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SUMMARY

Head and neck squamous cell carcinoma (HNSCC) is the 6th most prevalent cancer worldwide, and more than 12,000 deaths from this disease are anticipated in 2015 in the U.S. alone. The advent of the “Big Data” era for biomedicine, through the widespread use of genomic, transcriptomic, and other –omic data acquisition technologies, has enabled deeper exploration of the molecular-level mechanisms behind HNSCC development and progression. This knowledge in turn can lead to earlier diagnosis and better treatment strategies, resulting overall in better patient outcomes. However, the volume and complexity of –omic data present a major obstacle to fully realizing its potential to accelerate and enable basic and translational research for HNSCC.

The goal of this Ph.D. dissertation is to address several key technical challenges related to harnessing –omic data for clinical HNSCC research. These are (1) the lack of knowledge-driven modeling tools and systems for discovering biomarkers at the protein and metabolite levels; (2) the lack of effective strategies for integrating heterogeneous types of –omic data for prediction; and (3) the lack of systems-level representations of biomarker knowledge for effectively predicting responses to bioactive agents. This dissertation addresses these challenges through three specific aims:

1. Knowledge-driven Data Mining: To develop modeling tools to mine –omic datasets in HNSCC for biomarker discovery by harnessing existing knowledge

2. Integrated –Omic Modeling: To develop supervised learning models for predicting HNSCC progression through integration of –omic datasets
3. **System Modeling:** To develop dynamic system models for predicting response to combinations of multi-target agents against HNSCC

The research in this dissertation was completed in collaboration with the Winship Cancer Institute and Georgia Institute of Technology. The models and tools developed have been systematically evaluated and validated using a variety of –omic data types. These results and associated case studies demonstrate the contribution of this work to and its future potential in computational HNSCC research.
CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 Head and Neck Squamous Cell Carcinoma (HNSCC)

Head and neck cancer arises in the upper aerodigestive tract, at regions including the oral cavity, oropharynx, larynx, hypopharynx and tongue, as shown in Figure 1.1. As the vast majority (more than 95%) of head and neck cancers are squamous cell carcinomas [1], hereafter in this dissertation the disease will be referred to as head and neck squamous cell carcinoma (HNSCC).

Figure 1.1: Disease subsites for HNSCC. Figure from National Cancer Institute: http://www.cancer.gov/cancertopics/factsheet/Sites-Types/head-and-neck

1.1.1. Statistics and Epidemiology

HNSCC is the 6th most prevalent cancer globally, with more than 600,000 new cases expected annually [1-4]. In the U.S. in particular, it represents 3% of all cancers, and in 2015 approximately 60,000 new cases and more than 12,000 deaths are expected.
Historically, HNSCC has been associated with alcohol and tobacco usage, and particularly by their use in combination [1, 5]. There is also a high prevalence of the disease in East and Southeast Asia, associated with the popularity of betel (areca) nut chewing [6, 7]. Overall, the disease is most prevalent among males over the age of 60. However, there is a growing subpopulation of HNSCC cases associated with human papillomavirus (HPV) infection. These patients tend to be younger, lack a history of alcohol and tobacco use, and predominantly experience cancer of the oropharynx.

1.1.2. Current Approaches for Treatment and Prevention

HNSCC treatment options include surgery, radiation, chemotherapy, or combinations of these treatments; specific treatment protocols vary based on disease subsite and the stage at which the cancer presents [8]. Many patients with locally advanced (stage III/IV) disease respond favorably to treatments, and reach the so-called No Evidence of Disease (NED) status [9-13]. However, NED patients often later experience recurrence, secondary primary tumor (SPT) development, or metastatic disease. These factors give rise to the poor 5-year survival percentages (near 50%) observed for many HNSCC subsites [14].

1.2. The Role of Big Data: Opportunities and Challenges

The sequencing of the human genome in the previous decade heralded the era of “Big Data” in biomedicine. The concept of Big Data refers not only to the size of datasets being generated, but also to the complexity, quality, and utility of the measured features and to the speed of overall data acquisition. A common shorthand for these characteristics is the “five V’s”: volume, variety, velocity, veracity, and value [15, 16]. The recent
establishment of the Big Data to Knowledge (BD2K) initiative by the National Institutes of Health emphasizes the importance of this direction of research to multiple diseases, including cancers. The fundamental goal of Big Data analysis is to transform raw data, which may be too voluminous and complex for human interpretation, into organized, high-quality information and then into easily understandable knowledge. This is in turn used for decision-making and concrete actions. Figure 1.2 describes this pipeline.

In biomedicine, this pipeline is embodied by the identification of putative biomarkers that can be validated and then applied in clinical practice. Such biomarkers are individual genes, proteins, or other types of measurable characteristics which are associated with the disease state. There are two main reasons why biomarker research is important [17-19]. First, biomarkers may be harnessed for clinically relevant goals such as early detection, diagnosis, or patient stratification. Second, identified molecules may themselves be druggable targets, or they may interact with such targets, and therefore are of interest in pharmaceutical research.

One of the main sources of Big Data in biomedicine are the so-called ‘-omic’ technologies, which are capable of measuring completely, or to a large coverage extent, the genome, epigenome (epigenetic modifications), transcriptome (mRNA transcripts),
proteome (expressed as well as functionally active proteins), metabolome (metabolites, including lipids), and other bio-molecular feature spaces. The availability of these large-scale, high-resolution data has helped to identify molecular expression patterns underlying many diseases, including HNSCC [20-22]. However, harnessing the potential of Big Data for HNSCC is far from complete. Here, I identify three major challenges related to applying –omic data for better understanding of HNSCC characteristics and for translating them into therapeutic strategies.

1.2.1. Genomics and Downstream –Omits: Knowledge-driven Mining for Transcriptomics, Proteomics, and Metabolomics

Cancer is a genetic disease in the sense that the transformation of normal cells to cancer cells is driven by alterations to the genome [23-27]. Great strides have been made in uncovering genomic changes associated with many types of cancers, including HNSCC. In particular, large-scale initiatives by The Cancer Genome Atlas have systematically explored the patterns in mutations, copy number variations, and epigenetic effects associated with HNSCC [28-30]. Validated oncogenes, such as PIK3CA and CCND1, and tumor suppressors, such as TP53 and PTEN, have focused attention on key biological pathways and processes that contribute to the development and progression of HNSCC. The most recent such analysis by TCGA also delineated four different sub-types of HNSCC [30].

However, identifying alterations at the genomic level is insufficient to fully characterize the disease state. Downstream effects of the altered genome propagate through and modify the expression of genes, proteins, and metabolites. The ongoing advancement of sequencing (RNAseq), mass spectrometry, and array-based technologies
Figure 1.3: Comparison of the current number of PubMed hits for alternative –omics technologies in combination with head and neck cancer

provides powerful tools for data acquisition at these –omic levels. However, compared to progress in genomics, HNSCC research in proteomics – and especially in metabolomics – remains at an early stage. For example, Figure 1.3 compares publication counts in PubMed for these areas. One of the reasons is the inherent nature of the data: while genomic and transcriptomic data are completely described by nucleic acid sequences, amino acids describe only protein primary structure. Protein function and activity are determined by higher order structures and a complex network of regulatory interactions. Metabolites also exhibit great structural diversity, and are not encoded in the genome at all. In addition to this, high variation in abundance levels makes measurement and identification – and hence data interpretation – challenging [31]. Another critical reason is the lag in developing appropriate computational tools [32]. However, recent studies have underscored the importance of proteomics and metabolomics in understanding HNSCC development and progression [33-36]. Therefore, a key challenge is to develop
 mathematical models and tools for accelerating the identification of putative HNSCC biomarkers, particularly for proteomic and metabolomic data. And fundamentally, it is of interest to develop knowledge-driven models and tools, which can harness existing biological and biomarker knowledge to facilitate and accelerate data mining.

1.2.2. Integrated –Omics for Predicting Disease Progression

For most HNSCC subsites, there is a large difference in expected outcomes depending on the stage at which the disease is detected [14, 37]. Figure 1.4 shows trends for three subsites. Therefore, understanding the molecular-level changes that accompany disease development and progression could result in biomarkers for early diagnosis and in potential therapeutic targets. Recent modeling studies have investigated the differences between pre-malignant lesions and oral cancer using transcriptomic data [38, 39], and several transcriptomic, proteomic, and metabolomic studies have examined the differences between early and advanced stage HNSCC [34, 40-46]. However, these studies have yielded mixed results overall. Some identified discriminatory features
between early and advanced stage samples, while others did not. Moreover, some models for similar endpoints, using the same data type, identified non-overlapping feature sets.

Therefore, a key challenge in computational HNSCC research is effective data integration. Integration can occur both within and between –omic levels: by combining data of similar types across platforms (e.g., protein expression array and protein expression measured via mass spectrometry), or by combining different types of data (e.g., protein and gene expression data). Within –omic levels, some heterogeneity among datasets is expected due to experimental protocol- and platform-related factors; however, agreement is expected among fundamental putative biomarkers. Between –omic levels (e.g., genes and proteins), greater variation is expected because of the complex regulatory effects involved [47]. Better understanding of the key molecular features at each –omic level can provide insight into how these diverse molecular species collectively drive overall disease progression. Consequently, models which harness multiple types or levels of –omic data could provide better predictive performance and clinical utility.

1.2.3. Combination Strategies for Chemoprevention

Advances in –omic data acquisition and analysis have highlighted the importance of many signaling and metabolic pathways in HNSCC. As a result, molecularly targeted agents are emerging as a complement to conventional chemotherapeutics [2, 48]. However, due to factors such as pathway cross-talk, the response to individual targeted therapies has been limited, while those of combination therapies are promising. Some of these targeted agents, such as erlotinib and celecoxib, are also being applied for chemoprevention, in order to delay or prevent cancer progression [49, 50]. While these adjuvant chemoprevention therapies have shown promising effects in initial trials,
toxicity is a limiting factor. Therefore, the ongoing development of non-toxic agents for chemoprevention derived from natural dietary compounds, such as fruits and spices, is an important research direction [51, 52]. Aside from non-toxicity, one of the key strengths of these natural compounds, such as (-)epigallocatechin gallate (EGCG) from green tea, is that they are multi-target, interacting with key signaling pathways in complex manners. Moreover, combinations of natural compounds have demonstrated synergistic effects that can help compensate for limiting factors like low bioavailability [53-56].

Observations regarding individual versus combination strategies indicate that for predicting therapeutic and chemopreventive outcomes, it is insufficient to only identify molecular biomarkers. It is also necessary to gain a “systems-level” understanding of their roles in the context of signal transduction and metabolic pathways. This paradigm of data mining followed by modeling reflects the data → information → knowledge → action pipeline in Big Data research, since a system model is a higher-level representation of biomarker knowledge. Quantitative representations of cancer cell population and tumor growth have a long history in cancer research [57, 58]. In particular, the developing area of multi-scale cancer modeling explicitly links molecular-level observations, such as up-regulation of particular enzymes, to higher-level pathologically observed features, such as tumor aggressiveness. These representations are important for understanding system behavior and responses [59, 60]. However, previous modeling studies for HNSCC have focused on radiotherapy and chemotherapy, not targeted or multi-target therapeutic agents. Therefore, a key challenge is to develop a multi-scale modeling framework for HNSCC that can effectively predict the effects of combining multi-target agents.
1.2.4. Mathematical Modeling to Accelerate Translational Research

Mathematical modeling approaches are critical for addressing the challenges discussed in the preceding sections. The proposed solutions to these challenges are categorized into three main focus areas: (1) knowledge-driven mining, (2) data integration, and (3) system modeling. These approaches are all critical for handling the volume, variety, and velocity characteristics of Big Data. First, because of the volume and velocity of –omic data acquisition, modeling contributions that utilize existing knowledge to guide mining can help ameliorate the bottleneck imposed by analyzing large datasets. Second, data integration approaches are necessary for extracting knowledge from the volume (within –omic data types) and variety (between –omic data types) of large biological datasets. Lastly, system modeling provides a higher-level organization to the knowledge obtained through knowledge-driven data mining and data integration, and can generate specific, quantitative, and testable predictions.

1.3. Proposed Study and Organization of Dissertation

This dissertation focuses on addressing the three previously described key challenges related to HNSCC progression and chemoprevention. This is accomplished by developing mathematical models for data mining and for predicting system dynamics. The Specific Aims of this research are:

1. **Knowledge-Driven Data Mining**: To develop modeling tools to mine –omic datasets in HNSCC for biomarker discovery by harnessing existing knowledge
2. **Integrated –Omic Modeling**: To develop supervised learning models for predicting HNSCC progression through integration of –omic datasets

3. **System Modeling**: To develop dynamic system models for predicting response to combinations of multi-target agents against HNSCC

   In combination, this suite of modeling tools accelerates knowledge extraction from –omic Big Data in HNSCC. Chapter 2 of this dissertation focuses on Knowledge-Driven Data Mining, through the development of similarity measures applicable to multiple –omic data types. Chapter 3 also addresses Knowledge-Driven Data Mining, but focuses on constructing a system specifically for mining metabolomic data. Chapters 4
and 5 are focused on Integrated –Omic Modeling. Chapter 4 develops models for predicting HNSCC pathological stage by integrating transcriptomic and proteomic data. Chapter 5 proposes models for early detection of HNSCC through the integration of multiple transcriptomic datasets. Chapter 6 addresses System Modeling by developing multi-scale models for predicting the response to natural compound adjuvants for HNSCC chemoprevention.

Figure 1.5 describes the overall workflow of this dissertation, including the Specific Aims, the data types considered, and the developed models and tools. Chapter 7 concludes the dissertation by summarizing the key deliverables, including publications, and by discussing future directions for research.
CHAPTER 2

SIMILARITY MEASURES FOR EXPLORATORY DATA MINING

2.1. Applications of Similarity in Biomedical Research

Similarity measures are an important tool in the analysis of a wide range of biomedical data, with applications such as comparing peptide sequences [61] and gene expression data [62], as well as in text mining [63] and in image analysis [64, 65]. An important application of similarity measures is the detection of new and potentially functionally relevant patterns in large-scale biological datasets [62, 65, 66]. For example, if a particular gene is known to be associated with a disease, other genes potentially related to the disease may be detected by identifying highly similar patterns of expression. In this respect, similarity measures can be used to provide a shortlist of targets for further research.

Different similarity measures exhibit considerable variation in properties and performance [67, 68]. For example, many common measures do not have a probabilistic framework, although this is a useful property in terms of the interpretation of assigned similarity scores [69]. In this chapter, similarity measures with a probabilistic interpretation are proposed and developed. The first measure is restricted to two-class data, i.e., the comparison of binary images and data vectors. This model utilizes the hypergeometric distribution and Fisher’s exact test. However, many types of biological data are not inherently binary in nature, and the thresholding process can discard useful information. Thus, the second measure utilizes the multivariate hypergeometric distribution and the Fisher-Freeman-Halton test to extend the first model to accommodate the comparison of non-binary, “multi-class” data.
2.2. Introduction to Mass Spectrometry Imaging

Mass spectrometry imaging (MSI) data is used several times in this chapter for testing the similarity measures, due to the unique combination of molecular and morphological information it provides. It is also used in Chapter 3. Therefore, this section provides a brief introduction to MSI in order to facilitate interpretation of later results.

MSI is an extension of conventional (non-imaging) mass spectrometry that can yield spatially-resolved information about the molecular composition of a biological sample. MSI datasets are generated by acquiring the complete mass spectrum at multiple points across the sample surface, yielding a three-dimensional (x,y: spatial dimensions, e.g. tissue, and z: spectral dimension) dataset as shown in Figure 2.1. The MSI dataset includes valuable information which is not obtainable through similar analyses using immunohistochemistry staining or conventional mass spectrometry. In traditional histological analysis, tissue is typically stained for a small number of molecular targets. In contrast, MSI is capable of simultaneously tracking thousands of m/z (mass-to-charge ratio) values. Depending on the MSI acquisition modality, each m/z value can be
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Figure 2.1: (left) Three-dimensional structure of MSI data. (right): False-color visualizations of multiple m/z values from MSI datasets of mouse models of Tay-Sachs/Sandhoff disease.
interpreted as a molecule or molecular fragment. Additionally, staining can only identify known molecular targets, while the large-scale data acquired by MSI enables discovery of sample components (and hence, potential biomarkers). Compared to mass spectrometry alone, MSI preserves the sample’s spatial and morphological information. Thus, spectra corresponding to different regions of tissue samples like biopsies (e.g., tumor, marginal, or normal regions) can be differentiated, enabling more detailed and target-specific analysis. Due to these benefits, MSI is emerging as a popular experimental technique in proteomics [70], lipidomics [71], and metabolomics [72] research.

Because MSI is spatially-resolved, it is particularly relevant for research into diseases which have spatially localized characteristics – such as cancer. Recent MSI studies have investigated HNSCC [73], as well as cancers of the brain [74], breast [75], kidney [76], stomach [77], prostate [78], colon [79], pancreas [80], and bladder [81]. Other recent MSI studies have targeted diseases including Tay-Sachs/Sandhoff disease [82], Behçet disease [83], Parkinson’s disease [84, 85], Alzheimer’s disease [86], Duchenne muscular dystrophy [87, 88], Fabry disease [89], atherosclerosis [90] and stroke and ischemic injury [91-93]. In addition, MSI has been used to study bio-implant interfaces [94, 95] and drug distribution within tissues [96-101].

The spectral dimension of MSI data can be very large (e.g. tens of thousands of \( m/z \) values), making computational analysis essential to interpretation. Thus, it is critical to identify and to develop effective analytical methods for large-scale data mining and pattern recognition to effectively utilize MSI data. I have discussed the current state-of-the-art in MSI analysis techniques, including dimensionality reduction (e.g., principal
component analysis), clustering, and classification, in [102], but this content is outside the scope of this dissertation.

2.3. Binary Hypergeometric Similarity Measure

In this section, a binary similarity measure is proposed and developed, using the hypergeometric distribution and Fisher’s exact test as a basis. The hypergeometric distribution has previously been used in bioinformatics to assess similarity in microarray functional analysis and tandem mass spectrometry [103-105]. The proposed hypergeometric similarity measure is compared with cosine similarity and Pearson correlation in terms of desirable properties related to formulation and behavior. Cosine similarity and Pearson have previously been used to assess similarity in mass spectrometry data for tasks ranging from protein identification to quality control [106-110]. The performance of the proposed similarity measure on synthetic data and experimental MSI data is studied, and examples are provided to demonstrate its advantageous performance in identifying and ranking similarities.

Desirable Properties of a Similarity Measure

The proposed similarity measure should sufficiently meet the following properties related to design and performance. The similarity measure should (1) be monotonically increasing between [-1, 1], in order to facilitate interpretation and comparison with other measures; (2) have good power of discrimination, i.e., should identify differences where they exist; (3) be consistently defined, i.e., there should not be sets of valid (observable) inputs for which the similarity measure output is undefined, and valid inputs should utilize the full dynamic range of the output.
Definition of Similarity Measure

Consider a dataset consisting of \( i = 1, 2 \ldots m \) vectors \( x_i \in \mathbb{R}^N \). The reference vector \( x_i \) contains \( n_1 \) dimensions with intensities greater than a selected threshold. When converted to binary form with respect to some threshold, this vector will have \( n_1 \) ‘on’ dimensions and \( N - n_1 \) ‘off’ dimensions, which can be represented ‘1’ and ‘0’, respectively. A second, query vector \( x_j \) has \( n_2 \) ‘on’ dimensions. The total number of dimensions at which both images are ‘on’ is \( k \). The significance of overlap can be defined in terms of the probability of observing \( k \) given \( N, n_1, \) and \( n_2 \). If \( k \) of the \( n_1 \) dimensions from the first vector overlap \( k \) of the \( n_2 \) dimensions from the second vector, those \( k \) dimensions in the first vector may be arranged in \( \binom{n_1}{k} \) ways. In the second vector, the \((n_2 - k)\) dimensions which do not overlap may be arranged in \( \binom{N - n_1}{n_2 - k} \) ways. Thus, the total number of ways in which an overlap of \( k \) dimensions can occur, given \( n_1, n_2 \) and \( N \), is \((\binom{n_1}{k}\binom{N - n_1}{n_2 - k})\). When divided by the number of ways in which the \( n_2 \) ‘on’ dimensions in the second vector could be arranged if \( k \) of them were not constrained, this becomes the pmf of the hypergeometric distribution. I propose a similarity measure \( h(k,n_1,n_2,N) \) which is defined, for any valid \( k \), as the difference between the lower and upper “tails” of the hypergeometric distribution, as shown in equation (2.1).

\[
h = \sum_{i=\max(0,n_1+n_2-N)}^{k} \frac{\binom{n_1}{i}\binom{N-n_1}{n_2-i}}{\binom{N}{n_2}} - \sum_{j=k}^{\min(n_1,n_2)} \frac{\binom{n_1}{j}\binom{N-n_1}{n_2-j}}{\binom{N}{n_2}} \tag{2.1}
\]
The cumulative distribution function (cdf) of the hypergeometric distribution has previously been utilized as a similarity measure [111]. Since the population is discrete, additional information about $k$ may be obtained by considering the probability of observing overlap at least as extreme. Both of these quantities can be considered $p$-values of hypothesis tests. In both cases, the null hypothesis $H_0$ is that the observed overlap occurred by chance. This is described by the urn model, in which an urn contains marbles of two colors, one representing a pair of overlapping ‘on’ pixels and the other representing non-overlap. When $n_2$ marbles are drawn from the urn without replacement and $k$ of them are of the color representing overlap, the null hypothesis states that this has occurred by chance. The alternative hypotheses are that the observed overlaps are, respectively, larger or smaller than would be expected to occur at random for such an image pair. This implies that the images may be related, i.e., notably similar or dissimilar. Through the difference between these two probabilities, the proposed measure provides a scaled description of the unexpectedness of any observed overlap. The “tails” of the hypergeometric distribution also have upper bounds [112, 113]. For some parameter sets tested, the value of the hypergeometric pmf may be so small as to encounter machine resolution limits. Then, the proposed similarity measure may be implemented in terms of the upper bounds, as shown in equation (2.2).

$$h = \left( \left. \left( \frac{p_1}{p_1 + t_1} \right)^{p_1 + t_1} \left( \frac{1-p_1}{1-p_1 - t_1} \right)^{1-p_1 - t_1} \right) \right)^n$$

$$- \left( \left. \left( \frac{p_2}{p_2 + t_2} \right)^{p_2 + t_2} \left( \frac{1-p_2}{1-p_2 - t_2} \right)^{1-p_2 - t_2} \right) \right)^n$$

(2.2)

Here, $n = n_1$, $p_1 = \frac{n-n_2}{N}$ and $t_1 = \left( \frac{n_1-k}{n_1} - p_1 \right)$, such that $t_1 \geq 0$. Similarly, $p_2 = \frac{n_2}{N}$ and $t_2 = \left( \frac{k}{n_1} - p_2 \right)$, such that $t_2 \geq 0$. 
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**Similarity Measure Comparison and Assessment**

First, the cosine similarity and Pearson correlation for binary vectors are expressed with the same variables as the hypergeometric pmf, allowing direct comparison of their formulae. Similarities and differences among the measures may be observed through their formulae; the binary expressions for cosine similarity and Pearson correlation are shown in equations (2.3) and (2.4). These are derived by noting that for binary vectors $V_1$ and $V_2$, the dot product is equivalent to $k$, and the norms to $\sqrt{n_1}$ and $\sqrt{n_2}$. Equation (2.4) is equivalent to Matthews correlation coefficient (MCC) [111, 114].

\[
\frac{V_1 \cdot V_2}{\| V_1 \| \| V_2 \|} = \frac{k}{\sqrt{n_1 \sqrt{n_2}}} \quad (2.3)
\]

\[
\frac{(V_1 - \bar{V}_1) \cdot (V_2 - \bar{V}_2)}{\| V_1 - \bar{V}_1 \| \| V_2 - \bar{V}_2 \|} = \frac{k - \frac{n_1 n_2}{N}}{\sqrt{n_1(1 - \frac{n_1}{N})} \sqrt{n_2(1 - \frac{n_2}{N})}} \quad (2.4)
\]

**Performance on Synthetic and MSI Data**

First, considering the mathematical expressions for each similarity measure, both cosine similarity and Pearson correlation are both linear with respect to $k$, and behave nonlinearly with respect to $n_1$ and $n_2$. Cosine similarity is independent of $N$, while mean-centering in Pearson correlation brings $N$ into consideration. Pearson correlation asymptotically approaches cosine similarity for large $N$. The proposed measure, like Pearson correlation, considers $N$, but like cosine similarity, does not mean-center the data. Unlike both, it considers how unlikely it is to observe $k$ by chance.
Figure 2.2: Hypergeometric similarity measure (solid), cosine similarity (dot) and Pearson correlation (dash) for $N = 100$, $n_1 = n_2 = 50$.

