



HAL
open science

Ability of animals to detect cancer odors

Flora Gouzerh, Guila Ganem, Anaïs Pichevin, Laurent Dormont, Frédéric
Thomas

► **To cite this version:**

Flora Gouzerh, Guila Ganem, Anaïs Pichevin, Laurent Dormont, Frédéric Thomas. Ability of animals to detect cancer odors. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA) - Reviews on Cancer*, 2023, 1878 (1), pp.188850. 10.1016/j.bbcan.2022.188850 . hal-04231353

HAL Id: hal-04231353

<https://hal.science/hal-04231353v1>

Submitted on 8 Nov 2023

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Copyright

1
2
3
4
5
6
7
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16

Ability of animals to detect cancer odors

Flora Gouzerh^{1,2}, Guila Ganem³, Anaïs Pichevin², Laurent Dormont² & Frédéric Thomas¹

¹ Centre de Recherches Écologiques et Évolutives sur le Cancer, Maladies Infectieuses et Vecteurs: Ecologie, Génétique, Evolution et Contrôle, UMR IRD 224- CNRS 5290- Université de Montpellier, 34394, Montpellier, France

² Centre d'écologie Fonctionnelle et Evolutive, Université de Montpellier, CNRS, EPHE, IRD, Université Paul Valéry Montpellier 3, 34293, Montpellier, France

³ Institut des Sciences de l'Evolution, ISEM, Université Montpellier, CNRS, IRD, 34095, Montpellier, France

17 **Abstract:**

18

19 The olfactory capacity of animals has long been used by humans to help with various activities, e.g.,
20 hunting, detecting mines, locating people, and diagnosing diseases. Cancer is among the leading
21 diseases causing death worldwide. Several recent studies have underscored the benefit of using scent
22 to detect cancer, and this paper will review the studies using animals to detect tumor scents. A large
23 variety of animals have been used for this purpose—dogs, rodents, insects, and nematodes—and have
24 shown their capacity to detect cancer, with a success rate close to 90%. Here we discuss these studies,
25 their methodologies, and the animal models used. Finally, we discuss the medical perspectives for
26 cancer diagnosis using odors.

27

28

29 **Keywords:** Cancer odor, olfactory sensor, odor discrimination, volatile organic compounds,
30 behavioral response.

31

1. Introduction

Cancer is the second leading cause of death in the world, with an estimated 9.9 million deaths in 2020 [1]. For most cancers, it is widely acknowledged that the early determination of a malignant tumor is crucial for increasing the chance of survival. Indeed, most cancer deaths are linked to a delay in the diagnosis, attributable to the fact that early stage cancers are rarely associated with clear symptoms. Early diagnosis usually increases the effectiveness of therapies by treating the tumor at a stage at which it has not yet caused significant tissue damage or transferred metastases to other organs [2]. Thus, any tool allowing early tumor detection would be particularly valuable in the fight against cancer.

For the last 20 years, a new approach for early cancer detection has been explored that is based on the hypothesis that the presence of a tumor could—for various reasons, e.g., the altered metabolism of cancer cells—result in the production of specific volatile substances (volatile organic compounds [VOCs]) that are detectable by chemical analysis techniques [3]. In fact, many diseases can be detected because of the modifications they induce in body odors [4–7]. Among these diseases are infectious ones such as malaria [8] and tuberculosis [9], and chronic diseases such as mucoviscidose [10], asthma [11], and diabetes [12]. Cancer is no exception: several studies have shown that it was possible to detect differences in VOCs emission between healthy people and cancer patients, especially for lung, breast, and prostate cancers [3].

For many animal species, olfaction plays an essential role in both intra- and interspecific interactions [13–16]. For example, scent is involved in the identification of conspecifics, sex, social rank, or reproductive status [17,18]. There is also some evidence that olfactory capacities are used to recognize congeners who are sick following infections by pathogens [19–24].

Because of their olfactory acuity, animals have been used by humans for various tasks, from hunting to scent detection. The first use of animals for their sense of smell involved dogs in a military context to detect objects such as explosives, mines, and dead bodies during the Second World War [25]. Later, in the 1980s, rodents were used for the same reason. Because of their small size, mice could more easily enter small areas without triggering the explosives [26,27]. The dog's sense of smell is regularly used by police to detect explosives [28,29] and drugs [30], and to search for cadavers [25] as well as at the border for biosecurity [31]. For human diseases, it has been established that dogs, trained or not, can detect the imminence of an epilepsy crisis based on changes in their master's body odor [32,33]. More recently, dogs have been used to detect COVID-19 [34,35]. In addition to dogs, other animal species have been found that can detect body odors, notably rodents [36], bees [37], or drosophila [38]. Other insects such as wasps have also been trained to detect substances such as cocaine [39].

67 Recent advances in cancer research have shown that the ability of dogs to detect tumor-
68 associated odors could offer a relevant tool for cancer detection [40–42]. The aim of this paper is to
69 review current knowledge concerning the use of various animals to detect cancerous processes in
70 humans. We examined 49 publications reporting results on this topic published between 1989—the
71 year when the first publication in this field was reported—and 2022. We listed the species capable of
72 detecting cancers and analyzed the different methods to test scent discrimination by detailing the
73 advantages and inconveniences of each species. Finally, we explored the potential interest of each
74 animal group for early detection of cancer in humans.

75

76 **2. Material and methods**


77 Our exhaustive review was conducted by searching for published articles on PubMed
78 (<https://pubmed.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/>), Web of Science (www.webofknowledge.com), and Google
79 Scholar (<https://scholar.google.com/>) that contained the following keywords: “animal smells” or
80 “animal olfaction”, or “animal nose” AND “cancer” or “cancer detection” or “cancer odors” or
81 “cancer scent.” The literature included articles published in English from 1989 until 2022, excluding
82 systematic reviews or meta-analyses. For each study, in addition to publication year, we extracted the
83 following information: species, type of cancer, odor source (e.g., exhaled air, urine), whether or not
84 animals were naive before being included in the test, as well as specificity and sensitivity of the test.
85 All graphical representations were performed with the software R version 4.0.3 in Rstudio [43] and
86 required the following packages: ggplot2 [44], GGally[45], and cowplot [46].

87

88 **3. Results**

89

90 3.1 History of the use of animals in cancer detection



91

92 **Figure 1:** Number of papers by year published between 1989 and 2022 that addressed the ability of
 93 animals to detect cancer odors. Studied animals were divided into dogs and other species, which
 94 included nematodes, bees, drosophila, ants, mice, and rats.

95

96 Despite knowledge of the olfactory abilities of animals and their use in different fields, it was
 97 not investigated in cancer research until reports of anecdotes from the late 1980s about particular dog
 98 behaviors toward owners harboring tumors began to surface. The first study on the subject is a case
 99 report in 1989 [47]. This note refers to a 44-year-old woman who presented lesions, which were
 100 subsequently diagnosed as malignant melanoma. This patient sought medical care because her two
 101 dogs, a Border collie and a Doberman, had detected a lesion by sniffing it. Following this initial
 102 observation, no study was launched on the subject. It was not until a second case report in 2001 [48],
 103 which described the same scenario, that research was undertaken on the subject. In this second
 104 observation of spontaneous identification of cancer by a dog, the owner of a male Labrador retriever
 105 was diagnosed with melanoma following his dog's incessant reaction to the lesion (licking and
 106 sniffing). Following this second case report, animal studies were undertaken. In parallel, in the 2000s,
 107 research showed that it was possible to detect differences in odor profiles between healthy and
 108 cancerous individuals [3].

109 Since these first case reports, 46 studies have been conducted between 2004 and the present on
 110 the ability of animals to detect cancer (**Fig. 1; Table S1 and S2**). Most of these publications (31)
 111 concerned dogs, following the above described case studies. Because dogs are already common
 112 subjects of research based on sense of smell, many training protocols were available. Other animal
 113 species began to be studied from 2010 onwards, although much less frequently compared to studies
 114 with dogs (**Fig. 1 & 2**).

115 Among the other species studied are mouse and rat. These species are widely used in medical
116 research, including oncology [49,50]. Using genetically modified murine models, it is possible to
117 induce cancers that are very similar to those occurring in humans (e.g., [51,52] and then explore how
118 tumorigenesis induces modifications in the mouse odor bouquet [53,54]. It is also known that olfaction
119 is one of the most used senses in rodents [55–57]. However, only four publications involved mice
120 between 2010 and 2022 [53,58–60] and only one involved rats [61].

121 More recently—in 2014— invertebrates began to be used in this research field [62]. The
122 emergence of these new study models is certainly linked to the constraint of experimentation on
123 vertebrate animals, when researchers were encouraged to reduce the use of vertebrates and replace
124 them by other models whenever possible. Olfaction in insects is highly developed and is among the
125 most sensitive of the animal kingdom [63]. There are for instance several examples of insects that
126 demonstrate high sensitivity and selectivity in detecting and discriminating odours (Bromenshenk et
127 al. 2003, Schott et al. 2015, Chamberlain et al. 2012; Frederickx et al. 2011). Nevertheless, only three
128 studies have so far tested the olfactory capacity of insects in the context of cancer. In 2014, there was a
129 first publication on drosophila (*Drosophila melanogaster*) [62]; there was another in 2015 on bees
130 (*Apis mellifera*) [64], and one in 2022 on ants (*Formica fusca*) [65].

131 In 2015, a team in Japan began studying the ability of the nematode *Caenorhabditis elegans* to
132 detect cancer [66–72]. This organism, a study model in sensory neurobiology, offers many advantages
133 as a model system, one of which is its small and transparent body, which allows the imaging of
134 neuronal activity in real time [73]. The Japanese team produced seven publications supporting the
135 hypothesis that nematodes can detect and distinguish odors emitted by scent sources from cancerous
136 and healthy humans.

137 Figure 2 illustrates the percentage of publications made on each animal species. Many
138 different breeds of dogs were used. Certain breeds were selected that excel in olfaction-based tasks.
139 For instance, dogs such as Labrador retrievers, German shepherds, and Belgian shepherds are often
140 used in scenting tasks in the military field because of their drive and high trainability [74]. However,
141 at least 28 other dog breeds of various sizes have been tested for their ability to detect cancer-related
142 odors. More than half of the publications used medium-sized dogs (30–60 cm); 14 different breeds of
143 these sized were tested, especially Labrador retrievers.




Figure 2: Proportions of different animals used for odor detection. The dog breeds used (28 different breeds in referenced publications) were classified into three size categories: small, medium, large. Some dogs were crosses between two known breeds, so we were unable to identify the size category to which they belonged and they were therefore classified in the size category "NA."


157

158 The sense of smell of these different species was used to discriminate different cancers from
159 non-cancer samples. A total of 12 types of cancer were studied, with 10 different odor sources (**Fig.**
160 **3**). Lung cancer was the focus of most studies, with 14 publications, followed by breast cancer (10
161 publications), ovarian cancer (seven publications), and colorectal, melanoma, and prostate cancers,
162 with five publications each. The greater number of studies concerns lung cancer which is the most
163 prevalent cause of cancer deaths worldwide, and breast cancer which is the most frequently diagnosed
164 cancer in women worldwide [1]. Lung cancer and breast cancer are also the two cancers that have
165 been studied using the largest number of different organisms. Studies on lung cancer have been done
166 mainly with dogs, comprising 75% of the publications, but also mice, rats, and bees. Breast cancer has
167 been tested with dogs, ants, drosophila, and nematodes. Some cancers or stimuli have only been tested
168 using one species, e.g., prostate cancer (five dog studies), cervical cancer (one dog study), lymphoma
169 (one nematode study), leukemia (one nematode study), pancreatic cancer (four nematode studies), and
170 gastrointestinal cancer (three nematode studies). The detection abilities of dogs were tested on a larger
171 number of cancers than for any of the other organisms, eight in all: prostate, ovarian, melanoma, lung,
172 colorectal, cervical, breast, and bladder cancers. Studies using nematodes have included six different
173 cancers (pancreatic, lymphoma, leukemia, gastrointestinal, colorectal, and breast). Among studies
174 conducted using mice, two were on lung cancer [53,60], one on melanoma [75], and one on bladder
175 cancer [58]. Only one publication on lung cancer involved rats [61].

