

Review

Not peer-reviewed version

Advancing GCT Management: A Review of miR-371a-3p and Other miRNAs in Comparison to Traditional Serum Tumor Markers

[Crystal L Seales](#) , Dhruv Puri , [Nuphat Yodkhunnatham](#) , Kshitij Pandit , [Kit Yuen](#) , Sarah Murray , Jane Smitham , [John T Lafin](#) , [Aditya Bagrodia](#) *

Posted Date: 10 March 2024

doi: 10.20944/preprints202403.0544.v1

Keywords: Germ Cell Tumors; Biomarkers; Serum Tumor Markers; miRNAs



Preprints.org is a free multidiscipline platform providing preprint service that is dedicated to making early versions of research outputs permanently available and citable. Preprints posted at Preprints.org appear in Web of Science, Crossref, Google Scholar, Scilit, Europe PMC.

Copyright: This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

Review

Advancing GCT Management: A review of miR-371a-3p and Other miRNAs in Comparison to Traditional Serum Tumor Markers

Crystal L Seales^{1,2}, Dhruv Puri², Nuphat Yodkhunnatham², Kshitij Pandit², Kit Yuen², Sarah Murray³, Jane Smitham², John T Lafin⁴ and Aditya Bagrodia^{2,4,*}

¹ Morehouse School of Medicine, Atlanta, GA, United States

² Department of Urology, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, United States

³ Department of Pathology, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, United States

⁴ Department of Urology, University Texas Southwestern Medical Center, Dallas, TX United States

* Correspondence: Aditya Bagrodia, MD, Associate Professor, Department of Urology, University of California San Diego, Suite 1-200, 9400 Campus Point Drive, La Jolla, CA 92037, United States; Bagrodia@health.ucsd.edu

Simple Summary: Diagnosis and management of testicular germ cell tumors (TGCTs) currently relies on the use of unreliable biomarkers - conventional serum tumor markers (STMs). Variable levels of elevation in serum samples amongst patients and cancer types make the use of conventional STMs unfavorable for dependable diagnosis and clinical management of TGCTs. This review of recent studies suggests germ cell tumor associated miRNAs, such as miR-371a-3p, can be utilized as not only a reliable, but cost effective and convenient blood-based biomarker. However, before widespread clinical implementation, development of a protocol for sample collection, analysis, and interpretation is necessary to prevent overtreatment and guide management of patients.

Abstract: MicroRNAs, short non-protein coding RNAs, are overexpressed in GCTs. Circulating levels of germ cell tumor (GCT)- associated miRNAs, such as miR-371a-3p, can be utilized as efficient and cost-effective alternatives in diagnosing and managing patients presenting with GCTs. This quality of miRNAs has demonstrated favorable performance characteristics as a reliable blood-based biomarker with high diagnostic accuracy compared to current serum tumor markers (STMs) including α -fetoprotein (AFP), beta human chorionic gonadotropin (β -hCG), and lactate dehydrogenase (LDH). The conventional STMs exhibit limited specificity and sensitivity. Potential clinical implications of miRNAs include impact on de-escalating or intensifying treatment, detecting recurrence at earlier stages, and lessening the necessity of cross-sectional imaging or invasive tissue biopsy for non-teratomatous GCTs. Here we also highlight the outstanding issues that must be addressed prior to clinical implementation. Standards for measuring circulating miRNAs and determining ideal cutoff values are essential for integration into current clinical guidelines.

Keywords: germ cell tumors; biomarkers; serum tumor markers; miRNAs

1. Introduction

The global trend notes a rise in testicular cancer incidence among many different demographics across the globe in recent years [1]. There is a noticeable increase in the occurrence of testicular germ cell tumors (TGCTs), not just in younger cohorts, but notably among individuals over the age of 40 years [2,3]. This malignancy, once categorized as the predominant cancer in younger males, is now impacting the health and well-being of a broader demographic segment than previously recognized [4]. Consequently, the strategies employed by researchers, clinicians, and patients in confronting

testicular cancer need to be progressively refined to rise to the challenges posed by the evolving landscape of testicular cancer treatment and management.

Germ cell tumors (GCTs), which are neoplasms originating from germ cells within the testis, present in three primary categories: (i) yolk sac tumors and teratomas typically observed in neonates and infants; (ii) seminomas and nonseminomas, more common in adolescents and adults; and (iii) spermatocytic seminomas, which are rare but noteworthy [5]. Among these, seminomas and nonseminomas, also referred to as NSGCTs, are of critical concern given that they represent an overwhelming majority – nearly 99% – of testicular germ cell tumor incidences in the 15 to 44-year age group [1,6]. With the estimated number of new testicular cancer cases in the United States for 2023 being 9,120, and with over 291,000 men currently managing this disease, there is a significant impetus to pursue more affordable and less invasive diagnostic and monitoring strategies [7].

