medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.15.24310471; this version posted July 16, 2024. The copyright holder for this preprint (which was not certified by peer review) is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity.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-ND 4.0 International license .

Evaluation of the diagnostic value of YiDiXie™-HS, YiDiXie™-SS and YiDiXie™-D in liver tumors

Huimei Zhou[1,2,3#], Chen Sun[1,2,3#], Siwei Chen[1,2,4#], Yutong Wu[1,2,5] Xutai Li[1,2,3], Zhenjian Ge[1,2,5], Wenkang Chen[1,2,5], Yingqi Li[1,2,4], Shengjie Lin[1,2,5], Pengwu Zhang[1,2], Wuping Wang[1,2,4], Wei Li[6], Xiaoye Sun[7*], Ling Ji[8*], Jinying Li[9*], Yongqing Lai[1,2*]

1 Department of Urology, Peking University Shenzhen Hospital, Shenzhen, 518036; 2Institute of Urology, Shenzhen Peking University-The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology Medical Center, Shenzhen, 518036; 3 The Fifth Clinical Medical College of Anhui Medical University, Hefei 230032; 4 Shenzhen University Health Science Center, Shenzhen, China 518055; 5 Shantou University Medical College, Shantou, Guangdong 515041; 6 Shenzhen KeRuiDa Health Technology Co. , Ltd. , Shenzhen, 518071; 7 Department of Hepatology, Tianjin First Center Hospital, Tianjin, 300190; 8 Department of Laboratory Medicine, Peking University Shenzhen Hospital, Shenzhen, 518036; 9 Department of Ophthalmology, Peking University Shenzhen Hospital, Shenzhen, 518036.

# Contributed equally to this work.

*Corresponding author: Yongqing Lai, Peking University Shenzhen Hospital, 1120 Lianhua Road, Shenzhen 518036, E mail: yqlord@163.com; Jinying Li, Peking University Shenzhen Hospital, 1120 Lianhua Road, Shenzhen 518036, E mail: Ljyszbdyy@163.com; Ling Ji, Peking University Shenzhen Hospital, 1120 Lianhua Road, Shenzhen 518036, E mail: 1120303921@qq.com; Xiaoye Sun, Tianjin First Center Hospital, 24 Fukang Road, Tianjin 300190, E mail: sxy_tj@163.com.

Background: Liver cancer is one of the cancers that consistently ranks among the top five cancers in terms of incidence and mortality in many countries. Ultrasound is widely used in liver tumor screening or preliminary diagnosis. Enhanced CT is widely used in liver tumor diagnosis. However, false-positive results of ultrasound and enhanced CT will bring unnecessary mental pain, expensive examination costs, physical injuries, and even organ resection and loss of function; while false-negative results of enhanced CT will bring delayed treatment, and the patients will thus have to bear the adverse consequences of poor prognosis, high treatment costs, poor quality of life, and short survival period. There is an urgent need to find convenient, cost-effective and non-invasive diagnostic methods to reduce the false-positive rate of ultrasound and the false-negative and false-positive rates of enhanced CT for liver tumors. The purpose of this study is to evaluate the diagnostic value of YiDiXie™-HS, YiDiXie™-SS and YiDiXie™-D in liver tumors.

Patients and methods: This study finally included 166 subjects (the malignant group, n=134; the benign group, n=32). Remaining serum samples from the subjects were collected and tested using the YiDiXie™ all-cancer detection kit, which was applied to assess the sensitivity and specificity of YiDiXie™-SS, YiDiXie™-HS and YiDiXie™-D, respectively.

Results: YiDiXie™-SS had a sensitivity of 98.5% (95% CI: 94.7% - 99.7%; 132/134) in patients with a positive hepatic ultrasound, a specificity of 65.6% (95% CI: 48.3% - 79.6%; 21/32). Compared with enhanced CT alone, sequential use of YiDiXie™-SS and CT had comparable sensitivity, while the false-positive rate decreased from 37.5% (95% CI: 22.9% - 54.7%; 12/32) to 12.5% (95% CI: 5.0% - 28.1%; 4/32). This means that the application of YiDiXie™-SS reduced the false-positive rate of ultrasound by 65.6% (95% CI: 48.3% - 79.6%; 21/32) and the false-positive rate of enhanced CT by 66.7% with essentially no increase in the number of malignant tumors missed. YiDiXie™-HS had a sensitivity of 90.9% (95% CI:78.8% - 96.4%; 40/44) in patients with negative enhancement CT, a specificity of 85.0% (95% CI: 64.0% - 94.8%; 17/20). This means that YiDiXie™-HS reduced the false-negative rate of enhanced CT by 90.9% (95% CI: 78.8% - 96.4%; 40/44). YiDiXie™-D had a sensitivity of 31.1% (95% CI: 22.5% - 41.3%; 28/90) in patients with a positive enhanced CT; specificity was 91.7% (95% CI: 64.6% - 99.6%; 11/12). This means that YiDiXie™-D reduces the false positive rate of enhanced CT by 91.7% (95% CI: 64.6% - 99.6%; 11/12).

