medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

TITLE

Detection of Circulating Glial Cells Enables Non-Invasive Diagnosis of Glial Malignancies

AUTHORS

Kevin O'Neill[1†], Nelofer Syed[2†*], Timothy Crook[2†], Sudhir Dubey[3], Mahadev Potharaju[4], Sewanti Limaye[5], Anantbhushan Ranade[6], Giulio Anichini[2], Darshana Patil[7], Sudha S Murthy[7], Dadasaheb Akolkar[7], Pooja Fulmali[7], Vineet Datta[7], Sachin Apurwa[7], Jinumary John[7], Ajay Srinivasan[7], Rajan Datar[7]

[†]These authors contributed equally to this work.

AFFILIATIONS

[1] Department of Neurosurgery, Imperial College Healthcare NHS Trust, London, UK

[2] Department of Brain Sciences, John Fulcher Neuro-Oncology Laboratory, Burlington Danes Building, Hammersmith Hospital, Imperial College London, London, UK

[3] Institute of Neurosciences, Medanta-The Medicity, Gurugram, India

[4] Department of Radiation Oncology, Apollo Speciality Hospitals, Chennai, India

[5] Department of Medical Oncology, Sir HN Reliance Foundation Hospital and Research Centre, Mumbai, India

[6] Department of Medical Oncology, Avinash Cancer Clinic, Pune, India

[7] Department of Research and Innovations, Datar Cancer Genetics Private Limited, Nasik, India

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

CORRESPONDING AUTHOR

Dr. Nelofer Syed. E-mail: n.syed@imperial.ac.uk, Phone: +4402075945292

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

ABSTRACT

Diagnosis of primary glial malignancies (GLI-M) in individuals presenting with Intracranial Space Occupying Lesions (ICSOL) is based on histopathological evaluation (HPE) of tissue obtained by surgical resection or biopsy with attendant resource implications and risks. Approximately 70% of ICSOLs have non-malignant etiology and distinction from malignant lesions rests largely on HPE. Furthermore, GLI-M must be differentiated from metastatic lesions to the brain arising from solid tumors in other organs. We describe a blood-based test which detects GLI-M with high sensitivity and differentiates it from benign brain tumours (BBT) and brain metastases. The test is based on fluorescent multiplexed immunocytochemical (ICC) profiling for identification of Circulating Glial Cells (CGCs) and Circulating (Epithelial) Tumor Cells (CTCs) enriched from peripheral blood. The performance characteristics of the test were established in analytical validation as well as clinical studies. In an initial case-control study with discrete training (n = 31 BBT and n = 101 GLI-M) and test (n = 13 BBT and n = 44 GLI-M) sets, our platform showed 100% sensitivity and 100% specificity in identifying and differentiating GLI-M from BBT in the test set. In a prospective study of 68 individuals presenting with ICSOL, the test had 100% sensitivity and 100% specificity for identifying and differentiating GLI-M (n = 56) and BBT (n = 12). Finally, in a subset analysis of 586 samples, the test accurately identified samples from GLI-M (n = 40), BBT (n = 22), epithelial malignancies (EPI-M, n = 24) and healthy individuals (n = 500), with no false positive or false negative findings. The performance characteristics of this blood-based platform support its utility in clinical practice for diagnostic triaging of individuals presenting with ICSOL and facilitating more effective diagnosis compared to standard of care.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

KEYWORDS

Circulating Glial Cells; Non-invasive; Glial malignancy; brain tumor; Liquid Biopsy; Diagnosis

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

Standard of care (SoC) for establishing the diagnosis in individuals presenting with intracranial space occupying lesions (ICSOL) is histopathological evaluation (HPE) of tumor tissue specimens obtained from excision or biopsy. The differential diagnosis of such patients includes primary glial malignancy (GLI-M) and metastases from other solid tumors . Non- malignant ICSOL are more common than GLI-M and have different management, emphasising the critical importance of expeditious establishment of diagnosis. Furthermore, the anatomical site of the lesion may be associated with increased procedural risks and complications.

Previous attempts at non-invasive detection of GLI-M and at differentiating GLI-M from BBT and brain metastases have examined profiling of gene variants (1) or CpG island methylation (2) in cell-free DNA and profiling of exosomal mRNA / miRNA transcripts (3). However, these approaches have been limited by lower sensitivity and specificity (4). Circulating tumor cells (CTCs) are viable tumor derived cells in circulation, the molecular evaluation of which may be an alternative to or comparable with that of the tumor tissue from which they originate (5–7). CTCs are rarely detected in the peripheral blood of healthy individuals and their detection in such populations may be an indication of an underlying malignancy (8,9). In primary solid organ cancers, the existence of CTCs is linked to dissemination and metastatic spread. Since extracranial metastases are rarely (<0.5%) observed in GLI-M (6,10,11), the detection of circulating (malignant) glial cells (CGCs) in blood samples from patients with GLI-M appears to indicate that while CGCs can enter circulation, they are mostly unable to find a target tissue where they can egress, survive, and grow (12). In a study of organ transplantation where organ donors had subsequently died of glioblastoma multiforme (GBM), some recipients developed extracranial

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

metastases, strongly implying that these organs harbored disseminated malignant cells (13). Using a novel immunocapture method, Bang-Christensen et al reported 0.5 – 42 CGCs / 3 mL blood irrespective of grade or subtype of GLI-M (14). MacArthur et al used density-gradient centrifugation followed by telomerase assay in conjunction with Nestin expression and showed that CGCs could be detected in 8 out of 11 (72%) cases of glioma prior to radiotherapy with an average of 8.8 CGCs / mL of blood (5). Sullivan et al showed that CGCs detected in blood of patients with GLI-M exhibited mesenchymal like properties which could contribute to invasiveness allowing these CGCs to enter into circulation (10). Based on identification of CGCs as those with chromosome 8 polyploidy along with immunostaining for GFAP (positive) and CD45 (negative), Gao et al reported CGCs in peripheral blood of 24 out of 31 (77%) patients with GLI-M with no correlation between the number of CGCs and the subtype / grade of malignancy (15). Similarly, Krol et al reported CGC clusters in 7 of 13 (53.8%) cases of glioblastoma (16).

