MULTIMODAL SPECTROSCOPY AS A TRIAGE TEST FOR WOMEN AT RISK FOR CERVICAL NEOPLASIA: EXPERIENCE WITH A LOW COST COMMERCIAL PROTOTYPE

CONCLUSIONS: In the first clinical evaluation of a lower cost **RESULTS**: Accounting for protocol deviations, user/device er-**OBJECTIVE**: We evaluated multimodal hyperspectroscopy (MHS) "MHS offers the potential of a cost effective and in a busy private practice setting in Orange County, California. rors and no or discordant histology results, data from a total of commercial prototype, MHS increased detection of CIN2+ by efficient modality for earlier detection of CIN2+ Women enrolled at our clinic and two others were tested with a 320 (Table 1.) women were available for analysis, including 14 56% over the Pap test when both tests were equalized for specidisease in women at risk for cervical disease, ficity at 44%, the specificity for MHS using a prospectively detercost and size reduced version of the MHS device (Image 1.) uswith normal referral cytology, 153 with atypical squamous or ing a single-use patient interface (Image 2.). In addition, our glandular referral cytology, 148 with LSIL referral cytology and mined threshold. The population studied had insignificant numwhile at the same time reducing the number of bers of HSIL cytology and thus Pap cytology essentially had negpopulation consisted mainly of women who are most at need for five with high grade squamous intraepithelial lesion (HSIL) or colposcopies and biopsies currently performed on ligible triage value when compared with MHS. MHS offers the effective triaging to biopsy, i.e., those with atypical cells of undemalignant referral cytology (Table 2). Histologically, 41 women potential of a cost effective and efficient modality for earlier dewere diagnosed with cervical intraepithelial neoplasia (CIN2+), termined significance (ASC-US), atypical squamous cells, cannot normal and benign cervices." tection of CIN2+ disease in women at risk for cervical disease, rule out a high grade lesion (ASC-H) and low grade squamous in-145 with CIN1 and 134 with benign or normal cervices. Using a traepithelial lesion (LSIL) Papanicolaou (Pap) results and mostly prospectively set threshold, sensitivity for CIN2+ disease and while at the same time reducing the number of colposcopies and human papilloma virus (HPV) results. The objective specificity of normal and benign cervices for MHS alone were biopsies currently performed on normal and benign cervices. positive of the study was to compare the results of MHS with the current 88% and 44% respectively, as compared with 56% and 44% for Figure 1. ROC for Pap cytology and MHS adjunctive to Table 2. Number and Prevalence of final QA histopathology cytology alone, an improvement of 56% for MHS over Pap cytolstandard of care for triage in general and with the Pap test in Pap cytology as a function of reason for referral to colposcopy ogy. MHS was positive for 69% of CIN1 lesions. Integrating cyparticular. tology results for each subject with the MHS result did not improve performance, as specificity remained at 44%, but sensitiv-**METHODS**: After initial training 0.9 ity of MHS and Pap combined fell to 85%. In both cases, howand debugging, (n = 61) 444 8.0 women were tested at three ever, the improved sensitivity of MHS compared with the Pap test was statistically significant (p<0.01, Fisher's Exact Test). Posiclinical centers using preproductive and negative predictive values (excluding CIN1 lesions) for tion prototypes of the MHS de-MHS alone were 32% and 92% respectively, as compared with vice (Guided Therapeutics, Inc. 23% and 77% for cytology (Table 3). Triage value, reflected by Norcross, GA). A histopathology area under the ROC curve was 0.54 for cytology, 0.64 for MHS quality assurance review pro-0.3 Pap Test—AUC=0.541 MHS—AUC=0.675 alone and 0.68 for MHS combined with cytology, although the cedure was used for all subjects 0.2 value added by combining cytology with MHS occurred at the low in the study along with two year 0.1 follow up when available to desensitivity end of the ROC curve and thus would have minimal termine histological diagnoses. clinical significance (Figure 1). There were no adverse events 0.1 0.2 0.3 0.4 0.5 1 - Specificity and, similar to its predecessor prototype, women found the pro-Data analyses included receiver cedure with the new device acceptable. operating characteristic (ROC)

curves along with estimates of sensitivity, specificity and predictive values.



Image 1. LightTouch prototype in a clinical setting.

Image 2. Single-use patient interface.

Pivotal Study Clinical Sites 1-Emory University School of Medicine – Lisa C. Flowers, MD / Talaat S. Tadros, MD 2-University of Miami – Leo Twiggs, MD / Nahida Chakhtoura, MD **3-Orange County California – Marc Winter, MD / Daniel Sternfeld, MD**

Winter, ML, – Orange Coast Women's Medical Group, Laguna Hills, CA, Sternfeld, DR – Saddleback Women's Medical Group, Laguna Hills, CA

	Non	Non	Non	Non	Non			Non		
Age	Hispanic	Hispanic	Hispanic	Hispanic	Hispanic	Hispanic	Hispanic	Hispanic	Hispanic	
	American Indian Alaska	Asian	Black or African American	White	Native Hawaiian/ Pacific	Black or African American	White	TOTAL	TOTAL	TOTAL ENROLLED
	Native				Islander					
16-20	0	0	14	19	0	0	8	33	8	41
21-30	0	5	41	49	3	0	39	98	39	137
31-over	0	3	38	65	1	0	35	107	35	142
							TOTAL	238	82	320

Table 1. Demographics k	by age for 320 subjects
-------------------------	-------------------------





Table 3. Effectiveness of MHS and Pap cytology for CIN2+ and normal lesions

Value (%)	SENSITIVITY (n=41 CIN2+)	SPECIFICITY (n=134 Normal)	POSITIVE PREDICTIVE VALUE	NEGATIVE PREDICTIVE VALUE	
MHS	88	44	32	92	
Pap Cytology	56	44	23	77	
* Does not include 145 CIN1 lesions					



Referral Cytology	Normal	CIN1	CIN2+	TOTAL	% Prevalence CIN2+	
Negative	9	5	0	14*	0.0	
ASC-US	73	59	21	153	13.7	
LSIL	52	81	15	148	10.1	
HSIL	0	0	5	5	100	
	134	145	41	320	12.8	
xcludes one subject with no histopathology						

Supported in part by grants from the Georgia Research Alliance and the National Cancer Institute. Also supported by Guided Therapeutics, Inc.

LightTouchTM is a trademark of Guided Therapeutics, Inc. ©2010 Guided Therapeutics, Inc.