Second, the proposed similarity measure is compared with the cosine similarity and Pearson correlation by evaluating their output for binary image pairs having varying degrees of overlap. Figure 2.2 demonstrates that the proposed similarity measure satisfies criterion (1) regarding the desired properties of monotonicity and range. The hypergeometric similarity measure and Pearson correlation share a range of $[-1, 1]$, while for positive data the range of cosine similarity is $[0, 1]$. The extremes of the hypergeometric similarity measure represent the limits of observable overlap $k$ for a given parameter set $N$, $n_1$ and $n_2$.

Third, a synthetic dataset of binary vectors (images) with dimension $N = 10$ was created by considering all combinations of $n_2$, $n_1$ and $k$ such that $N \geq n_2 \geq n_1 \geq k$, and such that $k$ is greater than or equal to its minimum for any given $n_1$, $n_2$ and $N$ (i.e., $k \geq n_1 + n - N$). This dataset consists of 150 vector pairs. The three similarity measures were
evaluated for each pair, and their outputs compared in terms of relative rankings. Figure 2.3 shows the performance of the similarity measures over the synthetic dataset.

The rankings show that the proposed similarity measure fulfills criterion (2), which addresses discrimination of differing cases. In particular, I examine the extreme cases of (a) no overlap, (b) complete overlap and (c) ‘unsurprising’ overlap. (a) Cosine similarity assigns 0 to all vector pairs with no overlap; a large segment of the dataset is so labeled with no additional sorting. Pearson correlation and the proposed similarity measure both sort this subset of vectors. However, only the proposed similarity measure recognizes that $k = 0$ is more surprising when $n_1$ approaches $n_2$, because there is more opportunity for at least some overlap. (b) The treatment of cases with complete overlap ($k = n_1 = n_2$) is also favorable with the proposed similarity measure because it orders them in a meaningful manner. It identifies $k = 5$ as the most ‘surprising’ case of complete
overlap, since there are the most opportunities for non-overlap to occur. The probability that \( k = n_1 = n_2 = 5 \) is equal to \( \binom{5}{4} \binom{3}{2} \binom{2}{1} \). It also recognizes that \( k = 6 \) and \( k = 4 \) are equally ‘surprising’, since the probability of arranging \( n_2 = 6 \) pixels to completely overlap \( n_1 = 6 \) pixels is the same as arranging \( (N - n_2) = 4 \) pixels to completely overlap \( (N - n_1) = 4 \) pixels. The same pairings are observed for \( k = 7 \) and \( k = 3 \), and \( k = 8 \) and \( k = 2 \). In contrast, both cosine similarity and Pearson correlation assign 1 to this entire subset of vectors without further sorting. (c) The proposed similarity measure also meets criterion (3) regarding definition over the parameter space. Pearson correlation is not defined for vector pairs in which \( n_1 = N \) or \( n_2 = N \); this is evident from equation (4). The proposed similarity measure assigns 0 to these cases, because by definition, \( k = n_1 \). Thus, even though complete overlap occurs, it is not unexpected.
Fourth, the similarity measures were implemented on a biological MSI dataset. Although HNSCC tissue has previously been assessed using MSI [73], such data is currently not available to me for analysis. Instead, MSI data from a mouse model of Tay-Sachs/Sandhoff disease was used to test the similarity measure. Since general data characteristics for particular types of MSI data (e.g., MALDI, DESI, etc.) are expected to be similar regardless of the target tissue, it is reasonable to extrapolate conclusions to future performance on HNSCC MSI data. The experimental protocol for the MSI dataset investigated here is described in [82]. The image corresponding to m/z 890 was selected as a reference to due to its distinctive spatial pattern. The MSI dataset has a spectral dimension of 4,438 m/z values. It was manually inspected in non-binary mode to identify m/z values with similar spatial patterns; 47 m/z images were selected. The top 47 values selected by each similarity measure were compared to these values. The correspondence of the two lists was calculated for each similarity measure, and repeated for 11 alternative binarization thresholds. The upper bounds formulation shown in equation (2.2) used in this assessment due to the large variable values involved.

Figure 2.4 describes similarity measure performance, assessed as the fraction agreement between the top m/z values selected by each similarity measure and the manual selections. This comparison was carried out across multiple binarization thresholds based on the abundance percentiles of the mean spectrum. For this dataset, the 90th percentile yields top selections from the similarity measures which correspond most closely to the manual selections. The selections of the proposed measure and Pearson correlation correspond highly with the manual selections, and also with each other. The
selections of cosine similarity consistently differed from the other two, and from the manual selections.

**Discussion and Limitations of Binary Approach**

In summary, a hypergeometric similarity measure is proposed as a tool for the exploration and analysis of biomedical data. Due to its definition as the difference between the upper and lower “tails” of the hypergeometric distribution, the proposed similarity measure explicitly defines the unexpectedness of any observed overlap. Using synthetic data, the proposed similarity measure was compared with cosine similarity and Pearson correlation in terms of three criteria related to design and performance, and it was shown to perform favorably. Tests on a biological, non-HNSCC MSI dataset showed that the proposed similarity measure is effective in identifying visually notable spatial similarities. Together, these results indicate that the proposed similarity measure can play a useful role in assessing similarity in biomedical data.

However, several caveats remain. First and foremost, abundance is a key feature of biological data, and analyzing binary data ignores this information. In the MSI dataset examined here, analysis of binarized data still revealed informative patterns. However, for some HNSCC datasets, retaining abundance information may be necessary for meaningful analyses. The flexibility to accommodate abundance to some extent is particularly important for the goal of developing a general similarity measure that provides useful output for multiple HNSCC –omic data types. Second, if binary data is to be used, the selection of appropriate thresholds to convert non-binary data to binary data is an open problem. Many alternative methods for thresholding images have been
proposed in image processing [115]. Results on this particular biological dataset indicated that increasing the threshold can increase agreement with the set of manually selected $m/z$ values. However, the potential effects of inter-dataset variation on the performance of all three similarity measures have not yet been studied. That investigation would provide more insight into threshold effects and lead to more systematic recommendations for specific data types.

Instead, the next section in this chapter addresses this issue directly, by modifying the similarity measure to explicitly incorporate abundance.
2.4. Multivariate Hypergeometric Similarity Measure

In this section, the previous result is extended to present a general similarity measure that accommodates the comparison of non-binary, “multi-class” data. After defining the proposed multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure, I describe several tests using synthetic and biological data to investigate its performance. First, its patterns of sample ranking are again compared with those of cosine similarity and Pearson correlation, as well as with mutual information. These three similarity measures are used in the analysis of many types of biomedical data [62-65, 116]. Next, an algorithm called piecewise approximation, which facilitates the application of the proposed similarity measure to large samples, is developed and implemented.

Definition of Similarity Measure

Consider a dataset consisting of \( z = 1, 2 \ldots m \) vectors \( x_z \in \mathbb{R}^N \), with all intensities quantized into \( n \) bins, where \( N \) and \( n \) are positive integers. When comparing two such vectors, there are \( n^2 \) possible types of overlap between corresponding dimensions (i.e., in images, for spatially corresponding pixels). These overlaps can be represented as an \( n \times n \) contingency table, as shown in Figure 2.5. Each class \( k_{ij} \), for indices \( i = 1...n \) and \( j = 1...n \), represents the number of corresponding dimensions which are in bin \( i \) in the first (“reference”) vector and in bin \( j \) in the second (“query”) vector. The terminology is used in the sense that a given sample of interest would be selected as a “reference” and other samples in a dataset would be compared, or “queried” against it to find samples similar to the reference. The margins of the contingency table are fixed for a given pair of images: for each row \( i \), \( \sum_{j=1}^{n} k_{ij} = r_i \), the number of pixels in bin \( i \) in the reference image, and
Figure 2.5: An image pair (reference and query images) with pixels intensities binned into three levels is represented as a 3×3 contingency table with fixed marginal totals.

Similarly for each column $j$, $\sum_{i=1}^{n} k_{ij} = q_j$, the number of pixels in bin $j$ in the query image. By definition, $\sum_{ij} k_{ij} = N$. The probability of observing a particular distribution of overlaps $k_{ij}$, i.e., the probability of observing a given contingency table, can be represented as the product of probability mass functions of the multivariate hypergeometric distribution. Considering only the first column of an $n \times n$ contingency table with row marginal totals $r_i$, the column sum is $q_1 = k_{11} + k_{21} + \ldots + k_{n1}$. Each component $k_{i1}$ is drawn from its row sum $r_i$. Since each draw is independent, the probability of observing a particular distribution of pixels is given as $\frac{\binom{r_1}{k_{11}} \binom{r_2}{k_{21}} \ldots \binom{r_n}{k_{n1}}}{\binom{N}{q_1}}$. This quantity is a probability mass function of the multivariate hypergeometric distribution.

The probability of observing the second column is described similarly, but accounts for the pixels already assigned in the previous column: $\frac{\binom{r_1-k_{11}}{k_{12}} \binom{r_2-k_{21}}{k_{22}} \ldots \binom{r_n-k_{n1}}{q_{2n}}}{\binom{N-q_1}{q_2}}$. The same
pattern is followed through the \((n - 1)\)th column. Because the row and column sums are fixed, the configuration of the \(n\)th column is determined by the preceding columns. Since the configuration of the available dimensions in each column (aside from the \(n\)th column) is independent of the other columns, the probability \(p\) of the complete \(n \times n\) contingency table is given by the product of the column probabilities. This quantity, shown in equation (2.5), is known as the probability for \(k\)-variate contingency tables \([117, 118]\).

Here \(q = [q_1, q_2 \ldots q_n]\), \(r = [r_1, r_2 \ldots r_n]\) and \(k = [k_{11}, k_{12} \ldots k_{nn}]\).

\[
p(q,r,k) = \frac{\prod_{i=1}^{n} r_i! \times \prod_{j=1}^{n} q_j!}{N! \times \prod_{i,j} k_{ij}!}
\]  

(2.5)

In previous work focusing on binary data, the similarity measure was defined based on the hypergeometric distribution; the probability mass function of this distribution gives the probability of a \(2 \times 2\) contingency table \([119]\). The similarity measure was defined as the difference between the lower and upper “tails” of the hypergeometric distribution defined by the marginal totals \(r\) and \(q\). The values of \(r\) and \(q\) are a function of the particular reference image and query image being compared. The “tails” were defined with respect to the observed overlap, which was defined as the number of spatially corresponding pixels which are ‘on’ in both images, i.e., \(k_{11}\) in this terminology. To extend this approach from the two classes in binary data to \(n\) classes, I utilized the probability mass function of the \(n \times n\) contingency table.

The statistical significance of a contingency table is evaluated by performing Fisher’s exact test (in the binary case) or the Fisher-Freeman-Halton test (in the general case) \([117, 120]\). In both cases, the isomarginal family of tables (i.e. those tables having the same fixed margins \(r\) and \(q\) as the original table representing the reference and query image pair) is first generated, and the probability of each table within this family is
calculated. In the binary case, the hypergeometric distribution describes the isomarginal family. For each table in the isomarginal family, the value of a chosen statistic $S(k)$ is compared to that of the original table. With respect to $S(k)$, tables in the isomarginal family may be more extreme than the original table in two directions. The set of tables which are “more extremely large” have a larger than or equal value of the statistic, while the set of tables which are “more extremely small” have a smaller than or equal value of the statistic. The significance of a table in a particular direction is found by summing the probabilities of all tables within the respective set.

In the binary case, the choice of the statistic $S(k)$ is straightforward because due to the fixed margins, there is only one degree of freedom. $S(k) = k_{11}$ completely defines the table, and is reasonable because more similar images will have greater numbers of overlapping pixels. In the general case, however, there are $n^2 - 2n + 1$ degrees of freedom, and for $n > 2$, the choice of a statistic is not obvious. Here, I choose a vector of statistics – the set of diagonal elements of the $n \times n$ table – as $S(k)$, as shown in equation (2). These diagonal elements represent the exact matches – the spatially corresponding pixels in the reference and query images which are in the same class. While $S(k)$ may be defined in many alternative ways, I propose equation (2.6) as a reasonable choice for multi-class data because images which are more similar will have a greater number of each of the $n$ types of exact matches.

$$S(k) = [k_{11}, k_{22}, ..., k_{nn}] \quad (2.6)$$

For each table in the isomarginal family, I performed an index-wise comparison of each diagonal element to the corresponding diagonal element in the original table. In other words, I compared each element in $S(k)$ with the corresponding element in $S_0$. 
which is the instance of \( S(k) \) observed for the original table. If each diagonal element in the table is greater than or equal to its corresponding element in \( S_0 \), the table is assigned to set \( G \), the set of “more extremely large” tables with respect to all elements of \( S(k) \). If each diagonal elements is less than or equal to its corresponding element in \( S_0 \), the table is assigned to set \( L \), the set of “more extremely small” tables. Equation (2.7) defines the proposed multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure \( h \) in terms of the probabilities of the tables in these two sets.

\[
h = \sum_{L} p(q,r,k) - \sum_{G} p(q,r,k) 
\]

(2.7)

**Comparison of Similarity Measures**

The sample rankings obtained from the proposed measure are compared with those from cosine similarity, Pearson correlation, and mutual information. Cosine similarity and Pearson correlation are defined for vectors \( V_1 \) and \( V_2 \) in equations (2.8) and (2.9), respectively. Mutual information is defined in (2.10), where \( x_i \) and \( y_j \) are the elements of \( V_1 \) and \( V_2 \), respectively.

\[
\frac{V_1 \cdot V_2}{\|V_1\|\|V_2\|} 
\]

(2.8)

\[
\frac{(V_1 - \overline{V_1}) \cdot (V_2 - \overline{V_2})}{\|V_1 - \overline{V_1}\|\|V_2 - \overline{V_2}\|} 
\]

(2.9)

\[
- \sum_{i} p(x_i) \log_2(p(x_i)) + \sum_{j} p(y_j) \log_2(p(y_j)) 
\]

(2.10)

\[
+ \sum_{i} \sum_{j} p(x_i,y_j) \log_2(p(x_i,y_j)) 
\]
**Design of Synthetic Dataset**

First, the performance of the multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure is evaluated on synthetic data. While the proposed similarity measure is defined for any \( n \geq 2 \) classes, these synthetic experiments are performed using only three classes to clearly illustrate the method. Two synthetic datasets are used for this comparison. The first consists of the three-class isomarginal family defined by marginal totals \((r_1, r_2, r_3, q_1, q_2, q_3) = (5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5)\) and \(N = 15\). The second consists of all three-class tables with \(N = 5\).

2.4.1. Piecewise Approximation

Testing the significance of \(n \times n\) contingency tables obtained from biomedical data, such as MSI data, poses a challenge due to data size. As the numbers of pixels in the images, and hence the marginal totals, increase, generating the isomarginal family of tables to perform the Fisher-Freeman-Halton test becomes demanding. The number of possible tables increases factorially as the numbers of rows, columns or total pixels increase [121, 122]. As an analytical example, the number of three-class contingency tables where all rows and columns sum to \(r\) is given by \(\binom{r+2}{2} + 3\binom{r+3}{4}\) [123, 124]. When faced with a very large number of tables to enumerate in the isomarginal family, approximate solutions can be found through Monte Carlo testing [120]. However, in practice this may demand very large numbers of permutations to achieve satisfactory separation of similarity rankings.

Here I propose a piecewise method of approximation, in which the two images or data vectors to be compared are divided into a number of smaller subsections. The motivating idea is that similar samples will also have similar corresponding subsections.
Figure 2.6: Overview of piecewise approximation process: subsection (1.) corresponds to the top-left 4x4 blocks of the reference and query images; (2.) to the 4x4 blocks to the immediate right of (1.); and (n.) to the bottom-right 4x4 blocks. The similarity is calculated for each spatially corresponding reference and query section, and the overall similarity of the reference and query is calculated as a function of the sub-section scores.

For each pair of reference and query subsections, an $n \times n$ contingency table is constructed and the multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure is calculated. The overall similarity of the image pair is computed as a function of the similarities of all subsections. Figure 2.6 illustrates this process.

Piecewise approximation requires choices in how images or data vectors are separated into subsections (e.g., different subsection sizes) and how the similarity scores for the subsections are combined to obtain an overall similarity score for the image pair (e.g., different functions). Alternative choices are examined here through experiments on synthetic and biomedical data. First, the previously described synthetic dataset (for $N = 15$) is used to examine whether there is a pattern between subsection size and the extent of difference observed between the piecewise approximation rankings and the exact rankings. In this test, the rankings for each sample obtained by using subsections of size
3, 4 and 5 pixels are compared with the ranking calculated using the whole sample. To avoid the comparison of single-pixel sections, if the sample is not evenly divisible at a particular increment size, the remainder pixels are added to the previous subsection to create one subsection larger than the others. In the same experiment, the effect of permuting the reference and query samples which correspond to a single \( n \times n \) table is considered. While a given pair of samples yields a single \( n \times n \) table, mapping a given table back to the sample space yields non-unique indexing of spatially corresponding pixels. This type of indexing difference would not affect the similarity score of a given reference and query pair if the whole sample is utilized. However, when piecewise approximation is employed, different subsections may contain different proportions of the pixels for each type of overlap \( k_{ij} \). To examine how this may affect results, the ‘randperm’ function in MATLAB was used to generate a permutation of the sample indices, which was applied to both the reference and query samples before they were divided into subsections. This was repeated 10,000 times. The purpose of this step is to confirm that overall sample rankings in the synthetic dataset are not an artifact of arbitrary methods of generating synthetic samples from tables and subsectioning samples. For each subsection size, the sample ranking results shown are the mean across all permutations. Next, biomedical data was used to empirically compare alternative functions for aggregating the subsection similarity scores into an overall score for the image pair.

2.4.2. Performance on Synthetic Data

This section describes two sets of results. First, the performance of the proposed multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure is compared with the other similarity
measures using synthetic data. Second, the effects of subsection size and combination functions on the piecewise approximation method are investigated using synthetic and experimental MSI data.

In the first set of results, the rankings of samples in synthetic datasets by the three similarity measures are compared in Figures 2.7 and 2.8. Each sample (horizontal bar)
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**Figure 2.7:** Comparison of sample rankings by the four similarity measures for the synthetic dataset comprising the isomarginal family given by \((r_1, r_2, r_3, q_1, q_2, q_3) = (5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5)\). Each sample (horizontal bar) represents a certain number of exact matches, slight mismatches and large mismatches (corresponding to [green, yellow, red], or [medium, light and dark] in grayscale). The length of each color segment corresponds to the number of that type of match in the sample. For each similarity measure, the similarity score corresponding to each sample is shown on the right panel.
represents a single table, with the green, yellow and red segments representing the number of exact matches \((k_{11} + k_{22} + k_{33})\), slight mismatches \((k_{12} + k_{21} + k_{23} + k_{32})\) and large mismatches \((k_{13} + k_{31})\), respectively. In Figure 2.7, there are 231 tables represented; these tables comprise the isomarginal family defined by marginal totals \((r_1, r_2, r_3, q_1, q_2, q_3) = (5, 5, 5, 5, 5, 5)\).

All three similarity measures agree in that the highest score is assigned to the table with the largest number of exact matches. None of the similarity measures are monotonic with respect to the number of exact matches, but rankings from the proposed similarity measure are much closer to this trend than rankings from cosine similarity and Pearson correlation. Cosine similarity and Pearson correlation more closely sort by the number of large mismatches. For a single isomarginal family, the magnitudes and means of the two vectors are constant. The rankings of cosine similarity and Pearson correlation therefore depend on the value of the dot product, and the minimum dot product is observed when the number of large mismatches is maximized. The proposed similarity measure does not provide such distinction between slight and large mismatches, but it does provide a probabilistic interpretation which cosine similarity and Pearson correlation do not: the samples associated with extreme scores are the most “surprising” patterns of overlap observed. Mutual information assigns higher scores to cases where most pixels are concentrated in a few classes, but does not differentiate among the classes. For example, the tables with \([k_{11}, k_{22}, k_{33}] = [5,5,5]\) (i.e., all exact matches) and \([k_{31}, k_{22}, k_{13}] = [5,5,5]\) (i.e., many large mismatches) both receive equally high scores; as a result, the mutual information results do not show any trend with respect to exact matches, slight mismatches or large mismatches. In contrast, \([k_{11}, k_{22}, k_{33}] = [5,5,5]\) is ranked highly by
the proposed similarity measure, while \( [k_{31}, k_{22}, k_{13}] = [5,5,5] \) receives a much lower score.

Figure 2.8 considers the rankings of the 1287 tables generated by considering every possible combination of marginal totals such that \((r_1 + r_2 + r_3 = 5)\) and \((q_1 + q_2 + q_3 = 5)\). Again, all of the measures agree in that the highest score is assigned to the table with the largest number of exact matches, but the proposed similarity measure more consistently assigns lower scores to tables with fewer exact matches. The rankings in this

Figure 2.8: Comparison of sample rankings by the four similarity measures for the synthetic dataset containing all tables for \( N = 5 \). Each sample (horizontal bar) contains a certain number of exact matches, slight mismatches and large mismatches (corresponding to [green, yellow, red], or [medium, light and dark] in grayscale). The length of each color segment corresponds to the number of that type of match in the sample. For each similarity measure, the similarity score for each sample is shown on the right panel.
set of all tables for $N = 5$ illustrate additional probabilistic aspects of the proposed similarity measure. For example, the proposed measure can distinguish between instances of overlap with different distribution magnitudes. It assigns identical scores to the set of tables with $[k_{11}, k_{22}, k_{33}]$ as $[3,1,1]$, $[1,3,1]$ and $[1,1,3]$, and a different identical score to the other possible set of tables describing only exact overlap, with $[k_{11}, k_{22}, k_{33}]$ as $[2,2,1]$, $[2,1,2]$ and $[1,2,2]$. Pearson correlation and cosine similarity do not distinguish between these two sets of tables. Mutual information distinguishes the two sets of tables, but again does not distinguish between case cases of exact matches and many large mismatches; for example, the cases where $[k_{11}, k_{22}, k_{33}] = [3,1,1]$ and $[k_{31}, k_{22}, k_{13}] = [3,1,1]$ are assigned the same score, and $[k_{11}, k_{22}, k_{33}] = [2,2,1]$ and $[k_{31}, k_{22}, k_{13}] = [2,1,2]$ are assigned the same score. For a second example, in the proposed measure, all tables which have marginal totals such that only one $n \times n$ table is possible are mapped to a score of zero. If only one set of overlaps $k_{ij}$ can be observed for a particular pair of images or data vectors, then the overlap which is observed can be considered inherently “unsurprising.” In contrast, this set of tables is undefined for Pearson correlation (i.e., these tables are assigned the value NaN, as shown at the top of the Pearson correlation plot in Figure 2.8). Cosine similarity does not group these tables together or otherwise distinguish them.

In the second set of results, the effects of subsection size on the piecewise approximation result are described in Figure 2.9. The 231 samples in the synthetic dataset shown in Figure 2.7 are plotted in order of increasing exact score. The piecewise approximation scores for each sample, across increments of size 3, 4 and 5, are compared. For all three subsection sizes, the mean score from 10,000 permutations of the
Figure 2.9: The mean rankings of synthetic samples using piecewise approximation at different subsection sizes (size 3: blue dash-dot line; size 4: green dotted line; size 5: red dashed line) compared to rankings from using the whole sample (black, solid line).

reference and query vectors is shown. Overall, the piecewise approximation scores follow the trend of the exact score, but there are notable deviations. In such cases, samples are ranked higher or lower as an artifact of the piecewise sectioning process. Interestingly, these cases tend to correspond across all of the subsection sizes; if a sample was scored much higher or lower than its adjacent samples by the piecewise method, the same jump or dip in score was observed across all three subsection sizes. However, the magnitudes of the piecewise scores indicate that, as expected, larger sections give scores closer to the exact result.

