

1 **Evaluation of the budding and depth of invasion (BD) model in**
2 **oral tongue cancer biopsies**

3
4
5 Alhadi Almangush^{1,2,3}, Ilmo Leivo⁴, Maria Siponen^{5,6,7}, Elias Sundquist^{5,8}, Rayan Mroueh⁹, Antti
6 A. Mäkitie⁹, Ylermi Soini¹⁰, Caj Haglund^{11,12}, Pentti Nieminen¹³, Tuula Salo^{2,5,8,14}

7
8 ¹Department of Pathology, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

9 ²Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Diseases, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

10 ³Institute of Dentistry, University of Misurata, Misurata, Libya

11 ⁴Department of Pathology, University of Turku, Turku, Finland

12 ⁵Cancer and Translational Medicine Research Unit, University of Oulu, Oulu, Finland

13 ⁶Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Diseases, Kuopio University Hospital, Kuopio, Finland.

14 ⁷Institute of Dentistry, University of Eastern Finland, Kuopio, Finland

15 ⁸Medical Research Center, Oulu University Hospital, Oulu, Finland.

16 ⁹Department of Otorhinolaryngology– Head and Neck Surgery, Helsinki University Hospital and
17 University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland.

18 ¹⁰Department of Pathology and Forensic Medicine, University of Eastern Finland, Kuopio and Cancer
19 Center of Eastern Finland, Kuopio, Finland.

20 ¹¹Department of Surgery, University of Helsinki and Helsinki University Hospital, Helsinki, Finland.

21 ¹²Research Programs Unit, Translational Cancer Biology, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland

22 ¹³Medical Informatics and Statistics Research Group, University of Oulu, Oulu, Finland.

23 ¹⁴HUSLAB, Department of Pathology, Helsinki University Central Hospital, University of Helsinki,
24 Helsinki, Finland.

25
26 **Word count: 2238**

27
28 **Corresponding author:** Alhadi Almangush DDS, PhD
29 Department of Pathology, University of Helsinki, Helsinki, Finland
30 E-mail: alhadi.almangush@helsinki.fi
31 Telephone number: 00358 45 2044668
32
33
34
35

1 **Abstract**

2 It is of great clinical importance to identify simple prognostic markers from preoperative
3 biopsies that could guide treatment planning. Here, we compared tumor budding (B), depth
4 of invasion (D) and the combined scores (i.e. BD histopathologic model) in preoperative
5 biopsies and the corresponding postoperative specimens of oral tongue squamous cell
6 carcinoma (OTSCC). Tumor budding and depth of invasion were evaluated in the pre- and
7 postoperative samples from 100 patients treated for OTSCC. Sensitivity and specificity
8 statistics were used. Our results showed statistically significant ($P < 0.001$) relationship
9 between pre- and postoperative BD scores. There was an agreement between the pre- and
10 postoperative BD model scores in 83 cases (83%) with 57.1% sensitivity (95% CI: 39.4%
11 to 73.7%) and 96.9% specificity (95% CI: 89.3% to 99.6%). Our findings suggest that the
12 BD model, analyzed from representative biopsies, could be used for the treatment planning
13 of OTSCC.

14
15

16 **Key words:** Oral tongue cancer, Tumor budding, Tumor depth, BD model, Prognosis

17
18
19
20
21
22

1 **Introduction**

2 Oral or mobile tongue squamous cell carcinoma (OTSCC) has shown increased incidence
3 in several countries [1]. Aggressive behavior and poor prognosis are reported even at early
4 stages of the tumor [2, 3]. A preoperative biopsy is routinely obtained for histopathologic
5 diagnosis of suspicious tongue lesions. Although several prognostic markers for OTSCC
6 have been published, there is still a lack of validated markers that could easily be evaluated
7 in preoperative OTSCC histological sections. Therefore, identification of prognostic
8 marker(s) in biopsy specimens would be a valuable tool for treatment planning (local
9 resection with or without the neck dissection).

