

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 (<u>http://bmjopen.bmj.com</u>).

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

## A panel of serum biomarkers (GastroPanel) in diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and helicobacter pylori infection: a protocol of systematic review and meta-analysis

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2022-062849
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	17-Mar-2022
Complete List of Authors:	Wu, Dan; People' s Hospital of Xinjin District, Chengdu Shi, Anya; Lanzhou University Wang, Haiping; Gansu Provincial Key Laboratory of Biotherapy and Regenerative Medicine; Lanzhou University First Affiliated Hospital Yu, Xiuzhong; People's Hospital of Xinjin District, Chengdu
Keywords:	Gastrointestinal infections < GASTROENTEROLOGY, Hepatobiliary disease < GASTROENTEROLOGY, Gastrointestinal tumours < GASTROENTEROLOGY
	·



1 2		
3 4 5	1	A panel of serum biomarkers (GastroPanel) in diagnosis of
6 7	2	atrophic gastritis and helicobacter pylori infection: a protocol of
8 9 10	3	systematic review and meta-analysis
11 12	4	Dan Wu <sup>1</sup> , Anya Shi <sup>2</sup> , Haiping Wang <sup>3,4</sup> , Xiuzhong Yu <sup>5,*</sup>
13 14	5	
15 16	6	<sup>1</sup> People' s Hospital of Xinjin District, Chengdu, Sichuan 611430, China
17	7	<sup>2</sup> The Second Clinical Medical Hospital, Lan Zhou University, Lanzhou, Gansu, 730000,
19 20	8	China
21	9	<sup>3</sup> Gansu Provincial Key Laboratory of Biotherapy and Regenerative Medicine, Lanzhou,
22	10	Gansu, 730000, China
24 25	11	<sup>4</sup> The First Hospital of Lanzhou University, Lanzhou, Gansu, 730000, China
26 27	12	<sup>5</sup> People' s Hospital of Xinjin District, Chengdu, Sichuan 611430, China
28 29	13	
30 31	14	*Correspondence:
32 33	15	Xiuzhong Yu
34 35	16	E-mail: <u>yxzhh768019@163.com</u>
36 37	17	People' s Hospital of Xinjin District, NO. 149, Wujin West Road, Chengdu, Sichuan
38 39	18	610500, China
40 41	19	Tel: +86 13608076810
42 43	20	
44 45	21	
46 47 48	22	Running title: GastroPanel diagnose atrophic gastritis and helicobacter pylori infection
49 50	23	Count:
52 53	24	Abstract: 247
54 55 56	25	Text: 2265
57 58	26	Number of figures: 0
59 60	27	Number of tables: 1

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

- Dan Wu: dan101412@163.com
- 30 Anya Shi: shiay18@lzu.edu.cn
- 31 Haiping Wang: wanghp2016@hotmail.com
- 32 Xiuzhong Yu: yxzhh768019@163.com

for occiteries only

2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
1/	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
25	
26	
27	
28	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44 45	
45 46	
40 17	
48	
49	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
57	
58	
59	
60	

#### 34 Strengths and limitations of this study

This study will be the first systematic review and meta-analysis to synthetically 35 36 investigate the diagnostic accuracy of GastroPanel ® test for helicobacter pylori infection. 37

38 This research will be conducted in strict accordance with the relevant 39 methodological guidelines of systematic review and meta-analysis to minimize bias. 40

The majority of included studies may be cross-sectional study, which may 41 compromise the results of our study. 42

43 The publication bias is still of concern because this study will be limited to the .ons. English- and Chinese-language publications. 44

45

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, AI training, and similar technologies

#### 

## 46 ABSTRACT

47 Introduction The etiology of gastric cancer is still unclear but helicobacter pylori (HP)
48 infection and chronic atrophic gastritis recognized as two major risk factors for gastric
49 cancer. GastroPanel ® test (GP) is the first non-invasive diagnostic tool to detect
50 atrophic gastritis and helicobacter pylori infection.

51 The aim of the study is to conduct a systematic review and meta-analysis to review 52 published literature about the GP test for diagnosing atrophic gastritis (AG) and HP 53 infection. With the objective to estimate the diagnostic performance indices of GP for 54 atrophic gastritis and helicobacter pylori infection.

Methods and analysis This protocol of systematic review and meta-analysis is reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) Protocols statement guidelines. PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, Cochrane Library databases will be systematically searched to identify eligible studies. No language limitations were imposed. The studies will be downloaded into the Endnote X9 software and duplicates will be removed. Two review authors independently screened the full text against the inclusion criteria, extracted the data from each included study by using a piloted data extraction form, and conduct risk of bias assessment, resolving disagreement by discussion. Results will be synthesized narratively in summary tables, using a random effect bivariate model and we fit a summary hierarchical receiving operating characteristic (HSROC) curve. 

66 Ethics and dissemination This systematic review will include data extracted form
67 published studies, therefore, does not require ethics approval. The results of this study
68 will be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal.

**PROSPERO registration number** CRD42021282616.

#### 71 INTRODUCTION

Gastric cancer (GC) is the sixth most common cancer and the fourth most common cause of cancer-related deaths worldwide in 2020.<sup>1</sup> Although the incidence of the GC has decreased constantly over the past five years due to a decreasing prevalence of helicobacter pylori (HP) infection, GC still remains particularly high incidence worldwide.<sup>2</sup> In any case, early gastric cancer is still considered an initial phase of tumor progression with good prognosis, so early detection of these lesions is important for the screening of gastric cancer.<sup>3</sup> International guidelines recommend endoscopic surveillance with chromoendoscopy and guided biopsies to detect early gastric cancer and reduce mortality of subjects with atrophic gastritis, even after HP eradication.<sup>4</sup> However, the methods was invasive diagnostic tests, and was not cost-effective in regions with low incidence of gastric cancer and stepwise- or individualized screening according to the risk factors of gastric cancer.<sup>5</sup> Therefore, novel diagnostic tests were urgently needed to detect early GC.<sup>6</sup> 

The etiology of GC is still unclear but is known to involve the complex interplay of host and environment, with HP infection and its associated chronic atrophic gastritis (CAG) were recognized as two major risk factors for gastric cancer.<sup>7-9</sup> The Taipei global consensus supports the proposal that at an individual level, eradication of HP reduces the risk of GC in asymptomatic subjects.<sup>10</sup> Thus, the non-invasive diagnostic test for detection of AG and HP was promising tools for systematic screening of GC risk groups.<sup>11 12</sup> However, it is still a matter that identifying subjects with an underlying atrophic gastritis or HP infection. 

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Gastroscopy and histology are the gold standards for diagnosis of atrophic gastritis, but as a screening test, endoscope is expensive for the majority, especially in low-come countries.<sup>13</sup> Meantime, there were also studies showed that traditional endoscopy cannot reliably diagnose HP gastritis, atrophy or intestinal metaplasia.<sup>14-16</sup> Endoscope is an invasive test, it may make subjects to be uncomfortable and does not have good patient's compliance.<sup>17</sup> For the screening of HP infection, the current non-invasive method is urea breath tests, serology and stool antigen tests, urea breath tests had high

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

diagnostic accuracy while serology and stool antigen tests were less accurate.<sup>18</sup> However the urea breath tests also have some limitations, for instance the <sup>14</sup>C-UBTs are radioactive, and people should know the potential risks, so <sup>14</sup>C-UBTs cannot be performed in children or pregnant women, and repeated tests should be avoided.<sup>20</sup> The major drawback to use of  ${}^{13}C$ -UBTs is the cost of the equipment to measure  ${}^{13}CO_2$  in expired breath.<sup>21</sup> Therefore, novel diagnostic measures are urgently needed to allow detection of early AG and HP infection. The novel non-invasive tool alleviates the patients' pain during testing and at the same time improve patient's compliance. In addition, an accurate non-invasive test would be very helpful to improve our knowledge on the epidemiology of atrophic gastritis or HP infection in the general population. The global consensus report has agreed that serological tests (pepsinogen I and II and HP antibody) are useful for identifying individuals at increased risk for gastric cancer and for the diagnosis of chronic gastritis and gastric atrophy.<sup>22</sup> International guidelines and the Maastricht V/Florence Consensus Report also recommend that serological tests may be useful to the patients with HP infection.<sup>413</sup> 

GastroPanel ® test (GP) is the non-invasive diagnostic tool based on physiology of three biomarkers specific to stomach structure and function, complemented by ELISA (IgG) testing for pepsinogen I and II, Gastrin-17, and HP antibody.<sup>23-25</sup> Over the last decade, GP had been proposed as a non-invasive test for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection.<sup>23 26</sup> Moreover, recent original studies showed that this test is a useful non-invasive diagnostic tool in an individual patient, and as a population screening and surveillance tool.<sup>12 27</sup> Two systematic reviews and Meta-analyses were conducted to confirmed the accuracy of GP for diagnosing AG in 2016 and 2017.<sup>25 28</sup> But all the previous Meta-analyses were limited by the few studies with a small sample size for assessing the reliability of the test for the diagnosis. The limited number of studies also eroded the power of the subgroup analysis. To our knowledge, no meta-analysis on diagnostic accuracy of GP for HP infection. New evidence was published for the diagnostic performance indices of GP for both AG and HP infection.29-32

Page 7 of 19

1

2	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
, 0	
0	
9	
10	
11	
12	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
10	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
20	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	
20	
29	
30	
31	
32	
33	
34	
25	
35	
36	
37	
38	
39	
10	
40	
41	
42	
43	
44	
45	
16	
40	
47	
48	
49	
50	
50	
51	
52	
53	
54	
55	
56	
50	
5/	
58	
59	
60	

# 129 **OBJECTIVES**

This study aims to present a protocol for systematic review and meta-analysis to
estimate the diagnostic performance indices of GP for atrophic gastritis and HP
infection.

133 METHODS AND ANALYSIS

### 134 Study registration

This protocol of systematic review and meta-analysis is reported according to the
Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)
Protocols statement guidelines.<sup>33</sup>

This protocol has been registered with the International Prospective Register of
Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) database. PROSPERO registration number is
CRD42021282616.

141 Criteria for study selection

#### 142 Population

143 Population with doing biomarker panel GP test for diagnosing AG and HP infection.

#### 144 Index test

The index test is mainly biomarker panel GP test. The test is a serological test consisting of a panel of stomach-specific biomarkers: Pepsinogens I and II, Gastrin-17, and HP antibodies. Growing demand for non-invasive tests to screen the gastric cancer (GC) risk, GP was designed by Biohit Oyj and used for stomach health as the first serological test.<sup>23-25</sup> Over the last decade, GP has been proposed as a non-invasive test for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection.<sup>23 26</sup>

151 *Reference standards* 

152 There is no gold standard for diagnosis of HP infection. Gastroscopy and histology are 153 the gold standard for diagnosis of atrophic gastritis.<sup>13</sup> Therefore we considered only 154 gastroscopy and histology as the reference standard/ gold standard for diagnosis of 155 atrophic gastritis and HP infection.

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

#### 156 Target conditions or diseases

157 Atrophic gastritis (AG), which has two types: a gastric body predominant type in 158 patients with infection of HP, and an autoimmune type, limited to the gastric body and 159 fundus.<sup>34</sup> It is well known that the intestinal-type gastric adenocarcinoma develops in a 160 stepwise manner with a sequence of events that evolves from atrophic gastritis and 161 intestinal metaplasia to dysplasia and carcinoma.

HP infection remains one of the most prevalent infections worldwide, especially in low resource countries. HP infection has been clearly correlated with gastric carcinogenesis.

# *Type of studies*

All applicable studies that evaluate the accuracy of GP in diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection for the appropriate patient population regardless whether data were collected prospectively or retrospectively. However, letters, meeting abstracts, notes, comments, editorials, protocols, guidelines, case reports and case series will be excluded. Case-control studies will also be excluded, because these are prone to bias.

#### 170 Search strategy

A systematic search of PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, and Cochrane Library will
be performed. We will use a combination of the search field 'Title/Abstract' and MeSH
(alternatively Thesaurus or Subject Headings) for the best possible information retrieval.
A search field converting 'Title', 'Abstract' and 'Keywords' will be use in the absence
of a MeSH, Thesaurus or Subject Headings.

