Rational epitope imprinting of REG1B peptides for electrochemical determination of pancreatic cancer in urine
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Abstract

Three peptides (each containing 13 - 18 amino acids) were synthesized and used as templates for molecular imprinting and epitope recognition of the regenerating Protein 1B (REG1B), which is one of the urinary biomarkers for pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma (PDAC). Poly(ethylene-co-vinyl alcohol)s were employed as the host for molecular imprinting of the peptides. Following their preparation, the molecularly imprinted polymers (MIP) were examined by cyclic voltammetry. The electrochemical responses of a screen-printed gold substrate coated with the MIP were measured at a working voltage of 300 mV (vs. Ag/AgCl); the entire protein and the peptides gave similar responses at concentrations of <1.0 pg·mL⁻¹, with detection limits as low as 0.1 pg·mL⁻¹. Urine samples from healthy and PDAC patients were then analyzed by using this modified gold electrode, and the results are in agreement with data obtained with ELISA.
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Introduction

Molecularly imprinted polymers (MIPs) have been developed as a robust and inexpensive replacement for antibodies in the recognition of target molecules (e.g. antigens). Proteins like albumin, lysozyme, haemoglobin and myoglobin have been employed as model systems for the testing of protein imprinting [1]. Typically, the whole proteins have been used for molecular imprinting, although a few studies have tried to compare whole protein to peptide imprinting [2]. However, no general protocol has as yet been developed for the recognition of protein epitopes.

The approach of peptide, or epitope imprinting using a four amino acid peptide (YPLG, 4-mer) as the template to form a MIP (containing MAA and EGDMA) and then used for the recognition of a longer peptide (oxytocin) [3]. That group later compared MIPs using templates with amino acid substitutions (relative to the parent peptide hormone angiotensin II, 8-mer) [4]. A 15-mer peptide incorporating amino acids 90-95 of the Japanese encephalitis virus nonstructural protein 1 (NS1) Thr-Glu-Leu-Arg-Tyr-Ser-Trp-Lys-Thr-Trp-Gly-Lys-Ala-Lys-Met was chosen as the template for the recognition of Dengue virus protein by a quartz crystal microbalance (QCM) chip [5]. Imprinting porous silica scaffolds with a 16-residue peptide (from lysozyme C, 1.8 kDa) led to preferential binding of the whole protein (lysozyme, 14 kDa), compared to irrelevant protein targets. Tai’s group has also
imprinted different combinations of tetrapeptides [6]; segments (9-mer to 14-mer) of Anthrax protective antigen (PA$_{83}$, 83 kDa) [7]; and nine different linear epitope sequences (11 – 15 mer), selected to prepare MIPs to recognize creatine kinase (CK) isozymes [8]. The rational selection of peptide epitope templates (8- to 10-mer) for the recognition of proteins (e.g. trypsin, thermolysin, pepsin, chymotrypsin and Arg-protenase) by MIPs was also discussed by Bossi et al. [9] Li’s group intensively studied the sensing [10,11] and adsorption [12] of albumin by imprinting with 9- to 15-mer fragments [11] or with one or two mutated residues [10,12,11]. Multiepitope imprinting was also employed for the capture of proteins [13].

Electrochemical sensing is inexpensive, flexible and has demonstrable utility in point-of-care devices. Molecularly imprinted polymers (MIPs) hold out the possibility of adding selectivity and specificity, at low cost and without the stability and storage problems associated with biologically-derived molecular recognition. Piletsky and Turner [14], Blanco-López et al. [15], McCluskey et al. [16], Rao and Kala [17] and Suryanarayanan et al. [18] have reviewed electrochemical sensors using molecularly imprinted polymers as sensing elements. Small molecules (e.g. quercetin [19], theophylline [20], 3-hydroxyanthranilic [21] and imidacloprid [22]), proteins (e.g. albumin, lysozyme [23] and nuclear matrix protein 22 (NMP22) [24]) and even microorganisms (e.g. viruses [25], bacteria [26] and algae [27]) have been used as the imprinting templates. Moreover, molecularly imprinted polymers can be
integrated on microfluidic systems for either dielectric or electrochemical sensing of viruses [28] and urinary melatonin [29], respectively. The combination of MIPs and electrochemical analysis can thus be useful in a homecare system.

