Section: Clinical Chemistry

Original Research Article

FUTURE OF MONOCLONAL GAMMOPATHY DIAGNOSIS: MASS SPECTROMETRY, A TRANSFORMATION IN PERSPECTIVE BEYOND ELECTROPHORESIS

E. Maruthi Prasad[1], Rajesh Bendre[1]

[1]Department of Clinical Chemistry, Apollo Diagnostics Global Reference Laboratory, Hyderabad, Telangana, India

Received : 20/01/2026
Received in revised form : 09/03/2026
Accepted : 28/03/2026

Corresponding Author:
Dr. E. Maruthi Prasad,
Department of Clinical Chemistry, Apollo Diagnostics Global Reference Laboratory, Hyderabad, Telangana, India.
Email: emaruthip@gmail.com

DOI: 10.70034/ijmedph.2026.2.142

Source of Support: Nil,
Conflict of Interest: None declared

Int J Med Pub Health
2026; 16 (2); 826-834

ABSTRACT

Immunofixation electrophoresis (IFE) and serum protein electrophoresis (SPEP) have been the major diagnostic tools for monoclonal gammopathies (MGs) in diagnostic laboratory settings for over five decades. These techniques are necessary but show limitations such as resolution, subjectivity, and sensitivity. Recently, clinical laboratory settings are increasingly applying high-resolution technologies like mass spectrometry (MS) and next-generation sequencing (NGS). This article discusses the historic role and operational limitations of SPEP and IFE with analytical challenges in diagnostic settings for the first time. We also discussed ideas about backup plans, such as MS-based immunoglobulin profiling and a standard method for the detection and quantification of MS-based monoclonal proteins. Additionally, analyzing the B-cell repertoire through NGS provides an opportunity to examine the genome for clonal detection. The integration of both biochemical and genomic data with the biomarkers, such as abnormal glycosylation patterns and ratios of heavy/light chains, to evaluate the risk of myelomas. A framework for early intervention, precise surveillance, and individualized treatment approaches in myeloma management is urgently needed. This transformation affects labs in terms of operations and plans for the future and brings a new era for early disease diagnosis, tracing minimal residual disease, and creating personalized predictions about how maladies like Monoclonal Gammopathy of Undetermined Significance (MGUS) will evolve in their disease progression.

Keywords: Monoclonal gammopathy, mass spectrometry, serum protein electrophoresis, immunofixation electrophoresis, Next-generation sequencing, multiple myeloma, MGUS, proteomics, clonality.

INTRODUCTION

Monoclonal gammopathies (MGs) comprise several diseases characterized by the clonal proliferation of plasma cells or lymphocytes, initiating the production of monoclonal immunoglobulin fragments or M-proteins.[1] Non-malignant precursor conditions such as monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS) and smoldering multiple myeloma (SMM), in addition to malignant variants including multiple myeloma (MM), Waldenström's macroglobulinemia, and AL amyloidosis, represent a range of disorders unified by the abnormal M-protein.[2,3] Defined diagnosis, isotypic characterization, and quantification of the M-protein are critical for diagnosis, risk calculation, monitoring therapy response, and early diagnosis identification. Serum protein electrophoresis (SPEP) and immunofixation electrophoresis (IFE) have been the most effective methods for this purpose since the 1950s and 1960s.[4] These methods have proven invaluable to physicians and served as the foundation for diagnostic standards for years. The advent of effective and focused treatments in the 21st century has significantly improved patient outcomes for multiple myeloma. This transformational shift in medicine has thus rendered diagnostic sensitivity and accuracy. However, the limitations of traditional electrophoresis have become increasingly apparent, and the need for the advancement of more precise procedures.[5]

New improvements in mass spectrometry (MS) and next-generation sequencing (NGS) are making it easier to uncover novel things in metagenomics (MGs). In addition, mass spectrometry-based methodologies provide improved sensitivity and specificity for M-protein analysis, while next-generation sequencing delivers direct insight into the clonal B-cell population.[6,7] This article discusses the transition of historical analysis of SPEP and IFE, precisely assessing their limitations. Next, we provide a comprehensive comparison of emerging technologies, primarily emphasizing MS-based immunoglobulin profiling, followed by NGS, and concluding with other novel biomarkers. We also demonstrated how these instruments have transformed the diagnostic practices of physicians using case studies. We discuss the implications for clinical laboratories and the prospective developments ahead, including the challenges they may face. We suggest that the integration of mass spectrometry and next-generation sequencing will establish the new standard of care for the treatment of monoclonal gammopathies.

History of SPEP and IFE: Origins and Limitations

Tools: Dr. Arne Tiselius's groundbreaking invention of moving boundary electrophoresis in 1948 marked a pivotal advancement in the discovery of M-protein, earning him the Nobel Prize.[8] The clinical application was validated through the implementation of zone electrophoresis on cellulose acetate, followed by a transition to agarose gel, which led to the modern-day SPEP. Based on size and charge, the proteins are five main groups, such as total protein, albumin, alpha-1, alpha-2, beta, and gamma globulins.[9] A clear spike or peak/band in the gamma region, or less often in the beta or alpha-2 regions, indicates that the group of plasma cells are all the same, which is a monoclonal or M-band.[10] SPEP is a decent technology for primary screening, but this can't distinguish between the immunoglobulin heavy chain class, such as IgG, IgA, IgM, IgD, and IgE, or light chain type, such as kappa and lambda, of the M-band.[11] These limitations caused the development of immunoelectrophoresis (IEP) and, subsequently, a more effective and sensitive replacement, IFE, by Cawley et al. and others in the 1970s.[12,13]

In IFE, serum is subjected to electrophoresis and then covered with specific heavy/light chain antibodies.[14] The detection of M-protein is constrained by its precipitation curve. Using SPEP for measurement and IFE for classification together has been a common practice around the world for quite some time.

