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

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

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

*Corresponding author & contact details:

Dr. Purvi Purohit

Additional Professor

The Department of Biochemistry

AIIMS, Jodhpur

e-mail: dr.purvipurohit@gmail.com

Address: Department of Biochemistry, All India Institute of Medical Sciences (AIIMS), Jodhpur, Basni Phase II, Rajasthan-342005

Phone: +91 9928388223

Source of funding: None

Abstract:

Introduction: Growth Differentiation Factor-15 (GDF-15) has emerged as a novel marker in gynecological cancers. But its suitability in clinical diagnostics is yet to be recognized.

Materials and methods: We sorted out eligible studies from multiple online databases like Pubmed, Cochrane, ClinicalTrials.gov, Google Scholar, Web of Science, Embase, Scopus, LILACS, and Opengrey. The terms used were 'Growth Differentiation Factor-15', 'GDF-15', 'Macrophage Inhibitory Cytokine-1', 'MIC-1', 'Ovarian cancer', 'Ovarian carcinoma', 'Endometrial cancer', 'Endometrial carcinoma', 'Uterine cancer', 'Uterine Carcinoma', 'Cervical cancer', 'Cervical carcinoma', 'diagnosis', 'sensitivity', 'specificity', 'prognosis', and 'outcome'. Of the full-text, potentially eligible records, six were found eligible for inclusion into our meta-analysis. Studies were se-

lected only if the diagnosis was proven by pathology, cases recruited were those without any prior treatment, sufficient diagnostic accuracy data were present for GDF-15 in gynecological cancers, ethical approval was taken from Institutional Ethics Committee, and full-text material was available in English. Nonclinical research and animal studies were excluded. We took the assistance of the Rayyan QCRI software for the screening and selection process. We conducted the study following Meta-analysis Of Observational Studies in Epidemiology (MOOSE) guidelines and used Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies-2 (QUADAS-2) to assess the risk of bias.

The protocol was registered at PROSPERO, registration number CRD42019130097.

Results: We extracted diagnostic accuracy data from the articles and evaluated the role of GDF-15 by pooling the sensitivity, specificity, and diagnostic odds ratio (DOR) and plotting a summary receiver operating characteristic (SROC) curve. Since there was heterogeneity across the studies, random-effects model was employed to carry out the integration. The meta-analysis showed that GDF-15 has a pooled DOR of 12.74 at 80.5% sensitivity and 74.1% specificity, with an area under the curve (AUC) of 0.84.

Conclusion: Our analysis suggests that GDF-15 may be a useful candidate marker to differentiate malignant from non-malignant tumors of the female reproductive system.

Registration detail: PROSPERO, CRD42019130097.

Keywords: GDF-15, Ovarian Cancer, Endometrial Cancer, Benign Ovarian Tumors, MIC-1

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. Biomarkers contribute to the management of these cancers by pre-operative differentiation between benign and malignant pelvic masses, monitoring response to treatment and recurrence, and most importantly, attempting to detect disease at an earlier stage [2]. However, due to the limited value of existing circulating biomarkers, there is an unmet need for a newer one.

Human Growth Differentiation Factor-15 (GDF-15), also known as Macrophage Inhibitory Cytokine (MIC-1), is a member of the Transforming Growth Factor-β (TGF-β) superfamily [3]. A stress-responsive cytokine, it is not only highly expressed in inflammatory conditions but has emerged as a potential marker in cancer [4,5]. Recently, several studies have demonstrated it to be involved in different gynecological malignancies such as epithelial ovarian carcinoma (EOC) [6-10], endometrial carcinoma [11], uterine sarcoma [12], and cervical cancer [13], 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. However, 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 in order 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 [14,15]. Two independent reviewers performed a selective literature search on several databases (Pubmed, Cochrane, ClinicalTrials.gov, Google Scholar, Web of Science, Embase, Scopus, LILACS, Opengrey) between 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 [16]. MeSH terms or keywords used in the search were “Growth Differentiation Factor-15” OR “GDF-15” OR “Macrophage In-

hibitory Cytokine-1" OR "MIC-1" 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 on 20th June 2020 for latest 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 in Figure 1. 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.

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 [17] or manually calculated from other measures of diagnostic accuracy available in the articles [18] 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 [19]. 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 [20] according to the designated points viz. patient selection, index test, reference standard, and flow and timing (Supplementary table S1).