In this study, three peptides (13- to 18-mers) of Regenerating Protein 1B (REG1B) were selected for their solubility, and distinctiveness between homologous proteins REG1A, REG3, REG4 and Aggrecan. The peptides were synthesized and used as templates for the preparation of molecular imprinting and epitope recognition. Four poly(ethylene-co-vinyl alcohol)s containing ethylene mole % from 27 to 44 were employed to prepare the molecularly imprinted polymers by phase inversion, and the imprinted polymer electrodes were examined by electrochemical analysis. Finally, urine samples from healthy and pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma (PDAC) patients were examined by peptide-imprinted EVAL-based sensors and the REG1B concentrations measured.

**Experimental Section**

**Reagents and chemicals**

Peptides (SCSGFKKWKDESCEKK (Peptide 2), KSWDTGSPSSANAGYCAS (Peptide 4), KESSTDDSNVWIG (Peptide 6) of REG1B were ordered from Yao-Hong Biotechnology Inc. (HPLC grade, New Taipei City, Taiwan; [http://www.yh-bio.com.tw/](http://www.yh-bio.com.tw/)). Urea, creatinine
(TLC $\geq 98\%$), albumin (from bovine serum, minimum 98\%), sodium dodecyl sulphate (SDS) and poly(ethylene-co-vinyl alcohol) (abbreviated as EVAL) with ethylene 27, 32, 38 and 44 molar % were from Sigma-Aldrich Co. (St. Louis, MO; https://www.sigmaaldrich.com/). Dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) was purchased from Panreac (Barcelona, Spain; http://www.panreac.es/). Potassium ferrocyanide and potassium ferricyanide were both from J.T. Baker Chemical Co. (Center Valley, PA; http://jt baker.com/). Potassium chloride was from Showa Chemical Industry Co., Ltd. (Tokyo, Japan; http://showa-chemical.co.jp/).

De-ionized (DI) water, produced by a PURELAB Ultra (ELGA, Albania; http://www.elgalabwater.com/), used in the preparation of buffers and for rinse solutions was 18.2 M$\Omega$ cm in resistivity. Human REG1B cloned in Escherichia coli (E. coli) (#g1004044D06) was purchased from Bioresource Collection and Research Center (BCRC; http://www.bcrc.firdi.org.tw/), Hsinchu, Taiwan. The culture medium for Escherichia coli contained Miller (Luria-Bertani) LB Broth (BD Difco™; http://www.bd.com/) and Ampicillin 100 $\mu$g/mL. All chemicals were used as received unless otherwise mentioned.

**The preparation of peptide-imprinted polymers coated sensing chips**

EVALs were dissolved in DMSO at the concentration of 0.1 wt\% and with or without 1.0 mg·mL$^{-1}$ of template peptides. EVAL will crystallize from DMSO as the solvent is...
removed, as shown in the ternary water–DMSO–EVAL phase diagram [30], so polymer films are readily produced by evaporation of DMSO. The preparation of peptide-imprinted (MIPs) and non-imprinted (NIPs) EVAL thin films on the working electrodes consisted: (1) dropwise addition of 2 μL of the EVAL solution with or without 1.0 mg mL⁻¹ of template peptides on a screen-printed gold substrate (4 mm diameter, DropSens, Spain; http://www.dropsens.com/); (2) place polymer-coated electrodes in an oven at 50 °C for 6 h to enhance the evaporation of solvent; and then (3) removal of template peptides by washing with 10 mL of 0.1 wt % aqueous SDS and DI water three times.

