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Abstract
Ewing Sarcoma is the second most common primary bone sarcoma with 900 new diagnoses per year in Europe (EU27). It has a poor survival rate in the face of metastatic disease, with no more than 10% survival of the 35% who develop recurrence. Despite the remaining majority having localised disease, approximately 30% still relapse and die despite salvage therapies. Prognostic factors may identify patients at higher risk that might require differential therapeutic interventions. Aside from phenotypic features, quantitative biomarkers based on biological measurements may help identify tumours that are more aggressive. We audited the research which has been done to identify prognostic biomarkers for Ewing sarcoma in the past 15 years. We identified 86 articles were identified using defined search criteria. A total of 11,625 patients were reported, although this number reflects reanalysis of several cohorts. For phenotypic markers, independent reports suggest that tumour size > 8 cm and the presence of metastasis appeared strong predictors of negative outcome. Good histological response (necrosis > 90%) after treatment appeared a significant predictor for a positive outcome. However, data proposing biological biomarkers for practical clinical use remain un-validated with only one secondary report published. Our recommendation is that we can stratify patients according to their stage and using the phenotypic features of metastases, tumour size and histological response. For biological biomarkers, we suggest a number of validating studies including markers for 9p21 locus, heat shock proteins, telomerase related markers, interleukins, tumour necrosis factors, VEGF pathway, lymphocyte count, and a number of other markers including Ki-67.
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Introduction
Ewing sarcoma is the second most common primary bone sarcoma. It is an orphan state disease with approximately 900 new diagnoses a year in Europe [1]. It is also called the Ewing Sarcoma Family of Tumours (ESFT) and includes Ewing sarcoma of bone, extra-ossaceous Ewing sarcoma, Primitive Neuroectodermal (PNET) and Askin’s tumours. Ewing sarcoma is diagnostically defined by a Ewing sarcoma EWS (chromosome 22) translocation resulting in fusion with an ETS transcription factor, the commonest abnormality (85%) being EWS-FLI1 (chromosome 11). Ewing sarcoma is a disease affecting children and young adults with a peak incidence at age fifteen. With current treatment options the 5 year survival for non-metastatic disease is 60-70%. However, survival for the 25% of patients that present with metastatic disease is approximately 20% [2], and for those who develop relapsed and/or refractory disease, the survival is no more than 10%.

Current patients are subdivided by disease stage, namely non-metastatic, metastatic and recurrence, and patients in each group are treated the same. But apparently this subdivision is not always related to clinical outcome, because of the patients who present with non-metastatic disease, approximately 30% die within 5 years. This group may be currently undertreated while the 70% who survive may be over-treated. It may therefore be important to separate the high risk patients from the low risk patients and to be able to detect chemotherapy resistance and metastases early.

A way of predicting patients’ outcome is by using prognostic factors. The most commonly used are clinical features, eg age, gender, metastases. Biomarker is a synonym for biological markers and is defined as “a characteristic that is objectively measured and evaluated
as an indicator of normal biological processes, patho-
genetic processor or pharmacologic responses to a thera-
pneutic intervention” [3]. Biomarkers are currently already being used for screening, diagnosis, prognosis and monitoring of cancer patients. In 2005 the Report-
ing recommendations for tumour MARKer prognostic studies (REMARK) guidelines were published [4]. The goal of these guidelines is to make the results from clinical prognostic studies transparent and to improve the level of comparison that is possible between studies.

We report an overview of the research which has been done to identify reliable biomarkers for Ewing sarcoma in the past 15 years, where we detail the kind of markers that have been tested, the number of patients involved and the p-value showing the significance of the marker. The results highlight some interesting biomarkers, but they have yet to be validated.