Prior attempts at CTC / CGC based detection methods have largely been unsuccessful due to limitations of immunocapture based approaches to harvest sufficient CTCs / CGCs for meaningful downstream analysis (17,18). We have previously described functional enrichment of CTCs and CGCs from peripheral blood using a proprietary CGC/CTC enrichment medium (CEM) which selectively induces apoptosis in non-malignant cells and permits survival of malignant cells. This method yields sufficient viable CGCs/CTCs for downstream applications including multiplexed immunocytochemistry (ICC) (8,19). In the present study we have used this enrichment method for harvesting CGCs from blood samples of patients with GLI-M and identification based on co-expression of GFAP and OLIG-2 as determined by ICC profiling of the harvested CGCs. We describe the performance

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

characteristics of the blood-based test to detect GLI-M and differentiate it from BBT and EPI-M / melanoma with brain metastases.

METHODS

Study Design

Biological samples reported in this manuscript were primarily obtained from participants in three studies, GlioLENS (http://ctri.nic.in/Clinicaltrials/pmaindet2.php?trialid=31387), TRUEBLOOD (http://ctri.nic.in/Clinicaltrials/pmaindet2.php?trialid=31879) and RESOLUTE (http://ctri.nic.in/Clinicaltrials/pmaindet2.php?trialid=30733) to identify blood-biomarkers for detection of various types of malignancies and to differentiate cancer cases from individuals with benign conditions or healthy individuals. In addition, samples were also obtained from a prospective (blinded) observational study at the Imperial College, London which enrolled surgery- and biopsy-naïve adults with ICSOLs to determine concordance between the detection of CGCs in pre-surgery / pre-biopsy blood and subsequent HPE diagnosis on tumor tissue. The GlioLENS study enrolled known cases of GLI-M as well as symptomatic individuals with ICSOL suspected of GLI-M. The TRUEBLOOD study enrolled known cases of cancer and symptomatic individuals with suspected solid organ cancers and the RESOLUTE study enrolled asymptomatic adults with no prior diagnosis of cancer and no current symptoms or clinical features of cancer. All the aforementioned studies were approved by the ethics committees of the sponsor (Datar Cancer Genetics, DCG) as well as the participating centres. Written informed consent was obtained from adult study participants or their parents in case of patients aged less than 18 years. All studies were performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki. Specimens

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

were processed at the CAP and CLIA accredited facilities of Datar Cancer Genetics, which also adhere to quality standards ISO 9001:2015, ISO 27001:2013 and ISO 15189:2012. Fifteen millilitres of peripheral blood was collected from all adult study participants in EDTA vacutainers. In 3 patients aged less than 10 years, 5 mL blood was collected and in patients aged 10 – 17 years, 10 mL blood was collected. For suspected cases of GLI-M, blood collection was performed prior to the patients undergoing tissue sampling or neurosurgical excision, and where possible leftover tissue samples were also obtained from consenting participants. Biological samples were stored at 2°C - 8°C in appropriate tumor transport media during transport to reach the clinical laboratory within 48 h. The status of all samples was blinded to the operators (those who performed the enrichment and ICC) as well as the analysts (those who analyzed the data) by assigning unique 10-digit alphanumeric barcodes to minimize potential biases arising from prior knowledge of sample status.

Enrichment of Circulating Tumor/Glial Cells from Peripheral Blood

Blood samples (5 mL or 7.5 mL) were processed for the enrichment of CGCs/CTCs from peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMC) as described previously (20). Briefly, PBMCs were isolated from whole blood via lysis of red blood cells (RBCs) followed by centrifugation. PBMCs resuspended in Phosphate Buffered Saline (PBS) were treated with CEM for 5 days at 37°C, 5% CO_2, 65% RH. During treatment, the CEM induces cell death in all non-malignant (hemato-lymphoid, epithelial and endothelial) cells, while malignant tumor derived cells (CTCs) survive. On the 5th day, surviving cells and cell clusters are harvested by centrifugation and resuspended in PBS.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Immunocytochemistry Profiling of CTCs