**Electrochemical examination of peptides and REG1B with peptide-imprinted polymer-coated sensors**

The electrochemical analysis was performed by sample injection into a flow-cell (DRP-FLWCL, DropSens, Spain; http://www.dropsens.com/) for screen-printed electrodes. The working, counter and Ag/AgCl reference electrodes were covered by injecting ca.10 μL of an aqueous solution of 500 mM KCl, 20 mM K₄Fe(CN)₆ and 20 mM K₃Fe(CN)₆; the electrode in the flow-cell [29] was pre-wetted to ensure that the electrode surface is properly wet with the redox couple for the electrochemical response. The same volume of sample was then injected for measurements. The electrochemical reactions were controlled and monitored
with a potentiostat (608-1A, CH Instruments, Inc., Austin, TX; http://www.chinstruments.com/). The current response of the imprinted polymeric sensing electrodes was assessed using cyclic voltammetry. The potential was scanned from -0.6 V to 0.6 V at 0.1 V s\(^{-1}\) and the effects of imprinted peptides, interferent molecules and real samples on the peak currents for the ferri-/ferrocyanide system were recorded. Urine samples were collected from the PDAC patients and healthy volunteers. The study was approved by the Brent Medical Ethics Committee under REC reference no. 05/Q0408/65. Twenty microliters of urine samples were diluted to 20 mL with the previously mentioned ferri-/ferrocyanide solution. An enzyme-linked immuno-sorbent assay (ELISA) kit SEK11638 (Sino Biological Inc.; http://tw.sinobiological.com/) was employed to examine the REG1B concentration in random urine samples. All measurements in this work were carried out with at least two replicates; data are expressed as means and standard deviations.

**Surface characterization of peptide-imprinted EVAL thin films**

Peptide- and non-imprinted EVAL films were freeze-dried before examination by a SEM (Hitachi S4800, Hitachi High-Technologies Co., Tokyo, Japan; http://www.hitachi-hightech.com/), by electron spectroscopy for chemical analysis (ESCA, Axis Ultra DLD, Kratos Analytical Inc., Manchester, UK; http://www.kratos.com/) and by
Results and Discussion

The amino acid sequences of the REG1B peptides for the epitope recognition are listed in Table 1. The “rational” 1st choice is peptide 2 in Fig. 1, the C-terminal 16 amino acids of the protein. Important non-homologous amino-acids between REG1A and REG1B are at position 147, Q (glutamine, polar) to K (lysine, positive charge); positions 152-53, VP (hydrophobic valine and aromatic proline) to ES (glutamic acid, negative charge and serine, polar); and position 156, D (aspartic acid, negative charge) to K (lysine, positive charge). This sequence has six charged amino acids (KKDE DK), which suggests it is exposed on the protein surface. Its solubility in polar solvents should be very good due to six charged amino acids and five polar (SSTQC) amino acids. In addition, there are two bulky, aromatic amino acids (FW) within the sequence. The difference between REG1A and REG1B compared to REG3, REG4 and Aggrecan is relatively modest but should be sufficient to prevent cross-reaction. Most of the peptide forms an extended loop with only a short stretch (positions 149-152) forming a beta-strand. Furthermore, negatively charged amino acids in positions
151/129 (secreted protein/crystal structure positions), 155/133 and 156/134 (DED) have been proposed to form a contiguous parallel stretch on the protein surface [31]. Interestingly, positions 150/128 and 157/135 (KK) were also proposed to contribute to the exposed charged residues on the protein surface. The choice of peptides 4 and 6 are explained in the Electronic Supporting Material.

Cyclic voltammetry was employed to prescreen for the optimal composition of the EVALs. The potential at peak current was found to be 300 mV, Fig. S2(a). Figs. S1(b)-(d) show the current density differences, using MIP-coated electrodes, arising from the presence of peptides 2, 4 and 6 at 1.0 ng mL\(^{-1}\), for MIP coatings made from four different EVAL compositions. MIP electrodes formed from EVALs containing 27, 32 and 27 ethylene mole % had higher current density differences, compared to the other commercially available compositions, for peptides 2, 4 and 6, respectively. For example, the highest current density differences in the peptide 2 MIP- and NIP-coated electrodes were 75.85 ± 4.05 and 26.03 ± 5.71 \(\mu\text{A cm}^{-2}\), respectively. Interestingly, the higher ethylene mole % of EVALs decreased the current density difference in both MIP- and NIP-coated electrodes. The imprinting effectiveness for the peptide-imprinted polymers is defined as the ratio of the current difference of MIPs and NIPs, measured with given concentrations of target molecules (\textit{i.e.} peptides, in this study). The highest imprinting effectivenesses (IE) for peptide 4 was 2.6
(obtained by using EVAL containing 32 mole % of ethylene), and 2.9-3.0 for peptides 2 and 6 using 27 mole % ethylene of EVAL.

