

BMJ Open is committed to open peer review. As part of this commitment we make the peer review history of every article we publish publicly available.

When an article is published we post the peer reviewers' comments and the authors' responses online. We also post the versions of the paper that were used during peer review. These are the versions that the peer review comments apply to.

The versions of the paper that follow are the versions that were submitted during the peer review process. They are not the versions of record or the final published versions. They should not be cited or distributed as the published version of this manuscript.

BMJ Open is an open access journal and the full, final, typeset and author-corrected version of record of the manuscript is available on our site with no access controls, subscription charges or pay-per-view fees (http://bmjopen.bmj.com).

If you have any questions on BMJ Open's open peer review process please email <u>info.bmjopen@bmj.com</u>

BMJ Open

BMJ Open

Accuracy of blood-based biomarkers for screening advanced pre-cancerous colorectal lesions: a protocol for systematic review and meta-analysis.

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2021-060712
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	31-Dec-2021
Complete List of Authors:	Lathlean, Timothy JH; Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and Medical Research Institute, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University Wassie, Molla; Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and Medical Research Institute, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University Winter, Jean; Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and Medical Research Institute, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University Goyal, Rishabh; Flinders University College of Medicine and Public Health, Department of Medicine Young, Graeme; Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and Medical Research Institute, College of Medicine and Public Health, Department of Medicine Young, Graeme; Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health, Flinders University Symonds, Erin; Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health, Flinders University Symonds, Erin; Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health, Flinders University; Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health, Flinders University; Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health, Flinders University; Flinders Medical Centre, Bowel Health Service, Gastroenterology Department
Keywords:	GASTROENTEROLOGY, Gastrointestinal tumours < ONCOLOGY, Colorectal surgery < SURGERY

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts

Page 1 of 14

1

BMJ Open

2		
3	1	Accuracy of blood-based biomarkers for screening pre-cancerous colorectal lesions: a protocol for
4	2	systematic review and meta-analysis.
5	2	systematic review and meta-analysis.
6	3	Dr Timothy JH Lathlean: 1 Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and Medical
7	4	Research Institute (FHMRI), College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University, Bedford Park,
8		
9	5	Australia.
10	c	Dr Malla Wassia, Elinders Centre for Innovation in Conser, Elinders Health and Medical Desearch
11	6	Dr Molla Wassie: Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and Medical Research
12	7	Institute (FHMRI), College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University, Bedford Park, Australia.
13	•	
14	8	Dr Jean Winter: Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and Medical Research
15	9	Institute (FHMRI), College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University, Bedford Park, Australia.
16		
17	10	Professor Graeme Young: Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and Medical
18	11	Research Institute (FHMRI), College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University, Bedford Park,
19	12	Australia.
20		
21	13	Mr Rishabh Goyal: Department of Medicine, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders
22	14	University, Bedford Park, Australia.
23		
24	15	Associate Professor Erin Symonds: Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and
25	16	Medical Research Institute (FHMRI), College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University;
26	17	Bowel Health Service, Gastroenterology Department, Flinders Medical Centre, Bedford Park,
27		
28	18	Australia.
29	19	
30	15	
31	20	Corresponding author:
32	-	
33	21	Dr Timothy JH Lathlean, Level 3 Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer,
34 35		
36	22	Flinders Drive, Bedford Park, South Australia 5042
37	22	Dhamay (C1.0.0275-1075-5-00) (C1.0.0204-5702
38	23	Phone: +61 8 8275 1075, Fax: +61 8 8204 5703
39	24	timothy.lathlean@flinders.edu.au
40	24	
41	25	
42	-	
43	26	Word count: 3380 words
44		Word count: 3380 words
45	27	
46	• •	
47	28	Keywords:
48	20	Coloratel peoplesme: Diamarkers, adapama, Consitivity and Chasificity, Diagnostics, Dowel
49	29	Colorectal neoplasms; Biomarkers, adenoma; Sensitivity and Specificity; Diagnostics; Bowel.
50	30	
51	50	
52	31	Ethics statement:
53		
54	32	No ethical approval is required for this protocol as this will be a collation of previously published
55	33	literature.
56	-	
57		
58		
59		
60		

34 ABSTRACT

Introduction Colorectal cancer (CRC) is the third most diagnosed cancer and the second most

- 37 common cause of cancer mortality worldwide. Most CRCs develop through either the adenoma-to-
- carcinoma or the serrated pathways, and therefore detection and removal of these pre-cursor
 lesions can prevent the development of cancer. Current screening programs can aid in the detection
- 40 of CRC and adenomas; however, participation rates are suboptimal. Blood-based biomarkers may
- 40 of cite and adenomas, nowever, participation rates are suboptimal. Blood-based blona ker
 41 help to address these low participation rates in screening programs. Although blood-based
- 13 42 biomarker tests show promise for cancer detection, limited attention has been placed on the
- 14 43 sensitivity and specificity for detection of the pre-cursor lesions. The aim of this research is to 15 44 sensitivity and specificity for detection of the pre-cursor lesions. The aim of this research is to
- 44 conduct a systematic review and meta-analysis to evaluate the accuracy of blood-based biomarker
 45 tests in detecting advanced pre-cancerous lesions.
- Methods and Analysis This protocol was informed by the PRISMA-P and results will be reported in line with the PRISMA guidelines. Literature searches will be conducted on PubMed, Embase and Web of Science. Two reviewers will conduct the searches, and independently screen them, according to title and abstract and then the full-text versions of those selected articles as well as the risk of bias via the QUADAS-2. The GRADE guidelines will be used to validate the certainty of evidence for recommendations based on the risk of bias findings. Meta-analysis will be conducted where appropriate on groups of studies with low heterogeneity.
- Ethics and Dissemination No patient data will be included in our review and therefore ethics
 approval is not required. It is anticipated that the review will identify the most promising candidate
 biomarkers for clinical translation in the screening of advanced pre-cancerous lesions. The results
 will be published in a peer-reviewed journal.

STRENGTH AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- While many reviews have been published on blood biomarker test to detect colorectal cancer, our work will provide the first systematic review to evaluate the accuracy of blood-based biomarker tests in detecting pre-cancerous lesions;
- It is anticipated that the results of this systematic review and meta-analysis will identify candidate blood biomarkers for improving the non-invasive detection of pre-cancerous lesions;
- Due to the clinical and methodological diversity of different types of blood biomarkers studied for colorectal neoplasms, a limitation of our review could be heterogeneity.

67 INTRODUCTION

Colorectal cancer (CRC) is the third most diagnosed cancer and the second most common cause of cancer mortality worldwide¹. In Australia, the age-standardised CRC incidence rate is approximately 50 per 100,000 people². CRC screening programs (colonoscopy and/or faecal based screening measures) have demonstrated efficacy in reducing both CRC incidence and mortality³⁴. CRC develops through the adenoma (or sessile serrated) carcinoma pathway, where pre-cancerous lesions such as advanced adenomas and sessile serrated lesions may progress to CRC⁵⁶. The purpose of screening is to detect CRC at an early stage, enabling earlier interventions, which can lead to more efficacious treatment options and better patient outcomes including reduced morbidity and mortality. Furthermore, screening can also assist in the detection of pre-cancerous lesions, such as adenomas and advanced sessile serrated lesions that can be removed at colonoscopy, preventing approximately 80% of cancers⁷⁸. While colonoscopy is used as the main form of screening in several countries⁹, there are risks associated with the procedure such as bowel perforations (3.1/10,000 procedures) and major bleeding (14.6/10,000)¹⁰. Colonoscopy can also be expensive, and many

BMJ Open

invasive strategies for screening for pre-cancerous lesions is needed.

countries have limited capacity and resources for this procedure. Therefore, implementation of less-The faecal occult blood test, in particular the one using immunochemical test (FIT) technology, which detects the level of human haemoglobin (Hb) in the stool, has been shown to have benefit in the early detection and prevention of CRC¹⁰⁻¹². Most organised CRC screening programs around the world use FIT, mainly focusing on people at average risk (i.e., no family history²³ and/or no previous pre-cancerous lesions¹³⁻¹⁵). As outlined in a recent review¹³, FIT appears to maintain both high

sensitivity (range 55-100%) and specificity (range 77-97%) across 12 previous studies in the detection of CRC^{14,24}. While FIT has high accuracy for CRC detection, it can only detect up to 40% of advanced adenomas¹⁵ and only 16% of advanced sessile serrated lesions^{16 17} (depending on the positivity threshold applied and the number of samples collected). Even though FIT has good sensitivity for detecting CRC, the participation rate in FIT CRC screening programs is low, mainly due to faecal aversion and other issues leading to low acceptability in consumers¹⁸. An earlier study reported 78% of those surveyed preferring blood-based tests over faecal tests¹⁸. Furthermore, 83% of consumers would also prefer to have blood-based tests over colonoscopy, indicating the high acceptance rates of blood sampling over current screening options ¹⁹. This highlights the need for blood-based biomarkers, which may improve participation in CRC screening, as well as potentially increasing sensitivity for detection of pre-cancerous colonic lesions. Blood based biomarker tests can target the various changes occurring along the advanced adenoma to carcinoma pathway, contributing to aberrant protein, metabolic and immune functions²⁰²¹. Following these early initiating events, hyperproliferation of the colorectal epithelial cells can lead to the formation of polyps, which if left in place, can become adenomas and ultimately become invasive cancer. An alternate pathway (proposed more recently) is that of the alternative serrated pathway (15-30% of CRC)²², where the precursor lesion is the sessile serrated lesion. A useful diagnostic blood biomarker should be sensitive and specific for detecting early neoplastic transformation as well as for CRC, and have clinical accuracy to allow for optimal detection of CRC and pre-cancerous lesions^{23 24}. To date, there are no reviews investigating the accuracy of blood-based biomarkers for detection of advanced colonic adenomas and/or sessile serrated lesions. This project aims to investigate the sensitivity and specificity of blood-based biomarkers for the detection of advanced colonic adenomas and advanced sessile serrated lesions. **Objectives** 1. To evaluate the accuracy (sensitivity and specificity) of blood-based biomarkers for detection of important pre-cancerous lesions, namely advanced colorectal adenomas and advanced sessile serrated lesions. 2. To determine if the accuracy of blood-based biomarkers is influenced by clinicopathological features of pre-cancerous lesions. **METHODS AND ANALYSIS** The protocol for this review was based on Cochrane guidelines^{25 26}, PRISMA guidelines^{27 28} and other reviews already conducted in this area²⁹⁻³¹. Registration was submitted to PROSPERO (International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews), an international database for systematic reviews prospectively registered by the Centre for Reviews and Dissemination of the University of York (https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero). Patient and public involvement

127 The development of the research question and outcomes measures has been informed by patients'
 128 priorities, experience and preferences through regular contact with consumer groups. Patients will
 129 not be involved in the analysis and data collection of the systematic review and meta-analysis.

