

ADVANCES IN BIOMARKER-BASED LABORATORY DIAGNOSTICS FOR EARLY-STAGE CANCER DETECTION: CURRENT TRENDS AND FUTURE PERSPECTIVES

Shakhnoza Hamidova

Independent Researcher, New York, United States

Received: 2026-07-20 · Accepted: 2026-08-24

Abstract

Early-stage cancer detection remains a fundamental challenge in modern laboratory medicine and clinical oncology. The identification of malignant disease before the development of extensive local invasion or distant metastasis can substantially expand therapeutic opportunities and improve clinical outcomes. Conventional diagnostic procedures, including imaging, endoscopy, cytology, histopathology, and established serum tumor markers, remain essential but may have limited sensitivity for small or biologically heterogeneous tumors. Advances in molecular biology have resulted in the development of increasingly sophisticated biomarkers that can be measured in blood and other biological specimens. These include circulating tumor DNA, cell-free DNA methylation patterns, circulating microRNAs, extracellular vesicles, circulating tumor cells, tumor-associated proteins, metabolites, and multimarker molecular signatures. Modern laboratory platforms, including next-generation sequencing, digital polymerase chain reaction, mass spectrometry, highly sensitive immunoassays, and computational analysis, have expanded the capacity to detect low-abundance molecular signals. Nevertheless, biomarker performance depends on tumor type, stage, tumor burden, biological phenotype, sample quality, analytical methodology, and characteristics of the target population. False-positive results may result from inflammation, benign disease, age-related molecular alterations, or clonal hematopoiesis, whereas false-negative results may occur because early tumors release insufficient biomarker material into circulation. This article reviews current advances in biomarker-based laboratory diagnostics for early-stage cancer detection, evaluates major diagnostic opportunities and limitations, and discusses future directions including multimarker panels, longitudinal testing, artificial intelligence-assisted interpretation, standardized laboratory workflows, and integration with established screening strategies. The future of cancer biomarker diagnostics is likely to depend on combining complementary molecular signals with clinical and imaging information rather than relying on a single universal biomarker.

Keywords: cancer biomarkers, early-stage cancer, laboratory diagnostics, liquid biopsy, circulating tumor DNA, DNA methylation, microRNA, extracellular vesicles, molecular diagnostics, early cancer detection.

1. Introduction

Cancer develops through a multistep process involving genetic alterations, epigenetic dysregulation, abnormal cellular signaling, changes in tissue architecture, and interactions between malignant cells and the surrounding microenvironment. Although malignant transformation may begin years before clinical symptoms become apparent, the biological signals generated by an early tumor can be extremely subtle. This creates a major diagnostic challenge for laboratory medicine: a test must identify a small and heterogeneous molecular signal within a large background of normal biological material.

The clinical importance of early detection is closely associated with disease stage. When cancer remains localized, definitive local treatment may be possible for many malignancies. In contrast, metastatic disease frequently requires systemic treatment and may have a substantially different prognosis. Consequently, laboratory methods capable of identifying cancer at an early stage have attracted considerable scientific and clinical attention.

Traditional laboratory diagnostics have relied heavily on protein-based tumor markers. Molecules such as prostate-specific antigen, alpha-fetoprotein, carcinoembryonic antigen, and cancer-associated carbohydrate antigens have established roles in selected clinical settings. However, most conventional serum markers have limitations when used as independent population screening tools because they may be elevated in benign disorders and may remain within reference ranges during early disease. The development of molecular biomarkers has changed the diagnostic landscape. Tumor cells may release fragments of DNA, RNA, proteins, metabolites, and membrane-bound extracellular vesicles into surrounding fluids. These materials can potentially be collected without direct tissue biopsy. Blood-based analysis, commonly referred to as liquid biopsy, therefore provides an opportunity to study tumor-associated molecular alterations in a minimally invasive manner.

Circulating tumor DNA is one of the most extensively studied molecular analytes. It can contain tumor-specific mutations, copy-number changes, structural variants, and epigenetic alterations. Because these molecular abnormalities may reflect the tumor genome, ctDNA has attracted substantial interest as a potential diagnostic and monitoring biomarker. However, the concentration of tumor-derived DNA is often very low in early-stage disease, making highly sensitive analytical technologies necessary.

DNA methylation represents another important area of development. Aberrant methylation patterns may arise during early carcinogenesis and can provide information about tissue identity.

