

## Ovarian Cancer Screening: Current status and future directions

<sup>1,2</sup> Dr Zachary Nash MBBS, <sup>2</sup>Prof. Usha Menon MD(Res), FRCOG

<sup>1</sup>EGA Institute for Women's Health, University College London, London, United Kingdom

<sup>2</sup>MRC Clinical Trials Unit at UCL, Institute of Clinical Trials & Methodology, University College London, London, United Kingdom

Professor Usha Menon

MRC Clinical Trials Unit at UCL, Institute of Clinical Trials & Methodology,

Faculty of Population Health Sciences, University College London, UK.

Tel: 020 7670 4927; email: [u.menon@ucl.ac.uk](mailto:u.menon@ucl.ac.uk)

## **Abstract**

Ovarian cancer is the third most common gynaecological malignancy and the most lethal worldwide. Most patients are diagnosed with advanced disease which carries significant mortality. Improvements in treatment have only resulted in modest increases in survival. This has driven efforts to reduce mortality through screening. Multimodal ovarian cancer screening using a longitudinal CA125 algorithm has resulted in diagnosis at an earlier stage, both in average and high risk women in two large UK trials. However, no randomised controlled trial has demonstrated a definitive mortality benefit. Extended follow up is underway in the largest trial to date, UKCTOCS to explore the delayed reduction in mortality that was noted. Meanwhile, screening is not currently recommended in the general population. Some countries offer surveillance of high risk women. Novel screening modalities and longitudinal biomarker algorithms offer potential improvements to future screening strategies as does the development of better risk stratification tools.

**Key Words:** Ovarian Cancer, Screening, Early detection.

## **Introduction**

Screening is looking for early signs of a particular disease in apparently 'healthy' people who do not have 'any symptoms'. There are an increasing number of cancer screening programmes (1) with the aim to decrease mortality through detection of latent pre-cancerous and/or early stage invasive disease. The most successful and widely implemented of these is cervical cancer screening which has managed to decrease both disease incidence and mortality. A cancer where there have been ongoing efforts to explore screening is ovarian cancer (OC).

While the central idea is essentially simple, 'decreasing mortality by finding and treating those with previously undetected disease while avoiding harm to those who do not have the disease' the reality is far from straight forward. To address this, Wilson and Jungner published their classic screening criteria in 1968. Although modified with time, these principles continue to underpin any successful screening programme (1,2). This review critically examines screening for ovarian cancer through the prism of these principles of screening. In addition, it describes the new risk stratification tools that would allow better identification of the target population and a literature update (Jan 2010 to September 2019) on novel and emerging biomarkers, imaging techniques, and longitudinal algorithms.

### ***The condition should be an important health problem***

OC is the third most common gynaecological malignancy worldwide and carries the highest mortality. OC has an incidence of 11.7-12.1 per 100,000 in the USA and Europe, with slightly lower rates of disease in Asia and the Middle East (3).

Most (60%) patients are diagnosed with advanced disease (3) which is associated with significant mortality. 5-year survival rates for FIGO stage I disease is 90%, stage II 65%,

stage III 34%, and stage IV 15%. (3). As a result, the case fatality ratio is thrice that of breast cancer with approximately 240 000 new cases and 140 200 deaths worldwide in 2016 (4,5). Improvements in treatment have only resulted in modest increases in survival and in most developed countries, 10-year survival is around 35% (6).

***There should be an accepted treatment for patients with recognised disease***

Treatment varies by stage of disease and both national and international guidelines are available. The cornerstone is a combination of maximal surgical cytoreduction and platinum and taxane based chemotherapy. Primary surgery is followed by adjuvant chemotherapy if it is anticipated that all visible disease can be removed. However, in advanced disease, if the surgical team feel the latter is not achievable, neo-adjuvant chemotherapy is undertaken followed by interval debulking. There is increasing use of anti-angiogenic therapies, polyADP-ribose polymerase (PARP) inhibitors, inhibitors of growth factor signalling, or folate receptor inhibitors, as well as several immunotherapeutic approaches as adjuncts to conventional chemotherapy in advanced disease (7).

***The natural history of the condition, including development from latent to declared disease, should be adequately understood and there should be a recognisable latent or early symptomatic stage***

There have been significant advances in this area with both the primary site assignment (WHO 2014) and staging (FIGO 2014) classifications recently revised. The primary anatomy of the disease referred to as 'ovarian cancer' has now been formally documented to include epithelial cancers of the ovary, fallopian tubes, peritoneum and pelvic cancer where site cannot be assigned specifically to one of the latter (8). The revisions codify what has been in

clinical use for the last decade or so and incorporates many major scientific advances in our understanding of precursor events, lineages, and molecular characteristics.

A variety of tumours, such as epithelial (EOC), germ cell, and specialized stromal cell tumours, are included under ovarian cancer. The vast majority of OC's are epithelial and consist of five major types – high grade serous (HGSC), low grade serous (LGSC), endometrioid, clear cell and mucinous carcinomas. Alternatively, EOC can be subdivided based on these histological subtypes into two main groups: Type I and Type II tumours (9).

Type I (low grade serous, endometrioid, clear cell carcinomas and mucinous) are less common and represent 30% of all tumours. Precursor lesions include borderline serous tumours (LGSOC) and endometriosis (endometrioid, clear cell) (10). These tumours may have a relatively indolent course (9).

The most common type of EOC are Type II lesions, aggressive HGSCs that carry significant mortality. These cancers are the main target and markers able to distinguish them from more indolent cancers are key to a successful screening strategy. They exhibit a complex genomic terrain, marked by copy number alterations and the almost universal presence of TP53 tumour suppressor gene mutations (11). Whilst previously thought to arise from the ovarian surface epithelium, the origin of the majority of HGSC is now understood to be the fallopian tube, specifically the secretory cell of the fimbrial epithelium (12). Serous tubal intraepithelial carcinoma (STIC) lesions have been identified as a pre malignant lesion of epithelial OC and have been found histologically in the fallopian tube of up to 60% of sporadic serous OC cases (12). In addition, a nonproliferative 'p53 signature' in the secretory cells of the adjoining tubal epithelium, harbouring the same TP53 mutation as the STIC lesion and HGSC have been described. To date, STIC lesions are diagnosed during risk reducing salpingo-oophorectomy (RRSO) in high risk women, alongside HGSC and as

incidental findings when tubes are removed during surgery for benign conditions. There are a number of efforts underway to develop possible screening tests to detect the lesion; including direct visualisation using microlaparoscopy to achieve an optical biopsy (13), the accuracy of which may be improved with the addition of autofluorescence imaging (14); brush cytology of the fallopian tubes (15) and lavage cytology of the uterine cavity and proximal fallopian tubes (16).

The focus of ovarian cancer screening trials has therefore been, by necessity, the detection of early stage invasive disease. Modelling suggests that HGSC grow over four years and may exist as clinically undetected Stage III cancers for upto a year prior to diagnosis. They have a median diameter of ~3 cms when they metastasise into stage III or IV. To have a 50% sensitivity for Stage I/II, an annual screen would need to detect these adnexal tumours when they are ~1.3 cm in diameter (17). No current strategies are able to consistently detect cancers this small.

