

# 1 Profiling small RNAs in CRC screening samples such as 2 the widely used fecal immunochemical test, is it possible?

3 Einar Birkeland<sup>1\*</sup>, Giulio Ferrero<sup>2,3\*</sup>, Barbara Pardini<sup>4,5</sup>, Sinan U. Umu<sup>6</sup>, Sonia Tarallo<sup>4,5</sup>, Sara  
4 Bulfamante<sup>7</sup>, Geir Hoff<sup>8,9</sup>, Carlo Senore<sup>7</sup>, Trine B Rounge<sup>10,11\*</sup>, Alessio Naccarati<sup>4,5\*</sup>

5 \*Equal contributions

6

## 7 Affiliations

8 1. Centre for Bioinformatics, Department of Informatics, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway.

9 2. Dept. of Clinical and Biological Sciences, University of Turin, Turin, Italy.

10 3. Dept. of Computer Science, University of Turin, Turin, Italy.

11 4. Italian Institute for Genomic Medicine (IIGM), c/o IRCCS Candiolo, Turin, Italy.

12 5. Candiolo Cancer Institute, FPO-IRCCS, Candiolo, Turin, Italy.

13 6. Department of Pathology, Institute of Clinical Medicine, University of Oslo, Norway

14 7. Epidemiology and Screening Unit-CPO, University Hospital Città della Salute e della  
15 Scienza, Turin 10100, Italy.

16 8. Section for colorectal cancer screening, Cancer Registry of Norway, Oslo University  
17 Hospital, Norway

18 9. Dept of Research, Telemark Hospital, Skien, Norway

19 10. Department of Research, Cancer Registry of Norway, Oslo, Norway.

20 11. Centre for Bioinformatics, Department of Pharmacy, University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway.

21

22 **Corresponding authors:** Trine B Rounge, [trinro@uio.no](mailto:trinro@uio.no) and Alessio Naccarati,  
23 [alessio.naccarati@iigm.it](mailto:alessio.naccarati@iigm.it)

24

25 **Keywords:** Small RNA sequencing, Fecal Immunochemical Test (FIT), colorectal cancer

26 **NOTE:** This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.  
screening, stool biomarkers, microbiome, microRNAs

## 27 **Abstract**

28 Faecal microRNAs represent promising molecules with potential clinical interest as non-  
29 invasive diagnostic and prognostic biomarkers for their stability and detectability. Colorectal  
30 cancer (CRC) screening based on the fecal immunochemical test (FIT) is an effective tool for  
31 prevention of cancer development. However, due to the poor sensitivity of FIT for premalignant  
32 lesions, there is a need for implementation of complementary tests. Improving the identification  
33 of individuals who would benefit from further investigation with colonoscopy using molecular  
34 analysis, such as miRNA profiling of the FIT leftover buffer, would be ideal due to its  
35 widespread use.

36 In the present study, we applied small RNA sequencing to FIT leftover samples collected from  
37 two European screening populations. We showed robust detection of miRNA and microbial  
38 profiles, which were similar to those obtained from specimens sampled using RNA stabilising  
39 buffers and archived fecal samples. Detected miRNAs exhibited differential abundance  
40 between CRC and control samples that was consistent between sampling methods,  
41 suggesting a promising potential to identify small RNA CRC biomarkers using FIT leftovers.

42 We demonstrated that it is possible to analyse gut miRNAs in FIT leftover samples and  
43 envision that these potential biomarkers can complement the FIT in large scale screening  
44 settings.

45

## 46 **Introduction**

47 Colorectal cancer (CRC) is the third most common malignancy and the second leading cause  
48 of cancer-related deaths(1). The promotion of healthy lifestyles and dietary choices, the  
49 development of new strategies for disease management, and the implementation of global  
50 screening programs are some of the strategies to reduce CRC morbidity and mortality.