We identified eligible studies by searching PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, and Cochrane Library databases from inception to March 2022. The medical subject headings and keywords searched consisted of 'atrophic gastritis' 'helicobacter pylori' 'gastric cancer' 'GastroPanel'. The detailed search strategy for PubMed is shown in Table 1. Deduplication and screening details will be reported in a PRISMA flow diagram. No language or publication date limitations were imposed. To identify additional studies, we examined references lists from related reviews and studies that were included in our analysis. A complete search update of all databases will be 

#### BMJ Open

3 4	184	performed before the references lists that conduct the final analysis and hand screening
5 6	185	in the included studies.
/ 8 9	186	Selection of studies
10	187	The duplicated studies will be removed. And then two independent review authors will
12 12	188	screen the title and abstract to identify relevant studies. The full-text for identified
13 14 15	189	relevant studies will be obtained, two review authors will independently screen the full-
15 16	190	text against the eligible criteria. Any disagreement in study selection will be solved by
17	191	discussion. We will attempt to contact study authors if there were doubts about the
19 20	192	eligibility of a study. Primary reasons for exclusion will be documented in a PRISMA
21 22 23	193	flowchart.
24 25	194	Data extraction and management
26 27	195	Two review authors will extract the data from each included study independently, using
28 29	196	a data extraction form. Any disagreement in study selection will be solved by discussion.
30 31	197	Extracted data should include:
32 33	198	(1) First author;
34 35	199	(2) Year of publication;
36 37	200	(3) Study design (prospective or retrospective cohort studies, cross-sectional studies or
38	201	randomized controlled trials);
40	202	(4) Population characteristics (age, gender, country, etc.);
41 42	203	(5) Geographic origin of the study;
43	204	(6) Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants;
45 46	205	(7) Whether use of proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) over the last week;
47 48	206	(8) Number of AG and HP infection;
49 50	207	(9) The threshold values used for each test of the panel;
51 52	208	(10) Description of the reference/golden standard;
53 54	209	(11) Description of the index test;
55 56	210	(12) The indications for endoscopy;
57 58 59 60	211	(13) The number and site of gastric biopsy specimens used for defining the target

condition; 

(14) Grade of severity of atrophic gastritis (atrophy at any grade of severity or moderate-severe atrophy);

(15) Constructed  $2 \times 2$  tables that contained the precise numbers of true positive (TP), 

false negative (FN), false positive (FP) and truenegative (TN).

If we suspected an overlap of participants between multiple reports, we will identify multiple reports of the same study using the information provided in the reports. We sought further information from study authors, if necessary.

**Risk of bias assessment** 

Two reviewers will independently assess the quality of included studies using the Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies 2 (QUADAS-2) instrument. This instrument consists of four key domains that include patient selection, index test, reference standard, and flow of patients through the study and timing of the index and reference standard test. Each domain will be assessed in terms of risk of bias, and the first three domains will also be assessed in terms of applicability. Using this instrument, the risk of bias may be categorized as "low", "high", or "unclear". Discrepancies in the interpretation were resolved by consensus between the two reviewers, if necessary, arbitration by a third reviewer.

Data synthesis and analysis

Using  $2 \times 2$  tables, we will calculate summary estimates of sensitivity and specificity, positive and negative likelihood ratio and diagnostic odds ratio (DOR) with 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) using a random effect bivariate model. 

We will explore the heterogeneity between studies through visual examination of the hierarchical receiving operating characteristic (HSROC) curve. Heterogeneity across the studies will be determined by correlation coefficient between logit transformed sensitivity and specificity by bivariate model and asymmetry parameter,  $\beta$  (beta), where  $\beta=0$  corresponds to a symmetric ROC curve in which the DOR does not vary along the curve by HSROC model. To determine the final meta-analytic model, we used 

Page 11 of 19

#### **BMJ** Open

likelihood ratio tests to assess model fit. Likelihood ratio tests were also used to determine the statistical significance of differences in test accuracy. When heterogeneity was present, the degree was quantified using the I<sup>2</sup> statistic. Values of less than 25% are considered as homogenous and 25% to <50% are considered as having low heterogeneity. For values of 50% or more, significant heterogeneity is assumed. And heterogeneity will also be assumed at significance level of  $P \le 0.05$  and tested by chi-square. 

#### Subgroup analysis

If we extract sufficient data, we will perform subgroup analyses for any covariates that showed a statistically significant association with the summary estimates. We will explore the following sources of heterogeneity for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and helicobacter pylori infection and adding them as covariates, if appropriate, to a bivariate regression model: country, geographic origin, sample size, time of publication (early, recent), setting, study design.

Besides, for diagnosis of atrophic gastritis, we will perform subgroup analyses and meta-regressions by GC incidence (high-, intermediate-, low-), grade and extent of AG, activity of mucosal inflammation. For diagnosis of HP infection, subgroup analyses and meta regressions will be performed by application of PPIs, nonsteroidal antiinflammatory drugs and antibiotic to identify the reasons for heterogeneity. 

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

# Sensitivity analysis and publication bias

Sensitivity analysis will be performed to assess the stability of the meta-analytical results, using the one-by-one study removal and evaluated by descriptively comparing the magnitude and precision of the random effects summary effect sizes. Publication bias will be analyzed using precision funnel plots and the test statistics. 

#### Patients and public involvement

This protocol will use previously published data. No patients or members of public will be included in this study.

DISCUSSION 

HP infection and atrophic gastritis have been recognized as two major risk factors for gastric cancer.<sup>7-9</sup> To identify subjects with an underlying AG and HP infection plays a vital role in preventing and improving the prognosis for GC. The accurate non-invasive tool would be very helpful to identify these subjects, especially in the general population. GP test is the non-invasive diagnostic tool based on physiology of three biomarkers specific to stomach structure and function, complemented by ELISA (IgG) testing for Hp antibodies.<sup>23-25</sup> However, the accuracy of GP is still controversial. And it is necessary to provide a comprehensive review of the relevant studies publish to date. Therefore, we will conduct this systematic review and meta-analysis to provide more supportive evidence in diagnosing atrophic gastritis and HP infection by GastroPanel <sup>®</sup>. This study will synthesize the current literature on the diagnostic performance indices of GastroPanel<sup>®</sup> for atrophic gastritis and helicobacter pylori infection. However, there will be many limitations for this study. Firstly, the majority of included studies will be cross-sectional study, which might cause bias. Secondly, there may be heterogeneity due to this test combinates four biomarkers which have different evaluation criteria. Thirdly, publication bias is still of concern because this study will be limited to the English- and Chinese-language publications. 

.

#### 285 ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

Due to this study as a systematic review, ethics approval is not necessary as we are not
directly targeting individuals or extracting data without privacy. The results of this
study will be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal.

289 Contributors

290 XY and DW concepted and designed the study. HW critically revised the design. AS
291 and DW drafted the manuscript. DW, AS, HW, and XY critically revised and edited
292 the manuscript.

- **Funding** This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public,
- 55 294 commercial or not-for-profit sectors.
- 57 295 Competing interests None declared.
  58
- 59 296 **Patient consent for publication** Not required.

207		
231		
	13	

2 3	298		References
5	299	1	Ferlay J. Colombet M. Soeriomataram I. et al. Cancer statistics for the year 2020: An overview. Int J
6 7	300		<i>Cancer</i> 2021
8 9	301	2	Sung H. Ferlay J. Siegel RL, et al. Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of
10 11	302	-	Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries. CA Cancer I Clin 2021:71:200
12 13	303		49
14 15	304	3	Saragoni L. Upgrading the definition of early gastric cancer: better staging means more appropriate
16 17	305	-	treatment Cancer Biol Med 2015:12:355-61
18 19	306	4	Pimentel-Nunes P. Libânio D. Marcos-Pinto R. et al. Management of enithelial precancerous
20 21	207	т	anditions and logions in the stomach (MADS II): European Society of Costrointestingl Endescony
22	307		(ECCE) E E E E E E E E E E E E E E E E E
23	308		(ESGE), European Helicobacter and Microbiota Study Group (EHMSG), European Society of
25 26	309		Pathology (ESP), and Sociedade Portuguesa de Endoscopia Digestiva (SPED) guideline update 2019.
27 28	310		Endoscopy 2019;51:365-88.
29	311	5	Jencks DS, Adam JD, Borum ML, et al. Overview of Current Concepts in Gastric Intestinal
30 31	312		Metaplasia and Gastric Cancer. Gastroenterol Hepatol (NY) 2018;14:92-101.
32 33	313	6	Necula L, Matei L, Dragu D, et al. Recent advances in gastric cancer early diagnosis. World J
34 35	314		Gastroenterol 2019;25:2029-44.
36 37	315	7	Machlowska J, Baj J, Sitarz M, et al. Gastric Cancer: Epidemiology, Risk Factors, Classification,
38 39	316		Genomic Characteristics and Treatment Strategies. Int J Mol Sci 2020;21
40 41	317	8	Venerito M, Link A, Rokkas T, et al. Gastric cancer - clinical and epidemiological aspects.
42 43	318		Helicobacter 2016;21 Suppl 1:39-44.
44 45	319	9	Yusefi AR, Bagheri Lankarani K, Bastani P, et al. Risk Factors for Gastric Cancer: A Systematic
46 47	320		Review. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev 2018;19:591-603.
48 49	321	10	Liou JM, Malfertheiner P, Lee YC, et al. Screening and eradication of Helicobacter pylori for gastric
50 51	322		cancer prevention: the Taipei global consensus. Gut 2020;69:2093-112.
52 53	323	11	Cai Q, Zhu C, Yuan Y, et al. Development and validation of a prediction rule for estimating gastric
54 55	324		cancer risk in the Chinese high-risk population: a nationwide multicentre study. Gut 2019;68:1576-
56 57	325		87.
58 59	326	12	Koivurova OP, Koskela R, Blomster T, et al. Serological Biomarker Panel in Diagnosis of Atrophic
60			14

Page 15 of 19

#### **BMJ** Open

3	007	
4 5	321	Gastritis and Helicobacter pylori Infection in Gastroscopy Referral Patients: Clinical Validation of
6	328	the New-Generation GastroPanel(®) Test. Anticancer Res 2021;41:5527-37.
8	329	13 Malfertheiner P, Megraud F, O'Morain CA, et al. Management of Helicobacter pylori infection-the
9 10	330	Maastricht V/Florence Consensus Report. Gut 2017;66:6-30.
11 12	331	14 Bertges LC, Dibai FN, Bezerra G, et al. Comparison Between the Endoscopic Findings and the
13 14	332	Histological Diagnosis of Antral Gastrites. Arq Gastroenterol 2018;55:212-15.
15 16	333	15 Carr NJ, Leadbetter H, Marriott A. Correlation between the endoscopic and histologic diagnosis of
17 18	334	gastritis. Ann Diagn Pathol 2012;16:13-5.
19 20	335	16 Sharma S, Makaju R, Dhakal R, et al. Correlation between Endoscopic and Histopathological
21 22	336	Findings in Gastric Lesions. Kathmandu Univ Med J (KUMJ) 2015;13:216-9.
23 24	337	17 Graham DY, Kato M, Asaka M. Gastric endoscopy in the 21st century: appropriate use of an invasive
25	338	procedure in the era of non-invasive testing. Dig Liver Dis 2008;40:497-503.
27	339	18 Best LM, Takwoingi Y, Siddique S, et al. Non-invasive diagnostic tests for Helicobacter pylori
29	340	infection. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2018;3:CD012080.
31 22	341	19 Huh CW, Kim BW. [Diagnosis of Helicobacter pylori Infection]. Korean J Gastroenterol
33 34	342	2018;72:229-36.
34 35	343	20 O'Connor A. The Urea Breath Test for the Noninvasive Detection of Helicobacter pylori. Methods
30 37	344	Mol Biol 2021;2283:15-20.
38 39	345	21 Masucci L, Blackhouse G, Goeree R. Cost-effectiveness of the carbon-13 urea breath test for the
40 41	346	detection of Helicobacter pylori: an economic analysis. Ont Health Technol Assess Ser 2013;13:1-
42 43	347	28.
44 45	348	22 Sugano K, Tack J, Kuipers EJ, et al. Kyoto global consensus report on Helicobacter pylori gastritis.
46 47	349	<i>Gut</i> 2015;64:1353-67.
48 49	350	23 Väänänen H, Vauhkonen M, Helske T, et al. Non-endoscopic diagnosis of atrophic gastritis with a
50 51	351	blood test. Correlation between gastric histology and serum levels of gastrin-17 and pepsinogen I: a
52 53	352	multicentre study. Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2003;15:885-91.
54 55	353	24 McNicholl AG, Valle J, Gisbert JP. Response to: accuracy of GastroPanel test in detection of atrophic
56 57	354	gastritis. Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2015;27:105-6.
58 59	355	25 Syrjänen K. A Panel of Serum Biomarkers (GastroPanel®) in Non-invasive Diagnosis of Atrophic
60		15

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Gastritis. Systematic Review and Meta-analysis. *Anticancer Res* 2016;36:5133-44.

- 26 Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015:
  elaboration and explanation. *BMJ* 2016;354:i4086.
- 359 27 MÄki M, SÖderstrÖm D, Paloheimo L, et al. Helicobacter pylori (Hp) IgG ELISA of the New-
  - Generation GastroPanel® Is Highly Accurate in Diagnosis of Hp-Infection in Gastroscopy Referral
     Patients. *Anticancer Res* 2020;40:6387-98.
- 362 28 Zagari RM, Rabitti S, Greenwood DC, et al. Systematic review with meta-analysis: diagnostic
  363 performance of the combination of pepsinogen, gastrin-17 and anti-Helicobacter pylori antibodies
  364 serum assays for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis. *Aliment Pharmacol Ther* 2017;46:657-67.
- 365 29 Grad C, Pop A, Gaborean E, et al. Value of GastroPanel in the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis. *Exp*366 *Ther Med* 2021;22:1347.
- 367 30 Syrjänen K, Eskelinen M, Peetsalu A, et al. GastroPanel® Biomarker Assay: The Most
   368 Comprehensive Test for Helicobacter pylori Infection and Its Clinical Sequelae. A Critical Review.
   369 Anticancer Res 2019;39:1091-104.
- 31 Paloheimo L, Tiusanen T, Suovaniemi O, et al. Serological Biomarker Test (GastroPanel(®)) in the
   Diagnosis of Functional Gastric Disorders, Helicobacter pylori and Atrophic Gastritis in Patients
   Examined for Dyspeptic Symptoms. *Anticancer Res* 2021;41:811-19.
- 373 32 Chapelle N, Petryszyn P, Blin J, et al. A panel of stomach-specific biomarkers (GastroPanel®) for
  374 the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis: A prospective, multicenter study in a low gastric cancer incidence
  375 area. *Helicobacter* 2020;25:e12727.
  - 376 33 Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for
    377 reporting systematic reviews. *BMJ* 2021;372:n71.
  - 378 34 Li Y, Xia R, Zhang B, et al. Chronic Atrophic Gastritis: A Review. *J Environ Pathol Toxicol Oncol*379 2018;37:241-59.