Conclusion: YiDiXie™-SS has a significant effect on reducing the false-positive rate of ultrasound and enhanced CT for liver tumors, with no significant delay in malignancy treatment. YiDiXie™-HS substantially reduces the false negative rate of enhanced CT. YiDiXie™-D substantially reduces the false positive rate of enhanced CT. The YiDiXie™ test has significant diagnostic value in liver tumors, and is expected to solve the problems of "high false-positive rate of ultrasound", "high false-negative rate of enhanced CT" and "high false-positive rate of enhanced CT" in liver tumors.

Clinical trial number: ChiCTR2200066840.

Key words: Liver cancer, Ultrasound, Enhanced CT, False-positive, False-negative, YiDiXie™-HS, YiDiXie™-SS, YiDiXie™-D

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/10.1101/2024.07.15.24310471; this version posted July 16, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

INTRODUCTION

Hepatocellular carcinoma occurs frequently worldwide and poses a serious threat to human health and life[1]. Liver cancer is the third leading cause of cancer deaths worldwide[2,3]. The latest data show that there will be an estimated 865,000 new cases and 757,948 deaths in 2022[3]. China accounts for 45.3% of new cases and 47.1% of deaths from liver cancer worldwide[4,5]. The average number of years of life lost due to liver cancer is estimated to be 7.9 years[6]. The 5-year survival rate for advanced liver cancer is less than 20%, and the 5-year survival rate for early-stage liver cancer that undergoes radical treatment can be as high as 40%[7,8]. Some studies have shown that liver cancer is one of the most expensive cancers for men, costing as much as US$2,020.3 million in Korea alone in 2015[9]; while in countries such as the United States, the average total hospitalization cost per person is as much as US$25,738[10]. Thus, liver cancer is a serious threat to human health and brings a heavy economic burden.

Ultrasound is widely used in the screening or initial diagnosis of liver tumors. However, ultrasound can produce a large number of false-positive results[11,12]. When liver ultrasound is positive, patients usually undergo enhanced CT. False-positive liver ultrasound results mean that the patient undergoes unnecessarily expensive and radiologic tests and may undergo incorrect surgical procedures, and the patient will have to bear the adverse consequences of mental anguish, costly tests and surgeries, radiologic injuries, surgical injuries, and so on. Therefore, there is an urgent need to find a convenient, cost-effective and non-invasive diagnostic method to reduce the false-positive rate of liver ultrasound.

Enhanced CT is widely used in the diagnosis of liver tumors. On the one hand, enhanced CT can produce a large number of false-positive results. A prospective multicenter study showed that the false-positive rate of enhanced CT in 10-20 mm liver tumors was about 23.2%[13]. When enhancement CT is positive, patients are usually treated surgically[14-16]. A false-positive result on enhanced CT means that a benign disease is misdiagnosed as a malignant tumor, and the patient will have to bear the undesirable consequences of unnecessary mental suffering, expensive surgeries and examinations, physical injuries, and even loss of function. Therefore, there is an urgent need to find a convenient, cost-effective, and noninvasive diagnostic method to reduce the false-positive rate of enhanced CT for liver tumors.

On the other hand, enhanced CT can produce a large number of false-negative results. The false-negative rate of enhanced CT is 28.4% in 20-30 mm liver tumors and 32.1% in 10-20 mm lesions[13]. When enhancement CT is negative, patients are usually taken for observation and regular follow-up[14,15]. False-negative enhancement CT results imply misdiagnosis of malignant tumors as benign disease, which will potentially lead to delayed treatment, progression of malignancy, and possibly even development of advanced stages. Patients will thus have to bear the adverse consequences of poor prognosis, high treatment costs, poor quality of life, and short survival. Therefore, there is an urgent need to find a convenient, economical and noninvasive diagnostic method to reduce the false-negative rate of enhanced CT for liver tumors.

Based on the detection of miRNAs in serum, Shenzhen KeRuiDa Health Technology Co., Ltd. has developed "YiDiXie™ all-cancer test" (hereinafter referred to as the YiDiXie™ test)[17]. With only 200 milliliters of whole blood or 100 milliliters of serum, the test can detect multiple cancer types, enabling detection of cancer at home[17]. The YiDiXie™ test consists of three independent tests: YiDiXie™-HS, YiDiXie™-SS and YiDiXie™-D[17].

The purpose of this study is to evaluate the diagnostic value of YiDiXie™-HS, YiDiXie™-SS and YiDiXie™-D in liver tumors.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.15.24310471; this version posted July 16, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

PATIENTS AND METHODS

Study design

This work is part of the sub-study "Evaluating the diagnostic value of the YiDiXie ™ test in multiple tumors" of the SZ-PILOT study (ChiCTR2200066840).

The SZ-PILOT study (ChiCTR2200066840) is an observational, prospective, single-center research. Those who completed an informed consent form at the time of admission or physical examination for the donation of residual samples were all subjects in the study. For this investigation, the remaining 0.5 mL of serum sample was gathered.

It was a blinded trial research. The clinical information about the individuals was unknown to the laboratory staff who conducted the YiDiXie ™ test and the KeRuiDa laboratory technicians who calculated the results. YiDiXie ™ test results were likewise unknown to the clinical specialists who evaluated the participants' clinical data.

The study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Peking University Shenzhen Hospital and was conducted in accordance with the International Conference on Harmonization for "Good clinical practice guidelines" and the Declaration of Helsinki.

Participants

This study included participants who had a positive ultrasonography examination for liver tumors. The two groups of subjects were enrolled independently, and each subject who satisfied the inclusion criteria was added one after the other.

