Blood-Based Multi-Cancer Early Detection: Technologies, Potential Impact, and Implementation Considerations

Seyed Mohammad Badzohreh
Tarbiat Modares University of Tehran

Abstract

Drawing on the provided sources and our conversation history, here is an abstract regarding multi-cancer early detection (MCED) tests:

Multi-Cancer Early Detection (MCED) tests represent a transformative approach in oncology, aiming to simultaneously detect multiple cancer types through a single blood draw. These tests hold the potential for a stage shift towards earlier diagnosis, leading to improved patient outcomes and less intensive treatments. Various methodologies are being explored, including the analysis of methylation signatures of circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA) and spectroscopic liquid biopsies utilizing Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy combined with machine learning. The Dxcover® Cancer Liquid Biopsy, an example of the latter, has demonstrated the ability to detect early-stage cancers across eight different cancer types with high sensitivity and specificity. MCED tests offer the advantage of integrating seamlessly into existing diagnostic pathways due to their non-invasive nature. They could aid in ruling out cancer in low-suspicion cases and prioritizing high-risk individuals for further investigation. While showing promising performance in early detection and potentially achieving higher cancer detection rates than current single-cancer screening methods, further research is needed to establish standardized criteria for clinical validity and utility. Understanding public attitudes and developing clear diagnostic pathways for positive results will be crucial for the successful implementation of MCED screening. The continuous advancements in machine learning applied to these tests also suggest the potential for ongoing improvements in their performance. Overall, MCED tests offer a significant step towards earlier and broader cancer detection, with the potential to improve patient prognosis through timely intervention.

Introduction

Cancer remains a leading cause of mortality worldwide, with blood cancers holding a significant position among the various types. Early detection is paramount for improving treatment outcomes and survival rates across all cancers, including those of the blood. Traditional screening methods are often limited to a few specific cancer types and can suffer from limitations such as low detection rates for many cancers and high cumulative false-positive rates. In response to these challenges, there is a growing focus on the development and application of **multi-cancer early detection (MCED) tests**[1], which aim to simultaneously detect signals from multiple cancers, potentially revolutionizing cancer screening and early diagnosis[2]. This survey paper will explore the landscape of MCED tests with a specific focus on their potential and application in the early detection of blood cancers.

Keywords: Multi-Cancer Early Detection (MCED), liquid biopsy, early cancer detection, machine learning, cancer screening

Rationale and Technological Underpinnings of MCED Tests

The development of MCED tests is driven by the need for more effective early cancer detection strategies that can overcome the limitations of single-cancer screening programs. Current screening programs often target only a few prevalent cancers and may not be feasible or cost-effective for rarer cancer types, including many blood cancers[3]. MCED tests offer a paradigm shift by aiming to detect a shared cancer signal across multiple cancer types simultaneously, thereby potentially improving screening efficiency and overall cancer detection rates.

Several technological approaches are being explored for MCED tests, with liquid biopsy emerging as a central method. This involves analyzing biological fluids, primarily blood, for cancer-related biomarkers such as circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA), methylation signatures, RNA, proteins, metabolites, or even whole tumor cells.

- **Circulating Tumor DNA (ctDNA) analysis:** One prominent approach focuses on identifying and analyzing ctDNA, which are fragments of DNA shed by tumor cells into the bloodstream. Techniques like next-generation sequencing can be used to detect mutations or other genomic alterations indicative of cancer. Singlera is actively pursuing this tactic by hunting down the methylation signature of ctDNA for earlier cancer detection[4].
- **Methylation profiling:** Aberrant DNA methylation is a hallmark of cancer. MCED tests can analyze methylation patterns in cell-free DNA (cfDNA) to detect cancer signals and potentially identify the tissue of origin[5].
- **Spectroscopic analysis:** Another promising technology is Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy, as utilized in the Dxcover® Cancer Liquid Biopsy. This method analyzes the full complement of tumor and immune-derived markers present in blood derivatives and has shown potential for detecting multiple cancer types, including early-stage disease, with high ROC values for various cancers like brain, breast, colorectal, kidney, lung, ovarian, pancreatic, and prostate. This approach is highlighted for being rapid, low-cost, and requiring minimal sample preparation, making it potentially easy to integrate into existing diagnostic pathways[6].
- **miRNA-based diagnostics:** The analysis of microRNAs (miRNAs), small non-coding RNA molecules that play a role in gene regulation, is also being explored. A study described in the sources developed a diagnostic model based on the differential expression of miRNAs to detect multiple cancer types, suggesting the implication of common miRNAs for pan-cancer diagnosis[7].

The data generated from these technologies are often analyzed using sophisticated machine learning algorithms to distinguish cancer signals from background noise and to improve the accuracy and sensitivity of detection. These algorithms can continuously learn from new data, potentially enhancing the test performance over time. The potential of combining these pan-omic spectroscopic liquid biopsies with other orthogonal tests, such as cell-free DNA analysis, is also being investigated as a route to more efficient and accurate early cancer diagnosis.

Potential Application of MCED Tests in Blood Cancers

While the primary focus of many current MCED test developments is on solid tumors, their underlying principles and technologies hold significant promise for the early detection and management of blood cancers.

