

Differentiating Between Malignant Mesothelioma and Other Pleural Lesions Using Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy

Sadiku-Zehri, Fatlinda; Gamulin, Ozren; Škrabić, Marko; Qerimi-Krasniqi, Ardita; Sedlić, Filip; Šepac, Ana; Brčić, Luka; Batelja Vuletić, Lovorka; Seiwerth, Sven

Source / Izvornik: **Applied Spectroscopy**, 2020, 74, 808 - 818

Journal article, Accepted version

Rad u časopisu, Završna verzija rukopisa prihvaćena za objavljivanje (postprint)

<https://doi.org/10.1177/0003702820924726>

Permanent link / Trajna poveznica: <https://um.nsk.hr/um:nbn:hr:105:716955>

Rights / Prava: [In copyright](#)/[Zaštićeno autorskim pravom](#).

Download date / Datum preuzimanja: **2024-07-28**



Repository / Repozitorij:

[Dr Med - University of Zagreb School of Medicine Digital Repository](#)



Paper type: Submitted Paper

Differentiating Between Malignant Mesothelioma and Other Pleural Lesions Using Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy

Fatlinda Sadiku-Zehri^{1,2}, Ozren Gamulin^{3,4*}, Marko Škrabić^{3,4}, Ardita Qerimi-Krasniqi^{1,2}, Filip Sedlić⁵, Ana Šepac⁶, Luka Brčić⁷, Lovorka Batelja Vuletić^{6,8}, Sven Seiwerth^{6,8}

¹University of Prishtina, School of Medicine, Department of Histology and Embriology, Prishtina, Kosovo

²University Clinical Center of Kosovo, Institute of Pathology, Prishtina, Kosovo

³University of Zagreb, School of Medicine, Department of Physics and Biophysics, Zagreb, Croatia

⁴Center of Excellence for Advanced Materials and Sensing Devices, Research Unit New Functional Materials, Zagreb, Croatia

⁵University of Zagreb, School of Medicine, Department of Pathophysiology, Zagreb, Croatia

⁶University of Zagreb, School of Medicine, Department of Pathology, Zagreb, Croatia

⁷Medical University of Graz, Institute of Pathology, Graz, Austria

⁸KBC Zagreb, Clinical Department of Pathology and Cytology, Zagreb, Croatia

* Corresponding author email address: ozren@mef.hr

Abstract

Histopathology, despite being the gold standard as a diagnostic tool, does not always provide a correct diagnosis for different pleural lesions. Although great progress was made in this field, the problem to differentiate between reactive and malignant pleural lesions still stimulates the search for additional diagnostic tools. Our research using vibrational spectroscopy and PCA statistical modeling represents a potentially useful tool to approach the problem. The objective method this paper explores is based on the correlation between different types of pleural lesions and their vibrational spectra. Obtained tissue spectra recorded by infrared spectroscopy allowed us to categorize spectra in different groups using a created PCA statistical model. The PCA model was built using tissues of known pathology as the model group. The validation samples were then used to confirm the functionality of our PCA model. Student's T-test was also used for comparing samples in paired groups. The PCA model was able to clearly differentiate the spectra

of mesothelioma, metastasis and reactive changes (inflammation), and place them in discrete groups. Thus, we showed that FT-IR spectroscopy combined with PCA can differentiate pleural lesions with high sensitivity and specificity. This new approach could contribute in objectively differentiating specific pleural lesions, thus helping pathologists to better diagnose difficult pleural samples but also could shed additional light into the biology of malignant pleural mesothelioma.

Keywords: Pleura, mesothelioma, inflammation, metastatic adenocarcinoma, Fourier transform infrared spectroscopy, FT-IR spectroscopy, principal component analysis, PCA

Introduction

Malignant mesothelioma is a rare tumor with extremely poor prognosis and a tendency to increase its incidence.^{1,2} The challenge to objectively diagnose this type of tumor is rather huge as histologic patterns of malignant mesothelioma can imitate the appearance of many epithelial and nonepithelial malignancies.³ Moreover, some reactive changes of mesothelial cells can also mimic malignant mesothelioma.³⁻⁶ Reactive mesothelial changes that can mimic malignancy can be seen in the infection, infarction, systemic diseases, inflammatory changes, radiotherapy and chemotherapy, liver diseases, and in secondary changes in association with primary or metastatic tumors.⁷

For the time being and despite its subjectivity, histopathological evaluation remains the golden standard in diagnostics.^{5,8} Immunohistochemistry is especially important in differential diagnosis of malignant pleural mesothelioma and helps in differentiating primary from metastatic disease, for example pulmonary adenocarcinoma.⁴ Standard immunohistochemical panel includes antibodies specific to mesothelium (calretinin, thrombomodulin, WT-1, D2-40, CK 5/6, mesothelin) and negative markers (such as CEA, TTF-1, MOC-31, Ber Ep4).⁹⁻¹³ A panel, including at least two positive and two negative stains helps in identifying lesions of the mesothelial origin.⁹