Inpatients with "suspected (solid or haematological) malignancy" who had provided general informed consent for the donation of the remaining samples were initially included in the study. The study classified subjects into two groups based on their postoperative pathological diagnostic: those with a diagnosis of "malignant tumor" and those with a diagnosis of "benign tumor" The study omitted subjects whose pathology findings were not entirely clear. Some of samples in the malignant group were used in our prior works[17].

This study did not include those who failed the serum sample quality test before the YiDiXie™ test. For information on enrollment and exclusion, please see the subject group's prior article[17].

Sample collection, processing

The serum samples used in this study were obtained from serum remaining after consultation and treatment, without further blood donation. Approximately 0.5 ml samples of the remaining serum from the subjects were collected in the clinical laboratory and stored at -80°C for later use in the YiDiXie™ test.

"YiDiXie™ test"

The YiDiXie ™ test is performed using the YiDiXie ™ all-cancer detection kit. The YiDiXie ™ all-cancer detection kit is developed and crafted by Shenzhen KeRuiDa Health Technology Co. It uses fluorescent PCR technology as its in-vitro diagnostic system. To determine whether cancer is present in the subject, it measures the expression levels of dozens of miRNA biomarkers in the serum. The predefinition of appropriate thresholds for each miRNA biomarker ensures high specificity for each miRNA marker. The integration of independent assays into a parallel trial format results in a significant increase in sensitivity and high specificity for broad-spectrum cancers.

The YiDiXie™ test consists of three distinctly different tests: YiDiXie™-Highly Sensitive (YiDiXie™-HS), YiDiXie ™-Super Sensitive(YiDiXie ™-SS) and YiDiXie™-Diagnosis (YiDiXie™-D). YiDiXie™-HS has been developed with sensitivity and specificity in mind. YiDiXie ™ -SS significantly increased the number of miRNA tests to achieve extremely high sensitivity for all clinical stages of all malignancy

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.15.24310471; this version posted July 16, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

types. YiDiXie ™ -D dramatically increases the diagnostic threshold of individual miRNA tests to achieve very high specificity (very low false diagnosis rate) for all malignancy types.

Perform the YiDiXie ™ test according to the instructions provided by the YiDiXie ™ all-cancer detection kit. The detailed procedure can be found in our prior works[17].

The laboratory technicians at Shenzhen KeRuiDa Health Technology Co., Ltd examined the raw test results and determined that the YiDiXie ™ test had either "positive" or "negative" results.

Diagnosis of Enhanced CT

"Positive" or "negative" results are determined based on the diagnostic conclusion of the enhanced CT examination. If the diagnostic conclusion is "malignant or hepatocellular carcinoma (probable or highly probable)", the test result will be judged as "positive". If the diagnostic conclusion is " liver tumor", "(multiple) liver tumors (possible or probable)" or other expressions that are positive, more certain or inclined to benign tumor, or if the diagnostic conclusion is "malignant or hepatocellular carcinoma (probable) is not ruled out", "Hepatocellular carcinoma to be ruled out", "Liver tumor to be differentiated from hepatocellular carcinoma", "Further investigations recommended", etc., the diagnostic conclusion is judged to be "negative".

Extraction of clinical data

The subjects' inpatient medical records or physical examination reports were used to extract clinical, pathological, laboratory, and imaging data for this study. The AJCC staging manual (7th or 8th edition) was used by trained clinicians to complete clinical staging[18,19].

Statistical analyses

Descriptive statistics were reported for demographic and baseline characteristics. For categorical variables, the number and percentage of subjects in each category were calculated; For continuous variables, the total number of subjects (n), mean, standard deviation (SD) or standard error (SE), median, first quartile (Q1), third quartile (Q3), minimum, and maximum values were calculated. The Wilson (score) method was used to calculate 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for multiple indicators.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.15.24310471; this version posted July 16, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

RESULTS

Participant disposition

This study ultimately included 166 study subjects (malignant group, n = 134; benign group, n = 32 cases). The demographic and clinical characteristics of the 166 study subjects are listed in Table 1.

The two groups of study subjects were comparable in terms of demographic and clinical characteristics (Table 1). The mean (standard deviation) age was 51.8 (14.83) years and 30.7% (51/166) were female.

Table 1. Participants' demographic and clinical manifestation

	Cancer (n =134)		Benign (n =32)		Total (N = 166)	
Age, years						
Mean (SD)	53.9	(14.39)	43.2	(13.71)	51.8	(14.83)
Median (Q1,Q3)	54	(42, 66)	42	(35, 54)	40	(32, 54)
Min, max	24,	84	17,	67	17,	84
Age, group, n (%)						
< 50	51	(38.1)	23	(71.9)	74	(44.6)
⩾ 50	83	(61.9)	9	(28.1)	92	(55.4)
< 65	96	(71.6)	27	(84.4)	123	(74.1)
⩾ 65	38	(28.4)	5	(15.6)	43	(25.9)
Sex, n (%)						
Female	31	(23.1)	20	(62.5)	51	(30.7)
Male	103	(76.9)	12	(37.5)	113	(68.1)
Body mass index (kg/m2)						
n	127		30		157	
Mean (SD)	23.2	(3.49)	23.8	(3.15)	23.3	(3.42)
Median (Q1,Q3)	23.4	(20.3, 25.8)	22.9	(21.5, 25.6)	23.2	(20.4, 25.4)
Min, max	14.1	38.0	17.5	31.1	14.1	38.0
Body mass index category, n (%)						
Underweight	8	(6.0)	1	(3.1)	9	(5.4)
Benign	64	(47.8)	16	(50.0)	80	(48.2)
Overweight	46	(34.3)	9	(28.1)	55	(33.1)
Obese	9	(6.7)	4	(12.5)	13	(7.8)
Missing	7	(5.2)	2	(6.3)	9	(5.4)
AJCC clinical stage						
Stage I	134	(100)			134	(100)