- **Expanding the Scope of Detection:** Current research aims to broaden the application of MCED approaches to encompass a wider range of hematological malignancies. For instance, one study explicitly states the future plan to **expand their classification models to include other types of blood cancer, such as myeloma and chronic myeloid leukemia**. This indicates a recognition of the potential of these technologies beyond acute leukemias.
- **Leveraging Existing Methods for Leukemia Detection:** Machine learning and deep learning techniques are already being explored for the automated classification of acute leukemia using heterogeneous datasets. This foundation can be integrated into broader MCED platforms to allow for the detection of various blood cancer signals alongside solid tumor markers[8]. Studies also focus on cancer prediction using image-based approaches and hemogram blood test data, including automated systems for leukemia diagnosis with high accuracy. Furthermore, deep learning approaches are being used to detect malignant leukemia cells from microscopic blood smear images.
- **Pan-omic Analysis for Blood Cancer Signatures:** Spectroscopic liquid biopsy, which analyzes a broad range of molecular markers in the blood, could be particularly valuable for blood cancers. These cancers often involve systemic changes detectable in the blood, making them potentially amenable to pan-omic profiling using techniques like FTIR spectroscopy. The ability of such tests to detect early-stage disease across multiple cancer types suggests they could also identify early signs of various blood malignancies[9].
- **miRNA as a Pan-Cancer Biomarker:** The development of miRNA-based diagnostic models for multiple cancer types is also relevant to blood cancers. Since miRNAs play crucial roles in cellular processes,

including proliferation and differentiation, aberrant miRNA expression patterns in blood could serve as early indicators of hematological malignancies[10].

- **Addressing Challenges in Rare Blood Cancers:** MCED tests, by their nature of looking for shared cancer signals, might offer a pathway for improving early detection in rarer blood cancers where individual screening programs are not feasible. The development of synthetic data in oncology could also play a crucial role in training and validating MCED tests for these less common diseases[11].

Future research will likely focus on identifying blood cancer-specific biomarkers detectable through MCED platforms and validating the performance of these tests in hematological malignancies across different stages of disease. The integration of various liquid biopsy approaches and sophisticated analytical methods will be crucial in realizing the full potential of MCED tests for blood cancer early detection.

Potential Benefits and Impact of MCED Tests

The successful development and implementation of MCED tests, including their application to blood cancers, could yield significant benefits across the healthcare spectrum.

- **Earlier Cancer Detection and Improved Outcomes:** The primary aim of MCED tests is to detect cancer at earlier stages, when treatment is often more effective and can lead to better patient outcomes and survival rates. For blood cancers, earlier identification could allow for less intensive treatments and potentially prevent disease progression to more aggressive stages. The Dxcover® Cancer Liquid Biopsy has shown the ability to effectively detect early-stage disease.
- **Increased Screening Efficiency:** By simultaneously screening for multiple cancers, MCED tests could be more efficient than current single-cancer screening programs, particularly for cancers that lack effective screening methods or are less prevalent, including many types of blood cancer. This aggregated approach can improve screening efficiency and overall cancer detection rates.
- **Personalized Medicine Approaches:** The detailed molecular information obtained from MCED tests, such as methylation signatures or miRNA expression profiles, could potentially contribute to more personalized approaches in cancer management, including blood cancers. Understanding the specific molecular characteristics of an early-stage malignancy could inform treatment decisions and risk stratification.
- **Cost-Effectiveness and Healthcare Resource Allocation:** While the initial costs of developing and implementing MCED tests are substantial, their potential to detect cancers earlier and reduce the need for extensive treatments for advanced-stage diseases could lead to long-term cost savings for healthcare systems. Moreover, MCED tests could help prioritize patients for rapid diagnostic investigation, potentially optimizing the use of healthcare resources. The Dxcover® test is highlighted as a low-cost strategy.
- **Complementary to Existing Screening Programs:** MCED tests are not necessarily intended to replace existing screening programs but rather to complement them and fill gaps in early detection for cancers where no effective screening exists. Modeling suggests that incorporating an MCED blood test alongside current screening could improve screening efficiency.
- **Potential for "Rule-Out" in Symptomatic Patients:** MCED tests could be applied to help clinicians "rule-out" cancer in patients with low clinical suspicion, potentially reducing unnecessary and costly investigations.

The development of standardized criteria for clinical validity, benefit-risk, and clinical utility will be crucial for the widespread adoption of MCED tests. Furthermore, understanding public perceptions and tracking diagnostic pathways following a positive MCED test result are important considerations for successful implementation.

Challenges and Limitations of MCED Tests

Despite the considerable promise of MCED tests, several challenges and limitations need to be carefully considered and addressed before their widespread clinical implementation, including their application to blood cancers.

- **Specificity and False Positives:** A critical concern is the specificity of MCED tests and the potential for false-positive results. A positive signal from an MCED test would necessitate further diagnostic workup, which can include imaging, invasive procedures like biopsies, and significant patient anxiety[12]. The rate of false positives will need to be sufficiently low to ensure that the benefits of early detection outweigh the harms associated with unnecessary investigations. Modeling of MCED test outcomes considers total positives and the ratio of true positives to false positives. Studies on existing screening programs, like mammography, highlight the potential for anxiety related to false-positive results.
- **Sensitivity and Early-Stage Detection:** While MCED tests aim for early detection, their sensitivity, particularly for early-stage cancers that may shed limited amounts of biomarkers, is a key factor. Some liquid biopsies focused on single tumor-derived biomarkers have limitations in sensitivity, especially for early-stage cancers. The Dxcover® test demonstrated 64% detection of Stage I cancers with 99% specificity and 99% detection with 59% specificity, highlighting the trade-off between these two

parameters. Further research is needed to optimize the sensitivity of MCED tests across various cancer types and stages, including blood cancers[13].