176 Animals are presented with different sources of stimuli to see if they can discriminate the
177 odors of cancerous individuals. The most commonly used source is urine. Dogs were tested with odors
178 derived from human urine (11 publications) while mice were tested with both human (1 publication)
179 and mouse urine (two publications) and nematodes (one publication with mouse urine and six with
180 human urine). The second most used source is exhaled air from humans, with nine publications
181 involving dogs and one involving rats. Breath sample collection is not invasive to humans—the person
182 only needs to blow into a machine, similar to a stress test by a pulmonologist. Both urine and exhaled
183 breath are simple ways to quickly obtain odor samples. There are other noninvasive methods, such as
184 stool samples or soiled mouse bedding, in which odors emitted by mouse urine, feces, and glands can
185 be found. **Sweat is another noninvasive source that has been studied (eg.).** These odour sources are
186 not yet widely used, with only two publications using stool samples and one using soiled bedding.
187 These could be further developed, particularly in the context of colorectal and digestive cancers.

188 ~~Surprisingly, the most common odor sources—urine and air—are not the ones that have been~~
189 ~~tested on most organisms:~~ Cell cultures are often used as odor sources. The three publications
190 involving bees, ants, or drosophila all used odor stimuli from cell cultures. This stimulus was also

191 tested in three publications with dogs and one with nematodes. The other samples presented to the
 192 animals were more invasive and requires either blood sampling or biopsies for tissue or skin samples.
 193 Dogs were tested with a wide spectrum of samples, with eight different stimuli used. Nematodes were
 194 also tested for different cancers and different stimuli, although most studies were made using human
 195 urine [66,67,69–72].



196
 197 **Figure 3:** Summary of cancers and odor sources used with each animal, including the number of
 198 publications identified per cancer type and source of odour.

199
 200
 201
 202
 203
 204
 205

3.3 Experimental setup

207 Animals tested for cancer odor discrimination have different olfactory abilities and behavioral
 208 responses, which necessitates adapting the experimental set-up to the chosen animal model. Some
 209 methods are exclusive to one organism while others have been be generalized and used on several
 210 organisms by adapting the method to the study model. Three main techniques were identified: tests
 211 involving conditioning training, behavioral tests carried out without conditioning, and
 212 electrophysiology tests (**Table 1 and Experimental setup**). These tests showed similar overall
 213 capacities of the animals, although the tests using bees were inconclusive.

214 **Table 1: Summary of the advantages and disadvantages of techniques using each species to detect**
 215 **cancer associated odours**. Test details are given in the supplementary material.

Test technique	Species	Advantages	Disadvantages
Conditioning training	Dogs	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good sensitivity and specificity • A single trained individual is useful for several years • Many samples tested • Animal not killed 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Long training time required (several months). • Cost (over US\$50,000 per dog) • Few individuals/replicates • Ethical documents are needed for the experiment
	Bees	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good sensitivity and specificity • Short testing time (than 3 hours) • The individual can be killed or returned to the colony after the test (even though in the study mentioned bees have been killed) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No discrimination of cancerous individuals
	Ants	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good sensitivity and specificity • No ethical documents needed for experimentation • Large number of individuals available • Short testing time (a few minutes) • The individual can be killed or returned to the colony after the test 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many individuals are necessary
	Rats	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good sensitivity and specificity • Short training time (a few days) • Animals can be used several times on multiple samples (even though rats in the study mentioned have been euthanized after the experiment) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many individuals are necessary • Ethical documents are needed for the experiment
	Mice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good sensitivity and specificity • Short training time (a few days) • Animals can be used several times on multiple samples (even though mice in the study mentioned have been killed after the experiment) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many individuals are necessary • Ethical documents are needed for the experiment

Behavior test: habituation/ generalization	Mice	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good sensitivity and specificity • Short test time (a few minutes) • Animals can be used several times on multiple samples (even though mice in the study mentioned have been killed after the experiment) 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many individuals are necessary • Ethical documents are needed for the experiment • Limited number of tests per individuals
Behavior test: preference	Mice		<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • No preference for cancerous or healthy stimuli
	Nematodes	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Preference for cancerous stimuli • Good sensitivity and specificity • No ethical documents needed for experimentation • Large numbers of individuals are available • Reduced total duration of the experiment (a few minutes) • No training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many individuals are needed for one test • Killed after tests
Electrophysiology test (calcium imaging)	Drosophila	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Good sensitivity and specificity • No ethical documents needed for experimentation • Large number of individuals are available • Reduced total duration of the experiment (a few minutes) • No training 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Many individuals are needed for one test • Killed after tests

216

217 Conditioning tests involves learning by a system of reward or punishment (**see Experimental**
218 **setup**). This type of test can be used with dogs, insects, and rodents. To estimate the success rate of
219 conditioning tests, we can calculate the sensitivity and specificity as follows:

220

221 **Sensitivity = CP/ (CP+ MI)**

222 **Specificity= CN/ (CN+FA)**

223

224 where CP indicates a correct positive response, when animals detected the target sample; MI indicates
225 a false negative response, when animals did not detect the target sample; CN indicates a correct

226 negative response, when animals did not detect a control sample; and FA indicates a false positive
227 alert, when animals detected a blank or control sample.

228


229 All publications on dogs on average display good sensitivity, i.e., 71 ± 24 , as well as a good
230 specificity, i.e., 85 ± 18 . Some studies obtained scores higher than 90% or even 100% success. For
231 example, using blood serum, beagles had a sensitivity of 96.7% and a specificity of 97.5% [76]. Other
232 studies obtained much less conclusive results, with success rates below 50% [77–79]. Sensitivity and
233 specificity vary among studies, and we noted that they vary depending on the cancers tested and the
234 stimuli presented (Fig. 4). Sensitivity varies more than specificity, which means that dogs are more
235 likely to make false positives - indicating that a sick person is healthy - than false negatives, which can
236 have detrimental consequences for patients in the absence of other diagnostic methods. Detection of
237 urine showed the lowest sensitivity among the stimuli, yet it is the most common stimulus tested on
238 the dogs. Regarding the types of cancers tested, prostate and bladder cancers had average sensitivities
239 close to 50%, making them the least well detected cancers by dogs. However, this poor detection level
240 may be because only urine samples were used and that dogs are less sensitive to cancer related
241 molecules present in the urine.

242 Of the other animals tested by conditioning, mice showed success rates ranging between 80
243 and 100% (ref). In another study, mice could distinguish cancerous conspecifics based on their urine.
244 Compared with dogs, either mice are more sensitive to informative molecules present in the urine
245 and/or it might be easier to distinguish diseased conspecifics than non-conspecifics. The rat study used
246 exhaled breath samples to detect lung cancer, resulting in a sensitivity of 82% and a specificity of
247 81%. The two studies conducted on insects using conditioning tests gave mixed results. Bees did not
248 seem to be capable of discrimination between healthy and cancerous cell cultures with proboscis
249 extension response (PER) tests [64]. The failure of tests involving bees may be explained by the fact
250 that cell cultures do not produce compounds to which the bees are sensitive. While, test based on bees
251 olfaction were successful in other contexts, such as landmine detection [37] or in an ecological context
252 with the use of bees to detect the presence of larvae of the Mediterranean fruit fly [80]. The study
253 using ants [65] showed that when ants were conditioned with sugar water to the odor (healthy cell
254 cultures or cancerous cell cultures), they spent much more time near the conditioned smell than the
255 new smell. These results show that ants are able to distinguish between healthy and cancerous cells
256 and even between two different cancerous cells. Conditioning has advantages and disadvantages,
257 depending on the animal tested. In the context of cancer detection, for all species tested other than bees,
258 this method resulted in sensitivity and specificity above 80%.

259 Conditioning tests require a learning period that can be variable in length. This training time
260 can be a disadvantage with dogs. Dogs start training in average at 10 ± 4.8 months, with training
261 durations varying greatly among studies (average 41 ± 34 weeks). Some dogs were trained for only 3–4

262 weeks prior to testing [76,81] and others were trained for seven to 24 months [82–84]. This makes the
263 dog the organism that takes the longest to provide conclusive results. For all other species tested, the
264 learning time was much shorter, from a few minutes to a few days.

Figure 4: Global sensitivity and specificity for all experiments with dogs as a function of cancer type and odor sample. Boxplots represent the first, median, and third quartiles on the 95% extent. The dots represent the outliers and when there was only one data point.



265 However, once a dog is trained, its training can last for its lifetime and thus the same
266 individual can be used for a large number of tests, unlike, for example, insects or nematodes, which
267 usually cannot be used more than once, due to their short lifespan. The possibility of using trained
268 dogs throughout their lives makes them an attractive study model. Alternatively, studies involving
269 animals that cannot be used repeatedly require a sufficient number of individuals to be statistically
270 reliable. For example, habituation–discrimination tests typically involve between 10 and 20 mice/rats
271 and 30 or so ants for a given experiment in contrast to dog conditioning studies, where only one to 10
272 dogs were involved. This results in a large number of organisms to be tested; in the case of rodents,
273 this involves ethical constraints, while experimentation on invertebrates have fewer restrictions.

274 These advantages and disadvantages including the number of individuals required and the
275 ethical issues are common to all three testing methods—the other two being behavioral tests without
276 prior learning and electrophysiology tests. Behavioral tests were carried out on mice and nematodes.
277 Two types of tests were performed on mice. The first was a habituation/generalization test [60], where
278 the mouse was habituated for 14 minutes to a scent stimulus (cancerous or healthy) and then presented
279 with two new stimuli. The mouse will typically spend more time smelling the stimulus with which it is
280 less familiar. In this way, it can be determined whether mice can differentiate between the smells of
281 cancerous and healthy stimuli. This study showed that mice were able to discriminate between
282 cancerous conspecifics but—as with ants—this depended on the stimulus to which they had been
283 habituated. Mice were able to differentiate a cancerous stimulus from a non-cancerous one if they
284 were habituated to a non-cancerous stimulus, even at an early stage of cancer development. But when
285 a mouse was habituated to a cancerous stimulus, mice showed difficulty discriminating among two
286 different cancerous stimuli. This may be due to possible higher heterogeneity in odors emitted by two
287 cancerous stimuli [85].

288 The second behavioral test consists of a preference test where two different odors are placed
289 either in a Y-maze for mice or in two Petri dishes for nematodes. Despite their ability to detect the
290 odors, wild-derived mice did not show a preference for healthy or cancerous samples [60]. This was
291 not the case for nematodes, which were attracted to the odors emitted by stimuli of cancerous patients,
292 regardless of the cancer type or stage [66,70,71].

293 Behavioral tests involving mice or nematodes have good sensitivity and specificity scores.
294 This type of test allows a reduction in testing time by eliminating the need to learn by positive or
295 negative reinforcement. Nevertheless, as mentioned above, the number of individuals required is much
296 larger compared to conditioning with dogs. This disadvantage is not an issue for nematodes since there
297 are no ethical requirements for experimentation, which allows an unlimited number of individuals that
298 could be tested.

299 The last technique involves electrophysiology. As of now, it has only been tested on
300 *Drosophila melanogaster*, with calcium imaging [62]. For this method, the response of drosophila to
301 olfactory stimuli presented to the fly's antennae, was examined at the brain level using calcium
302 imaging . Even if this study did not specifically identify candidate VOCs, it showed that drosophila
303 has a network of natural chemosensors that seem to respond to odors of medical interest (i.e. [62]).

304

305 3.4 Medical perspectives

306

307 Cancer detection by animals—from dogs or mice to insects and nematodes—seems to be a
308 promising avenue. Indeed, they seem to be able to detect cancer even with only slight variations in
309 body VOCs. This capacity to detect cancer could allow a much more accurate diagnosis than current
310 cancer screening tests, such as MRI. However, there are different experimental setups depending on
311 which animal is used and different behavioral responses and measures, such as digging, rolling over,
312 sitting, rearing, and barking with dogs; physiological measurements such as electroantennography
313 (EAG) coupled with calcium imaging with insects; and attraction or repulsion responses with mice or
314 nematodes. Furthermore, a number of different stimuli can be presented to animals. The optimization
315 of these stimuli for each type of cancer and for each animal must be considered. Some stimuli are
316 currently little used even though they are potentially reliable. Other stimuli, such as urine, are often
317 used even though they do not necessarily give the best results (e.g. in studies with dogs). Furthermore,
318 given the detection capacity of insects, it is important to test stimuli other than cell cultures to see if
319 this capacity could be extended to other commonly used stimuli, e.g., urine or exhaled air.