7 8 130 Eligibility criteria

9 131 Population

1 2

11 132 People over the age of 18 of either sex with a diagnosis of advanced adenomas and/or sessile 12 133 serrated lesions based on colonoscopy findings, who have also had any blood-based biomarker test, 13 134 will be included in the study. Advanced adenoma features are defined as advanced are polyp size \geq 14 15 135 10mm, villous features, or high-grade dysplasia, whereas advanced sessile serrated lesions include 16 136 those with dysplastic changes³², and/or size \geq 10mm⁵. Studies investigating high-risk patients (e.g., 17 137 familial risk and hereditary syndromes) will be excluded, as this does not represent the average 18 138 population risk for development of colorectal adenomas or sessile serrated lesions. Furthermore, 19

- 139 only studies published after 2006 will be included given the increase in the number of studies from
- 21 140 this period and the changes in technology to accurately detect blood-based biomarkers.

23 141 Intervention

24 This review will consider studies that evaluate diagnostic accuracy (sensitivity and specificity) of 142 25 143 blood-based biomarkers for detection of advanced adenomas and/or advanced sessile serrated 26 27 144 lesions. The blood-biomarker study must apply wet-lab based methods (e.g., by testing a biological 28 145 mechanism that is thought to be dysregulated in cancer) in blood samples collected from patients. 29 146 Further, sufficient detailed methodology about the technique used for testing, sample preparation 30 147 methods and analytical technique used is required in order to assess the reliability and the validity of 31 32 148 each blood-based biomarker. 33

34 149 Comparison

The studies must compare the diagnostic accuracy of the blood-biomarkers from individuals with
 colonic pre-cancerous lesions alongside 1) individuals with no evidence of colonic neoplastic disease,
 and/or 2) individuals with CRC.

- 39 40 153 **Outcomes**
- 4142 154 The main outcomes to be evaluated are:
- 43
44155i)Accuracy: the sensitivity and specificity of a blood-based biomarker test to detect advanced45156pre-cancerous lesions(s);
- 46 157 ii) How the accuracy of the test to detect advanced adenomas/ sessile serrated lesions
 47 158 compares to its ability to detect CRC.
- 49 159 Additional outcomes may include:
 50
- a) Whether the blood test can detect adenomas/sessile serrated lesions in certain places of the
 colon (e.g., distal vs proximal);
- 54 162 b) The association between the blood test results and pathology of the pre-cancerous lesions; 55
- 56 163 c) The assessment of lifestyle factors influencing the accuracy of the blood test; and, 57
- 164 d) Whether there have been investigations into the cause of false positive blood test results in
 165 participants without adenomas, sessile serrated lesions or CRC.

-			
3	166	Measures of effect: Sensi	itivity will be presented on a 0 (least sensitive) to 1 (most sensitive) scale on
4	167		om the analysis. Concurrent analysis of sensitivity/specificity will be
0	168		C curve for the combination of all the tests.
7 8	169	Studies	
9	170	Given initial searches so f	far, it is anticipated that the level of evidence for this review is most likely to
10	171		al (and some experimental studies), including cohort, case-control, and
	172		The inclusion and exclusion criteria for this review are summarised in Table
	173	1.	
14	174	Table 1: Summary of inclus	ion and exclusion criteria
16			
17		Inclusion criteria	
18		Population	Adult patients of both sexes with a diagnosis of colonic advanced adenomas
19			and/or advanced sessile serrated lesions based on colonoscopy outcomes as a
20			part of screening, diagnostic or surveillance, and who have also had blood
21 22		Intervention /Evenesure	collected prior to polypectomy for biomarker analysis.
22 23		Intervention/Exposure	Blood-based biomarker methodology is explained in detail, including the nature of the biomarker (e.g. DNA, miRNA), quantitation technique,
24			preparation method, accuracy for patients with colonic adenomas/sessile
25 26		Comparison	serrated lesions. Blood-based biomarker studies in non-cancer controls and/or those with
20		Comparison	colorectal cancers.
28		Study type	Quantitative observational and experimental studies.
29		Exclusion criteria	
30		Population	Those without a diagnosis of advanced colonic adenomas/sessile serrated
31 32 33			lesions based on colonoscopy (i.e. otherwise healthy controls or those with CRC). Those where colonoscopy has been completed for familial risk conditions.
34		Intervention/Exposure	Non blood-based biomarkers (e.g., faecal biomarkers).
35		Study type	Studies not in English, published prior to 2006, review articles, articles
36 37			investigating blood-based biomarkers with <i>in-vitro</i> or animal models. Those not including a measure of test sensitivity.
39	175		
40 41	176	Information sources	
42	177	Information sources will	be restricted to publications in English and articles published after 2006.
43	178	Specific search strategies	using medical subjective heading (MESH) will be utilized where
44	179		ng databases will be used for the literature search: PubMed, Embase (OVID
75	180		ience. Authors who have published conference abstracts of work not yet
40	181		ed journals as a full text original research article will be contacted to
49	182		shed literature. Grey literature will be included in the review via a Google
50	183	Scholar search.	
51 52	184	Search strategy	
50	185	The search will be condu	cted by two authors (RG, TL) and informed by subject-specific expertise (ES,
54	186		ord search strategy was developed for PubMed and identified appropriate
55			
50	187		e completeness of the search. If MESH search terms do not add any further
	188		ed and only keywords used to improve the precision of the search approach.
50	189		ay be used to reflect differences across the three databases. The initial
59 60	190	PubMed search strategy	is included in the supplementary material (Supplementary Table 1).
00			

BMJ Open

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Two authors (RG, TL) under the guidance of the other authors (ES, JW, MW, GY) will search all information sources to identify suitable studies and then independently screen the full-text articles of all eligible studies. Information extracted (using a specified extraction template) will be completed by RG, with accuracy checked by TL. There will be no blinding by author, research group and/or

institution in the included studies.

Data management

The complete record for each eligible study (including citation, abstract and other identifiable information) will be imported into Endnote 20 (Clarivate Analytics). The full text version for all included studies will be obtained and store in Endnote 20. Screening will be carried out utilizing a

predetermined template to reflect the above stated inclusion and exclusion criteria.

Selection process

The study selection process aims to reflect the best practice guidelines outlined in the Cochrane handbook³¹. Initial screening aims to only include studies aligning with the inclusion criteria readily identifiable from the title and abstract. The reason for exclusion for each study will be recorded. Where eligibility is unclear, the reviewers will obtain and review the full text of the article, using the predetermined screening template to ascertain eligibility for inclusion. Studies identified as unclear will be checked to determine the eligibility of the study.

Data collection process

Data will be extracted from studies by two independent reviewers (RG, MW) using a standardised extraction form, based on the Cochrane data extraction template²⁵ as a guide and entered into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. The data extracted will include study population (including age, gender, country, reason for colonoscopy), type of blood-based biomarker (e.g. methylated DNA), test method (e.g. serum vs plasma; analysis technique such as digital droplet PCR), type of study, number of participants, pathology details (e.g., type of pre-cancerous lesion, stage of CRC, how patients were classified as 'healthy' or without cancer), and outcomes of significance to the review objectives (i.e., the sensitivity/specificity of the blood-based biomarker for colonic adenomas/sessile lesions as well as CRC and non-neoplastic controls). Data extraction domains will involve: 1) article details (author, title, country of origin), 2) population, 3) methods, and 4) results. A standardised extraction sheet will be tested for completeness on a subset of studies, after which any relevant updates will be made prior to full extraction of all eligible studies. The extracted data will be reviewed for accuracy by TL and any discrepancies discussed and resolved as a group.

Data items

A summary of data items to be extracted from included studies is outlined in Table 2. Where data is not identifiable or unclear, attempts will be made to contact the corresponding author for clarification. On attempts to contact the author being unsuccessful within a set timeframe and the clarification potentially having an impact on the eligibility, the study will be deemed ineligible based on ambiguity. If there is evidence of overlapping samples, where the same cohort appears to have been used for multiple studies, the authors will be contacted to confirm eligibility. Where other types of biomarkers (e.g. tissue-based biomarkers) or blood-based biomarkers used for other advanced cancers are used, only the blood-based biomarkers specific to colonic advanced pre-cancerous lesions (and CRC) will be used for extraction.

2		
3 4	232	Table 2: Sumn
4 5		Information
6		Background
7 8 9 10		Methodology
11 12 13 14		Wethouology
15 16 17 18		Results
19 20	233	CfDNA: circulatin
21 22	234	Risk of bias
23	235	A formal risk
24 25	236	Cochrane Ha
25 26	237	assessing dia
27	238	type of blood
28	239	of the index t
29	240	to four phase
30	241	published flo
31 32	242	judgement of
33	243	and the first
34	244	of bias, signa
35	245	general popu
36	246	reference sta
37 38	247	bias and aim
39 40	248	Data synthes
41	249	Studies will b
42 43	250	can be carrie
44	251	outcome mea
45	252	hierarchical s
46 47	253	In order to be
48 40	254	must maintai
49 50	255	same type of
50 51	256	process for m
52	257	homogeneity
53	258	homogeneity
54	259	following dat
55 56	200	The hoters
56 57	260	The heteroge
58	261	1. t
59	262	S
60	263	2 +

nary of items to be extracted from eligible studies using the standardised extraction form

Information area	Data extracted
Background	Authors
	Year of publication
	Name of the blood-based biomarker
	Blood-based biomarker type (e.g., cfDNA, miRNA etc.)
Methodology	Specimen type (e.g., serum vs plasma)
	Study type
	Number of participants included
	Cohort included (e.g. no neoplasia detected, advanced adenoma, CRC)
	Technique used for blood-biomarker assay (e.g. qPCR)
Results	Accuracy of blood-based biomarker (sensitivity, specificity) for advanced
	adenoma/sessile serrated lesion
	Accuracy of blood-based biomarker (sensitivity, specificity) for CRC

g cell free DNA, CRC: colorectal cancer

of bias assessment will be conducted via the QUADAS-2 tool, as recommended in the ndbook²⁵, which is used for evaluating potential bias (quality appraisal) of studies gnostic test accuracy. The following domains will be assessed: i) patient selection, ii) d biomarker, iii) reference standard and iv) flow of patients through the study and timing test(s) and reference standard ("flow and timing"). The tool will be completed according es: 1) state the review question; 2) develop review specific guidance; 3) review the w diagram for the primary study or construct a flow diagram if none is reported; and, 4) f bias and applicability. Each domain will then be assessed in terms of the risk of bias three domains are also assessed for applicability. To help reach a judgement on the risk Iling questions will be included, such as "were the participants representative of the lation of those with advanced colorectal lesion?" and "was there an acceptable ndard referred to?". These identify aspects of study design related to the potential for to help reviewers make risk of bias judgements.

sis

e synthesised using a best evidence synthesis. Meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy d out; however more sophisticated methods may be required to simultaneously analyse asures (i.e., sensitivity and specificity). Methods such as bivariate model and ummary receiver operating characteristic (HSROC) model may be carried out.