Q1,Q3, first quartile, third quartile; SD, standard deviation.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.15.24310471; this version posted July 16, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Diagnostic performance of enhanced CT in patients with positive liver ultrasound

As shown in Table 2, the sensitivity of enhanced CT for the malignant group was 67.2% (95% CI: 58.8% - 74.5%; 90/134). The specificity of enhanced CT for the benign group was 62.5% (95% CI: 45.3% - 77.1%; 20/32).

Table 2. Performance of CT in liver ultrasound-positive patients

	Cancer	Benign	Total
	134	32	166
Positive	90	12	102
Negative	44	20	64

SEN = 90/134 = 67.2% (58.8% - 74.5%) SPE = 20/32 = 62.5% (45.3% - 77.1%)
FNR = 44/134 = 32.8% (25.5% - 41.2%) FPR = 12/32 = 37.5% (22.9% - 54.7%)

Two-sided 95% Wilson confidence intervals were calculated.

SEN, Sensitivity. SPE, Specificity. FNR, False negative rate. FPR, False positive rate.

Diagnostic performance of sequential use of YiDiXie™-SS and CT in liver ultrasound-positive patients

To resolve the challenge of high false-positive rate of liver ultrasound, YiDiXie™-SS was applied to liver ultrasound-positive patients.

As shown in Table 3, the sensitivity of YiDiXie™-SS for the malignant group was 98.5% (95% CI: 94.7% - 99.7%; 132/134).The specificity of YiDiXie™-SS for the benign group was 65.6% (95% CI: 48.3% - 79.6%; 21/32).

This means that the application of YiDiXie™-SS reduced the false positive rate of liver ultrasound by 65.6% (95% CI: 48.3% - 79.6%; 21/32) with essentially no increase in malignancy leakage.

Table 3. Performance of YiDiXie™-SS in liver ultrasound-positive patients

	Cancer	Benign	Total
	134	32	166
Positive	132	11	143
Negative	2	21	23

SEN = 132/134 = 98.5% (94.7% - 99.7%) SPE = 21/32 = 65.6% (48.3% - 79.6%)
FNR = 2/134 = 1.5% (0.3% - 5.3%) FPR = 11/32 = 34.4% (20.4% - 51.7%)

Two-sided 95% Wilson confidence intervals were calculated.

SEN, Sensitivity. SPE, Specificity. FNR, False negative rate. FPR, False positive rate.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.15.24310471; this version posted July 16, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

To further identify benign and malignant liver tumors, enhanced CT was applied to patients with positive YiDiXie ™ -SS. As shown in Table 4, the sensitivity of enhanced CT for the malignant group was 67.4% (95% CI: 59.0% - 74.8%; 89/132). The specificity of enhanced CT for the benign group was 63.6% (95% CI: 35.4% - 84.8%; 7/11).

Table 4. Performance of CT in patients with positive YiDiXie™-SS results

	Cancer	Benign	Total
	132	11	143
Positive	89	4	93
Negative	43	7	50

SEN = 89/132 = 67.4% (59.0% - 74.8%) SPE = 7/11 = 63.6% (35.4% - 84.8%)
FNR = 43/132 = 32.6% (25.2% - 41.0%) FPR = 4/11 = 36.4% (15.2% - 64.6%)

Two-sided 95% Wilson confidence intervals were calculated.

SEN, Sensitivity. SPE, Specificity. FNR, False negative rate. FPR, False positive rate.

Table 5 shows the diagnostic performance of sequential use of YiDiXie™-SS and CT in patients with positive liver ultrasound. Sequential use of YiDiXie™-SS and CT had a sensitivity of 66.4% (95% CI: 58.1% - 73.9%; 89/134) in the malignant group. While sequential use of YiDiXie™-SS and CT had a specificity of 87.5% (95% CI: 71.9% - 95.0%; 28/32) for the benign group (Table 5).

sequential use of YiDiXie ™ -SS and CT had comparable sensitivity, whereas the false-positive rate decreased from 37.5% (95% CI:22.9% - 54.7%; 12/32) to 12.5% (95% CI:5.0% - 28.1%; 4/32).

This means that the application of YiDiXie™-SS reduces the false-positive rate of enhanced CT by 66.7% with essentially no increase in malignancy leakage.

Table 5. Performance of sequential use of YiDiXie™-SS and CT

	Cancer	Benign	Total
	134	32	166
Positive	89	4	93
Negative	45	28	73

SEN = 89/134 = 66.4% (58.1% - 73.9%) SPE = 28/32 = 87.5% (71.9% - 95.0%)
FNR = 45/134 = 33.6% (26.1% - 41.9%) FPR = 4/32 = 12.5% (5.0% - 28.1%)

Two-sided 95% Wilson confidence intervals were calculated.