10 We have previously introduced the budding and depth (BD) histopathologic model
11 as a prognostic tool in OTSCC [4]. The prognostic value of this model has been validated
12 in cohorts of oral squamous cell carcinomas (OSCC) [5, 6]. In these studies, the BD model
13 was shown to have superior prognostic power when compared to the other previously
14 introduced histopathologic grading systems, such as WHO grading [7], malignancy
15 grading of the deep invasive margins [8], and histological risk score [9]. Additionally,
16 tumor budding is associated with the progression and prognosis of several epithelial
17 cancers, such as head and neck [10], esophageal [11], colorectal [12], pancreatic [13], lung
18 [14] and breast [15]. Specifically in OTSCC, budding correlates with occult cervical lymph
19 node metastasis and poor prognosis [16, 17]. Similarly, the depth of invasion is a prognostic
20 marker for OTSCC [17]. Recently, pre- and postoperative samples were compared in a
21 study of 91 OSCC cases, and it was shown that both budding and tumor depth correlated
22 significantly with relapse-free survival [18]. To our knowledge, however, there is no
23 sizeable cohort where the BD model has been tested in OTSCC biopsies and compared to

1 the corresponding postoperative OTSCC samples. The aim of this study was to analyze the
2 sensitivity and specificity of preoperative BD scores of hematoxylin and eosin stained
3 OTSCC biopsies compared to the postoperative BD scores of the corresponding cases.

4

5 **Material and Methods**

6 Hematoxylin and eosin (HE) stained slides from pre- and postoperative samples of 145
7 patients diagnosed with OTSCC at the University Hospitals of Helsinki, Kuopio and Oulu
8 between the years 1981 and 2016 were retrieved for this study. The use of pre- and
9 postoperative samples and the data inquiry was approved by the ethics committees of
10 Helsinki, Kuopio and Oulu University Hospitals. All patients were diagnosed by incisional
11 biopsy and treated by surgical excision of the tumor. Patients without either pre- or
12 postoperative counterparts available were excluded. Cases received preoperative therapy
13 were also excluded. A total of 100 cases were eligible for the comparative analyses.

14 Tumor budding (B) was defined as the presence of single cancer cell or cluster of
15 less than five cancer cells. The invasive front (IF) was evaluated under low magnification
16 ($\times 4$) and then the field with highest density of tumor budding was counted under high
17 magnification ($\times 20$). The depth of tumor invasion (D) was measured from the surface of
18 the tumor to the deepest point of invasion. The scoring was performed by an independent
19 researcher (AA) and reviewed by an experienced head and neck pathologist (IL). BD scores
20 were assigned as previously described [4] (Fig. 1). In brief, score 0 refers to <5 buds at the
21 IF and <4 mm in depth. Score 1 refers to either presence of ≥ 5 buds at the IF or a deep
22 tumor of ≥ 4 mm in depth. Score 2 refers to the presence of ≥ 5 buds at the IF and a deep
23 tumor of ≥ 4 mm in depth.

1 **Statistical analysis:** All analyses were performed with IBM SPSS version 20. The
2 statistical significance of the relationship between pre- and postoperative measures was
3 evaluated using chi-square test. For sensitivity and specificity statistics with their 95%
4 confidence intervals (95% CI), BD scores of low and intermediate were combined together
5 (low and intermediate vs. high) to evaluate the predictive power of preoperative score for
6 the postoperative score of the corresponding sample.

7

8 **Results**

9 **Patient Characteristics**

10 One case received preoperative therapy and was therefore excluded from our analysis. A
11 total of 100 patients were enrolled in the statistical analyses of the study. There were 51
12 males (51.0%). Stage distribution was as follows: 41 cases (41.0%) were assigned as stage
13 I, 40 (40.0%) as stage II, 9 (9.0%) as stage III, and 10 (10.0%) as stage IV. The mean age
14 at diagnosis was 60.8 years (range 27 to 91 years). All tumors were located on the oral
15 tongue (OTSCC).

