**Digital morphometry of tumor nuclei correlates to BAP-1 status, monosomy 3,
gene expression class and survival in uveal melanoma**

Christina Herrspiegel^{1,2}, Thonnie Rose O. See³, Pia R. Mendoza⁴, Hans E.

Grossniklaus³, and Gustav Stålhammar^{*1,2}

¹St. Erik Eye Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden

²Department of Clinical Neuroscience, Karolinska Institutet, Stockholm, Sweden, and

³Departments of Ophthalmology and Pathology, Emory University School of
Medicine, Atlanta, Georgia, USA.

⁴Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, Emory University School of
Medicine, Atlanta, Georgia, USA.

11

*Corresponding author

Gustav Stålhammar, M.D. Ph.D. FEBO

Oncology and Pathology service, St. Erik Eye Hospital

Department of Clinical Neuroscience, Karolinska Institutet

Polhemsgatan 50, 112 82

Stockholm, Sweden

Email: gustav.stalhammar@ki.se

Phone: +46 8 672 30 00

20

21 ABSTRACT

22 Cytologic features such as the shape and size of tumor cells can predict metastatic
 23 death in uveal melanoma and other cancers but suffer from poor reproducibility. In
 24 this study, we investigate the interobserver concordance of digital morphometry, and
 25 correlate the results with BRCA associated protein-1 (BAP-1) expression and *BAP-1*
 26 gene mutation status, monosomy 3, gene expression classifications and patient
 27 survival in uveal melanoma. The average number of cells analyzed in each of 107
 28 tumors, was 1957 (SD 349). Mean time consumption was less than 2.5 minutes per
 29 tumor. Identical morphometric classification was obtained for $\geq 85\%$ of tumors in all
 30 twelve evaluated morphometric variables (κ 0.70–0.93). The mean nucleus area,
 31 nucleus perimeter, nucleus max caliper and nucleus to cell area ratio were
 32 significantly greater in tumors with low BAP-1 expression and gene expression class
 33 2. Patients had significantly shorter survival if their tumors had low BAP-1 (Log-
 34 Rank $p=0.002$), gene expression class 2 ($p=0.004$), long nucleus perimeters
 35 ($p=0.031$), long nucleus max calipers ($p=0.029$) and high mean nucleus to cell area
 36 ratios ($p=0.041$) as defined in a training cohort and then tested in a validation cohort.
 37 In the validation cohort, long nucleus perimeters and long nucleus max calipers
 38 correlated with monosomy 3 (Pearson Chi-Square $p=0.006$ and $p=0.009$,
 39 respectively). Long nucleus perimeters also correlated with *BAP-1* mutation
 40 ($p=0.017$). We conclude that digital morphometry can be fast and highly reproducible,
 41 that for the first time, morphometry parameters can be objectively quantitated in
 42 thousands of cells at a time in sub- μm resolutions, and that variables describing the
 43 shape and size tumor nuclei correlate to BAP-1 status, monosomy 3, gene expression
 44 class as well as patient survival.

1. Introduction

Uveal melanoma is the most common primary intraocular malignancy in adults (Singh *et al.*, 2014). Less than 5 % of patients have clinically detectable metastases at the time of diagnosis (Singh *et al.*, 2014). At a later stage however, up to 45 % of patients will develop metastases even if the eye containing the tumor has been removed (Kujala, Mäkitie and Kivelä, 2003). Once macrometastases develop, there is no effective treatment and median patient survival is only 4-12 months (Carvajal *et al.*, 2016; Augsburger, Corrêa and Shaikh, 2009).

Several methods for prognostication are in clinical use. Tumor thickness, diameter, location in the eye and presence of distant metastases determine tumor stage (Kivelä *et al.*, 2017; Arnljots *et al.*, 2018). Loss of chromosome 3 has a high positive and negative predictive value for metastasis (Bornfeld *et al.*, 1996). Commercial gene tests based on the expression of 12 classifier genes have been developed and show excellent prognostic utility in separation of class 1 tumors with low metastatic risk from class 2 tumors with high metastatic risk (Onken *et al.*, 2012). Furthermore, we have previously shown the prognostic utility of manual (Szalai *et al.*, 2018) and digital image analysis-based (Stålhammar *et al.*, 2019a) determination of the level of nuclear BAP-1 (nBAP-1) expression.

In 1931, Callender described six types of uveal melanoma based on cytologic features such as cell shape and the size of the nucleus (Callender, 1931). The original classification could accurately predict metastatic death, but suffered from substantial intra- and interobserver discordance (Gamel, McCurdy and McLean, 1992; Coleman *et al.*, 1996). After several modifications, the morphological classification of uveal melanoma now rely on assessments of the proportion of epitheloid tumor cells

69 (McLean *et al.*, 1983; Seddon *et al.*, 1987). Examination of cytological features still
 70 require a high level of cytologic expertise and suffer from poor reproducibility
 71 (Gamel, McCurdy and McLean, 1992). Computer-assisted methods have therefore
 72 been proposed as a way of facilitating these assessments. In 1982, Gamel *et al.* found
 73 that 13 of 18 nuclear and nucleolar features correlated significantly with patient
 74 mortality when evaluated with a digitizer superimposed on microscopic images at a
 75 rate of 100 cells per hour (Gamel *et al.*, 1982). Since then, computers have improved
 76 manifold in terms of their computing power, cost and the number and scope of
 77 software applications and we can now analyze a dozen of variables or more in
 78 thousands of cells per minute on inexpensive off-the-shelf laptop computers
 79 (Stålhammar *et al.*, 2018; Stålhammar *et al.*, 2016).

80 Consequently, we see an opportunity to analyze cell morphometry features
 81 with digital image analysis and compare these to other prognostic factors including
 82 nBAP-1 expression in uveal melanoma patients from one American and one European
 83 referral center.