e considered for meta-analysis, the outcomes and the methodology of eligible studies in homogeneity. For example, they need to have used the same type of test with the comparators (i.e., a DNA methylation test for adenomas vs non-cancer controls). The neta-analysis will be more clear pending data extraction, based on assumptions of remaining true. The remainder of this section is based on such an assumption of in outcomes and methodology of the studies; however, some changes may be needed a extraction.

eneity of the eligible studies will be assessed according to outcome categories, such as:

- he sensitivity of the test to detect pre-cancerous lesion (advanced adenoma and /or sessile serrated lesion);
- 60 2. 263 the blood test methodology has been clearly described;

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

3. the blood test considers the anatomical status (i.e. distal vs proximal) of the precancerous lesion (advanced adenoma/sessile serrated lesion); 4. the association between the blood test results and pathological or histological features of the pre-cancerous lesion (advanced adenoma/sessile serrated lesion); 5. the association between the blood test results and CRC status; 6. the assessment of factors influencing the accuracy of the blood test; 7. the quality of the studies included according to the QUADAS-2 tool. Where homogeneity is sufficient between groups within these categories, then inclusion within meta-analysis either as a large group or several subgroups will be determined by all authors. If the eligible studies are clearly homogenous, then each reviewer will place studies into appropriate subgroups for analysis. This process will be done by each reviewer independently to determine which factors will allow the best and most accurate comparisons to be made. Relevant sub-groupings are likely to be made based on the methodological factors listed in Table 2 above. For example, subgroupings according to whether the patient group(s) have different classifications of colonic adenoma(s)/sessile serrated lesion(s) would be considered, as appropriate for the eligible studies. If suitable, reviewers can include studies in more than one sub-group (i.e., different genomic analysis, different technique), however, in this instance the subgroups will not be used in the same metaanalysis. Where reviewers agree on what is to be grouped for each meta-analysis, this process will be carried out. If there is not broad consensus on the groups, further discussion will take place. If the reviewers disagree, the authors as a group will determine suitability of meta-analysis or metasynthesis. On a meta-analysis being deemed appropriate by the reviewers, a statistical test of heterogeneity will be carried out, providing an I² value in the heterogeneity of the sample³⁸. The I² value will be reported as a percentage and interpreted as suggested in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews³¹. Significance in the measure of heterogeneity as calculated by the chi squared test, will be set at $p \le 0.10$. In the event significance was reported, the l^2 statistic will be then explored to define the magnitude of heterogeneity about the finding, where 0-40, 30-60, 50-90 and 75+ are suggestive of low, moderate, substantial, and considerable heterogeneity, respectively³¹. In the instance of statistical heterogeneity, leave-one-out sensitivity analyses may be performed; however, groups considered to exceed the minimal value for heterogeneity will be ineligible for meta-analysis and hence considered for meta-synthesis instead.

Comparisons in some of the categories may be challenging to assess due to differences in biomarker selection as well as study design. Where meta-analysis has been decided as appropriate by the group, results will be extracted from the eligible studies and aggregated, with changes normalised and reported as percentage changes or standard mean differences in all studies. Where data are lacking, the authors of relevant studies will be contacted to provide further clarity on the data. If the data are not sufficiently homogenous, a critical/narrative synthesis will be focused from the data set alongside some binary elements of analysis. In this context, statements such as 'increase', 'decrease', or 'no change' in the accuracy of the proposed blood-based biomarkers will be described.

53 303 Confidence in cumulative evidence54

The potential of publication bias will be minimised through a comprehensive search of unpublished studies, contacting respective authors in the field and including grey literature obtained via several further methods (e.g., snowballing of primary and review article reference lists). Conference presentations not carried through to publication will also be reviewed, with authors contacted. Further statistical tests, such as the Begg and Mazumbar's rank correlation test and Egger's linear

BMJ Open

regression model, may be applied to each category and overall analyses. On publication bias being detected, Duval and Tweedie's trim and fill correction may be applied, and the resultant effect sizes and 95% confidence intervals examined in further detail.
The pooled data will be assessed using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development and Evaluation (GRADE) approach to evaluate the overall quality and 'certainty of recommendations' from the literature ³³⁻³⁵ . The GRADE approach will be used to determine the certainty and strength of evidence according to the categories (methodological and outcome based/results) in Table 2 and carried out in accordance with set recommendations. For example, observational studies will be assigned a 'low' certainty of recommendation prior to then either being upgraded or downgraded from this point, based on the quality of the evidence ³⁶ . Studies will be upgraded for factors such as large effect sizes or mean test positivity is associated with more aggressive pre-cancerous lesions, blood-based biomarker characteristics and accuracy of the biomarker (sensitivity/specificity). Potential downgrading of studies for certainty of evidence may occur when there is substantial publication bias, indirect relationships with results (i.e., unexplained confounding) or inconsistencies between studies. From this process, qualitative ratings for the certainty of evidence and recommendations will be listed as 'high', 'moderate', 'low' or 'very low' and able to be interpreted according to the GRADE approach ^{34,36,37} . Contributorship statement All authors have contributed to the focus of this systematic review topic and have revised and reviewed each draft of the protocol and approved the final manuscript. Competing interests Professor Young has a consultancy arrangement with a company that has developed a blood test for CRC detection (Clinical Genomics). Funding The authors have not declared a specific grant for this research from any funding agency in the public, commercial or non-for-profit sectors.
Contributorship statement
All authors have contributed to the focus of this systematic review topic and have revised and reviewed each draft of the protocol and approved the final manuscript.
Competing interests 6
Professor Young has a consultancy arrangement with a company that has developed a blood test for CRC detection (Clinical Genomics).
Funding
Data sharing statement
Data sharing statement Data sharing not applicable as no datasets generated and/or analysed for this study Data sharing not applicable as no datasets generated and/or analysed for this study Study

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

1 2		
3	220	
4	338	REFERENCES
5	339	1. Ferlay J, Ervik M, Lam F, et al. Global Cancer Observatory: Cancer Today. In: Cancer IAfRo, ed.
6	340	Lyon, 2020.
7	341	2. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Cancer in Australia Canberra2020 [Available
8	342	from: https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/cancer/cancer-data-in-australia/.
9	343	3. Levin TR, Corley DA, Jensen CD, et al. Effects of Organized Colorectal Cancer Screening on Cancer
10 11	344	Incidence and Mortality in a Large Community-Based Population. <i>Gastroenterology</i>
12	345	2018;155(5):1383-91.e5. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2018.07.017 [published Online First:
13	346	2018/07/23]
14	347	4. Zorzi M, Fedeli U, Schievano E, et al. Impact on colorectal cancer mortality of screening
15	348	programmes based on the faecal immunochemical test. Gut 2015;64(5):784-90. doi:
16	349	10.1136/gutjnl-2014-307508 [published Online First: 2014/09/03]
17	350	5. Cock C, Anwar S, Byrne SE, et al. Low Sensitivity of Fecal Immunochemical Tests and Blood-Based
18	351	Markers of DNA Hypermethylation for Detection of Sessile Serrated Adenomas/Polyps.
19	352	DIGESTIVE DISEASES AND SCIENCES 2019;64(9):2555-62. doi: 10.1007/s10620-019-05569-8
20 21	353	6. Loktionov A. Biomarkers for detecting colorectal cancer non-invasively: DNA, RNA or proteins?
21	354	WORLD JOURNAL OF GASTROINTESTINAL ONCOLOGY 2020;12(2):124-48.
23	355	7. Citarda F, Tomaselli G, Capocaccia R, et al. Efficacy in standard clinical practice of colonoscopic
24	356	polypectomy in reducing colorectal cancer incidence. New England Journal of Medicine
25	357	2001;329:1977-81.
26	358	8. Winawer SJ, Zauber AG, Ho MN, et al. Prevention of colorectal cancer by colonoscopic
27	359	polypectomy. The National Polyp Study Workgroup. N Engl J Med 1993;329(27):1977-81.
28	360	doi: 10.1056/nejm199312303292701 [published Online First: 1993/12/30]
29 30	361	9. Schreuders EH, Ruco A, Rabeneck L, et al. Colorectal cancer screening: a global overview of
31	362	existing programs. <i>Gut</i> 2015;64(10):1637-49.
32	363	10. Lin JS, Perdue LA, Henrikson NB, et al. Screening for colorectal cancer: Updated evidence report
33	364	and systematic review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. <i>Clinical Review and</i>
34	365	Education 2021;325(19):1978-97.
35	366	11. Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care. Recommendations on screening for colorectal
36	367	cancer in primary care. Canadian Medical Association Journal 2016;188:340-48.
37 38	368	12. Cubiella J, Marzo-Castillejo M, Mascort-Roca JJ, et al. Clinical Practice Guideline. Diagnosis and
30 39	369	prevention of colorectal cancer. 2018 update. Gastroenterologia and Hepatologica
40	370	2018;41(9):585-96.
41	371	13. Young GP, Symonds EL, Allison JE, et al. Advances in Fecal Occult Blood Tests: the FIT revolution.
42	372	Dig Dis Sci 2015;60(3):609-22. doi: 10.1007/s10620-014-3445-3 [published Online First:
43	373	2014/12/11]
44	374	14. Cancer Council Australia Colorectal Cancer Guidelines Working Party. Clinical practice guidelines
45 46	375	for the prevention, early detection and management of colorectal cancer. In: Australia CC,
46 47	376	ed., 2017.
47	377	15. Lane JM, Chow E, Young GP, et al. Interval fecal immunochemical testing in a colonoscopic
49	378	surveillance program speeds detection of colorectal neoplasia. Gastroenterology
50	379	2010;139(6):1918-26.
51	380	16. Cock C, Anwar S, Byrne SE, et al. Low Sensitivity of Fecal Immunochemical Tests and Blood-Based
52	381	Markers of DNA Hypermethylation for Detection of Sessile Serrated Adenomas/Polyps.
53	382	Digestive Diseases and Sciences 2019;64:2555-62.
54	383	17. Symonds EL, Pedersen SK, Baker RT, et al. A Blood Test for Methylated BCAT1 and IKZF1 vs. a
55 56	384	Fecal Immunochemical Test for Detection of Colorectal Neoplasia. Clin Transl Gastroenterol
57	385	2016;7(1):e137. doi: 10.1038/ctg.2015.67 [published Online First: 2016/01/15]
58	386	18. Osborne JM, Wilson C, Moore V, et al. Sample preference for colorectal cancer screening tests:
59	387	Blood or stool? Open Journal of Preventive Medicine 2012;2(3):326-31.
60		