Immunoglobulins in monoclonal gammopathies: Monoclonal proteins among the immunoglobulin classes highlight significant diagnostic and clinical implications.

Immunoglobulin G (IgG): IgG is the major immunoglobulin linked with monoclonal gammopathies, such as MGUS, multiple myeloma, and Waldenström's macroglobulinemia. SPEP commonly demonstrates an M-spike; however, it is unable to differentiate between subtypes of heavy chain, thus limiting accurate diagnosis.[15]

Immunoglobulin A (IgA): IgA monoclonal proteins are often associated with severe myeloma variants and renal disorders. The migration of IgA frequently intersects with other serum proteins (especially alpha-2 globulin), thereby complicating precise detection. IgA comprises a significant amount of carbohydrates, mainly in polymerized forms such as dimers and trimmers, and prefers bonding to other serum proteins, which alters its mobility within an electric field, causing it to deviate from the characteristic localization of immunoglobulins, i.e., the beta-gamma bridge.[16]

Immunoglobulin M (IgM): IgM monoclonal proteins are suggestive of Waldenström's macroglobulinemia and are linked with hyperviscosity syndromes. The pentameric structure of IgM offers challenges for quantification and complicates interpretation.[17]

Immunoglobulin D (IgD): The incidence of IgD monoclonal gammopathies is rare but shows aggressive behavior, often occurring in younger-age patients.[18] Due to their low serum concentrations, SPEP often fails to detect IgD proteins, necessitating the use of more sophisticated diagnostic methods.[19]

Immunoglobulin E (IgE): The monoclonal protein IgE is uncommonly observed and characteristically indicative of aggressive myeloma linked with a poor prognosis.[20] Minimal physiological levels of IgE necessitate the utilization of more sensitive diagnostic procedures. The distribution highlights the predominance of IgG monoclonal proteins and the diagnostic challenges associated with rarer classes such as IgD and IgE. All immunoglobulin classes are associated with specific clinical implications and laboratory limitations, highlighting the necessity for corresponding methods such as mass spectrometry to ensure accurate diagnosis and treatment monitoring [Table 1].

Table 1: Incidence of Immunoglobulins in monoclonal gammopathies

Immunoglobulins	Incidence (%)	Observations	Limitations in detection
IgG	60–70	Most prevalent; associated with MGUS, multiple myeloma, and Waldenström forms	SPEP shows the presence of an M-spike but is unable to subtype the heavy chain [21–23].
IgA	20-25	Linked to aggressive myeloma, renal failures	Migration overlaps with other proteins [24,25].
IgM	10-15	Waldenstrom macroglobulinemia, hyperviscosity	Pentameric structure of IgM complicates quantitation [22,26]

IgD	<1	Rare, associated with aggressive diseases, younger patients	Very low serum concentrations, often missed in SPEP [27,28]
IgE	<0.1-0.5	Extremely rare, linked to aggressive myeloma with poor prognosis	IgE levels are physiologically low, requires IFE for confirmation [29]

Limitations/constraints of the Electrophoretic Model

Although, the SPEP and IFE are main methods in multiple myelomas, but they have major flaws that mark hard to make treatment decisions.

Analytical Sensitivity: SPEP has a sensitivity ranges 0.2 to 0.5 g/L for detecting M-protein, while IFE shows marginally higher sensitivity, approximately 0.1 to 0.2 g/L.[30,31] This lack of sensitivity is the main gap in numerous conditions.

M-proteins may persist at levels below the detection threshold of IFE, complicating the validation of complete remission and the surveillance for early progression in MGUS and SMM 32. For instance, Mills et al. (2016) assessed M-proteins using nanobody enrichment coupled MALDI-TOF that were detectable by urine/serum protein electrophoresis. Their procedure enhanced serum for immunoglobulin extraction, segregated light chains from heavy chains, and employed microflow LC-ESI-Q-TOF MS for quantification. Monoclonal immunoglobulin Rapid Accurate Molecular Mass" (miRAMM) provided the reliable detection of M-proteins with high sensitivity compared to existing gel-based methods such as SPE and IFE.[32]

Suboptimal resolution and interference: Migration of M-proteins on SPEP are affected by several factors such as protein charge, molecular weight, glycosylation, sample concentration, electrophoretic medium, and technical variables. Polyclonal immunoglobulins that migrate together may mask/obscure the small monoclonal components. Additionally, proteins, such as transferrin, fibrinogen, or hemoglobin-haptoglobin complexes, can make false bands that resembles M-protein. This leads to unnecessary concern and false-positive outcomes.[33] This complicates the challenging differentiation between biclonal gammopathies and a single, large M-protein. However, in these type of cases, we use dilution of β-mercaptoethanol (BME) to address the monoclonal component. BME serves as a reducing agent breaking disulphide bonds linked to IgM pentamers and IgA dimers for allowing appropriate migration through the gel.[34,35]

The dilution effect is crucial; for BME to be effective, it must be administered in the appropriate quantity. This indicates that diluting the patient's serum could complicate the detection of a small monoclonal M-protein, as it reduces the concentration.

