

Gene Variability between Perineural-Positive and Perineural-Negative Squamous Cell Skin Cancers

Ashley C Mays^{1*}, Jeff Chou², Ann L Craddock³, Lance Miller⁴ and J Dale Browne¹

¹Department of Otolaryngology, Wake Forest Baptist Health, USA

²Center for Public Health Genomics, Department of Biostatistical Sciences, Cancer Genomics Core and Biostatistics Core, Comprehensive Cancer Center, Wake Forest University Health Sciences, USA

³Comprehensive Cancer Center, Wake Forest School of Medicine, USA

⁴Department of Cancer Biology, Comprehensive Cancer Center of Wake Forest University, Wake Forest School of Medicine, USA

Abstract

Background: Recurrent cutaneous squamous cell cancer (CSCC) is associated with poor outcomes with perineural invasion reported as a frequent finding in such lesions. Given the morbidity associated with late recurrence, identifying aggressive subtypes of CSCC at the time of primary excision is all the more necessary. This project sought to identify differentially expressed genes (DEGs) between perineural invasion-positive (PP) and perineural invasion-negative (PN) CSCC. Gene-based classification models for diagnosis of perineural invasion in CSCC were also developed.

Method: Forty fresh-frozen surgical specimens of CSCC with presence or absence of histopathological perineural invasion were processed for RNA isolation and hybridization to Affymetrix-U219 DNA microarrays. Raw gene expression data were normalized by Robust Multi-array Averaging (RMA) and log₂ transformed. DEGs were identified by empirical Bayes statistics using the Bioconductor limma package. BRB-ArrayTools software was used to develop gene expression-based sample classification models. Using leave-one-out cross-validation, the resulting accuracies of eight different classification algorithms were evaluated.

Results: Twenty-one PP and 19 PN samples were analyzed. At a stringent limma p-value ($p < 0.001$), 24 genes were differentially expressed between specimens. The cross-validated performance of the eight classification models exhibited a mean accuracy of 85-95%. Diagonal linear discriminant was most accurate at 95%, followed by Bayesian compound covariate at 94%. The poorest accuracy (85%) was observed for 1-Nearest neighbor and Support vector machines. For all eight methods, the sensitivities and specificities ranged from 79%-95%.

Conclusion: Gene expression distinguishes between PP and PN CSCC. Classification models based on these gene patterns distinguish PP and PN cancers with strong statistical accuracy and may potentiate more timely and objective diagnosis of perineural invasion that could guide more comprehensive adjuvant therapies.

Keywords: Squamous cell skin cancer; Perineural invasion; Genetic markers; Molecular markers

Introduction

Cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma accounts for approximately 20% of new cases of non-melanoma skin cancer diagnosed each year [1]. Some 2.5-14% of these cancers have perineural invasion and with simple excision [1], have been found to recur 46% of the time [2]. Many who present with clinical signs of perineural invasion, such as paresthesias or facial weakness, have a history of previous CSCC resection with reported negative margins [3,4]. These recurrences often require skull base or sub-cranial resections in order to obtain negative margins. The morbidity of such resections and the subsequent adjuvant radiotherapy is certainly much greater than a local excision at the primary site. Identifying lesions with perineural invasion at the time of primary excision could direct more extensive surgical management at that time or radiotherapy to limit recurrences and poor outcomes.

Molecular markers of perineural invasion have been investigated in multiple cancer types; however no consensus has been determined for CSCC of the head and neck. Markers in the head and neck, including MT1-MMP [5], p75 nerve growth factor receptor [6], tyrosine kinase receptor 4 [7-9], foxp3 [10], alpha heat shock protein [11], Ecad proteins [12], CD44 [13], and NGF and TrkA overexpression in adenoid cystic carcinoma [14] have all been identified as associated with perineural invasion, however there has been limited replicability. To date there have been no gene expression profiling studies aimed at

profiling cancer tissue with perineural invasion to find specific genes implicated in the disease. This study aims to identify gene signatures linked to perineural invasion using microarray analysis in order to build an initial framework of genes with the hope of better honing these signatures to a more specific signature in future studies. This signature could potentially be used to create a diagnostic or screening assay to be used in the clinical setting for identifying samples that are high risk for perineural invasion.