### ***There should be an agreed policy on whom to screen***

There is agreement that there are two target populations for screening. The general population where an average individual's lifetime risk of OC is 1.3-2% (18) and the high-risk population, currently identified on the basis of family history and limited genetic testing, with a lifetime OC risk of 10% or more. However, there is wide variation in an individual's OC risk due to lifestyle, reproductive and, genetic factors.

As many as 21% of epithelial ovarian cancers are linked to lifestyle and reproductive risk factors, although the impact of each factor is relatively modest (19). Obesity, as measured by BMI, is associated with increased risk in a dose dependant fashion. In women with BMI >22, HR of 1.07 (95% CI 1.02–1.12) per 5 kg/m<sup>2</sup> have been reported (20) and in

those with BMI >40, a 22% increase in risk (OR 1.22 95% CI 1.05–1.41) (21). Talc use and black tea consumption have also been associated with increased risk with OR 1.31 (95% CI 1.24–1.39) (22) and OR 1.56 (95% CI 1.07–2.28) (23), respectively.

Conversely, low dose, continuous, long term, aspirin use has been reported as a protective factor and is associated with OR 0.56 (95% CI 0.32–0.97) (24) Alcohol consumption, statin use and physical activity have all shown a non-significant trend towards reduced risk (24, 25, 26). Whilst cigarette use shows conflicting results, with no association (27) or increase risk of mucinous OC only (OR 1.31 95% CI 1.03–1.65) (28).

Multiple reproductive factors have been shown to be protective including; ever use (OR 0.73 95% CI 0.66-0.81) and greater than 10 years use (OR 0.43 95% CI 0.37-0.51) of the combined hormonal contraceptive (CHC) (29). Similarly, increasing parity is associated with reduced risk - Para 1: RR 0.72 (95% CI 0.65–0.79). Para 2: RR 0.57 (95% CI 0.41–0.52) Para 3 or above: RR 0.46 (95% CI 0.41 – 0.52) (30). Breast feeding also decreases risk - Less than 6 months (RR 0.79 95% CI 0.72-0.87), six to twelve months RR (0.72 95% CI 0.64-0.81), greater than 13 months (RR 0.67 95% CI 0.56-0.79) (31).

Gynaecological risk factors include endometriosis (OR 1.46 95% CI 1.31–1.63) (31) and current-or-recent hormone replacement therapy (HRT) use (RR 1.37 95% CI 1.29-1.46) with this risk persisting 10 years after stopping long-duration HRT (RR 1.25 95% CI 1.07-1.46) (32). The data on OC risk in women who have undergone hysterectomy are conflicting, varying from neutral (33,34) to decreased (35), or modestly increased (35). The most recent, a population based health record linkage study of 837,942 Australian women has found no evidence of an association (36). This is likely because often the tubes are left behind when the ovaries are conserved during benign hysterectomy. Hysterectomy with unilateral salpingo-oophorectomy appears protective (OR 0.65 95% CI 0.45–0.94) (33) with similar

effect estimates as seen in women who have undergone unilateral salpingectomy (OR 0.71 95% 0.56–0.91) or bilateral salpingectomy (OR 0.35 95% CI 0.17–0.73). Similarly, tubal ligation appears protective (OR 0.87 95% CI 0.78–0.98) (37). These findings are in keeping with the tubal origins of OC.

Moderate to high penetrance genes account for 5-15% of OCs. Mutations in high penetrance genes confer substantially increased risk by 80 years of age (44% BRCA1 and 17% BRCA 2 carriers (38) with lower risk in MLH1 and MSH2 (Lynch syndrome) of 10-15% (39). RAD51C and RAD51D have a risk of 11-12%, BRIP1 is 5.8% and PALB2 is 5%. (40,41,42) Low-penetrance inherited genetic variants (single nucleotide polymorphisms, 'SNPs') of which 37 have been identified thus far individually confer a 1.2 to 1.4 fold increase in epithelial OC risk with a few conferring a relative risk reduction (up to 0.8). It is likely that a large number of as yet unidentified low risk loci, each with a small effect size, make up the majority of the remaining 60% of unaccounted inherited risk and cumulatively contribute to the polygenic risk to OC (43).

There are significant efforts underway to combine these genetic, reproductive and lifestyle factors to better understand an individual's risk. This would help better stratify the population such that those at highest risk of OC can be offered preventative surgery with screening targeted at high risk women who refuse or wish to delay risk reducing surgery and as well as those at moderate risk. This would improve performance characteristics of screening and make it more cost effective. Risk-stratification using genetic and non-genetic factors is currently being evaluated in breast cancer screening trials.

Existing OC screening trials (Table 1) have used age and family history of ovarian cancer to identify target populations for screening. In addition, high risk trials have also used mutation status. A recent model combining reproductive factors (CHC use, parity, tubal



ligation, endometriosis), family history of OC in first-degree relatives and 13 low-risk SNPs suggests that it would be possible to risk stratify women from the general population from 0.35% lifetime risk (very low risk) to up to 8.8% lifetime risk (moderate risk levels) of OC, with the majority of those in the highest risk quartile having no family history (44). There are a number of models, of similar discriminatory ability, that mainly predict BRCA carrier status (e.g. BRCAPRO, BODICEA, Myriad II), but also in some instances risk of ovarian cancer (e.g. BODICEA). The current focus is to incorporate additional SNPs, epidemiological, lifestyle and reproductive factors to individualise OC risk prediction (45). CanRisk (BODICEA V) is one such recently released ovarian and breast cancer risk assessment tool that can assist clinicians during a consultation (46). Alongside this, there are studies such as 'FORECEE' exploring molecular markers and methylation profiles in cervical cytology cells for risk prediction of ovarian and other (breast, cervical, endometrial) women's cancers (47).

***There should be a suitable test or examination that has a high level of accuracy***

A lack of awareness of symptoms of OC is a potential barrier to early presentation (48). However, there is little evidence that patient education and routine enquiry about OC symptoms (persistent abdominal bloating, abdominal pain, and feeling full quickly) can result in detecting early stage disease (48,49). Similarly, pelvic examination has been found to have poor sensitivity (5.1%) with no additional OC cases detected by the addition of bimanual examination to screening using CA125 or transvaginal ultrasound alone (50). The focus of finding an accurate test for pre-clinical detection of OC has therefore been on biomarkers (initially in blood and increasingly in other bodily fluids) and imaging techniques.

