Evaluating the clinical performance of a novel dual-target stool DNA test for colorectal cancer detection

Zhongxin Wang^{*1}, Jian shang ^{*2,3}, Guannan Zhang^{*4}, Lingjun Kong⁴, Feng Zhang⁴, Ye Guo⁴, Yaling Dou^{**4}, Jun Lin^{**2}

¹Department of Clinical Laboratory, The First Affiliated Hospital of Anhui Medical University, Hefei, China.

²Department of Gastroenterology, Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University, Wuhan, China.

³Hubei Clinical Center and Key Lab of Intestinal and Colorectal Diseases, Wuhan, China.

⁴Department of Clinical Laboratory, Peking Union Medical College Hospital, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences, Beijing, China.

* Contributed equally.

** Co-corresponding authors.

Corresponding Authors:

Yaling Dou

Department of Clinical Laboratory, Peking Union Medical College Hospital, Chinese Academy of Medical Sciences, Beijing 100730, China.

Email: pumchdy167@163.com

Jun Lin

Department of Gastroenterology, Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University, Wuhan, Hubei, China

Email: linjun5478@163.com

ABSTRACT

BACKGROUND AND AIMS: Methylation-based stool DNA test showed a promising application for colorectal cancer (CRC) detection. This study aimed to evaluate the performance of a novel dual-target stool DNA test (DT-sDNA), composed of *SDC2* and *TFPI2*, for the detection of CRC in clinical practice by using large-scale data from a multicenter clinical trial. **METHODS:** We enrolled 1,164 participants from three independent hospitals, including 320 CRC patients, 148 adenomas, 396 interfering diseases and 300 healthy controls. Their stool samples were collected and tested paralleled by DT-sDNA test under the guidance of standard operating procedure. All participants were dichotomized as positive and negative according to the cycling threshold (Ct) values measured by quantitative methylation-specific PCR (MSP). The diagnostic performance of DT-sDNA test was assessed by calculating indexes of sensitivity, specificity, and overall coincidence rate. Sanger sequencing and retesting of resected participants were performed to verify the accuracy and effectiveness of the test. **RESULTS:** Overall, the sensitivity, specificity, and total coincidence rate of DT-sDNA test for CRC detection were 95.31%, 88.39%, and 90.29%,

respectively, with the kappa value of 0.775 ($P < 0.05$) when comparing to non-CRCs. The sensitivities for the detection of advanced adenomas (n=38) and non-advanced adenomas (n=110) were 63.16% and 33.64%, and the specificity was 96.67% for healthy normal controls. The methylation status of *SDC2* and *TFPI2* in 375 samples were verified by Sanger sequencing and the average coincidence rate reached 99.62%. The coincidence rate was 94.12% (n=32) for 34 participants that undertook DT-sDNA test again after surgical resection. These results demonstrated high accuracy of the DT-sDNA test in discriminating CRCs from other diseases and healthy controls. **CONCLUSIONS:** The novel DT-sDNA test showed good performance for the diagnosis of colorectal cancer in clinical practice; fda.hubei.gov.cn number; 20190020787.

Keywords colorectal cancer; stool DNA; early detection; multicenter clinical trial

INTRODUCTION

Colorectal cancer (CRC) is one of the most common digestive cancers. Both the incidence and mortality rates of CRC ranked as the top five among all cancers in China¹. A lower CRC incidence was found in China than that in USA and UK, whereas the mortality was much higher², which might be related to the lower rate of early detection in Chinese. Several screening methods were developed for the diagnosis of CRC and each of them has individual features that can affect the perceptions and preferences of both patients and physicians. Colonoscopy is a highly specific test for CRC and thus is recommended as the reference method for CRC screening with high sensitivity. However it has disadvantages of invasiveness and low patient compliance³. Computed tomography (CT) colonography shows high sensitivity and specificity in detecting both tumors and polyps, but has limitations such as invasive and radiation exposing⁴. Guaiac fecal occult blood test (gFOBT) and fecal immunological test (FIT) are two methods based on stool samples with obvious advantages of noninvasiveness and convenience⁵, while they showed lower sensitivities due to the reason that not all patients with CRC had fecal occult blood⁶.

Multi-target stool DNA (MT-sDNA) test based on abnormally methylated DNA is an option for the screening of asymptomatic persons at average risk of CRC. Several MT-sDNA tests have been recently evaluated for their use in CRC detection and the associated results demonstrated their superior sensitivity during clinical practices, which is almost closed to the reference method of colonoscopy⁷⁻⁹. Cologuard® (Exact Sciences Corporation, USA) was the first commercially MT-sDNA test approved by US Food and Drug Administration (FDA) for using population-wide to screen average-risk individuals. This MT-sDNA test detected two methylated DNA biomarkers and the mutations of *KRAS*, as well as hemoglobin biomarker simultaneously. Its clinical sensitivity achieved 92.3% which is superior as compared to FIT although the specificity was a little inferior⁷. Unlike Cologuard®, the commercial products of "EarlyTect-Colon Cancer" (Genomictree, South Korean) and Colosafe (Creative Biosciences CO., Ltd., China), approved by Korean Food and Drug Administration and China National Medical Products Administration respectively, only detect methylated *SDC2* as target^{9,10}. Single-target stool DNA (ST-sDNA) tests have the advantages over MT-sDNA test such as only fecal sample is required and are more patient compliance. However, the reported sensitivities for ST-sDNA tests are much lower than MT-sDNA tests which almost does not exceed 90%¹¹. The approved Epi proColon 2.0 assay by USFDA and Chinese FDA (CFDA) is a blood-based test that detects aberrant methylated *SEPT9* in CRCs¹². Its ability to detect CRC varied greatly in different studies with a pooled sensitivity of 72% and specificity of 92%¹³.