Method

Sample acquisition

The contents of the Tumor Tissue Shared Resource (Comprehensive

***Corresponding author:** Ashley C Mays, MD, Otolaryngology Resident, Wake Forest University School of Medicine, Otolaryngology, Medical Center Blvd, 4th Floor Watlington Hall, Winston Salem, NC 27857, USA, 2528147606, Tel: 336 716-9066; Fax: 336 716-3857; E-mail: abiddy@wakehealth.edu

Received September 19, 2015; **Accepted** October 26, 2015; **Published** October 31, 2015

Citation: Mays AC, Chou J, Craddock AL, Miller L, Browne JD (2015) Gene Variability between Perineural-Positive and Perineural-Negative Squamous Cell Skin Cancers. J Clin Med Genomics 3: 133. doi:10.4172/2472-128X.1000133

Copyright: © 2015 Mays AC, et al. This is an open-access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original author and source are credited.

Cancer Center of Wake Forest University) were searched for cases of CSCC of the head and neck after Institutional Review Board approval. All samples within the tumor bank had previously been placed into the bank after patient consent. Fresh frozen samples were utilized for microarray expression analysis. Additional samples were collected in a prospective fashion by identifying patients in our outpatient head and neck oncologic clinics, as well as a private dermatologic surgery clinic. These patients were consented for use of their tissue samples in this study.

Confirmation of tumor

All eligible samples underwent review by a faculty or fellow dermatopathologist in order to confirm the presence or absence of perineural invasion and to assess the adequacy of cancer tissue versus benign stromal tissue. Perineural invasion was determined histologically by using hematoxylin and eosin stain. Tumor samples were macrodissected (1 to 4 cores, approximately 2 mm², were punched from each block) to obtain tissue with >80% cellularity of malignant epithelium. Tumors with sparse cancer cellularity were excluded from analysis.

RNA processing and quality analysis

Tumor tissues samples were disrupted under liquid nitrogen and homogenized according to the Qiagen QiaShredder protocol. Total RNA (approximately 1-10 ug per sample) was isolated from each tumor sample according to the Qiagen RNeasy Microarray Tissue Mini Kit protocol. Once adequate mass was confirmed using an Eppendorf BioPhotometer, the quality of the RNA was assessed using an Agilent 2100 Bioanalyzer. RNA suitable for microarray processing were selected using the following criteria: 1) RNA integrity number (RIN) >8.0; and 2) absorbance ratio (A260/A280) between 1.8 - 2.1.

Expression microarray analysis

Forty samples [21 perineural-positives (PP) and 19 perineural-negatives (PN)] that met tissue and RNA quality criteria were profiled on the Affymetrix GeneAtlas U219 human genome array strip in the Comprehensive Cancer Center's Cancer Genomics Shared Resource. For each sample, 250 ng of total RNA was used as a starting template for the reverse transcription and labeling reactions. Exogenous PolyA controls were spiked into each sample to monitor quality of amplification reaction. The amplified and biotinylated cRNA targets were hybridized to the microarrays, stained, washed and scanned according to standard Affymetrix protocols. Log intensity distributions and pair-wise correlations between arrays were examined to assess quality of each microarray hybridization. The resultant raw data (CEL files) were normalized using the RMA (Robust Multi-array Average) algorithm [15] as implemented in the Affymetrix GeneAtlas Instrument Control Software and log₂ transformed for downstream statistical analyses.

Analytical plan

Differentially expressed genes (DEGs) between PN and PP samples were identified by using random variance model for univariate tests implemented in BRB-Array Tools [16]. At two different significant thresholds of p values 0.001 and 0.005, we obtained 24 and 130 probe sets, respectively. In addition, we used Significant Analysis of Microarray (SAM) with target proportion of false discoveries of 0.05 to obtain 134 probe sets. The above selected sets of genes were used in pathway enrichment analyses using the NIAID's DAVID microarray resource [17] and construction of classification models.

BRB-Array Tools software [16] was used to develop gene expression-based sample classification models. Using leave-one-out cross-validation, the resulting accuracies of eight different classification algorithms were evaluated. They are (1) The Prediction Analysis for Microarrays (PAM), using the shrunken centroid algorithm [18]; (2) The Compound Covariate Predictor, using a weighted linear combination of log-intensities for genes that are univariately significant at the specified level [19]; (3) The Diagonal Linear Discriminant Analysis (DLDA), using linear discriminant analysis, but ignoring correlations among the genes to avoid over-fitting the data [20]; (4-5) The 1 or 3 Nearest Neighbor Predictor, using Euclidean distance as the distance metric to predict the class of test samples; (6) Nearest Centroid Prediction, predicting a test sample belonging to a class corresponding to the nearest centroid; (7) Support Vector Machine (SVM), with linear kernel functions, to separate the data subject to penalty costs on the number of specimens misclassified [21]; (8) The Bayesian compound covariate predictor, using weighted average of the log expression values of the selected genes, with the weights being the t statistics of differential expression in that training set [22]. For each outcome of the eight methods, accuracy= $[(A+B)/n]$, sensitivity= $[A/(A+C)]$ and specificity= $[B/(D+B)]$ were calculated. A represents the number of perineural samples predicted as perineural, B presents the number of non-perineural samples predicted as non-perineural, C represents the number of perineural samples predicted as non-perineural, D represents the number of non-perineural samples predicted as perineural, and N represents the total number of samples.