Next, different statistics for combining the similarity scores of subsections into a single overall score for the sample pair are compared empirically, using MSI data with a
Figure 2.10: Empirical comparison of alternative functions for combining subsection similarity scores into an overall similarity score through piecewise approximation. Each dot on the scatter plot represents one query image (m/z value); 4,438 are in the dataset. The value (image pair score) of the dot represents the similarity score assigned to the query image based on the specified function of its subsection scores. For example, in the ‘mean’ plot, the image pair score of each query image is the average similarity score of its subsections.

subsection size of 4x4 pixels for piecewise approximation. Figure 2.10 shows the image pair similarity scores for each of the 4,438 m/z values, computed as the mean, median, mode, variance, skewness or kurtosis of all of their subsection scores. The x-axis of these plots, showing indices 1 through 4,438, represents the query m/z images; each is associated with a single score (dot) on the y-axis. This score is obtained by evaluating the specified function (e.g., the mean) over the set of subsection scores obtained for that query image when it was compared to the reference image. To interpret these results, it is necessary to consider that the reference m/z image corresponds to index 783. Since the most similar image in the dataset to the reference image should be the reference image itself, a well-performing function should assign the most extreme score to this index. This
result is observed for the mean, median, variance and kurtosis functions. During previous study of this dataset for the binary measure, 47 of the 4,438 images were observed to be qualitatively very similar to the reference m/z image, and those images were observed to be associated with indices relatively close to the reference index [119]. In contrast, lower indices were associated with noisy images (an artifact of MALDI MSI data acquisition), and higher indices with sparse images. A well-performing function would therefore exhibit a peak centered at the reference index of 783. The mean and kurtosis both show this feature by assigning extreme (higher and lower than most others, respectively) scores to indices close to the reference index.

2.5. Case Studies

Two HNSCC datasets were examined in this study. The first was a gene expression microarray dataset consisting of 25 cancer patient samples. This dataset was obtained from the ArrayExpress repository (ID: E-GEOD-6791), and is described in [125]. This study used the Affymetrix Human Genome U133 Plus 2.0 array platform, which contains 54,675 probes. To obtain gene expression values, raw .CEL files were processed with the robust multi-array average (RMA) algorithm in the Affymetrix Expression Console software. The second was a protein expression dataset consisting of reverse phase protein array (RPPA) data available from The Cancer Proteome Atlas [126]. This dataset consisted of 212 cancer patient samples and described the expression of 187 proteins. For both of these datasets, EGFR (which is up-regulated in more than 80% of HNSCC) was used as the reference gene and protein, respectively.

In order to (1) further investigate the generality of the similarity measure performance, (2) test a metabolomics (lipidomics) dataset, and (3) provide an easy-to-
interpret visual representation of performance, an MSI dataset was also investigated. This was the same experimental MSI data used previously, from a mouse model of Tay-Sachs/Sandhoff disease, and used to profile different lipid species in the brain [82]. The image corresponding to \( m/z \) 889.6 (located at index 783 within the dataset) was again selected as the reference image due to its distinctive spatial pattern. The MSI data has a spectral dimension of 4,438 \( m/z \) values, and all \( m/z \) images were tested as query images against the reference image of \( m/z \) 889.6.

For all of these datasets, the three-class cases were used for the experiments. Feature (gene, protein, \( m/z \))-specific, percentile-based threshold pairs \((x, y)\) were used to bin each expression value into “high” \((> y)\), “medium” \((x < \text{ and } \leq y)\) or “low” \((\leq x)\) classes. For the gene and protein expression datasets, results from several alternative threshold pairs were compared. For the MSI dataset, the upper threshold \( y \) was arbitrarily selected as the 50\(^{th} \) percentile of the mean spectrum of the dataset, and the lower threshold \( x \) was 0. The piecewise approximation approach was used in all cases. For the gene and protein expression datasets, the primary subsection size was fixed at 10 features. In the MSI dataset, a primary subsection size of \( 4 \times 4 \) was chosen after testing several sizes in an effort to balance section size and computational time. The proposed similarity measure score was calculated for each subsection. For the gene and protein expression datasets, the average score across subsections was taken as the overall similarity for the feature pair. For the MSI data, two functions (the mean and kurtosis) for combining subsection scores into an aggregate image pair score were compared. Finally, for all datasets, the top features selected by the proposed similarity measure using three
classes were compared to the top three-class results for cosine similarity, Pearson correlation and mutual information.

2.5.1. Gene Expression

Tables 2.1-2.3 show the top 20 gene rankings for each of the similarity measures for a single EGFR reference probe across three alternative percentile-based thresholds. First, for all cases, the reference probe ‘211550_at’ is selected as the most similar, as it should be. Second, this set of results demonstrates that the multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure is successful in identifying genes which are associated with head and neck cancer. Moreover, across the three alternative thresholds considered, the proposed similarity measure identified 41 probes that were not in the top 20 rankings of the other similarity measures. Among these, 15 genes have been associated with head and neck cancer in recent studies: STX6 [127], BCL2L2 [128], RGS20 [129], SSSCA1 [130, 131], EHD2 [132], SYNPO2L [133], CNR2 [134], HCRP1 [135], CSNK1G2 [136, 137], EFNB1 [138], SH3GL2 [139], KRT31 [140], FKBPA [141], SLC7A8 [142], and BCL2L14 [143]. In addition, HIBADH [144] and DSG1 [145] have been associated with head and neck cancer on the protein level.

These results also emphasize the value of integrating multiple forms of analysis in order to leverage complementary findings. One option is combining the results from alternative similarity measures. In addition, the benefits of examining a single dataset across alternative thresholds can be clearly observed through the notably different gene lists for each measure in Tables 2.1-2.3. Parallel assessments with different probes for the same gene are also important. For example, the top 20 rankings by the multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure for another EGFR probe gave relevant results such as
ITGBL1 [146] and TMCC1 [147]. Overall, these observations indicate that applying the multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure can yield relevant and useful results.

Table 2.1: Top 20 rankings by similarity measures on head and neck cancer microarray data, using percentiles [25, 50] as thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure</th>
<th>Pearson correlation</th>
<th>Cosine similarity</th>
<th>Mutual information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probe</td>
<td>Gene</td>
<td>Probe</td>
<td>Gene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211550_at</td>
<td>EGFR</td>
<td>211550_at</td>
<td>EGFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202264_s_at</td>
<td>TOMM40</td>
<td>211716_x_at</td>
<td>ARHGDIA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1555140_a_at</td>
<td>BCL2L2</td>
<td>203411_s_at</td>
<td>LMNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216293_at</td>
<td>CLTA</td>
<td>212013_3</td>
<td>KPNA6 // LOC1006528 28 // LOC1006533 35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203256_at</td>
<td>CDH3</td>
<td>210128_s_at</td>
<td>LTB4R</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243313_at</td>
<td>SYNPO2L</td>
<td>1554097_a_at</td>
<td>MIR31HG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21217_at</td>
<td>RANGAP1</td>
<td>206642_at</td>
<td>DSG1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1559946_s_at</td>
<td>RUVBL2</td>
<td>210527_x_at</td>
<td>TUBA3C // TUBA3D</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203114_at</td>
<td>SSSCA1</td>
<td>214564_s_at</td>
<td>PCDHGC3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204145_at</td>
<td>GSS</td>
<td>221001_at</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>224314_s_at</td>
<td>EGLN1</td>
<td>230704_s_at</td>
<td>ITGB4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1552618_at</td>
<td>STX6</td>
<td>234743_at</td>
<td>LIMD1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>200815_s_at</td>
<td>PAFAH1B1</td>
<td>242211_x_at</td>
<td>WDR90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1569303_s_at</td>
<td>RGS20</td>
<td>209873_s_at</td>
<td>PKP3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221870_at</td>
<td>EHD2</td>
<td>221801_x_at</td>
<td>NEFL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211716_x_at</td>
<td>ARHGDIA</td>
<td>228587_at</td>
<td>FAM83G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>203411_s_at</td>
<td>LMNA</td>
<td>234894_at</td>
<td>ITIH6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216060_s_at</td>
<td>DAAM1</td>
<td>241405_at</td>
<td>LOC400604</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206642_at</td>
<td>DSG1</td>
<td>1555183_at</td>
<td>TERF2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>231995_s_at</td>
<td>HIBADH</td>
<td>218727_at</td>
<td>SLC38A7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2.2: Top 20 rankings by similarity measures on head and neck cancer microarray data, using percentiles [25, 75] as thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Similarity Measure</th>
<th>Pearl correlation</th>
<th>Cosine similarity</th>
<th>Mutual information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probe</td>
<td>Gene</td>
<td>Probe</td>
<td>Gene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211550_at</td>
<td>EGFR</td>
<td>211550_at</td>
<td>EGFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234591_at</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>1558378_a_at</td>
<td>AHNAK2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>222834_s_a_t</td>
<td>GNG12</td>
<td>204996_s_at</td>
<td>CELA2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>220624_s_a_t</td>
<td>ELF5</td>
<td>206447_at</td>
<td>CELA2A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233918_at</td>
<td>DCDC2B</td>
<td>234591_at</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1558378_a_at</td>
<td>AHNAK2</td>
<td>201183_s_at</td>
<td>CHD4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216176_at</td>
<td>HCRP1</td>
<td>222834_s_at</td>
<td>GNG12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>210365_at</td>
<td>ALLC</td>
<td>233918_at</td>
<td>DCDC2B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234749_s_a_t</td>
<td>POC1A</td>
<td>220624_s_at</td>
<td>ELF5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1553137_s_at</td>
<td>KLF11</td>
<td>221115_s_at</td>
<td>LENEPE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1559205_s_at</td>
<td>LENEPE</td>
<td>1552575_s_a_t</td>
<td>C6orf141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221115_s_at</td>
<td>LENEPE</td>
<td>1559205_s_a_t</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>221183_at</td>
<td>LOC1005073_88</td>
<td>217175_at</td>
<td>UGT2B15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>204996_s_a_t</td>
<td>CDK5R1</td>
<td>217308_at</td>
<td>OR1F2P</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1567068_at</td>
<td>OR4D1</td>
<td>220944_at</td>
<td>PGLYRP4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206586_at</td>
<td>CNR2</td>
<td>221629_s_a_t</td>
<td>FAM203A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206642_at</td>
<td>DSG1</td>
<td>227672_at</td>
<td>C8orf73</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>225500_s_a_t</td>
<td>SCAF1</td>
<td>232409_s_at</td>
<td>FBXL16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236614_at</td>
<td>LOC729683</td>
<td>1554912_s_a_t</td>
<td>ESYT3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237111_at</td>
<td>LOC388942</td>
<td>1559075_s_a_t</td>
<td>BAHCC1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Table 2.3: Top 20 rankings by similarity measures on head and neck cancer microarray data, using percentiles [50, 75] as thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure</th>
<th>Pearson correlation</th>
<th>Cosine similarity</th>
<th>Mutual information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Probe</td>
<td>Gene</td>
<td>Probe</td>
<td>Gene</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>211550_at</td>
<td>EGFR</td>
<td>211550_at</td>
<td>EGFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>214119_s_at</td>
<td>FKBPA1</td>
<td>201183_s_at</td>
<td>CHD4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>206677_at</td>
<td>KRT31</td>
<td>1559205_s_at</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1561509_at</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>224239_at</td>
<td>DEFB103A /// DEFB103B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205938_at</td>
<td>PPM1E</td>
<td>1570531_at</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234191_at</td>
<td>BCL2L14</td>
<td>231737_at</td>
<td>CACNG4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205341_at</td>
<td>EHD2</td>
<td>217175_at</td>
<td>UGT2B15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202945_at</td>
<td>FPIS</td>
<td>220021_at</td>
<td>TMC7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>229432_at</td>
<td>NAGS</td>
<td>1552575_a_at</td>
<td>C6orf141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244258_at</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>221629_x_at</td>
<td>FAM203A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1557514_a_at</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>231243_s_at</td>
<td>BHLHE41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208337_s_at</td>
<td>NR5A2</td>
<td>231908_at</td>
<td>ZDHHC18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233069_at</td>
<td>PPP4R1L</td>
<td>232718_at</td>
<td>LIN00589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>215835_at</td>
<td>LOC100653174</td>
<td>237430_at</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234933_at</td>
<td>CC2D2A</td>
<td>220944_at</td>
<td>PGLYRP4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>216603_at</td>
<td>SLC7A8</td>
<td>244202_at</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202711_at</td>
<td>EFNB1</td>
<td>221259_s_at</td>
<td>TEX11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202574_s_at</td>
<td>CSN1K2G</td>
<td>1558871_at</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235748_s_at</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>231295_at</td>
<td>ME3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>205751_at</td>
<td>SH3GL2</td>
<td>217234_s_at</td>
<td>EZR</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5.2. Protein Expression

The similarity measure results for RPPA data are shown in Tables 2.4-2.6, for three alternative threshold selections. For all threshold selections – and for all similarity

Table 2.4: Top 20 rankings by similarity measures on head and neck cancer RPPA data, using percentiles [25, 50] as thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure</th>
<th>Pearson correlation</th>
<th>Cosine similarity</th>
<th>Mutual information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EGFR</td>
<td>EGFR</td>
<td>EGFR</td>
<td>EGFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EGFR_pY1068</td>
<td>EGFR_pY1068</td>
<td>EGFR_pY1068</td>
<td>EGFR_pY1068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>E-Cadherin</td>
<td>eEF2K</td>
<td>VHL</td>
<td>VHL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>eIF4G</td>
<td>VHL</td>
<td>Akt</td>
<td>Akt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HER2</td>
<td>p70S6K</td>
<td>p70S6K</td>
<td>E-Cadherin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Akt</td>
<td>beta-Catenin</td>
<td>beta-Catenin</td>
<td>Bap1-c-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>eEF2K</td>
<td>Tuberin</td>
<td>Tuberin</td>
<td>Tuberin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tuberin</td>
<td>mTOR</td>
<td>mTOR</td>
<td>beta-Catenin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>p70S6K</td>
<td>ERK2</td>
<td>HER2</td>
<td>mTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>eIF4G</td>
<td>VHL</td>
<td>Akt</td>
<td>Akt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PDK1_pS241</td>
<td>PDK1_pS241</td>
<td>SF2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>INPP4B</td>
<td>Chk1_pS345</td>
<td>Chk1_pS345</td>
<td>CD31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>c-Myc</td>
<td>Ku80</td>
<td>Ku80</td>
<td>Bax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Tuberin</td>
<td>mTOR</td>
<td>mTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>c-Jun_pS73</td>
<td>E-Cadherin</td>
<td>E-Cadherin</td>
<td>p70S6K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>mTOR</td>
<td>elF4G</td>
<td>elF4G</td>
<td>elF4G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>mTOR</td>
<td>eIF4G</td>
<td>eIF4G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>beta-Catenin</td>
<td>Bap1-c-4</td>
<td>Bap1-c-4</td>
<td>c-Met_pY1235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>PDK1_pS241</td>
<td>PDK1_pS241</td>
<td>SF2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ERK2</td>
<td>TSC1</td>
<td>TSC1</td>
<td>MEK1_pS217_S221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2.5: Top 20 rankings by similarity measures on head and neck cancer RPPA data, using percentiles [25, 75] as thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure</th>
<th>Pearson correlation</th>
<th>Cosine similarity</th>
<th>Mutual information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EGFR</td>
<td>EGFR</td>
<td>EGFR</td>
<td>EGFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EGFR_pY1068</td>
<td>EGFR_pY1068</td>
<td>EGFR_pY1068</td>
<td>EGFR_pY1068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>E-Cadherin</td>
<td>eEF2K</td>
<td>VHL</td>
<td>VHL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>eIF4G</td>
<td>VHL</td>
<td>Akt</td>
<td>Akt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>HER2</td>
<td>p70S6K</td>
<td>p70S6K</td>
<td>E-Cadherin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Akt</td>
<td>beta-Catenin</td>
<td>beta-Catenin</td>
<td>Bap1-c-4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>eEF2K</td>
<td>Tuberin</td>
<td>Tuberin</td>
<td>Tuberin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Tuberin</td>
<td>mTOR</td>
<td>mTOR</td>
<td>beta-Catenin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>p70S6K</td>
<td>ERK2</td>
<td>HER2</td>
<td>mTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>eIF4G</td>
<td>VHL</td>
<td>Akt</td>
<td>Akt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>PDK1_pS241</td>
<td>PDK1_pS241</td>
<td>SF2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>INPP4B</td>
<td>Chk1_pS345</td>
<td>Chk1_pS345</td>
<td>CD31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>c-Myc</td>
<td>Ku80</td>
<td>Ku80</td>
<td>Bax</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Tuberin</td>
<td>mTOR</td>
<td>mTOR</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>c-Jun_pS73</td>
<td>E-Cadherin</td>
<td>E-Cadherin</td>
<td>p70S6K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>mTOR</td>
<td>elF4G</td>
<td>elF4G</td>
<td>elF4G</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>mTOR</td>
<td>eIF4G</td>
<td>eIF4G</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>beta-Catenin</td>
<td>Bap1-c-4</td>
<td>Bap1-c-4</td>
<td>c-Met_pY1235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>PDK1_pS241</td>
<td>PDK1_pS241</td>
<td>SF2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>ERK2</td>
<td>TSC1</td>
<td>TSC1</td>
<td>MEK1_pS217_S221</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
measures – the top-ranked protein was EGFR itself, as expected. The second-most similar protein was phosphorylated EGFR (Tyr1068). Overall, the selections among the different measures were highly congruent. However, among the three threshold-cases, there were several cases where relevant HNSCC-relevant proteins were selected by the multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure, but not by others. These included well-known cancer-related proteins like c-Myc [148], phosphorylated c-Jun [149], HER2 [150], and NF-kB [1], as well as proteins which have been implicated in HNSCC in recent studies, like INPP4B [151, 152] and ACC1 and AMPK [153]. Others highlighted only by the multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure in this case study were GSK3-alpha-beta [154], Ku80 [155], and TSC1 [156].

Table 2.6: Top 20 rankings by similarity measures on head and neck cancer RPPA data, using percentiles [50, 75] as thresholds

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure</th>
<th>Pearson correlation</th>
<th>Cosine similarity</th>
<th>Mutual information</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>EGFR</td>
<td>EGFR</td>
<td>EGFR</td>
<td>EGFR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>EGFR_pY1068</td>
<td>EGFR_pY1068</td>
<td>EGFR_pY1068</td>
<td>EGFR_pY1068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>mTOR</td>
<td>mTOR</td>
<td>mTOR</td>
<td>CD31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>p70S6K</td>
<td>VHL</td>
<td>VHL</td>
<td>mTOR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>PDK1_pS241</td>
<td>PDK1_pS241</td>
<td>PDK1_pS241</td>
<td>VHL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>beta-Catenin</td>
<td>HER2_pY1248</td>
<td>HER2_pY1248</td>
<td>p70S6K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>VHL</td>
<td>Chk1_pS345</td>
<td>Chk1_pS345</td>
<td>PDK1_pS241</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>E-Cadherin</td>
<td>p70S6K</td>
<td>p70S6K</td>
<td>Akt</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>AMPK_pT172</td>
<td>eEF2K</td>
<td>eEF2K</td>
<td>14-3-3_ epsilon</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>eEF2K</td>
<td>Tuberin</td>
<td>Tuberin</td>
<td>SF2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Ku80</td>
<td>E-Cadherin</td>
<td>E-Cadherin</td>
<td>PDK1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>Tuberin</td>
<td>INPP4B</td>
<td>INPP4B</td>
<td>eEF2K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>eIF4G</td>
<td>eIF4G</td>
<td>eIF4G</td>
<td>beta-Catenin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>HER2</td>
<td>beta-Catenin</td>
<td>beta-Catenin</td>
<td>PRDX1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Chk1_pS345</td>
<td>Ku80</td>
<td>Ku80</td>
<td>Caspase_7_cleavedD198</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>ACC_pS79</td>
<td>Dvl3</td>
<td>Dvl3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>p90RSK</td>
<td>ERK2</td>
<td>ERK2</td>
<td>HER2_pY1248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>NF-kB-ppS36</td>
<td>p90RSK</td>
<td>p90RSK</td>
<td>E-Cadherin</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>c-Jun_pS73</td>
<td>ACC1</td>
<td>ACC1</td>
<td>c-Met_pY1235</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>INPP4B</td>
<td>MEK1</td>
<td>MEK1</td>
<td>Dvl3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.5.3. Mass Spectrometry Imaging (Lipidomic) Data

In the final set of results, the similarity measure was applied to the experimental MSI data. The top 12 m/z images selected by each measure are shown in Figure 2.11. All measures agree that the reference itself is the most similar (selection 1: m/z 889.6). Notably, the proposed similarity measure gives results which are qualitatively very similar to the reference m/z image. The Pearson correlation and mutual information results for three classes also closely resemble the reference m/z image, while the cosine similarity results for three classes include several noisy images without a clearly discernible pattern. Interestingly, the top 12 results selected by the proposed similarity

![Figure 2.11](image-url)

Figure 2.11: The 12 most similar m/z images, as ranked by the four similarity measures. The multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure results are shown with the mean and kurtosis as combination functions.
measure using the mean and kurtosis as combination functions are not identical. Moreover, neither set of results overlaps completely with the results from Pearson correlation, mutual information, and cosine similarity. For example, the proposed similarity measure, using the mean as the combination function, selects \( m/z \) 908.9, which none of the others select. Similarly, \( m/z \) 894.5, another unique selection, is picked by the proposed similarity measure when using the kurtosis as the combination function. Examining the top \( n \) results is common when applying a similarity measure to a dataset, and these observations indicate that applying the proposed multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure can yield relevant and useful results.

2.6. Discussion and Key Innovations

This chapter describes the design, development, and testing of two similarity measures. The second, the multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure, is the main result. It enables the pairwise comparison of images and data vectors featuring any positive integer number of intensity levels. This is an extension of initial work on the hypergeometric similarity measure, which was restricted to binary data. Using synthetic datasets, the proposed multivariate measure was compared to Pearson correlation, cosine similarity and mutual information in terms of sample rankings, and identified several favorable properties of the proposed measure. Next, a method of piecewise approximation was developed to facilitate the application of this approach to large datasets. Piecewise approximation was tested at several different subsection sizes on synthetic data, and was observed to follow the trend of the exact score. Functions for combining subsection similarity scores found through piecewise approximation were empirically assessed using biological data. The proposed similarity measure was tested on two HNSCC datasets: gene expression microarray data and reverse phase protein array
(RPPA) data. The proposed similarity measure was also demonstrated to be effective in identifying qualitatively similar images in a lipidomics MSI dataset. Critically, for all datasets, it made relevant selections which were not identified by other similarity measures in their top selections.

The results of this study highlight several avenues for further research on the multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure. For instance, this approach is defined for any positive integer number of classes, but the results in this study have considered only three classes. Three classes were chosen both for simplicity in examining similarity measure properties and to highlight the difference between the binary case and the multi-class case. Future research can assess the effect of increasing the number of classes. However, as previously noted, the generation of the isomarginal family becomes increasingly demanding as the number of classes increases [121-124]. Additionally, alternative definitions of the statistic \( S(k) \) will be explored. Here, I chose \( S(k) \) as the set of diagonal elements of the contingency table. In the future, it may be desirable to include sub- and super-diagonal terms when larger numbers of classes are considered. The selection of the appropriate number of classes – and of appropriate thresholds for separating classes – is another issue of interest. In this study, several percentile-based thresholds between classes were compared for the gene and protein expression datasets. From the perspective of practical biomedical applications, choices of thresholds for a particular dataset may be based on examination of descriptive data statistics, or by applying selected tests as a preliminary step [157]. The selection of functions for aggregating subsection scores obtained from piecewise approximation is another area for further study. Six functions were tested in this study, and many additional functions could
be tested. Interestingly, the set of top selections using the mean and kurtosis were not identical, indicating that it may also be useful to consider which combination functions may be complimentary.

The Key Innovations of this chapter are:

- Development of binary hypergeometric similarity measure using Fisher’s exact test
- Development of multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure using the Fisher-Freeman-Halton test
- Development of a piecewise approximation algorithm to facilitate application of the multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure to high-dimensional data vectors
- Implementation on two HNSCC (transcriptomic and proteomic) and one non-HNSCC (MSI, metabolomic / lipidomic) datasets indicates that the proposed multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure makes relevant selections not identified by other similarity measures
CHAPTER 3

DETECT-TLC: EXPLORATORY DATA MINING FOR METABOLOMICS

3.1. Data Acquisition for Metabolomics

Metabolomics offers a perspective of the small molecules, including lipids, within an organism or patient [158, 159]. Compared to other -omics levels, the “chemical fingerprint” measured through metabolomics is highly dynamic, and has been shown to be a promising direction for the diagnosis and monitoring of disease [160, 161]. In HNSCC in particular, metabolomics approaches are demonstrating promising results for disease detection and early diagnosis [34-36]

The key data acquisition methodologies used in metabolomics are \(^1\)H NMR and mass spectrometry. Mass spectrometry is used both alone and coupled to liquid (LC) and gas (GC) chromatography (LC-MS and GS-MS, respectively) [162, 163]. The reason for this coupling is because the chromatography step staggers the input sample flow to the mass spectrometer according to size, charge, or other properties, thereby generating sparser and easier-to-interpret mass spectra.