**Transvaginal Ultrasound (TVS)**

TVS permits direct visualisation of the adnexa and detection of disease directly through morphological changes or through characteristics associated with increased OC risk such as increasing ovarian volume (51). However, many aggressive ovarian cancers metastasise before tumours reach a sonographically-detectable size with multiple cases documented in the multimodal arm of UKCTOCS, wherein serum CA125 levels were rising but ultrasound scans by experienced gynaecological Level II ultrasonographers were normal (52). In addition, the subjective nature of the assessment is a key limitation, especially in the context of a first line test for general population screening which requires involvement of large numbers of sonographers. In UKCTOCS, despite a training and accreditation programme for sonographers and implementation of quality assurance interventions that improved ovarian visualisation rates (53), high levels of inter-observer variation in identification of 'normal postmenopausal ovaries' were reported on an audit of static TVS images between both sonographers and experts and between different experts (54). In addition to decrease in size of ovaries in older postmenopausal women, ovarian visualisation is technically challenging in women with raised BMI or those who have undergone hysterectomy, tubal ligation or unilateral oophorectomy (55).

Poor visualisation of the fallopian tube and of tumours below 1cm in diameter are further limitations. Techniques aimed at improving image resolution such as Doppler flow, microbubble contrast enhanced ultrasonography, and photo-acoustic imaging may allow detection of smaller, earlier cancers in the future (56). Advanced imaging techniques being investigated in mouse models include use of immunological biomarkers such as modified macrophages targeting cancer cells (57) and nano-probes (58).

### **Biomarkers and longitudinal algorithms**

CA125 remains the most effective biomarker of high grade serous OC. The application of CA125 in screening has evolved from use of cut-offs, such as >35IU (59,60) to change over time using longitudinal algorithms, such as the risk of ovarian cancer algorithm (ROCA) (61). CA125 change as measured by the ROCA has been shown to detect a greater proportion of cancers. Half of the invasive epithelial ovarian cancers detected in trials using the ROCA in high risk (62) and low risk (63) women were detected when CA 125 was <35IU/L and would have been missed if a single cut-off threshold was used. More recently, retrospective analysis of data from UKCTOCS suggests that other longitudinal algorithms to interpret CA125 such as the Parametric Empirical Bayes (PEB) (64) and Methods of Mean Trends (MMT) (65) may have similar performance characteristics for first line screening.

Additional combinations of biomarkers have been suggested to improve sensitivity. Of these HE4 (Human Epididymis 4) has been the most promising, although its performance, when used alone, is inferior to CA125 (66). Potential strategies of combining a wide range of blood biomarkers have therefore been considered, using CA125 in addition to HE4, transthyretin, CA15-3, CA72.4 (64), TP53 (67), glycodelin, mesothelin, MMP7 (68), CYFRA 21-1, VTCN1 (64), Protein Z, Fibronectin, C-reactive protein (69).

Of particular interest is the analysis of free tumour DNA. The recently described 'CancerSEEK' panel combined mutations (including TP53) in circulating free DNA with 8 circulating protein biomarkers, including CA125. This initial case control study recruited clinically diagnosed patients and 812 controls from an asymptomatic population. Sensitivity was 98% with 79% specificity for invasive epithelial ovarian cancer. Further validation is however required with independent sample sets and in the context of screening (samples preceding diagnosis) (70). More recently fragmentation patterns of cell free DNA in plasma has demonstrated high specificity and acceptable sensitivity in the detection of a range of

malignancies, including ovarian cancer (71). Similar approaches to detect tumour DNA using mutation profiling have been reported in novel lower genital tract specimens such as vaginal and endocervical liquid cytology samples (72), tampons (73, 74) and uterine lavage (75, 76).

Aberrant O-glycosylation which is an inherent and specific property of cancer cells has been studied to potentially aid in differentiating cancer from these benign conditions, thereby improving specificity of the assay. Microarray glycoprofiling of CA125 (77) as well as glycopeptide spectra analysis of serum (78) have been explored to differentiate between early stage clear cell carcinoma and benign pathology, especially endometriomas.

### **Screening strategies**

Tests are usually used in combination (first line or sequentially) in screening to increase accuracy. In ovarian cancer screening this includes a combined, first line strategy of serum CA125 (interpreted using a cut-off of >35 units/mL) and TVS (ovarian arm of the U.S. Prostate, Lung, Colorectal and Ovarian Cancer Screening Trial (PLCO) (61) and Japanese Shizuoka Cohort Screening Study) (62). Sequential use has utilised either CA125 followed by repeat CA125 (interpreted initially using a cut-off in Barts (79) and more recently a longitudinal risk algorithm in the multimodal arm of UKCTOCS (61), the pilot RCT that preceded it (80) and the pilot US general population trial (81); followed by TVS or TVS as a first line test, followed by repeat ultrasound (University of Kentucky Study (82,83) and ultrasound arm of UKCTOCS (61)).

Studies in high-risk populations (UK Familial Ovarian Cancer Screening study UK FOCSS Phase 2 (84,85) and the US Cancer Genetics Network and Gynaecologic Oncology Group trials) have adopted a multimodal strategy utilising ROCA, similar to that used in the general population trials (59).

Screening is usually performed annually in general population settings and more frequently in high-risk populations (4-monthly in UKFOCSS Phase II (85), 3-monthly in Cancer Genetics Network (86) and Gynaecologic Oncology Group (87) Studies.

**There should be evidence from randomised controlled trials of a mortality benefit**

Only two RCTs have reported the impact of screening on disease specific mortality. In the U.S. Prostate, Lung, Colorectal and Ovarian Cancer Screening Trial (PLCO) of 78,286 women at a median of 14.7 years, there was no difference in deaths due to OC between the screen and no screen arms (RR 1.06; 95%CI 0.87-1.3) (59).

In the UKCTOCS, between 2001-5, a total of 202,638 postmenopausal women, at average population risk of OC, aged 50-74 were randomised (2:1:1) to no screening, longitudinal CA125 based multimodal screening (MMS) or, annual TVS (USS). Screening (involving 673,765 annual ultrasound and CA125 screens) continued until the end of 2011 with women receiving a median of 9 and a maximum of 11 annual screens. Follow-up included electronic health records linkage to cancer and death registry and postal questionnaires. At a median follow-up of 11.1 years (IQR 10.0-12.0), there was a higher proportion of women diagnosed with low-volume invasive epithelial ovarian and peritoneal cancer (stage I, II, and IIIa) in the MMS (40%;  $p < 0.0001$ ) but not in the USS group (24%;  $p = 0.57$ ) compared to the 'no screening' group (26%). In the both groups, there was a non-significant trend towards an average reduced OC mortality of 11% (95% CI -7 to 27;  $p = 0.21$ ) in USS and 15% (95% CI -3 to 30;  $p = 0.10$ ) in the MMS group using the Cox proportional hazards model. When prevalent cases were excluded in the MMS arm, a significant decrease in mortality from OC was observed ( $p = 0.021$ ). (61) Mortality reduction was greater in years 7-14 than years 0-7 from randomisation. As the mortality rates were still rising in the 'no

screening' arm at censorship, extended follow-up is underway to assess the long term effect of screening on mortality (88).