Furthermore, the sensitivity for adenomas and polyps was only 0.15 making it unsuitable for screening test.

Several types of research have reported frequently hypermethylated status of *SDC2* and *TFPI2* in tumor tissues of CRC, but rarely in normal colon tissues¹⁴⁻¹⁹ and that was confirmed in our preliminary studies (data prepared for publishing). In this multicenter, double-blinded case-control study, the clinical performance of the DT-sDNA test was comprehensively evaluated in more than 1,000 participants. In addition, the association of the test with patient's clinical characteristics was also analyzed. These outcomes will provide robust support for the early detection of colorectal cancer in clinical practice.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Study Design

In this study, more than 1,000 individuals were enrolled from three hospitals (Peking Union Medical College Hospital, The First Affiliated Hospital of Anhui Medical University, and Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University) under the Technical Guidelines for Clinical Trials of in vitro Diagnostic Reagents (CFDA notice No. 16 2014). According to the guidance of In-Vitro Diagnostic Reagent Registration released by China Food and Drug Administration (2014), this clinical trial was registered in Hubei Food and Drug Administration, China (NO. 20190020787, <http://fda.hubei.gov.cn/bsfw/bmcxfw/bjcx/>). The study was performed parallelly in three centers after it was approved by the institutional ethics review committee of each hospital. The approved ID numbers of Peking Union Medical College Hospital, The First Affiliated Hospital of Anhui Medical University, and Zhongnan Hospital of Wuhan University were KS2020260, PJ2019-09-04, and 2019009-1K, respectively. All participants signed informed consent and were told the test results. The primary measures of this study, including sensitivity, specificity and total coincidence rate, were calculated to evaluate the accuracy of this DT-sDNA test as compared with the reference method of colonoscopy or pathology.

Participant enrollment

This study enrolled 1,196 participants in three hospitals from July 2019 to May 2020. All participants were over 18 years old. The included CRC patients must meet the following qualifications: 1) the disease status was confirmed by colonoscopy or histopathological examination, and 2) did not undertake resections and 3) no radiotherapy or chemotherapy. Interfering diseases include other untreated digestive tumors (stomach, liver, esophagus, and pancreatic cancer) and benign digestive diseases (esophagitis, gastritis, enteritis, inflammatory bowel disease, appendicitis, peptic ulcer, colorectal polyps, colorectal adenoma, and hemorrhoids). The recruited participants were then excluded if their stool DNA samples or the Ct values measured by MSP did not pass quality controls.

116 ***Samples Preparation***

117 About 10~15g fresh fecal samples from all participants were collected before surgical resection
 118 and then transferred to a 45 ml storage tube that contained 30 ml of preservative buffer (Wuhan
 119 Ammunition Life-tech Company, Ltd., Hubei, China) within four hours. All the collected fecal
 120 samples were assigned a unique id for blinded testing before they were delivered to the medical
 121 testing laboratory of each center or stored at -80 °C until use if they were not processed in time.
 122 The corresponding clinical characteristics of patient age, gender, TNM stage²⁰, anatomical
 123 location, and differentiation were also collected. Patients with the anatomical location of cecum,
 124 ascending colon, transverse colon, and hepatic flexure were grouped as right-sided tumors, while
 125 for descending colon, sigmoid colon, and rectosigmoid junction, they were classified as left-sided
 126 tumors. Two serum biomarkers, CEA and CA19-9 were retrieved for following analysis if they
 127 were available.

128 ***Bisulfite Treatment and Methylation Specific PCR***

129 Stool DNA was isolated from fecal samples using the stool DNA extraction kit (Wuhan
 130 Ammunition Life-tech Company, Ltd., Hubei, China) according to the instructions. The purified
 131 DNA was then treated with sodium bisulfite to convert unmethylated cytosine to uracil while
 132 leaving methylated cytosine unchanged. Briefly, the purified DNA, conversion buffer and
 133 protection buffer were incubated at 98°C for 10 min, and then treated with sodium bisulfite at
 134 64°C for 1h. The bisulfite-treated DNA was then centrifuged at 12000rpm for 30 seconds for
 135 purifying. After two steps of washing, the DNA was dried at room temperature and eluted with
 136 40ul TE buffer.