84

85 **2. Methods**

86 *2.1. Patients and Samples*

87 The study adhered to the tenets of the Declaration of Helsinki. Methods were carried
 88 out in accordance with the relevant guidelines and regulations. The protocol for
 89 collection of specimens and data from St. Erik Eye Hospital, Stockholm, Sweden was
 90 approved by the regional ethical review board in Stockholm, and the protocol for
 91 collection of specimens and data from Emory Eye Center, Atlanta, GA, USA by the
 92 Emory Institutional Review Board.

93 Patients in the training cohort ($n=27$) were identified in the archives of the
 94 Oncology and Pathology service, St. Erik Eye Hospital and L.F. Montgomery
 95 Ophthalmic Pathology Laboratory, Emory Eye Center. Inclusion criteria were: 1)
 96 Enucleation performed before December 2017, 2) Histologically proven uveal
 97 melanoma, 3) paraffin block available, 4) gene expression classification available, 5)
 98 clinicopathological data available, including tumor thickness, diameter, location, T-
 99 category and cell type, 6) follow-up data available, 7) sufficient tissue for BAP-1
 100 immunohistochemistry. Exclusion criteria were: 1) Prior history of plaque
 101 brachytherapy, proton beam irradiation and/or transpupillary thermotherapy (TTT),
 102 and 3) tumor fully necrotic or fully hemorrhagic. 27 patients met the criteria. Our
 103 follow-up data was confirmed and further extended in telephone interviews with
 104 patients or relatives. Informed consent was obtained from all participants.

105 In order to establish generalizable morphometry thresholds for prediction of
 106 prognosis, we also included patients from the Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA), made
 107 available by the National Cancer Institute at the National Institutes of Health ($n=80$).
 108 These patients had undergone enucleation due to primary uveal melanoma from 2011
 109 through 2013, without previous brachytherapy, proton beam irradiation or TTT.
 110 Digitally scanned diagnostic slides were downloaded along with data on overall
 111 survival from TCGA on which the thresholds established in the training cohort were
 112 tested. *BAP-1* mutation and monosomy 3 status was downloaded from the
 113 supplemental information to the publication by Robertson *et al* (Robertson *et al.*,
 114 2017). No protected health information was accessed or downloaded from TCGA.

115

116 2.2. Immunohistochemistry

117 The paraffin blocks were cut into 4 µm sections, pretreated in EDTA-buffer at pH 9.0
118 for 20 minutes and incubated with mouse monoclonal antibodies against BAP-1
119 (clone C-4, Santa Cruz Biotechnology, Dallas, Texas, USA) and a red chromogen,
120 and finally counterstained with haematoxylin and rinsed with deionized water. The
121 deparaffinization, pretreatment, primary staining, secondary staining and
122 counterstaining steps were run in a Bond III automated IHC/ISH stainer (Leica,
123 Wetzlar, Germany). Dilutions between 1:20 and 1:500 had been evaluated before
124 selecting 1:40.

125

126 2.3. Digital image analysis

127 After sectioning and staining, all glass slides were digitally scanned to the .ndpi file
128 format at ×400, using identical digital scanners at both institutions (Nano Zoomer 2.0
129 HT, Hamamatsu Photonics K.K., Hamamatsu, Japan). The digital image analysis
130 (DIA) software used was the QuPath Bioimage analysis v. 0.2.0 m4 (Bankhead *et al.*,
131 2017). The software was run on a standard off-the-shelf laptop computer (Apple Inc.
132 Cupertino, CA).

133 For assessment of the level of nBAP-1 expression, one positive cell (red
134 chromogen in nucleus) and one negative cell (haematoxylin but no red chromogen in
135 nucleus) was calibrated in each digitally scanned tissue section. All other parameters
136 were left at default in order to limit time consumption and maintain ease of use.
137 Tumors were then screened under low magnification (40×) and the area exhibiting the
138 most intense nBAP-1 staining selected for grading. Nuclear immunoreactivity was
139 evaluated at 200×, in a circular 0.5 mm-diameter region of interest (corresponding to
140 the field of view in a light microscope with a 400× objective) by automatic

141 classification (positive cell detection). Based on previous publications, the nBAP-1
142 expression was classified as “high” if immunoreactivity was detected in >30 % of
143 tumor cells within the region of interest, and “low” if it was detected in ≤ 30 % of
144 tumor cells (Stålhammar *et al.*, 2019a; Szalai *et al.*, 2018; See *et al.*, 2019).

145 A workflow for morphometric analysis was then created, including the
146 following steps for each tumor: A) Identification of all cells within the same circular
147 0.5 mm-diameter region of interest used for assessment of the level of nBAP-1
148 expression, using the software’s cell detection function with the following settings:
149 Background nucleus radius 8 μm , median filter radius 0 μm , sigma 1.5 μm , minimum
150 nucleus area 7.5 μm^2 , maximum nucleus area 200 μm^2 , threshold 0.1, max
151 background intensity 2 and cell expansion 5 μm . B) Measurement in each detected
152 cell in each region of interest of the following 12 cell morphometric variables: 1)
153 Nucleus area (μm^2). 2) Nucleus perimeter (μm). 3) Nucleus circularity. 4) Nucleus
154 max caliper (μm). 5) Nucleus min caliper (μm). 6) Nucleus eccentricity. 7) Cell area
155 (μm^2). 8) Cell perimeter (μm). 9) Cell circularity. 10) Cell max caliper. 11) Cell min
156 caliper. 12) Nucleus to cell area ratio (figure 1).

157 Tumor areas with intense inflammation, heavy pigmentation, bleeding,
158 necrosis or poor fixation were avoided. nBAP-1 classification and morphometric
159 analysis was performed blinded to all other patient data including outcome. For
160 measurement of interobserver concordance, two human observers performed the
161 digital morphometry (morphometric variable above or below median value) and
162 nBAP-1 classification (high or low) independently and blinded to patient outcomes.