16

17 **Histopathologic correlation between biopsy specimens and surgical resection** 18 **specimens**

19 **Tumor budding (B)**

20 The number of tumor budding in biopsies ranged from 0 to 13 buds (median 1, mean 3.5);
21 and for corresponding postoperative samples from 0 to 17 buds (median 3, mean 3.9). Of
22 the cases, 82 (82%) had the same B category (low <5 buds or high ≥ 5 buds) in pre- and
23 postoperative samples. The association between pre- and postoperative B was statistically

1 significant (P value of chi-square test < 0.001). The preoperative scores showed a good
2 sensitivity of 59.1% (95% CI: 43.3% to 73.7%) and a high specificity of 100% (95% CI:
3 93.6% to 100%) in predicting the postoperative score of the same case (Table 1).

4 **Depth of invasion (D)**

5 In biopsy specimens, depth values ranged from 0.5 to 10 mm (mean 4.1 mm, median 4
6 mm); and for the corresponding postoperative samples ranged from 0.5 to 23 mm (mean
7 6.3 mm, median 6 mm). Of the cases, 77 (77.0%) had the same D category (superficial < 4
8 mm or deep ≥ 4 mm) in pre- and postoperative samples. The relationship between the pre-
9 and postoperative D value was statistically significant (P value of chi-square test < 0.001).

10 The preoperative measurement showed a high predictive power of postoperative
11 measurement with 77.1% sensitivity (65.6% to 86.3%) and 76.7% specificity (57.2% to
12 90.1%) (Table 1).

13 **BD model**

14 For preoperative samples, 35 cases (34.7%) had BD score 0, 43 cases (42.6%) had score 1,
15 and 23 cases (22.8%) had score 2. In postoperative samples, 21 cases (20.8%) had score 0,
16 44 cases (43.6%) had score 1, and 36 cases (35.6%) had score 2. There was a significant
17 association between scores of BD model and cTNM stage (two-sided $P = 0.001$). The BD
18 histological model showed a highly significant relationship between pre- and postoperative
19 measurements (P value of chi-square test < 0.001). There was an agreement between the
20 pre- and postoperative scores of the BD model in 83 cases (83.0%) with 57.1% sensitivity
21 (95% CI: 39.4% to 73.7%) and 96.9% specificity (95% CI: 89.3% to 99.6%) (Table 1).

22

23

1

2 **Discussion**

3 During the histopathologic evaluation of OTSCC, pathologists attempt to identify
4 histopathological prognostic markers. Identification of such markers, especially in early
5 stage tumors, could guide clinical treatment decisions. Recently, our group suggested the
6 BD model as a prognostic tool in a large multicenter cohort of OTSCC [4]. This model is
7 now also validated in other cohorts of OSCC [5, 6]. In the multivariate analysis of these
8 previous studies, BD model showed superior prognostic power compared to the other
9 parameters. In this study, we demonstrated a significant relationship between the BD scores
10 in pre- and postoperative OTSCC samples. This finding is particularly useful for making
11 treatment decisions at an early stage, but occasionally highly aggressively behaving cases.
12 The use of BD model in daily practice might provide a reliable additional prognostic tool
13 that could overcome the shortcoming of currently used preoperative tumor size staging (T)
14 and histopathological biopsy grading. Both of these commonly used preoperative analyses,
15 tumor clinical size measurement and cancer cells differentiation grading, have been
16 criticized for their low prognostic power of the cancer [2, 19].

17 Cancer cell can invade individually or in a collection of cell clusters [20]. Different
18 patterns for head and neck cancers invasion has been suggested, including worst pattern of
19 invasion (WPOI) and tumor budding. WPOI was introduced as a part of histologic risk
20 model [21], and it was shown as a useful prognostic marker in early OTSCC [2]. However,
21 tumor satellites, which represent type 5 WPOI and are defined as tumor island/s located
22 one mm or more away from the main tumor or next closest satellite, require the evaluation
23 of all tumor sections [21] and thus this score remains inapplicable for biopsy specimen

1 **analyses.** On the other hand, tumor budding is a recently introduced histopathologic pattern
2 which has been reported as a promising prognosticator in several carcinomas [10-13, 15]
3 and has been successfully evaluated in preoperative biopsy [18, 22]. A five-bud cutoff point
4 has widely been used in OSCC [17, 23-25] and other cancers [26, 27] to stratify the tumors
5 into low risk (<5 buds) or high risk groups (≥ 5 buds).