For pathology, the main challenge lies in differentiating between malignant and reactive mesothelial cells. Tumor invasion into a lung or surrounding fat and muscle tissue presently remains the only criterion of malignancy.^{3,9,14-16} Immunohistochemistry markers CD147 and GLUT-1 were used to differentiate reactive from malignant mesothelial cells, and they were shown to have sensitivity of 88.8% and 90.9% specificity.¹⁷ Recent studies have analyzed

possible markers for differentiating malignant from benign mesothelial cells, like loss of BAP-1 expression by immunohistochemistry and p16 deletion by FISH, together showing high specificity (100%) and good sensitivity representing the currently applied standard diagnostic tool.^{18–23} Also, MTAP and BAP-1 immunohistochemistry in combination were shown to be highly specific (100%) for diagnosis of malignant mesothelioma and sensitive in 90% of cases.^{24,25} CD47, being a molecule that inhibits the phagocytosis, was found to be overexpressed in malignant mesothelioma and in combination with BAP-1 was shown to be sensitive (78%) and specific (100%) to differentiate malignant mesothelioma from reactive mesothelial cells.²⁶ It has recently been shown that tumor cells can be distinguished from normal counterparts by comparing their Fourier transform infrared (FT-IR) spectra.^{27–29} The necessary information for the differentiation between normal and abnormal cell and tissues is based on their biochemical content which generates small differences in their infrared spectra (i.e., intensity, bandwidth and spectral position of the vibrational band).^{30–33} On the other hand, FT-IR spectroscopy offers many advantages in the cancer diagnosis such as simplicity, reproducibility, short procedures, and is a relatively cost-effective process.^{34–36} This method was also successfully used to distinguish other benign from malignant changes in organs such as colon, prostate, breast, cervix, stomach, oral, liver, skin, thyroid and esophageus.^{37–41}

The goal of our study was to evaluate FT-IR spectroscopy as an analytical method in mesothelial proliferations and as a possible diagnostic tool in pleural pathology. Finding a new diagnostic method should increase the diagnostic accuracy and help avoid misdiagnosis and inadequate treatment.

Materials and Methods

Tissue Samples

In our study, we compared the spectra of tissue samples from 32 patients with different pathology in order to identify a possible difference between them. Tissue samples of malignant mesothelioma of the pleura (mesothelioma), pleuritis, i.e., inflammation, adenocarcinoma metastatic to pleura (metastasis), and normal pleura were obtained from the paraffin blocks retrieved from the archives of the Department of Pathology, University of Zagreb School of Medicine. All used blocks originated from different patients.

Table I. Types and number of tissue samples.

Tissue type	Number of patients	Number of sections per patient	Sections for histopathology evaluation (5 μm thick)	Samples for FT-IR (10 μm thick)
Normal pleura	2	22	2	40
Inflammation	10	23	2	210
Mesothelioma	10	23	2	210
Metastasis	10	23	2	210
Total	32	91	8	670

As shown in Table I, 23 tissue sections were cut and prepared from each tissue block (patient) except for the normal pleura where we had 22 sections. The cutting was done on a sliding microtome (pmmmedical, Germany) after which the sections were placed on glass slides. The first and the last section were 5 μm thick, while the 21 others were 10 μm thick. The first and the last section were stained with hematoxylin and eosin (H&E) and re-examined by a pathologist using optical microscope in order to ascertain the tissue type. On the other hand, each of the 21 tissue sections (20 for normal pleura) from every block became a sample for FT-IR spectroscopy hence FT-IR spectrum was recorded from all 670 samples. Samples for FT-IR spectroscopy went through the deparaffinization process in which the removal of paraffin was done following standard histology protocols. The standard process of deparaffinization implies removal of paraffin from the tissue sample and rehydration of the cells. The tissue samples were put on silicon windows, placed in thermostat (60 °C) for one hour and deparaffinized by a standard procedure according to Bancroft et al.⁴² (xylene, alcohol, distilled water). Then, the samples were placed in vacuum for 60 minutes to extract remaining water since FT-IR spectra are sensitive to it (removing excess water from tissue, not from the cells) and thereafter their IR spectra were recorded.

FT-IR Spectroscopy

Vibrational spectra of the samples were recorded with PerkinElmer Spectrum GX spectrometer equipped with liquid N₂ refrigerated mercury–cadmium–telluride (MCT) detector. Optical grade

silicon windows were used for acquiring 1000 scan background, which was automatically subtracted from tissue spectra. 100 scans were recorded for each tissue section in order to obtain the vibrational spectra, which lasted around 5 min. for each sample. Data were acquired in 450–4000 cm^{-1} spectral range, in transmission mode with a resolution of 4 cm^{-1} . The sample area with diameter of ~ 1 cm was recorded at once. The resulting spectrum was a sum of contributions of all the tissues in the sample area with characteristics depending on the relative contributions of those tissues (i.e., different relative concentration of standard molecules existing in every biological material).

Data Analysis

The software Kinetics, running under Matlab R2010b (The Mathworks Inc.), was used for processing the spectra.³⁰ First, all recorded spectra were baseline corrected and normalized using the peak at 1646 cm^{-1} (amide I) at to exclude possible differences caused by the variations in recording conditions. Baseline of the spectra was determined by the lowest characteristic points along the spectrum; straight lines were interpolated between the selected points and then subtracted from the spectrum.^{43,44} Baseline correction and normalization are relevant preprocessing techniques for FT-IR spectra which create a linear correlation between absorbance and concentration. Many physical and chemical factors, like sample size, humidity, interferences, molecular interactions etc., can affect this correlation. The preprocessing techniques compensate the deviations from linear relationships and intensify the relationship between the spectral signals and concentrations of the analytes, although preprocessing corrections lead to slight changes of the raw spectra.

