Computer-aided prognosis: Predicting patient and disease outcome via quantitative fusion of multi-scale, multi-modal data
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**A B S T R A C T**

Computer-aided prognosis (CAP) is a new and exciting complement to the field of computer-aided diagnosis (CAD) and involves developing and applying computerized image analysis and multi-modal data fusion algorithms to digitized patient data (e.g. imaging, tissue, genomic) for helping physicians predict disease outcome and patient survival. While a number of data channels, ranging from the macro (e.g. MRI) to the nano-scales (proteins, genes) are now being routinely acquired for disease characterization, one of the challenges in predicting patient outcome and treatment response has been in our inability to quantitatively fuse these disparate, heterogeneous data sources. At the Laboratory for Computational Imaging and Bioinformatics (LCIB) at Rutgers University, our team has been developing computerized algorithms for high dimensional data and image analysis for predicting disease outcome from multiple modalities including MRI, digital pathology, and protein expression. Additionally, we have been developing novel data fusion algorithms based on non-linear dimensionality reduction methods (such as Graph Embedding) to quantitatively integrate information from multiple data sources and modalities with the overarching goal of optimizing meta-classifiers for making prognostic predictions. In this paper, we briefly describe 4 representative and ongoing CAP projects at LCIB. These projects include (1) an Image-based Risk Score (iBRS) algorithm for predicting outcome of Estrogen receptor positive breast cancer patients based on quantitative image analysis of digitized breast cancer biopsy specimens alone, (2) segmenting and determining extent of lymphocytic infiltration (identified as a possible prognostic marker for outcome in human epidermal growth factor amplified breast cancers) from digitized histopathology, (3) distinguishing patients with different Gleason grades of prostate cancer (grade being known to be correlated to outcome) from digitized needle biopsy specimens, and (4) integrating protein expression measurements obtained from mass spectrometry with quantitative image features derived from digitized histopathology for distinguishing between prostate cancer patients at low and high risk of disease recurrence following radical prostatectomy.

© 2011 Elsevier Ltd. All rights reserved.

1. Introduction

Most researchers agree that cancer is a complex disease which we do not yet fully understand. Predictive, preventive, and personalized medicine (PPM) has the potential to transform clinical practice by decreasing morbidity due to diseases such as cancer by integrating multi-scale, multi-modal, and heterogeneous data to determine the probability of an individual contracting certain diseases and/or responding to a specific treatment regimen [3]. In the clinic, the same treatment applied to two patients with diseases that look very similar often have vastly different outcomes under the same treatment [4,5]. A part of this difference is undoubtedly patient specific, but a part must also be a result of our limited understanding of the relationship between disease progression and clinical presentation.

1.1. Need for quantitative data fusion in personalized medicine

An understanding of the interplays of different hierarchies of biological information from proteins, tissue, metabolites, and imaging will provide conceptual insights and practical innovations that will profoundly transform people's lives [3,5,6]. There is a consensus among clinicians and researchers that a more quantitative approach, using computerized imaging techniques to better understand tumor morphology, combined with the classification of disease into more meaningful molecular subtypes, will lead to better patient care and more effective therapeutics [5,7,8]. With the advent of digital pathology [3,6,9], multi-functional imaging, mass spectrometry, immuno-histochemical, and fluorescent
in situ hybridization (FISH) techniques, the acquisition of multiple, orthogonal sources of genomic, proteomic, multi-parametric radiological, and histological information for disease characterization is becoming routine at several institutions [10,11]. Computerized image analysis and high dimensional data fusion methods will likely constitute an important piece of the diagnostic tool-set to enable physicians to predict which patients may be susceptible to a particular disease and also for predicting disease outcome and survival. These tools will also have important implications in theranostics [12–14], the ability to predict how an individual may react to various treatments, thereby (1) providing guidance for developing customized therapeutic drugs and (2) enabling development of preventive treatments for individuals based on their potential health problems. A theragnostic profile that is a synthesis of various biomarker and imaging tests from different levels of the biological hierarchy (genomic, proteomic, metabolic) could be used to characterize an individual patient and her/his drug treatment outcome.