2.5 Data analysis

Previously published guidelines and methods for conducting a meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy were consulted [21-23]. Analyses were performed on Review Manager 5.3 (RevMan 5.3) [24], R programming platform with the aid of R packages **meta** and **mada** (Meta-Analysis of Diagnostic Accuracy) [25-29] and the MetaDTA online tool as described by Freeman et al [30]. 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 inverse variance method was used to calculate the weights of individual studies. Statistically significant heterogeneity among the studies was verified using Cochran's Q and I^2 statistics and fixed or random-effects model was chosen accordingly. Publication bias was examined using the funnel plot asymmetry test and Egger's test. For all analytical purposes, $p<0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

Registration detail: PROSPERO, CRD42019130097.

3. Results

3.1 Study selection

One hundred fifty (150), potentially relevant studies were retrieved in our search. They were scanned for titles, keywords, abstracts, and 138 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 [8,9], Polish [6], Norwegian [7,11,12], and Belgian [12] patients, suffering from ovarian carcinoma [6-9], endometrial carcinoma [11], and uterine sarcoma [12]. 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 [7,11,12], serum [8,9], or peritoneal fluid [6]. Enzyme-linked Immunosorbent Assay (ELISA) was primarily used to measure GDF-15, while one group each used immunoradiometric assay (IRMA) and multiplex immunoassay [6,7]. The diagnos-

tic measures were sensitivity, specificity, and AUC. Only three (3) out of the six studies provided a cut-off value of GDF-15, ranging from 519.6 pg/mL to 748 pg/mL [7-9].

3.3 Risk of bias of included studies

The studies were assessed for quality using the QUADAS-2 list (Figure 2). According to the QUADAS-2 assessment, five out of six studies had low concerns regarding bias or applicability, which revealed they were of good quality. 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 3. 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 4. 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.

Publication bias analysis was carried out by Begg's funnel plot and rank test, and no significant bias was detected (Kendall's $\tau=0.2$, $p=0.719$) (Figure 5). Additionally, it was assessed with Egger's regression analysis which revealed no significant result ($p=0.175$).

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 (Staff et al. 2010) had a 'low risk' of bias and applicability across all domains in the QUADAS-2 assessment. Four other studies had either an 'unclear' or 'high' risk of bias in one of the four domains, while Staff et al. 2011 had one 'unclear' applicability concern (Supplementary table S2). We also found significant heterogeneity across the studies. Publication bias analysis was carried out by the funnel plot asymmetry test, and it did not yield any evidence of bias.

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 [1,31]. 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 [32]. Till date, there are no biomarkers widely used in clinical settings of gynecological malignancies for prediction of survival, the progression of malignancy, or disease recurrence. Serum cancer antigen (CA125) has been in use as a biomarker for clinical diagnosis and monitoring of treatment response in EOC, but its sensitivity as an independent marker is suboptimal in early-stage post-menopausal women [2,9,33]. 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, prolactin) for detection or monitoring are subject to hormonal and metabolic alterations and not unique to cancer development [34]. 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 [35]. Several systematic reviews in the past have elaborated the role of existing biomarkers or combinations thereof in ovarian or endometrial cancers alone [36-39]. 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 [39], 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.

Under normal conditions, GDF-15 is only found in large amounts in the placenta [40]. It is significantly increased in various pathological conditions, including inflammation and cancer. Several groups have proposed it as a biomarker in prostatic, colorectal, hepatocellular, and pancreatic carcinomas, among other malignancies [5,41]. 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 an adjunct 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% [6,7], 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. 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.

5. Conclusion

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.

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: A Cancer Journal for Clinicians*. doi:10.3322/caac.21492
2. 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
3. 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.
4. 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.
5. Modi, A., Dwivedi, S., Roy, D., et al. (2019). Growth differentiation factor 15 and its role in carcinogenesis: an update. *Growth Factors*, 1–18. doi:10.1080/08977194.2019.1685988
6. Chudecka-Glaz, A., Cymbaluk-Płoska, A., Menkiszak, J., et al. (2015). Assessment of selected cytokines, proteins, and growth factors in the peritoneal fluid of patients with ovarian cancer and benign gynecological conditions. *OncoTargets and Therapy*, 471. doi:10.2147/ott.s73438
7. 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. *Gynecologic Oncology*, 118(3), 237–243. doi:10.1016/j.ygyno.2010.05.032
8. Zhang, Y., Hua, W., Niu, L., et al. (2016). Elevated growth differentiation factor 15 expression predicts poor prognosis in epithelial ovarian cancer patients. *Tumor Biology*, 37(7), 9423–9431. doi:10.1007/s13277-015-4699-x
9. 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
10. Lima, C. A., Jammal, M. P., Martins-Filho, A., et al. (2017). Stromal Growth Differentiation Factor 15 and Its Association with Ovarian Cancer. *Gynecologic and Obstetric Investigation*, 83(1), 35–39. doi:10.1159/000473891
11. Staff, A. C., Trovik, J., Zahl, E. A. G., et al. (2011). Elevated Plasma Growth Differentiation Factor-15 Correlates with Lymph Node Metastases and Poor Survival in Endometrial Cancer. *Clinical Cancer Research*, 17(14), 4825–4833. doi:10.1158/1078-0432.ccr-11-0715