137 The converted stool DNA was tested by DT-sDNA test kit developed by Wuhan Ammunition
 138 Life-tech Company, Ltd under the instructions. The methylation status of *SDC2* and *TFPI2* were
 139 measured by Ct values of MSP. *ACTB* was used as an internal MSP control and a measurement
 140 was considered valid only if the Ct value of *ACTB* was no more than 34. An invalid measurement
 141 would be performed second DNA extraction, bisulfite conversion, and MSP. Samples were
 142 assigned negative detection if both of the Ct values of *SDC2* and *TFPI2* were larger than 38,
 143 otherwise, they were assigned positive detection. All the undetermined Ct values of *SDC2* and
 144 *TFPI2* were arbitrarily given a value of 45 for the largest Ct is 45 in ABI 7500 real-time PCR device.

145 ***Outcome Measures and Statistical Analysis***

146 The primary endpoints were the sensitivity, specificity, and overall coincidence rate. These
 147 indexes were calculated by following equations:

$$Sensitivity (\%) = \frac{TP}{TP + FN} * 100$$

$$Specificity (\%) = \frac{TN}{TN + FP} * 100$$

$$\text{Overall coincidence rate (\%)} = \frac{TP + TN}{TP + FN + TN + FP} * 100$$

148 where TP, FN, TN and FP represent true positive, false negative, true negative and false positive.
 149 Cohen's kappa test was used to measure the diagnostic reliability of DT-sDNA test as compared
 150 with the reference methods (colonoscopy or histopathological examination). Pearson's
 151 chi-squared test was conducted to determine the difference between two categories. *P* values <
 152 0.05 were considered as statistically significant. All statistical analysis and figure plotting were
 153 performed using R software (v3.6.1). The method and result of statistical analysis were revised by
 154 Professor Changming Lu, the principal academic expert of Wuhan Ammunition Life-tech Company,
 155 Ltd.

156 **RESULTS**

157 ***Subject Features***

158 After 27 participants that did not meet the inclusion criteria and the other 5 whose DT-sDNA
 159 test did not pass the quality control were excluded, we finally included 1,164 participants (**Figure**
 160 **1**). Of the 1,164 participants, 455 (39.09%) undertook the examination of colonoscopy, while the
 161 rest 710 (60.91%) participants received histopathological examinations (**Supplementary Table 1**).
 162 The study population consisted of 300 healthy normal controls, 396 participants with interfering
 163 diseases, 148 adenomas, and 320 CRCs with the median ages ranging from 49 to 63 years old
 164 (**Table 1**). No significant difference in gender distribution was observed in the four
 165 aforementioned categories ($\chi^2 = 2.26$, *P* = 0.52). CRCs were classified I to IV according to the
 166 TNM staging system²⁰, of which 89.69% were stage I-III (**Table 1**). Sanger sequencing were
 167 performed for 375 samples that contained 263 and 112 samples whose detected results were
 168 consistent and not consistent with their diagnosed disease status to verify the accuracy of
 169 DT-sDNA test. Besides, 34 patients were followed up and their stool samples were retested with
 170 DT-sDNA test after surgical resections.

172 ***Methylation Status of SDC2 and TFPI2 in Study Population***

173 Three independent batches of tests were performed by using 10 positive references (P1-P10)
 174 and 10 negative references (N1-N10) to assess the stability of this DT-sDNA test. The
 175 amplification curves of MSP showed apparently distinct Ct values for methylated and
 176 un-methylated targets (**Figure 2A-D**), indicating that MSP can be used to discriminate positive
 177 and negative samples. Good consistency of Ct values of *ACTB* was observed among three
 178 independent batches for both positive and negative references (**Figure 3A**) with all Ct values no
 179 more than 34 which reflected a robust quality control of the test. Similar results were also
 180 obtained for the 100% consistency among the measured results of three independent batches for
 181 all 20 references (**Figure 3B**). These results suggested the high stability of the DT-sDNA test.

182 The methylation profiles of *SDC2* and *TFPI2* were then evaluated among the 1,164 participants
183 by DT-sDNA test. Methylated *SDC2* and *TFPI2* were detected in 261 (22.42%) and 362 (31.10%)
184 samples respectively, and 403 (34.62%) samples contained either methylated *SDC2* or methylated
185 *TFPI2*. We found that the combined sDNA test detected more positive samples, however, 88
186 (7.56%) samples which were classified as interfering diseases (n=27) and adenomas (n=61) were
187 tested positive (Figure 4). Besides, 15 CRCs showed unmethylated *SDC2* and *TFPI2*, which might
188 imply a specific methylator phenotype of CRCs represented by the methylation status of these
189 two genes.
190

191 ***Performance of methylated SDC2 and TFPI2 in Detection of CRCs and*** 192 ***Adenomas***