The interpretation of IFE is greatly affected by the technologist or pathologist's level of experience and skill, which can lead to subjectivity and differences between observers. Identifying a subtle monoclonal band amidst a polyclonal background or nonspecific precipitation is inherently subjective. Studies indicate only moderate inter-observer concordance, even among experienced laboratories, particularly for faint bands.[36] While BME dilution allow for the persistence of subtle monoclonal components in an indistinct manner, this underscores the importance of confirmatory mass spectrometry for precise characterization. Nevertheless, the technical requirement for BME dilution might concentrate a small monoclonal component "indistinct" when applying in gel-based methods. Depending solely on this may result in missed or delayed diagnoses [Figure 1].

Figure 1: A. SPEP shows triclonal gammopathy with three distinct monoclonal bands in the gamma region. B. After treatment with BME dilution, the pattern showed to biclonal gammopathy due to the reduction of disulfide-linked aggregates and improved visualization of clonal components.

Limited quantification capabilities: SPEP measures the M-spike; however, the accuracy is limited due background polyclonal immunoglobulins, peak morphology, and the densitometer integration.

Electrophoretic methods evaluate clonality indirectly by analysing the restricted movement of proteins, thereby preventing direct characterization of clonality. Limited information is provided regarding the unique structural signature of the M-protein or the genetic character of the linked clone.

Altogether these limitations create a diagnostic ceiling that goes against the goals of modern diagnosis, namely early intervention, accurate monitoring, and personalized treatments [Table 2].

Table 2: Limitations of SPEP and IFE 37,38

Category	Specific limitation	Clinical concern	Reason
Analytical sensitivity	SPEP sensitivity: 0.2 - 0.5 g/L IFE sensitivity: ~0.1 - 0.2 g/L	Inability to confirm complete remission. Complicated surveillance for early progression in MGUS/SMM. False-negative results in diseases with low burden (e.g., AL Amyloidosis), delaying diagnosis.	M-proteins persisting below the detection threshold cannot be reliably identified.

Resolution and interference	Masking of small M-proteins by co-migrating polyclonal immunoglobulins. False-positive bands from proteins like transferrin, fibrinogen, or hemoglobin-haptoglobin complexes. Difficulty distinguishing biclonal gammopathies from a single large M-protein.	False-positive results cause unnecessary patient stress and further testing. Potential for mischaracterization of the disease (e.g., missing a biclonal case).	Limited separation resolution and non-specific protein interactions during electrophoresis.
Subjectivity in interpretation	Interpretation is highly dependent on the technologist/pathologist's skill and experience. Identifying subtle bands in a polyclonal background is inherently subjective. Only moderate inter-observer concordance, especially for faint bands.	Inconsistent results between different laboratories. Risk of missing low-level disease (false negative) or over-interpreting artifacts (false positive).	The method relies on visual inspection and pattern recognition, which is not fully standardized.
Limited quantification	SPEP M-spike measurement is not highly accurate. Affected by background polyclonal immunoglobulins, peak shape, and densitometer integration method.	Inability to track small changes in tumor burden over time. Hinders accurate monitoring for minimal residual disease (MRD) and deep remission assessment.	Quantification is indirect and semi-quantitative, lacking the precision needed for subtle trends.
Indirect clonality assessment	Methods infer clonality from restricted band migration. No direct characterization of the M-protein's unique structure or the genetic identity of the clone.	Lacks specific information needed for personalized therapy (e.g., targeted treatments). Cannot provide a unique signature for ultra-sensitive monitoring.	The technique analyses protein migration patterns, not the DNA or precise protein sequence of the clone.

Fresh Technologies for monoclonal gammopathy detection: Electrophoretic limitations have led to the advancement of novel platforms that can offer improved resolution, sensitivity, and outcomes. Mass spectrometry for immunoglobulin profiling, Next-generation sequencing of the B-cells, and biomarkers-integrated data are the future technologies to be considered in monoclonal gammopathy detection.

Mass spectrometry to profile immunoglobulins: In recent years, mass spectrometry has emerged as powerful tool for M-protein detection representing a significant progression clinical proteomics. Matrix-Assisted Laser Desorption/Ionization Time-of-Flight (MALDI-TOF) mass spectrometry and Liquid Chromatography-Tandem Mass Spectrometry (LC-MS/MS) are the two main types of mass spectrometry methods. The fundamental principle includes applying mass spectrometry to determine the mass-to-charge ratio (m/z) of immunoglobulin molecules.

Clonal population of plasma cells produces immunoglobulin molecules that exhibit identical or nearly identical amino acid sequences in their variable regions that generates a distinct mass signature and appears as a prominent peak on the mass spectrum.

Barnidge et al. (2014) developed the MS-based method for identifying the monoclonal M-protiens using serum immunoglobulin enrichment, reduction with DTT to separate heavy and light chains, followed by microflow LC-ESI-Q-TOF MS analysis. This approach enabled multiply charged light and heavy chain ions converted to their molecular masses, and for peak area calculations of light chains and quantification. They also revealed isotypes through the light chain component of an M-protein through the molecular mass analysis. Multiple myeloma samples shpowed the light chain portion of the M-protein was consistently detected, including those that were undetectable by SPE, IFE, and quantitative methods. Their study introduced a top-down mass spectrometry approach for isotyping M-protein light chains, applying a distinctive isotype-specific fragmentation pattern that eases both quantification and identification of isotype analysis. Overall, their findings indicated that microflow LC-ESI-Q-TOF MS demonstrates enhanced sensitivity and specificity relative to traditional methods, suggested its potential as an effective approach for the detection and isotyping of M-protein.[39]