### **Evidence from other trials**

In the Japanese Shizuka Cohort Screening Study which randomised 82,487 women, at a mean follow-up of 9.2 years, the proportion of women with stage I OC was higher in the screened group (63%) than in the control group (38%) but did not reach statistical significance ( $p=0.2285$ ). No mortality results have been published from this trial (60). The University of Kentucky Study was a single arm prospective study in which 25,327 women underwent TVS screening. Sensitivity for detection of primary OC was 81%. 5-year survival rates were higher in screened women who developed OC compared to unscreened women treated for OC using the same institutional protocols. ( $74.8\% \pm 6.6\%$  vs  $53.7\% \pm 2.3\%$   $P<.001$ ) (82,83). Whilst these results are encouraging, it is likely that there is a significant healthy volunteer effect, given the cohort design.

In high-risk women, evidence is limited to cohort studies as it was thought to be unethical to randomise to 'no screening'. Further, in high risk populations no studies have reported mortality, with all using performance characteristics and stage shift as the primary outcome.

UK FOCSS Phase I demonstrated that annual screening is ineffective in detecting early stage disease (84). In Phase II, 4-monthly screening, use of the longitudinal ROCA algorithm and central management of results was undertaken. Between 2007-2012, 4,348 women, who declined standard of care (risk reducing salpingo-oophorectomy, RRSO) underwent 13,728 women-years of screening. They were encouraged to undergo RRSO throughout the study. Median follow up was 4.8 years. In women diagnosed with OC during

and within one year of the last screen, there was a significantly higher proportion with low-volume stage I-IIIa disease (63% vs 6%  $P=0.0004$ ), and less need for neoadjuvant chemotherapy (5% vs 44%  $P=0.008$ ) compared with women diagnosed with OC >1 year after the end of screen (85). In two similar studies conducted in the USA by the Cancer Genetics Network and Gynaecologic Oncology Group, 3,692 high-risk women underwent 13,080 woman years of 3-monthly multimodal screening using CA125 interpreted using the ROCA algorithm. Of 15 incident cancers, six were detected through screening (50% stage I/II), nine at RRSO and one woman was missed (86).

There are two ongoing trials in high-risk populations. In the UK, a pilot NHS study, 'Avoiding Late Diagnosis of Ovarian Cancer (ALDO)' is underway in BRCA mutations carriers who decline RRSO. Instigated based on the encouraging data from UKFOCSS Phase II, it uses a multimodal screening strategy with CA125 interpreted using ROCA (89). In the United States, a randomised trial is underway with high-risk women undergoing 6-monthly screening and intermediate-risk women annual screening. Women are being randomised to CA 125 and HE4 at every screen or CA 125 as first line test followed by HE4 as second-line test; The longitudinal PEB algorithm is being used to interpret the blood biomarkers with those with high scores undergoing confirmatory biomarker measurements followed by TVS. (85).

### **Morbidity (physical and psychological)**

All screening is associated with morbidity due to false positive and false negative results. False positive results lead to 'unnecessary' operations with its attendant risk of complications in women who have no cancer. In UKCTOCS, in the MMS group 4.4 and the

USS group 11 operations were undertaken per OC detected. 3.5% of women undergoing 'unnecessary' operations, without resultant diagnosis of malignancy, suffered a major surgical complication (61). In the PLCO, a higher serious complication rate of 15% was reported in women undergoing surgery with findings of false positive screening result (90). The other issue is the cancers being missed and the misleading reassurance of a false negative results. In UKCTOCS, of ovarian, tubal and primary peritoneal cancers diagnosed within a year of a screening, 16% were missed in the MSS and 29% in the USS group (61).

Screening for disease in the general population did not increase anxiety (91) or result in a reduction in sexual activity or functioning (92). However, an abnormal screening result and need for second line tests did result in increased psychological morbidity, primarily due to worry (91), as well as decreased sexual pleasure in the short term (92).

In the high risk population, screening for disease was reassuring and acceptable to the majority of women. However, the limitations of screening were not always understood. This resulted in false reassurance and disappointment if screening was ineffective (93).

### ***The test should be acceptable to the population***

The majority of postmenopausal women found TVS acceptable, with only 3.5% reporting moderate or severe pain. However, women reporting pain were more likely to drop out (OR 0.87) compared to those reporting no pain (94). Pilot studies undertaken in the set-up of UKCTOCS have shown that blood test has high acceptability (personal communication).

It is difficult to assess uptake of OC screening in the context of a national programme. In UKCTOCS, of 1,243,282 women invited, acceptance rate varied from 19% to 33% between different parts of the country (95). Compliance with annual screening in



UKCTOCS was 78% with USS and 81% with MMS (61). High risk populations were similarly motivated (80). This suggests that the screening strategies are likely to be acceptable. However, all such studies are subject to a significant healthy volunteer effect (96) and compliance rates in a screening programme are likely to be lower.

***The cost of case-finding (including diagnosis and treatment of patients diagnosed) should be economically balanced and screening should be a continuing process and not a 'once and for all' project.***

A number of cost effectiveness analysis using the published UKCTOCS data are available. All are based on the assumption of a mortality benefit of multimodal screening being shown in extended follow up of the UKCTOCS trial (97). An analysis of individual trial data by UKCTOCS trialists suggested that a national programme of multimodal screening would approach the National Institute for Health and Care Excellence (NICE) cost effectiveness threshold for England (98). Similarly, a USA model suggested that multimodal screening is potentially cost-effective, however this would only be certain when the size of any mortality benefit is known as well as the cost of the CA125 algorithm (99).

Any implementation of general population screening would require an ongoing multi-year commitment from commissioning bodies if it is to have a long term impact. In the National Health Service in UK, this would be the remit of national screening committee (1) who would make a decision based on assessment of each the criteria described above. Evaluation of high-risk screening in the UK would fall under the remit of guidelines committees such as NICE. Key issues in addition to cost, would be high quality universal coverage and the impact on workforce, particularly of skilled sonographers.

## **Current Guidelines**

With no impact on mortality demonstrated in RCTs, population screening of women at average risk is not currently recommended by the UK national screening committee (1) or US National screening committee (100). Screening for OC in women with a high risk of OC is not routinely offered by the NHS. The U.S. Preventative Task Force, whilst not supporting screening, does give clinicians discretion to allow 6 monthly screening from age 30-35 (101).

## **Summary**

There remains an urgent need for strategies to detect ovarian cancer earlier in order to reduce mortality. Both in the low-risk and in the high-risk population, there is evidence that a multimodal strategy based on longitudinal CA125 profile and second line TVS can lead to earlier diagnosis. However, no screening strategy has been shown to definitely decrease OC mortality. Longer term follow-up is underway in UKCTOCS to establish whether the trends in mortality reduction can be confirmed.

A key limitation of current screening strategies is the lack of tests that are able to detect pre malignant and early stage disease. Innovative strategies being investigated include longitudinal biomarker algorithms, detection of tumour DNA in cervical cytology or uterine lavage specimens and blood and improved targeted imaging of the adnexa.

Increased understanding of the environmental, reproductive and genetic risk factors for OC is improving risk stratification that is key to defining the target population for screening or primary prevention.