The diagnosis of testicular germ cell tumors (TGCTs) predominantly relies on a comprehensive approach that includes a variety of methods to ensure accuracy. These methods typically encompass (i) a thorough physical examination of the testes to detect any abnormalities, (ii) advanced imaging techniques such as ultrasound (US) and magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) to visualize the internal structure of the testes and identify potential tumors, (iii) the measurement of serum tumor marker levels, which serve as a non-invasive liquid biopsy providing preliminary assessment before proceeding to more invasive diagnostic procedures, and (iv) a tissue biopsy, the definitive method for diagnosing TGCTs by allowing direct examination of the tumor cells under a microscope [7]. Serum tumor markers are particularly valuable in the diagnostic process, as they involve the analysis of various substances, including metabolites, proteins, and nucleic acids, that are released into the bloodstream by tumor cells, providing insights into changes in gene expression and the genomic profile of the tumor [8]. The traditional serum tumor markers (STMs) used in the diagnosis of TGCTs are α -fetoprotein (AFP), Beta human chorionic gonadotropin (β -hCG), and lactate dehydrogenase (LDH) [9]. However, these conventional STMs have several limitations that can impact their effectiveness in accurately diagnosing TGCTs. One significant limitation is that AFP and β -hCG levels can be elevated in conditions unrelated to TGCTs, such as disruptions in endocrine and metabolic processes. Furthermore, LDH is a marker of cell death and can be elevated in a variety of conditions characterized by increased cell turnover, making it less specific for TGCTs [10,11]. Additionally, seminomas, a type of TGCT, do not produce AFP, so an elevated AFP level would not be indicative of a seminoma but could suggest the presence of non-seminomatous germ cell tumors (NSGCTs). Moreover, both LDH and β -hCG can be elevated in any type of GCT, providing little specificity in determining the exact type of cancer [12]. Studies have highlighted the limitations of conventional STMs in the management of testicular cancer. For example, a study involving 793 patients between January 2014 and July 2021 found that of the 71 patients who had a relapse, only 31 (43.6%) were marker-positive. Additionally, 124 patients (15.6%) experienced at least one false-positive marker elevation, defined as a positive marker result in a patient who remained free from a proven relapse for at least 6 months after the incident. These false-positive results can lead to unnecessary additional imaging or a hesitancy to investigate further due to the perceived irrelevance of the marker elevations [13]. Another study conducted in 2020 reviewed the records of 794 patients with GCTs treated in three Spanish hospitals and found that of the 125 patients who developed a first recurrence, 123 had marker levels recorded. Seventy-nine patients (64%) had elevated tumor markers at diagnosis, and 76 (62%) had elevated markers at first recurrence [14]. The unreliable elevation and lack of specificity of conventional STMs make them less favorable for reliable diagnosis and clinical management. In light of these limitations, there is a growing interest in exploring alternative biomarkers that can provide more accurate and specific diagnostic information. One such promising avenue is the analysis of blood-circulating microRNAs (miRNAs) in standard germ cell tumor screening regimens. These small non-coding RNA molecules have been shown to play a crucial role in gene regulation and have the potential to serve as more reliable and specific biomarkers for the diagnosis and management of TGCTs.

MicroRNAs (miRNAs) are short, non-coding RNA molecules that play a crucial role in the regulation of gene expression, affecting approximately one-third of protein-coding genes in the

human genome [15]. The biogenesis of miRNAs involves several steps, starting with the transcription of primary miRNAs (pri-miRNAs) that are subsequently processed into precursor miRNAs (pre-miRNAs). These pre-miRNAs are then further cleaved to form mature miRNAs, which are incorporated into the RNA-induced silencing complex (RISC). Within this complex, miRNAs can bind to complementary sequences in target messenger RNAs (mRNAs), leading to the degradation or translational repression of these target mRNAs [16]. In the context of cancer, miRNA expression can become dysregulated, leading to the disruption of normal cellular processes. miRNAs can act as oncogenes (referred to as oncomiRs) or tumor suppressors, depending on their target genes and the context of their expression. In germ cell tumors (GCTs), oncomiRs are often overexpressed, leading to the suppression of their target tumor suppressor genes. Conversely, tumor suppressor miRNAs can be downregulated, resulting in the overexpression of their target oncogenes [15]. This dysregulation of miRNA levels creates an environment conducive to cancer growth and progression. The alterations in miRNA expression patterns can serve as valuable biomarkers for the detection and differentiation of various histotypes of testicular germ cell tumors [16]. By analyzing these changes, clinicians can gain insights into the molecular underpinnings of the disease, which can inform diagnostic, therapeutic, and prognostic strategies. The application of miRNA-based biomarkers in clinical practice has the potential to enhance the accuracy of diagnosis, guide treatment decisions, and provide prognostic information, ultimately improving patient outcomes in testicular cancer management.

This review aims to illuminate the multifaceted role of circulating microRNAs (miRNAs) as liquid biopsies in the management of germ cell tumors (GCTs). First, we explore the current clinical benefits and implications of utilizing circulating miRNAs, emphasizing their potential to revolutionize non-invasive diagnostic and prognostic approaches in oncology. Second, we delve into the outstanding issues surrounding the use of miRNAs, such as challenges in standardization, quantification, and interpretation, that must be meticulously addressed prior to their widespread clinical implementation. Finally, we discuss the potential applications of circulating miRNAs in GCT management, including their role in early detection, monitoring treatment response, and predicting disease recurrence, thereby underscoring their promise in enhancing patient outcomes and personalizing cancer care.

