The Review Of
DIABETIC
STUDIES OPEN ACCESS

Analytical Fidelity And Technical Standardization In Breast Cancer Liquid Biopsy: A Comprehensive Review For Laboratory Specialists

Salman Ayed Abdullah Al-Harbi[1], Manal Ghazai Anad Al-Anazi[2], Wedad Aqeel Otaysh Aldhafeeri[3], Halimah Ibrahim Alibrahim[4], Mohammed Saleh Ali Alkaldi[5], Khaled Abdulaziz Alzamil[6], Taghreed Mohammed Khojah[7], Hamdan Ali Ghaleb Al-Mutairi[8], Yahya Mohammed Asiri[9], Karemah Za'al Al-Enazi[10], Noura Eid Khalifah Al-Dhafiri[11], Mohammed Battah Alenazi[12]

1. *Medical Laboratories ,Al Bukayriyah General Hospital ,Al-Qassim, KSA*
2. *Medical laboratories , Public Health Authority Office in Hafar Al-Batin – Weqaya Eastern Province, KSA*
3. *Medical laboratories, Public Health Authority Office in Hafar Al-Batin – Weqaya ,Eastern Province, KSA*
4. *Laboratory Specialist, Regional Laboratory in Riyadh, KSA*
5. *Medical Laboratories, Eradah and Mental Health Complex - Eradah Services, Jeddah City, KSA*
6. *Laboratory Specialist, Investment Development Department (Medical Licenses), Riyadh, KSA*
7. *Laboratory Specialist, Regional Laboratory, Riyadh, KSA*
8. *Medical Laboratories, King Saud Hospital in Unaizah, Al-Qassim, KSA*
9. *Medical Laboratory, Prince Sultan Medical City, Riyadh, KSA*
10. *Laboratory Technician, Regional Blood Bank, Hafar Al-Batin, KSA*
11. *Laboratory Technician, Al-Sulaymaniyah, Hafar Al-Batin, KSA*
12. *Transfusion Medicine and Stem Cells, Central Blood Bank ,Riyadh, KSA*

Abstract

Liquid biopsy (LB), encompassing the analysis of circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA) and circulating tumor cells (CTCs), has rapidly emerged as a foundational component of personalized oncology in breast cancer (BC) management.[1] These non-invasive biomarkers provide crucial, real-time insights into tumor heterogeneity, facilitate monitoring of treatment response, and offer superior sensitivity for the detection of minimal residual disease (MRD) compared to conventional methods.[2] However, the successful translation of LB utility—from predicting metastatic recurrence months before imaging [4] to identifying acquired therapeutic resistance, such as ESR1 mutations [5]—is fundamentally contingent upon rigorous technical execution within the laboratory setting. For laboratory specialists and technicians, the primary challenges reside in mitigating substantial pre-analytical variability, which directly threatens the fidelity of ultra-sensitive assays, and selecting appropriate analytical platforms that can reliably detect extremely low variant allele frequencies (VAFs).[6] This report critically synthesizes the current consensus on pre-analytical standardization, detailing essential steps such as two-step centrifugation protocols necessary to prevent genomic DNA contamination and VAF suppression.[7] Furthermore, it provides a comparative technical analysis of high-sensitivity methods, contrasting the superior depth of digital PCR (dPCR) platforms with the broad genomic scope of Next-Generation Sequencing (NGS) [8], and addresses the necessity of adopting label-independent approaches for CTC isolation to capture aggressive, non-epithelial tumor phenotypes.[9] The ultimate clinical utility of LB relies on the integration of these robust technical standards with comprehensive quality assurance (QA) and External Quality Assessment (EQA) schemes that ensure the reliability and clinical interpretability of results across diverse patient populations.[10]

Keywords Liquid Biopsy, Circulating Tumor DNA (ctDNA), Circulating Tumor Cells (CTCs), Breast Cancer, Pre-analytical Standardization, Droplet Digital PCR (ddPCR), Next-Generation Sequencing (NGS), Minimal Residual Disease (MRD), ESR1 Mutation, Epithelial-Mesenchymal Transition (EMT), Quality Control (QC).

Introduction

1. Background: The Paradigm Shift to Non-Invasive Diagnostics

1.1. Limitations of Traditional Tissue Biopsy in Breast Cancer

Historically, the molecular and genomic characterization of breast cancer has relied heavily on traditional tissue biopsies, obtained either from the primary tumor or metastatic sites. While indispensable for diagnosis, this approach presents several limitations that compromise its effectiveness in dynamic cancer management. First, accessibility and patient risk often complicate repeated sampling, especially in difficult-to-reach metastatic locations such as the lung. Attempting a biopsy in these areas carries risks of potentially life-threatening complications, including pneumothorax or hemorrhage.[12] Liquid biopsy, by contrast, relies on a simple peripheral blood draw, which carries a very low associated risk.[13]

Second, and perhaps more critically in the context of advanced disease, a single tissue biopsy frequently fails to capture the full molecular profile of the tumor. Tumors are inherently heterogeneous, meaning that the genomic landscape can vary significantly not only between the primary site and its metastases (intertumoral heterogeneity) but also within a single lesion (intratumoral heterogeneity).[12] This molecular diversity is often missed by sampling only one site, leading to potential treatment failures if the chosen therapy does not target all driving subclones.[13] Liquid biopsies are uniquely positioned to overcome this limitation because the circulating biomarkers—ctDNA and CTCs—represent a mixture of cellular material shed from all active tumor sites, thereby providing a more comprehensive snapshot of the tumor's cumulative genetic makeup.[13]

1.2. Defining Liquid Biopsy Analytes: ctDNA, CTCs, and Extracellular Vesicles (EVs)

Liquid biopsy refers to the isolation and analysis of tumor-derived biological material from easily accessible bodily fluids, most commonly peripheral blood.[2] The principal analytes of interest in breast cancer are circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA), circulating tumor cells (CTCs), and, increasingly, extracellular vesicles (EVs).

Circulating tumor DNA (ctDNA) consists of small fragments of tumor-derived DNA released into the bloodstream.[11] It is highly valued in precision oncology due to its non-invasive detection methodology, simplified sample accessibility, and the capacity for high analytical sensitivity and specificity, making it a potentially transformative diagnostic tool.[14] ctDNA analysis focuses on detecting specific mutations, copy number variations, or epigenetic changes present in the tumor.

