



University of Dundee

Biomarkers in lung cancer screening

Baldwin, David R.; Callister, Matthew E.; Crosbie, Philip A.; O'Dowd, Emma L.; Rintoul, Robert C.; Robbins, Hilary A.

Published in:
European Respiratory Journal

DOI:
[10.1183/13993003.04367-2020](https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.04367-2020)

Publication date:
2021

Document Version
Peer reviewed version

[Link to publication in Discovery Research Portal](#)

Citation for published version (APA):

Baldwin, D. R., Callister, M. E., Crosbie, P. A., O'Dowd, E. L., Rintoul, R. C., Robbins, H. A., & Steele, R. J. C. (2021). Biomarkers in lung cancer screening: the importance of study design. *European Respiratory Journal*, 57(1), [2004367]. <https://doi.org/10.1183/13993003.04367-2020>

General rights

Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in Discovery Research Portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.

- Users may download and print one copy of any publication from Discovery Research Portal for the purpose of private study or research.
- You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain.
- You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal.

Take down policy

If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.



Biomarkers in lung cancer screening: the importance of study design

Journal:	<i>European Respiratory Journal</i>
Manuscript ID	Draft
Manuscript Type:	Editorial
Date Submitted by the Author:	n/a
Complete List of Authors:	Baldwin, David; Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, Department of Respiratory medicine; University of Nottingham, Epidemiology and public health Callister, Matthew; Leeds Teaching Hospitals NHS Trust, Department of Respiratory Medicine, Leeds Teaching Hospitals; Crosbie, Philip; University Hospital South Manchester, North West Lung Centre O'Dowd, Emma; Nottingham University Hospitals NHS Trust, Respiratory Medicine ; University of Nottingham, Epidemiology and public health Rintoul , Robert; University of Cambridge, Oncology; PAPWORTH HOSPITAL NHS FOUNDATION TRUST, Thoracic Oncology Robbins, Hilary; International Agency for Research on Cancer Steele, Robert; University of Dundee, Surgery
Key Words:	lung cancer screening, biomarkers, methodology of clinical trials
Abstract:	Low radiation dose computed tomography is an effective method of screening people at high risk of developing lung cancer. Participants are selected either by age and tobacco smoking criteria or multivariable models. Using biomarkers to select people for lung cancer screening may be able to identify those at high risk who do not meet conventional criteria while avoiding further investigation in those without malignant disease. In this issue of the ERJ two biomarkers intended for use in selecting people for CT screening are reported. Both studies are unable to conclude that the biomarker is suitable for this intended use because of issues with the study design. The EarlyCDT-Lung blood test was used to select people at high risk of lung cancer for a regime of LDCT screening but only those with positive tests (10%) had LDCT, which is itself highly sensitive for early-stage lung cancer and can detect cancers 4-6 years before they present. Thus, it is impossible to calculate the contribution of the blood test to the detection of early-stage disease because 90% of the participants were excluded from LDCT. Gaga and colleagues report on the development and validation of a new blood biomarker, Lung EpiCheck; however here the issue is that the case and control groups are different and hence discrimination is likely over-estimated. Study design should allow the added contribution of the biomarker to be identified and quantified, in direct comparison to the gold-standard method and in the population in which it is to be used.

This is an author-submitted, peer-reviewed version of a manuscript that has been accepted for publication in the *European Respiratory Journal*, prior to copy-editing, formatting and typesetting. This version of the manuscript may not be duplicated or reproduced without prior permission from the European Respiratory Society. The publisher is not responsible or liable for any errors or omissions in this version of the manuscript or in any version derived from it by any other parties. The final, copy-edited, published article, which is the version of record, is available without a subscription 18 months after the date of issue publication

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60



SCHOLARONE™
Manuscripts

Biomarkers in lung cancer screening: the importance of study design

**David R Baldwin, Matthew E Callister, Philip A Crosbie, Emma L O'Dowd,
Robert C Rintoul, Hilary A Robbins, Robert J C Steele**

David R Baldwin
Consultant Respiratory Physician, Nottingham University Hospitals
Honorary Professor of Medicine, University of Nottingham
Respiratory Medicine
Nottingham University Hospitals, City Campus
Hucknall Road
Nottingham UK
NG5 1PB

Email: David.baldwin@nottingham.ac.uk

Matthew E Callister
Consultant Respiratory Physician, Leeds Teaching Hospitals
Honorary Professor of Medicine, University of Leeds
St James's University Hospital
Beckett Street
Leeds, LS9 7TF.