## **Acknowledgements**

We wish to thank all patients who have participated in the many screening trials that have informed understanding of screening for ovarian cancer and the investigators, staff and funding agencies that have committed significant resources without which the trials upon which this review has been based wouldn't have been able to be undertaken.

## **Role of the funding source**

ZN is supported by The National Institute for Healthcare Research (NIHR) as an Academic Clinical Fellow in Obstetrics and Gynaecology. UM is supported by the National Institute for Health Research (NIHR), University College London Hospitals Biomedical Research Centre and MRC core funding (MR\_UU\_12023).

## **Practice Points**

- Screening for ovarian cancer is not proven to reduce mortality and not recommended in the low risk population
- Screening for an individual's risk of OC allows intervention with risk reducing strategies in high risk populations
- A screening strategy using longitudinal CA-125 as first line strategy interpreted with risk of ovarian cancer algorithm and transvaginal combined strategies increase effectiveness of screening

## **Research Agenda**

- Extended follow up in UKCTOCS the largest RCT to date, to establish if the trend to mortality benefit is confirmed
- Pilot studies of intensive screening alongside risk-reducing surgery in high-risk populations to evaluate impact on detection of early stage disease
- Longitudinal biomarker algorithms, detection of tumour DNA in blood and cervical cytology/uterine lavage specimens and improved targeted imaging of the adnexa to improve sensitivity for detection of early stage and pre-malignant disease
- Refining risk prediction strategies to enable more cost-effective early detection and prevention strategies

### **Conflicts of Interest**

ZN reports no conflicts of interest. UM has stock ownership awarded by UCL in Abcodia Ltd, a UCL spinout company with an interest in biomarkers for early detection of cancer and the commercial rights to the Risk of Ovarian Cancer Algorithm used in ovarian cancer screening.

### **References**

1] Current UK national screening committee recommendations. Available at: <https://legacyscreening.phe.org.uk/screening-recommendations.php>. Accessed 6th August 2019.

\*2] Andermann A, Blancquaert I, Beauchamp S, Déry V. Revisiting Wilson and Jungner in the genomic age: a review of screening criteria over the past 40 years. *B World Health Organ.* 2008;86:317–19.

\*3] Philip Jessmon, Talia Boulanger, Wei Zhou & Pallavi Patwardhan. Epidemiology and treatment patterns of epithelial ovarian cancer, *Expert Review of Anticancer Therapy.* 2017;17:5, 427-437.

4] Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Dikshit R, Eser S, Mathers C, Rebelo M, et al. Cancer incidence and mortality worldwide: sources, methods and major patterns in GLOBOCAN 2012. *Int J Cancer* 2015;136:E359–386.

5] Siegel RL, Miller KD, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2016. *CA Cancer J Clin.* 2016;66:7–30.

6] Coleman MP, Forman D, Bryant H, the ICBP Module 1 Working Group  
Cancer survival in Australia, Canada, Denmark, Norway, Sweden, and the UK, 1995–2007 (the International Cancer Benchmarking Partnership): an analysis of population-based cancer registry data. *Lancet.* 2011;377: 127-138.

\*7] Cortez AJ, Tudrej P, Kujawa KA, Lisowska KM. Advances in Ovarian Cancer therapy. *Cancer Chemother Pharmacol.* 2018;81(1):17–38.

8] Zeppernick F, Meinhold-Heerlein I. *Arch Gynecol Obstet.* The new FIGO staging system for ovarian, fallopian tube, and primary peritoneal cancer. 2014;290(5):839-42.

- 9] Kurman RJ, Shih IeM. The origin and pathogenesis of epithelial ovarian cancer: a proposed unifying theory. *Am J Surg Pathol*. 2010;34(3):433–43.
- 10] Wang S1, Qiu L, Lang JH, Shen K, Yang JX, Huang HF, et al. Clinical analysis of ovarian epithelial carcinoma with coexisting pelvic endometriosis. *Am J Obstet Gynecol*. 2013;208(5):413.e1-5.
- 11] Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network. Integrated genomic analyses of ovarian carcinoma. *Nature*. 2011;474(7353):609-15.
- 12] Kroeger PT Jr, Drapkin R. Pathogenesis and heterogeneity of ovarian cancer. *Curr Opin Obstet Gynecol*. 2017;29(1):26-34.
- 13] Demco L. Complications of microlaparoscopy and awake laparoscopy. *Journal of Society of Laparoendoscopic Surgeons*. 2003;7(2):141–145.
- 14] McAlpine JN, El Hallani S, Lam SF, Kalloger SE, Luk M, Huntsman DG, et al. Autofluorescence imaging can identify preinvasive or clinically occult lesions in fallopian tube epithelium: a promising step towards screening and early detection. *Gynecol Oncol*. 2011;120(3):385–392.

15] Lum D, Guido R, Rodriguez E, Lee T, Mansuria S, D'Ambrosio, et al. Brush cytology of the fallopian tube and implications in ovarian cancer screening. *J Minim Invasive Gynecol*. 2014;21(5):851–856.

16] Maritschnegg E, Wang Y, Pecha N, Horvat R, Van Nieuwenhuysenet E, Vergote I, et al. Lavage of the uterine cavity for molecular detection of müllerian duct carcinomas: a proof-of-concept study. *J Clin Oncol*. 2015;33(36):4293–4300.

17] Brown PO, Palmer C. The preclinical natural history of serous ovarian cancer: defining the target for early detection. *PLoS medicine* 2009 Jul;6(7):e1000114.

18] SEER. Cancer Stat facts: Ovarian cancer. Available at <https://seer.cancer.gov/statfacts/html/ovary.html>. Accessed 6th August 2019.

19] Parkin DM, Boyd L, Walker LC. The fraction of cancer attributable to lifestyle and environmental factors in the UK in 2010. *Br J Cancer* 2011;105(suppl 2):S77–81.

20] Bhaskaran K, Douglas I, Forbes H, dos-Santos-Silva I, Leon DA, Smeeth L. Body-mass index and risk of 22 specific cancers: a population-based cohort study of 5.24 million UK adults. *Lancet* 2014;384:755–65.

21] Olsen CM, Nagle CM, Whiteman DC, Ness R, Pearce CL, Pike MC, et al. Obesity and risk of ovarian cancer subtypes: evidence from the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium. *Endocr Relat Cancer* 2013;20:251–62.

22] Penninkilampi R, Eslick GD. Perineal talc use and ovarian cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *Epidemiology* 2018;29:41–49.

23] Leung AC, Cook LS, Swenerton K, Gilks B, Gallagher RP, Magliocco A, et al. Tea, coffee, and caffeinated beverage consumption and risk of epithelial ovarian cancers. *Cancer Epidemiol* 2016;45:119–25.

24] Baandrup L, Dehlendorff C, Friis S, Olsen JH, Kjaer SK. Statin use and risk for ovarian cancer: a Danish nationwide case- control study. *Br J Cancer* 2015;112:157–61.