31	Table 1 Search strategy used in PubMed
Numbe	r Search terms
1	"helicobacter pylori"[MeSH Terms]
2	"helicobacter nemestrinae"[Title/Abstract]
3	"helicobacter infections"[Title/Abstract]
4	"Helicobacter"[Title/Abstract]
5	"pylori"[Title/Abstract]
6	"H.Pylori"[Title/Abstract]
7	"Campylobacter"[Title/Abstract]
8	"campylobacter pylori"[Title/Abstract]
9	1 or 2-9
10	"gastritis, atrophic"[MeSH Terms]
11	"atrophic gastritides"[Title/Abstract]
12	"atrophic gastritis"[Title/Abstract]
13	10 or 11-12
14	"GastroPanel"[Title/Abstract]
15	"serum biomarkers"[Title/Abstract]
16	"panels"[Title/Abstract]
17	"pepsinogens"[MeSH Terms]
18	"pepsinogen i"[Title/Abstract]
19	"pepsinogen ii"[Title/Abstract]
20	"pepsinogen i ii"[Title/Abstract]
21	"Gastrin-17"[Title/Abstract]
22	"helicobacter pylori antibodies"[Title/Abstract]
23	14 or 15-22
24	9 and 13 and 23

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

		BMJ Open BMJ Open BMJ Open BMJ Open BMJ Open BMJ Open BMJ Open	
PRISMA-P (Preferred Readdress in a systematic readeress in a systemati	eporting eview p	g Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist: recommended items to	)
Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item of 28	Page
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORM	ATION	es ppter	8
Title:		a a te	
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review	1
Update	1b	If the protocol is for an update of a previous systematic review, identify as such	NA
Registration	2	If registered, provide the name of the registry (such as PROSPERO) and registration where	4, 7
Authors:		nd	
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide phasical mailing address of corresponding author	1, 2
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review $\frac{2}{3}$	12
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol, identify as such and list changes; otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments	NA
Support:			
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review	12
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor	NA
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the pretocol	NA
INTRODUCTION		d sim	
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known	5-6
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)	6, 7
METHODS		oril 3	
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as years considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review	7, 8
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	8
Search strategy	10	Present draft of search strategy to be used for at least one electronic database, including alanned limits, such that it could be repeated	8, 16
Study records:			
		For poor review only, http://bmionon.hmi.com/site/about/gwidelines.yhtml	

	BMJ Open           Set         BMJ Open	
	n-2022-C yright, ii	
Data management	a Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the view	9, 1
Selection process	b State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent reviews) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	9
Data collection process	c Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done independently, in duplicate), an processes for obtaining and confirming data from investigators	y 9, 1
Data items	2 List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding ources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	9, 1
Outcomes and prioritization	3 List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization and additional outcomes, w rationale	ith 10
Risk of bias in individual studies	4 Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, include whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthetics	10
Data synthesis	a Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	10
	ib If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures between the synthesis of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consister by (such as I <sup>2</sup> , Kendall's τ)	10, 1
	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses imea-regression)	11
	id If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned 🖉 📱	NA
Meta-bias(es)	6 Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across stadies selective reporting within studies)	11
Confidence in cumulative evidence	7 Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	NA
	en.bmj.com/ on April 30, 2025 and similar technologies.	
	For peer review only - http://bmiopen.bmi.com/site/about/guidelines.xhtml	

## A panel of serum biomarkers (GastroPanel) in diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and helicobacter pylori infection: a protocol of systematic review and meta-analysis

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2022-062849.R1
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	18-Aug-2022
Complete List of Authors:	Wu, Dan; People's Hospital of Xinjin District Chengdu Shi, Anya; Lanzhou University Wang, Haiping; Lanzhou University Gansu Provincial Key Laboratory of Biotherapy and Regenerative Medicine; Lanzhou University First Affiliated Hospital Yu, Xiuzhong; People's Hospital of Xinjin District Chengdu
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b> :	Diagnostics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Gastroenterology and hepatology, Diagnostics, Infectious diseases
Keywords:	Gastrointestinal infections < GASTROENTEROLOGY, Hepatobiliary disease < GASTROENTEROLOGY, Gastrointestinal tumours < GASTROENTEROLOGY



1 2		
2 3 4	1	A panel of serum biomarkers (GastroPanel) in diagnosis of
5 6 7	2	atrophic gastritis and helicobacter pylori infection: a protocol of
, 8 9	3	systematic review and meta-analysis
10 11	Ũ	systematic review and meta analysis
12	4	Dan Wu <sup>1</sup> , Anya Shi <sup>2</sup> , Haiping Wang <sup>3,4</sup> , Xiuzhong Yu <sup>5,*</sup>
13 14	5	
15 16	6	<sup>1</sup> People' s Hospital of Xinjin District, Chengdu, Sichuan 611430, China
17 18	7	<sup>2</sup> The Second Clinical Medical Hospital, Lan Zhou University, Lanzhou, Gansu, 730000,
19 20	8	China
21	9	<sup>3</sup> Lanzhou University Gansu Provincial Key Laboratory of Biotherapy and Regenerative
22 23 24	10	Medicine, Lanzhou, Gansu, 730000, China
25	11	<sup>4</sup> The First Hospital of Lanzhou University, Lanzhou, Gansu, 730000, China
26 27 20	12	<sup>5</sup> People' s Hospital of Xinjin District, Chengdu, Sichuan 611430, China
28 29	13	
30 31	11	*Correspondence:
32	17	
33 34	15	Xiuzhong Yu
35	16	E-mail: yxzhh768019@163.com
36 37 38	17	People' s Hospital of Xinjin District, NO. 149, Wujin West Road, Chengdu, Sichuan
39	18	610500, China
40 41	19	Tel: +86 13608076810
42 43	20	
44 45	21	
46 47 48	22	Running title: GastroPanel diagnose atrophic gastritis and helicobacter pylori infection
40 49 50 51	23	Count:
52 53	24	Abstract: 247
54 55 56	25	Text: 2287
57 58	26	Number of figures: 0
59 60	27	Number of tables: 1

- 29 Dan Wu: dan101412@163.com
- 30 Anya Shi: shiay18@lzu.edu.cn
- 31 Haiping Wang: wanghp2016@hotmail.com
- 32 Xiuzhong Yu: yxzhh768019@163.com

to perteries only

### 34 ABSTRACT

Introduction The etiology of gastric cancer is still unclear but helicobacter pylori (HP)
infection and chronic atrophic gastritis recognized as two major risk factors for gastric
cancer. GastroPanel<sup>®</sup> test (GP) is the first non-invasive diagnostic tool to detect atrophic
gastritis and helicobacter pylori infection.

The aim of the study is to conduct a systematic review and meta-analysis to review
published literature about the GP test for diagnosing atrophic gastritis (AG) and HP
infection. With the objective to estimate the diagnostic performance indices of GP for
atrophic gastritis and helicobacter pylori infection.

Methods and analysis This protocol of systematic review and meta-analysis is reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) Protocols statement guidelines. PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, Cochrane Library databases will be systematically searched to identify eligible studies. No language limitations were imposed. The studies will be downloaded into the Endnote X9 software and duplicates will be removed. Two review authors independently screened the full text against the inclusion criteria, extracted the data from each included study by using a piloted data extraction form, and conduct risk of bias assessment, resolving disagreement by discussion. Results will be synthesized narratively in summary tables, using a random effect bivariate model and we fit a summary hierarchical receiving operating characteristic (HSROC) curve.

54 Ethics and dissemination This systematic review will include data extracted form
55 published studies, therefore, does not require ethics approval. The results of this study
56 will be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal.

**PROSPERO registration number** CRD42021282616.

# 59 Strengths and limitations of this study

This study will be the first systematic review and meta-analysis to synthetically
 investigate the diagnostic accuracy of GastroPanel<sup>®</sup> test for helicobacter pylori
 infection.

This research will be conducted in strict accordance with the relevant
 methodological guidelines of systematic review and meta-analysis to minimize
 bias.

The majority of included studies may be cross-sectional study, which may
compromise the results of our study.

The publication bias is still of concern because this study will be limited to the
 English- and Chinese-language publications.

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

### 71 INTRODUCTION

Gastric cancer (GC) is the sixth most common cancer and the fourth most common cause of cancer-related deaths worldwide in 2020.<sup>1</sup> Although the incidence of GC has decreased steadily over the past five years due to a decreasing prevalence of helicobacter pylori (HP) infection, GC still remains particularly high incidence worldwide.<sup>2</sup> In any case, early gastric cancer is still considered an initial phase of tumor progression with good prognosis, so early detection of these lesions is important for the screening of gastric cancer.<sup>3</sup> International guidelines recommend endoscopic surveillance with chromoendoscopy and guided biopsies to detect early gastric cancer and reduce mortality of subjects with atrophic gastritis, even after HP eradication.<sup>4</sup> However, the method is an invasive test and is not cost-effective in regions with low incidence of gastric cancer and stepwise- or individualized screening according to the risk factors of gastric cancer.<sup>5</sup> Therefore, novel diagnostic tests were urgently needed to detect early GC.6 

The etiology of GC is still unclear but is known to involve the complex interplay of host and environment, with HP infection and its associated chronic atrophic gastritis (CAG) were recognized as two major risk factors for gastric cancer.<sup>7-9</sup> The Taipei global consensus supports the proposal that at an individual level, eradication of HP reduces the risk of GC in asymptomatic subjects.<sup>10</sup> Thus, the non-invasive diagnostic test for detection of AG and HP is a promising tool for systematic screening of GC risk groups.<sup>11 12</sup> However, the optimal diagnostic test for detection of AG and HP infection is still under discussion. 

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Gastroscopy and histology are the gold standards for diagnosis of atrophic gastritis, but
as a screening test, endoscope is expensive for the majority, especially in low-income
countries.<sup>13</sup> Several studies have showed that traditional endoscopy cannot reliably
diagnose HP gastritis, atrophy or intestinal metaplasia.<sup>14-16</sup> Endoscopy is an invasive
test, which causes much discomfort, thus reducing patient compliance.<sup>17</sup> For the
screening of HP infection, the current non-invasive methods are urea breath tests,
serology and stool antigen tests. Urea breath tests have to make it have high diagnostic

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

accuracy while serology and stool antigen tests were less accurate.<sup>18</sup> <sup>19</sup> However the urea breath tests also have some limitations, for instance the <sup>14</sup>C-UBTs are radioactive, and people should know the potential risks, so <sup>14</sup>C-UBTs cannot be performed in children or pregnant women, and repeated tests should be avoided.<sup>20</sup> The major drawback to use of  ${}^{13}C$ -UBTs is the cost of the equipment to measure  ${}^{13}CO_2$  in expired breath.<sup>21</sup> Therefore, novel diagnostic methods are urgently needed to allow detection of early AG and HP infection. The novel non-invasive tool significantly improves patient's compliance. In addition, an accurate non-invasive test would be very helpful to improve our knowledge of the epidemiology of atrophic gastritis or HP infection in the general population. The global consensus report has agreed that serological tests (pepsinogen I and II and HP antibody) are useful for identifying individuals at increased risk for gastric cancer and for the diagnosis of chronic gastritis and gastric atrophy.<sup>22</sup> International guidelines and the Maastricht V/Florence Consensus Report also recommend that serological tests may be useful to the patients with HP infection.<sup>413</sup> 

GastroPanel<sup>®</sup> test (GP) is the non-invasive diagnostic tool based on physiology of three biomarkers specific to stomach structure and function, complemented by ELISA (IgG) testing for pepsinogen I and II, Gastrin-17, and HP antibody.<sup>23-25</sup> Over the last decade, GP had been proposed as a non-invasive test for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection.<sup>23 26</sup> Moreover, recent original studies showed that this test is a useful non-invasive diagnostic tool in an individual patient, and as a population screening and surveillance tool.<sup>12</sup> <sup>27</sup> Two systematic reviews and Meta-analyses confirmed the accuracy of GP for diagnosing AG in 2016 and 2017.<sup>25 28</sup> Previous Meta-analyses were limited by the few studies with a small sample size for assessing the reliability of the test for the diagnosis. The limited number of studies also eroded the power of the subgroup analysis. To our knowledge, there are no meta-analysis on diagnostic accuracy of GP for HP infection. New evidence has been published for the diagnostic performance indices of GP for both AG and HP infection.<sup>29-32</sup> 

- **OBJECTIVES** 
  - 128 This study aims to present a protocol for systematic review and meta-analysis to