Sensitivity and specificity: MS-based methods consistently achieved sensitivities 10¬¬−100 times’ précised than IFE, and allowing for the identification of M-proteins at concentrations as low as 0.01 g/L. This helps to find false negative cases of "IFE-negative" M-proteins. Mass spectrometry specificity gives accurate results by the proteins that migrate together or therapeutic monoclonal antibodies, which can be recognized and distinguished from the patient's M-protein due to different protein masses.[40,41]

Advantages of Mass spectrometry in gammopathies: MS can conclude the isotype (IgG, IgA, etc.), the type of light chain, and the particular amount of the M-protein at the same time. These type of mass fingerprints are unique in the way to conclude the clone apart from normal proteins. This method is accurate for diagnosing biclончal gammopathies, clonal evolution, differentiating endogenous M-proteins, and quantitation.

a. **Identification of Biclonal gammopathies:** Mass spectrometry can precisely differentiate between two distinct M-proteins that may appear as a single band on immunofixation electrophoresis.[42,43]

b. **Monitoring clonal evolution:** Alterations in the majority of the M-proteins may indicate the occurrence of a subclone, a case undetectable by electrophoresis.[39]
c. **Differentiating endogenous from therapeutic M-proteins:** The increasing use of monoclonal antibody therapies (e.g., daratumumab) has complicated IFE analysis, as these substances present as exogenous M-proteins.[44] MS method can effectively differentiate daratumumab from a patient's myeloma protein, thereby preventing misinterpretation.
d. **Quantification:** Though initial applications were mainly qualitative, approaches for accurate measurement of the monoclonal component using LC-MS/MS with stable isotope-labeled internal standards are now under development and validation, providing precision significantly superior to SPEP.[45]

Next-Generation Sequencing of the B-Cell Repertoire: Though, the MS-methods characterizes the proteins expressed, where the next-generation sequencing directly investigates the genomic blueprint of the clonal B-cell or plasma cell population. The principle of NGS in immunoglobulin genes includes the amplification and sequencing of the variable regions of heavy and light chains (e.g., variability, diversity, and joining (VDJ) rearrangements) from DNA or RNA of blood or bone marrow.[46,47] The clonal population is evaluated by a predominant, unique nucleotide sequence that is overexpressed in the array. The NGS offers in identifying and tracking clones and monitoring the diseases for personalized treatments. The International Myeloma Working Group (IMWG) standardized parameters for treatment response and minimal residual disease (MRD) in multiple myeloma.

These guidelines signify a transition from dependence entirely on end-organ injury (Calcium, renal impairment, anaemia, and bone marrow (CRAB) criteria) to the integration of advanced molecular and imaging techniques.

MRD assessment is considered as a dynamic endpoint, using next-generation flow cytometry, sequencing, and imaging techniques, and criteria for standardizing clinical trials and patient care globally. Rustad et al. (2019) analysed immunoglobulin repertoires in 905 plasma cell myeloma and control samples, with particular to CDR3 regions. They revleald that the clonal heavy and/or light chain sequences in all patients, with subclones present in only 3.2%. Cohort of 45 patient's data with sequential samples, dominant clonal CDR3 sequences persisted consistently over time, despite the whole-exome sequencing indicated clonal evolution in nearly 50% of cases. Subclonal CDR3 variants were rare, that showed an absence of selective pressure for affinity maturation during active disease state. Somatic hypermutation and non-templated insertions are critical factors in establishing the exclusivity of the light chain, thereby eased reliable tracking. Overall, baseline clonal sequences function as reliable biomarkers for the long-term surveillance of malignant clones in multiple myeloma.[48]

Peripheral blood monitoring: Identification of circulating clonal cells or cell-free DNA (cfDNA) containing the clonotypic sequence in peripheral blood is under intensive study. Liquid biopsy offers a minimally invasive method for tracking disease burden and clonal evolution over time.[49–51]

Integration with MS: The integration of MS and NGS provides a detailed, serum-based analysis of the secreted M-protein, while NGS offers an extensive, cellular-based assessment of the clonal load. Their integration offers a complete view of the disease condition.

Biomarkers in gammopathies: In addition to these technologies, biomarkers are also significant in gammopathies.

Heavy/light chain (HLC) assays: Immunoassays use antibodies to find epitopes made by the combination of a certain heavy chain (like IgG) and a light chain (kappa or lambda). This offers possibility to measure IgGκ, IgGλ, IgAκ, and IgAλ separately 52,53. Any imbalance in the HLC ratio (e.g., increased IgGκ / decreased IgGλ) indicates clonality and holds prognostic importance, even in the absence of detectable M-protein via SPEP.[54,55]

Glycosylation: The fragment crystallizable (Fc) region of immunoglobulins is glycosylated, and malignant plasma cells show abnormal glycosylation patterns. Mass spectrometry or lectin-based tests are used to diagnose certain glycoforms, which have been associated with a disease progression and the immune system.[56]

Risk Assessment: The future of gammopathies is rooted in the integration of diverse data streams. Risk models integrating MS-based M-protein levels, NGS-based clonal burden, HLC ratio, and unique glycosylation patterns is expected to assist as a more robust and personalised prognostic tools compared to any of these parameters in separation.

Case studies and diagnostic transitions

Literature showed that these methods can be integrated and practically lead to substantial diagnostic transformations.