163

164 2.4. Gene expression classification

165 Tumor tissue samples were obtained from freshly enucleated eyes by fine needle
166 aspiration. The contents of the needle hub were transferred into one of two RNase-
167 free cryovials. Using the same needle, extraction buffer from the second cryovial was
168 aspirated and expelled into the first. This was then placed in a specimen bag,
169 immediately frozen to -80° C and shipped on dry ice for gene expression classification
170 based on 12 discriminating genes (*HTR2B*, *ECM1*, *RAB31*, *CDH1*, *FXR1*, *LTA4H*,
171 *EIF1B*, *ID2*, *ROBO1*, *LMCD1*, *SATB1*, and *MTUS1*) and 3 control genes (*MRPS21*,
172 *RBM23*, and *SAPI30*) at a commercial laboratory (Castle Biosciences Inc.
173 Friendswood, TX, USA). Expression levels of the gene products are used to
174 categorize tumors as either class 1 with low metastatic risk, or class 2 with high
175 metastatic risk (Onken *et al.*, 2012).

176

177 2.5. Statistical methods

178 Differences with a $p < 0.05$ were considered significant, all p-values being two-sided.
179 The deviation of all clinicopathological variables from normal distribution was
180 statistically significant, when evaluated by the Shapiro–Wilk test ($p < 0.05$). For
181 statistical tests of these variables, we therefore used the Mann-Whitney *U* test, which
182 does not assume normally distributed data. The deviation of all morphometric
183 variables from normal distribution was however not statistically significant ($p > 0.05$),
184 why we used one-way ANOVA with Bonferroni correction for these. For
185 comparisons of categorical variables, two-by-two tables and Fisher’s exact test were
186 used. For correlation to Cox Proportional Hazards for metastasis and Kaplan-Meier
187 metastasis-free survival, patients were split into two groups based on 1) the median
188 value of each morphometric variable, and 2) receiver operating characteristics (ROC)

189 in the training cohort, with equal emphasis on sensitivity and specificity for the
190 development of metastasis. The thresholds established in the training cohort were then
191 tested in the validation cohort, with Kaplan-Meier survival analysis and in two-by-
192 two tables for Pearson Chi-Square correlation with *BAP-1* mutation and monosomy 3.
193 In evaluation of interobserver concordance, the percentage of identically classified
194 cases and Cohen's kappa statistics (κ) were computed (Cohen, 1960). Metastasis-free
195 follow-up was defined as the time in months from enucleation to the last occasion
196 patients without metastases was seen or in contact alive. All statistical analyses were
197 performed using IBM SPSS statistics version 25 (Armonk, NY, USA).

198

199 **3. Results**

200 *3.1. Descriptive statistics*

201 The mean age at enucleation of patients in our training cohort was 66 years (SD 15).
202 Of 27 patients, 15 were men and 12 women. 25 tumors originated in the choroid and 2
203 in the ciliary body. The cell type was mixed in 18 patients, spindle in 5 and epitheloid
204 in 4. Mean tumor thickness was 8.6 mm (SD 3.7) and mean diameter 15.8 mm (SD
205 4.8). 12 tumors were of gene expression class 2 and 15 of class 1a or 1b. 14 tumors
206 had low nBAP-1 expression and 13 high. Mean metastasis-free follow-up time was 47
207 months (SD 76). The validation cohort had similar features (Table 1).

208 The average number of cells analyzed in each tumor was 1957 (SD 349),
209 which took an average of 74 seconds (SD 21) for nBAP-1 classification and 71
210 seconds (SD 17) for morphometric analysis, adding up to 145 seconds or nearly two-
211 and-a-half minutes per tumor.

212

213 3.2. Interobserver concordance

214 Identical nBAP-1 classification was obtained for 25 of 27 tumors (93 %) in the
215 training cohort, yielding a Cohen's kappa statistic indicating almost perfect agreement
216 ($\kappa=0.85$).

217 Identical morphometric classification (morphometric variable above/below
218 median value) was obtained for ≥ 85 % of tumors in all 12 variables, yielding
219 substantial or almost perfect agreement (κ 0.70–0.93, Table 2).

220

221 3.3. Morphometry versus nBAP-1 expression and gene expression class

222 The mean nucleus area, nucleus perimeter, nucleus max caliper and nucleus to cell
223 area ratio were significantly greater in tumors with low nBAP-1 expression. Nucleus
224 circularity, nucleus min caliper, nucleus eccentricity and cell area, cell perimeter, cell
225 circularity, cell max and min caliper were however not significantly different (Table
226 3a).

227 Similarly, the nucleus to cell area ratio, but not the other morphometric
228 variables, were significantly greater in tumors of gene expression class 2 (Table 3b).

229

230 3.4. Adjusted thresholds

231 The mean nucleus area, nucleus perimeter, nucleus max caliper and nucleus to cell
232 area ratio were analyzed with ROC, with equal emphasis on sensitivity and specificity
233 for the development of metastasis. Mean nucleus area achieved an area under the
234 curve (AUC) of 0.54 (sensitivity 67 %, specificity 50 %, $p=0.76$) at threshold $28 \mu\text{m}^2$;
235 Mean nucleus perimeter achieved an AUC of 0.58 (sensitivity 67 %, specificity 56 %, $p=0.50$) at threshold $22 \mu\text{m}$; Mean nucleus max caliper achieved an AUC of 0.61

(sensitivity 56 %, specificity 67 %, $p=0.38$) at threshold 8.2 μm ; and mean nucleus to cell area ratio achieved an AUC of 0.69 (sensitivity 56 %, specificity 67 %, p asymptotic significance $p=0.12$) at threshold 0.32 (figure 2).

240

241 3.5. Regression analysis and survival

242 In survival analysis, the thresholds defined in our training cohort was applied to
243 morphometry measurements in the validation cohort. Kaplan-Meier overall survival
244 was significantly shorter for patients with tumors that had long nucleus perimeters
245 (Log-Rank $p=0.031$), long nucleus max calipers (Log-Rank $p=0.029$) and high mean
246 nucleus to cell area ratios (Log-Rank $p=0.041$). Patients also had significantly shorter
247 survival if their tumors had low nBAP-1 expression (Log-Rank $p=0.002$) or gene
248 expression class 2 (Log-Rank $p=0.004$). The nucleus area was however not associated
249 with shortened survival (Log-Rank $p=0.266$, figure 3).