- **Tumor of Origin Identification:** If an MCED test detects a cancer signal, identifying the tissue or origin is crucial for guiding subsequent diagnostic and treatment pathways. For blood cancers, which are often systemic, this might be less of a challenge compared to solid tumors[14]. However, an MCED test might detect a low-grade or indolent blood malignancy that would not require immediate intervention, raising questions about the clinical significance of the finding. Some studies suggest the potential to explore different spectral profiles for each cancer type to predict the tumor of origin.
- **Overdiagnosis and Overtreatment:** The detection of early-stage cancers, particularly indolent ones, raises the risk of overdiagnosis, where a cancer is detected that would not have caused harm during the patient's lifetime, and subsequent overtreatment, which exposes patients to unnecessary risks and side effects. This is a known concern in screening for various cancers[15].
- **Clinical Utility and Impact on Mortality:** Ultimately, the clinical utility of MCED tests will be determined by their ability to improve cancer-specific and all-cause mortality. Large-scale prospective studies are needed to demonstrate that early detection through MCED tests translates into tangible benefits for patients. Standardized criteria for clinical validity, benefit-risk, and clinical utility relative to MCED are still under development[16].
- **Regulatory Landscape:** The regulatory oversight of MCED tests, particularly laboratory-developed tests, is an evolving area. Clear guidelines and frameworks will be necessary to ensure the safety and effectiveness of these tests.
- **Public Perception and Implementation:** Understanding public perceptions of MCED tests and establishing clear diagnostic pathways for managing positive results will be essential for successful implementation. Surveys are being conducted to understand thoughts on MCED tests. Integrating new blood tests into existing diagnostic pathways without significant disruption to clinical practice will also be important.

Addressing these challenges through rigorous research, technological advancements, and careful consideration of ethical and practical implications will be crucial for realizing the full potential of MCED tests in improving cancer detection and patient outcomes, including those with blood malignancies.

title

Several innovative approaches are being explored for MCED, aiming to detect cancer earlier and across multiple types:

- **Methylation Signatures of Circulating Tumor DNA (ctDNA):** Singlera Genomics is employing a strategy to detect cancer by hunting down the **methylation signature of ctDNA** in the blood. This approach looks for specific changes in the DNA of tumor cells that are present in the bloodstream. Another study mentions **methylation profiling of circulating tumor DNA** for the detection of ovarian cancer and non-small cell lung cancer, further highlighting the utility of this method in liquid biopsies for cancer detection[17].
- **Spectroscopic Liquid Biopsy:** The Dxcover® Cancer Liquid Biopsy utilizes **Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy and machine-learning algorithms to detect cancer**[18]. This pan-omic approach analyzes the full complement of tumor and immune-derived markers present within blood derivatives. This method has shown promising results in detecting multiple cancer types, including brain, breast, colorectal, kidney, lung, ovarian, pancreatic, and prostate cancers, often at early stages[19]. The test is noted for being **rapid, low-cost, and requiring minimal sample preparation**, making it potentially easy to integrate into existing diagnostic pathways. It can also be fine-tuned to maximize either sensitivity or specificity[20].
- **Deep Learning on Imaging Data:** While not directly an MCED blood test, research into **deep learning models for analyzing whole slide images (WSI)** to determine tumor mutational burden (TMB) in lung adenocarcinoma and for various other cancer-related tasks demonstrates the growing role of artificial intelligence in cancer diagnostics. The development and validation of deep learning algorithms for improving Gleason scoring of prostate cancer and for predicting disease-free survival in lung adenocarcinomas based on preoperative CT scans are further examples. These advancements in analyzing imaging data could potentially complement blood-based MCED tests by providing more detailed information upon detection of a cancer signal.
- **miRNA Analysis:** One study focused on developing a cancer diagnostic model by assessing the **differential expression of miRNAs** between cancer patients and non-cancer controls. By ranking miRNAs based on limma analysis and investigating their targeted growth signaling pathways, the researchers identified common miRNAs implicated in the diagnosis of multiple cancer types. This suggests that analyzing **miRNA profiles in blood could be a component of future MCED tests**[21].

- **Multi-modal Data Integration:** The concept of **combining different types of data**, such as clinical, biological, and radiomic data, with machine learning is being explored to improve diagnostic and prognostic accuracy in various cancers. This multi-modal approach could also be applied to MCED tests, integrating blood-based biomarkers with other patient data to enhance detection and characterization.
- **Machine Learning Algorithms:** Various machine learning algorithms, including K-Nearest Neighbors (KNN) and Naive Bayes (NB)[22], are being used in cancer prediction and classification based on different types of data, such as image data and hemogram blood tests. Ensemble convolutional networks are also being developed for cancer classification using microarray datasets. The continuous learning capability of machine learning algorithms from new data is highlighted as a way to continuously improve the performance of MCED tests.