**BMJ** Open

estimate the diagnostic performance indices of GP for atrophic gastritis and HP
infection.
METHODS AND ANALYSIS
Study registration
This protocol of systematic review and meta-analysis is reported according to the
Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)
Protocols statement guidelines. <sup>33</sup>
This protocol has been registered with the International Prospective Register of
Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) database. PROSPERO registration number is
CRD42021282616.
Criteria for study selection
Population
Population who had biomarker panel GP test for diagnosing AG and HP infection.
Index test
The index test is mainly biomarker panel GP test. The test is a serological test consisting
of a panel of gastric-specific biomarkers: Pepsinogens I and II. Gastrin-17, and HP
antibodies. Growing demand for non-invasive tests to screen the gastric cancer (GC)
antibodies. Growing demand for non-invasive tests to screen the gastric cancer (GC) risk. GP was designed by Biohit Oyj and used for stomach health as the first serological
antibodies. Growing demand for non-invasive tests to screen the gastric cancer (GC) risk. GP was designed by Biohit Oyj and used for stomach health as the first serological test. <sup>23-25</sup> Over the last decade, GP has been proposed as a non-invasive test for the
antibodies. Growing demand for non-invasive tests to screen the gastric cancer (GC) risk. GP was designed by Biohit Oyj and used for stomach health as the first serological test. <sup>23-25</sup> Over the last decade, GP has been proposed as a non-invasive test for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection. <sup>23 26</sup>
antibodies. Growing demand for non-invasive tests to screen the gastric cancer (GC) risk. GP was designed by Biohit Oyj and used for stomach health as the first serological test. <sup>23-25</sup> Over the last decade, GP has been proposed as a non-invasive test for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection. <sup>23 26</sup> <i>Reference standards</i>
antibodies. Growing demand for non-invasive tests to screen the gastric cancer (GC) risk. GP was designed by Biohit Oyj and used for stomach health as the first serological test. <sup>23-25</sup> Over the last decade, GP has been proposed as a non-invasive test for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection. <sup>23 26</sup> <i>Reference standards</i> Compared with other Hp detection methods, histology is the gold standard.
antibodies. Growing demand for non-invasive tests to screen the gastric cancer (GC) risk. GP was designed by Biohit Oyj and used for stomach health as the first serological test. <sup>23-25</sup> Over the last decade, GP has been proposed as a non-invasive test for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection. <sup>23 26</sup> <i>Reference standards</i> Compared with other Hp detection methods, histology is the gold standard. Gastroscopy and histology are the gold standard for diagnosis of atrophic gastritis. <sup>13</sup>
antibodies. Growing demand for non-invasive tests to screen the gastric cancer (GC) risk. GP was designed by Biohit Oyj and used for stomach health as the first serological test. <sup>23-25</sup> Over the last decade, GP has been proposed as a non-invasive test for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection. <sup>23 26</sup> <i>Reference standards</i> Compared with other Hp detection methods, histology is the gold standard. Gastroscopy and histology are the gold standard for diagnosis of atrophic gastritis. <sup>13</sup> Therefore we considered only gastroscopy and histology as the reference standard/ gold
antibodies. Growing demand for non-invasive tests to screen the gastric cancer (GC) risk. GP was designed by Biohit Oyj and used for stomach health as the first serological test. <sup>23-25</sup> Over the last decade, GP has been proposed as a non-invasive test for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection. <sup>23 26</sup> <i>Reference standards</i> Compared with other Hp detection methods, histology is the gold standard. Gastroscopy and histology are the gold standard for diagnosis of atrophic gastritis. <sup>13</sup> Therefore we considered only gastroscopy and histology as the reference standard/ gold standard for diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection.
antibodies. Growing demand for non-invasive tests to screen the gastric cancer (GC) risk. GP was designed by Biohit Oyj and used for stomach health as the first serological test. <sup>23-25</sup> Over the last decade, GP has been proposed as a non-invasive test for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection. <sup>23 26</sup> <i>Reference standards</i> Compared with other Hp detection methods, histology is the gold standard. Gastroscopy and histology are the gold standard for diagnosis of atrophic gastritis. <sup>13</sup> Therefore we considered only gastroscopy and histology as the reference standard/ gold standard for diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection. <i>Target conditions or diseases</i>

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

**BMJ** Open

patients with infection of HP, and an autoimmune type, limited to the gastric body and
fundus.<sup>34</sup> It is well known that the intestinal-type gastric adenocarcinoma develops in a
stepwise manner with a sequence of events that evolves from atrophic gastritis and
intestinal metaplasia to dysplasia and carcinoma.

HP infection remains one of the most prevalent infections worldwide, especially in low resource countries. HP infection has been clearly correlated with gastric carcinogenesis.
 <sup>35</sup>

# 163 Type of studies

All applicable studies that evaluate the accuracy of GP in diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection for the appropriate patient population regardless whether data were collected prospectively or retrospectively. However, letters, meeting abstracts, notes, comments, editorials, protocols, guidelines, case reports and case series will be excluded. Case-control studies will also be excluded, because these are prone to bias.

#### 169 Search strategy

A systematic search of PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, and Cochrane Library will
be performed. We will use a combination of the search field 'Title/Abstract' and MeSH
(alternatively Thesaurus or Subject Headings) for the best possible information retrieval.
A search field converting 'Title', 'Abstract' and 'Keywords' will be use in the absence
of a MeSH, Thesaurus or Subject Headings.

We identified eligible studies by searching PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, and Cochrane Library databases from inception to March 2022. The medical subject headings and keywords searched consisted of 'atrophic gastritis' 'helicobacter pylori' 'gastric cancer' 'GastroPanel'. The detailed search strategy for PubMed is shown in Table 1. Deduplication and screening details will be reported in a PRISMA flow diagram. No language or publication date limitations were imposed. To identify additional studies, we examined references lists from related reviews and studies that were included in our analysis. A complete search update of all databases will be performed before the references lists that conduct the final analysis and hand screening 

1 2		
3 4 5	184	in the included studies.
6 7	185	Selection of studies
8	186	The duplicated studies will be removed. And then two independent review authors will
10 11	187	screen the title and abstract to identify relevant studies. The full-text for identified
12	188	relevant studies will be obtained, thereafter, two review authors will independently
13 14 15	189	screen the full-text against the eligible criteria. Any disagreement in study selection will
15 16	190	be resolved by consensus. We will attempt to contact study authors if there were doubts
17 18	191	about the eligibility of a study. Primary reasons for exclusion will be documented in a
19 20 21	192	PRISMA flowchart.
22	193	Data extraction and management
23 24	194	Two review authors will extract the data from each included study independently using
25 26	195	a data extraction form Any disagreement in study selection will be solved by discussion
27 28	196	Extracted data should include:
29 30	107	(1) First author:
31 32	197	(1)  First aution,
33	198	(2) Year of publication;
34 35	199	(3) Study design (prospective or retrospective cohort studies, cross-sectional studies or
36 37	200	randomized controlled trials);
38 30	201	(4) Population characteristics (age, gender, country, etc.);
40	202	(5) Geographic origin of the study;
41	203	(6) Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants;
43 44	204	(7) Whether use of proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) over the last two weeks;
45 46	205	(8) Number of AG and HP infection;
47 48	206	(9) The threshold values used for each test of the panel;
49 50	207	(10) Description of the reference/golden standard;
51 52	208	(11) Description of the index test;
53 54	209	(12) The indications for endoscopy;
55 56	210	(13) The number and site of gastric biopsy specimens used for defining the target
57 58	211	condition;
59 60		

212 (14) Grade of severity of atrophic gastritis (atrophy at any grade of severity or
213 moderate-severe atrophy);

- 214 (15) Constructed  $2 \times 2$  tables that contained the precise numbers of true positive (TP),
- 215 false negative (FN), false positive (FP) and truenegative (TN);
- 216 (16) Recent antibiotic ingestion;
- 217 (17) Alcohol ingestion;
- 218 (18) Bile salts;

- 219 (19) Time lag between taking the samples and analysis;
- (20) Whether the samples were transported to a lab for analysis, and under whatconditions.

If we suspected an overlap of participants between multiple reports, we will
identify multiple reports of the same study using the information provided in the reports.
We sought further information from study authors, if necessary.

225 Risk of bias assessment

Two reviewers will independently assess the quality of included studies using the Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies 2 (QUADAS-2) instrument. This instrument consists of four key domains that include patient selection, index test, reference standard, and flow of patients through the study and timing of the index and reference standard test. Each domain will be assessed in terms of risk of bias, and the first three domains will also be assessed in terms of applicability. Using this instrument, the risk of bias may be categorized as "low", "high", or "unclear". Discrepancies in the interpretation were resolved by consensus between the two reviewers, if necessary, arbitration by a third reviewer.

235 Data synthesis and analysis

Using 2 × 2 tables, we will calculate summary estimates of sensitivity and specificity,
positive and negative likelihood ratio and diagnostic odds ratio (DOR) with 95%
confidence intervals (95% CI) using a random effect bivariate model.

- 239 We will explore the heterogeneity between studies through visual examination of the

Page 11 of 18

#### **BMJ** Open

hierarchical receiving operating characteristic (HSROC) curve. Heterogeneity across the studies will be determined by correlation coefficient between logit transformed sensitivity and specificity by bivariate model and asymmetry parameter,  $\beta$  (beta), where  $\beta=0$  corresponds to a symmetric ROC curve in which the DOR does not vary along the curve by HSROC model. To determine the final meta-analytic model, we will use likelihood ratio tests to assess model fit. Likelihood ratio tests will also be used to determine the statistical significance of differences in test accuracy. When heterogeneity is present, the degree will be quantified using the I<sup>2</sup> statistic. Values of less than 25% are considered as homogenous and 25% to <50% are considered as having low heterogeneity. For values of 50% or more, significant heterogeneity is assumed. And heterogeneity will also be assumed at significance level of P< 0.05 and tested by chi-square.

#### Subgroup analysis

If we extract sufficient data, we will perform subgroup analyses for any covariates that showed a statistically significant association with the summary estimates. We will explore the following sources of heterogeneity for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and helicobacter pylori infection and adding them as covariates, if appropriate, to a bivariate regression model: country, geographic origin, sample size, time of publication (early, recent), setting, study design. 

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Besides, for diagnosis of atrophic gastritis, we will perform subgroup analyses and meta-regressions by GC incidence (high-, intermediate-, low-), grade and extent of AG, activity of mucosal inflammation. For diagnosis of HP infection, subgroup analyses and meta regressions will be performed by application of PPIs, nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and antibiotic to identify the reasons for heterogeneity.

### Sensitivity analysis and publication bias

Sensitivity analysis will be performed to assess the stability of the meta-analytical results, using the one-by-one study removal and evaluated by descriptively comparing the magnitude and precision of the random effects summary effect sizes. Publication

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

268 bias will be analyzed using precision funnel plots and the test statistics.

269 Patients and public involvement

This protocol will use previously published data. No patients or members of public willbe included in this study.

# 272 DISCUSSION

HP infection and atrophic gastritis have been recognized as two major risk factors for gastric cancer.<sup>7-9</sup> To identify subjects with an underlying AG and HP infection plays a vital role in preventing and improving the prognosis for GC. The accurate non-invasive tool would be very helpful to identify these subjects, especially in the general population. GP test is the non-invasive diagnostic tool based on physiology of three biomarkers specific to stomach structure and function, complemented by ELISA (IgG) testing for Hp antibodies.<sup>23-25</sup> However, the accuracy of GP is still controversial. And it is necessary to provide a comprehensive review of the relevant studies published to date. Therefore, we will conduct this systematic review and meta-analysis to provide more supportive evidence in diagnosing atrophic gastritis and HP infection by GastroPanel<sup>®</sup>. This study will synthesize the current literature on the diagnostic performance indices of GastroPanel ® for atrophic gastritis and helicobacter pylori infection. However, there will be many limitations for this study. Firstly, the majority of included studies will be cross-sectional study, which might cause bias. Secondly, there may be heterogeneity with because this test combines four biomarkers which have different evaluation criteria. Thirdly, publication bias is still of concern because this study will be limited to the English- and Chinese-language publications. 

# ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

Due to this study as a systematic review, ethics approval is not necessary as we are not
directly targeting individuals or extracting data without privacy. The results of this
study will be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal.