Immunocytochemistry (ICC) profiling of samples for identification of CTCs/CGCs was performed as described previously (19). Briefly, viable apoptosis-resistant cells enriched from 5 mL of blood were resuspended in 1000 µL 1x Phosphate Buffered Saline (PBS) and 100 µL aliquots were seeded into 10 wells (each well is equivalent to 500 µL blood sample). Cells were fixed with 4% paraformaldehyde, permeabilized with 0.3% Triton-X 100 and treated with 3% BSA (blocking). Cells in separate wells were immunostained with separate primary (1°) Ab cocktails for multiplexed analysis of marker combinations to identify CGCs, (a) 1:100 Anti-GFAP + 1:500 Anti-CD45, and (b) 1:100 Anti-OLIG2 + 1:500 Anti-CD45. In the subset of samples where cells were enriched from 7.5 mL blood, the status of a third marker combination, i.e., 1:500 Anti-PanCK + 1:500 Anti-CD45 was evaluated in addition to the above to identify CTCs from epithelial malignancies (EPI-M). Each marker combination was evaluated in 5 wells (500 µL × 5 = 2.5 mL equivalent of blood). Samples were washed with PBS and incubated with respective secondary (2°) Ab. Finally, cells were washed with PBS and treated with 4',6-Diamidino-2-phenylindole dihydrochloride (DAPI) for nuclear staining. Control samples were included in each run. Samples were evaluated on the Cell-Insight CX7 High Content Screening (HCS) Platform (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA, USA) to determine the Fluorescence Intensity (FI) for each marker. Figure 1 is a schema of the functional enrichment of malignant cells and ICC profiling to detect CGCs. The decision matrix for assigning samples into various categories is provided in Table 1.

Method Development and Optimization

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Comprehensive details of method development and optimization studies are provided in the Supplementary Materials.

Analytical Validation

Analytical validation established the performance characteristics of the test with standard analyte (U87MG cells), spiked into and serially diluted with healthy donor blood, and processed for tumor cell enrichment (by CEM treatment) and ICC profiling to determine the recovery.

Analyte Stability and Recovery

To determine the Analyte Stability, 36 × 5 mL aliquots of healthy donor blood were each spiked with ~15 U87MG cells. Of these 36 spiked samples, 6 samples each were either processed immediately or after 24 h, 48 h, 72 h, 96 h and 120 h storage at 2°C - 8°C respectively. Of the 6 aliquots evaluated at each time point, 3 aliquots each were used to determine recovery of GFAP+ cells and OLIG2+ cells respectively. Additionally, 30 mL blood was collected from a known case of CNS malignancy and split into 6 aliquots of 5 mL each; one sample was processed immediately (0 h), and the others were processed after 24 h, 48 h, 72 h, 96 h and 120 h storage at 2°C - 8°C respectively. Recovery at 0 h was normalized as 100% and recoveries at 24 h, 48 h, 72 h, 96 h and 120 h were determined relative to the 0 h recovery.

Linearity

U87MG cells were spiked into 176 × 5 mL aliquots of healthy donor blood samples, stored for 48 h at 2°C - 8°C and then processed for recovery. The 176 aliquots comprised 2 sets of 88 aliquots (11 spikes × 8 replicates). The study also included 16 × 5 mL aliquots (2 sets × 8 replicates) of healthy donor blood samples which were

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

not spiked. Each set was assigned for detection of one of the two marker positive cell types (GFAP+ / OLIG2+). Samples were stored for 48 h at 2°C - 8°C. Linearity was evaluated by Linear Regression.

Limits of Detection, Quantitation and Blank

The Limit of Blank (LoB) was determined from the 8 × 5 mL unspiked healthy donor blood samples per marker in the Linearity study. The Limit of Detection (LoD) of each marker was determined from a subset of the Linearity Study which included 24 × 5 mL samples spiked with 1, 3 or 5 U87MG cells (8 of each). The LoQ was determined from a subset of 32 × 5 mL samples from the Linearity Study which were spiked with 1, 3, 5, or 10 U87MG cells (8 of each) per marker.

Sensitivity, Specificity and Accuracy

Sensitivity was determined from a subset of the Linearity Study samples which included 40 × 5 mL samples spiked with 5, 10, 20, 40 and 80 U87MG cells (8 of each) per marker type. Specificity was determined from the 8 × 5 mL unspiked healthy donor blood samples (per marker type) in the Linearity study. Accuracy was determined based on total true positive and true negative samples detected out of the total samples per marker type.

Precision

On Day 1, User 1 spiked 15 (Low) U87MG cells into each of 8 × 5 mL aliquots of healthy donor blood, and 150 (High) U87MG cells into each of another 8 × 5 mL aliquots of healthy donor blood. All samples (8 Low spike + 8 High spike) were stored for 48 h at 2°C - 8°C and processed. User 1 repeated this study over 10 consecutive days and used one of two Cell-Insight CX7 HCS Instruments. User 2 independently replicated the study on 10 consecutive days and used the second

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

HCS Instrument. Mean Recoveries (%) were used to calculate Standard Deviation (SD) and Coefficient of Variation (CV, %) for Intra-Run, Inter-Run and Inter-Operator.

Interfering Substances

The performance characteristics of the test were evaluated in presence of endogenous (pathology markers) and exogenous factors (non-anticancer drugs) as potential interfering agents. Pure (analytical grade) molecules for each of these agents were obtained from commercial vendors and stored under recommended conditions until use. All substances were reconstituted as per manufacturer's instructions in appropriate solvents to prepare working stock solutions which were immediately used for spiking studies. The exogenous substances (drugs) were used at the reported medically relevant Peak Plasma Concentrations (C_{Max}), while endogenous substances (serum parameters) were evaluated at concentrations that are considered clinically elevated. Blood from a healthy donor (120 mL) who was not under any medication (last 14 days) was procured from a blood bank and spiked with about 1200 U87MG cells (to achieve 10 cells / mL). The spiked sample was split into 24 × 5 mL aliquots; 23 aliquots were spiked with each of the above substances at the indicated concentrations and 1 aliquot was used as an unspiked control. Each 5 mL sample was used for detection of GFAP+ cells and OLIG2+ cells, respectively as per the immunostaining procedure.