It's important to note that many MCED tests under development combine next-generation genome sequencing and machine learning to detect multiple cancer types. The ability to detect a shared cancer signal across different malignancies allows for the aggregation of individual cancer prevalence, potentially leading to higher positive predictive values and overall cancer detection rates compared to single-cancer screening tests.
Future advancements in MCED will likely involve refining these technologies, identifying novel biomarkers detectable in blood, and validating their clinical utility through large-scale studies. The integration of multiple detection methods and sophisticated analytical tools will be key to maximizing the accuracy and effectiveness of MCED tests.

application and evaluation of technologies and methods
we can now look at the application and evaluation of technologies and methods, particularly in the context of cancer classification and detection, which includes blood cancers.

- **Expanding Blood Cancer Classification with Deep Learning:** One source explicitly states plans for future work to **expand blood cancer classification to include other types like myeloma and chronic myeloid leukemia**. This aligns with our previous discussion about the potential of MCED tests to address various cancers, including those of the blood. The study also aims to **evaluate their proposed dataset using various deep learning algorithms to compare their performance** in this area. This underscores the importance of machine learning, particularly deep learning, in advancing cancer diagnostics, as mentioned in our previous turn. Furthermore, they intend to develop an **online Internet of Things (IoT) application to collect and analyze a larger volume of blood data**[23]. This highlights the trend towards leveraging technology for large-scale data acquisition and analysis in cancer research.
- **Spectroscopic Liquid Biopsy for Multiple Cancers:** The Dxcover® Cancer Liquid Biopsy, which uses **FTIR spectroscopy and machine learning**, has demonstrated effectiveness in detecting various cancers through blood analysis. While this study focused on solid tumors (brain, breast, colorectal, kidney, lung, ovarian, pancreatic, and prostate), the underlying principle of analyzing a broad range of blood-based markers using spectroscopy and machine learning could potentially be applied to improve the earlier detection or classification of blood cancers as well. The pan-omic nature of this approach, analyzing both tumor and immune-derived markers in blood derivatives, might offer advantages in detecting the complex biological changes associated with blood malignancies[24].
- **ctDNA Methylation for Early Cancer Detection:** The strategy of hunting for the **methylation signature of circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA)** in blood, as employed by Singlera Genomics, represents another key technology for early cancer detection. While the source doesn't specify its application to blood cancers, the principle of detecting tumor-specific DNA alterations in blood is relevant. Future MCED tests for blood cancers could potentially incorporate ctDNA methylation analysis to identify early signs of malignancy.
- **Deep Learning on Imaging Data as a Complementary Approach:** While primarily focused on solid tumors like lung adenocarcinoma, the research on using **deep learning to analyze whole slide images (WSI)** for features like tumor mutational burden (TMB) and other diagnostic tasks highlights the power of AI in extracting valuable information from medical images. In the context of blood cancers, where diagnosis often involves microscopic examination of blood smears and bone marrow biopsies, similar deep learning techniques could be further developed to automate and enhance the analysis of these visual data, potentially complementing blood-based MCED tests. Studies already exist focusing on leukemia detection using computer vision on blood smear images.
- **Machine Learning for Cancer Prediction and Classification:** Various machine learning algorithms like KNN and Naive Bayes have been used for cancer prediction using image-based approaches and hemogram blood test data. The development of ensemble convolutional networks for cancer classification using microarray data further illustrates the application of machine learning in analyzing complex biological data for cancer-related insights. These techniques could be adapted and applied to blood cancer datasets to improve diagnostic and prognostic models.

evaluation and real-world applications of the cancer detection technologies and methods

- **Evaluation of Deep Learning Models for Blood Cancer Classification:** As mentioned previously, there is a direct plan to **evaluate the proposed dataset for blood cancer classification using various deep learning algorithms**. This step is crucial to determine the effectiveness and accuracy of these computational methods in a real-world context for different types of blood cancers. Comparing the performance of different deep learning approaches will help identify the most suitable techniques for this specific application[25].
- **Validation of Spectroscopic Liquid Biopsy:** The study on the Dxcover® Cancer Liquid Biopsy highlights the need for **future studies to validate the technology with a greater number of patient samples** and to explore combinatorial pathways with other tests like cell-free DNA. **Prospective patient recruitment and blinded analysis are being planned to truly assess the efficacy of this technique**. This emphasis on rigorous validation is essential before such a blood test can be widely adopted in clinical practice.
- **Clinical Utility of MCED Blood Tests:** Several sources discuss the potential impact of Multi-Cancer Early Detection (MCED) blood tests on screening efficiency and cancer detection rates. Modeling studies have been conducted in the US and UK to estimate screening outcomes when an MCED test is used alongside current screening programs[26]. These evaluations consider measures like the number of total positives, true positives (cancers detected), the true positive to false positive ratio, cancer detection rate, and diagnostic cost per confirmed cancer diagnosis. These analyses aim to understand the **potential clinical utility and cost-effectiveness of integrating MCED tests into existing healthcare systems**[27].
- **Deep Learning in Analyzing Medical Images for Cancer:** Research on deep learning models like Image2TMB for determining tumor mutational burden from whole slide images and other models for tasks like Gleason scoring of prostate cancer and predicting survival in lung adenocarcinoma demonstrate the **evaluation of AI in analyzing medical images for cancer-related information**. These studies often involve training and testing models on large datasets and comparing their performance to existing methods or clinical benchmarks. The focus is on assessing the accuracy and potential of these AI tools to improve diagnostic and prognostic capabilities.
- **Machine Learning for Treatment Prediction:** One study describes the development of a nomogram based on a collagen feature support vector machine for **predicting treatment response to neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy in rectal cancer patients**[28]. This exemplifies the evaluation of machine learning algorithms in predicting how patients will respond to specific cancer treatments, which is a critical aspect of personalized medicine.