2		
3	388	19. Adler A, Geiger S, Keil A, et al. Improving compliance to colorectal cancer screening using blood
4	389	and stool based tests in patients refusing screening colonoscopy in Germany. BMC
5	390	Gastroenterology 2014;14:183.
6	391	20. Grady WM, Markowitz SD. The molecular pathogenesis of colorectal cancer and its potential
7	392	application to colorectal cancer screening. <i>Dig Dis Sci</i> 2015;60(3):762-72. doi:
8	393	10.1007/s10620-014-3444-4 [published Online First: 2014/12/11]
9 10	393 394	21. Loktionov A. Biomarkers for detecting colorectal cancer non-invasively: DNA, RNA or proteins?
10		-
12	395	World J Gastrointest Oncol 2020;12(2):124-48. doi: 10.4251/wjgo.v12.i2.124 [published
13	396	Online First: 2020/02/28]
14	397	22. Leggett B, Whitehall V. Role of the serrated pathway in colorectal cancer pathogenesis.
15	398	Gastroenterology 2010;138:2088-100.
16	399	23. Ladabaum U, Dominitz JA, Kahi C, et al. Strategies for Colorectal Cancer Screening.
17	400	Gastroenterology 2020;158(2):418-32. doi: 10.1053/j.gastro.2019.06.043 [published Online
18	401	First: 2019/08/09]
19	402	24. Worm Ørntoft MB. Review of Blood-Based Colorectal Cancer Screening: How Far Are Circulating
20	403	Cell-Free DNA Methylation Markers From Clinical Implementation? Clin Colorectal Cancer
21	404	2018;17(2):e415-e33. doi: 10.1016/j.clcc.2018.02.012 [published Online First: 2018/04/22]
22	405	25. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, et al. Cochrane Handbook for Systematic Reviews of
23	406	Interventions. In: Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, et al., eds., 2021.
24	407	26. Nagorni A, Bjelakovic G. Colonoscopic polypectomy for prevention of colorectal cancer. <i>Cochrane</i>
25	408	Database of Systematic Reviews 2009;2
26	409	27. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-
27	405	analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. Systematic Reviews 2015;4(1)
28 29		
29 30	411	28. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-
31	412	analysis protocols (PRISMA-P). <i>BMJ Online</i> 2015;350:7647.
32	413	29. Hariharan R, Jenkins M. Utility of the methylated SEPT9 test for the early detection of colorectal
33	414	cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy. BMJ Open
34	415	Gastroenterol 2020;7(1):e000355. doi: 10.1136/bmjgast-2019-000355 [published Online
35	416	First: 2020/03/05]
36	417	30. Hitchins MP, Vogelaar IP, Brennan K, et al. Methylated SEPTIN9 plasma test for colorectal cancer
37	418	detection may be applicable to Lynch syndrome. BMJ Open Gastroenterology 2019;6(1) doi:
38	419	10.1136/bmjgast-2019-000299
39	420	31. Rasti A, Mehrazma M, Madjd Z, et al. Diagnostic and prognostic accuracy of miR-21 in renal cell
40	421	carcinoma: a systematic review protocol. BMJ Open 2016;6(1):e009667. doi:
41	422	10.1136/bmjopen-2015-009667
42	423	32. Bettington M, Walker N, Rosty C, et al. Clinicopathological and molecular features of sessile
43	424	serrated adenomas with dysplasia or carcinoma. <i>Gut</i> 2017;66(1):97-106.
44	425	33. Goldet G, Howick J. Understanding GRADE: an introduction. <i>Journal of Evidence Based Medicine</i>
45	426	2013;6:50-4.
46	420	
47 49		34. Shunemann H, Brozek J, Guyatt GH, et al. GRADE handbook for grading quality of evidence and
48 49	428	strength of recommendations. In: Shunemann H, Brozek J, Guyatt GH, et al., eds., 2013.
49 50	429	35. Yang B, Mustafa RA, Bossuyt PM, et al. GRADE Guidance: 31. Assessing the certainty across a
51	430	body of evidence for comparative test accuracy. <i>Journal of Clinical Epidemiology</i>
52	431	2021;136:146-56. doi: 10.1016/j.jclinepi.2021.04.001
53	432	36. Helfand M, Shunemann H. GRADE guidelines: 3. rating the quality of evidence. Journal of Clinical
54	433	Epidemiology 2011;64:401-06.
55	434	37. Higgins JPT, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ. Measuring the inconsitency in meta-analysis. BMJ Online
56	435	2003;327:557-60.
57		
58	436	
59		
60		

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
10 11	
11	
12	
13	
13 14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
20	
21 22 23	
22	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
20 29	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
46	
47	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
55 54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

3

4

5

6

60

1 2

1	Supplementary material: PubMed search 25 th October 2021
---	---

2 Supplementary Table 1. Systematic review search results in PubMed

Search Number	Query	Results
1	Marker	1,520,779
2	Biomarker	1,009,617
3	"Biological marker"	3,104
4	"Molecular marker"	7,655
5	#1 OR #2 OR #3 OR #4	1,578,921
6	Blood	5,155,911
7	Serum	1,187,369
8	Plasma	987,178
9	Blood-based	3,792
10	Serum-based	1,221
11	Plasma-based	1,480
12	"Liquid biopsy"	5,495
13	#6 OR #7 OR #8 OR #9 OR #10 OR #11 OR #12	5,937,796
14	Colorect*	199,866
15	Colon*	640,135
16	Bowel	536,671
17	Caec*	11,030
18	Rect*	244,366
19	"Large intestin*"	19,115
20	#14 OR #15 OR #16 OR #17 OR #18 OR #19	1,292,245
21	Adenoma*	120,722
22	Polyp	53,083
23	Serrated	4,934
24	#21 OR #22 OR #23	163,256
25	Diagnos*	5,574,405
26	Screen*	928,076
27	Detect*	2,567,713
28	"Early detection"	97,568
29	"Early diagnosis"	110,371
30	Test	2,972,332
31	#25 OR #26 OR #27 OR #28 OR #29 OR #30	9,851,696
32	#5 AND #13 AND #20 AND #24 AND #31	1172

auuress in a syste		d Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 حية د review protocol*	12 0
Section and topic	Item No		ິສ Where item can be fou ຫ≤
ADMINISTRATIV	E INF		ay 20
Title:		ate	nement S
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	Bage 1
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	
Registration	2	If registered provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	⊆ Spage 3
Authors:		and	o a de erie d
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	Fage 1
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review	age 9
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify a such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	Ĕ
Support:			Page 9
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	Page 9
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	<u>A</u> N/A
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	N/A
INTRODUCTION		mia	on J
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	Pages 2 and 3
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participant interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	20
METHODS		gies	25 at
Eligibility criteria	8		Arage 4 ence
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned	age 5 and Supplementary Tabl

		BMJ Open	d by co	¢amlob∉	
			by copyright, including for	bmjopen-2021-0	
		limits, such that it could be repeated	nclu	-0607	
Study records:		T. T	ldin	N	
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	ig for u	on-30 I	Page 6
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) three each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis) Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators.	ISUS re	May 20 Enseid	Page 6
Data collection process	11c				
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	Ē g	s ⊒	
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale			Page 4 and 5
Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in da synthesis Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	taamini	rom http	Page 7
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	ng,	ä	age 7 and 8
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures, methods handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I^2 , Kendall's τ) Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-	d₽.	mjopen.	Page 8
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	ng, an	omj.co	Page 8
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	and s	đ	Page 8
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, select reporting within studies)	lar	on Ju	Page 8 and 9
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	techn	14 ,	Page 2 (abstract) and Page 9
clarification on the in PRISMA-P Group a From: Shamseer L, M	tems. A nd is o loher I	ed that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elaborat Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0. D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Prefer RISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.	jies.	in at Age	luding checklist) is held by the orting items for systematic review an
		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtr	nl	de I	-

3 4

BMJ Open

BMJ Open

Accuracy of blood-based biomarkers for screening advanced pre-cancerous colorectal lesions: a protocol for systematic review and meta-analysis.

Manuscript ID Article Type: Date Submitted by the Author: Complete List of Authors:	BMJ Open bmjopen-2021-060712.R1 Protocol 22-Mar-2022 Lathlean, Timothy JH; Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and Medical Research Institute, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University
Article Type: Date Submitted by the Author: Complete List of Authors:	Protocol 22-Mar-2022 Lathlean, Timothy JH; Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and Medical Research Institute, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University
Date Submitted by the Author: Complete List of Authors:	22-Mar-2022 Lathlean, Timothy JH; Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and Medical Research Institute, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University
Author: Complete List of Authors:	Lathlean, Timothy JH; Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and Medical Research Institute, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University
	Health and Medical Research Institute, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University
	Wassie, Molla; Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and Medical Research Institute, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University Winter, Jean; Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and Medical Research Institute, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University Goyal, Rishabh; Flinders University College of Medicine and Public Health, Department of Medicine Young, Graeme; Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and Medical Research Institute, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University Symonds, Erin; Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and Medical Research Institute, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University Symonds, Erin; Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and Medical Research Institute, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University; Flinders Medical Centre, Bowel Health Service, Gastroenterology Department
Primary Subject Heading :	Gastroenterology and hepatology
Secondary Subject Heading:	Genetics and genomics, Research methods
	GASTROENTEROLOGY, Gastrointestinal tumours < ONCOLOGY, Colorectal surgery < SURGERY

SCHOLARONE[™] Manuscripts

Page 1 of 18

1 2	Accuracy of blood-based biomarkers for screening pre-cancerous colorectal lesions: a protocol for systematic review and meta-analysis.
3 4 5	Dr Timothy JH Lathlean: Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and Medical Research Institute, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University, Bedford Park, Australia.
6 7	Dr Molla M Wassie: Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and Medical Research Institute, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University, Bedford Park, Australia.
8 9	Dr Jean Winter: Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and Medical Research Institute, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University, Bedford Park, Australia.
10 11	Mr Rishabh Goyal: Department of Medicine, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders
12 13 14	Professor Graeme Young: Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and Medical Research Institute, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University, Bedford Park, Australia.
15 16 17	Institute, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University, Bedford Park, Australia. Mr Rishabh Goyal: Department of Medicine, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University, Bedford Park, Australia. Professor Graeme Young: Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and Medical Research Institute, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University, Bedford Park, Australia. Associate Professor Erin Symonds: Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Health and Medical Research Institute, College of Medicine and Public Health, Flinders University; Bowel Health Service, Gastroenterology Department, Flinders Medical Centre, Bedford Park, Australia. Corresponding author: Dr Timothy JH Lathlean, Level 3 Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer, Flinders Drive, Bedford Park, South Australia 5042 Phone: +61 8 8275 1075, Fax: +61 8 8204 5703 tim.lathleanphd@gmail.com
18	Jses -
19	Corresponding author:
20	Dr Timothy JH Lathlean, Level 3 Flinders Centre for Innovation in Cancer,
21	Flinders Drive, Bedford Park, South Australia 5042
22	Phone: +61 8 8275 1075, Fax: +61 8 8204 5703
23	tim.lathleanphd@gmail.com
24	
25	Word count: 3202 words
26	ning,
27	Keywords:
28	Word count: 3202 wordsKeywords:Colorectal neoplasms; Biomarkers, adenoma; Sensitivity and Specificity; Diagnostics; Bowel.Ethics statement:No ethical approval is required for this protocol as this will be a collation of previously published
29	r tech
30	Ethics statement:
31 32	No ethical approval is required for this protocol as this will be a collation of previously published iterature.
	c -