Case study 1: Mills et al. (2016) study on MASS-FIX yielded matching key isotype data for 98% of serum M-proteins (n = 152) and 95% of urine M-proteins (n = 55) in patient samples. M-protein quantified by MASS-FIX at 1 g/dL, exhibiting reduced bias compared to protein electrophoresis. Samples exhibiting M-protein concentrations of 0.045 g/dL, along with a detection capacity for M-proteins at 0.01 g/dL, demonstrated intra-assay and inter-assay coefficients of variation (CVs) of 20%. Thereby the measurement of light chain ratios for IgG, IgA, and IgM can be conducted using MASS-FIX. Post-treatment, retrospective serial monitoring of myeloma patients revealed that MASS FIX provided precise quantitative data compared to the biochemical tests (heavy/light) and protein electrophoresis. Redefined complete response in Multiple Myeloma, a patient with IgGκ multiple myeloma achieves a stringent complete response (sCR) based on conventional criteria (negative SPEP and IFE). Nevertheless, MALDI-TOF MS continues to detect a distinct albeit minor monoclonal IgGκ signal. This patient has a higher chance of early progression than another MS-negative patient, which suggests that "MS-negative CR" shows a stronger response. Overall, they revealed that the MASS-FIX can be used to screen, diagnosis, and surveillance of plasma cell diseases.[57]

Case study 2: Moonen et al. (2023) evaluated u-MASS-FIX, a sophisticated mass spectrometry technique, as a substitute for urine-IFE. Traditional urine testing for monoclonal proteins via urine-IFE requires sufficient urine concentration. Their analysis of 1008 patient urine samples from Mayo Clinic patients revealed that u-MASS-FIX exhibited a 91% concordance with urine-IFE. The urine-MASS-FIX demonstrated superior alignment with serum free light chain ratios. They also identified glycosylated light chains and smaller fragments that were undetectable by urine-IFE. From urine-MASS-FIX detection limit of 0.156 mg/mL was achieved as a reliable and precise alternative to urine-IFE. Overall, increased sensitivity and workflow benefits, showed enhanced monitoring capabilities for plasma cell disorders.{43]

Case Study 3: Fuentes-Trillo et al. (2025) characterized by the clonal expansion of B-cells exhibiting specific immunoglobulin changes in chronic lymphocytic leukemia (CLL). They applied NGS to analyze changes in patient samples (47 healthy, and 319 CLL), thereby confirming clonality via distinct VDJ rearrangements. Their study revealed a successful distinguishing between dominant clones from subclonal variants, showed that isotype switching occured within the same lineage, thereby avoiding the misclassification of new malignancies, and for monitoring MRD and distinguishing between clonal evolution and secondary malignancies, thereby influencing proper patient management and treatment methods.[58]

On the other hand, advancement of research indicates that MS and NGS are superior methods for evaluating plasma cell disorders. Mills et al. demonstrated that mass spectrometry (MS) attains a combined sensitivity and specificity greater than 95% for the detection of monoclonal proteins, surpassing the performance of IFE. MS consistently revealed clinically significant M-proteins in samples that tested negative with IFE, particularly in cohorts with monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance (MGUS), smoldering myeloma (SMM), and AL amyloidosis. In addition, NGS for detecting minimal residual disease (MRD) confirmed that MRD negativity is the most significant predictor of prolonged survival in multiple myeloma, irrespective of other traditional methods. Recent literature underscores the significance of MS and NGS in increasing diagnostic sensitivity and refining prognostic assessments in plasma cell disorders.

Effects on the operations of clinical laboratories: The switch from electrophoresis to MS and NGS is a major transformation for laboratories in terms of their work, skills required, and economical requirements.

Platform validation and standardization: To use MS in a clinical diagnostic setting, it requires rigorous testing against established positive and negative standards (IFE) with reliable references and cut-off values for detection. Unlike IFE, which is standardized, MALDI-TOF methods may vary across laboratories in terms of standardization and interpretion criteria.[59]

Duration of operational process and response: MS methods deliver improved scalability and reduced labor compared to IFE; however, they depend on precise sample preparations and data interpretations. The initial turnaround time may be extended; however, it is subject to improvement.

Costs and pay: Laboratories need extensive cost-benefit assessments since the high initial capital cost of MS and NGS equipment, and the higher testing cost in comparison to SPE or IFE. Through the consolidation of several tests into a single platform, this evaluation seeks to establish if these technologies can improve patient outcomes and reduce errors (eg. like M-protein detection and daratumumab interference resolution).

Bioinformatics and trainings: The workforce needs a new set of skills in MS, bioinformatics along with NGS data. This shows a significant move from the graphical interpretation skills currently applied for IFE [Table 3].

Table 3: Operational Implications of Transitioning to MS/NGS in the Clinical Laboratory

Operational area	Current state (SPE/IFE)	Future state (MS / NGS)	Key challenges for implementation
Platform validation & standardization	Well-established and standardized protocols and interpretation criteria.	Lack of standardization. Methods (e.g., MALDI-TOF) can vary between labs. Requires rigorous validation against IFE and new reference intervals.	Developing universal standards and clinical cut-offs to ensure consistency and reliability across laboratories.
Workflow & throughput	Manual and labor-intensive, especially IFE. Limited throughput due to hands-on time.	Highly automated with potential for high throughput.	Complex sample prep (e.g., immuno-enrichment) and data analysis can lead to a longer initial turnaround time that needs optimization.
Financial considerations	Lower initial capital cost. Well-understood cost-per-test and reimbursement.	Very high initial capital investment for MS/NGS instruments. Higher per-test cost.	Justifying the cost via cost-benefit analysis (e.g., improved outcomes, reduced errors, consolidated testing).