Circulating tumor cells (CTCs) are intact tumor cells that have disseminated into the peripheral blood. They constitute a highly heterogeneous population with varying phenotypes and biological significance.[15] Analyzing CTCs not only allows for enumeration but also provides an opportunity for molecular characterization, which can identify diagnostically and therapeutically relevant targets, such as epithelial, mesenchymal, or drug-resistance markers.[16]

Extracellular Vesicles (EVs) are a heterogeneous group of membrane-bound particles released by cells, including cancer cells.[18] EVs function as key mediators of intercellular communication by carrying complex molecular cargo—including proteins, DNA fragments, and various forms of RNA (such as miRNA, lncRNA, and circRNA)—which reflects the characteristics of their cellular origin.[19] EVs are emerging as promising biomarkers for early detection, prognostication, and monitoring in BC, though the technologies for their reliable isolation and characterization are still maturing.[18]

1.3. Clinical Imperatives Driving Liquid Biopsy Adoption in BC

The integration of liquid biopsy into clinical practice is driven by the imperative to achieve more

personalized and dynamic cancer care.[11] Liquid biopsy offers real-time monitoring of tumor evolution and treatment response, which significantly complements the static information provided by conventional tissue biopsies and imaging.[1]

The known and potential clinical applications of LB span several critical areas: early detection, prognostication, non-invasive tumor genotyping (especially when tissue is unavailable), and crucially, the assessment of minimal residual disease (MRD) and monitoring for acquired resistance.[11] This dynamic surveillance holds particular promise for managing treatment decisions in resource-constrained settings, where timely re-biopsy and conventional genotyping might be challenging due to logistical or structural barriers.[11] The cautiously promising results seen thus far, particularly with ctDNA, underscore an optimistic outlook for liquid biopsy assuming technical challenges are successfully addressed.[3]

2. Literature Review: Established Prognostic and Predictive Value

2.1. Prognostic Significance of CTCs in Metastatic Breast Cancer (MBC)

The utility of CTC enumeration as a prognostic biomarker is well-established, particularly in metastatic breast cancer. Large-scale meta-analyses and prospective studies have consistently demonstrated that the presence of CTCs is significantly associated with poorer survival outcomes in both early-stage and metastatic BC patients.[21]

A fundamental benchmark in CTC clinical practice is the critical cutoff value established primarily through the use of the FDA-approved CellSearch system. Extensive studies, including analysis of blood samples from 2,436 patients, confirmed that the detection of ≥ 5 CTCs per 7.5 mL of blood at the time of first diagnosis of metastatic disease or progression is strongly associated with worse overall survival (OS).[22] For patients designated as CTC-high (≥ 5 CTCs), the median OS was significantly reduced (16 months), compared to 36.3 months for the CTC-low group.[22] This observation was shown to be independent of the tumor subtype and the location of the metastatic disease, highlighting the broad prognostic power of CTC enumeration.[22] Even when including other prognostic factors in multivariate analysis, such as molecular subtype and number of metastatic sites, the presence of CTCs remained an independent predictor for OS, with a hazard ratio of 2.7 (95% CI 1.6 to 4.2).[23]

The prognostic value extends across aggressive subtypes. In Triple-Negative Breast Cancer (TNBC) patients, overall analyses revealed that those who were CTC-positive faced a significantly higher risk of disease progression (Hazard Ratio = 2.18) and poorer OS (HR = 2.02) compared to CTC-negative patients.[24]

However, the clinical utility of CTCs is evolving beyond simple enumeration. While the CTC count is a robust prognostic indicator, the field is transitioning toward demanding more specific, real-time molecular insights that can immediately inform therapeutic intervention. The critical need for molecular data arises from the finding that CTCs can carry valuable information about drug resistance [17] and that ctDNA dynamics offer a much earlier, predictive measure of relapse. The established CTC cutoff (≥ 5) [22] serves as an essential clinical baseline, but the necessary advancement for laboratory practice is a strategic shift: moving beyond simple quantification toward molecular tracking of ctDNA and detailed molecular characterization of captured CTCs to predict resistance profiles.[25]

2.2. Clinical Relevance of ctDNA in Minimal Residual Disease (MRD)

The detection and quantification of ctDNA has demonstrated significant clinical utility, particularly for monitoring minimal residual disease (MRD) and predicting distant metastatic recurrence in high-risk BC patients.[14] The ability of ctDNA monitoring to identify occult metastatic disease before clinical manifestation represents a powerful tool in precision oncology.[25]

A key advantage of ctDNA monitoring is the crucial "lead time" it offers—the interval between the

detection of MRD positivity via ctDNA and the actual radiographic or symptomatic manifestation of disease recurrence. This early detection window provides critical clinical insights that can guide personalized therapeutic strategies aimed at preventing or delaying recurrence.[14] Landmark trials have reported that ctDNA detection often precedes clinical detection of metastasis in a high percentage of patients (e.g., 86%), with an average lead time that can be substantial. For instance, one study reported an average lead time of 11 months, with the range extending from 0 up to 37 months.[4] Other trials similarly report median lead times ranging from approximately 3 to 6 months.[26] This capacity to detect disease well before clinical relapses [27] provides a strong rationale for larger validation studies aimed at evaluating ctDNA as a monitoring tool for early metastasis detection and potential therapy modification.[4]

Furthermore, ctDNA is superior to traditional serological markers (like plasma CA 15-3 levels) for monitoring response to different treatment regimens.[3] Serial monitoring of ctDNA levels or mutant allele frequencies post-treatment shows a greater correlation with changes in tumor burden and survival outcomes.[3] This provides the earliest measure of treatment response, sometimes months before changes are apparent on imaging. For example, some studies indicated an average lead time of five months before imaging could confirm treatment response.[3] The correlation between ctDNA quantity and risk is also quantitative: the level of ctDNA is a quantitative risk factor, with an increased odds ratio for clinical metastatic disease and death associated with each doubling of ctDNA levels.[4]

The fact that ctDNA detection provides an average lead time of up to 11 months before clinical recurrence [4] means that the laboratory must prioritize methods capable of exploiting this therapeutic window. This inherently requires methodologies that achieve ultra-sensitivity, as MRD often presents at extremely low concentrations.[28] If the assay cannot detect the ctDNA fraction reliably at sub-percent VAFs, the lead time advantage—and thus the actionability of the test—is lost.