The effect of the concentration of peptides on optimized MIP and NIP-coated electrodes was further examined by using cyclic voltammetry. Figure 2(a) plots the cyclic voltammograms (CVs) of various peptide 2 concentrations on MIP electrodes; Figure 2(b) shows that the current density significantly increases with increasing concentration of peptide 2. Figures 2(c)-(d) show the response of MIP electrodes recognizing peptide 4 and peptide 6, compared to NIP electrodes of the same EVAL composition. In all cases, the MIP electrodes responded much more strongly than NIP electrodes, with imprinting effectiveness of 2-3. The ferrocyanide and ferricyanide ions are critical to the response in the cyclic voltammetry of electrochemical activity on MIP-coated electrodes [24]. MIP-coated electrodes have greater electrochemical activity in ferro/ferricyanide solution with more bound template or target (e.g. peptide/protein in this work), possibly due to some induced partial charge on the electrode surface [24].

The three optimized MIP sensors were then employed to measure the same *E. coli* culture medium; the measured (or apparent) REG1B concentrations were 35.21±4.79, 82.60±4.04 and 45.03±2.62 ng mL⁻¹ by peptide 2-, 4- and 6-imprinted polymer-coated sensors, for sensors calibrated with peptides. The concentration measured by the peptide 4-imprinted
polymer-coated sensor is about 2-fold higher than that by peptide 2- and 6-imprinted polymer-coated sensors, which may due to the exposure peptides on the surface of REG1B. The actual concentration of REG1B was estimated at 78-213 ng/mL using an ELISA assay. Therefore, the peptide 4-imprinted polymer-coated electrodes were used for the latter real urine sample measurements.

The surface morphologies and nitrogen atomic concentrations of peptide 4 MIPs before and after template removal is shown in Fig. S3. When comparing the surface morphologies of peptide 4 MIPs before and after template removal in Figs. S3(a) and S3(b), the surface roughness seems higher for the surface before template removal. Moreover, nanoaggregates of size less than 50 nm can be found in Fig. S3(b). The nitrogen atomic profile in Fig. S2(c) showed the nitrogen surface concentration decreased from 2.83 to 0.33%, as expected when the nitrogen-rich template is removed by washing. A small amount of template molecules are likely still entrapped inside MIPs, but they may not reduce the recognition ability of MIPs. In Figs. S3(d) and (e), the surface roughness of the peptide 4 MIPs increased from 1.3 to 2.3 on removing target molecules and increased to 10.9 nm on target rebinding; however, the peptides may form nanoaggregates that are as large as 100 nm before binding on the MIP thin film. The aggregation of peptides may also reduce the electrochemical interactions between the surface of the MIP and target molecules, perhaps by affecting folding and unfolding. Note,
however, that aggregation can actually increase the responsive range of a MIP sensor by raising the upper limit for sensing to 1000 pg mL\(^{-1}\). 

Finally, Table S1 summarizes analyses of six urine samples from the PDAC patients and healthy volunteers. The REG1B in the samples fell in the range 0.47± 0.12 to 0.55±0.12 and 62.25± 7.01 to 205.48± 20.96 ng mL\(^{-1}\) for healthy volunteers and PDAC patients, respectively. These results are in agreement with measurements using enzyme-linked immunosorbent assay (ELISA) \([32]\) in Table S1. The detectable range and sample volume with ELISA are about 3.13-200 pg mL\(^{-1}\) and 100 \(\mu\)L (www.sinobiologicalcdn.com/reagent/SEK11638.pdf), which is about 10 fold higher than the limit of detection of the MIP electrodes in this work. The urine samples from the healthy volunteers were not detectable because they were diluted 1000-fold for storage and transportation.