Case Control Clinical Study I

The ability of the test to identify and differentiate GLI-M from BBT based on assessment of GFAP and OLIG2 was ascertained and established in a cohort of 189 samples which included 145 known cases (recently diagnosed, therapy naïve) of GLI-M, and 44 known cases of BBT (Supplementary Tables S1 and S2). All samples

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

were assigned to Training and Test Sets in a 70%:30% ratio. The analysts were unblinded to the clinical status of samples in the Training Set to determine the concordance of marker expression (Decision Matrix). Subsequently, the analysts who remained blinded to the actual clinical status of samples in the Test Set, predicted the status of these samples based on the marker expression profiles and the Decision Matrix. The concordance of the prediction with the actual clinical status (which was subsequently revealed) was used to determine the performance characteristics of the test including Sensitivity, Specificity and Accuracy.

Case Control Clinical Study II

The ability of the test to identify and differentiate GLI-M from BBT and EPI-M based on assessment of GFAP, OLIG2 and PanCK was ascertained and established in a cohort of 586 samples which included 500 healthy adults (no prior diagnosis of cancer nor any current symptoms or clinical features of cancer), 24 previously diagnosed and treated cases of EPI-M with brain metastases, 40 recently diagnosed therapy naïve cases of GLI-M and 22 known cases of BBT. After sample processing and ICC, the analyss predicted the status of these samples based on the marker expression profiles and the Decision Matrix. The concordance of the prediction with the actual clinical status (which was subsequently revealed) was used to determine the performance characteristics of the test including Sensitivity, Specificity and Accuracy.

Prospective Clinical Study

The performance characteristics of the test were evaluated in an independent, multi-centric prospective observational study in a cohort of 68 individuals presenting with

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

ICSOL on brain imaging suspected of GLI-M (Supplementary Tables S1 and S2). After sample processing and ICC, the analysis predicted the status of these samples based on the marker expression profiles and the Decision Matrix. The concordance of the prediction with the actual clinical status (which was subsequently revealed) was used to determine the performance characteristics of the test including Sensitivity, Specificity and Accuracy.

Orthogonal Verification - Fluorescence in situ Hybridization (FISH)

FISH was performed on enriched malignant cells from pre-biopsy blood samples and matched tumor tissue from 44 individuals including 22 cases of GLI-M and 22 cases of BBT to determine concordance in detection of EGFR gene amplification. This cohort of samples was populated from the three clinical studies where matched blood and tumor tissue samples were available for each patient. FISH was performed according to manufacturer's instructions using ZytoLight® SPEC EGFR/CEN 7 Dual Color Probe (Zytovision Inc, Germany), which is a mixture of ZyOrange (Excitation: 547 nm; Emission: 572 nm) conjugated "CEN 7" probe specific for the alpha satellite centromeric region of Chromosome 7 (D7Z1) and ZyGreen (Excitation: 503 nm; Emission: 528 nm) conjugated "SPEC EGFR" probe specific for the chromosomal region 7p11.2* harboring the EGFR gene. The protocol for processing tumor tissue as well as malignant cells in suspension (CTCs / CGCs) was as specified in the manufacturer's instructions for use of the kit. A-431 (vulval squamous cell carcinoma) cell line which has been reported to harbour EGFR amplification was used as positive control as were tumor samples where EGFR amplification was previously ascertained by next generation sequencing (NGS). Peripheral blood mononuclear cells (PBMCs) isolated from asymptomatic individuals

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

with no prior history of cancer and no current symptoms suspected of cancer were used as negative controls. Processed samples were visualized by fluorescence microscopy (Axio Imager Z2, Carl Zeiss, Germany). Reference cell line A-431 was used for validation of EGFR FISH probes.

RESULTS

Method Development and Optimization

The findings of the Method Development and Optimization studies are provided in Supplementary Materials.

Analytical Validation

Table 2 is a summary of all the findings of the analytical validation study.

Stability and Recovery

In the spiked samples, ≥80% recovery was observed for each cell type for up to 48 h (Supplementary Table S3). In clinical samples, the CTC recovery was ≥85% at 48 h, when 0 h recovery was normalized as 100% (Supplementary Table S3). The findings of the stability and recovery studies indicated that clinical samples could be stored at 2°C-8°C for up to 48 h with ≤15% loss of cells.

Linearity

Recovery of spiked cells was generally higher at and above 5 cells / 5 mL (Supplementary Figure S1). R^2 ≥0.99 in all markers demonstrated the linear response characteristics of the method, especially in the range of 5 - 1280 cells / 5 mL (Table below Supplementary Figure S1) which is considered the reportable range.

Limits of Detection, Quantitation and Blank

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

No (marker positive) cells were detected in any of the unspiked samples (no false positives). Thus, the limit of blank was determined to be 0 cells / mL. The Limit of Detection (LoD) was determined as 1 cell / 5 mL. For the LoQ, the Allowable Deviation from Linearity (ADL) was pre-specified at 15%. The LoQ was determined to be 6 cells / 5 mL for GFAP and 5 cells / 5 mL for OLIG2. The overall LoQ of the Device was 6 cells / 5 mL. At the numerical threshold of 5 cells / 5 mL for sample positivity, the observed deviation from linearity was -17% for GFAP and -19% for OLIG2, which are within the permissible range of -26% to +22% for 15% ADL, as specified in CLSI EP06.