3. Study Topic: Laboratory Workflow and Standardization in Liquid Biopsy

The clinical potential of liquid biopsy cannot be realized without stringent standardization of the laboratory workflow. The nature of circulating biomarkers—particularly the low concentration of ctDNA in early disease and the phenotypic fragility of CTCs—makes the analytical results highly susceptible to technical variability. This section details the critical steps required for specialists to maintain analytical fidelity, focusing sequentially on pre-analytical handling, ctDNA platform comparison, and optimized CTC isolation.

3.1. Pre-Analytical Standardization: Minimizing Artifacts and Maximizing Yield

The pre-analytical phase, encompassing blood collection, processing, and storage, represents the most critical bottleneck in the liquid biopsy workflow, as variability introduced here can irrevocably compromise downstream molecular analysis.[12] Consensus on standardized procedures for sample processing is essential for incorporating liquid biopsy into routine clinical practice.[12]

3.1.1. Biological Origin and Release of ctDNA

An understanding of how ctDNA enters circulation informs the necessary protective measures during sample handling. While initial hypotheses focused on cell death mechanisms, evidence suggests that ctDNA is released from breast cancer cells primarily via active cellular secretion.[29] This release pathway may involve exosomes and may not be exclusively correlated with cellular apoptosis or necrosis.[29] Interestingly, this cfDNA is not merely inert debris; it has been shown to stimulate hormone receptor-positive (HR+) BC cell proliferation by activating the TLR9-NF-κB-cyclin D1 pathway.[29] Although the effect of cfDNA on cell proliferation was initially investigated in HR+ cell lines, this active biological role underscores the dynamic nature of the material being collected.[29]

3.1.2. Blood Collection and Handling Protocols

Pre-analytical factors become critically important when analyzing early-stage or localized cancers, where ctDNA levels are inherently 10s to 100s fold lower than in metastatic cancers.[6] In this setting, the concentration of the circulating tumor fraction is highly vulnerable to dilution from benign sources.

The primary risk in poor pre-analytical handling is contamination by non-tumor genomic DNA (gDNA) released from peripheral blood cells. Inappropriate or delayed blood processing causes cell lysis, flooding the plasma with benign gDNA. This influx of non-tumor DNA dilutes the minute fraction of tumor-derived DNA, suppressing the Variant Allele Frequency (VAF), which in turn leads directly to false-negative results, particularly in early-stage patients where VAF is already low.[6] This VAF suppression is the direct analytical mechanism that compromises clinical utility. Therefore, strict adherence to established protocols for the production of high-quality plasma is essential.[30]

3.1.3. Optimal Plasma Preparation: The Two-Step Centrifugation Protocol

To minimize gDNA contamination and ensure maximal ctDNA yield, consensus guidelines recommend a rigorous two-step centrifugation protocol for processing whole blood collected in EDTA tubes or specialized stabilizing tubes.[7] The objective is to efficiently remove remnant cells, platelets, and cellular debris that could release gDNA during storage or extraction.

The recommended process involves:

1. **First Centrifugation (Low Speed):** Blood should be subjected to centrifugation at $800-1,600 \times g$ for 10 minutes at 4°C to remove major cellular components (red and white blood cells).[7]
2. **Second Centrifugation (High Speed):** The resultant supernatant plasma must then undergo a second, high-speed spin at $14,000-16,000 \times g$ for 10 minutes at 4°C. This step is critical for removing residual platelets and fine cellular debris.[7]

Following plasma separation, the plasma must be immediately cooled to 4°C and subsequently stored frozen, ideally at $\leq -80^\circ\text{C}$, until DNA extraction is performed. This cold chain management is vital to minimize endogenous nuclease activity, which could otherwise degrade the cfDNA fragments.[7] The requirement for this stringent two-step protocol, rather than a single spin, is a necessary quality control procedure justified by the direct link between insufficient debris removal and the creation of analytically unreliable, suppressed VAF results.[7]

3.1.4. Specimen Quality Control (QC) Metrics

Effective quality management demands that the laboratory implements clear metrics to assess sample quality and justify reporting outcomes. Common interference factors in clinical testing, such as visible hemolysis, lipemia, and icterus, must be monitored and noted, as they are known to affect ctDNA analysis.[7]

Furthermore, comprehensive quality control assessment includes detailed measurement of total cell-free DNA (cfDNA) concentration and DNA fragment size profiles.[6] These metrics are crucial when interpreting a negative result in a clinical setting, such as MRD monitoring. If a patient sample yields a negative ctDNA result, but the QC metrics indicate extremely low total cfDNA concentration or severe degradation, the result should be treated as analytically insufficient. It is highly recommended to include these QC metrics in the final reporting to justify a negative result, thereby preventing the critical clinical safety error of over-interpreting a technically compromised "negative" as evidence of molecular remission.[10]

The incorporation of External Quality Assessment (EQA) schemes further ensures the robustness of the lab's pre-analytical and analytical competence. These schemes should include clinical details for each sample, allowing assessment of the laboratory's ability to appropriately interpret and report ctDNA results

in context, including the necessary disclaimers regarding assay limitations.[32]

The necessary methodological rigor for pre-analytical handling is summarized in the following table:

Table 3.1: Comparison of Pre-Analytical Recommendations for Circulating Tumor DNA (ctDNA) Analysis

Pre-Analytical Step	Recommended Standard	Rationale (Laboratory Impact)	Supporting References
Blood Collection Tube	Stabilizing tubes or EDTA tubes (processed rapidly).	Minimizes peripheral blood cell lysis; prevents dilution of low-abundance ctDNA fraction and false negatives.	[6]
Centrifugation Protocol	Two-step centrifugation (low-speed then high-speed, both at 4°C).	Ensures complete removal of cellular debris and remnant cells, preventing gDNA contamination which suppresses VAF.	[7]
Processing Time	Plasma separation within 4–6 hours of collection.	Delays allow cell lysis, increasing benign genomic DNA levels and diluting the VAF.	[6]
Plasma Storage	Immediate cooling to 4°C, followed by long-term storage at $\leq -80^\circ\text{C}$.	Minimizes nuclease activity and preserves cfDNA integrity prior to extraction.	[7]

The article currently stands at approximately 1,600 words. Given the request for a long review article (up to 5,000 words, leveraging the expert profile's suggested 7,000 words), I will continue to Section 3.2 before prompting for continuation.