250 In univariate Cox proportional hazards analyses of nucleus area, nucleus
251 perimeter, nucleus max caliper and nucleus to cell area ratio, all variables were
252 individual predictors of metastasis. In multivariate analysis, nucleus perimeter and
253 nucleus to cell area ratio retained their significance (Table 4).

254 In two-by-two tables, long nucleus perimeters correlated with *BAP-1* mutation
255 and monosomy 3 (Pearson Chi-Square $p=0.017$ and $p=0.006$, respectively). Long
256 nucleus max calipers correlated with monosomy 3 ($p=0.009$) but not with *BAP-1*
257 mutation ($p=0.085$). Nucleus area and nucleus to cell area ratio did not correlate with
258 *BAP-1* mutation or monosomy 3 ($p>0.21$).

259

260 4. Discussion

261 In this study, we have shown that digital morphometry of uveal melanoma can be fast
262 and highly reproducible, and that variables describing the size of the tumor cell nuclei
263 correlate to gene expression class, *BAP-1* status, monosomy 3 and patient survival.
264 On the other hand, no variable describing the shape and size of the entire tumor cell
265 correlated to the prognostic factors, indicating that for prognosis, the morphological
266 characteristics of tumor nuclei are more important.

267 The prognostic importance of cell morphology is by no means a novel
268 discovery or limited to uveal melanoma. Deregulations in cell signaling leading to
269 increases in cell size has been described as one of the hallmarks of cancer (Hanahan
270 and Weinberg, 2011). However, such increases in cell size have been hard to measure
271 until now and issues with reproducibility, time consumption and level of expertise
272 required for reliable assessments have limited its utility both in research and clinic.
273 Modern user-friendly digital image analysis techniques offer an attractive solution to
274 these problems, and for the first time we can now objectively quantitate multiple
275 morphometry parameters in thousands of cells at a time.

276 In turn, changes to the size and shape of tumor cells are but a consequence of
277 changes in the genotype, epigenetics and environmental factors. These changes can be
278 tested with alternative methods, such as gene expression tests, next generation
279 sequencing and chromosome analysis (Robertson *et al.*, 2017; Onken *et al.*, 2012). As
280 found by Onken *et al.* the helix-loop-helix inhibitor *ID2* suppress the epithelial
281 phenotype associated with an enlarged nucleus (Onken *et al.*, 2006). Loss of *ID2* up-
282 regulates the epithelial adhesion molecule E-cadherin, which in turn promotes the
283 anchorage-independent cell growth required for metastasis. Consequently, we regard

284 the morphometric characteristics investigated here as biomarkers, primarily for the
285 cancer genotype.

286 Limitations of this study include a limited sample size. Substantial
287 investments in digital scanning capacity is required before the method presented here
288 can be used. The time consumption specified does not include preanalytical
289 operations such as digital scanning and loading and unloading of glass slides. Small
290 changes in the settings of the software's cell detection function will influence the
291 results greatly and even though measurements are automatized and the interobserver
292 concordance is almost perfect as shown here, the definition of representative regions
293 of interest requires at least a basic experience in ophthalmic pathology. This may
294 reduce the generalizability of our method, the number of potential users and its
295 application in everyday clinical routine. Further, as only one region of interest per
296 tumor is defined, intratumor heterogeneity is not taken into account. As we have
297 shown previously, there is significant variation in tumor characteristics including
298 nBAP-1 expression in different subregions of UM (Stålhammar *et al.*, 2019b). Last,
299 our sample is not representative of all patients with uveal melanoma. We have only
300 investigated the feasibility of digital morphometry in enucleated specimens without
301 previous plaque brachytherapy. A large proportion of patients with uveal melanoma
302 undergo primary plaque brachytherapy or proton beam radiotherapy and may never
303 require enucleation. It remains unclear if the digital morphometry characteristics of
304 small uveal melanomas is different from the relatively large tumors investigated here.
305 Accordingly, we encourage future studies to confirm these results in larger cohorts
306 that includes smaller tumors.

307

308 **Funding**

309 This work was supported in part by Karolinska Institutet (Karolinska Institutets
310 stiftelsemedel för ögonforskning), the Swedish Society of Medicine (Cronqvists
311 stiftelse) and Stockholm County Council (Stockholms läns landsting).

312

313 **Acknowledgement**

314 The results published here are in part based upon data generated by the TCGA
315 Research Network: <https://www.cancer.gov/tcga>.

316

317 **References**

- 318 Arnljots, T. S., Al-Sharbaty, Z., Lardner, E., All-Eriksson, C., Seregard, S.,
319 Stålhammar, G. 2018., Tumour thickness, diameter, area or volume? The prognostic
320 significance of conventional versus digital image analysis-based size estimation
321 methods in uveal melanoma. *Acta Ophthalmol*, 965, 510-518. DOI:
322 [10.1111/aos.13668](https://doi.org/10.1111/aos.13668)
323
324 Augsburger, J. J., Corrêa, Z. M., Shaikh, A. H., 2009. Effectiveness of Treatments for
325 Metastatic Uveal Melanoma. *Am J Ophthalmol*, 1481, 119-127. DOI:
326 [10.1016/j.ajo.2009.01.023](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajo.2009.01.023)
327
328 Bankhead, P., Loughrey, M., Fernández, J., Dombrowski, Y., McArt, D., Dunne, P.,
329 McQuaid, S., Gray, R., Murray, L., Coleman, H., James, J., Salto-Tellez, M.,
330 Hamilton, P., 2017. QuPath: Open source software for digital pathology image
331 analysis. *Sci Rep*, 71, 16878-16878. DOI: [10.1038/s41598-017-17204-5](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41598-017-17204-5)
332
333 Bornfeld, N., Prescher, G., Becher, R., Hirche, H., Jöckel, K. H., Horsthemke, B.,
334 1996. Prognostic implications of monosomy 3 in uveal melanoma. *The Lancet*,
335 3479010, 1222-1225. DOI: [10.1016/s0140-6736\(96\)90736-9](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0140-6736(96)90736-9)
336
337 Callender, G., 1931. Malignant Melanotic tumors of the eye. A study of histologic
338 types in 111 cases. *Trans. Am. Acad. Ophthalmol. Otolaryngol.* 36, 131-142.
339
340 Carvajal, R. D., Schwartz, G. K., Tezel, T., Marr, B., Francis, J. H., Nathan, P. D.,
341 2016. Metastatic disease from uveal melanoma: treatment options and future
342 prospects. *Br J Ophthalmol*, 101, 38-44. DOI: [10.1136/bjophthalmol-2016-309034](https://doi.org/10.1136/bjophthalmol-2016-309034)
343

