosis of the plasma cell and also inhibits the NF-κB pathway by reducing the release of proinflammatory cytokines and inducing anti-apoptotic pathways at the tubular level.¹¹⁵⁻¹¹⁷ Usually the side effects are not serious; it causes development or worsening of peripheral neuropathy, although this is less common when the route of administration is subcutaneous.¹¹⁸ Prophylaxis against herpes zoster is also recommended due to the risk of reactivation.¹¹¹

Among the cytotoxic agents, both melphalan and cyclophosphamide have an effect on B-cells and plasma cells, however cyclophosphamide is used more frequently because it is less toxic.^{107,111} Another alternative is bendamustine, approved for the treatment of some lymphomas and suitable for patients with renal failure since it is predominantly metabolised in the liver.¹¹⁹⁻¹²¹

Melphalan is used in myeloablative doses as a conditioning therapy for autologous haematopoietic stem cell transplantation in selected cases with no significant extrarenal disease.^{107,111} This autologous transplant has been proven to improve survival of patients with multiple myeloma and light chain amyloidosis. However, in practice less than 20% of patients are suitable candidates for this treatment, which is associated with high morbidity and mortality.^{86,122-124}

Monoclonal antibodies such as rituximab (targeting the CD20 antigen) are a suitable therapeutic option in the different forms of B-cell mediated MGRS, because of their good tolerance and limited number of side effects.^{107,111,112} The use of daratumumab (targeting CD38) for relapsed or refractory myeloma has been approved.¹²⁵ However, experience on its use in cases of MGRS is currently lacking.

Table 6 – Therapeutic regimens proposed for MGRSs.

Disease	Treatment
Proliferative glomerulonephritis with monoclonal Ig deposits	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 1–2 CKD, proteinuria <1 g/day: observation • Stage 1–2 CKD with proteinuria >1 g/day, progressive CKD or stage 3–4 CKD: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Cyclophosphamide + bortezomib + dexamethasone if IgG or IgA - Rituximab ± cyclophosphamide + dexamethasone if IgM - If <65 years: high-dose melphalan following an HSCT • Stage 5 CKD candidate for kidney transplant: high-dose melphalan + HSCT
Type 1 cryoglobulinaemia-associated glomerulonephritis	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Paucisymptomatic or low-grade B-cell proliferation: observation • Symptomatic: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> - Plasmacytic clone: bortezomib + cyclophosphamide ± thalidomide - Lymphoplasmacytic clone: rituximab - Alternative: bendamustine
Immunotactoid glomerulopathy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Treatment regimens similar to those employed in CLL, based on cyclophosphamide or bendamustine ± rituximab • For isolated gammopathy, treatment regimen based on bortezomib
Ig-related amyloidosis (AL, AH, AHL)	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Classification in three stages according to the increase in levels of NT-proBNP and troponin • Stage 1–2: melphalan or cyclophosphamide + dexamethasone + bortezomib • Stage 3: cyclophosphamide + dexamethasone + bortezomib • Heart transplant if cardiac involvement; HSCT in selected cases
Monoclonal Ig deposition disease	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 1–3 CKD: cyclophosphamide + bortezomib + dexamethasone, with subsequent HSCT in selected cases. Alternative: bendamustine • Stages 4–5 CKD: cyclophosphamide + bortezomib + dexamethasone + HSCT if candidate for kidney transplant
Light chain proximal tubulopathy	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Stage 1–3 CKD: cyclophosphamide, bortezomib or thalidomide + HSCT in selected cases • Stage 4–5 CKD: HSCT if they are candidates for a kidney transplant. If not, conservative management

AH: heavy-chain amyloidosis; AHL: heavy- and light-chain amyloidosis; AL: light-chain amyloidosis; CKD: chronic kidney disease; HSCT: haematopoietic stem cell transplantation; Ig: immunoglobulin; NT-proBNP: N-terminal pro-brain natriuretic peptide.

Source: Adapted from original by Fermand et al.¹⁰⁷

Within the family of immunomodulatory drugs, thalidomide would be more suitable than lenalidomide, due to the fact that the latter is excreted by the kidneys and can also cause kidney function deterioration in some cases.^{126–128} However, side effects have also been reported with thalidomide, such as the development of hyperkalaemia.¹²⁹

Conclusions

MGRSs are associated with a wide range of kidney diseases resulting from the depositions of immunoglobulin or of its components in the kidneys, or through the deregulation of the complement system. Although the mortality of patients with MGRS is lower than that of myeloma or other related neoplastic forms, the likelihood of developing advanced chronic kidney disease is very high. For this reason, when evaluating patients with suspected MGRS it is necessary to conduct complete anatomopathological, haematological and biochemical studies. These studies allow to determine the type of entity and the extension of the disease. Advances in the understanding of these entities have made it possible to improve the clinical course and survival in several forms of MGRS. However, more studies and clinical experience are necessary to design more effective therapeutic protocols. It is a priority the close collaboration between nephrologists and haematologists to individualise the treatment to the clinical characteristics and comorbidity of patients, in an attempt to improve the overall prognosis of these diseases.