SEN, Sensitivity. SPE, Specificity. FNR, False negative rate. FPR, False positive rate.

Compared with enhanced CT alone (Table 2),

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.15.24310471; this version posted July 16, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

Diagnostic Performance of YiDiXie™-HS in Enhanced CT Negative Patients

In order to solve the challenge of the high rate of missed diagnosis in enhanced CT, YiDiXie™-HS was applied to patients with negative enhanced CT.

As shown in Table 6, the sensitivity of YiDiXie™-HS for the malignant group was 90.9% (95% CI: 78.8% - 96.4%; 40/44). While the specificity of YiDiXie™-HS for the benign group was 85.0% (95% CI: 64.0% - 94.8%; 17/20).

This means that the application of YiDiXie™-HS reduced the false-negative rate of enhanced CT by 90.9% (95% CI:78.8% - 96.4%; 40/44).

Table 6. Performance of YiDiXie™-HS in patients with negative CT results

	Cancer	Benign	Total
	44	20	64
Positive	40	3	43
Negative	4	17	21

SEN = 40/44 = 90.9% (78.8% - 96.4%) SPE = 17/20 = 85.0% (64.0% - 94.8%)
FNR = 4/44 = 9.1% (3.6% - 21.2%) FPR = 3/20 = 15.0% (5.2% - 36.0%)

Two-sided 95% Wilson confidence intervals were calculated.

SEN, Sensitivity. SPE, Specificity. FNR, False negative rate. FPR, False positive rate.

Diagnostic Performance of YiDiXie™-HS in Enhanced CT Negative Patients

False-positive results were significantly worse than false-negative results in some patients, so YiDiXie™-D was applied to these patients to reduce their false-positive rate.

As shown in Table 7, the sensitivity of YiDiXie™-D for the malignant group was 31.1% (95% CI: 22.5% - 41.3%; 28/90). The specificity of YiDiXie™-D for the benign group was 91.7% (95% CI: 64.6% - 99.6%; 11/12).

This means that YiDiXie™-SS reduced the false positive rate of enhanced CT by 91.7% (95% CI: 64.6% - 99.6%; 11/12).

Table 7. Performance of YiDiXie™-D in patients with positive CT results

	Cancer	Benign	Total
	90	12	102
Positive	28	1	29
Negative	62	11	73

SEN = 28/90 = 31.1% (22.5% - 41.3%) SPE = 11/12 = 91.7% (64.6% - 99.6%)
FNR = 62/90 = 68.9% (58.7% - 77.5%) FPR = 1/12 = 8.3% (0.4% - 35.4%)

Two-sided 95% Wilson confidence intervals were calculated.

SEN, Sensitivity. SPE, Specificity. FNR, False negative rate. FPR, False positive rate.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.15.24310471; this version posted July 16, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

DISCUSSION

Clinical significance of YiDiXie™-SS in patients with positive ultrasound examination of liver tumors

The "YiDiXie™ test" consists of 3 tests with very different characteristics: YiDiXie™-HS, YiDiXie™-SS and YiDiXie™-D. Among them, YiDiXie™-HS combines high sensitivity and high specificity. YiDiXie ™ -SS has very high sensitivity for all malignant tumor types, but slightly lower specificity. YiDiXie ™ -D has very high specificity for all malignant tumor types, but lower sensitivity.

In patients with a positive ultrasound examination for liver tumors, the sensitivity and specificity of further diagnostic methods are important. Balancing the tension between sensitivity and specificity is essentially a balancing act between the "danger of underdiagnosis of malignant tumors" and the "danger of misdiagnosis of benign tumors". In general, false-positive ultrasound of benign liver tumors is usually treated with enhanced CT rather than surgery. Therefore, false-positive liver tumor ultrasound does not lead to serious consequences such as surgical trauma and loss of function. Thus, the "risk of malignant tumor underdiagnosis" is much higher than the "risk of benign tumor misdiagnosis" in patients with a positive ultrasound for liver tumors. Therefore, YiDiXie™-SS, which has a very high sensitivity but a slightly lower specificity, was chosen to reduce the false-positive rate of liver tumor ultrasound.

As shown in Table 3, the sensitivity of YiDiXie™-SS in the malignant group was 98.5%(95% CI: 94.7% - 99.7%;132/134). The specificity of YiDiXie™-SS for the benign tumor group was 65.6%(95% CI: 48.3% - 79.6%;21/32). These results indicate that, while maintaining sensitivity close to 100%, YiDiXie™-SS reduced the false-positive rate in 65.6%(95% CI: 48.3% - 79.6%;21/32) of liver ultrasound.

YiDiXie™-SS has another important diagnostic value. Compared to enhanced CT alone, sequential use of YiDiXie ™ -SS and CT had comparable sensitivity, but the false positive rate was reduced from 21.5% (95% CI: 13.3% - 33.0%; 14/65) to 6.2% (95% CI: 2.4% - 14.8%; 4/65) (Tables 2 and 5). This means that the application of YiDiXie™-SS reduced the false-positive rate of enhanced CT by 66.7% with essentially no increase in malignancy leakage.