6 Depth of invasion has been reported as a significant prognosticator in OTSCC [17,
7 28, 29]. The cutoff point of 4mm depth is widely accepted and has been validated in recent
8 OTSCC studies [2, 30, 31]. Of note, a meta-analysis has also concluded that 4mm would
9 be an optimal cutoff point [32]. In this study, we found a good correlation between the
10 depth in pre-operative and postoperative samples when we stratified the cases into two
11 categories (superficial <4mm vs. deep ≥ 4 mm). However, when the exact measurements
12 (i.e. quantitative) of pre- and postoperative depth were compared, the correlations were
13 low. This was expected as in postoperative samples the measurement could be taken at
14 several sites of the cancer sections, while in the preoperative biopsies the measurement is
15 possible only from a limited tumor area. More importantly, in the present series both
16 measurements were in the same category (superficial <4mm or deep ≥ 4 mm) in 77% of the
17 cases. For the remaining cases, low quality biopsies (e.g. superficial samples missing the
18 deepest part of the tumor) did not allow accurate measurement of the invasion depth. The
19 validity of preoperative tumor depth evaluation by ultrasonography or magnetic resonance
20 imaging (or both) has been confirmed in many studies [33-36]. This should be considered
21 as a surrogate method in case the entire tumor thickness is unclear in the preoperative
22 biopsy. Additionally, the depth of invasion evaluation from fresh-frozen intraoperative

1 sections has shown a strong association with the postoperative measurement [37]. Such
2 procedures could also reduce the inaccuracy in the preoperative biopsy measurement.

3 **Similar to our multicenter Finnish study of 100 OTSCC patients**, a Japanese group
4 has recently published a study of 91 OSCC cases from tongue and floor of mouth [18].
5 They concluded that the budding scores in particular showed a significant correlation
6 between biopsies and corresponding resected specimens. Such a correlation was also
7 observed with the depth measurements, but with less accuracy. These two separate cohorts
8 both highlight the usefulness of preoperative evaluation of the budding, and in cases of
9 representative, sufficiently deep biopsies, also the depth of invasion. **Of note, the results of**
10 **our current study are based on SCC cases from the mobile tongue only, a subsite of oral**
11 **cavity, in which SCCs are mostly human papilloma virus (HPV) negative [38, 39]. In**
12 **contrast, HPV-positive head and neck SCCs most commonly occur in the oropharynx**
13 **(including base of the tongue) and are reported to have a favorable prognosis [40].**

14 All our cases that had different scores (about 17%) in the BD model in preoperative
15 compared to postoperative samples had non-representative biopsies. These biopsies were
16 often badly fragmented, too superficial, or had some technical artifacts, such as tangential
17 cutting. Therefore, we strongly recommend that clinicians carefully take a large (at least 4
18 mm wide and 4 mm deep) biopsy (or several biopsies from different parts of the tumor)
19 that includes the deepest part of the tumor. A high quality biopsy would allow the
20 pathologist to evaluate the BD model accurately. However, if the quality of the biopsy is
21 low (too shallow, fragmented, or not in the deepest area), the BD model evaluation would
22 be inadequate.

1 Several previous findings have shown that the BD model is a simple and predictive
2 histopathological grading system for OSCC patients [4-6, 18]. Here, we demonstrated that
3 in satisfactory biopsies, the BD model can be evaluated from HE-stained slides, and the
4 BD scores significantly corresponded to the scores of postoperative tumor resection
5 samples.

6

7

8 **Compliance with ethical standards:** Institutional Review Board approval was obtained
9 from the ethics committees of Helsinki, Kuopio and Oulu University Hospitals.

10

11 **Funding:** This study was supported by Finnish Dental Society (Alhadi Almagush),
12 Maritza and Reino Salonen Foundation (Ilmo Leivo) and the Finnish Cancer Society
13 (Tuula Salo).

14

15 **Conflict of interest:** The authors declare that they have no conflict of interest.