Materials and methods

Search strategy

We report data available in the public domain only. Papers were identified from PubMed searches and from refer-
ces in the found articles. The search algorithm was: (Ewing sarcoma) AND (prognostic factors) OR (biomar-
ker). Only papers published between 1995 and 2010 are included. The latest search was done in June 2010. When-
ever multiple reports from the same study were published, we used only the report with the latest published date to avoid any duplication of information. Papers were eligible if they: (1) described (or cited a paper that described) a Ewing sarcoma study of prognostic factors or biomarkers; (2) were published in English; and (3) came from industrialized countries. All types of evaluation were accepted (full papers, conference abstracts, reports) as long as results (including data) were presented.

Data extraction

Data extraction was conducted independently by the first author (A.M. v. M.). We used a systematic method for the search normally used for meta-analysis [5]. Dif-
fences in data extraction were resolved by consensus with a second author (A.B.H). From each eligible trial we recorded authors’ names, journal and year of publi-
cation and the results from the study.

Results and Discussion

Eligible trials

A flow-chart indicating the identification of reports for inclusion in the analysis is reported for Ewing sarcoma (Figure 1). During the search many reports had to be excluded mainly because no prognostic markers were reported in the article. When we searched the reports using full text, we had to exclude some papers because no Ewing sarcoma patients were included in these reports. We identified 86 articles which were eligible for our search criteria. In these papers a total of 11, 625 patients were reported.

In this report we looked at the published data on the use of biomarkers for the last 15 years. Biomarkers were grouped into phenotypic markers and biological markers. Markers were taken as statistically significant if p < 0.05. For phenotypic markers we reported the outcome for gender, tumour size, presence of metastases and histological response after treatment (Tables 1, 2, 3 &4). We showed the p-value reported in the eligible articles and the distribution of p correlated to the number of patients (Figures 2). There doesn’t seem to be a relation-
ship between the number of patients and the p-value. For example, the distribution of histological response shows that the studies with small patient numbers have the same statistical significance as these with large patient numbers. Throughout this report, the assump-
tion is that the biomarker has a linear relationship to outcome. We know that for many biomarkers, this is not the case. For example, data transformation using either bicubic splines or fractional polynomials is often required to correlate continuous relationships between biomarkers and outcome, as opposed to predefined cut-
points [6]. We can only have limited extrapolation of the reported data to outcome as in most instances these questions have not been addressed.

Primary outcome

The investigated biomarkers are subdivided in two groups, phenotypic markers and biological markers. For
the phenotypic markers gender, tumour size, metastases and histological response are reported in Tables 1, 2, 3 and 4. For all these phenotypic markers we compared the patient number and p-value, in which p < 0.05 was taken as statistically significant. However we weren’t able to retrieve the p-value in all articles, sometimes it was only mentioned as being significant or non-significant. For each phenotypic marker we looked at the differences in overall survival between: for gender, men vs women; for tumour size, < 8-10 cm vs > 8-10 cm; for metastasis presence at initial presentation vs absence and for histological response, > 90% necrosis vs < 90% necrosis. Distributions of p related to patient numbers in these four phenotypic markers are shown in Figures 2. For these four phenotypic markers we show that there is no correlation between the number of patients and the statistical significance of the outcome. More phenotypic markers were reported: fusion type, ethnicity, performance status and margins. However because of the low number of studies which reported these outcomes these results are not shown in detail. In 26 articles the impact of tumour site on the overall survival is shown, but because sites are compared in different ways it is difficult to summarize these findings.

Currently clinical stage is being used to determine whether a patient has a high or low risk for developing metastases or recurrence. However, it seems that clinical stage is not always related to outcome, because of the patients who present with non-metastatic disease, only 70% of them survive for 5-years. Therefore, what is the difference between the 70% of the patients who survive and the 30% who don’t? Can one somehow foretell chemotherapy resistance and detect metastases early? One way to predict the outcome of patients apart from clinical stage is to use biomarkers. These are objective measurements which reflect biological processes. The biomarkers currently being used are tumour size and the presence of metastases. Biological markers are not being used, even though they may provide a way to predict a patient’s outcome more accurately than phenotypic markers. From the results for phenotypic markers we can see that gender is probably not significant important for patient outcome. In 15 articles we found 11 reports that gender is non-significant. Tumour size > 8 cm seems to be important, with 15 out of 22 articles finding it to be a predictor and significantly related to negative outcome. The presence of metastasis is a strong predictor of negative outcome with 24 articles reporting it as significantly relevant compared to only 3 reporting it as non-significant. For histological response, 12 out of 16 articles the p-value was only mentioned as being significant or non-significant.