The incidence and prevalence of this group of diseases in the Spanish population is not currently known. There are few cases published.¹³⁰ According to the clinical experience,

these diseases are not frequent, but so far no epidemiological studies have been conducted which confirm these assessments. Furthermore, as they are rare diseases, but requiring a complex study, the diagnosis might end up being less appropriate or incomplete in patients attended to in many hospitals which do not have the necessary non-conventional diagnostic tools. Nevertheless the implementation of these tools in all hospitals does not seem to be an efficient measure. Therefore, the creation of centres of excellence and diagnostic-therapeutic reference for these types of diseases could be an appropriate investment to benefit from the health care, academic and economic value.

GLOSEN study proposal

In 2009, an international group for research into MGRSs was created. Nephrology, haematology and anatomical pathology departments from several countries participate in the group.^{4,26,107} The studies and publications by the members of this research group are currently recognised as the forefront of research into these diseases, with very significant diagnostic and therapeutic advances. The incorporation of Spanish groups into this international group could result in mutual benefits, such as training and transfer of experience to Spanish members, as well as the incorporation of Spanish centres and patients into international clinical trials.

All of these reasons could justify the creation of a national MGRS register which would help to research the clinical-pathological characteristics of these entities, and to identify evolutionary and response determinants to current treatments.

We believe that the 'Grupo de Estudio de la Patología Glomerular de la Sociedad Española de Nefrología' [Glomerular Disease Study Group of the Spanish Society of Nephrology] (GLOSEN) may be the ideal framework to lead a study of these characteristics, given its ample experience in conducting collaborative projects.^{131–133}

As an initial project, it is proposed to collect retrospectively all diagnosed cases of MGRS with renal biopsy during recent years from the different centres taking part in the study. Although a work proposal will be sent to all members of the group soon, we are hereby launching a message to attract the interest of all nephrologists and pathologists interested in glomerular diseases, and requesting their collaboration in the study.

Conflicts of interest

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest related to the publication of this article.

Key concepts

1. MGRSs are characterised by the proliferation of a clone of B-cells or plasma cells which synthesise and secrete a monoclonal immunoglobulin or one of its components (light or heavy chains), with the capacity to be deposited and be the cause of glomerular, tubular, interstitial or vascular damage.
2. Given the heterogeneity of MGRS-associated kidney disease, the renal biopsy is fundamental, and its proper histological analysis must include optical microscopy, immunofluorescence and electron microscopy.
3. There are different ways of classifying MGRS-associated kidney disease, although the most accepted method is in accordance with the organisation of the deposits: "organised" (fibrils, microtubules and crystals) or "non-organised" (monoclonal immunoglobulin deposition disease, proliferative glomerulonephritis with monoclonal immunoglobulin deposits and monoclonal immunoglobulin-associated C3 glomerulonephritis).
4. The diagnostic study should also include electrophoresis and plasma and urine immunofixation to identify the monoclonal protein and the determination of free light chains.
5. In addition, myeloma should be ruled out and the cell clone producing the monoclonal protein should be characterised by a bone marrow aspiration and biopsy.
6. Current treatment is based on clinical experience of the treatment of malignant blood dyscrasias. Close collaboration between nephrologists and haematologists to personalise the treatment to the clinical characteristics and comorbidity of patients is therefore a priority.

Acknowledgements

This study has been partly supported by the FEDER [Spanish Federation for Rare Diseases] funds ISCIII-RETIC REDinREN RD16/0009.