3.1.1. Coupling Thin Layer Chromatography with Mass Spectrometry Imaging

While LC and GC both return 1D data – i.e., spectra with intensities on the vertical axis and retention time on the horizontal axis – thin layer chromatography (TLC) is a 2D chromatographic separation process. Figure 3.1 shows how separated mixture components appear as spots on a TLC plate. TLC is a commonly used technique in synthetic and organic chemistry for the separation of complex mixtures due to its
simplicity and speed [164]. In metabolomics, TLC alone has been applied to study bacteria [165, 166], but it is frequently combined with mass spectrometry analysis.

Due to the 2D nature of TLC, it can be coupled with mass spectrometry either by assessing an individual spot using conventional mass spectrometry, or by interrogating the entire TLC plate through MSI [167-170]. MSI analysis of TLC plates has been performed using different mass spectrometry ionization approaches, including including matrix assisted laser desorption ionization (MALDI) [171] and desorption electrospray ionization (DESI) [172, 173].

The advantage of TLC-MSI coupling is the molecular-level resolution: instead of being restricted to spots visible on the TLC plate, the MSI datacube can describe thousands of measurable spots. Examining a TLC-MSI dataset is straightforward if the analyte of interest is known, but for exploratory data mining purposes, the volume of data presents a challenge. This provides an opportunity for knowledge-driven mining in terms of implicit similarity: the goal is to identify all m/z images containing regions similar to a TLC spot, regardless of its spatial location or orientation. Currently, the state-of-the-art is
manual inspection of the thousands of images in the MSI dataset to detect such images of interest, which is a substantial data processing bottleneck. This chapter presents the development, testing, and validation of DetectTLC, a software tool for automatically detecting m/z images containing regions similar to TLC spots.

3.2. Development of Image Feature-Based Modeling Tool

The hypothesis behind DetectTLC is that m/z images containing spot-like regions are distinguishable from other images on the basis of quantitative image features. DetectTLC utilizes a five-step image processing pipeline, culminating in the extraction of such features. In the first step, smoothing filters are used to remove background noise from the m/z images, and very sparse and noisy images are excluded based on pixel counts. In the second step, the continuous-intensity m/z images comprising the MSI dataset are converted into binary images. In the third step, morphological image processing operations are used to fill in small holes in the binary m/z images. In the fourth step, quantitative image features are extracted for each m/z image in the dataset, with the goal of associating more extreme feature values with m/z images which contain TLC spot-like regions. In the fifth and final step, the m/z images are ranked in terms of the quantitative image features and are visualized in the graphical user interface.

Alternative combinations of these steps were compared in order to identify well-performing pipelines. Each of these steps is discussed in detail in the following section.

3.2.1. Image Processing Pipeline

*Step 1: Smoothing and Pixel-count Filters*

Median filtering was used to remove background noise. For the MSI datasets examined in this study, 5×5 and 7×7 median filters were compared, but the difference in
performance was small compared to the effects of other factors, so only results from 7×7 filters are shown. Median filtered-results are also compared with un-filtered results.

The pixel-count-based filter was useful for removing sparse and streak-filled images from consideration. It was observed that many DESI-MSI images were sparse or streak-filled. In different datasets, the necessity of performing this filtering step may vary, as few such images may exist. Typically, binary m/z images with fewer than 5 and more than 1500 non-zero pixels were removed from consideration. Results with and without this filtering step were compared.

**Step 2: Generating Binary Images**

Two different methods for generating binary images were compared in this study. The first is a manually-selected threshold: if any signal $S$ was present at a pixel $(x, y)$ in the original m/z image above the threshold value $T$ (i.e., $S(x, y) > T$), the value of the pixel in the binary image $B(x, y) = 1$. Otherwise, $B(x, y) = 0$. Users may select the desired threshold through the Advanced Options menu of the DetectTLC interface, which also provides a visualization of the selected threshold with respect to the average spectrum of the dataset. The second technique is Otsu’s method, which selects the threshold at which the within-class variance of the pixels assigned to each label is minimized [174].

**Step 3: Morphological Operations**

As shown in Figure 3.2, an m/z image may feature a spot-like region that is not solid, i.e., single pixels or clusters of a few pixels where no or low signal was detected may occur between pixels where signal was detected. To the user, this area is interpreted
as a single spot-like region regardless. However, these discontinuities can influence the automated, image-feature based detection of spot-like regions. To address this issue, DetectTLC applies morphological image processing operations to the MSI dataset. Erosion and dilation are two basic morphological operators used in image processing. A structuring element of a particular shape – common shapes include disks, squares, and diamonds – is used to remove (in erosion) or add (in dilation) a layer of pixels from the image. The compound morphological operators of opening and closing are defined in terms of erosion and dilation: in opening, erosion is followed by dilation, and in closing, dilation is followed by erosion. In this study, we compared the performance of dilation and opening in generating homogenous spot-like regions: dilation fills in small holes in a single region and gaps between regions, while opening removes connections between separate regions.

*Step 4: Scoring Based on Quantitative Image Feature Values*

The performances of eight quantitative image features were investigated and compared in the development of DetectTLC. These included seven shape-based features:
area, compactness, convex area, eccentricity, extent, number of connected regions, and solidity; and one texture-based feature: entropy. Each of these features is described further in Table 3.1.

Table 3.1. Definition and description of image features investigated in the development of DetectTLC.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Image feature</th>
<th>Definition</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area ($A$)</td>
<td>$A = \sum f(x)$, where $x$ represents pixels with a value of one in the binary image, and $f$ is a neighborhood operation function.</td>
<td>This feature is the weighted sum of pixels with a value of one in the binary image. Different spatial distributions of pixels are weighted. Images containing a spot-like region may have lower area values than images with other structures.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compactness ($Co$)</td>
<td>$Co = P^2 / A$, where $P$ is the perimeter of the non-zero region and $A$ is its area.</td>
<td>Compactness is a regional descriptor defined as the ratio of an object’s squared perimeter to its area. Compactness is minimal for disk-shaped regions [115], so images with a spot-like region may be characterized by lower compactness values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convex area ($Ca$)</td>
<td>$Ca = \sum x$ where $x$ represents pixels which are in the convex hull of the image.</td>
<td>The convex area is the number of pixels inside the convex hull, which is the smallest convex polygon that contains the entire region of non-zero pixels. A smaller convex area implies a small, cohesive region of interest, so images containing a spot-like region may be characterized by lower convex area values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccentricity ($Ec$)</td>
<td>$Ec = Dc / Dv$, where $Dc$ is the distance from the center to the focus of the ellipse, and $Dv$ is the distance from the center to a vertex.</td>
<td>Eccentricity is calculated by fitting an ellipse to the region of interest, such that the ellipse and the region share the same second moments. The image feature is then the eccentricity of the fitted ellipse. For a circular region, eccentricity would be 0; for a line it would be 1. Images containing a spot-like region may be characterized by lower eccentricity values.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.1 continued overleaf.
Table 3.1, continued

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feature</th>
<th>Definition</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Entropy (( En ))</strong></td>
<td>( En = - \sum_{i=0}^{1} p_i \log_2(p_i) ), where ( p_i ) represents the fraction of zero ((i = 0)) and non-zero ((i = 1)) pixels in the image. Entropy is a measure of randomness used to describe image texture. For binary images, entropy is defined in terms of the fractions of zero and non-zero pixels. The quantity is maximized when the fraction of each pixel type is equal, so images with larger spot-like regions may be characterized by higher entropy values.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Extent (( Ex ))</strong></td>
<td>( Ex = \sum x / \sum B ), where ( x ) represents pixels which are within the region, and ( B ) represents all pixels which are within the bounding box. Extent is defined in terms of the bounding box, which is the smallest rectangular region that completely encloses the region. Extent measures the proportion to which the region of interest fills the bounding box. Images with a spot-like region may be characterized by higher values of ( Ex ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Number of connected regions (( Re ))</strong></td>
<td>( Re = E + H ), where ( E ) is the Euler number and ( H ) is the number of holes. The number of connected components is related to the Euler number ( (E) ), a commonly used shape-based image feature. The Euler number is defined as the difference between the number of connected components and the number of holes ( (H) ). In an image with solid spot-like feature, ideally there would be no holes ( (Re = E) ), so the number of connected components was considered as a feature instead of Euler's number. Images with several distinct spot-like regions may be characterized by higher values of ( Re ).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Solidity (( S ))</strong></td>
<td>( S = A / Ca ), where ( A ) is the image feature Area and ( Ca ) is the image feature Convex area. Solidity is a composite feature, defined in terms of Area and Convex Area. This image feature measures the fraction of pixels which are in both the convex hull and the region of interest. Images with a spot-like region may be characterized by higher values of ( S ).</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3.2.2. Features of Graphical User Interface

The user interface comprises four windows, with the main window shown in Figure 3.3. This window displays the spot-containing images identified through different
Figure 3.3: The main graphical user interface with the top 24 images containing spot-like regions are displayed. Data is first uploaded and (optionally) de-isotoped, following which the user may select from “Protocol 1” or “Protocol 2” for feature selection, or design their own processing pipeline through the “Advanced Options” tab. Spots with similar spatial distributions may be identified using the “Similarity Options”. Selected images and/or spectra may be exported using the “Export Options”.

algorithms, and contains a control panel for accessing the “Load New Dataset“, “Advanced Options“, and “Similarity Options“ menus. Algorithm results are displayed on the main graphical user interface (GUI), 24 m/z images at a time. After running a processing protocol, images are initially sorted based on a quantitative image feature-based score. Within each window, they may be re-sorted by ascending m/z value for convenience. A scroll bar is used to scan though all images, which may also be visualized with alternate color schemes if desired. Additionally, the user can narrow the examined mass range for more targeted examination of images containing spot-like regions. The main user options in the DetectTLC GUI are described below.
Load New Dataset

DetectTLC accommodates MSI data in Analyze 7.5 and mzXML format (with time and position information). It also accepts MSI data which have been imported into MATLAB and saved as matrices in ‘.mat’ files. Thus, other MSI data formats can also be used with DetectTLC if they are first imported into MATLAB.

De-isotope data

DetectTLC currently uses a basic de-isotoping algorithm in which the highest-intensity m/z value in each 3 Da-window is retained. Each spectrum is de-isotoped individually, and the spectra are then re-assembled into a de-isotoped datacube. After de-isotoping is performed, all further processing protocols will automatically be performed on the de-isotoped data. In order to return to the raw data (with no de-isotoping), it is necessary to re-load the data files.

Visualization

The main graphical user interface displays 24 m/z images at a time. The scroll bar at the bottom of the tool screen allows users to scroll through the dataset, showing m/z images 25-48, 49-72, etc. Whenever a processing protocol is implemented, the interface will show the top 24 m/z images according to that protocol, and the user can scroll through the rest of the ordered selections. Additionally, the user can select among three color schemes to customize the visualization in order to enhance detection of relevant m/z images.
**Pre-set automatic protocols**

Two automatic protocols are offered. The first, “Protocol 1: Larger spots”, uses entropy as the quantitative image feature for scoring. The second, “Protocol 2: Smaller spots”, uses compactness as the image feature. The default settings for filtering by intensity, filtering by non-zero pixels and median filtering are implemented in both of these protocols.

**Refresh current dataset**

By pressing the “Refresh dataset” button, the user can return the display to the original MSI data before any processing protocols (pre-set or via the advanced options) were applied. If the dataset had been de-isotoped, the de-isotoped data will be shown.

**Find m/z values**

This option displays all images corresponding to the user-input m/z range. Any processing steps that are called after the “Find m/z values” command will operate only on the images within that m/z range. To process the entire dataset, it is necessary to press the ‘Refresh dataset’ button first.

**Ignore m/z values**

This feature can be used to select m/z images which are not of interest to the user (e.g., noisy images, or images with homogeneous signal intensity) and remove them from the current dataset view. The original MSI data can be retrieved by using the “Refresh dataset” option.
Sort by image feature value or m/z value

As a default, the m/z images returned by any processing protocol are sorted by the quantitative image feature value. To facilitate review, the 24 images within an individual screen may also be sorted in order of ascending m/z value.

Export (with or without average spectrum)

Two different export utilities are available in DetectTLC: (1) Export Selected Images and (2) Export With Spectrum. In (1) Export Selected Images, the user can use the checkboxes below each m/z image to make selections, and then click the button labeled “Export Selected Images”. All selected images will be saved in ‘.fig’ format to the user-specified directory, and an ASCII file listing the selected m/z values will be created in the same directory. Multiple m/z images within one screen (24 images) can be exported simultaneously. In (2) Export With Spectrum, the user will instead click the button labeled “With Spectrum”. A new figure will appear, showing the selected m/z image. The user can use the drawing cursor to select a region of interest by drawing a line through the spot-like region or around it. After the region of interest is selected, a composite figure containing both the m/z image and the average spectrum in the region of interest (Figure 3.4) will be saved as a MATLAB ‘.fig’ file in the user-specified directory. Again, multiple m/z images (24 per screen) can be selected simultaneously. If multiple m/z images are selected, the process of manual region of interest selection will be repeated for each image, and an ASCII file listing the selected m/z values will be created in the same directory.
Figure 3.4: Example of selected $m/z$ image ($m/z$ 140.1043) to draw a region of interest (ROI, outlined in white) and resulting average spectrum for selected pixels.

**Advanced Options GUI**

The Advanced Options GUI (Figure 3.5) provides users with more control over how the MSI data is processed and analyzed. Four different pre-processing control panels are available: (1) Generation of binary images; (2) Pixel-count filtering; (3) Median filtering; and (4) Image feature selection.

Figure 3.5: Advanced Options GUI in DetectTLC.
In DetectTLC, morphological operations and image feature scores are computed on binary $m/z$ images. In the “Generation of binary images” control panel, the user has the option of using Otsu’s method (default) or manually selecting a threshold for generating binary $m/z$ images. The success of the thresholding process is highly dependent on spectral signal-to-noise; it is valuable to identify genuine spots that may have low abundance, but that are still sufficiently above baseline noise. Manual threshold selection allows for the user’s knowledge of the spectral quality to be factored into the processing, but Otsu’s method for threshold selection provides a satisfactory approach without the need for user input. In the case studies presented here, manual threshold selection and Otsu’s method yielded comparable results across all other processing variables. The average spectrum across the MSI dataset is displayed below the thresholding panel in the GUI, and when the “Apply” button is clicked, the manually-selected threshold is overlaid on the spectrum as a red line.

The “Pixel-count filtering” control panel can be used to eliminate sparse images (i.e., $m/z$ images with non-zero signal in very few pixels) and so-called streaky images (i.e., $m/z$ images with high intensity signal in many pixels, but in a noisy, non-informative spatial pattern). In the MSI dataset analyzed in this paper, sparse images were generated as a result of the centroiding process. These images were eliminated by establishing a minimum of 5 pixels for a spot to be detected. Conversely, no more than 1500 pixels for a particular $m/z$ could be present for a true spot, as the presence of that many pixels indicated streaks or widespread presence of a species across the entire TLC plate (e.g., an impurity in the DESI solvent). For general use, a histogram showing the distribution of $m/z$ images with different numbers of non-zero pixels is displayed. The user can refer to
this histogram to select the upper and lower thresholds for pixel-count filtering. When the “Apply” button is clicked, all $m/z$ images containing a number of non-zero pixels above the upper threshold or below the lower threshold are discarded from the dataset. The default setting is to discard images with fewer than 5 non-zero pixels and with more than 1500 non-zero pixels.

In the “Median filtering of $m/z$ images” panel, the user can select the size of the two-dimensional median filter applied to remove “salt-and-pepper” background noise from the $m/z$ images. The default setting is a 5×5 median filter. If no median filtering is desired, the filter size should be set to 0×0.

The fourth and final panel allows the user to select from among the eight image features investigated in this paper: area, compactness, convex area, eccentricity, entropy, extent, number of connected regions, and solidity. The $m/z$ images remaining after the filtering steps, sorted according to the selected image feature, will be displayed in the main GUI. Selection of the image feature of interest is independent of the three pre-processing options. It is not necessary to perform any pre-processing before applying the image feature-based sorting – the default settings of Otsu’s method, < 5, > 1500 pixel-count filtering, and 5×5 median filtering will be applied. The three pre-processing steps can also be applied individually or in any combination prior to selecting an image feature.

**Similarity Assessment**

Multiple protocols for performing similarity analysis are available in DetectTLC. The most basic method, which is implemented by selecting any $m/z$ image via its
Figure 3.6: Advanced Similarity Options GUI in DetectTLC. The binary template corresponding to the selected m/z image for m/z 140 is shown as an example.

By clicking the “Find Similar” button, will return the most similar m/z images within the same dataset, as ranked by the binary hypergeometric similarity measure (described in Chapter 2). Alternatively, by clicking the “Advanced Similarity” button, the Advanced Similarity Options window will open, as shown in Figure 3.6.

The Advanced Similarity Options window provides three methods for managing the region of interest (ROI) for similarity assessment. These are: (1) Create and save a new ROI template (may then be used with the same or another dataset, i.e., “inter-dataset”); (2) Import an existing ROI template (may be from the same or another dataset, i.e., “inter-dataset”); (3) Create and implement an ROI template on the current dataset (i.e., “intra-dataset”). These options are described further as follows.

The first option, “Save ROI (inter-dataset)” enables the user to draw a binary ROI template and save it for later use, with the same or another MSI dataset having the same spatial dimensions. If the checkbox of any m/z image was selected in the main GUI, that m/z image will be provided as the guide for drawing the binary template. If not, the
average image across the loaded dataset will be provided. Once the template is drawn, the
user may save it to a selected filename and directory. If a particular $m/z$ image is used as
the template basis, three variables are saved: the binary ROI, the $m/z$ vector from current
dataset, and the peak height of selected $m/z$ in the current average spectrum. When the
template is imported later, this data will be used to draw a spectrum of similar peaks. If
the average $m/z$ image is used as the template basis, only the binary ROI is saved.

In the second option, “Import ROI (inter-dataset)”, a previously drawn ROI can be
loaded. In order to use this ROI for similarity assessment, it must have the same
spatial dimensions as the currently loaded dataset. Some variations in spatial dimensions
can be handled by DetectTLC. These are:

1. Template image is rotated 90 degrees with respect to current dataset. DetectTLC
   will rotate the template so that the dimensions match.

2. Template image has one extra row and/or column. DetectTLC will delete the first
   row and/or column from the dataset.

3. Template image is rotated 90 degrees and has an extra row and/or column.

Before any of these actions are taken, DetectTLC will notify the user that the
spatial dimensions of the current dataset and selected template do not match. If the
mismatch falls into any of these three categories, DetectTLC will prompt as to whether
the template should be automatically adjusted. If the mismatch does not fall into these
three categories, DetectTLC will prompt the user to load a different template for use with
the current dataset.

In the third option, “Draw template (intra-dataset)”, the user can draw a template
which will immediately be used for similarity assessment on the currently loaded dataset,
and which will not be saved. This differs from basic “Find Similar” option in that the user may select which similarity metric to use, and the spectrum of most similar peaks may be plotted.

After a template is available (either through the Import or Draw options), the median filter, pixel-count filter, “Choose similarity measure,” and “Plot spectrum of most similar” panels become visible. The median filter and pixel-count filter options are as described previously. The user may select between two similarity measures: Pearson correlation or the hypergeometric similarity measure. As discussed in Chapter 2, analyses on MSI and other types of high-dimensional data have indicated that these two similarity measures tend to yield relevant but complementary (i.e., including non-overlapping, unique selections) top ranked results [175, 176]. Once the “Select” button is pressed, similarity assessment will proceed using the selected measure, and the m/z values in the current dataset will be sorted in the main GUI according to their similarity to the template. After similarity assessment has completed, the user may plot a spectrum of most similar m/z values by choosing the number to plot in the “Plot spectrum of most similar” panel. If the imported template was based on a particular m/z value, that m/z value (the precursor peak, in precursor-product analysis) will be indicated in red on the spectrum, and the similar peaks from the current dataset will be plotted in black. Otherwise, all peaks will be plotted in black.

3.3. Case Studies

The datasets used for the case studies are related to prebiotically-relevant abiotic synthesis of nucleic acids such as DNA and RNA. While these datasets are not linked to HNSCC, the advantage is that they are less complex mixtures than eukaryotic cell
lysates. Thus, they provide test cases for DetectTLC that have comparatively less chemical noise and are easier to interpret, thereby facilitating the testing and validation of the tool.

Three datasets were investigated. The first and second both involved reaction products that are part of the synthesis of pyrazin-2-one (PZO). The two datasets were generated by using two different solvent systems (A and B). PZO-A was used in the first case study, Pipeline Comparison, and PZO-A and PZO-B were investigated in the second case study, TLC Spot Detection. The third dataset, which was utilized in the Parent-Fragment Ion Detection case study, used the reaction synthesis mixture for 2-aminopyrazine (APZ). All datasets were DESI-MSI. The full details of the experimental data acquisition process are described in [177].

3.3.1. Pipeline Comparison

Considering the two thresholding methods, two morphological operators, two median filter options (none and 7×7), two pixel-count filter options (none and excluding < 5, > 1500), and eight image features, a total of 128 alternative processing pipelines are possible. These were compared for the PZO MSI dataset. Each pipeline was assessed by the number of images in the top 40 rankings which contained true spot-like regions, as determined by manual inspection and verification of selected spots by collaborators in the Fernández lab. The full results of this comparison are shown in Table 3.2.

For this MSI dataset, the best results were returned by the analysis pipeline consisting of (1) Otsu’s threshold, (2) morphological opening, (3) application of a 7×7 median filter, and (4) removal of images with < 5 and > 1500 non-zero pixels. For all of the image features except area, all 40 of the top 40 ranked images contained TLC spot-
Table 3.2: Performance comparison of all 128 alternative processing pipelines in identifying \( m/z \) images containing TLC spot-like regions among the top 40 rankings.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Binarization</th>
<th>Morphological Operation</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>5&lt;(x&lt;1500)</th>
<th>None</th>
<th>5&lt;(x&lt;1500)</th>
<th>Pixel Filtering</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5&lt;(x&lt;1500)</td>
<td>None</td>
<td>5&lt;(x&lt;1500)</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>Dilation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Otsu</td>
<td>Dilation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of connected regions</td>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>Dilation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Otsu</td>
<td>Dilation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convex area</td>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>Dilation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Otsu</td>
<td>Dilation</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccentricity</td>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>Dilation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Otsu</td>
<td>Dilation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compactness</td>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>Dilation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>30</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Otsu</td>
<td>Dilation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidity</td>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>Dilation</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Otsu</td>
<td>Dilation</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>Dilation</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Otsu</td>
<td>Dilation</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entropy</td>
<td>Manual</td>
<td>Dilation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Otsu</td>
<td>Dilation</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>39</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Opening</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>40</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 3.7: Example of \textit{m/z} images featuring larger TLC spot-like regions. The top 40 selections are shown for the analysis pipeline consisting of (1) Otsu’s method for generating binary images, (2) morphological opening, (3) 7×7 median filtering, (4) removal of images with < 5 and > 1500 non-zero pixels, and (5) entropy image feature.

Figure 3.8: Example of \textit{m/z} images featuring smaller TLC spot-like regions. The top 40 selections are shown for the analysis pipeline consisting of (1) Otsu’s method for generating binary images, (2) morphological opening, (3) 7×7 median filtering, (4) removal of images with < 5 and > 1500 non-zero pixels, and (5) the compactness image feature.
like regions. The difference among the feature measures is most clearly demonstrated by the variety and size of the spots identified, as illustrated to an extent in Figures 3.7-3.8.

To further investigate these differences, the overlap among the top 40 rankings between each feature pair is shown in Table 3.3. This comparison confirms qualitative observations: image features which returned \( m/z \) images with smaller spot-like regions, such as compactness and convex area, had similar top 40 lists (e.g., 34/40 in common). Meanwhile, entropy, which returned \( m/z \) images with larger spot-like regions, and compactness had very different lists (e.g., 11/40 in common). Importantly, none of the image features were completely redundant in terms of their top 40 rankings. Image feature pairs which highlighted similar types (e.g. smaller or larger) of spot-like regions still returned unique \( m/z \) images. For example, entropy and extent both tended to

Table 3.3: Pairwise comparison of \( m/z \) images selected as the top 40 selections by different image features.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Area</th>
<th># Connected Regions</th>
<th>Convex Area</th>
<th>Eccentricity</th>
<th>Compactness</th>
<th>Solidity</th>
<th>Extent</th>
<th>Entropy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td># Connected Regions</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Convex Area</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eccentricity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compactness</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solidity</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extent</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Entropy</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
highlight larger spot-like regions, but only 20/40 of their top-ranked images were in common. Thus, examining both of their top-ranked lists would be helpful during analysis, compared to considering only one image feature.

3.3.2. TLC Spot Detection

This case study demonstrates the application of DetectTLC in exploratory data mining through the PZO-A and PZO-B datasets.