### Table 1 Outcome for phenotypic marker: gender

| Author          | Year | Pt number | P     |
|-----------------|------|-----------|-------|
| Craft et al.    | 1997 | 142       | 0.3   |
| Aparicio et al. | 1998 | 116       | NS    |
| Ahrens et al.   | 1999 | 177       | 0.92  |
| Ginsberg et al. | 1999 | 85        | 0.79  |
| Givens et al.   | 1999 | 85        | NS    |
| Bacci et al.    | 2000 | 359       | 0.02  |
| Jenkins et al.  | 2001 | 93        | 0.73  |
| Krasin et al.   | 2005 | 33        | 0.25  |
| Bacci et al.    | 2006 | 579       | 0.03  |
| De Angelis et al| 2007 | 24       | NS    |
| Levee et al.    | 2008 | 262       | 0.05  |
| Jawad et al.    | 2009 | 1631      | 0.004 |
| Kikuta et al.   | 2009 | 8         | 0.53  |
| Sari et al.     | 2010 | 87        | 0.04  |
| Xie et al.      | 2010 | 18        | 0.36  |

NS: not significant

### Table 2 Outcome for phenotypic marker: tumour size

| Author          | Year | Pt number | P     |
|-----------------|------|-----------|-------|
| Aparicio et al. | 1998 | 116       | 0.0016|
| Kawai et al.    | 1998 | 20        | 0.0038|
| Ahmad et al.    | 1999 | 24        | 0.277 |
| Givens et al.   | 1999 | 85        | NS    |
| Cotterill et al.| 2000 | 975      | 0.001 |
| De Alava et al. | 2000 | 55        | 0.02  |
| Jenkins et al.  | 2001 | 93        | 0.0001|
| Obelin et al.   | 2001 | 141       | 0.002 |
| Rutkowski et al.| 2003 | 13        | 0.05  |
| Krasin et al.   | 2004 | 37        | S     |
| Matsumoto et al.| 2004 | 21       | 0.05  |
| Krasin et al.   | 2005 | 33        | 0.25  |
| Aksnes et al.   | 2006 | 56        | 0.001 |
| Bacci et al.    | 2006 | 579       | 0.0004|
| Mikulin et al.  | 2006 | 27        | 0.031 |
| Cheung et al.   | 2007 | 28        | NS    |
| Rodriguez-Galindo et al. | 2008 | 220     | 0.018 |
| Yonemori et al.| 2008 | 79        | S     |
| Jawad et al.    | 2009 | 1631      | 0.001 |
| Kikuta et al.   | 2009 | 8         | 0.018 |
| Lee et al.      | 2010 | 725       | 0.001 |
| Xie et al.      | 2010 | 18        | 0.44  |

NS: not significant, S: significant
articles found that necrosis > 90% after treatment is a significant predictor for positive outcome.

For some phenotypic markers it is unclear how the cut-off point between predictor of positive or negative outcomes is determined. For tumour size the cut-off point for negative outcome is > 8 cm, but it is undefined how this is selected. It seems more logical that tumour size is a continuous variable with an increasingly negative outcome with increasing size. The same can probably be said for age and surgical margins.

Biological markers are more difficult to compare, because for most of these markers only one or two reports are published. We grouped the biological markers according to their function and we ended up with 5 groups, namely cell cycle, karyotype, immunological, blood products and the remaining biological markers which couldn’t be classified in one of the other groups. The results from the biological markers are shown in Tables 5, 6, 7, 8 and 9. The correlation between patient number and statistical significance of the outcome for these five groups is shown in Figures 3.