Additionally, the effects of interference by albumin, creatinine and urea in urine on the peptide 4 MIP electrodes are shown in Figure 3(a). The interference at 1.0 ng mL\(^{-1}\) did not give a current change higher than 23.45± 1.47 \(\mu\)A cm\(^{-2}\). Typically, the reference albumin concentration in random urine is less than 23 \(\mu\)g mL\(^{-1}\) (i.e. 2.3 ng mL\(^{-1}\) after dilution ten thousand times for REG1B test). Fig. 3(b) depicts the comparison of the electrochemical signals of REG1B and peptide 4 titrated to the peptide 4 MIP sensor. Clearly, at lower concentration (less than 1.0 pg mL\(^{-1}\)), the response of REG1B to peptide 4 MIP sensors is
very close to that of peptide 4, suggesting that the entire protein can participate in electron
transfer processes. At higher concentrations, the response falls off slightly for the protein
compared to the imprinted peptide. The electrochemical reaction results of peptide 4 and
REG1B on peptide 4 imprinted EVAL (32 mol% ethylene) thin films were fit by the Hill
equation, giving the maximum response for \(154.93 \pm 3.15\) and \(112.92 \pm 2.97\ \mu\text{A cm}^{-2}\),
respectively. The Hill equation, which can represent binding site cooperativity, has been used
for the binding analysis of target molecules to MIP [33,34]: \[
\log\left(\frac{Y}{1-Y}\right) = n \log[F] - n \log K_A,
\]
where \(Y\) is the binding site occupancy, \(n\) the Hill coefficient, \([F]\) the free ligand concentration
and \(K_A\) is the microscopic dissociation constant. The Hill coefficient (\(n\)) and microscopic
dissociation constant (\(K_A\)) for the binding of peptide 4 and REG1B are 0.22, 10.95 pg mL\(^{-1}\)
and 0.17, 25.17 pg mL\(^{-1}\), which give an equilibrium constant for dissociation (\(K_d\)) of around
1.69 - 1.73.

The MIP-based sensor remains stable for a long time and can be stored for reuse [35];
Figure S4 shows the reusability and reproducibility of measurements made with the peptide 4
MIP-coated electrode. The degradation in the electrochemical response of the electrode
during the first five cycles was less than 10\%, but may have been higher if the rebound target
had not been completely removed. The reproducibility in the construction of MIP-based
electrochemical sensors has been well established in other studies [21,36,24]. Long term
stability is also expected: EVAL MIP nanoparticles stored in darkness at room temperature for six months still show good sensitivity to target molecules [37]. The competitive recognition of the imprinted template and interferents is shown in Fig. 6. The relative current density differences were 95.01± 9.65, 87.64± 11.68, and 91.71±6.67 % when peptide 4 co-exists with albumin, creatinine or urea.

Conclusions

Epitope recognition of proteins is important for both the binding of antibodies and for the preparation of the artificial antibodies (i.e. molecularly imprinted polymers). This study demonstrates the utility of rational selection of appropriate peptides as the templates for imprinting. The urine samples from patients with pancreatic cancer showed higher electrochemical response compared to samples from healthy controls, consistent with their expected elevated levels of the marker protein. The rational design of peptide-based molecularly imprinted polymers can be used for the epitope recognition of proteins, at far lower cost compared with whole protein imprinting. Thus, epitope imprinting shows great potential for future development of sensitive, diagnostic homecare sensors.
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Legends

**Figure 1.** The comparison of peptide 2 in Regenerating Islet-Derived 1 Beta (REG1B) protein with non-homologous peptides from REG1A, REG3G, REG3A, REG4 and Aggrecan.

