Concordance of Self- and Clinician-Collected Anorectal Swabs for Human Papillomavirus (HPV) Detection in HIV-Negative Men Who Have Sex with Men (MSM)

Nicholas Yared

M.D. University of Minnesota Minneapolis, MN, USA



Improving Lives Through the Prevention & Treatment of Anogenital & HPV-Related Diseases



• No financial relationships or conflict of interest to disclose





# Background

- Anal squamous cell cancer (ASCC) is rare in the United States but incidence is rising
- ASCC screening endorsed by New York State Department of Health and HIV Medicine Association of the Infectious Disease Society of America) for HIV-positive MSM
- No guidelines for ASCC screening for HIV-negative MSM despite higher ASCC incidence (5.1 per 100,000 men) compared to general population of U.S. men (1.8 per 100,000 men)



# Background

- Initial ASCC screening method Anal canal swabs to detect DNA from high-risk HPV (HR-HPV) types
- Self-collected swabs have potential for rapid, easy, cost-effective detection of HR-HPV DNA
- Prior demonstration of comparable detection of HR-HPV DNA for paired self-collected and clinician-collected swabs (Clin Inf Dis 2006;42(2):308-9)
- Details of self-collection process variable among studies with optimal collection method undetermined





- 1. Determine sensitivity and specificity of self-collected anal swabs for HPV DNA detection assuming clinician-collection as gold standard
- 2. Determine concordance of self-collected and clinician-collected swabs for HPV DNA detection





# Methods – Inclusion and Exclusion Criteria

### • Inclusion Criteria:

- Men age 18 years or older
- Self-reported prior sexual contact with other men
- Negative HIV test within 3 months prior to study visit
- Permitted men with history of anogenital warts or receipt of HPV vaccine

### • Exclusion Criteria:

- Current or prior diagnosis of anal cancer
- Limited manual dexterity prohibiting utilization of self-collected swab



# Methods – Study Workflow

- Cross-sectional study design All participants attended a single inperson study visit
- Study visit steps:
  - 1. Informed consent given
  - 2. Completion of online pre-intervention survey
  - 3. Self-collection of single anal swab
  - 4. Clinician-collection of single anal swab
  - 5. Blood sample collected for type-specific HPV antibody testing
- Following study visit, participants completed an online postintervention survey assessing their perceptions of the swab selfcollection method



# Methods – Self-Collection Process

- Self-collection instructions adapted from Lampinen TM, et al. Sex Transm Dis 2006; 33(6)386-8
- Polyester-tipped swab (Puritan Medical Products, Guilford, Maine) inserted 3-4 cm into anal canal
- Swab rotated once for self-collection and then removed and agitated in liquid media transport vial (PreservCyt; Hologic, Inc., Marlborough, MA) for 30 seconds
- Clinician-collected swab was rotated 3-4 times because of use as "gold standard" collection method

#### structions for Self-Collection of Anal Swab Specime

























pottle firmly on a flat surface

iohazard waste containe













# Methods – Sample and Data Analysis

### • Sample Processing

- HPV Genotyping: DNA extraction → Polymerase chain reaction → Restriction fragment length polymorphism → Agarose gel electrophoresis
- Statistical Analysis
  - Sensitivity and specificity of self-collection calculated using HPV types detected via clinician-collection to define positive and negative values
  - McNemar's test used to calculate proportion of HPV DNA positive results for self-collected samples compared to clinician-collected samples
  - Kappa statistic used to calculate inter-rater agreement of HPV DNA results detected between paired self-collected and clinician-collected samples



## **Participant Characteristics**

- N = 78 participants with paired anal swab samples
- Mean age of 35 years (Interquartile Range = 26-41 years)
- 83.3% Caucasian race, 91% Non-Hispanic ethnicity
- 92.3% reported 3 or more sexual partners in past year
- Prior anal pap?
  - No 64.1%
  - Yes 16.7%
  - Unsure 19.2%
- HPV vaccine status?
  - At least 1 dose 34.6%
  - All 3 doses 5.1%
  - Never received 52.6%
  - Unsure 12.8%



#### Table 1. Pairwise Comparisons of HPV DNA Prevalence For Self- and Clinician-Collected Anorectal Swabs

S	Self-Collected, n (%)	Clinician-Collected, n (%)	<i>p</i> -value	Sensitivity	Specificity
Any HPV	54 (69.2%)	57 (73.1%)	0.440	84.2%	71.4%
Any HR-HPV*	33 (42.3%)	43 (55.1%)	0.012	69.8%	91.4%
4v HPV⁺	16 (20.5%)	23 (29.5%)	0.034	60.9%	96.4%
9v HPV <sup>‡</sup>	25 (32.1%)	33 (42.3%)	0.090	62.5%	89.1%
HPV Type 16	3 (3.8%)	8 (10.3%)	0.024	37.5%	100%
HPV Type 18	3 (3.8%)	5 (6.4%)	0.159	60%	100%