The above results imply that YiDiXie ™ -SS significantly reduces the probability of erroneous enhancement CT and surgery for benign liver tumors, with essentially no increase in malignant tumor underdiagnosis. In other words, YiDiXie™-SS significantly reduces the mental suffering, expensive examination and surgery costs, radiological injuries, surgical injuries, and other adverse consequences for patients with false-positive ultrasound examinations of liver tumors, without essentially increasing the delay in the treatment of malignant tumors. Therefore, YiDiXie™-SS meets the clinical needs well and has important clinical significance and wide application prospects.

Clinical significance of YiDiXie™-HS in patients with negative enhanced CT

For patients with negative enhanced CT, the sensitivity and specificity of further diagnostic methods are important. Balancing the tension between sensitivity and specificity is essentially a balancing act between the "danger of malignant tumors being missed" and the "danger of benign tumors being misdiagnosed". A higher false-negative rate means that more malignant tumors are under-diagnosed, leading to delayed treatment and progression of the malignant tumor, which may even develop into advanced stages. As a result, patients will have to bear the adverse consequences of poor prognosis, short survival, poor quality of life, and high treatment costs. In general, when benign liver tumors are misdiagnosed as malignant tumors, they are usually treated with surgery, which does not affect the patient's prognosis, and their treatment costs

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.15.24310471; this version posted July 16, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

are much lower than those of advanced cancers. Therefore, for patients with negative enhancement CT, the risk of malignant tumor misdiagnosis is higher than the risk of benign tumor misdiagnosis. Therefore, YiDiXie ™ -HS with high sensitivity and specificity was chosen to reduce the false-negative rate of enhanced CT for liver tumors.

As shown in Table 6, YiDiXie ™ -HS had a sensitivity of 90.9%(95% CI:78.8% - 96.4%;40/44) and a specificity of 85.0%(95% CI: 64.0% - 94.8%;17/20). These results indicate that the application of YiDiXie ™ -HS reduced the false-negative rate of enhanced CT by 90.9%(95% CI:78.8% - 96.4%;40/44).

These results imply that YiDiXie ™ -HS significantly reduces the misdiagnosis rate of a negative enhancement CT for malignant tumors. In other words, YiDiXie™-HS significantly reduces the poor prognosis, high treatment cost, poor quality of life, and short survival of patients with false-negative enhancement CT of liver tumors. Therefore, YiDiXie ™ -HS meets the clinical needs well and has important clinical significance and wide application prospects.

Clinical significance of YiDiXie™-D in patients with positive enhanced CT of liver tumors

Patients with positive enhanced CT of liver tumors are usually treated surgically. However, there are some conditions that require extra caution in choosing whether to operate or not, hence further diagnosis, e.g. smaller tumors, tumors with difficulty in preserving the hepatic lobe, tumors requiring lobectomy, giant liver tumors, liver insufficiency, and poor general condition of the patient.

In patients with positive enhanced CT for liver tumors, both sensitivity and specificity of further diagnostic methods are important. Weighing the contradiction between sensitivity and specificity is essentially weighing the contradiction between "the danger of underdiagnosis of malignant tumors" and "the danger of misdiagnosis of benign tumors". Because smaller tumors have a lower risk of tumor progression and distant metastasis, the "risk of "malignant tumor underdiagnosis" is much lower than the risk of "benign tumor misdiagnosis". For tumors that are difficult to preserve the liver lobe, tumors that require lobectomy, and giant liver tumors, the risk of ""misdiagnosis of benign tumors"" is much higher than the risk of ""misdiagnosis of malignant tumors"" because a large amount of hepatic tissue needs to be removed, or the surgery is more traumatic. For patients with hepatic insufficiency, because the risk of "hepatic insufficiency or even hepatic failure after surgery" is higher, the "harm of misdiagnosis of benign tumor" is much higher than the "harm of misdiagnosis of malignant tumor". For patients with poor general conditions, the risk of ''misdiagnosis of benign tumor" is much higher than the risk of ''malignant tumor" because the perioperative risk is much higher than the general condition. Therefore, for these patients, the highly specific but less sensitive YiDiXie ™ -D was chosen to reduce the false-positive rate of enhanced CT for liver tumors.

As shown in Table 7, YiDiXie ™ -D had a sensitivity of 31.1%(95% CI: 22.5% - 41.3%;28/90) and specificity of 91.7%(95% CI: 64.6% - 99.6%;11/12). These results indicate that YiDiXie™-SS reduced the false positive rate of enhanced CT by 91.7%(95% CI: 64.6% - 99.6%;11/12).

These results mean that YiDiXie ™ -D significantly reduces the probability of incorrect surgery in these patients who require extra caution. In other words, YiDiXie ™ -D significantly reduces the risk of adverse outcomes such as surgical trauma, hepatic lobectomy, hepatic insufficiency, hepatic failure, and even death and other serious perioperative complications in these patients. Therefore, YiDiXie™-D meets the clinical needs well and has important clinical significance and wide application prospects.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.15.24310471; this version posted July 16, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

YiDiXie™ test has the potential to solve three challenges of liver tumor

Firstly, the three products of the "YiDiXie ™ test are clinically important in liver tumors. As mentioned earlier, the YiDiXie ™ -SS, YiDiXie ™ -HS and the YiDiXie ™ -D have significant diagnostic value in patients with positive ultrasound, negative enhanced CT or positive enhanced CT, respectively.

