Self-supervised learning unveils morphological clusters behind lung cancer types and prognosis
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ABSTRACT

Histopathological images of tumors contain abundant information about how tumors grow and how they interact with their micro-environment. Characterizing and improving our understanding of phenotypes could reveal factors related to tumor progression and their underpinning biological processes, ultimately improving diagnosis and treatment. In recent years, the field of histological deep learning applications has seen great progress, yet most of these applications focus on a supervised approach, relating tissue and associated sample annotations.

Supervised approaches have their impact limited by two factors. Firstly, high-quality labels are expensive in time and effort, which makes them not easily scalable. Secondly, these methods focus on predicting annotations from histological images, fundamentally restricting the discovery of new tissue phenotypes. These limitations emphasize the importance of using new methods that can characterize tissue by the features enclosed in the image, without pre-defined annotation or supervision.

We present Phenotype Representation Learning (PRL), a methodology to extract histomorphological phenotypes through self-supervised learning and community detection. PRL creates phenotype clusters by identifying tissue patterns that share common morphological and cellular features, allowing to describe whole slide images (WSIs) through compositional representations of cluster contributions.

We used this framework to analyze histopathology slides of adenocarcinoma (LUAD) and squamous cell carcinoma (LUSC) lung cancer subtypes from The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) and New York University (NYU) cohorts. We show that PRL achieves a robust lung subtype prediction providing statistically relevant phenotypes for each lung subtype. We further demonstrate the significance of these phenotypes in lung adenocarcinoma overall and recurrence free survival, relating clusters with patient outcomes, cell types, grown patterns, and omic-based immune signatures.

Our framework provides a simple, interpretable and versatile method that can correlate histomorphological patterns with different clinical annotations, without the need of retraining for different prediction purposes.
1 Introduction

Whole slide images (WSIs) contain abundant information on the highly heterogeneous nature of tumors and continue to be the primary data source for definitive cancer diagnosis, prognostication, and medical therapy selection. However, pathologist interpretation is time consuming and prone to interobserver variation, depending on expertise, knowledge, and on the inherent difficulty in characterizing certain tumors or patterns. Deep learning supervised methods have shown to be quite efficient and on par with specialists on tumor classification tasks. In addition, these approaches have also enabled conclusions not possible by human interpretation, such as genetic alteration, survival and immunotherapy response prediction.

While such approaches lead to good results, obtaining rigorous clinical annotations is time consuming and requires expertise. Annotations are however crucial to properly train supervised models or to further study the significance of certain histomorphologies, e.g. shows the predictive potential of tumor regions to predict immunotherapy response. Semi and weakly-supervised approaches have emerged to alleviate this bottleneck. They can learn from a small subset of labeled data, and have proven to be beneficial in various applications, including histopathology. These methods range from a cluster-based approach on support vector machine for breast cancer tissue classification, to teacher-student architectures on a large colorectal cancer datasets. On the other hand, weakly-supervised approaches such as multiple instance learning (MIL) naturally fit tasks for WSI label prediction. In this setting, we have a single annotation for a WSI and multiple tile instances that together conform the WSI; MIL aims to find which tile instances are correlated with the WSI annotation. Of especial relevance is the attention-deep MIL model, which introduces interpretability into a MIL deep learning model by providing attention scores to the WSI tiles. This model has been extensively used and adapted to histopathology.

Parallel to these method developments, interest for unsupervised and self-supervised methods is growing in the field of histopathology; unlike other supervised approaches, these models create representations of tissue images without the need of labels and solely from information encapsulated in the image. This line of work has recently being applied to a range of different tasks, showing for example that tumor regions are not necessarily the best predictor for tumor mutations, that variational auto-encoders (VAEs) can disentangle morphological components of single cells from H&E stained images, or that self-supervised models can be successfully used for cell nuclei segmentation.
To date most lung adenocarcinoma studies have employed supervised approaches, using pathologist-assigned morphological assessments or genotype data as training labels\(^8,37\). These approaches rival pathologists in the identification of tumour subtype such as adenocarcinoma (LUAD) versus squamous cell carcinoma (LUSC). Furthermore, deep learning approaches to cell type identification in WSIs have established that the number of immune-cold regions in lung adenocarcinoma is an independent predictor of poor patient outcomes\(^38\). The morphology of lung cancer is known to be particularly heterogeneous and complex, with classification guidelines from the World Health Organization being adjusted several times since 1999, in the hope to improve prognostication\(^39\). While a recent study\(^1\) has shown the prognostic value of a new grading system of adenocarcinoma, others have more specifically studied the morphological features of nuclei within the tumor epithelium region\(^40\).

Here, we propose a method to extract histomorphological phenotype representations through self-supervised learning and community detection. This approach provides a simple mechanism to relate phenotype clusters with different clinical annotations, without the need to retrain the model unlike other supervised and weakly-supervised end-to-end solutions. In addition, our methodology is easily interpretable, allowing pathologists to scrutinize tissue patterns and their relations to annotations such as cancer type, overall survival, or recurrence free survival.

We used our method to discriminate lung cancer subtypes between adenocarcinoma (LUAD) and squamous cell (LUSC), and survival analysis for lung adenocarcinoma using WSIs from The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) and the New York University (NYU) School of Medicine as an independent cohort. In this paper, we provide evidence of how our methodology finds phenotypes that can (A) discriminate between LUAD and LUSC, (B) be prognostic of overall and recurrence free survival, and (C) show correlations between cell types, grown patterns, and omic-based immune signatures. Our methodology can be applied to any cancer, offering a powerful discovery approach that can be used to study histomorphological patterns across cancer types.