320 Twelve different cancers have been studied using animals as cancer detectors. Human cancers
321 (18 in total) have already been studied by chemical analysis of their VOCs to identify molecular
322 differences between cancerous and healthy patients (see the review [3]). However, this review has
323 shown that there was no universal compound associated with cancer odours. It is interesting to note
324 that the cancers most studied by chemical analysis of human VOCs—apart from lung cancer—are
325 different to those that have been investigated by animal detection, e.g., cervical cancer [86].

326 To make the best use of animals in the field of disease detection and especially for cancer, it is
327 essential to choose an experimental set-up that is easily duplicated and can be extended to a large
328 number of cancers. Based on several studies, it appears that animals can detect cancer at very early
329 stages of precancerous lesions [60,66,83]. This could be useful for initial diagnoses or for cases of
330 relapse, which are sometimes difficult to detect. Early detection is critical to more effectively treat
331 patients. In addition, cancer detection methods must be accurate, fast, simple, and affordable. In this
332 respect, animals that are well trained, or for which a reliable protocol can be established, can help
333 detect early stages of cancer using primary and noninvasive screening. While the different animals that

334 could be used all have advantages and disadvantages, all offer a non-invasive rapid diagnostic tool for
335 human cancers.

336 The use of animals could be ethically problematic, especially the use of dogs and mice, so in
337 this context it may seem preferable to use organisms such as insects or nematodes rather than
338 mammalian detectors like dogs for instance. Another alternative is chemical analysis. Techniques such
339 as GC-MS (gas chromatography – mass spectrometry), LC-MS (liquid chromatography coupled with
340 mass spectrometry), and PTRMS (proton transfer reaction mass spectrometry) show promise in the
341 identification of VOCs that can help identify cancerous individuals. Although chemical analysis may
342 be less sensitive than animal “noses” Further, these analyses are time-consuming and tedious because
343 cancer impact on VOCs does not always involve the same compounds, thus many samples and
344 analyses would be necessary to identify potential cancer biomarkers. Indeed, several candidate VOC
345 molecules have already been identified [3], but there is no consensus on one or more potential
346 biomarkers, although some compounds such as hexanal, acetone, ethanol, or nonanal have been
347 pointed out in several publications [3]. In the absence of general diagnostic markers, the use of
348 animals to detect early stages of cancer development might be more effective.

349 4. Discussion

350

351 The use of animals in the fight against cancer, although effective, is still in its infancy. Indeed,
352 the potential of animals to detect cancer at an early stage has only been explored in the last 20 years.
353 The use of several animals seem promising, with success rates above 80% for most. All species tested
354 have advantages and disadvantages, although from an ethical point of view the development of
355 experiments using invertebrates such as nematodes, ants, or drosophila should be given special
356 attention. Moreover, this ability to detect cancer—with or without learning—opens the door to new
357 questions about how and why animals are able to discriminate these odors.

358 Many species have evolved highly developed olfactory systems, allowing them to find their
359 prey or food, avoid predators and toxic resources, or to socially interact [13,87]. The need to know
360 one's environment has led animals to develop a highly efficient olfactory system that—with or without
361 training—allows them to identify cancerous individuals. We know about the impact of infectious
362 parasites on the social relationships of several animal species ([20,22,24]), but we know little about
363 cancer. No studies to our knowledge have looked at the ability of conspecifics in the wild to avoid
364 cancerous individuals. Documentation of cancer in natural populations is limited because most wild
365 animals live and die anonymously. The exact prevalence of cancer in a population requires detailed
366 knowledge of the organism under study (e.g., demography, distribution, migration) as well as
367 extensive monitoring and sampling. However, the relative paucity of cancer research in natural

368 environments does not signify that it is not important in determining the survival of an organism and
369 in shaping ecological dynamics. Indeed, we know that many species—from hydra to humans—can
370 develop cancer [88]. Although there is little information on the prevalence of cancer in nature, some
371 studies have been able to show that cancer can be a significant cause of death in nature [89–92],
372 although population monitoring to investigate the prevalence of cancer is very difficult to set up in the
373 wild. Only Tasmanian devils and beluga have thus far been extensively studied for cancer [93,94].

374 Concerning the impact of cancer on wild animals, i.e., whether their olfactory capacity allows
375 them to identify a cancerous congener, no study to our knowledge has asked this question. The only
376 study carried out on the impact of cancer on intra- or interspecies relationships was done on tumoral
377 hydras and showed that tumorous polyps were more predated by fish [95]. Is this only due to their
378 larger size, or do they emit different odors that allow fish to differentiate them? For other predators
379 such as the wolf, the dog's ancestor, do they use their sense of smell to detect sick individuals, and can
380 they distinguish cancerous individuals? Are cancerous individuals, which may carry more pathogens
381 following cancer-induced immune suppression [96], excluded from the group or less frequently
382 chosen as sexual partners (e.g., [97])? These questions are even more relevant for species harboring
383 transmissible tumors, such as Tasmanian devils [91]. In this species, the extent to which individuals
384 may avoid each other to prevent contamination is poorly understood. There are many questions about
385 how cancer is perceived in nature by animals and especially how animals perceive cancerous animals
386 using their sense of smell. For species with post-reproductive cancer, selection should not play a role
387 on social interactions since the cancer will not affect the fitness of breeders. However, **oncogenic**
388 **processes may appear at a younger age in some species, or in the case of transmissible cancers, it is**
389 **possible that selection plays a role in the olfactory capacities of animals to enable them to avoid**
390 **conspecifics in poor conditions ([98,99]).**

391 Oncogenic agents such as UV radiation, oncogenic contaminants, and hormones released into
392 waterways are increasingly present in the environment due to human encroachment and habitat
393 degradation. Because many of these carcinogens are new, exposed organisms may not have developed
394 effective defense mechanisms and may not have the capacity to avoid them, which might make
395 wildlife particularly vulnerable to carcinogenesis [100–102]. Exploring the extent to which chemical
396 ecology will be central in these novel ecological contexts will be fascinating and will require the
397 integration of concepts and techniques from different disciplines in addition to chemical ecology (e.g.,
398 behavioral ecology, physiology, molecular biology, oncology).

399

400

401 **5. Concluding remarks**

402

403 Animals can use their sense of smell to detect objects, drugs, people, or even diseases such as
404 cancer. This ability is shared by many animals that use olfaction **as a means of communication** in the
405 wild. Their sense of smell allows them to obtain information about the individuals around them,
406 including their age, sex, and health status. Using their ability to identify individuals with parasitic,
407 chronic, or genetic diseases such as cancer is a promising avenue for the early detection of many
408 diseases.

409 Different experimental techniques could be used with different animals. This review covered
410 olfactory studies that used dogs as well as other species and highlighted the advantages and
411 disadvantages of each species. Analyzing the neural electrophysiological responses (e.g.,
412 electroantennography) of species capable of detecting cancer and thus identifying the compounds that
413 are different between cancer patients and healthy ones would be invaluable. However, this involves a
414 vast number of individuals who are destined to be euthanized. In this respect, insects or other
415 invertebrates may be an interesting avenue of research: they have highly developed olfactory
416 capacities and their use in experimentation is not at this time subjected to any ethical constraints.
417 Finally, the ability of animals to detect cancer raises many interesting ecological and evolutionary
418 questions.

419

420

421

422 **Author's Contribution**

423 FG and AP collected the data. FG analyzed the data and wrote the paper. LD, FT, and GG supervised
424 the project and contributed to the final manuscript.

425

426 **Declaration of Competing Interest**

427 The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships
428 that could have influenced the work reported in this paper.

429 **Acknowledgements**

430 This work is supported by an ANR TRANSCAN grant (ANR-18-CE35- 0009), the MAVA
431 Foundation, and a CNRS International Associated Laboratory Grant. FG was supported by a doctoral
432 fellowship from the University of Montpellier.

433

434

435

436 **Reference**

- 437 [1] H. Sung, J. Ferlay, R.L. Siegel, M. Laversanne, I. Soerjomataram, A. Jemal, F. Bray,
438 Global Cancer Statistics 2020: GLOBOCAN Estimates of Incidence and Mortality
439 Worldwide for 36 Cancers in 185 Countries, *CA Cancer J Clin.* 71 (2021) 209–249.
440 <https://doi.org/10.3322/caac.21660>.
- 441 [2] V.L. Athey, R.J. Suckling, A.M. Tod, S.J. Walters, T.K. Rogers, Early diagnosis of lung
442 cancer: Evaluation of a community-based social marketing intervention, *Thorax.* 67
443 (2012) 412–417. <https://doi.org/10.1136/thoraxjnl-2011-200714>.
- 444 [3] F. Gouzerh, J.-M. Bessière, B. Ujvari, F. Thomas, A.M. Dujon, L. Dormont, Odors and
445 cancer: Current status and future directions, *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA) -*
446 *Reviews on Cancer.* (2022) 188644. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.BBCAN.2021.188644>.
- 447 [4] F. Prugnotte, T. Lefe, A. Pape, Infection , Genetics and Evolution Infection and body
448 odours : Evolutionary and medical perspectives, *Infection, Genetics and Evolution.*, 9
449 (2009) 1006–1009. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.meegid.2009.04.018>.
- 450 [5] S. Sethi, R. Nanda, T. Chakraborty, Clinical application of volatile organic compound
451 analysis for detecting infectious diseases, *Clin Microbiol Rev.* 26 (2013) 462–475.
452 [https://doi.org/10.1128/CMR.00020-13/ASSET/BCFA621B-3481-44BA-9028-](https://doi.org/10.1128/CMR.00020-13/ASSET/BCFA621B-3481-44BA-9028-04A98288403B/ASSETS/GRAPHIC/ZCM9990924260004.JPEG)
453 [04A98288403B/ASSETS/GRAPHIC/ZCM9990924260004.JPEG](https://doi.org/10.1128/CMR.00020-13/ASSET/BCFA621B-3481-44BA-9028-04A98288403B/ASSETS/GRAPHIC/ZCM9990924260004.JPEG).
- 454 [6] F. Buljubasic, G. Buchbauer, The scent of human diseases : a review on speci fi c
455 volatile organic compounds as diagnostic biomarkers, *Flavour Fragr J.* 30 (2015) 5–25.
456 <https://doi.org/10.1002/ffj.3219>.
- 457 [7] J. Pereira, P. Porto-Figueira, C. Cavaco, K. Taunk, S. Rapole, R. Dhakne, H.
458 Nagarajaram, J.S. Câmara, Breath analysis as a potential and non-invasive frontier in
459 disease diagnosis: An overview, *Metabolites.* 5 (2015) 3–55.
460 <https://doi.org/10.3390/metabo5010003>.
- 461 [8] R. Lacroix, W.R. Mukabana, L.C. Gouagna, J.C. Koella, Malaria infection increases
462 attractiveness of humans to mosquitoes, *PLoS Biol.* 3 (2005) 1590–1593.
463 <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pbio.0030298>.
- 464 [9] M. Syhre, S.T. Chambers, The scent of Mycobacterium tuberculosis, *Tuberculosis.* 88
465 (2008) 317–323. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.TUBE.2008.01.002>.
- 466 [10] M. Barker, M. Hengst, J. Schmid, H.J. Buers, B. Mittermaier, D. Klemp, R. Koppmann,
467 Volatile organic compounds in the exhaled breath of young patients with cystic fibrosis,
468 *European Respiratory Journal.* 27 (2006) 929–936.
469 <https://doi.org/10.1183/09031936.06.00085105>.
- 470 [11] B. Ibrahim, M. Basanta, P. Cadden, D. Singh, D. Douce, A. Woodcock, S.J. Fowler,
471 Non-invasive phenotyping using exhaled volatile organic compounds in asthma,
472 *Thorax.* 66 (2011) 804–809. <https://doi.org/10.1136/thx.2010.156695>.
- 473 [12] M. Phillips, R.N. Cataneo, T. Cheema, J. Greenberg, Increased breath biomarkers of
474 oxidative stress in diabetes mellitus, *Clinica Chimica Acta.* 344 (2004) 189–194.
475 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cccn.2004.02.025>.
- 476 [13] A.R. Blaustein, Sexual Selection and Mammalian Olfaction, *Am Nat.* 117 (1981) 1006–
477 1010. <https://doi.org/10.1086/283786>.