193 The sensitivity, specificity, and area under ROC curve (AUC) were calculated to evaluate the
194 diagnostic performance of DT-sDNA test for CRCs. Overall, the sensitivity for CRC detection was
195 95.31% (95%CI: 88.64% - 97.21%) with specificities of 88.39% (95%CI: 73.80% - 90.32%) for all
196 non-CRCs and 96.67% (95%CI: 80.49% - 98.35%) for healthy normal controls (Figure 5A&B). The
197 AUC was 0.92 (95%CI: 0.90~0.93) when using all non-CRCs as negative controls, but improved to
198 0.96 (95%CI: 0.94~0.97) when compared to healthy normal controls (Figure 5A&B). Colorectal
199 adenoma was known as the main precancerous lesion of CRC. We observed a sensitivity of 41.22%
200 (95%CI: 36.36% - 48.68%) for adenoma detection (Figure 5C). However, for advanced and
201 non-advanced adenomas, the sensitivities were 63.16% (95%CI: 55.81% - 76.56%) and 33.64%
202 (95%CI: 30.41% - 42.02%) respectively (Supplemental Table 2). The sensitivity for early-stage (I
203 and II) CRCs detection was a little higher than that of late-stage (III and IV) CRCs (96.93% vs
204 93.06%) (Figure 5D&E). Additionally, we found that the methylated *SDC2* in detecting both CRCs
205 and adenomas presented higher specificity and lower sensitivity, while it was inversed for the
206 methylated *TFPI2*. This result might elucidate the improved detected performance of the
207 combined DT-sDNA test than these of any target alone.
208

209 ***Performance of methylated SDC2 and TFPI2 in Detection of Interfering*** 210 ***Diseases***

211 The study recruited 396 participants who suffered the common digestive diseases and they
212 were classified as interfering diseases. The positive detection rate for interfering diseases was
213 6.70% (n=27), which referred to the specificity of 93.15% (n=367) (Supplemental Table 3). Kappa
214 values for methylated *SDC2*, *TFPI2* and the combined dual-target were 0.72, 0.78 and 0.88
215 respectively (Table 2), suggested a good agreement of DT-sDNA test in discriminating interfering
216 diseases from CRCs.

217 **Validation by Sanger Sequencing and Surgical Following**

218 The methylation status of *SDC2* and *TFPI2* in 375 samples were verified by performing Sanger
 219 sequencing. The unmethylated cytosine in a CpG site will be transformed to thymine after the
 220 treatment of sodium bisulphite, while the methylated cytosine is not changed. By sequencing the
 221 products of MSP, we can directly determine whether the target is methylated according to
 222 sequence of CpG sites. We observed a 100% consistency of the methylation status of *SDC2*
 223 between the DT-sDNA tests and sequenced results ($\kappa = 1.00$) (**Table 3**). The kappa value for
 224 *TFPI2* achieved 0.98, despite that 3 samples were not in line between the two methods.
 225 Furthermore, 34 CRC patients were followed-up after resected and their stool samples were
 226 retested by DT-sDNA test under the same operations. Four CRCs that were recognized as false
 227 negative before surgical resection were detected negative again after resection, and the rest 28
 228 CRCs that were positive detections showed negative tests after resection. The overall consistency
 229 rate was 94.12% (32/34) except for two CRCs that were disagreed with expected (**Supplemental**
 230 **Table 4**).
 231

232 **Association of Clinical Features with Methylation Status of *SDC2* and**

233 ***TFPI2***

234 The association of DT-sDNA test with patient clinical features was assessed by calculating the
 235 detection rate of different groups of CRCs. The positive detection rate of DT-sDNA did not show
 236 significant variation in patient's gender, age, TNM stage, tumor location, and differentiation
 237 (**Table 4**). Notably, the positive detection rates of *TFPI2* alone in all categories were relatively
 238 higher than these of *SDC2* alone, except for the right-sided, which might be related to the
 239 significantly different histological and molecular characteristics between left-sided and
 240 right-sided CRCs^{21, 22}. Two serum tumor markers, carcinoembryonic antigen (CEA) and
 241 carbohydrate antigen 19-9 (CA19-9) were measured in 254 and 227 participants, respectively.
 242 Although the specificities of CEA and CA19-9 for CRC detection achieved approximately 90%, the
 243 sensitivities were pretty low (**Supplemental Table 5**).

244 **DISCUSSION**

245 As one of the most common human cancers, the mortality of CRCs has been decreased with
 246 the emergence of new medical technologies and therapeutic agents. However, many patients still
 247 couldn't be treated effectively or often suffered a low quality of life after the treatments. This
 248 partly attributed to their inability to be detected in precancerous lesions before progressing to
 249 cancerous or early-stage before spreading beyond the bowel wall. Several studies suggested that
 250 it should be suitable for CRC early detection because of the high correlation of mortality with
 251 disease stage^{23, 24}. Therefore, developing novel highly accurate, non-invasive and cost-saving
 252 tests is of critical importance for screening in large-scale population with average-risk of CRC²⁵⁻²⁷.