1.1 PRL: Phenotype Representation Learning through self-supervised learning and community detection

PRL creates phenotype clusters that automatically identify distinct cellular and morphological tissue features without using any label or annotation, enabling to build compositional representations of whole slide images (WSIs) by phenotype cluster contributions. This approach permits to use WSI representations across different kinds of clinical annotations, avoiding the need of model retraining unlike other supervised
Figure 1. Overview of PRL framework architecture. A Whole slide images (WSIs) are processed for tile extraction and stain color normalization. B Self-supervised training of backbone $f_\theta$ in order to create tissue tile representations. C Tiles are projected into $z$ vector representations using the frozen backbone network $f_\theta$. Continuously, phenotype clusters are defined by using Leiden community detection over a nearest neighbor graph of $z$ tissue representations. D WSIs are defined by a vector with dimensionality equal to the number of phenotype clusters, each dimension equals the percentage of the cluster contribution to the total number of tiles in the slide. PRL creates WSI representations that can be easily used in interpretable models such as logistic regression or cox regression relating tissue phenotypes with clinical annotations.
end-to-end solutions. **Figure 1** captures the entire PRL methodology.

The framework starts by segmenting WSIs into $224 \times 224$ tiles at 5X magnification ($2.016 \mu m$ per pixel) and without overlap. Tiles are filtered out if the tissue in the image does not cover at least 60% of the area. Finally, stain normalization is applied\(^{41}\) (**Figure 1-A**). PRL uses self-supervised learning\(^{42}\) to capture morphological and cellular characteristics found in tissue into vector representations. Additionally, it creates representations that are invariant to color and slight zoom distortions, mitigating the impact of variations in the imaging process across institutions\(^{43}\) (**Figure 1-B**). Since these representations contain relevant information about tissue, the relationship between them is meaningful. Motivated by this idea, PRL defines a nearest neighbors graph between representations and uses Leiden community detection\(^{44}\) to find phenotype clusters (**Figure 1-C**).

Defining these clusters allows us to easily describe WSIs. WSIs are represented by a single vector with dimensionality equal to the total number of clusters and each dimension accounts for the percentage of a phenotype with respect to the total tissue area (**Figure 1-D**). PRL’s approach to describing WSIs provides (A) interpretability through tissue patterns that can be easily visualized in the context of WSI and by individual tiles, (B) the application of interpretable models such as logistic regression or Cox regression, verifying the statistical significance of phenotypes in subtype classification or survival, and (C) broader association studies with genomic, transcriptomic and other omics profiles.

In the following sections, we demonstrate the effectiveness of our proposed method in the context of lung cancer. First in lung adenocarcinoma (LUAD) and squamous cell carcinoma (LUSC) tissue differentiation, and secondly on lung adenocarcinoma overall and recurrence free survival. Finally, we characterize the lung adenocarcinoma phenotype clusters using clinical variables, cell type densities, and genomic and transcriptomic features.

## 2 Results

### 2.1 Lung adenocarcinoma versus squamous cell carcinoma classification

We evaluated PRL’s performance at classifying lung adenocarcinoma (LUAD) versus squamous cell carcinoma (LUSC) tissue differentiation, and secondly on lung adenocarcinoma overall and recurrence free survival. Finally, we characterize the lung adenocarcinoma phenotype clusters using clinical variables, cell type densities, and genomic and transcriptomic features.
from a training, validation, and test set with WSIs from different institutions across sets. On average, the training set accounts for 60% of the slides, validation for 20%, and test set for 20%. The motivation behind setting a 5 fold cross-validation with non-overlapping institutions is to test PRL reliability against the variability of imaging process over institutions. PRL achieved an average TCGA test set AUC of 0.93 with 95% confidence intervals (CI) of 0.91-0.95, and an average of 0.98 with 95% CI of 0.97-0.99 on the independent test cohort from NYU. These results provide evidence of robustness in prediction of LUAD and LUSC subtype across different institutions (Figure 2-A).

One of the main features of PRL’s approach is the interpretability behind the outcome prediction. Figure 2 B-D and Figure 3 A-E provide insight into the relationship between histomorphological patterns and classification of WSIs into LUAD and LUSC.

Figure 2-B shows a Uniform Manifold Approximation and Projection (UMAP) dimensionality reduction of WSI representations for the TCGA and NYU cohorts, showing a division between LUAD and LUSC even in 2 dimensions. Figure 2-C displays a bi-hierarchical clustering based on WSI representations. We used a gradient color scheme to label clusters based on their subtype purity from 100% LUSC (blue) to 100% LUAD (orange), we calculated purity as the percentage of the dominant subtype tiles with respect to the total cluster tiles. The ground truth label of each WSI is shown on the y-axis using the same color code, LUAD (orange) and LUSC (blue). LUAD WSIs show correlation with clusters of high LUAD subtype purity, concurrently LUSC slides show correlation with clusters of high LUSC subtype purity. Additionally, Figure 2-D shows a UMAP dimensionality reduction of the 224 × 224 tissue tile representations, each tile is labeled LUAD or LUSC based on its associated WSI ground truth label; this figure also shows each tile and its corresponding phenotype cluster assignment. Finally, it displays phenotype clusters and their connections through partition-based graph abstraction (PAGA), each node graph is represented with the percentage of lung subtype tiles in the cluster. We see that distinct regions of the space define lung subtype and phenotype clusters with a high percentage of a particular subtype.