Results

Twenty-one PP and 19 PN samples were analyzed and deemed adequate for analysis. At a stringent p-value threshold of $p < 0.001$, 24 genes were differentially expressed between PP and PN specimens (Table 1). At a p-value threshold of $p < 0.005$, 130 genes were differentially expressed between PP and PN specimens. Gene expression-based classification models were developed using both p value thresholds, $p < 0.001$ and $p < 0.005$. At the p-value threshold of $p < 0.001$, the cross-validated performance of the eight classification models exhibited a mean accuracy of 85-95%. DLDA was most accurate at 95%, followed by Bayesian compound covariate at 94%. The poorest accuracy (85%) was observed for 1-Nearest neighbor and Support vector machines. For all eight methods, the sensitivities and specificities ranged from 79%-95% (Table 2).

At the p-value threshold of $p < 0.005$, the cross-validated performance of the eight classification models exhibited a mean accuracy of 82-92%. PAM was most accurate at 92%, followed by the Compound covariate predictor, DLDA, and Bayesian compound covariate predictor 90%. The poorest accuracy (82%) was observed for 1-nearest neighbor, 3-nearest neighbors, and Support vector machines. For all eight methods, the sensitivities and specificities ranged from 63%-90%. We performed gene ontology/pathway enrichment analysis on selected DEGs at both p-value thresholds of $p < 0.001$ and $p < 0.005$, however, no significant enrichments were observed.

Discussion

Perineural invasion of the head and neck has been identified as a marker of poor outcomes, decreased survival, increase locoregional recurrence and shorter time to recurrence [4]. In the head and neck, cancer cells may spread along the entire cranial nerve network in a retrograde or anterograde fashion in a relatively low resistance manner. Once patients become symptomatic, many times with facial paresthesias

Gene Name	Symbol	P value	Fold Change	Probe set
galactose-3-O-sulfotransferase 4	GAL3ST4	0.0001024	0.46	11728763_x_at
syntrophin, beta 2 (dystrophin-associated protein A1, 59kDa, basic component 2)	SNTB2	0.0003669	0.73	11720113_at
transmembrane protein 140	TMEM140	0.0005974	0.43	11758500_s_at
transmembrane protein 187	TMEM187	0.0006195	0.61	11719619_at
thioredoxin interacting protein	TXNIP	0.0006261	0.44	11756431_s_at
A kinase (PRKA) anchor protein 10	AKAP10	0.0007236	0.79	11759300_s_at
X-linked inhibitor of apoptosis	XIAP	0.0007908	0.77	11725699_at
AT rich interactive domain 4B (RBP1-like)	ARID4B	0.0008541	0.75	11721880_s_at
mannosidase, beta A, lysosomal	MANBA	0.0009077	0.63	11750126_a_at
serine carboxypeptidase 1	SCPEP1	0.0009216	0.52	11749550_a_at
pseudouridylate synthase 10	PUS10	0.000953	0.66	11738413_a_at
empty spiracles homeobox 1	EMX1	0.0009638	1.11	11735490_a_at
kaptin (actin binding protein)	KPTN	0.0009297	1.3	11722835_a_at
SH2 domain containing 4A	SH2D4A	0.0008936	1.37	11732259_at
BCL2/adenovirus E1B 19kDa interacting protein 3-like	BNIP3L	0.0008312	1.43	11746802_x_at
GrpE-like 2, mitochondrial (E. coli)	GRPEL2	0.0007293	1.44	11719301_s_at
aldehyde dehydrogenase 1 family, member L1	ALDH1L1	0.0006572	1.15	11761771_a_at
potassium voltage-gated channel, subfamily H (eag-related), member 1	KCNH1	0.0005852	1.18	11735587_a_at
1-acylglycerol-3-phosphate O-acyltransferase 5 (lysophosphatidic acid acyltransferase, epsilon)	AGPAT5	0.0004022	1.68	11730752_s_at
PIN2/TERF1 interacting, telomerase inhibitor 1	PINX1	0.0003153	1.43	11758823_a_at
chromosome 18 open reading frame 25	C18orf25	0.0003041	1.49	11726216_s_at
mitochondrial ribosomal protein S9	MRPS9	0.0002405	1.33	11721683_a_at
INO80 complex subunit C	INO80C	5.96e-05	1.72	11728410_a_at
prenyl (decaprenyl) diphosphate synthase, subunit 1	PDSS1	5.59e-05	1.77	11720547_a_at

