Published in final edited form as:

Conf Proc IEEE Eng Med Biol Soc. 2009 ; 2009: 6687–6690. doi:10.1109/IEMBS.2009.5334009.

Automated Classification of Renal Cell Carcinoma Subtypes Using Bag-of Features

Hussain Raza¹, R. Mitchell Parry², Yachna Sharma¹, Qaiser Chaudry¹, Richard A. Moffitt², A. N. Young^{1,2}, and May D. Wang^{1,2}

¹Electrical and Computer Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, 30332

²Wallace H. Coulter department of Biomedical Engineering, Georgia Institute of Technology, Atlanta, GA, 30332

Abstract

The task of analyzing tissue biopsies performed by a pathologist is challenging and time consuming. It suffers from intra- and inter-user variability. Computer assisted diagnosis (CAD) helps to reduce such variations and speed up the diagnostic process. In this paper, we propose an automatic computer assisted diagnostic system for renal cell carcinoma subtype classification using scale invariant features. We capture the morphological distinctness of various subtypes and we have used them to classify a heterogeneous data set of renal cell carcinoma biopsy images. Our technique does not require color segmentation and minimizes human intervention. We circumvent user subjectivity using automated analysis and cater for intra-class heterogeneities using multiple class templates. We achieve a classification accuracy of 83% using a Bayesian classifier.

Introduction

Renal cell carcinoma (RCC) accounts for approximately 3% of adult malignancies and 90–95% of neoplasms arising from the kidney [1]. It is characterized by lack of early warning signs, diverse clinical manifestations and resistance to radiation and chemotherapy. The World Health Organization (WHO) classification system has defined several subtypes of RCC [2]; the most common subtypes include Clear Cell (CC) RCC (83%), Chromophobe (CH) RCC (2%), Papillary (PA) RCC (11%) and Oncocytoma (ON) RCC (4%). Fig. 1 shows sample images of each subtype.

Clinicians treat these RCC subtypes differently; therefore, it is extremely important to identify them accurately for treatment planning. Manual categorization of subtypes is a challenging and time-consuming process, involving inter-and intra-observer variability. In addition, for greater impact and outreach of translational medicine, CAD systems should be designed to provide consistent results for image datasets acquired from different clinical labs using varying image acquisition protocols. Moreover, user involvement should be minimized to reduce bias and subjectivity. The majority of efforts on cancer subtype classification

involve manual intervention for color segmentation to extract tissue morphological features from differentially stained images [3][4]. A color segmentation based CAD algorithm may not be efficient for dynamic handling of all the variations in a new dataset. The scale invariant feature transform (SIFT) is a computer vision technique [5] that has been widely used in object recognition [6], feature tracking [7] and image registration [8]. The SIFT algorithm operates on features computed around key points in an image. These key points are consistent and recognizable under different magnifications and illumination conditions. Descriptors are calculated for each key point to encapsulate intensity variations in the neighborhood. RCC subtypes are mainly distinguished by their morphology and stain color distribution [9]. Table I summarizes distinct characteristics of the four subtypes. The location of key points depends on the morphology and the descriptors capture intensity variations around the neighborhood. Fig. 2 shows a sample papillary image with key points. Note that the key points are mainly located in the nuclear rich regions and not the homogenous lumen regions.

In this work, we develop an automatic CAD system for RCC subtype classification using SIFT features. Our methodology circumvents user involvement in an effort to provide consistent results for highly heterogeneous datasets with a wide range of intra-class variations.

Background

Fig. 3 shows a flow chart of the complete methodology. First, we convert the RGB images to gray scale, then we detect key points. Thereafter, we compute a feature descriptor around each key point. Then, we match key point descriptors from input images to template images. Next, we evaluate the number of matches between each template and the test image. We use the number of matches for each subtype as features for classification. A detailed description of each step is given below.

A. Image Acquisition

The image data set consists of hematoxylin and eosin (H&E) stained tissue biopsy images. We resected tissue samples for this study by total nephrectomy following standard pathological procedures to fix, section, and stain the tissue. Then, we embedded histological samples in paraffin to slice the microscopic sections and stained them with Hematoxylin and eosin. Board-certified anatomic pathologists using WHO histo-pathological criteria diagnosed all the tumors. We took photomicrographs at a total magnification of 200 $\times$ and 1200 $\times$ 1600 pixels. We captured 48 images, 12 for each subtype: CC, CH, ON, and PA.

B. Feature Extraction

Key Point Detection using the Harris Method—We used the Harris corner detection method [20] for key point localization. We want to select key points (i.e., corners), which will be stable under different scales. That is, if we have two images of the same object each with a different scale and view, the same key points should be detected. The basic idea is that we should easily recognize these corners by looking at the image gradient near a candidate key point. In smooth regions, the gradient is near zero. Near an edge, the gradient

points strongly in one direction. Near a corner, the gradient points strongly in multiple directions.