Figure 3-A displays a Forest plot of the logistic regression’s coefficients across the 5 fold cross-validation, showing that clusters 31, 11, 22, 36, 28 are statistically significant predictors of LUAD while clusters 5, 45 predict LUSC. Histomorphological phenotype patterns can be easily visualized in the context of a WSI (Figure 3 D-E) or by individual tiles in the cluster (Figure 3 B-C), providing a simple way for pathologists to interpret tissue patterns with clinical annotations. Impressively, the successful assignment of tumour types was achieved using images equivalent to a 5X magnification, without sufficient resolution to identify intercellular bridging which is one of the key morphological features used by pathologists to
assign tumour type. Furthermore, the other pathognomonic feature, tumour cell keratinisation, was absent from many clusters with high LUSC purity. This indicates the existence of additional, perhaps subtle or hard-to-describe highly tumour-type-specific features which are driving tile representation.

Therefore, throughout Figures 2 and 3 we show that the phenotype of clusters 31, 11, 22, 36, 28 (LUAD) and 5, 45 (LUSC) have a high percentage of each lung subtype tiles, clear correlations between WSI labels and subtype purity, and statistical significance in predicting LUAD and LUSC.

2.2 Prognostic morphological clusters in lung adenocarcinoma overall and recurrence free survival

We used our methodology to analyze the relevance of PRL’s phenotype clusters in lung adenocarcinoma (LUAD) overall and recurrence free survival. We tested this hypothesis by using Cox proportional hazards models for survival prediction, by correlating gene immunogenomic signatures, and histopathological assessment of tissue appearances.

On the LUAD overall survival analysis, we used a 5 fold cross-validation over the TCGA data and use the NYU cohort as an additional independent set. The TCGA cohort is composed by 443 patients while the NYU cohort is composed of 276 patients. We used a Cox proportional hazards regression over patient representations, describing each patient as a composition of the different phenotype clusters. PRL’s phenotype clusters are able to achieve a mean concordance index (c-index) of 0.60 with 95% confidence intervals (CI) of 0.56-0.63 on the TCGA test set and a mean c-index of 0.65 with 95% CI of 0.63-0.67 on the NYU set. Figure 4-A shows a Forest plot of the Cox proportional hazards coefficients over the 5 fold cross-validation, providing insight into the relationship between cluster phenotypes and their relevance.
Figure 3. Lung adenocarcinoma (LUAD) versus squamous cell carcinoma (LUSC) interpretability behind classification performance. A Forest plot of the logistic regression’s coefficients. We highlighted statistically significant clusters (p-value < 0.05) and included each cluster’s dominant subtype and purity. We calculated purity as the percentage of the dominant subtype tiles with respect to the total cluster tiles. B Tissue tile samples for clusters favoring LUAD prediction. C Tissue tile samples for clusters favoring LUSC prediction. D LUAD WSI with an overlay of phenotype clusters. The order of clusters is sorted by percentage of area, from largest to smallest. E LUSC WSI with an overlay of phenotype clusters. Phenotype clusters 31, 11, 22, 36, 28 (LUAD) and 5, 45 (LUSC) show (1) high percentage of respective lung subtypes, (2) correlation between WSI labels and phenotype purity, and (3) statistical significance when predicting each subtype.
in predicting overall survival; negative values show association with survival while positive values are associated with a death event. In Figure 4-B we show samples of the top phenotype clusters associated with lower risk and Figure 4-C samples of phenotype clusters associated with higher risk. Finally, Figure 4-D and Figure 4-E display high and low risk groups for the TCGA and NYU cohorts respectively, both of them statistically significant (p values < 0.05). Phenotype clusters associated with lower risk are typified by low-grade in situ appearances (e.g. Fig. 4-B cluster 37) or dense lymphocytic infiltrates overrunning and possibly destroying epithelial areas (e.g. Fig. 4-B cluster 1). High-risk clusters often show poorly differentiated high-grade growth patterns with minimal inflammation (e.g. Fig. 4-C cluster 15, 39).

We also performed a LUAD recurrence free survival study on systemic and loco-regional recurrence. In this case, we used the NYU cohort as it provides detailed information of these types of recurrence, it is composed of 276 patients. Once again we used a 5 fold cross-validation, achieving a mean c-index of 0.74 with 95% CI of 0.70-0.80 on the NYU test set. Figure 5-A displays a Forest plot of the Cox proportional hazards coefficients over the 5 fold cross-validation, showing the relationship between cluster phenotypes and their relevance in recurrence. In Figure 5-B we show samples of the top phenotype clusters associated with lower risk of recurrence and Figure 5-C samples of phenotype clusters associated with higher risk of recurrence. Finally, Figure 5-D displays Kaplan-Meier curves and Figure 5-E UMAP dimensionality reduction on patient representations for high and low risk groups on the NYU cohort, both figures show a clear split between risk groups. Histopathological scrutiny of tile images shows low risk clusters which include dense chronic inflammatory infiltrates overrunning epithelial areas (e.g. Fig. 5-B cluster 29), while high-risk clusters are typified by solid and cribriform growth patterns with relatively sparse inflammation (e.g. Fig. 5-C clusters 6, 11, 15).

