

American Urological Association

MP20-7116 Do urinary-based molecular Biomarker have the ability to predict the grade of non-muscle invasive bladder cancer?

Ahmed Abdelgawad^{*,1}, Mahmoud Laimon², Abdelwahab Hashem², Mohamed M. Abdellatif², Dalia Magdy¹, Laila A. Eissa³, Ahmed Mosbah² ¹ Center of Excellence for Genome & Cancer Research, Urology and Nephrology Center, ³ Biochemistry department, Faculty of Pharmacy., Mansoura, Egypt

Background

- cancer (BC) is the ninth most Bladder common cancer. Incidence rates are highest in Europe, the United States and Egypt with 430,000 cases diagnosed in 2012 new worldwide. Most BC patients (70%) present with NMIBC, between 50% and 70% of them do recur, and approximately 10% to 20% of them progress to muscle invasive disease (MIBC) (1).
- Until now, the standard non-invasive urinary marker is urinary cytology. This technique was more sensible in high-grade tumors than in low-grade ones, with an overall sensitivity ranging from 25–70% (2, 3).
- > Investigators do their best to search for a non-invasive, highly sensitive and specific marker of BC. As urine is in contact with BC and can be collected non-invasively and in large amounts, urine-based assays are a natural and promising source for biomarkers.
- Micro-RNA155 (mir-155), MicroRNA·200b (mir-200b) human telomerase transcriptase (hTERT), and E2F3 transcription factor had a role in BC pathogenesis.
- The objective of this study was to To determine the ability of urine-based tumor markers in detection, staging, and grading of BC in a registered prospective trial.

Methods

reverse

- \triangleright A registered prospective trial (NCT0359136 for 64 NMIBC patients. From (50-100 m voided urine samples, total RNA extract from sedimented urothelial cells we analyzed by a reverse transcriptase polymerase chain reaction assay for presence of mir-155, mir-200b, hTERT a E2F3 transcript.
- \triangleright A receiver operating characteristics (ROC) w plotted in order to choose the best cut-off point Sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive val (PPV) and negative predictive value (NP were calculated for each test.

Results

- > Patients demographic were comparab (table 1)
- \triangleright The expression levels of the mir-155 did show difference between high grade (H) and low grade (LG) (p=0.06) (table 1
- ▶ Both mir-155 and mir-200b had the lowe AUC (table 2). E2F3 and hTEF expression in urine was higher in H NMIBC group than in LG NMIBC (1 0.001) (table 1).
- The sensitivity, specificity, accuracy E2F3 were 86%, 76.2%, and 82.8% respectively. The sensitivity, specificit accuracy of hTERT were 86%, 66.7%, and 79.7%, respectively (table 2 and figure 1

Table 1: Baseline patie	nt and urinary ma	arkers characteristi	cs				
Variable	LG N = 21	HG N = 43	P valu				
Base	line patient charac	eteristics (Mean ± S	D)				
Age (years)	56.57 ± 12.36	61.21 ± 10.18	0.12				
Gender N ⁰ (%)							
Male	14 (66.7 %)	36 (83.7 %)	0.12				
female BMI (kg/m ²)	7 (33.3 %) 27.41 ± 3.62	$\frac{7(16.3\%)}{26.14 \pm 3.80}$	0.21				
Serum creatinine (mg/dl)	1.37 ± 1.89	1.31 ± 1.13	0.89				
Hemoglobin (gm/dl)	12.78 ± 1.66	12.68 ± 1.56	0.82				
INR	1.07 ± 0.09	1.09 ± 0.09	0.53				
Baseline u	Baseline urinary markers characteristics (Mean ± SD)						
Telomerase	5.46 ± .89	7.93 ± 1.70	< 0.00				
E2F3	2.64 ± .45	4.89 ± 1.36	< 0.00				
MIR-155	.48 ± .19	.58 ± .21	0.064				
MIR- 200b	.28 ± .08	.54 ± .19	< 0.00				

ln't IG	Test	AUC	Cut off value	Sensiti vity (%)	Specifi city (%)	PPV (%)	NPV (%)	Accura cy (%)	P va
1) est RT	mir- 155	0.341	0.590	41.86	38.09	58.06	24.24	40.63	0.0
HG P<	mir- 200b	0.122	0.360	23.26	19.05	37.03	10.81	21.88	0.1
of %, ity.	hTERT	0.872	5.605	86.05	66.67	84.09	70	79.69	< 0.0
ity, Ind I).	E2F3	0.889	3.055	86.05	76.19	88.09	72.73	82.81	< 0.0



American Urological Association