DetectTLC Identifies Known Reaction Mixture Components

Three major products of the PZO synthesis process have previously been identified, and their chemical structures are known. These molecules are indicated in Figure 3.9(b). The TLC-MSI dataset was analyzed using DetectTLC. The top 20 results included images corresponding to the known products in terms of $m/z$ and spatial location, as shown in Figure 3.9(c-d).

![Figure 3.9](image)

Figure 3.9: (a) Fluorescence image of a developed high-performance TLC (HPTLC) plate with the area imaged through DESI-MSI outlined in green (b) Known products of the PZO reaction, with numbers indicating the spatial location of each product in the fluorescence and MS images (c) Selected ion images acquired by DESI-MSI of reaction products previously identified, and (d) the corresponding images found by DetectTLC.
DetectTLC Can Help to Identify Relevant Components through Untargeted Analysis

When the PZO reaction mixture was analyzed using solvent system B, an intense fluorescent spot was observed that had not been seen using solvent system A, as shown in Figure 3.10(a). Processing the PZO-B dataset with DetectTLC yielded an ion image (m/z 167.0353) in which the spot was co-localized with that of the fluorescent image, as shown in Figure 3.10(c). This image was the 13th generated by DetectTLC, and appeared on the first page of results in the main GUI. Combining the DetectTLC-supplied m/z value with knowledge of reaction chemistry, my collaborators in the Fernández lab were able to tentatively identify this spot as 3,5(6)-dimethyl-4-oxoethyl-2-oxo-pyrazin-4-ium, a plausible reaction side-product of PZO synthesis.

Figure 3.10: (a) Fluorescence image of a developed high-performance TLC (HPTLC) plate of the PZO reaction mixture, as separated by solvent system B. The green box indicates the area imaged using DESI-MSI, and Spot 4 indicates the unknown signal. (b) The manually plotted image of m/z 167.0353 and (c) the DetectTLC image identifying compound with m/z 167.0815 to be co-localized with Spot 4.
### 3.3.3. Parent-Fragment Ion Detection

The third and final case study applies the similarity assessment capabilities of DetectTLC to assist in structural identification of detected ions. In order to identify ions detected through mass spectrometry, it is necessary to obtain fragmentation data from high-energy ionization. In a typical tandem mass spectrometry (MS/MS) analysis, a precursor (parent) ion is selected for fragmentation. In MSI, selecting and fragmenting individual parent ions while maintaining high imaging throughput is challenging. A solution is to instead alternate between high- and low-energy scans while imaging, enabling both parent and fragment ions to be detected during a single experiment. This results in two datasets of equal or almost equal spatial dimensions, one consisting of parent ions, and another of fragment ions. DetectTLC utilizes spatial similarity measures to match potential fragments with parents.

This process is performed by allowing the user to select a parent ion of interest using the ‘Advanced Similarity’ GUI, and then identifying the most similar images in the fragment ion dataset. The intact parent ion of interest was 5(2-hydroxyethyl)-2-aminopyrazine (m/z 140.0817), a predicted side-product of the APZ reaction. The image corresponding to m/z 140.1 was first identified by DetectTLC from the low collision-energy dataset, as previously shown in Figure 3.6, and was used to create a template of the spot’s location. Figures 3.11 and 3.12 show the results of the similarity assessment process, using Pearson correlation and the hypergeometric similarity measure, respectively. Both measures returned the same top 9 ranked ions, but sorted in different orders. Two of the top-ranked ions (m/z 122.0714 and 78.0345) were assigned to H₂O and CH₆N₂O losses from the parent ion, respectively. This observed fragmentation
pattern supports the structural assignment of 5(2-hydroxyethyl)-2-aminopyrazine to ions at m/z 140.0817.

In order to validate the fragment ions selected by DetectTLC, they were compared to liquid chromatography-tandem MS (LC-MS/MS) analysis performed on the parent ion.

Figure 3.11: (top) The most similar fragment ion images observed when Pearson correlation was applied using the image of the precursor ion (m/z 140.1) as a reference. (bottom) The fragmentation mass spectrum showing the top 10 most similar m/z values (reference m/z indicated by dashed red line). DetectTLC automatically generates both of these figures during similarity analysis.
Figure 3.12: (top) The most similar fragment ion images observed when the hypergeometric similarity was applied using the image of the precursor ion (m/z 140.1) as a reference. (bottom) The fragmentation mass spectrum showing the top 10 most similar m/z values (reference m/z indicated by dashed red line). DetectTLC automatically generates both of these figures during similarity analysis.

These results are shown in Figure 3.13. Three of the ions, at m/z 78.0, 122.1, and 140.1, were identified in both datasets. The LC-MS/MS experiment also identified four other fragment ions which were not selected by DetectTLC: m/z 95.1, 105.0, 109.1, and 110.1. Investigation as to why these ions were missed by DetectTLC showed that three of
DetectTLC similarity matching was performed using $m/z$ 140.1 as a template, and the high-energy ion images with red borders were in the top 8 outputs of DetectTLC. Figure courtesy of Fernández lab.

them ($m/z$ 95.1, 105.0, and 109.1) had very low contrast between the TLC spot and the background. The deisotoping protocol was also found to be a factor in filtering out these relevant images; follow-up experiments (not shown) with smaller windows for deisotoping led to the selection of $m/z$ 109.1 and 110.1 among the top 16 results.

### 3.4. Applications to HNSCC Research

DetectTLC is a general tool capable of processing TLC-MSI data from different biological contexts, including HNSCC. As previously noted, metabolomic research
through mass spectrometry in HNSCC is gaining momentum [35, 36]. In addition, TLC has been applied in HNSCC lipidomics research in several recent publications. For example, Gu and colleagues used TLC to separate and visualize lipids from five HNSCC cell lines in order to determine the mechanism by which RRR-α-tocopheryl succinate, a vitamin E analogue, induces apoptosis [178]. Yang and colleagues used TLC to track the effects of deguelin, which has been shown to have chemopreventive effects against other cancers, on HNSCC via the pro-apoptotic sphingolipid ceramide [179]. Thus, as research into metabolomics continues to grow, TLC-MSI analysis can help to uncover relevant metabolite- and lipid-centric patterns in HNSCC. DetectTLC can accelerate these experiments by removing the bottleneck of manual data processing.

### 3.5. Discussion and Key Innovations

In this chapter, I have described the design, development, and validation of DetectTLC, a software tool for accelerating metabolomics research through coupled TLC-MSI analysis. The previous state-of-the-art in assessing TLC-MSI datasets was manual inspection of the data to search for m/z images with TLC spot-like regions. DetectTLC automates this process, thereby removing a significant bottleneck to TLC-MSI experiments. While the TLC-MSI datasets tested during its development are related to prebiotic chemistry, DetectTLC is a general system that can be applied to metabolomics research in many different contexts, including HNSCC.

The utility of DetectTLC has been validated in the second and third case studies. First, it was demonstrated that DetectTLC is capable of automatically detecting spots corresponding to both expected and unexpected reaction mixture components. Second, it was demonstrated that DetectTLC can assist in structural identification of ions of interest
when multi-modal MSI is performed. During these validation experiments, some limitations of the current algorithms were also identified. Future versions of DetectTLC can incorporate image processing algorithms for the elimination of noisy background signals. They can also incorporate more sophisticated methods for deisotoping MSI data, in order to avoid inadvertent filtering of relevant m/z images in favor of neighboring high-intensity noisy images.

DetectTLC was developed and implemented in MATLAB. To enable widespread use of the tool, an executable (.exe) version of the tool has been generated. The tool will soon be freely deployed to the community via the website of Bio-MIBLAB at Georgia Institute of Technology.

The work described in this chapter was performed in collaboration with Dr. May D. Wang, Dr. Facundo M. Fernández and Dr. Rachel (Bennett) Stryffeler. Dr. Stryffeler performed MSI data acquisition and LC-MS/MS validation, while I implemented the DetectTLC tool and performed software-side experiments. The project idea and the design of DetectTLC tool capabilities and features were jointly developed.

The Key Innovations of this chapter are:

- Development of the first analytical pipelines using quantitative image features for identifying m/z images containing spot-like regions in MSI data
- Design, implementation, and validation of the first software tool, DetectTLC, for enabling and accelerating TLC-MSI studies in metabolomics by automatically finding mixture components of potential interest in TLC-MSI datasets
CHAPTER 4

SUPERVISED LEARNING MODELS FOR PATHOLOGICAL STAGE USING PROTEOMIC AND TRANSCRIPTOMIC DATA

4.1 HNSCC Disease Stage and Outcomes

The stage at which HNSCC is detected is important to therapeutic outcomes; patients with early stage (I and II) cancer have between 60-95% chance of successful local treatment, while those with advanced stage cancer are at high risk for recurrence or metastatic disease [37]. Greater knowledge of the molecular characteristics of different stages can provide insight into the mechanisms of HNSCC progression, and may help in identifying more effective therapeutic targets and strategies for treatment.

Previous research studies have analyzed gene expression, proteomic, and metabolomic data individually for studying differences between HNSCC stages, with mixed results. For example, three transcriptomic studies have related selected genes and gene signatures to different HNSCC stages [40, 45, 46], while two other transcriptomic studies did not find any discriminatory genes [41, 43]. A recent proteomic study using SELDI-TOF mass spectrometry data identified 11 m/z values differentially expressed between early- and late-stage oral SCC, but a satisfactory predictive model could not be developed [42]. Another recent study, using MALDI-TOF mass spectrometry data, identified several peaks that tended to correlate with clinical disease progression; however, no predictive model was developed [44]. A metabolomic study using $^1$H NMR data identified several metabolite markers that discriminated between early and advanced stage HNSCC samples [34]. Additional bioinformatics studies – and in particular, the
development of predictive models that harness multiple data types – may help to gain additional insight into the differences between early and advanced HNSCC.

In this chapter, I investigated how quantitative functional proteomics, via reverse phase protein array (RPPA) data, can be used to develop predictive models for HNSCC stage. RPPA data is acquired by probing a sample with antibodies against specific proteins with regard to their activation states. With respect to HNSCC, RPPA data has been used to identify differentially expressed proteins between cancer and normal samples [180] and to identify proteins affected by the presence of an anti-invasion compound in nasopharyngeal carcinoma [181]. RPPA data has been applied to build predictive models for several other cancer types. Recent examples include for prognosis [182], drug response [183], and risk of recurrence [184] in breast cancer; for treatment response in ovarian cancer [185]; and for drug sensitivity in non-small-cell lung cancer [186].

In addition, I expanded upon previous efforts by developing predictive models for the same patient set using RNAseq data, and performing integrated analysis of RPPA and RNAseq data through functional assessment and ensemble model development. The goal of this investigation is to develop a set of improved predictive models, and thereby gather additional insight into HNSCC progression across multiple biological scales.

4.2 Protein and Gene Expression Datasets

RPPA data for HNSCC was downloaded from The Cancer Proteome Atlas (TCPA) [126] at http://bioinformatics.mdanderson.org/main/TCPA:Overview. This dataset consists of 212 patient samples and measures the response to 187 antibodies. TCPA provides a proteomic complement to The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) [187] at
http://cancergenome.nih.gov/, where clinical, transcriptomic, and genomic data for the same patients are available. RNAseq data (Version 2) for HNSCC was downloaded from TCGA. Data was available for 210 of the same patients.

The downloaded RPPA data had been normalized and protein expression had been quantified using the “Supercurve Fitting” method. The details of these preprocessing steps are described in [126, 188]. In TCPA, antibodies are grouped into three classes: “validated”, “under evaluation”, and “use with caution.” To perform a more conservative analysis, only those proteins with antibodies described as “validated” in both [126, 188] were utilized in this study. 113 proteins were considered for further analysis. In TCGA, RNAseq (Version 2) data has been aligned using MapSplice and quantified using RSEM [189, 190]. This dataset describes 20,531 genes. The un-normalized data was used for differential expression analysis and the normalized data was used for classification.

The clinical data for the 212 patients was downloaded from TCGA. Pathological stage information was used to divide the RPPA and RNAseq datasets into two groups: patients with early stage (stage I and II) cancer, and patients with advanced stage (stage III, IVA, IVB) cancer. Pathological state was unavailable for 12 patients, so clinical stage was substituted. One patient for whom the pathological stage was unavailable and the clinical stage was IVC was not considered, because unlike the other advanced cases, stage IVC involves metastatic disease. For RPPA, the early stage group contained 50 patients, and the advanced stage group contained 161 patients. The two patients for whom RNAseq data was unavailable were both of advanced pathological stage.
4.3. Model Development

Figure 4.1: The nested cross-validation framework used in this study. The outer split was repeated \( n = 3 \) times, and the inner 10-fold cross-validation was repeated \( m = 5 \) times.

Classification Methods

Four individual binary classification methods and two ensemble classification methods were tested: k-nearest neighbors (KNN), support vector machine (SVM), naïve Bayes, decision tree, Adaboost, and bagging / Random Forests. Optimal parameters for each model were selected via nested cross-validation and grid search. Table I lists the range of parameters tested for each model, and Figure 4.1 describes the \( 3 \times 5 \times 10 \) nested cross-validation scheme. Optimization was performed with respect to the Matthews correlation coefficient (MCC). The area under the ROC curve (AUC) is also reported for the model having the maximum mean MCC. Analyses were performed using MATLAB (Mathworks, Natick MA).
Table 4.1: Classification model parameters examined via nested cross-validation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification Method</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Set of values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNN</td>
<td>Number of neighbors (K)</td>
<td>$K \in {1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM</td>
<td>Kernel, Soft margin cost (C), $\gamma$ for GBRF</td>
<td>Kernels: linear, Gaussian radial basis function (GRBF) $C \in 2^m$, $m \in [-1,0,1]$ $\gamma \in 2^m$, $m \in [-1,0,1]$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naïve Bayes</td>
<td>Prior distribution</td>
<td>Distributions: normal, kernel</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Tree</td>
<td>Splitting criterion</td>
<td>Criteria: Gini diversity index (GDI), Twoing rule, Maximum deviance reduction (MDR)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaboost</td>
<td>Number of trees (N)</td>
<td>$N \in {25,50,100}$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bagging / Random Forests</td>
<td>Proportion ($m$) of all variables ($p$) to retain</td>
<td>$m \in [\sqrt{p}, \frac{p}{4}, \frac{p}{2}, p]$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Feature Selection**

Three alternative feature selection methods were tested: two filter approaches and one wrapper approach.

The first filter method was based on differential expression. For RPPA data, the Wilcoxon rank-sum test was applied to identify proteins with significantly different expression between the early and advanced stage groups. Multiple testing corrections were applied by calculating the FDR for each protein, using the method of Benjamini and Hochberg through the R package p.adjust. To obtain a less conservative initial feature set, clinical stage was used to obtain a differentially expressed protein list. This yielded 11 proteins with FDR values $\leq 0.05$, including the five proteins found when only pathological stage was used. A comprehensive examination of this feature space was performed by considering alternative classification models for every combination of the 11 features, i.e., $\sum_{i=1}^{11} \binom{11}{i} = 2047$ feature sets were considered. For RNAseq data, differential expression analysis was performed using two alternative tools, edgeR and EBSeq, of which the latter uses Bayesian methods [191, 192]. For a threshold of
FDR ≤ 0.05, edgeR identified 495 genes and EBSeq found 267 genes. These two lists had 108 genes in common. Due to the large number of differentially expressed genes identified by each method, comprehensive investigation of the feature space was not possible. Instead, model performances were compared across four feature sets: each differential expression result individually, the 108 common genes, and the 654 genes in the union of the selections of both methods.

The second filter method was mRMR (minimum redundancy maximum relevance), implemented using the FEAST toolbox [193-195]. The performance of each model was optimized for up to the top 50 features. The RNAseq data contained 1,414,819 unique count values, and the vast majority of values were observed only once. Due to this high dynamic range and memory limitations, the count values of the unscaled RNAseq data were binned prior to performing mRMR. The number of binned levels was chosen to balance performance and computational cost; 30,000 binned levels were the best alternative given the available computational resources.

In the wrapper approach, sequential forward feature selection (SFS) was performed. Model performance was optimized for up to the top 20 features. Due to the large number of genes in the RNAseq data, SFS was performed only after initial filtering based on differential expression. The input to SFS was the 654 genes found to be differentially expressed by edgeR and EBSeq in combination.

*Data Scaling*

Due to the high dynamic range of features in RNAseq data, two data scaling methods were tested. In the first – denoted scaled (1) – each feature was scaled by
dividing by the maximum value observed for that feature across any sample. In the second – denoted scaled (2) – each feature was scaled by subtracting its mean and dividing by its standard deviation, as suggested in [196]. The predictive modeling results for RNAseq with SFS are from unscaled data. For the differential expression and mRMR feature selection techniques, the best result among the two alternative scaling choices and unscaled data is shown.

**Integrated Analysis**

One of the fundamental goals of systems biology is to integrate information from multiple levels of biological complexity in order to increase actionable biological and clinical knowledge. However, this is a very challenging task. Several studies have demonstrated that mRNA and protein expression levels generally exhibit only moderate linear correlation; that is, mRNA expression may predict protein expression to a partial extent, but protein expression is also influenced by regulation at the post-transcriptional and post-translational levels [197-200]. Thus, models developed by integrating mRNA and protein features in some manner may potentially show improved performance over models using individual data types only. In a recent review, Haider and Pal discussed eight frameworks for performing integrated analysis of transcriptomic and proteomic data: union of data types, comparison of functional contexts, topological network analysis, merging datasets in individual domains, missing value estimation, multiple regression analysis, clustering, and dynamic modeling [201]. Due to the constraints of the available data, the techniques of merging datasets in individual domains, missing value estimation, multiple regression analysis, and dynamic modeling are not possible. In this
chapter, I examine model development based on the first two remaining methods: combination of the two data types and the results of functional assessment.

In the first case, RPPA and scaled RNAseq data were naively combined into a composite dataset. One dataset contained 221 features (113 RPPA and the 108 common RNAseq features) and the other contained 767 features (113 RPPA and the 654 union RNAseq features). SVM, KNN, and decision tree models with SFS were constructed using nested CV, with a maximum of 20 features. The better result among the two RNAseq scaling methods is reported.

In the second case, functional analysis of the genes corresponding to RNAseq and RPPA features in the best-performing models was performed using DAVID [202, 203] and the Reactome Analysis Tool [204]. I hypothesized that, if an ensemble of these models was created, individual models representing different functional categories would yield better-performing ensembles. This was tested by systematically evaluating all possible ensembles from nine SFS models: SVM, KNN, naïve Bayes, decision tree, and Adaboost using RPPA data, and SVM, KNN, decision tree, and Adaboost using RNAseq data. Ensemble decisions followed a majority voting scheme, and mean MCC values were compared across 100 repetitions of 10-fold CV.

4.4. Model Performance

4.4.1. Individual Data Types

Table 4.2 shows the predictive model performance of the six classifiers on the RPPA data. In general, performance is moderate, with several models achieving mean MCC values greater than 0.4 and AUC values greater than 0.7. The best performing
Table 4.2: Performance evaluation of alternative predictive models across feature selection methods for RPPA data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification Method</th>
<th>Rank-Sum Test</th>
<th>mRMR</th>
<th>SFS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCC</td>
<td>AUC</td>
<td>MCC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM</td>
<td>0.43±0.15</td>
<td>0.75±0.11</td>
<td>0.37±0.21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naïve Bayes</td>
<td>0.32±0.18</td>
<td>0.71±0.09</td>
<td>0.33±0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Tree</td>
<td>0.16±0.17</td>
<td>0.64±0.13</td>
<td>0.12±0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNN</td>
<td>0.35±0.28</td>
<td>0.74±0.13</td>
<td>0.28±0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adaboost</td>
<td>0.11±0.24</td>
<td>0.71±0.11</td>
<td>0.25±0.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Forests</td>
<td>MCC</td>
<td>AUC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RPPA model was SVM with SFS feature selection. The SVM models outperformed the other classifiers for all feature selection methods on the RPPA dataset, and the SFS models outperformed the other feature selection methods for all classifiers. The naïve Bayes and KNN models were the next best in performance, while the decision tree models did not perform as well. The two ensemble classifiers showed markedly different performance. For mRMR and SFS, Adaboost outperformed the decision tree models, although it did not perform as well as the other individual classifiers. The Random Forests classifier gave surprisingly poor performance for the RPPA data, with an MCC value close to zero.

Table 4.3 shows the predictive model performance of five classifiers on the RNAseq data. The best RNAseq models, which achieve mean MCC values greater than 0.6, outperform the best RPPA models. Again, the SFS models outperformed the other feature selection methods for all classifiers. The highest performing RNAseq model was KNN with SFS; the Adaboost and SVM models with SFS performed almost as well in terms of MCC, though the SVM AUC value was non-informative. The Random Forests model for RNAseq data showed better mean performance than that for RPPA data, but it also had a large standard deviation. For differential expression and mRMR feature
selection, the SVM models outperformed the other classifiers in terms of MCC. Under these two feature selection methods, the decision tree and Adaboost models showed better performance for RNAseq data than for RPPA data, but KNN was not notably different. In the majority of cases, scaled data showed better performance, and the second scaling method was more often better than the first.

### 4.4.2. Commonly Selected Features and Functional Analysis

The existence of well-performing models implies that the selected features are of functional importance. The five RPPA SFS models were compared, and 11 features were selected in at least two models. All of these have been associated with HNSCC in the literature: AR [205], C-Raf [206], CDK1 [207], Cyclin B1 [208], MAPK_pT202_Y204 [1], N-Cadherin [209], PDK1 [210], PI3K-p85 [211], VEGFR2 [212], c-Jun_pS73 [213], and p27_pT198 [214]. In particular, AR was selected by four models, CDK1 and Cyclin B1 by three, and the others by two. Table 4.4 shows the number of total common features between each model pair. The low counts show that some models achieved comparable performance using very different feature sets. Even greater feature diversity was observed for the RNAseq SFS models. Among the four models, 52 features were present in total, but only two features were selected in more than one model: FAM27B and KRTAP17-1.
Table 4.4: Comparison and functional analysis of the RPPA SFS models:
The number of features, GO functional annotations, and pathways (KEGG and Reactome) in common between different models are indicated.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SVM</th>
<th>Naïve Bayes</th>
<th>Decision Tree</th>
<th>KNN</th>
<th>Adaboost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SVM</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features: 18</td>
<td>Features: 2</td>
<td>Features: 4</td>
<td>Features: 2</td>
<td>Features: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO terms: 10</td>
<td>GO terms: 2</td>
<td>GO terms: 1</td>
<td>GO terms: 0</td>
<td>GO terms: 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEGG: 11</td>
<td>KEGG: 0</td>
<td>KEGG: 7</td>
<td>KEGG: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Naïve Bayes</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features: 14</td>
<td>Features: 3</td>
<td>Features: 1</td>
<td>Features: 1</td>
<td>Features: 1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO terms: 5</td>
<td>GO terms: 4</td>
<td>GO terms: 0</td>
<td>GO terms: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEGG: 0</td>
<td>KEGG: -</td>
<td>KEGG: -</td>
<td>KEGG: -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactome: 112</td>
<td>Reactome:97</td>
<td>Reactome:82</td>
<td>Reactome:59</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Decision Tree</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features: 11</td>
<td>Features: 2</td>
<td>Features: 1</td>
<td>Features: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO terms: 15</td>
<td>GO terms: 1</td>
<td>GO terms: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEGG: 25</td>
<td>KEGG: 12</td>
<td>KEGG: -</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactome: 208</td>
<td>Reactome:103</td>
<td>Reactome:71</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>KNN</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Features: 2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features: 15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GO terms: 0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO terms: 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>KEGG: -</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEGG: 12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Reactome:56</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactome: 126</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Adaboost</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Features: 8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO terms: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KEGG: 0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reactome: 131</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Functional analysis of the SFS feature sets was performed via DAVID and Reactome. DAVID was used to find significantly enriched Gene Ontology (GO) terms and KEGG pathways, while Reactome also returned significant pathways. In terms of specific features and GO terms, the five RPPA SFS models were diverse, with relatively few commonalities. However, many common pathways were found, both through KEGG and through Reactome. Seven KEGG pathways were common among the SVM, decision tree, and KNN RPPA models. These consisted of three signaling pathways: ErbB,
neurotrophin, and insulin signaling, and four cancer-related pathways: pathways in cancer, colorectal cancer, pancreatic cancer, and chronic myeloid leukemia. Reactome returned many more significant pathways than DAVID, and 46 pathways were in common among all five models. Most of these related to signal transduction and mitotic progression.

Notably, there were no results in DAVID for the four RNAseq feature lists from the SFS models. Reactome returned results for only the KNN RNAseq model. The nine pathways identified fell into four categories: regulation of gene expression and development in beta cells, visual transduction and phototransduction, retinoid metabolism and transport, and the synthesis of bile acids and bile salts. Retinoids are important therapeutics for many cancer types, including HNSCC [215], and recent studies have shown that bile acids may be associated with head and neck cancer [216, 217].