Secondly, the YiDiXie ™ test's three products can greatly reduce the workload of clinicians and enable timely diagnosis and treatment of malignant tumor cases that would otherwise be delayed. On the one hand, the pressure of non-essential work for imaging physicians or surgeons can be greatly reduced by YiDiXie ™ -SS. When the ultrasound is positive, the patient is usually treated with an enhanced CT examination. The timely completion of these enhanced CT examinations is directly dependent on the number of imaging physicians. In many parts of the world, appointments are made for months or even more than a year. This inevitably delays the treatment of malignancy cases among them. It's common for patients with ultrasound-positive liver tumors to wait for enhanced CT to detect malignancy progression or distant metastases.. As shown in Table 3, "YiDiXie™ -SS reduces the false-positive rate in patients with ultrasound-positive liver tumors by 65.6%(95% CI: 48.3% - 79.6%;21/32) with essentially no increase in the leakage of malignant tumors . This greatly reduces the stress of non-essential work for imaging physicians.

YiDiXie ™ -SS also provides significant relief from non-essential work for surgeons. Patients with liver tumors with positive enhanced CT are usually treated with surgery. The timely completion of these procedures is directly dependent on the number of surgeons. In many parts of the world, appointments are made for months or even more than a year. This inevitably delays the treatment of malignant cases among them, and thus it is not uncommon for patients with liver tumors awaiting surgery to develop malignant progression or even distant metastases. Compared with the application of enhanced CT alone, sequential use of YiDiXie™ -SS and CT had comparable sensitivity, but the false-positive rate was reduced from 21.5% (95% CI:13.3% - 33.0%; 14/65) to 6.2% (95% CI:2.4% - 14.8%; 4/65) (Tables 2 and 5), decreasing enhanced CT's 66.7% false positive rate. This significantly relieves surgeons from non-essential work. As a result, YiDiXie ™ -SS can greatly relieve the stress of non-essential work for imaging physicians and surgeons, facilitating timely diagnosis and treatment of liver tumors or other diseases that would otherwise be delayed.

On the other hand, YiDiXie™-HS and YiDiXie™ -D can greatly reduce clinicians' work pressure. When the diagnosis is difficult on enhanced CT, the patient usually requires an enhanced MRI or a puncture biopsy. The timely completion of these enhanced MRIs or liver puncture biopsies is directly dependent on the number of imaging physicians available. Appointments of several months or even more than a year are available in many parts of the world. It is also not uncommon for patients with liver tumors awaiting enhanced MRI examinations or puncture biopsies to experience malignant progression or even distant metastases. YiDiXie ™ -HS and YiDiXie ™ -D can replace these enhanced MRI examinations or puncture biopsies, greatly easing clinicians' workload and facilitating timely diagnosis and treatment of other tumors that would otherwise be delayed.

Finally, the YiDiXie ™ test enables "just-in-time" diagnosis of liver tumors. On the one hand, the YiDiXie ™ test requires only a tiny amount of blood and allows patients to complete the diagnostic process non-invasively without having to leave their homes. Only 20 μl of serum is required to complete a YiDiXie ™ test, which is equivalent to approximately one drop of whole blood (one drop of whole blood is approximately 50 μl, which yields 20-25 μl of serum)[17]. Taking into account the pre-test sample quality assessment test and 2-3 repetitions, 0.2 ml of whole blood is sufficient for the YiDiXie ™ test[17]. The 0.2 ml of finger blood can be collected at

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.15.24310471; this version posted July 16, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

home by the average patient using a finger blood collection needle, eliminating the need for venous blood collection by medical personnel, and allowing patients to complete the diagnostic process non-invasively without having to leave their homes[17].

On the other hand, the diagnostic capacity of the YiDiXie™ test is virtually unlimited. Figure 1 shows the basic flowchart of the YiDiXie™ test, which shows that not only does the YiDiXie™ test not require a doctor or medical equipment, but it also does not require medical personnel to collect the blood.

As a result, the YiDiXie™ test is completely independent of the number of medical personnel and facilities, and its capacity is virtually unlimited. In this way, the YiDiXie™ test enables "just-in-time" diagnosis of liver tumors, without patients having to wait anxiously for an appointment.

In short, the YiDiXie™ test has significant diagnostic value in liver tumors, and is expected to solve the problems of "high false-positive rate of ultrasound", "high false-negative rate of enhanced CT" and "high false-positive rate of CT" in liver tumors.



Figure 1. Basic flowchart of the "YiDiXie™ test".

Limitations of the study

Firstly, the number of cases in this study was small, so further clinical studies with larger sample sizes are necessary for further assessment.

Secondly, the purpose of this study was to control for both malignant and benign tumors in inpatients, and future cohort studies of patients with positive thyroid tumor ultrasound scans are needed to further assess them.

Finally, the results of this study may be biased because it was a single-centre study. Future studies in multiple centers are necessary to further evaluate it.

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.15.24310471; this version posted July 16, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

CONCLUSION

YiDiXie ™ -SS has a significant effect on reducing the false-positive rate of ultrasound and enhanced CT for liver tumors, with no significant delay in malignancy treatment. YiDiXie ™ -HS substantially reduces the false negative rate of enhanced CT. YiDiXie™-D substantially reduces the false positive rate of enhanced CT. The YiDiXie™ test has significant diagnostic value in liver tumors, and is expected to solve the problems of "high false-positive rate of ultrasound", "high false-negative rate of enhanced CT" and "high false-positive rate of enhanced CT" in liver tumors.