REFERENCES

1. Sethi S, Fervenza FC, Rajkumar SV. Spectrum of manifestations of monoclonal gammopathy-associated renal lesions. *Curr Opin Nephrol Hypertens.* 2016;25:127–37.
2. International Myeloma Working Group. Criteria for the classification of monoclonal gammopathies, multiple myeloma and related disorders: a report of the International Myeloma Working Group. *Br J Haematol.* 2003;121:749–57.
3. Glavey SV, Leung N. Monoclonal gammopathy: the good, the bad and the ugly. *Blood Rev.* 2016;30:223–31.
4. Bridoux F, Leung N, Hutchison CA, Touchard G, Sethi S, Fermand JP, et al. International Kidney and Monoclonal Gammopathy Research Group: Diagnosis of monoclonal gammopathy of renal significance. *Kidney Int.* 2015;87:698–711.
5. Pratt G, Bowcock S, Chantry A, Cook G, Jackson G, Lai M, et al. Time to redefine myeloma. *Br J Haematol.* 2015;171:1–10.
6. Kyle RA, Rajkumar SV. Monoclonal gammopathies of undetermined significance. *Best Pract Res Clin Haematol.* 2005;18:689–707.
7. Kyle RA. Monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS). *Baillieres Clin Haematol.* 1995;8:761–81.
8. Kyle RA, Therneau TM, Rajkumar SV, Larson DR, Plevak MF, Offord JR, et al. Prevalence of monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance. *N Engl J Med.* 2006;354:1362–9.
9. Cabrera Q, Macro M, Hebert B, Cornet E, Collignon A, Troussard X. Epidemiology of monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS): the experience from the specialized registry of hematologic malignancies of Basse-Normandie (France). *Cancer Epidemiol.* 2014;38:354–6.
10. Ogmundsdóttir HM, Haraldsdóttir V, Jóhannesson MG, Olafsdóttir G, Bjarnadóttir K, Sigvaldason H. Monoclonal gammopathy in Iceland: a population-based registry and follow-up. *Br J Haematol.* 2002;118:166–73.
11. Bladè J, Rosiñol L, Cibeira MT, de Larrea CF. Pathogenesis and progression of monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance. *Leukemia.* 2008;22:1651–7.
12. Kyle RA, Durie BG, Rajkumar SV, Landgren O, Blade J, Merlini G, et al. Monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS) and smoldering (asymptomatic) multiple myeloma: IMWG consensus perspectives risk factors for progression and guidelines for monitoring and management. *Leukemia.* 2010;24:1121–7.
13. Kyle RA, Rajkumar SV. Monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance and smouldering multiple myeloma: emphasis on risk factors for progression. *Br J Haematol.* 2007;139:730–43.
14. Kristinsson SY, Björkholm M, Andersson TM, Eloranta S, Dickman PW, Goldin LR, et al. Patterns of survival and causes of death following a diagnosis of monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance: a population-based study. *Haematologica.* 2009;94:1714–20.
15. Dispenzieri A, Katzmann JA, Kyle RA, Larson DR, Melton LJ, Colby CL, et al. Prevalence and risk of progression of light-chain monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance: a retrospective population-based cohort study. *Lancet.* 2010;375:1721–8.