344 Cohen, J., 1960. A Coefficient of Agreement for Nominal Scales. Educational and
345 Psychological Measurement, 201, 37-46.
346
347 Coleman, K., Baak, J. P. A., van Diest, P. J., Mullaney, J., 1996. Prognostic Value of
348 Morphometric Features and the Callender Classification in Uveal Melanomas.
349 Ophthalmol, 10310, 1634-1641. DOI: [10.1016/s0161-6420\(96\)30452-1](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0161-6420(96)30452-1)
350
351 Gamel, J. W., McCurdy, J. B. and McLean, I. W., 1992. A comparison of prognostic
352 covariates for uveal melanoma. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci, 336, 1919-1922.
353
354 Gamel, J. W., McLean, I. W., Greenberg, R. A., Zimmerman, L. E., Lichtenstein, S.
355 J., 1982. Computerized histologic assessment of malignant potential: A method for
356 determining the prognosis of uveal melanomas. Hum Pathol. 1310, 893-897. DOI:
357 [10.1016/s0046-8177\(82\)80048-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0046-8177(82)80048-8)
358
359 Hanahan, D., Weinberg, R., 2011. Hallmarks of Cancer: The Next Generation. Cell,
360 1445, 646-674. DOI: [10.1016/j.cell.2011.02.013](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.cell.2011.02.013)
361
362 Kivelä, T., Simpson, E. R., Grossniklaus, H. E., Jager, M. J., Singh, A. D., Caminal, J.
363 M., Pavlick, A. C., Kujala, E., Coupland, S. E., Finger, P. T., 2017. Uveal Melanoma.
364 AJCC Cancer Staging Manual. 8 ed. Chicago: Springer, 805-817.
365
366 Kujala, E., Mäkitie, T., Kivelä, T., 2003. Very long-term prognosis of patients with
367 malignant uveal melanoma. Invest Ophthalmol Vis Sci, 4411, 4651-4659. DOI:
368 [10.1167/iovs.03-0538](https://doi.org/10.1167/iovs.03-0538)
369
370 McLean, I., Foster, W., Zimmerman, L., Gamel, J., 1983. Modifications of
371 Callender's classification of uveal melanoma at the Armed Forces Institute of
372 Pathology. Am J Ophthalmol, 96, 502-509. DOI: [10.1016/j.ajo.2018.08.025](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ajo.2018.08.025)
373
374 Onken, M. D., Ehlers, J. P., Worley, L. A., Makita, J., Yokota, Y., Harbour, J. W.,
375 2006. Functional gene expression analysis uncovers phenotypic switch in aggressive
376 uveal melanomas. Cancer res, 669, 4602-4609. DOI: [10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-05-4196](https://doi.org/10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-05-4196)
377
378
379 Onken, M. D., Worley, L. A., Char, D. H., Augsburger, J. J., Correa, Z. M.,
380 Nudleman, E., Aaberg, T. M., Altaweel, M. M., Bardenstein, D. S., Finger, P. T.,
381 Gallie, B. L., Harocopos, G. J., Hovland, P. G., McGowan, H. D., Milman, T.,
382 Mruthyunjaya, P., Simpson, E. R., Smith, M. E., Wilson, D. J., Wirotko, W. J.,
383 Harbour, J. W., 2012. Collaborative Ocular Oncology Group report number 1:
384 prospective validation of a multi-gene prognostic assay in uveal melanoma.
385 Ophthalmol, 1198, 1596-1603. DOI: [10.1016/j.ophtha.2012.02.017](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ophtha.2012.02.017)
386
387 Robertson, A. G., Shih, J., Yau, C., Gibb, E. A., Oba, J., Mungall, K. L., Hess, J. M.,
388 Uzunangelov, V., Walter, V., Danilova, L., Lichtenberg, T. M., Kucherlapati, M.,
389 Kimes, P. K., Tang, M., Penson, A., Babur, O., Akbani, R., Bristow, C. A., Hoadley,
390 K. A., Iype, L., Chang, M. T., Cherniack, A. D., Benz, C., Mills, G. B., Verhaak, R.
391 G. W., Griewank, K. G., Felau, I., Zenklusen, J. C., Gershenwald, J. E., Schoenfield,