253 Traditional diagnostic methods, such as colonoscopy and histopathological examination have

254 been widely used for the detection of CRC. The remarkable sensitivity of colonoscopy made it the
255 reference method for both cancerous and precancerous lesions screening, however obvious
256 limitations such as the invasive procedures and low patient compliance are still existed^{28, 29}. Fecal
257 occult blood test (gFOBT) and fecal immunochemical test (FIT) are two noninvasive screening
258 methods based on occult blood in the stool, while both of them showed somewhat lower
259 sensitivities and might lead to false-negative test results³⁰. Similarity was obtained for the serum
260 markers of CEA and CA19-9³¹. The methylation-based, noninvasive stool DNA test has been
261 documented many advantages with superior accuracy, as well as convenient procedures and high
262 patient compliance. At present, many studies are focusing on developing novel methylated
263 targets for CRC screening, despite that few of them are commercially available. Cologuard was
264 the first commercially available MT-sDNA test approved by FDA and the sensitivity reached 92.3%
265⁷. The other two commercially available sDNA tests were 'EarlyTect-Colon Cancer' (Genomictree,
266 South Korean) and Colosafe (Creative Biosciences CO., Ltd., China), of which both were based on
267 the aberrantly methylated SDC2, and their sensitivities were approximately around 90%^{9, 10}. Our
268 findings showed that the dual-target sDNA test achieved an excellent sensitivity of 95.31% for
269 CRC detection, outperforming not only the serum markers but also two commercially available
270 sDNA tests. For advanced adenomas, it had a detection rate of 63.16%, which was higher than
271 that of 'Consafe' and comparable to the 'EarlyTect'. Besides, the DT-sDNA test showed superior
272 sensitivity and specificity for the detection of both CRC and adenoma when compared to Epi
273 proColon 2.0¹³.

274 It should be noted that combining two single targets, which means increasing the number of
275 false positives, could decrease the specificity of the test. Our results showed that the specificity
276 of this DT-sDNA test was lower than that of the two single-target sDNA tests, 'EarlyTect' and
277 'Colosafe'. However, when using healthy normal controls and interfering diseases as negative
278 controls separately, the specificities improved from 88.39% to 96.67% and 93.18%, respectively.
279 This finding implies that the disadvantage could be eliminated or at least diminished by integrating
280 clinical symptoms of participants during the testing.

281 Meanwhile, we did not observe significant variations of this DT-sDNA test in detecting CRCs
282 with different clinical features, indicating its ability is not affected by patient gender and age, as
283 well as tumor locations and differentiation. Moreover, the capabilities of *SDC2* and *TFPI2* alone in
284 detecting left-sided and right-sided CRCs showed significant preference. Given the huge
285 distinctive features of left- and right-sided colons^{22, 32}, it would be reasonable for the preference
286 of the methylated *SDC2* and *TFPI2* in detecting different locations' CRCs, which could elucidate,
287 from one hand the improved sensitivity of combined two targets than that of any single target
288 alone.

289 In summary, the performance of this novel dual-target stool DNA test for the diagnosis of CRCs
290 was evaluated using large-scale data collected from a multicenter clinical trial. Outcomes of this
291 study showed high sensitivities of the test in detecting CRCs and remarkable specificities were
292 also observed in screening interfering diseases and healthy normal controls. However, some
293 shortcomings of the test still exist. The sensitivity for adenomas detection is not yet pretty well,
294 especially for the detection of non-advanced adenomas. In addition, the performance in
295 screening asymptomatic persons at average risk of CRC needs to be assessed in a larger
296 population. For screening purposes, the target for both sensitivity and specificity of a test would
297 be not the same as diagnostic purposes³³. Nevertheless, the robustness of this non-invasive

298 dual-target test in clinical practice indicated that it could be used as a screening option for
299 individuals with average risk of CRC.
300

301 Disclosure of Potential Conflicts of Interest

302 YL Dou reports research funding from Wuhan Ammunition Life-tech Company, Ltd., Hubei, China.
303 All other authors declare no conflict of interest.

304 Authors' Contributions

305 Study design: YL Dou, J Lin, ZX Wang
306 Study supervision: YL Dou
307 Data collection (patient information, stool sample preparation, etc.): ZX Wang, S Jian, GN Zhang,
308 LJ Kong, F Zhang, Y Guo
309 Methodology development: S Jian, LJ Kong, F Zhang, Y Guo
310 Data analysis and interpretation (e.g., statistical analysis, computational analysis): GN Zhang, LJ
311 Kong
312 Manuscript writing, review, and revision: YL Dou, J Lin, ZX Wang
313 Other (i.e. stool DNA extraction, methylation-specific PCR): GN Zhang, LJ Kong

314 Acknowledgments

315 We thank Yang Zhang, Jiadan Xu, Yuanyuan Hu, Fubing Wang, Guangming Ye and Jun Xiao, for
316 their assistance in preparing stool samples and collecting participants' information used in the
317 study. We declare that submitted manuscript does not contain previously published material, and
318 are not under consideration for publication elsewhere. Each author has made an important
319 scientific contribution to the study and is thoroughly familiar with the primary data. All authors
320 listed have read the complete manuscript and have approved submission of the paper. The
321 manuscript is truthful original work without fabrication, fraud or plagiarism.

