The Key Genes for Perineural Invasion in Pancreatic Ductal Adenocarcinoma Identified With Monte-Carlo Feature Selection Method
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Background: Pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma (PDAC) is the most aggressive form of pancreatic cancer. Its 5-year survival rate is only 3–5%. Perineural invasion (PNI) is a process of cancer cells invading the surrounding nerves and perineural spaces. It is considered to be associated with the poor prognosis of PDAC. About 90% of pancreatic cancer patients have PNI. The high incidence of PNI in pancreatic cancer limits radical resection and promotes local recurrence, which negatively affects life quality and survival time of the patients with pancreatic cancer.

Objectives: To investigate the mechanism of PNI in pancreatic cancer, we analyzed the gene expression profiles of tumors and adjacent tissues from 50 PDAC patients which included 28 patients with perineural invasion and 22 patients without perineural invasion.

Method: Using Monte-Carlo feature selection and Incremental Feature Selection (IFS) method, we identified 26 key features within which 15 features were from tumor tissues and 11 features were from adjacent tissues.

Results: Our results suggested that not only the tumor tissue, but also the adjacent tissue, was informative for perineural invasion prediction. The SVM classifier based on these 26 key features can predict perineural invasion accurately, with a high accuracy of 0.94 evaluated with leave-one-out cross validation (LOOCV).

Conclusion: The in-depth biological analysis of key feature genes, such as TNFRSF14, XPO1, and ATF3, shed light on the understanding of perineural invasion in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma.
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INTRODUCTION

Pancreatic cancer is a type of common malignant tumor of the digestive tract, the most aggressive form of which is pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma (PDAC), which has a 5-year survival rate of only 3–5% (Huang et al., 2014). The poor prognosis of PDAC is largely due to the lack of early symptoms, explosive outcomes, and resistance to treatment (Pour et al., 2003). Currently, there is no effective method to detect pancreatic cancer in its early stages. However, with increasing insight into the mechanism of this cancer over time, novel therapies are being researched and developed (Rossi et al., 2014).

Pancreatic cancer has poor responses to conventional therapies, such as chemotherapy and irradiation (Rossi et al., 2014). Although surgery has been indicated to be an effective therapeutic approach to eliminate cancer cells, 70–81% of patients are rendered unresectable because of locally advanced disease or distant metastatic lesions (White et al., 2001; Mossner, 2010; Cai et al., 2013) and most patients who have undergone surgery experience recurrence and comorbidities (Pour et al., 2003). In the last few decades, Gemcitabine has been the preferred treatment option for PDAC. However, recent studies suggested that FOLFIRINOX (a regimen combining fluorouracil, leucovorin, oxaliplatin, and irinotecan) has shown a significant therapeutic advantage in patients with advanced PDAC (Kleger et al., 2014; Ferrone et al., 2015). In addition, the curative effect of oral fluorouracil in Asian patients with PDAC has been proven (Gid-Arregui and Juarez, 2015).

Most studies have focused on biomarkers to predict the progression or recurrence of PDAC. It has been reported that about 90% of the later stage pancreatic cancers have point mutations of KRAS, indicating that KRAS may be used as a diagnostic marker of PDAC (Campbell et al., 2007; De Oliveira et al., 2012; Zhang et al., 2014). SLIT2-ROBO signaling in PDAC has also been reported to enhance metastasis and predispose PDAC cells to neural invasion (Gohrig et al., 2014). There have also been some important and highly penetrative genes identified, such as CEACAM1, MCU, VDAC1, PKM2, CYCS, G1SORF52, TMEM51, LARP1, and ERLIN2 (Calabretta et al., 2016; Giulietti et al., 2016). Although many biomarkers have now been shown to be associated with PDAC, their effectiveness in the early detection of cancer still require verification.