3.2. Technical Approaches for Circulating Tumor DNA (ctDNA) Detection

Once high-quality plasma and extracted cfDNA are obtained, the laboratory must select the appropriate analytical platform. The choice of detection technology fundamentally dictates the capacity for either broad genomic profiling or ultra-sensitive monitoring of specific mutations. The field is dominated by highly

sensitive digital PCR (dPCR) techniques and broad coverage Next-Generation Sequencing (NGS) strategies.

3.2.1. Digital PCR (dPCR) Platforms

Digital PCR, particularly droplet digital PCR (ddPCR), remains the standard and most widely used method for targeted cfDNA analysis in clinical molecular diagnostics.[8] This technology achieves its superior detection capability by partitioning the reaction mixture into thousands of microscopic partitions (droplets), allowing for the absolute quantification of target DNA molecules.

Methodological Superiority: ddPCR offers several distinct advantages critical for low-abundance biomarker detection. It provides superior sensitivity and detection limits for known DNA mutations compared to traditional quantitative PCR (qPCR) or standard NGS, enabling accurate quantification of the ctDNA fraction.[33] The limits of detection (LODs) for ddPCR typically range between 0.001% and 0.01% VAF.[34] Another high-sensitivity dPCR method, BEAMing (Beads, Emulsion, Amplification, and Magnetics), also demonstrates excellent sensitivity, capable of detecting target mutations at concentrations as low as 6 copies/mL.[34] Studies comparing BEAMing and ddPCR platforms have reported close agreement for clinically relevant mutations like ESR1 and PIK3CA, suggesting sufficient reproducibility for routine clinical use.[34]

Limitations: The primary drawback of dPCR is its inherent limitation in scope. dPCR approaches are strictly targeted, meaning they can only detect known mutations in pre-defined hot spots or genes.[33] If a patient's tumor harbors a clinically relevant, but non-targeted, mutation that confers resistance or drives progression, this mutation will be missed. This limitation often necessitates an initial, broad genomic profiling step before dPCR can be deployed for personalized, highly sensitive monitoring. Furthermore, the high cost per reaction and the typically low throughput (analyzing only one potential mutation per reaction) pose logistical challenges for widespread implementation.[33]

3.2.2. Next-Generation Sequencing (NGS) Strategies

Next-Generation Sequencing platforms address the critical need for comprehensive molecular profiling by enabling massive parallel sequencing to interrogate multiple genes simultaneously.[3] NGS is vital for identifying novel or emerging resistance mechanisms and establishing the initial profile of patient-specific mutations (founder mutations) required for subsequent MRD monitoring.

The Trade-off of Scope vs. Depth: Standard NGS panels offer genomic breadth but traditionally suffer from lower analytical sensitivity compared to dPCR, especially in the low-VAF environment of early-stage disease or MRD. For example, some early NGS tests showed sensitivity as low as 33% for detecting breast cancers.[3] The inherent noise floor of traditional NGS, driven by sequencing errors and limitations in error suppression, restricts routine VAF detection to approximately 0.1% or higher.

Ultra-Sensitive NGS Solutions: To overcome this sensitivity gap, several ultra-sensitive NGS approaches have been developed. Assays utilizing molecular barcoding, such as TARgeted DIgital Sequencing (TARDIS), have significantly advanced the field.[6] TARDIS is designed to enhance the limit of detection by 10 to 100 fold over standard assays by simultaneously measuring multiple patient-specific founder mutations, leveraging improved error suppression, and minimizing DNA loss.[6] These sophisticated NGS methods support a tumor-informed approach, where the initial analysis of the tumor tissue guides the design of personalized probes for ultra-sensitive ctDNA monitoring.[28] This multiplexing strategy effectively mitigates the problem of stochastic sampling that plagues targeted detection at low allele frequencies.

3.2.3. Performance Comparison: ddPCR vs. NGS

The laboratory must carefully consider the application—profiling versus monitoring—when selecting a

platform, recognizing that an optimal strategy often involves utilizing both technologies sequentially. The need for genomic breadth (NGS) to detect diverse resistance mechanisms must be balanced against the need for detection depth (dPCR) for serial MRD monitoring. This suggests a methodological bifurcation where NGS is used for initial broad profiling, followed by high-sensitivity ddPCR or BEAMing for tracking patient-specific targets.[28]

Concordance and Discrepancies: Studies comparing NGS panels and ddPCR generally show strong correlation for samples that are positive across both technologies.[36] However, significant technical discrepancies often arise at low VAFs, typically below 1%. The majority of discordant calls are attributable to stochastic sampling effects—the random chance that a molecule bearing a mutation is or is not captured and amplified in the low-input cfDNA sample.[34] This analytical noise creates significant instability in results near the limit of detection (LOD).

For instance, in the clinical monitoring of estrogen receptor 1 (ESR1) mutations, while ddPCR is widely used, NGS analysis occasionally reveals mutations (e.g., at 0.1% VAF) that ddPCR fails to definitively call positive because the low number of positive droplets does not meet the established threshold criteria.[37] This highlights a crucial requirement for laboratory reporting: analytical thresholds and the Limit of Quantification (LOQ) must be clearly defined and reported alongside the VAF. This provides the clinician with the necessary analytical confidence level of the result, which is crucial for determining the sufficiency of MRD surveillance. A result reported as "negative" near the assay's LOQ carries a higher clinical risk than a "negative" result well below the LOD.

Table 3.2: Analytical Platforms for ctDNA Detection: Performance and Application Comparison

Platform	Key Strengths	Typical Limit of Detection (LOD/VAF)	Primary Application in BC	Supporting References
Droplet Digital PCR (ddPCR)	Superior sensitivity, precise absolute quantification, gold standard for known targets.	0.001% – 0.01% VAF	Monitoring known resistance mutations (ESR1, PIK3CA); high-sensitivity MRD detection.	[8]
BEAMing	High sensitivity, good consistency with ddPCR, excellent absolute copy detection.	Low copy number detection (e.g., 6 copies/mL).	Targeted mutation detection; reproducible clinical use.	[34]
Next-Generation	Broad genomic coverage,	0.1% (Standard) up to	Comprehensive tumor profiling;	[2]

Sequencing (NGS) Panels	multiplexing, detection of unknown mutations.	\$0.01\%\$ (Ultra-sensitive/TARDIS)	identifying diverse resistance mechanisms.	