2. Insights into the Advantages of Circulating miRNAs

As tumors proliferate, the constituent cells emit a variety of substances that play a pivotal role in cellular communication [8]. One innovative diagnostic approach, liquid biopsy, involves the collection of bodily fluids—namely blood, urine, or semen—to capture these tumor-derived biomarkers. These specimens are then analyzed using methods tailored to the specific fluid type. The burgeoning interest in liquid biopsies stems from their minimal invasiveness and the consequent ease of sample collection, as well as the method's potential for continuous monitoring of tumor dynamics [8]. MicroRNAs (miRNAs), in particular, have garnered attention over the past several years. Their stability and profuse presence in the bloodstream render them highly detectable markers, significantly aiding in the identification and tracking of cancerous developments in patients [16].

2.1. Discriminating TGCTs from Normal Testicular Tissue

There are numerous clusters of miRNAs associated with specific tumors and their overexpression can assist in accurately predicting cancer histology. For example, MicroRNA-302, which increases the rate of cell proliferation by inhibiting cyclin-dependent kinase (CDK) 2 and 4, is elevated in the blood of TGCT patients while it is downregulated in liver, stomach, and colon cancer [16]. Of the various clusters of miRNAs considered in making an accurate diagnosis of TGCT, including miR-372-3p, miR-367-3p, miR-371a-3p, and miR-373-3p, it was concluded that quantifying circulating miR-371a-3p alone is sufficient for the diagnosis of TGCT [17]. In addition, variation of miRNA levels between TGCT subtypes has been documented. A study using formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded (FFPE) tissue samples found upregulated miR-371a-3p levels among the TGCT subtypes of pure seminoma, seminoma in mixed TGCT, embryonal carcinoma and other nonseminomas

including teratomas compared to healthy tissue [18]. It must be noted that pure seminomas exhibited the highest of the miR-371a-3p expression levels while the post-pubertal teratomas exhibited the lowest expression level, although still higher than healthy tissue [18]. Currently, there is no reliable circulating miRNA that is available for the detection of teratoma. The levels of miR-371a-3p and the classic GCT markers were also compared in patients with TGCT, and it was found that the sensitivity of the miRNA test was significantly higher than each of the classic markers separately and the markers combined [19]. Dieckmann et al. noted circulating miR-371a-3p levels, also referred to as the M371 test, had a sensitivity of 90.1%, specificity of 94%, and an area under the curve (AUC) of 0.97 when used for prediction of GCT histology [19,20]. Moreover, three additional investigations corroborated these results, demonstrating sensitivity levels between 93.1% and 96%, specificity ranging from 96.1% to 100%, and an area under the curve (AUC) ranging from 0.97 to 0.98. Hence, miRNA371 emerges as a potentially valuable novel biomarker for testicular germ cell tumors (TGCT) [21–23] (Table 1). Comparatively, serum tumor markers AFP, LDH, and β -hCG had sensitivities of less than 50% in seminomas.

Table 1. miR371 for TGCT primary diagnosis.

Author	Year	Patient (n)	Sensitivity (%)	Specificity (%)	AUC*
Dieckmann [19,20]	2019	616	91.8	96.1	0.97
Nappi [21]	2019	110	96	100	0.97
Badia [22]	2021	69	93.1	100	0.98
Sequeira [23]	2022	82	93.6	100	0.98

*Note: AUC = Area under the curve.

2.2. Treatment Monitoring

Common treatment options for testicular germ cell tumors range from orchiectomy alone to radiotherapy, chemotherapy, or retroperitoneal lymph node dissection (RPLND) [24]. While it is possible for TGCT cure rates to be high, the use of the mentioned treatments, either independently or in combination, can cause toxic effects resulting in treatment related morbidity [25]. Complications can include but are not limited to cardiovascular disease, additional malignant neoplasms, pulmonary complications, nephrotoxicity, and avascular necrosis [26]. Using miRNAs to verify treatment effectiveness can assist healthcare providers in determining or revising the patient-centered treatment plan to decrease excessive procedures and exposure to risks. When necessary, miRNAs have the potential to identify germ cell tumors that are resistant to standard treatments. A study by Leao et al. documented a significant decrease in miRNA levels from pre-chemotherapy to post-chemotherapy [27]. Circulating levels of miR-371a-3p also correctly predicted residual GCTs post-chemotherapy with 100% sensitivity. In addition, a decrease in miRNA was observed following orchiectomies; however, levels did not return to a normal range [19]. Access to this data can support or oppose options for retroperitoneal lymph node dissection which is documented to be therapeutic in about 55% to 60% of patients after chemotherapy [27]. Surveillance after treatment also compounds potential treatment risks related to 6 to 10 additional imaging scans and exposure to ionizing radiation [28,29]. Considering the noted sensitivity and specificity of miR-371a-3p circulating levels, the possibility of deescalating the use of unnecessary treatment or surveillance methods can become a reality [29].

