BAP1 Dataset Information

July 2023

Table 1: Patient demographics and tumor volume statistics.

| | Total (n=131) | BAP1 Status [+] (n=60) | BAP1 Status [-] (n=71) |
|---------|--------------------------|------------------------|------------------------|
| Sex | | | |
| Male | 84 | 42 | 42 |
| Female | 47 | 18 | 29 |
| Age | | | |
| Median | 69 | 69 | 69 |
| Range | 21-90 | 51-90 | 21-81 |
| Tumor v | olume [mm ³] | | |
| Median | 12697 | 11045 | 14485 |
| Range | 1323 - 98413 | 1323 - 98413 | 2134 - 66561 |

Table 2: Image acquisition characteristics.

| Table 2: Image acquisition characteristics. | | | | | |
|---|---------------|------------------------|------------------------|--|--|
| | Total (n=131) | BAP1 Status [+] (n=60) | BAP1 Status [-] (n=71) | | |
| Pixel Size [mm] | | | | | |
| Median | 0.72 | 0.71 | 0.73 | | |
| Range | 0.56 – 1.07 | 0.57 – 1.07 | 0.56 – 0.95 | | |
| Slice Thickness | [mm] | | | | |
| Median | 3 | 3 | 3 | | |
| Range | 1-5 | 1-5 | 1-5 | | |
| kVp [kV] | | | | | |
| Median | 120 | 120 | 120 | | |
| Range | 80 – 140 | 100 – 120 | 80-140 | | |
| Scanner Manufa | acturer | | | | |
| GE | 65 | 31 | 34 | | |
| Philips | 43 | 20 | 23 | | |
| Toshiba | 10 | 4 | 6 | | |
| Siemens | 13 | 5 | 8 | | |
| Reconstruction | Kernel | | | | |
| GE: Standard | 64 | 31 | 33 | | |
| GE: Chest | 1 | 0 | 1 | | |
| Philips: B | 42 | 20 | 22 | | |
| Philips: C | 1 | 0 | 1 | | |
| Toshiba: FC13 | 5 | 1 | 4 | | |
| Toshiba: FC14 | 1 | 1 | 0 | | |
| Toshiba: FC18 | 4 | 2 | 2 | | |
| Siemens: B30f | 3 | 0 | 3 | | |
| Siemens: B31f | 1 | 0 | 1 | | |
| Siemens: B40f | 1 | 0 | 1 | | |
| Siemens: B31s | 1 | 0 | 1 | | |
| Siemens: B35s | 1 | 1 | 0 | | |
| Siemens: Bf39f | 1 | 0 | 1 | | |
| Siemens: Br36f | 1 | 0 | 1 | | |
| Siemens: Br40d | 1 | 1 | 0 | | |
| Siemens: I31f | 2 | 2 | 0 | | |
| Siemens: I41f | 1 | 1 | 0 | | |

Table 1: Comparisons of the three classification models: gradient boosting, extra trees, and random forest. P-values comparing the differences in AUC values were calculated using the DeLong test, with their corresponding confidence intervals (CIs), prior to multiple comparisons correction. Significance levels (α) and widths of the CIs were adjusted based on multiple comparisons.

| Comparison | p-value for ΔAUC | α | CI of Δ AUC |
|--|--------------------------|---------------|---|
| Gradient boosting versus extra trees | 0.0013* | | 97.5% CI: [0.0068 0.038] 98.3% CI: [0.014 0.040] |
| Gradient boosting versus random forest Extra trees versus random forest | $0.3917 \\ 0.32$ | 0.017 0.025 | 98.3% CI: [0.014 0.040] 95% CI: [-0.0041 0.013] |

^{*}Statistical significance was achieved after correcting for multiple comparisons using Bonferroni-Holm corrections.

Table 1: Texture features selected for the three classifiers across the 100 repeated cross validations and the selection frequency each feature was chosen for classification.

| Transformation | Class | Feature | Selection Frequency |
|----------------------------------|-------|-------------------------------|---------------------|
| $LoG (\sigma = 1.5 \text{ mm})$ | GLSZM | High Gray Level Zone Emphasis | 100% |
| $LoG (\sigma = 1.55 \text{ mm})$ | GLCM | Cluster Prominence | 100% |
| $LoG (\sigma = 0.75 \text{ mm})$ | GLSZM | High Gray Level Zone Emphasis | 95% |
| Wavelet (bior1.1–HL) | GLDZM | High Gray Level Emphasis | 95% |
| $LoG (\sigma = 0.75 \text{ mm})$ | GLCM | Correlation | 92% |