Growth Differentiation Factor-15 as a candidate biomarker in gynecologic malignancies: A meta-analysis

Dipayan Roy MD,[1] Anupama Modi M.Sc.,[1] Manoj Khokhar M.Sc.,[1] Manu Goyal MD DNB,[2] Shailja Sharma MD,[1] Purvi Purohit PhD,*[1] Puneet Setia MD,[3] Antonio Facciorusso MD PhD,[4] Praveen Sharma PhD[1]

Author affiliations:

[1]Department of Biochemistry, AIIMS Jodhpur, India

[2]Department of Obstetrics & Gynaecology, AIIMS Jodhpur, India

[3]Department of Forensic Medicine & Toxicology, AIIMS Jodhpur, India

[4]Gastroenterology Unit, University of Foggia, Italy

ORCiD:

Dipayan Roy: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3429-1470

Anupama Modi: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6488-4701

Manoj Khokhar: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7106-8545

Manu Goyal: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8691-1790

Purvi Purohit: https://orcid.org/0000-0001-8559-2911

Puneet Setia: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-0849-0759

Antonio Facciorusso: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-2107-2156

Praveen Sharma: https://orcid.org/0000-0002-8324-737X

***Corresponding author & contact details**:

Dr. Purvi Purohit

Additional Professor

The Department of Biochemistry

AIIMS, Jodhpur

E-mail: dr.purvipurohit@gmail.com

Word count: manuscript- 4,760 (whole), 2,354 (without title page, abstract, references, tables, figures and figure legends), abstract- 99, references- 49, tables- 3, figures- 3

Funding information: This study was not funded.

Abstract:

Growth Differentiation Factor-15 (GDF-15), though emerged as a novel marker in gynecological cancers, is yet to be recognized in clinical diagnostics. Eligible studies were sorted from multiple online databases, namely PubMed, Cochrane, ClinicalTrials.gov, Google Scholar, Web of Science, Embase, Scopus, LILACS, OpenGrey. From six studies, histopathologically diagnosed cases without prior treatment, and with diagnostic accuracy data for GDF-15 in gynecological cancers, were included. Our meta-analysis shows that GDF-15 has pooled diagnostic odds ratio of 12.74 at 80.5% sensitivity and 74.1% specificity, and an AUC of 0.84. Hence, GDF-15 is a potential marker to differentiate gynecological malignancy from non-malignant tumors.

Keywords: Biostatistics, Cancer Biomarkers, Detection/Diagnosis, Ovarian Cancer, GDF-15, MIC-1, NAG-1, PLAB, PTGFB

1. Introduction

Cancers of the ovary, fallopian tube, body of uterus, cervix, vagina, and vulva come under the broad heading of cancers of the female reproductive system. They are one of the major causes of cancer-related mortality, accounting for 13.1% of age-standardized cancer-related deaths in females (1). The difficulty of detecting cancer in its early stages is the primary factor for poor clinical outcomes (2). Biomarkers contribute to the management of these cancers by pre-operative differentiation between benign and malignant pelvic masses, progression of malignancy, monitoring response to treatment and recurrence, and most importantly, attempting to detect disease at an earlier stage (3). To date, there are no such biomarkers widely used in clinical settings of gynecological malignancies.

Serum cancer antigen 125 (CA125) has been in use as a biomarker for clinical diagnosis and monitoring of treatment response in epithelial ovarian carcinoma (EOC), but its sensitivity as an independent marker is suboptimal in early-stage post-menopausal women (3-5). Endometrial cancer incidence is on the rise worldwide. Early diagnosis can significantly improve its outcome as 5-year survival is >90% in early-stage disease. Existing markers (e.g., leptin, adiponectin, and prolactin) for detection or monitoring are subject to hormonal and metabolic alterations and not unique to cancer development (6). Also, cervical cancer is one of the leading causes of female cancer-related mortality. Although the conventional tumor marker, squamous cell carcinoma is a useful prognostic marker, its role in early diagnosis is limited (7).