2.3. Detection of Early Relapse

The difference observed in miR-371a-3p elevation between TGCT subtypes is also illustrated between clinical stages. In a study containing 874 participants of ages 16 to 69 years, 616 with TGCT and 258 controls, concluded that patients of a clinical stage greater than 1 (one) had higher miR-371a-3p levels than those with clinical stage 1 (CSI) [19]. More advanced staged tumors consistently express a higher median of miRNA values than that of localized tumors. This is explained by the likelihood of the miRNA levels correlating with the physical amount of tumor present in the body [19]. Of 35

patients to relapse in the study, 21 presented with clinical stage 2 or greater disease. This classification of “high burden” relapse correlates with significantly higher miR-371a-3p levels compared to that found in low burden relapse. With the highest risk of relapse occurring during the first 2 to 3 years after initial treatment, about 30% of patients on active surveillance will relapse during follow-up [30]. The retroperitoneum was found to be one of the most common sites of relapse. Diagnosis of relapse sooner in the disease process increases the chance of cure by treatment. With knowledge of likely sites of relapse and metastasis, detection approaches must meet the demand for precision. CT scans or radiography usually only detect metastases about ≥ 1 cm in size causing tumor progression to initially go unnoticed. In addition, imaging at institutions can occur at a frequency ranging from every 2 months after initial staging and diagnosis to eventually every year; once again increasing the potential radiation burden [30]. A study by Hamilton et al. illustrates a large discrepancy between the current inconsistent methods of relapse detection. This study observed relapse was detected by routine imaging in about 52% of cases, STMs in 33% of cases, and only 11% of cases were first detected by both positive imaging and STMs simultaneously [30]. During active surveillance, the change in miRNA levels can predict relapse at initial stages. miR-371a-3p values were found to be higher at relapse compared to postorchietomy levels for 94.1% of patients in the Lobo et al. investigation [31]. 100% of patients exhibiting recurrence in the Fankhauser et al. study were determined to have elevated miR-371a-3p levels. Of those patients, 80% of relapse was identified with marked miRNA levels before the use of standard imaging and tumor marker elevation [32]. Monitoring miR-371a-3p levels decreased recurrence detection time by upwards of 2 months compared to standard follow-up methods including imaging [32].

3. Current Limitations

3.1. Expression of miRNAs Differ among TGCT Subtypes

A generalized miRNA serum cut-off value for TGCTs is not established in part due to the documented variation in levels among TGCT subtypes. The difference in levels provides a greater challenge in interpreting the resulting values and translating the acquired information into a usable clinical decision-making schema. Vilela-Salgueiro et al. describes the relative levels of expression in GCT subgroups. Seminomas have the greatest increase in miRNA expression compared to non-seminomatous TGCTs. Comparatively, pre-pubertal TGCTs have higher expression levels than post-pubertal TGCTs [18]. It is also notable that only 59% of seminomas less than 1 cm in size express markers making them more difficult to detect [18]. Teratomas do not express miR-371a-3p or express less than other subtypes [19]. Proper distinction and categorization of lab values that accurately reflect disease burden and subtypes are necessary to appropriately determine treatment plans [18]. Variation in expression levels can lead to more specific therapies, but concurrent limitations such as methodological factors make this information use premature. This matter is also complicated by the lack of elevated miRNA expression, such as miR-371a-3p, in testicular tumors not originating from germ cells [33]. With this consideration, a greater use of serial miRNA measurements with standardized protocols could reveal more information on expression levels among various populations of patients diagnosed with TGCTs.

3.2. Unrefined Standardized Protocols

Understanding the immense possibilities for use of circulating microRNAs is underway; however, a major hindrance could result from the current lack of standardized conventions used to collect, store, analyze, and interpret data. The development of an accepted protocol may limit obstacles, such as interlaboratory heterogeneity, allowing for widespread clinical use of circulating miRNA levels [34,35]. Current studies are gaining traction on this issue. [28] Lafin et al. suggested the use of raw Cq values from serum qPCR-based methods with pre-amplification after discovering the normalization process of assays increased the likelihood of variation and therefore heterogeneity [34]. The use of raw miR-371a-3p Cq data, in this context, is associated with lower cost which can be useful for incorporation of miRNA analysis into routine clinical testing. Baseline decision making

criteria aimed at reducing misclassification of samples via establishment of ideal cut-off values for negative, positive, or indeterminate (grounds for reanalysis) samples are also suggested in the mentioned study. Cut-off values may be dependent on the clinical scenario as the expression of miRNA varies between disease subtypes as previously described. Further, each lab may have variable cutoffs as well. Protocol formation can prevent overtreatment and guide the management of patients.

4. Potential Applications of Circulating mRNAs

4.1. Risk Assessment and Genetic Screening

Individuals predisposed to common cancers such as breast cancer and colon cancer make up an estimated 5-10% of cancer occurrences [36]. This phenomenon termed hereditary cancer, results from germline mutations in certain predisposition genes, such as BRCA1/2 in breast cancer and MSH2 in colon cancer [36]. Knowledge and identification of these common cancer syndromes rely heavily on the availability and efficacy of genetic tests. Risk assessment and genetic screening for TGCTs can lead to more informed decision-making for at-risk individuals who may also be at higher risk of developing more than one primary cancer. Evaluation and development of certain miRNA profiles could be used to assess an individual's probability of developing germ cell tumors, allowing for preventative measures.