25] Kelemen LE, Bandera EV, Terry KL, Rossing MA, Brinton LA, Doherty JA, et al. Recent alcohol consumption and risk of incident ovarian carcinoma: a pooled analysis of 5,342 cases and 10,358 controls from the Ovarian Cancer Association Consortium. *BMC Cancer*. 2013;13:28.

26] Moorman PG, Myers ER, Schildkraut JM, Iversen ES, Wang F, Warren N. Effect of hysterectomy with ovarian preservation on ovarian function. *Obstet Gynecol* 2011;118:1271–9.

27] Wentzensen N, Poole EM, Trabert B, White E, Arslan AA, Patel AV, et al. Ovarian cancer risk factors by histologic sub-type: an analysis from the Ovarian Cancer Cohort Consortium. *J Clin Oncol* 2016;34:2888–98.



- 28] Faber MT, Kjaer SK, Dehlendorff C, Chang-Claude J, Andersen KK, Hogdall E, et al. Cigarette smoking and risk of ovarian cancer: a pooled analysis of 21 case-control studies. *Cancer Causes Control* 2013;24:989–1004.
- 29] Havrilesky LJ, Gierisch JM, Moorman PG, Coeytaux RR, Urrutia RP, Lowery WJ, et al. Oral contraceptive use for the primary prevention of ovarian cancer. *Evid Rep Technol Assess*. 2013;1–514.
- 30] Sung HK, Ma SH, Choi JY, Hwang Y, Ahn C, Kim BG, et al. The effect of breastfeeding duration and parity on the risk of epithelial ovarian cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis. *J Prev Med Public Health* 2016;49:349–66.
- 31] Pearce CL, Templeman C, Rossing MA, Lee A, Near AM, Webb PM, et al. Association between endometriosis and risk of histological subtypes of ovarian cancer: a pooled analysis of 65. case-control studies. *Lancet Oncol* 2012;13:385–94.
- 32] Collaborative Group on Epidemiological Studies of Ovarian Cancer, Beral V, Gaitskell K, Hermon C, Moser K, Reeves G, et al. Menopausal hormone use and ovarian cancer risk: individual participant meta-analysis of 52 epidemiological studies. *Lancet* 2015;385:1835–42.
- 33] Rice MS, Murphy MA, Vitonis AF, Cramer DW, Titus LJ, Tworoger SS, et al. Tubal ligation, hysterectomy and epithelial ovarian cancer in the New England Case-Control Study. *Int J Cancer* 2013;133:2415–21.

34] Wang C, Liang Z, Liu X, Zhang Q, Li S. The association between endometriosis, tubal ligation, hysterectomy and epithelial ovarian cancer: meta-analyses. *Int J Environ Res Public Health*. 2016;13(11). pii E1138.

35] Jordan SJ, Nagle CM, Coory MD, Maresco D, Protani MM, Pandeya NA, et al. Has the association between hysterectomy and ovarian cancer changed over time? A systematic review and meta-analysis. *Eur J Cancer*. 2013;49:3638–47.

36] Wilson LF, Tuesley K, Webb PM, Tuesley K, Stewart LM, Jordan SJ. The Association between hysterectomy and ovarian cancer risk: A population-based record-linkage study. *JNCI*. 2019; 10.1093/jnci/djz015.

37] Madsen C, Baandrup L, Dehlendorff C, Kjaer SK. Tubal ligation and salpingectomy and the risk of epithelial ovarian cancer and borderline ovarian tumors: a nationwide case-control study. *Acta Obstet Gynecol Scand*. 2015;94:86–94.

38] Kuchenbaecker KB, Hopper JL, Barnes DR, Phillips KA, Mooij TM, Roos-Blom MJ, et al. Risks of breast, ovarian, and contralateral breast cancer for BRCA1 and BRCA2 mutation carriers. *JAMA*. 2017;317:2402–16.

39] Bonadona V, Bonaiti B, Olschwang S, Grandjouan S, Huiart L, Longy M, et al. Cancer risks associated with germline mutations in MLH1, MSH2, and MSH6 genes in Lynch syndrome. *JAMA*. 2011;305:2304–10.

40] Song H, Dicks E, Ramus SJ, Tyrer JP, Intermaggio MP, Hayward J, et al. Contribution of germline mutations in the RAD51B, RAD51C, and RAD51D genes to ovarian cancer in the population. *J Clin Oncol* 2015;33:2901–7.

41] Loveday C, Turnbull C, Ruark E, Xicola RM, Ramsay E, Hughes D, et al. Germline RAD51C mutations confer susceptibility to ovarian cancer. *Nat Genet.* 2012;44:475–6.

42] Ramus SJ, Song H, Dicks E, Tyrer JP, Rosenthal AN, Intermaggio MP, et al. Germline mutations in the BRIP1, BARD1, PALB2, and NBN genes in women with ovarian cancer. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2015;27;107(11) pii: djv21.

43] Kar SP, Berchuck A, Gayther SA, Goode EL, Moysich KB, Pearce CL, et al. Common genetic Variation and susceptibility to ovarian cancer: current insights and future Directions. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2018;27(4):395-404.

44) Pearce CL, Stram DO, Ness RB, Stram DA, Roman LD, Templeman C, et al. Population distribution of lifetime risk of ovarian cancer in the United States. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 2015;24:671–6

\*45] Jervis S, Song H, Lee A, Dicks E, Harrington P, Baynes C, et al. A Risk Prediction Algorithm for Ovarian Cancer Incorporating BRCA1, BRCA2, Common Alleles and Other Familial Effects. *J Med Genet.* 2015; 52(7):465-75.

46] CanRisk Programme. Available at <https://ccge.medschl.cam.ac.uk/canrisk/>. Accessed 8<sup>th</sup> August 2019

47] FORECEE. Female cancer prediction using cervical omics to individualise screening and prevention (FORECEE). Available at: <http://www.forecee.eu/>. Accessed 8th August 2019.

48] Low EL, Waller J, Menon U, Jones A, Reid F, Simon AE. Ovarian cancer symptom awareness and anticipated time to help-seeking for symptoms among UK women. *J Fam Plann Reprod Health Care*. 2013;39(3):163-71.

49] Low EL, Simon AE, Waller J, Wardle J, Menon U. Experience of symptoms indicative of gynaecological cancers in UK women. *Br J Cancer*. 2013;20:109(4):882-7.

50] Doroudi M, Kramer BS, Pinsky PF. The bimanual ovarian palpation examination in the Prostate, Lung, Colorectal and Ovarian cancer screening trial: Performance and complications. *J Med Screen*. 2017;24(4):220-222.

51] Bodelon C, Pfeiffer RM, Buys SS, Black A, Sherman ME. Analysis of serial ovarian volume measurements and incidence of ovarian cancer: implications for pathogenesis. *J Natl Cancer Inst*. 2014 Sep 13;106(10). pii: dju262

52) Menon U, Ryan A, Kalsi J, Gentry-Maharaj A, Dawnay A, Habib M, et al. Risk Algorithm Using Serial Biomarker Measurements Doubles the Number of Screen-Detected Cancers

Compared with a Single-Threshold Rule in the United Kingdom Collaborative Trial of Ovarian Cancer Screening. *J Clin Oncol*. 2015; 33:2062–2071.