1.2. Challenges to fusion of imaging and non-imaging biological data

If multiple sensors or sources are used in the inference process, in principle, they could be fused at one of 3 levels in the hierarchy; (1) raw data-level fusion, (2) feature-level fusion, or (3) decision-level fusion [15,16]. Several classifier ensemble or multiple classifier schemes have been recently proposed to associate and correlate data at the decision-level (combination of decisions (COD)) [17–24]; a much easier task compared to data integration at the raw-data or feature level (combination of features (COF)). Traditional decision fusion based approaches have focused on combining either binary decisions \( y_2(c) \in \{+1,-1\} \), or probabilistic classifier outputs \( p_{2}(c) \) obtained via classification of each of the \( k \) individual data sources \( f_{2}(c) \), \( \alpha \in \{1,2,\ldots,k\} \), via a Bayesian framework [25], Dempster–Shafer evidence theory [26], fuzzy set theory, or via classical decision ensembles schemes, e.g. Adaboost [19], Support Vector Machines (SVM) [18], or Bagging [17]. At a given data scale (e.g. radiological images such as MRI and CT), several researchers [27–35] have developed techniques for combining imaging data sources (assuming the registration problem has been solved) by simply concatenating the individual image modality attributes \( f_{MRI}(c) \) and \( f_{CT}(c) \) at every spatial location \( c \) to create a combined feature vector \( f_{MER}(c), f_{CT}(c) \) which can be input to a classifier. However when the individual modalities are heterogeneous (image and non-image based) and of different dimensions, e.g. a 256 dimensional vectorial spectral signal \( f_{MER}(c) \) and a scalar image intensity value \( f_{MRI}(c), f_{CT}(c) \), a simple concatenation \( \{f_{MRI}(c), f_{MER}(c)\} \) will not provide a meaningful data fusion solution. Thus, a significant challenge in integrating heterogeneous imaging and non-imaging biological data has been the lack of a quantifiable knowledge representation framework to reconcile cross-modal, cross-dimensional differences in feature values.

While no general theory yet exists for domain data fusion, most researchers agree that heterogeneous data needs be represented in a way that will allow for confrontation of the different channels, an important prerequisite to fusion or classification. Bruno et al. [36] recently designed a multimodal dissimilarity space for retrieval of video documents. Lanckriet et al. [37] and Lewis et al. [38] both presented kernel based frameworks for representing heterogeneous data relating to protein sequences and then used the data representation in conjunction with a SVM classifier [18] for protein structure prediction. Mandic et al. [39] recently proposed a sequential data fusion approach for combining wind measurements via the representation of directional signals within the field of complex numbers. Coppock and Mazlack [40] extended Gower’s metric [41] for nominal and ordinal data integration within an agglomerative hierarchical clustering algorithm to cluster mixed data.

In spite of the challenges, data fusion at the feature level aims at retrieving the interesting characteristics of the phenomenon being studied [39]. Kernel-based formulations have been used in combining multiple related datasets (such as gene expression, protein sequence, and protein–protein interaction data) for function prediction in yeast [37] as well as for heterogeneous data fusion for studying Alzheimer’s disease [42]. However the selection and tuning of the kernels used in multi-kernel learning (MKL) play an important role in the performance of the approach. This selection proves to be non-trivial when considering completely heterogeneous, multi-scale data such as molecular protein-, and gene-expression signatures and imaging and metabolic phenotypes. Additionally these methods typically employ the same kernel or metric, across modalities, for estimating object similarity. Thus while the Euclidean kernel might be appropriate for image intensities, it might not be appropriate for all feature spaces (e.g. time series spectra or gene expression vectors) [43].