16

17

18 **References**

- 19 1. Ng JH, Iyer NG, Tan MH, Edgren G (2016) Changing epidemiology of oral
20 squamous cell carcinoma of the tongue: A global study. *Head Neck*. doi:
21 10.1002/hed.24589
- 22 2. Almagush A, Bello IO, Coletta RD, Makitie AA, Mäkinen LK, Kauppila JH,
23 Pukkila M, Hagstrom J, Laranjeira J, Soini Y, Kosma VM, Koivunen P, Kelner N,
24 Kowalski LP, Grenman R, Leivo I, Laara E, Salo T (2015) For early-stage oral
25 tongue cancer, depth of invasion and worst pattern of invasion are the strongest
26 pathological predictors for locoregional recurrence and mortality. *Virchows Arch*
27 467:39-46. doi: 10.1007/s00428-015-1758-z

- 1 3. Ganly I, Patel S, Shah J (2012) Early stage squamous cell cancer of the oral tongue-
2 -clinicopathologic features affecting outcome. *Cancer* 118:101-111. doi:
3 10.1002/cncr.26229
- 4 4. Almangush A, Coletta RD, Bello IO, Bitu C, Keski-Santti H, Makinen LK,
5 Kauppila JH, Pukkila M, Hagstrom J, Laranne J, Tommola S, Soini Y, Kosma VM,
6 Koivunen P, Kowalski LP, Nieminen P, Grenman R, Leivo I, Salo T (2015) A
7 simple novel prognostic model for early stage oral tongue cancer. *Int J Oral*
8 *Maxillofac Surg* 44:143-150. doi: 10.1016/j.ijom.2014.10.004
- 9 5. Sawazaki-Calone I, Rangel A, Bueno AG, Morais CF, Nagai HM, Kunz RP, Souza
10 RL, Rutkauskis L, Salo T, Almangush A, Coletta RD (2015) The prognostic value
11 of histopathological grading systems in oral squamous cell carcinomas. *Oral Dis*
12 21:755-761. doi: 10.1111/odi.12343
- 13 6. Strieder L, Coutinho-Camillo CM, Costa V, da Cruz Perez DE, Kowalski LP,
14 Kaminagakura E (2017) Comparative analysis of three histologic grading methods
15 for squamous cell carcinoma of the lip. *Oral Dis* 23:120-125. doi:
16 10.1111/odi.12586
- 17 7. Barnes L EJ, Reichart P, Sidransky D (2005) World Health Organization
18 classification of tumors. *Pathology and genetics of head and neck tumours* IARC
19 Press: Lyon.
- 20 8. Bryne M, Koppang HS, Lilleng R, Kjaerheim A (1992) Malignancy grading of the
21 deep invasive margins of oral squamous cell carcinomas has high prognostic value.
22 *J Pathol* 166:375-381. doi: 10.1002/path.1711660409
- 23 9. Brandwein-Gensler M, Teixeira MS, Lewis CM, Lee B, Rolnitzky L, Hille JJ,
24 Genden E, Urken ML, Wang BY (2005) Oral squamous cell carcinoma: histologic
25 risk assessment, but not margin status, is strongly predictive of local disease-free
26 and overall survival. *Am J Surg Pathol* 29:167-178
- 27 10. Almangush A, Salo T, Hagstrom J, Leivo I (2014) Tumour budding in head and
28 neck squamous cell carcinoma - a systematic review. *Histopathology* 65:587-594.
29 doi: 10.1111/his.12471
- 30 11. Almangush A, Karhunen M, Hautaniemi S, Salo T, Leivo I (2016) Prognostic value
31 of tumour budding in oesophageal cancer: a meta-analysis. *Histopathology* 68:173-
32 182. doi: 10.1111/his.12781
- 33 12. Rogers AC, Winter DC, Heeney A, Gibbons D, Lugli A, Puppa G, Sheahan K
34 (2016) Systematic review and meta-analysis of the impact of tumour budding in
35 colorectal cancer. *Br J Cancer* 115:831-840. doi: 10.1038/bjc.2016.274
- 36 13. Karamitopoulou E (2012) Tumor budding cells, cancer stem cells and epithelial-
37 mesenchymal transition-type cells in pancreatic cancer. *Front Oncol* 2:209. doi:
38 10.3389/fonc.2012.00209
- 39 14. Kadota K, Nitadori J, Woo KM, Sima CS, Finley DJ, Rusch VW, Adusumilli PS,
40 Travis WD (2014) Comprehensive pathological analyses in lung squamous cell
41 carcinoma: single cell invasion, nuclear diameter, and tumor budding are
42 independent prognostic factors for worse outcomes. *J Thorac Oncol* 9:1126-1139.
43 doi: 10.1097/JTO.0000000000000253
- 44 15. Gujam FJ, McMillan DC, Mohammed ZM, Edwards J, Going JJ (2015) The
45 relationship between tumour budding, the tumour microenvironment and survival

