ABSTRACT

Survival prediction using whole slide images (WSIs) is a complex and difficult task, as handling gigapixel WSI directly is computationally impossible. In the past few years, people have worked out multiple instance learning (MIL) strategies to deal with WSIs, i.e., splitting WSI into many patches (instances) and aggregating features across patches. Moreover, to better predict the survival outcome of patients, different modalities have been explored, among which gene features are used the most frequently. In this paper, we explore a graph-based strategy to handle WSIs and investigate a transformer-based strategy to combine different modalities for survival prediction. Moreover, clinical data was also adopted and different encoding manners of clinical information were explored. Experiments on two public datasets from The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed graph-transformer framework for survival prediction.
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1. INTRODUCTION

Although computer vision has been in rapid development in general with novel and revolutionary methods proposed one after another, how to deal with gigapixel whole slide image (WSI) remains challenging and complex. The difficulty comes from: (1) WSIs are too large so processing them directly is computationally infeasible and (2) WSIs usually only have slide-level labels (e.g., a binary label or a cancer type label for one WSI) as the detailed pixel-level annotations are expensive and hard to obtain, which means tasks on WSIs are weakly supervised tasks in nature.

The past few years have witnessed large improvements in processing WSIs. People usually adopted the multiple instance learning (MIL) frameworks to deal with gigapixel WSI, which can be described as two stages: (1) splitting WSIs into bags of patches (instances) and extracting features on those patches, (2) aggregating features across instances to acquire global features for slide-level prediction [1, 2].

Although the coarse framework has handling WSIs is established, representation learning is still being explored. At the bag (WSI) level, conventionally popular methods are based on sets, which simply don’t take the order and dependency within a bag (i.e., across instances) into consideration, and hence it induces permutation-invariant feature aggregation on instances [3, 4]. However, since set-based methods assume neither dependency nor ordering across instances, these methods lack the ability to utilize the interactions between instances (e.g., interactions across cells in different patches), and the whole topology structure of WSI is ignored although this problem could be alleviated to some extent when combining set-based methods with attention mechanism.

Recently, graph-based methods have emerged, by which people not only focus on feature extraction and aggregation of patches but also explore the topology structure of the WSI as a whole [5]. To better make use of multi-scale and heterogeneous information of WSIs, some researchers propose network architecture to exploit hierarchical features as well as spatial structures for different resolutions [6, 7]. From the perspective of graph-based methods, we regard a WSI as a graph and patches as nodes of the graph, which has proven to surpass the state-of-the-art performance using set-based methods on some datasets. At the instance (patch) level, how to encode information about different patches has been a classic question. People have worked out lots of methods to encode information on patches, ranging from simple CNN to more complex networks [1, 8]. Apart from that, people consider using multi-modality methods to boost performance, among which many works have been done to fuse gene features into pathology (i.e., WSI features) since tumors are often correlated with genes [9]. However, people seldom consider using other information like clinical information of patients. And how to effectively combine different modalities is still worth exploring.

In this paper, we focus on multi-modal WSI survival prediction and present a novel graph-transformer architecture to effectively learn the slide-level representation of WSI and integrate multi-modal information. To utilize the spatial information of different patches in WSI, we formulate WSI as a graph data structure and employ a graph convolutional layer to conduct local feature aggregation.
We then adopt a transformer architecture to effectively aggregate the WSI node features from a global perspective. More importantly, we encode the clinical data and genomic data information as extra feature tokens and adopt the transformer architecture to learn the relationship between them with WSI features, so that we can effectively integrate multimodal data for more accurate prediction. Experiments on two public TCGA datasets demonstrate the effectiveness of the proposed graph-transformer framework for survival prediction.

2. METHODS

2.1. Problem Formulation

We use Multiple Instance Learning (MIL) as our framework to handle WSIs for weakly supervised learning, which could be formulated as:

\[ F(X_i) = h(g \{ (f(x_{ij})) \}) \quad x_{ij} \in X_i \]

where \( X_i = \{ x_{i1}, ..., x_{iN} \} \in R^{N \times d_i} \) represents the bag of instance features of the i-th sample, and \( x_{ij} \) stands for the j-th patch in the i-th sample. We define function \( f : R^{d_1} \rightarrow R^{d_2} \) as the encoding function to map raw features into embeddings. The function \( g : R^{N \times d_2} \rightarrow R^{d_3} \) is an aggregating function to aggregate features across patches to get our overall features. And \( h : R^{d_3} \rightarrow R^{\#\text{class}} \) is a task-specific function, it could be a softmax function to output the probabilities of all classes for classification tasks.