Perineural invasion (PNI) is a process in which cancer cells invade the surrounding nerves and perineural spaces (Ceyhan et al., 2008), which is associated with recurrence (Dai et al., 2007; Gil et al., 2010) and poor outcome (Bapat et al., 2011). PNI also contributes to the severe pain syndrome in patients with advanced PDAC (Zhu et al., 1999; Esposito et al., 2008). It is estimated that the incidence of PNI reaches up to 90% in pancreatic cancer (Nakao et al., 1996). The high incidence of PNI in pancreatic cancer limits radical resection and promotes local recurrence, which negatively affects life quality and survival time of the patients with pancreatic cancer (Hirai et al., 2002). Among the factors influencing the prognosis of pancreatic cancer, PNI has gradually become an independent prognostic factor and pathological feature. Therefore, further studies are urgently needed to investigate the mechanism of PNI in pancreatic cancer, thus providing a theoretical basis for the treatment of pancreatic cancer. Adjacent tissues are important parts of a tumor microenvironment, and existing studies have taken adjacent tissues as normal tissues for control to study the difference between cancer tissues and normal tissues. However, present studies have indicated that there will still be some physiological changes in adjacent tissues affected by the tumor tissues of patients (Casbas-Hernandez et al., 2015; Yamakawa et al., 2019). A number of studies have included adjacent tissues in cancer research, and researchers have found that adjacent tissues can also serve as a marker of tumor prognosis (Lee et al., 2019). In this study, PNI was studied in combination with the differences between tumor tissues and adjacent tissues of patients to find prognostic biomarkers affecting PNI.

In this work, we analyzed the gene expression profiles of 28 pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma patients with perineural invasion and 22 pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma patients without perineural invasion. Both tumor and adjacent tissues were profiled. With Monte-Carlo feature selection and Incremental Feature Selection (IFS) method, 26 key features were identified. Interestingly, 15 of them were from tumor tissues but the other 11 features were from adjacent tissues. Our results proved that the microenvironment of the tumor is important for perineural invasion. Based on these 26 key features, a Support Vector Machine (SVM) predictor was constructed and its accuracy, evaluated with Leave-One-Out Cross Validation (LOOCV), was 0.94, which needs to be validated in another independent large dataset. But many key feature genes, such as TNFRSF14, XPO1, and ATF3, showed great promise on explaining perineural invasion in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Datasets

We downloaded the gene expression profiles of tumors and adjacent tissues in 50 pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma patients from GEO (Gene Expression Omnibus) under accession number GSE102238 (Yang et al., 2020). In this dataset, 28 patients had perineural invasion while 22 patients had an absence of perineural invasion. Each patient had both tumor and adjacent tissues profiled. With Monte Carlo feature selection and Incremental Feature Selection (IFS) method, 26 key features were found to be associated with PDAC, their effectiveness in the early detection of cancer still require verification.

Perineural invasion (PNI) is a process in which cancer cells invade the surrounding nerves and perineural spaces (Ceyhan et al., 2008), which is associated with recurrence (Dai et al., 2007; Gil et al., 2010) and poor outcome (Bapat et al., 2011). PNI also contributes to the severe pain syndrome in patients with advanced PDAC (Zhu et al., 1999; Esposito et al., 2008). It is estimated that the incidence of PNI reaches up to 90% in pancreatic cancer (Nakao et al., 1996). The high incidence of PNI in pancreatic cancer limits radical resection and promotes local recurrence, which negatively affects life quality and survival time of the patients with pancreatic cancer (Hirai et al., 2002). Among the factors influencing the prognosis of pancreatic cancer, PNI has gradually become an independent prognostic factor and pathological feature. Therefore, further studies are urgently needed to investigate the mechanism of PNI in pancreatic cancer, thus providing a theoretical basis for the treatment of pancreatic cancer. Adjacent tissues are important parts of a tumor microenvironment, and existing studies have taken adjacent tissues as normal tissues for control to study the difference between cancer tissues and normal tissues. However, present studies have indicated that there will still be some physiological changes in adjacent tissues affected by the tumor tissues of patients (Casbas-Hernandez et al., 2015; Yamakawa et al., 2019). A number of studies have included adjacent tissues in cancer research, and researchers have found that adjacent tissues can also serve as a marker of tumor prognosis (Lee et al., 2019). In this study, PNI was studied in combination with the differences between tumor tissues and adjacent tissues of patients to find prognostic biomarkers affecting PNI.