- 478 [14] M.R.E. Symonds, M.A. Elgar, The evolution of pheromone diversity, *Trends Ecol Evol.*
479 23 (2008) 220–228. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2007.11.009>.
- 480 [15] S.P. Caro, J. Balthazart, Pheromones in birds: Myth or reality?, *Journal of Comparative*
481 *Physiology A.* 196 (2010) 751–766. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00359-010-0534-4>.
- 482 [16] S.K. Woodley, Pheromonal communication in amphibians, *J Comp Physiol A*
483 *Neuroethol Sens Neural Behav Physiol.* 196 (2010) 713–727.
484 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00359-010-0540-6>.
- 485 [17] C. Desjardins, J.A. Maruniak, F.H. Bronson, Social rank in house mice: Differentiation
486 revealed by ultraviolet visualization of urinary marking patterns, *Science* (1979). 182
487 (1973) 939–941. <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.182.4115.939>.
- 488 [18] D. Restrepo, W. Lin, E. Salcedo, K. Yamazaki, G. Beauchamp, Odortypes and MHC
489 peptides: complementary chemosignals of MHC haplotype?, *Trends Neurosci.* 29
490 (2006) 604–609. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tins.2006.08.001>.
- 491 [19] C.E.J. Kennedy, J.A. Endler, S.L. Poynton, H. McMinn, Behavioral Ecology and
492 Sociobiology Parasite load predicts mate choice in guppies, *Behav Ecol Sociobiol.* 21
493 (1987) 291–295.
- 494 [20] D.H. Clayton, The influence of parasites on host sexual selection, *Parasitology Today.* 7
495 (1991) 329–334. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-4758\(91\)90211-6](https://doi.org/10.1016/0169-4758(91)90211-6).
- 496 [21] M. Kavaliers, D.D. Colwell, Odours of parasitized males induce aversive responses in
497 female mice, *Anim Behav.* 50 (1995) 1161–1169. [https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-3472(95)80032-8)
498 [3472\(95\)80032-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0003-3472(95)80032-8).
- 499 [22] M.E. Scott, K.D. Ehman, Female mice mate preferentially with non-parasitized males,
500 2002.
- 501 [23] B. O’Shea, E. Rebollar-Tellez, R.D. Ward, J.G.C. Hamilton, D. el Naiem, A. Polwart,
502 Enhanced sandfly attraction to *Leishmania*-infected hosts, *Trans R Soc Trop Med Hyg.*
503 96 (2002) 117–118. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0035-9203\(02\)90273-7](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0035-9203(02)90273-7).
- 504 [24] C. Poirotte, F. Massol, A. Herbert, E. Willaume, P.M. Bomo, P.M. Kappeler, M.J.E.
505 Charpentier, Mandrills use olfaction to socially avoid parasitized conspecifics, *Sci Adv.*
506 3 (2017) e1601721. <https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.1601721>.
- 507 [25] A. Rebmann, E. David, M. H.Sorg, *Cadaver Dog Handbook: Forensic Training and*
508 *Tactics for the Recovery of Human Remains*, 2000.
509 [https://books.google.fr/books?hl=fr&lr=&id=WTXuc7BjA-](https://books.google.fr/books?hl=fr&lr=&id=WTXuc7BjA-QC&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=dog+found+cadaver&ots=XUzJQHHDwd&sig=FMj8ztQngug3QQLTZbmbIMazmGU#v=onepage&q=dog%20found%20cadaver&f=false)
510 [QC&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=dog+found+cadaver&ots=XUzJQHHDwd&sig=FMj8ztQn](https://books.google.fr/books?hl=fr&lr=&id=WTXuc7BjA-QC&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=dog+found+cadaver&ots=XUzJQHHDwd&sig=FMj8ztQngug3QQLTZbmbIMazmGU#v=onepage&q=dog%20found%20cadaver&f=false)
511 [gug3QQLTZbmbIMazmGU#v=onepage&q=dog%20found%20cadaver&f=false](https://books.google.fr/books?hl=fr&lr=&id=WTXuc7BjA-QC&oi=fnd&pg=PA1&dq=dog+found+cadaver&ots=XUzJQHHDwd&sig=FMj8ztQngug3QQLTZbmbIMazmGU#v=onepage&q=dog%20found%20cadaver&f=false)
512 (accessed January 28, 2022).
- 513 [26] D.A. Marshall, R.L. Doty, D.P. Lucero, B.M. Stotnick, Odor detection thresholds in the
514 rat for the vapors of three related perfluorocarbons and ethylene glycol dinitrate, *Chem*
515 *Senses.* 6 (1981) 421–433. <https://doi.org/10.1093/CHEMSE/6.4.421>.
- 516 [27] A. Poling, B. Weetjens, C. Cox, N.W. Beyene, H. Bach, A. Sully, Using trained
517 pouched rats to detect land mines: another victory for operant conditioning, *J Appl*
518 *Behav Anal.* 44 (2011) 351–355. <https://doi.org/10.1901/JABA.2011.44-351>.

- 519 [28] K.G. Furton, L.J. Myers, The scientific foundation and efficacy of the use of canines as
520 chemical detectors for explosives, *Talanta*. 54 (2001) 487–500.
521 [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0039-9140\(00\)00546-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0039-9140(00)00546-4).
- 522 [29] I. Gazit, J. Terkel, Explosives detection by sniffer dogs following strenuous physical
523 activity, *Appl Anim Behav Sci*. 81 (2003) 149–161. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591(02)00274-5)
524 [1591\(02\)00274-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0168-1591(02)00274-5).
- 525 [30] A.F.A. Fattah, S. el Abdel-Hamid, Influence of gender, neuter status, and training
526 method on police dog narcotics olfaction performance, behavior and welfare, *J Adv Vet*
527 *Anim Res*. 7 (2020) 655–662. <https://doi.org/10.5455/javar.2020.g464>.
- 528 [31] C. Browne, K.J. Stafford, The use of scent-detection dogs, Article in *Irish Veterinary*
529 *Journal*. (2006). <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/261663456> (accessed
530 November 8, 2022).
- 531 [32] V. Strong, S.W. Brown, Should people with epilepsy have untrained dogs as pets?,
532 *Seizure*. 9 (2000) 427–430. <https://doi.org/10.1053/seiz.2000.0429>.
- 533 [33] V.S. Francis, H.K. Holness, K.G. Furton, The ability of narcotic detection canines to
534 detect illegal synthetic cathinones (bath salts), *Front Vet Sci*. 6 (2019) 98.
535 <https://doi.org/10.3389/FVETS.2019.00098/BIBTEX>.
- 536 [34] P. Jendryny, C. Schulz, F. Twele, S. Meller, M. von Köckritz-Blickwede, A.D.M.E.
537 Osterhaus, J. Ebberts, V. Pilchová, I. Pink, T. Welte, M.P. Manns, A. Fathi, C. Ernst,
538 M.M. Addo, E. Schalke, H.A. Volk, Scent dog identification of samples from COVID-
539 19 patients - A pilot study, *BMC Infect Dis*. 20 (2020) 1–7.
540 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12879-020-05281-3>.
- 541 [35] D. Grandjean, C. Elie, C. Gallet, C. Julien, V. Roger, L. Desquilbet, G. Alvergnat, S.V.
542 Delarue, A. Gabassi, M. Minier, L. Choupeaux, S. Kerneis, C. Delaugerre, J. Rô Me Le
543 Goff, J.-M. Treluyerid, Diagnostic accuracy of non-invasive detection of SARS-CoV-2
544 infection by canine olfaction, *PLoS One*. 17 (2022) e0268382.
545 <https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0268382>.
- 546 [36] T.L. Edwards, C. Cox, B. Weetjens, T. Tewelde, A. Poling, Giant African pouched rats
547 (*Cricetomys gambianus*) that work on tilled soil accurately detect land mines, *J Appl*
548 *Behav Anal*. 48 (2015) 696–700. <https://doi.org/10.1002/JABA.214>.
- 549 [37] J. Bromenshenk, C. Henderson, R. Seccomb, S. Rice, R. Etter, S. Bender, P. Rodacy, J.
550 Shaw, N. Seldomridge, L. Spangler, J. Wilson, Can Honey Bees Assist in Area
551 Reduction and Landmine Detection?, *Journal of Conventional Weapons Destruction*. 7
552 (2003) 5.
- 553 [38] B. Marshall, C.G. Warr, M. de Bruyne, Detection of Volatile Indicators of Illicit
554 Substances by the Olfactory Receptors of *Drosophila melanogaster*, *Chem Senses*. 35
555 (2010) 613–625. <https://doi.org/10.1093/CHEMSE/BJQ050>.
- 556 [39] D. Olson, G. Rains, Use of a Parasitic Wasp as a Biosensor, *Biosensors 2014*, Vol. 4,
557 Pages 150-160. 4 (2014) 150–160. <https://doi.org/10.3390/BIOS4020150>.
- 558 [40] S.W. Brooks, D.R. Moore, E.B. Marzouk, F.R. Glenn, R.M. Hallock, Canine Olfaction
559 and Electronic Nose Detection of Volatile Organic Compounds in the Detection of
560 Cancer: A Review, *Cancer Invest*. 33 (2015) 411–419.
561 <https://doi.org/10.3109/07357907.2015.1047510>.