16. Alpers CE, Hopper J Jr, Biava CG. Light-chain glomerulopathy with amyloid-like deposits. *Hum Pathol.* 1984;15:444–8.
17. Alpers CE, Tu WH, Hopper J Jr, Biava CG. Single light chain subclass (kappa chain) immunoglobulin deposition in glomerulonephritis. *Hum Pathol.* 1985;16:294–304.
18. Solomon A, Weiss DT, Kattine AA. Nephrotoxic potential of Bence Jones proteins. *N Engl J Med.* 1991;324:1845–51.
19. Alexanian R, Barlogie B, Dixon D. Renal failure in multiple myeloma pathogenesis and prognostic implications. *Arch Intern Med.* 1990;150:1693–5.
20. Knudsen LM, Hjorth M, Hippe E. Renal failure in multiple myeloma: reversibility and impact on the prognosis Nordic Myeloma Study Group. *Eur J Haematol.* 2000;65:175–81.
21. Davenport A, Merlini G. Myeloma kidney: advances in molecular mechanisms of acute kidney injury open novel therapeutic opportunities. *Nephrol Dial Transplant.* 2012;27:3713–8.
22. Heher EC, Rennke HG, Laubach JP, Richardson PG. Kidney disease and multiple myeloma. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2013;8:2007–17.
23. Pauksakon P, Revelo MP, Horn RG, Shappell S, Fogo AB. Monoclonal gammopathy: significance and possible causality in renal disease. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2003;42:87–95.
24. Merlini G, Stone MJ. Dangerous small B-cell clones. *Blood.* 2006;108:2520–30.
25. Herrera GA. Renal lesions associated with plasma cell dyscrasias: practical approach to diagnosis, new concepts, and challenges. *Arch Pathol Lab Med.* 2009;133:249–67.
26. Leung N, Bridoux F, Hutchison CA, Nasr SH, Cockwell P, Fermand JP, et al. International Kidney and Monoclonal Gammopathy Research Group Monoclonal gammopathy of renal significance: when MGUS is no longer undetermined or insignificant. *Blood.* 2012;120:4292–5.
27. Al-Hussain T, Hussein MH, Mana HA, Akhtar M. Renal involvement in monoclonal gammopathy. *Adv Anat Pathol.* 2015;22:121–34.
28. Chauvet S, Bridoux F, Ecotière L, Javaugue V, Sirac C, Arnulf B, et al. Kidney diseases associated with monoclonal immunoglobulin M-secreting B-cell lymphoproliferative disorders: a case series of 35 patients. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2015;66:756–67.
29. Herrera GA. The contributions of electron microscopy to the understanding and diagnosis of plasma cell dyscrasia-related renal lesions. *Med Electron Microsc.* 2001;34:1–18.
30. Herrera GA, Turbat-Herrera EA. Ultrastructural immunolabeling in the diagnosis of monoclonal light-and heavy-chain-related renal diseases. *Ultrastruct Pathol.* 2010;34:161–73.
31. Sethi S, Vrana JA, Theis JD, Leung N, Sethi A, Nasr SH, et al. Laser microdissection and mass spectrometry-based proteomics aids the diagnosis and typing of renal amyloidosis. *Kidney Int.* 2012;82:226–34.
32. Nasr SH, Said SM, Valeri AM, Sethi S, Fidler ME, Cornell LD, et al. The diagnosis and characteristics of renal heavy-chain and heavy/light-chain amyloidosis and their comparison with renal light-chain amyloidosis. *Kidney Int.* 2013;83:463–70.
33. Sethi S, Theis JD, Vrana JA, Fervenza FC, Sethi A, Qian Q, et al. Laser microdissection and proteomic analysis of amyloidosis, cryoglobulinemic GN, fibrillary GN, and immunotactoid glomerulopathy. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2013;8:915–21.
34. Jain D, Green JA, Bastacky S, Theis JD, Sethi S. Membranoproliferative glomerulonephritis: the role for laser microdissection and mass spectrometry. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2014;63:324–8.
35. Nasr SH, Galgano SJ, Markowitz GS, Stokes MB, D'Agati VD. Immunofluorescence on pronase-digested paraffin sections: a valuable salvage technique for renal biopsies. *Kidney Int.* 2006;70:2148–51.