Sensitivity, Specificity and Accuracy

Based on recovery of marker positive cells in 40 spiked samples (5 – 80 cells / 5 mL), the sensitivity was 92.5% for GFAP and 95.0% for OLIG2. Since marker positive cells were undetectable in any of the un-spiked samples (per marker), the specificity was deemed to be 100%. Accuracy was determined to be 95.3% for GFAP and 96.9% for OLIG2 (Supplementary Table S4).

Precision

Supplementary Table S5 provides the intra-run, inter-run and inter-operator %CV for all markers at low spike, high spike and cumulative. The cumulative %CV was ≤5.5% for GFAP and ≤6.2% for OLIG2.

Interfering Substances

The presence of drugs at medically relevant peak plasma concentrations (C_{Max}) or the deranged (clinically, high) serum parameters did not significantly impact the sensitivity of the test for detection of spiked U87MG cells (Supplementary Table S6). The study established the ability of the test to remain unaffected in presence of systemic treatment agents (drugs) and elevated serum parameters.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Case Control Clinical Study Findings

The performance characteristics of the test were first established in a stringent, blinded cross-validation study which was designed to minimize the risk of overfitting in the training set. The demographics of this cohort is provided in Supplementary Table S1 and S2. The findings of the training and test set are provided in Table 3, Supplementary Table S7 and Supplementary Table S8. Among the 101 GLI-M cases in the Training Set, 100 were positive (99%) and 1 was negative (1%) for CGCs. Among the 31 cases of BBT, 1 (3.2%) was positive for CGCs and 30 (96.8%) were negative for CGCs. In absence of follow-up data demonstrating diagnosis of GLI-M, the positive BBT case was considered as a false positive. In the Test Set (n = 57), there were 44 samples with positive and 13 samples with negative findings. All 44 positive samples were determined to be GLI-M yielding a sensitivity of 100%. All negative samples were determined to be BBT yielding a specificity of 100%.

Similar performance characteristics (100% sensitivity and 100% specificity) were observed in the second Case Control Clinical study which included samples from GLI-M, BBT, EPI-M and healthy individuals; the demographics of this cohort is provided in Supplementary Table S9. The Test accurately predicted and classified samples from GLI-M, BBT, EPI-M and healthy individuals based on profiling of enriched cells by GFAP, OLIG2 and PanCK. The findings of this study are provided in Table 4.

Prospective Clinical Study

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

The performance characteristics of the test to identify and differentiate GLI-M and BBT were evaluated in a prospective multi-centric cohort of 68 patients presenting with ICSOL, the demographics of which are shown in Supplementary Tables S1 and S2. Twenty three samples were from Imperial College, London, 41 samples from different hospitals across India and 4 samples were from other global locations (Supplementary Table S10). Of the 68 cases, 53 were positive for CGCs, 3 were equivocal and 12 samples were negative as per the Decision Matrix. After unblinding, it was revealed that all positive and equivocal samples were GLI-M while all negative samples were BBT. In the test, equivocal findings are considered as a positive indication for further diagnostic work-up. Since marker positive cells were detected in samples found to be in agreement with a clinical diagnosis of malignancy after evaluation of tumor tissue, the test showed a sensitivity of 100%. The test had a specificity of 100% based on undetectability of CGCs in all 12 BBT cases (Table 3, Supplementary Table S11 and Supplementary Table S12).

Orthogonal Verification – FISH

Among the 22 cases of BBT, there were no instances of EGFR copy gain detected by FISH on tumor tissue. All 22 samples were also negative for CGCs indicating 100% concordance for specificity (Malignant v/s Benign).

Among the 22 cases of GLI-M, EGFR copy gain was observed on tumor tissue in 8 cases, all of which were also detectable on CGCs indicating 100% concordance (sensitivity). Among the remaining 14 samples with normal EGFR status by FISH, the CGCs also showed normal status indicating 100% concordance (specificity).

DISCUSSION

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Presentation of patients with intra-cranial malignancy is frequently symptomatically non-specific and differentiating such patients from those with benign conditions or with absent pathology is challenging. Indicative of this, GBM presents as a medical emergency more frequently than any other common cancer, implying that effective strategies for rapid diagnostic stratification of patients presenting with suspicious symptoms are urgently required. Furthermore, it is clearly critical to differentiate glial tumours from BBT or metastases from other solid tumors. Obtaining a tissue diagnosis via biopsy of ICSOL is often challenging and has well-described risks.

Here we describe a blood-based test for detection of GLI-M in individuals presenting with ICSOL, based on detection of CGCs by multiplexed fluorescence ICC profiling. The test can detect common subtypes that account for about 97% of all GLI-M, irrespective of age, gender, subtype and grade. The analytical validation of our platform confirmed accuracy and reliability of the test. The clinical validation study demonstrated 100% sensitivity and 100% specificity for detection of GLI-M. The performance characteristics of the test favour clinical adoption of this technology for supporting more effective diagnosis in individuals presenting with ICSOL. Brain tumors account for 85% to 90% of all primary central nervous system (CNS) tumors (21) and ~300,000 (~1.6%) of the total ~19,300,000 annual cancer incidences and 250,000 (~2.5%) of the total 10,000,000 annual cancer-related mortality globally (22). GBM is the most common subtype accounting for almost half (49%) of all malignant tumors. At present, HPE of resected / biopsied tumor tissue is the standard of care for diagnosis of CNS malignancies. Surgical resection or biopsy are more challenging under circumstances of poor patient performance, in the presence of comorbidities or patients' reluctance (23). Procedural risks are well-documented and include pain and discomfort, intracranial haemorrhage, cerebral edema, infections as

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

well as morbidity and mortality (24). Further, prior studies also suggest that around 70% of patients with intracranial lesions have benign conditions (25) indicating that in a sizeable population of symptomatic individuals, the ability to obtain the same inference non-invasively would significantly reduce the requirement for invasive biopsy. There is therefore considerable benefit in non-invasive detection of GLI-M including risk mitigation, resource optimization, cost benefits and avoidance of delays in time to diagnosis and time to treatment, especially in unresectable cases where tissue sampling is unviable.