- 562 [41] T. Jezierski, M. Walczak, T. Ligor, J. Rudnicka, B. Buszewski, Study of the art : canine
563 olfaction used for cancer detection on the basis of breath odour . Perspectives and
564 limitations, *J Breath Res.* 9 (2015) 027001. [https://doi.org/10.1088/1752-](https://doi.org/10.1088/1752-7155/9/2/027001)
565 [7155/9/2/027001](https://doi.org/10.1088/1752-7155/9/2/027001).
- 566 [42] F. Pirrone, M. Albertini, Olfactory detection of cancer by trained sniffer dogs: A
567 systematic review of the literature, *Journal of Veterinary Behavior: Clinical*
568 *Applications and Research.* 19 (2017) 105–117.
569 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jveb.2017.03.004>.
- 570 [43] R Core Team, A language and environment for statistical computing. R Foundation
571 for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria., (2020). <https://www.r-project.org/>.
- 572 [44] M.H. Wickham, Package “ggplot2” Type Package Title An implementation of the
573 Grammar of Graphics, (2014).
- 574 [45] B. Schloerke, J. Crowley, D. Cook, Package ‘GGally’. Extension to ‘ggplot2.’ 713
575 (2018). <https://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/GGally/index.html> (accessed June 12,
576 2022).
- 577 [46] C.O. Wilke, H. Wickham, M.C.O. Wilke, “Package ‘cowplot’”. Streamlined Plot Theme
578 and Plot Annotations for ‘ggplot2.’, (2019). <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-7470-9261>
579 (accessed June 12, 2022).
- 580 [47] H. Williams, A. Pembroke, Sniffer dogs in the melanoma clinic?, *The Lancet.* 333
581 (1989) 734. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(89\)92257-5](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(89)92257-5).
- 582 [48] J. Church, H. Williams, Another sniffer dog for the clinic? [12], *Lancet.* 358 (2001)
583 930. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736\(01\)06065-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0140-6736(01)06065-2).
- 584 [49] R. Meuwissen, A. Berns, Mouse models for human lung cancer, *Genes Dev.* 19 (2005)
585 643–664. <https://doi.org/10.1101/GAD.1284505>.
- 586 [50] B.S. Carver, P.P. Pandolfi, Mouse Modeling in Oncologic Preclinical and Translational
587 Research, *Clinical Cancer Research.* 12 (2006) 5305–5311.
588 <https://doi.org/10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-06-0482>.
- 589 [51] D. Li, T. Shimamura, H. Ji, L. Chen, H.J. Haringsma, K. McNamara, M.C. Liang, S.A.
590 Perera, S. Zaghlul, C.L. Borgman, S. Kubo, M. Takahashi, Y. Sun, L.R. Chirieac, R.F.
591 Padera, N.I. Lindeman, P.A. Jänne, R.K. Thomas, M.L. Meyerson, M.J. Eck, J.A.
592 Engelman, G.I. Shapiro, K.K. Wong, Bronchial and peripheral murine lung carcinomas
593 induced by T790M-L858R mutant EGFR respond to HKI-272 and rapamycin
594 combination therapy, *Cancer Cell.* 12 (2007) 81–93.
595 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccr.2007.06.005>.
- 596 [52] X. Jiao, O. Nawab, T. Patel, A. v. Kossenkov, N. Halama, D. Jaeger, R.G. Pestell,
597 Recent advances targeting CCR5 for cancer and its role in immuno-oncology, *Cancer*
598 *Res.* 79 (2019) 4801–4807. [https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-19-](https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-19-1167/653842/AM/RECENT-ADVANCES-TARGETING-CCR5-FOR-CANCER-AND-ITS)
599 [1167/653842/AM/RECENT-ADVANCES-TARGETING-CCR5-FOR-CANCER-](https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-19-1167/653842/AM/RECENT-ADVANCES-TARGETING-CCR5-FOR-CANCER-AND-ITS)
600 [AND-ITS](https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-19-1167/653842/AM/RECENT-ADVANCES-TARGETING-CCR5-FOR-CANCER-AND-ITS).
- 601 [53] K. Matsumura, M. Opiekun, H. Oka, A. Vachani, S.M. Albelda, K. Yamazaki, G.K.
602 Beauchamp, Urinary volatile compounds as biomarkers for lung cancer: A proof of
603 principle study using odor signatures in mouse models of lung cancer, *PLoS One.* 5
604 (2010) e8819. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0008819>.

- 605 [54] Y. Hanai, K. Shimono, H. Oka, Y. Baba, K. Yamazaki, G.K. Beauchamp, Analysis of
606 volatile organic compounds released from human lung cancer cells and from the urine
607 of tumor-bearing mice, *Cancer Cell Int.* 12 (2012) 7. [https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2867-](https://doi.org/10.1186/1475-2867-12-7)
608 12-7.
- 609 [55] B. Malnic, J. Hirono, T. Sato, L.B. Buck, Combinatorial Receptor Codes for Odors,
610 *Cell.* 96 (1999) 713–723. [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-8674\(00\)80581-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0092-8674(00)80581-4).
- 611 [56] R.E. Johnston, Chemical Communication in Rodents: from Pheromones to Individual
612 Recognition, *J Mammal.* 84 (2003) 1141–1162. <https://doi.org/10.1644/BLE-010>.
- 613 [57] H. Sakano, Neural Map Formation in the Mouse Olfactory System, *Neuron.* 67 (2010)
614 530–542. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.NEURON.2010.07.003>.
- 615 [58] T. Sato, Y. Katsuoka, K. Yoneda, M. Nonomura, S. Uchimoto, Sniffer mice
616 discriminate urine odours of patients with bladder cancer : A proof-of-principle study
617 for non-invasive diagnosis of cancer-induced odours, *Sci Rep.* 7 (2017) 1–10.
618 <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-15355-z>.
- 619 [59] A. Kokocińska-Kusiak, M. Woszczyło, M. Zybala, J. Maciocha, K. Barłowska, M.
620 Dzieciół, Canine Olfaction: Physiology, Behavior, and Possibilities for Practical
621 Applications, *Animals* 2021, Vol. 11, Page 2463. 11 (2021) 2463.
622 <https://doi.org/10.3390/ANI11082463>.
- 623 [60] F. Gouzerh, B. Buatois, M.R. Hervé, M. Mancini, A. Maraver, L. Dormont, F. Thomas,
624 G. Ganem, Odours of cancerous mouse congeners: detection and attractiveness, *Biol*
625 *Open.* 11 (2022) bio059208. <https://doi.org/10.1242/BIO.059208>.
- 626 [61] Y. Oh, O.S. Kwon, S.S. Min, Y.B. Shin, M.K. Oh, M. Kim, Olfactory Detection of
627 Toluene by Detection Rats for Potential Screening of Lung Cancer, *Sensors.* 21 (2021)
628 2967. <https://doi.org/10.3390/S21092967>.
- 629 [62] M. Strauch, A. Lüdke, D. Münch, T. Laudes, C. Giovanni Galizia, E. Martinelli, L.
630 Lavra, R. Paolesse, A. Ulivieri, A. Catini, R. Capuano, C. di Natale, More than apples
631 and oranges - Detecting cancer with a fruit fly's antenna, *Sci Rep.* 4 (2014) 1–9.
632 <https://doi.org/10.1038/srep03576>.
- 633 [63] C. Gadenne, R.B. Barrozo, S. Anton, Plasticity in Insect Olfaction: To Smell or Not to
634 Smell?, <Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1146/Annurev-Ento-010715-023523>. 61 (2016) 317–333.
635 <https://doi.org/10.1146/ANNUREV-ENTO-010715-023523>.
- 636 [64] K. Schallschmidt, R. Becker, H. Zwaka, R. Menzel, D. Johnen, C. Fischer-Tenhagen, J.
637 Rolff, I. Nehls, In vitro cultured lung cancer cells are not suitable for animal-based
638 breath biomarker detection, *J Breath Res.* 9 (2015) 027103.
639 <https://doi.org/10.1088/1752-7155/9/2/027103>.
- 640 [65] B. Piqueret, B. Bourachot, C. Leroy, P. Devienne, F. Mechta-Grigoriou, P. d'Ettorre, J.-
641 C. Sandoz, Ants detect cancer cells through volatile organic compounds, *IScience.* 25
642 (2022) 103959. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ISCI.2022.103959>.
- 643 [66] T. Hirotsu, H. Sonoda, T. Uozumi, Y. Shinden, K. Mimori, Y. Maehara, N. Ueda, M.
644 Hamakawa, A highly accurate inclusive cancer screening test using *Caenorhabditis*
645 *elegans* scent detection, *PLoS One.* 10 (2015) e0118699.
646 <https://doi.org/10.1371/JOURNAL.PONE.0118699>.

- 647 [67] H. Kusumoto, K. Tashiro, S. Shimaoka, K. Tsukasa, Y. Baba, S. Furukawa, J.
648 Furukawa, T. Suenaga, M. Kitazono, S. Tanaka, T. Niihara, T. Hirotsu, T. Uozumi,
649 Behavioural Response Alteration in *Caenorhabditis elegans* to Urine After Surgical
650 Removal of Cancer: Nematode-NOSE (N-NOSE) for Postoperative Evaluation,
651 *Biomark Cancer*. 11 (2019) 1179299X1989655.
652 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1179299X19896551>.
- 653 [68] Y. Ueda, K. Kawamoto, M. Konno, K. Noguchi, S. Kaifuchi, T. Satoh, H. Eguchi, Y.
654 Doki, T. Hirotsu, M. Mori, H. Ishii, Application of *C. elegans* cancer screening test for
655 the detection of pancreatic tumor in genetically engineered mice, *Oncotarget*. 10 (2019)
656 5412. <https://doi.org/10.18632/ONCOTARGET.27124>.
- 657 [69] H. Kusumoto, K. Tashiro, S. Shimaoka, K. Tsukasa, Y. Baba, S. Furukawa, J.
658 Furukawa, T. Niihara, T. Hirotsu, T. Uozumi, Efficiency of Gastrointestinal Cancer
659 Detection by Nematode-NOSE (N-NOSE), *In Vivo*. 34 (2020) 73–80.
660 <https://doi.org/10.21873/INVIVO.11747>.
- 661 [70] A. Asai, M. Konno, M. Ozaki, K. Kawamoto, R. Chijimatsu, N. Kondo, T. Hirotsu, H.
662 Ishii, Scent test using *Caenorhabditis elegans* to screen for early-stage pancreatic
663 cancer, *Oncotarget*. 12 (2021) 1687. <https://doi.org/10.18632/ONCOTARGET.28035>.
- 664 [71] S. Inaba, N. Shimozone, H. Yabuki, M. Enomoto, M. Morishita, T. Hirotsu, E. di
665 Luccio, Accuracy evaluation of the *C. elegans* cancer test (N-NOSE) using a new
666 combined method, *Cancer Treat Res Commun*. 27 (2021) 100370.
667 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CTARC.2021.100370>.
- 668 [72] M. Kobayashi, A. Fujita, T. Ogawa, Y. Tanisaka, M. Mizuide, N. Kondo, Y. Imaizumi,
669 T. Hirotsu, S. Ryozaawa, *Caenorhabditis elegans* as a Diagnostic Aid for Pancreatic
670 Cancer, *Pancreas*. 50 (2021) 673–678.
671 <https://doi.org/10.1097/MPA.0000000000001814>.
- 672 [73] S. Rengarajan, E.A. Hallem, Olfactory circuits and behaviors of nematodes, *Curr Opin*
673 *Neurobiol*. 41 (2016) 136. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CONB.2016.09.002>.
- 674 [74] Z. Polgár, M. Kinnunen, D. Újváry, Á. Miklósi, M. Gácsi, A Test of Canine Olfactory
675 Capacity: Comparing Various Dog Breeds and Wolves in a Natural Detection Task,
676 *Plos One* . 11 (2016) e0154087.
- 677 [75] A. Kokocinska-Kusiak, J. Matalińska, M. Sacharczuk, M. Sobczyńska, K. Góral-
678 Radziszewska, B. Wileńska, A. Misicka, T. Jezierski, Can mice be trained to
679 discriminate urine odor of conspecifics with melanoma before clinical symptoms
680 appear?, *Journal of Veterinary Behavior*. 39 (2020) 64–76.
681 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JVEB.2020.04.004>.
- 682 [76] H. Junqueira, T.A. Quinn, R. Biringer, M. Hussein, C. Smeriglio, L. Barrueto, J.
683 Finizio, X.Y.M. Huang, Accuracy of canine scent detection of non–small cell lung
684 cancer in blood serum, *Journal of the American Osteopathic Association*. 119 (2019)
685 413–418.
686 <https://doi.org/10.7556/JAOA.2019.077/MACHINEREADEABLECITATION/RIS>.
- 687 [77] C.M. Willis, S.M. Church, C.M. Guest, W.A. Cook, N. McCarthy, A.J. Bransbury,
688 M.R.T. Church, J.C.T. Church, Olfactory detection of human bladder cancer by dogs:
689 Proof of principle study, *Br Med J*. 329 (2004) 712–714.
690 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bmj.329.7468.712>.