51 Screening selected age groups at risk is considered the most effective tool to prevent CRC  
52 development by detecting early tumor forms and precancerous lesions(2). In many European  
53 countries, the first step of CRC screening relies on non-invasive stool-based tests such as  
54 fecal immunochemical test (FIT). If the test is positive, patients are invited to visual  
55 examinations based on invasive endoscopic methods, such as colonoscopy. The advantage  
56 of first-line FIT is the relatively low-cost and ease of execution compared to colonoscopy. The  
57 FIT does not require specific preparation or dietary restriction and consequently has high  
58 acceptance rates. However, due to its poor sensitivity for premalignant lesions and the burden  
59 associated with an excessive number of colonoscopy procedures, different countries adopt  
60 thresholds for FIT positivity that are suited to their colonoscopy capacity, in a balancing act  
61 between sensitivity and specificity.

62 This highlights the need for alternative biomarkers to improve CRC screening accuracy. The  
63 implementation of complementary tests based on the analysis of the leftover of FIT stool  
64 samples could help improve in the identification of those individuals that would benefit from  
65 further investigation by colonoscopy. Both observational and experimental evidence point to  
66 a role for the gut microbiome in development and progression of CRC (3). We have shown  
67 that it is possible to profile the microbiome in FIT leftover samples and archived stool samples  
68 (4). However, larger discovery studies are needed to identify clinically valuable biomarkers(5).

69 Small noncoding RNAs (sRNAs), particularly microRNAs (miRNAs), are detectable and stable  
70 in stool samples and are emerging as a candidate source of biomarkers for the non-invasive  
71 diagnosis of gastrointestinal diseases, including CRC(6). Using small RNA sequencing, we  
72 demonstrated the possibility to quantify the levels of both human and microbial sRNAs in  
73 human stool samples. Interestingly, the combined use of human and microbial sRNA levels  
74 was more efficient than using the two biomarkers alone in classifying CRC patients from  
75 colonoscopy-negative control subjects(7).

76 While we have shown that gut derived miRNAs are potential biomarkers for CRC, little is  
77 known about the possibility of measuring them in a screening population by using the FIT  
78 buffer leftovers. In this study, carried out in two independent European laboratories, we

79 showed not only the feasibility of small RNA sequencing in FIT samples but we also tested  
80 the profiling robustness by comparing sequencing data in FIT samples with feces collected in  
81 stabilising buffers and long term archived fecal samples. In addition, we showed that some  
82 gut miRNAs differed in abundance between CRC and controls, suggesting a potential for  
83 discovering CRC biomarkers.

## 84 **Material and Methods**

### 85 **Cohorts and samples**

86 **BCSN - FIT:** Bowel Cancer Screening in Norway (BCSN) is an ongoing (2012- ) randomized  
87 trial comparing once-only sigmoidoscopy with repeated FIT tests every second year for up to  
88 four rounds. The study is a pilot for the national screening program(8). Stool samples are  
89 collected on plastic sticks designed to catch about 10µg stool and then stored in a 2ml buffer  
90 (Eiken Chemicals Ltd., Tokyo, Japan). Thirteen FIT samples from anonymized subjects were  
91 randomly selected for the purpose of this feasibility study.

92 **NORCCAP - stool:** The Norwegian Colorectal Cancer Prevention (NORCCAP) screening trial  
93 was carried out from 1999 to 2001(9). Participants were asked to bring a fresh frozen stool  
94 specimen collected at home less than one week before sigmoidoscopy and to keep in a 20ml  
95 vial in their home deep freezer (-20°C) until attendance for flexible sigmoidoscopy. Eleven  
96 anonymized stool samples were randomly selected.

97 **MITOS - FIT and stool:** The Italian biological samples have been collected in the frame of the  
98 regular Piedmont Region CRC screening in the Microbiome and MiRNA in Torino Screening  
99 project (MITOS). The Piedmont Region screening program invites all residents, aged 59-69 to  
100 undergo a single sample biennial FIT (Eiken Chemicals Ltd., Tokyo, Japan). A total of 185  
101 subjects (based on colonoscopy results classified in 22 CRC, 80 advanced adenoma (AA), 30  
102 non-advanced adenoma (nAA), and 53 controls) were included in the present study. Among  
103 them, 57 subjects also provided stool samples collected in nucleic acid collection and transport  
104 tubes with RNA stabilising solution (Norgen Biotek Corp.) before undergoing colonoscopy.