2.3 Lung adenocarcinoma association with cell types, histological growth pattern, and omic signatures

Furthermore, we systematically characterized the phenotype clusters in three different ways: (1) By using Spearman’s rank correlation between cluster contributions and gene immunogenomic signatures such as tumor infiltrating leukocytes (TIL), proliferation, or wound healing, (2) by annotating cells in the tiles with Hover-Net, and using the two-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test to measure over and under representation of cell types in each cluster, and (3) using manual annotations of pathologists in the NYU whole slide images (WSIs); measuring enrichment or depletion of LUAD histological subtypes such as solid, acinar, papillary, micropapillary, and lepidic using the Hypergeometric test.
Figure 4. Lung adenocarcinoma overall survival. A Log hazard ratio of Cox proportional hazards model over a 5 fold cross-validation over TCGA data and NYU as independent cohort. We averaged coefficients across fold and combined p-values with Fisher’s combined probability test, we highlight statistically significant clusters (p-value $< 0.05$). This plot shows the relationship between cluster phenotypes and their relevance in predicting overall survival, negative values show association with survival while positive values are associated with a death event. B Top relevant clusters associated with survival. C Top relevant clusters associated with a patient’s death. D High and low risk groups on TCGA cohort showing statistical significance (p-value $3.7 \times 10^{-3} < 0.05$). E High and low risk groups on NYU cohort showing statistical significance (p-value $1.6 \times 10^{-2} < 0.05$). These figures correspond to PRL’s performance of mean concordance index (c-index) of 0.60 with 95% confidence intervals (CI) of 0.56-0.63 on the TCGA test set and a mean c-index of 0.65 with 95% CI of 0.63-0.67 on the NYU set. Phenotype clusters associated with lower risk are typified by low-grade in situ appearances (e.g. B cluster 37) or dense lymphocytic infiltrates overrunning and possibly destroying epithelial areas (e.g. B cluster 1). High-risk clusters often show poorly differentiated high-grade growth patterns with minimal inflammation (e.g. C clusters 15, 39).
Figure 5. Lung adenocarcinoma recurrence free survival. 

A Log hazard ratio of Cox proportional hazards model over a 5 fold cross-validation on the NYU cohort. We averaged coefficients across fold and combined p-values with Fisher’s combined probability test, we highlight statistically significant clusters (p-value < 0.05). This plot shows the relationship between cluster phenotypes and their positive or negative relevance in predicting recurrence. 

B Top relevant clusters associated with lower risk recurrence. 

C Top relevant clusters associated with high risk of recurrence. 

D High and low risk groups on N cohort showing statistical significance (p-value $7.26 \times 10^{-6} < 0.05$). 

E Uniform Manifold Approximation and Projection (UMAP) dimensionality reduction of patient vector representations for the NYU cohort, each representation is labeled according to the risk group for recurrence, low-risk (blue) and high-risk (orange). These figures correspond to PRL’s performance of mean concordance index (c-index) of 0.74 with 95% CI of 0.70-0.80 on the NYU test set. Histopathological scrutiny of tile images shows low risk clusters which include dense chronic inflammatory infiltrates overrunning epithelial areas (e.g. B cluster 29), while high-risk clusters are typified by solid and cribriform growth patterns with relatively sparse inflammation (e.g. C clusters 6, 11, 15).
Through this study we were able to link phenotype clusters to their ability to predict survival, to immunogenomic signatures, and to direct histological observations of tissue, including LUAD histological growth patterns and cell type densities. Figure 6-A shows a bi-hierarchical clustering of phenotype clusters and immunogenomic signature correlations where positive correlations are showed in red and negative as blue. In addition, Cox log hazard ratio coefficients for overall and recurrence free survival are gradient colored from favoring poor survival outcomes as purple to favoring better survival outcomes as green. Figure 6-B also displays a bi-hierarchical clustering of phenotype clusters and cell type over and under representations, where over-representations are represented in red and under-representations in blue. Finally, Figure 6-C shows a bi-hierarchical clustering of phenotype clusters and LUAD histological growth pattern enrichment; depletion is shown in blue and enrichment in red. The column’s dendrogram in all subfigures corresponds to the bi-hierarchical clustering of phenotype clusters and immunogenomic signatures, as we used this setting to more easily relate these analyses in the same context.

Throughout this analysis we found that phenotype clusters that are associated with better outcomes, also have positive correlations with tumor infiltrating leukocytes (TIL), lymphocyte infiltration signature score, T-cell receptors (TCR), and macrophage regulation; in addition those same clusters see over-representations of inflammatory, dead, and neoplastic cells. We highlight these clusters in box $X$. On the other hand, box $Y$ shows phenotype clusters that are associated with worse outcomes have positive correlations with proliferation and wound healing signatures, seeing under-representations for inflammatory and dead cells, and enrichment for solid histological patterns.

3 Discussion

We proposed Phenotype Representation Learning (PRL) as an unsupervised methodology made of four major steps, (1) whole slide image (WSI) processing, (2) self-supervised learning of tissue tiles, (3) tissue representation clustering, and (4) phenotype cluster interpretation. This approach therefore performs learning and clustering of tiles from histopathology WSIs in an unbiased manner, releasing the need of expensive annotations, and providing clear insight in the decision process for a selected task.