- 1 in patients with invasive ductal breast cancer. *Br J Cancer* 113:1066-1074. doi:
2 10.1038/bjc.2015.287
- 3 16. Xie N, Wang C, Liu X, Li R, Hou J, Chen X, Huang H (2015) Tumor budding
4 correlates with occult cervical lymph node metastasis and poor prognosis in clinical
5 early-stage tongue squamous cell carcinoma. *J Oral Pathol Med* 44:266-272. doi:
6 10.1111/jop.12242
- 7 17. Almangush A, Bello IO, Keski-Santti H, Makinen LK, Kauppila JH, Pukkila M,
8 Hagstrom J, Laranne J, Tommola S, Nieminen O, Soini Y, Kosma VM, Koivunen
9 P, Grenman R, Leivo I, Salo T (2014) Depth of invasion, tumor budding, and worst
10 pattern of invasion: prognostic indicators in early-stage oral tongue cancer. *Head
11 Neck* 36:811-818. doi: 10.1002/hed.23380
- 12 18. Seki M, Sano T, Yokoo S, Oyama T (2016) Histologic assessment of tumor
13 budding in preoperative biopsies to predict nodal metastasis in squamous cell
14 carcinoma of the tongue and floor of the mouth. *Head Neck* 38 Suppl 1:E1582-
15 1590. doi: 10.1002/hed.24282
- 16 19. Piazza C, Montalto N, Paderno A, Taglietti V, Nicolai P (2014) Is it time to
17 incorporate 'depth of infiltration' in the T staging of oral tongue and floor of mouth
18 cancer? *Curr Opin Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg* 22:81-89. doi:
19 10.1097/MOO.0000000000000038
- 20 20. Krakhmal NV, Zavyalova MV, Denisov EV, Vtorushin SV, Perelmuter VM (2015)
21 Cancer Invasion: Patterns and Mechanisms. *Acta Naturae* 7:17-28
- 22 21. Brandwein-Gensler M, Smith RV, Wang B, Penner C, Theilken A, Broughel D,
23 Schiff B, Owen RP, Smith J, Sarta C, Hebert T, Nason R, Ramer M, DeLacure M,
24 Hirsch D, Myssiorek D, Heller K, Prystowsky M, Schlecht NF, Negassa A (2010)
25 Validation of the histologic risk model in a new cohort of patients with head and
26 neck squamous cell carcinoma. *Am J Surg Pathol* 34:676-688. doi:
27 10.1097/PAS.0b013e3181d95c37
- 28 22. Ueno H, Mochizuki H, Shinto E, Hashiguchi Y, Hase K, Talbot IC (2002)
29 Histologic indices in biopsy specimens for estimating the probability of extended
30 local spread in patients with rectal carcinoma. *Cancer* 94:2882-2891. doi:
31 10.1002/cncr.10551
- 32 23. Wang C, Huang H, Huang Z, Wang A, Chen X, Huang L, Zhou X, Liu X (2011)
33 Tumor budding correlates with poor prognosis and epithelial-mesenchymal
34 transition in tongue squamous cell carcinoma. *J Oral Pathol Med* 40:545-551. doi:
35 10.1111/j.1600-0714.2011.01041.x
- 36 24. Attramadal CG, Kumar S, Boysen ME, Dhakal HP, Nesland JM, Bryne M (2015)
37 Tumor Budding, EMT and Cancer Stem Cells in T1-2/N0 Oral Squamous Cell
38 Carcinomas. *Anticancer Res* 35:6111-6120
- 39 25. Hori Y, Kubota A, Yokose T, Furukawa M, Matsushita T, Takita M, Mitsunaga S,
40 Mizoguchi N, Nonaka T, Nakayama Y, Oridate N (2017) Predictive Significance
41 of Tumor Depth and Budding for Late Lymph Node Metastases in Patients with
42 Clinical N0 Early Oral Tongue Carcinoma. *Head Neck Pathol*. doi:
43 10.1007/s12105-017-0814-1
- 44 26. Nakagawa Y, Ohira M, Kubo N, Yamashita Y, Sakurai K, Toyokawa T, Tanaka H,
45 Muguruma K, Shibutani M, Yamazoe S, Kimura K, Nagahara H, Amano R, Ohtani
46 H, Yashiro M, Maeda K, Hirakawa K (2013) Tumor budding and E-cadherin