For the survival prediction task, instead of estimating the survival time of patients, we want to get an ordinal risk value acquired through the survival function:

\[ S(T \geq t, X_i) = \prod_{i=1}^{t} (1 - H(T = t | T \geq t, X_i)) \]

To simplify the task, we divide survival time into intervals (represented as \( i \in \{ 0, 1, 2, 3 \} \) in the formula) according to quartiles so that we can use accumulative multiplication of \( H \) to obtain \( S \) instead of integration.

2.2. Graph-Based WSI Feature Aggregation

To better utilize the spatial information of WSIs, rather than treat different patches within a bag as independent from each other using set-based methods, we use graph-transformer architecture [5]. This model regards WSIs as graphs, splits WSIs into patches, and treats them as nodes of graphs. Based on the spatial structure of patches, nodes are connected as a graph, then a WSI is converted to a graph \( G = (V, A) \), where \( V = \{ v_1, v_2, ..., v_N \} \) is the set of nodes denoting patches and containing node features \( \vec{v}_i \in R^{d_4} \), and \( A \) is the adjacency matrix. \( A_{ij} = 1 \) if node \( v_i \) and \( v_j \) are adjacent to each other. To extract features from raw image data of patches as node features, we use pre-trained KimiaNet as our feature extractor [10]. Since every patch has 8 neighbors at most, the sum of each row or column of \( A \) is at least 1 and at most 8.

Then we pass the graph through a graph convolutional (GC) layer to get denser and more representative features [11]. The basic process during which the GC layer implements the message passing and aggregation could be formulated as:

\[ H^{(l+1)} = ReLU(\tfrac{1}{2} \bar{A}D^{-\frac{1}{2}}AD^{-\frac{1}{2}}H^{(l)}W^{(l)}) \]

\( \bar{A} = A + I \) is the adjacency matrix with self-connections added. \( D_{ii} = \sum_j A_{ij} \) and \( W^{(l)} \) is a trainable matrix. \( H^{(0)} \) is initialized as the feature matrix \( X = [v_1^T, v_2^T, ..., v_N^T]^T \in R^{N \times d_2} \). After a GC layer, we use mincut pooling to get our final graph tokens, the loss of which is unsupervised and differentiable and is derived from min cut optimization objective: partitioning node set \( V \) in K disjoint subsets by removing the minimum volume of edges [12].

2.3. Clinical and Genomic Data Encoding

Apart from pathological features, people often use gene features as another modality to boost performance [9, 13]. In this paper, we use gene data and clinical information of patients besides pathological features. Since clinical and gene data are both tabular data in nature, we adopt TabNet to encode them as dense embeddings. TabNet uses sequential attention to choose which features to reason from at each decision step with an encoder-decoder structure and it is proven empirically to surpass state-of-the-art tree-based methods when handling some tabular data [14]. To extract latent information contained in tabular data, both the encoder and decoder of TabNet could be used for iterations (3 iterations in our experiment for both). We then use the reconstructed features output by the decoder as our encoded embeddings. For the clinical information, besides encoding using TabNet, we also try encoding them directly (denoted as emb in section 3): for categorical attributes, we use categorical embeddings while we transfer numeric attributes to categorical ones according to their distributions.

2.4. Transformer-based Multimodal Fusion

When combining different modalities with pathological features, we simply treat gene embeddings or clinical embeddings extracted above as tokens and concatenate them with previous graph tokens as well as a CLS token. Figure 1 displays how we combine pathological features with gene data using TabNet. For gene data or clinical data extracted by TabNet, it will yield one reconstructed embedding to be treated as one token while for clinical data encoded directly, each attribute will become one embedding (e.g., 9 attributes yield 9 tokens).
Fig. 1. Illustration of our transformer-based framework for the survival of the prediction by combining WSI with gene profile with TabNet. Pathological features are extracted by GraphTransformer and genomic features are encoded by TabNet and they are both treated as tokens to be combined and then fed into a Transformer layer.

Lastly, we pass all the tokens through a transformer layer [15, 16], where feature nodes are regarded as tokens in a sequence and the adjacency matrix is treated as positional information and self-attention is used to capture importance across patches. Given that \( x = \{e_1, ..., e_N\} \in R^{N \times D} \) is the sequence of feature nodes (tokens) extracted from the graph, \( qkv \) could be computed using the standard self-attention (SA) method (\( N \) is the number of tokens).