4.4.3. Integrated Analysis

The results for developing SFS models based on naïve combination of the RPPA and RNAseq datasets are shown in Table 4.5. All of the models outperformed the corresponding RPPA SFS models for the same classification method in terms of mean MCC values. However, only the SVM models showed improvement over the RNAseq SFS models as well. Moreover, only the models for the smaller composite dataset (221 features) utilized both RPPA and RNAseq features. The RPPA features selected by the SVM model for the smaller composite dataset were Cyclin B1 and p38_pT180_Y182. Cyclin B1 was one of the commonly selected features among the RPPA SFS models; p38 is a mitogen-activated protein kinase that has also been associated with HNSCC [218]. The models for the larger composite dataset (767 features) selected only
Table 4.5: Performance evaluation of alternative predictive models using two composite RPPA and RNAseq datasets. Legend: scaled (1), scaled (2).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification Method</th>
<th>SFS (221 features)</th>
<th>SFS (767 features)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MCC</td>
<td>AUC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM</td>
<td>0.68±0.15</td>
<td>0.82±0.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Tree</td>
<td>0.50±0.20</td>
<td>0.75±0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KNN</td>
<td>0.53±0.21</td>
<td>0.77±0.11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

RNAseq features. Thus, the improvement in MCC seen for the best-performing model (SVM with the larger composite dataset) cannot be attributed to integrating data types, but may be due in part to using scaled data.

Figure 4.2 compares the performance of single-data type models (RPPA and RNAseq) with ensembles comprised of only RPPA models, only RNAseq models, or both. The last category contains all possible ensembles with three to nine member models. Results represent the mean performance of 10-fold CV for the 209 common patients in the RPPA and RNAseq datasets, across 100 repetitions. The best single-data type ensembles had higher mean MCC values than individual models of that data type. Additionally, combination ensembles of multiple sizes were found which had better performance than any of the single-data type ensembles.

The performances of the RPPA-only ensembles were compared in terms of the previous functional analysis results. For example, the best performing RPPA-only ensemble (SVM, KNN, Adaboost) achieved a mean MCC value of 0.54, and 50 Reactome pathways were in common among the three feature sets. The worst-performing ensemble (SVM, Naïve Bayes, decision tree) had a mean MCC of 0.25 and 86 Reactome pathways in common. Among the RPPA-only ensembles overall, a correlation of -0.44 was observed between the mean MCC values and the number of Reactome pathways in
Figure 4.2: Comparison of individual and ensemble model performances over 100 repetitions of 10-fold CV. Combination ensembles, which allow for heterogeneity in both data type and component model type, outperform RPPA-only and RNAseq-only models.

common among the ensemble member models.

While the RNAseq ensembles had the highest median performance, several combined RPPA and RNAseq ensembles had higher overall performance. Among all of the ensembles tested – RPPA only, RNAseq only, and combination – 27 ensembles were identified which had better performance than the best-performing individual RNAseq model in more than 90 of the 100 CV repetitions. Of these, two were RNAseq-only ensembles. Another two were combination ensembles containing three and four models, respectively, in which only RNAseq models were chosen as members. The other 23 notable ensembles all contained both RPPA and RNAseq member models.

Among these 23 was the best performing ensemble overall, which achieved a mean MCC value of 0.80. This is higher than any of the model performances reported for previous tests. Steiger’s Z test was used to compare the MCC performance of this
ensemble model with those of the highest performing RNAseq (KNN) and composite (SVM) models [219]. In both cases, the improvement was statistically significant ($p < 0.01$). This particular ensemble incorporated the Adaboost RPPA SFS model and the SVM, KNN, and Adaboost RNAseq SFS models.

4.5. Discussion and Key Innovations

In this study, I have performed an in-depth analysis of HNSCC RPPA data by implementing six different classification methods, using nested cross-validation to optimize parameters, and testing three alternative feature selection methods. This supervised approach contrasts with previous HNSCC studies using RPPA data, which have conducted unsupervised and differential expression analyses [180, 181]. It also differs from previous supervised studies on RPPA data [182, 183] in two ways. First, this study assesses the performances of several different combinations of feature selection methods and classification algorithms in order to identify the potentially relevant protein feature sets. Second, this study builds upon current research by developing integrated proteomic and transcriptomic models, and comparing them to RPPA-only and RNAseq-only models. In particular, I performed two types of integrated analysis: one by direct combination of RPPA and RNAseq data, and another by constructing ensemble models using both data types. To my knowledge, this is the first such comparative, integrated study for modeling progression in HNSCC.

From a modeling perspective, this study identified the integrated ensemble approach with both RPPA and RNAseq models as the best overall. The top-performing model for predicting HNSCC pathological stage was obtained using this approach, and had a statistically significant higher MCC value than the best performing individual
RNAseq and composite models. Notably, modeling results appear to support the initial conjecture that less functional agreement among the feature sets of member models will be associated with better performance. First, the RNAseq-only and the combination RPPA and RNAseq ensembles were observed to outperform the RPPA-only ensembles. Second, a moderate negative correlation was observed between the performances of RPPA-only ensembles and the numbers of common Reactome pathways among ensemble members. These observations indicate that higher-performing ensembles tended to be more functionally diverse in terms of member model feature sets. Investigation on larger datasets, as well as assessment using ensemble diversity measures and different ensemble construction techniques [220], are directions for further research. More rigorous examination of how and why different classifier and feature selection method combinations tend to vary in performance on RPPA and RNAseq data is also an important task.

A related question of interest is performing multi-class classification to study biomolecular expression patterns among individual HNSCC stages, rather than grouping them into early and advanced disease. Another is investigating the differences between normal and early stage HNSCC samples. For investigating these questions, the availability of sufficiently large – in terms of both patients and features – public datasets is a constraint. While matched tumor and normal RNAseq data is available on TCGA for HNSCC, RPPA data for matched normal samples is yet unavailable. In addition, an inherent limitation of RPPA data is that only a selected set of proteins is measured. A larger set of proteins could enable discovery, in that proteins which were previously not implicated in HNSCC – or cancer in general – might be identified as informative features.
through modeling. TCPA is currently in the process of extending their antibody set to cover 500 proteins [126], which will help to address this limitation to some extent. The availability of more extensive proteomic data for HNSCC through mass spectrometry is a related promising avenue. The Clinical Proteomic Tumor Analysis Consortium (CPTAC), like TCPA, is currently building a proteomic complement to TCGA. CPTAC hosts a library of LC-MS/MS data from tumor samples that are also in TCGA. At the time of writing, data from breast cancer, ovarian cancer, colon adenocarcinoma, and rectum adenocarcinoma have been released. Future availability of such data for HNSCC would be valuable to researchers.

From a systems biology perspective, investigating multiple types of –omic datasets to gain insight into disease processes is an important area of research. Numerous individual proteins and genes selected as features in well-performing models in this study have been previously associated with HNSCC in the literature, including in a recent large-scale study by The Cancer Genome Atlas Network [221]. Additionally, functional analysis of the features selected in the top-performing models revealed notable patterns. Many processes – e.g., signal transduction pathways including those through EGFR and ERBB2, and events related to mitotic progression – were commonly represented among the RPPA model features. The RNAseq feature sets were much more diverse, but some of the associated biological processes have still been linked with HNSCC in the literature.

While this integrative modeling study of RPPA and RNAseq data can provide guidance for further research, integration in general should be interpreted with caution. Because RPPA is a tool for functional proteomics, it is several biological steps removed from the mRNA counts measured by RNAseq, and mRNA is itself distinct from genome-
level factors. Thus, further investigation into additional data types – e.g., copy number variations, mutations, DNA methylation, protein subunits and alternative activation states, metabolites – is needed for drawing conclusions about the specific mechanisms underlying HNSCC progression. Appropriate comparison and combination of multiple data types will help to fill in the gaps and provide greater insight into the process of disease development. By harnessing the diverse data from initiatives like TCPA, TCGA, and CPTAC, bioinformatics studies can lead to better understanding of the molecular bases of HNSCC and also other cancers.

The Key Innovations of this chapter are:

- Performed the first supervised modeling study for modeling progression in HNSCC by integrating both proteomic and transcriptomic data
- Developed between-omic level integrated ensemble models with significant improvement in performance for predicting HNSCC pathological stage
CHAPTER 5

SUPERVISED LEARNING MODELS FOR EARLY DETECTION

USING TRANSCRIPTOMIC DATA MODELS

5.1. Transcriptomic Modeling Research in HNSCC

Investigation of gene expression patterns in HNSCC is an active area of research, with numerous studies conducted using gene expression microarrays within the last 10 years [222]. More recently, transcriptomic research has shifted towards RNA sequencing (RNAseq) because of its high sensitivity and dynamic range [223]. However, due to variations in the sample population, small samples sizes, and differences in experimental design and analysis methods, different transcriptomic studies on the same disease may report notably different lists of significant or key genes [224]. For this reason, integrated analysis of multiple transcriptomic studies is necessary for identifying consistent, fundamental gene expression patterns that indicate HNSCC status.

Previous predictive modeling studies have applied gene expression data to various problems related to HNSCC, including predicting metastatic disease [225, 226], the development of cancer in patients with oral premalignant lesions [38, 39], and the risk of recurrence and relapse [227, 228]. A key aspect of HNSCC research is early detection: if the cancer is detected at an early stage, patient response to treatment is relatively high, and five year survival rates for multiple disease subsites exceed 80% [14, 37]. However, most cases are detected only at locally advanced stages, which are associated with much worse outcomes. For the same disease subsites, survival for locally advanced cases ranged from 49.8-73%. Current screening recommendations for oral cancer are based on
conventional visual and tactile examinations [229]. Effective supervised models for predicting HNSCC status – and in particular, for differentiating early-stage HNSCC patients from healthy individuals – based on molecular data could be useful clinical tools.

In this chapter, I present an integrated transcriptomic analysis of HNSCC, with the goal of developing robust predictive models for determining disease status. Because the lack of early stage samples is an obstacle, models are initially developed for predicting HNSCC status in general, and are then applied to predict early stage HNSCC in particular. The workflow for this study is shown in Figure 5.1. First, differential expression (DE) analysis was performed on several microarray datasets to identify common DE genes and to investigate the extent of variation among datasets. Second, classification models optimized on one microarray dataset were implemented on the others, in order to evaluate within-platform model robustness. Third, individual and
ensemble classification models developed using the microarray datasets were applied to RNAseq data, to test (i) between-platform robustness, i.e., if informative gene feature sets and model structures are transferrable across data types and (ii) performance in detecting early stage HNSCC. Finally, well-performing models were integrated into a software tool with a graphical user interface in order to make predictive models more accessible to HNSCC researchers and clinicians.

5.2. Microarray and RNAseq Datasets

Gene expression microarray datasets were obtained from the Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) and ArrayExpress public repositories. To increase consistency in the downstream analysis, datasets selected for study met the following criteria: (i) data was from patient samples, not cell lines; (ii) data from both diseased and normal samples were available; (iii) the raw, unprocessed data was available; (iv) an associated publication was available; and (v) Affymetrix array platforms were used. These filtering steps led to five candidate Affymetrix datasets. Of these, three were chosen for further analysis because they shared the Human Genome U133 Plus 2.0 (54,675 probes) or U133A (27,777 probes) arrays, enabling direct comparison of probes. Only the 22,277 common probes were used for analysis. These datasets are described in Table 5.1. To obtain gene expression values, the raw .CEL files were processed with RMA in the Affymetrix Expression Console software.

Table 5.1. Description of gene expression microarray datasets examined in study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dataset</th>
<th>Affymetrix Array Platform</th>
<th>Samples</th>
<th>Reference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-GEOD-9844</td>
<td>Human Genome U133 Plus 2.0</td>
<td>25 cancer, 12 normal</td>
<td>[125]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-GEOD-6791</td>
<td>Human Genome U133 Plus 2.0</td>
<td>42 cancer, 11 normal</td>
<td>[230]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-GEOD-23036</td>
<td>Human Genome U133A 2.0</td>
<td>63 cancer, 5 normal</td>
<td>[231]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RNAseq data (Version 2) for HNSCC was obtained from The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA), along with associated clinical data. The data has been aligned using MapSplice and quantified using RSEM [189, 190]. Count data for 20,531 genes are available in this dataset. Un-normalized data was used for DE analysis, and normalized data for classification. At the time of analysis, matched tumor and normal RNAseq data was available for 40 patients. Of these, 17 patients were categorized as early stage (pathological stages I and II).

5.3. Model Development

Differential Expression Analysis and Feature Selection

Both the two-sample t-test and Wilcoxon rank-sum test were used to identify DE genes between the HNSCC and normal samples in the microarray datasets. Multiple

![Figure 5.2: Schematic of nested cross-validation (nested CV) framework](image-url)
testing correction was implemented by controlling the False Discovery Rate (FDR ≤ 0.05) or by implementing Bonferroni correction (α_{Bonferroni} = 0.05). DE analysis was performed on the RNAseq data using edgeR (FDR ≤ 0.05) [192]. To evaluate consistency in gene expression patterns across datasets, the DE gene lists were compared to each other. For classification, features were selected via mRMR (minimum redundancy maximum relevance) from the microarray datasets, implemented using the FEAST toolbox in MATLAB [193-195]. The performance of each classification model was optimized for up to the top 50 features.

**Binary Classifiers**

Three binary classification methods were tested: k-nearest neighbors (KNN), support vector machine (SVM), and decision tree (DT). Optimal parameters for each model were selected via grid search from the ranges shown in Table 5.2, using a nested cross-validation scheme as shown in Figure 5.2. Optimization was performed with respect to the Matthews correlation coefficient (MCC), and the area under the ROC curve (AUC) is also reported for optimized models. All analyses were performed using MATLAB (Mathworks, Natick MA).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Classification Method</th>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Set of values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>KNN</td>
<td>Number of neighbors (K)</td>
<td>( K \in {1,2,3,4,5,6,7,8,9,10} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SVM</td>
<td>Kernel</td>
<td>Kernels: linear, Gaussian radial basis function (GRBF)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Soft margin cost (C)</td>
<td>( C \in 2^m, m \in [-2,-1,0,1,2] )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( \gamma ) for GBRF</td>
<td>( \gamma \in 2^m, m \in [-2,-1,0,1,2] )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decision Tree (DT)</td>
<td>Splitting criterion</td>
<td>Criteria: Gini diversity index (GDI), Twoing rule, Maximum deviance reduction (MDR)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
5.3.1. Evaluation of Model Robustness across Microarray Datasets

The robustness of each model was first evaluated by testing the model on the other microarray datasets, i.e., those which were not used in its development. In order to avoid the issue of batch effects entirely, models were not applied to other datasets directly. Instead, the model parameters and feature set associated with the top performing model of each classifier type for dataset \( i \) were used to train a model on dataset \( j \) (\( \forall j \neq i \)), with \( i, j \in [1,2, ...n] \), where \( n \) is the number of microarray datasets. In addition, this comparison was also carried out after combining the feature sets for alternative models. For example, such a model to be tested on E-GEOD-6791 would combine the optimized feature sets for both E-GEOD-9844 and E-GEOD-23036. The rationale behind this experiment is to test whether a composite feature library, defined as the union of optimal feature sets from multiple datasets, would help to improve average predictive performance on new incoming datasets.

Application of Microarray-Developed Models to RNAseq Data

Next, model robustness across data formats was investigated by applying microarray-developed models to RNAseq data from TCGA. As described for the microarray-only cross-performance tests, the model parameters and feature set associated with a given microarray model was used to train a model on the RNAseq data. In order to transfer the optimized microarray feature sets, microarray probes were mapped to RNAseq features on the level of gene symbols.

In addition to testing the performance of the nine individual and nine possible feature combination-based models on RNAseq data, two ensemble modeling frameworks
– majority voting and stacking [220] – were tested. Majority voting is the simplest ensemble framework; given a set of predicted labels from alternative models, the ensemble-predicted label is the most-commonly predicted label. All possible combinations of the nine individual microarray models (three classifier types for three datasets) with at least three members were considered for voting-based ensembles, resulting in 511 alternative models. Stacking involves a two-step classification process. In the first step, label predictions are obtained from alternative models on the training data. This set of predicted labels serves as the features for a second classification model, which is used to generate the final predictions. Three stacking models were developed, using all nine individual microarray models as the first-level predictors, and SVM, KNN, and DT were tested as the three second-level classifiers.

Tool Design

The developed predictive models were integrated into a software tool with a graphical user interface (GUI) to make them more accessible to HNSCC researchers, and for easy application to new datasets. Users can apply previously developed individual or ensemble models to process incoming datasets, and then visualize and export the results.

5.4. Model Performance

Comparison of DE Gene Lists and mRMR Selections

Notable differences were observed among the DE genes selected in each microarray dataset, as shown in Table 5.3. The more conservative Bonferroni method resulted in only 5 common DE genes among the three datasets: *MMP1*, *ABCA8*, *MYO1B*, *ARHGEF10L*, and *SASH1*; all of these have been associated with HNSCC in recent
Table 5.3. Comparison of DE Genes across Microarray Datasets

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>E-GEOD-6791</th>
<th>E-GEOD-9844</th>
<th>E-GEOD-23036</th>
<th>Common DE Genes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Bonferroni</td>
<td>FDR</td>
<td>Bonferroni</td>
<td>FDR</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>T-test</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>5763</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>2451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rank-sum test</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6836</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2759</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When applying FDR, more than 600 common DE genes were identified across the three datasets for both statistical tests. Functional analysis was performed on the common FDR gene lists using DAVID [202]. Although not statistically significant, the top 10 Gene Ontology (GO) terms selected for both sets included GO:0006915~apoptosis, GO:0008219~cell death, GO:0012501~programmed cell death, GO:0016265~death, GO:0043588~skin development. Overall, these results indicate that while there is substantial variation across the microarray datasets, the commonly-selected DE genes are relevant to HNSCC.

This variation was also observed for the RNAseq data: 10,239 DE genes were identified in the RNAseq data through edgeR; 526 and 610 of these genes overlapped with the microarray common DE gene lists (FDR) for the t-test and rank-sum test, respectively. Some of the commonly selected DE features were also represented in the mRMR feature lists. The common DE genes selected using either test with FDR were compared with the top 50 mRMR-selected features for the three microarray datasets. The number of features in the intersection of these lists ranged from 17 to 23.

5.4.1. Model Performance across Microarray Datasets

Table 5.4 shows the performance of KNN models developed using one microarray dataset on the others. The top three rows show the performance of the KNN model optimized through nested CV for each dataset. For example, the best-performing
Table 5.4. Multi-Dataset Performance of KNN Models in terms of MCC (AUC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Table 5.4. Multi-Dataset Performance of KNN Models in terms of MCC (AUC)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Data for Model Development</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-GEOD-6791</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-GEOD-9844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-GEOD-23036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Average Cross-Dataset Performance</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KNN model on the dataset E-GEOD-6791 was developed using the same dataset. This resulted in perfect performance on testing data, with MCC and AUC values of 1±0. The same model (i.e., KNN with a given parameter set and feature set) also performed well when applied to another dataset, E-GEOD-9844, giving MCC and AUC values of 0.89±0.10 and 0.94±0.06. However, when applied to the third dataset, E-GEOD-23036, very poor performance was observed, with the mean MCC near zero and the mean AUC near 0.5. This example demonstrates the lack of model robustness across datasets. Similar patterns are observed for the other datasets for KNN, as well as for the DT and SVM models in Tables 5.5 and 5.6, respectively.

The lower three rows of Table 5.4 show the model performances resulting from combining the optimal feature sets of the other two models. For example, the bottom-most row shows that using the combined optimal feature sets of the E-GEOD-9844 and E-GEOD-23036 KNN models to develop a KNN model for E-GEOD-6791 resulted in MCC and AUC values of 0.84±0.17 and 0.95±0.05, respectively. While this is lower than
Table 5.5. Multi-Dataset Performance of DT Models through MCC (AUC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data for Model Development</th>
<th>Prediction Dataset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-GEOD-6791</td>
<td>E-GEOD-9844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1±0 (1±0)</td>
<td>0.88±0.10 (0.94±0.06)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.93±0.12 (0.94±0.10)</td>
<td>0.76±0.11 (0.86±0.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-0.07±0.09 (0.62±0.11)</td>
<td>0.82±0.19 (0.90±0.10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Cross-Dataset Performance</td>
<td>0.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.93±0.12 (0.94±0.10)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6. Multi-Dataset Performance of SVM Models through MCC (AUC)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data for Model Development</th>
<th>Prediction Dataset</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>E-GEOD-6791</td>
<td>E-GEOD-9844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1±0 (0.5±0)</td>
<td>0.89±0.10 (0.54±0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.85±0.14 (0.98±0.03)</td>
<td>0.89±0.10 (1±0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.51±0.28 (0.82±0.12)</td>
<td>0.88±0.10 (0.99±0.02)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Cross-Dataset Performance</td>
<td>0.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>0.89±0.10 (0.5±0)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.76±0.22 (0.98±0.03)</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

the performance of the optimal model developed for E-GEOD-6791 itself, it is higher than the average cross-dataset performance observed from applying either of the two other models to this dataset. For this particular group of datasets, E-GEOD-6791 and E-GEOD-23036 showed poor performance during cross-prediction tests with the other, while E-GEOD-9844 showed more stable performance. Similar trends for cross-prediction are shown for all classifiers tested. Overall, utilizing a composite feature set
aggregated from multiple models appears to yield more robust predictions for previously unseen data.

5.4.2. Performance of Microarray-Developed Models on RNAseq Data

Overall, individual (non-ensemble) models developed using microarray data performed reasonably well on RNAseq data, as shown in Figure 5.3. This experiment tracks the distribution of mean MCC values of each model category across 100 repetitions of 3-fold CV on the RNAseq dataset. The median performance of the KNN, DT, and SVM models when applied to the RNAseq data was 0.73, with the best results for any CV repetition approaching 0.86 (result set (a)). The feature combination approach (b) showed a slight increase in median performance, but also resulted in many low-performing outliers. Voting using single-classifier models (c-e) showed slight increases in median performance – the KNN-only and DT-only ensembles achieved median performances of 0.78, and the SVM-only ensemble reached 0.81 – and also increases in

Figure 5.3: Comparison of alternative individual and ensemble models developed from microarray data when applied to predict HNSCC vs. normal samples from RNAseq data.
Figure 5.4: Comparison of alternative individual and ensemble models developed from microarray data when applied to predict early stage HNSCC vs. normal samples from RNAseq data.

the minimum performance. The combination voting approaches (f-l) had a trend of slightly increasing median performance and of lower variation as the number of models in the combination increased. The seven-, eight-, and nine-member ensembles had best overall median performances, ranging from 0.85-0.87. Among the stacking ensembles (m-o), the best median performance was observed with KNN as the secondary classifier.

In total, 42 models were developed which had better performance than the best-performing individual model (mean MCC = 0.8599) in at least 50 of the 100 CV repetitions. These models were part of the five-, six-, seven- and nine-member voting ensembles, which also had smaller amounts of variation than many of the other model categories. Most of these models had instances of statistically significant improvement ($p \leq 0.05$) over the best-performing individual model, as assessed by Steiger’s Z-test [219].
Figure 5.4 shows the performance of the same models when applied to the early stage vs. normal RNAseq data, across 100 repetitions of 3-fold CV. Overall, performances are slightly lower and also more variable, reflecting the more challenging nature of the classification problem. Otherwise, similar trends were observed across the model categories. In terms of mean MCC, the median performance for the individual models (a) was 0.68. The median performances of the combination voting ensembles were in the range of 0.77-0.78. Unlike in the previous experiment, no models had better performance than the best-performing individual model across any CV repetition (MCC = 0.89) for more than 50 of the 100 CV repetitions. This is due in part to the overall lower model performances in most categories, as well as the slightly higher value of the maximum individual performance for this experiment. However, almost all of the combination voting models and one stacking model (f-o) exceeded the median performance of the individual models.

**Tool Design**

The suite of microarray models was integrated into a MATLAB GUI that allows users to (i) load a new dataset of interest, (ii) select a model developed using previously examined datasets, or compare all models, and (iii) implement the selected model(s) and visualize and export the results. Figure 5.5 shows a screenshot of the interface. The goal of developing this system is to enable HNSCC researchers, particularly those from more clinical-oriented, non-computational backgrounds, to take advantage of predictive modeling resources developed by the computational research community. In particular, by gathering multiple models from different datasets together in a single tool, it becomes
Figure 5.5: Screenshot of tool interface, displaying import, analysis, visualization, and export capabilities.

easier to implement ensemble approaches that improve overall performance.