ABSTRACT

Introduction Colorectal cancer (CRC) is the third most diagnosed cancer and the second most

- common cause of cancer mortality worldwide. Most CRCs develop through either the adenoma-to-
- carcinoma or the serrated pathways, and therefore detection and removal of these pre-cursor
- lesions can prevent the development of cancer. Current screening programs can aid in the detection
- of CRC and adenomas; however, participation rates are suboptimal. Blood-based biomarkers may help to address these low participation rates in screening programs. Although blood-based
- biomarker tests show promise for cancer detection, limited attention has been placed on the
- sensitivity and specificity for detection of the pre-cursor lesions. The aim of this research is to
- conduct a systematic review and meta-analysis to evaluate the accuracy of blood-based biomarker tests in detecting advanced pre-cancerous lesions.
- Methods and Analysis This protocol was informed by the PRISMA-P and results will be reported in line with the PRISMA guidelines. Literature searches will be conducted on PubMed, Embase and Web of Science. Two reviewers will conduct the searches, and independently screen them, according to title and abstract and then the full-text versions of those selected articles as well as the risk of bias via the QUADAS-2. The GRADE guidelines will be used to validate the certainty of evidence for recommendations based on the risk of bias findings. Meta-analysis will be conducted where appropriate on groups of studies with low heterogeneity.
- Ethics and Dissemination No patient data will be included in our review and therefore ethics approval is not required. It is anticipated that the review will identify the most promising candidate biomarkers for clinical translation in the screening of advanced pre-cancerous lesions. The results will be published in a peer-reviewed journal.
 - PROSPERO Registration CRD42021285173

STRENGTH AND LIMITATIONS OF THIS STUDY

- Comprehensive review of blood-based biomarkers, involving a thorough search strategy to identify studies relating to detection of advanced adenomas;
- This review will take a thorough approach, carrying out screening, quality appraisal and data extraction according to the independent duplicate method;
- Meta-analysis of the accuracy of blood-based biomarkers for advanced adenomas will be conducted to identify potential biomarkers upholding high diagnostic accuracy; and,
- A potential limitation may be the limited numbers of studies focusing on advanced adenomas in place or in addition to CRC.

INTRODUCTION

Colorectal cancer (CRC) is the third most diagnosed cancer and the second most common cause of cancer mortality worldwide¹. In Australia, the age-standardised CRC incidence rate is approximately 50 per 100,000 people². CRC screening programs (colonoscopy and/or faecal based screening measures) have demonstrated efficacy in reducing both CRC incidence and mortality³⁴. CRC develops through the adenoma (or sessile serrated) carcinoma pathway, where pre-cancerous lesions such as advanced adenomas and sessile serrated lesions may progress to CRC⁵⁶. The purpose of screening is to detect CRC at an early stage, enabling earlier interventions, which can lead to more efficacious treatment options and better patient outcomes including reduced morbidity and mortality. Furthermore, screening can also assist in the detection of pre-cancerous lesions, such as adenomas and advanced sessile serrated lesions that can be removed at colonoscopy, preventing approximately 80% of cancers⁷⁸. While colonoscopy is used as the main form of screening in several

Page 3 of 18

 BMJ Open

- countries⁹, there are risks associated with the procedure such as bowel perforations (3.1/10,000 procedures) and major bleeding (14.6/10,000)¹⁰. Colonoscopy can also be expensive, and many countries have limited capacity and resources for this procedure. Therefore, implementation of less-invasive strategies for screening for pre-cancerous lesions is needed. The faecal occult blood test, in particular the one using immunochemical test (FIT) technology, which detects the level of human haemoglobin (Hb) in the stool, has been shown to have benefit in the early detection and prevention of CRC¹⁰⁻¹². Most organised CRC screening programs around the world use FIT, mainly focusing on people at average risk (i.e., no family history¹³ and/or no previous pre-cancerous lesions¹⁴⁻¹⁶). As outlined in a recent review¹⁶, FIT appears to maintain both high sensitivity (range 55-100%) and specificity (range 77-97%) across 12 previous studies in the detection of CRC^{15 17}. While FIT has high accuracy for CRC detection, it can only detect up to 40% of advanced adenomas¹⁴ and only 16% of advanced sessile serrated lesions^{5 18} (depending on the positivity threshold applied and the number of samples collected). Even though FIT has good sensitivity for detecting CRC, the participation rate in FIT CRC screening programs is low, mainly due to faecal aversion and other issues leading to low acceptability in consumers¹⁹. An earlier study reported 78% of those surveyed preferring blood-based tests over faecal tests¹⁹. Furthermore, 83% of consumers would also prefer to have blood-based tests over colonoscopy, indicating the high acceptance rates of blood sampling over current screening options²⁰. This highlights the need for blood-based biomarkers, which may improve participation in CRC screening, as well as potentially increasing sensitivity for detection of pre-cancerous colonic lesions. Blood based biomarker tests can target the various changes occurring along the advanced adenoma to carcinoma pathway, contributing to aberrant protein, metabolic and immune functions⁶²¹. Following these early initiating events, hyperproliferation of the colorectal epithelial cells can lead to the formation of polyps, which if left in place, can become adenomas and ultimately become invasive cancer. An alternate pathway (proposed more recently) is that of the alternative serrated pathway (15-30% of CRC)²², where the precursor lesion is the sessile serrated lesion. A useful diagnostic blood biomarker should be sensitive and specific for detecting early neoplastic transformation as well as for CRC, and have clinical accuracy to allow for optimal detection of CRC and pre-cancerous lesions^{13 17}. To date, there are no reviews investigating the accuracy of blood-based biomarkers for detection of advanced colonic adenomas and/or sessile serrated lesions. This project aims to investigate the sensitivity and specificity of blood-based biomarkers for the detection of advanced colonic adenomas and advanced sessile serrated lesions. **Objectives** 1. To evaluate the accuracy (sensitivity and specificity) of blood-based biomarkers for detection of important pre-cancerous lesions, namely advanced colorectal adenomas and advanced sessile serrated lesions. 2. To determine if the accuracy of blood-based biomarkers is influenced by clinicopathological features of pre-cancerous lesions. **METHODS AND ANALYSIS** The protocol for this review was based on Cochrane guidelines^{23 24}, PRISMA guidelines^{25 26} and other
- Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

(International Prospective Register of Systematic Reviews), an international database for systematic

reviews prospectively registered by the Centre for Reviews and Dissemination of the University of

reviews already conducted in this area²⁷⁻²⁹. Registration was registered with PROSPERO

York (https://www.crd.york.ac.uk/prospero/display_record.php?ID=CRD42021285173). This study

commenced on October 2021 and is anticipated to be ready for publication in May 2022.

 Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Patient and public involvement The development of the research question and outcomes measures has been informed by patients' priorities, experience and preferences through regular contact with consumer groups, including Cancer Voices Australia. These consumers had previous experience either as a patient or support person for someone with colorectal cancer or had experience with having adenomas detected at colonoscopy. Provision for 'ad hoc' comments on the research process will also be facilitated due to regular contact with these groups. Patients will not be involved in the analysis and data collection of the systematic review and meta-analysis. **Eligibility criteria** Population People over the age of 18 of either sex with a diagnosis of advanced adenomas and/or sessile serrated lesions based on colonoscopy findings, who have also had any blood-based biomarker test, will be included in the study. Advanced adenoma features are defined as advanced are polyp size \geq 10mm, villous features, or high-grade dysplasia³⁰⁻³², whereas advanced sessile serrated lesions include those with dysplastic changes³³, and/or size \geq 10mm⁵. These definitions for advanced pre-cancerous lesions match Australian³⁴ and US³⁵ guidelines. Studies investigating high-risk patients (e.g., familial risk and hereditary syndromes) will be excluded, as this does not represent the average population risk for development of colorectal adenomas or sessile serrated lesions. Furthermore, only studies published after 2006 will be included given the increase in the number of studies from this period and the changes in technology to accurately detect blood-based biomarkers. Intervention This review will consider studies that evaluate diagnostic accuracy (sensitivity and specificity) of blood-based biomarkers for detection of advanced adenomas and/or advanced sessile serrated lesions. The blood-biomarker study must apply wet-lab based methods (e.g., by testing a biological mechanism that is thought to be dysregulated in cancer) in blood samples collected from patients. Further, sufficient detailed methodology about the technique used for testing, sample preparation methods and analytical technique used is required in order to assess the reliability and the validity of each blood-based biomarker. Comparison The studies must compare the diagnostic accuracy of the blood-biomarkers from individuals with colonic pre-cancerous lesions alongside 1) individuals with no evidence of colonic neoplastic disease, and/or 2) individuals with CRC. Outcomes The main outcomes to be evaluated are: i) Accuracy: the sensitivity and specificity of a blood-based biomarker test to detect advanced pre-cancerous lesions(s); ii) How the accuracy of the test to detect advanced adenomas/ sessile serrated lesions compares to its ability to detect CRC. Secondary outcomes of interest are:

colon (e.g., distal vs prox	
) The association betwe	een the blood test results and pathology of the pre-cancerous lesions; and,
	een investigations into the cause of false positive blood test results in nomas, sessile serrated lesions or CRC.
Forest plots produced fro	itivity will be presented on a 0 (least sensitive) to 1 (most sensitive) scale on om the analysis. Concurrent analysis of sensitivity/specificity will be C curve for the combination of all the tests.
Studies	
pe based on observation	far, it is anticipated that the level of evidence for this review is most likely to al (and some experimental studies), including cohort, case-control, and The inclusion and exclusion criteria for this review are summarised in Table
Table 1: Summary of inclus	sion and exclusion criteria
Inclusion criteria	
Population	Adult patients of both sexes with a diagnosis of colonic advanced adenomas and/or advanced sessile serrated lesions based on colonoscopy outcomes as a part of screening, diagnostic or surveillance, and who have also had blood collected prior to polypectomy for biomarker analysis.
Intervention/Exposure	Blood-based biomarker methodology is explained in detail, including the nature of the biomarker (e.g. DNA, miRNA), quantitation technique, preparation method, accuracy for patients with colonic adenomas/sessile serrated lesions.
Comparison	Blood-based biomarker studies in non-cancer controls and/or those with colorectal cancers.
Study type	Quantitative observational and experimental studies.
Exclusion criteria	7
Population	Those without a diagnosis of advanced colonic adenomas/sessile serrated lesions based on colonoscopy (i.e. otherwise healthy controls or those with CRC). Those where colonoscopy has been completed for familial risk conditions.
Intervention/Exposure	Non blood-based biomarkers (e.g., faecal biomarkers).
Study type	Studies not in English, published prior to 2006, review articles, articles investigating blood-based biomarkers with <i>in-vitro</i> or animal models. Those not including a measure of test sensitivity.
Information sources	
	he we think along while the weak in Fredrick and a think a while he along the wave
pecific search strategies ppropriate. The followir	be restricted to publications in English and articles published after 2006. s using medical subjective heading (MESH) will be utilized where ng databases will be used for the literature search: PubMed, Embase (OVID ience. Authors who have published conference abstracts of work not yet
	ed journals as a full text original research article will be contacted to
•	shad literature. Cray literature will be included in the review view of a Caegle

7	-/ 0	
8	171	c) Whether there have been investigations into the cause of false positive blood test results
9 10	172	participants without adenomas, sessile serrated lesions or CRC.
11	173	Measures of effect: Sensitivity will be presented on a 0 (least sensitive) to 1 (most sensitive)
12 13	174	Forest plots produced from the analysis. Concurrent analysis of sensitivity/specificity will be
14	175	presented on a ROC/AUC curve for the combination of all the tests.
15 16	176	Studies
17 18	177	Given initial searches so far, it is anticipated that the level of evidence for this review is mos
10	178	be based on observational (and some experimental studies), including cohort, case-control,
20	179	cross-sectional designs. The inclusion and exclusion criteria for this review are summarised
21 22	180	1.