			Securing adequate payer reimbursement is critical.
Personnel & expertise	Relies on technologists skilled in manual techniques and pathologists trained in visual interpretation of bands.	Requires new specialized roles: Mass Spectrometry Experts, Bioinformaticians, and Clinicians who can integrate complex data.	Significant workforce retraining and recruitment. A fundamental shift from visual skills to data science and analytical chemistry expertise.

Future Directions: Altogether the recent advancements in the detection of gammopathies indicates that these technologies will be integrated and applied in a well-established manner.

Ultra-early detection and risk prediction: The sensitivity of MS is appropriate for population screening of MGUS, which allows the detection of individuals at risk for MM, years prior to potential progression. NGS-based genome profiling the clones enable the possibility to develop accurate models to predict MGUS/MM patients for early intervention strategies.[60,61]

Dynamic monitoring of therapy response and resistance: The integration of serial MS monitoring (tracking the M-protein mass and potential emergence of new peaks) with NGS-based MRD and cell-free DNA analysis from liquid biopsies will provide a real-time, multi-dimensional assessment of treatment efficiency and the emergence of resistant subclones.[62]

Personalized medicine and vaccine development: The ability to sequence the unique idiotype of the M-protein via NGS opens the door for personalized immunotherapy, such as patient-specific idiotype vaccines.[63] Additionally, characterizing the neoantigens presented by malignant plasma cells could guide other immunotherapeutic approaches.

Artificial Intelligence (AI): The integration of AI, high-dimensional data generated by MS and NGS are ideally appropriate for investigation by machine learning algorithms.[64] AI trained to identify subtle patterns in MS spectra or NGS repertoires that predict clinical behavior, potentially aid in discovering novel prognostic biomarkers beyond human perception.

CONCLUSION

The era of depending on SPE and IFE techniques for the diagnosis and management of monoclonal gammopathies may soon phased out as they no longer sufficient to meet the demands of higher sensitivity, and disease management in gammopathies. Recently, MS-based immunoglobulin profiling offers a ground-breaking results in analytical performance, offering superior sensitivity, specificity, and objective characterization of the M-protein. In addition, the NGS also delivering unparalleled depth in tracking the underlying clonal populations (both in the bone marrow and peripheral blood).

Together, these evidences from recent literature and case studies endorses that MS and NGS are already causing a diagnostic shift, redefining disease states, and prompting clinical results. This path of advancing is not one of simple replacement, but of intelligent integration-combining the proteomic analysis with genomic level clonal tracking along with biomarkers to create a comprehensive diagnostic picture of the disease. Although there are operational challenges such as validation, cost, and expertise, and verification/conclusions. However, the compelling clinical benefits of early detection, precise monitoring, and personalized assessments/treatments, favours adoption of these new technologies for diagnosis and management of gammopathies.

Acknowledgments: The authors are thankful to the Management, Apollo Diagnostics Global Reference Lab, Hyderabad 500037, India for their support during the study.

REFERENCES

1. Wang, C., Xu, C. & Li, J. Editorial: Monoclonal gammopathies of clinical significance: Clinical and therapeutic implications. Front Endocrinol (Lausanne) 14, 1107283 (2023).
2. Landgren, O. Monoclonal Gammopathy of Undetermined Significance and Smoldering Myeloma: New Insights into Pathophysiology and Epidemiology. Hematology Am Soc Hematol Educ Program 2010, 295–302 (2010).
3. Current risk stratification and staging of multiple myeloma and related clonal plasma cell disorders | Leukemia. https://www.nature.com/articles/s41375-025-02654-y.
4. Li, W. et al. Comparison of SPE, IFE, and FLC in Monitoring Patients with Multiple Myeloma After Autologous Stem Cell Transplantation. Cell Biochem Biophys 73, 643–647 (2015).
5. McCudden, C. R. et al. Recognition and management of common, rare, and novel serum protein electrophoresis and immunofixation interferences. Clinical Biochemistry 51, 72–79 (2018).
6. Zajec, M. et al. Mass Spectrometry for Identification, Monitoring, and Minimal Residual Disease Detection of M-Proteins. Clin Chem 66, 421–433 (2020).
7. Coradin, M. et al. Next-Generation Monitoring: M-Insight® Clinical Application in Multiple Myeloma. Blood 144, 6967 (2024).
8. Smithies, O. How It All Began: A Personal History of Gel Electrophoresis. in Protein Electrophoresis: Methods and Protocols (eds Kurien, B. T. & Scofield, R. H.) 1–21 (Humana Press, Totowa, NJ, 2012). doi:10.1007/978-1-61779-821-4_1.
9. Cray, C. Protein electrophoresis of non-traditional species: A review. Veterinary Clinical Pathology 50, 478–494 (2021).
10. Prisi, S. et al. Unraveling the Possibilities of Monoclonal Protein Migration, Identification, and Characterization in SPEP on Capillary Zone Electrophoresis. J Lab Physicians 14, 505–510 (2022).
11. Singh, G. Serum and Urine Protein Electrophoresis and Serum-Free Light Chain Assays in the Diagnosis and Monitoring of Monoclonal Gammopathies. J Appl Lab Med 5, 1358–1371 (2020).
12. McMaster, M. L. & Csako, G. Protein electrophoresis, immunoelectrophoresis and immunofixation electrophoresis as predictors for high-risk phenotype in familial Waldenström macroglobulinemia. Int J Cancer 122, 1183–1188 (2008).
13. Cawley, L. P., Minard, B. J., Tourtellotte, W. W., Ma, B. I. & Chelle, C. Immunofixation electrophoretic techniques applied to identification of proteins in serum and cerebrospinal fluid. Clin Chem 22, 1262–1268 (1976).