- 691 [78] R.T. Gordon, C.B. Schatz, L.J. Myers, M. Kosty, C. Gonczy, J. Kroener, M. Tran, P.
692 Kurtzhals, S. Heath, J.A. Koziol, N. Arthur, M. Gabriel, J. Hemping, G. Hemping, S.
693 Nesbitt, L. Tucker-Clark, J. Zaayer, The use of canines in the detection of human
694 cancers, *Journal of Alternative and Complementary Medicine*. 14 (2008) 61–67.
695 <https://doi.org/10.1089/acm.2006.6408>.
- 696 [79] K.R. Elliker, B.A. Sommerville, D.M. Broom, D.E. Neal, S. Armstrong, H.C. Williams,
697 Key considerations for the experimental training and evaluation of cancer odour
698 detection dogs: Lessons learnt from a double-blind, controlled trial of prostate cancer
699 detection, *BMC Urol*. 14 (2014) 1–9. <https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2490-14-22>.
- 700 [80] K. Chamberlain, M. Briens, J.H. Jacobs, S.J. Clark, J.A. Pickett, Use of honey bees
701 (*Apis mellifera* L.) to detect the presence of Mediterranean fruit fly (*Ceratitis capitata*
702 Wiedemann) larvae in Valencia oranges, *J Sci Food Agric*. 92 (2012) 2050–2054.
703 <https://doi.org/10.1002/JSFA.5742>.
- 704 [81] M. McCulloch, T. Jezierski, M. Broffman, A. Hubbard, K. Turner, T. Janecki,
705 Diagnostic Accuracy of Canine Scent Detection in Early- and Late-Stage Lung and
706 Breast Cancers, *Integr Cancer Ther*. 5 (2006) 30–39.
707 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534735405285096>.
- 708 [82] H. Sonoda, S. Kohnoe, T. Yamazato, Y. Satoh, G. Morizono, K. Shikata, M. Morita, A.
709 Watanabe, M. Morita, Y. Kakeji, F. Inoue, Y. Maehara, Colorectal cancer screening
710 with odour material by canine scent detection, *Gut*. 60 (2011) 814–819.
711 <https://doi.org/10.1136/GUT.2010.218305>.
- 712 [83] G. Horvath, H. Andersson, S. Nemes, Cancer odor in the blood of ovarian cancer
713 patients : a retrospective study of detection by dogs during treatment , 3 and 6 months
714 afterward, *BMC Cancer*. 13 (2013) 396.
- 715 [84] S.M. Mazzola, F. Pirrone, G. Sedda, R. Gasparri, R. Romano, L. Spaggiari, A.
716 Mariangela, Two-step investigation of lung cancer detection by sniffer dogs, *J Breath*
717 *Res*. 14 (2020) 026011. <https://doi.org/10.1088/1752-7163/ab716e>.
- 718 [85] N.D. Marjanovic, R.A. Weinberg, C.L. Chaffer, Cell Plasticity and Heterogeneity in
719 Cancer, (2012). <https://doi.org/10.1373/clinchem.2012.184655>.
- 720 [86] H. Guerrero-Flores, T. Apresa-García, Ó. Garay-Villar, A. Sánchez-Pérez, D. Flores-
721 Villegas, A. Bandera-Calderón, R. García-Palacios, T. Rojas-Sánchez, P. Romero-
722 Morelos, V. Sánchez-Albor, O. Mata, V. Arana-Conejo, J. Badillo-Romero, K.
723 Taniguchi, D. Marrero-Rodríguez, M. Mendoza-Rodríguez, M. Rodríguez-Esquível, V.
724 Huerta-Padilla, A. Martínez-Castillo, I. Hernández-Gallardo, R. López-Romero, C.
725 Bandala, J. Rosales-Guevara, M. Salcedo, A non-invasive tool for detecting cervical
726 cancer odor by trained scent dogs, *BMC Cancer*. 17 (2017) 1–8.
727 <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12885-016-2996-4>.
- 728 [87] B.W. Ache, J.M. Young, Olfaction: Diverse Species, Conserved Principles, *Neuron*. 48
729 (2005) 417–430. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.NEURON.2005.10.022>.
- 730 [88] T.A.F. Albuquerque, L. Drummond do Val, A. Doherty, J.P. de Magalhães, From
731 humans to hydra: patterns of cancer across the tree of life, *Biological Reviews*. 93
732 (2018) 1715–1734. <https://doi.org/10.1111/BRV.12415>.
- 733 [89] H.L. Ratcliffe, Incidence and Nature of Tumors in Captive Wild Mammals and Birds,
734 *Am J Cancer*. 17 (1933) 116–135. <https://doi.org/10.1158/AJC.1933.116>.

- 735 [90] H.B. Andervont, T.B. Dunn, Occurrence of Tumors In Wild House Mice 1, *J Natl*
736 *Cancer Inst.* 28 (1962) 1153–1163.
737 <https://academic.oup.com/jnci/article/28/5/1153/883305> (accessed October 21, 2021).
- 738 [91] D. McAloose, A.L. Newton, Wildlife cancer: a conservation perspective, *Nature*
739 *Reviews Cancer* 2009 9:7. 9 (2009) 517–526. <https://doi.org/10.1038/nrc2665>.
- 740 [92] T. Madsen, A. Arnal, M. Vittecoq, F. Bernex, J. Abadie, S. Labrut, D. Garcia, D.
741 Faugère, K. Lemberger, C. Beckmann, B. Roche, F. Thomas, B. Ujvari, *Cancer*
742 *Prevalence and Etiology in Wild and Captive Animals, Ecology and Evolution of*
743 *Cancer.* (2017) 11–46. <https://doi.org/10.1016/B978-0-12-804310-3.00002-8>.
- 744 [93] D. Martineau, K. Lemberger, A. Dallaire, P. Labelle, T.P. Lipscomb, P. Michel, I.
745 Mikaelian, *Cancer in wildlife, a case study: beluga from the St. Lawrence estuary,*
746 *Québec, Canada., Environ Health Perspect.* 110 (2002) 285–292.
747 <https://doi.org/10.1289/EHP.02110285>.
- 748 [94] H. McCallum, D.M. Tompkins, M. Jones, S. Lachish, S. Marvanek, B. Lazenby, G.
749 Hocking, J. Wiersma, C.E. Hawkins, *Distribution and impacts of Tasmanian devil facial*
750 *tumor disease, Ecohealth.* 4 (2007) 318–325. [https://doi.org/10.1007/s10393-007-0118-](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10393-007-0118-0)
751 *0.*
- 752 [95] J. Boutry, J. Mistral, L. Berlioz, A. Klimovich, J. Tökölyi, L. Fontenille, B. Ujvari,
753 A.M. Dujon, M. Giraudeau, F. Thomas, *Tumors (re)shape biotic interactions within*
754 *ecosystems: Experimental evidence from the freshwater cnidarian Hydra, Science of*
755 *The Total Environment.* 803 (2022) 149923.
756 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.SCITOTENV.2021.149923>.
- 757 [96] A. Dujon, J.S. Brown, D. Destoumieux-Garzón, M. Vittecoq, R. Hamede, A. Tasiemski,
758 J. Boutry, S. Tissot, C. Alix-Panabieres, P. Pujol, F. Renaud, F. Simard, B. Roche, B.
759 Ujvari, F. Thomas, *On the need for integrating cancer into the One Health perspective,*
760 *Evol Appl.* 14 (2021) 2571–2575. <https://doi.org/10.1111/EVA.13303>.
- 761 [97] M. Vittecoq, H. Ducasse, A. Arnal, A.P. Møller, B. Ujvari, C.B. Jacqueline, T. Tissot,
762 D. Missé, F. Bernex, N. Pirot, K. Lemberger, J. Abadie, S. Labrut, F. Bonhomme, F.
763 Renaud, B. Roche, F. Thomas, *Animal behaviour and cancer, Anim Behav.* 101 (2015)
764 19–26. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.ANBEHAV.2014.12.001>.
- 765 [98] M. Vittecoq, B. Roche, S.P. Daoust, H. Ducasse, D. Missé, J. Abadie, S. Labrut, F.
766 Renaud, M. Gauthier-Clerc, F. Thomas, *Cancer: A missing link in ecosystem*
767 *functioning?, Trends Ecol Evol.* 28 (2013) 628–635.
768 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.tree.2013.07.005>.
- 769 [99] F. Thomas, F. Vavre, T. Tissot, M. Vittecoq, M. Giraudeau, F. Bernex, D. Misse, F.
770 Renaud, N. Raven, C. Beckmann, R. Hamede, P.A. Biro, B. Ujvari, *Cancer Is Not*
771 *(Only) a Senescence Problem, Trends Cancer.* 4 (2018) 169–172.
772 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.trecan.2018.01.002>.
- 773 [100] A.A. Fernandez, P.R. Bowser, *Selection for a dominant oncogene and large male size as*
774 *a risk factor for melanoma in the Xiphophorus animal model, Mol Ecol.* 19 (2010)
775 3114–3123. <https://doi.org/10.1111/J.1365-294X.2010.04738.X>.
- 776 [101] M. Giraudeau, T. Sepp, B. Ujvari, P.W. Ewald, F. Thomas, *Human activities might*
777 *influence oncogenic processes in wild animal populations, Nat Ecol Evol.* 2 (2018)
778 1065–1070. <https://doi.org/10.1038/S41559-018-0558-7>.

- 779 [102] T. Sepp, B. Ujvari, P.W. Ewald, F. Thomas, M. Giraudeau, Urban environment and
780 cancer in wildlife: available evidence and future research avenues, *Proceedings of the*
781 *Royal Society B*. 286 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1098/RSPB.2018.2434>.
- 782 [103] L.F. Campbell, L. Farmery, S.M.C. George, P.B.J. Farrant, Canine olfactory detection
783 of malignant melanoma, *BMJ Case Rep*. 2013 (2013) bcr2013008566.
784 <https://doi.org/10.1136/bcr-2013-008566>.
- 785 [104] D. Pickel, G.P. Manucy, D.B. Walker, S.B. Hall, J.C. Walker, Evidence for canine
786 olfactory detection of melanoma, *Appl Anim Behav Sci*. 89 (2004) 107–116.
787 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.applanim.2004.04.008>.
- 788 [105] G. Horvath, G.A.K. Järverud, S. Järverud, I. Horváth, Human ovarian carcinomas
789 detected by specific odor, *Integr Cancer Ther*. 7 (2008) 76–80.
790 <https://doi.org/10.1177/1534735408319058>.
- 791 [106] G. Horvath, H. Andersson, G. Paulsson, Characteristic odour in the blood reveals
792 ovarian carcinoma, *BMC Cancer*. 10 (2010) 1–6. [https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2407-10-](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2407-10-643)
793 [643](https://doi.org/10.1186/1471-2407-10-643).
- 794 [107] J.N. Cornu, G. Cancel-Tassin, V. Ondet, C. Girardet, O. Cussenot, Olfactory detection
795 of prostate cancer by dogs sniffing urine: A step forward in early diagnosis, *Eur Urol*.
796 59 (2011) 197–201. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.eururo.2010.10.006>.
- 797 [108] R. Ehmann, E. Boedeker, U. Friedrich, J. Sagert, J. Dippon, G. Friedel, T. Walles,
798 Canine scent detection in the diagnosis of lung cancer: Revisiting a puzzling
799 phenomenon, *European Respiratory Journal*. 39 (2012) 669–676.
800 <https://doi.org/10.1183/09031936.00051711>.
- 801 [109] C.M. Willis, L.E. Britton, R. Harris, J. Wallace, C.M. Guest, Volatile organic
802 compounds as biomarkers of bladder cancer: Sensitivity and specificity using trained
803 sniffer dogs, *Cancer Biomarkers*. 8 (2010) 145–153. [https://doi.org/10.3233/CBM-](https://doi.org/10.3233/CBM-2011-0208)
804 [2011-0208](https://doi.org/10.3233/CBM-2011-0208).
- 805 [110] B. Buszewski, T. Ligor, T. Jezierski, A. Wenda-Piesik, M. Walczak, J. Rudnicka,
806 Identification of volatile lung cancer markers by gas chromatography-mass
807 spectrometry: Comparison with discrimination by canines, *Anal Bioanal Chem*. 404
808 (2012) 141–146. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00216-012-6102-8>.
- 809 [111] M. Walczak, T. Jezierski, A. Górecka-Bruzda, M. Sobczyńska, J. Ensminger, Impact of
810 individual training parameters and manner of taking breath odor samples on the
811 reliability of canines as cancer screeners, *Journal of Veterinary Behavior: Clinical*
812 *Applications and Research*. 7 (2012) 283–294.
813 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jveb.2012.01.001>.
- 814 [112] T. Amundsen, S. Sundstrom, T. Buvik, O.A. Gederaas, R. Haaverstad, Can dogs smell
815 lung cancer? First study using exhaled breath and urine screening in unselected patients
816 with suspected lung cancer, *Acta Oncol (Madr)*. 53 (2014) 307–315.
817 <https://doi.org/10.3109/0284186X.2013.819996>.
- 818 [113] J. Rudnicka, M. Walczak, T. Kowalkowski, T. Jezierski, B. Buszewski, Determination
819 of volatile organic compounds as potential markers of lung cancer by gas
820 chromatography-mass spectrometry versus trained dogs, *Sens Actuators B Chem*. 202
821 (2014) 615–621. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.snb.2014.06.006>.