From a technical point of view, the self-supervised representations are learned using Barlow Twins\textsuperscript{42}. Apart from a comparison with other semi or fully-supervised approaches to classify breast cancer regions\textsuperscript{39}, that novel architecture has not yet been extensively applied to histopathology. Very recently developed by Zbontar et al.\textsuperscript{42}, Barlow Twins was developed to learn representations invariant to distortions while improving several shortcomings present in many existing self-supervised methods (avoidance of collapse
Figure 6. Lung adenocarcinoma (LUAD) survival analysis and cluster correlations. A Bi-hierarchical clustering of phenotype clusters and immunogenomic features\textsuperscript{47} correlations where positive correlations are showed in read and negative as blue. Cox coefficients for overall and recurrence free survival are colored with a gradient scheme, from favoring death or recurrence as purple to favoring survival or no recurrence as green. B Bi-hierarchical clustering of phenotype clusters and cell type over and under representations, over-representations are represented in red and under-representations in blue. C Bi-hierarchical clustering of phenotype clusters and LUAD histological subtype enrichment, depletion is shown in blue and enrichment in red. The column’s dendrogram in all subfigures correspond to the bi-hierarchical of clusters and immunogenomic signatures, we used this scheme to more easily relate these analyses in the same context. Box X highlights clusters that are associated with better survival outcomes (low risk of death and recurrence) have positive correlations with tumor infiltrating leukocytes (TIL), lymphocyte infiltration signature score, T-cell receptors (TCR), and macrophage regulation; and show over-representations of inflammatory, dead, and neoplastic cells. Box Y highlights clusters that are worse survival outcomes (high risk of death and recurrence), have positive correlations with proliferation and wound healing expressions, under-representations for inflammatory and dead cells, and enrichment for solid histological patterns.

by de-correlation, large batches, or architecture asymmetry are not required). The authors showed on the ImageNet dataset that this self-supervised approach is better or on par with other existing approaches. In our pipeline, we use the state-of-the art Leiden algorithm to cluster phenotypes from the tissue representations in the latent space. Consequently, each WSI or sets of WSIs associated to a patient can be described by a simple vector which describes its Leiden cluster contributions. Like a simplified barcode, it is this representation which can then be used to interpret the slide or patient. This approach introduces two important advantages compared to other deep learning approaches, firstly our phenotype clusters are created solely from tissue information, not by correlation with clinical annotations, and secondly, it introduces interpretability by allowing visual inspection of the phenotype cluster tiles and by proving statistical significance with respect to the clinical prediction task.

This method was used to analyze WSIs from patients with lung cancer and assess its ability to distinguish adenocarcinoma (LUAD) from squamous cell carcinoma (LUSC). The TCGA cohort was used as a training set and to a posteriori identify clusters that are most relevant to the task. On the independent cohort from NYU, the average AUC of 0.99 is even better than results previously obtained by training Inception-V3\textsuperscript{8}. Such results are in line with performances obtained with other recent strategies: AUCs of 0.94-0.96 were obtained using a unified memory mechanism on WSIs rather than tiles\textsuperscript{50}, AUC of 0.915 using a pre-trained ResNet50 followed by multiple instance learning, or 0.968 using a weak supervision expectation-maximization framework\textsuperscript{51}. In several supervised deep learning approaches, the decision is described as a “black box” and understanding how the classifier makes a decision is not straightforward.
In contrast, our methodology provides clear insight on the relevant clusters and the correlation with the classification task. Our method delivered clusters that show distinct patterns of lung subtype and supported this conclusion by providing evidence of significance, and correlations between WSI labels and subtype purity. Furthermore, it allows to visualize the phenotype clusters by individual tiles or in the context of WSI, a simple way for pathologist to interpret tissue patterns with clinical annotations.

Next, the same principle was used to study lung adenocarcinoma overall survival and recurrence free survival. Our results show that lymphocyte density in tumor regions is relevant for overall survival prediction. This is in line with other literature results such as Chen et al.\textsuperscript{29} where the authors showed that tumor infiltrating lymphocyte (TIL) is an important marker for cancer prognosis by using histological and gene expression data; our method achieved a mean concordance-index (c-index) of 0.65 over the external NYU cohort, and of 0.60 over TCGA only using WSIs, as compare to Chen et al. where the authors used histological and gene expression data achieving a mean c-index of 0.59, and 0.548 only using histological data. On the other hand, there are common methods which specifically study the overall survival in regard with a particular feature. In Lu et al.\textsuperscript{40} for example, a neural network is used to detect the epithelial region and then segment the nuclei within it. In the subsequent analysis of the nuclei features, the authors identified 23 features (such as the eccentricity of the nuclei, its solidity or intensity measurements) with prognosis value.

Our methodology’s mean concordance-index of 0.74 in recurrence free survival is in line with the recently latest grading system in Moreira et al.\textsuperscript{1}, this approach proposed a revised grading system based on expert assessment of LUAD WSIs. It is well established that the proportions of high-risk growth patterns (solid, micropapillary, and latterly recognised complex glandular patterns such as the cribriform pattern) have predictive value for the risk of lung adenocarcinoma recurrence\textsuperscript{52}. In our hands, PRL also finds that solid and cribriform growth patterns are common in poor outcome clusters. However, it does not find a strong correlation on the case of micropapillary growth. There are two likely reasons: first, our use of 5X images may not convey adequate cellular detail to discern micropapillae, and second, micropapillary growth pattern is by nature a combination of micropapillae (usually a small minority of the image area) against a background of an invasive acinar or papillary pattern, and this background appearance may predominate in tile representation.

Finally, we analyzed the phenotype clusters through three different sources of information; immunogenomic signatures derived from genomic and transcriptomic profiles, automated cellular annotations from tissue images, and histological subtype annotations from pathologists. Along with the survival analysis,
these correlations provided a comprehensive overview of the information contained in the phenotype clusters and their predictive potential, showing that tissue patterns that favor better prognostic outcomes suggest an effective immune response and low-grade disease, while clusters that favor a patient’s death or recurrence show a lack of immune response, high-grade tumor morphology, and cellular proliferation.

