

BREATH TEST TO DETECT WOMEN AT LOW RISK FOR BREAST CANCER: POTENTIAL CLINICAL AND ECONOMIC BENEFITS

Michael Phillips, Therese B Bevers, Linda Hovanesian Larsen, Nadine Pappas, Sonali Pathak

doi: <https://doi.org/10.1101/2024.10.09.24315190>

This article is a preprint and has not been certified by peer review [what does this mean?]. It reports new medical research that has yet to be evaluated and so should not be used to guide clinical practice.

[Abstract](#)[Info/History](#)[Metrics](#)[Preview PDF](#)

Abstract

Background: A breath test for volatile organic compounds has identified biomarkers associated with breast cancer. We evaluated the potential clinical and economic benefits of a breath test to detect women at low risk for breast cancer by comparing its negative predictive value (NPV) to the NPV of screening mammography. Methods: Sensitivity and specificity values for screening mammography were obtained from the Food & Drug Administration Mammography Quality Standards Act; Amendments to Part 900 Regulations Docket No. FDA-2013-N-0134. The high values were sensitivity = 79.0%, specificity = 88.9% and the low values were sensitivity = 66.0%, specificity = 88.9%. In two previous studies of 771 women undergoing mammography, breath testing identified breast cancer with sensitivity=84% and specificity = 68.6% in 178 asymptomatic women, and sensitivity=82% and specificity = 77% in 593 who were symptomatic. These values were projected to a hypothetical screening population of 100,000 asymptomatic women with average breast cancer prevalence of 450/100,000, in order to estimate the NPV and PPV (positive predictive value) for breath testing and screening mammography respectively. Results: Breath test in asymptomatic women: NPV = 99.895% and PPV = 1.19%; in symptomatic women: NPV = 99.895% and PPV = 1.59%. For screening mammography, NPV = 99.83% and PPV = 2.82% (low values), increasing to NPV= 99.89% and PPV =

3.12% (high values). A negative breath test identified 68.3% of the screening population as having low risk of breast cancer, with NPV similar to mammography. Based on Medicare reimbursement rates, elimination of mammography in women with a negative breath test could reduce the annual cost of breast cancer screening by 38.9%. Conclusions: In a hypothetical screening population, a negative breath test ruled out breast cancer with the same accuracy as a negative mammogram. A screening breath test could potentially eliminate the need for two thirds of all mammograms and reduce the costs of screening without increasing the risk of false-negative findings. If applied in clinical practice, this approach could potentially reduce the costs and burdens of breast cancer screening services, and benefit women by lessening the discomfort, anxiety, radiation exposure, and costs associated with mammography.

Competing Interest Statement

Michael Phillips is President and CEO of Menssana Research, Inc. All other authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

Clinical Trial

NCT02888366

Funding Statement

The study was funded by NIH NCI Grant Number 5R44CA203019

Author Declarations

I confirm all relevant ethical guidelines have been followed, and any necessary IRB and/or ethics committee approvals have been obtained.

Yes

The details of the IRB/oversight body that provided approval or exemption for the research described are given below:

Clinical studies were reviewed and approved by an Institutional Review Board (IRB) at all participating sites. Written informed consent was obtained from all individual participants. All procedures performed in studies involving human participants were in accordance with the ethical standards of the institutional and/or national research committee and with the 1964 Helsinki declaration and its later amendments or comparable ethical standards.

I confirm that all necessary patient/participant consent has been obtained and the appropriate institutional forms have been archived, and that any patient/participant/sample identifiers included were

not known to anyone (e.g., hospital staff, patients or participants themselves) outside the research group so cannot be used to identify individuals.

Yes

I understand that all clinical trials and any other prospective interventional studies must be registered with an ICMJE-approved registry, such as ClinicalTrials.gov. I confirm that any such study reported in the manuscript has been registered and the trial registration ID is provided (note: if posting a prospective study registered retrospectively, please provide a statement in the trial ID field explaining why the study was not registered in advance).

Yes

I have followed all appropriate research reporting guidelines, such as any relevant EQUATOR Network research reporting checklist(s) and other pertinent material, if applicable.

Yes

Copyright

The copyright holder for this preprint is the author/funder, who has granted medRxiv a license to display the preprint in perpetuity. It is made available under a CC-BY-ND 4.0 International license.

bioRxiv and medRxiv thank the following for their generous financial support:

The Chan Zuckerberg Initiative, Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory, the Sergey Brin Family Foundation, California Institute of Technology, Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Center, Imperial College London, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Stanford University, University of Washington, and Vrije Universiteit Amsterdam.

[^ Back to top](#)

[← Previous](#)

[Next →](#)

Posted October 10, 2024.

[Download PDF](#)

[Print/Save Options](#)

[Author Declarations](#)

[Data/Code](#)

[Email](#)

[Share](#)

[Citation Tools](#)

[Get QR code](#)

Post

Like 0