The existence of CGCs is enigmatic considering the rarity of systemic metastases in these cases. Nevertheless, several prior studies have shown the presence of CGCs in various subtypes of GLI-M ranging from low grade gliomas to GBM (6,10,15,16) as well as their absence in healthy individuals and those with non-malignant brain tumors. We show in the present study that it is possible to obtain sufficient viable CGCs in peripheral blood samples for detection of GLI-M and differentiation of GLI-M from BBT and brain metastases of solid tumors.

Our test for detection of CGCs is based on evaluation of GFAP and OLIG-2 expression. Further, positive marker expression is based on standardized fluorescence intensities (FI) detected using a sensitive and automated high content screening platform which minimizes the risk of false negatives. The design of our test is not prone to the sensitivity and specificity limitations encountered by prior efforts at CGC/CTC detection; this is substantiated by the high sensitivity and specificity of the test shown in analytical and clinical validation.

Our test is minimally invasive and is performed on a venous draw of 5 mL peripheral blood. The test provides an additional layer of high quality evidence which supports clinical decision making, leading to a more effective diagnosis of glial malignancies

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

and providing a window of opportunity to plan subsequent disease management procedures prior to lifting the scalpel. The strength of our study is the use of an adequately powered sample size and multiple validation studies with blinded sample analysis, all of which demonstrated high concordance between test findings and clinical diagnosis and support clinical application of the test. Although the assay has high performance characteristics for detection of glial malignancy, the test does not detect rarer subtypes such as CNS lymphoma and gliosarcoma. The test is also not intended to differentiate the subtype or grade of malignancy.

In conclusion, we present a blood-based, non-radiological test for detection of glial malignancies in symptomatic individuals who are advised an invasive biopsy as part of standard diagnostic work-up. Our test enables more effective clinical decision making by providing direct evidence of the presence of GLI-M in suspected individuals.

ETHICS STATEMENT

All biological samples were obtained from participants in three studies,

GlioLENS with CTRI number CTRI/2019/02/017663

(http://ctri.nic.in/Clinicaltrials/pmaindet2.php?trialid=31387),

TRUEBLOOD with CTRI number CTRI/2019/03/017918

(http://ctri.nic.in/Clinicaltrials/pmaindet2.php?trialid=31879) and

RESOLUTE with CTRI number CTRI/2019/01/017219

(http://ctri.nic.in/Clinicaltrials/pmaindet2.php?trialid=30733).

Datar Cancer Genetics Limited Institutional Ethics Committee of Datar Cancer Genetics Private Limited gave ethical approval for GlioLENS, TRUEBLOOD and RESOLUTE. Institutional Ethics Committee – Clinical Studies of Apollo Hospitals,

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Hyderabad gave ethical approval for GlioLENS. All participants provided their written informed consent. All studies were performed in accordance with the Declaration of Helsinki.

CONFLICTS OF INTEREST

The authors Kevin O'Neill, Nelofer Syed, Timothy Crook, Sudhir Dubey, Mahadev Potharaju, Sewanti Limaye, Anantbhushan Ranade, Giulio Anichini have declared no conflicts of interest. The authors Darshana Patil, Sudha S Murthy, Dadasaheb Akolkar, Pooja Fulmali, Vineet Datta, Sachin Apurwa, Jinumary John, Ajay Srinivasan are employees of Datar Cancer Genetics Private Limited. Rajan Datar is the founder of Datar Cancer Genetics Private Limited.

AUTHOR CONTRIBUTIONS

Kevin O'Neill - Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Writing - review & editing

Nelofer Syed - Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Writing - review & editing

Timothy Crook - Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Writing - review & editing

Sudhir Dubey - Conceptualization, Investigation, Writing - review & editing

Mahadev Potharaju - Conceptualization, Investigation, Writing - review & editing

Sewanti Limaye - Conceptualization, Investigation, Writing - review & editing

Anantbhushan Ranade - Conceptualization, Investigation, Writing - review & editing

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Giulio Anichini - Conceptualization, Investigation, Project administration, Resources, Writing - review & editing

Darshana Patil - Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Supervision, Visualization, Writing - review & editing

Sudha S Murthy - Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Supervision, Visualization, Writing - review & editing

Dadasaheb Akolkar - Conceptualization, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing - review & editing

Pooja Fulmali - Data curation, Formal analysis, Investigation, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Validation, Writing - review & editing

Vineet Datta - Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Project administration, Resources, Supervision, Visualization, Writing - review & editing

Sachin Apurwa - Data curation, Formal analysis, Methodology, Software, Supervision, Validation, Visualization, Writing - review & editing

Jinumary John - Data curation, Formal analysis, Methodology, Software, Validation, Visualization, Writing - original draft

Ajay Srinivasan - Data curation, Formal analysis, Methodology, Software, Validation, Visualization, Writing - original draft

Rajan Datar - Conceptualization, Funding acquisition, Methodology, Project administration, Resources, Software, Supervision, Visualization, Writing - original draft

FUNDING

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

This study did not receive any external funding. The entire study was funded by Datar Cancer Genetics Private Limited.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The authors are grateful to the staff of Datar Cancer Genetics Private Limited for their contributions in managing various clinical, operational and laboratory aspects of the study.