Table 3 Outcome for phenotypic marker: metastases

| Author                  | Year | Pt number | P   |
|-------------------------|------|-----------|-----|
| Terrier et al, Eur J Cancer 31 (3), 307-14[36] | 1995 | 315       | 0.003 |
| Terrier et al, Semin Diagn Pathol 13 (3), 250-7[37] | 1996 | 315       | S   |
| Aparicio et al, Oncology 55, 20-6[9] | 1998 | 116       | 0.03 |
| De Alava et al, J Clin Oncol 16 (4), 1248-55[38] | 1998 | 99        | 0.008 |
| Paulussen et al, J Clin Oncol 16 99, 3044-52 [39] | 1998 | 114       | S   |
| Ahmad et al, Cancer 85, 725-31[23] | 1999 | 24        | 0.219 |
| Baldini et al, Ann Surg 230 (1), 79-86[40] | 1999 | 37        | 0.002 |
| Ginsberg et al, J Clin Oncol 17, 1809-14[11] | 1999 | 85        | 0.33 |
| Luksch et al, Tumori 85 (2), 101-7[41] | 1999 | 73        | S   |
| Cotterill et al, J Clin Oncol 18, 3108-14[24] | 2000 | 975       | 0.0001 |
| De Alava et al, Cancer 89, 783-92[25] | 2000 | 55        | 0.02 |
| Wei et al, Cancer 89, 793-9[42] | 2000 | 39        | 0.0071 |
| Jenkins et al, Med Pediatr Oncr 37, 383-9[14] | 2001 | 93        | 0.04 |
| Zielenska et al, Cancer 91, 2156-64[43] | 2001 | 26        | 0.0137 |
| Martin et al, Arch Surg 138, 281-5[44] | 2003 | 59        | 0.02 |
| Fuchs et al, Clin Cancer Res 10, 1344-53[45] | 2004 | 31        | 0.022 |
| Matsunobu et al, Clin Cancer Res 10, 1003-12[29] | 2004 | 21        | NS  |
| Weston et al, B J Cancer 91, 225-32[46] | 2004 | 385       | 0.001 |
| Aksnes et al, Acta Oncr 45, 38-46[30] | 2006 | 56        | 0.001 |
| Kreuter, Eur J Cancer 45, 1904-11[47] | 2006 | 40        | S   |
| La et al, Int J Radiat Oncol Biol Phys 64 (2), 544-50[48] | 2006 | 60        | 0.036 |
| Cheung et al, Clin Cancer Res 13 (23), 6978-83[32] | 2007 | 28        | 0.04 |
| Leavey et al, Pediatr blood Cancer 51 (3), 334-8[18] | 2008 | 262       | 0.02 |
| Yongemori et al, J Cancer Res Clin Oncol 134, 389-95[34] | 2008 | 79        | 0.02 |
| Jawad et al, Cancer 115, 3526-36[19] | 2009 | 385       | 0.001 |
| Sani et al, Pediatr Blood Cancer 54, 19-24[21] | 2010 | 87        | 0.001 |
| Xie et al, Chin J Cancer 29 (4), 420-4 | 2010 | 18        | 0.01 |