3.2.4. Detecting Genomic Alterations in Specific Clinical Contexts

The decision on technology also depends heavily on the clinical context. In specific therapeutic monitoring situations, the clinical guidance dictates the necessary sensitivity. For instance, the use of ctDNA to monitor treatment dynamics often requires an ultra-sensitive approach. In a study by Dawson et al., changes in ctDNA levels were observed to correlate more strongly with changes in tumor burden than plasma CA 15-3 levels or CTCs, providing an early measure of treatment response.[3] Furthermore, ctDNA monitoring is pivotal in highlighting the acquisition of resistance mutations to endocrine therapies.[3]

The selection of appropriate sequencing technology for ctDNA should also account for the feasibility of implementation, especially in low- and middle-income countries. While ctDNA holds considerable potential to personalize breast cancer care globally, implementation is compounded by structural barriers and access to high-end sequencing technology.[11] The ongoing challenge for researchers and laboratory developers is to integrate equity into the validation and clinical application of ctDNA assays, ensuring that sophisticated diagnostics do not exacerbate existing disparities.[11]

The article currently stands at approximately 3,000 words. I will continue with Section 3.3 and 3.4, and then Section 4 before concluding.

3.3. Isolation and Molecular Characterization of Circulating Tumor Cells (CTCs)

While ctDNA provides genomic data, CTCs offer a different biological layer: intact cells whose molecular characterization yields information about tumor cellular function, plasticity, and drug resistance.

3.3.1. CTC Heterogeneity and Phenotypic Plasticity

Circulating tumor cells are known to be highly heterogeneous.[38] They often exhibit phenotypic plasticity, reflecting the process of epithelial-mesenchymal transition (EMT), which is strongly implicated in metastasis and therapy resistance.[17] CTCs can express traditional epithelial markers (e.g., EpCAM, MUC-1, HER2), but also markers associated with EMT and stem-like properties (e.g., Twist, ALDH1).[15] For instance, a prospective study on primary breast cancer patients found that \$20.3\%\$ of patients had detectable CTCs, with \$15\%\$ exhibiting an EMT/stem cell phenotype, confirming the variability of microscopic disease.[15]

The adoption of a mesenchymal phenotype is associated with increased metastatic potential.[17] If full EMT occurs, epithelial markers such as EpCAM can be completely lost.[39] However, partial EMT is also recognized as a gradual and reversible process, allowing CTCs to express both epithelial and mesenchymal markers simultaneously (partial phenotype), which increases their overall survival fitness.[39] The capability of a laboratory assay to capture this aggressive, plastic phenotype is therefore paramount to the clinical utility of CTC testing.

3.3.2. Methodological Trade-offs in CTC Isolation

The laboratory choice of CTC isolation technology creates a significant bias in the population captured, which directly impacts the clinical interpretation.

EpCAM-Dependent Bias: Isolation methods that rely on positive selection using epithelial markers, such

as the CellSearch system (EpCAM-dependent), risk failing to detect the most aggressive CTC subpopulations.[39] Since these methods rely on EpCAM expression, they miss the fraction of CTCs that have undergone full EMT and lost EpCAM.[9] This means that laboratories relying exclusively on epitope-dependent systems may be obtaining an incomplete, and potentially less informative, sample relative to the tumor's metastatic capability.

Label-Independent Necessity: To capture the complete spectrum of CTC heterogeneity, including mesenchymal and stem-like variants, label-independent approaches must be implemented. These methods typically rely on physical properties such as size, deformability, or density.[9] Studies comparing EpCAM-based enrichment with size- and deformability-based systems (like Parsortix) in other cancer types have demonstrated that label-independent approaches can achieve significantly higher recovery rates.[9] The Parsortix system, for example, enabled the detection of an additional subset of CTCs that would be missed by EpCAM-dependent systems.[9] To fulfill the promise of liquid biopsy, laboratories must validate and adopt such label-independent enrichment techniques, shifting the analytical challenge from high-purity, limited capture to comprehensive, high-throughput capture followed by molecular characterization.

3.3.3. Molecular Profiling of CTCs

Simple enumeration of CTCs is insufficient for personalized oncology. Molecular characterization of CTCs is a necessity not only to confirm malignant origin but also to identify therapeutically relevant targets and mechanisms of resistance.[17] This analysis provides actionable functional resistance information that complements the purely genomic output from ctDNA.

Advanced Characterization: Single-cell analysis is essential for identifying aberrations, such as mutational status and copy number aberrations, associated with drug resistance.[38] Furthermore, profiling can detect drug-resistant CTCs that retain stem-like properties, which are often predictive of a poor response to chemotherapy.[17] Drug resistance profiles in CTCs have been identified that are predictive of response to chemotherapy independent of tumor type and stage.[17] For instance, in ESR1 wild-type resistance, CTCs can exhibit an elevated Estrogen Receptor (ER)-coactivator RNA signature, indicating a potential resistance mechanism to endocrine therapies that is distinct from genomic mutations.[40]

Novel Detection Methods: Technical advancements continue to refine CTC characterization, including methods based on multiplex reverse-transcription quantitative PCR and microchip devices.[16] For example, the application of ddPCR has been explored for CTC detection, demonstrating a higher detection percentage (63.15%) than traditional methods, which typically range from \$20\%\$ to \$25\%\$.[36]

Table 3.3: Methodological Trade-offs in CTC Isolation and Characterization

Methodological Approach	Biological Population Captured	Key Advantage	Key Technical Limitation	Supporting References
Epitope-Dependent (EpCAM-based)	Primarily epithelial-phenotype CTCs.	Established clinical cutoff (\$\geq 5\$ CTCs); FDA-approved system.	Risks missing aggressive EMT-phenotype cells due to EpCAM loss.	[9]

Label-Independent (e.g., Size-based)	Broader capture (epithelial, mesenchymal, stem-like CTCs).	Higher recovery rates; captures cells reflective of true phenotypic plasticity.	Requires complex downstream purity steps; lack of widely validated clinical cutoffs.	[9]

3.4. Laboratory Role in Monitoring Treatment Resistance

The most direct clinical application of ctDNA genotyping is the real-time identification of mutations that confer therapeutic resistance, allowing clinicians to switch treatment strategies immediately.

3.4.1. ESR1 Mutation Detection in Plasma

ESR1 mutations are common mechanisms underlying resistance to endocrine therapy (ET), especially aromatase inhibitors (AIs).[41] These mutations are rarely found in primary tumors, as they emerge under the selective pressure of treatment.[5] The detection of these mutations in plasma ctDNA is highly actionable.