105

## 106 **small RNA extraction and library preparation**

107 FIT stool samples were obtained from buffer leftovers contained in the original collection  
108 device (approx. 1ml). NORCCAP feces was thawed and homogenized in a buffer (Omnigene-  
109 GUT, DNAGenotek). For BCSN FIT and NORCCAP stool samples, RNA was extracted from  
110 200µl buffer leftovers and buffer mix, respectively. RNA was purified using phenol-chloroform  
111 phase separation and miRNeasy Mini Kit (cat. no. 217004, QIAgen).

112 For the MITOS cohort, total RNA from stool and FIT leftover samples was extracted using the  
113 Stool Total RNA Purification Kit (Norgen Biotek Corp.) as previously described(7).

114 sRNA transcripts were converted into barcoded cDNA libraries with the NEBNext Multiplex  
115 Small RNA Library Prep Set for Illumina following the NEBNext Multiplex Small RNA Library  
116 Prep Protocol E7330 (Protocol E7330, New England BioLabs Inc., USA)(7, 10).

117 The size selection of purified RNA fragments for the MITOS cohort was performed as  
118 described in (7). For BCSN and NORCCAP samples the size selection was performed with a  
119 cut size optimized to cover RNA molecules from 17 to 47 nt in length. Small RNA libraries  
120 were indexed and sequenced on Illumina platforms.

121

## 122 **Bioinformatics and statistical analysis**

123 Quantification of reads mapping to miRBase v22.1 miRNA sequences was performed using  
124 the smrnaseq pipeline (<https://nf-co.re/smrnaseq>) with reads prefiltered using fastp and the  
125 *skip\_mirdeep* option. Reads unmapped on these annotations were aligned against the human  
126 hg38 genome using Bowtie2 with *-very-sensitive-local* option. The human-unmapped reads  
127 were mapped against microbial genomes using Kraken 2 (v2.1.2) as described in(7).

128 Reads mapping to miRNAs were normalized and Differential Expression (DE) analyses were  
129 performed using the DESeq2. Differential abundance analysis of reads mapped to microbes  
130 was performed with SIAMCAT with default settings. For more details, see Supplementary  
131 Methods.

## 132 **Results and discussion**

### 133 **Cohort and alignment statistics**

134 Fecal samples collected with different sampling, storage, and processing procedures were  
135 analysed to identify stably expressed miRNAs with a potential to be used as CRC biomarkers  
136 (**Figure 1A**). From the MITOS cohort, two sample types were collected for each individual:  
137 stool samples collected in RNA-stabilising buffer, and leftover buffer derived from CRC-  
138 screening FIT samples. Two sets of anonymized Norwegian samples were also assessed:  
139 archived stool samples stored without stabilising buffer from the NORCCAP study, and leftover  
140 buffer from Norwegian CRC-screening FIT samples from the BCSN trial.

141 As reported in **Supplementary Table 1A** and **B**, a mean of 0.12% of small RNA sequencing  
142 reads (range: 0.003-0.062%) were assigned to miRNAs in stool samples, while a mean of  
143 0.15% reads from FIT leftovers were assigned to miRNAs (range:0.03-0.61%). Considering  
144 10 as the minimum number of normalised reads to define a miRNA as detected, on average  
145 63 (range: 32-235) and 41 (range: 16-191) miRNAs were detected in stool and FIT leftover  
146 samples, respectively (**Supplementary Table 1A-B**). Still, when accounting for differences in  
147 sequencing depth by rarefaction, no differences in the number of miRNAs detected were found  
148 between sampling groups ( $p>0.1$ ). The stool miRNAs detected in the MITOS cohort samples  
149 included most of the annotations observed in previous analyses performed on the same  
150 samples analysed using a different pipeline(7).

151 For two FIT leftover samples, the small RNA sequencing was performed on libraries generated  
152 from two different amounts of starting material (250 and 400  $\mu$ l). Comparing the rate of miRNA-  
153 mapped reads, similar rates were observed (0.4-0.9% of mapped reads) with an average of  
154 33 miRNAs (range: 31-34) detected in each experiment. No significant differences were  
155 observed among the miRNA levels measured in such experiments and, as expected, the  
156 levels of detected molecules were significantly correlated ( $\rho=0.43-0.60$ ,  $p<0.001$ )  
157 (**Supplementary Figure 1A** and **Supplementary Table 1C**). The intra-individual correlation  
158 between miRNA levels was higher than among different individuals (**Supplementary Figure**

159 **1B**). Taken together all fecal/FIT samples collected in all cohorts, t FIT leftover samples  
160 differed systematically from stool samples (see PCA analysis in **Figure 1B**).