1.3. Use of non-linear dimensionality reduction methods for uniformly representing multi-modal data

Recently, approaches involving the use of dimensionality reduction (DR) methods for representing high dimensional data in terms of embedding vectors in a reduced dimensional space have been proposed. Applications have included the fusion of heterogeneous dimensional data (e.g. scalar imaging (MRI) and vectorial information (e.g. magnetic resonance spectroscopy (MRS))) [44–46] by attempting to reduce the dimensionality of the higher dimensional data source to that of the lower dimensional modality via principal component analysis (PCA), independent component analysis (ICA), or a linear combination model (LCM) [47]. However, these strategies often lead to non-optimal fusion solutions due to (a) use of linear DR schemes, (b) dimensionality reduction of only the non-imaging data channel and (c) large scaling differences between the different modalities. Yu and Tresp proposed a generalized PCA model for representing real-world image painting data [48]. Recently, manifold learning (ML) methods such as isometric mapping (Isomap) [49] and locally linear embedding (LLE) [50] have become popular for mapping high dimensional information into a low dimensional representation for the purpose of visualization or classification. While these non-linear DR (NLDR) methods enjoy advantages compared to traditional linear DR methods such as PCA [51] and LCM [52] in that they are able to discover non-linear relationships in the data [53,54], they are notoriously susceptible to the choice of optimal embedding parameters [49,50].

Researchers have since been developing novel methods for overcoming the difficulties in obtaining an appropriate manifold representation of the data. Samko et al. [55] has developed an estimator for optimal neighborhood size for Isomap. However, in cases of varying neighborhood densities, an optimal neighborhood size may not exist on a global scale. Others have developed adaptive methods that select neighbors based on additional constraints such as local tangents [56,57], intrinsic dimensionality [58], and estimating geodesic distances within a neighborhood [59]. The additional constraints in these adaptive methods aim to create a graph that does not contain spurious neighbors, but the use of additional constraints leaves the user with an additional degree of freedom to define when creating a manifold.

Along with other groups [60–62], the Rutgers Laboratory for Computational Imaging and Bioinformatics (LCIB) group has been working on developing NLDR schemes that have been shown to be more resistant to some of the failings of LLE [50] and Isomap [49]. C-Embed is a consensus NLDR scheme that [54,63–65] combines multiple low dimensional multi-dimensional projections of the data to obtain a more robust low dimensional data representation, one which is not sensitive to careful selection of the neighborhood
parameter \( k \), unlike LLE and Isomap. These schemes [11,63,65–69] allow for non-linearly transforming each of the \( k \) individual high dimensional homogeneous modalities into the common format of low dimensional embedding vectors thereby enabling direct, data-level fusion of structural, functional, metabolic, architectural, genomic, and proteomic information in the original space while overcoming the differences in scale, size, and dimensionality of individual feature spaces. This integrated representation of multiple modalities in the transformed space can be used to train meta-classifiers for studying and predicting biological activity.

1.4. Need to identify markers of aggressive disease

While a diagnostic marker identifies diseased from normal tissue, a prognostic marker identifies subgroups of patients associated with different disease outcomes. With increasing early detection of diseases via improved diagnostic imaging methodologies [21,64,65,69–73], it has become important to predict biologic behaviors and disease “aggressiveness”. Clinically applicable prognostic markers are urgently needed to assist in the selection of optimal therapy. In the context of prostate cancer (PCa), well established prognostic markers include histologic grade, prostate specific antigen (PSA), margin positivity, pathologic stage, intraglandular tumor extent, and DNA ploidy [74–76]. Other recently promising prognostic indicators include tumor suppressor gene p53, cell proliferation marker Ki-67, Oncogenetiq 519, microsatellite instability, angiogenesis and tumor vascularity (TVC), vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF), and E-cadherin [76,77]. None of these factors, however, have individually proven to be accurate enough to serve routinely as a prognostic marker [77,78]. The problem is that men with early detected PCa have in 50% of cases [79], and in some cases 80% [80], a homogeneous pattern with respect to most standard prognostic variables (PSA < 10, T1c, Gleason score < 7). In this growing group of patients, the traditional markers seem to lose their efficacy and the subsequent therapy decision is complicated. Gao et al. [81] suggest that only a combination of multiple prognostic markers will prove superior to any individual marker. Graefen et al. [82] and Stephenson et al. [83–85] have suggested that better prognostic accuracy can be obtained by a combination of the individual markers via a machine classifier like an artificial neural network.

1.5. Graph based features to characterize spatial arrangement of nuclear structures

Graphs are effective techniques to represent spatial arrangement of structures by defining a large set of topological features. These features are quantified by definition of computable metrics. The use of spatial-relation features for quantifying cellular arrangement was proposed in the early 1990s [86,87], but did not find application to biomedical imagery until recently [88–94]. However, with recent evidence demonstrating that for certain classes of tumors, tumor–host interactions correlate with clinical outcome [95], graph algorithms clearly have a role to play in modeling the tumor–host network and hence in predicting disease outcome.