The Matlab R2010b and PLS_Toolbox (Eigenvector Research) were used to perform the principal component analysis (PCA). PCA is an unsupervised statistical method which reduces the multidimensional experimental data set to a much smaller number of uncorrelated variables called principal components.⁴⁵ Usually, only the first two principal components, PC1 and PC2, which account for most of the variance presented in the experimental data, are utilized in majority of applications. Whole mid-IR spectra (4000–450 cm^{-1}) were used for the PCA. Also, we used an advanced preprocessing method, generalized least squares weighting (GLSW), which is commonly utilized to identify the unwanted covariance structure (i.e., how variables change together) and remove these sources of variance from the data prior to calibration or prediction.^{46–}

⁴⁹ In our analysis, the application of GLSW was necessary in order to minimize the differences between spectra recorded during the prolonged period of time (e.g., possible variations in recording conditions such as humidity) and to remove information from the inter-referring compounds without losing relevant tissue type-related variability among the data (e.g., removing the differences caused by different subtypes inside all three investigated pathological tissue types and emphasizing the true spectral differences between these tissue types). Then, using PCA we made a quantitative model, which was used to identify unknown tissue samples by their FT-IR spectra. Based on the presented model, new undetermined samples can be checked in order to establish whether they belong to a certain group of pleural changes. The Venetian blind method, in which the program autonomously selects N number of sets with M number of spectra, which are excluded from the modelling set and then used for prediction of the modelling set was chosen for the cross-validation. The cross-validation has been performed for both the models; in the first created PCA model, the cross-validation is mainly used for the determination of number of principal components by calculating errors, while in the second PCA model (used for prediction), the cross-validation assesses the ability of the model to predict the testing set spectra position in PC1-PC2 space, i.e., determine the unknown tissue type.

To overcome the possible problem of overfitting, two additional classification algorithms were applied: partial least squares discriminate analysis (PLS-DA) (PLS Toolbox) and k-nearest neighbor (KNN) algorithm (RapidMiner).⁵⁰ For both procedures leave-one-out cross validation was utilized.

Another statistical method used to evaluate differences between studied groups was Student's T-test (STT). To obtain the difference spectra, the mean spectrum of one sample group was subtracted from the mean spectrum of the another group, in six combinations. Student's T-test was used to analyze the difference spectra in the manner that each wavenumber was examined to determine if the difference in intensity between mean spectra of two tissues is statistically significant.

Results

Histopathologic Evaluation

In our samples, selected from the archive of the Department of Pathology, University of Zagreb School of Medicine, the original histopathologic diagnoses were based on morphology and

immunohistochemical (IHC) analysis. For the purpose of this study the material was reviewed and the histopathological diagnosis was confirmed by one of the authors (SS) and ascertained by clinico-pathological and radiological correlation as well as follow up. In order to assure tissue quality and presence of given morphology the first and the last section of all selected paraffin blocks were stained with H&E and reviewed by a pathologist.




Figure 1. H&E staining. (a) normal pleura, (b) inflammation, (c) metastasis, and (d) mesothelioma. (e) A representative photograph of the sample's sizes.

The studied mesothelioma samples consisted of six epithelioid type, three sarcomatoid type, and one biphasic type. Metastasis samples originated from lungs (seven samples), colon (one sample), and kidney-clear cell (two samples). Tumor tissue in all samples from lungs consisted of atypical cylindrical to cuboid epithelial cells, forming regular to irregular glandular structures. Also the metastatic tumor tissue from colon consisted of glandular structures, while samples from kidney are composed of atypical epithelial clear cells forming closed lumens. In addition, all the tumors (metastatic and primary) were proven by immunohistochemically workup according to standard diagnostic guidelines. In our study, all inflammatory diseases of pleura samples were chronic inflammation including four samples of granulomatous pleuritis with giant cells. Normal pleural tissue samples were from visceral pleura, without lung tissue and prepared in a swiss role fashion (as seen in Figure 1a). A representative photograph of the sizes of the sample, which were almost all smaller than a beam diameter, is shown in Figure 1e.

Table II. Histopathology diagnosis (number of cases).

Tissue types	Histopathology diagnosis and number of cases		
Normal pleura	Normal tissue (2)		
Inflammation	Chronic inflammation (6)	Granulomatous pleuristis (4)	
Mesothelioma	Epitheloid (6)	Sarcomatoid (3)	Biphasic (1)
Metastatis	From lung (7)	From colon (2)	Clear cell type (1)

FT-IR Spectra

The infrared spectra of the studied tissues are complex, consisting of many spectral bands due to the presence of macromolecules (lipids, proteins, polysaccharides and nucleic acids). These tissues absorb the infrared light mostly in the two spectral regions: 800–1800 cm^{-1} and 2800–3700 cm^{-1} . The diameter of infrared light beam that passed through our tissue samples was 1 cm, hence everything that was in the field of 1 cm diameter of every sample was recorded in a FT-IR spectrum. As tumor samples are heterogenous in their composition, every compound of every sample gave its contribution to the recorded spectra.^{51–53} As an example of the aforementioned complexity, the mean spectra of all four tissue types are presented in Figure 2. Each mean spectrum was calculated from 210 spectra of the same tissue type except for the normal pleura which was calculated from 40 recorded spectra. Generally, IR spectra of almost all tissues are rather similar, which is also visible in Figure 2. where very small and inconclusive spectral difference can be noticed. Hence, in order to recognize differences between different pathologies and possibly separate samples into discrete groups, more powerful statistical analyses are needed.




Figure 2. Mean spectra from four groups of samples. Lines of different color represent different group: red: inflammation, blue: mesothelioma; yellow: metastasis; green: normal pleura.

Student's T-Test on FT-IR Spectra

Since the differences between mean spectra of four groups of samples on Figure 2 are not clearly visible, we performed Student's T-test (STT) on all six possible pairs of mean spectra of different tissue types: metastasis-mesothelioma, metastasis-inflammation, metastasis-pleura, mesothelioma-inflammation, mesothelioma-pleura, and inflammation-pleura. Significance level of $p < 0.01$ was used for all combinations. STT calculates statistically significant difference between intensities in mean spectra of the two tissue groups at each wavenumber.^{44,54}




Figure 3. Student's T-test for six possible combinations. Blue and green lines represent mean spectra of the compared groups of samples and the red line represents the differential spectrum between the following pairs. (a) metastasis and mesothelioma; (b) normal pleura and mesothelioma; (c) inflammation and mesothelioma; (d) metastasis and normal pleura; (e) inflammation and metastasis; (f) inflammation and normal pleura.