161 Since the 57 stool samples from the MITOS cohort were collected from the same subjects  
162 donating FIT leftover samples, a paired comparative analysis was performed between the  
163 miRNA levels measured in the two biospecimens. The analysis was focused on the levels of  
164 23 miRNAs that were consistently identified across both stool and FIT samples (exceeding a  
165 median of 10 normalised reads; **Figure 1C** and **Supplementary Table 1D**). These miRNAs  
166 correspond well with the most abundant miRNAs in circulation, including miR-1246, -320, -21-  
167 5p,-1290,-148a-3p being among the top 10 abundant miRNAs in serum samples(11). As  
168 reported in **Supplementary Table 1D**, 57% of these miRNAs were characterised by levels  
169 positively correlated (average  $\rho=0.36$ ,  $p<0.05$ ) between the two biospecimens. Among  
170 them, miR-4713-3p, miR-1246, and miR-192-5p were characterised by the highest correlation.  
171 All the 23 miRNAs were also detected in the Norwegian cohorts (**Figure 1C**), despite the  
172 different sampling, preservation, and RNA extraction procedures. Moreover, there was a  
173 positive correlation between FIT and stool samples for the mean normalised abundance of  
174 miRNAs ( $\rho=0.78$ ; **Figure 1D**), which was also found in the Norwegian samples ( $\rho=0.52$ )  
175 (**Figure 1D** and **Supplementary Figure 1C**).

176

### 177 **miRNA differential expression in MITOS stool and FIT samples**

178 DE analysis was performed between MITOS-stool and MITOS-FIT miRNA levels detected in  
179 subjects with CRC or AA with respect to colonoscopy-negative subjects. Considering the 23  
180 miRNAs detected in both biofluids, 12 were associated with significantly different levels in stool  
181 samples from CRC/AA patients (adj.  $p<0.05$ ; **Supplementary Table 1E**). Comparing  
182 separately AA and CRC patients with colonoscopy-negative subjects, four and eight DE  
183 miRNAs were observed, respectively. Two miRNAs (miR-192-5p, and let-7b-5p) were DE in  
184 both comparisons. Conversely, four miRNAs were significantly more (let-7b-5p and miR-148a-  
185 3p) and less (miR-4451 and miR-11399) abundant in FIT leftover samples of CRC patients  
186 with respect to colonoscopy-negative subjects (**Supplementary Table 1F**). The levels of the



187 23 miRNAs were characterised by a coherent difference in both MITOS-stool and MITOS-FIT  
188 samples ( $\rho=0.69$ ,  $p<0.001$ ) (**Figure 1E-F**).

189 Functional analysis of DE miRNA target genes showed the prevalence of terms related to cell  
190 cycle regulation and DNA-damage response for the targets of miRNAs with increased levels  
191 in CRC patients (**Supplementary Table 1G-H**). Conversely, targets of miRNAs decreasing in  
192 patient samples were enriched in processes related to apoptosis, unfolded protein stress  
193 response, and immune response (**Supplementary Table 1G-H**).

#### 194 **Microbial classification/diversity**

195 After the identification of human miRNAs, the remaining reads were aligned against the human  
196 genome and the subsequent unmapped reads were investigated for their microbial sRNA  
197 content. This approach classified reads in the range of 36-40 nt, of which 38.5% and 37.4%  
198 were classified in the MITOS stool and FIT samples, respectively.  
199 Given the previous evidence on the concordance between microbial abundances estimated  
200 by small RNA sequencing and metagenomic data(7), the human-unmapped sRNA-Seq reads  
201 were used to infer the microbial abundance in our data. Overall, FIT samples displayed a  
202 higher abundance of taxa belonging to the *Bacteroidetes* phylum, whereas stool samples were  
203 dominated by *Firmicutes* (**Figure 2A-B**), with the composition of stool and FIT samples  
204 differing significantly (PERMANOVA  $p < 0.05$ ; **Figure 2C**). This could indicate a differential  
205 sensitivity of bacteria to the buffer components in the FIT and NORGEN buffers, where the  
206 former has a relatively high concentration of the potent antimicrobial compound sodium azide  
207 (12). Still, at the species level, there was concordance between FIT and stool samples (**Figure**  
208 **2D**). Within the MITOS study subjects, we assessed differences in microbial taxa between  
209 colonoscopy-negative and either CRC, AA, or CRC/AA. Only one species - *Filimonas lacunae*  
210 - was found to be significantly more abundant in stool samples collected from CRC cases than  
211 in controls, with nominal significance also observed in FIT samples. Like for human miRNAs,  
212 the direction and magnitude of differences in taxa abundance between CRC cases and



