## Supplemental data file

## Inherent limitations of rare event detection ${ }^{1-3}$

Three principle issues in rare event detection were evaluated. First, what is the lowest number of CTC that would need to be in a tube of blood to detect one CTC? Second, what is the theoretical level of variability in measuring the reproducibility of rare events based on a random distribution? Third, if one obtains a given result in clinical practice, what is the range of CTC numbers that might have actually been in the tube based on statistical considerations?

The probability of a random sample of size $n$ containing $x$ events in a total of $n$ tests using the binomial distribution is given by the following formula:

$$
\begin{aligned}
\mathrm{P}(x) & =\frac{n!}{x!(n-x!)} p^{x}(1-p)^{n-x}=\binom{n}{x} p^{x}(1-p)^{n-x} \\
\text { Where: } \quad \mathrm{P}(x) & =\text { the probability of an event }(x) \text { in a unit of space } \\
x & =\text { number of events } \\
p & =\text { probability of detecting (or observing) } x \text { events } \\
1-p & =\text { probability of not detecting (or observing) } x \text { events } \\
n & =\text { sample size }
\end{aligned}
$$

The mean $\mu$ and variance $\sigma^{2}$ of the binomial distribution are given by the following:

$$
\mu=n p \quad \text { and } \quad \sigma^{2}=n p(1-p)
$$

The minimum average number of CTCs $(n)$ required to be present in a single 7.5 mL sample of blood to ensure the detection on average of at least 1 CTC $(\mu)$ given an average assay recovery of CTCs spiked into 7.5 mL of blood of $\sim 85 \%(p)$, is therefore:

$$
\begin{gathered}
\mu=n p \\
1=n(85 \%) \\
n=1 / 0.85 \sim=1.2 \text { CTC }
\end{gathered}
$$

The standard deviation $\sigma$ for this value of $n$ would be determined as follows:

$$
\sigma=\sqrt{n p(1-p)}=\sqrt{1.2 * 0.85(1-0.85)}=0.4
$$

These results indicate that in order to detect on average 1 CTC with an average assay recovery of $85 \%$, a 7.5 mL blood sample would have to contain on average 1.2 CTCs.

For CTC detection, imagine a volume of blood that has been divided into CTC size units. This creates a very large sample size $n$, with a very small probability $p$ of any single volume $n$ containing an event $x$ (i.e. a CTC). In this situation, with a large $n$ and a small p, the Poisson distribution can be used to approximate the binomial probability. The Poisson distribution is important in describing random (or rare) occurrences where each sample (or volume) $n$ has an equal probability of containing an event $x$, such as is the case with the distribution of CTC in a volume of blood.

The probability of a random sample of size $n$ containing $x$ events can be calculated using the Poisson distribution and is given by the following formula:

$$
P(x)=\frac{e^{-\mu} \mu^{x}}{x!}
$$

An interesting and useful property of a Poisson distribution is that the variance $\sigma^{2}$ is equal to the mean $\mu$. This would make the standard deviation equal to $\sqrt{\mu}$, and the theoretical coefficient of variation (\%CV) equal to $\frac{\sqrt{\mu}}{\mu}$.

Using the above \%CV formula, at CTC counts of 4, 18, 71, 286, and 1142, the inherent \%CVs of actually counting those numbers of events would be predicted to be $50 \%, 24 \%, 12 \%, 6 \%$, and $3 \%$, respectively. These predicted $\%$ CVs are very similar to the observed $\%$ CVs of $47 \%, 22 \%, 11 \%, 2 \%$, and $5 \%$, respectively, shown in Table 1. These findings suggest that the CellSearch assay does not add additional variation to the inherent variation of counting random events due to the Poisson distribution.

When calculating confidence intervals (CI) for rare events (i.e. CTC counts), one must keep in mind that the Poisson distribution assumes the shape of a normal distribution when the number of events is greater than about 100. So we use a Poisson distribution for rare events (when the number of events is less than 100), but when the number of events is greater than 100, we can use a modified formula from the normal distribution to determine the $95 \%$ Cl's.

Table 2 provides the lower and upper confidence factors used to calculate an exact $95 \% \mathrm{Cl}$ based on a specified number of events (or counts), from 1 to 100 . To calculate the exact $95 \% \mathrm{Cl}$, multiply the number of events (or counts) by the associated confidence factors and add these values separately to the count. For example, in Table 1, the average observed number of CTC at the 18 CTC spike was 22 CTC (122\% recovery). The lower and upper confidence limits are calculated using the confidence factors provided in Table 2. The factors for 22 events are 0.6267 and 1.5140 for the lower and upper limits of the $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$, respectively. Therefore, the exact $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ for the average CTC count of 22 would be:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Lower limit }=22(0.6267)=13.8 \\
& \text { Upper limit }=22(1.5140)=33.3
\end{aligned}
$$