NS: not significant, S: significant

Table 4 Outcome for phenotypic marker: histological response

| Author                  | Year | Pt number | P   |
|-------------------------|------|-----------|-----|
| Delepine et al, J Chemother 9 (5), 352-63[49] | 1997 | 39        | 0.05 |
| Pepic et al, J Clin Oncol 15 (4), 1553-9[50] | 1997 | 118       | 0.0001 |
| Aparicio et al, Oncology 55, 20-6[9] | 1998 | 116       | 0.018 |
| Paulussen et al, J Clin Oncol 16 (9), 3044-52 [39] | 1998 | 114       | S   |
| Abudu et al, J Bone Joint Surg 81 (2), 317-22 [51] | 1999 | 50        | 0.03 |
| Ahrens et al, Med Pediatr Oncol 32, 186-95 [10] | 1999 | 177       | 0.27 |
| Baldini et al, Ann Surg 230 (1), 79-86[40] | 1999 | 37        | 0.01 |
| Bacci et al, J Clin Oncol 14, 4-11[13] | 2000 | 359       | 0.001 |
| De Alava et al, Cancer 89, 783-92[25] | 2000 | 55        | 0.001 |
| Chali et al, J Clin Oncol 21, 3836-43[52] | 2003 | 31        | 0.0001 |
| Scotlandi et al, Eur J Cancer 41, 1349-61[53] | 2005 | 113       | 0.05 |
| Bacci et al, Acta Oncr 45, 469-75[16] | 2006 | 579       | 0.0005 |
| Mikulic et al, J Pediatr Surg 41, 524-9[31] | 2006 | 27        | 0.047 |
| Avigad et al, Clin Cancer Res 13 (19), 5777-83 [54] | 2007 | 32        | 0.13 |
| Yongemori, J Cancer Res Clin Oncr 134, 389-95v [34] | 2008 | 79        | 0.04 |
| Meynet et al, Cancer Res 70 (9), 3730-8[55] | 2010 | 97        | 0.02 |

S: significant

Figure 2 Distribution of p related to patient number for the phenotypic markers: gender, tumour size, metastases and histological response. The red line shows the cut-off point of p = 0.05.
Table 5 Outcome for biological markers: cell cycle

| Author                  | Year  | Biomarker         | Pt number | P     |
|-------------------------|-------|-------------------|-----------|-------|
| Landanyi et al, J Pathol 175 (2), 211-7 | 1995  | MDM-2             | 30        | 0.005 |
| Lukosch et al, Tumori 85 (2), 101-7(41)| 1999  | Mitose presence   | 73        | S     |
| Sollazzo et al, tumori 85 (3), 167-73(56) | 1999  | Ki-67             | 38        | 0.01  |
| De Alava et al, Cancer 89, 783-92(25)  | 2000  | Ki-67             | 55        | 0.005 |
| Abudu et al, Br J Cancer 79(7-8), 1185-9(57) | 1999  | P53               | 60        | 0.001 |
| Huang et al, J Clin Oncol 23, 548-58(58) | 2004  | P27               | 21        | 0.01  |
| Matsumobu et al, Cinn Cancer Res 10, 1003-12(9) | 2000  | INK4a             | 39        | 0.001 |
| Wei et al, Cancer 89, 793-9(42)       | 2001  | P16INK4a          | 20        | 0.41  |
| Maitra et al, Arch Pathol Lab Med 125, 1207-12(59) | 2001  | P14ARF            | 50        | 0.03  |
| Huang et al, J Clin Oncol 23, 548-58(58) | 2005  | P21WAF1           | 20        | 0.61  |
| Maitra et al, Arch Pathol Lab Med 125, 1207-12(59) | 2004  | Cadherin-11       | 20        | 0.024 |
| Cheung et al, Clin Cancer Res 13 (23), 6978-83(32) | 2007  | STEAP1            | 28        | 0.0012|
| Cheung et al, Clin Cancer Res 13 (23), 6978-83(32) | 2007  | CCND1             | 28        | 0.0077|
| Martins et al, Cancer Res 68 (15), 6260-70(61) | 2008  | Heat shock 90     | 54        | S     |
| Zanini et al, Virchows Arch 452, 157-67(62)   | 2008  | Heat shock 27     | unknown   | NS    |