Table 1: Summary of inclusion and exclusion criteria

Inclusion criteria	
Population	Adult patients of both sexes with a diagnosis of colonic advanced adenomas and/or advanced sessile serrated lesions based on colonoscopy outcomes as part of screening, diagnostic or surveillance, and who have also had blood collected prior to polypectomy for biomarker analysis.
Intervention/Exposure	Blood-based biomarker methodology is explained in detail, including the nature of the biomarker (e.g. DNA, miRNA), quantitation technique, preparation method, accuracy for patients with colonic adenomas/sessile serrated lesions.
Comparison	Blood-based biomarker studies in non-cancer controls and/or those with colorectal cancers.
Study type	Quantitative observational and experimental studies.
Exclusion criteria	
Population	Those without a diagnosis of advanced colonic adenomas/sessile serrated lesions based on colonoscopy (i.e. otherwise healthy controls or those with CRC). Those where colonoscopy has been completed for familial risk conditions.
Intervention/Exposure	Non blood-based biomarkers (e.g., faecal biomarkers).
Study type	Studies not in English, published prior to 2006, review articles, articles investigating blood-based biomarkers with <i>in-vitro</i> or animal models. Those not including a measure of test sensitivity.

Information sources

Information sources will be restricted to publications in English and articles Specific search strategies using medical subjective heading (MESH) will be ut appropriate. The following databases will be used for the literature search: P interface) and Web of Science. Authors who have published conference abst published in peer reviewed journals as a full text original research article will identify relevant unpublished literature. Grey literature will be included in the review via a Google Scholar search. White papers and industry databases were deemed outside the scope of the review. Search strategy

The search will be conducted by two authors (RG, TL) and informed by subject-specific expertise (ES, JW, MW, GY). The keyword search strategy was developed for PubMed and identified appropriate MESH keywords to ensure completeness of the search. If MESH search terms do not add any further hits, these will be removed and only keywords used to improve the precision of the search approach. Different search terms may be used to reflect differences across the three databases. The initial

9 197 PubMed search strategy is included in the supplementary material (Supplementary Table 1).

Two authors (RG, TL) under the guidance of the other authors (ES, JW, MW, GY) will search all information sources to identify suitable studies and then independently screen the full-text articles of all eligible studies. Information extracted (using a specified extraction template) will be completed by RG, with accuracy checked by TL. There will be no blinding by author, research group and/or institution in the included studies.

1718 203 Data management

The complete record for each eligible study (including citation, abstract and other identifiable
 information) will be imported into Endnote 20 (Clarivate Analytics). The full text version for all
 included studies will be obtained and store in Endnote 20. Screening will be carried out utilizing a
 predetermined template to reflect the above stated inclusion and exclusion criteria.

25 208 Selection process 26

The study selection process aims to reflect the best practice guidelines outlined in the Cochrane handbook²³. Initial screening aims to only include studies aligning with the inclusion criteria readily identifiable from the title and abstract. The reason for exclusion for each study will be recorded. Where eligibility is unclear, the reviewers will obtain and review the full text of the article, using the predetermined screening template to ascertain eligibility for inclusion. Studies identified as unclear will be checked to determine the eligibility of the study.

35 215 Data collection process

Data will be extracted from studies by two independent reviewers (RG, MW) using a standardised extraction form, based on the Cochrane data extraction template²³ as a guide and entered into a Microsoft Excel spreadsheet. The data extracted will include study population (including age, gender, country, reason for colonoscopy), type of blood-based biomarker (e.g. methylated DNA), test method (e.g. serum vs plasma; analysis technique such as digital droplet PCR), type of study, number of participants, pathology details (e.g., type of pre-cancerous lesion, stage of CRC, how patients were classified as 'healthy' or without cancer), and outcomes of significance to the review objectives (i.e., the sensitivity/specificity of the blood-based biomarker for colonic adenomas/sessile lesions as well as CRC and non-neoplastic controls). Data extraction domains will involve: 1) article details (author, title, country of origin), 2) population, 3) methods, and 4) results. A standardised extraction sheet will be tested for completeness on a subset of studies, after which any relevant updates will be made prior to full extraction of all eligible studies. The extracted data will be reviewed for accuracy by TL and any discrepancies discussed and resolved as a group.

53 229 **Data items** 54

A summary of data items to be extracted from included studies is outlined in Table 2. Where data is not identifiable or unclear, attempts will be made to contact the corresponding author for clarification. On attempts to contact the author being unsuccessful within a set timeframe and the clarification potentially having an impact on the eligibility, the study will be deemed ineligible based on ambiguity. If there is evidence of overlapping samples, where the same cohort appears to have

2		
3	235	been used for multiple studies, the authors will be contacted to confirm eligibility. Where other
4	236	types of biomarkers (e.g. tissue-based biomarkers) or blood-based biomarkers used for other
6	237	advanced cancers are used, only the blood-based biomarkers specific to colonic advanced pre-
7	238	cancerous lesions (and CRC) will be used for extraction.
8 9	239	Table 2: Summary of items to be extracted from eligible studies using the standardised extraction form

Information area	Data extracted
Background	Authors
	Year of publication
	Name of the blood-based biomarker
	Blood-based biomarker type (e.g., cfDNA, miRNA etc.)
Methodology	Specimen type (e.g., serum vs plasma)
	Study type
	Number of participants included
	Cohort included (e.g. no neoplasia detected, advanced adenoma, CRC)
	Technique used for blood-biomarker assay (e.g. qPCR)
Results	Accuracy of blood-based biomarker (sensitivity, specificity) for advanced
	adenoma/sessile serrated lesion
	Accuracy of blood-based biomarker (sensitivity, specificity) for CRC

25 240 CfDNA: circulating cell free DNA, CRC: colorectal cancer

27 241 **Risk of bias**

A formal risk of bias assessment will be conducted via the QUADAS-2 tool, as recommended in the Cochrane Handbook²³, which is used for evaluating potential bias (quality appraisal) of studies assessing diagnostic test accuracy. The following domains will be assessed: i) patient selection, ii) type of blood biomarker, iii) reference standard and iv) flow of patients through the study and timing of the index test(s) and reference standard ("flow and timing"). The tool will be completed according to four phases: 1) state the review question; 2) develop review specific guidance; 3) review the published flow diagram for the primary study or construct a flow diagram if none is reported; and, 4) judgement of bias and applicability. Each domain will then be assessed in terms of the risk of bias and the first three domains are also assessed for applicability. To help reach a judgement on the risk of bias, signalling questions will be included, such as "were the participants representative of the general population of those with advanced colorectal lesion?" and "was there an acceptable reference standard referred to?". These identify aspects of study design related to the potential for bias and aim to help reviewers make risk of bias judgements.

45 255 Data synthesis

Studies will be synthesised using a best evidence synthesis. Meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy
can be carried out; however more sophisticated methods may be required to simultaneously analyse
outcome measures (i.e., sensitivity and specificity). Methods such as bivariate model and
hierarchical summary receiver operating characteristic (HSROC) model may be carried out.

In order to be considered for meta-analysis, the outcomes and the methodology of eligible studies must maintain homogeneity. For example, they need to have used the same type of test with the same type of comparators (i.e., a DNA methylation test for adenomas vs non-cancer controls). The process for meta-analysis will be more clear pending data extraction, based on assumptions of homogeneity remaining true. The remainder of this section is based on such an assumption of homogeneity in outcomes and methodology of the studies; however, some changes may be needed following data extraction.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

BMJ Open

1 2

2		
3 4	267	The heterogeneity of the eligible studies will be assessed according to outcome categories, such as:
5	268	1. the sensitivity of the test to detect pre-cancerous lesion (advanced adenoma and /or
6 7	269	sessile serrated lesion);
8	270	the blood test methodology has been clearly described;
9	271	3. the blood test considers the anatomical status (i.e. distal vs proximal) of the pre-
10	272	cancerous lesion (advanced adenoma/sessile serrated lesion);
11	273	4. the association between the blood test results and pathological or histological features
12	274	of the pre-cancerous lesion (advanced adenoma/sessile serrated lesion);
13 14	275	5. the association between the blood test results and CRC status;
15	276	6. the assessment of factors influencing the accuracy of the blood test;
16	277	7. the quality of the studies included according to the QUADAS-2 tool.
17	270	Where how consists is a finite that you are used in these actors size, then inclusion within
18 19	278	Where homogeneity is sufficient between groups within these categories, then inclusion within
20	279	meta-analysis either as a large group or several subgroups will be determined by all authors. If the
21	280	eligible studies are clearly homogenous, then each reviewer will place studies into appropriate sub-
22	281	groups for analysis. This process will be done by each reviewer independently to determine which
23	282	factors will allow the best and most accurate comparisons to be made. Relevant sub-groupings are
24 25	283	likely to be made based on the methodological factors listed in Table 2 above. For example, sub-
25 26	284	groupings according to whether the patient group(s) have different classifications of colonic
27	285	adenoma(s)/sessile serrated lesion(s) would be considered, as appropriate for the eligible studies. If
28	286	suitable, reviewers can include studies in more than one sub-group (i.e., different genomic analysis,
29	287	different technique), however, in this instance the subgroups will not be used in the same meta-
30	288	analysis. Where reviewers agree on what is to be grouped for each meta-analysis, this process will
31 32	289	be carried out. If there is not broad consensus on the groups, further discussion will take place. If the
33	290	reviewers disagree, the authors as a group will determine suitability of meta-analysis or meta-
34	291	synthesis.
35	292	On a meta-analysis being deemed appropriate by the reviewers, a statistical test of heterogeneity
36	293	will be carried out, providing an I ² value in the heterogeneity of the sample ³⁶ . The I ² value will be
37 38	294	reported as a percentage and interpreted as suggested in the Cochrane Handbook for Systematic
39	295	Reviews ²³ . Significance in the measure of heterogeneity as calculated by the chi squared test, will be
40	296	set at $p \le 0.10$. In the event significance was reported, the I ² statistic will be then explored to define
41	297	the magnitude of heterogeneity about the finding, where 0-40, 30-60, 50-90 and 75+ are suggestive
42	298	of low, moderate, substantial, and considerable heterogeneity, respectively ²³ . In the instance of
43 44	299	statistical heterogeneity, leave-one-out sensitivity analyses may be performed; however, groups
45	300	considered to exceed the minimal value for heterogeneity will be ineligible for meta-analysis and
46	301	hence considered for meta-synthesis instead.
47	501	
48	302	Comparisons in some of the categories may be challenging to assess due to differences in biomarker
49 50	303	selection as well as study design. Where meta-analysis has been decided as appropriate by the
51	304	group, results will be extracted from the eligible studies and aggregated, with changes normalised
52	305	and reported as percentage changes or standard mean differences in all studies. Where data are
53	306	lacking, the authors of relevant studies will be contacted to provide further clarity on the data. If the
54	307	data are not sufficiently homogenous, a critical/narrative synthesis will be focused from the data set
55 56	308	alongside some binary elements of analysis. In this context, statements such as 'increase',
50 57	309	'decrease', or 'no change' in the accuracy of the proposed blood-based biomarkers will be described.
58	240	
59	310	
60		