**Figure 2.** (a) Cyclic voltammetry of peptide 4 solutions measured using peptide 4-imprinted coated electrodes using a potentiostat. The calibration curve of (b) peptide 2, (c) peptide 4 and (c) peptide 6 to peptide- and non-imprinted polymer based sensors. The working potential was 300mV (vs. ref. electrode).

**Figure 3.** (a) The effect of the interferents (e.g. albumin, urea and creatinine) at 1.0 ng/mL on peak current response using peptide 4-imprinted coated electrodes. (b) The comparison of the peptide 4 MIP sensors titrated with peptide 4 or REG1B. The working potential was 300mV (vs. ref. electrode).

**Figure 4.** The complete recognition of the imprinted template co-exists with interferents (e.g. albumin, urea and creatinine) at 1.0 ng mL$^{-1}$. The relative current densities were compared with the original electrochemical response.
Tables:

**Table 1.** The peptides of Regenerating Protein 1 Beta (REG1B) used to imprint onto poly(ethylene- co-vinyl alcohol)s. Peptides 2, 4 and 6 contain 16, 18 and 13 amino acids and 2, 3 and 3 aromatic or hydrophobic amino acids. The last column indicates the screen of EVALs with highest imprinting effectiveness.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Protein</th>
<th>Amino acid sequence</th>
<th>Peptides</th>
<th>Amino acids</th>
<th>EVAL (mole%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Aromatic &amp; Hydrophobic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>REG1B</td>
<td>MAQTNSFFMLISLMFLSLSQGESQTELPNPRISCP</td>
<td>Peptide 6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>EGT NAYRSYCYYFNEDPETWDADLYCNMNSSG</td>
<td>Peptide 4</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NLVSVTQAEAGAVSLSKESSTDDSNVWIGLHDPKK</td>
<td>Peptide 2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NRRWHSSGSLVSYKSWDTGSPSSANAGYCAML</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TSCGFKWKDESECKKFSTFVCXKFN</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Figures

| 120 | 121 | 122 | 123 | 124 | 125 | 126 | 127 | 128 | 129 | 130 | 131 | 132 | 133 | 134 | 135 | (Secreted protein/crystal structure sequence) |
|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----|-----------------------------------------------|
| 142 | 143 | 144 | 145 | 146 | 147 | 148 | 149 | 150 | 151 | 152 | 153 | 154 | 155 | 156 | 157 |                          |
| S   | S   | T   | G   | F   | Q   | K   | W   | K   | D   | V   | P   | C   | E   | D   | K   | REG1A                          |
| C   | S   | K   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | REG1B                          |
| R   | L   | Y   | N   | D   | A   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | REG3G                          |
| R   | A   | L   | R   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | REG3A                          |
| N   | N   | N   | L   | T   | S   | S   | N   | E   | N   | K   | R   |     |     |     |     | REG4                            |
| H   | E   | K   |     | E   | N   |     |     |     |     |     |     |     | N   | Y   | H   | Aggrecan                        |

Lin et al.- Figure 1
Electronic Supporting Material (ESM):

The possible 2nd choice is peptide 4 (Fig. S1(a)), close to C-terminus part of the protein, 18 amino acids long. Important non-homologous amino acids between REG1A and REG1B: positions 125, 126 GI (neutral/hydrophobic) to DT (negative charge/polar), position 128 A (hydrophobic) to S (polar), position 134 P (aromatic) to A (hydrophobic). The peptide has 1-2 charged amino acids (K/KD). The peptide solubility should be adequate due to 1-2 charged amino acids and seven polar (SSSNYCS) amino acids. Also, there are two bulky, aromatic amino acids (WY) within the sequence. The difference between REG1A and REG1B compared to REG3, REG4 and Aggrecan is substantial, thus cross-reaction is unlikely. Proline 134/112 is at the center of the extended loop, and indeed most of this peptide is within this loop. Positions 135/113 and 136/114 (G and Y) have been proposed to form a Ca$^{2+}$-binding site (site 1), while positions 128/106 and 130/108 (A and S) are thought to form a second Ca$^{2+}$-binding site (site 2).