S: significant, NS: not significant

Table 6 Outcome for biological markers: karyotype

| Author                | Year  | Biomarker            | Pt number | P     |
|-----------------------|-------|----------------------|-----------|-------|
| Tarkannen et al, Cancer Genet Cytogenet 114, 35-41 | 1999  | 1q                   | 28        | NS    |
| Hattinger et al, Br J Cancer 86, 1763-9(63)       | 2002  | 1q                   | 134       | 0.046 |
| Tarkannen et al, Cancer Genet Cytogenet 114, 35-41 | 1999  | 6p2.1                | 28        | 0.004 |
| Lopez-Guerrero et al, Lab Invest 81 (6), 803-14(64) | 2001  | 9p21 locus           | 19        | 0.005 |
| Hattinger et al, Br J Cancer 86, 1763-9(63)       | 2002  | 16q                  | 134       | 0.008 |
| Hattinger et al, Genes Chromosomes Cancer 24 (3), 243-54(65) | 1999  | Chr 1                | 58        | 0.004 |
| Tarkannen et al, Cancer Genet Cytogenet 114, 35-41 | 1999  | Chr 8                | 58        | 0.17  |
| Hattinger et al, Genes Chromosomes Cancer 24 (3), 243-54(65) | 2002  | Chr 8                | 134       | NS    |
| Tarkannen et al, Genes Chromosomes Cancer 24 (3), 243-54(65) | 1999  | Chr 12               | 28        | NS    |
| Hattinger et al, Genes Chromosomes Cancer 24 (3), 243-54(65) | 1999  | Chr 12               | 58        | 0.63  |
| Hattinger et al, Br J Cancer 86, 1763-9(63)       | 2002  | Chr 12               | 134       | 0.009 |
| Ohali et al, J Clin Oncol 21, 3836-43(52)         | 2003  | Telomerase activity  | 31        | 0.0001|
| Avigad et al, Clin Cancer Res 13 (19), 5777-83(54) | 2007  | Telomerase length    | 32        | 0.015 |

NS: not significant, Chr: Chromosome

Table 7 Outcome for biological markers: immunological

| Author                  | Year  | Biomarker     | Pt number | P     |
|-------------------------|-------|---------------|-----------|-------|
| Rutkowski et al, J Surg Oncol 84, 151-9(27) | 2003  | IL-1ra        | 13        | 0.0001|
| Rutkowski et al, J Surg Oncol 84, 151-9(27) | 2003  | sIL-2ra       | 13        | 0.005 |
| Rutkowski et al, J Surg Oncol 84, 151-9(27) | 2003  | IL-6          | 13        | 0.001 |
| Rutkowski et al, J Surg Oncol 84, 151-9(27) | 2003  | IL-8          | 13        | 0.0001|
| Rutkowski et al, J Surg Oncol 84, 151-9(27) | 2003  | IL-10         | 13        | 0.01  |
| Rutkowski et al, J Surg Oncol 84, 151-9(27) | 2003  | TNF RI        | 13        | 0.001 |
| Rutkowski et al, J Surg Oncol 84, 151-9(27) | 2003  | TNF RII       | 13        | 0.01  |
| Rutkowski et al, J Surg Oncol 84, 151-9(27) | 2003  | M-CSF         | 13        | 0.01  |
| Berghuis et al, J Pathol 218, 222-31(66)       | 2009  | HLA class I   | 67        | NS    |

NS: not significant
that ki67, an S-phase cell cycle biomarker, may be a biomarker of cell activity in the tumour that significantly correlates with outcome. The mechanism for the activation of cell cycle appears unclear, but is presumably driven by other factors other than EWS-FLI1 translocation. Loss of function of cell cycle dependent kinases (p16, p14, p21) and other regulators of the cell cycle through the p53 pathway (MDM2, p53), also appear deregulate in a proportion of tumours and potentially are useful prognostic markers. Importantly, activity of telomerase appears significantly correlated with outcome as occurs in many other tumours. There appears much interest in