Key point Feature Descriptor—We evaluate the feature descriptor around a 16×16 neighborhood of detected key points as described in [5]. Briefly, the gradient magnitudes in the 16×16 neighborhood are summarized in 4×4 sub regions by calculating the histogram of normalized gradient magnitudes in eight directional bins. Fig. 4 shows the gradient values and associated descriptor for a sample key point. The final descriptor length is 128 (8 bins for 16 regions), see Fig 4 (bottom right).

C. Key point Matching

We use minimization of sum of squared differences (SSD) to match the key points in a sample image with the key points in the template images. We perform initial analysis using a standard template image for one subtype and calculate the number of matching key points with standard templates of other subtypes. We do this to test the efficacy of SIFT matching for RCC subtype classification. Fig. 5 shows the results. It is clear from Table II that there are more matches (diagonal elements) with the same subtype class than with different classes.

Inter-subtype (non-diagonal elements) matches reflect the neighborhood similarities embedded within certain key points due to image components that are ubiquitous among most or all subtypes. For example, key points around large lumen spaces and necrotic regions may match key points from other classes that have similar neighborhood gradients. In addition, sometimes images from within classes exhibit different key point descriptors due to *intra-class* heterogeneity in the biopsy image data. These limitations add to the classification error. We use two template images for each subtype so that intra-class variations can be accommodated. We match each input image with the template images of each subtype and use the average number of matches from the two templates as a feature for classification. We normalize the number of matches by dividing by the product of the number of points in the test and template images. Table III shows the mean and standard deviation of matches among image subtypes.

D. Subtype Classification

We used a Bayesian classifier to classify a set of 40 test images (10 for each subtype). We selected the templates from images that are not part of the test set. To estimate the error of classification, we used leave one out cross validation (LOO CV).

Results and Conclusion

Table IV shows the confusion matrix for classification. Fig. 6. shows the scatter plot of each test image using three out of four features. We achieved an accuracy of 83% among the four subtypes. SIFT descriptors encapsulated the intensity variations around a key point. Lumen spaces and necrotic regions were common in all of the subtypes. Therefore, sift descriptors near lumen features will result in considerable numbers of matches with templates from other classes. In addition, intra-class heterogeneity contributes to lesser number of matches

with the respective templates and more numbers of matches with templates from other classes. For example, in Fig. 7, the image on the left is a Clear Cell RCC but our system classified it incorrectly because it is very different from a typical Clear Cell image (Fig 7, right image). However, our method is automatic and attempts to handle intra-class heterogeneities by using multiple templates.

Discussion and Future work

Our classification accuracy (83%) is encouraging for a four class system since there is no manual interaction involved. Still, other works have reported higher accuracies using more user interaction. We favor automatic methods, because user interaction not only takes effort but also introduces subjectivity.

Biological images are immensely diverse and creation of an ideal template set with all possible variations is not always feasible, especially for relatively rare diseases where training images may be scarce. We have used two representative template images of each subtype in an attempt to account for possible intra class heterogeneities, but selection of more templates may be justified, depending on the expected heterogeneity of images. A technique with expert knowledge based template set selection might result in increased classification accuracy, but care should be taken to not just include ideal images, but also to include some low quality images in template sets to match all possible inputs.

In the future, we plan to extend our analysis using a variable size descriptor (proportional to cell size) which includes stain color information, (color SIFT). This would help us encapsulate tissue morphology, stain color, and texture into one descriptor. In addition, we can use the correlation of tissue features, such as cell size, with the descriptors to create a codebook to map tissue morphology back to key point descriptors. We expect that this methodology can easily extend to the classification of other medical images, including other types of cancers, or imaging modalities.

Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank Dr. R. Mitchell Parry and Richard Moffitt for their valuable comments during the preparation of this manuscript.

References

1. Yin-Goen Q, et al. Advances in molecular classification of renal neoplasms. *Histology and histopathology*. 2006; 21(1-3):325–339. [PubMed: 16372253]
2. Eble, JN.; Sauter, G.; Epstein, JI.; Sesterhenn, IA., editors. *Pathology and Genetics of Tumours of the Urinary System and Male Genital Organs*. IARC Press; Lyon France: Feb. 2004 WHO Classification of Tumours.
3. Waheed S, Moffitt RA, Chaudry Q, Young AN, Wang MD. Computer Aided Histopathological Classification of Cancer. *Proc IEEE Bioinformatics and Bioengineering*. 2007:503–508.
4. Chaudry Q, Raza SH, Young AN, Wang MD. Automated Renal Cell Carcinoma Subtype Classification Using Morphological, Textural and Wavelet-based Features. *Journal of Signal Processing: Special Issue on Biomedical Imaging*. 2008
5. Lowe DG. Distinctive image features from scale-invariant keypoints. *International Journal of Computer Vision*. 2004; 60(2):91–110.