Overall, this study shows the potential of PRL, an unsupervised strategy to partition a set of WSIs into meaningful clusters that can later be used to segment an image or perform classification. The possible use of this approach for patient prognostication would relieve pathologists from time-consuming manual annotation, but in the short term at least visual inspection of clusters \textit{a posteriori} would be necessary. Furthermore, we have shown that the correlation of a cluster with information retrieved from other tools, whether it is sequencing information, features extracted by another segmentation algorithm, or clinical information from the pathologist, can generate pathological and biological hypotheses to direct further focused tissue-based research. In the future, we aim to develop this tool, and broaden its application to other tumour types with the aim of discovering recurrent histomorphological phenotypes which underlie the full range of strategies seen in the full spectrum of human solid malignancy.

4 Methods

4.1 Datasets

For our lung subtype prediction task we use The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) and an independent external cohort from New York University (NYU), both formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded (FFPE) and hematoxylin and eosin (H&E) stained whole slide images (WSIs). The TCGA cohort is composed of 1021 WSIs, 513 of adenocarcinoma (LUAD) and 508 WSIs of squamous cell carcinoma (LUSC). The NYU cohort is composed of 138 WSIs, 72 of LUAD and 66 of LUSC.

The adenocarcinoma overall survival analysis used the TCGA LUAD cohort and an additional cohort from NYU. The TCGA cohort is composed by 443 patients with a censorship rate of 0.64 and all stages (Stage 1-4), the NYU cohort is composed of 276 patients with a censorship rate of 0.80 and only Stage 1 cases. Further details on both cohorts such as Kaplan-Meier curves and a distribution comparison between follow-up times can be found in the Appendix.

The adenocarcinoma recurrence free survival analysis focuses on recurrence types of systemic and loco-regional. This dataset is composed by the same 276 patients of the NYU cohort used in the overall survival analysis, the censorship rate for recurrence is 0.82. In addition, 70 NYU WSIs have manual
annotations from pathologists on histological subtypes (solid, papillary, micropapillary, acinar, and lepidic) allowing individual tile labeling. Further details on the recurrence free survival cohort can be found in the Appendix 9.1.1.

The immune landscape features used in the Section 2.3 are derived from an immunogenomic analysis of 33 cancer types by utilizing data compiled by TCGA published by Thorsson et al.47.

4.2 Whole Slide Image Processing

We make use of the publicly available pipeline DeepPATH8 to divide each WSI into non-overlapping tiles of $224 \times 224$ at 5X magnification (with tiles re-sampled to ensure $2.016\mu m$ per pixel), filter out images with less than 60% tissue in total area, and apply stain normalization41.

4.3 Self-Supervised Learning

Self-Supervised learning aims to create useful representations of data based on its features which, unlike supervised methods, does so without relying on expensive human annotations. These methods use a pretext task as a mean to capture relevant feature information into each instance representation. Subsequently, these representations can be used in downstream tasks.

A common setup in self-supervised learning is the use of a data augmentation pipeline $T$ in order to create invariant representations against image distortions53 and a backbone network $f_{\theta}$ to project the images into a latent space $z \in \mathbb{R}^D$; $\{z_1, z_2, ..., z_{2N-1}, z_{2N}\} = \{f_{\theta}(\tilde{x}_1), f_{\theta}(\tilde{x}_1'), ..., f_{\theta}(\tilde{x}_N), f_{\theta}(\tilde{x}_N')\}$. Right after, the representations are batch normalized for each transformation set $Z \in \mathbb{R}^{N \times D}; \{Z_{2n}, Z_{2n-1}\}$ and calculates $C \in [-1, 1]^{D \times D}$ as the cross-correlation matrix computer between $\{Z_{2n}, Z_{2n-1}\}$ along the batch dimension.

The loss is defined by two terms, the invariance term that attempts to create representations invariant to distortions and the redundancy reduction term where off-diagonal features of the correlation matrix are minimized to prevent any redundant information between them (Equation 1). The parameter $\lambda$ is used as a
weighting factor to balance the difference in number between the diagonal and off-diagonal terms:

$$L = \sum_{i} (1 - C_{ii})^2 + \lambda \sum_{i \neq j} C_{ij}^2 ; C_{ij} = \frac{\sum_{n=1}^{N} z_{2n-1,i} z_{2n,j}}{\sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{N} (z_{2n,i})^2} \sqrt{\sum_{n=1}^{N} (z_{2n-1,j})^2}}$$

(1)

It is relevant to mention how Barlow Twins avoids trivial solutions to the pretext task, also known as collapse in self-supervised learning, where representations for different images hold constant values. This method avoids collapse via redundancy reduction, forcing decorrelation between features of the latent representations, and by batch normalizing the batch vector representations before computing the cross-correlation matrix. It has shown not to be dependent on batch sizes as contrastive methods\textsuperscript{54, 55}.

In our work we trained the self-supervised model using 250K tile images for 60 epochs and batch size of 64. We used a single GPU (NVIDIA Titan Xp 12GB/NVIDIA RTX 24GB) with training times ranging between 48 to 72 hours. Once the backbone network $f_{\theta}$ was trained, it was frozen and only used to project tissue tiles into representations.

### 4.4 Clustering Representations

Leiden community detection\textsuperscript{44} has been shown to be a successful algorithm on discovering well connected communities in graph structures. Derived as an improvement from Louvain algorithm\textsuperscript{56}, it uses an heuristic method to find partitions in graphs.