TGCTs arise from various factors including environmental and genetic susceptibilities. However, familial aggregation of cancer is greatly due to inherited susceptibility in the absence of strong environmental risk factors [37]. A sibling is at a four-fold increase for colon cancer if another sibling is diagnosed [37]. A two- to three-fold risk is illustrated for breast cancer in daughters who had a mother and sister affected with breast cancer [37]. This increase in risk due to heritable factors is also observed in various iterations for those diagnosed with testicular cancer: (i) a four-fold increase in sons with fathers who have testicular cancer [38], (ii) a eight-fold increase when a brother has testicular cancer [38], and (iii) a three-fold increased risk for first-degree relatives of patients with testicular cancer [39] (Table 2). Although low penetrance for testicular cancer is supported, this finding suggests the polygenic nature of this disease process [37]. Each genetic hit or mutation acts in synergy to increase the odds of developing cancer.

Table 2. Familial risk factors associated with testicular germ cell tumors.

Diagnosed Relative	SIR*	Reference
Father	4	[38]
Brother	8.46	[38]
Son	4.5	[38]
First-degree relative	3.1	[39]

*Note: SIR = Standardized incidence ratios.

With the availability and development of different miRNA profiling methods, screening could highlight the presence of malignant cells. These alterations, which can be explained by a variety of mechanisms including epigenetic changes, DNA point mutations, and chromosomal modifications of genes are illustrated by the differences in miRNA expression [40]. The relationship between miRNA dysregulation and cancer is unlikely to be random. This was supported by data suggesting at least 50% of miRNAs are located at disturbed genomic sites involved in cancer [41]. Demonstrated with the 13q31 region found to be amplified in B-cell lymphomas which includes the miR-17-92 cluster of seven miRNAs resulting in a 10-fold increase in pri-miRNA levels in 65% of B-Cell lymphoma samples [42]. In parallel, the TGCT-related miRNAs exhibiting increased expression, such as miR-371a-3p, are found in the 19q13.42 region [43]. In addition to TGCTs-related miRNAs, significant recurring mutations were observed in the KIT, KRAS, and NRAS genes of the seminoma subtypes at rates of 18%, 14%, and 4% respectively [44]. The mentioned genes, if mutated, can result in constitutive action of their protein products leading to heightened stimulation of signaling

pathways and therefore cell proliferation [45]. The variation of miRNA gene expression in combination with recently found gene associations such as the KRAS gene found on chromosome 12 (112p) in TGCTs can lead to a comprehensive genetic profile suggesting risk of cancer and potential tumor types and subtypes.

Once a patient is evaluated for their known or suspected risk of GCTs the subsequent actions involving genetic counseling are vital for supporting the patient. Just as innovations in technology allow for advanced screening at costs more affordable for the general public, the same is occurring within the evolving field of cancer genetic counseling. What once was laden with exorbitant costs and strict insurance-based criteria is now more accessible to a broader set of patients as it plays a significant role in the management of care [46]. Patients and providers can easily get a snapshot of the general risk of developing common cancers including breast, ovarian, and colon cancer with the use of online databases and risk assessment tools. This knowledge of mutation probabilities depended on standardized testing strategies and an investment in research that provided a foundation for subsequent streamlined clinical biomarker and genetic screenings [47]. Incorporating miRNA biomarker levels enhances the current risk stratification categories, especially for TGCTs that currently include several environmental and genetic factors such as age, ethnicity, cryptorchidism, and dysregulation of the KIT gene [48]. Patients also deemed exceptional candidates for screening include those mentioned above with a family history of disease. Genetic testing can reduce morbidity and mortality [49]. With this information, more providers are recommending appropriate screening options for eligible participants. Most patients screened are satisfied in choosing to do so. A BRCAsearch study from 2019 reported 98.7% of participants receiving BRCA1/2 germline mutation testing were content with having pursued the testing [50].

4.2. Early Detection Biomarkers

MiRNAs could serve as early biomarkers for the presence of germ cell tumors in patients not previously diagnosed, enabling earlier identification and staging of disease. With the increase in screening and possible diagnoses, there is an understandable burden of knowledge placed upon patients, screening participants, and their social support. Mellon et al. describes the risk perception and cancer worries among relatives associated with familial breast cancer risks [51]. The level of worry related to inherited cancer risks supports the need for cancer genetic counseling in addition to reliable means for evaluating biomarkers to provide patients with a realistic and complete picture of their health options.

Clinical stage I (CSI) seminoma and nonseminomas testicular cancer accounts for 68% of cases in newly diagnosed patients. As the most common stage of disease, it is defined as being confined to the testis without evidence of disseminated disease [52,53]. It is important to note that early detection in the majority of patients does not equate to early action, especially when active surveillance is a recommended option absent of treatment related consequences [53]. Discovery of disease at such an early stage allows the patient and their family to have more control over their future treatment decisions. Access to individualized treatment plans appropriately matched to specific diagnoses will contribute to improved quality of life. On average from development of symptoms to definitive diagnosis, there is a delay of 3 to 5 months, but diagnostic delay can range from 1 to 36 months resulting in clinical consequences [54]. The detection of TGCTs in CSI has a 5-year survival rate of 99% while later stages have a decreased survival rate of 72.5% [52]. The use of early detection and active surveillance becomes a greater priority in the clinical setting under these circumstances which has demonstrated reduced quantities of surgeries, chemotherapy cycles, and radiation treatments with similar survival rates [53].