53] Sharma A, Burnell M, Gentry-Maharaj A, Campbell S, Amso NN, Seif MW, Fletcher G, et al. Quality assurance and its impact on ovarian visualization rates in the multicenter United Kingdom Collaborative Trial of Ovarian Cancer Screening (UKCTOCS). *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. 2016;47(2):228-35.

54] Stott W, Campbell S, Franchini A, Blyuss O, Zaikin A, Ryan A, et al. Sonographers' self-reported visualization of normal postmenopausal ovaries on transvaginal ultrasound is not reliable: results of expert review of archived images from UKCTOCS. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. 2018;51(3):401-408.

55] Sharma A, Burnell M, Gentry-Maharaj A, Campbell S, Amso NN, Seif MW, et al. Factors affecting visualization of postmenopausal ovaries: descriptive study from the multicenter United Kingdom Collaborative Trial of Ovarian Cancer Screening (UKCTOCS). *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. 2013 Oct;42(4):472-7.55]

56] Mathieu KB, Bedi DG, Thrower SL, Qayyum A, Bast RC Jr. Screening for ovarian cancer: imaging challenges and opportunities for improvement. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. 2018; 51(3): 293–303.

57] Aalipour A, Chuang H, Surya M, Aloma L, D'Souza, Seung-min Park. Engineered immune cells as highly sensitive cancer diagnostics *Nature Biotechnology*. 2019;37:531–539.

58] Pal S, Ray A, Andreou C, Zhou Y, Rakshit T, Wlodarczyk M, et al. DNA-enabled rational design of fluorescence-Raman bimodal nanoprobe for cancer imaging and therapy. *Nat Commun.* 2019;10(1):1926.

\*59] Pinsky PF, Yu K, Kramer BS, Black A, Buys SS, Partridge E, et al. Extended mortality results for ovarian cancer screening in the PLCO trial with median 15years follow-up. *Gynecol Oncol.* 2016 Nov;143(2):270-275.

\*60] Kobayashi H, Yamada Y, Sado T, et al. A randomized study of screening for ovarian cancer: a multicenter study in Japan. *Int J Gynecol Cancer* 2008;18:414–20.

\*61] Jacobs IJ, Menon U, Ryan A, Gentry-Maharaj A, Burnell M, Kalsi JK, et al. Ovarian cancer screening and mortality in the UK Collaborative Trial of Ovarian Cancer Screening (UKCTOCS): a randomised controlled trial. *Lancet* 2015;387:945–56.

62] Skates SJ, Greene MH, Buys SS, Mai PL, Brown P, Piedmonte M, et al. Early detection of ovarian cancer using the risk of ovarian cancer algorithm with frequent CA125 testing in women at increased familial risk—combined results from two screening trials. *Clin Cancer Res.* 2017;23:3628–37.

63] Menon U, Ryan A, Kalsi J, Gentry-Maharaj A, Dawnay A, Habib M, et al. Risk algorithm using serial biomarker measurements doubles the number of screen-detected cancers com-

pared with a single-threshold rule in the United Kingdom Collaborative Trial of Ovarian Cancer Screening. *J Clin Oncol*. 2015;33:2062–71.

64] Drescher CW, Shah C, Thorpe J, O'Briant K, Anderson GL, Berg CD, et al. Longitudinal screening algorithm that incorporates change over time in CA125 levels identifies ovarian cancer earlier than a single-threshold rule. *Journal of clinical oncology : official journal of the American Society of Clinical Oncology* 2013 Jan 20;31(3):387-92.

65] Blyuss O, Burnell M, Ryan A, Gentry-Maharaj A, Marino IP, Kalsi J, et al. Comparison of longitudinal CA125 algorithms as a first-line screen for ovarian cancer in the general population. *Clin Cancer Res*. 2018;24(19):4726–33.

66] Cramer DW, Bast RC Jr, Berg CD, Diamandis EP, Godwin AK, Hartge P, et al. Ovarian cancer biomarker performance in prostate, lung, colorectal, and ovarian cancer screening trial specimens. *Cancer Prev Res*. 2011;4:365–74

67] Yang WL, Gentry-Maharaj A, Simmons A, Ryan A, Fourkala EO, Lu Z, et al. Elevation of TP53 autoantibody before CA125 in preclinical invasive epithelial ovarian cancer. *Clin Cancer Res* 2017;23:5912–22

68] Blyuss O, Gentry-Maharaj A, Fourkala EO, Ryan A, Zaikin A, Menon U, et al. Serial patterns of ovarian cancer biomarkers in a prediagnosis longitudinal dataset. *Biomed Res Int* 2015; 2015:681416.

69] Russell MR, Walker MJ, Williamson AJ, Gentry-Maharaj A, Ryan A, Kalsi J, et al. Protein Z: a putative novel biomarker for early detection of ovarian cancer. *Int J Cancer* 2016;138:2984–92.

70] Cohen JD, Li L, Wang Y, Thoburn C, Afsari B, Danilova L, et al. Detection and localization of surgically resectable cancers with a multi-analyte blood test. *Science*. 2018;359:926–30.

71] Cristiano S, Leal A, Phallen J, Fiksel J, Adleff V, Bruhm DC, et al. Genome-wide cell-free DNA fragmentation in patients with cancer. *Nature*. 2019 Jun;570(7761):385-389.

72] Kinde I, Bettgowda C, Wang Y, Wu J, Agrawal N, Shih le M, et al. Evaluation of DNA from the Papanicolaou test to detect ovarian and endometrial cancers. *Sci Transl Med*. 2013;5:167ra4

73] Erickson BK, Kinde I, Dobbin ZC, Wang Y, Martin JY, Alvarez RD, et al. Detection of somatic TP53 mutations in tampons of patients with high-grade serous ovarian cancer. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2014;124:881–5

74] Clinicaltrials.gov. Advanced methods for cancer detection by vaginal screening (ADVISE). Available at: <https://clinical-trials.gov/ct2/show/NCT02622776?term=Advanced+Methods+for+Cancer+Detection+by+Vaginal+Screening+%28ADVISE%29&rank=51>. Retrieved 6<sup>th</sup> August 2019.



75] Maritschnegg E, Wang Y, Pecha N, Horvat R, Van Nieuwen- huysen E, Vergote I, et al. Lavage of the uterine cavity for molecular detection of Müllerian duct carcinomas: a proof-of-concept study. *J Clin Oncol* 2015;33:4293–300.

76] Clinicaltrials.gov. Biomarkers for early detection of ovarian cancer using uterine lavage (BEDOCA). Available at: <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT03150121?term=Biomarkers+for+Early+Detection+of+Ovarian+Cancer+Using+Uterine+Lavage+%28BEDOCA%29&rank=51>. Accessed 8th August 2019.

77] Chen K, Gentry-Maharaj A, Burnell M, Steentoft C, Marcos-Silva L, Mandel U, et al. Microarray Glycoprofiling of CA125 improves differential diagnosis of ovarian cancer. *J Proteome Res*. 2013 Mar 1;12(3):1408-18. doi: 10.1021/pr3010474. Epub 2013 Feb 19.