FUNDING

This study was supported by Shenzhen High-level Hospital Construction Fund, Clinical Research Project of Peking University Shenzhen Hospital (LCYJ2020002, LCYJ2020015, LCYJ2020020, LCYJ2017001).

REFERENCES

1. de Lope CR, Tremosini S, Forner A, Reig M and Bruix J: Management of HCC. J Hepatol. 56 Suppl 1: S75-87, 2012.
2. Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, Laversanne M, Soerjomataram I, Jemal A and Bray F: Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries. CA Cancer J Clin. 71: 209-249, 2021.
3. Bray F, Laversanne M, Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, Soerjomataram I and Jemal A: Global cancer statistics 2022: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. CA Cancer J Clin. 74: 229-263, 2024.
4. Rumgay H, Arnold M, Ferlay J, Lesi O, Cabasag CJ, Vignat J, Laversanne M, McGlynn KA and Soerjomataram I: Global burden of primary liver cancer in 2020 and predictions to 2040. J Hepatol. 77: 1598-1606, 2022.
5. Xia C, Dong X, Li H, Cao M, Sun D, He S, Yang F, Yan X, Zhang S, Li N et al.: Cancer statistics in China and United States, 2022: profiles, trends, and determinants. Chin Med J (Engl). 135: 584-590, 2022.
6. Cucchetti A, Trevisani F, Bucci L, Ravaioli M, Farinati F, Giannini EG, Ciccarese F, Piscaglia F, Rapaccini GL, Di Marco M et al.: Years of life that could be saved from prevention of hepatocellular carcinoma. Aliment Pharmacol Ther. 43: 814-24, 2016.
7. Akinyemiju T, Abera S, Ahmed M, Alam N, Alemayohu MA, Allen C, Al-Raddadi R, Alvis-Guzman N, Amoako Y, Artaman A et al.: The Burden of Primary Liver Cancer and Underlying Etiologies From 1990 to 2015 at the Global, Regional, and National Level: Results From the Global Burden of Disease Study 2015. JAMA Oncol. 3: 1683-1691, 2017.
8. Shah C, Mramba LK, Bishnoi R, Bejjanki H, Chhatrala HS and Chandana SR: Survival differences among patients with hepatocellular carcinoma based on the stage of disease and therapy received: pre and post sorafenib era. J Gastrointest Oncol. 8: 789-798, 2017.
9. Kim YA, Lee YR, Park J, Oh IH, Kim H, Yoon SJ and Park K: Socioeconomic Burden of Cancer in Korea from 2011 to 2015. Cancer Res Treat. 52: 896-906, 2020.
10. Kalsekar I, Hsiao CW, Cheng H, Yadalam S, Chen BP, Goldstein L and Yoo A: Economic burden of cancer among patients with surgical resections of the lung, rectum, liver and uterus: results from a US hospital database claims analysis. Health Econ Rev. 7: 22, 2017.
11. Sutherland T, Watts J, Ryan M, Galvin A, Temple F, Vuong J and Little AF: Diffusion-weighted MRI for

medRxiv preprint doi: https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.07.15.24310471; this version posted July 16, 2024. 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-ND 4.0 International license .

hepatocellular carcinoma screening in chronic liver disease: Direct comparison with ultrasound screening. J Med Imaging Radiat Oncol. 61: 34-39, 2017.

12. Singal A, Volk ML, Waljee A, Salgia R, Higgins P, Rogers MA and Marrero JA: Meta-analysis: surveillance with ultrasound for early-stage hepatocellular carcinoma in patients with cirrhosis. Aliment Pharmacol Ther. 30: 37-47, 2009.
13. Aubé C, Oberti F, Lonjon J, Pageaux G, Seror O, N'Kontchou G, Rode A, Radenne S, Cassinotto C, Vergniol J et al.: EASL and AASLD recommendations for the diagnosis of HCC to the test of daily practice. Liver Int. 37: 1515-1525, 2017.
14. European: EASL Clinical Practice Guidelines: Management of hepatocellular carcinoma. J Hepatol. 69: 182-236, 2018.
15. Heimbach JK, Kulik LM, Finn RS, Sirlin CB, Abecassis MM, Roberts LR, Zhu AX, Murad MH and Marrero JA: AASLD guidelines for the treatment of hepatocellular carcinoma. Hepatology. 67: 358-380, 2018.
16. Forner A, Reig M and Bruix J: Hepatocellular carcinoma. Lancet. 391: 1301-1314, 2018.
17. Chen Sun, Chong Lu, Yongjian Zhang, et al. Evaluation of the Multi-Cancer Early Detection (MCED) value of YiDiXie™-HS and YiDiXie™-SS. medRxiv, 2024: doi: 10.1101/2024.03.11.24303683.
18. Edge SB and Compton CC: The American Joint Committee on Cancer: the 7th edition of the AJCC cancer staging manual and the future of TNM. Ann Surg Oncol. 17: 1471-4, 2010.
19. Amin MB, Greene FL, Edge SB, Compton CC, Gershenwald JE, Brookland RK, Meyer L, Gress DM, Byrd DR and Winchester DP: The Eighth Edition AJCC Cancer Staging Manual: Continuing to build a bridge from a population-based to a more "personalized" approach to cancer staging. CA Cancer J Clin. 67: 93-99, 2017.