In this work, we analyzed the gene expression profiles of 28 pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma patients with perineural invasion and 22 pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma patients without perineural invasion. Both tumor and adjacent tissues were profiled. With Monte-Carlo feature selection and Incremental Feature Selection (IFS) method, 26 key features were identified. Interestingly, 15 of them were from tumor tissues but the other 11 features were from adjacent tissues. Our results proved that the microenvironment of the tumor is important for perineural invasion. Based on these 26 key features, a Support Vector Machine (SVM) predictor was constructed and its accuracy, evaluated with Leave-One-Out Cross Validation (LOOCV), was 0.94, which needs to be validated in another independent large dataset. But many key feature genes, such as TNFRSF14, XPO1, and ATF3, showed great promise on explaining perineural invasion in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma.
Identification of Key Genes Using Monte-Carlo Feature Selection

As we can see, the feature number was much greater than the sample size. If we directly used so many features to classify the patients, it would obviously overfit. To partially solve this problem, we adopted the Monte-Carlo feature selection method (Draminski et al., 2008) to rank the features. The Monte-Carlo feature selection method randomly chooses a number of features and then constructs a number of tree classifiers (Chen et al., 2018a; Pan et al., 2018; Wang et al., 2018). Based on these tree classifiers, it assigns each feature an importance value. If a feature is selected by many tree classifiers, it is more important than others.

Let us formulate the algorithm formally. Suppose \( d \) is the total number of features, we randomly select \( m \) features (\( m \ll d \)) for \( s \) times and construct \( t \) trees for each of the \( s \) subsets. At last, \( s \times t \) classification trees will be constructed. A feature \( g \)'s relative importance (RI) can be reflected by how many times it is used to set a decision rule by the \( s \times t \) trees and how much it contributes to the classification of the \( s \times t \) trees, and is calculated with the equation below:

\[
RI_g = \sum_{\tau=1}^{s} (wAcc)^u \sum_{n_g(\tau)} IG(n_g(\tau)) \left( \frac{\text{no. in } n_g(\tau) \text{ in } 1 \text{ to } \tau}{\text{no. in } \tau} \right)^v
\]

(1)

where \( wAcc \) is the weighted classification accuracy of decision tree, \( IG(n_g(\tau)) \) is the information gain of node \( n_g(\tau) \), \( \text{no. in } n_g(\tau) \text{ in } 1 \text{ to } \tau \) is the number of samples under node \( n_g(\tau) \), \( \text{no. in } \tau \) is the number of samples in decision tree and \( u \) and \( v \) are parameters.

To be more specific, \( wAcc \) is defined as follows:

\[
wAcc = \frac{1}{c} \sum_{i=1}^{c} \frac{n_{ij}}{n_{i1} + n_{i2} + \cdots + n_{ic}}
\]

(2)

where \( c \) is the number of classes (it is 2 in this study) and \( n_{ij} \) is the number of samples from class \( i \) that are classified as class \( j \) (\( i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, c \)).

The features were ranked based on their RI values from large to small as \( F \)

\[
F = [f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_N]
\]

(3)

where \( N \) is the total number of features (50,984 for this study).

Construction of SVM Predictor for Perineural Invasion

Although all features were ranked using Monte-Carlo feature selection, it was not clear how many top features should be selected to construct a final predictor for perineural invasion. To choose the final key features for the predictor, we adopted the Incremental Feature Selection (IFS) method (Wang et al., 2017; Zhang et al., 2017; Chen et al., 2018b,c; Li et al., 2018) to optimize the key features and their predictor. We tested 500 different feature sets \( (F_1, F_2, \ldots, F_{500}) \), where \( F_i = [f_1, f_2, \ldots, f_i] \). In other words, feature set \( F_i \) contains the top \( i \) features in \( F \) from equation (2). For each feature set, we constructed a support vector machine (SVM) predictor. Based on the number of features and their accuracy, we can balance the model complexity and performance and choose the final key features and optimized model. In this study, the SVM predictor was constructed using R function svm from package e1017 and leave-one-out cross validation (LOOCV) was used to evaluate the performance of the SVM predictor.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The Top Discriminative Genes Between Patients Were With Perineural Invasion and Without Perineural Invasion

The gene expression profiles in the tumor and adjacent tissues can represent the difference between pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma patients with perineural invasion and without perineural invasion. The gene expression in the tumor directly shows the activity of pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma while the gene expression in the adjacent tissue reflect the microenvironment of the tumor. Therefore, we combined the gene expression profiles in tumors and in adjacent tissues for each patient and compared the combined profiles between pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma patients with perineural invasion and
**TABLE 1** | The 26 key discriminative features between patients with perineural invasion and without perineural invasion.