36. Leung N, Nasr SH. A patient with abnormal kidney function and a monoclonal light chain in the urine. *Clin J Am Nephrol.* 2016;11:1073–82.
37. Nasr SH, Valeri AM, Sethi S, Fidler ME, Cornell LD, Gertz MA, et al. Clinicopathologic correlations in multiple myeloma: a case series of 190 patients with kidney biopsies. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2012;59:786–94.
38. Lorenz EC, Sethi S, Poschusta TL, Ramirez-Alvarado M, Kumar S, Lager DJ, et al. Renal failure due to combined cast nephropathy, amyloidosis and light-chain deposition disease. *Nephrol Dial Transplant.* 2010;25:1340–3.
39. Qian Q, Leung N, Theis JD, Dogan A, Sethi S. Coexistence of myeloma cast nephropathy, light chain deposition disease, and nonamyloid fibrils in a patient with multiple myeloma. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2010;56:971–6.
40. Pozzi C, Locatelli F. Kidney and liver involvement in monoclonal light chain disorders. *Semin Nephrol.* 2002;22:319–30.
41. Picken MM. Amyloidosis—where are we now and where are we heading. *Arch Pathol Lab Med.* 2010;134:545–51.
42. Said SM, Sethi S, Valeri AM, Leung N, Cornell LD, Fidler ME, et al. Renal amyloidosis: origin and clinicopathologic correlations of 474 recent cases. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2013;8:1515–23.
43. Merlini G, Wechalekar AD, Palladini G. Systemic light chain amyloidosis: an update for treating physicians. *Blood.* 2013;121:5124–30.
44. Rosenstock JL, Markowitz GS, Valeri AM, Sacchi G, Appel GB, D'Agati VD. Fibrillary and immunotactoid glomerulonephritis: distinct entities with different clinical and pathologic features. *Kidney Int.* 2003;63:1450–61.
45. Nasr SH, Valeri AM, Cornell LD, Fidler ME, Sethi S, Leung N, et al. Fibrillary glomerulonephritis: a report of 66 cases from a single institution. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2011;6:775–84.
46. Nasr SH, Fidler ME, Cornell LD, Leung N, Cosio FG, Sheikh SS, et al. Immunotactoid glomerulopathy: clinicopathologic and proteomic study. *Nephrol Dial Transplant.* 2012;27:4137–46.
47. Terrier B, Karras A, Kahn JE, Le Guenno G, Marie I, Benarous L, et al. The spectrum of type I cryoglobulinemia vasculitis: new insights based on 64 cases. *Medicine (Baltimore).* 2013;92:61–8.
48. Nasr SH, Markowitz GS, Reddy BS, Maesaka J, Swidler MA, D'Agati VD. Dysproteinemia, proteinuria, and glomerulonephritis. *Kidney Int.* 2006;69:772–5.
49. Karras A, Noël LH, Droz D, Delansorne D, Saint-André JP, Aucouturier P, et al. Renal involvement in monoclonal (type I) cryoglobulinemia: two cases associated with IgG3 kappa cryoglobulin. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2002;40:1091–6.
50. Hemminger J, Kandarpa M, Tsai A, Nadasdy T. Proliferative glomerulonephritis with monoclonal IgG1 deposits in a hepatitis C virus-positive patient. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2016;67:703–8.
51. DeLyria PA, Avedschmidt SE, Yamada C, Farkash EA. Fatal cryocrystalglobulinemia with intravascular and renal tubular crystalline deposits. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2016;67:787–91.
52. Herrera GA. Proximal tubulopathies associated with monoclonal light chains: the spectrum of clinicopathologic manifestations and molecular pathogenesis. *Arch Pathol Lab Med.* 2014;138:1365–80.
53. Messiaen T, Deret S, Mougenot B, Bridoux F, Dequiedt P, Dion JJ, et al. Adult Fanconi syndrome secondary to light chain gammopathy clinicopathologic heterogeneity and unusual features in 11 patients. *Medicine (Baltimore).* 2000;79:135–54.