12. Trovik, J., Salvesen, H. B., Cuppens, T., Amant, F., & Staff, A. C. (2014). Growth Differentiation Factor-15 as Biomarker in Uterine Sarcomas. *International Journal of Gynecological Cancer*, 24(2), 252–259. doi:10.1097/igc.0000000000000037
13. Li, S., Ma, Y.-M., Zheng, P.-S., & Zhang, P. (2018). GDF15 promotes the proliferation of cervical cancer cells by phosphorylating AKT1 and Erk1/2 through the receptor ErbB2. *Journal of Experimental & Clinical Cancer Research*, 37(1). doi:10.1186/s13046-018-0744-0
14. 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: 2008–12.
15. 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.
16. Mourad Ouzzani, Hossam Hammady, Zbys Fedorowicz, and Ahmed Elmagarmid. Rayyan — a web and mobile app for systematic reviews. *Systematic Reviews* (2016) 5:210, DOI: 10.1186/s13643-016-0384-4.
17. Mark Mitchell, Baurzhan Muftakhidinov and Tobias Winchen et al, "Engauge Digitizer Software." Webpage: http://markummitchell.github.io/engauge-digitizer, Last Accessed: December 31, 2019
18. Šimundić A. M. (2009). Measures of Diagnostic Accuracy: Basic Definitions. *EJIFCC*, *19*(4), 203–211.
19. 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.
20. Whiting PF1, Rutjes AW, Westwood ME, et al; QUADAS-2 Group. QUADAS-2: a revised tool for the quality assessment of diagnostic accuracy studies. *Ann Intern Med.* 2011 Oct 18;155(8): 529-36. doi: 10.7326/0003-4819-155-8-201110180-00009.
21. Campbell, J. M., Klugar, M., Ding, S., et al. (2015). *Diagnostic test accuracy. International Journal of Evidence-Based Healthcare, 13(3), 154–162.* doi:10.1097/xeb.0000000000000061
22. Deville WL, Buntinx F, Bouter LM, et al. Conducting systematic reviews of diagnostic studies: didactic guidelines. BMC Med Res Methodol 2002;2:9.
23. Chappell FM, Raab GM, Wardlaw JM. When are summary ROC curves appropriate for diagnostic meta-analyses? *Stat Med* 2009; 28:2653–68.

24. Review Manager Web (RevMan Web). The Cochrane Collaboration, 2019. Available at revman.cochrane.org
25. 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/.
26. RStudio Team (2015). RStudio: Integrated Development for R. RStudio, Inc., Boston, MA URL *http://www.rstudio.com/*.
27. 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
28. Philipp Doebler (2019). mada: Meta-Analysis of Diagnostic Accuracy. R package version 0.5.9. https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=mada
29. Guido Schwarzer (2007), meta: An R package for meta-analysis, R News, 7(3), 40-45.
30. Freeman, S. C., Kerby, C. R., Patel, A., Cooper, N. J., Quinn, T., & Sutton, A. J. (2019). Development of an interactive web-based tool to conduct and interrogate meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy studies: MetaDTA. *BMC Medical Research Methodology*, 19(1). doi:10.1186/s12874-019-0724-x
31. Mishra K. Gynaecological malignancies from palliative care perspective. *Indian J Palliat Care*. 2011;17(Suppl):S45–S51. doi:10.4103/0973-1075.76243
32. Becker DA, Thomas ED, Gilbert AL, et al. Improved outcomes with dose-dense paclitaxel-based neoadjuvant chemotherapy in advanced epithelial ovarian carcinoma. *Gynecol Oncol.* 2016;142(1):25–29.
33. E. Hogdall, Cancer antigen 125 and prognosis, *Curr. Opin. Obstet. Gynecol.* 20 (1) (2008) 4–8.
34. Townsend MH, Ence ZE, Felsted AM, et al. Potential new biomarkers for endometrial cancer. *Cancer Cell Int*. 2019;19:19. Published 2019 Jan 21. doi:10.1186/s12935-019-0731-3
35. Iida, M., Banno, K., Yanokura, M., et al. (2014). Candidate biomarkers for cervical cancer treatment: Potential for clinical practice (Review). *Molecular and Clinical Oncology,* 2, 647-655. https://doi.org/10.3892/mco.2014.324
36. 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
37. 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. *International Journal of Gynecological Cancer*, 26(2), 331–340. doi:10.1097/igc.0000000000000621