| Rank | Tissue | Probe | RI | Probe sequence | blastn Score | blastn Identities | Chromosome position | Gene symbol |
|------|--------|-------|----|----------------|--------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 1    | Adjacent | p12601 | 0.0518 | GGCTGAAGGAGAATCTCATATATATTAAAA GTGGTACAGATGGTTGGGAC2AAGA | 11 bits (60) | 60/60 (100%) | chr4:3545147-3545206 | AL590235.1 |
| 2    | Tumor | p18602 | 0.0395 | CTTGCGATTTCGACCTGTCTATCTGAAATGGGA GAAAGGAAAGAATTATATCAC | 11 bits (60) | 60/60 (100%) | chr12:25944921-25944862 | RASSF8-AS1 |
| 3    | Tumor | A_24_P88801 | 0.0370 | CAGACGGAGTCTAGAACTTTTGAGCCTTACG AGCAAGCTTATGTGTGCCTTGGTGAAC | 11 bits (60) | 60/60 (100%) | chr2:110123870-110123811 | NPHP1 |
| 4    | Tumor | A_33_P3329128 | 0.0352 | GGCTCGTGGGAAATCATATTATTTTAAA GTTGACTCACAGTTTGGAACAAGA | 11 bits (60) | 60/60 (100%) | chr4:3545147-3545206 | AL590235.1 |
| 5    | Adjacent | A_21_P0010506 | 0.0271 | TTAGGCCAAGTGTGGAGAAATCAATGATGT TGACGATGAGGCTCCCTGAGAAATCACA | 11 bits (60) | 60/60 (100%) | chr1:2565049-2565108 | TNFRSF14 |
| 6    | Adjacent | A_24_P941759 | 0.0243 | ATGCTTCAAGTAAATGCAATACAAAACATA ACCACTATTAGTGAATTCATTGATAT | 11 bits (60) | 60/60 (100%) | chr14:30619533-30619592 | G2E3 |
| 7    | Adjacent | p14843 | 0.0238 | AGTGACTGATTGAAACAGTTGTACCGTA TATAGGAAGGGGCTCTTGTATGAATATG | 80.5 bits (43) | 43/43 (100%) | chr7:19813727-19813685 | AC004543.1 |
| 8    | Adjacent | p28694 | 0.0238 | CATTACTGGCGTGAATGGGAATATGAA AGATGTGCGCAGAATACGTAGCAAGGGGCAAGAAGGAGG | 11 bits (60) | 60/60 (100%) | chr1:1660100-1660159 | FO704657.1/SLC35E2B |
| 9    | Tumor | p4684 | 0.0236 | AAGGTGTTGAAGCATAGACGCTGGAACATAAATG ACTCATGCTCCTCACTGGAAGAAGG | 11 bits (60) | 60/60 (100%) | chr14:106365450-106365391 | LINC02320 |
| 10   | Adjacent | A_23_P170088 | 0.0214 | ATCTCTTCTCTGTCTTTAGGGCTCTCCTCC CTTACGTCTCCTGCTGCACCTCTGTGTCAAC | 106 bits (57) | 59/60 (98%) | chr9:137392642-137392583 | EXD3 |
| 11   | Tumor | A_23_P988372 | 0.0198 | TCAAGTGAAGAGAAAGGAAAATACCTGTGGCGCTAA ACCGCTTCTCCTTACTATTACGAGCAGC | 11 bits (60) | 60/60 (100%) | chr9:136115009-136114960 | TMEM250 |
| 12   | Tumor | A_24_P277673 | 0.0191 | CAAAGTGACTGAGGATGTAATCTTGCGGCGCATTACC AAGTGCGCATCTGCGGCGCTTGGGCC | 11 bits (60) | 60/60 (100%) | chr6:26246918-26246859 | HIST1H4G |
| 13   | Tumor | A_19_P00803575 | 0.0190 | AAGCGAGTTGTATAATTCATCTCGTGGTGG TATTCTTGTCCTAATGTAGCTAGTGGCTAAGC | 11 bits (60) | 60/60 (100%) | chr17:17192194-17192253 | MPRT5 |