213 colonoscopy-negative subjects were consistent in stool and FIT samples ( $\rho = 0.48$ ,  $p$   
214  $<0.001$ ).

## 215 **Conclusions**

216 Taken together, our results show that by using small RNA sequencing we can profile both  
217 stool miRNAs and microbial taxa in the left-over FIT buffer used in CRC screening. The  
218 consistent levels of miRNAs between sampling methods suggest that FIT may be used for  
219 miRNA biomarker research in large scale screening settings. This feasibility study also  
220 confirms that the alterations in gut miRNA levels in CRC patients observed in FIT samples  
221 may be used to detect miRNAs in FIT as biomarkers to improve screening performance.

## 222 **Ethics approval and consent to participate**

223 For the MITOS cohort the study design and the informed consent were approved by the local  
224 Ethics committee (AOU Città della salute e della Scienza di Torino, Italy). For the NORCCAP  
225 and BCSN cohorts anonymized samples were used. This was approved by the Norwegian  
226 Regional Ethics Committee - South-East (REC) projects, S-98052 and 2011/1272,  
227 respectively.

228

## 229 **Availability of data and materials**

230 The datasets used and/or analysed during the current study are available from the  
231 corresponding author on reasonable request.

232

## 233 **Competing interests**

234 The authors declare that they have no competing interests

235

## 236 **Funding**

237 This work was supported by the Italian Institute for Genomic Medicine (IIGM) and Compagnia  
238 di San Paolo Torino, Italy (to AN, BP, and ST). This project has received funding from the

239 European Union's Horizon 2020 research and innovation program under grant agreement No  
240 825410 (ONCOBIOME project to AN, BP, and ST). The research leading to these results has  
241 received funding from AIRC under IG 2020 - ID. 24882 – P.I. Naccarati Alessio Gordon (to  
242 AN) and under IG2019 - ID. 23473 - P.I. Senore Carlo (to CS). This project also received  
243 funding from the Norwegian Cancer Society open call 2017 (190179) to TBR and 2018  
244 (198048) to TBR and from the Cancer Registry of Norway funds to TBR.

#### 245 **Authors' contributions**

246 Concept and design (TBR, AN);  
247 Collection and assembly of the data (GH, TBR, AN, CS);  
248 Experimental tasks, data analysis and interpretation (EB, GF, BP, SUU);  
249 Provisions of study materials or patients (GH, CS, SB);  
250 Manuscript writing (EB, GF, BP, TBR, and AN);  
251 Manuscript editing (All);  
252 Final approval of the version (All).

253

#### 254 **Acknowledgements**

255 We would like to thank Jan Inge Nordby for performing laboratory analyses for the Norwegian  
256 samples and the sequencing service was provided by the Norwegian Sequencing Centre  
257 (<https://www.sequencing.uio.no>), a national technology platform hosted by Oslo University  
258 Hospital and the University of Oslo supported by the Research Council of Norway and the  
259 Southeastern Regional Health Authority.

260

#### 261 **References**


262

263 1. Y. Xi, P. Xu, Global colorectal cancer burden in 2020 and projections to 2040. *Transl*  
264 *Oncol* **14**, 101174 (2021).