<sup>\*</sup>HR-HPV = High-risk HPV types; Includes types 16, 18, 26, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 39, 45, 51, 52, 53, 56, 58, 59, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 73, 82, 85, and 97

<sup>+</sup>4v HPV = 4-valent HPV vaccine types (6, 11, 16, 18)

<sup>\*</sup>9v HPV = 9-valent HPV vaccine types (6, 11, 16, 18, 31, 33, 45, 52, 58)



Improving Lives Through the Prevention & Treatment of Anogenital & HPV-Related Diseases

## Table 2. Agreement of HPV DNA Results Between Self-Collected and Clinician-CollectedSampling Methods Among MSM (N = 78)

	Percent Agreement	к (95% CI*)	
Any HPV	80.8	0.53 (0.42 – 0.65)	
HR-HPV**	79.5	0.60 (0.49 – 0.71)	
4v HPV Types <sup>†</sup>	85.9	0.63 (0.52 – 0.74)	
9v HPV Types <sup>‡</sup>	76.9	0.51 (0.40 – 0.62)	
HPV Type 16	93.6	0.52 (0.42 – 0.62)	
HPV Type 18	97.4	0.74 (0.63 – 0.85)	

\*CI = confidence interval

\*\* HR-HPV = High-risk HPV types; Includes types 16, 18, 26, 30, 31, 33, 34, 35, 39, 45, 51, 52, 53, 56, 58, 59, 66, 67, 68, 69, 70, 73, 82, 85, and 97

<sup>+</sup>4v = 4-valent, in reference to the HPV vaccine containing HPV types 6, 11, 16, and 18

<sup>‡</sup>9v = 9-valent, in reference to the HPV vaccine containing HPV types 6, 11, 16, 18, 31, 33, 45, 52, and 58



# Conclusions

- Low sensitivity and moderate-to-high specificity for detection of high-risk and vaccinepreventable HPV types with self-collected anal swab method compared to cliniciancollected method
- Moderate inter-rater agreement of self-collected and clinician-collected anal swabs
- Higher number of false-negative HPV results seen with self-collection method suggest need for modification of instructional methods
  - Nature of collection being blind as an inherent limitation for sampling HPV DNA present
  - HPV DNA detection may improve with increased number of swab rotations
- Study limitations:
  - Cross-sectional study design Unknown if and to what degree improvement in detection would occur with repetition of self-collection process
  - Convenience sample of participants drawn from a single metropolitan area
  - Clinical applicability of results impacted by HR-HPV DNA detection remaining an adjunctive marker to cytology for ASCC screening



# Acknowledgements

### **Co-Authors and Mentors**

- Shalini Kulasingam PhD
- Keith Horvath PhD
- Jason Baker M.D., M.S.

### Grant Support

- University of Minnesota Masonic Cancer Center SPECS Program Grant
- NIAID T32 Al055433-11A1 Training Grant





## References

- 1. Siegel R, Naishadham D, Jemal A. Cancer statistics, 2012. CA Cancer J Clin 2012;62(1):10-29.
- 2. SEER Cancer Stat Facts: Anal Cancer [Internet]. Bethesda, MD: National Cancer Institute [cited 2017 Oct 30]. Available from: <u>https://seer.cancer.gov/statfacts/html/anus.html</u>.
- 3. Silverberg MJ, Lau B, Justice AC, Engels E, Gill MJ, Goedert JJ, et al. Risk of anal cancer in HIVinfected and HIV-uninfected individuals in North America. Clin Infect Dis 2012;54:1026-1034.
- 4. Machalek DA, Poynten M, Jin F, Fairley CK, Farnsworth A, Garland SM, et al. Anal human papillomavirus infection and associated neoplastic lesions in men who have sex with men: A systematic review and meta-analysis. Lancet Oncol 2012;13(5):487-500.
- 5. Lampinen TM, Chan K, Anema A, et al. Self-screening for rectal sexually transmitted infections: Human papillomavirus. Clin Infect Dis 2006;42(2):308-9.
- 6. Lampinen TM, Latulippe L, Van Niekerk D, et al. Illustrated instructions for self-collection of anorectal swab specimens and their adequacy for cytological examination. Sex Transm Dis 2006;33(6):386-8.