Human Growth Differentiation Factor-15 (GDF-15), also known as Macrophage Inhibitory Cytokine (MIC-1), non-steroidal anti-inflammatory drug (NSAID) activated gene (NAG-1), placental bone morphogenetic protein (PLAB), placental transforming growth factor-beta (PTGFB), prostate derived factor (PDF), and PL-74 is a member of the Transforming Growth Factor-β (TGF-β) superfamily (8, 9). Under normal conditions, GDF-15 is only found in large amounts in the placenta (10). It is also a stress-responsive cytokine that is not only highly expressed in inflammatory conditions but has emerged as a potential marker in cancer diagnosis and progression

(9, 11, 12). Recently, several studies have demonstrated it to be involved in different gynecological malignancies such as EOC (4, 13-16), endometrial carcinoma (17), uterine sarcoma (18), and cervical cancer (19), where it is seen to be increased in serum or upregulated in tissue in case of malignant tumors compared to non-malignant ones. Hence, its applicability as a biomarker that can differentiate a benign mass from a malignant one and aid in the early detection of gynecological malignancies would be a significant advancement. Recently, Maeno et al. (20) developed a novel, flow-through membrane immunoassay-based measurement system for GDF-15 for the screening of uterine sarcoma. This chemiluminescence assay-based method correlated well with the GDF-15 measurements from ELISA (18). Nevertheless, the inconsistency of the data across different studies prevents us from pinpointing its clinical relevance in these patients. We have compiled original articles citing the role of GDF-15 in cancers of the female reproductive tract and performed a systematic analysis to evaluate its importance as a diagnostic biomarker.

2. Materials and Methods

2.1 Data sources and eligibility criteria

We conducted this study following the Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) and Preferred Reporting Items for a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Diagnostic Test Accuracy Studies (PRISMA-DTA) guidelines (21, 22). Two independent reviewers performed a selective literature search on several databases (Pubmed, Cochrane, ClinicalTrials.gov, Google Scholar, Web of Science, Embase, Scopus, LILACS, Opengrey) during 16th-20th March 2019. All relevant articles were screened as per titles and abstracts and subsequently reviewed for eligibility after they were combined and imported to Rayyan QCRI software (23). MeSH terms or keywords used in the search were ((“Growth Differentiation Factor-15” OR “GDF-15” OR “Macrophage Inhibitory Cytokine-1” OR “MIC-1” OR “NSAID-activated gene-1” OR “NAG-1” OR “placental transforming growth factor-beta” OR “PTGFB” OR “placental bone morphogenetic protein” OR “PLAB” OR “prostate derived factor” OR “PDF” OR “PL-74”) AND (“Ovarian cancer” OR “Ovarian carcinoma” OR “Endometrial cancer” OR “Endometrial carcinoma” OR “Uterine cancer”

OR “Uterine Carcinoma” OR “Cervical cancer” OR “Cervical carcinoma”) AND (“diagnosis” OR “sensitivity” OR “specificity” OR “prognosis” OR “outcome”)). References of identified articles and related reviews were manually searched for articles that may have been left out. The entire search strategy was carried out again latest on 3rd April 2021 for new articles which may have been left out of the analyses. No such study was found.

2.2 Study selection

The selection procedure is schematically depicted according to the PRISMA 2020 flow diagram (Figure 1) (24). Full-text studies were included as long as they met the following criteria: (1) included cases that were first identified without prior treatment; (2) proven diagnosis by pathology; (3) studies reported diagnostic feature of GDF-15 in cancers of the female reproductive tract; (4) sufficient data for describing or calculating Sensitivity, Specificity, and Area Under Curve (AUC); (5) studies approved by an Ethics Committee or Institutional Review Board, i.e. studies must have mentioned that written informed consent had been taken from all subjects before inclusion.

Accordingly, exclusion criteria were- (1) studies in which patient received therapy, (2) studies with insufficient data, and also, failure to contact the authors, (3) studies with <10 cases, (4) duplicate publications, (5) non-clinical research, animal studies, reviews, conference abstracts, case reports, meta-analyses.

Registration detail: PROSPERO, CRD42019130097.

2.3 Data collection

Data were extracted from articles in the form of the lead author, year of publication, country of the study population, the number of patients, sample type, method of testing, sensitivity, specificity, cut-off value, and AUC by two independent reviewers. In the articles where sensitivity and specificity were not explicitly mentioned, they were extracted from the AUC curve using the Engauge Digitizer software (25) or manually calculated from other measures of diagnostic accuracy available in the articles (26) or both. Efforts were made to contact the authors of the original articles for the missing data but to no avail. In cases where a study had data for multiple comparisons, only

one comparison was chosen in the final analysis considering the relevance to our research topic, heterogeneity issues and to avoid a unit-of-analysis error (27). All disagreements were resolved by discussion or consensus with a third reviewer.