- 822 [114] U. Yoel, J. Gopas, J. Ozer, R. Peleg, P. Shvartzman, Canine scent detection of volatile
823 elements, characteristic of malignant cells, in cell cultures, *Israel Medical Association*
824 *Journal*. 17 (2015) 567–570.
- 825 [115] G. Taverna, L. Tidu, F. Grizzi, V. Torri, A. Mandressi, P. Sardella, G. la Torre, G.
826 Coccione, M. Seveso, G. Giusti, R. Hurler, A. Santoro, P. Graziotti, Olfactory system
827 of highly trained dogs detects prostate cancer in urine samples, *Journal of Urology*. 193
828 (2015) 1382–1387. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.juro.2014.09.099>.
- 829 [116] M. Murarka, Z.I. Vesley-Gross, J.L. Essler, P.G. Smith, J. Hooda, R. Drapkin, C.M.
830 Otto, Testing ovarian cancer cell lines to train dogs to detect ovarian cancer from blood
831 plasma: A pilot study, *Journal of Veterinary Behavior*. 32 (2019) 42–48.
832 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jveb.2019.04.010>.
- 833 [117] A. Thuleau, C. Gilbert, P. Bauër, S. Alran, V. Fourchette, E. Guillot, A. Vincent-
834 Salomon, J.-C. Kerihuel, J. Dugay, V. Semetey, I. Kriegel, I. Fromantin, A New
835 Transcutaneous Method for Breast Cancer Detection with Dogs, *Oncology*. 96 (2019)
836 110–113. <https://doi.org/10.1159/000492895>.
- 837 [118] J.L. Essler, C. Wilson, A.C. Verta, R. Feuer, C.M. Otto, Differences in the Search
838 Behavior of Cancer Detection Dogs Trained to Have Either a Sit or Stand-Stare Final
839 Response, *Front Vet Sci*. 7 (2020) 118. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fvets.2020.00118>.
- 840 [119] N. Kybert, K. Prokop-Prigge, C.M. Otto, L. Ramirez, E. Joffe, J. Tanyi, J. Piltz-
841 Seymour, A.T.C. Johnson, G. Preti, Exploring ovarian cancer screening using a
842 combined sensor approach: A pilot study, *AIP Adv*. 10 (2020) 35213.
843 <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5144532>.
- 844 [120] G.A.A. Schoon, D. de Jonge, P. Hilverink, How dogs learn to detect colon cancer—
845 Optimizing the use of training aids, *Journal of Veterinary Behavior*. 35 (2020) 38–44.
846 <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jveb.2019.10.006>.
- 847 [121] C. Guest, R. Harris, K.S. Sfanos, E. Shrestha, A.W. Partin, B. Trock, L. Mangold, R.
848 Bader, A. Kozak, S. McLean, J. Simons, H. Soule, T. Johnson, W.Y. Lee, Q. Gao, S.
849 Aziz, P.M. Stathatou, S. Thaler, S. Foster, A. Mershin, Feasibility of integrating canine
850 olfaction with chemical and microbial profiling of urine to detect lethal prostate cancer,
851 *PLoS One*. 16 (2021) e0245530. <https://doi.org/10.1371/journal.pone.0245530>.
- 852 [122] S. Kure, S. Iida, M. Yamada, H. Takei, N. Yamashita, Y. Sato, M. Miyashita, Breast
853 Cancer Detection from a Urine Sample by Dog Sniffing: A Preliminary Study for the
854 Development of a New Screening Device, and a Literature Review, *Biology*. 10 (2021)
855 517. <https://doi.org/10.3390/BIOLOGY10060517>.
- 856 [123] P. Riedlova, S. Tavandzis, J. Kana, M. Tobiasova, I. Jasickova, J. Roubec,
857 Olfactometric diagnosis of lung cancer by canine scent – A double-blinded study,
858 *Complement Ther Med*. 64 (2022) 102800.
859 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.CTIM.2022.102800>.
- 860 [124] C. Feil, F. Staib, M.R. Berger, T. Stein, I. Schmidtman, A. Forster, C.C. Schimanski,
861 Sniffer dogs can identify lung cancer patients from breath and urine samples, *BMC*
862 *Cancer*. 21 (2021) 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1186/S12885-021-08651-5>.
- 863 [125] Y. Oh, Y. Lee, J. Heath, M. Kim, Applications of animal biosensors: A review, *IEEE*
864 *Sens J*. 15 (2014) 637–645. <https://doi.org/10.1109/JSEN.2014.2358261>.

- 865 [126] R.A. Rescorla, Behavioral studies of Pavlovian conditioning., *Annu Rev Neurosci.* 11
866 (1988) 329–352. <https://doi.org/10.1146/ANNUREV.NE.11.030188.001553>.
- 867 [127] M.E. Bitterman, R. Menzel, A. Fietz, S. Schäfer, Classical conditioning of proboscis
868 extension in honeybees (*Apis mellifera*)., *J Comp Psychol.* 97 (1983) 107–119.
869 <https://doi.org/10.1037/0735-7036.97.2.107>.
- 870 [128] Y. Matsumoto, R. Menzel, J.C. Sandoz, M. Giurfa, Revisiting olfactory classical
871 conditioning of the proboscis extension response in honey bees: A step toward
872 standardized procedures, *J Neurosci Methods.* 211 (2012) 159–167.
873 <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.JNEUMETH.2012.08.018>.
- 874 [129] S.J. Schapiro, M.A. Bloomsmith, G.E. Laule, Positive Reinforcement Training As a
875 Technique to Alter Nonhuman Primate Behavior: Quantitative Assessments of
876 Effectiveness, Http://Dx.Doi.Org/10.1207/S15327604JAWS0603_03. 6 (2010) 175–
877 187. https://doi.org/10.1207/S15327604JAWS0603_03.
- 878 [130] B.A. Iwata, Negative reinforcement in applied behavior analysis: an emerging
879 technology, *J Appl Behav Anal.* 20 (1987) 361–378.
880 <https://doi.org/10.1901/JABA.1987.20-361>.
- 881 [131] J. Todrank, G. Heth, Odor-genes covariance and genetic relatedness assessments:
882 rethinking odor-based ““recognition”” mechanisms in rodents., in: *Adv Study Behav*,
883 2003: pp. 77–130.
- 884 [132] D. Schneider, Electrophysiological investigation on the antennal receptors of the silk
885 moth during chemical and mechanical stimulation, *Experientia* 1957 13:2. 13 (1957)
886 89–91. <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF02160110>.
- 887 [133] B. Weissbecker, J.J.A. van Loon, M.A. Posthumus, H.J. Bouwmeester, M. Dicke,
888 IDENTIFICATION OF VOLATILE POTATO SESQUITERPENOIDS AND THEIR
889 OLFACTORY DETECTION BY THE TWO-SPOTTED STINKBUG *Perillus*
890 *bioculatus*, *J Chem Ecol.* 26 (2000).
- 891 [134] C. Grienberger, A. Konnerth, Imaging Calcium in Neurons, *Neuron.* 73 (2012) 862–
892 885. <https://doi.org/10.1016/J.NEURON.2012.02.011>.

893

894

895

896 **SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL:**

897

898 *Table S1: List of studies that examined the ability of dogs to discriminate cancer odors, including details on dog breed, sex, age, training duration, previous experience, cancer type, sample type,*

899 *and the main results of each study.*

Study type	Authors	Year of publication	Cancer type	Number of dogs tested	Breed	Sex	Age	Length of time trained	Previous experience	Odor samples	Sensitivity for each dog	Specificity for each dog	Global detection sensitivity (%)	Global detection specificity (%)
Case reports	[47]	1989	Melanoma	1	Border collie and Doberman	NA	NA		Naive	Skin lesion				
	[48]	2001	Melanoma	1	Labrador retriever	Male	NA		Naive	Skin lesion				
	[103]	2013	Melanoma	1	Alsatian	Female	NA		Naive	Skin lesion				
Prospective study	[104]	2004	Melanoma	2	Standard schnauzer	Male	4 years		Different distinctions. Served 2.5 years in police; certified bomb-detection dog; served in research efforts by the US Department of Defense	Tissue	NA	NA	86%	
					Golden retriever	Female	6 years		Different distinctions				75%	
	[77]	2004	Bladder cancer	6	Mixed breed	Male	6 years	7 months	Obedience	Urine	11%	NA	41%	NA
					Labrador retrievers	Female	7 years				33%			
					Cocker spaniel	Male	1.5 years				55.50%			
Female	2 years	55.50%												

					Female	5 years					44%			
					Female	7 years					44%			
[81]	2006	Breast cancer and lung cancer	5	Labrador retriever	Male	7–18 months	2–3 weeks	Recruited dogs were screened for their level of eagerness to sniff objects and respond to commands	Exhaled breath	NA	NA	Lung cancer: 99% Breast cancer: 88%	Lung cancer: 99% Breast cancer: 98%	
				Labrador retriever	Male									
				Labrador retriever	Female									
				Portuguese water dog	Male									
				Portuguese water dog	Female									
[78]	2008	Breast cancer	6	Aussie cocker mix	Male	2 years	12–14 months	NA	Urine	28%	NA	20.5%	NA	
				Collie mix	Females	8 years		NA		28%				
				German shepherd		4 years		Tracking, agility, obedience		22%				
				Rhodesian ridgeback		5 years		Agility, obedience, rally		28%				
				Boxer		6.5 years		Agility, obedience, rally		17%				
				Italian greyhound	Male	5 years		Agility		11%				
		Prostate cancer	4	Chihuahua mix	Females	4 years		Service: therapy		6%				
				Miniature goldendoodle		2.5 years		Service: therapy		15%				
				Pembroke Welsh corgi		6 years		Therapy: obedience		22%				
				Border collie		2 years		NA		28%				
[105]	2008	Ovarian cancer	1	Giant schnauzer	NA	4 years	12 months		Human sample tumor bank	100%	100%	100%	97.5%	
[106]	2010	Ovarian	2	Giant	Females	7 years	9 months	Trained to	Blood and			Blood:	Blood: 98%	

			cancer		schnauzer				detect ovarian carcinoma	tissue test			100%	
					Giant schnauzer		3 years	9 months	Naive				Tissue: 100%	Tissue: 95%
[107]	2011		Prostate cancer	1	Belgian Malinois shepherd	NA	NA	16 months	Chosen among young dogs destined for explosives detection training. No previous training	Urine and blood	91%			
[108]	2012		Lung cancer	4	German shepherd	2 Males and 2 Females	2.5-3 years	NA	Family dogs	Exhaled breath	NA	NA	71%	93%
				German shepherd										
				Labrador retriever										
				Australian shepherd										
[82]	2011		Colorectal cancer	1	Labrador retriever	Female	8 years	6 months (November 2008 through June 2009)	Trained for water rescue beginning in 2003 and then began training as a cancer detection dog in 2005	Human watery stool	91%	99%	91%	99%
										Exhaled breath	97%	99%	97%	99%