Methylation-based assays may therefore have the potential not only to identify cancer-associated molecular abnormalities but also to estimate the likely anatomical origin of the tumor.

Circulating microRNAs have also been extensively investigated. These short non-coding RNA molecules regulate gene expression and can participate in processes involved in carcinogenesis. Their relative stability in biological fluids makes them attractive laboratory targets. Nevertheless, their biological functions are not cancer-specific, and changes may occur in inflammatory, metabolic, and other non-malignant conditions.

Extracellular vesicles constitute another promising source of biomarkers. These membrane-bound structures transport proteins, nucleic acids, and lipids between cells. Tumor-derived extracellular vesicles can contain molecular information reflecting malignant cell behavior and interactions with the microenvironment. Their diagnostic potential is significant, but laboratory standardization remains a major requirement.

Technological advances have accompanied biomarker discovery. Next-generation sequencing can characterize multiple genetic alterations simultaneously, digital PCR can detect low-frequency molecular variants, and mass spectrometry can identify complex metabolic and protein signatures. Artificial intelligence and advanced statistical methods may further improve interpretation of multimarker datasets.

The objective of this article is to examine contemporary advances in biomarker-based laboratory diagnostics for early-stage cancer detection, with emphasis on emerging molecular technologies, diagnostic sensitivity and specificity, current limitations, and future opportunities for clinical implementation.

2. Materials and Methods

A structured analytical review approach was used to evaluate contemporary biomarker-based

laboratory strategies for early cancer detection. The assessment focused on molecular and biochemical biomarkers that can be measured in minimally invasive or non-invasive biological specimens, with particular emphasis on blood-based diagnostics.

The major biomarker categories considered included circulating tumor DNA, cell-free DNA, DNA methylation patterns, circulating microRNAs, extracellular vesicles, circulating tumor cells, tumor-associated proteins, metabolic signatures, and multimarker panels. Conventional serum tumor markers were also considered as a reference category to provide context for the transition from traditional to molecular diagnostics.

Analytical technologies evaluated included polymerase chain reaction-based assays, digital PCR, next-generation sequencing, targeted sequencing, methylation-specific analysis, immunoassays, liquid chromatography–mass spectrometry, extracellular vesicle isolation techniques, and computational biomarker profiling.

The analysis focused on diagnostic characteristics relevant to early-stage cancer screening. These included analytical sensitivity, clinical sensitivity, specificity, positive predictive value, negative predictive value, reproducibility, tissue-of-origin information, and the potential influence of disease prevalence on clinical interpretation.

Factors that may influence biomarker detection were also considered. These included tumor size, anatomical location, vascularization, cellular turnover, tumor biology, molecular heterogeneity, age, smoking status, chronic inflammation, comorbidities, and pre-analytical sample conditions.

Particular attention was given to the distinction between analytical and clinical sensitivity. Analytical sensitivity reflects the ability of a laboratory platform to identify very low concentrations of a molecular target. Clinical sensitivity reflects the proportion of patients with disease who are correctly detected. A technically sensitive assay may therefore still demonstrate limited clinical sensitivity if early tumors release insufficient biomarker material.

The potential role of multimarker strategies was evaluated because cancer-associated molecular alterations are heterogeneous and no single biomarker is expected to be universally informative across all tumor types. The analysis also considered the importance of independent validation and prospective evaluation in asymptomatic populations.

3. Results

The review demonstrated substantial progress in biomarker-based laboratory diagnostics, particularly in the development of blood-based molecular approaches capable of detecting tumor-associated signals without direct tissue sampling. The most significant advances involved circulating nucleic acids, epigenetic biomarkers, extracellular vesicles, and multimarker molecular signatures.

Circulating tumor DNA emerged as an important component of modern liquid biopsy research. ctDNA analysis can identify genetic alterations associated with malignant cells, including point mutations, small insertions and deletions, copy-number abnormalities, and structural changes. Its principal advantage is that molecular information can be obtained from a blood sample rather than directly from the tumor.

However, early-stage disease remains a difficult setting for ctDNA detection. The quantity of tumor-derived DNA may be extremely small compared with the total circulating cell-free DNA pool. Consequently, highly sensitive sequencing or digital PCR techniques are required. Even when analytical sensitivity is excellent, clinical sensitivity may remain limited because not all tumors release sufficient DNA into the circulation.

DNA methylation-based diagnostics demonstrated another important development. Epigenetic abnormalities can occur during malignant transformation and may generate recognizable patterns within circulating cell-free DNA. Methylation signatures can sometimes provide information related to tissue origin, increasing their potential value in multi-cancer detection strategies.