Results of STT performed on pairs of mean spectra is presented in Figure 3. In every STT, blue and green lines represent the mean spectra of the compared pairs, while the red line represents the differential spectrum between mean spectra of the two different groups of tissue. Thicker parts of the red lines in any differential spectrum represent wavenumbers with statistically significant difference. From

STT results presented in Figure 3, it is possible to assess the spectral regions that contribute most to the spectra differences between tissue types. Based on literature, vibrational bands present in FT-IR spectra of a biological tissue are listed in Table III.^{31,55,56} Student's T-test indicated the existence of certain statistically significant difference between the spectra of different pathologies which opened the possibility to use multivariable methods for tissue type differentiation.

Table III. Band assignments in FT-IR spectra of biological tissues.^{31,55,56}

Wavenumber (cm ⁻¹)	Assignment
3611	O–H and N–H stretching vibrations
3500–3600	OH bonds
3401	O–H and N–H stretching vibrations
3396	O–H asymmetric stretching
3330	N–H asymmetric stretching
3300	Amide A bands stemming from N–H stretching modes in proteins and acid nucleic
3008	Olefinic–CH stretching vibration: unsaturated lipids, cholesterol esters
1630–1670	Amide I, peptide, protein
1515–1570	Amide II, peptide, protein
1468	CH ₂ scissoring: lipids
1453	CH ₂ bending: mainly lipids with little contribution from proteins
1400	COO ⁻ symmetric stretching: fatty acids
1343	CH ₂ wagging: phospholipid fatty acid, triglyceride, amino acid side chains
1238	PO ₂ ⁻ asymmetric stretching fully hydrogen-bonded: mainly nucleic acids with little contribution from phospholipids
968	C–N ⁺ –C stretch: nucleic acids, ribose–phosphate main chain vibrations of RNA–DNA
933	Z-type DNA
915	Ribose ring vibrations: RNA–DNA
868	Left-handed helix DNA (Z form)

Principal Component Analysis

Observed differences in Figure 3 indicated a possibility to build a PCA model which might be able to distinguish between three investigated pathological tissue types and may identify spectra of unknown pathologies.⁴⁵ FT-IR spectra of biological samples are often very similar and important differences are covered with noise and spectral changes caused by small but unavoidable sample preparation variations. Therefore, statistical analysis must be used to recognize spectral changes due to the treatment or disease.

For the purpose of this research we created the PCA model from the recorded spectra in order to identify pathological tissue types. Figure 4 shows the scatterplot of PCA scores for the two first principal components of all recorded spectra from four groups: mesothelioma, metastasis, inflammation, and normal pleura. It is obvious that obtained data, which includes differences in intensity, bandwidth, and position of the vibrational band between spectra, are able to create a model that classifies unknown tissue samples into categories of different pathologies.




Figure 4. PC1-PC2 scatterplot as a result of PC analysis with all recorded spectra. Blue squares represent spectra of the mesothelioma, green stars represent the spectra of metastases, red triangles are inflammation spectra and light blue crosses are spectra of normal pleura.

Although there is not a clear distinction between the mean spectra of four groups of samples plotted in Figure 2, the difference between individual FT-IR spectra is visible after the application of PCA. As seen in Figure 4, in the PC1-PC2 principal component space, there is a difference between FT-IR spectra recorded from samples of mesothelioma, metastasis, inflammation, and normal pleura, hence it is possible to distinguish between four groups of tissues. Few spectra that overlap or fall into proximity of other groups do not change successfulness of presented PCA model. Reasons for overlapping spectra between two different tissue groups are probably small differences in recording conditions or sampling procedure. Nevertheless, their number is small and those spectra can be excluded from the model without

further consequences on the model precision. Number of problematic spectra can also be reduced by more precise defining of sample preparation and spectra recording procedure.

Unknown Sample Spectra Identification and Model Validation

In the final step, we validated the accuracy of our model in identification of the unknown samples. For that purpose, a new model was made using only three pathological tissue groups which pose differential diagnostic problems, i.e., normal pleura was excluded from the model.




Figure 5. PC1-PC2 scatterplot of the PCA model without spectra of normal pleura and the validation of the model. Green star: metastasis (model spectra); white rhombuses: identified metastasis (validation spectra); blue square: mesotheliomas (model spectra); purple triangles: identified mesothelioma (validation spectra); red triangles: inflammation (model spectra); turquoise crosses: identified inflammation (validation spectra).