(Continued)
| Rank | Tissue | Probe | RI   | Probe sequence (Genomic) | blastn Score | blastn Identities | Chromosome position | Gene symbol |
|------|--------|-------|------|--------------------------|--------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------|
| 14   | Tumor  | A_33_P3802966 | 0.0190 | GAGGGGATACATCGACGCGGACGTCG | 111 bits (60) | 60/60 (100%) | chr7:120932228-120932169 | No significant similarity found |
| 15   | Adjacent | A_32_P207124 | 0.0166 | CCCTGCGTTCCCTTGGGTCTGTGT | 111 bits (60) | 60/60 (100%) | chr22:42027707-42027766 | WBP2NL |
| 16   | Tumor  | A_23_P410128 | 0.0165 | ACGCAACCAAAATAAAGATGATTTATGGGT | 111 bits (60) | 60/60 (100%) | chr7:28738207-28738148 | CREB5 |
| 17   | Adjacent | p28485   | 0.0157 | AGTGGAGGCTTAAGAGGTGTTTCTTCT | 111 bits (60) | 60/60 (100%) | chr5:92432262-924322203 | AC114316.1/AC124854.1 |
| 18   | Tumor  | A_33_P3349334 | 0.0149 | AGGGCTTGTATGATCTATTCCTTTCAAAATG | 111 bits (60) | 60/60 (100%) | chr14:55049328-55049387 | SOCS4 |
| 19   | Adjacent | A_33_P349334 | 0.0148 | ACGCTTGTATGCTATTTTCAGCTAA | 111 bits (60) | 60/60 (100%) | chr2:61478760-61478701 | AC017627.1/XPO1 |
| 20   | Adjacent | RNA95815 | 0.0145 | AGATGGGAAGGCCAAGGAAATGCC | 106 bits (57) | 59/60 (98%) | chrM:7526-7585 | MT-TD |
| 21   | Adjacent | RNA95815 | 0.0145 | TAAAAGGAGAAAGGGAGGGGCAGGTGTC | 111 bits (60) | 60/60 (100%) | chr13:98797175-98797116 | DOCK9 |
| 22   | Tumor  | A_33_P2359817 | 0.0142 | AGAAGATGGAAAGCGCACTTATGTGAATGCC | 111 bits (60) | 60/60 (100%) | chr20:566600085-566600144 | ATF3 |
| 23   | Tumor  | RNA95815 | 0.0141 | TAAAGAGGAGGGGAGGAGACCTTTGT | 111 bits (60) | 60/60 (100%) | chr1:19188401-19188460 | UBP4 |
| 24   | Adjacent | A_24_P338953 | 0.0139 | TGGTAAGTAAACGTTTATTCATGACGG | 111 bits (60) | 60/60 (100%) | chr20:8871665-8871724 | PLCB1 |
without perineural invasion using Monte-Carlo feature selection. Based on the RI values, which represented how well a gene feature can classify the two groups of patients, we ranked all the features and further analyzed the top 500 discriminative genes.

The Final Key Features and SVM Predictor for Perineural Invasion

With IFS method (Chen et al., 2017a,b,c,d; Li and Huang, 2017; Liu et al., 2017), we evaluated the prediction accuracy of different feature sets and plotted the IFS curve in which the X-axis was the number of features and the Y-axis was their prediction accuracy evaluated with LOOCV. The IFS curve was shown in Figure 1. It can be seen that when 175 genes were used, the accuracy was the highest, at 0.96. But when only 26 genes were used, the accuracy became 0.94. Balancing both model complexity and performance, we chose the 26 genes as the final key features and their SVM predictor as the optimized predictor for perineural invasion. The 26 key features were given in Table 1. With the 26 key features, 15 features were from tumor tissues while 11 features were from adjacent tissues. These results suggested that not only the tumor tissue, but also the adjacent tissue, was informative for perineural invasion prediction.

Compare the SVM Predictor With Other Classification Methods

To compare the SVM predictor with other classification methods, we tried three other classification algorithms: decision tree (R function rpart from package rpart), nearest neighbor (R function knn with k = 1 from package class), and naive Bayes (R function naiveBayes from package e1071). The highest accuracies of decision tree, nearest neighbor, naive Bayes were 0.76 with 24 features, 0.94 with 44 features, and 0.94 with 185 features, respectively. Their performances were worse than SVM and required more features.

Compare the Monte-Carlo Feature Selection With Other Seven Feature Selection Methods

There have been many feature selection methods. Each has its assumption and application scenario. Therefore, we compared the Monte-Carlo feature selection results with seven other feature selection methods in Weka (Frank et al., 2016): chi-squared statistic (ChiSquared), correlation (Correlation), gain ratio (GainRatio), information gain (InfoGain), OneR classifier (OneR), ReliefF (ReliefF), and symmetrical uncertainty