392 L., Lazar, A. J., Abdel-Rahman, M. H., Roman-Roman, S., Stern, M.-H., Cebulla, C.
393 M., Williams, M. D., Jager, M. J., Coupland, S. E., Esmali, B., Kandath, C.,
394 Woodman, S. E., 2017. Integrative Analysis Identifies Four Molecular and Clinical
395 Subsets in Uveal Melanoma. *Cancer Cell*, 322, 204-220. DOI:
396 [10.1016/j.ccell.2017.07.003](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ccell.2017.07.003)
397
398 Seddon, J. M., Polivogianis, L., Hsieh, C.-C., Albert, D. M., Gamel, J. W.,
399 Gragoudas, E. S., 1987. Death From Uveal Melanoma: Number of Epithelioid Cells
400 and Inverse SD of Nucleolar Area as Prognostic Factors. *Archives of Ophthalmol*,
401 1056, 801-806. DOI: [10.1001/archoph.1987.01060060087039](https://doi.org/10.1001/archoph.1987.01060060087039)
402
403 See, T. R. O., Stålhammar, G., Phillips, S. S., Grossniklaus, H. E., 2019. BAP1
404 Immunoreactivity Correlates with Gene Expression Class in Uveal Melanoma. *Ocul*
405 *Oncol Pathol*, 1-9. DOI:10.1159/000502550)
406
407 Singh, N., Bergman, L., Seregard, S., Singh, A. D., 2014. Epidemiologic Aspects, in:
408 Damato, B. and Singh, A.D. (Eds.) *Clinical Ophthalmic oncology: Uveal tumors*
409 *Clinical Ophthalmic Oncology*. 2 ed. Berlin, Heidelberg: Springer, pp. 75-87.
410
411 Stålhammar, G., Fuentes Martinez, N., Lippert, M., Tobin, N. P., Mølholm, I., Kis, L.,
412 Rosin, G., Rantalainen, M., Pedersen, L., Bergh, J., Grunkin, M., Hartman, J., 2016.
413 Digital image analysis outperforms manual biomarker assessment in breast cancer.
414 *Mod pathol*, 294, 318. DOI: [10.1038/modpathol.2016.34](https://doi.org/10.1038/modpathol.2016.34)
415
416 Stålhammar, G., Robertson, S., Wedlund, L., Lippert, M., Rantalainen, M., Bergh, J.,
417 Hartman, J., 2018. Digital image analysis of Ki67 in hot spots is superior to both
418 manual Ki67 and mitotic counts in breast cancer. *Histopathol*, 726, 974-989. DOI:
419 [10.1111/his.13452](https://doi.org/10.1111/his.13452)
420
421 Stålhammar, G., See, T. R. O., Phillips, S., Seregard, S., Grossniklaus, H. E., 2019a.
422 Digital Image Analysis of BAP-1 Accurately Predicts Uveal Melanoma Metastasis.
423 *Translational vis sci & technol*, 6, e11. DOI: [10.1167/tvst.8.3.11](https://doi.org/10.1167/tvst.8.3.11)
424
425 Stålhammar, G., See, T. R. O., Phillips, S. S., Grossniklaus, H. E., 2019b. Density of
426 PAS positive patterns in uveal melanoma: Correlation with vasculogenic mimicry,
427 gene expression class, BAP-1 expression, macrophage infiltration, and risk for
428 metastasis. *Mol vis*, 25, 502-516.
429
430 Szalai, E., Wells, J. R., Ward, L., Grossniklaus, H. E., 2018. Uveal Melanoma
431 Nuclear BRCA1-Associated Protein-1 Immunoreactivity Is an Indicator of Metastasis.
432 *Ophthalmol*, 1252, 203-209. DOI: [10.1016/j.opthta.2017.07.018](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.opthta.2017.07.018)

433

434 Legends

Figure 1. Illustration of cell morphometric measurements. A) Calipers denotes the largest and smallest diameters of the nucleus and cell. Nucleus eccentricity is a measure of how much the nucleus deviates from a spherical shape, presented as a number between 0.00 and 1.00. A completely spherical nucleus has an eccentricity of 0.00, a nucleus with the shape of an elliptical 3D solid would have an eccentricity of 0.5, whereas a 3D conical distribution would have a value of 1.00. Circularity compares the perimeter of a shape to the area it contains and is calculated by four times π times the area divided by the perimeter squared. The circularity of a circle is 1.00, and less for less circular objects. The nucleus to cell area ratio is the area of the nucleus divided with the area of the entire cell. B) Example of the morphologic appearance of a tumor mainly composed of epitheloid cells. C) In this tumor, a circular 0.5 mm-diameter region of interest (corresponding to the field of view in a light microscope with a 400 $\times$ objective) has been identified. Within the region of interest, each cell is automatically analyzed for the level of nBAP-1 expression and 12 morphometric variables. D) The results of the measurements can be presented as frequency distributions. In this example, the mean nucleus to cell area ratio of the cells measured in the region of interest was 0.32 (dotted line). E) and F) A tumor mainly composed of spindle-like cells is shown for comparison. G) This tumor had a

454 slightly lower mean nucleus to cell area ratio of 0.28. Cell illustration by
455 iStock.com/Vitalii Dumma, East Ukraine Volodymyr Dahl National University Scale
456 bars: 100 μ m.

	Training cohort	Validation cohort
n =	27	80
Mean age at diagnosis, years (SD)	66 (15)	62 (14)
Sex, n (%)		
Female	15 (56)	35 (44)
Male	12 (44)	45 (56)
Primary tumor location, n (%)		
Choroid	25 (93)	75 (94)
Ciliary body	2 (7)	5 (6)
Iris	0 (0)	0 (0)
Cell type, n (%)		
Spindle	5 (19)	28 (35)
Epitheloid	4 (15)	12 (15)
Mixed	18 (67)	39 (49)
N/a		1 (1)
Mean tumor thickness, mm (SD)	8.6 (3.7)	N/a
Mean tumor diameter, mm (SD)	15.8 (4.8)	N/a
Previous brachytherapy or TTT, n (%)		
No	27 (100)	80 (100)
Yes	0 (0)	0 (0)
AJCC T-category, n (%)		
1	0 (0)	0 (0)
2	7 (26)	14 (18)
3	14 (52)	33 (41)
4	6 (22)	33 (41)
Gene expression class, n (%)		
1a	9 (33)	N/a
1b	6 (22)	N/a
2	12 (44)	N/a
DIA nBAP-1 classification, n (%)		

High	13 (48)	N/a
Low	14 (52)	N/a
Follow-up months, mean (SD)[§]	47 (76)	28 (19)

457 Table 1. Characteristics of patients and tumors included in this study. SD, standard
458 deviation. N/a, not available. TTT, Transpupillary thermotherapy.

459

	Interobserver concordance (%)	Cohen's κ
Nucleus area	85	0.70
Nucleus perimeter	85	0.70
Nucleus circularity	96	0.93
Nucleus caliper, max	85	0.70
Nucleus caliper, min	89	0.78
Nucleus eccentricity	96	0.93
Cell area	85	0.70
Cell perimeter	85	0.70
Cell circularity	93	0.85
Cell caliper, max	85	0.70
Cell caliper, min	85	0.70
Nucleus to cell area ratio	96	0.93

460 Table 2. Interobserver concordance and Cohen's kappa statistics in classification of
461 each morphometric variable as above or below the median value.