Table 1 lists common spatial, graph based features that one can extract from the Voronoi Diagram (VD), Delaunay Triangulation (DT), and the Minimum Spanning Tree (MST) [96–98]. Additionally a number of features based off nuclear statistics can be similarly extracted. Using the nuclear centroids in a tissue region (Fig. 1(a) as vertices, the DT graph (Fig. 1(b)), a unique triangulation of the centroids, and the MST (Fig. 1(c)), a graph that connects all centroids with the minimum possible graph length, can be constructed. These features quantify important biological information, such as the proliferation and structural arrangement of the cells in the tissue, which is closely tied to cancerous activity. Our hypothesis is that the genetic descriptors that define clinically relevant classes of cancer are reflected in the visual characteristics of the cellular morphology and tissue architecture, and that these characteristics can be measured by image analysis techniques. We believe that image-based classifiers of disease developed via comprehensive analysis of quantitative image-based information present in tissue histology will have strong correlation with gene-expression based prognostic classification.

1.6. Ongoing Projects at the Laboratory for Computational Imaging and Bioinformatics (LCIB)

At LCIB in Rutgers University, we have been developing an array of computerized image analysis and high dimensional data analysis, fusion tools for quantitatively integrating molecular features of a tumor (as measured by gene expression profiling or mass spectrometry) [54,99], results from the imaging of the tumor cellular architecture and microenvironment (as captured in histological imaging) [6,9], the tumor 3-d tissue architecture [100], and its metabolic features (as seen by metabolic or functional imaging modalities such as Magnetic Resonance Spectroscopy (MRS)) [21,64,65,69–73]. In this paper, we briefly describe 4 representative and ongoing projects at LCIB in the context of predicting outcome of breast and prostate cancer patients and involving computerized image, data analysis and fusion of quantitative measurements from digitized histopathology, and protein expression features obtained via mass spectrometry. Preliminary data pertaining to these projects is also presented.

2. Image-based risk score for ER+ breast cancers

The current gold standard for achieving a quantitative and reproducible prognosis in estrogen receptor-positive breast cancers (ER+ BC) is via the Oncotype DX (Genomic Health, Inc.) molecular assay, which produces a Recurrence Score (RS) between 0 and 100, where a high RS corresponds to a poor outcome and vice versa. In [101], we presented Image-based Risk Score (iBrIS), a novel CAP scheme that uses only quantitatively derived information (architectural features derived from spatial arrangement of cancer nuclei) from digitized ER+ BC biopsy specimens (Fig. 1(a)) to help clinicians predict which ER+ BC patients have more aggressive disease and consequently need adjuvant chemotherapy over and above standard hormonal therapy. The hypothesis behind iBrIS is that quantitative image features can be used to implicitly model tumor grade which is known to be correlated with outcome in ER+ BC total of 25 architectural features, derived from the DT and MST graphs are extracted (using the nuclear centers as graph vertices). These features quantify the area and perimeter of triangles in the DT and branch lengths in the MST (Table 1). Graph Embedding [102], a non-parametric NLDR technique, is employed to project the features onto a reduced 3D space while simultaneously preserving object-class relationships. This allows us to observe the discriminability of the architectural features with respect to low and high RS on a smooth, continuous manifold (Fig. 2(a)). The 3D embedding is subsequently unraveled into a normalized 1D iBrIS scale (Fig. 2(b)). With a large enough cohort of annotated data, prognostic thresholds \( \theta_1 \) and \( \theta_2 \) could be learnt and employed for making prognostic predictions of outcome.