Table 1: Differentially expressed genes between PP and PN tumors at p-value threshold p<0.0001 *Note Fold change >1 indicates greater expression in PP samples. Fold change <1 indicates greater expression in PN samples.

		Sensitivity	Specificity	PPV	NPV	Accuracy
Diagonal Linear Discriminant	Negative	0.947	0.952	0.947	0.952	95%
	Positive	0.952	0.947	0.952	0.947	
Bayesian Compound Covariate	Negative	0.789	0.857	0.833	0.818	94%
	Positive	0.857	0.789	0.818	0.833	
PAM	Negative	0.895	0.952	0.944	0.909	92%
	Positive	0.952	0.895	0.909	0.944	
Compound Covariate	Negative	0.895	0.905	0.895	0.905	90%
	Positive	0.905	0.895	0.905	0.895	
3-Nearest Neighbors	Negative	0.895	0.905	0.895	0.905	90%
	Positive	0.905	0.895	0.905	0.895	
Nearest Centroid	Negative	0.895	0.905	0.895	0.905	90%
	Positive	0.905	0.895	0.905	0.895	
1-Nearest Neighbor	Negative	0.842	0.857	0.842	0.857	85%
	Positive	0.857	0.842	0.857	0.842	
Support Vector Machines	Negative	0.895	0.81	0.81	0.895	85%
	Positive	0.81	0.895	0.895	0.81	

Table 2: Gene-based classification models for p-value threshold of p<0.001, 24 differentially expressed genes. NPV=negative predictive value; PPV=positive predictive value.

or facial palsy, the tumor has often spread into larger named nerves or to the skull base, making surgical options more morbid. Though new excision techniques, such as Mohs micrographic surgery, allow serial frozen sectioning to track margins, these techniques generally treat smaller and less advanced skin cancers with more subtle perineural

invasion [1]. Artifact from frozen sectioning has contributed to the underreporting of perineural invasion with this technique, despite its well-documented ability to clear microscopic disease [23]. Therefore, diagnostic or screening methods utilizing gene markers of perineural invasion or more aggressive subtypes could decrease underreporting,