78] Hayashi M, Matsuo K, Tanabe K, Ikeda M, Miyazawa M, Yasaka M, et al. Comprehensive Serum Glycopeptide Spectra Analysis (CSGSA): A Potential New Tool for Early Detection of Ovarian Cancer. *Cancers (Basel)*. 2019 Apr 27;11(5). pii:E591.

79] Jacobs IJ, Skates SJ, MacDonald N, Menon U, Rosenthal AN, Davies AP, et al. Screening for ovarian cancer: a pilot randomised controlled trial. *Lancet*. 1999 Apr 10;353(9160):1207-10.

80) Menon U, Skates SJ, Lewis S, Rosenthal AN, Rufford B, Sibley K, et al. Prospective study using the risk of ovarian cancer algorithm to screen for ovarian cancer. *J Clin Oncol*. 2005 Nov 1;23(31):7919-26. PubMed PMID: 16258091.

81) Lu KH, Skates S, Hernandez MA, Bedi D, Bevers T, Leeds L, et al. A 2-stage ovarian cancer screening strategy using the Risk of Ovarian Cancer Algorithm (ROCA) identifies early-stage incident cancers and demonstrates high positive predictive value. *Cancer*. 2013 Oct 1;119(19):3454-61.

82] van Nage II Jr JR, DePriest PD, Ueland FR, et al. Ovarian cancer screening with annual transvaginal sonography: findings of 25,000 women screened. *Cancer*. 2007;109:1887–96.

83] van Nagell Jr JR, Miller RW, DeSimone CP, et al. Long-term survival of women with epithelial ovarian cancer detected by ultrasonographic screening. *Obstet Gynecol*. 2011;118:1212–21.

84] Rosenthal AN, Fraser L, Manchanda R, Badman P, Philpott S, Mozersky J, et al. Results of annual screening in phase I of the United Kingdom familial ovarian cancer screening study highlight the need for strict adherence to screening schedule. *J Clin Oncol*. 2013;31:49–57.

\*85] Rosenthal AN, Fraser LSM, Philpott S, Manchanda R, Burnell M, Badman P, et al. Evidence of stage shift in women diagnosed with ovarian cancer during phase II of the United Kingdom Familial Ovarian Cancer Screening Study. *J Clin Oncol*. 2017;35:1411–20.

86] Skates SJ, Greene MH, Buys SS, Mai PL, Brown P, Piedmonte M, et al. Early detection of ovarian cancer using the risk of ovarian cancer algorithm with frequent CA125 testing in

women at increased familial risk—combined results from two screening trials. *Clin Cancer Res* 2017;23:3628–37

87) Clinicaltrials.Gov. A trial using novel markers to predict malignancy in elevated-risk women. Available at: <https://clinicaltrials.gov/ct2/show/NCT01121640>. Retrieved July 25, 2017.

88) National Institute for Healthcare Research (NIHR) Funding awards. Long term impact of screening on ovarian cancer mortality in the UK Collaborative Trial of Ovarian Cancer Screening (UKCTOCS) <https://www.fundingawards.nihr.ac.uk/award/16/46/01> Retrieved July 25, 2017.

89] The ALDO project - Avoiding Late Diagnosis of Ovarian Cancer. Available at: <https://www.uclh.nhs.uk/OurServices/ServiceA-Z/Cancer/NCV/Pages/TheALDOproject.aspx>  
Accessed 8th August 2019

90] Buys SS, Partridge E, Black A, Johnson CC, Lamerato L, Isaacs C, et al. Effect of screening on ovarian cancer mortality: the Prostate, Lung, Colorectal and Ovarian (PLCO) cancer screening randomized controlled trial. *JAMA*. 2011;305:2295–303.

91] Barrett J, Jenkins V, Farewell V, Menon U, Jacobs I, UKCTOCS trialists et al. Psychological morbidity associated with ovarian cancer screening: results from more than 23,000 women in the randomised trial of ovarian cancer screening (UKCTOCS). *BJOG*. 2014;121(9):1071-9.

92] Fallowfield L, Solis-Trapala I, Menon U, Langridge C, May S, Jacobs I, et al. The effect of ovarian cancer screening on sexual activity and functioning: results from the UK collaborative trial of ovarian cancer screening RCT. *Br J Cancer*. 2017;116(8):1111-1117.

93] Lifford KJ, Clements A, Fraser L, Lancaster D, Brain K; PsyFOCS Management Group. A qualitative study of women's experiences of familial ovarian cancer screening. *Psychooncology*. 2013;22(11):2576-84.

94] Gentry-Maharaj A, Sharma A, Burnell M, et al. Acceptance of transvaginal sonography by postmenopausal women participating in the United Kingdom Collaborative Trial of Ovarian Cancer Screening. *Ultrasound Obstet Gynecol*. 2013;41: 73–79.

95) Menon U, Gentry-Maharaj A, Ryan A, Sharma A, Burnell M, Hallett R, et al. Recruitment to multicentre trials--lessons from UKCTOCS: descriptive study. *BMJ*. 2008 Nov 13;337:a2079.

96] Burnell M, Gentry-Maharaj A, Ryan A, Apostolidou S, Habib M, Kalsi J, et al. Impact on mortality and cancer incidence rates of using random invitation from population registers for recruitment to trials. *Trials*. 2011 Mar 1;12:61. doi: 10.1186/1745-6215-12-61.

97] Kearns B, Chilcott J, Whyte S, Preston L and Sadler S. Cost-effectiveness of screening for ovarian cancer amongst postmenopausal women: a model-based economic evaluation. *BMC Medicine* volume 14, Article number: 200 (2016)

\*98] Menon U, McGuire AJ, Raikou M, Ryan A, Davies SK, Burnell M, et al. The cost-effectiveness of screening for ovarian cancer: results from the UK Collaborative Trial of Ovarian Cancer Screening (UKCTOCS). *Br J Cancer*. 2017 Aug 22;117(5):619-627. doi: 10.1038/bjc.2017.222. Epub 2017 Jul 25.

99] Moss HA, Berchuck A, Neely ML, Myers ER, Havrilesky LJ. Estimating Cost-effectiveness of a Multimodal Ovarian Cancer Screening Program in the United States: Secondary Analysis of the UK Collaborative Trial of Ovarian Cancer Screening (UKCTOCS). *JAMA Oncol*. 2018 Feb 1;4(2):190-195.

\*100] Henderson JT, Webber EM, Sawaya GF. Screening for Ovarian Cancer: Updated Evidence Report and Systematic Review for the US Preventive Services Task Force. *JAMA*. 2018;319(6):595–606.

101] USPSTF. Ovarian cancer screening: draft recommendation statement. Available at: <https://www.uspreventiveservices-taskforce.org/Page/Document/draft-recommendation-statement174/ovarian-cancer-screening1#Pod9>. Accessed 6th August 2019.