DATA AVAILABILITY

All data produced in the present work are contained in the manuscript and its supplementary file.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

REFERENCES

1. Ramkissoon LA, Pegram W, Haberberger J, Danziger N, Lesser G, Strowd R, et al. Genomic Profiling of Circulating Tumor DNA From Cerebrospinal Fluid to Guide Clinical Decision Making for Patients With Primary and Metastatic Brain Tumors. Front Neurol. 2020;11:544680.
2. Nassiri F, Chakravarthy A, Feng S, Shen SY, Nejad R, Zuccato JA, et al. Detection and discrimination of intracranial tumors using plasma cell-free DNA methylomes. Nat Med. 2020 Jul;26(7):1044–7.
3. Ebrahimkhani S, Vafaee F, Hallal S, Wei H, Lee MYT, Young PE, et al. Deep sequencing of circulating exosomal microRNA allows non-invasive glioblastoma diagnosis. NPJ Precis Oncol. 2018;2:28.
4. Pickles JC, Fairchild AR, Stone TJ, Brownlee L, Merve A, Yasin SA, et al. DNA methylation-based profiling for paediatric CNS tumour diagnosis and treatment: a population-based study. Lancet Child Adolesc Heal. 2020 Feb;4(2):121–30.
5. Macarthur KM, Kao GD, Chandrasekaran S, Alonso-Basanta M, Chapman C, Lustig RA, et al. Detection of brain tumor cells in the peripheral blood by a telomerase promoter-based assay. Cancer Res. 2014 Apr;74(8):2152–9.
6. Müller C, Holtschmidt J, Auer M, Heitzer E, Lamszus K, Schulte A, et al. Hematogenous dissemination of glioblastoma multiforme. Sci Transl Med. 2014 Jul;6(247):247ra101.
7. Kan LK, Drummond K, Hunn M, Williams D, O'Brien TJ, Monif M. Potential biomarkers and challenges in glioma diagnosis, therapy and prognosis. BMJ Neurol open. 2020;2(2):e000069.
8. Akolkar D, Patil D, Crook T, Limaye S, Page R, Datta V, et al. Circulating

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

ensembles of tumor-associated cells: A redoubtable new systemic hallmark of cancer. Int J cancer. 2020 Jun;146(12):3485–94.

9. Ranade A, Bhatt A, Page R, Limaye S, Crook T, Akolkar D, et al. Hallmark Circulating Tumor-Associated Cell Clusters Signify 230 Times Higher One-Year Cancer Risk. Cancer Prev Res (Phila). 2021 Jan;14(1):11–6.
10. Sullivan JP, Nahed B V, Madden MW, Oliveira SM, Springer S, Bhere D, et al. Brain tumor cells in circulation are enriched for mesenchymal gene expression. Cancer Discov. 2014 Nov;4(11):1299–309.
11. Hamilton JD, Rapp M, Schneiderhan T, Sabel M, Hayman A, Scherer A, et al. Glioblastoma multiforme metastasis outside the CNS: three case reports and possible mechanisms of escape. J Clin Oncol Off J Am Soc Clin Oncol. 2014 Aug;32(22):e80-4.
12. Eibl RH, Schneemann M. Liquid Biopsy and Primary Brain Tumors. Cancers (Basel). 2021 Oct;13(21).
13. Jimsheleishvili S, Alshareef AT, Papadimitriou K, Bregy A, Shah AH, Graham RM, et al. Extracranial glioblastoma in transplant recipients. J Cancer Res Clin Oncol. 2014 May;140(5):801–7.
14. Bang-Christensen SR, Pedersen RS, Pereira MA, Clausen TM, Løppke C, Sand NT, et al. Capture and Detection of Circulating Glioma Cells Using the Recombinant VAR2CSA Malaria Protein. Cells. 2019 Aug;8(9).
15. Gao F, Cui Y, Jiang H, Sui D, Wang Y, Jiang Z, et al. Circulating tumor cell is a common property of brain glioma and promotes the monitoring system. Oncotarget. 2016 Nov;7(44):71330–40.
16. Krol I, Castro-Giner F, Maurer M, Gkountela S, Szczerba BM, Scherrer R, et al. Detection of circulating tumour cell clusters in human glioblastoma. Br J

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Cancer. 2018 Aug;119(4):487–91.