Thus, for the average \% recovery of $122 \%$ ( 22 / 18 CTC)

$$
\begin{aligned}
\text { Lower limit } & =(14 / 18) * 100 \%=77.7 \% \\
\text { Upper limit } & =(33 / 18) * 100 \%=183.3 \%
\end{aligned}
$$

$95 \%$ C.I. for average of $122 \%$ recovery $=78 \%$ to $183 \%$
The formula for the calculation of an approximate $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$ for a Poisson distribution with more than 100 counts $\mu$ is:

$$
\text { Approximate C.I. }=\mu \pm z_{\alpha} \sqrt{\mu}
$$

Where: $z_{\alpha}=1.645$ for a $90 \% \mathrm{Cl}, 1.96$ for a $95 \% \mathrm{CI}$, or 2.58 for a $99 \% \mathrm{Cl}$

Lastly, similar considerations apply to the issue of estimating the range of CTC numbers when a given number is measured by the assay. Recall that for a Poisson distribution the variance $\sigma^{2}$ is equal to the mean $\mu$, which would make the standard
deviation equal to the square root of the mean $\sigma=\sqrt{\mu}$. For a sample size of $n=1, \sigma$ is indeterminate, as we have no knowledge of $\sigma$ from a single determination ( $x_{1}$ ). Although $\sigma$ is unknown, it is possible to determine the true mean value $\mu$ within a certain confidence interval $\left[\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}\right.$ ]. For $n \rightarrow \infty$, a Poisson distribution with a mean $\mu$ and standard deviation $\sigma$ is known. If we take one sample from this distribution ( $n=1$ ), this sample will contain $x_{1}$ number of CTCs. If we assume that this sample falls within a given confidence interval $\left(z_{\alpha}\right)$, the true average falls within $\left[\mu_{1}, \mu_{2}\right]$ with the same given confidence, if $\mu_{1}$ and $\mu_{2}$ are defined as follows:

$$
x_{1}=\mu_{1}-z_{\alpha} \sqrt{\mu_{1}} \text { and } x_{1}=\mu_{2}+z_{\alpha} \sqrt{\mu_{2}}
$$

when you solve the above equation for $\mu_{1}$ and $\mu_{2}$, you get

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mu_{1}=\left(x_{1}+z_{\alpha}\right)-\frac{\sqrt{\left(2 z_{\alpha}+2 x_{1}\right)^{2}-4 x_{1}{ }^{2}}}{2} \\
& \mu_{2}=\left(x_{1}+z_{\alpha}\right)+\frac{\sqrt{\left(2 z_{\alpha}+2 x_{1}\right)^{2}-4 x_{1}^{2}}}{2}
\end{aligned}
$$

Figure 1 shows $\mu_{1}$ and $\mu_{2}$ for a $95 \% \mathrm{Cl}\left(z_{\alpha}=1.96\right.$, solid line), the $68 \% \mathrm{CI}\left(z_{\alpha}=\right.$ 1.00, short dashed line), and the $38 \% \mathrm{Cl}\left(z_{\alpha}=0.50\right.$, long dashed line) for $x_{1}$ values of 0 to 25 CTC. The range of the true average, $\mu$, based on a single blood draw resulting in $x_{1}$ number of CTC, can be read from Figure 1 with $38 \%$, 68\%, and $95 \%$ confidence. For example when 5 CTC are detected ( $x_{1}=5$ ), you can be $95 \%$ confident that the true average lies between the 2 and 12 CTC, $68 \%$ confident that the true average lies between 3 and 9 CTC, and 38\% confident that the true average lies between 3 and 8 CTC.
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Table 1. Method accuracy measured by recovery of SKBR-3 tumor cells spiked into 7.5 mL blood of 5 healthy donors

| Expected | Observed CTC Count |  |  | \% Recovery |  | \%CV |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CTC Count | Average | StDev | 95\% C.I. | Average | 95\% C.I. |  |
| $\mathbf{4}$ | 4 | 2 | $1-11$ | 110 | $25-275$ | 47 |
| $\mathbf{1 8}$ | 22 | 5 | $14-33$ | 122 | $78-183$ | 22 |
| $\mathbf{7 1}$ | 70 | 8 | $55-88$ | 99 | $77-124$ | 11 |
| $\mathbf{2 8 6}$ | 247 | 5 | $216-277$ | 86 | $76-97$ | 2 |
| $\mathbf{1 1 4 2}$ | 971 | 46 | $910-1032$ | 85 | $80-90$ | 5 |