322 Tables

323 **Table 1 Subject features**

Clinical feature	Normal	Adenoma	Interfering diseases	CRC
Age				
(median[interquile])	49.00(39.00~58.25)	58.00(50.75~64.25)	49.00(37.00~57.25)	63.00(54.00~71.00)
Gender (%)				
Male	154 (51.33)	83 (60.14)	216 (54.55)	184 (57.50)
Female	146 (48.67)	65 (47.10)	180 (45.45)	136 (42.50)
Stage (%)				

I				49 (15.32)
II				114 (35.62)
III				124 (38.75)
IV				20 (6.25)
Not available				13 (4.06)
Summary (%)	300 (25.77)	148 (12.72)	396 (34.02)	320 (27.49)

324

325 **Table 2 Kappa test for agreement of SDC2 and TFPI2 in detection of interfering diseases**

		Detected Negative	Detected Positive	Kappa (95%CI)	Pr value
SDC2	Interfering diseases	391	5	0.72 (0.67~0.77)	< 0.001
	CRCs	91	229		
TFPI2	Interfering diseases	371	25	0.78 (0.73~0.83)	< 0.001
	CRCs	51	269		
SDC2/TFPI2	Interfering diseases	369	27	0.88 (0.85~0.92)	< 0.001
	CRCs	15	305		

326

327 **Table 3 Validation by Sanger sequencing**

		Sanger sequencing		Kappa (95%CI)	Pr value
		Negative	Positive		
SDC2	Negative	258	0	1.00 (1.00~1.00)	< 0.001
	Positive	0	117		
TFPI2	Negative	187	1	0.98 (0.96~1.00)	< 0.001
	Positive	2	185		

328

329 **Table 4 Positive detection rate of DT-sDNA test for different clinical features of CRCs**

Characteristics	CRCs	Stool DNA test			X ² test P
		SDC2 (%n)	TFPI2 (%n)	SDC2/TFPI2 (%n)	
Gender					0.97
Male	184	70.65 (130)	85.33 (157)	95.65 (176)	
Female	136	72.79 (99)	82.35 (112)	94.85 (129)	
Age					0.92
<50	54	74.07 (40)	85.19 (46)	94.44 (51)	
50~60	70	70.00 (49)	81.43 (57)	94.29 (66)	
60~70	106	70.75 (75)	83.96 (89)	96.23 (102)	
>=70	90	72.22 (65)	84.62 (77)	95.56 (86)	
TNM Stage					0.21
I-II	163	73.01 (119)	81.60 (133)	96.93 (158)	

III-IV	144	68.75 (99)	85.42 (124)	93.06 (134)	
Not available	13	84.62 (11)	100 (13)	100 (13)	
Location					0.44
Left-sided	53	69.81 (37)	90.57 (48)	96.23 (51)	
Right-sided	32	87.50 (28)	62.50 (20)	96.88 (31)	
Other colon	67	62.69 (42)	76.12 (51)	92.54 (62)	
Rectum	151	74.17 (112)	91.39 (138)	96.69 (146)	
Ileocecal valve	17	58.82 (10)	70.59 (12)	88.24 (15)	
Differentiation					0.12
High	24	70.83 (17)	75.00 (18)	87.50 (21)	
Moderate	280	71.07 (199)	85.00 (238)	95.71 (268)	
Low	16	75.00 (12)	87.50 (14)	100.00 (16)	

330

331 Figures

332 **Figure 1 Overview of the clinical trial design.** CRC indicates colorectal cancer. The 148 adenoma
333 patients includes 38 advanced adenoma patients and 110 non-advanced adenoma patients.

334

335 **Figure 2 Amplification curves of methylation specific PCR for unmethylated SDC2/TFPI2 (A),**
336 **methylated SDC2 (B), methylated TFPI2 (C) and methylated SDC2/TFPI2 (D).** $\Delta Rn = Rn$ (post-PCR
337 read) – Rn (pre-PCR read), where Rn = normalized reporter. The X-axis indicate PCR cycles from 1
338 to 45. Ct values were calculated according to the PCR cycle number at which the fluorescence
339 meets the threshold in the amplification plot.

340

341 **Figure 3 Three batches of DT-sDNA tests for 10 positive and 10 negative references. A:** Ct values
342 of *ACTB* measured by MSP for 20 references. **B:** Detected results of the 20 references in three
343 batches. N1-N10: 10 negative references, P1-P10: 10 positive references. B1-B3 represents batch
344 1, 2 and 3.

345

346 **Figure 4 Methylation profiles of SDC2 and TFPI2 in study population.** C1, C2 indicate the
347 methylation status of *SDC2* and *TFPI2* respectively. C3 represents the detected results of 1,164
348 enrolled participants. C4 represents four groups of the study population.