One advantage of methylation analysis is that it can examine patterns across multiple genomic regions rather than depending on a single tumor-specific mutation. This may be particularly useful when tumors are genetically heterogeneous. Nevertheless, methylation profiles are also influenced by aging, environmental exposures, smoking, inflammation, and tissue-specific physiology.

Circulating microRNAs represented a further category of promising laboratory biomarkers. Because these molecules are relatively stable in circulation, they can potentially be measured repeatedly. Altered expression patterns have been associated with several malignancies, and panels containing multiple microRNAs may provide greater discriminatory information than isolated markers.

Nevertheless, the biological overlap between malignant and non-malignant conditions limits the specificity of many microRNA candidates. Inflammatory disorders, tissue injury, infection, and metabolic changes can influence circulating microRNA concentrations. Standardization of sample collection and normalization procedures remains essential.

Extracellular vesicles provided a biologically rich source of information. Tumor-derived vesicles may carry DNA fragments, messenger RNA, microRNAs, proteins, and lipids. Their molecular composition can reflect the state of the tumor and its microenvironment. These properties make extracellular vesicles attractive candidates for future laboratory diagnostics.

The principal limitations of extracellular-vesicle-based diagnostics are methodological. Different isolation and purification methods may generate vesicle populations with different compositions. Differences in sample processing and characterization can therefore produce variable biomarker measurements between laboratories.

Circulating tumor cells offered another source of tumor-derived information. Unlike cell-free DNA or RNA fragments, CTCs are intact cells and can potentially provide information about cellular phenotype, molecular heterogeneity, and metastatic behavior. However, their concentration in peripheral blood is often extremely low during early-stage disease, making detection technically demanding.

Protein biomarkers remain relevant despite the increasing emphasis on molecular diagnostics.

Conventional proteins can provide information about tumor burden, tissue injury, inflammation, or specific tumor-associated processes. Their major advantage is the availability of well-established immunoassay platforms. Their limitation is that many proteins lack sufficient specificity when used alone.

Metabolomic approaches have expanded the range of measurable cancer-associated signals.

Malignant cells undergo metabolic reprogramming, which can alter circulating metabolites.

High-resolution mass spectrometry can identify complex metabolic profiles that may distinguish cancer-associated states from normal physiology. However, metabolic signatures are highly sensitive to diet, medications, renal function, age, microbiome composition, and other physiological factors.

The analysis indicated that multimarker approaches may provide greater diagnostic robustness than isolated biomarkers. Combining genetic, epigenetic, protein, RNA, and metabolic information can increase the probability of detecting biologically diverse tumors. Computational algorithms can integrate these variables into composite diagnostic models.

However, increased molecular complexity creates additional requirements for laboratory quality control. The greater the number of analytes included in a diagnostic panel, the greater the potential impact of missing data, technical variability, batch effects, and statistical overfitting.

Another important finding was the difference between case-control performance and real-world screening performance. Biomarker studies conducted using patients with established cancer and healthy controls can demonstrate impressive discrimination. However, asymptomatic screening populations contain many individuals with benign diseases and other conditions that can generate similar molecular signals.

False-positive findings therefore represent a major limitation. Age-related clonal hematopoiesis can produce somatic blood-cell mutations that may be mistaken for tumor-derived mutations. Chronic inflammation and tissue injury can alter circulating DNA, RNA, protein, and metabolite profiles. These factors must be incorporated into biomarker validation strategies.

False-negative results remain equally important. Some early tumors may produce little circulating molecular material, and biological heterogeneity means that one tumor may shed a detectable biomarker while another of similar size does not. Therefore, a negative molecular result should not necessarily exclude malignancy when clinical or imaging evidence remains suspicious.

Pre-analytical factors were also identified as important determinants of diagnostic reliability. Time between blood collection and plasma separation, temperature during transport, storage conditions, hemolysis, extraction procedures, and laboratory platform can all influence biomarker measurements. Standard operating procedures are therefore essential for reproducibility.

4. Discussion

The rapid development of biomarker-based laboratory diagnostics has created new possibilities for identifying cancer before the emergence of advanced anatomical disease. The transition from traditional protein markers toward genomic, epigenomic, transcriptomic, vesicular, and metabolic biomarkers represents a broader transformation in laboratory medicine.