real-world implementation and potential challenges

- **Integrating Novel Blood Tests into Existing Diagnostic Pathways:** The Dxcover® Cancer Liquid Biopsy is presented as a simple, rapid blood test that **could fit seamlessly into current diagnostic pathways** because blood serum testing is already common in medical laboratories. The low cost and minimal sample preparation required could also facilitate easier integration. However, the study also notes that **future studies are still required to validate the technology** with more patient samples, including prospective recruitment and blinded analysis, before widespread implementation.
- **Standardized Criteria for MCED Blood Tests:** A key challenge for the implementation of Multi-Cancer Early Detection (MCED) blood tests is the **lack of standardized criteria for clinical validity, benefit-risk, and clinical utility relative to current screening methods**. This highlights the need for establishing clear benchmarks and guidelines to ensure that these new tests provide tangible benefits and are appropriately used in clinical practice.
- **Perceptions and Diagnostic Pathways for MCED Tests:** The successful implementation of MCED tests will also depend on understanding **public perceptions of the test and effectively tracking diagnostic pathways** for individuals who receive a positive signal. Clear protocols will be needed to manage follow-up testing and potential anxiety associated with a positive result[29].
- **Modeling the Impact of MCED Tests on Screening Programs:** Studies modeling the potential impact of MCED blood tests alongside current screening programs in the US and UK provide insights into the logistical and economic considerations of real-world implementation. These models estimate outcomes like total positives, true positives, cancer detection rates, and diagnostic costs, which are crucial for healthcare systems to evaluate the feasibility and value of incorporating these new screening tools.
- **Regulatory Landscape for Cancer Detection Technologies:** The sources touch upon the regulatory aspects, mentioning FDA authorization for AI-driven devices for colon cancer and prostate cancer detection. This indicates that while these technologies are advancing, they still need to navigate regulatory processes to ensure safety and effectiveness before they can be broadly implemented in clinical settings. The discussion around the regulatory oversight of Laboratory Developed Tests (LDTs) further underscores the evolving landscape of bringing novel diagnostic tests to market.

- **Need for Validation in Diverse Populations:** While not explicitly stated as a challenge in these specific excerpts, it is a well-known consideration in the implementation of any diagnostic test. Validation across diverse demographic groups and in real-world clinical settings (beyond controlled studies) is essential to ensure the generalizability and equitable application of these technologies.

In summary, while the sources present promising technologies for cancer detection and classification, their real-world implementation faces challenges related to **validation, the establishment of standardized criteria, understanding patient perceptions, integration into existing pathways, navigating regulatory processes, and ensuring generalizability**. Ongoing research and rigorous evaluation are crucial steps in overcoming these hurdles and translating these advancements into meaningful improvements in cancer care.

specific technologies and methods for cancer detection and classification:

- **Spectroscopic Liquid Biopsy using FTIR and Machine Learning:** One significant method described is the **Dxcover® Cancer Liquid Biopsy**, which utilizes **Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy** to analyze blood samples. This spectroscopic data is then processed using **machine-learning algorithms** to detect the presence of cancer. This approach has shown promising results in a large-scale study (n=2092 patients) for detecting **eight different cancer types**: brain, breast, colorectal, kidney, lung, ovarian, pancreatic, and prostate. The test achieved high Area Under the Receiver Operating Characteristic curve (ROC) values for each of these cancers when compared to symptomatic non-cancer controls (ranging from 0.76 for breast to 0.91 for colorectal, kidney, and lung). Furthermore, when all eight cancer types were pooled, the test could detect **64% of Stage I cancers with 99% specificity** and **99% of Stage I cancers with 59% specificity**, demonstrating its potential for early-stage detection. The pan-omic nature of this liquid biopsy analyzes a broad range of tumour and immune-derived markers in blood derivatives.
- **Detection of Methylation Signatures of Circulating Tumor DNA (ctDNA):** Singlera Genomics is highlighted for its strategy of **hunting down the methylation signature of circulating tumour DNA (ctDNA)** as a method for earlier and better cancer detection. This approach focuses on identifying specific alterations in the DNA released by tumor cells into the bloodstream.
- **Deep Learning for Tumor Mutational Burden (TMB) Assessment from Whole Slide Images (WSI):** In the realm of image analysis, a study by Jain et al. developed a **deep learning model based on the Inception-v3 architecture, named Image2TMB, to determine the TMB status (high versus low) directly from frozen H&E slides** in lung adenocarcinoma. The model was trained and tested at multiple magnifications (5X, 10X, and 20X), and the TMB status probabilities from these magnifications were aggregated using a Random Forest. This showcases the application of deep learning in extracting molecular information from digital pathology images.
- **Machine Learning for General Cancer Prediction and Classification:** The sources also mention broader applications of machine learning in cancer prediction. For instance, studies have used **image-based approaches** for cancer prediction and developed automated systems for the **diagnosis of leukemia** using methods like K-means clustering[30]. Additionally, **machine learning algorithms like KNN and Naive Bayes** are described as basic models used for classification in machine learning. Furthermore, ensemble convolutional networks (ECN-2 and ECN-3) are proposed for cancer classification using microarray data.