Table 2. 95\% Confidence Interval Factors for Poisson-Distributed Events

| number of events | 95\% CI, Lower Limit Factor | 95\% CI, Upper Limit Factor | number of events | 95\% CI, Lower Limit Factor | 95\% CI, Upper <br> Limit Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | 0.0000 | 3.7000 | 51 | 0.7446 | 1.3148 |
| 1 | 0.0253 | 5.5716 | 52 | 0.7468 | 1.3114 |
| 2 | 0.1211 | 3.6123 | 53 | 0.7491 | 1.3080 |
| 3 | 0.2062 | 2.9224 | 54 | 0.7512 | 1.3048 |
| 4 | 0.2725 | 2.5604 | 55 | 0.7533 | 1.3016 |
| 5 | 0.3247 | 2.3337 | 56 | 0.7554 | 1.2986 |
| 6 | 0.3670 | 2.1766 | 57 | 0.7574 | 1.2956 |
| 7 | 0.4021 | 2.0604 | 58 | 0.7593 | 1.2927 |
| 8 | 0.4317 | 1.9704 | 59 | 0.7612 | 1.2899 |
| 9 | 0.4573 | 1.8983 | 60 | 0.7631 | 1.2872 |
| 10 | 0.4795 | 1.8390 | 61 | 0.7649 | 1.2845 |
| 11 | 0.4992 | 1.7893 | 62 | 0.7667 | 1.2820 |
| 12 | 0.5167 | 1.7468 | 63 | 0.7684 | 1.2794 |
| 13 | 0.5325 | 1.7100 | 64 | 0.7701 | 1.2770 |
| 14 | 0.5467 | 1.6778 | 65 | 0.7718 | 1.2746 |
| 15 | 0.5597 | 1.6493 | 66 | 0.7734 | 1.2722 |
| 16 | 0.5716 | 1.6239 | 67 | 0.7750 | 1.2700 |
| 17 | 0.5825 | 1.6011 | 68 | 0.7765 | 1.2677 |
| 18 | 0.5927 | 1.5804 | 69 | 0.7781 | 1.2656 |
| 19 | 0.6021 | 1.5616 | 70 | 0.7795 | 1.2634 |
| 20 | 0.6108 | 1.5444 | 71 | 0.7810 | 1.2614 |
| 21 | 0.6190 | 1.5286 | 72 | 0.7824 | 1.2593 |
| 22 | 0.6267 | 1.5140 | 73 | 0.7838 | 1.2573 |
| 23 | 0.6339 | 1.5005 | 74 | 0.7852 | 1.2554 |
| 24 | 0.6407 | 1.4879 | 75 | 0.7866 | 1.2535 |
| 25 | 0.6471 | 1.4762 | 76 | 0.7879 | 1.2516 |
| 26 | 0.6532 | 1.4652 | 77 | 0.7892 | 1.2498 |
| 27 | 0.6590 | 1.4549 | 78 | 0.7905 | 1.2480 |
| 28 | 0.6645 | 1.4453 | 79 | 0.7917 | 1.2463 |
| 29 | 0.6697 | 1.4362 | 80 | 0.7929 | 1.2446 |
| 30 | 0.6747 | 1.4276 | 81 | 0.7941 | 1.2429 |
| 31 | 0.6795 | 1.4194 | 82 | 0.7953 | 1.2413 |
| 32 | 0.6840 | 1.4117 | 83 | 0.7965 | 1.2397 |
| 33 | 0.6884 | 1.4044 | 84 | 0.7976 | 1.2381 |

Table 2 (con't). 95\% Confidence Interval Factors for Poisson-Distributed Events

| number of <br> events | 95\% CI, Lower <br> Limit Factor | $95 \%$ CI, Upper <br> Limit Factor |  | number of <br> events | 95\% CI, Lower <br> Limit Factor | $95 \%$ CI, Upper <br> Limit Factor |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 34 | 0.6925 | 1.3974 |  | 85 | 0.7988 | 1.2365 |
| 35 | 0.6965 | 1.3908 |  | 86 | 0.7999 | 1.2350 |
| 36 | 0.7004 | 1.3844 |  | 87 | 0.8010 | 1.2335 |
| 37 | 0.7041 | 1.3784 |  | 88 | 0.8020 | 1.2320 |
| 38 | 0.7077 | 1.3726 |  | 89 | 0.8031 | 1.2306 |
| 39 | 0.7111 | 1.3670 |  | 90 | 0.8041 | 1.2292 |
| 40 | 0.7144 | 1.3617 |  | 91 | 0.8051 | 1.2278 |
| 41 | 0.7176 | 1.3566 |  | 92 | 0.8061 | 1.2264 |
| 42 | 0.7207 | 1.3517 |  | 93 | 0.8071 | 1.2251 |
| 43 | 0.7237 | 1.3470 |  | 94 | 0.8081 | 1.2237 |
| 44 | 0.7266 | 1.3425 |  | 95 | 0.8091 | 1.2224 |
| 45 | 0.7294 | 1.3381 |  | 96 | 0.8100 | 1.2212 |
| 46 | 0.7321 | 1.3339 |  | 97 | 0.8109 | 1.2199 |
| 47 | 0.7348 | 1.3298 |  | 98 | 0.8118 | 1.2187 |
| 48 | 0.7373 | 1.3259 |  | 99 | 0.8128 | 1.2175 |
| 49 | 0.7398 | 1.3221 |  | 100 | 0.8136 | 1.2163 |
| 50 | 0.7422 | 1.3184 |  |  |  |  |
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