One of the central advantages of molecular biomarkers is their potential to detect biological abnormalities rather than relying solely on structural changes. Genetic and epigenetic alterations may occur during the early phases of carcinogenesis. In theory, this creates an opportunity to identify malignant processes before tumors become sufficiently large to produce symptoms or obvious imaging abnormalities.

However, early detection is technically more demanding than detection of advanced disease. A large tumor may release substantial quantities of DNA, RNA, proteins, and other biomolecules, whereas a small localized tumor may release only a minimal molecular signal. This fundamental biological limitation cannot be completely solved by improving laboratory instrumentation.

Highly sensitive technologies can lower the analytical detection threshold, but greater analytical sensitivity may introduce another problem: the detection of molecular abnormalities that are not caused by clinically significant cancer. Therefore, increasing sensitivity without maintaining adequate specificity can reduce the practical value of a screening test.

The distinction between analytical and clinical sensitivity is particularly important. Digital PCR and ultra-deep sequencing can detect very low-frequency molecular variants. Nevertheless, if only a small proportion of patients with early-stage cancer release detectable amounts of the target biomarker, clinical sensitivity will remain limited.

ctDNA illustrates this problem. Tumor-specific mutations can be highly informative when present, but early-stage tumors may contribute only a very small fraction of circulating cell-free DNA. Furthermore, mutations identified in plasma may originate from clonal hematopoiesis rather than a solid tumor.

Molecular interpretation should therefore consider the possibility of non-tumor sources.

Methylation-based diagnostics may address some of these challenges because epigenetic patterns can provide tissue-associated information. Instead of asking only whether a mutation is present, methylation analysis can potentially characterize a broader molecular pattern. This may facilitate both cancer detection and estimation of tumor origin. Nevertheless, age and environmental exposure can modify DNA methylation, requiring careful population-specific validation.

The development of multimarker assays is an important current trend. Cancer is not a single molecular disease, and different tumors can follow distinct genetic and epigenetic pathways. Combining several independent biomarker classes may therefore provide broader biological coverage than a single analyte.

For example, a diagnostic system could theoretically integrate routine laboratory values, circulating DNA mutations, methylation signatures, selected proteins, and microRNA patterns. Each individual component might have modest discriminatory value, but the combined molecular profile could provide a more informative risk estimate.

Artificial intelligence and machine learning may become increasingly important in this context. High-dimensional molecular datasets cannot always be interpreted effectively using conventional statistical approaches. Computational models can identify complex interactions among biomarkers and clinical variables. However, machine-learning systems are vulnerable to overfitting, selection bias, data leakage, and population-specific patterns.

External validation is therefore essential. A biomarker model should be evaluated in populations that are independent from the dataset used for discovery. Ideally, validation should include multiple healthcare institutions, different geographic regions, diverse demographic groups, and representative screening populations.

Another major consideration is the prevalence of cancer in the target population. In low-prevalence screening settings, even a highly specific test can generate substantial numbers of false-positive results when applied to large populations. This can lead to additional imaging, endoscopy, biopsy, psychological distress, and healthcare costs.

Consequently, biomarker evaluation should extend beyond sensitivity and specificity. Positive predictive value, negative predictive value, likelihood ratios, number needed to investigate, downstream procedures, stage distribution, and patient outcomes should all be considered.

The clinical role of biomarker testing also requires careful definition. A molecular test may be useful for risk stratification without being sufficient for definitive diagnosis. A positive blood-based biomarker result may appropriately trigger targeted imaging or endoscopic investigation rather than being treated as proof of cancer.

This complementary model may be particularly useful for multi-cancer screening. A molecular blood test could identify individuals with an elevated probability of malignancy and potentially suggest a

tissue of origin. Conventional diagnostic procedures could then be directed toward the most likely anatomical site.

Longitudinal biomarker measurement represents another promising future direction. A single molecular measurement may be difficult to interpret because individuals have substantial biological variability. Repeated measurements could identify persistent or progressively changing molecular abnormalities. Temporal changes may therefore provide additional information beyond a single threshold-based result.

Standardization remains one of the most important requirements for clinical translation. Laboratories should harmonize sample collection, processing, storage, extraction, sequencing, calibration, quality-control procedures, and reporting. Without analytical consistency, apparently promising biomarkers may perform differently across institutions.

The ethical and economic dimensions of molecular screening should also be considered. Genomic testing may reveal incidental findings, hereditary risk information, or uncertain molecular abnormalities. Clear consent procedures and appropriate counseling may therefore become increasingly important.

