

Quantitative thermal imaging biomarkers to detect acute skin toxicity from breast radiation therapy using supervised machine learning

SAEDNIA, Khadijeh, TABBARAH, Sami, LAGREE, Andrew, WU, Tina, KLEIN, Jonathan, GARCIA, Eduardo, HALL, Michael, CHOW, Edward, RAKOVITCH, Eileen, CHILDS, Charmaine <<http://orcid.org/0000-0002-1558-5633>>, SADEGHI-NAINI, Ali and TRAN, William

Available from Sheffield Hallam University Research Archive (SHURA) at:

<http://shura.shu.ac.uk/25736/>

This document is the author deposited version. You are advised to consult the publisher's version if you wish to cite from it.

Published version

SAEDNIA, Khadijeh, TABBARAH, Sami, LAGREE, Andrew, WU, Tina, KLEIN, Jonathan, GARCIA, Eduardo, HALL, Michael, CHOW, Edward, RAKOVITCH, Eileen, CHILDS, Charmaine, SADEGHI-NAINI, Ali and TRAN, William (2020). Quantitative thermal imaging biomarkers to detect acute skin toxicity from breast radiation therapy using supervised machine learning. *International Journal of Radiation Oncology*Biology*Physics*, 106 (5), 1071-1083.

Copyright and re-use policy

See <http://shura.shu.ac.uk/information.html>

Table 1

Demographic and clinical information of the patients (n=90) involved in the study.

Demographic and Clinical Characteristics	CTCAE ≥ 2 (n= 37)		CTCAE ≤ 1 (n= 53)		p-values
	(n)	%	(n)	%	
Age (Years)					0.87
Mean Age (\pm SD)	59 (\pm 12)		59 (\pm 12)		
Maximum Age	85	---	88	---	
Minimum Age	32	---	28	---	
Race					0.84
Asian	5	13.5%	14	26.4%	
Black	2	5.4%	0	0%	
Caucasian	26	70.3%	33	62.3%	
Hispanic	1	2.7%	5	9.4%	
Other	3	8.1%	1	1.9%	
Cup Size^a					0.22
A	5	13.5%	11	20.8%	
B	10	27%	6	11.3%	
C	6	16.2%	9	17%	
D	8	21.6%	11	20.8%	
E	2	5.4%	10	18.9%	
Not Applicable	6	16.2%	6	11.3%	
Histological Type					0.20
IDC	22	59.5%	34	64.2%	
DCIS	12	32.4%	10	18.9%	
ILC	2	5.4%	7	13.2%	
IMC	1	2.7%	0	0%	
Not Evaluated	0	0%	2	3.8%	

Demographic and Clinical Characteristics	CTCAE ≥ 2 (n= 37)		CTCAE ≤ 1 (n= 53)		p-values
	(n)	%	(n)	%	
Demographic and Clinical	CTCAE ≥ 2 (n= 37)		CTCAE ≤ 1 (n= 53)		0.30
Tumor Grade					
Low	4	10.8%	11	20.8%	
Intermediate	22	59.5%	23	43.4%	
High	11	29.7%	19	35.8%	
Molecular Subtype					
ER Status:					0.46
Positive	29	78.4%	40	75.5%	
Negative	6	16.2%	6	11.3%	
Undefined	2	5.4%	7	13.2%	
PR Status:					0.46
Positive	24	64.9%	33	62.3%	
Negative	11	29.7%	13	24.5%	
Undefined	2	5.3%	7	13.2%	
HER2 Status:					0.41
Positive	2	5.4%	6	11.3%	
Negative	33	89.2%	41	77.4%	
Undefined	2	5.4%	6	11.3%	
Tumor Size (cm)^c					0.83
Average Size (\pm SD)	2.2 (\pm 2.2)	---	2.2 (\pm 1.3)	---	
Maximum Size	12.7	---	6.5	---	
Minimum Size	0.2	---	0.1	---	
Tumor Laterality					1.00
Left	18	48.6%	26	49.1%	
Right	19	51.4%	27	50.9%	
Surgical Procedure					0.76
Mastectomy	6	16.2%	7	13.2%	
Lumpectomy	31	83.8%	46	86.8%	

Characteristics	(n)	%	(n)	%	p-values
Menopausal Status					0.26
Pre/Peri-Menopausal	9	24.3%	8	15.1%	
Post-Menopausal	22	59.5%	41	77.4%	
Unknown	6	16.2%	4	7.5%	
Adjuvant Chemotherapy					0.65
Yes	14	37.8%	17	32.1%	
No	22	59.5%	36	67.9%	
Unknown	1	2.7%	0	0%	
Adjuvant Chemotherapy Type					0.87
AC-T	6	42.9%	6	35.3%	
FEC-D	3	21.4%	2	11.8%	
TC	2	14.3%	4	23.5%	
PACL	1	7.1%	1	5.9%	
Unknown	2	14.3%	4	23.5%	
Local vs Locoregional Irradiation					0.50
Locoregional (4-Field)	14	37.8%	16	30.2%	
Local (Whole breast only)	23	62.2%	37	69.8%	
Radiation Dose to Skin Volume (cGy)					0.17
Average dose (\pm SD)	2313 (\pm 591)	---	2182 (\pm 253)	---	
Maximum dose	4500	---	3405	---	
Minimum dose	2128	---	2000	---	
Tumor Laterality					1.00
Left	18	48.6%	26	49.1%	
Right	19	51.4%	27	50.9%	

^a Cup sizes follow the North American standard. ^b Grading was performed through the Nottingham score. ^c Tumor sizes were obtained through pathology reports.

Abbreviations: CTCAE= Common Terminology Criteria for Adverse Events; IDC= Invasive Ductal Carcinoma; DCIS= Ductal Carcinoma in Situ; ILC= Invasive Lobular Carcinoma; IMC= Invasive Mammary Carcinoma; ER= Estrogen Receptor; PR= Progesterone Receptor; HER2= Human Epidermal Growth Factor Receptor 2; SD: Standard deviation. P values were calculated using Fisher's exact test, Mann-Whitney U test and T-Test as appropriate.

Table 2

Prediction of the skin toxicity using the optimal feature sets (relative change from the baseline at $f_x = 5$)

Experiment	Optimal Feature Set	Tr Acc	Te Acc	Te AUC	Te Sen	Te Spec
One	Max. Temp (°C), Median Temp (°C), Mean Temp (°C), Skewness, Kurtosis	0.79	0.73	0.90	0.86	0.63
Two	Median Temp (°C), Mean Temp (°C), Skewness, Kurtosis	0.76	0.73	0.84	0.71	0.75
Three	Mean Temp (°C), GLCM-COR, GLCM-ENE, GLCM-HOM, GLRLM-GLN	0.91	0.87	0.98	0.86	0.88
Four	Mean Temp (°C), GLCM-COR, GLCM-ENE, GLRLM-LRLGLE	0.86	0.80	0.93	1.0	0.63

Bolded values denote the highest value amongst the feature set for predictive accuracy and AUC values.

Abbreviations: Tr = Train; Te = Test; Sen= Sensitivity; Spec = Specificity; Acc = Accuracy; AUC = Area Under the Curve; GLCM= Grey Level Co-Occurrence Matrix; GLRLM= Grey level Run Length Matrix; COR= Correlation; ENE= Energy; HOM= Homogeneity; GLN= Gray Level Non-Uniformity; LRLGLE= Long Run Low Grey Level Emphasis.