2.4 Assessment of risk of bias

Quality assessment and risk of bias of the studies were evaluated by the revised Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies-2 (QUADAS-2) criteria (28) according to the designated points viz. patient selection, index test, reference standard, and flow and timing. All relevant evidence were included in the final analysis (28).

2.5 Data analysis

Previously published guidelines and methods for conducting a meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy were consulted (29-31). Analyses were performed on Review Manager 5.3 (RevMan 5.3) (32), R programming platform with the aid of R packages **meta** and **mada** (Meta-Analysis of Diagnostic Accuracy) (33-37) and the MetaDTA online tool as described by Freeman et al. (38). The primary outcomes were obtained as pooled sensitivity, specificity, positive likelihood ratio (PLR), negative likelihood ratio (NLR), diagnostic odds ratio (DOR), and AUC with corresponding 95% confidence intervals (CI) by grouping the data from the studies. The bivariate model (39) for calculating summary measures in diagnostic accuracy studies was used for the analysis. Statistically significant heterogeneity among the studies was verified using Cochran's Q and I^2 statistics and a fixed or random-effects model was chosen accordingly. Funnel plot asymmetry for the examination of publication bias was not performed as the number of included studies was less than 10 (40).

For all analytical purposes, $p<0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

3. Results

3.1 Study selection

One hundred ninety-six (196), potentially relevant studies were retrieved in our search (Figure 1). They were scanned for titles, keywords, abstracts, and a total of one hundred eighty-four (184) studies were eliminated because they were either duplicates, out of scope or basic or animal model

studies. The remaining 12 studies were read in detail, and finally, 6 of them, comprising 923 cases of gynecological cancers and 465 non-cancer controls, were considered eligible for diagnostic meta-analysis according to our inclusion criteria.

3.2 Study characteristics

The study characteristics are summarized in Table 1. In the six diagnostic studies finally included, the study participants involved Chinese (4, 15), Polish (13), Norwegian (14, 17, 18), and Belgian (18) patients, suffering from ovarian carcinoma (4, 13-15), endometrial carcinoma (17), and uterine sarcoma (18). The final diagnosis was all confirmed histologically and staged according to the International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics (FIGO) staging. The control group was non-cancer controls and comprised of healthy pre-and post-menopausal controls, benign ovarian tumors, and benign leiomyoma. Samples were either EDTA plasma (14, 17, 18), serum (4, 15), or peritoneal fluid (13). Enzyme-linked Immunosorbent Assay (ELISA) was primarily used to measure GDF-15, while one group each used immunoradiometric assay (IRMA) and multiplex immunoassay (13, 14). The diagnostic measures were sensitivity, specificity, and AUC. Only three out of the six studies provided a cut-off value of GDF-15, ranging from 519.6 pg/mL to 748 pg/mL (4, 14, 15).

3.3 Risk of bias of included studies

The studies were assessed for quality using the QUADAS-2 list (Table 3). According to the QUADAS-2 assessment, five out of six studies were at risk of bias, whereas only one study showed concern regarding applicability. All studies were included for further statistical analysis.

3.4 Synthesis of results

The Higgins' I^2 for the diagnostic odds ratio of all studies was 86.5% (95% CI 72.8%-93.3%, $p<0.01$), indicating considerable heterogeneity in the pooled data. Values ranging from 60.9% to 90.6% were also detected in other subgroups in the diagnostic data. Hence, we resorted to using the random-effects model for the studies.

The measures of diagnostic accuracy for the included studies are depicted in Table 2 and Figure 2. The overall pooled sensitivity, specificity, diagnostic odds ratio (DOR) and area under the curve

(AUC) for GDF-15 used to distinguish gynecological cancers from non-cancerous tumors, were 0.805 (95% CI: 0.711-0.873), 0.741 (95% CI: 0.611-9.839), 12.738 (95% CI: 5.034-32.231), and 0.835 respectively, corresponding to a positive likelihood ratio (PLR) of 3.103 (95% CI: 1.671-4.535) and a negative likelihood ratio (NLR) of 0.264 (95% CI: 0.146-0.383). The summary ROC curve is shown in Figure 3. These results suggest that GDF-15 levels can be used as a useful alternative biomarker in diagnosing cancers of the female reproductive tract compared to non-cancerous tumors.