| Monte Carlo | Best Rank in other seven methods | ChiSquared | Correlation | GainRatio | InfoGain | OneR | ReliefF | SymmetricalUncert |
|-------------|---------------------------------|------------|-------------|-----------|----------|------|---------|------------------|
| 1           | OneR 4                          | 6          | 12          | 51        | 12       | 4    | 21      | 15               |
| 2           | ChiSquared 14                    | 14         | 49          | 52        | 24       | 94   | 306     | 30               |
| 3           | GainRatio 2                      | 18         | 1121        | 2         | 16       | 267  | 11      | 9                |
| 4           | GainRatio 4                      | 20         | 501         | 4         | 15       | 227  | 220     | 8                |
| 5           | SymmetricalUncert 5             | 13         | 38          | 13        | 10       | 527  | 1602    | 5                |
| 6           | ReliefF 4                       | 26         | 43          | 168       | 39       | 613  | 4       | 67               |
| 7           | Correlation 8                   | 10         | 8           | 135       | 19       | 1839 | 80      | 29               |
| 8           | SymmetricalUncert 3             | 11         | 74          | 12        | 9        | 6306 | 121     | 3                |
| 9           | ChiSquared 25                   | 25         | 47          | 170       | 38       | 5466 | 194     | 69               |
| 10          | Correlation 5                   | 40         | 5           | 140       | 48       | 760  | 545     | 72               |
| 11          | GainRatio 1                     | 19         | 1205        | 1         | 18       | 10   | 67      | 11               |
| 12          | GainRatio 29                    | 123        | 1697        | 29        | 114      | 11583| 8543    | 46               |
| 13          | Correlation 1                   | 31         | 1           | 17        | 13       | 73   | 3       | 14               |
| 14          | Correlation 6                   | 45         | 6           | 9         | 31       | 1037 | 160     | 22               |
| 15          | ChiSquared 1, InfoGain 1,        | 1          | 89          | 11        | 1        | 13   | 7       | 1                |
|             | SymmetricalUncert 1             |            |             |           |          |      |         |                   |
| 16          | ChiSquared 1, SymmetricalUncert 4| 12         | 239         | 14        | 11       | 4030 | 128     | 4                |
| 17          | ReliefF 38                      | 100        | 2787        | 238       | 155      | 1528 | 38      | 269              |
| 18          | ChiSquared 53                   | 53         | 106         | 417       | 57       | 366  | 572     | 192              |
| 19          | GainRatio 3                     | 17         | 1935        | 3         | 17       | 609  | 115     | 10               |
| 20          | ChiSquared 22                   | 22         | 581         | 406       | 34       | 4094 | 335     | 97               |
| 21          | ChiSquared 15                   | 15         | 3593        | 251       | 26       | 2325 | 489     | 66               |
| 22          | ChiSquared 16                   | 16         | 21          | 250       | 25       | 45   | 56      | 65               |
| 23          | ChiSquared 41                   | 41         | 303         | 139       | 50       | 3739 | 329     | 70               |
| 24          | ChiSquared 62                   | 62         | 2882        | 404       | 120      | 197  | 2038    | 259              |
| 25          | ReliefF 429                    | 10141      | 12902       | 10141     | 10141    | 6549 | 429     | 10141            |
| 26          | ReliefF 52                     | 71         | 1801        | 438       | 142      | 11874| 52      | 288              |
FIGURE 2 | The IFS curves of seven other feature selection methods from Weka. (A) The IFS curve of ChiSquaredAttributeEval; (B) The IFS curve of CorrelationAttributeEval; (C) The IFS curve of GainRatioAttributeEval; (D) The IFS curve of InfoGainAttributeEval; (E) The IFS curve of OneRAttributeEval; (F) The IFS curve of ReliefFAttributeEval; (G) The IFS curve of SymmetricalUncertAttributeEval. The IFS curves of seven other feature selection methods from Weka were plotted. Their peak accuracies were 0.88, 0.94, 0.90, 0.88, 0.76, 0.92, and 0.88, all smaller than the highest accuracy of Monte-Carlo feature selection, which was 0.96.

(SymmetricalUncert). The default parameters in Weka were used for the seven feature selection methods.

We checked the ranks of the 26 key features selected by the Monte-Carlo method in the other seven feature selection methods. Their ranks were listed in Table 2. It can be seen that most of the features ranked on top with other methods as well. The first feature by Monte-Carlo ranked fourth by OneR, the third feature ranked second by GainRatio, the fourth feature ranked fourth by GainRatio, the fifth feature ranked fifth by SymmetricalUncert, the sixth feature ranked fourth by ReliefF, the seventh feature ranked eighth by Correlation, and the eighth feature ranked third by SymmetricalUncert.