The separation between samples with high and low RS (Fig. 2(a)) is reflected quantitatively by the classification accuracy >84% [101] of a SVM classifier. Furthermore, by re-labeling the samples into three classes of low, intermediate, and high RS (Fig. 2(b)) we are able to qualitatively confirm that the variations in phenotype described by the architectural features are truly representative of the underlying differences in genotype that affect disease outcome.
Table 1
A breakdown of 50 architectural features used for quantification of spatial arrangement of nuclei in histopathology images, comprising 25 graph-based and 25 nearest neighbor features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature set</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th># of features</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Voronoi Diagram (VD)</td>
<td>Total area of all polygons, polygon area, polygon perimeter, polygon chord length</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaunay Triangulation (DT)</td>
<td>Triangle side length, triangle area</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum Spanning Tree (MST)</td>
<td>Edge length</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuclear statistics (nearest neighbor)</td>
<td>Density of nuclei, distance to (3, 5, 7) nearest nuclei, nuclei in (10, 20, \ldots, 50) pixel radius</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 1. Nuclear centroids from an \(\alpha\) ER+ BC histopathology image are used to construct associated \(\beta\) Delaunay Triangulation and \(\gamma\) Minimum Spanning Tree graphs. A total of 12 architectural features are extracted from these graphs and used to quantitatively model phenotypic appearance and hence implicitly the grade of ER+ BC biopsy specimen.

3. Lymphocytic infiltration and outcome in HER2+ breast cancers

The identification of phenotypic changes in BC histopathology with respect to corresponding molecular changes is of significant clinical importance in predicting BC outcome. One such example is the presence of lymphocytic infiltration (LI) in BC histopathology, which has been correlated with nodal metastasis and distant recurrence in human epidermal growth factor amplified (HER2+) breast cancers.

In [103,104], we introduced a computerized image analysis system for detecting and grading the extent of LI in a digitized HER2+ BC biopsy image. The methodology comprised a region-growing scheme to automatically segment all nuclei (lymphocytic and non-lymphocytic) within the image. The segmentation was then refined via Maximum a Posteriori estimation, which utilizes (1) size and intensity information to isolate lymphocytic nuclei and (2) Markov Random Fields [9] to separate clusters of LI from the surrounding baseline level of immune response. The centroids of the resulting lymphocytic nuclei are used to construct graphs (VD, DT, MST) and a total of 50 architectural features are extracted from each histopathology image (Table 1). The features are reduced to a 3D embedding space via Graph Embedding. Fig. 3 shows that the low dimensional representation (obtained via Graph Embedding) of HER2+ BC histopathology images from which Voronoi graph based features were derived to quantitatively characterize the extent, pattern, and density of LI (presence of lymphocytic nuclei), results in a smooth curvilinear manifold with a continuous transition from low to intermediate to high levels of LI (levels of LI have been clinically correlated to disease outcome – high levels of LI result in better outcome/survival) [105]. By mapping new samples onto this manifold and based on the location of the sample on the manifold, a prediction of disease outcome could be made. The manifold in the meta-space captures the biological transformation of the disease in its transition from good to poor prognosis cancer. In conjunction with the architectural features, a SVM classifier was able to successfully distinguish samples with different levels of LI extent at >90% classification accuracy [104] (the ground truth for LI extent was identified by an expert clinician as being either high, intermediate, or low for each histology image).

Fig. 2. 37 ER+ histopathology images are plotted in (a) a 3D Graph Embedding space created by reducing the 25 architectural features. The embedding is linearized into (b) the 1D lBRiS scale. Overlaying Recurrence Score labels allows us to identify prognostic thresholds \(\theta_1\) and \(\theta_2\) for distinguishing poor and good outcome ER+ BC’s.
4. Automated Gleason grading on prostate cancer histopathology

PCa is diagnosed in over 200,000 people and causes 27,000 deaths in the US annually. However, the five-year survival rate for patients diagnosed at an early stage of tumor development is very high [106,107]. If PCa is found on a needle biopsy, the tumor is then assigned a Gleason grade (1–5) [6,9]. Gleason grade 1 tissue is highly differentiated and non-infiltrative while grade 5 is poorly differentiated and highly infiltrative. Gleason grading is predominantly based on tissue architecture (spatial arrangement of nuclei and glands) and tumor morphology (shape and size of glands and...
nuclei). As tissue regions transform from (a) benign to malignant, and (b) tumor regions transform from lower to higher grades, the architecture and morphology of the images undergo significant changes: nuclear proliferation and infiltration increase, glands in the prostate tissue become smaller, circular, and uniform, and the overall texture of the tissue is altered. Since Gleason grade is known to be strongly correlated to disease outcome, accurately distinguishing between different Gleason grades is critical for making treatment decisions. While pathologists are able to reliably distinguish between low and high Gleason grades (1 and 5), there is a great deal more inter- and intra-observer variability when it comes to distinguishing intermediate Gleason 3 and 4 patterns (see Fig. 4(a) and (d)).