4. Discussion

Our study has identified six original articles which evaluated the role of GDF-15 as a candidate biomarker in diagnosing malignancies of the female reproductive tract from non-malignant tumors. We performed a meta-analysis and found it to be a potential robust biomarker with a pooled sensitivity and specificity of 80.5% and 74.1%, respectively. One study (14) had a 'low risk' of bias and applicability across all domains in the QUADAS-2 assessment. Five other studies had either 'unclear' or 'high' risk of bias in one of the four domains, among which Staff et al. (17) also had one 'unclear' applicability concern. We also found significant heterogeneity across the studies.

Malignancies of the female reproductive tract are one of the major causes of cancer-related mortality in females, mainly because these cancers are diagnosed at later stages (1, 2). Pre-operative detection of malignant lesions is also crucial for optimal management. Furthermore, the disease-free survival (DFS) of EOC patients is often poor even after extensive resection (41). Several systematic reviews in the past have elaborated the role of existing biomarkers or combinations thereof in ovarian or endometrial cancers alone (42-45). CA125 as a diagnostic biomarker to differentiate malignant and borderline ovarian tumors from benign lesions showed a promising sensitivity and specificity of 80% and 75%, respectively (45), which is comparable to our pooled estimates. Nevertheless, to our knowledge, a marker potent enough to discriminate malignant gynecological tumors in early stages from non-malignant ones without compromising on either sensitivity or specificity is not yet described. Several groups have proposed GDF-15 as a biomarker in prostatic,

colorectal, hepatocellular, and pancreatic carcinomas as well as other malignancies and non-malignant inflammatory conditions (46, 47). Therefore, it is clear from the existing evidence that GDF-15 may not be specific for any single cancer type. However, GDF-15 is substantially increased or upregulated across all gynecological malignancies. Thus, it can be used as a complementary diagnostic biomarker in addition to existing diagnosing strategies, wherein it may be a useful biomarker in the diagnosis of early-stage EOC from benign ovarian tumors and other non-cancerous tumors of the female reproductive tract in such scenarios. In our study, the pooled sensitivity was comparably close with the sensitivity values of GDF-15 across all articles which were taken for analysis. While two articles on ovarian carcinoma showed the specificity of GDF-15 to be below 60% (13, 14), the pooled specificity came out to be 74.1%, possibly because of sizeable inter-study variation.

There are certain limitations to our study. There were low sample sizes for individual cancer types. Most of the studies were at risk of bias, primarily due to a case-control design, which is known to exaggerate diagnostic accuracy (48, 49). So far, the studies have been confined only to Chinese and European populations. Thus, a small sample with such a highly selective population will require further validation studies to establish its applicability in diagnosis in a clinical setting. Studies on a large scale need to be carried out in other populations. In our review, we could not include studies on all the cancers of the female reproductive system, namely cervical and vulval cancers, as data were either not present or did not fit our inclusion criteria. Furthermore, studies on in-vitro models and animal models were also left out. Patients with treatment history had to be excluded as anti-cancer therapy may alter the expression levels of GDF-15.

The applicability of GDF-15 can be verified with future prospective studies focusing on larger sample size and patient ethnicities. Finally, before implementing it into clinical practice, cut-off values for GDF-15 must be determined and internationally validated. Here, the cut-off value to differentiate between malignant and non-malignant tumors or healthy controls is mentioned in only three of the six studies included. Large scale prospective cohorts, then, are necessary to validate a

uniform cut-off. To summarize, our analysis suggests that GDF-15 may be a useful candidate marker to differentiate malignant from non-malignant tumors of the female reproductive system.

Acknowledgement: None.

Disclosure of interest: The authors report no conflict of interest.

References:

1. Bray, F., Ferlay, J., Soerjomataram, I., Siegel, R. L., Torre, L. A., & Jemal, A. (2018). Global Cancer Statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries. *CA Cancer J Clin.* 2018 Nov;68(6):394-424. doi:10.3322/caac.21492
2. Mishra K. Gynaecological malignancies from palliative care perspective. *Indian J Palliat Care*. 2011;17(Suppl):S45–S51. doi:10.4103/0973-1075.76243
3. Yang WL, Lu Z, Bast RC Jr. The role of biomarkers in the management of epithelial ovarian cancer. *Expert Rev Mol Diagn*. 2017;17(6):577–591. doi:10.1080/14737159.2017.1326820
4. Zhao, D., Wang, X. & Zhang, W. GDF15 predict platinum response during first-line chemotherapy and can act as a complementary diagnostic serum biomarker with CA125 in epithelial ovarian cancer. *BMC Cancer* 18, 328 (2018) doi:10.1186/s12885-018-4246-4
5. E. Hogdall. Cancer antigen 125 and prognosis, *Curr. Opin. Obstet. Gynecol.* 20 (1) (2008) 4–8.
6. Townsend MH, Ence ZE, Felsted AM, Parker AC, Piccolo SR, Robison RA, O'Neill KL. Potential new biomarkers for endometrial cancer. *Cancer Cell Int*. 2019;19:19. Published 2019 Jan 21. doi:10.1186/s12935-019-0731-3
7. Iida, M., Banno, K., Yanokura, M., Nakamura, K., Adachi, M., Nogami, Y., Umene, K., Masuda, K., Kisu, I., Iwata, T., et al. (2014). Candidate biomarkers for cervical cancer treatment: Potential for clinical practice (Review). *Mol Clin Oncol.* 2, 647-655. doi:10.3892/mco.2014.324
8. Bootcov MR, Bauskin AR, Valenzuela SM, et al. MIC-1, a novel macrophage inhibitory cytokine, is a divergent member of the TGF-beta superfamily. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A.* 1997;94:11514–9.
9. Adela R, Banerjee SK. GDF-15 as a target and biomarker for diabetes and cardiovascular diseases: a translational prospective. *J Diabetes Res*. 2015; 2015:490842.
10. Lawton LN, Bonaldo MF, Jelenc PC, Qiu L, Baumes SA, Marcelino RA, de Jesus GM, Wellington S, Knowles JA, Warburton D, et al. Identification of a novel member of the TGF-

beta superfamily highly expressed in human placenta. *Gene* 1997;1:17–26. doi: 10.1016/s0378-1119(97)00485-x

11. Modi, A., Dwivedi, S., Roy, D., Khokhar, M., Purohit, P., Vishnoi, J., Pareek, P., Sharma, S., Sharma, P., Misra, S. (2019). Growth differentiation factor 15 and its role in carcinogenesis: an update. *Growth Factors*, 2019 Aug;37(3-4):190-207. doi:10.1080/08977194.2019.1685988
12. Modi A, Roy D, Purohit P, Pareek P, Vishnoi J. Analysis of Serum Growth Differentiation Factor-15 in Progression of Breast Cancer in Type II Diabetes Mellitus Patients. *Metabolism.* March 2021; 116(Suppl):154538. doi:10.1016/j.metabol.2020.154538.
13. Chudecka-Głaz AM, Cymbaluk-Płoska AA, Menkiszak JL, Pius-Sadowska E, Machaliński BB, Sompolska-Rzechuła A, Rzepka-Górska IA. Assessment of selected cytokines, proteins, and growth factors in the peritoneal fluid of patients with ovarian cancer and benign gynecological conditions. *Onco Targets Ther*. 2015 Feb 23;8:471-485. doi: 10.2147/OTT.S73438.
14. Staff, A. C., Bock, A. J., Becker, C., Kempf, T., Wollert, K. C., & Davidson, B. (2010). Growth differentiation factor-15 as a prognostic biomarker in ovarian cancer. *Gynecol Oncol*, 118(3), 237–243. doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2010.05.032
15. Zhang Y, Hua W, Niu LC, Li SM, Wang YM, Shang L, Zhang C, Li WN, Wang R, Chen BL, et al. Elevated growth differentiation factor 15 expression predicts poor prognosis in epithelial ovarian cancer patients. *Tumour Biol*. 2016 Jul;37(7):9423-9431. doi: 10.1007/s13277-015-4699-x.
16. Lima CA, Jammal MP, Martins-Filho A, Silveira TP, Micheli DC, Tavares-Murta BM, Murta EFC, Nomelini RS. Stromal Growth Differentiation Factor 15 and Its Association with Ovarian Cancer. *Gynecol Obstet Invest*. 2018;83(1):35-39. doi: 10.1159/000473891.
17. Staff AC, Trovik J, Eriksson AG, Wik E, Wollert KC, Kempf T, Salvesen HB. Elevated plasma growth differentiation factor-15 correlates with lymph node metastases and poor survival in endometrial cancer. *Clin Cancer Res*. 2011 Jul 15;17(14):4825-4833. doi:10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-11-0715.