Future diagnostic platforms are likely to become increasingly integrated. Rather than relying on a single biomarker, next-generation laboratory diagnostics may combine molecular signatures with routine laboratory data, demographic characteristics, clinical risk factors, imaging, and longitudinal health information.

The ultimate objective should not simply be the identification of more molecular abnormalities. A clinically meaningful screening strategy must demonstrate that earlier detection leads to appropriate intervention and improved outcomes. Prospective studies should therefore evaluate whether biomarker-based screening shifts diagnosis toward earlier stages, reduces cancer-related mortality, avoids excessive invasive testing, and remains cost-effective.

5. Conclusion

Biomarker-based laboratory diagnostics are rapidly evolving and have created new opportunities for the early detection of malignant disease. Circulating tumor DNA, cell-free DNA methylation, microRNAs, extracellular vesicles, circulating tumor cells, proteins, and metabolic signatures provide complementary sources of biological information that can be obtained through minimally invasive sampling.

Modern analytical technologies, including next-generation sequencing, digital PCR, advanced immunoassays, and mass spectrometry, have increased the ability of laboratories to identify low-abundance molecular signals. However, the presence of a highly sensitive analytical platform does not guarantee adequate clinical sensitivity, particularly in patients with small or biologically low-shedding tumors.

The major challenges include tumor heterogeneity, low biomarker concentration, false-positive molecular findings, clonal hematopoiesis, inflammatory and age-related changes, pre-analytical variability, and differences between research cohorts and real-world screening populations. These limitations demonstrate why no single biomarker can currently be regarded as a universal solution for early cancer detection.

Multimarker strategies, longitudinal testing, artificial intelligence-assisted interpretation, and integration with established screening technologies represent important future directions. The most effective laboratory diagnostic systems are likely to combine molecular biomarkers with clinical risk assessment and targeted imaging or tissue-based confirmation.

Ultimately, the success of biomarker-based cancer diagnostics should be measured not only by analytical accuracy but by their ability to detect clinically meaningful disease earlier, guide appropriate diagnostic evaluation, reduce unnecessary procedures, and contribute to improved patient outcomes. Continued prospective validation and laboratory standardization will be essential for translating promising molecular discoveries into reliable clinical screening tools.

References

1. Hanahan D. Hallmarks of Cancer: New Dimensions. *Cancer Discovery*. 2022;12(1):31–46.
2. Heitzer E, Haque IS, Roberts CES, Speicher MR. Current and future perspectives of liquid biopsies in genomics-driven oncology. *Nature Reviews Genetics*. 2019;20:71–88.

- 3.Wan JCM, Massie C, Garcia-Corbacho J, et al. Liquid biopsies come of age: towards implementation of circulating tumour DNA. *Nature Reviews Cancer*. 2017;17:223–238.
- 4.Bettegowda C, Sausen M, Leary RJ, et al. Detection of circulating tumor DNA in early- and late-stage human malignancies. *Science Translational Medicine*. 2014;6(224):224ra24.
- 5.Cohen JD, Li L, Wang Y, et al. Detection and localization of surgically resectable cancers with a multi-analyte blood test. *Science*. 2018;359(6378):926–930.
- 6.Lennon AM, Buchanan AH, Kinde I, et al. Feasibility of blood testing combined with PET-CT to screen for multiple cancers. *Science*. 2020;369(6499):eabb9601.
- 7.Mitchell PS, Parkin RK, Kroh EM, et al. Circulating microRNAs as stable blood-based markers for cancer detection. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*. 2008;105(30):10513–10518.
- 8.Théry C, Witwer KW, Aikawa E, et al. Minimal information for studies of extracellular vesicles 2018 (MISEV2018). *Journal of Extracellular Vesicles*. 2018;7(1):1535750.
- 9.Schwarzenbach H, Hoon DSB, Pantel K. Cell-free nucleic acids as biomarkers in cancer patients. *Nature Reviews Cancer*. 2011;11:426–437.
- 10.Aravanis AM, Lee M, Klausner RD. Next-generation sequencing of circulating tumor DNA for early cancer detection. *Cell*. 2017;168(4):571–575.



Indexed & Abstracted In

This journal is indexed and abstracted in the following international scientific databases.



Google Scholar



ISSN



ORCID



CiteFactor



ResearchBib



DOI



Zenodo



Crossref

Crossref



Grammarly

Article Verification

Scan the QR code to verify the authenticity of this article

DOI: 10.4103/aams.0498