54. Bridoux F, Sirac C, Hugue V, Decourt C, Thierry A, Quellard N, et al. Fanconi's syndrome induced by a monoclonal Vkappa3 light chain in Waldenstrom's macroglobulinemia. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2005;45:749–57.
55. Stokes MB, Aronoff B, Siegel D, D'Agati VD. Dysproteinemia-related nephropathy associated with crystal-storing histiocytosis. *Kidney Int.* 2006;70:597–602.
56. El Hamel C, Thierry A, Trouillas P, Bridoux F, Carrion C, Quellard N, et al. Crystal-storing histiocytosis with renal Fanconi syndrome: pathological and molecular characteristics compared with classical myeloma-associated Fanconi syndrome. *Nephrol Dial Transplant.* 2010;25:2982–90.
57. Larsen CP, Bell JM, Harris AA, Messias NC, Wang YH, Walker PD. The morphologic spectrum and clinical significance of light chain proximal tubulopathy with and without crystal formation. *Mod Pathol.* 2011;24:1462–9.
58. Gupta V, El Ters M, Kashani K, Leung N, Nasr SH. Crystalglobulin-induced nephropathy. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2015;26:525–9.
59. Tsuji T, Itoh Y, Nakamura T, Toyozumi Y, Arima N, Tsuda H. Crystalglobulinemia syndrome due to monoclonal gammopathy of renal significance. *QJM.* 2015;108:417–8.
60. Gu X, Herrera GA. Light-chain-mediated acute tubular interstitial nephritis: a poorly recognized pattern of renal disease in patients with plasma cell dyscrasia. *Arch Pathol Lab Med.* 2006;130:165–9.
61. Lin J, Markowitz GS, Valeri AM, Kambham N, Sherman WH, Appel GB, et al. Renal monoclonal immunoglobulin deposition disease: the disease spectrum. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2001;12:1482–92.
62. Pozzi C, D'Amico M, Fogazzi GB, Curioni S, Ferrario F, Pasquali S, et al. Light chain deposition disease with renal involvement: clinical characteristics and prognostic factors. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2003;42:1154–63.
63. Nasr SH, Valeri AM, Cornell LD, Fidler ME, Sethi S, D'Agati VD, et al. Renal monoclonal immunoglobulin deposition disease: a report of 64 patients from a single institution. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2012;7:231–9.
64. Nasr SH, Markowitz GS, Stokes MB, Seshan SV, Valderrama E, Appel GB, et al. Proliferative glomerulonephritis with monoclonal IgG deposits: a distinct entity mimicking immune-complex glomerulonephritis. *Kidney Int.* 2004;65:85–96.
65. Soares SM, Lager DJ, Leung N, Haugen EN, Fervenza FC. A proliferative glomerulonephritis secondary to a monoclonal IgA. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2006;47:342–9.
66. Nasr SH, Satoskar A, Markowitz GS, Valeri AM, Appel GB, Stokes MB, et al. Proliferative glomerulonephritis with monoclonal IgG deposits. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2009;20:2055–64.
67. Masai R, Wakui H, Komatsuda A, Togashi M, Maki N, Ohtani H, et al. Characteristics of proliferative glomerulo-nephritis with monoclonal IgG deposits associated with membranoproliferative features. *Clin Nephrol.* 2009;72:46–54.
68. Guiard E, Karras A, Plaisier E, Duong van Huyen JP, Fakhouri F, Rougier JP, et al. Patterns of noncryoglobulinemic glomerulonephritis with monoclonal Ig deposits: correlation with IgG subclass and response to rituximab. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2011;6:1609–16.
69. Sethi S, Rajkumar SV. Monoclonal gammopathy-associated proliferative glomerulonephritis. *Mayo Clin Proc.* 2013;88:1284–93.
70. Bridoux F, Desport E, Frémeaux-Bacchi V, Chong CF, Gombert JM, Lacombe C, et al. Glomerulonephritis with isolated C3 deposits and monoclonal gammopathy: a fortuitous association. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2011;6:2165–74.
71. Zand L, Kattah A, Fervenza FC, Smith RJ, Nasr SH, Zhang Y, et al. C3 glomerulonephritis associated with monoclonal gammopathy: a case series. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2013;62:506–14.
72. Sethi S, Sukov WR, Zhang Y, Fervenza FC, Lager DJ, Miller DV, et al. Dense deposit disease associated with monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2010;56:977–82.
73. Jokiranta TS, Solomon A, Pangburn MK, Zipfel PF, Meri S. Nephritogenic lambda light chain dimer: a unique human miniautoantibody against complement factor H. *J Immunol.* 1999;163:4590–6.
74. Meri S, Koistinen V, Miettinen A, Törnroth T, Seppälä IJ. Activation of the alternative pathway of complement by monoclonal lambda light chains in membranoproliferative glomerulonephritis. *J Exp Med.* 1992;175:939–50.
75. Debiec H, Hanoy M, Francois A, Guerrot D, Ferlicot S, Johonet C, et al. Recurrent membranous nephropathy in an allograft caused by IgG3 targeting the PLA2 receptor. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2012;23:1949–54.
76. Larsen CP, Ambuzs JM, Bonsib SM, Boils CL, Cossey LN, Messias NC, et al. Membranous-like glomerulopathy with masked IgG kappa deposits. *Kidney Int.* 2014;86:154–61.
77. Dingli D, Larson DR, Plevak MF, Grande JP, Kyle RA. Focal and segmental glomerulosclerosis and plasma cell proliferative disorders. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2005;46:278–82.
78. Grundmann F, Witthus M, Göbel H, Kisner T, Siewert R, Benzing T, et al. Monoclonal gammopathy-associated pauci-immune extracapillary-proliferative glomerulonephritis successfully treated with bortezomib. *Clin Kidney J.* 2013;6:327–9.
79. Ali A, Schlanger L, Nasr SH, Sethi S, Gorbatkin SM. Proliferative C4 dense deposit disease, acute thrombotic microangiopathy, a monoclonal gammopathy, and acute kidney failure. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2016;67:479–82.
80. Rigothier C, Delmas Y, Roumenina LT, Contin-Bordes C, Lepreux S, Bridoux F, et al. Distal angiopathy and atypical hemolytic uremic syndrome: clinical and functional properties of an anti-factor H IgA antibody. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2015;66:331–6.
81. Cheungpasitpon W, Leung N, Sethi S, Gertz MA, Fervenza FC. Refractory atypical hemolytic uremic syndrome with monoclonal gammopathy responsive to bortezomib-based therapy. *Clin Nephrol.* 2015;83:363–9.
82. Yao H, Monge M, Renou M, Lecaque C, Jauréguy M, Presne C, et al. Thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura due to anti-ADAMTS13 antibodies in multiple myeloma. *Clin Nephrol.* 2014;81:210–5.
83. Koga T, Yamasaki S, Nakamura H, Kawakami A, Furusu A, Taguchi T, et al. Renal thrombotic microangiopathies/thrombotic thrombocytopenic purpura in a patient with primary Sjögren's syndrome complicated with IgM monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance. *Rheumatol Int.* 2013;33:227–30.
84. Doshi M, Lahoti A, Danesh FR, Batuman V, Sanders PW. Paraprotein-related kidney disease: kidney injury from paraproteins—what determines the site of injury? *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2016;11:2288–94.
85. Alpers CE, Kowalewska J. Fibrillary glomerulonephritis and immunotactoid glomerulopathy. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2008;19:34–7.
86. Rosner MH, Edeani A, Yanagita M, Glezman IG, Leung N. Paraprotein-related kidney disease: diagnosing and treating monoclonal gammopathy of renal significance. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2016;11:2280–7.
87. Bancu I, Cañas L, Juega FJ, Pérez M, Malumbres S, Bonet J, et al. Outcomes of monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance in patients who underwent kidney transplantation. *Transplant Proc.* 2015;47:2344–5.