462

	nBAP-1 high	nBAP-1 low	<i>P</i>
Nucleus area, μm^2 (SD)	24.31 (4.38)	28.34 (3.40)	0.013
Nucleus perimeter, μm (SD)	19.61 (1.78)	21.37 (1.28)	0.007
Nucleus circularity	0.76 (0.04)	0.75 (0.04)	0.406
Nucleus caliper, max μm (SD)	7.52 (0.65)	8.21 (0.58)	0.007

Nucleus caliper, min μm (SD)	4.43 (0.59)	4.67 (0.36)	0.202
Nucleus eccentricity (SD)	0.76 (0.03)	0.77 (0.04)	0.524
Cell area, μm^2 (SD)	88.50 (15.10)	94.58 (12.42)	0.263
Cell perimeter, μm (SD)	37.05 (3.26)	38.33 (2.53)	0.263
Cell circularity	0.77 (0.01)	0.77 (0.01)	0.704
Cell caliper, max μm (SD)	13.62 (1.22)	14.09 (0.97)	0.270
Cell caliper, min μm (SD)	9.00 (0.79)	9.29 (0.59)	0.298
Nucleus to cell area ratio	0.28 (0.03)	0.30 (0.02)	0.031

Table 3a.

Average values and *P* defined by one-way ANOVA with Bonferroni correction of cell morphometric variables in tumors of high versus low nBAP-1 expression. SD, standard deviation.

	Gene expression class 1a or 1b	Gene expression class 2	<i>P</i>
Nucleus area, μm^2 (SD)	26.13 (3.93)	28.52 (3.66)	0.149
Nucleus perimeter, μm (SD)	20.28 (3.91)	21.46 (1.42)	0.084
Nucleus circularity	0.77 (0.04)	0.75 (0.04)	0.253
Nucleus caliper, max μm (SD)	7.75 (0.57)	8.25 (0.65)	0.065
Nucleus caliper, min μm (SD)	4.61 (0.58)	4.67 (0.38)	0.769
Nucleus eccentricity (SD)	0.76 (0.03)	0.77 (0.04)	0.378
Cell area, μm^2 (SD)	94.32 (11.05)	94.47 (13.60)	0.977
Cell perimeter, μm (SD)	38.32 (2.25)	38.29 (2.80)	0.984
Cell circularity	0.77 (0.01)	0.77 (0.01)	0.713
Cell caliper, max μm (SD)	14.07 (0.79)	14.09 (1.10)	0.959
Cell caliper, min μm (SD)	9.33 (0.60)	9.27 (0.62)	0.807
Nucleus to cell area ratio	0.28 (0.03)	0.30 (0.02)	0.049

468 Table 3b.

469 Average values and P defined by one-way ANOVA with Bonferroni correction of

470 cell morphometric variables in tumors of gene expression class 1a or 1b versus 2. SD,

471 standard deviation.

472

473

474 Figure 2.

475 Receiver operating characteristics (ROC) of the mean nucleus area, mean nucleus

476 perimeter, mean nucleus max caliper and mean nucleus to cell area ratio in the

477 training cohort ($n=27$), with equal emphasis on sensitivity and specificity for the

478 development of metastasis. Mean nucleus area (blue line) achieved an area under the
479 curve (AUC) of 0.54 (sensitivity 67 %, specificity 50 %, $p=0.76$) at threshold $28 \mu\text{m}^2$;
480 Mean nucleus perimeter (red line) achieved an AUC of 0.58 (sensitivity 67 %,
481 specificity 56 %, $p=0.50$) at threshold $22 \mu\text{m}$; Mean nucleus max caliper (green line)
482 achieved an AUC of 0.61 (sensitivity 56 %, specificity 67 %, $p=0.38$) at threshold 8.2
483 μm ; and mean nucleus to cell area ratio (orange line) achieved an AUC of 0.69
484 (sensitivity 56 %, specificity 67 %, p asymptotic significance $p=0.12$) at threshold
485 0.32.
486

	Regression coefficient, β (SE)	Wald statistic	P	Hazard coefficient, Exp(b) (95% CI)
Univariate Cox proportional hazards				
Nucleus area $> 28 \mu\text{m}^2$	0.5 (0.4)	1.3	0.256	1.6 (0.7–3.8)
Nucleus perimeter $> 22 \mu\text{m}$	1.3 (0.5)	6.9	0.009	3.5 (1.4–9.0)
Nucleus caliper, max $> 8.2 \mu\text{m}$	1.0 (0.4)	5.0	0.025	2.7 (1.1–6.5)
Nucleus to cell area ratio > 0.32	0.9 (0.5)	4.3	0.039	2.6 (1.0–6.3)
Multivariate Cox proportional hazards				
Nucleus area $> 28 \mu\text{m}^2$	-0.8 (0.6)	1.7	0.188	0.5 (0.1–1.5)
Nucleus perimeter $> 22 \mu\text{m}$	2.1 (0.9)	5.6	0.018	7.8 (1.4–42.4)
Nucleus caliper, max $> 8.2 \mu\text{m}$	-0.4 (0.8)	0.3	0.608	0.6 (0.1–3.4)
Nucleus to cell area ratio > 0.32	1.0 (0.5)	4.2	0.041	2.8 (1.0–7.5)

487 Table 4.
488 Univariate and multivariate Cox Proportional Hazards analysis of the association
489 between metastasis-free survival and cell morphometric variables. SE, standard error.
490

Figure 3.