The model used for identification of unknown samples was built with 150 randomly chosen spectra from each tissue group. The rest of spectra, 60 from each group, were used for model validation.⁵⁷ In Figure 5, which presents distribution of PC scores in the PC1-PC2 space, the new model validated by the total of 180 spectra recorded from mesothelioma, metastasis and inflammation of pleura is shown. Spectra used to create the PCA model are grouped in three separated regions in Figure 5, with one region for each tissue type. Every region is encircled by an ellipse surrounding the area where 95% of spectra of the same tissue type are placed. Inside those regions, symbols representing spectra used for modeling are found: Blue squares for mesothelioma samples, red triangles for inflammation samples, and green stars for metastasis samples. Validation spectra, also visible on Figure 5, are shown with purple triangles for mesotheliomas, turquoise crosses for inflammation and white rhombuses representing metastasis. Spectra used for model validation are also surrounded by an ellipse with specific color representing the region of particular sample type with color matching the color of the sample symbols. As can be seen, samples of the same, identified pathologies are grouped together and their groups are overlapping with region of the graph where modeling spectra are placed, showing that validation spectra were correctly identified. Although the region of the inflammation identifiers is wider than the others, only small number of spectra are overlapping with the region of metastatic tumors (only two from 210 spectra from metastasis). Furthermore, more than 90% of the spectra from inflammation group are placed inside the inflammation region of the graph. Sample heterogeneity or different type of sample inflammation might be the possible reasons for wider spread of inflammation spectra in the PC1-PC2 space. Thus we can infer that the new model, built from randomly chosen spectra was validated with more than 95% certainty. This model allows us to add more new recorded spectra of pleural lesions and those spectra will be identified by the model as being either mesothelioma, metastasis or inflammatory (reactive) changes. Since the model validation with the randomly chosen testing set implies that the samples from the same patients are used both in training and testing set, the possibility of false positive results is increased. In order to verify our results two different procedures were executed. In the first procedure a new testing set, created by extracting spectra recorded on samples from two random patients from every tissue group, was made and the PCA modelling and validation procedure was repeated yielding almost the same results (data not shown).

Second, we used two new algorithms for model training: PLS-DA and KNN. The results obtained by these algorithms are presented in form of the two confusion matrices given in Table IV. Both algorithms exhibit extremely high accuracy confirming the correctness and demonstrating the viability of our PCA model.

Table IV. Obtained confusion matrices for the PLS-DA and KNN algorithms.

PLS-DA	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3
Predicted as Class 1	205	1	0
Predicted as Class 2	3	208	1
Predicted as Class 3	1	0	206
KNN	Class 1	Class 2	Class 3
Predicted as Class 1	189	42	1
Predicted as Class 2	19	153	12
Predicted as Class 3	1	14	194

Discussion

Discriminating between different types of pleural lesions still remains a diagnostic challenge because of their often non-specific or overlapping histopathological appearance.³⁻⁶ Also, despite significant progress in the field so far, there is no specific stain that can ensure the definitive differential diagnosis between different types of reactive and malignant changes.¹⁶ PCA model presented in this article is a promising objective approach for their potential differentiation. Model and its validation are shown in Figure 5, in which it is visible that spectra from which model was made are clearly separated into three groups. Moreover, most of the spectra fall into a smaller ellipse which surrounds 95% of the same tissue type. Validation spectra are also grouped in the same areas, except there is a slight overlap between inflammation and metastasis validation group even though their overall separation is still very good. Furthermore, there is no overlapping of validation spectra between mesothelioma and metastasis group and between mesothelioma and inflammation group. From Figure 5 we estimate that PCA model accurately identified more than 95% of all validation spectra. For the current model the whole FT-IR spectra was used, while, as seen from STT (Figure 3), not all parts of spectra equally contribute to the spectral differences. We assume that some future model can be improved by using only

relevant parts of the spectra. Also, certain scattering of the spectra on PCA score graph (Figure 5) can be ascribed to small differences in sample preparation and recording conditions. That can be reduced if the details of FT-IR recording procedure are standardized. However, the presented model is already very successful in recognizing changes in pleural tissue and provides a new approach for tackling challenges in differential diagnostics.

As mentioned earlier, 10 blocks per tissue type were used in our experiment and each block was cut in 21 tissue sections (20 tissue sections for normal pleura). Consequently, more than 200 sections were produced for each tissue type hence our study altogether analysed 670 spectra from 670 tissue sections. For PCA modeling, each tissue section can be considered as a separate sample because of the small molecular inhomogeneities within each tissue block. As can be seen from validation process (Figure 5), the model built with this assumption is successful. Moreover, if the differences between blocks of the same tissue were significant, additional groups of spectra within a single tissue group, i.e., pathology would appear in both Figures 4 and 5. Since there are no additional groups, we can safely assume that each section behaves as a distinct sample of the same tissue type. In this article we showed that this kind of approach to tissue type and pathological changes identification is possible. For clinical application a model with tissue spectra from more patients must be built, so our next step will be to test this model on a larger patient cohort.

In our final model (Figure 5) spectra recorded on healthy pleura samples were excluded due to several reasons. First, normal pleura is very thin and amount of tissue collected during the diagnostic procedure is rather small thereby making it hard to produce samples with recordable infrared absorption. Second, normal pleura tissue can also be easily distinguished from pathological tissues using conventional methods, hence a special model for that purpose is not needed. Third, the PCA model can be successfully built without normal pleura because the distribution of pathological tissue spectra in the PC1-PC2 space does not depend on the spectra of normal pleura. Comparing the spectra distribution of in the PCA model where only pathologically changed tissue was used (Figure 5) and the one where normal pleura was included (Figure 4), it is obvious that relative positions of pathological spectra groups and their distributions are similar, suggesting that omission of the normal pleura group is an acceptable simplification. Furthermore, Figure 4 also shows a visible difference between three pathological

and one healthy tissue type and it is obvious that spectra from normal pleura formed a separated group, which shows the indubitable spectroscopical difference from the other tissue types. Preparation of samples for histopathology examination and the need for complex immunohistochemistry analysis is time-consuming and rather expensive. After the PCA model is built, the amount of time necessary for the analysis of new unknown samples is very short, approximately 30 minutes for the complete procedure which is performed on unstained formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded sections. So FT-IR combined with the PCA modelling promises to eventually be cost-effective and time-saving in comparison to the standard histopathological procedures.