Based on the similarity between tokens, we can get attention weights \( \{A_{ij}\} \). Multihead Self-Attention (MSA) is also utilized to combine information extracted by \( m \) number of heads. The whole basic framework of a transformer layer could be formulated as:

\[
q = xW_q, k = xW_k, v = xW_v \quad W_q, W_k, W_v \in R^{D \times Dh} \\
A = \text{softmax}(qk^T/\sqrt{d_h}), \quad SA(x) = Av \quad A \in R^{N \times N} \\
MSA(x) = [SA_1(x)U_1; \ldots ; SA_m(x)U_m] \quad U_i \in R^{Dh \times D} \\
t_0 = [x_{\text{class}}; h_1; \ldots ; h_N], \quad h_i = e_iE \quad E \in R^{D \times D'} \\
t_l = MSA((LN(t_{l-1})) + t_{l-1}) \quad l = 1 \ldots L \\
t_l = MLP(LN(t_l')) + t_l' \quad l = 1 \ldots L
\]

where LN denotes Layer Normalization, MLP denotes a multi-layer perceptron and L is the number of MSA blocks. In the end, we get our output:

\[
H = \text{Sigmoid}(LN(t_L^{(0)}))
\]

which serves as the hazards of patients. The whole framework is trained in an end-to-end manner.

3. EXPERIMENTS

3.1. Datasets

For this work, we use Lung Adenocarcinoma (LUAD) and Stomach Adenocarcinoma (STAD) datasets from The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA), a public data consortium including matched WSIs, and clinical and gene data. Clinical information contains a patient’s age, race, gender, etc. And for gene data, we selected the most strongly expressed 250 genes. Before analyzing these datasets, we filter out little WSIs, which contain less than 100 nodes, to ensure data quality. LUAD contains 317 patient samples with 822 WSIs (approx 35 GB) and an average bag size of 1546 patches (nodes). STAD contains 372 patient samples with 397 WSIs (approx 39 GB) and an average bag size of 3002 patches. For each dataset, we divide patients into four intervals according to the quartiles of their survival time.
Table 1. Experiment Results (c-index ± a standard error of a mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Modalities and Models</th>
<th>LUAD</th>
<th>STAD</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>WSI(ABMIL)</td>
<td>0.5377 ± 0.0153</td>
<td>0.5208 ± 0.0229</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSI(GraphTransformer)</td>
<td>0.5576 ± 0.0556</td>
<td>0.5468 ± 0.0422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSI(GraphTransformer) + Clinical Info (TabNet)</td>
<td>0.5367 ± 0.0272</td>
<td>0.5566 ± 0.0506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSI(GraphTransformer) + Clinical Info (Emb)</td>
<td><strong>0.5962 ± 0.0194</strong></td>
<td>0.5527 ± 0.0418</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSI(GraphTransformer) + Gene (TabNet)</td>
<td>0.5605 ± 0.0630</td>
<td>0.5432 ± 0.0222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WSI(GraphTransformer) + Gene (TabNet) + Clinical Info(Emb)</td>
<td>0.5804 ± 0.0358</td>
<td><strong>0.5581 ± 0.0427</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2. Kaplan-Meier Analysis based on risk stratification on LUAD dataset. The survival curves are plotted using risk scores given by models w.r.t. ground-truth survival time (in months). The Logrank test is performed to compare the two survival distributions statistically.

3.2. Evaluation Metrics

On each dataset, we choose five-fold cross-validation to evaluate our models and concordance index (c-index)

\[
c = \frac{\# \text{concordant pairs}}{\# \text{concordant pairs} + \# \text{discordant pairs}}
\]

is used as our standard to measure the performance of risk prediction.

3.3. Experiment Results

The experimental results are shown in Table 1. Firstly, we compare our graph-based method with the state-of-the-art set-based method Attention-based Deep Multiple Instance Learning (ABMIL) [3]. An increase of 3.7% and 5.0% is achieved respectively on LUAD and STAD datasets. We also compare different modalities based on our graph-based models. Our experiments show that when other modalities are added, performance could improve most of the time, and a maximum increase of 6.9% and 2.1% is achieved respectively. Moreover, we evaluate the model’s ability in risk stratification, which is widely used for survival analysis models [7, 9]. We stratify patients into two groups according to the median of the predicted risk scores. From Figure 2, we can see that graph-based methods could separate patients into low and high risk groups better than the set-based method ABMIL. Judging from the p-values of Logrank test, graph-based methods are much better than ABMIL, and adding different modalities could bring higher performance with smaller p-values too.

4. CONCLUSION

In this paper, we compare the graph-based method graph-transformer with the traditional state-of-the-art set-based method ABMIL for WSI analysis. We also propose a new transformer-based framework to effectively combine different modality data for survival prediction. Extensive experiments carried out prove that graph transformer has better performance than ABMIL. Empirically, with other modalities added with pathological features, modals could improve their performance in general. However, it’s not always promising to combine other modalities and even doing so would hurt the performance, which indicates that how to extract features from genes and clinical information and how to combine different modalities remain open and challenging. Future work would focus on how to extract features of different modalities better, as well as investigating fusion methods of different modalities.
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