- clinical perineural invasion in cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 146: 746-751.
4. Liebig C, Ayala G, Wilks JA, Berger DH, Albo D (2009) Perineural invasion in cancer: a review of the literature. *Cancer* 115: 3379-3391.
 5. Germani RM, Civantos FJ, Elgart G, Roberts B, Franzmann EJ (2009) Molecular markers of micrometastasis in oral cavity carcinomas. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 141: 52-58.
 6. Chan MM, Tahan SR (2010) Low-affinity nerve growth factor receptor (P75 NGFR) as a marker of perineural invasion in malignant melanomas. *J Cutan Pathol* 37: 336-343.
 7. Chen-Tsai CP, Colome-Grimmer M, Wagner RF (2004) Correlations among Neural Cell Adhesion Molecule, Nerve Growth Factor, and Its Receptors, TrkA, TrkB, TrkC, and p75NGFR, in Perineural Invasion by Basal Cell and Cutaneous Squamous Cell Carcinomas. *Dermatol Surg* 30: 1009-1016.
 8. Kolokythas A, Cox DP, Dekker N, Schmidt BL (2010) Nerve growth factor and tyrosine kinase A receptor in oral squamous cell carcinoma: is there an association with perineural invasion? *J Oral Maxillofac Surg* 68: 1290-1295.
 9. Lewis Kelso R, Colome-Grimmer MI, Uchida T, Wang HQ, Wagner RF Jr (2006) p75(NGFR) immunostaining for the detection of perineural invasion by cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma. *Dermatol Surg* 32: 177-183.
 10. Tallon B, Bhawan J (2010) FoxP3 expression is increased in cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma with perineural invasion. *J Cutan Pathol* 37: 1184-1185.
 11. Solares CA, Boyle GM, Brown I, Parsons PG, Panizza B (2010) Reduced alphaB-crystallin staining in perineural invasion of head and neck cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 142: S15-19.
 12. Wang SJ, Wong G, de Heer AM, Xia W, Bourguignon LY (2009) CD44 variant isoforms in head and neck squamous cell carcinoma progression. *Laryngoscope* 119: 1518-1530.
 13. Zhang CY, Mao L, Li L, Tian Z, Zhou XJ, et al. (2007) Promoter methylation as a common mechanism for inactivating E-cadherin in human salivary gland adenoid cystic carcinoma. *Cancer* 110: 87-95.
 14. Kobayashi K, Ando M, Saito Y, Kondo K, Omura G, et al. (2015) Nerve Growth Factor Signals as Possible Pathogenic Biomarkers for Perineural Invasion in Adenoid Cystic Carcinoma. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 153: 218-224.
 15. Irizarry RA, Hobbs B, Collin F et al. (2003) Exploration, normalization, and summaries of high density oligonucleotide array probe level data. *Biostatistics* 4: 249-64.
 16. Simon R, Lam A, Li MC, Ngan M, Meneses S, et al. (2007) Analysis of gene expression data using BRB-ArrayTools. *Cancer Inform* 3: 11-17.
 17. Huang DW, Sherman BT, Tan Q (2007) DAVID Bioinformatics Resources: expanded annotation database and novel algorithms to better extract biology from large gene lists. *Nucleic Acids Res* 35: W169-75.
 18. Tibshirani R, Hastie T, Narasimhan B, Chu G (2002) Diagnosis of multiple cancer types by shrunken centroids of gene expression. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 99: 6567-6572.
 19. Radmacher MD, McShane LM, Simon R (2002) A paradigm for class prediction using gene expression profiles. *J Comput Biol* 9: 505-511.
 20. Dudoit S, Fridlyand J, Speed TP (2002) Comparison of discrimination methods for the classification of tumors using gene expression data. *Journal of the American Statistical Association* 97: 77-87.
 21. Vapnik V (1995) *The Nature of Statistical Learning*. Springer-Verlag, New York.
 22. Wright G, Tan B, Rosenwald A, Hurt EH, Wiestner A, et al. (2003) A gene expression-based method to diagnose clinically distinct subgroups of diffuse large B cell lymphoma. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 100: 9991-9996.
 23. Shimizu I, Thomas VD (2014) Evaluation of nerves in Mohs micrographic surgery: histologic mimickers of perineural invasion and nervous tissue on frozen section. *Dermatol Surg* 40: 497-504.
 24. Goldenberg A, Ortiz A, Kim SS, Jiang SB (2015) Squamous cell carcinoma with aggressive subclinical extension: 5-year retrospective review of diagnostic predictors. *J Am Acad Dermatol* 73: 120-126.
 25. Karia PS, Jambusaria-Pahlajani A, Harrington DP, et al. (2014) Evaluation of American Joint Committee on Cancer, International Union against Cancer, and Brigham and Women's Hospital tumor staging for cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma. *J Clin Oncol* 32: 327-334.
 26. Kivisaari AK, Kallajoki M, Mirtti T, et al. (2008) Transformation-specific matrix metalloproteinases (MMP)-7 and MMP-13 are expressed by tumour cells in epidermolysis bullosa-associated squamous cell carcinomas. *British Journal of Dermatology* 158: 778-785.
 27. Farshchian M, Kivisaari A, Ala-Aho R, Riihilä P, Kallajoki M, et al. (2011) Serpin peptidase inhibitor clade A member 1 (SerpinA1) is a novel biomarker for progression of cutaneous squamous cell carcinoma. *Am J Pathol* 179: 1110-1119.
 28. Zhou J, Chng WJ (2013) Roles of thioredoxin binding protein (TXNIP) in oxidative stress, apoptosis and cancer. *Mitochondrion* 13: 163-169.
 29. Hui ST, Andres AM, Miller AK, Spann NJ, Potter DW, et al. (2008) Txnip balances metabolic and growth signaling via PTEN disulfide reduction. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 105: 3921-3926.
 30. Wu N, Zheng B, Shaywitz A, Dagon Y, Tower C, et al. (2013) AMPK-dependent degradation of TXNIP upon energy stress leads to enhanced glucose uptake via GLUT1. *Mol Cell* 49: 1167-1175.