At LCIB, we have developed a PCA system that employs morphological, architectural (Table 1), and textural features derived from prostate needle biopsy specimens [108] to distinguish intermediate Gleason patterns. These features include information traditionally used in the Gleason grading paradigm (morphology and nuclear density) as well as features not considered by pathologists (such as second-order co-adjacency and global texture features). By employing these features in conjunction with a SVM classifier, we were able to distinguish between 40 samples of Gleason grades 3 and 4 with an accuracy of 96.2%. Fig. 4(g) illustrates these results, where each point on the scatter plot represents a PCA biopsy sample (Gleason grade 3 shown with green circles while Gleason grade 4 samples as blue squares). The distance between any two samples is related to their similarity in the original, high dimensional feature space; samples that cluster together have similar feature values and likely to belong to the same Gleason pattern.

5. Integrated proteomic, histological signatures for predicting prostate cancer recurrence

Following radical prostatectomy (RP), there remains a substantial risk of disease recurrence (estimated at 25–40%) [109]. Studies have identified infiltration beyond the surgical margin, and high Gleason score as possible predictors of prostate cancer recurrence. However, owing to inter-observer variability in Gleason grade determination, cancers identified with the same Gleason grade could have significantly different outcomes [110]. Discovery of a predictive biomarker for outcome following RP would allow for therapeutic intervention if the patient was found to have poor prognosis. Protein expression features of excised prostate tissue may add complementary prognostic information to standard morphologic and architectural features derived from histopathology [111].

In [99], we attempted to integrate morphological and architectural features (Table 1) quantitatively extracted from digitized excised prostate specimens along with protein expression measurements obtained via electrospray mass spectrometry from the dominant tumor nodule; the idea being to develop an integrated prognostic meta-marker for predicting disease recurrence following RP (Fig. 5). To accommodate two widely different modalities (imaging and proteomics), we developed the Generalized Fusion

![Fig. 5. Regions of interest (a, f) identified (segmented glands) by our PPMM + HNCuts [2] scheme (and validated by a pathologist) for extracting a sample of the prostate tumor for mass spectrometry analysis (e, j). An adjacent slice is used to examine the architectural (c, d, h, i) image features (see Table 1) from the prostate. The top row corresponds to a gland from a relapsed patient, and the bottom row corresponds to a relapse-free patient.](image)

![Fig. 6. Preliminary fusion results using the knowledge representation framework to distinguish between a total of 25 progressors (squares) and non-progressors (circles). In (a)-(c), respectively are shown the meta-space embedding results obtained using (a) histological image features alone, (b) peptide features alone, and (c) the fused histo-proteomics feature set.](image)
Framework (GFf) for homogeneously representing each of the data types in a normalized, and dimensionality compatible meta-space representation prior to classification in the fused space.

Greater separation between prostate cancer recurrence (red squares) and non-recurrence (green circles) cases was observed in the combined morphologic, architectural, proteomic space (Fig. 6C) compared to the individual modality spaces (Fig. 6A and B). These results appear to suggest that inclusion of complementary proteomic measurements with traditional Gleason grading-based morphologic and architectural measurements may allow for improved prediction of PCa recurrence following RP.

6. Concluding remarks

In this paper we briefly described some of the primary challenges in the quantitative fusion of multi-scale, multi-modal data for building prognostic meta-classifiers for predicting treatment response and patient outcome. We also described some of the ongoing efforts at the Laboratory for Computational Imaging and Bioinformatics (LCIB) at Rutgers University to address some of these computational challenges in personalized therapy and high-lighted ongoing projects in computer-aided prognosis of breast and prostate cancer. Other groups such as Cooper et al. [112] are applying similar techniques to predicting survival outcome in the context of follicular lymphomas. Further developments in this area will only come about by close and dedicated interactions between computer and imaging scientists, clinicians, onco logists, radiologists, and pathologists.
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