- 294 Contributors
  - 295 XY and DW concepted and designed the study. HW critically revised the design. AS

2		
3 4	296	and DW drafted the manuscript. DW, AS, HW, and XY critically revised and edited
5 6	297	the manuscript.
7 8	298	Funding This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public,
9 10	299	commercial or not-for-profit sectors.
11 12	300	Competing interests None declared.
13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21 22 32 4 25 26 27 28 29 30 31 22 33 34 35 36 37 38 39 40 41 42 43 44 50 51 52 53 45 56 57 58 59 60	301 302	Patient consent for publication Not required.
		13

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

3	303		References
4 5	304		
6	305	1	Ferlay J, Colombet M, Soerjomataram I, et al. Cancer statistics for the year 2020: An overview. Int J
7	306		Cancer 2021
8	307	2	Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, et al. Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of
9 10	308		Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries. CA Cancer J Clin 2021;71:209-
11	309		49.
12	310	3	Saragoni L. Upgrading the definition of early gastric cancer: better staging means more appropriate
13 14	311		treatment. Cancer Biol Med 2015;12:355-61.
15	312	4	Pimentel-Nunes P, Libânio D, Marcos-Pinto R, et al. Management of epithelial precancerous
16	313		conditions and lesions in the stomach (MAPS II): European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy
17 19	314		(ESGE), European Helicobacter and Microbiota Study Group (EHMSG), European Society of
19	315		Pathology (ESP), and Sociedade Portuguesa de Endoscopia Digestiva (SPED) guideline update 2019.
20	316		Endoscopy 2019;51:365-88.
21	317	5	Jencks DS. Adam JD. Borum ML, et al. Overview of Current Concepts in Gastric Intestinal
22 23	318		Metaplasia and Gastric Cancer. <i>Gastroenterol Hepatol (N Y)</i> 2018:14:92-101.
24	319	6	Necula L. Matei L. Dragu D. et al. Recent advances in gastric cancer early diagnosis. <i>World J</i>
25	320		Gastroenterol 2019:25:2029-44
26	321	7	Machlowska I Bai I Sitarz M et al Gastric Cancer: Epidemiology Risk Factors Classification
27	322	,	Genomic Characteristics and Treatment Strategies Int I Mol Sci 2020:21
29	323	8	Venerito M Link A Rokkas T et al Gastric cancer - clinical and enidemiological aspects
30	324	0	Helicobacter 2016:21 Suppl 1:39-44
31	325	9	Vusefi AR Bagheri Lankarani K Bastani P et al Risk Factors for Gastric Cancer: A Systematic
33	326	,	Review Asian Pac I Cancer Prev 2018:10:591-603
34	327	10	Liou IM Malfertheiner P. Lee VC, et al. Screening and eradication of Helicobacter pylori for gastric
35	328	10	concer prevention: the Taipai global concensus. <i>Gut</i> 2020;60:2003, 112
30 37	320	11	Cai Q. Zhu C. Yuan Y. et al. Development and validation of a prediction rule for estimating castric
38	320	11	cancer risk in the Chinese high risk population: a nationwide multicentre study. <i>Cut</i> 2010;69:1576
39	331		er
40 41	332	12	07. Kajuuraya OP Kaskela P. Blomster T. et al. Serological Biomarker Panel in Diagnosis of Atrophic
42	332	12	Constriction and Holiophaster pulori Infaction in Control Patiente: Clinical Validation of
43	224		the New Concertion Costro Donal (19) Test. Antiognoon Des 2021:41:5527.27
44	225	12	Malfortheiner D. Magraud E. O'Marain CA. et al. Management of Halioahastar nulari infection the
45 46	335	15	Management of Hencobacter pyton infection-the
47	227	14	Dertage LC, Dibei EN, Dezerre C, et al. Comparison Detween the Endessenia Findings and the
48	220	14	Benges LC, Dibai FN, Bezerra G, et al. Comparison Between the Endoscopic Findings and the
49 50	330 220	15	Histological Diagnosis of Antral Gastrites. <i>Arq Gastroenterol</i> 2018;55:212-15.
51	339	15	Carr NJ, Leadbetter H, Marriott A. Correlation between the endoscopic and histologic diagnosis of $(12012 + 12002 + 12012 + 1$
52	340	17	gastritis. Ann Diagn Pathol 2012;16:13-5.
53	341	16	Sharma S, Makaju R, Dhakal R, et al. Correlation between Endoscopic and Histopathological
54 55	342	17	Findings in Gastric Lesions. <i>Kathmandu Univ Med J (KUMJ)</i> 2015;13:216-9.
56	343	17	Granam DY, Kato M, Asaka M. Gastric endoscopy in the 21st century: appropriate use of an invasive
57	344	1.0	procedure in the era of non-invasive testing. <i>Dig Liver Dis</i> 2008;40:497-503.
58 59	345	18	Best LM, Takwoingi Y, Siddique S, et al. Non-invasive diagnostic tests for Helicobacter pylori
60	346		infection. Cochrane Database Syst Rev 2018;3:CD012080.

Page 15 of 18

1

# BMJ Open

2		
3	347	19 Huh CW, Kim BW. [Diagnosis of Helicobacter pylori Infection]. Korean J Gastroenterol
4 5	348	2018;72:229-36.
6	349	20 O'Connor A. The Urea Breath Test for the Noninvasive Detection of Helicobacter pylori. Methods
7	350	Mol Biol 2021;2283:15-20.
8 9	351	21 Masucci L, Blackhouse G, Goeree R. Cost-effectiveness of the carbon-13 urea breath test for the
10	352	detection of Helicobacter pylori: an economic analysis. Ont Health Technol Assess Ser 2013;13:1-
11	353	28.
12	354	22 Sugano K, Tack J, Kuipers EJ, et al. Kyoto global consensus report on Helicobacter pylori gastritis.
14	355	<i>Gut</i> 2015;64:1353-67.
15	356	23 Väänänen H, Vauhkonen M, Helske T, et al. Non-endoscopic diagnosis of atrophic gastritis with a
16	357	blood test. Correlation between gastric histology and serum levels of gastrin-17 and pepsinogen I: a
1/ 18	358	multicentre study. Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2003;15:885-91.
19	359	24 McNicholl AG, Valle J, Gisbert JP. Response to: accuracy of GastroPanel test in detection of atrophic
20	360	gastritis. Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol 2015:27:105-6.
21	361	25 Syrianen K. A Panel of Serum Biomarkers (GastroPanel®) in Non-invasive Diagnosis of Atrophic
22 23	362	Gastritis Systematic Review and Meta-analysis <i>Anticancer Res</i> 2016:36:5133-44
24	363	26 Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta-analysis protocols (PRISMA-P) 2015:
25	364	elaboration and explanation <i>BMI</i> 2016:354:i4086
26	365	27 MÄki M. SÖderström D. Balohaima I. et al. Heliophaster pylori (Hp) IgG ELISA of the New
27	366	Consistion CostroBanel® Is Highly Accurate in Diagnosis of Hp Infection in Costroscopy Poferral
20	300	Definition GastroPanel® Is Highly Accurate in Diagnosis of Hp-Infection in Gastroscopy Referrar
30	367	Patients. Anticancer Res 2020;40:6387-98.
31	368	28 Zagari RM, Rabitti S, Greenwood DC, et al. Systematic review with meta-analysis: diagnostic
32	369	performance of the combination of pepsinogen, gastrin-17 and anti-Helicobacter pylori antibodies
33	370	serum assays for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis. <i>Aliment Pharmacol Ther</i> 2017;46:657-67.
35	371	29 Grad C, Pop A, Gaborean E, et al. Value of GastroPanel in the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis. <i>Exp</i>
36	372	<i>Ther Med</i> 2021;22:1347.
37	373	30 Syrjänen K, Eskelinen M, Peetsalu A, et al. GastroPanel® Biomarker Assay: The Most
39	374	Comprehensive Test for Helicobacter pylori Infection and Its Clinical Sequelae. A Critical Review.
40	375	Anticancer Res 2019;39:1091-104.
41	376	31 Paloheimo L, Tiusanen T, Suovaniemi O, et al. Serological Biomarker Test (GastroPanel(®)) in the
42 43	377	Diagnosis of Functional Gastric Disorders, Helicobacter pylori and Atrophic Gastritis in Patients
44	378	Examined for Dyspeptic Symptoms. Anticancer Res 2021;41:811-19.
45	379	32 Chapelle N, Petryszyn P, Blin J, et al. A panel of stomach-specific biomarkers (GastroPanel®) for
46	380	the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis: A prospective, multicenter study in a low gastric cancer incidence
4/ 48	381	area. Helicobacter 2020;25:e12727.
49	382	33 Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for
50	383	reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71.
51	384	34 Li Y, Xia R, Zhang B, et al. Chronic Atrophic Gastritis: A Review. J Environ Pathol Toxicol Oncol
52 53	385	2018;37:241-59.
54	386	35 Cancer IAfRo. Schistosomes, liver flukes and Helicobacter pylori. <i>IARC monographs on the</i>
55	387	evaluation of carcinogenic risks to humans 1994:61:3-12.
56 57	200	,
57 58	300	
59		
60		46
		15

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

389		Table 1 Search strategy used in PubMed
	Number	Search terms
	1	"helicobacter pylori"[MeSH Terms]
	2	"helicobacter nemestrinae"[Title/Abstract]
	3	"helicobacter infections"[Title/Abstract]
	4	"Helicobacter"[Title/Abstract]
	5	"pylori"[Title/Abstract]
	6	"H.Pylori"[Title/Abstract]
	7	"Campylobacter"[Title/Abstract]
	8	"campylobacter pylori"[Title/Abstract]
	9	1 or 2-9
	10	"gastritis, atrophic"[MeSH Terms]
	11	"atrophic gastritides"[Title/Abstract]
	12	"atrophic gastritis"[Title/Abstract]
	13	10 or 11-12
	14	"GastroPanel"[Title/Abstract]
	15	"serum biomarkers"[Title/Abstract]
	16	"panels"[Title/Abstract]
	17	"pepsinogens"[MeSH Terms]
	18	"pepsinogen i"[Title/Abstract]
	19	"pepsinogen ii"[Title/Abstract]
	20	"pepsinogen i ii"[Title/Abstract]
	21	"Gastrin-17"[Title/Abstract]
	22	"helicobacter pylori antibodies"[Title/Abstract]
	23	14 or 15-22
	24	9 and 13 and 23
	24	9 and 13 and 23

address in a systematic re	eporting eview p	g Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 صطحة المعنية rotocol*
Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item ອີ້ນີ ເຮັ້ນ
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORM	ATION	es re
Title:		Erate
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review
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 and reg
Authors:		
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide <b>b</b> sical mailing address of corresponding author
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review $\frac{2}{3}$
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol identify as such and list char otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments
Support:		
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the pretocol
INTRODUCTION		sin 🦉
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)
METHODS		olog pril a
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as yo considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or ot 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 alanned limits, such that it coube repeated
Study records:		

Data management       11a       Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the view       9, 10         Selection process       11b       State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent regrows) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)       9         Data collection process       11c       Describe planned method of extracting data from envestigators       9, 10         Data items       12       List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding additional outcomes, with rationale       9, 10         Outcomes and prioritization       13       List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization define all outcomes for which study will be upantitatively synthesised       66         Risk of bias in individual studies       14       Describe enricipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including prioritization       10         Data synthesis       15a       Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised       66         15b       If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesised       66       66       66       66       66       66       66       66       66       66       66       66       66       66       66       66       66 <th></th> <th></th> <th>BMJ Open Sp pe</th> <th></th>			BMJ Open Sp pe	
Data management       11a       Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughough the seview       9, 10         Selection process       11b       State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent refervers); (http://gramman.com/processes)       9         Data collection process       11c       Describe planned method of extracting data from investigators       9       9       9         Data items       12       List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding provide); and process, any pre-planned data       9, 10         Outcomes and prioritization       13       List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization difficient all outcomes or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data syndice       9       10         Data synthesis       15a       Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including growthesis difficient or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data syndice       10         Data synthesis       15a       Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies       10         Data synthesis       15a       Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including any planned exploration of comparted, escribe planned assesside (such as a syndicipate) synthesis dia data syndice       10         Data synthesis       15a       Desc			n-2022-0 yright, ir	
Selection process       11b       State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent regress is) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, cligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)       9, 10         Data collection process       11e       Describe planned method of extracting data from investigators       9, 10         Data items       12       List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, fungation and additional outcomes, with rationale       9, 10         Outcomes and prioritization       13       List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of the interpendent of study level, or both, state how this information will be used in data synthesis       10         Data synthesis       15a       Describe planned methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including prioritization of study level, or both, state how this information will be used in data synthesis       10         Data synthesis       15a       Describe refree quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures of the synthesis, describe planned summary measures of the synthesis, describe planned summary measures of the synthesis of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of completery synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned at sorted set of combining data from studies is is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned set of summary planned set of summary planned set of summary planned set of combining data from studies is of the body of evidence will be assessed such as GRADE is a set of the body of evidence will be assessed such as GRADE is	Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughout the view	9, 10
Data collection process       11c       Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, dige indices), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications       9, 10         Data items       12       List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding morecess), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications       9, 10         Outcomes and prioritization       13       List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization       9, 10         Risk of bias in individual studies       14       Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both, state how this information will be used in data synthesis       10         Data synthesis       15a       Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised       00, 11         15c       Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses methods of handling data and methods of commutation will be exploration of complete exploration in thexplorating explorating exploration in the sought expl	Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent review) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	9
Data items       12       List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding protects), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications       9, 10         Outcomes and prioritization       13       List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization       10         Risk of bias in individual studies       14       Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including prioritization       10         Data synthesis       15a       Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including prioritization       10         Data synthesis       15a       Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesis.       10         15b       If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measure exploration of considered y (such as F, Kendall's r)       10, 11         15c       Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as publication bias across stelling selective reporting within studies)       10         15d       If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned exploration of considered y (such as F, Kendall's r)       10, 11         15d       Describe now the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)       NA         Meta-bias(es)       16       Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across stelling selective reporting within studies)       NA<	Data collection process	11c	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	9, 10
Outcomes and prioritization       13       List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization of the source of study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data symbolic of the source or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data symbolic of the source of study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data symbolic of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistence (study as a reappropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures (study as 1°, Kendall's r)       10, 11         Data synthesis       15       Describe anticipated for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures (study as 1°, Kendall's r)       10, 11         Data synthesis       15       Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses measures (study as 1°, Kendall's r)       10, 11         15       Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses measures (study as 1°, Kendall's r)       10, 11         15       Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses measures for any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across studies selective reporting within studies studies, including any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as GRADE)       11         Confidence in cumulative evidence       17       Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)       NA         NA, not applicable.       NA       NA       NA       NA       N	Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding fources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	9, 10
Risk of bias in individual studies       14       Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, including other this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis of the done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis of the done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis of the done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis of the done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis of the done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis of the done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis of the done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis of the done at the outcome of study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis of the done at the outcome of study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis of the done at the outcome of study level, or both; state how this information of consistence (such as IP, Kendall's r)       10         150       If duantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned is selective reporting within studies)       10         Meta-bias(es)       16       Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across statice selective reporting within studies)       11         Confidence in cumulative evidence       17       Describe ow the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization and additional outcomes, with rationale	10
Data synthesis       15a       Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised       10         15b       If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measure softwich so fhandling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned supportiation of comparence will softwich softwi	Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, include whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesis	10
15b       If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measure without of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistence (such as F, Kendall's r)       10, 11         15c       Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses) (such as P, Kendall's r)       11         15d       If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned       10, 11         15d       If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned       10         Meta-bias(es)       16       Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across statice selective reporting within studies)       11         Confidence in cumulative evidence       17       Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)       10         NA, not applicable.       NA       11       10       11         Subjective       11       11       11         Output       11       11       11       11         Confidence in cumulative evidence       17       Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)       10       NA         NA, not applicable.       11       10       11       10       10       10         Subjective       10       11       10       10       10 </td <td>Data synthesis</td> <td>15a</td> <td>Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised</td> <td>10</td>	Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	10
15c       Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyse) more-regression)       11         15d       If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned       NA         Meta-bias(es)       16       Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across stratice selective reporting within studies)       11         Confidence in cumulative evidence       17       Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)       NA         NA, not applicable.       NA       NA       NA       NA		15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measure the synthesis of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as I <sup>2</sup> , Kendall's $\tau$ )	10, 11
15d       If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned of a specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across statilies selective reporting within studies)       11         Confidence in cumulative evidence       17       Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADG)       0       NA         NA, not applicable.       0		15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses mea-regression)	11
Meta-bias(es)       16       Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across stiffied selective reporting within studies)       11         Confidence in cumulative evidence       17       Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)       NA         NA, not applicable.       18       Security and similar technologies.       10       NA		15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned 🛱	NA
Confidence in cumulative evidence       17       Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)       Image: Confidence in cumulative evidence       Image: Confidence       Image: Confidence in cumu	Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across stadies selective reporting within studies)	11
NA, not applicable.	Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	NA
Ť	NA, not applicable.		pen.bmj.com/ on April 30, 2025 at Departmer ,, and similar technologies.	