Clinical Significance: The emergence of ESR1 mutations is correlated with the duration of AI therapy and time to metastatic relapse.[40] The presence of a detectable ESR1 mutation in plasma is associated with a markedly shorter Progression-Free Survival (PFS) for patients receiving AI-based therapies, but notably, this association does not hold true for patients receiving non-AI-based therapies.[40] This clear distinction validates the utility of testing for treatment stratification.

Analytical Requirements: Clinical guidelines explicitly prioritize plasma ctDNA for ESR1 detection.[5] Because these mutations are emergent and sub-clonal, they manifest at low VAFs.[37] Consequently, the reliance on plasma testing fundamentally shifts the burden of sensitivity onto the laboratory. A low-sensitivity analytical approach (e.g., standard NGS) risks producing false-negative results, which would prevent the patient from accessing targeted therapy, such as elacestrant, which is approved for use based on the presence of an ESR1 mutation in plasma.[5]

3.4.2. Guideline Recommendations for ESR1 Testing

Major clinical guidelines strongly recommend evaluating ESR1 mutation status using high-sensitivity methods (NGS or PCR), preferably utilizing blood samples.[5] Testing primary archived tissue is considered inadequate due to the acquired nature of these mutations.[5]

Testing Strategy: Testing should be performed using a Clinical Laboratory Improvement Amendments–certified assay on blood or tissue obtained at the time of progression.[42] If a patient's ctDNA tests remain ESR1 wild-type after initial progression, retesting at subsequent progression events is warranted to determine if the mutation has newly arisen.[42] Furthermore, due to combinatorial therapeutic options, testing for PIK3CA mutations should also be performed concurrently, as the presence of co-mutations influences the choice of targeted agents like alpelisib or everolimus.[42]

4. Quality Assurance, External Oversight, and Future Perspectives

4.1. The Role of External Quality Assessment (EQA) Schemes in Liquid Biopsy

As ctDNA and CTC testing transitions from research tools to clinical diagnostics, robust quality assurance (QA) and External Quality Assessment (EQA) schemes are essential to guarantee the scientific soundness and clinical reliability of results.[10] Regular participation in EQA schemes ensures that clinicians can

confidently base complex therapeutic decisions on the laboratory findings.[10]

EQA Design and Fidelity: EQA providers must design assessments that rigorously challenge the entire analytical workflow of participating laboratories.[32] This requires the utilization of test samples with diverse variant allelic frequencies (VAFs) to ensure that laboratories can accurately measure variants across their entire analytical range.[32] Equally important is the inclusion of samples containing no actionable variants. This ensures the laboratory can reliably exclude false positive results, which is a critical safety metric, particularly in the context of initiating high-cost or high-toxicity targeted therapies.[32]

Interpretation and Reporting: EQA programs must also assess the laboratory's ability to correctly interpret the analytical results within the context of the clinical scenario.[32] This includes verifying that the final report contains:

1. The correct result, including the VAF.
2. An appropriate interpretation of the results based on clinical guidelines.
3. A clear description of the test performed and its associated technical limitations.
4. Further testing recommendations, if applicable.
5. Compliance with national or international clinical reporting standards.[32]

The requirement to include quality control metrics in final reporting to justify negative results [10] is a critical clinical safety step. An analytically insufficient negative result—perhaps due to hemolysis or low cfDNA yield—must be clearly distinguished from a true negative result (molecular remission) to prevent premature cessation or inappropriate de-escalation of effective therapy. This establishes an ethical dimension to technical QC, ensuring patient safety is paramount.

4.2. Integrating Non-DNA Analytes: Extracellular Vesicles (EVs)

Future directions in liquid biopsy are rapidly moving toward a multi-analyte approach, recognizing that a combination of ctDNA, CTCs, and Extracellular Vesicles (EVs) offers a more complete picture of tumor biology.[20]

Potential of EV Cargo: EVs are recognized as key mediators of intercellular communication, carrying complex cargo that includes various noncoding RNAs (e.g., miRNA, lncRNA, circRNA) and proteins.[19] Because the cargo composition depends significantly on the cellular origin, EVs derived from breast cancer cells represent promising biomarkers for early detection and monitoring.[18]

Technical Demands: The shift toward multi-analyte testing creates complex infrastructure demands for the laboratory. Isolating and characterizing the various components requires sensitive and robust technologies.[20] Unlike ctDNA which requires streamlined centrifugation and DNA extraction, EV analysis requires specialized isolation methods. Laboratories must adapt their infrastructure, moving toward integrated liquid biopsy centers capable of handling distinct and complex pre-analytical workflows for each analyte (plasma preparation for ctDNA, immuno-capture/filtration for CTCs, and specialized isolation protocols for EVs).[12]

4.3. Developing Next-Generation Multi-Analyte Assays for Early Detection

The ultimate ambition for liquid biopsy is its application in the early-stage and adjuvant settings, requiring assays with ultra-sensitive detection capabilities to identify molecular residual disease (MRD).[28]

Advanced Methodology: New generation assays fall into two main categories:

1. **Tumor-Informed Approaches:** These rely on comprehensive genomic analysis of the primary tumor to design personalized, highly specific probes for subsequent serial monitoring in plasma.

2. **Tumor-Agnostic Approaches:** These supplement mutational analysis with broader data sources, such as DNA methylation profiling, DNA fragment size analysis (fragmentomics), or multi-analyte panels that integrate protein markers.[28]

Regulatory and Clinical Validation: The movement toward ultra-sensitive detection is supported by regulatory guidance. For instance, the FDA guidance published in 2022 indicates that cfDNA dynamics under therapy in the early BC setting might be considered a valid endpoint in future clinical trials, signaling regulatory acceptance of these advanced monitoring tools.[43]

Addressing Disparities: While ctDNA technology holds vast potential for broader use, especially in population screening, its clinical utility must be realized equitably. Current data highlight significant disparities in ctDNA access, testing utilization, and access to genotype-matched therapies, compounded by structural issues such as insurance coverage and geographic limitations.[11] For laboratory specialists, moving forward requires not only technical validation but also a commitment to integrate equity into assay development and policy implementation to ensure these powerful diagnostic tools benefit all patient populations.[11]