The algorithm starts by assigning each node in the graph to a different community, then it iterates through the steps described below until there are no further changes in the network. Firstly, for each node the algorithm will evaluate the gain of modularity when the node is moved from the current community to a neighboring one; if there’s a positive gain, the node is kept in the new community. After an initial pass, this process is repeated for nodes that changed community until it reaches a local maxima, finding a partition of the graph. Secondly, the previous partition is refined by possibly further splitting some of the previously defined communities. This is done by randomly merging a node to a community if it increases modularity, which allows to further explore the partition space and avoid badly connected communities, a shortcoming from Louvain algorithm\textsuperscript{44}. Finally, nodes in each community are aggregated and communities are treated as nodes in the next iteration.

Modularity is defined by Equation 2, where $e_c$ is the number of edges in a community $c$, $\frac{k^2}{2m}$ is the
expected number of edges, $K_c$ is the sum of the degrees of the nodes in a community $c$, and $m$ is the total number of edges in the network. $\gamma$ is the resolution parameter where higher values lead to more communities and lower values to fewer communities.

$$H = \frac{1}{2m} \sum_c \left( e_c - \gamma \frac{K_c^2}{2m} \right)$$

In order to find phenotype clusters from self-supervised tissue representations, we create a graph by using $K$ nearest neighbors ($K = 250$) over 200,000 randomly sampled vectors from the training set, and use Leiden community detection to define clusters. Subsequently, we assign clusters to vector representations of additional sets by using again $K$ nearest neighbors between vectors of the training set and each of the vectors of the additional set.

We performed the clustering process an initial time in an effort to automatically identify and remove representations of background and artifact tiles. Once these representations were removed, we run the clustering process an additional time so these non informative tile representations do not interfere in the number of tissue communities found from the Leiden algorithm.

### 4.5 Whole Slide Representations

We defined whole slide image and patient representations as a vector with dimensionality equal to the number of Leiden clusters $C$, where each dimension describes the percentage contribution of a phenotype cluster to the total tissue area (Equation 3):

$$w = \{w_0, w_1, ..., w_{C-1}\} \text{ where } \{w_i \in [0, 1] / \sum_{i=0}^{C-1} w_i = 1\}$$

In order to use these WSI representations in linear models we perform the center log ratio transformation (Equation 4). Models such as logistic regression or Cox proportional-hazards require independence between the covariates, the original definition of the WSI representations are an example of compositional data which violates this assumption ($\sum_{i=0}^{C-1} w_i = 1$), the center log ratio transformation breaks the co-dependency between variables facilitating the use of these models. In addition, we use multiplicative replacement to avoid zero values before applying center log ratio transformation.

$$\text{clr}(w) = \{\log \frac{w_0}{g(w)}, \log \frac{w_1}{g(w)}, ..., \log \frac{w_{C-1}}{g(w)}\} \text{ where } g(w) = \left(\prod_{i=0}^{C-1} w_i\right)^{1/C}$$
4.6 Evaluation

To train the self-supervised model, we randomly selected 678 slides out of all 1021 LUAD and LUSC TCGA WSIs, leaving the NYU cohort unseen. In addition, we subsampled 250K of 583K tiles from those selected WSIs. Once the self-supervised model was trained, it was frozen and used to project tissue tiles into representations.

For our lung adenocarcinoma and squamous cell carcinoma classification analysis we perform the following procedure. We setup a 5 fold cross validation, and to further prevent site-specific bias\textsuperscript{43}, we performed it in a way to obtain non-overlapping institutions between TCGA training, validation, and test sets. For each fold, we defined Leiden clusters based on representations of the TCGA training set and assign clusters to TCGA validation and test representations based on those found in the training set. The cohort from NYU was used as an additional external test set to which those clusters were assigned as well. Subsequently, we fit a logistic regression using WSI representations from the training set and evaluated performance on TCGA validation and test sets, and NYU cohort. The motivation behind this procedure was to confirm that the methodology is robust against different imaging process across institutions, maintaining consistent performance.

Once we established that clustering on different training sets provides similar performance, we locked down a particular cluster configuration and used it to evaluate the performance of the logistic regression across the 5 fold cross validation. We used this procedure so clusters are common across folds and we can evaluate their statistical significance to predict lung adenocarcinoma or squamous cell carcinoma. We combined coefficients for the logistic regression across folds by averaging them and combined p-values with Fisher’s method, using a p value threshold of 0.05. These results can be found in Section 2.1.

We follow a similar process for our LUAD overall survival analysis. We setup a 5 fold cross validation using the TCGA dataset, dividing it into a training and test set, and kept NYU as an additional independent test set. In this case we did not consider a TCGA validation set or non-overlapping institutions due to the limited number of samples and in an effort to have balanced folds. For each fold, we defined clusters based on representations of the TCGA training set and assigned clusters to representations of TCGA test and NYU based on those found in the training set. Afterwards, we used Cox proportional hazards regression to model overall survival, we fit the mode using WSI representations from the training set and evaluated the performance on TCGA test and NYU sets. As in the case of the lung subtype classification, the motivation for this approach was to show that the methodology is robust even when clustering is done across different
training sets.

Then, we locked down a particular cluster configuration to find statistically significant clusters across folds. We combined coefficients for the Cox proportional hazards regression across folds by averaging them and combined p-values with Fisher’s method, using a p value threshold of 0.05. These results can be found in Section 2.2.