Similarly, for the seven methods, the top 500 ranked genes were further evaluated with IFS and their accuracies were used to represent how different they were between two groups of samples. The IFS results of the seven feature selection methods in Weka was shown in Figure 2. It can be seen that the peak LOOCV SVM accuracies of ChiSquared, Correlation, GainRatio, InfoGain, OneR, ReliefF, and SymmetricalUncert were 0.88, 0.94, 0.90, 0.88, 0.76, 0.92, and 0.88, respectively. They were all smaller than the highest accuracy of Monte-Carlo feature selection, which was 0.96.

We compared the best Monte-Carlo genes with the best genes selected by the other seven methods in Weka using R package SuperExactTest1 (Wang et al., 2015). The number of overlapped genes between Monte-Carlo and SymmetricalUncert, ReliefF, OneR, InfoGain, GainRatio, Correlation, and ChiSquared were 10, 10, 4, 11, 13, 5, and 12, respectively. The enrichment p values between Monte-Carlo and SymmetricalUncert, ReliefF, OneR, InfoGain, GainRatio, Correlation, and ChiSquared were 4.88E-31, 3.41E-22, 1.78E-08, 3.85E-33, 7.46E-31, 4.57E-14, and 4.40E-36, respectively. The Monte-Carlo selected genes were most like the ChiSquared selected genes and most unlike the OneR selected genes.

**The Biological Functions of Key Genes for Perineural Invasion**

The probes of Agilent-052909 CBC_IncRNAmRNA_V3 microarray were poorly annotated. We mapped the probe sequence onto the human genome using blastn2 with default parameters against Genome (GRCh38.p12 reference, Annotation Release 109) and identified the best match genes for these probes.

1https://CRAN.R-project.org/package=SuperExactTest
2https://blast.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov
Zhu et al. Key Genes for PDAC

The biological functions of the 15 genes from tumor tissues, the 11 genes from adjacent tissues, and the combined 26 genes were analyzed using GATHER\(^3\). The enrichment results were shown in Table 3. For tumor signature genes, they were significantly enriched onto GO:0016043: cell organization and biogenesis and GO:0006996: organelle organization and biogenesis with a \(p\) value of 0.0004 and 0.006, respectively. For adjacent genes, TNFRSF14 was involved in hsa04060: Cytokine-cytokine receptor interaction. DOCK9, NPHP1, and SOCS4 from tumors and CREB5 and XPO1 from adjacent tissues were all targets of transcription factor NF-\(\kappa\)B.

Bockman DE et al. found that a large number of molecules, such as LIF (Bressy et al., 2018), CCL2–CCR2 (Jessen and Mirsky, 2016), and NCAM (Deborde et al., 2016), were involved in PNI by studying the paracrine mechanism of signal transduction between nerves and cancer cells (Wang et al., 2014). For instance, cellular adhesion molecules LICAM mediates the homologous interaction between the tumor and nerves and increases PNI to promote the development of cancer (Ben et al., 2014; Lund et al., 2015). According to Giulia Gasparini et al., nerve growth factor (NGF) may be involved in the migration of glial cells in PNI. The results suggested that high levels of NGF and its affinity receptor TrkA were associated with the frequency of occurrence and severity of PNI, as well as decreased survival time and increased pain in patients with PDAC (Barbacid, 1995; Demir et al., 2010; Wang et al., 2014; Gasparini et al., 2019). The importance of GDNF-RET signal transduction in PDAC nerve invasion has been emphasized in many studies (Gil et al., 2010; Demir et al., 2012). Demir et al. have shown that in PDAC, soluble GFR\(\alpha\)1 released by nerves can promote the binding of neural GDNF and RET in pancreatic adenocarcinoma, thus enhancing PNI (He et al., 2014; Mulligan, 2018). The synthesis, secretion, and transport of these cytokines are carried out by organelle organization, such as ribosomes and endoplasmic reticulum (Alrawashdeh et al., 2019). This evidence supports our findings that there is a close relationship between GO:0006996 (organelle organization), hsa04060 (Cytokine-cytokine receptor interaction), and PDAC PNI. In addition, some studies have shown that the activation of the NF-\(\kappa\)B signaling pathway affects a wide range of biological processes, including immunity, inflammation, stress response, B cell development, and lymphoid organogenesis (Yu et al., 2017; Balaji et al., 2018), while PNI in PDAC is associated with lymph node metastasis (Chatterjee et al., 2012).