349

350 **Figure 5 Performance of the SDC2 and TFPI2 methylation in detection of adenoma and CRCs.** All
351 non-CRCs include healthy normal controls, interfering diseases, and adenomas. Advanced
352 adenomas and non-advanced adenomas are integrated together as adenomas.

353 References:

354 1. Feng RM, Zong YN, Cao SM, Xu RH. Current cancer situation in China: good or bad news from
355 the 2018 Global Cancer Statistics? Cancer Commun (Lond) 2019;39:22.

- 356 2. Zhu J, Tan Z, Hollis-Hansen K, Zhang Y, Yu C, Li Y. Epidemiological Trends in Colorectal
357 Cancer in China: An Ecological Study. *Digestive Diseases and Sciences* 2017;62:235-243.
- 358 3. Simon K. Colorectal cancer development and advances in screening. *Clinical interventions in*
359 *aging* 2016;11:967-976.
- 360 4. Kijima S, Sasaki T, Nagata K, Utano K, Lefor AT, Sugimoto H. Preoperative evaluation of
361 colorectal cancer using CT colonography, MRI, and PET/CT. *World journal of gastroenterology*
362 2014;20:16964-16975.
- 363 5. Li JN, Yuan SY. Fecal occult blood test in colorectal cancer screening. *J Dig Dis* 2019;20:62-64.
- 364 6. Imperiale TF, Ransohoff DF, Itzkowitz SH, Turnbull BA, Ross ME. Fecal DNA versus fecal
365 occult blood for colorectal-cancer screening in an average-risk population. *N Engl J Med*
366 2004;351:2704-14.
- 367 7. Imperiale TF, Ransohoff DF, Itzkowitz SH, Levin TR, Lavin P, Lidgard GP, Ahlquist DA, Berger
368 BM. Multitarget stool DNA testing for colorectal-cancer screening. *N Engl J Med* 2014;370:1287-97.
- 369 8. Oh TJ, Oh HI, Seo YY, Jeong D, Kim C, Kang HW, Han YD, Chung HC, Kim NK, An S.
370 Feasibility of quantifying SDC2 methylation in stool DNA for early detection of colorectal cancer.
371 *Clin Epigenetics* 2017;9:126.
- 372 9. Wang J, Liu S, Wang H, Zheng L, Zhou C, Li G, Huang R, Wang H, Li C, Fan X, Fu X, Wang X,
373 Guo H, Guan J, Sun Y, Song X, Li Z, Mu D, Sun J, Liu X, Qi Y, Niu F, Chen C, Wu X, Wang X, Song
374 X, Zou H. Robust performance of a novel stool DNA test of methylated SDC2 for colorectal cancer
375 detection: a multicenter clinical study. *Clin Epigenetics* 2020;12:162.
- 376 10. Han YD, Oh TJ, Chung TH, Jang HW, Kim YN, An S, Kim NK. Early detection of colorectal
377 cancer based on presence of methylated syndecan-2 (SDC2) in stool DNA. *Clin Epigenetics*
378 2019;11:51.
- 379 11. Mojtabanezhad SA, Yassi M, Nouraie M, Sahebkar A, Varshoe TF, Kerachian MA. The
380 importance of stool DNA methylation in colorectal cancer diagnosis: A meta-analysis. *PLoS One*
381 2018;13:e0200735.
- 382 12. Lamb YN, Dhillon S. Epi proColon(®) 2.0 CE: A Blood-Based Screening Test for Colorectal
383 Cancer. *Mol Diagn Ther* 2017;21:225-232.
- 384 13. Nian J, Sun X, Ming S, Yan C, Ma Y, Feng Y, Yang L, Yu M, Zhang G, Wang X. Diagnostic
385 Accuracy of Methylated SEPT9 for Blood-based Colorectal Cancer Detection: A Systematic Review
386 and Meta-Analysis. *Clin Transl Gastroenterol* 2017;8:e216.
- 387 14. Oh T, Kim N, Moon Y, Kim MS, Hoehn BD, Park CH, Kim TS, Kim NK, Chung HC, An S.
388 Genome-wide identification and validation of a novel methylation biomarker, SDC2, for blood-based
389 detection of colorectal cancer. *J Mol Diagn* 2013;15:498-507.
- 390 15. Park YS, Kim DS, Cho SW, Park JW, Jeon SJ, Moon TJ, Kim SH, Son BK, Oh TJ, An S, Kim JH,
391 Chae JD. Analysis of Syndecan-2 Methylation in Bowel Lavage Fluid for the Detection of Colorectal
392 Neoplasm. *Gut Liver* 2018;12:508-515.
- 393 16. Niu F, Wen J, Fu X, Li C, Zhao R, Wu S, Yu H, Liu X, Zhao X, Liu S, Wang X, Wang J, Zou H.
394 Stool DNA Test of Methylated Syndecan-2 for the Early Detection of Colorectal Neoplasia. *Cancer*
395 *Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2017;26:1411-1419.
- 396 17. Hibi K, Goto T, Kitamura YH, Yokomizo K, Sakuraba K, Shirahata A, Mizukami H, Saito M,
397 Ishibashi K, Kigawa G, Nemoto H, Sanada Y. Methylation of TFPI2 gene is frequently detected in
398 advanced well-differentiated colorectal cancer. *Anticancer Res* 2010;30:1205-7.
- 399 18. Hibi K, Goto T, Shirahata A, Saito M, Kigawa G, Nemoto H, Sanada Y. Detection of TFPI2

methylation in the serum of colorectal cancer patients. *Cancer Lett* 2011;311:96-100.