Table 8 Outcome for biological markers: blood products

| Author                  | Year | Biomarker  | Pt number | P    |
|-------------------------|------|------------|-----------|------|
| Holzer et al, Med Pediatr Oncol 36 (6), 601-4[67] | 2001 | VEGF       | 6         | NS   |
| Pavlakovic et al, Int J Cancer 92, 756-60[68]    | 2001 | VEGF       | 4         | 0.017|
| Rutkowski et al, J Surg Oncol 84, 151-9[27]     | 2003 | VEGF       | 13        | NS   |
| Fuchs et al, Clin Cancer Res 10, 1344-53[45]    | 2004 | VEGF       | 31        | 0.0047|
| Jimeno et al, Pediatr Blood Cancer 49, 352-7[69] | 2007 | VEGF       | 16        | NS   |
| Kreuter et al, Eur J Cancer 42, 1904-11[47]     | 2006 | VEGF-A     | 40        | 0.013|
| Kreuter et al, Eur J Cancer 42, 1904-11[47]     | 2006 | VEGFR-1    | 40        | 0.946|
| Kreuter et al, Eur J Cancer 42, 1904-11[47]     | 2006 | VEGFR-2    | 40        | 0.946|
| Aparicio et al, Oncology 55, 20-6[9]            | 1998 | Lymphocyte count | 116 | 0.0044|
| De Angulo et al, J Pediatr Hematol Oncol 29 (1), 48-52[17] | 2007 | Lymphocyte count | 24  | 0.001|
| De Angulo et al, J Pediatr Hematol Oncol 29 (1), 48-52[17] | 2007 | Platelet count | 24   | NS   |
| De Angulo et al, J Pediatr Hematol Oncol 29 (1), 48-52[17] | 2007 | Neutrophil count | 24   | NS   |
| Aparicio et al, Oncology 55, 20-6[9]            | 1998 | Erythrocyte sedimentation rate | 116 | 0.02  |
| Oberlin et al, B J Cancer 85 (11), 1646-54[26]  | 2001 | Erythrocyte sedimentation rate | 141 | 0.04  |
| Yabe et al, Oncol Rep 19 (1), 129-34[70]        | 2008 | Erythrocyte sedimentation rate | 20  | NS   |

NS: not significant

Table 9 Outcome for biological markers: remaining

| Author                  | Year | Biomarker  | Pt number | P    |
|-------------------------|------|------------|-----------|------|
| Craft et al, Eur J Cancer 33 (7), 1061-9[8]    | 1997 | LDH        | 142       | NS   |
| Aparicio et al, Oncology 55, 20-6[9]            | 1998 | LDH        | 116       | NS   |
| Givens et al, Int J Oncol 14 (6), 1039-43[12]  | 1999 | LDH        | 85        | NS   |
| Bacci et al, Oncol Rep 6 (4), 807-11[71]       | 1999 | LDH        | 618       | S    |
| Luksch et al, Tumor 85 (2), 101-7[41]          | 1999 | LDH        | 73        | S    |
| Bacci et al, J Clin Oncol 18, 4-11[13]         | 2000 | LDH        | 359       | 0.0003|
| Matsunobu et al, Clin Cancer Res 10, 1003-12[29]| 2004 | LDH        | 21        | NS   |
| Bacci et al, Acta Oncol 45, 469-75[16]         | 2006 | LDH        | 579       | 0.0005|
| Cheung et al, Clin Cancer Res 13 (23), 6978-83[32] | 2007 | LDH        | 28        | 0.99 |
| Yabe et al, Oncol Rep 19 (1), 129-34[70]       | 2008 | LDH        | 20        | NS   |
| Leavey et al, Pediatr Blood Cancer 51 (3), 334-8[18] | 2008 | LDH        | 262       | 0.0016|
| Xie et al, Chin J Cancer 29 (4), 420-4          | 2010 | LDH        | 18        | NS   |
| Terrier et al, Eur J Cancer 31 (3), 307-14[36]  | 1995 | Filigree pattern | 315 | 0.044 |
| Terrier et al, Eur J Cancer 31 (3), 307-14[36]  | 1995 | Dark cells  | 315       | 0.043|
| Aparicio et al, Oncology 55, 20-6[9]            | 1998 | Albumine levels | 116 | 0.0006|
| Sollazzo et al, Tumor 85 (3), 167-73[56]       | 1999 | c-myc      | 38        | S    |
| Ohali et al, Oncogene 23, 8997-9006[60]        | 2004 | MTA1       | 20        | 0.003|
| Cheung et al, Clin Cancer Res 13 (23), 6978-83[32] | 2007 | NKX2-2     | 28        | 0.0017|
| Kikuta et al, Clin Cancer Res 15 (8), 2885-94[20] | 2009 | Nucleophosmin positivity | 8  | 0.01  |
| Meynet et al, Cancer Res 70 (9), 3730-8[55]    | 2010 | Xg expression | 97  | 0.047 |