14. Kraj, M., Kruk, B., Szczepiński, A. & Warzocha, K. Comparison of immunoglobulin free light chain (FLC), heavy chain/light chain (HLC) assays and immunofixation (IFE) in assessment of remission in multiple myeloma. Acta Haematologica Polonica 43, 122–131 (2012).
15. Kaur, J. et al. Monoclonal Gammopathy of Undetermined Significance: A Comprehensive Review. Clinical Lymphoma Myeloma and Leukemia 23, e195–e212 (2023).
16. Visram, A. et al. Disease monitoring with quantitative serum IgA levels provides a more reliable response assessment in multiple myeloma patients. Leukemia 35, 1428–1437 (2021).
17. Gertz, M. A. Waldenström Macroglobulinemia: 2025 Update on Diagnosis, Risk Stratification, and Management. Am J Hematol 100, 1061–1073 (2025).
18. Hanbali, A. et al. Uncommon Entities, Uncommon Challenges: A Review of Rare Plasma Cell Disorders. Hematology Reports 17, (2025).
19. Buckley, R. H. & Fiscus, S. A. Serum IgD and IgE concentrations in immunodeficiency diseases. J Clin Invest 55, 157–165 (1975).
20. Hanbali, A. et al. Uncommon Entities, Uncommon Challenges: A Review of Rare Plasma Cell Disorders. Hematology Reports 17, (2025).
21. Sulaiman, A. & Caturegli, P. Falsely abnormal serum protein electrophoresis after administration of intravenous immunoglobulins (IVIG): A retrospective cohort study. Practical Laboratory Medicine 42, e00434 (2024).
22. Bibas, M., Sarosiek, S. & Castillo, J. J. Waldenström Macroglobulinemia - A State-of-the-Art Review: Part 1: Epidemiology, Pathogenesis, Clinicopathologic Characteristics, Differential Diagnosis, Risk Stratification, and Clinical Problems. Mediterr J Hematol Infect Dis 16, e2024061 (2024).
23. Vyas, S. G. & Singh, G. Prospective Identification of Oligoclonal/Abnormal Band of the Same Immunoglobulin Type as the Malignant Clone by Differential Location of M-Spike and Oligoclonal Band. J Clin Med Res 9, 826–830 (2017).
24. Woziwodzka, K. et al. New Markers of Renal Failure in Multiple Myeloma and Monoclonal Gammopathies. J Clin Med 9, 1652 (2020).
25. Kundu, S. et al. Multiple Myeloma and Renal Failure: Mechanisms, Diagnosis, and Management. Cureus 14, e22585.
26. Oskam, N. et al. Biochemical analysis reveals aberrant and variable Immunoglobulin M composition in Waldenström macroglobulinemia and IgM monoclonal gammopathy of unknown significance. Front. Immunol. 16, (2025).
27. Hanbali, A. et al. Uncommon Entities, Uncommon Challenges: A Review of Rare Plasma Cell Disorders. Hematology Reports 17, (2025).
28. Vladutiu, A. O. Immunoglobulin D: Properties, Measurement, and Clinical Relevance. Clin Diagn Lab Immunol 7, 131–140 (2000).
29. Kehl, N. et al. IgE type multiple myeloma exhibits hypermutated phenotype and tumor reactive T cells. J Immunother Cancer 10, e005815 (2022).
30. Zajec, M. et al. Integrating Serum Protein Electrophoresis with Mass Spectrometry, A New Workflow for M-Protein Detection and Quantification. J. Proteome Res. 19, 2845–2853 (2020).
31. Katzmann, J. A. et al. Screening panels for detection of monoclonal gammopathies. Clin Chem 55, 1517–1522 (2009).
32. Murray, D. et al. Detection and prevalence of monoclonal gammopathy of undetermined significance: a study utilizing mass spectrometry-based monoclonal immunoglobulin rapid accurate mass measurement. Blood Cancer J 9, 102 (2019).
33. Bossuyt, X. & Mariën, G. False-negative results in detection of monoclonal proteins by capillary zone electrophoresis: a prospective study. Clin Chem 47, 1477–1479 (2001).
34. Kyle, R. A. & Rajkumar, S. V. Criteria for diagnosis, staging, risk stratification and response assessment of multiple myeloma. Leukemia 23, 3–9 (2009).
35. Henry's Clinical Diagnosis and Management by Laboratory Methods. (2021).
36. Miyakis, S. et al. International consensus statement on an update of the classification criteria for definite antiphospholipid syndrome (APS). Journal of Thrombosis and Haemostasis 4, 295–306 (2006).
37. Murray, D. L. et al. Mass spectrometry for the evaluation of monoclonal proteins in multiple myeloma and related disorders: an International Myeloma Working Group Mass Spectrometry Committee Report. Blood Cancer J. 11, 24 (2021).
38. Keren, D. F. & Schroeder, L. Challenges of measuring monoclonal proteins in serum. Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine (CCLM) 54, 947–961 (2016).
39. Barnidge, D. R. et al. Using mass spectrometry to monitor monoclonal immunoglobulins in patients with a monoclonal gammopathy. J Proteome Res 13, 1419–1427 (2014).
40. Zajec, M. et al. Mass Spectrometry for Identification, Monitoring, and Minimal Residual Disease Detection of M-Proteins. Clin Chem 66, 421–433 (2020).
41. Mills, J. R. & Murray, D. L. Identification of Friend or Foe: The Laboratory Challenge of Differentiating M-Proteins from Monoclonal Antibody Therapies. J Appl Lab Med 1, 421–431 (2017).
42. Fatica, E. M. et al. MALDI-TOF mass spectrometry can distinguish immunofixation bands of the same isotype as monoclonal or biclonal proteins. Clinical Biochemistry 97, 67–73 (2021).
43. Moonen, D. H. et al. Utilizing Mass Spectrometry to Detect and Isotype Monoclonal Proteins in Urine: Comparison to Electrophoretic Methods. Clin Chem 69, 746–753 (2023).
44. McCudden, C. et al. Monitoring multiple myeloma patients treated with daratumumab: teasing out monoclonal antibody interference. Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine (CCLM) 54, 1095–1104 (2016).
45. McIlroy, G. et al. Monoclonal immunoglobulin measurement by mass spectrometry in patients with multiple myeloma and kidney failure: Analysis from the EuLITE trial. Br J Haematol 207, 294–298 (2025).
46. Dunn-Walters, D., Townsend, C., Sinclair, E. & Stewart, A. Immunoglobulin gene analysis as a tool for investigating human immune responses. Immunol Rev 284, 132–147 (2018).
47. Faham, M. et al. Deep-sequencing approach for minimal residual disease detection in acute lymphoblastic leukemia. Blood 120, 5173–5180 (2012).
48. Rustad, E. H. et al. Stability and uniqueness of clonal immunoglobulin CDR3 sequences for MRD tracking in multiple myeloma. American Journal of Hematology 94, 1364–1373 (2019).
49. Shishido, S. N. et al. Characterizing circulating rare cells in peripheral blood for detecting and monitoring multiple myeloma and precursor states. npj Precis. Onc. 9, 388 (2025).
50. Tembhare, P. R. et al. Circulating Clonal Plasma Cells at Diagnosis and Peripheral Blood Measurable Residual Disease Assessment Provide Powerful Prognostication Biomarkers in Newly-Diagnosed Multiple Myeloma Patients Treated without Autologous Transplant. Blood 140, 1135–1136 (2022).
51. Petersenn, S. et al. Diagnosis and management of prolactin-secreting pituitary adenomas: a Pituitary Society international Consensus Statement. Nat Rev Endocrinol 19, 722–740 (2023).
52. Warren, J. S. Immunoglobulin Quantification and Viscosity Measurement. in Manual of Molecular and Clinical Laboratory Immunology 65–73 (John Wiley & Sons, Ltd, 2016). doi:10.1128/9781555818722.ch7.
53. Paolini, L. Quantification of β region IgA paraproteins – should we include immunochemical "heavy/light chain" measurements? Counterpoint. Clinical Chemistry and Laboratory Medicine (CCLM) 54, 1059–1064 (2016).
54. Ludwig, H. et al. Immunoglobulin heavy/light chain ratios improve paraprotein detection and monitoring, identify residual disease and correlate with survival in multiple myeloma patients. Leukemia 27, 213–219 (2013).
55. Napodano, C. et al. Laboratory and Clinical Settings of Heavy/Light Chain (HLC) Assays in the Management of Monoclonal Gammopathies and Multiple Myeloma. Journal of Personalized Medicine 13, (2023).