The motivation behind this study was to create an objective method which makes it possible to distinguish between three most common types of pathological pleura tissues with accuracy at least comparable to standard pathological methods. Results showed that spectroscopic differences between pleural pathological tissues can be observed and used for their recognition utilizing PCA modeling. We also noticed that certain parts of spectra have stronger contribution to spectra separation in created PCA model. That fact will be used in our future work in order to detect which molecules undergo biochemical changes caused by certain disease.

Conclusion

From our results, we can conclude that FT-IR spectroscopy combined with PCA is very sensitive and can clearly distinguish different types of pleural lesions. FT-IR spectra of different pathology tissues were recorded followed by STT and PCA modeling which confirmed the existence of spectral difference between samples. Then, validation of the created PCA model showed that its accuracy is higher than 95%. This work indicates that FT-IR spectroscopy combined with PCA could represent a valuable tool in analyzing the still challenging problem of mesothelioma diagnosis although additional spectra of tissue samples should be recorded with more precise recording protocols in order to build a reliable clinical model.

Acknowledgments

This article was partially supported by the Croatian Science Foundation grant 4173 Reprogramiranje citoprotektivnih puteva u mezoteliomu [Reprogramming of cytoprotective pathways in malignant mesothelioma], by the Croatian Science Foundation under the project (IP-

2014-09-7046) and also by the project co-financed by the Croatian Government and the European Union through the European Regional Development Fund—the Competitiveness and Cohesion Operational Programme (KK. 01.1.1.01.0001).

Declaration of Conflicting Interests

The authors declare that they have no conflict of interests.

References

1. B.W.S. Robinson, R.A. Lake. "Advances in Malignant Mesothelioma". *N. Engl. J. Med.* 2005. 353(15): 1591–603.
2. M. Dogan, G. Utkan, C. Hoczade, D. Uncu, et al. "The Clinicopathological Characteristics with Long-Term Outcomes in Malignant Mesothelioma". *Med. Oncol.* 2014. 31(10): 232.
3. K.J. Butnor. "My Approach to the Diagnosis of Mesothelial Lesions". *J. Clin. Pathol.* 2006. 59(6): 564–574.
4. T.C. Allen. "Recognition of Histopathologic Patterns of Diffuse Malignant Mesothelioma in Differential Diagnosis of Pleural Biopsies". *Arch. Pathol. Lab. Med.* 2005. 129(11): 1415–1420.
5. K. Kadota, K. Suzuki, C.S. Sima, V.W. Rusch et al. "Pleomorphic Epithelioid Diffuse Malignant Pleural Mesothelioma: A Clinicopathological Review and Conceptual Proposal to Reclassify as Biphasic or Sarcomatoid Mesothelioma". *J. Thorac. Oncol.* 2011. 6(5): 896–904.
6. S. A. Sahn. "Pleural Diseases Related to Metastatic Malignancies". *Eur. Respir. J.* 1997. 10(8): 1907–1913.
7. H.A. Saleh, M. El-Fakharany, H. Makki, A. Kadhim, S. Masood. "Differentiating Reactive Mesothelial Cells from Metastatic Adenocarcinoma in Serous Effusions: The Utility of Immunocytochemical Panel in the Differential Diagnosis". *Diagn. Cytopathol.* 2009. 37(5): 324–332.
8. R.K. Dukor. "Vibrational Spectroscopy in the Detection of Cancer". In: P.R. Griffiths, J.M. Chalmers, editors. *Handbook of Vibrational Spectroscopy*. New Jersey: John Wiley and Sons. 2006.

9. W.D. Travis, E. Brambilla, A.P. Burke, A. Marx, A.G. Nicholson. WHO Classification of Tumours of the Lung, Pleura, Thymus, and Heart. Lyon: International Agency for Research on Cancer, 2015.
10. J.K. Trupiano, K.R. Geisinger, M.C. Willingham, P. Manders, et al. "Diffuse Malignant Mesothelioma of the Peritoneum and Pleura, Analysis of Markers". *Mod. Pathol.* 2004. 17(4): 476–481.
11. H. Kitazume, K. Kitamura, K. Mukai, Y. Inayama, et al. "Cytologic Differential Diagnosis Among Reactive Mesothelial Cells, Malignant Mesothelioma, and Adenocarcinoma: Utility of Combined E-Cadherin and Calretinin Immunostaining". *Cancer.* 2000. 90(1): 55–60.
12. C.E. Comin, L. Novelli, V. Boddi, M. Paglierani, S. Dini. "Calretinin, Thrombomodulin, CEA, and CD15: A Useful Combination of Immunohistochemical Markers for Differentiating Pleural Epithelial Mesothelioma from Peripheral Pulmonary Adenocarcinoma". *Hum. Pathol.* 2001. 32(5): 529–536.
13. E. Politi, C. Kandaraki, C. Apostolopoulou, T. Kyritsi, H. Koutselini. "Immunocytochemical Panel for Distinguishing Between Carcinoma and Reactive Mesothelial Cells in Body Cavity Fluids". *Diagn. Cytopathol.* 2005. 32(3): 151–155.
14. T. Kawai, M. Suzuki, K. Kageyama. "Reactive Mesothelial Cell and Mesothelioma of the Pleura". *Virchows Arch. A.* 1981. 393(3): 251–263.
15. P.T. Cagle, A. Churg. "Differential Diagnosis of Benign and Malignant Mesothelial Proliferations on Pleural Biopsies". *Arch. Pathol. Lab. Med.* 2005. 129(11): 1421–1427.
16. A.N. Husain, T.V. Colby, N.G. Ordóñez, T.C. Allen, et al. "Guidelines for Pathologic Diagnosis of Malignant Mesothelioma 2017 Update of the Consensus Statement from the International Mesothelioma Interest Group". *Arch. Pathol. Lab. Med.* 2018. 142(1): 89–108.
17. C. Pinheiro, A. Longatto-Filho, T.R. Soares, H. Pereira, et al. "CD147 Immunohistochemistry Discriminates Between Reactive Mesothelial Cells and Malignant Mesothelioma". *Diagn. Cytopathol.* 2012. 40(6): 478–483.
18. J. Andrici, A. Sheen, L. Sioson, K. Wardell, et al. "Loss of Expression of BAP1 is a Useful Adjunct, which Strongly Supports the Diagnosis of Mesothelioma in Effusion Cytology". *Mod. Pathol.* 2015. 28(10): 1360–1368.