S: significant, NS: not significant
secondary copy number changes and mutations in Ewing sarcoma, and in particular, chromosome 1 (Table 6). For example, recent evidence points to gain of 1q and alteration in abundance of a gene product called CDT2 involved in ubiquitination [7]. It is however difficult to objectively say anything about the other reported markers because they may influence each other. This appears most clear for tumour size and metastases, where bigger tumours may correlate with a higher chance of having metastases. For biological markers it is probably the same issue, but less clear because we don’t really know their true experimental influence on tumour genesis. For example, LDH levels are probably a reflection of cell turnover in larger tumours, and may be an indirect measure of bulk of disease (comparing Table 2 versus Table 9). It is also more difficult to say anything about biological markers because they haven’t been tested as extensively as phenotypic markers, and certainly they have not often been validated independently. Results for most of these markers are only reported in 1 or 2 articles with sometimes small numbers of patients and no statistical validation. To improve this situation it would important to capture high quality clinical material and clinical outcome to develop a bio-bank. We may be able to test the most promising biomarkers from previously run studies and so define their significance. Either a multivariate analysis or data mining analysis should be done to evaluate the way biomarkers affect each other. The easiest way to achieve this objective is by collecting material and outcome data from large phase III trials. It is also important to standardize the way material is collected and how the biomarkers are compared. For example, the phenotypic marker tumour site is the most often tested marker with results published in 26 articles (data not shown). However it is not possible to say anything about these results since different tumour sites are compared in the reports. This is also true for the marker age in which different age groups are compared with each other, for example some articles compare patients < 18 years vs > 18 years, others < 30 years vs > 30 years (data not shown).

For markers of tumour growth, angiogenesis if often quantified, but so far biomarker analysis has been predominantly limited to measurement of VEGF pathway (Table 8). The immunological biological markers interleukins and tumour necrosis factors seem very promising (Table 7). However these have all been tested in one institute, with very small patient numbers and the data doesn’t seem to be validated. Most of the biological markers mentioned in the blood products group (Table 8) are probably surrogates for tumour size and they should be validated in either a multivariate analysis or

![Figure 3 Distribution of p related to patient number for the biological markers related to cell cycle, karyotype, immunological, blood products and remaining markers. The red line shows the cut-off point of p = 0.05. Note, there is no line for immunological phenotypic markers because for all the results p < 0.05.](http://www.clinicalsarcomaresearch.com/content/2/1/7)
machine learning to see if they can be used as an objective biological marker.

At the present time it is possible to make a definite list of biological biomarkers able to predict patient outcome, mainly because these markers also have to be stratified with respect to the major staging phenotypic features, e.g. presence of metastasis and degree of histological response. It is also unclear what quality control measure were used in the limited patient cohorts. Our recommendation would be continue divide patients according to their disease stage and also to use the phenotypic biomarkers metastasis, tumour size and histological response. For biological biomarkers we would like to validate previous work done on the markers for 9p21 locus and the involved genes and proteins, heat shock proteins, telomerase related markers, interleukins, tumour necrosis factors, VEGF pathway, lymphocyte count, MTA1, STEAP1, CCND1, MDM-2, Ki-67, p53, p27 and cadherin-11. At this time, neither phenotypic (clinical) or biological biomarkers are utilised in stratification of patients in clinical trials.
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