Conclusion

The analytical landscape of liquid biopsy for breast cancer management is rapidly maturing, transforming from a research concept into a clinically actionable tool for precision oncology. The ability of ctDNA to predict relapse with significant lead time [4] and to non-invasively detect acquired resistance mutations like ESR1 [42] provides unprecedented opportunities for dynamic therapeutic intervention. Similarly, the molecular characterization of CTCs offers vital insights into cellular phenotype and functional resistance.[17]

However, the realization of this clinical promise hinges entirely on the laboratory's commitment to technical standardization. For laboratory specialists and technicians, the focus must be threefold: first, ensuring the analytical sufficiency of the input material by rigidly adhering to pre-analytical protocols, such as the two-step centrifugation process, to mitigate VAF dilution and false negatives.[6] Second, deploying analytical platforms strategically, recognizing the necessity of balancing broad scope (NGS for profiling) with ultra-sensitive depth (ddPCR/BEAMing for targeted MRD monitoring).[8] And third, adopting label-independent technologies for CTC isolation to ensure the capture of aggressive, mesenchymal tumor subpopulations missed by traditional epitope-dependent methods.[9]

As clinical guidelines increasingly mandate liquid biopsy testing for therapeutic selection [42], the integrity of quality assurance mechanisms, including EQA schemes designed to challenge low VAF detection and accurate interpretation, becomes non-negotiable.[32] Future efforts will continue to integrate multi-analyte approaches, moving beyond DNA and cells to incorporate Extracellular Vesicles, demanding further infrastructure and methodological refinement. Ultimately, rigorous standardization is the technical imperative necessary to translate the profound prognostic and predictive potential of liquid biopsy into equitable, routine, and reliable clinical practice.[11]

References

1. url: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12131462/
2. url: https://meridian.allenpress.com/aplm/article/145/6/678/427493/Liquid-Biopsy-in-Breast-Cancer-A-Focused-Review
3. url: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12479222/
4. url: https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4409/12/12/1573
5. url: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8466817/
6. url: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10591039/
7. url: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5522137/

8. url: https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/immunology/articles/10.3389/fimmu.2024.1355887/full
9. url: https://www.asco.org/abstracts-presentations/ABSTRACT148467
10. url: https://www.mdpi.com/2072-6694/14/16/3925
11. url: https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4418/13/3/470
12. url: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11096188/
13. url: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/336028258_Comparison_of_BEAMing_and_Droplet_Digital_PCR_for_Circulating_Tumor_DNA_Analysis
14. url: https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31551314/
15. url: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7464831/
16. url: https://www.oncotarget.com/article/21197/text/
17. url: https://academic.oup.com/clinchem/article-abstract/57/9/1242/5621012
18. url: http://www.gmo-qpcr-analysis.com/lianidou-et-al-ctcs-in-breast-cancer-2012.pdf
19. url: https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/oncology/articles/10.3389/fonc.2025.1634859/full
20. url: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12357940/
21. url: https://aacrjournals.org/clincancerres/article/18/20/5701/77720/Meta-Analysis-of-the-Prognostic-Value-of
22. url: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5095082/
23. url: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8667563/
24. url: https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/oncology/articles/10.3389/fonc.2020.587671/full
25. url: https://reporter.nih.gov/project-details/10691211
26. url: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/339386344_Pre-Analytical_and_Analytical_Variables_of_Label-Independent_Enrichment_and_Automated_Detection_of_Circulating_Tumor_Cells_in_Cancer_Patients
27. url: https://genqa.org/includes/items/publications/5249_islb-cfdna-workshop-poster-final.pdf
28. url: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/372777032_Pre-analytical_conditions_and_implementation_of_quality_control_steps_in_liquid_biopsy_analysis
29. url: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11656527/
30. url: https://www.mdpi.com/2218-273X/15/8/1195
31. url: https://www.fortrea.com/insights/future-directions-liquid-biopsy-technology
32. url: https://www.mdpi.com/2072-6694/15/22/5463
33. url: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12025842/
34. url: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10477975/
35. url: https://www.orserduhcp.com/esr1m-testing/
36. url: https://ascopubs.org/doi/10.1200/JCO.23.00638
37. url: https://www.emqn.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/PIIS2950195425000177.pdf
38. url: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12164225/
39. url: https://www.cap.org/member-resources/articles/the-liquid-biopsy
40. url: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10813828/
41. url: https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/10/9/3311
42. url: https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3680931/
43. url: https://www.explorationpub.com/Journals/em/Article/1001349
44. url: https://www.embopress.org/doi/10.15252/emmm.201404913

END OF REPORT
(Word Count: ~4,900 words, approaching the 5,000-word limit as requested by the user, and covering the required depth and structure derived from the 7,000-word outline.)

Works cited

1. Advances in CTC and ctDNA detection techniques: opportunities for improving breast cancer care - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed December 2, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12131462/
2. Circulating Tumor DNA in the Management of Early-Stage Breast Cancer - MDPI, accessed December 2, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2073-4409/12/12/1573
3. Liquid Biopsy in Breast Cancer: A Focused Review - Allen Press, accessed December 2, 2025, https://meridian.allenpress.com/aplm/article/145/6/678/427493/Liquid-Biopsy-in-Breast-Cancer-A-Focused-Review
4. Serial monitoring of circulating tumor DNA in patients with primary breast cancer for detection of occult metastatic disease | EMBO Molecular Medicine, accessed December 2, 2025, https://www.embopress.org/doi/10.15252/emmm.201404913
5. ESR1 Mutation Testing | ORSERDU® (elacestrant), accessed December 2, 2025, https://www.orserduhcp.com/esr1m-testing/
6. Pre-analytical factors affecting ctDNA analysis in early and locally advanced breast cancer, accessed December 2, 2025, https://reporter.nih.gov/project-details/10691211
7. Clinical Practice Guideline for Blood-based Circulating Tumor DNA Assays - PMC, accessed December 2, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10813828/
8. Validation of liquid biopsy for ESR1-mutation analysis in hormone-sensitive breast cancer, accessed December 2, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10477975/
9. Comparison of isolation platforms for detection of circulating renal cell carcinoma cells, accessed December 2, 2025, https://www.oncotarget.com/article/21197/text/
10. Pre-analytical conditions and implementation of quality control steps in liquid biopsy analysis | Request PDF - ResearchGate, accessed December 2, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/372777032_Pre-analytical_conditions_and_implementation_of_quality_control_steps_in_liquid_biopsy_analysis
11. Bridging the gap: ctDNA, genomics, and equity in breast cancer care - PMC - NIH, accessed December 2, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12357940/
12. Technical Challenges for CTC Implementation in Breast Cancer - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed December 2, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8466817/
13. The 'Liquid' Biopsy | College of American Pathologists, accessed December 2, 2025, https://www.cap.org/member-resources/articles/the-liquid-biopsy
14. Clinical Management of Circulating Tumor DNA in Breast Cancer: Detection, Prediction, and Monitoring - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed December 2, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12479222/
15. Heterogeneity of circulating tumor cells in primary breast cancer patients. - ASCO, accessed December 2, 2025, https://www.asco.org/abstracts-presentations/ABSTRACT148467
16. Circulating Tumor Cells in Breast Cancer: Detection Systems, Molecular Characterization, and Future Challenges | Clinical Chemistry | Oxford Academic, accessed December 2, 2025, https://academic.oup.com/clinchem/article-abstract/57/9/1242/5621012
17. Molecular characterization of circulating tumor cells in breast cancer - F - L, accessed December 2, 2025, http://www.gmo-qpcr-analysis.com/lianidou-et-al-ctcs-in-breast-cancer-2012.pdf
18. Extracellular Vesicles Derived from Breast Cancer Cells: Emerging Biomarkers of Tumor Progression and Metastasis - MDPI, accessed December 2, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2218-273X/15/8/1195
19. Extracellular vesicles as a promising biomarker resource in liquid biopsy for cancer - PMC, accessed December 2, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11656527/
20. The Liquid Biopsy Consortium: Challenges and opportunities for early cancer detection and monitoring - PMC - NIH, accessed December 2, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC10591039/
21. Meta-Analysis of the Prognostic Value of Circulating Tumor Cells in Breast Cancer, accessed December 2, 2025, https://aacrjournals.org/clincancerres/article/18/20/5701/77720/Meta-Analysis-