18. Trovik, J., Salvesen, H. B., Cuppens, T., Amant, F., & Staff, A. C. (2014). Growth Differentiation Factor-15 as Biomarker in Uterine Sarcomas. *Int J of Gynecol Cancer*, 24(2), 252–259. doi:10.1097/igc.0000000000000037

19. Li S, Ma YM, Zheng PS, Zhang P. (2018). GDF15 promotes the proliferation of cervical cancer cells by phosphorylating AKT1 and Erk1/2 through the receptor ErbB2. *J Exp Clin Cancer Res*, 37(1):80. doi:10.1186/s13046-018-0744-0

20. Maeno M, Mizutani T, Tsuyoshi H, Yamada S, Ishikane S, Kawabe S, Nishimura K, Yamada M, Miyamoto K, Yoshida Y. Development of a novel and rapid measurement system for growth differentiation factor-15, progranulin, and osteopontin in uterine sarcoma. *Endocr J*. 2020 Jan 28;67(1):91-94. doi: 10.1507/endocrj.EJ18-0572.

21. Stroup DF, Berlin JA, Morton SC, Olkin I, Williamson GD, Rennie D. Meta-analysis of observational studies in epidemiology: a proposal for reporting. Meta-analysis of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) group. *JAMA* 2000;283: 2008–2012.

22. McInnes MDF, Moher D, Thombs BD, McGrath TA, Bossuyt PM, The PRISMA-DTA Group (2018). Preferred Reporting Items for a Systematic Review and Meta-analysis of Diagnostic Test Accuracy Studies: The PRISMA-DTA Statement. *JAMA.* 2018 Jan 23;319(4):388-396. doi: 10.1001/jama.2017.19163.

23. Ouzzani M, Hammady H, Fedorowicz Z, Elmagarmid A. Rayyan-a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. *Syst Rev*. 2016 Dec 5;5(1):210. doi: 10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4.

24. Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, Boutron I, Hoffmann TC, Mulrow CD, Shamseer L, Tetzlaff JM, Akl EA, Brennan SE, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;372:n71. doi: 10.1136/bmj.n71

25. Mark Mitchell, Baurzhan Muftakhidinov and Tobias Winchen et al, "Engauge Digitizer Software." Webpage: http://markummitchell.github.io/engauge-digitizer, Last Accessed: April 3, 2021

26. Šimundić A. M. (2009). Measures of Diagnostic Accuracy: Basic Definitions. *EJIFCC*, *19*(4), 203–211.

27. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, Cumpston M, Li T, Page MJ, Welch VA (editors). *Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of Interventions* version 6.0 (updated July 2019). Cochrane, 2019. Available from www.training.cochrane.org/handbook.

28. Whiting PF, Rutjes AW, Westwood ME, Mallett S, Deeks JJ, Reitsma JB, Leeflang MM, Sterne JA, Bossuyt PM; QUADAS-2 Group. QUADAS-2: a revised tool for the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies. *Ann Intern Med.* 2011 Oct 18;155(8):529-536. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-155-8-201110180-00009.

29. Campbell JM, Klugar M, Ding S, Carmody DP, Hakonsen SJ, Jadotte YT, White S, Munn Z. Diagnostic test accuracy: methods for systematic review and meta-analysis. *Int J Evid Based Healthc*. 2015 Sep;13(3):154-62. doi: 10.1097/XEB.0000000000000061.

30. Deville WL, Buntinx F, Bouter LM, Montori VM, de Vet HC, van der Windt DA, Bezemer PD. Conducting systematic reviews of diagnostic studies: didactic guidelines. *BMC Med Res Methodol* 2002;2:9. doi:10.1186/1471-2288-2-9.

31. Chappell FM, Raab GM, Wardlaw JM. When are summary ROC curves appropriate for diagnostic meta-analyses? *Stat Med* 2009; 28:2653–2668.

32. Review Manager Web (RevMan Web). The Cochrane Collaboration, 2019. Available at revman.cochrane.org

33. R Core Team (2013). R: A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. URL http://www.R-project.org/.

34. RStudio Team (2015). RStudio: Integrated Development for R. RStudio, Inc., Boston, MA URL *http://www.rstudio.com/*.

35. Shim SR, Kim SJ, Lee J. Diagnostic test accuracy: application and practice using R software. *Epidemiol Health*. 2019;41:e2019007. doi:10.4178/epih.e2019007

36. Philipp Doebler (2019). mada: Meta-Analysis of Diagnostic Accuracy. R package version 0.5.9. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=mada