Philip A J Crosbie
Clinical Senior Lecturer & Honorary Consultant in Respiratory Medicine
Division of Infection, Immunity and Respiratory Medicine,
University of Manchester
Manchester Thoracic Oncology Centre, North West Lung Centre, Manchester
University NHS Foundation Trust,
Wythenshawe, M23 9LT.

Emma L O'Dowd
Consultant Respiratory Physician, Nottingham University Hospitals
Honorary Associate Professor of Medicine, University of Nottingham
Respiratory Medicine
Nottingham University Hospitals, City Campus
Hucknall Road
Nottingham UK

NG5 1PB**Robert C Rintoul**

Reader in Thoracic Oncology, Department of Oncology, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, UK CB2 0QQ

Honorary Consultant Respiratory Physician, Department of Thoracic Oncology, Royal Papworth Hospital, Cambridge, UK CB2 0AY.

Hilary A Robbins

Scientist, Genetic Epidemiology Group

International Agency for Research on Cancer, Lyon, France

150 cours Albert Thomas; 69372 Lyon CEDEX 08; France

Robert J C Steele

Senior Research Professor and Chair, UK National Screening Committee

University of Dundee, Department of Surgery, Ninewells Hospital, Dundee

DD1 9SY, UK.

Declarations

HAR: Where authors are identified as personnel of the International Agency for Research on Cancer / World Health Organization, the authors alone are responsible for the views expressed in this article and they do not necessarily represent the decisions, policy or views of the International Agency for Research on Cancer / World Health Organization.

PAJC: supported by the NIHR Manchester Biomedical Research Centre.

RCR: the Chief Investigator of the LuCiD study, sponsored by Owlstone Medical but declares no financial support or financial interest in Owlstone Medical. RCR is supported by the NIHR Cambridge Biomedical Research Centre and Cancer Research UK Cambridge Centre.

Funding

HAR was supported in part by the INTEGRAL program (U19 CA203654).

Biomarkers in lung cancer screening: the importance of study design

In most randomised controlled trials of low radiation dose computed tomography (LDCT) screening for lung cancer, eligibility has been determined by age and tobacco smoking criteria.(1, 2) A number of multivariable risk prediction models have been developed that are more sensitive and specific, but are still heavily dependent on smoking and age.(3) Some have been used successfully in trials and pilot programmes and have yielded higher detection rates, although they may also select people with more comorbidities.(4-6) Using biomarkers to select people for lung cancer screening is an important area for research because it offers the possibility to identify those at high risk who aren't eligible for screening by conventional criteria while avoiding further investigation in those who do not have malignant disease. This means that the impact of the intervention as a whole could be greater (more lives saved) and harms, due to the screening of low-risk people or those without cancer, could be avoided. Two biomarkers intended for use in lung screening are presented in this issue of the ERJ.

Sullivan et al describe the use of the "EarlyCDT-Lung", a 7-autoantibody blood test to detect lung cancer which was evaluated in a randomised trial in Scotland (Early Lung Cancer Detection in Scotland, ECLS)(7). Just over twelve thousand people who were at high risk of developing lung cancer by age and smoking criteria were randomised 1:1 to an intervention arm or usual care. In the intervention arm, participants were offered EarlyCDT-Lung, and those who were test-positive ($\approx 10\%$; $n=598$) went on to have an initial chest X-ray followed by LDCT every 6 months for 24 months. The researchers report a lower proportion of late-stage cancers in the active arm, 33 of 56 (59%) compared with 52 of 71 (73%) in the control arm (HR 0.64 (95% CI 0.41, 0.99)). Seven patients with unclassified stage in the control arm were assumed to be diagnosed at late stage, whereas all in the intervention arm had known stage. This assumption favoured the primary outcome of the study, making the difference in late stage disease statistically significant. The authors reported sensitivity estimates 2 years after recruitment, for lung cancer overall and stratified by early/late stage disease.