6. Suga, A.; Fukuda, K.; Takiguchi, T.; Arikawa, Y. Object recognition and segmentation using SIFT and Graph Cuts. ICPR; 2008. p. 1-4.
7. Battistoni, S.; Gallo, G.; Puglisi, G.; Scellato, S. SIFT Features Tracking for Video Stabilization. CIAP; 2007. p. 825-830.
8. Delponte E, Isgro F, Odone F, Verri A. SVD-matching Using SIFT features. Special Issue on the Vision, Video and Graphics Conference 2005. 2006; 68(5-6):415-431.
9. Atlas of Genetics and Cytogenetics in Oncology and Haematology. URL <http://AtlasGeneticsOncology.org>
10. Walker RF, Jackway PT, Lovell B. Classification of cervical cell nuclei using morphological segmentation and textural feature extraction. Proc of the 2nd Australian and New Zealand Conference on Intelligent Information Systems. 1994:297-301.
11. Roula, MA.; Diamond, J.; Bouridane, A.; Miller, P.; Amira, A. IEEE International Symposium on Biomedical Imaging. Washington D. C.: 2002. A multispectral computer vision system for automatic grading of prostatic neoplasia; p. 193-196.
12. Esgiar AN, Naguib RNG, Sharif BS, Bennett MK, Murray A. Microscopic image analysis for quantitative measurement and feature identification of normal and cancerous colonic mucosa. IEEE Transactions on Information Technology in Biomedicine. Sep; 1998 2(3):197-203. [PubMed: 10719530]
13. Esgiar AN, Naguib RNG, Sharif BS, Bennett MK, Murray A. Fractal analysis in the detection of colonic cancer images. IEEE Transactions on Information Technology in Biomedicine. Mar; 2002 6(1):54-8. [PubMed: 11936597]
14. Fernández M, Mavilio A. Texture analysis of medical images using the wavelet transform. AIP Conference Proceedings. Oct.2002 630:164-168.
15. Diamond J, Anderson N, Bartels P, Montironi R, Hamilton P. The use of morphological characteristics and texture analysis in the identification of tissue composition in prostatic neoplasia. Human Pathology. 2004; 35:1121-1131. [PubMed: 15343515]
16. Arivazhagan S, Ganesan L. Texture classification using wavelet transform. Pattern Recogn Lett. 2003; 24(9-10):1513-1521.
17. Moradi, Mehdi; Abolmaesoumi, Purang; Mousavi, Parvin. Deformable Registration Using Scale Space Keypoints. Proceedings of SPIE. 2006
18. Qiu, Bo. A Refined SVM Applied in Medical Image Annotation. Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg; 2007. p. 690-693.
19. Setia, Lokesh; Teynor, Alexandra; Halawani, Alaa; Burkhardt, Hans. Image Classification using Cluster Cooccurrence Matrices of Local Relational Features. ACM; 2006.
20. Harris C, Stephens M. A combined key point and edge detector (PDF). Proceedings of the 4th Alvey Vision Conference. 1988:147-151.

Fig 1.

Fig 2.

Fig 3.

Fig 4.

Fig 5.

Fig 6.

Fig 7.

Table I
Hallmarks of RCC Subtypes

Subtype	Morphology	Stain color
CC	Solid growth pattern, condensed and hyper chromatic nuclei.	Clear cytoplasm
CH	Large polygonal cells arranged in solid nests or tubules.	Clear area/halo around nucleus,
ON	Granular cytoplasm, cells arranged in nests, or trabecular patterns, round and centrally located nuclei.	Abundant pink cytoplasm
PA	Tubulo-papillary architecture	granular cytoplasm

Table II

Number of SIFT Matches between Template Pairs.

	CC	CH	ON	PA
CC	18	13	5	11
CH	5	10	4	5
ON	7	16	20	10
PA	7	6	4	13

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Author Manuscript

Table III

Mean and Standard Deviation of Number of SIFT Matches between Templates and Test Images.

	CC	CH	ON	PA
CC	.0168±.004	.0527±.004	.03±.004	.026±.003
CH	.0142±.001	.0571 ±.007	.0341±.003	.029±.003
ON	.0132±.002	.0547±.005	.046±.011	.031±.004
PA	.0129±.001	.0478±.003	.039±.003	.0365±.003

Table IV

Confusion Matrix for RCC Subtype Classification using SIFT.

	CC	CH	ON	PA
CC	8	2	0	0
CH	1	8	1	0
ON	0	1	9	0
PA	1	1	0	8