5.5. Discussion and Key Innovations

Consistency among different studies lends support to research findings; in the same way, consistent performance among datasets increases confidence in a predictive model, and in the functional importance of the features that it utilizes. In this chapter, I developed predictive models for HNSCC using gene expression data that exhibit robust performance both within and between transcriptomic data types. Other recent transcriptomic HNSCC studies have also compared results across several datasets. De Cecco and colleagues used three microarray datasets to develop their model, and tested it on six other datasets, including TCGA RNAseq data [227]; however, the endpoint of interest in their study was risk of relapse, not diagnosis. Saintigny and colleagues tested
their model for risk of oral cancer development in leukoplakia patients on nine other microarray datasets [39]. In addition, neither of these studies considered multiple classification approaches and ensemble methods, as in this study. Ye and colleagues performed a meta-analysis across 63 HNSCC transcriptomic studies, considering premalignant lesions vs. normal samples, primary tumors vs. normal samples, and primary tumors vs. metastatic disease [125]; however, the study focused identifying key genes and pathways, and did not build predictive models. This study contributes to the existing literature on transcriptomic analysis for HNSCC by considering several alternative modeling frameworks for the endpoint of disease state, with an application of early diagnosis. Overall, multiple models with good performance (MCC ≥ 0.8, AUC ≥ 0.8) were identified. In addition, I compared and identified ensemble strategies that increased model performance for differentiating both general and early HNSCC from normal samples.

Another direction for further research is in the integration of protein and gene expression data for early HNSCC detection. Several recent studies have investigated the use of salivary RNA and/or proteins for detecting oral cancer [235-237]. Some of the salivary RNA markers validated in [235] – IL-1B, IL-8, and H3F3A – were also selected in the DE gene lists in this study, and IL-8 was one of the mRMR-selected features for E-GEOD-9844. This observation is promising in both directions: applying other feature selection methods to the current group of datasets may reveal more previously-validated markers, and future validation studies may support the clinical relevance of features used in the current models. In addition, in Chapter 4, I have demonstrated that combining transcriptomic and proteomic models increases performance when predicting HNSCC
pathological stage [238]. Thus, models combining multiple –omic data types may also improve performance for early disease detection.

While current results are encouraging, more systematic testing, comparison, and refinement of models will be possible with additional and larger datasets. The three microarray datasets investigated here collectively include only 158 samples, and the number of matched tumor-normal RNAseq samples currently available in TCGA is also limited. However, data availability – and particularly for early stage disease – is always a limitation in cancer research. Therefore, one of the design goals of the modeling tool is to continually update its collection of individual and ensemble models as users upload additional labeled transcriptomic data. In this sense, it can serve to accelerate translational research. In the process, the tool can also be expanded to accommodate data and models for other prediction endpoints, such as length of survival, recurrence, and response to alternative therapies. It can also consider specific subsets of HNSCC, such as HPV+ vs. HPV- disease [239]. Thus, it can become a central component of a future clinical decision support system for assisting in HNSCC diagnosis and treatment planning.

The Key Innovations of this chapter are:

- Performed within–omic level integrative modeling study using microarray and RNAseq data for detection of HNSCC
- Translated ensemble models developed for discriminating between HNSCC and paired normal cases to the problem of early HNSCC detection
- Implemented tool to facilitate model translation and use of ensemble transcriptomic models in the HNSCC research community
CHAPTER 6

DYNAMIC SYSTEM MODELS FOR PREDICTION OF RESPONSE TO COMBINATION ADJUVANTS

6.1. Chemoprevention in HNSCC

Currently, HNSCC treatment options include surgery, radiation, chemotherapy, or combinations of these treatments [8]. Many patients with locally advanced (stage III/IV) disease respond favorably to initial treatment, but later experience locoregional recurrence, secondary primary tumor (SPT) development, or metastatic disease [9-13]. Chemoprevention is defined as the application of natural or synthetic agents to delay or prevent cancer progression. Adjuvant chemoprevention therapies have been shown to improve overall and disease-free survival in HNSCC; however, toxicity is a limiting factor [49, 240]. Therefore, the identification of safe, non-toxic adjuvant therapies for chemoprevention in HNSCC is of great clinical interest.

Because of these characteristics, natural compounds from dietary agents are promising as chemoprevention adjuvants for HNSCC. The primary catechin found in green tea, (-)epigallocatechin gallate (EGCG), has been shown to be an effective antioxidant and has a wide range of effects on signal transduction pathways implicated in cancer [240]. It affects multiple processes including cell proliferation and division, angiogenesis, and apoptosis. Recent phase II clinical trials have indicated that green tea extract is effective in preventing oral cancer development in patients with premalignant oral lesions [241, 242]. However, the effects of EGCG alone are limited by low oral bioavailability [54, 55, 243]. Thus, the identification of effective combinations of EGCG and other natural compounds is of interest, since natural compound combinations may
yield more-than-additive effects while maintaining low toxicity profiles. For example, green tea catechin in combination with curcumin, which is found in turmeric, has been shown to have synergistic apoptotic activity in larynx carcinoma cell lines [56]. EGCG in particular has been shown to synergistically increase apoptosis in HNSCC cell lines when combined with luteolin, an antioxidant found in many green vegetables [244], as well as with resveratrol, which is found in grape skins and red wine [53].

6.1.1. Prediction with Dynamic System Models

Predicting effective combinations of natural compounds is challenging due to their multi-target effects on complex biochemical signaling networks. Mathematical modeling for cancer is a diverse and growing area of research; although inherently much simpler than the complex biological systems represented, models provide tools for predicting outcomes and generating testable hypotheses [58-60]. Mathematical models can assist chemoprevention research by relating the activities of individual and combination agents to cellular-level responses, such as proliferation, survival, and apoptosis. For example, my prior work involved developing an agent-based model to predict the response of an HNSCC cell line to the combination of paclitaxel and the anti-angiogenic compound 2-methoxyestradiol (2ME2) [245]. These types of models may help to advance clinical research via the generation of specific, testable hypotheses, i.e., the response to alternative drug combinations, as well as the prediction of specific therapeutic targets that could increase favorable responses. In addition to the previously mentioned model, for HNSCC, models have been developed to predict the effects of radiotherapy [246, 247], and some models do so by incorporating clinical imaging data [248-250]. Other models focus on optimizing radiotherapy-chemotherapy combination
treatments [251, 252], and yet another focus is the prediction of nanoparticle drug uptake [253]. However, these models do not take into account the molecular pathway-level processes by which natural compounds exert their effects. In addition, previous mathematical models for chemoprevention for multiple cancer types mainly focused on cost-effectiveness, not biological effectiveness, and considered the effects of conventional chemotherapeutics [254-256].

To address this issue, this study develops a multi-scale dynamic model for predicting the response to natural compound chemoprevention agents in HNSCC, based on their targeted effects on signal transduction pathways. In computational cancer research, multi-scale dynamic models are those which describe behaviors at multiple spatial scales, and potentially also across different time scales. Possible spatial scales encompass the atomic, molecular, cellular, tissue, organ, and patient levels. The model developed here describes behaviors at the molecular and cellular levels. The model is applied to predict the combination effects of EGCG and resveratrol in several HNSCC cell lines. I also demonstrate how the multi-scale design enables use of the model for hypothesis generation, including the prediction of specific pathway targets and potential effective natural compound combinations. In addition, the initially developed multi-scale ordinary differential equation (ODE) model is then coupled to an agent-based model (ABM), which enables natural compound response prediction in complex, heterogeneous cellular environments. These models provide groundwork for advancing research into safer, non-toxic chemoprevention adjuvants for HNSCC from a computational perspective.
6.2. Model Development

6.2.1. Cell Lines and Dose Response Data

Dose response data from three HNSCC cell lines – Tu212, Tu686, and SQCCY1 – were used to develop and test the model. For Tu212, the percentage of apoptotic cells (early and advanced apoptosis) was measured for six dosage levels for resveratrol and 10 dosage levels for EGCG, as shown in Figure 6.1. The combination response was measured for four levels: 30µM EGCG with 10µM or 15µM resveratrol (abbreviated E30R10 and E30R15, respectively) and 40µM EGCG with 10µM or 15µM resveratrol (E40R10 and E40R15). For Tu686 and SQCCY1, the combination response was measured for 12 levels each: 15µM or 20 µM resveratrol with 30, 40, 50, 60, 70, or 80µM EGCG.

Figure 6.1: Dose response data for the Tu212, Tu686, and SQCCY1 cell lines. Image courtesy of Dr. A.R.M.R. Amin at Winship Cancer Institute.
**Modeling Workflow**

Available dose response data was separated into training and testing sets in order to estimate model parameters. Training data comprised of the EGCG-only and resveratrol-only dose response measurements, along with all but two of the combination responses. The remaining two responses were used for testing. For Tu212, \( \binom{4}{2} = 6 \) training-testing splits were evaluated, and for the other two cell lines, \( \binom{12}{2} = 66 \) splits were tested. Parameters were estimated by minimizing the root-mean-square error (RMSE) between the simulated and experimentally observed percentages of apoptosis.

Two alternative optimization methods were tested, both with the constraint that all parameters be non-negative: sequential quadratic programming (SQP) and the genetic algorithm (GA). SQP is a deterministic, gradient-based optimization method in which a quadratic programming sub-problem is solved at each iteration. For SQP, a constant initial parameter estimate of \( p \in \mathbb{R}^{33} \) was used, where \( p_i = 0.1 \ \forall \ i \in [1, 2, 3, ..., 33] \).

The GA is a direct-search optimization method which uses evolutionary mechanisms to explore the parameter space to approach a global minimum. The initial GA population had 1,250 entries, of which 250 were sampled from \( U \sim [0,1] \); 250 were sampled from \( U \sim [0,n] \), where \( n \) is twice the maximum value observed for the SQP-optimized parameters from any training-testing split for the Tu212 cell line; and 750 were obtained by adding normally distributed noise to the SQP-optimized parameters from all six trials for the Tu212 cell line: \( p_{i,GA} = p_{i,SQP} + v_i \) s. t. \( v_i \sim N \left( 0, \frac{2p_{i,SQP}}{10} \right) \), \( \forall \ i \in [1, 2, 3, ..., 33] \). Pairwise Pearson correlations between optimal parameter estimates obtained through each trial and each optimization method were used to assess the consistency of estimates.
6.2.2. Single-Scale Models

Two alternative models were considered to model the combination drug effects, using cellular-level processes only. In the first case, the living and apoptotic (both early and late apoptosis) cell dynamics are tracked by first-order ODEs, as shown in Table 6.1. EGCG and resveratrol effects are modeled through the apoptosis rate parameter $k_{\text{death}}$. The observed nonlinear effects are naively modeled through higher-order functions of natural compound concentrations.

In the second case, the Combination Index (CI), a measure used to assess drug combinations, was applied, as shown in Table 6.2. The CI indicates whether the combined effect of two drugs is additive (CI = 1), synergistic (CI < 1), or antagonistic (CI > 1). Chou and Talalay related the CI to administered drug ratios [257, 258]. The training

Table 6.1: Naïve ODE single-scale model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>[cells] = [living] + [apoptotic]</th>
<th>The population is divided into living and apoptotic cells. Early and late apoptotic cells are pooled together.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{d[\text{living}]}{dt} = k_{\text{division}}[\text{living}] - k_{\text{death}}[\text{living}]$</td>
<td>Synergistic effects are naively modeled using higher-order concentration terms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{d[\text{apoptotic}]}{dt} = k_{\text{death}}[\text{living}]$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{\text{death}} = k_{\text{baseline}} + r_1[\text{res}] + e_1[\text{egcg}] + \sum_{i=2}^{K=9} \lambda_i([\text{res}] + [\text{egcg}])^i$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
data was used to estimate the CI value and the Hill function parameters. The combination effect $E$ for the testing data was then estimated using Nelder-Mead simplex direct search.

### 6.2.3. Multi-Scale Ordinary Differential Equation Model

The multi-scale ODE model modifies the naïve single-scale model by defining the division rate parameter $k_{division}$ and the apoptosis rate parameter $k_{death}$ as functions of molecular species known to regulate these processes. In addition, the targeted effects of EGCG and resveratrol are modeled. Thus, both cellular-level and molecular-level factors are considered. The molecular-level model describes a system comprised of signal

Table 6.2: CI-based single-scale model

| $\frac{C_A^*}{C_A} + \frac{C_B^*}{C_B} = CI$ | $C_{A}, C_{B}$ are the amounts of drugs A and B in the combination, while $C_{A}^*, C_{B}^*$ are the amounts of drugs A and B that would yield the same effect as the combination if each was administered alone. |
| $\frac{C_A^*}{IC_{50,A}} \left( \frac{E}{1-E} \right)^{\frac{1}{h_A}} + \frac{C_B^*}{IC_{50,B}} \left( \frac{E}{1-E} \right)^{\frac{1}{h_B}} = CI$ | The Hill function of order $h_d$ relating the probability of response $p_d$ to the drug concentration $x$ is: $p_d(x) = \frac{x^{h_d}}{x^{h_d} + IC_{50x}^{h_d}}$. Using this to model the response curves of drugs A and B individually, the CI equation can be expressed as shown. $E$ is the combination effect. |
transduction pathways known to be highly relevant in many cancers, including HNSCC. These are the MAPK/ERK pathway, PI3K-Akt signaling, and their effects on modulators of apoptosis including p53, Bcl-2, and BAD. Figure 6.2 shows this signaling network, as well as the points at which the effects of EGCG and resveratrol are modeled. Some molecular targets are affected by both agents. EGCG has been shown to induce p53 expression in multiple cell types, and resveratrol is also associated with p53 activation [243]. In addition, both EGCG and resveratrol have been shown to inhibit NF-kB signaling [243], AP-1 activity [243, 259, 260], and PI3K-Akt [243, 261-263]. EGCG also inhibits phosphorylation of EGFR and association of Raf1 and MEK1 [243, 264]. Resveratrol has dose-dependent effects on phosphorylation of Erk1/2 [265, 266]. Table 6.3 shows the generalized mass action model for this system, and the relationship between the molecular-level model and the cellular-level model.
The general structure of the generalized mass action equations in Table 6.3 is as follows:

\[
\frac{d[X]}{dt} = v_A[X][X_{activating \ factor}] - x_A[X][X_{inhibiting \ factor}]
\]

This is of course a basic approximation of the complex biochemical interactions occurring in the signal transduction network. Here, \(X\) is assumed to be the activated (e.g., phosphorylated) form of the molecule. The differential equation is second-order because the process of de-activation (e.g., dephosphorylation) is being described implicitly. That is, the kinetic parameter \(v_A\) is assumed to represent the rate of activation by \(X_{activating \ factor}\) scaled by the proportion of \(X\) which has become de-activated, and which can thus be activated by association with \(X_{activating \ factor}\). The same pattern is followed for the kinetic parameter \(x_A\) and \(X_{inhibiting \ factor}\). A more complete representation of the activation or inhibition processes could include separate variables and equations for the active and inactive forms of \(X\). For example:

\[
[X_{total}] = [X] + [X_{inactive}]
\]

\[
\frac{d[X]}{dt} = v_A[X_{inactive}][X_{activating \ factor}] - x_A[X][X_{inhibiting \ factor}] - k_d[X]
\]

\[
\frac{d[X_{inactive}]}{dt} = -v_A[X_{inactive}][X_{activating \ factor}] + x_A[X][X_{inhibiting \ factor}] + k_d[X]
\]

In this representation, active \(X\) would be generated by the association of \(X_{activating \ factor}\) with the inactive form of \(X\), and it would be removed either by association with \(X_{inhibiting \ factor}\) or natural degradation back to its inactive state, governed by the kinetic rate constant \(k_d\). This representation also makes the simplifying assumption that the total amount of \(X\) (active and inactive forms) remains constant under the time-scale of interest.
Table 6.3: Multi-scale ODE model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Equation</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{d[EGFR]}{dt} = -e_1[EGCG][EGFR]$</td>
<td>The signal transduction pathway model includes 12 molecular species.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{d[Ras]}{dt} = v_1[EGFR][Ras]$</td>
<td>The multi-target effects of EGCG and resveratrol are modeled directly on the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{d[Raf]}{dt} = v_2[Ras][Raf] - x_1[Akt][Raf]$</td>
<td>various biochemical entities in the pathway. The model includes 33 rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{d[MEK]}{dt} = v_3[Raf][MEK] - e_2[EGCG][MEK]$</td>
<td>parameters comprising activating intermolecular interactions ($v_i$),</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{d[Erk]}{dt} = v_4[MEK][Erk] - r_1[Res][Erk]$</td>
<td>inhibitory interactions ($x_i$), pro-proliferation ($p_i$) and pro-apoptosis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{d[AP1]}{dt} = v_5[Erk][AP1] - r_2[Res][AP1] - e_3[EGCG][AP1]$</td>
<td>($a_i$) effects, and the effects of EGCG ($e_i$) and resveratrol ($r_i$).</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{d[PI3K]}{dt} = v_6[Ras][PI3K] - r_3[Res][PI3K]$</td>
<td>Again, the population is divided into living and apoptotic cells. Early</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{d[Akt]}{dt} = v_7[PI3K][Akt] - r_4[Res][Akt] - e_5[EGCG][Akt]$</td>
<td>and late apoptotic cells are pooled together.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{d[NFkB]}{dt} = v_8[NFkB][Akt] - r_5[Res][NFkB]$</td>
<td>The division and apoptosis kinetic rate parameters are direct functions of</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{d[p53]}{dt} = -x_3[Bcl2][p53] - x_4[Akt][p53] + r_6[Res][p53]$</td>
<td>pathway entity concentrations.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{d[Bcl2]}{dt} = v_9[Bcl2][NFkB] - x_2[BAD][Bcl2]$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{d[BAD]}{dt} = -x_5[BAD][Akt]$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{d[living]}{dt} = k_{division}[living] - k_{death}[living]$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\frac{d[apoptotic]}{dt} = k_{death}[living]$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{division} = p_{21}[Erk] + p_{22}[AP1]$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$k_{death} = \max(0, a_{21}[p53] + a_{22}[BAD] - a_{51}[Akt] - a_{52}[NFkB])$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Another, even more complex and realistic representation could include protein transcription, translation, and degradation rates, as well as detailed enzymatic response patterns like Michaelis-Menten or multi-substrate kinetics. The reason for avoiding these representations is the lack of measured kinetic rate constants and the lack of time-series molecular expression data for estimating these parameters. This is problematic because the number of these parameters will increase as the model increases in complexity. In the future, as additional data become available, this foundational model can be expanded to accommodate more specific biochemical interactions of interest.

6.2.4. Multi-Scale Agent-Based Model

A key assumption behind ODE models is that the population is well-mixed, with no spatial gradients. This is appropriate for an in vitro study in which a homogeneous cell population is evenly distributed in its environment. However, research into natural compounds for chemoprevention also involves more complex in vitro environments (e.g. multicellular spheroids) and in vivo studies. ABMs are well-suited for representing heterogeneous cell populations, inter-cellular interactions, cell movement, and the complex spatial structure of tumors. The multi-scale ODE model was therefore used to develop a multi-scale agent-based model (ABM).

In this ABM framework each agent represents a single cell. Instead of kinetic rate parameters, ABMs utilize transition probabilities, i.e., the probability that each agent experiences division \( p_d \) or apoptosis \( p_a \) during a given time step. The multi-scale ODE is used to drive the ABM by enabling estimation of the apoptosis probability at each time step. For the purpose of estimating \( p_a, p_d \) is assumed to be constant, based on the cell cycle duration of the Tu212 cell line (~24 hours). The fraction of apoptosis predicted by
Table 6.4: Coupling the multi-scale ODE and agent-based models

| Total living cells after $T$ time steps: $N_0(1 + p_d)^T(1 - p_a)^T$ |
| Total apoptotic cells after $T$ time steps: $\sum_{i=1}^{T} N_0(1 + p_d)^i(1 - p_a)^{i-1}p_a$ |

If $N_0$ cells are initially present, total numbers of living and apoptotic cells after a certain number of time steps ($T$) are represented in terms of probabilities of division ($p_d$) and apoptosis ($p_a$).

$e = c \times \left( \sum_{i=1}^{T} N_0(1 + p_d)^i(1 - p_a)^{i-1}p_a + N_0(1 + p_d)^T(1 - p_a)^T \right) - \sum_{i=1}^{N} N_0(1 + p_d)^i(1 - p_a)^{i-1}p_a$

The overall probability of apoptosis ($c$) can be used to estimate $p_a$.

the ODE (for a homogeneous population of the agent-cell under consideration) defines $c$, the cumulative probability of apoptosis over the prediction timeframe. As shown in Table 6.4, $p_a$ can then be estimated by minimizing the error $e$.

In this manner, the ODE model for a homogeneous population can be used to govern the behavior of a single agent-cell, though it may exist in a heterogeneous population. In turn, population heterogeneity can also affect the behavior of single agent-cells. While the multi-scale ODE provides the forward drive to the ABM, the ABM can also provide feedback to the ODE model. Characteristics of the tumor microenvironment, such as hypoxia, can significantly modulate the activities of signal transduction pathways, including EGFR and PI3K-Akt signaling, thereby affecting the behavior of individual cells [267, 268]. The hypoxic effect experienced by a single cell can be estimated through the spatial environment of the ABM, and fed back into the ODE, in order to more realistically model microenvironmental effects on individual cells.
6.3. Model Performance

*Multi-scale model outperforms single-scale models in predicting response to EGCG and resveratrol combinations*

As shown in Figure 6.3, the naïve single-scale model was unable to replicate experimentally-observed trends in either the training or testing sets, demonstrating poor performance overall. The CI-based model was able to make reasonable predictions of combination effects, but lacked the structure to enable causal analysis for alternative combinations.

![Figure 6.3: The performance of (a) the multi-scale model (RMSE = 0.0231), (b) the CI-based single-scale model (RMSE = 0.0578), and (c) the naïve single-scale model (RMSE = 0.1529) for a trial on Tu212 data, in which the E30R10 and E30R15 samples were used in training the models, and the E40R10 and E40E15 samples were used for testing. RMSE values are based on the testing samples only.](image-url)
perturbations. The multi-scale ODE model predictions of EGCG and resveratrol combination effects were more accurate than those of either single-scale model. This improvement in performance was observed across all six trials for the Tu212 cell line. Overall, the improvement in performance by the multi-scale model (GA-optimized) was statistically significant \( p \leq 0.05 \), Wilcoxon rank-sum test) compared to the CI-based and naïve single-scale models. The performance of the SQP-optimized multi-scale model was comparable; when discounting one outlier trial, it also showed statistically significant improvement over the single-scale models. Parameter estimates across trials and across optimization methods were generally consistent, exhibiting median Pearson correlation values exceeding 0.7.

In addition, at the final simulation time step, the normalized ratios of pathway elements (with respect to EGFR) were compared to the normalized gene expression ratios for the combination treatment case. While the ratios alone cannot be used to ascertain the correctness of the model, the high Pearson correlation value \( r = 0.89 \) between the simulated and experimental ratios implies that the model predictions remain in a reasonable region of the state space.

**SQP Optimization Shows Consistent Performance in Local Initialization Neighborhood**

The results shown in the previous section were based off of a constant initial parameter estimate of \( p \in \mathbb{R}^{33} \), where \( p_i = 0.1 \forall i \in \{1, 2, 3, ..., 33\} \). Because the parameter optimization space may be complex and irregular, the effect of different initialization points on the SQP-based optimization was evaluated. The model performance for the Tu212 cell line across the six trials was evaluated in terms of RMSE
Figure 6.4. (a) Comparison of the SQP optimization performance at different initial parameter estimates for the Tu212 cell line, and (b) correlation of the optimized parameters obtained from different initial estimates with those obtained from the initial estimate of $p_l = 0.1 \forall i$.

for six alternative initialization points, as shown in Figure 6.4(a). Initializing at $p_l = 0.05 \forall i, p_l = 0.1 \forall i, p_l = 0.2 \forall i$, and $p_l = 0.3 \forall i$ gave similar distributions of testing
errors. Initializing at $p_i = 0.01 \forall i$ and $p_i = 0.4 \forall i$ gave an increased range of testing errors, and a much larger outlier value. Training errors (not shown) were consistently small for all initializations except for $p_i = 0.4 \forall i$.

Additionally, initializations with $p_i = 0.05 \forall i$, $p_i = 0.2 \forall i$, and $p_i = 0.3 \forall i$ yielded parameter estimates that had fairly high Pearson correlation values (median $> 0.8$) with those estimated using $p_i = 0.1 \forall i$, as shown in Figure 6.5(b). Notably, during the other two cases of $p_i = 0.01 \forall i$ and $p_i = 0.4 \forall i$, which were associated with higher testing error outliers and more variable correlations, stalling at low iteration counts was observed during the optimization process for some trials.