- 1 expression are useful predictors of nodal involvement in T1 esophageal squamous
2 cell carcinoma. *Anticancer Res* 33:5023-5029
- 3 27. Luo WR, Gao F, Li SY, Yao KT (2012) Tumour budding and the expression of
4 cancer stem cell marker aldehyde dehydrogenase 1 in nasopharyngeal carcinoma.
5 *Histopathology* 61:1072-1081. doi: 10.1111/j.1365-2559.2012.04350.x
- 6 28. Tan WJ, Chia CS, Tan HK, Soo KC, Iyer NG (2012) Prognostic significance of
7 invasion depth in oral tongue squamous cell carcinoma. *ORL J Otorhinolaryngol*
8 *Relat Spec* 74:264-270. doi: 10.1159/000343796
- 9 29. Jung J, Cho NH, Kim J, Choi EC, Lee SY, Byeon HK, Park YM, Yang WS, Kim
10 SH (2009) Significant invasion depth of early oral tongue cancer originated from
11 the lateral border to predict regional metastases and prognosis. *Int J Oral Maxillofac*
12 *Surg* 38:653-660. doi: 10.1016/j.ijom.2009.01.004
- 13 30. Ganly I, Goldstein D, Carlson DL, Patel SG, O'Sullivan B, Lee N, Gullane P, Shah
14 JP (2013) Long-term regional control and survival in patients with "low-risk," early
15 stage oral tongue cancer managed by partial glossectomy and neck dissection
16 without postoperative radiation: the importance of tumor thickness. *Cancer*
17 119:1168-1176. doi: 10.1002/cncr.27872
- 18 31. Han MW, Lee JC, Kim YM, Cha HJ, Roh JL, Choi SH, Nam SY, Cho KJ, Kim
19 SW, Kim SY (2015) Epithelial-mesenchymal transition: clinical implications for
20 nodal metastasis and prognosis of tongue cancer. *Otolaryngol Head Neck Surg*
21 152:80-86. doi: 10.1177/0194599814556061
- 22 32. Huang SH, Hwang D, Lockwood G, Goldstein DP, O'Sullivan B (2009) Predictive
23 value of tumor thickness for cervical lymph-node involvement in squamous cell
24 carcinoma of the oral cavity: a meta-analysis of reported studies. *Cancer* 115:1489-
25 1497. doi: 10.1002/cncr.24161
- 26 33. Goel V, Parihar PS, Parihar A, Goel AK, Waghvani K, Gupta R, Bhutekar U
27 (2016) Accuracy of MRI in Prediction of Tumour Thickness and Nodal Stage in
28 Oral Tongue and Gingivobuccal Cancer With Clinical Correlation and Staging. *J*
29 *Clin Diagn Res* 10:TC01-05. doi: 10.7860/JCDR/2016/17411.7905
- 30 34. Lodder WL, Teertstra HJ, Tan IB, Pameijer FA, Smeele LE, van Velthuysen ML,
31 van den Brekel MW (2011) Tumour thickness in oral cancer using an intra-oral
32 ultrasound probe. *Eur Radiol* 21:98-106. doi: 10.1007/s00330-010-1891-7
- 33 35. Mark Taylor S, Drover C, Maceachern R, Bullock M, Hart R, Psooy B, Trites J
34 (2010) Is preoperative ultrasonography accurate in measuring tumor thickness and
35 predicting the incidence of cervical metastasis in oral cancer? *Oral Oncol* 46:38-
36 41. doi: 10.1016/j.oraloncology.2009.10.005
- 37 36. Preda L, Chiesa F, Calabrese L, Latronico A, Bruschini R, Leon ME, Renne G,
38 Bellomi M (2006) Relationship between histologic thickness of tongue carcinoma
39 and thickness estimated from preoperative MRI. *Eur Radiol* 16:2242-2248. doi:
40 10.1007/s00330-006-0263-9
- 41 37. S Kumar S GN, Anila K R, Sebastian P. (2015) Can frozen section be used to assess
42 depth of invasion of early carcinoma of tongue? *Oral Oncol* 51:e87-88
- 43 38. Lydiatt WM, Patel SG, O'Sullivan B, Brandwein MS, Ridge JA, Migliacci JC,
44 Loomis AM, Shah JP (2017) Head and Neck cancers-major changes in the
45 American Joint Committee on cancer eighth edition cancer staging manual. *CA*
46 *Cancer J Clin* 67:122-137. doi: 10.3322/caac.21389