	[109]	2010	Bladder cancer	4	Cocker spaniel	Males	6 and 8 years	NA	Obedience commands	Urine	NA	NA	57-73%	56-92%
					Springer spaniel	Male	5 years							
					Labrador retriever	Female	6 years							
	[110]	2012	Lung cancer	NA	German shepherd mix	Male	20-22 months		NA	Exhaled breath	NA	NA	82.2%	82.4%
	[111]	2012	Breast and lung cancer, melanoma	6	German shepherd	Males	3 dogs ≥ 20-22 months; 3 dogs ≤ 6 months	NA	Naive	Exhaled breath	NA	NA	79%	78%
				Labrador retriever										
	[83]	2013	Ovarian cancer	2	Giant schnauzer	NA	10 years	2 years		Blood	Series I: 97%; Series II (3 months after chemo): 50%; 6 months after chemo: 60%	Series I: 99%; Series II (3 months after chemo): 96%; 6 months after chemo: 90%	Series I: 97%; Serie II: 70% and 80%	Series I: 99%; Serie II: 95% and 92%
					Giant schnauzer	NA	6 years				Series I: 97%; Series II (3 months after	Series I: 100% Series II (3 months after chemo):		

											chemo): 80%; 6 months after chemo: 100%	94%; 6 months after chemo: 94%		
[112]	2014	Lung cancer	4	Belgian shepherd	Male	8 years		Scent-tracking missing people, environmental pollutants	Exhaled breath, Urine	Exhaled breath: 76%; urine: 66%	Exhaled breath: 33.3%; urine: 41.7%	66–76%	33-41.7%	
				Border collie	Male	4 years		Scent tracking, environmental pollutants						
				Wire-haired dachshund	Male	8 years		Scent tracking						
				Rottweiler	Female	3 years		Scent tracking						
[79]	2014	Prostate cancer	2	Labrador	NA	9 years			Urine	13%	71%	17%	73%	
				Border collie	NA	3 years				25%	75%			
[113]	2014	Lung cancer	2	German shepherd mix	Male	NA	NA	NA	Exhaled breath	NA	NA	86%	28%	
[114]	2015	Breast cancer	2	Belgian shepherd, Groenendael type	Female	5 years	6 months	Detect explosives and identify people who need to be singled out in a group	Cell culture	NA	NA	100%	100%	
				Belgian shepherd, Malinois type	Female	2.5 years								
[115]	2015	Prostate cancer	2	German shepherd	Females	2–3 years	4 months	Explosives detection	Urine	Dog 1: 100% Dog 2: 98.6%	Dog 1: 98.7% Dog 2: 97.6%	98.7–100%	97.6-98.7%	
[64]	2015	Lung cancer	2	Labrador retriever	Female	3 years	8 months	Both dogs had basic obedience training and were experienced in scent	2 lines of cell culture	40%	50%	45%	15%	
				Mixed breed	Male									20%

									discrimination					
[86]	2017	Cervical cancer	1	Beagle	Male	3 years			Trained for drug detection	Human fresh biopsies; smear sample	Smears: 92.78%; Surgical bandages: 96.36%	Smears: 99.1%; Surgical bandages: 99.55%	Smears: 92.78; Surgical bandages: 96.36	Smears: 99.1; Surgical bandages: 99.55
[76]	2019	Lung cancer	3	Beagle 1	NA	2 years	4 weeks	Naive		Blood serum	91%	100%	96.7%	97.5%
				Beagle 2							100%	100%		
				Beagle 3							82%	97%		
[116]	2019	Ovarian cancer	1(4 started training)	German shepherd	Female	33 months	NA	Naive		Cell culture	87.40%			
				German shepherd	Female	12 months								
				Labrador retriever	Male	49 months								
				German shepherd	Female	50 months								
[117]	2019	Breast cancer	2	Belgian shepherd	Males	18 months	5 months	Naive		Skin secretions	100%	100%	90.3%	90.3%
				Belgian shepherd							88.9%	88.9%		
[118]	2020	Ovarian cancer	4	German shepherd	3 Females / 1 Male	2-7 years	NA	NA		Blood plasma	False alarm: 14-41%; hesitated: 7-42%	NA	24-56%	NA
				Labrador retriever										
				English springer spaniel										
[84]	2020	Lung cancer	3	Belgian Malinois	Female	5 years	1 year	NA		Urine	First trial 45%; second trial 55%	First trial 89%; second trial 91%	54.60%	90.30%
				Belgian Malinois	Female	3 years					First trial 55%; second trial 36%	First trial 91%; second trial 87%		

					Mixed breed	Female	3 years				first trial 73%; second trial 64%	First trial 91%; second trial 93%		
[119]	2020	Ovarian cancer	3	English springer spaniel	NA	12–20 months	6 months	NA	Blood plasma	95.1%	NA	95.70%	NA	
				German shepherd						98.7%				
				Labrador retriever, yellow						93.3%				
[120]	2020	Colorectal cancer	8	Nova Scotia duck tolling retriever	Female	2 years	NA	Privately owned	Stool	74%	94%	82%	92%	
				Labrador × golden retriever	Female	2 years		Rejected as guide dog		88%	91%			
				English cocker spaniel	Female	1 years		Working dog line		88%	87%			
				English cocker spaniel	Female	1 years		Working dog line		79%	90%			
				Labrador × golden retriever	Female	2 years		Rejected as guide dog		83%	90%			
				Labrador × golden retriever	Female	1 years		Rejected as guide dog		80%	91%			
				English cocker spaniel	Male	1 years		Working dog line		80%	95%			
				Belgian Malinois	Female			Working dog line		84%	96%			
[121]	2021	Prostate cancer	2	Labrador retriever	Female	4 years	3 years	NA	Urine	71.4%	76.2%	71.4%	73%	
				Wire-haired Hungarian Vizsla	Female	7 years				71.4%	70.0%			
[122]	2021	Breast cancer	1	Labrador retriever	Female	9 years	12 months	Water rescue dog, and then, because of her	Urine	100%	100%			

									high ability of sniffing out and eagerness, she was recruited to have a cancer detection training					
[123]	2022	Lung cancer	2	Labrador retriever		4 years	21 months	Naive	Blood, Exhaled breath	blood: 69% breath: 62%	blood: 67% breath: 71%			
				Australian cattle dog		5 years	15 months	Naive		blood: 62% breath: 75%	blood: 97% breath: 90%			
[124]	2021	Lung cancer	1	Golden retriever		7 years	1 year	Raised to discriminate different smells e.g., chamomile tea, cinnamon, or coffee	Exhaled breath	78%				
									Urine	87.80%				

901 **Table S2:** List of studies that examined the ability of rodents and invertebrates to discriminate cancer odors, including details on cancer type, animal type, sex, and age, training type and duration,
 902 odor source, and the main results of each study.

Animal	Authors	Year of publication	Cancer type	Sex	Age (weeks)	Number of animals tested	Training	Training duration	Odor samples	Success or p-value	
Mouse	[53]	2010	Lung	Males		6	Y training maze with water recompense	14 days	Mouse urine	Discrimination success > 80%	
				Female		1					
	[58]	2017	Bladder	Males	3 weeks		23	Y-maze behavioral assay with water recompense	1–2 days	Human urine	100%
	[75]	2020	Melanoma	Females	9 weeks	11	Spontaneous preference/avoidance in the open files and Y-maze tests	few days	Mouse urine	Non-significant preference for conspecifics with melanoma	
				Males		15					
				Females		20	Trained mice tested in Y maze with treats as a recompense				P < 0.01 spontaneous from conspecifics with melanoma
				Males		20					
	[60]	2022	Lung	Females	12 weeks	18	Spontaneous preference/avoidance in Y-maze tests	10 min test	Soiled mouse bedding	Non-significant preference for conspecifics with melanoma	
Males				12 weeks	11–16	Habituation/generalization tests	21 min test	Soiled mouse bedding	p < 0.01; mice discriminate cancerous mice at early and late stages of cancer development		

Rats	[61]	2021	Lung	Males	4 weeks	12	Trained rats tested to discrimination reinforcement / reward / punishment	30 min once a day	Exhaled breath	Sensitivity: 82%; Specificity: 81%
<i>Drosophila melanogaster</i>	[62]	2014	Breast	Females	1–5 days old	NA	Calcium imagery	A few minutes	Cell culture	Significant difference
Honeybee (<i>Apis mellifera</i>)	[64]	2015	Lung	Females	NA	20 in total, 14 tested	Test of proboscis extension (PER)	1 h	Cell culture	No discrimination (p = 0.062)
Ant (<i>Formica fusca</i>)	[65]	2022	Ovarian and breast	Females (foragers)	A few days	36	Conditioning test with reward sugar solution + memory tests	A few minutes	Cell culture	Discrimination between healthy and cancerous, but not between two cell culture lines
Nematode (<i>Caenorhabditis elegans</i>)	[66]	2015	Colorectal, gastric, breast			50–100	Preference tests in Petri dish with one stimulus (healthy or cancerous) on each side	A few minutes	Cell culture, tissue, blood, urine	Sensitivity: 95.8%; Specificity: 95.00%
	[67]	2019	Colorectal, gastric			50–100			Urine	61.1–82.1%
	[68]	2019	Pancreatic		Young adults	50			Mouse urine	Sensitivity: 71.40%; Specificity: 83.30%

	2020			50			
[69]		Gastrointestinal				Urine, blood	80–90%
	2021						
[72]		Pancreatic		50–100		Urine	Sensitivity: 84.6%; Specificity: 60%
	2021	Breast, esophageal, gastric, colon, gallbladder, bile duct, pancreatic, malignant lymphoma, acute myeloid leukemia		100			
[71]						Urine	Sensitivity: 87.50%; Specificity: 90.20%
	2021						
[70]		Pancreatic cancer		50–100		Blood, urine	P < 0.001

775 **Experimental setups:**

776

777 **I) Conditioning training**

778

779 Two types of conditioning training can be used in animals: classical conditioning and operant
780 conditioning [125].

781 • **Classical conditioning**

782 Classical conditioning, which is based on the Pavlov reflex, implies that certain stimuli
783 automatically provoke certain responses [126]. The first step in classical conditioning is to associate a
784 neutral stimulus that initially has no effect on the animal—for example, the smell of a cancerous
785 individual—with an unconditioned stimulus, such as sugar, which provokes an unconditioned
786 response. As the neutral stimulus is closely followed by an unconditioned stimulus that naturally
787 triggers an unconditioned response, the neutral stimulus is associated with an unconditioned stimulus,
788 so that the association between the two becomes stronger and the unconditioned response develops.
789 Based on Pavlov's principle, procedures have been adapted to insects that are more commonly called
790 differential conditioning of the proboscis extension response (PER) [127,128].

791 • **Operant conditioning**

792 The other type of learning is operant conditioning, which refers to the fact that a behavior can be
793 controlled by its consequence (reward, called reinforcement, or punishment). The animal's behavioral
794 response to a stimulus will be followed by a reinforcement, i.e., the response has a favorable result
795 such as food [129]. In the case of negative reinforcement, the animal will be subjected to an aversive
796 stimulus such as an electric shock, or bitter or unpleasant food [130]. This learning technique is used
797 to train dogs and rats, and for some studies on mice. With conditioning, two parameters are calculated
798 to evaluate detection capacity—sensitivity and specificity.

799

800 **II) Behavioral tests**

801 • **Habituation/ generalization tests**

802

803 The concept of these tests is to habituate an individual to an odor for a given period of time and
804 then present him two new odors; it is assumed that the odor to which the organism will go more is the
805 one that is more different [131].

806

807 • **Preference tests / choice tests**

808 The choice tests take place in a Y-shaped enclosure or another container such as a Petri dish for
809 small organisms. These containers allow the individual to move towards one of the two stimuli
810 presented, which are placed at each end of the olfactometer branch or on opposite sides of the Petri
811 dish. The time spent in each position indicates the preferred stimulus.

812

775 **III) Electrophysiology test**

776

777 The last type of test used to determine whether animals can detect cancer consists of analyzing the
778 neuronal response of an insect's antenna to an odorant stimulus. For these tests, insects must be killed
779 before antennae are removed from the animal to perform the experiments.

780

781 • **Electroantennography (EAG)**

782 Electroantennographie (EAG) is a bioassay widely used in experimental entomology for the
783 detection of volatile compounds. This technique consists of analyzing what the insect's antennal
784 olfactory receptor detects. A neurological response recorded from the antenna indicates whether the
785 compound is detected by the organism. For this purpose, the antenna of an insect is connected to two
786 electrodes. The antennae are exposed to an odor (a single compound or mixture of volatile
787 components) and the electric response of the antenna is recorded by the electrodes via an amplifier
788 [132,133]. This technique has never been used to determine whether an insect is able to detect the
789 smell of a cancerous individual.

790

791 • **Calcium imaging**

792 This technique allows an even finer level of detection compared to EAG. It consists in visualizing
793 the activated areas of the olfactory lobes of an insect during olfactory perception [134].

794

795