37. Guido Schwarzer (2007), meta: An R package for meta-analysis, R News, 7(3), 40-45.

38. Freeman SC, Kerby CR, Patel A, Cooper NJ, Quinn T, & Sutton AJ. (2019). Development of an interactive web-based tool to conduct and interrogate meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy studies: MetaDTA. *BMC Med Res Methodol*, 19(1):81. doi:10.1186/s12874-019-0724-x

39. Reitsma JB, Glas AS, Rutjes AWS, Scholten RJPM, Bossuyt PM, & Zwinderman AH. (2005). Bivariate analysis of sensitivity and specificity produces informative summary measures in diagnostic reviews. *J Clin Epidemiol*, 58(10), 982–990. doi:10.1016/j.jclinepi.2005.02.022

40. Mavridis D, Salanti G. How to assess publication bias: funnel plot, trim-and-fill method and selection models. *Evid Based Ment Health*. 2014 Feb;17(1):30. doi: 10.1136/eb-2013-101699. PMID: 24477535

41. Becker DA, Thomas ED, Gilbert AL, Boone JD, Straughn JM Jr, Huh WK, Bevis KS, Leath CA 3rd, Alvarez RD. Improved outcomes with dose-dense paclitaxel-based neoadjuvant chemotherapy in advanced epithelial ovarian carcinoma. *Gynecol Oncol*. 2016;142(1):25–29.

42. Lan Z, Fu D, Yu X, & Xi M. (2015). Diagnostic values of osteopontin combined with CA125 for ovarian cancer: a meta-analysis. *Familial Cancer*, 15(2), 221–230. doi:10.1007/s10689-015-9847-3

43. Hu, L., Du, S., Guo, W., Chen, D., & Li, Y. (2016). Comparison of Serum Human Epididymis Protein 4 and Carbohydrate Antigen 125 as Markers in Endometrial Cancer. *Int J Gynecol Cancer*, 26(2), 331–340. doi:10.1097/igc.0000000000000621

44. Wang, J., Gao, J., Yao, H., Wu, Z., Wang, M., & Qi, J. (2014). Diagnostic accuracy of serum HE4, CA125 and ROMA in patients with ovarian cancer: a meta-analysis. *Tumor Biol*, 35(6), 6127–6138. doi:10.1007/s13277-014-1811-6

45. Medeiros, L. R., Rosa, D. D., da Rosa, M. I., & Bozzetti, M. C. (2009). Accuracy of CA 125 in the diagnosis of ovarian tumors: A quantitative systematic review. *Euro J Obstet Gynecol Reprod Biol*, 142(2), 99–105. doi:10.1016/j.ejogrb.2008.08.011

46. Wang Y, Jiang T, Jiang M, Gu S. Appraising growth differentiation factor 15 as a promising biomarker in digestive system tumors: a meta-analysis. *BMC Cancer*. 2019 Feb 26;19(1):177. doi: 10.1186/s12885-019-5385-y.

47. Roy D, Purohit P, Modi A, Khokhar M, Shukla RKG, Chaudhary R, Sankanagoudar S, Sharma P. Growth Differentiation Factor-15 as a Biomarker of Obese Pre-diabetes and Type 2 Diabetes Mellitus in Indian Subjects: A Case-control Study. *Curr Diabetes Rev*. 2021 Jan 3. doi: 10.2174/1573399817666210104101739. Epub ahead of print. PMID: 33397240.

48. Lijmer JG, Mol BW, Heisterkamp S, Bonsel GJ, Prins MH, van der Meulen JH, Bossuyt PM. Empirical evidence of design-related bias in studies of diagnostic tests. JAMA. 1999 Sep 15;282(11):1061-6. doi: 10.1001/jama.282.11.1061. Erratum in: JAMA 2000 Apr 19;283(15):1963. PMID: 10493205.

49. Whiting P, Rutjes AW, Reitsma JB, Glas AS, Bossuyt PM, Kleijnen J. Sources of variation and bias in studies of diagnostic accuracy: a systematic review. Ann Intern Med. 2004 Feb 3;140(3):189-202. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-140-3-200402030-00010. PMID: 14757617.