Ă

## A panel of serum biomarkers (GastroPanel) in diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and helicobacter pylori infection: a protocol of systematic review and meta-analysis

Journal:	BMJ Open
Manuscript ID	bmjopen-2022-062849.R2
Article Type:	Protocol
Date Submitted by the Author:	08-Sep-2022
Complete List of Authors:	Wu, Dan; People's Hospital of Xinjin District Chengdu Shi, Anya; Lanzhou University Wang, Haiping; Lanzhou University Gansu Provincial Key Laboratory of Biotherapy and Regenerative Medicine; Lanzhou University First Affiliated Hospital Yu, Xiuzhong; People's Hospital of Xinjin District Chengdu
<b>Primary Subject Heading</b> :	Diagnostics
Secondary Subject Heading:	Gastroenterology and hepatology, Diagnostics, Infectious diseases
Keywords:	Gastrointestinal infections < GASTROENTEROLOGY, Hepatobiliary disease < GASTROENTEROLOGY, Gastrointestinal tumours < GASTROENTEROLOGY
	•



1 2		
2 3 4 5	1	A panel of serum biomarkers (GastroPanel) in diagnosis of
6 7	2	atrophic gastritis and helicobacter pylori infection: a protocol of
8 9 10	3	systematic review and meta-analysis
11 12	4	Dan Wu <sup>1</sup> , Anya Shi <sup>2</sup> , Haiping Wang <sup>3,4</sup> , Xiuzhong Yu <sup>5,*</sup>
13 14	5	
15 16	6	<sup>1</sup> People' s Hospital of Xinjin District, Chengdu, Sichuan 611430, China
17	7	<sup>2</sup> The Second Clinical Medical Hospital, Lan Zhou University, Lanzhou, Gansu, 730000,
19 20	8	China
20 21	9	<sup>3</sup> Lanzhou University Gansu Provincial Key Laboratory of Biotherapy and Regenerative
22 23	10	Medicine, Lanzhou, Gansu, 730000, China
24 25	11	<sup>4</sup> The First Hospital of Lanzhou University, Lanzhou, Gansu, 730000, China
26 27	12	<sup>5</sup> People's Hospital of Xiniin District. Chengdu, Sichuan 611430. China
28 29	13	
30 31	14	*Correspondence:
32	15	Viuzhong Vu
33 34	10	E meile swahk 7(8010@1(2.com
35 36	10	E-mail: $yxznn/68019(@105.com)$
37 38	17	People's Hospital of Xinjin District, NO. 149, Wujin West Road, Chengdu, Sichuan
39 40	18	610500, China
41 42	19	Tel: +86 13608076810
43	20	
45	21	
46 47 48	22	Running title: GastroPanel diagnose atrophic gastritis and helicobacter pylori infection
49 50	23	Count:
51 52 53	24	Abstract: 250
54 55	25	Text: 2282
50 57 58	26	Number of figures: 0
59 60	27	Number of tables: 1

- 29 Dan Wu: dan101412@163.com
- 30 Anya Shi: shiay18@lzu.edu.cn
- 31 Haiping Wang: wanghp2016@hotmail.com
- 32 Xiuzhong Yu: yxzhh768019@163.com

to perteries only

#### 34 ABSTRACT

Introduction The etiology of gastric cancer is still unclear but helicobacter pylori (HP)
infection and chronic atrophic gastritis recognized as two major risk factors for gastric
cancer. GastroPanel<sup>®</sup> test (GP) is the first non-invasive diagnostic tool to detect atrophic
gastritis and helicobacter pylori infection.

The aim of the study is to conduct a systematic review and meta-analysis to review
published literature about the GP test for diagnosing atrophic gastritis (AG) and HP
infection. With the objective to estimate the diagnostic performance indices of GP for
atrophic gastritis and helicobacter pylori infection.

Methods and analysis This protocol of systematic review and meta-analysis is reported according to the Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA) Protocols statement guidelines. PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, Cochrane Library databases will be systematically searched from inception to March 2022 for eligible studies. No language limitations were imposed. The studies will be downloaded into the Endnote X9 software and duplicates will be removed. Two review authors independently screened the full text against the inclusion criteria, extracted the data from each included study by using a piloted data extraction form, and conduct risk of bias assessment, resolving disagreement by discussion. Results will be synthesized narratively in summary tables, using a random effect bivariate model and we fit a summary hierarchical receiving operating characteristic (HSROC) curve.

54 Ethics and dissemination This systematic review will include data extracted form
55 published studies, therefore, does not require ethics approval. The results of this study
56 will be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal.

**PROSPERO registration number** CRD42021282616.

# 59 Strengths and limitations of this study

This study will be the first systematic review and meta-analysis to synthetically
 investigate the diagnostic accuracy of GastroPanel<sup>®</sup> test for helicobacter pylori
 infection.

This research will be conducted in strict accordance with the relevant
 methodological guidelines of systematic review and meta-analysis to minimize
 bias.

The majority of included studies may be cross-sectional study, which may
compromise the results of our study.

The publication bias is still of concern because this study will be limited to the
 English- and Chinese-language publications.

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

### 71 INTRODUCTION

Gastric cancer (GC) is the sixth most common cancer and the fourth most common cause of cancer-related deaths worldwide in 2020.<sup>1</sup> Although the incidence of GC has decreased steadily over the past five years due to a decreasing prevalence of helicobacter pylori (HP) infection, GC still remains particularly high incidence worldwide.<sup>2</sup> In any case, early gastric cancer is still considered an initial phase of tumor progression with good prognosis, so early detection of these lesions is important for the screening of gastric cancer.<sup>3</sup> International guidelines recommend endoscopic surveillance with chromoendoscopy and guided biopsies to detect early gastric cancer and reduce mortality of subjects with atrophic gastritis, even after HP eradication.<sup>4</sup> However, the method is an invasive test and is not cost-effective in regions with low incidence of gastric cancer and stepwise- or individualized screening according to the risk factors of gastric cancer.<sup>5</sup> Therefore, novel diagnostic tests were urgently needed to detect early GC.6 

The etiology of GC is still unclear but is known to involve the complex interplay of host and environment, with HP infection and its associated chronic atrophic gastritis (CAG) were recognized as two major risk factors for gastric cancer.<sup>7-9</sup> The Taipei global consensus supports the proposal that at an individual level, eradication of HP reduces the risk of GC in asymptomatic subjects.<sup>10</sup> Thus, the non-invasive diagnostic test for detection of AG and HP is a promising tool for systematic screening of GC risk groups.<sup>11 12</sup> However, the optimal diagnostic test for detection of AG and HP infection is still under discussion. 

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Gastroscopy and histology are the gold standards for diagnosis of atrophic gastritis, but
as a screening test, endoscope is expensive for the majority, especially in low-income
countries.<sup>13</sup> Several studies have showed that traditional endoscopy cannot reliably
diagnose HP gastritis, atrophy or intestinal metaplasia.<sup>14-16</sup> Endoscopy is an invasive
test, which causes much discomfort, thus reducing patient compliance.<sup>17</sup> For the
screening of HP infection, the current non-invasive methods are urea breath tests,
serology and stool antigen tests. Urea breath tests has high diagnostic accuracy while

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

serology and stool antigen tests were less accurate.<sup>18 19</sup> However the urea breath tests also have some limitations, for instance the <sup>14</sup>C-UBTs are radioactive, and people should know the potential risks, so <sup>14</sup>C-UBTs cannot be performed in children or pregnant women, and repeated tests should be avoided.<sup>20</sup> The major drawback to use of <sup>13</sup>C-UBTs is the cost of the equipment to measure <sup>13</sup>CO<sub>2</sub> in expired breath.<sup>21</sup> Therefore, novel diagnostic methods are urgently needed to allow detection of early AG and HP infection. The novel non-invasive tool significantly improves patient's compliance. In addition, an accurate non-invasive test would be very helpful to improve our knowledge of the epidemiology of atrophic gastritis or HP infection in the general population. The global consensus report has agreed that serological tests (pepsinogen I and II and HP antibody) are useful for identifying individuals at increased risk for gastric cancer and for the diagnosis of chronic gastritis and gastric atrophy.<sup>22</sup> International guidelines and the Maastricht V/Florence Consensus Report also recommend that serological tests may be useful to the patients with HP infection.413 

GastroPanel<sup>®</sup> test (GP) is the non-invasive diagnostic tool based on physiology of three biomarkers specific to stomach structure and function, complemented by ELISA (IgG) testing for pepsinogen I and II, Gastrin-17, and HP antibody.<sup>23-25</sup> Over the last decade, GP had been proposed as a non-invasive test for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection.<sup>23 26</sup> Moreover, recent original studies showed that this test is a useful non-invasive diagnostic tool in an individual patient, and as a population screening and surveillance tool.<sup>12</sup> <sup>27</sup> Two systematic reviews and Meta-analyses confirmed the accuracy of GP for diagnosing AG in 2016 and 2017.<sup>25 28</sup> Previous Meta-analyses were limited by the few studies with a small sample size for assessing the reliability of the test for the diagnosis. The limited number of studies also eroded the power of the subgroup analysis. To our knowledge, there are no meta-analysis on diagnostic accuracy of GP for HP infection. New evidence has been published for the diagnostic performance indices of GP for both AG and HP infection.<sup>29-32</sup> 

- **OBJECTIVES** 
  - 128 This study aims to present a protocol for systematic review and meta-analysis to