These examples illustrate a variety of technologies and methods being explored for cancer detection and classification, ranging from non-invasive blood tests analyzing molecular signatures and broad metabolic changes to advanced image analysis using deep learning on tissue samples, and more general machine learning approaches applied to different types of biological data.

increasing role of Artificial Intelligence (AI) and Machine Learning (ML) in impacting clinical outcomes in oncology

- **AI and Deep Learning in Medical Image Analysis for Diagnosis and Prognosis:** Several sources highlight the use of AI, particularly deep learning, to analyze medical images for improved cancer diagnosis and prognosis.
    - Deep learning models are being developed to analyze **endobronchial ultrasound (EBUS) images for lung nodule diagnosis**, showing high precision and sensitivity[31].
    - AI algorithms are used in **liver cancer diagnosis** based on multimodal imaging and to **predict lymph node metastasis in lung cancer** using radiomics and machine learning.
    - In **cervical cancer**, deep learning is applied to pathological images to predict survival outcomes.
    - AI-based organ feature creation can accurately predict normal lung dose in **breast cancer** patients receiving adjuvant radiotherapy.
    - For **prostate cancer**, random forest classifiers leveraging MRI features have shown improved detection accuracy compared to traditional CAD approaches. Deep learning models are also being used to analyze prostate needle biopsy slides.

  - AI-enhanced classifiers combining deep learning for imaging and liquid biopsy are being developed for **early lung cancer diagnosis**, aiming for improved sensitivity and specificity.
  - AI algorithms are being used for **real-time lesion detection during colonoscopy** for colon cancer, leading to improved adenoma detection rates[32].
  - Preoperative CT scans are being analyzed by deep learning models to predict disease-free survival in patients with **lung adenocarcinomas**.
- **AI for Predicting Treatment Response and Personalizing Therapy:** AI and ML are also being used to predict patient response to cancer treatments and personalize therapeutic decisions.
  - A nomogram based on machine learning is used to predict the response to neoadjuvant chemoradiotherapy in **rectal cancer patients**.
  - Machine learning algorithms are being applied to plasma proteomic profiles to improve first-line treatment decisions in **metastatic non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC)**[33].
  - Multi-modal deep learning models integrating clinical data and digital histopathology from **prostate biopsies** can predict long-term, clinically relevant outcomes, aiding in personalized therapy decisions.
  - AI ensemble models using digital pathology images and clinical trial data are being used to predict distant metastasis risk in **prostate cancer**, improving the targeted use of androgen deprivation therapy (ADT).
- **AI in Drug Discovery and Development:** AI is being utilized to accelerate the process of identifying potential cancer therapeutics. AI-driven molecular design using generative algorithms and reinforcement learning has significantly reduced drug design timelines, with the first AI-designed drug entering clinical trials in record time.
- **FDA-Approved AI-Enabled Medical Devices in Oncology:** The increasing impact of AI in clinical practice is further underscored by the FDA clearance and authorization of several AI-enabled medical devices for cancer diagnosis and treatment. These include tools for:
  - Real-time detection of colon polyps during colonoscopy.
  - Early detection of lung cancer from CT scans.
  - Analysis of prostate needle biopsy slides for cancer detection.
  - Prediction of extranodal extension in HPV-associated oropharyngeal carcinoma using CT-based deep learning.
  - AI-powered diagnostic assistance in digital dermoscopy for skin cancer diagnosis.
  - AI software for prostate cancer radiotherapy planning.
  - AI prognostic tools in localized prostate cancer, even included in NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines.

These examples collectively demonstrate the expanding role of AI and machine learning across the cancer care continuum, from early detection and diagnosis to prognosis prediction and personalized treatment strategies, with a growing number of AI-powered tools receiving regulatory approval for clinical use.

Multi-Cancer Early Detection (MCED) tests

- **Concept and Potential Benefits:** MCED tests aim to **simultaneously detect and localize multiple cancers** through a single blood test. This approach has the potential to lead to an **overall stage shift towards earlier diagnosis**, which could result in **less-intensive treatments and better patient outcomes**. Current recommended screening programs are limited to a few individual cancers, and MCED tests could address this limitation by improving screening efficiency and potentially reducing morbidity and mortality associated with cancer. By detecting a shared cancer signal across multiple cancer types, MCED can aggregate prevalence to improve screening efficiency, resulting in a higher positive predictive value (PPV) and overall cancer detection rate compared to current single-cancer screening tests.
- **Different Methodologies for MCED:** Several approaches are being explored for MCED tests:
  - **Methylation signatures of circulating tumour DNA (ctDNA):** Singlera Genomics is developing a test that **hunts down the methylation signature of ctDNA** for early cancer detection.
  - **Spectroscopic liquid biopsy:** The **Dxcover® Cancer Liquid Biopsy** uses **Fourier transform infrared (FTIR) spectroscopy** and machine learning to detect multiple cancer types from blood samples by analyzing a broad range of tumour and immune-derived markers.
  - **Combining next-generation genome sequencing and machine learning:** MCED tests utilize these technologies to **detect multiple cancer types**, including those with insufficient prevalence for efficient single-cancer screening.
- **Performance and Detection Rates:**