On our LUAD recurrence free survival analysis, we used a 5 fold cross validation over the NYU cohort. In this case, we use the same clusters defined by the TCGA training sets of overall survival. Finally, we used the same cluster configuration selected in overall survival. This allows us to relate statistically significant clusters for recurrence free and overall survival. We combined coefficients for the Cox proportional hazards regression across folds by averaging them and combine p-values with Fisher’s method, using a p value threshold of 0.05.

High and low risk groups were defined by the median of the hazard predictions of the training set. This median value was later used to divide risk groups for the test and additional independent sets. We used logrank test to measure statistical significance between risk groups and use a p-value threshold of 0.05.

4.7 Cluster correlations

Correlation analysis between phenotype clusters and immune landscape features was done through Spearman’s rank correlation with a p-value threshold of 0.01. These results are captured in Section 2.2.

To account for enrichment and depletion of cell types in tissue tiles of each cluster, we used HoverNet\textsuperscript{48} to annotate counts of neoplastic, connective, inflammatory, and dead cells in each tile. These annotations allows us to measure the distribution of cell type counts per tile for each cluster and the entire population of tiles. We measured over and under-representation of each cell type in a cluster by measuring the distribution shift between the entire population and cluster tiles. We used the Two-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov (K-S) test to account for this distribution shift and used the K-S statistic $D_{n,m}$ to quantify for over-representation and under-representations, assigning $+D_{n,m}$ if there is over-representation and $-D_{n,m}$ if there is under-representation. The Two-sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test uses the statistic $D_{n,m}$ to quantify the distance between empirical distributions. The statistic is defined as $D_{n,m} = \sup_{x} |F_{1,n}(x) - F_{2,m}(x)|$ where $F_{1,n}(x), F_{2,m}$ are the empirical distribution functions of the first and second samples, $n$ is the sample size for the $F_1$, $m$ is the sample size for the $F_2$, and $x$ the support for both distributions. The null hypothesis is rejected if $D_{n,m} > c(\alpha) \sqrt{\frac{n+m}{nm}}$ and $c(\alpha) = \sqrt{-0.5 \cdot log\left(\frac{\alpha^2}{2}\right)}$, we chose significance threshold as $\alpha = 0.01$. Results for over and under-representation of cell types per cluster can
be found in Section 2.2.

Additionally, we measured enrichment of lung adenocarcinoma subtypes such as solid, acinar, papillary, micropapillary, and lepidic for each cluster. The lung adenocarcinoma NYU cohort contains manual annotations from pathologists on these histological subtypes, and we translated the manual region annotations into individual tile annotations. Subtype enrichment is measured by using the hypergeometric test comparing each cluster to the entire population of annotated tiles.

The hypergeometric test uses the hypergeometric distribution in order to measure the statistical significance of seeing \( k \) successes in \( n \) draws from a population of size \( N \) with \( K \) successes, without replacement. In our case, we specify \( k \) as the number of tiles with of a particular histological subtype given as the number of total tiles in the cluster \( n \), \( K \) is the number of tiles with the same particular histological subtype in the entire population of annotated tiles of size \( N \). We measure enrichment by using a fold metric defined as \( k/\mathbb{E}[x] \) where \( \mathbb{E}[x] \) is the expectation of the hypergeomtric distribution given \( n, K, N \). Enrichment for a particular histological subtype shows as \( \text{fold} > 1 \) and depletion as \( \text{fold} < 1 \), we use a p-value threshold of 0.01.

5 Data Availability

The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) whole slide images and corresponding labels for lung lung adenocarcinoma (LUAD) and squamous cell carcinoma (LUSC) are available at the Genomic Data Commons portal (https://gdc.cancer.gov/). This data is publicly available without restriction, authentication or authorization necessary. Reasonable requests for the additional New York University cohorts data may be addressed to the corresponding author.

6 Code Availability

The code is written in Python and deep learning models are implemented in TensorFlow. We used Leiden\textsuperscript{44} and PAGA\textsuperscript{46} algorithm implementations from ScanPy\textsuperscript{59}, Cox proportional hazards and Keplein-Meier models from Lifelines\textsuperscript{60}, statistical tests (Fisher’s exact, hyper-geometrical, and Kolmogorov-Smirnov) from SciPy\textsuperscript{61}, and logistic regression implementation from statsmodels\textsuperscript{62}.

Code, pre-trained models, and demonstrations can be found at https://github.com/AdalbertoCq/Phenotype-Representation-Learning.
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9 Appendix

9.1 Methods

9.1.1 Datasets

Figure 7. Kaplan-Meier curves of overall survival events and comparison distribution of follow-up times for The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) and New York University (NYU) cohorts. Censored samples are represented by a cross.

Figure 8. Kaplan-Meier curves of recurrence free survival events of systemic and loco-regional recurrence for the New York University (NYU) cohort. Censored samples are represented by a cross.
9.2 Results

9.2.1 Lung adenocarcinoma and squamous cell carcinoma classification

**Figure 9.** The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) and New York University (NYU) phenotype tile samples for statistically significant clusters on lung adenocarcinoma (LUAD) versus cell squamous cell carcinoma (LUSC) classification.
9.2.2 Lung adenocarcinoma overall and recurrence free survival

**Figure 10.** The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) and New York University (NYU) phenotype tile samples for statistically significant clusters on lung adenocarcinoma (LUAD) overall survival.
Figure 11. The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) and New York University (NYU) phenotype tile samples for statistically significant clusters on lung adenocarcinoma (LUAD) recurrence free survival.