**BMJ** Open

estimate the diagnostic performance indices of GP for atrophic gastritis and HP
infection.
METHODS AND ANALYSIS
Study registration
This protocol of systematic review and meta-analysis is reported according to the
Preferred Reporting Items for Systematic Reviews and Meta-Analyses (PRISMA)
Protocols statement guidelines. <sup>33</sup>
This protocol has been registered with the International Prospective Register of
Systematic Reviews (PROSPERO) database. PROSPERO registration number is
CRD42021282616.
Criteria for study selection
Population
Population who had biomarker panel GP test for diagnosing AG and HP infection.
Index test
The index test is mainly biomarker panel GP test. The test is a serological test consisting
of a panel of gastric-specific biomarkers: Pepsinogens I and II. Gastrin-17, and HP
antibodies. Growing demand for non-invasive tests to screen the gastric cancer (GC)
antibodies. Growing demand for non-invasive tests to screen the gastric cancer (GC) risk. GP was designed by Biohit Oyj and used for stomach health as the first serological
antibodies. Growing demand for non-invasive tests to screen the gastric cancer (GC) risk. GP was designed by Biohit Oyj and used for stomach health as the first serological test. <sup>23-25</sup> Over the last decade, GP has been proposed as a non-invasive test for the
antibodies. Growing demand for non-invasive tests to screen the gastric cancer (GC) risk. GP was designed by Biohit Oyj and used for stomach health as the first serological test. <sup>23-25</sup> Over the last decade, GP has been proposed as a non-invasive test for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection. <sup>23 26</sup>
antibodies. Growing demand for non-invasive tests to screen the gastric cancer (GC) risk. GP was designed by Biohit Oyj and used for stomach health as the first serological test. <sup>23-25</sup> Over the last decade, GP has been proposed as a non-invasive test for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection. <sup>23 26</sup> <i>Reference standards</i>
antibodies. Growing demand for non-invasive tests to screen the gastric cancer (GC) risk. GP was designed by Biohit Oyj and used for stomach health as the first serological test. <sup>23-25</sup> Over the last decade, GP has been proposed as a non-invasive test for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection. <sup>23 26</sup> <i>Reference standards</i> Compared with other Hp detection methods, histology is the gold standard.
antibodies. Growing demand for non-invasive tests to screen the gastric cancer (GC) risk. GP was designed by Biohit Oyj and used for stomach health as the first serological test. <sup>23-25</sup> Over the last decade, GP has been proposed as a non-invasive test for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection. <sup>23 26</sup> <i>Reference standards</i> Compared with other Hp detection methods, histology is the gold standard. Gastroscopy and histology are the gold standard for diagnosis of atrophic gastritis. <sup>13</sup>
antibodies. Growing demand for non-invasive tests to screen the gastric cancer (GC) risk. GP was designed by Biohit Oyj and used for stomach health as the first serological test. <sup>23-25</sup> Over the last decade, GP has been proposed as a non-invasive test for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection. <sup>23 26</sup> <i>Reference standards</i> Compared with other Hp detection methods, histology is the gold standard. Gastroscopy and histology are the gold standard for diagnosis of atrophic gastritis. <sup>13</sup> Therefore we considered only gastroscopy and histology as the reference standard/ gold
antibodies. Growing demand for non-invasive tests to screen the gastric cancer (GC) risk. GP was designed by Biohit Oyj and used for stomach health as the first serological test. <sup>23-25</sup> Over the last decade, GP has been proposed as a non-invasive test for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection. <sup>23 26</sup> <i>Reference standards</i> Compared with other Hp detection methods, histology is the gold standard. Gastroscopy and histology are the gold standard for diagnosis of atrophic gastritis. <sup>13</sup> Therefore we considered only gastroscopy and histology as the reference standard/ gold standard for diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection.
antibodies. Growing demand for non-invasive tests to screen the gastric cancer (GC) risk. GP was designed by Biohit Oyj and used for stomach health as the first serological test. <sup>23-25</sup> Over the last decade, GP has been proposed as a non-invasive test for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection. <sup>23 26</sup> <i>Reference standards</i> Compared with other Hp detection methods, histology is the gold standard. Gastroscopy and histology are the gold standard for diagnosis of atrophic gastritis. <sup>13</sup> Therefore we considered only gastroscopy and histology as the reference standard/ gold standard for diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection. <i>Target conditions or diseases</i>

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

**BMJ** Open

patients with infection of HP, and an autoimmune type, limited to the gastric body and
fundus.<sup>34</sup> It is well known that the intestinal-type gastric adenocarcinoma develops in a
stepwise manner with a sequence of events that evolves from atrophic gastritis and
intestinal metaplasia to dysplasia and carcinoma.

HP infection remains one of the most prevalent infections worldwide, especially in low resource countries. HP infection has been clearly correlated with gastric carcinogenesis.
 <sup>35</sup>

# 163 Type of studies

All applicable studies that evaluate the accuracy of GP in diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and HP infection for the appropriate patient population regardless whether data were collected prospectively or retrospectively. However, letters, meeting abstracts, notes, comments, editorials, protocols, guidelines, case reports and case series will be excluded. Case-control studies will also be excluded, because these are prone to bias.

#### 169 Search strategy

A systematic search of PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, and Cochrane Library will
be performed. We will use a combination of the search field 'Title/Abstract' and MeSH
(alternatively Thesaurus or Subject Headings) for the best possible information retrieval.
A search field converting 'Title', 'Abstract' and 'Keywords' will be use in the absence
of a MeSH, Thesaurus or Subject Headings.

We identified eligible studies by searching PubMed, Embase, Web of Science, and Cochrane Library databases from inception to March 2022. The medical subject headings and keywords searched consisted of 'atrophic gastritis' 'helicobacter pylori' 'gastric cancer' 'GastroPanel'. The detailed search strategy for PubMed is shown in Table 1. Deduplication and screening details will be reported in a PRISMA flow diagram. No language or publication date limitations were imposed. To identify additional studies, we examined references lists from related reviews and studies that were included in our analysis. A complete search update of all databases will be performed before the references lists that conduct the final analysis and hand screening 

1 2		
3 4 5	184	in the included studies.
6 7	185	Selection of studies
8 9	186	The duplicated studies will be removed. And then two independent review authors will
10 11	187	screen the title and abstract to identify relevant studies. The full-text for identified
12	188	relevant studies will be obtained, thereafter, two review authors will independently
13 14 15	189	screen the full-text against the eligible criteria. Any disagreement in study selection will
15 16	190	be resolved by consensus. We will attempt to contact study authors if there were doubts
17	191	about the eligibility of a study. Primary reasons for exclusion will be documented in a
19 20	192	PRISMA flowchart.
21 22	193	Data extraction and management
23 24	194	Two review authors will extract the data from each included study independently using
25 26	195	a data extraction form. Any disagreement in study selection will be solved by discussion.
27 28	196	Extracted data should include:
29 30	197	(1) First author:
31 32	198	(2) Year of publication:
33 34	199	(3) Study design (prospective or retrospective cohort studies, cross-sectional studies or
35 36	200	randomized controlled trials);
37 38	201	(4) Population characteristics (age, gender, country, etc.):
39 40	202	(5) Geographic origin of the study:
41 42	203	(6) Inclusion and exclusion criteria for participants:
43 44	204	(7) Whether use of proton pump inhibitors (PPIs) over the last two weeks:
45 46	205	(8) Number of AG and HP infection:
47 48	206	(9) The threshold values used for each test of the panel:
49 50	207	(10) Description of the reference/golden standard:
50 51 52	208	(11) Description of the index test:
53 54	209	(12) The indications for endoscopy:
54 55	210	(13) The number and site of gastric biopsy specimens used for defining the target
57	211	condition.
50 59		
00		

212 (14) Grade of severity of atrophic gastritis (atrophy at any grade of severity or
213 moderate-severe atrophy);

- 214 (15) Constructed  $2 \times 2$  tables that contained the precise numbers of true positive (TP),
- 215 false negative (FN), false positive (FP) and truenegative (TN);
- 216 (16) Recent antibiotic ingestion;
- 217 (17) Alcohol ingestion;
- 218 (18) Bile salts;

 219 (19) Time lag between taking the samples and analysis;

(20) Whether the samples were transported to a lab for analysis, and under whatconditions.

If we suspected an overlap of participants between multiple reports, we will
identify multiple reports of the same study using the information provided in the reports.
We sought further information from study authors, if necessary.

225 Risk of bias assessment

Two reviewers will independently assess the quality of included studies using the Quality Assessment of Diagnostic Accuracy Studies 2 (QUADAS-2) instrument. This instrument consists of four key domains that include patient selection, index test, reference standard, and flow of patients through the study and timing of the index and reference standard test. Each domain will be assessed in terms of risk of bias, and the first three domains will also be assessed in terms of applicability. Using this instrument, the risk of bias may be categorized as "low", "high", or "unclear". Discrepancies in the interpretation were resolved by consensus between the two reviewers, if necessary, arbitration by a third reviewer.

235 Data

# Data synthesis and analysis

Using 2 × 2 tables, we will calculate summary estimates of sensitivity and specificity,
positive and negative likelihood ratio and diagnostic odds ratio (DOR) with 95%
confidence intervals (95% CI) using a random effect bivariate model.

239 We will explore the heterogeneity between studies through visual examination of the

Page 11 of 18

#### **BMJ** Open

hierarchical receiving operating characteristic (HSROC) curve. Heterogeneity across the studies will be determined by correlation coefficient between logit transformed sensitivity and specificity by bivariate model and asymmetry parameter,  $\beta$  (beta), where  $\beta=0$  corresponds to a symmetric ROC curve in which the DOR does not vary along the curve by HSROC model. To determine the final meta-analytic model, we will use likelihood ratio tests to assess model fit. Likelihood ratio tests will also be used to determine the statistical significance of differences in test accuracy. When heterogeneity is present, the degree will be quantified using the I<sup>2</sup> statistic. Values of less than 25% are considered as homogenous and 25% to <50% are considered as having low heterogeneity. For values of 50% or more, significant heterogeneity is assumed. And heterogeneity will also be assumed at significance level of P< 0.05 and tested by chi-square.

#### Subgroup analysis

If we extract sufficient data, we will perform subgroup analyses for any covariates that showed a statistically significant association with the summary estimates. We will explore the following sources of heterogeneity for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis and helicobacter pylori infection and adding them as covariates, if appropriate, to a bivariate regression model: country, geographic origin, sample size, time of publication (early, recent), setting, study design. 

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

Besides, for diagnosis of atrophic gastritis, we will perform subgroup analyses and meta-regressions by GC incidence (high-, intermediate-, low-), grade and extent of AG, activity of mucosal inflammation. For diagnosis of HP infection, subgroup analyses and meta regressions will be performed by application of PPIs, nonsteroidal anti-inflammatory drugs and antibiotic to identify the reasons for heterogeneity.

### Sensitivity analysis and publication bias

Sensitivity analysis will be performed to assess the stability of the meta-analytical results, using the one-by-one study removal and evaluated by descriptively comparing the magnitude and precision of the random effects summary effect sizes. Publication

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

bias will be analyzed using precision funnel plots and the test statistics.

269 Patients and public involvement

This protocol will use previously published data. No patients or members of public willbe included in this study.

# 272 DISCUSSION

HP infection and atrophic gastritis have been recognized as two major risk factors for gastric cancer.<sup>7-9</sup> To identify subjects with an underlying AG and HP infection plays a vital role in preventing and improving the prognosis for GC. The accurate non-invasive tool would be very helpful to identify these subjects, especially in the general population. GP test is the non-invasive diagnostic tool based on physiology of three biomarkers specific to stomach structure and function, complemented by ELISA (IgG) testing for Hp antibodies.<sup>23-25</sup> However, the accuracy of GP is still controversial. And it is necessary to provide a comprehensive review of the relevant studies published to date. Therefore, we will conduct this systematic review and meta-analysis to provide more supportive evidence in diagnosing atrophic gastritis and HP infection by GastroPanel<sup>®</sup>. This study will synthesize the current literature on the diagnostic performance indices of GastroPanel ® for atrophic gastritis and helicobacter pylori infection. However, there will be many limitations for this study. Firstly, the majority of included studies will be cross-sectional study, which might cause bias. Secondly, there may be heterogeneity because this test combines four biomarkers which have different evaluation criteria. Thirdly, publication bias is still of concern because this study will be limited to the English- and Chinese-language publications. 

# ETHICS AND DISSEMINATION

Due to this study as a systematic review, ethics approval is not necessary as we are not
directly targeting individuals or extracting data without privacy. The results of this
study will be submitted to a peer-reviewed journal.

- 294 Contributors
  - 295 XY and DW concepted and designed the study. HW critically revised the design. AS

2		
3 4	296	and DW drafted the manuscript. DW, AS, HW, and XY critically revised and edited
5 6	297	the manuscript.
7 8	298	Funding This research received no specific grant from any funding agency in the public,
9 10	299	commercial or not-for-profit sectors.
11 12	300	Competing interests None declared.
$\begin{array}{c} 13\\ 14\\ 15\\ 16\\ 17\\ 18\\ 19\\ 20\\ 21\\ 22\\ 23\\ 24\\ 25\\ 26\\ 27\\ 28\\ 29\\ 30\\ 31\\ 32\\ 33\\ 34\\ 35\\ 36\\ 37\\ 38\\ 39\\ 40\\ 41\\ 42\\ 43\\ 44\\ 45\\ 46\\ 47\\ 48\\ 9\\ 50\\ 51\\ 52\\ 53\\ 54\\ 55\\ 56\\ 57\\ 58\\ 59\\ 60\\ \end{array}$	301 302	Patient consent for publication Not required.
		13

Erasmushogeschool . Protected by copyright, including for uses related to text and data mining, Al training, and similar technologies.