5. Conclusions

Investigation of miRNAs in relation to germ cell tumors is gaining traction and is documented to be superior to conventional tumor markers. The use of specific circulating markers such as miR-371a-3p gives insight into patients' disease status, treatment efficacy, and recurrence in a non-invasive, cost-effective manner. The current benefits and additional applications are, however, met

with weaknesses that must be addressed before the full breadth of potential for this liquid biopsy test is realized. Establishing a standardized methodology for providing valid and reliable results could lead to utilization of the differences seen among TGCT subtypes. MiRNA values can improve the clinical decision-making process for physicians in the care of patients diagnosed with germ cell tumors. Enhanced detection, diagnostic mechanisms, and potentially preventative strategies for cancer does bring about new ethical and personal challenges [55]. Although widespread early detection mechanisms for GCTs such as miRNA biomarkers are being explored, the question of equitable access to these screening methods and the influence of outside sources (socio-economic, cultural, and political) act as potential barriers in its implementation and warrant future inquiry.

Funding: This review received no external funding.

Conflicts of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Trabert B, Chen J, Devesa SS, Bray F, McGlynn KA. International patterns and trends in testicular cancer incidence, overall and by histologic subtype, 1973–2007. *Andrology*. 2015;3(1):4-12. doi:10.1111/andr.293
2. Ekblom A, Akre O. Increasing incidence of testicular cancer—birth cohort effects. *APMIS Acta Pathol Microbiol Immunol Scand*. 1998;106(1):225-229; discussion 229-231. doi:10.1111/j.1699-0463.1998.tb01340.x
3. Yamashita S, Koyama J, Goto T, et al. Trends in Age and Histology of Testicular Cancer from 1980-2019: A Single-Center Study. *Tohoku J Exp Med*. 2020;252(3):219-224. doi:10.1620/tjem.252.219
4. Chovanec M, Kalavska K, Mego M, Cheng L. Liquid biopsy in germ cell tumors: biology and clinical management. *Expert Rev Mol Diagn*. 2020;20(2):187-194. doi:10.1080/14737159.2019.1685383
5. Looijenga LHJ, Oosterhuis JW. Pathobiology of testicular germ cell tumors: views and news. *Anal Quant Cytol Histol*. 2002;24(5):263-279.
6. Ghazarian AA, Trabert B, Devesa SS, McGlynn KA. Recent trends in the incidence of testicular germ cell tumors in the United States. *Andrology*. 2015;3(1):13-18. doi:10.1111/andr.288
7. Cancer of the Testis - Cancer Stat Facts. SEER. Accessed July 11, 2023. <https://seer.cancer.gov/statfacts/html/testis.html>
8. Oshi M, Murthy V, Takahashi H, et al. Urine as a Source of Liquid Biopsy for Cancer. *Cancers*. 2021;13(11):2652. doi:10.3390/cancers13112652
9. Murray MJ, Huddart RA, Coleman N. The present and future of serum diagnostic tests for testicular germ cell tumours. *Nat Rev Urol*. 2016;13(12):715-725. doi:10.1038/nrurol.2016.170
10. Egan J, Salari K. Biomarkers in Testicular Cancer: Classic Tumor Markers and Beyond. *Urol Clin North Am*. 2023;50(1):133-143. doi:10.1016/j.ucl.2022.09.002
11. Mir MC, Pavan N, Gonzalgo ML. Current Clinical Applications of Testicular Cancer Biomarkers. *Urol Clin North Am*. 2016;43(1):119-125. doi:10.1016/j.ucl.2015.08.011
12. Gilligan TD, Seidenfeld J, Basch EM, et al. American Society of Clinical Oncology Clinical Practice Guideline on Uses of Serum Tumor Markers in Adult Males With Germ Cell Tumors. *J Clin Oncol*. 2010;28(20):3388-3404. doi:10.1200/JCO.2009.26.4481
13. Fischer S, Rothermundt C, Stalder O, et al. The Value of Tumour Markers in the Detection of Relapse—Lessons Learned from the Swiss Austrian German Testicular Cancer Cohort Study. *Eur Urol Open Sci*. 2023;50:57-60. doi:10.1016/j.euros.2023.01.013
14. Trigo JM, Tabernero JM, Paz-Ares L, et al. Tumor markers at the time of recurrence in patients with germ cell tumors. *Cancer*. 2000;88(1):162-168. doi:10.1002/(SICI)1097-0142(20000101)88:1<162::AID-CNCR22>3.0.CO;2-V
15. Saliminejad K, Khorram Khorshid HR, Soleymani Fard S, Ghaffari SH. An overview of microRNAs: Biology, functions, therapeutics, and analysis methods. *J Cell Physiol*. 2019;234(5):5451-5465. doi:10.1002/jcp.27486
16. De Martino M, Chieffi P, Esposito F. miRNAs and Biomarkers in Testicular Germ Cell Tumors: An Update. *Int J Mol Sci*. 2021;22(3):1380. doi:10.3390/ijms22031380
17. Piao J, Lafin JT, Scarpini CG, et al. A Multi-institutional Pooled Analysis Demonstrates That Circulating miR-371a-3p Alone is Sufficient for Testicular Malignant Germ Cell Tumor Diagnosis. *Clin Genitourin Cancer*. 2021;19(6):469-479. doi:10.1016/j.clgc.2021.08.006