88. Goebel TE, Schiltz NK, Woodside KJ, Pillai AC, Caimi PF, Lazarus HM, et al. Neoplastic and non-neoplastic complications of solid organ transplantation in patients with preexisting monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance. *Clin Transplant.* 2015;29:851–7.
89. Zand L, Lorenz EC, Cosio FG, Fervenza FC, Nasr SH, Gandhi MJ, et al. Clinical findings, pathology, and outcomes of C3GN after kidney transplantation. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2014;25:1110–7.
90. Nasr SH, Sethi S, Cornell LD, Fidler ME, Boelkins M, Fervenza FC, et al. Proliferative glomerulonephritis with monoclonal IgG deposits recurs in the allograft. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2011;6:122–32.
91. Leung N, Lager DJ, Gertz MA, Wilson K, Kanakiriya S, Fervenza FC. Long-term outcome of renal transplantation in light-chain deposition disease. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2004;43:147–53.
92. Czarnecki PG, Lager DJ, Leung N, Dispensieri A, Cosio FG, Fervenza FC. Long-term outcome of kidney transplantation in patients with fibrillary glomerulonephritis or monoclonal gammopathy with fibrillary deposits. *Kidney Int.* 2009;75:420–7.
93. Dember LM. Amyloidosis-associated kidney disease. *J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2006;17:3458–71.
94. Dispensieri A, Kyle RA, Lacy MQ, Rajkumar SV, Therneau TM, Larson DR, et al. POEMS syndrome: definitions and long-term outcome. *Blood.* 2003;101:2496–506.
95. Roncioletti F, Rebora A. Updated classification of papular mucinosis, lichen myxedematosus, and scleromyxedema. *J Am Acad Dermatol.* 2001;44:273–81.
96. Leung N, Barnidge DR, Hutchison CA. Laboratory testing in monoclonal gammopathy of renal significance (MGRS). *Clin Chem Lab Med.* 2016;54:929–37.
97. Leung N, Gertz M, Kyle RA, Fervenza FC, Irazabal MV, Eirin A, et al. Urinary albumin excretion patterns of patients with cast nephropathy and other monoclonal gammopathy-related kidney diseases. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2012;7:1964–8.
98. Katzmeh JA, Dispensieri A, Kyle RA, Snyder MR, Plevak MF, Larson DR, et al. Elimination of the need for urine studies in the screening algorithm for monoclonal gammopathies by using serum immunofixation and free light chain assays. *Mayo Clin Proc.* 2006;81:1575–8.
99. Rao M, Lamont JL, Chan J, Concannon TW, Comenzo R, Ratichek SJ, et al. Serum free light chain analysis for the diagnosis, management, and prognosis of plasma cell dyscrasias: future research needs: identification of future research needs from comparative effectiveness review N° 73. Rockville (MD): Agency for Healthcare Research and Quality (US); 2012. Report No.: 12-EHC135-EF. AHRQ Future Research Needs Papers.
100. Jenner E. Serum free light chains in clinical laboratory diagnostics. *Clin Chim Acta.* 2014;427:15–20.
101. Palladini G, Russo P, Bosoni T, Verga L, Sarais G, Lavatelli F, et al. Identification of amyloidogenic light chains requires the combination of serum-free light chain assay with immunofixation of serum and urine. *Clin Chem.* 2009;55:499–504.
102. Hutchison CA, Harding S, Hewins P, Mead GP, Townsend J, Bradwell AR, et al. Quantitative assessment of serum and urinary polyclonal free light chains in patients with chronic kidney disease. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2008;3:1684–90.
103. Hutchison CA, Plant T, Drayson M, Cockwell P, Kountouri M, Basnayake K, et al. Serum free light chain measurement aids the diagnosis of myeloma in patients with severe renal failure. *BMC Nephrol.* 2008;9:11.
104. Palladini G, Dispensieri A, Gertz MA, Kumar S, Wechalekar A, Hawkins PN, et al. New criteria for response to treatment in immunoglobulin light chain amyloidosis based on free light chain measurement and cardiac biomarkers: impact on survival outcomes. *J Clin Oncol.* 2012;30:4541–9.
105. Tate JR, Gill D, Cobcroft R, Hickman PE. Practical considerations for the measurement of free light chains in serum. *Clin Chem.* 2003;49:1252–7.
106. Ramirez-Alvarado M, Ward CJ, Huang BQ, Gong X, Hogan MC, Madden BJ, et al. Differences in immunoglobulin light chain species found in urinary exosomes in light chain amyloidosis (AL). *PLOS ONE.* 2012;7:e38061.
107. Fermant JP, Bridoux F, Kyle RA, Kastritis E, Weiss BM, Cook MA, International Kidney and Monoclonal Gammopathy Research Group. How I treat monoclonal gammopathy of renal significance (MGRS). *Blood.* 2013;122:3583–90.
108. Wechalekar AD, Gillmore JD, Hawkins PN. Systemic amyloidosis. *Lancet.* 2016;387:2641–54.
109. Larsen CP, Boils CL, Cossey LN, Sharma SG, Walker PD. Clinicopathologic features of membranous-like glomerulopathy with masked IgG kappa deposits. *Kidney Int Rep.* 2016;1:299–305.
110. Javaugue V, Karras A, Glowacki F, McGregor B, Lacombe C, Goujon JM, et al. Long-term kidney disease outcomes in fibrillary glomerulonephritis: a case series of 27 patients. *Am J Kidney Dis.* 2013;62:679–90.
111. Hogan JJ, Weiss BM. Bridging the divide: an onco-nephrologic approach to the monoclonal gammopathies of renal significance. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2016;11:1681–91.
112. Motwani SS, Herlitz L, Monga D, Jhaveri KD, Lam AQ. Paraprotein-related kidney disease: glomerular diseases associated with paraproteinemias. *Clin J Am Soc Nephro.* 2016;11:2260–72.
113. Chanan-Khan AA, Kaufman JL, Mehta J, Richardson PG, Miller KC, Lonial S, et al. Activity and safety of bortezomib in multiple myeloma patients with advanced renal failure: a multicenter retrospective study. *Blood.* 2007;109:2604–6.
114. San-Miguel JF, Richardson PG, Sonneveld P, Schuster MW, Irwin D, Stadtmauer EA, et al. Efficacy and safety of bortezomib in patients with renal impairment: results from the APEX phase 3 study. *Leukemia.* 2008;22:842–9.
115. Meister S, Schubert U, Neubert K, Herrmann K, Burger R, Gramatzki M, et al. Extensive immunoglobulin production sensitizes myeloma cells for proteasome inhibition. *Cancer Res.* 2007;67:1783–92.
116. Bianchi G, Oliva L, Cascio P, Pengo N, Fontana F, Cerruti F, et al. The proteasome load versus capacity balance determines apoptotic sensitivity of multiple myeloma cells to proteasome inhibition. *Blood.* 2009;113:3040–9.
117. Ludwig H, Drach J, Graf H, Lang A, Meran JG. Reversal of acute renal failure by bortezomib-based chemotherapy in patients with multiple myeloma. *Haematologica.* 2007;92:1411–4.
118. Moreau P, Pylypenko H, Grosicki S, Karamaneshi I, Leleu X, Grishunina M, et al. Subcutaneous versus intravenous administration of bortezomib in patients with relapsed multiple myeloma: a randomised, phase 3, non-inferiority study. *Lancet Oncol.* 2011;12:431–40.
119. Knop S, Straka C, Haen M, Schwedes R, Hebart H, Einsele H. The efficacy and toxicity of bendamustine in recurrent multiple myeloma after high-dose chemotherapy. *Haematologica.* 2005;90:1287–8.
120. Pönnisch W, Andrea M, Wagner I, Hammerschmidt D, Kreibich U, Schwarzer A, et al. Successful treatment of patients with newly diagnosed/untreated multiple myeloma and advanced renal failure using bortezomib in combination with bendamustine and prednisone. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol.* 2012;138:1405–12.
121. Rummel M, Kaiser U, Balser C, Stauch M, Brugger W, Welslau M, et al. Bendamustine plus rituximab versus fludarabine