  - The Dxcover® test demonstrated the ability to detect **64% of Stage I cancers when specificity was 99%**, and **99% of Stage I cancers with 59% specificity** when tuned for higher sensitivity, across eight different cancer types.
  - Models suggest that MCED tests can achieve a **higher cancer detection rate** than currently endorsed screening tests.
- **Integration into Diagnostic Pathways:** MCED blood tests, being a normal blood test, have the potential to be **easily integrated into current diagnostic pathways**. The Dxcover® test, in particular, is highlighted as a **simple, rapid blood test** that could fit seamlessly, as blood serum testing is already common. It could help clinicians **rule out cancer in low-suspicion cases** and prioritize at-risk patients for rapid diagnostic investigation. Combining spectroscopic liquid biopsies with other orthogonal tests, such as cell-free DNA analysis, could provide an efficient route to diagnosis.
- **Considerations and Future Directions:**
  - Standardized criteria for **clinical validity, benefit-risk, and clinical utility** are still lacking for MCED blood tests compared to existing screening methods.
  - Further studies are needed to **validate the efficacy** of MCED technologies with larger patient samples through prospective recruitment and blinded analysis.
  - Understanding **public perceptions** and establishing clear **diagnostic pathways** for positive results are crucial for successful implementation.
  - The continuous learning capabilities of machine learning algorithms used in MCED tests suggest that **test performance characteristics can continuously improve** with new data.
  - The low-cost nature of some MCED approaches, like the spectroscopic liquid biopsy, could facilitate earlier diagnosis when treatment is more effective and less toxic.

In summary, MCED tests represent a promising avenue for early cancer detection across multiple types, offering the potential for significant improvements in patient outcomes. However, further research, standardization, and careful integration into healthcare systems are necessary to realize their full potential.

References

[1] Hubbell, E., Clarke, C.A., Aravanis, A.M. and Berg, C.D., 2021. Modeled reductions in late-stage cancer with a multi-cancer early detection test. Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention, 30(3), pp.460-468.

[2] Nicholson, B.D., Oke, J., Virdee, P.S., Harris, D.A., O'Doherty, C., Park, J.E., Hamady, Z., Sehgal, V., Millar, A., Medley, L. and Tonner, S., 2023. Multi-cancer early detection test in symptomatic patients referred for cancer investigation in England and Wales (SYMPLIFY): a large-scale, observational cohort study. The Lancet Oncology, 24(7), pp.733-743.

[3] Hubbell, E., Clarke, C.A., Aravanis, A.M. and Berg, C.D., 2021. Modeled reductions in late-stage cancer with a multi-cancer early detection test. Cancer Epidemiology, Biomarkers & Prevention, 30(3), pp.460-468.

[4] Jiang, T., Ren, S. and Zhou, C., 2015. Role of circulating-tumor DNA analysis in non-small cell lung cancer. Lung Cancer, 90(2), pp.128-134.

[5] Zuo, T., Tycko, B., Liu, T.M., Lin, H.J.L. and Huang, T.H., 2009. Methods in DNA methylation profiling. Epigenomics, 1(2), pp.331-345.

[6] Ingle Jr, J.D. and Crouch, S.R., 1988. Spectrochemical analysis.

[7] Mishra, S., Yadav, T. and Rani, V., 2016. Exploring miRNA based approaches in cancer diagnostics and therapeutics. Critical reviews in oncology/hematology, 98, pp.12-23.

[8] Vaghela, H.P., Modi, H., Pandya, M. and Potdar, M.B., 2015. Leukemia detection using digital image processing techniques. International Journal of Applied Information Systems, 10(1), pp.43-51.

[9] Jamnongsong, S., Kueanjinda, P., Buraphat, P., Sakornsakolpat, P., Vaeteewoottacharn, K., Okada, S., Jirawatnotai, S. and Sampattavanich, S., 2022. Comprehensive drug response profiling and pan-omic analysis identified therapeutic candidates and prognostic biomarkers for Asian cholangiocarcinoma. Iscience, 25(10).

[10] Wong, N.W., Chen, Y., Chen, S. and Wang, X., 2018. OncomiR: an online resource for exploring pan-cancer microRNA dysregulation. Bioinformatics, 34(4), pp.713-715.

[11] Pillai, R.K. and Jayasree, K., 2017. Rare cancers: Challenges & issues. Indian Journal of Medical Research, 145(1), pp.17-27.

[12] Gelhorn, H., Ross, M.M., Kansal, A.R., Fung, E.T., Seiden, M.V., Krucien, N. and Chung, K.C., 2023. Patient preferences for multi-cancer early detection (MCED) screening tests. The Patient-Patient-Centered Outcomes Research, 16(1), pp.43-56.

[13] Shao, S.H., Allen, B., Clement, J., Chung, G., Gao, J., Hubbell, E., Liu, M.C., Swanton, C., Tang, W.W., Yimer, H. and Tummala, M., 2023. Multi-cancer early detection test sensitivity for cancers with and without current population-level screening options. Tumori Journal, 109(3), pp.335-341.

[14] Lu, S.H., Tsai, W.S., Chang, Y.H., Chou, T.Y., Pang, S.T., Lin, P.H., Tsai, C.M. and Chang, Y.C., 2016. Identifying cancer origin using circulating tumor cells. Cancer biology & therapy, 17(4), pp.430-438.

[15] Gupta, P., Gupta, M. and Koul, N., 2020. Overdiagnosis and overtreatment; how to deal with too much medicine. Journal of Family Medicine and Primary Care, 9(8), pp.3815-3819.