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

- 3 311 Confidence in cumulative evidence
- 5 312 The potential of publication bias will be minimised through a comprehensive search of unpublished
- ⁶7 313 studies, contacting respective authors in the field and including grey literature obtained via several
- 5 314 further methods (e.g., snowballing of primary and review article reference lists). Conference
- 9 315 presentations not carried through to publication will also be reviewed, with authors contacted.
 10 316 Further statistical tests, such as the Begg and Mazumbar's rank correlation test and Egger's linear
- 11 317 regression model, may be applied to each category and overall analyses. On publication bias being
- 12 318 detected, Duval and Tweedie's trim and fill correction may be applied, and the resultant effect sizes
- and 95% confidence intervals examined in further detail.
- 15 320 The pooled data will be assessed using the Grading of Recommendations Assessment, Development 16 321 and Evaluation (GRADE) approach to evaluate the overall quality and 'certainty of recommendations' 17 322 from the literature³⁶⁻³⁸. The GRADE approach will be used to determine the certainty and strength of 18 19 323 evidence according to the categories (methodological and outcome based/results) in Table 2 and 20 324 carried out in accordance with set recommendations. For example, observational studies will be 21 assigned a 'low' certainty of recommendation prior to then either being upgraded or downgraded 325 22 326 from this point, based on the quality of the evidence³⁹. Studies will be upgraded for factors such as 23 24 327 large effect sizes or mean test positivity is associated with more aggressive pre-cancerous lesions, 25 328 blood-based biomarker characteristics and accuracy of the biomarker (sensitivity/specificity). 26 329 Potential downgrading of studies for certainty of evidence may occur when there is substantial 27 330 publication bias, indirect relationships with results (i.e., unexplained confounding) or inconsistencies 28 331 between studies. From this process, qualitative ratings for the certainty of evidence and 29 30 332 recommendations will be listed as 'high', 'moderate', 'low' or 'very low' and able to be interpreted
- $\begin{array}{ccc} 31 & 333 & \text{according to the GRADE approach}^{38-40}.\\ 32 & \end{array}$
- 33 334 Ethics and dissemination of results
- No patient data will be included in our review and therefore ethics approval is not required. It is
 anticipated that the review will identify the most promising candidate biomarkers for clinical
 translation in the screening for advanced pre-cancerous lesions. The results will be published in a
 peer-reviewed journal and presented at appropriate domestic/international conferences.
- 40
41339Contributorship statement
- 42 340 All authors have contributed to the focus of this systematic review topic and have revised and 43 341 reviewed each draft of the protocol and approved the final manuscript. Specifically, ES and GY were 44 342 responsible for the initial conceptualisation of this work. TL, ES, MW, JW, ES and RG led the planning, 45 design as well as the conduct and reporting of this manuscript. All authors made substantial 46 343 47 344 contributions to the drafting and critical revision of the work and all authors approved the final 48 345 manuscript. 49
- 50 346 Competing interests51
- S47 Professor Young has a consultancy arrangement with a company that has developed a blood test for
 S48 CRC detection (Clinical Genomics).
- 55 349 **Funding** 56
- The authors have not declared a specific grant for this research from any funding agency in the
 public, commercial or non-for-profit sectors.
- 60 352 Data sharing statement

BMJ Open

1 2		
2 3	353	Data sharing not applicable as no datasets generated and/or analysed for this study
4	222	Data sharing not applicable as no datasets generated and/or analysed for this study
5 6		
7		
8		
9 10		
11		
12		
13 14		
14		
16		
17 18		
10		
20		
21 22		
22		
24		
25 26		
20		
28		
29 30		
31		
32		
33 34		
35		
36		
37 38		
39		
40		
41 42		
43		
44 45		
45 46		
47		
48 49		
49 50		
51		
52 53		
55 54		
55		
56 57		
57 58		
59		
60		

1 2		
3	354	
4	354	REFERENCES
5	355	1. Ferlay J, Ervik M, Lam F. Global Cancer Observatory: Cancer Today Lyon2020 [Available from:
6	356	https://gco.iarc.fr/today/home
7	357	2. Australian Institute of Health and Welfare (AIHW). Cancer in Australia Canberra2020 [Available
8	358	from: https://www.aihw.gov.au/reports/cancer/cancer-data-in-australia/.
9	359	3. Levin TR, Corley DA, Jensen CD, et al. Effects of organized colorectal cancer screening on cancer
10 11	360	incidence and mortality in a large community-based population. <i>Gastroenterol</i>
12	361	2018;155(5):1383-91.
13	362	4. Zorzi M, Fedeli U, Schievano E, et al. Impact on colorectal cancer mortality of screening
14	363	programmes based on the faecal immunochemical test. <i>Gut</i> 2015;64(5):784-90.
15	364	5. Cock C, Anwar S, Byrne SE, et al. Low sensitivity of fecal immunochemical tests and blood-based
16	365	markers of DNA hypermethylation for detection of sessile serrated adenomas/polyps. <i>Dig</i>
17	366	Dis Sci 2019;64(9):2555-62.
18	367	6. Loktionov A. Biomarkers for detecting colorectal cancer non-invasively: DNA, RNA or proteins?
19 20	368	World J Gastrointest Oncol 2020;12(2):124-48.
20	369	7. Citarda F, Tomaselli G, Capocaccia R, et al. Efficacy in standard clinical practice of colonoscopic
22	370	polypectomy in reducing colorectal cancer incidence. <i>Gut</i> 2001;48(6):812-5.
23	371	8. Winawer SJ, Zauber AG, Ho MN, et al. Prevention of colorectal cancer by colonoscopic
24	372	polypectomy. The National Polyp Study Workgroup. N Engl J Med 1993;329(27):1977-81.
25	373	9. Schreuders EH, Ruco A, Rabeneck L, et al. Colorectal cancer screening: a global overview of
26	374	existing programmes. <i>Gut</i> 2015;64(10):1637-49.
27	375	10. Lin JS, Perdue LA, Henrikson NB, et al. Screening for colorectal cancer: Updated evidence report
28 29	376	and systematic review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. JAMA 2021;325(19):1978-
30	377	98.
31	378	11. Canadian Task Force on Preventive Health Care. Recommendations on screening for colorectal
32	379	cancer in primary care. CMAJ 2016;188(5):340-48.
33	380	12. Cubiella J, Marzo-Castillejo M, Mascort-Roca JJ, et al. Clinical practice guideline. Diagnosis and
34	381	prevention of colorectal cancer. 2018 Update. Gastroenterol Hepatol 2018;41(9):585-96.
35 36	382	13. Ladabaum U, Dominitz JA, Kahi C, et al. Strategies for colorectal cancer screening. Gastroenterol
30 37	383	2020;158(2):418-32.
38	384	14. Lane JM, Chow E, Young GP, et al. Interval fecal immunochemical testing in a colonoscopic
39	385	surveillance program speeds detection of colorectal neoplasia. Gastroenterol
40	386	2010;139(6):1918-26.
41	387	15. Cancer Council Australia Colorectal Cancer Guidelines Working Party. Clinical practice guidelines
42	388	for the prevention, early detection and management of colorectal cancer. In: Australia CC,
43	389	ed., 2017.
44 45	390	16. Young GP, Symonds EL, Allison JE, et al. Advances in fecal occult blood tests: the FIT revolution.
46	391	Dig Dis Sci 2015;60(3):609-22.
47	392	17. Worm Ørntoft MB. Review of blood-based colorectal cancer screening: How far are circulating
48	393	cell-free DNA methylation markers from clinical implementation? <i>Clin Colorectal Cancer</i>
49	394	2018;17(2):e415-e33.
50	395	18. Symonds EL, Pedersen SK, Baker RT, et al. A blood test for methylated BCAT1 and IKZF1 vs. a
51	396	fecal immunochemical test for detection of colorectal neoplasia. <i>Clin Transl Gastroenterol</i>
52 53	397	2016;7(1):e137.
55 54	398	19. Osborne JM, Wilson C, Moore V. Sample preference for colorectal cancer screening tests: Blood
55	399	or stool? Open J Prev Med 2012;2(3):326-31.
56	400	20. Adler A, Geiger S, Keil A, et al. Improving compliance to colorectal cancer screening using blood
57	401	and stool based tests in patients refusing screening colonoscopy in Germany. BMC
58	402	Gastroenterol 2014;14:183.
59	403	21. Grady WM, Markowitz SD. The molecular pathogenesis of colorectal cancer and its potential
60	404	application to colorectal cancer screening. <i>Dig Dis Sci</i> 2015;60(3):762-72.