- 265 2. M. Buskermolen *et al.*, Colorectal cancer screening with faecal immunochemical  
266 testing, sigmoidoscopy or colonoscopy: a microsimulation modelling study. *Bmj* **367**,  
267 15383 (2019).
- 268 3. J. L. A. Vleugels, Y. Hazewinkel, P. Fockens, E. Dekker, Natural history of diminutive  
269 and small colorectal polyps: a systematic literature review. *Gastrointest Endosc* **85**,  
270 1169-1176 e1161 (2017).
- 271 4. T. B. Rounge *et al.*, Evaluating gut microbiota profiles from archived fecal samples.  
272 *BMC Gastroenterol* **18**, 171 (2018).
- 273 5. A. S. Kvaerner *et al.*, The CRCbiome study: a large prospective cohort study examining  
274 the role of lifestyle and the gut microbiome in colorectal cancer screening participants.  
275 *BMC Cancer* **21**, 930 (2021).
- 276 6. T. S. Francavilla A, Pardini B, Naccarati A, Fecal microRNAs as non-invasive  
277 biomarkers for the detection of colorectal cancer: a systematic review. *Minerva*  
278 *Biotechnologica* **31**, 30-42 (2019).
- 279 7. S. Tarallo *et al.*, Altered Fecal Small RNA Profiles in Colorectal Cancer Reflect Gut  
280 Microbiome Composition in Stool Samples. *mSystems* **4** (2019).
- 281 8. M. M. Zhu *et al.*, Comparison of immunochemical and guaiac-based fecal occult blood  
282 test in screening and surveillance for advanced colorectal neoplasms: a meta-analysis.  
283 *J Dig Dis* **11**, 148-160 (2010).
- 284 9. M. Bretthauer *et al.*, Design, organization and management of a controlled population  
285 screening study for detection of colorectal neoplasia: attendance rates in the  
286 NORCCAP study (Norwegian Colorectal Cancer Prevention). *Scand J Gastroenterol*  
287 **37**, 568-573 (2002).
- 288 10. G. Ferrero *et al.*, Small non-coding RNA profiling in human biofluids and surrogate  
289 tissues from healthy individuals: description of the diverse and most represented  
290 species. *Oncotarget* **9**, 3097-3111 (2018).
- 291 11. S. U. Umu *et al.*, A comprehensive profile of circulating RNAs in human serum. *RNA*  
292 *Biol* **15**, 242-250 (2018).

- 293 12. S. Zouiouich *et al.*, Comparison of Fecal Sample Collection Methods for Microbial  
294 Analysis Embedded within Colorectal Cancer Screening Programs. *Cancer Epidemiol*  
295 *Biomarkers Prev* **31**, 305-314 (2022).  
296  
297


298 **Figures:**



299

300 **Figure 1.** **A.** Graphical representation of the study. **B.** PCA of samples based on mature  
 301 miRNA read counts. **C.** Bar plot reporting, for each cohort and sample type, the average levels  
 302 of the miRNAs associated with the highest levels in MITOS FIT-leftover samples. **D.** Mean  
 303 normalised abundance of miRNAs in paired MITOS-FIT (x-axis) and MITOS-Stool (y-axis)

304 samples. Each point represents a miRNA coloured based on the Spearman correlation  
305 coefficient for comparison of paired samples. Only miRNAs detected in at least 15% of each  
306 sample type were included in this analysis. **E.** Scatterplot showing the log<sub>2</sub>FC of expression  
307 computed considering MITOS-stool (x-axis) and MITOS-FIT-leftover (y-axis) miRNA levels in  
308 samples from CRC patients with respect to those from colonoscopy-negative subjects. **F.**  
309 Heatmap of the Z-score-normalised DE miRNA levels in MITOS-stool and MITOS-FIT-leftover  
310 samples. Neg, colonoscopy negative subjects; AA, advanced adenoma; nAA, non-advanced  
311 adenoma; CRC, colorectal cancer.



312

313 **Figure 2. A-B.** Classification of reads according to microbial taxa. Relative abundance of phyla  
314 in FIT-leftover and stool samples from MITOS (**A**) and NOR (**B**) cohorts. **C.** Principal  
315 coordinate (PCo) plot of FIT and stool samples (including unpaired samples). **D.** Mean relative  
316 abundance of species in stool samples (x-axis) and FIT samples (y-axis), coloured according

317 to the Spearman's rho of the correlation between the relative abundances in paired FIT and  
318 stool samples. The solid diagonal line represents equal abundance in either biospecimen type.