[16] Pletcher, M.J. and Pignone, M., 2011. Evaluating the clinical utility of a biomarker: a review of methods for estimating health impact. Circulation, 123(10), pp.1116-1124.

[17] Liang, W., Zhao, Y., Huang, W., Gao, Y., Xu, W., Tao, J., Yang, M., Li, L., Ping, W., Shen, H. and Fu, X., 2019. Non-invasive diagnosis of early-stage lung cancer using high-throughput targeted DNA methylation sequencing of circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA). Theranostics, 9(7), p.2056.

[18] Cheng, C., Liu, J., Zhang, C., Cai, M., Wang, H. and Xiong, W., 2010. An overview of infrared spectroscopy based on continuous wavelet transform combined with machine learning algorithms: application to chinese medicines, plant classification, and cancer diagnosis. Applied Spectroscopy Reviews, 45(2), pp.148-164.

[19] Cameron, J.M., Sala, A., Antoniou, G., Brennan, P.M., Butler, H.J., Conn, J.J., Connal, S., Curran, T., Hegarty, M.G., McHardy, R.G. and Orringer, D., 2023. A spectroscopic liquid biopsy for the earlier detection of multiple cancer types. British Journal of Cancer, 129(10), pp.1658-1666.

[20] Smith, C.A., Chang, M.M., Kundrod, K.A., Novak, E.N., Parra, S.G., López, L., Mavume, C., Lorenzoni, C., Maza, M., Salcedo, M.P. and Carns, J.L., 2023. A low-cost, paper-based hybrid capture assay to detect high-risk HPV DNA for cervical cancer screening in low-resource settings. Lab on a Chip, 23(3), pp.451-465.

[21] Backes, C., Meese, E. and Keller, A., 2016. Specific miRNA disease biomarkers in blood, serum and plasma: challenges and prospects. Molecular diagnosis & therapy, 20, pp.509-518.

[22] Kamel, H., Abdulah, D. and Al-Tuwaijari, J.M., 2019, June. Cancer classification using gaussian naive bayes algorithm. In 2019 international engineering conference (IEC) (pp. 165-170). IEEE.

[23] Shaikh, F. and Karwande, V.S., 2021. Blood Bank And Blood Wastage Management using internet of things and stream analytics. International Journal, 6(3).

[24] Medipally, D.K., Cullen, D., Untereiner, V., Sockalingum, G.D., Maguire, A., Nguyen, T.N.Q., Bryant, J., Noone, E., Bradshaw, S., Finn, M. and Dunne, M., 2020. Vibrational spectroscopy of liquid biopsies for prostate cancer diagnosis. Therapeutic advances in medical oncology, 12, p.1758835920918499.

[25] Khan, S., Sajjad, M., Hussain, T., Ullah, A. and Imran, A.S., 2020. A review on traditional machine learning and deep learning models for WBCs classification in blood smear images. Ieee Access, 9, pp.10657-10673.

[26] Schrag, D., Beer, T.M., McDonnell, C.H., Nadauld, L., Dilaveri, C.A., Reid, R., Marinac, C.R., Chung, K.C., Lopatin, M., Fung, E.T. and Klein, E.A., 2023. Blood-based tests for multicancer early detection (PATHFINDER): a prospective cohort study. The Lancet, 402(10409), pp.1251-1260.

[27] Hackshaw, A., Cohen, S.S., Reichert, H., Kansal, A.R., Chung, K.C. and Ofman, J.J., 2021. Estimating the population health impact of a multi-cancer early detection genomic blood test to complement existing screening in the US and UK. British Journal of Cancer, 125(10), pp.1432-1442.

[28] Zhang, B., Shi, H. and Wang, H., 2023. Machine learning and AI in cancer prognosis, prediction, and treatment selection: a critical approach. Journal of multidisciplinary healthcare, pp.1779-1791.

[29] Naseem, R., Howe, N., Pretorius, S., Williams, C., Lendrem, C., Pallmann, P., Carrol, E.D. and PROTECT study team, 2025. Mapping decision-making pathways: Determination of intervention entry points for diagnostic tests in suspected serious infection. NIHR Open Research, 4, p.35.

[30] Eyvazi, H. and Rajaei, A. (2024) 'Enhanced MOGA-DBSCAN: Improving clustering quality with a density-adjusted outlier index'. In: Machine Learning and Knowledge Discovery 2024, 18-19 December. [Online] Available at: https://mlkd.aut.ac.ir/proceedings/2024/paper/3B.6.pdf

[31] Sheski, F.D. and Mathur, P.N., 2008. Endobronchial ultrasound. Chest, 133(1), pp.264-270.

[32] Yamada, M., Saito, Y., Imaoka, H., Saiko, M., Yamada, S., Kondo, H., Takamaru, H., Sakamoto, T., Sese, J., Kuchiba, A. and Shibata, T., 2019. Development of a real-time endoscopic image diagnosis support system using deep learning technology in colonoscopy. Scientific reports, 9(1), p.14465.

[33] Reck, M., Popat, S., Reinmuth, N., De Ruysscher, D., Kerr, K.M., Peters, S. and ESMO Guidelines Working Group, 2014. Metastatic non-small-cell lung cancer (NSCLC): ESMO Clinical Practice Guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. Annals of oncology, 25, pp.iii27-iii39.