Table 1: Study characteristics of all the articles included in the diagnostic meta-analysis

Study	Country and recruitment period	Design	Group1 (N1)	Group2 (N2)	Method	Cut-off (pg/mL)	TP	FN	FP	TN	Staging	Index test	Reference test
Staff 2010 (14)	Norway; 2003-2009	Prospective	Ovarian carcinoma (125)	Borderline and benign ovarian tumors (187)	EDTA Plasma; IRMA	736	100	25	79	108	25/11/71/18	GDF-15	FIGO
Zhao 2018 (4)	China; 2009-2013	Retrospective	Epithelial ovarian carcinoma (122)	Healthy control (120)	Serum; ELISA	519.6	104	18	14	106	I & II = 13; III & IV = 109	GDF-15	FIGO
Zhang 2016 (15)	China; 2010-2013	Retrospective	Epithelial ovarian carcinoma (120)	Healthy control (40)	Serum; ELISA	748	91	29	7	33	I & II = 41; III & IV = 104	GDF-15	FIGO
Trovik 2014 (18)	Multicenter (Norway, Belgium); 2001-2010	Prospective case control	Uterine sarcoma (19)	Benign leiomyoma (50)	EDTA Plasma; ELISA	-	16	3	6	34	9/3/3/4	GDF-15	FIGO
Staff 2011 (17)	Norway; 2003-2009	Nested case control	Endometrial carcinoma (510)	Healthy control (40)	EDTA Plasma; ELISA	-	319	182	18	32	366/57/63/24	GDF-15	FIGO
Chudecka-Glaz 2015 (13)	Poland; NR	Retrospective	Ovarian carcinoma (36)	Benign tumors (38)	Peritoneal fluid; Multiplex	-	34	2	17	21	I & II = 10; III & IV = 26	GDF-15	FIGO

Abbreviations: CA125 = Cancer Antigen 125; ELISA = enzyme linked immunosorbent assay; FIGO = International Federation of Gynecology and Obstetrics; GDF-15 = Growth Differentiation Factor-15; IHC = Immunohistochemistry; IRMA = Immunoradiometric assay; NR = not reported

Table 2: Measures of diagnostic accuracy in the selected studies

Study	Sensitivity (95% CI)	Specificity (95% CI)	DOR (95% CI)	AUC
Staff 2010 (14)	0.800 (0.719; 0.866)	0.578 (0.503; 0.649)	5.47 (3.23; 9.25)	0.790
Zhao 2018 (4)	0.853 (0.777; 0.910)	0.883 (0.812; 0.935)	43.75 (20.69; 92.52)	0.913
Zhang 2016 (15)	0.758 (0.672; 0.832)	0.825 (0.672; 0.927)	14.79 (5.92; 36.99)	0.894
Trovik 2014 (18)	0.842 (0.604; 0.966)	0.850 (0.702; 0.943)	30.22 (6.69; 136.52)	0.710
Staff 2011 (17)	0.637 (0.593; 0.679)	0.640 (0.492; 0.771)	3.12 (1.70; 5.71)	0.860
Chudecka-Glaz 2015 (13)	0.944 (0.813; 0.993)	0.553 (0.383; 0.714)	21.00 (4.40; 100.22)	0.752
Pooled data	0.805 (0.711; 0.873)	0.741 (0.611; 0.839)	12.74 (5.03; 32.23)	0.835

Abbreviations: 95% CI = 95% Confidence Interval; AUC = Area under the curve; DOR = Diagnostic odds ratio

Table 3: Evaluation of the risk of bias and applicability concerns of the included diagnostic studies using QUADAS-2

Study	Risk of Bias				Applicability Concerns		
	Patient Selection	Index Test	Reference Standard	Flow and Timing	Patient Selection	Index Test	Reference Standard
Staff 2010 (14)	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Zhao 2018 (4)	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Zhang 2016 (15)	High	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Trovik 2014 (18)	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low
Staff 2011 (17)	High	Low	Low	Low	Low	Unclear	Low
Chudecka-Glaz 2015 (13)	Low	Unclear	Low	Low	Low	Low	Low



Figure 1: PRISMA 2020 flow diagram depicting the study selection procedure



Figure 2: Forest plots of GDF-15 for the (a) sensitivity, (b) specificity, and (c) diagnostic odds ratio of the pooled data from the included studies



Figure 3: ROC plot displaying extrapolated SROC curve, the summary estimate for sensitivity and specificity, and percentage study weights

Figure legends

Figure 1: PRISMA 2020 flow diagram depicting the study selection procedure

Figure 2: Forest plots of GDF-15 for the (a) sensitivity, (b) specificity, and (c) diagnostic odds ratio of the pooled data from the included studies

Figure 3: ROC plot displaying extrapolated SROC curve, the summary estimate for sensitivity and specificity, and percentage study weights