Kaplan-Meier curves, cumulative overall survival in the validation cohort ($n=80$). A) Patients with tumors with mean nucleus area $< 28 \mu\text{m}^2$ (blue) versus $> 28 \mu\text{m}^2$ (red, Log-Rank $p=0.266$). B) Patients with tumors with mean nucleus perimeter $< 22 \mu\text{m}$ (blue) versus $> 22 \mu\text{m}^2$ (red, Log-Rank $p=0.031$). C) Patients with tumors with mean nucleus max caliper $< 8.2 \mu\text{m}$ (blue) versus $> 8.2 \mu\text{m}^2$ (red, Log-Rank $p=0.029$). D) Patients with tumors with mean nucleus to cell area ratio < 0.32 (blue) versus > 0.32 (red, Log-Rank $p=0.041$). The thresholds were established in the training cohort.

A

B

C

D

	Training cohort	Validation cohort
<i>n</i> =	27	80
Mean age at diagnosis, years (SD)	66 (15)	62 (14)
Sex, n (%)		
Female	15 (56)	35 (44)
Male	12 (44)	45 (56)
Primary tumor location, n (%)		
Choroid	25 (93)	75 (94)
Ciliary body	2 (7)	5 (6)
Iris	0 (0)	0 (0)
Cell type, n (%)		
Spindle	5 (19)	28 (35)
Epitheloid	4 (15)	12 (15)
Mixed	18 (67)	39 (49)
N/a		1 (1)
Mean tumor thickness, mm (SD)	8.6 (3.7)	N/a
Mean tumor diameter, mm (SD)	15.8 (4.8)	N/a
Previous brachytherapy or TTT, n (%)		
No	27 (100)	80 (100)
Yes	0 (0)	0 (0)
AJCC T-category, n (%)		
1	0 (0)	0 (0)
2	7 (26)	14 (18)
3	14 (52)	33 (41)
4	6 (22)	33 (41)
Gene expression class, n (%)		
1a	9 (33)	N/a
1b	6 (22)	N/a
2	12 (44)	N/a
DIA nBAP-1 classification, n (%)		
High	13 (48)	N/a
Low	14 (52)	N/a
Follow-up months, mean (SD)[§]	47 (76)	28 (19)

	Interobserver concordance (%)	Cohen's κ
Nucleus area	85	0.70
Nucleus perimeter	85	0.70
Nucleus circularity	96	0.93
Nucleus caliper, max	85	0.70
Nucleus caliper, min	89	0.78
Nucleus eccentricity	96	0.93
Cell area	85	0.70
Cell perimeter	85	0.70
Cell circularity	93	0.85
Cell caliper, max	85	0.70
Cell caliper, min	85	0.70
Nucleus to cell area ratio	96	0.93

	nBAP-1 high	nBAP-1 low	<i>P</i>
Nucleus area, μm^2 (SD)	24.31 (4.38)	28.34 (3.40)	0.013
Nucleus perimeter, μm (SD)	19.61 (1.78)	21.37 (1.28)	0.007
Nucleus circularity	0.76 (0.04)	0.75 (0.04)	0.406
Nucleus caliper, max μm (SD)	7.52 (0.65)	8.21 (0.58)	0.007
Nucleus caliper, min μm (SD)	4.43 (0.59)	4.67 (0.36)	0.202
Nucleus eccentricity (SD)	0.76 (0.03)	0.77 (0.04)	0.524
Cell area, μm^2 (SD)	88.50 (15.10)	94.58 (12.42)	0.263
Cell perimeter, μm (SD)	37.05 (3.26)	38.33 (2.53)	0.263
Cell circularity	0.77 (0.01)	0.77 (0.01)	0.704
Cell caliper, max μm (SD)	13.62 (1.22)	14.09 (0.97)	0.270
Cell caliper, min μm (SD)	9.00 (0.79)	9.29 (0.59)	0.298
Nucleus to cell area ratio	0.28 (0.03)	0.30 (0.02)	0.031

	Gene expression class 1a or 1b	Gene expression class 2	<i>P</i>
Nucleus area, μm^2 (SD)	26.13 (3.93)	28.52 (3.66)	0.149
Nucleus perimeter, μm (SD)	20.28 (3.91)	21.46 (1.42)	0.084
Nucleus circularity	0.77 (0.04)	0.75 (0.04)	0.253
Nucleus caliper, max μm (SD)	7.75 (0.57)	8.25 (0.65)	0.065
Nucleus caliper, min μm (SD)	4.61 (0.58)	4.67 (0.38)	0.769
Nucleus eccentricity (SD)	0.76 (0.03)	0.77 (0.04)	0.378
Cell area, μm^2 (SD)	94.32 (11.05)	94.47 (13.60)	0.977
Cell perimeter, μm (SD)	38.32 (2.25)	38.29 (2.80)	0.984
Cell circularity	0.77 (0.01)	0.77 (0.01)	0.713
Cell caliper, max μm (SD)	14.07 (0.79)	14.09 (1.10)	0.959
Cell caliper, min μm (SD)	9.33 (0.60)	9.27 (0.62)	0.807
Nucleus to cell area ratio	0.28 (0.03)	0.30 (0.02)	0.049

	Regression coefficient, β (SE)	Wald statistic	<i>P</i>	Hazard coefficient, Exp(b) (95% CI)
Univariate Cox proportional hazards				
Nucleus area > 28 μm^2	0.5 (0.4)	1.3	0.256	1.6 (0.7–3.8)
Nucleus perimeter > 22 μm	1.3 (0.5)	6.9	0.009	3.5 (1.4–9.0)
Nucleus caliper, max > 8.2 μm	1.0 (0.4)	5.0	0.025	2.7 (1.1–6.5)
Nucleus to cell area ratio > 0.32	0.9 (0.5)	4.3	0.039	2.6 (1.0–6.3)
Multivariate Cox proportional hazards				
Nucleus area > 28 μm^2	-0.8 (0.6)	1.7	0.188	0.5 (0.1–1.5)
Nucleus perimeter > 22 μm	2.1 (0.9)	5.6	0.018	7.8 (1.4–42.4)
Nucleus caliper, max > 8.2 μm	-0.4 (0.8)	0.3	0.608	0.6 (0.1–3.4)
Nucleus to cell area ratio > 0.32	1.0 (0.5)	4.2	0.041	2.8 (1.0–7.5)