- plus rituximab for patients with relapsed indolent and mantle-cell lymphomas: a multicentre, randomised, open-label, non-inferiority phase 3 trial. *Lancet Oncol.* 2016;17:57–66.
122. Badros A, Barlogie B, Siegel E, Roberts J, Langmaid C, Zangari M, et al. Results of autologous stem cell transplant in multiple myeloma patients with renal failure. *Br J Haematol.* 2001;114:822–9.
123. Irazabal MV, Eirin A, Gertz MA, Dispenzieri A, Kumar S, Buadi FK, et al. Acute kidney injury during leukocyte engraftment after autologous stem cell transplantation in patients with light-chain amyloidosis. *Am J Hematol.* 2012;87:51–4.
124. Gertz MA, Dingli D. How we manage autologous stem cell transplantation for patients with multiple myeloma. *Blood.* 2014;124:882–90.
125. Dimopoulos MA, Oriol A, Nahm H, San-Miguel J, Bahlis NJ, Usmani SZ, et al. Daratumumab, lenalidomide and dexamethasone for multiple myeloma. *N Engl J Med.* 2016;375:1319–31.
126. Chen N, Lau H, Kong L, Kumar G, Zeldis JB, Knight R, et al. Pharmacokinetics of lenalidomide in subjects with various degrees of renal impairment and in subjects on hemodialysis. *J Clin Pharmacol.* 2007;47:1466–75.
127. Niesvizky R, Naib T, Christos PJ, Jayabalan D, Furst JR, Jalbrzikowski J, et al. Lenalidomide-induced myelosuppression is associated with renal dysfunction: adverse events evaluation of treatment-naïve patients undergoing front-line lenalidomide and dexamethasone therapy. *Br J Haematol.* 2007;138:640–3.
128. Specter R, Sanchorawala V, Seldin DC, Shelton A, Fennessey S, Finn KT, et al. Kidney dysfunction during lenalidomide treatment for AL amyloidosis. *Nephrol Dial Transplant.* 2011;26:881–6.
129. Harris E, Behrens J, Samson D, Rahemtulla A, Russell NH, Byme JL. Use of thalidomide in patients with myeloma and renal failure may be associated with unexplained hyperkalaemia. *Br J Haematol.* 2003;122:160–1.
130. Ramos R, Poveda R, Bernis C, Ara J, Sunyer M, Arrizabalaga P, et al. Renal involvement in benign monoclonal gammopathies: an underdiagnosed condition. *Nefrologia.* 2008;28:525–9.
131. Espinosa M, Ortega R, Sánchez M, Segarra A, Salcedo MT, González F, et al. Spanish Group for Study of Glomerular Diseases (GLOSEN) Association of C4d deposition with clinical outcomes in IgA nephropathy. *Clin J Am Soc Nephrol.* 2014;9:897–904.
132. Caro J, Gutiérrez-Solís E, Rojas-Rivera J, Agraz I, Ramos N, Rabasco C, et al., Grupo de Estudio de las Enfermedades Glomerulares de la Sociedad Española de Nefrología (GLOSEN). Predictors of response and relapse in patients with idiopathic membranous nephropathy treated with tacrolimus. *Nephrol Dial Transplant.* 2015;30:467–74.
133. Rabasco C, Cavero T, Román E, Rojas-Rivera J, Olea T, Espinosa M, et al., Spanish Group for the Study of Glomerular Diseases (GLOSEN). Effectiveness of mycophenolate mofetil in C3 glomerulonephritis. *Kidney Int.* 2015;88:1153–60.