1
2
3 The most important limitation in the research design, which the researchers acknowledge,
4 was that neither the participants who tested negative by EarlyCDT-Lung, nor the participants
5 in the control arm, were offered LDCT. This has three implications for interpreting the results
6 presented. Firstly, the ability of LDCT screening to diagnose lung cancer at earlier stages is
7 well-established, with 75% or more diagnosed at stage I/II.(1, 2, 5) Since LDCT screening was
8 only offered to those who tested positive by the biomarker, it is not possible to determine
9 whether EarlyCDT-Lung made any improvement to earlier detection. Indeed, a test
10 generating a result at random would be expected to result in earlier diagnosis in the
11 intervention group, simply by triggering a CT scan in a proportion of these participants.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Secondly, assessing overall sensitivity for lung cancer after only 2 years follow-up is likely to
22 overestimate the sensitivity of the EarlyCDT-screening intervention (reported as 32%). This
23 is because lung cancer has a sojourn time (interval between development and presentation
24 of cancer) of 4-6 years(8) – indeed ‘catch-up’ of cancer presentations in the non-LDCT-
25 screened group in NLST continued for 9 years(9). Therefore, one would expect continued
26 identification of lung cancers in the test negative group over subsequent years of follow-up,
27 thereby progressively reducing the sensitivity (i.e. the proportion identified by the test). A
28 more accurate estimate of the sensitivity of the EarlyCDT-Lung would have been obtained if
29 all participants in the screened arm had received an exit LDCT, because LDCT detects many of
30 these cancers. Furthermore, a strange aspect of the ECLS results is that more lung cancers
31 were recorded in the control group (n=71) than in the intervention group (n=56). LDCT
32 typically detects a 2.2-fold (NELSON), 2.4 (MILD) to 3.1-fold (LUSI) greater number of cancers
33 in the LDCT arm compared with the no-screening control arm in the first 2 years(2, 10, 11). In
34 the ECLS, 71 lung cancers were detected over 2 years in the control arm. If LDCT had been
35 offered to all intervention-arm participants we would expect at least 156 (2.2 x 71) lung
36 cancers to be detected. Among these, approximately 117 (75%) would be expected to be
37 stage I/II. Since only 12 participants had stage I/II lung cancer in the EarlyCDT positive group,
38 the test sensitivity would be 10%. The ECLS reported sensitivity of 52% for stage I/II disease
39 is, therefore, likely to be a substantial over-estimate and entirely due to the fact that only test
40 positive participants had LDCT.
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 Finally, measuring sensitivity for early versus late stage disease (in the absence of screening
4 for the test negative group) is flawed. Any comparison of sensitivities between these two
5 groups is biased by the fact that the cancers in the test positive group will generally be early
6 stage cancers detected by LDCT screening, whereas those in the test-negative participants
7 will present at a later time-point and therefore likely to be more advanced stage. Thus,
8 EarlyCDT-Lung must be compared directly with existing methods for selecting people for
9 screening (and should include LDCT for test negative participants) before any conclusions
10 about its utility can be drawn. At worst, it could cause considerable harm by excluding people
11 at high risk who would be selected by currently available and validated multivariable models.
12 It is noted that in ECLS 90% of participants were effectively excluded from LDCT by virtue of
13 the negative blood test.
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23

24
25 A number of other biomarkers for lung screening are in various stages of development.(12)
26 However, biomarkers with promising early results have often failed in subsequent research
27 (13, 14), and this is often explained by differences in design of studies between development
28 and validation. For initial development studies, biomarkers are typically tested for differences
29 between cases and controls. A common pitfall is that biomarkers are capable of distinguishing
30 between cases and controls at the time of diagnosis, but fail when tested in pre-diagnostic
31 samples, or fail in the setting of early-stage disease. Another pitfall is that cases and controls
32 are often poorly matched for important factors, or even derived from separate populations.
33 When later validated in a population of at-risk people, the test performs less well. Therefore,
34 initial control populations should be derived from the same cohort as the patients with cancer
35 and selected in a way that simulates the intended downstream use of the biomarker. For
36 example, biomarkers intended for use in selection for screening should be tested in a group
37 potentially eligible for screening. The biomarker should then be compared with the gold-
38 standard method for the clinical application of interest, for example, to risk prediction models
39 if intended for use in defining eligibility for screening.
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53