- 1 39. Sgaramella N, Coates PJ, Strindlund K, Loljung L, Colella G, Laurell G, Rossiello
2 R, Muzio LL, Loizou C, Tartaro G, Olofsson K, Danielsson K, Fahraeus R,
3 Nylander K (2015) Expression of p16 in squamous cell carcinoma of the mobile
4 tongue is independent of HPV infection despite presence of the HPV-receptor
5 syndecan-1. *Br J Cancer* 113:321-326. doi: 10.1038/bjc.2015.207
6 40. Kang H, Kiess A, Chung CH (2015) Emerging biomarkers in head and neck cancer
7 in the era of genomics. *Nat Rev Clin Oncol* 12:11-26. doi:
8 10.1038/nrclinonc.2014.192
9

10

1 Table 1. Distribution of cases according to preoperative and postoperative scores

	Postoperative budding		Total
Preoperative budding	Low	High	
	n (%)	n (%)	
· Low	56 (75.7)	18 (24.3)	74 (100)
· High	0	26 (100)	26 (100)
	Postoperative depth		
Preoperative depth	Superficial	Deep	
	n (%)	n (%)	
· Superficial	23 (59.0)	16 (41.0)	39 (100)
· Deep	7 (11.5)	54 (88.5)	61 (100)
	Postoperative BD score		
Preoperative BD score	Low or intermediate	High	
	n (%)	n (%)	
· Low or intermediate	63 (80.8)	15 (19.2%)	78 (100)
· High	2 (9.1%)	20 (90.9%)	22 (100)

2
3
4
5

1 Figure 1 legend

2

3 Score 0 (A-D): Small magnification of preoperative biopsy (A) of superficial tumor
4 without tumor budding in the higher magnification (B) of the IF. Small magnification for
5 the corresponding resection specimen (C), and higher magnification of the IF (D).

6

7 Score 1 (E-H): Small magnification of preoperative biopsy of very deep tumor (E), without
8 tumor budding at the invasive front (F). Small magnification of the corresponding resection
9 specimen (G) and higher magnification of the IF (H) which shows no tumor budding.

10

11 Score 2 (I-L): Small magnification of preoperative biopsy of very deep tumor (I), with the
12 presence of tumor budding at the IF in the higher magnification (J). Small magnification
13 of the corresponding resection specimen (K) and higher magnification of the IF (L) which
14 shows tumor budding.

15

16


17 * IF: Invasive front.

18 Small magnification: $\times 20$

19 Higher magnification: $\times 100$

20

21



1