19. B.S. Sheffield, H.C. Hwang, A.F. Lee, K. Thompson, et al. "BAP1 Immunohistochemistry and P16 FISH to Separate Benign from Malignant Mesothelial Proliferations". *Am. J. Surg. Pathol.* 2015. 39(7): 977–982.
20. M. Cigognetti, S. Lonardi, S. Fisogni, P. Balzarini, et al. "BAP1 (BRCA1-Associated Protein 1) is a Highly Specific Marker for Differentiating Mesothelioma from Reactive Mesothelial Proliferations". *Mod. Pathol.* 2015. 28(8): 1043–1057.
21. T. Hida, M. Hamasaki, S. Matsumoto, A. Sato, et al. "BAP1 Immunohistochemistry and P16 FISH Results in Combination Provide Higher Confidence in Malignant Pleural Mesothelioma Diagnosis: ROC Analysis of the Two Tests". *Pathol. Int.* 2016. 66(10): 563–570.
22. S. Monaco, M. Mehrad, S. Dacic. "Recent Advances in the Diagnosis of Malignant Mesothelioma: Focus on Approach in Challenging Cases and in Limited Tissue and Cytologic Samples". *Adv. Anat. Pathol.* 2018. 25(1): 24–30.
23. T. Matsubara, G. Toyokawa, Y. Yamada, K. Nabeshima, et al. "A Case of the Resected Lymphohistiocytoid Mesothelioma: BAP1 is a Key of Accurate Diagnosis". *Anticancer Res.* 2017. 37(12): 6937–6941.
24. T. Hida, M. Hamasaki, S. Matsumoto, A. Sato, et al. "Immunohistochemical Detection of MTAP and BAP1 Protein Loss for Mesothelioma Diagnosis: Comparison with 9p21 FISH and BAP1 Immunohistochemistry". *Lung Cancer.* 2017. 104: 98–105.
25. K.B. Berg, S. Dacic, C. Miller, S. Cheung, A. Churg. "Utility of Methylthioadenosine Phosphorylase Compared with BAP1 Immunohistochemistry, and CDKN2A and NF2 Fluorescence in Situ Hybridization in Separating Reactive Mesothelial Proliferations from Epithelioid Malignant Mesotheliomas". *Arch. Pathol. Lab. Med.* 2018. 142(12): 1549–1553.
26. C.M. Schürch, S. Forster, F. Brühl, S.H. Yang, et al. "The 'Don't Eat Me' Signal CD47 is a Novel Diagnostic Biomarker and Potential Therapeutic Target for Diffuse Malignant Mesothelioma". *Oncoimmunology.* 2017. 7(1): E1373235.
27. R. Gasper, G. Vandenbussche, E. Goormaghtigh. "Ouabain-Induced Modifications of Prostate Cancer Cell Lipidome Investigated with Mass Spectrometry and FT-IR Spectroscopy". *Biochim. Biophys. Acta.* 2011. 1808(3): 597–605.

28. R. Gasper, E. Goormaghtigh. "Effects of the Confluence Rate on the FT-IR Spectrum of PC-3 Prostate Cancer Cells in Culture". *Analyst*. 2010. 135(12): 3048–3051.
29. J. Sule-Suso, N.R. Forsyth, V. Untereiner, G.D. Sockalingum. "Vibrational Spectroscopy in Stem Cell Characterisation: is There a Niche?" *Trends Biotechnol.* 2014. 32(5): 254–262.
30. S. Rak, T. De Zan, J. Stefulj, M. Kosović, et al. "FT-IR Spectroscopy Reveals Lipid Droplets in Drug Resistant Laryngeal Carcinoma Cells Through Detection of Increased Ester Vibrational Bands Intensity". *Analyst*. 2014. 139(13): 3407–3415.
31. Z. Movasaghi, S. Rehman, I. Rehman. "Fourier Transform Infrared (FT-IR) Spectroscopy of Biological Tissues". *Appl. Spectrosc. Rev.* 2008. 43(2): 134-179.
32. A.I. Mazur, J.L. Monahan, M. Miljković, N. Laver, et al. "Vibrational Spectroscopic Changes of B-Lymphocytes Upon Activation. *J. Biophotonics*. 2013. 6(1): 101–109.
33. A.L. Mitchell, K.B. Gajjar, G. Theophilou, F.L. Martin, P.L. Martin-Hirsch. "Vibrational Spectroscopy of Biofluids for Disease Screening or Diagnosis: Translation from the Laboratory to a Clinical Setting". *J. Biophotonics*. 2014. 7(3–4): 153–165.
34. Q.B. Li, X.J. Sun, Y.Z. Xu, L.M. Yang, et al. "Diagnosis of Gastric Inflammation and Malignancy in Endoscopic Biopsies Based on Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy". *Clin. Chem.* 2005. 51(2): 346–350.
35. R.K. Sahu, S. Mordechai. "The Increasing Relevance of FT-IR Spectroscopy in Biomedicine". *J. Med. Phys. Appl. Sci.* 2015. 1(1): 1–3.
36. H.P. Wang, H.C. Wang, Y.J. Huang. "Microscopic FT-IR Studies of Lung Cancer Cells in Pleural Fluid". *Sci. Total Environ.* 1997. 204(3): 283–287.
37. D. Sheng, F. Xu, Q. Yu, T. Fang, et al. "A Study of Structural Differences Between Liver Cancer Cells and Normal Liver Cells Using FT-IR Spectroscopy". *J. Mol. Struct.* 2015. 1099: 18–23.
38. M. Wu, W. Zhang, P. Tian, X. Ling, Z.B. Xu. "Intraoperative Diagnosis of Thyroid Diseases by Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy Based on Support Vector Machine". *Int. J. Clin. Exp. Med.* 2016. 9(2): 2351–2358.
39. C.A. Lima, V.P. Goulart, L. Côrrea, T.M. Pereira, D.M. Zezell. "ATR-FT-IR Spectroscopy for the Assessment of Biochemical Changes in Skin Due to Cutaneous Squamous Cell Carcinoma". *Int. J. Mol. Sci.* 2015. 16(4): 6621–6630.