3	303		References
4 5	304		
6	305	1	Ferlay J, Colombet M, Soerjomataram I, et al. Cancer statistics for the year 2020: An overview. Int J
7	306		Cancer 2021
8	307	2	Sung H, Ferlay J, Siegel RL, et al. Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of
9 10	308		Incidence and Mortality Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries. CA Cancer J Clin 2021;71:209-
11	309		49.
12	310	3	Saragoni L. Upgrading the definition of early gastric cancer: better staging means more appropriate
13 14	311		treatment. Cancer Biol Med 2015;12:355-61.
15	312	4	Pimentel-Nunes P, Libânio D, Marcos-Pinto R, et al. Management of epithelial precancerous
16	313		conditions and lesions in the stomach (MAPS II): European Society of Gastrointestinal Endoscopy
17 19	314		(ESGE), European Helicobacter and Microbiota Study Group (EHMSG), European Society of
18	315		Pathology (ESP), and Sociedade Portuguesa de Endoscopia Digestiva (SPED) guideline update 2019.
20	316		Endoscopy 2019;51:365-88.
21	317	5	Jencks DS. Adam JD. Borum ML, et al. Overview of Current Concepts in Gastric Intestinal
22	318		Metaplasia and Gastric Cancer. <i>Gastroenterol Hepatol (N Y)</i> 2018:14:92-101.
24	319	6	Necula L. Matei L. Dragu D. et al. Recent advances in gastric cancer early diagnosis. <i>World J</i>
25	320		Gastroenterol 2019:25:2029-44
26 27	321	7	Machlowska I Bai I Sitarz M et al Gastric Cancer: Epidemiology Risk Factors Classification
27	322	,	Genomic Characteristics and Treatment Strategies Int I Mol Sci 2020:21
29	323	8	Venerito M Link A Rokkas T et al Gastric cancer - clinical and enidemiological aspects
30	324	0	Helicobacter 2016:21 Suppl 1:39-44
31	325	9	Vusefi AR Bagheri Lankarani K Bastani P et al Risk Factors for Gastric Cancer: A Systematic
33	326	,	Review Asian Pac I Cancer Prev 2018:10:591-603
34	327	10	Liou IM Malfertheiner P. Lee VC. et al. Screening and eradication of Helicobacter pylori for gastric
35	328	10	cancer prevention: the Taipei global concensus. <i>Gut</i> 2020:60:2003-112
30 37	320	11	Cai Q. Zhu C. Yuan Y. et al. Development and validation of a prediction rule for estimating castric
38	330	11	cancer risk in the Chinese high risk population: a nationwide multicentre study. <i>Gut</i> 2019;68:1576
39	331		87
40 41	332	12	67. Kojvurova OP Koskela R. Blomster T. et al. Serological Biomarker Panel in Diagnosis of Atrophic
42	333	12	Costritis and Heliophaster pulori Infection in Costroscopy Paferral Patiente: Clinical Validation of
43	334		the New Concretion Costro Danal (@) Test. Antiognoor Pog 2021:41:5527.27
44 45	335	12	Malfortheiner P. Magraud F. O'Morain CA. et al. Management of Halizabacter pulari infection the
46	336	15	Maastricht V/Elorance Concensus Penort. <i>Gut</i> 2017:66:6-20
47	337	14	Restance LC Dibai EN Rezerra G et al Comparison Retween the Endoscopia Eindings and the
48	338	14	Histological Diagnosis of Antral Costritos. Ang Castroontaral 2018:55:212-15
49 50	220	15	Corr NL Loodbattor II. Morriett A. Correlation between the endescenie and histological diagnosis of
51	339	13	cart NJ, Leadbetter H, Marriott A. Correlation between the endoscopic and histologic diagnosis of
52	340 244	17	gastrius. Ann Diagn Painoi 2012,10:15-5.
53	341	10	Sharma S, Makaju K, Dhakal K, et al. Correlation between Endoscopic and Histopathological $\Sigma^{-1}$
54 55	34Z	17	Findings in Gastric Lesions. <i>Kathmandu Univ Med J (KUMJ)</i> 2015;13:216-9.
56	343 244	17	Granam DY, Kato M, Asaka M. Gastric endoscopy in the 21st century: appropriate use of an invasive
57	344 245	10	procedure in the era of non-invasive testing. <i>Dig Liver Dis</i> 2008;40:497-503.
58 59	343 240	18	Best LM, Takwoingi Y, Stadique S, et al. Non-invasive diagnostic tests for Helicobacter pylori infection $G_{1}$ is $D_{2}$ if $D_{2}$ and $D_{3}$ an
60	340		intection. Cochrane Database Syst Kev 2018;3:CD012080.

Page 15 of 18

1

# BMJ Open

2		
3	347	19 Huh CW, Kim BW. [Diagnosis of Helicobacter pylori Infection]. Korean J Gastroenterol
4 5	348	2018;72:229-36.
6	349	20 O'Connor A. The Urea Breath Test for the Noninvasive Detection of Helicobacter pylori. Methods
7	350	<i>Mol Biol</i> 2021;2283:15-20.
8	351	21 Masucci L, Blackhouse G, Goeree R. Cost-effectiveness of the carbon-13 urea breath test for the
9 10	352	detection of Helicobacter pylori: an economic analysis. Ont Health Technol Assess Ser 2013;13:1-
11	353	28.
12	354	22 Sugano K, Tack J, Kuipers EJ, et al. Kyoto global consensus report on Helicobacter pylori gastritis.
13 14	355	<i>Gut</i> 2015;64:1353-67.
15	356	23 Väänänen H. Vauhkonen M. Helske T. et al. Non-endoscopic diagnosis of atrophic gastritis with a
16	357	blood test. Correlation between gastric histology and serum levels of gastrin-17 and pensinogen I: a
17	358	multicentre study <i>Eur J Gastroenterol Hepatol</i> 2003:15:885-91
18 19	359	24 McNicholl AG Valle I Gisbert IP. Response to: accuracy of GastroPanel test in detection of atrophic
20	360	gastritis Fur I Gastroenterol Henatol 2015:27:105-6
21	361	25 Syrianen K. A. Panel of Serum Biomarkers (GastroPanel®) in Non-invasive Diagnosis of Atrophic
22	362	Gastritis Systematic Review and Meta analysis Anticancer Res 2016:36:5133-44
25 24	363	26 Preferred reporting items for systematic review and meta analysis protocols (PPISMA P) 2015:
25	364	alaboration and explanation <i>BML</i> 2016:254:i4086
26	265	27 Mälti M. Söderetröre D. Belekeiner I. et al. Heliochecter ruleri (Hr.) I-C. EUSA of the New
27 28	305	27 MARI M, Soderstrom D, Paloneimo L, et al. Helicobacter pylori (Hp) IgG ELISA of the New-
28 29	300	Generation GastroPanel® Is Highly Accurate in Diagnosis of Hp-Infection in Gastroscopy Referral
30	367	Patients. Anticancer Res 2020;40:6387-98.
31	368	28 Zagari RM, Rabitti S, Greenwood DC, et al. Systematic review with meta-analysis: diagnostic
32	369	performance of the combination of pepsinogen, gastrin-17 and anti-Helicobacter pylori antibodies
33 34	370	serum assays for the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis. <i>Aliment Pharmacol Ther</i> 2017;46:657-67.
35	371	29 Grad C, Pop A, Gaborean E, et al. Value of GastroPanel in the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis. <i>Exp</i>
36	372	<i>Ther Med</i> 2021;22:1347.
37	373	30 Syrjänen K, Eskelinen M, Peetsalu A, et al. GastroPanel® Biomarker Assay: The Most
39	374	Comprehensive Test for Helicobacter pylori Infection and Its Clinical Sequelae. A Critical Review.
40	375	Anticancer Res 2019;39:1091-104.
41	376	31 Paloheimo L, Tiusanen T, Suovaniemi O, et al. Serological Biomarker Test (GastroPanel(®)) in the
42 43	377	Diagnosis of Functional Gastric Disorders, Helicobacter pylori and Atrophic Gastritis in Patients
44	378	Examined for Dyspeptic Symptoms. Anticancer Res 2021;41:811-19.
45	379	32 Chapelle N, Petryszyn P, Blin J, et al. A panel of stomach-specific biomarkers (GastroPanel®) for
46	380	the diagnosis of atrophic gastritis: A prospective, multicenter study in a low gastric cancer incidence
47 48	381	area. Helicobacter 2020;25:e12727.
49	382	33 Page MJ, McKenzie JE, Bossuyt PM, et al. The PRISMA 2020 statement: an updated guideline for
50	383	reporting systematic reviews. BMJ 2021;372:n71.
51 52	384	34 Li Y, Xia R, Zhang B, et al. Chronic Atrophic Gastritis: A Review. J Environ Pathol Toxicol Oncol
52 53	385	2018;37:241-59.
54	386	35 Cancer IAfRo. Schistosomes, liver flukes and Helicobacter pylori. IARC monographs on the
55	387	evaluation of carcinogenic risks to humans 1994;61:3-12.
56 57	388	
58	500	
59		
60		15

389		Table 1 Search strategy used in PubMed
	Number	Search terms
	1	"helicobacter pylori"[MeSH Terms]
	2	"helicobacter nemestrinae"[Title/Abstract]
	3	"helicobacter infections"[Title/Abstract]
	4	"Helicobacter"[Title/Abstract]
	5	"pylori"[Title/Abstract]
	6	"H.Pylori"[Title/Abstract]
	7	"Campylobacter"[Title/Abstract]
	8	"campylobacter pylori"[Title/Abstract]
	9	1 or 2-9
	10	"gastritis, atrophic"[MeSH Terms]
	11	"atrophic gastritides"[Title/Abstract]
	12	"atrophic gastritis"[Title/Abstract]
	13	10 or 11-12
	14	"GastroPanel"[Title/Abstract]
	15	"serum biomarkers"[Title/Abstract]
	16	"panels"[Title/Abstract]
	17	"pepsinogens"[MeSH Terms]
	18	"pepsinogen i"[Title/Abstract]
	19	"pepsinogen ii"[Title/Abstract]
	20	"pepsinogen i ii"[Title/Abstract]
	21	"Gastrin-17"[Title/Abstract]
	22	"helicobacter pylori antibodies"[Title/Abstract]
	23	14 or 15-22
	24	9 and 13 and 23
	24	9 and 13 and 23

address in a systematic re	eportin eview p	g Items for Systematic review and Meta-Analysis Protocols) 2015 checklist: recommended item
Section and topic	Item No	Checklist item ទី 28 ធ្លូ ទ
ADMINISTRATIVE INFORM	ATION	es re
Title:		Erae ate
Identification	1a	Identify the report as a protocol of a systematic review
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 and reg
Authors:		nd sch
Contact	3a	Provide name, institutional affiliation, e-mail address of all protocol authors; provide physical mailing address of corresponding author
Contributions	3b	Describe contributions of protocol authors and identify the guarantor of the review $\frac{2}{3}$
Amendments	4	If the protocol represents an amendment of a previously completed or published protocol identify as such and list chan otherwise, state plan for documenting important protocol amendments
Support:		
Sources	5a	Indicate sources of financial or other support for the review
Sponsor	5b	Provide name for the review funder and/or sponsor
Role of sponsor or funder	5c	Describe roles of funder(s), sponsor(s), and/or institution(s), if any, in developing the pretocol
INTRODUCTION		sim <u>m</u> in
Rationale	6	Describe the rationale for the review in the context of what is already known
Objectives	7	Provide an explicit statement of the question(s) the review will address with reference to participants, interventions, comparators, and outcomes (PICO)
METHODS		olog pril 3
Eligibility criteria	8	Specify the study characteristics (such as PICO, study design, setting, time frame) and report characteristics (such as yo considered, language, publication status) to be used as criteria for eligibility for the review
Information sources	9	Describe all intended information sources (such as electronic databases, contact with study authors, trial registers or oth 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 galanned limits, such that it cou be repeated
Study records:		

		BMJ Open Sp pp	
		yright, ir	
Data management	11a	Describe the mechanism(s) that will be used to manage records and data throughou the view	9, 10
Selection process	11b	State the process that will be used for selecting studies (such as two independent review) through each phase of the review (that is, screening, eligibility and inclusion in meta-analysis)	9
Data collection process	11c	Describe planned method of extracting data from reports (such as piloting forms, done integration of the planned method of extracting data from investigators integration of the planned method of extracting data from investigators integration of the planned method of extracting data from investigators integration of the planned method of extracting data from investigators integration of the planned method of extracting data from investigators integration of the planned method of extracting data from investigators integration of the planned method of extracting data from investigators integration of the planned method of extracting data from investigators integration of the planned method of extracting data from investigators integration of the planned method of extracting data from investigators integration of the planned method of extracting data from investigators integration of the planned method of extracting data from investigators integration of the planned method of extracting data from investigators integration of the planned method of extracting data from investigators integration of the planned method of extracting data from investigators integration of the planned method of extracting data from investigators integration of the planned method of extracting data from investigators integration of the planned method of extracting data from investigators integrated method method method of extracting data from investigators integrated method me	9, 10
Data items	12	List and define all variables for which data will be sought (such as PICO items, funding fources), any pre-planned data assumptions and simplifications	9, 10
Outcomes and prioritization	13	List and define all outcomes for which data will be sought, including prioritization and additional outcomes, with rationale	10
Risk of bias in individual studies	14	Describe anticipated methods for assessing risk of bias of individual studies, includes whether this will be done at the outcome or study level, or both; state how this information will be used in data synthesized	10
Data synthesis	15a	Describe criteria under which study data will be quantitatively synthesised	10
	15b	If data are appropriate for quantitative synthesis, describe planned summary measures the synthesis of handling data and methods of combining data from studies, including any planned exploration of consistency (such as $I^2$ , Kendall's $\tau$ )	10, 11
	15c	Describe any proposed additional analyses (such as sensitivity or subgroup analyses mean-regression)	11
	15d	If quantitative synthesis is not appropriate, describe the type of summary planned 🛱	NA
Meta-bias(es)	16	Specify any planned assessment of meta-bias(es) (such as publication bias across stadies selective reporting within studies)	11
Confidence in cumulative evidence	17	Describe how the strength of the body of evidence will be assessed (such as GRADE)	NA
NA, not applicable.		pen.bmj.com/ on April 30, 2025 at Departme , and similar technologies.	
		nt GEZ-I	

Ă