17. Habli Z, AlChamaa W, Saab R, Kadara H, Khraiche ML. Circulating Tumor Cell Detection Technologies and Clinical Utility: Challenges and Opportunities. Cancers (Basel). 2020 Jul;12(7).
18. Rushton AJ, Nteliopoulos G, Shaw JA, Coombes RC. A Review of Circulating Tumour Cell Enrichment Technologies. Cancers (Basel). 2021 Feb;13(5).
19. Gaya A, Crook T, Plowman N, Ranade A, Limaye S, Bhatt A, et al. Evaluation of circulating tumor cell clusters for pan-cancer noninvasive diagnostic triaging. Cancer Cytopathol. 2021 Mar;129(3):226–38.
20. Crook T, Gaya A, Page R, Limaye S, Ranade A, Bhatt A, et al. Clinical utility of circulating tumor-associated cells to predict and monitor chemo-response in solid tumors. Cancer Chemother Pharmacol. 2021 Feb;87(2):197–205.
21. Brain Tumor: Statistics [Internet]. Cancer.Net. [cited 2022 Feb 19]. Available from: https://www.cancer.net/cancer-types/brain-tumor/statistics
22. Cancer Stat Facts: Brain and Other Nervous System Cancer [Internet]. seer.cancer.gov. [cited 2022 Feb 19]. Available from: https://seer.cancer.gov/statfacts/html/prost.html
23. Malone H, Yang J, Hershman DL, Wright JD, Bruce JN, Neugut AI. Complications Following Stereotactic Needle Biopsy of Intracranial Tumors. World Neurosurg. 2015 Oct;84(4):1084–9.
24. Koszewski W, Kroh H, Kunert P. [Difficulties in stereotactic biopsies of brain tumors]. Neurol Neurochir Pol. 2002;36(3):481–8.
25. Miller KD, Ostrom QT, Kruchko C, Patil N, Tihan T, Cioffi G, et al. Brain and other central nervous system tumor statistics, 2021. CA Cancer J Clin. 2021 Sep;71(5):381–406.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Schema of Test.

Functional enrichment of CTCs is achieved using a proprietary CGC/CTC enrichment medium (CEM) that eliminates all non-malignant cells and permits tumor derived malignant cells to survive. Subsequently, the multiplexed immunocytochemistry (ICC) evaluates and identifies CGCs based on positivity of the indicated markers.

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Decision Matrix. The Decision Matrix shows the relation between various marker expression combinations and the predictions for each sample. Primary classification of samples is based on expression of GFAP and OLIG2 . The matrix also explains the classification in a subset of samples where PanCK was used in addition to the above markers. GLI-M: Glial malignancy; BBT: benign brain tumor; EPI-M: epithelial malignancy with brain metastases.

Table 2. Summary of Analytical Validation.

The findings of Analytical Validation indicate that the Test provides consistent, accurate and reproducible results with little or no interference from routine endogenous or exogenous factors when samples are obtained, stored and processed under the recommended conditions. Comprehensive details are provided in Supplementary materials.

Table 3. Clinical Performance Characteristics.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Performance characteristics of the test were determined in 2 separate clinical studies, a case control study as well as a prospective study. In both studies, the sensitivity, specificity and accuracy were determined. In the test design, samples with equivocal findings for GLI-M are considered as positive and recommended for clinical follow-up. Thus the performance characteristics were determined with the same consideration.

Table 4. Concordance Analysis in Clinical Subset

In a subset analysis of GLI-M and BBT, the samples were also evaluated to determine the status of the epithelial marker PanCK by immunocytochemistry (ICC), along with GFAP and OLIG2 . The analysis also included samples from healthy individuals as well as solid organ cancer cases with metastases to the brain (EPI-M). All samples were evaluated for all markers in an assessor-blinded manner and the concordance between marker-predicted classification and actual status determined and presented in the table.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

FIGURES

Figure 1. Schema of Test.



medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

TABLES

Table 1. Decision Matrix.

GFAP	OLIG2	PanCK*	Classification
+	+	-	GLI-M
+	-	-	
-	+	-	
-	-	+	EPI-M
-	-	-	BBT / Healthy
(any other findings)			Indeterminate

**for the subset of samples where PanCK was evaluated.*

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 2. Summary of Analytical Validation.

	GFAP	OLIG2
Analyte Stability	48 h	48 h
Recovery	>80%	>80%
Linearity	>0.99	>0.99
Linear Range	5 – 1280 cells / 5 mL	5 – 1280 cells / 5 mL
Limit of Blank	0 cells / mL	0 cells / mL
Limit of Detection	1 cell / 5 mL	1 cell / 5 mL
Limit of Quantitation	6 cells / 5 mL	5 cells / 5 mL
Sensitivity	92.5% (79.6% - 98.4%)	95.0% (83.1% - 99.4%)
Specificity	100% (85.8% - 100%)	100% (85.8% - 100%)
Accuracy	95.3% (86.9% - 99.0%)	96.9% (89.2% - 99.6%)
Precision	CV ≤ 5.5%	CV ≤ 6.2%
Interference	None	None

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .

Table 3. Clinical Performance Characteristics of the Test.

	Case Control Cohort	Prospective Cohort
Sensitivity	100% (95% CI: 91.9% - 100%)	100% (95% CI: 97.8% - 100%)
Specificity	100% (95% CI: 75.3% - 100%)	100% (95% CI: 76.8% - 100%)
Accuracy	100% (95% CI: 94.7% - 100%)	100% (95% CI: 94.9% - 100%)

Table 4. Concordance Analysis in Clinical Subset.

		CTC / CGC Status	Verified Clinical Status				Concordance
			GLI-M (n = 40)	BBT (n = 22)	EPI-M (n = 24)	Healthy (n = 500)	
Test Prediction	GLI-M (n = 40)	CGC+, CTC-	40	-	-	-	100%
	BBT / Healthy (n = 522)	CGC-, CTC-	-	22	-	500	100%
	EPI-M (n = 24)	CGC-, CTC+	-	-	24	-	100%

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2022.07.06.22277300; this version posted July 10, 2022. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY 4.0 International license .