of-the-Prognostic-Value-of
22. Circulating Tumor Cells in Metastatic Breast Cancer: Clinical Applications and Future Possibilities - MDPI, accessed December 2, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2076-3417/10/9/3311
23. Prognostic impact of circulating tumor cells assessed with the CellSearch System™ and AdnaTest Breast™ in metastatic breast cancer patients: the DETECT study - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed December 2, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC3680931/
24. The significant prognostic value of circulating tumor cells in triple-negative breast cancer: a meta-analysis - PMC - NIH, accessed December 2, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5095082/
25. Circulating tumor DNA: from discovery to clinical application in breast cancer - Frontiers, accessed December 2, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/immunology/articles/10.3389/fimmu.2024.1355887/full
26. Liquid biopsy for minimal residual disease and monitoring in early-stage non-small cell lung cancer: current clinical utility and implementation challenges, accessed December 2, 2025, https://www.explorationpub.com/Journals/em/Article/1001349
27. Liquid clues: tracking early-stage breast cancer with ctDNA - a mini review - Frontiers, accessed December 2, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/oncology/articles/10.3389/fonc.2025.1634859/full
28. Future directions in liquid biopsy technology | Fortrea, accessed December 2, 2025, https://www.fortrea.com/insights/future-directions-liquid-biopsy-technology
29. Characterization of the release and biological significance of cell-free DNA from breast cancer cell lines - PMC - NIH, accessed December 2, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC5522137/
30. International society of liquid biopsy (ISLB) perspective on minimal requirements for ctDNA testing in solid tumors - EMQN, accessed December 2, 2025, https://www.emqn.org/wp-content/uploads/2025/08/PIIS2950195425000177.pdf
31. International society of liquid biopsy (ISLB) perspective on minimal requirements for ctDNA testing in solid tumors - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed December 2, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12164225/
32. Expert Opinion Recommendations for External Quality Assessment for Liquid Biopsy testing from the European Liquid Biopsy Society ctDNA Workshop - GenQA, accessed December 2, 2025, https://genqa.org/includes/items/publications/5249_islb-cfdna-workshop-poster-final.pdf
33. Clinical Evidence of Circulating Tumor DNA Application in Aggressive Breast Cancer - MDPI, accessed December 2, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2075-4418/13/3/470
34. Comparison of BEAMing and Droplet Digital PCR for Circulating Tumor DNA Analysis, accessed December 2, 2025, https://www.researchgate.net/publication/336028258_Comparison_of_BEAMing_and_Droplet_Digital_PCR_for_Circulating_Tumor_DNA_Analysis
35. Comparison of BEAMing and Droplet Digital PCR for Circulating Tumor DNA Analysis, accessed December 2, 2025, https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/31551314/
36. Increased blood draws for ultrasensitive ctDNA and CTCs detection in early breast cancer patients - PubMed Central, accessed December 2, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC11096188/
37. Detection of ESR1 Mutations in Tissue and Liquid Biopsy with Novel Next-Generation Sequencing and Digital Droplet PCR Assays: Insights from Multi-Center Real Life Data of Almost 6000 Patients - PMC - PubMed Central, accessed December 2, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC12025842/
38. Dissecting Molecular Heterogeneity of Circulating Tumor Cells (CTCs) from Metastatic Breast Cancer Patients through Copy Number Aberration (CNA) and Single Nucleotide Variant (SNV) Single Cell Analysis - MDPI, accessed December 2, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2072-6694/14/16/3925

39. Epithelial Cell Adhesion Molecule: An Anchor to Isolate Clinically Relevant Circulating Tumor Cells - PMC - NIH, accessed December 2, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC7464831/
40. Evaluation of endocrine resistance using ESR1 genotyping of circulating tumor cells and plasma DNA - NIH, accessed December 2, 2025, https://pmc.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/articles/PMC8667563/
41. Detection of ESR1 Mutations Based on Liquid Biopsy in Estrogen Receptor-Positive Metastatic Breast Cancer: Clinical Impacts and Prospects - Frontiers, accessed December 2, 2025, https://www.frontiersin.org/journals/oncology/articles/10.3389/fonc.2020.587671/full
42. Testing for ESR1 Mutations to Guide Therapy for Hormone Receptor–Positive, Human Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor 2–Negative Metastatic Breast Cancer: ASCO Guideline Rapid Recommendation Update, accessed December 2, 2025, https://ascopubs.org/doi/10.1200/JCO.23.00638
43. The Diversity of Liquid Biopsies and Their Potential in Breast Cancer Management - MDPI, accessed December 2, 2025, https://www.mdpi.com/2072-6694/15/22/5463