54 Also in this issue of ERJ, Gaga et al report on a novel methylation-based biomarker, Lung
55 EpiCheck, which shows a sensitivity of 85% for early stage lung cancer with a specificity of
56 64% when combined with other risk factors. This new test is promising but, quite rightly, the
57 authors recommend further prospective trials to establish how the test performs in
58
59
60

1
2
3 populations eligible for screening. As the authors acknowledge, there were important
4 differences in the cases and controls in the European dataset due to retrospective selection
5 of cases and identification of controls from an outpatient population. Furthermore, the
6 controls did not have follow-up or LDCT to look for early-stage lung cancer. In the single-
7 centre Chinese validation set, healthy controls were used. Thus, the high AUC of 0.94 is likely
8 a result of the marked difference between cases and controls and will reduce when the
9 biomarker is used to select people for screening where cases and controls are from the same
10 population. One important step will be to use the test alongside LDCT screening and compare
11 the performance with that of currently validated risk models.
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20

21 Biomarkers offer a promising approach to improve the impact of screening, because unlike
22 conventional risk prediction models, they may be able to identify people who have high risk
23 for lung cancer without concurrently elevated risk for competing causes of death related to
24 age and smoking. However, it is important to establish whether a positive biomarker is also a
25 marker for poor outcome, as biomarkers may detect more aggressive disease with a poor
26 prognosis.⁽¹⁵⁾ For example, some cell-free DNA tests may be correlated with more aggressive
27 tumours. ⁽¹⁶⁻¹⁸⁾ Conventional cancer screening reduces mortality mainly by detecting less
28 aggressive tumours (length time effect) so although detecting aggressive cancers early may
29 improve treatment options, the impact on mortality may be less. Sullivan et al show that a
30 positive Early CDT, based on measuring the immune response to lung cancer, in combination
31 with LDCT showed a non-significant trend to reduced mortality. This may merit further study.
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 The ultimate aim is to have a biomarker that is inexpensive and can be used as the screening
44 test, with LDCT being the downstream investigation, in a similar way to colorectal screening
45 where the faecal immunochemical test or faecal occult blood test is followed by colonoscopy.
46 It is important that the test identifies not only people who will develop disease, but
47 specifically people who can benefit.
48
49
50
51
52

53 Many promising biomarkers are emerging,⁽¹⁹⁻²¹⁾ but the onus is on the research community
54 to test each one using robust methodology. Studies must be designed in such a way that the
55 added contribution of the biomarker can be clearly identified and quantified, in direct
56 comparison to the gold-standard method for the task that the biomarker purports to
57
58
59
60

1
2
3 accomplish. This is an exciting and promising field, but the excitement must be met with
4 carefully designed, definitive studies.
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60