We investigated their clinical relevance with the survival of 117 pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma patients from Kaplan Meier-plotter\(^4\) (Nagy et al., 2018). 17 genes were included in the database. 11 of them (NPHP1, WBP2NL, EXD3, G2E3, DOCK9, CT47A12, TMEM250, PLCB1, XPO1, HIST1H4G, and SLC35E2B) were significant with a \(p\) value smaller than 0.05 and one (ATF3) was marginally significant with a \(p\) value of 0.074. The Kaplan Meier plot of these 12 survival-associated genes were shown in Supplementary Figure 1.

\[^{3}https://changlab.uth.tmc.edu/gather/\]
\[^{4}https://kmplot.com/analysis/\]

| Function | GO:0016043: cell organization and biogenesis | GO:0006996: organelle organization and biogenesis | V$HEN1_02: HEN1 | V$NFKB_Q6: NF-kappaB |
|----------|---------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------|-----------------|----------------------|
| # Genes  | HIST1H4G, NPHP1, SOCS4                       | HIST1H4G, NPHP1                               | NPHP1, SOCS4    | DOCK9, NPHP1, SOCS4  |
| \(p\) value | 0.0004                                      | 0.006                                        | 0.0003          | 0.0002               |
| Bayes factor | 4                                           | 2                                           | 4               | 3                    |

| Function | V$USF_01: upstream stimulating factor       | V$MYC_Q2                                      | V$NMYC_01: N-Myc | V$MYCMAX_02: c-Myc:Max heterodimer |
|----------|--------------------------------------------|----------------------------------------------|-----------------|-----------------------------------|
| # Genes  | ATF3, CREB5, TNFRSF14, XPO1               | ATF3, CREB5, TNFRSF14, XPO1                  | ATF3, CREB5, XPO1 | ATF3, CREB5, XPO1                 |
| \(p\) value | <0.0001                                    | 0.0004                                       | 0.0001          | 0.0008                            |
| Bayes factor | 7                                           | 5                                           | 3               | 3                                 |

**Table 3** The enriched functions of the 15 genes from tumor tissues, the 11 genes from adjacent tissues, and the combined 26 genes using GATHER.
To select the most possible key genes, we constructed the network of the 26 genes using STRING database\(^5\) version 11.0 (Szklarczyk et al., 2018). The network of the identified genes was shown in Figure 3. It can be seen that six genes from tumors were mapped onto the network and they can be grouped into three categories: (1) the XPO1, UBR4, EXD3 cluster in which XPO1 was the hub gene with degree of six (RAN, RANGAP1, CDC42, JUN, UBR4, EXD3); (2) the ATF3, CREB5 cluster in which ATF3 was the hub gene with degree of five (JUN, ATF4, CDC42, AH11, CREB5); and (3) the TNFRSF14 cluster in which the degree of TNFRSF14 was three (JUN, BTLA, TNFRSF14). Therefore, the three genes (XPO1, ATF3, and TNFRSF14) from tumors were the hubs.

Probe A_21_P0010506, ranked 5th in Table 1, was mapped onto TNFRSF14. TNFRSF14, also known as HVEM, encodes a member of the TNF receptor superfamily that activates either proinflammatory or inhibitory signaling pathways (Pasero et al., 2012). Recent reports indicate that HVEM and its ligands may also be involved in tumor progression and resistance to immune response (Derre et al., 2010). The tumor microenvironment of
Pancreatic cancer is a common cancer and pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma (PDAC) is the most aggressive subtype, with a 5-year survival rate of only 3–5%. Perineural invasion (PNI) is associated with the poor prognosis of PDAC. Adjacent tissues are normal tissues that grow around tumors. There are often some capillaries and immune cells in the adjacent tissues due to the influences of tumor invasion. Adjacent tissues are often some capillaries and immune cells in the adjacent tissues due to the influences of tumor invasion. Adjacent tissues constitute the tumor microenvironment (Degos et al., 2019; Harmon et al., 2019). Many studies have been conducted on the adjacent tissues of patients, and the results suggest that the expression of corresponding genes in adjacent tissues can be used to predict the prognosis of patients (Lee et al., 2019). To explore the mechanism of PNI, by analyzing the gene expression profiles of tumors and adjacent tissues from 28 pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma patients with perineural invasion and 22 pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma patients without perineural invasion, we identified 26 key features, within which 15 features were from tumor tissues while 11 features were from adjacent tissues. These results merit further validation in large cohort studies.
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