40. P.D. Lewis, K.E. Lewis, R. Ghosal, S. Bayliss, et al. "Evaluation of FT-IR Spectroscopy as a Diagnostic Tool for Lung Cancer Using Sputum". *BMC Cancer*. 2010. 10: 640.
41. M. Dimitrova, D. Ivanova, I. Karamancheva, A. Milev, I. Dobrev. "Application of FT-IR-Spectroscopy for Diagnosis of Breast Cancer Tumors". *J. Univ. Chem. Technol. Metall.* 2009. 44(3): 297–300.
42. J.D. Bancroft, C. Layton, S. Kim Suvarna. "Tissue Processing". In: S. Kim Suvarna, C. Layton, J.D. Bancroft, editors. *Bancroft's Theory and Practice of Histological Techniques*. London: Elsevier Ltd., 2018. Chap. 6, Pp. 73–138.
43. D.-W. Sun. "Fundamentals and Instruments". *Infrared Spectroscopy for Food Quality Analysis and Control*. Amsterdam: Elsevier Inc., 2009. Chap. 1, Pp. 1–174.
44. A. Gagneaux, J.M. Ruyschaert, E. Goormaghtigh. "Cell Discrimination by Attenuated Total Reflection-Fourier Transform Infrared Spectroscopy: The Impact of Preprocessing of Spectra". *Appl. Spectrosc.* 2006. 60(9): 1022–1028.
45. S. Wold, K. Esbensen, P. Geladi. "Principal Component Analysis". *Chemom. Intell. Lab. Syst.* 1987. 2: 37–52.
46. H. Martens, M. Høy, B.M. Wise, R. Bro, P.B. Brockhoff. "Pre-Whitening of Data by Covariance-Weighted Pre-Processing". *J. Chemom.* 2003. 17(3): 153–165.
47. U.K. Acharya, K.B. Walsh, P.P. Subedi. "Robustness of Partial Least-Squares Models to Change in Sample Temperature: I. A Comparison of Methods for Sucrose in Aqueous Solution". *J. Infrared Spectrosc.* 2014. 22(4): 279–286.
48. C.S. Silva, M.F. Pimentel, J.M. Amigo, C. García-Ruiz, F. Ortega-Ojeda. "Chemometric Approaches for Document Dating: Handling Paper Variability". *Anal. Chim. Acta.* 2018. 1031: 28–37.
49. M.G. Nespeca, G.B. Piassalonga, J.E. De Oliveira. "Infrared Spectroscopy and Multivariate Methods as a Tool for Identification and Quantification of Fuels and Lubricant Oils in Soil". *Environ. Monit. Assess.* 2018. 190(2): 72.
50. I. Mierswa, M. Wurst, R. Klinkenberg, M. Scholz, T. Euler. "YALE: Rapid Prototyping for Complex Data Mining Tasks". In: *Proceedings of the 12th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery and Data Mining*. 2006. Pp. 935–940. DOI: 10.1145/1150402.1150531.

51. N. McGranahan, C. Swanton. "Biological and Therapeutic Impact of Intratumor Heterogeneity in Cancer Evolution". *Cancer Cell*. 2015. 27(1): 15–26.
52. M. Gerlinger, A.J. Rowan, S. Horswell, J. Larkin, et al. "Intratumor Heterogeneity and Branched Evolution Revealed by Multiregion Sequencing". *N. Engl. J. Med.* 2012. 366(10): 883–892.
53. F. Vuletić, V. Zajec, L.B. Vuletić, S. Seiwert. "Intratumoral Heterogeneity". *Diagn. Pathol.* 2018. 4(1). DOI: 10.17629/www.diagnosticpathology.eu-2018-4:257.
54. R. Gasper, J. Dewelle, R. Kiss, T. Mijatovic, E. Goormaghtigh. "IR Spectroscopy as a New Tool for Evidencing Antitumor Drug Signatures". *Biochim. Biophys. Acta.* 2009. 1788: 1263–1270.
55. N.S. Ozek, S. Tuna, A.E. Erson-Bensan, F. Severcan. "Characterization of Microrna-125b Expression in MCF7 Breast Cancer Cells by ATR-FT-IR Spectroscopy". *Analyst.* 2010. 135(12): 3094–3102.
56. G. Bellisola, C. Sorio. "Infrared Spectroscopy and Microscopy in Cancer Research and Diagnosis". *Am. J. Cancer Res.* 2011. 2(1): 1–21.
57. R. Bro, K. Kjeldahl, A.K. Smilde, H.A. Kiers. "Cross-Validation of Component Models: A Critical Look at Current Methods". *Anal. Bioanal. Chem.* 2008. 390(5): 1241–1251.