References

1. National Lung Screening Trial Research T, Aberle DR, Adams AM, Berg CD, Black WC, Clapp JD, et al. Reduced lung-cancer mortality with low-dose computed tomographic screening. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2011;365(5):395-409.
2. de Koning HJ, van der Aalst CM, de Jong PA, Scholten ET, Nackaerts K, Heuvelmans MA, et al. Reduced Lung-Cancer Mortality with Volume CT Screening in a Randomized Trial. *N Engl J Med*. 2020;382(6):503-13.
3. Ten Haaf K, Jeon J, Tammemagi MC, Han SS, Kong CY, Plevritis SK, et al. Risk prediction models for selection of lung cancer screening candidates: A retrospective validation study. *PLoS Med*. 2017;14(4):e1002277.
4. Tammemagi MC, Schmidt H, Martel S, McWilliams A, Goffin JR, Johnston MR, et al. Participant selection for lung cancer screening by risk modelling (the Pan-Canadian Early Detection of Lung Cancer [PanCan] study): a single-arm, prospective study. *Lancet Oncol*. 2017;18(11):1523-31.
5. Field JK, Duffy SW, Baldwin DR, Whynes DK, Devaraj A, Brain KE, et al. UK Lung Cancer RCT Pilot Screening Trial: baseline findings from the screening arm provide evidence for the potential implementation of lung cancer screening. *Thorax*. 2016;71(2):161-70.
6. Mazzone PJ, Silvestri GA, Patel S, Kanne JP, Kinsinger LS, Wiener RS, et al. Screening for Lung Cancer: CHEST Guideline and Expert Panel Report. *Chest*. 2018;153(4):954-85.
7. Sullivan FM, Mair FS, Anderson W, Armory P, Briggs A, Chew C, et al. Earlier diagnosis of lung cancer in a randomised trial of an autoantibody blood test followed by imaging. *Eur Respir J*. 2020.
8. Ten Haaf K, van Rosmalen J, de Koning HJ. Lung cancer detectability by test, histology, stage, and gender: estimates from the NLST and the PLCO trials. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*. 2015;24(1):154-61.
9. National Lung Screening Trial Research T. Lung Cancer Incidence and Mortality with Extended Follow-up in the National Lung Screening Trial. *J Thorac Oncol*. 2019;14(10):1732-42.
10. Paci E, Puliti D, Lopes Pegna A, Carrozzi L, Picozzi G, Falaschi F, et al. Mortality, survival and incidence rates in the ITALUNG randomised lung cancer screening trial. *Thorax*. 2017;72(9):825-31.
11. Becker N, Motsch E, Trotter A, Heussel CP, Dienemann H, Schnabel PA, et al. Lung cancer mortality reduction by LDCT screening-Results from the randomized German LUSI trial. *Int J Cancer*. 2019.
12. Seijo LM, Peled N, Ajona D, Boeri M, Field JK, Sozzi G, et al. Biomarkers in Lung Cancer Screening: Achievements, Promises, and Challenges. *J Thorac Oncol*. 2019;14(3):343-57.
13. Ilie M, Hofman V, Long-Mira E, Selva E, Vignaud JM, Padovani B, et al. "Sentinel" circulating tumor cells allow early diagnosis of lung cancer in patients with chronic obstructive pulmonary disease. *PLoS One*. 2014;9(10):e111597.
14. Marquette CH, Boutros J, Benzaquen J, Ferreira M, Pastre J, Pison C, et al. Circulating tumour cells as a potential biomarker for lung cancer screening: a prospective cohort study. *Lancet Respir Med*. 2020;8(7):709-16.
15. Yuxia M, Zhennan T, Wei Z. Circulating miR-125b is a novel biomarker for screening non-small-cell lung cancer and predicts poor prognosis. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol*. 2012;138(12):2045-50.

16. Gressel GM, Maggi EC, Harmon BE, Ye KQ, Kuo DYS, Dolan SM, et al. Low molecular weight serum cell-free DNA concentration is associated with clinicopathologic indices of poor prognosis in women with uterine cancer. *J Transl Med.* 2020;18(1):323.
17. Lennon AM, Buchanan AH, Kinde I, Warren A, Honushefsky A, Cohain AT, et al. Feasibility of blood testing combined with PET-CT to screen for cancer and guide intervention. *Science.* 2020;369(6499).
18. Cohen JD, Li L, Wang Y, Thoburn C, Afsari B, Danilova L, et al. Detection and localization of surgically resectable cancers with a multi-analyte blood test. *Science.* 2018;359(6378):926-30.
19. Shen SY, Singhanian R, Fehringer G, Chakravarthy A, Roehrl MHA, Chadwick D, et al. Sensitive tumour detection and classification using plasma cell-free DNA methylomes. *Nature.* 2018;563(7732):579-83.
20. Liu MC, Oxnard GR, Klein EA, Swanton C, Seiden MV, Liu MC, et al. Sensitive and specific multi-cancer detection and localization using methylation signatures in cell-free DNA. *Annals of Oncology.* 2020;31(6):745-59.
21. Chabon JJ, Hamilton EG, Kurtz DM, Esfahani MS, Moding EJ, Stehr H, et al. Integrating genomic features for non-invasive early lung cancer detection. *Nature.* 2020;580(7802):245-51.