56. Girard, L.-P., Soekojo, C. Y., Ooi, M., Chng, W. J. & de Mel, S. Immunoglobulin M Monoclonal Gammopathies of Clinical Significance. Front Oncol 12, 905484 (2022).
57. Mills, J. R. et al. Comprehensive Assessment of M-Proteins Using Nanobody Enrichment Coupled to MALDI-TOF Mass Spectrometry. Clin Chem 62, 1334–1344 (2016).
58. Fuentes-Trillo, A. et al. Characterization of Chronic Lymphocytic Leukemia Immunoglobulin Rearrangements from Partial Read Sequencing. Genomics Proteomics Bioinformatics 23, qzaf041 (2022).
59. Sanguinetti, M. & Posteraro, B. Identification of Molds by Matrix-Assisted Laser Desorption Ionization–Time of Flight Mass Spectrometry. J Clin Microbiol 55, 369–379 (2017).
60. Gutiérrez-González, A., Del Hierro, I. & Cariaga-Martínez, A. E. Advancements in Multiple Myeloma Research: High-Throughput Sequencing Technologies, Omics, and the Role of Artificial Intelligence. Biology (Basel) 13, 923 (2024).
61. Alberge, J.-B. et al. Genomic landscape of multiple myeloma and its precursor conditions. Nat Genet 57, 1493–1503 (2025).
62. Kubicki, T. et al. Mass spectrometry–based assessment of M protein in peripheral blood during maintenance therapy in multiple myeloma. Blood 144, 955–963 (2024).
63. Wen, Y.-J., Barlogie, B. & Yi, Q. Idiotype-specific cytotoxic T lymphocytes in multiple myeloma: evidence for their capacity to lyse autologous primary tumor cells. Blood 97, 1750–1755 (2001).
64. dariusz-jacoszek. Artificial Intelligence in Drug Discovery and Development. nexocode https://nexocode.com/blog/posts/artificial-intelligence-in-drug-discovery-and-development/ (2021).