18. Vilela-Salgueiro B, Barros-Silva D, Lobo J, et al. Germ cell tumour subtypes display differential expression of microRNA371a-3p. *Philos Trans R Soc B Biol Sci.* 2018;373(1748):20170338. doi:10.1098/rstb.2017.0338
19. Dieckmann KP, Radtke A, Geczi L, et al. Serum Levels of MicroRNA-371a-3p (M371 Test) as a New Biomarker of Testicular Germ Cell Tumors: Results of a Prospective Multicentric Study. *J Clin Oncol.* 2019;37(16):1412-1423. doi:10.1200/JCO.18.01480
20. Fankhauser CD, Nuño MM, Murray MJ, Frazier L, Bagrodia A. Circulating MicroRNAs for Detection of Germ Cell Tumours: A Narrative Review. *Eur Urol Focus.* 2022;8(3):660-662. doi:10.1016/j.euf.2022.04.008
21. Nappi L, Thi M, Lum A, et al. Developing a Highly Specific Biomarker for Germ Cell Malignancies: Plasma miR371 Expression Across the Germ Cell Malignancy Spectrum. *J Clin Oncol Off J Am Soc Clin Oncol.* 2019;37(33):3090-3098. doi:10.1200/JCO.18.02057
22. Badia RR, Abe D, Wong D, et al. Real-World Application of Pre-Orchiectomy miR-371a-3p Test in Testicular Germ Cell Tumor Management. *J Urol.* 2021;205(1):137-144. doi:10.1097/JU.0000000000001337
23. Sequeira JP, Lobo J, Constâncio V, et al. DigiMir Test: Establishing a Novel Pipeline for MiR-371a Quantification Using Droplet Digital PCR in Liquid Biopsies From Testicular Germ Cell Tumor Patients. *Front Oncol.* 2022;12:876732. doi:10.3389/fonc.2022.876732
24. Cheng L, Albers P, Berney DM, et al. Testicular cancer. *Nat Rev Dis Primer.* 2018;4(1):1-24. doi:10.1038/s41572-018-0029-0
25. Wood GE, Chamberlain F, Tran B, et al. Treatment de-escalation for stage II seminoma. *Nat Rev Urol.* 2023;20(8):502-512. doi:10.1038/s41585-023-00727-0
26. Fung C, Dinh P, Ardeshir-Rouhani-Fard S, Schaffer K, Fossa SD, Travis LB. Toxicities Associated with Cisplatin-Based Chemotherapy and Radiotherapy in Long-Term Testicular Cancer Survivors. *Adv Urol.* 2018;2018:8671832. doi:10.1155/2018/8671832
27. Leão R, van AT, Figueiredo A, et al. Serum miRNA Predicts Viable Disease after Chemotherapy in Patients with Testicular Nonseminoma Germ Cell Tumor. *J Urol.* 2018;200(1):126-135. doi:10.1016/j.juro.2018.02.068
28. Joffe JK, Cafferty FH, Murphy L, et al. Imaging Modality and Frequency in Surveillance of Stage I Seminoma Testicular Cancer: Results From a Randomized, Phase III, Noninferiority Trial (TRISST). *J Clin Oncol Off J Am Soc Clin Oncol.* 2022;40(22):2468-2478. doi:10.1200/JCO.21.01199
29. Matulewicz RS, Fankhauser CD, Sheinfeld J, Bagrodia A. Novel approaches to redesign surveillance strategies following orchiectomy for localized testicular cancer: a narrative review. *Transl Androl Urol.* 2023;12(6):1016022-1011022. doi:10.21037/tau-22-855
30. Hamilton RJ, Nayan M, Anson-Cartwright L, et al. Treatment of Relapse of Clinical Stage I Nonseminomatous Germ Cell Tumors on Surveillance. *J Clin Oncol.* 2019;37(22):1919-1926. doi:10.1200/JCO.18.01250
31. Lobo J, Leão R, Gillis AJM, et al. Utility of Serum miR-371a-3p in Predicting Relapse on Surveillance in Patients with Clinical Stage I Testicular Germ Cell Cancer. *Eur Urol Oncol.* 2021;4(3):483-491. doi:10.1016/j.euo.2020.11.004
32. Fankhauser CD, Christiansen AJ, Rothermundt C, et al. Detection of recurrences using serum miR-371a-3p during active surveillance in men with stage I testicular germ cell tumours. *Br J Cancer.* 2022;126(8):1140-1144. doi:10.1038/s41416-021-01643-z
33. Belge G, Grobelny F, Radtke A, et al. Serum levels of microRNA-371a-3p are not elevated in testicular tumours of non-germ cell origin. *J Cancer Res Clin Oncol.* 2021;147(2):435-443. doi:10.1007/s00432-020-03429-x
34. Lafin JT, Scarpini CG, Amini A, et al. Refining the serum miR-371a-3p test for viable germ cell tumor detection. *Sci Rep.* 2023;13(1):10558. doi:10.1038/s41598-023-37271-1
35. Liu Q, Lian Q, Lv H, Zhang X, Zhou F. The Diagnostic Accuracy of miR-371a-3p for Testicular Germ Cell Tumors: A Systematic Review and Meta-Analysis. *Mol Diagn Ther.* 2021;25(3):273-281. doi:10.1007/s40291-021-00521-x
36. Riley BD, Culver JO, Skrzynia C, et al. Essential Elements of Genetic Cancer Risk Assessment, Counseling, and Testing: Updated Recommendations of the National Society of Genetic Counselors. *Journal of Genetic Counseling.* 2012;21(2):151-161. doi:10.1007/s10897-011-9462-x
37. Modification of cancer risks in offspring by sibling and parental cancers from 2,112,616 nuclear families - Dong - 2001 - International Journal of Cancer - Wiley Online Library. Accessed January 21, 2024.