38. 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 Biology*, 35(6), 6127–6138. doi:10.1007/s13277-014-1811-6

39. 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. *European Journal of Obstetrics & Gynecology and Reproductive Biology*, 142(2), 99–105. doi:10.1016/j.ejogrb.2008.08.011

40. Lawton LN, Bonaldo MF, Jelenc PC, et al. Identification of a novel member of the TGF-beta superfamily highly expressed in human placenta. *Gene* 1997;**1**:17–26.

41. Wang, Y., Jiang, T., Jiang, M. *et al.* Appraising growth differentiation factor 15 as a promising biomarker in digestive system tumors: a meta-analysis. *BMC Cancer***19,** 177 (2019). https://doi.org/10.1186/s12885-019-5385-y

Table and figure legends

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

Table 2: Measures of diagnostic accuracy in the selected studies

Figure 1: Flowchart depicting the study selection procedure

Figure 2: Quality assessment of the studies included for diagnostic analysis using QUADAS-2 tool in RevMan 5.3

Figure 3: 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 4: ROC plot displaying extrapolated SROC curve, the summary estimate for sensitivity and specificity, and percentage study weights

Figure 5: Publication bias by Begg's funnel plot for overall pooled diagnostic effect

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

Study	Country	Recruitment period	Design	Group1 (N1)	Group2 (N2)	Method	Cut-off (pg/mL)	TP	FN	FP	TN	Index/ Reference test
Staff 2010 [7]	Norway	2003-2009	Prospective case control	Ovarian carcinoma (125)	Borderline and benign ovarian tumors (187)	EDTA Plasma; IRMA	736	100	25	79	108	GDF-15/ FIGO
Zhao 2018 [9]	China	2009-2013	Retrospective	Epithelial ovarian carcinoma (122)	Healthy control (120)	Serum; ELISA	519.6	104	18	14	106	GDF-15/ FIGO
Zhang 2016 [8]	China	2010-2013	Retrospective	Epithelial ovarian carcinoma (120)	Healthy control (40)	Serum; ELISA	748	91	29	7	33	GDF-15/ FIGO
Trovik 2014 [12]	Multicenter (Norway, Belgium)	2001-2010	Prospective case control	Uterine sarcoma (19)	Benign leiomyoma (50)	EDTA Plasma; ELISA	-	16	3	6	34	GDF-15/ FIGO
Staff 2011 [11]	Norway	2003-2009	Nested case control	Endometrial carcinoma (510)	Healthy control (40)	EDTA Plasma; ELISA	-	319	182	18	32	GDF-15/ FIGO
Chudecka-Glaz 2015 [6]	Poland	-	Retrospective	Ovarian carcinoma (36)	Benign tumors (38)	Peritoneal fluid; Multiplex	-	34	2	17	21	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

Table 2: Measures of diagnostic accuracy in the selected studies

Study	Sensitivity (95% CI)	Specificity (95% CI)	DOR (95% CI)	AUC
Staff 2010 [7]	0.800 (0.719; 0.866)	0.578 (0.503; 0.649)	5.47 (3.23; 9.25)	0.790
Zhao 2018 [9]	0.853 (0.777; 0.910)	0.883 (0.812; 0.935)	43.75 (20.69; 92.52)	0.913
Zhang 2016 [8]	0.758 (0.672; 0.832)	0.825 (0.672; 0.927)	14.79 (5.92; 36.99)	0.894
Trovik 2014 [12]	0.842 (0.604; 0.966)	0.850 (0.702; 0.943)	30.22 (6.69; 136.52)	0.710
Staff 2011 [11]	0.637 (0.593; 0.679)	0.640 (0.492; 0.771)	3.12 (1.70; 5.71)	0.860
Chudecka-Glaz 2015 [6]	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 curve; DOR = Diagnostic odds ratio



Figure 1: Flowchart depicting the study selection procedure



Figure 2: Quality assessment of the studies included for diagnostic analysis using QUADAS-2 tool in RevMan 5.3







Figure 3: 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 4: ROC plot displaying extrapolated SROC curve, the summary estimate for sensitivity and specificity, and percentage study weights



Figure 5: Publication bias by Begg's funnel plot for overall pooled diagnostic effect