Model-based Comparison of Cell Line Responses

Alternative estimates of model parameters indicated differences in the responses of the three cell lines to the various combinations of resveratrol and EGCG. For example, Figure 6.5(a) shows the model predictions for the Tu686 cell line, using the parameters optimized for the Tu212 cell line. The combination response predictions track the experimental observations well, but the model over-predicted responses to treatment with resveratrol and EGCG individually, particularly for higher concentrations. This suggests that while Tu686 and Tu212 have similar responses to resveratrol and EGCG in combination, Tu686 is less sensitive to the individual treatments. Figure 6.5(b) shows the corresponding results for the SQCCY1 cell line; as for Tu686, the model over-predicted responses to treatment with resveratrol and EGCG individually. Moreover, compared to Tu686, the combination effect predictions for SQCCY1 when using the Tu212-optimized parameters were poorer. In comparison, model parameters optimized for the SQCCY1 cell line effectively predicted combination responses, as shown in Figure 6.6, as well as
individual responses to resveratrol and EGCG (not shown). However, the SQCCY1- and Tu212-optimized parameter sets exhibited low correlations, implying different patterns of activity.

Figure 6.5. Comparison of the experimental and predicted responses to resveratrol alone (left), EGCG alone (right) and the 12 combination treatments (bottom) using Tu212-optimized parameters for (a) for the Tu686 cell line and (b) the SQCCY1 cell line.
One of the main goals of developing dynamic models of biological systems is to predict how the system may respond to alternative perturbations. A perturbation may represent, for example, the effect of a drug on specific reaction or on a group of reactions initiated by a common molecule. The model can then be used to rank alternative perturbations in terms of their predicted effect. In this sense, the model can identify potential drug targets and generate testable hypotheses. In the first case study, the multi-scale ODE model is applied to predict which perturbations, in addition to the best-performing EGCG-resveratrol combination (E40R15), can further increase the fraction of apoptotic cells for the Tu212 cell line.

The experimental dose response data for EGCG and resveratrol in this study has been acquired from three HNSCC cell lines in vitro. In the second case study, the multi-scale ABM is applied to predict how the apoptosis patterns for EGCG and resveratrol combinations may change in more complex cellular environments, by considering the microenvironmental factor of hypoxia. Hypoxia is associated with many negative effects, such as suppression of apoptosis and increased cancer cell survival, increased
angiogenesis and invasiveness, and decreased sensitivity to both radiotherapy and chemotherapy [267, 269]. In HNSCC in particular, hypoxia measures are associated with poorer overall and disease-free survival [269]. One of the key signal transduction pathways affected by hypoxia is PI3K-Akt signaling. In HNSCC, hypoxia has been shown to increase activated Akt expression both in vitro and in xenograft models; moreover, this effect occurs independently of upstream EGFR status [267, 270]. The second case study will mimic these effects by varying the initial relative Akt activity input to the internal ODE model driving each agent cell, as a function of the degree of hypoxia experienced by that agent cell.

6.4.1. Target Prediction

Using the Tu212 cell line response data, 14 parameters modulating intermolecular interactions were selected for perturbation analysis. The parameters related to EGCG and resveratrol effects and the proliferation and apoptosis rates were held constant. Two types of perturbations were considered: doubling and halving the original parameter values. Each type of perturbation was applied to each of the \( \sum_{i=1}^{14} \binom{14}{i} = 16,383 \) possible combinations of the 14 parameters. The combinations were ranked in terms of the fraction apoptosis observed after each perturbation. For both the SQP- and GA-derived parameter sets, the same top two perturbations were identified, as shown in Figure 6.7. If only one process was perturbed, halving Akt-mediated inhibition of p53 increased the predicted apoptotic fraction to above 0.75. If two processes were perturbed, halving Akt-mediated activation of NF-kB in addition increased the predicted apoptosis fraction to above 0.80. Further perturbations led to only slight increases in the predicted fraction of apoptotic cells.
Figure 6.7: (a) The predicted apoptotic response from the top perturbation is shown in cyan, and the response for the top two perturbations is shown in magenta. (b) The processes within the signaling network targeted by each perturbation are highlighted in cyan and magenta, respectively.

These predictions emphasize the importance of Akt-mediated signaling in HNSCC. For example, the Head and Neck Cancer Tissue Array Initiative has shown that Akt-mTOR signaling is often activated in HNSCC, independently of mutant p53 or EGFR [271]. Moreover, the Akt signaling pathway is a key mechanism by which the cell
can bypass inhibition of EGFR [272, 273]. That Akt-mediated processes were the top two ranked perturbation targets suggests that additional synergistic effects may be observed by combining EGCG and resveratrol with other natural compounds that target Akt signaling, such as curcumin, pomegranate, and lycopene [243]. For example, a recent study demonstrated that combining resveratrol with curcumin induced greater pro-apoptotic effects in several HNSCC cell lines than curcumin alone [274].

6.4.2. Spatial Feedback and Effects of Hypoxia

The ABM was used to investigate how spatial structures and hypoxic effects might affect responses to the resveratrol and EGCG combinations. Figure 6.8 describes this workflow and the interaction between the ODE and the ABM.

The first case involved a uniform random distribution of cells (Figure 6.9(a)),
Figure 6.9: (a) uniform randomly distributed cell population; (b) spherical cell distribution. Baseline fraction apoptosis patterns with no $O_2$-based effects for (c) the uniform population and (d) the spherical population. Apoptosis fraction patterns with $O_2$-based effects on Akt activity for (e) the uniform population and (f) the spherical population.
similar to the *in vitro* cell culture environment, while the second case involved a spherical distribution of cells (Figure 6.9(b)), similar to a multicellular spheroid or avascular tumor. In the first case, an O\(_2\) gradient was imposed by simulating the presence of a blood vessel along the vertical axis, from which O\(_2\) diffused into the environment. In the second case, the O\(_2\) gradient results from diffusion into the sphere from the ambient environment. In both cases, the O\(_2\) gradients were calculated following the models and parameters in [275, 276]. The effect of hypoxia on Akt activity was modeled as a linear function of the O\(_2\) gradient.

In the case with randomly distributed cells, the fraction apoptosis predicted by the ABM when no hypoxic effects were present matched the experimental observations for the Tu212 cell line, as shown in Figure 6.9(c). In the case with cells arranged in a sphere, the baseline fraction apoptosis, with no O\(_2\) gradient, was predicted to be higher, as shown in Figure 6.9(d). This is reasonable because cell proliferation is restricted in the interior of the sphere due to cell crowding, while apoptosis is not. In both scenarios, the model predicted that even moderate increases in Akt activity (10-50%) could result in notable decreases in the predicted fraction of apoptotic cells. Figure 6.9(e-f) show the predicted response patterns when the O\(_2\) gradient resulted in a maximum 20% increase in Akt activity for hypoxic cells. These predictions are supported by recent findings that the pro-apoptotic activity of curcumin, which affects many of the same pathways as EGCG and resveratrol, was inhibited by overexpression of active Akt [277].
6.5. Gene Expression Analysis

RNAseq analysis was used to implicate additional genes and processes for future expansion and refinement of the model. RNAseq data was available for four samples: no treatment, resveratrol-only, EGCG-only, and one combination (E40R15). Bioconductor packages were used to annotate sorted BAM files using the hg19 reference sequence from UCSC and to count reads. Differential expression analysis was performed using edgeR [192] to compare each treatment case against the no treatment case, with an FDR threshold of 0.05. Functional analysis of differentially expressed gene (DEG) lists was performed using DAVID [202].

The synergistic effect of EGCG and resveratrol is apparent through the pattern of DEGs observed for individual and combination treatments, as shown in Table 6.5. EGCG treatment alone led to 54 DEGs, and resveratrol alone led to 111 DEGs. The combination treatment led to a more than four-fold increase, with 466 DEGs. Among all three lists, 22 genes were in common. The DEGs associated with combination treatment also represented a larger variety of biological processes, as shown by Gene Ontology (GO) mining in Table 6.6. 19 GO terms were implicated with the combination treatment DEG list. Among these, two terms were also implicated in the EGCG DEG list, and four in the resveratrol DEG list. Key processes implicated include regulation of cell proliferation,

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>NT vs. EGCG</th>
<th>NT vs. Resveratrol</th>
<th>NT vs. Combination</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NT vs. EGCG</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT vs. Resveratrol</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>111</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NT vs. Combination</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>466</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 6.6: Significant Gene Ontology terms associated with the DEG list for the no treatment vs. combination case. Terms also associated with the EGCG and resveratrol DEG lists are marked.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GO:0006955~immune response</th>
<th>GO:0043067~regulation of programmed cell death</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GO:0009611~response to wounding</td>
<td>GO:0070482~response to oxygen levels</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO:0006952~defense response</td>
<td>GO:0010941~regulation of cell death</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO:0010033~response to organic substance</td>
<td>GO:0009615~response to virus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO:0006954~inflammatory response</td>
<td>GO:0051384~response to glucocorticoid stimulus</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO:0042127~regulation of cell proliferation</td>
<td>GO:0001893~maternal placenta development</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO:0048545~response to steroid hormone stimulus</td>
<td>GO:0001666~response to hypoxia</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO:0031960~response to corticosteroid stimulus</td>
<td>GO:0030595~leukocyte chemotaxis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO:0042981~regulation of apoptosis</td>
<td>GO:0050900~leukocyte migration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO:0009719~response to endogenous stimulus</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

apoptosis, and cell death. Notably, the response to oxygen levels and hypoxia are also included in this list. Overall, the results of RNAseq analysis clearly indicate that the combined effect of EGCG and resveratrol is much more extreme and wide-reaching than the effects of either alone.

### 6.6. Discussion and Key Innovations

This chapter proposes a multi-scale ODE model for predicting and studying the combination effects of natural compounds for HNSCC chemoprevention. The model successfully predicted the combination effects of EGCG and resveratrol in three HNSCC cell lines. In addition, a multi-scale agent-based model was developed in order to couple the predictions of the ODE with feedback from spatially heterogeneous and complex cellular environments. Case studies applied these models to predict the effects of additional targeted interventions and the effects of microenvironmental hypoxia on cell population response.
Multi-scale models of cancer, which can encompass scales from the atomic to the patient level, are valuable tools for quantitatively predicting outcomes and generating testable hypotheses. Many recent models have focused on specific processes in cancer biology, such as invasion [278, 279], angiogenesis [280], and metastasis [281]. Others have focused on specific cancer types. For example, models of brain cancer and non-small cell lung cancer have related the interaction dynamics of EGFR, TGF-α, PLC-γ, and other molecules to proliferative or migratory cell phenotypes [282-284]. Models which consider drug response range from focusing on conventional chemotherapeutics [285, 286] and radiotherapy [287] to those describing the effects of targeted therapeutics, such as a tyrosine kinase inhibitor against EGFR [282], the anti-angiogenic agent endostatin [280], anti-invasive matrix metalloprotease [279], and antiandrogen therapy [288]. I distinguish the current study from prior art in two ways. First, from a biological and clinical perspective, this model focuses specifically on HNSCC and in particular on chemoprevention, not on conventional therapeutics. Second, from a modeling perspective, this model focuses on the complex effects of natural compounds, which interact with the biochemical system at multiple points, rather than targeted therapeutics.

The current results highlight several key directions for future research. First, RNAseq analysis revealed that the combination effects of EGCG and resveratrol are much more extensive than the individual effects of either. Further research into these effect patterns – particularly at the protein and metabolite levels – will yield greater insight into the mechanisms of these natural compounds, and will indicate how they can be more effectively applied in clinical settings. As additional data – particularly the kinetic parameters governing molecular-level processes – become available, the current
models can be expanded and refined to include more biological details. For example, the molecular pathway modeled here omits some intermediate mechanistic steps, such as the role of IKK in the activation of NF-kB, and that of MDM2 in inhibiting p53. These and other interactions have relevance to how EGCG and resveratrol exert their effects [289-292]. As such, they are important in interpreting model predictions, particularly target predictions. Another motivation for model expansion is that all three HNSCC cell lines modeled here are p53 mutants. As more information is gathered on the effects of mutant p53 losses and gains of function on other components of the signal transduction network, these cell line-specific effects can be incorporated into the model [293, 294]. Next, as the model predictions indicate, the response to EGCG and resveratrol may be dampened in more complex in vitro and in vivo settings, due to microenvironmental and other factors. This is a multi-faceted challenge, and potential solutions include combination with other natural compounds or targeted agents, as suggested by the first case study, as well as the development of effective drug delivery and cell-targeting strategies.

In the long term, as these challenges are addressed, models for predicting natural compound chemoprevention response could become part of a personalized treatment planning system for HNSCC patients. Such models could take into account patient-specific clinical data and –omic expression signatures in order to predict regimens of effective, non-toxic chemoprevention adjuvants. The current modeling study provides the groundwork for the development of such a system, with the overall goal of preventing recurrence, SPT development, and metastasis, and improving HNSCC patient outcomes.

The Key Innovations of this chapter are:
• Developed first multi-scale models for predicting the combination effects of natural compounds in HNSCC

• Tested multi-scale ODE model on dose response data from three HNSCC cell lines, and extended it to generate a multi-scale ABM

• Demonstrated application of ODE and ABM models for target prediction and prediction of response in complex environments, respectively
CHAPTER 7

CONCLUSION

The concrete goals of this dissertation were to develop mathematical modeling tools for mining –omic datasets and for the analysis of biological system behavior in the context of HNSCC. The specific technical achievements of this dissertation corresponding to the three research objectives are:

1. Development and validation of mathematical modeling tools for knowledge-driven exploratory data mining of transcriptomic, proteomic, and metabolomic datasets, in terms of both explicit (hypergeometric similarity measures, DetectTLC) and implicit (DetectTLC) similarity-based analysis

2. Construction of predictive models using integrated analyses between –omic levels to discriminate between early and advanced HNSCC, and within –omic levels for developing robust predictive models applicable to early disease detection

3. Development and validation of integrated molecular- and cellular-level ordinary differential equation model for predicting the response to natural compound adjuvants in HNSCC cell populations, and extension to an agent-based model for prediction under different microenvironmental conditions

7.1. Concrete Innovation Deliverables

The key innovations of this dissertation, as noted at the closing of each chapter, are summarized below:

- (Chapter 2) Development of binary hypergeometric similarity measure using Fisher’s exact test
• (Chapter 2) Development of multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure using the Fisher-Freeman-Halton test

• (Chapter 2) Development of a piecewise approximation algorithm to facilitate application of the multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure to high-dimensional data vectors

• (Chapter 2) Implementation on two HNSCC (transcriptomic and proteomic) and one non-HNSCC (MSI, lipidomic) datasets indicates that proposed multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure makes relevant selections not identified by other similarity measures

• (Chapter 3) Development of the first analytical pipelines using quantitative image features for identifying m/z images containing spot-like regions in MSI data

• (Chapter 3) Design, implementation, and validation of the first software tool, DetectTLC, for enabling and accelerating TLC-MSI studies in metabolomics by automatically finding mixture components of potential interest in TLC-MSI datasets

• (Chapter 4) Performed the first supervised modeling study for modeling progression in HNSCC by integrating both proteomic and transcriptomic data

• (Chapter 4) Developed between-omic level integrated ensemble models with significant improvement in performance for predicting HNSCC pathological stage

• (Chapter 5) Performed within–omic level integrative modeling study using microarray and RNAseq data for detection of HNSCC

• (Chapter 5) Translated ensemble models developed for discriminating between HNSCC and paired normal cases to the problem of early HNSCC detection
• (Chapter 5) Implemented tool to facilitate model translation and use of ensemble transcriptomic models in the HNSCC research community

• (Chapter 6) Developed first multi-scale models for predicting the combination effects of natural compounds in HNSCC

• (Chapter 6) Tested multi-scale ODE model on dose response data from three HNSCC cell lines, and extended it to generate a multi-scale ABM

• (Chapter 6) Demonstrated application of ODE and ABM models for target prediction and prediction of response in complex environments, respectively

Figure 7.1 demonstrates how these deliverables map to both clinical challenges and technical challenges in HNSCC research.
7.2. Concrete Publication Deliverables

The section provides a comprehensive list of publications completed during my years as a Ph.D. student. Those which contribute directly to this dissertation are highlighted in Table 7.1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Specific Aim</th>
<th>Sub-Aim</th>
<th>Citation</th>
<th>Publication Type</th>
<th>Publication Status</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Binary hypergeometric similarity measure</td>
<td>[C1]</td>
<td>Conference paper</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure</td>
<td>[J2]</td>
<td>Journal paper</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Early stage vs. normal: microarray and RNAseq data</td>
<td>[C6]</td>
<td>Conference paper</td>
<td>Accepted for Publication</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Early vs. advanced stage: gene and protein expression data</td>
<td>[C4] [J4]</td>
<td>Conference paper Journal paper</td>
<td>Published Under review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Single-scale, cellular-level cancer model</td>
<td>[C3]</td>
<td>Conference paper</td>
<td>Published</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Published or Accepted for Publication

Journal Papers


Book Chapters


Refereed (Peer-Reviewed) Conference Papers


Manuscripts under Review

Journal Papers


Manuscripts in Preparation

Journal Papers


7.3. Directions for Future Research and Concluding Remarks

The models and tools developed in this dissertation are complete and fully functional. However, the critical final step in a research project is to recognize potential future applications and extensions of the current work. Some specific avenues for further inquiry were mentioned in the discussion sections concluding each chapter. Here, I elaborate on opportunities in two dimensions: (1) basic and translational research in HNSCC and (2) the design and development of novel mathematical models.

7.3.1. Basic and Translational Research in HNSCC

One of the major goals of Big Data research in biomedicine is biomarker identification, for specific and practical applications like early diagnosis, patient stratification, and prediction of treatment response. Applying the modeling infrastructure developed in this dissertation to new, more comprehensive –omic datasets can greatly facilitate these tasks:

*Early Disease Detection with Transcriptomic, Proteomic, and Metabolomic Data*

Because of the differences in HNSCC outcomes according to the stage at which the disease is detected, molecular marker-based systems for early diagnosis of HNSCC could have a large clinical impact. This is particularly important for disease subsites for which early disease symptoms may be limited, like the oropharynx, or for which symptoms may be misattributed, as in the oral cavity [295, 296]. Overlap between the transcriptomic features identified in Chapter 5 and validated salivary mRNA markers for detecting oral cancer [235] is encouraging, and establishes the stage for clinical validation of other transcriptomic features highlighted through the models developed in
this research. In addition, Chapter 4 demonstrated that the integration of proteomic and transcriptomic data can assist in stage prediction. This between-omic level integration may also assist in the problem of early diagnosis, once proteomic data for matched early and normal patient samples becomes available. Incorporating metabolomic data into these models is also worthy of investigation.

Integration of Mass Spectrometry Imaging and Natural Compound Chemoprevention Research

The potential of MSI in HNSCC research is immense, and informative model-driven experiments could immediately follow the acquisition of MSI datasets from HNSCC samples. Possible experimental settings include tumors, xenografts, or spheroidal cultures. MSI enables combined molecular and spatial analysis. This could be particularly informative following treatment with bio-active natural compounds. Chapter 6 developed a multi-scale ABM, which is a spatial model that could be applied to understand and predict spatially heterogeneous molecular expression and cellular-level response patterns observed in MSI data. In addition, the similarity measures developed in Chapter 2 could be applied to assess spatial molecular expression patterns across tissue regions (i.e., tumor, marginal, and surrounding normal), as well as among regions showing different degrees of response to administered natural compounds.

Integration of TLC-MSI and Chemoprevention Research

Another key direction for research is the investigation of lipid and metabolite profiles in HNSCC. The natural compounds being investigated for HNSCC
chemoprevention affect multiple biochemical entities, both directly and indirectly. For example, recent studies have indicated the importance of lipid rafts to the effects of EGCG and resveratrol on downstream signaling [297, 298]. The DetectTLC system developed in Chapter 3 provides a computational framework for investigating the effects of natural compounds on lipids and metabolites, and hence for obtaining a better understanding of their mechanisms of action.

Applications of Similarity Measure in Biomedical Image Analysis

The multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure introduced in Chapter 2 may also be applied to other data types in addition to molecular expression –omic data. One potential application is with wavelets, which are used for signal and image processing in many different application areas. For example, in radiomics, features from wavelet-transformed X-ray computed tomography (CT) images were among a set of image features used for prognostic prediction in HNSCC [299]. In this dissertation, data similarity was assessed based on binned expression levels. Future research could investigate the performance of the proposed similarity measure for comparing images and data in terms of wavelet features.

Another potential application is in tissue imaging using quantum dots (QDs). QDs are fluorescent nanoparticles that can be conjugated to antibodies for targeted visualization of molecular and cellular targets [300, 301]. Compared to fluorescent dyes, QDs are advantageous because of their long-lasting fluorescence, target specificity, and multiplexing capabilities. Clinical applications are currently not possible due to the issue of heavy metal toxicity. However, this may change in the future as an initial trial in non-
human primates showed no toxic effects during the first 90 days after administration [302]. However, QDs remain valuable for research applications. In recent HNSCC research in particular, QDs have been used to investigate the association of aldehyde dehydrogenase 1 with lymph node metastasis [303] and that of caveolin-1 with clinical stage, histological grade, and cancer development [304]. Additionally, QD-based immunohistofluorescence was observed to have greater sensitivity and objectivity compared to immunohistochemistry in an HNSCC application [303]. The multivariate hypergeometric similarity measure developed in Chapter 2 provides a framework for comparing fluorescent images, particularly when using multiplexed QDs. In one scenario, each bin (i.e., the class to which a pixel is assigned) in the reference and query images could represent a QD expression intensity level, enabling two QDs to be compared. In another scenario, each bin could represent an $n$-dimensional vector of expression levels for a group of $n$ QDs, thereby enabling similarity assessment of multiplexed QD data.

7.3.2. Design and Development of Novel Mathematical Models

The design and development of new modeling techniques can assist in many biomedical research areas, including HNSCC. In the following section, I identify key directions for building upon and extending the modeling infrastructure developed in this dissertation:

*Time-Series Analysis*

Chapters 4 and 5 have demonstrated the development of integrated –omics models for predicting clinically relevant endpoints. However, all data currently used is static, obtained at a single time-point. Metabolomics data in particular is highly dynamic,
and has shown potential not only for early diagnosis but also for monitoring of disease status [160, 161, 305]. This reveals an opportunity to develop predictive models which utilize time-series –omic data to track patient risk and prognosis over time. Such models could help clinicians monitor the status of their patients and could serve to improve personalized medicine.

**Ensemble Model Construction**

Chapters 4 and 5 have also demonstrated how integrated ensemble modeling techniques can improve prediction performance. However, selecting the most appropriate ensemble from among all possible ensembles can be challenging, especially to users from non-computational backgrounds. A second predictive modeling layer could help to address this issue. For example, the input to such a model could be a new dataset of interest. Given historical performance patterns observed for other datasets across various models (as in Chapter 5), a similarity-based approach (as in Chapter 2) could be used to compare dataset properties, and thereby identify corresponding ensemble constructions that are likely to yield good performance on the new dataset.

**Systems Models**

Chapter 6 developed multi-scale models for predicting the response to natural compounds. While my previous HNSCC system model used parameters based on experimental data [245], parameter estimation was necessary for the more complex multi-scale model. Thus, a key direction for improvement is parameterization of molecular- and cellular-level processes based on experimental measurements. This could be a dynamic
process in itself. For example, when a new cell line or patient becomes available, such a model could accept accompanying time-series data and automatically extract relevant parameters. If no data is available, a similarity-based approach (as in Chapter 2) may be used to identify the most relevant previously examined samples, and adapt experimental parameters from them. This would reduce the number of parameters to be estimated via error minimization. Next, another direction for improvement is to expand the list of processes associated with the multi-scale ABM to include movement and mechanical interactions. This would enable more realistic prediction of cellular-level behaviors, and investigation of cancer-relevant processes like invasion and metastasis. Lastly, nanoparticles – including gold nanoparticles – have been proposed as delivery vehicles to improve bioavailability of natural compounds [54, 306]. In addition, there has been evidence that the combination of natural compounds and hyperthermia can have synergistic effects [307]. Thus, the multi-scale ABM could be integrated with models for nanoparticle-based drug delivery and hyperthermia for cancer treatment, a subject which I have previously reviewed [308].

7.3.3. Concluding Remarks

In this dissertation, I have developed a suite of mathematical modeling tools to address key challenges in HNSCC research. It includes mathematical models for data mining and system dynamics that have been successfully applied to investigate HNSCC molecular characteristics, progression, and chemoprevention response. In the preceding sections, I have also discussed several potential seeds for future investigations, building upon this work. Overall, this dissertation contributes to the research space by accelerating
and enabling the application of large –omics datasets to basic and translational cancer research.
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