- <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/full/10.1002/1097-0215%28200102%299999%3A9999%3C%3A%3AAID-IJC1147%3E3.0.CO%3B2-C?sid=nlm%3Apubmed>
38. Hemminki K, Li X. Familial risk in testicular cancer as a clue to a heritable and environmental aetiology. *Br J Cancer*. 2004;90(9):1765-1770. doi:10.1038/sj.bjc.6601714
 39. Dieckmann KP, Pichlmeier U. The prevalence of familial testicular cancer: an analysis of two patient populations and a review of the literature. *Cancer*. 1997;80(10):1954-1960.
 40. Leva GD, Croce CM. miRNA profiling of cancer. *Current opinion in genetics & development*. 2013;23(1):3. doi:10.1016/j.gde.2013.01.004
 41. Calin GA, Sevignani C, Dumitru CD, et al. Human microRNA genes are frequently located at fragile sites and genomic regions involved in cancers. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2004;101(9):2999-3004. doi:10.1073/pnas.0307323101
 42. He L, Thomson JM, Hemann MT, et al. A microRNA polycistron as a potential human oncogene. *Nature*. 2005;435(7043):828-833. doi:10.1038/nature03552
 43. MIR371A microRNA 371a [Homo sapiens (human)] - Gene - NCBI. Accessed February 20, 2024. <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/gene/?term=442916>
 44. Shen H, Shih J, Hollern DP, et al. Integrated Molecular Characterization of Testicular Germ Cell Tumors. *Cell Rep*. 2018;23(11):3392-3406. doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2018.05.039
 45. Zhu G, Pei L, Xia H, Tang Q, Bi F. Role of oncogenic KRAS in the prognosis, diagnosis and treatment of colorectal cancer. *Molecular Cancer*. 2021;20(1):143. doi:10.1186/s12943-021-01441-4
 46. Schiend J, Stopfer J. Cancer Genetic Counseling—Current Practice and Future Challenges. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Med*. 2020;10(6):a036541. doi:10.1101/cshperspect.a036541
 47. Domchek SM, Bradbury A, Garber JE, Offit K, Robson ME. Multiplex Genetic Testing for Cancer Susceptibility: Out on the High Wire Without a Net? *JCO*. 2013;31(10):1267-1270. doi:10.1200/JCO.2012.46.9403
 48. Gaddam SJ, Chesnut GT. Testicle Cancer. In: *StatPearls*. StatPearls Publishing; 2024. Accessed February 20, 2024. <http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/books/NBK563159/>
 49. Metcalfe K, Lynch HT, Foulkes WD, et al. Effect of Oophorectomy on Survival After Breast Cancer in BRCA1 and BRCA2 Mutation Carriers. *JAMA Oncol*. 2015;1(3):306-313. doi:10.1001/jamaoncol.2015.0658
 50. Nilsson MP, Nilsson ED, Borg Å, Brandberg Y, Silfverberg B, Loman N. High patient satisfaction with a simplified BRCA1/2 testing procedure: long-term results of a prospective study. *Breast Cancer Res Treat*. 2019;173(2):313-318. doi:10.1007/s10549-018-5000-y
 51. Mellon S, Gold R, Janisse J, et al. Risk perception and cancer worries in families at increased risk of familial breast/ovarian cancer. *Psychooncology*. 2008;17(8):756-766. doi:10.1002/pon.1370
 52. Heijnsdijk EAM, Supit SJ, Looijenga LHJ, de Koning HJ. Screening for cancers with a good prognosis: The case of testicular germ cell cancer. *Cancer Med*. 2021;10(8):2897-2903. doi:10.1002/cam4.3837
 53. Nichols CR, Roth B, Albers P, et al. Active Surveillance Is the Preferred Approach to Clinical Stage I Testicular Cancer. *JCO*. 2013;31(28):3490-3493. doi:10.1200/JCO.2012.47.6010
 54. Huyghe E, Muller A, Miesusset R, et al. Impact of Diagnostic Delay in Testis Cancer: Results of a Large Population-Based Study. *European Urology*. 2007;52(6):1710-1716. doi:10.1016/j.eururo.2007.06.003
 55. Ghose S, Radhakrishnan V, Bhattacharya S. Ethics of cancer care: beyond biology and medicine. *Ecanermedalscience*. 2019;13:911. doi:10.3332/ecancer.2019.911

Disclaimer/Publisher's Note: The statements, opinions and data contained in all publications are solely those of the individual author(s) and contributor(s) and not of MDPI and/or the editor(s). MDPI and/or the editor(s) disclaim responsibility for any injury to people or property resulting from any ideas, methods, instructions or products referred to in the content.