19. Glöckner SC, Dhir M, Yi JM, McGarvey KE, Van Neste L, Louwagie J, Chan TA, Kleeberger W, de Bruïne AP, Smits KM, Khalid-de BC, Jonkers DM, Stockbrügger RW, Meijer GA, Oort FA, Iacobuzio-Donahue C, Bierau K, Herman JG, Baylin SB, Van Engeland M, Schuebel KE, Ahuja N. Methylation of TFPI2 in stool DNA: a potential novel biomarker for the detection of colorectal cancer. *Cancer Res* 2009;69:4691-9.

20. Network NCC. Colon Cancer (Version 1.2018), 2018.

21. Gervaz P, Usel M, Rapiti E, Chappuis P, Neyroud-Kaspar I, Bouchardy C. Right colon cancer: Left behind. *Eur J Surg Oncol* 2016;42:1343-9.

22. Missiaglia E, Jacobs B, D'Ario G, Di Narzo AF, Sonesson C, Budinska E, Popovici V, Vecchione L, Gerster S, Yan P, Roth AD, Klingbiel D, Bosman FT, Delorenzi M, Tejpar S. Distal and proximal colon cancers differ in terms of molecular, pathological, and clinical features. *Ann Oncol* 2014;25:1995-2001.

23. Ukegijini K, Zadnikar M, Warschkow R, Müller S, Schmied BM, Marti L. Baseline mortality-adjusted survival in colon cancer patients. *Langenbecks Arch Surg* 2016;401:633-41.

24. Manilich EA, Kiran RP, Radivoyevitch T, Lavery I, Fazio VW, Remzi FH. A novel data-driven prognostic model for staging of colorectal cancer. *J Am Coll Surg* 2011;213:579-588, 588.e1-2.

25. Binefa G, Rodríguez-Moranta F, Teule A, Medina-Hayas M. Colorectal cancer: from prevention to personalized medicine. *World J Gastroenterol* 2014;20:6786-808.

26. Wolf A, Fontham E, Church TR, Flowers CR, Guerra CE, LaMonte SJ, Etzioni R, McKenna MT, Oeffinger KC, Shih YT, Walter LC, Andrews KS, Brawley OW, Brooks D, Fedewa SA, Manassaram-Baptiste D, Siegel RL, Wender RC, Smith RA. Colorectal cancer screening for average-risk adults: 2018 guideline update from the American Cancer Society. *CA Cancer J Clin* 2018;68:250-281.

27. Schreuders EH, Ruco A, Rabeneck L, Schoen RE, Sung JJ, Young GP, Kuipers EJ. Colorectal cancer screening: a global overview of existing programmes. *Gut* 2015;64:1637-49.

28. Cooper GS, Kou TD, Rex DK. Complications following colonoscopy with anesthesia assistance: a population-based analysis. *JAMA Intern Med* 2013;173:551-6.

29. Inadomi JM, Vijan S, Janz NK, Fagerlin A, Thomas JP, Lin YV, Muñoz R, Lau C, Somsouk M, El-Nachef N, Hayward RA. Adherence to colorectal cancer screening: a randomized clinical trial of competing strategies. *Arch Intern Med* 2012;172:575-82.

30. Lee JK, Liles EG, Bent S, Levin TR, Corley DA. Accuracy of fecal immunochemical tests for colorectal cancer: systematic review and meta-analysis. *Ann Intern Med* 2014;160:171.

31. Attallah AM, El-Far M, Ibrahim AR, El-Desouky MA, Omran MM, Elbendary MS, Attallah KA, Qura ER, Abdallah SO. Clinical value of a diagnostic score for colon cancer based on serum CEA, CA19-9, cytokeratin-1 and mucin-1. *Br J Biomed Sci* 2018;75:122-127.

32. Minoo P, Zlobec I, Peterson M, Terracciano L, Lugli A. Characterization of rectal, proximal and distal colon cancers based on clinicopathological, molecular and protein profiles. *Int J Oncol* 2010;37:707-18.

33. Bujang MA, Adnan TH. Requirements for Minimum Sample Size for Sensitivity and Specificity Analysis. *J Clin Diagn Res* 2016;10:YE01-YE06.

1,196 Participants enrolled from three centers

27 excluded for they did not meet inclusion criteria

1,169 included for stool DNA testing

5 excluded for their failure in quality control

1,164 included for evaluation

300 normal controls

396 interfering diseases

148 adenoma

320 CRCs

375 validated by sanger sequencing

34 retested after resection

A

B

C

D