The third candidate peptide, peptide 6 (Fig. S1(b)), is from the middle part of the protein, and is 13 amino acids long. There are modest differences in non-homologous amino-acids between REG1A and REG1B: position 92 G (glycine, neutral) to S (serine, polar), position 96 F (phenylalanine, large hydrophobic) to S (polar). The peptide has four charged amino acids (KEDD). The peptide solubility should be very good due to the four charged amino acids and three polar (STN) amino acids. The difference between REG1A and REG1B compared to REG3, REG4 and Aggrecan is substantial, thus cross-reaction is very unlikely. A large part of this peptide forms an extended loop (positions 90-97), whereas several amino acids (positions 97-99) form the short beta-strand. Furthermore, negative charge amino acids in positions 94/72 and 95/73 (DD) have been proposed to form a contiguous parallel stretch on the protein surface. Notably, position 90/68 (E) is proposed to contribute to the opposite, less acidic surface of the protein.
Figure S1. The comparison of (a) peptide 4 and (b) peptide 6 in Regenerating Islet-Derived 1 Beta (REG1B) protein with non-homologous peptides from REG1A, REG3G, REG3A, REG4 and Aggrecan.
Table S1. The current measurement of urine samples by peptide 4-imprinted EVAL coated electrodes. Three urine samples from healthy and pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma (PDAC) were diluted a thousand and ten thousand times, respectively, and then measured with electrochemical analysis and ELISA (N.D.: not detectable).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regimenation</th>
<th>Sample Name</th>
<th>ΔCurrent density (μA·cm⁻²)</th>
<th>Converted concentration (ng·mL⁻¹)</th>
<th>Mean concentration (ng·mL⁻¹)</th>
<th>ELISA results (ng·mL⁻¹)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>PDAC 1/10000</td>
<td>PDAC1</td>
<td>59.26</td>
<td>206.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>58.73</td>
<td>184.10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PDAC2</td>
<td>57.15</td>
<td>131.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.34</td>
<td>137.21</td>
<td>137.92±6.62</td>
<td>159.51±52.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>57.60</td>
<td>144.87</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PDAC3</td>
<td>53.91</td>
<td>66.69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>53.86</td>
<td>65.90</td>
<td>62.25±7.01</td>
<td>92.30±28.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>52.92</td>
<td>54.17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HEALTHY 1/1000</td>
<td>H1</td>
<td>34.44</td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.06</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td>0.47±0.12</td>
<td>N.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>31.74</td>
<td>0.36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H2</td>
<td>33.09</td>
<td>0.46</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33.52</td>
<td>0.50</td>
<td>0.55±0.12</td>
<td>N.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.21</td>
<td>0.68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>H3</td>
<td>33.68</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.94</td>
<td>0.45</td>
<td>0.54±0.11</td>
<td>N.D.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>35.07</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure S2. (a) Cyclic voltammetry of peptide 2 solutions measured using peptide 2-imprinted and non-imprinted polymer coated electrodes using a potentiostat. Current density difference for the (b) peptide 2-imprinted; (c) peptide 4-imprinted; and (d) peptide 6-imprinted and non-imprinted polymers coated electrode for 1.0 ng·mL⁻¹ and buffer solution of target molecules when voltages of 0.36 were applied. The imprinting effectiveness was defined as the ratio of the current density difference of peptides on the MIPs to that on the NIPs of the same composition.
Figure S3. The surface morphology of peptide 4-imprinted polymers prepared using 32 mole% of ethylene EVAL (a) before and (b) after template removal of peptide 4. (c) Nitrogen atomic analysis of above surface by electron spectroscopy for chemical analysis (ESCA). AFM images of peptide 4-imprinted polymers prepared using 32 mole% of ethylene EVAL (d) after template removal and (e) after rebinding of peptide 4. The image size is 10x10 μm² and the maximum heights are 34 and 340 nm, respectively.
Figure S4. The reusability of the peptide 4-imprinted MIP electrode. The electrode was used to measure a 1.0 ng mL$^{-1}$ solution of peptide 4, rinsed, and then reused for at least 5 cycles.