Enseignement Superieur (ABES) . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

2		
3	405	22. Leggett B, Whitehall V. Role of the serrated pathway in colorectal cancer pathogenesis.
4	406	Gastroenterol 2010;138(6):2088-100.
5	407	23. Higgins JPT, Thomas J, Chandler J, et al. Cochrane handbook for systematic reviews of
6 7	408	interventions. Second edition. ed. Hoboken, New Jersey: The Cochrane Collaboration 2019.
8	409	24. Nagorni A, Bjelakovic G. Colonoscopic polypectomy for prevention of colorectal cancer. Cochr
9	410	Database Syst Rev 2009;2
10	411	25. Moher D, Shamseer L, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-
11	412	analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015 statement. Syst Rev 2015;4(1):1.
12	413	26. Shamseer L, Moher D, Clarke M, et al. Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-
13	414	analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ 2015;350:g7647.
14 15	415	27. Hariharan R, Jenkins M. Utility of the methylated SEPT9 test for the early detection of colorectal
16	416	cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis of diagnostic test accuracy. BMJ Open
17	417	Gastroenterol 2020;7(1):e000355.
18	418	28. Hitchins MP, Vogelaar IP, Brennan K, et al. Methylated SEPTIN9 plasma test for colorectal cancer
19	419	detection may be applicable to Lynch syndrome. BMJ Open Gastroenterol
20	420	2019;6(1):e000299.
21 22	421	29. Rasti A, Mehrazma M, Madjd Z, et al. Diagnostic and prognostic accuracy of miR-21 in renal cell
22	422	carcinoma: a systematic review protocol. BMJ Open 2016;6(1):e009667.
24	423	30. Lambert R, Provenzale D, Ectors N, et al. Early diagnosis and prevention of sporadic colorectal
25	424	cancer. Endoscopy 2001;33(12):1042-64.
26	425	31. Nagorni A. Advanced colorectal adenoma. <i>Archives Oncology</i> 2004;12:59-60.
27	426	32. Fenocchi E, Gaggero P, Rondan M. Usefulness of the fecal immunochemical test in the detection
28	427	of advanced adenomas in subjects at average risk for colorectal cancer. <i>Endoscopia</i>
29 30	428	2015;27(2):64-68.
31	429	33. Bettington M, Walker N, Rosty C, et al. Clinicopathological and molecular features of sessile
32	430 431	serrated adenomas with dysplasia or carcinoma. <i>Gut</i> 2017;66(1):97-106. 34. Cancer Council Australia Colonoscopy Surveillance Working Party. Clinical practice guidelines for
33	431	surveillance colonoscopy. Sydney, 2018.
34	433	35. Gupta S, Lieberman D, Anderson JC, et al. Recommendations for follow-up after colonoscopy and
35	434	polypectomy: A consensus update by the US Multi-Society Task Force on colorectal cancer.
36 37	435	Am J Gastroenterol 2020;115(3):415-34.
38	436	36. Yang B, Mustafa RA, Bossuyt PM, et al. GRADE Guidance: 31. Assessing the certainty across a
39	437	body of evidence for comparative test accuracy. J Clin Epidemiol 2021;136:146-56.
40	438	37. Goldet G, Howick J. Understanding GRADE: an introduction. <i>J Evid Based Med</i> 2013;6(1):50-54.
41	439	38. Shunemann H, Brozek J, Guyatt GH. GRADE handbook for grading quality of evidence and
42	440	strength of recommendations.2013.
43 44	441	39. Balshem H, Helfand M, Schünemann HJ, et al. GRADE guidelines: 3. Rating the quality of
44 45	442	evidence. J Clin Epidemiol 2011;64(4):401-6.
46	443	40. Higgins JP, Thompson SG, Deeks JJ, et al. Measuring inconsistency in meta-analyses. BMJ
47	444	2003;327(7414):557-60.
48	445	
49	445	
50 51		
52		
53		
54		
55		
56		
57 58		
50		

58 59

1Marker2Biomarker3"Biological marker"4"Molecular marker"	1,520,77
3 "Biological marker"	
	1,009,61
	3,104
	7,655
5 #1 OR #2 OR #3 OR #4	1,578,92
6 Blood	5,155,91
7 Serum	
	1,187,36
8 Plasma	987,178
9 Blood-based	3,792
10 Serum-based	1,221
11 Plasma-based	1,480
12 "Liquid biopsy"	5,495
13 #6 OR #7 OR #8 OR #9 OR #10 OR #11 OR	#12 5,937,79
14 Colorect*	199,866
15 Colon*	640,135
16 Bowel	536,671
17 Caec*	11,030
18 Rect*	244,366
19 "Large intestin*"	19,115
20 #14 OR #15 OR #16 OR #17 OR #18 OR #	19 1,292,24
21 Adenoma*	120,722
22 Polyp	53,083
23 Serrated	4,934
24 #21 OR #22 OR #23	163,256
25 Diagnos*	5,574,40
26 Screen*	928,076
27 Detect*	2,567,71
28 "Early detection"	97,568
29 "Early detection"	110,371
30 Test	2,972,33
31 #25 OR #26 OR #27 OR #28 OR #29 OR # 32 #5 AND #13 AND #20 AND #24 AND #3	

1
2 3
5 4
4
5
7
/ 8
9
10
11
12
13
14 15 16
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28
29
30
31
32
33
34 35
35
36
37
39
40
41
42
43
44 45
45 46
46 47
47 48
40 49
49 50
50 51
52
52 53
55 54
55
56
57
58
50

1

Search Number	Query	Results
1	Marker	1,494,869
2	Biomarker	476,589
3	"Biological marker"	361,140
4	"Molecular marker"	21,712
5	#1 OR #2 OR #3 OR #4	2,040,222
6	Blood	2,577,094
7	Serum	208,082
8	Plasma	187,378
9	Blood-based	780,242
10	Serum-based	195,019
11	Plasma-based	162,152
12	"Liquid biopsy"	9,905
13	#6 OR #7 OR #8 OR #9 OR #10 OR #11 OR #12	7,562,205
14	Colorect*	337,010
15	Colon*	986,230
16	Bowel	284,284
17	Caec*	14,509
18	Rect*	378,999
19	"Large intestin*"	110,687
20	#14 OR #15 OR #16 OR #17 OR #18 OR #19	1,650,217
21	Adenoma*	159,256
22	Polyp	78,303
23	Serrated	5,746
24	#21 OR #22 OR #23	214,866
25	Diagnos*	7,360,031
26	Screen*	1,504,388
27	Detect*	3,358,994
28	"Early detection"	104,936
29	"Early diagnosis"	192,795
30	Test	3,442,978
31	#25 OR #26 OR #27 OR #28 OR #29 OR #30	12,342,669
32	#5 AND #13 AND #20 AND #24 AND #31	1,895

For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml

Search Number	Query	Results
1	Marker	1,021,77
2	Biomarker	214,492
3	"Biological marker"	3,633
4	"Molecular marker"	12,620
5	#1 OR #2 OR #3 OR #4	1,188,94
6	Blood	2,771,32
7	Serum	1,195,35
8	Plasma	1,647,44
9	Blood-based	4,414
10	Serum-based	1,379
11	Plasma-based	4,984
12	"Liquid biopsy"	6,077
13	#6 OR #7 OR #8 OR #9 OR #10 OR #11 OR #12	4,935,83
14	Colorect*	281,808
15	Colon*	885,669
16	Bowel	222,847
17	Caec*	12,419
18	Rect*	436,618
19	"Large intestin*"	12,692
20	#14 OR #15 OR #16 OR #17 OR #18 OR #19	1,601,96
21	Adenoma*	94,489
22	Polyp	44,085
23	Serrated	9,215
24	#21 OR #22 OR #23	132,732
25	Diagnos*	3,184,46
26	Screen*	1,089,59
27	Detect*	4,159,27
28	"Early detection"	78,759
29	"Early diagnosis"	78,824
30	Test	5,969,00
31	#25 OR #26 OR #27 OR #28 OR #29 OR #30	12,151,43
32	#5 AND #13 AND #20 AND #24 AND #31	821

1
2 3
4
5 6
0 7
8
9 10
11
12 13
14
15 16
10
18
19 20
21
22
23 24
25
26 27
28
29 30
30 31
32
33 34
35
36 37
38
39
40 41
42
43 44
45
46 47
47 48
49
50 51
52
53 54
54 55
56
57 58
50

Supplementary 7	Table 4. S	Systematic	review	search r	esults in	PubMed
-----------------	------------	------------	--------	----------	-----------	--------

Search Number	Query	Results
1	Marker	1,520,779
2	Biomarker	1,009,617
3	"Biological marker"	3,104
4	"Molecular marker"	7,655
5	#1 OR #2 OR #3 OR #4	1,578,921
6	Blood	5,155,911
7	Serum	1,187,369
8	Plasma	987,178
9	Blood-based	3,792
10	Serum-based	1,221
11	Plasma-based	1,480
12	"Liquid biopsy"	5,495
13	#6 OR #7 OR #8 OR #9 OR #10 OR #11 OR #12	5,937,796
14	Colorect*	199,866
15	Colon*	640,135
16	Bowel	536,671
17	Caec*	11,030
18	Rect*	244,366
19	"Large intestin*"	19,115
20	#14 OR #15 OR #16 OR #17 OR #18 OR #19	1,292,245
21	Adenoma*	120,722
22	Polyp	53,083
23	Serrated	4,934
24	#21 OR #22 OR #23	163,256
25	Diagnos*	5,574,405
26	Screen*	928,076
27	Detect*	2,567,713
28	"Early detection"	97,568
29	"Early diagnosis"	110,371
30	Test	2,972,332
31	#25 OR #26 OR #27 OR #28 OR #29 OR #30	9,851,696
32	#5 AND #13 AND #20 AND #24 AND #31	1172

address in a syste		d Reporting Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 c ic review protocol*	12 o	
Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item	n 30 M	Where item can be fou
ADMINISTRATIV	E INF		ay 20 nsei es re	
Title:			gne	
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review		age 1
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	22. Bownl gnement S	V/A
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration number	₹ <u> </u>	Page 3
Authors:			perie	
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author	ur (A	Page 1
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review		Page 9
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	ьă	
Support:				Page 9
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor		age 9
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	š ž	Ŋ/A
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the protocol	<u>n <</u>	√/А
INTRODUCTION			ال on دانس	
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	. te BUI	Pages 2 and 3
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participation interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	20	
METHODS			25 a	
Eligibility criteria	8		Agence	Page 4
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study author trial registers or other grey literature sources) with planned dates of coverage	rs, Biblio	age 5
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including planned	gra	Page 5 and Supplementary Tabl

3 4

24

		BMJ Open	l by cc		
			d by copyright, including for		20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 20 2
		limits, such that it could be repeated	t, incl		4
Study records:		mints, such that it could be repeated	di		7
Data	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the review	ng 1	9	Page 6
management	IIu				Page 6
Selection	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviewers) three each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	o	E.	Page 6
process		each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	З. Г	Isei	
Data collection	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done	elat	ign	Sage 6
process		Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), any processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigator	sëd	. ž i	7
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding sources			
		any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	tex	Su	2
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of main and additional outcomes, with rationale	tand	perieu	Page 4 and 5
Risk of bias in	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether	t	ŝ	Page 7
individual studies		will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in da synthesis	atanin	ABES	
Data synthesis	15a		ing,	-	Page 7 and 8
-	15b		s o⊉£		Page 8
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses, meta-regression)	ing, ar		Page 8
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned	and s	•	Page 8
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies, select reporting within studies)	tivellar		Page 8 and 9
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	techn	, ,	Page 2 (abstract) and Page 9
clarification on the i PRISMA-P Group a From: Shamseer L, M	tems nd is o loher l	led that this checklist be read in conjunction with the PRISMA-P Explanation and Elabora Amendments to a review protocol should be tracked and dated. The copyright for PRISMA distributed under a Creative Commons Attribution Licence 4.0. D, Clarke M, Ghersi D, Liberati A, Petticrew M, Shekelle P, Stewart L, PRISMA-P Group. Prefer RISMA-P) 2015: elaboration and explanation. BMJ. 2015 Jan 2;349(jan02 1):g7647.	guies.	(inf	eluding checklist) is held by the porting items for systematic review ar
		For peer review only - http://bmjopen.bmj.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtr	nl		2 D _