An analytical approach differentiates between individual and collective cancer invasion

Elad Katz\textsuperscript{a,}\textsuperscript{1,}\textsuperscript{*}, Wim Verleyen\textsuperscript{b,}\textsuperscript{1}, Colin G. Blackmore\textsuperscript{c}, Michael Edward\textsuperscript{d}, V. Anne Smith\textsuperscript{b} and David J. Harrison\textsuperscript{a}

\textsuperscript{a}Breakthrough Research Unit and Division of Pathology, Institute of Genetics and Molecular Medicine, University of Edinburgh, Edinburgh, UK
\textsuperscript{b}School of Biology, University of St Andrews, St Andrews, UK
\textsuperscript{c}Definiens AG, Munich, Germany
\textsuperscript{d}Faculty of Medicine, Section of Dermatology, Division of Cancer Sciences, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, UK

Abstract. Tumour cells employ a variety of mechanisms to invade their environment and to form metastases. An important property is the ability of tumour cells to transition between individual cell invasive mode and collective mode. The switch from collective to individual cell invasion in the breast was shown recently to determine site of subsequent metastasis. Previous studies have suggested a range of invasion modes from single cells to large clusters. Here, we use a novel image analysis method to quantify and categorise invasion.

We have developed a process using automated imaging for data collection, unsupervised morphological examination of breast cancer invasion using cognition network technology (CNT) to determine how many patterns of invasion can be reliably discriminated. We used Bayesian network analysis to probabilistically connect morphological variables and therefore determine that two categories of invasion are clearly distinct from one another.

The Bayesian network separated individual and collective invading cell groups based on the morphological measurements, with the level of cell-cell contact the most discriminating morphological feature. Smaller invading groups were typified by smoother cellular surfaces than those invading collectively in larger groups. Interestingly, elongation was evident in all invading cell groups and was not a specific feature of single cell invasion as a surrogate of epithelial-mesenchymal transition.

In conclusion, the combination of cognition network technology and Bayesian network analysis provides an insight into morphological variables associated with transition of cancer cells between invasion modes. We show that only two morphologically distinct modes of invasion exist.
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1. Introduction

Spread and metastasis of breast cancer is responsible for the vast majority of patient morbidity and mortality associated with this disease [1]. The invasive properties of cancer cells underlying metastatic disease have been investigated extensively for many years [2–4], with new treatments beginning to enter clinical trials. There are few effective, short term biomarkers. Novel approaches in clinical trials include cytotoxins such as taxanes and biological agents, especially those targeting tyrosine kinases such as Trastuzumab (Herceptin) [5]. Anti-angiogenic approaches such as the use of the anti-VEGF-A antibody Bevacizumab (Avastin) in metastatic breast cancer have failed so far to improve the prognosis of metastatic breast cancer patients [6]. The 5-year survival of patients with metastatic
breast cancer patients is currently estimated at 26% [1, 7].

Cancer cells are capable of transitioning from one mode of invasion to another in response to both endogenous cues and the environment [8]. The tumour environment influences the mode of cancer cell invasion which has been labelled individual or collective [9]. Preservation of cell-cell contacts enables a larger number of cells to invade collectively, rather than as single cells which may be undergoing epithelial to mesenchymal transition (EMT) [10]. Christofori and colleagues have suggested a classification of cancer cell invasion, broadly dividing it to “single” cell and collective invasion [2]. Collective invasion was further divided into “cohort invasion” of 6–10 cells loosely attached to the bulk of the tumour [11] and “coordinated invasion” of larger cell groups, maintaining some contact with the bulk of the tumour [12]. The biological and clinical distinction between these groups remains uncertain. Importantly, even with the same genetic background, individually invading cells target distal sites such as the lung and collectively invading cells showed preference for lymph node metastasis [13].

Until now, the sole morphological distinction between invasion modes was the number of cells invading [2]. If morphological type of invasion is to be a useful biomarker it must be reliably and reproducibly measurable using a multitude of morphological parameters. The analysis method also would have to be feasible in the clinical context, where paraffin-embedded primary breast cancer tissue is often the only available material. Previous work has relied heavily on intravital or confocal imaging [14, 15], both of which are unlikely to be implemented in the clinic. While individual cell invasion is usually associated with down regulation of cell-cell contact molecules such as E-cadherin [16], somewhat paradoxically, it does not imply necessarily that the cells are invading entirely as single cells. In lobular breast carcinomas, despite down-regulation of E-cadherin, small groups of cells invade together in single file formation [17]. Triple negative breast cancers (ER-PR-HER2-) are usually associated with EMT and poor prognosis, but rarely display a complete switch from collective to individual invasion, probably due to up-regulation of N-cadherin [18]. Collective cell invasion has not been investigated as much as individual cell invasion in vitro, although it is a very prominent feature in human cancer biopsy samples [10, 19–21]. In squamous cancer cells, several key proteins were implicated in collective invasion type, including a mucin-type glycoprotein called podoplanin [22] and the small GTPase CDC42 [21].

Bayesian networks have been previously applied in cancer biology, usually as a method of revealing mechanism or underlying interaction in high-throughput data [23–25], but they have not been used in morphological analysis. Using Bayesian network analysis, we show that automatically measured morphological variables can characterise two invasion types in organotypic culture, individual and collective, which can be discriminated by a number of morphological variables: cell-cell contact, invading group area and surface roughness.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Cell lines, collagen invasion assays and tumour materials

H16N-2 is an immortalized cell line derived from normal breast epithelium. H16N-2 cells were cultured in DFCI media [26]. Generation of the C35 transfected pool (C35pool) and the C35.C3 clone (C35hi) is described in detail elsewhere [27]. For collagen invasion assays, rat collagen type I solution (0.3–0.5 mg/ml) was mixed with 10^5 human breast fibroblasts (from reduction mammoplasty) per 3 ml lattice and left to contract in fibroblast media (DMEM (Invitrogen) supplemented with 10% serum, 50 U/ml penicillin, and 50 mg/ml streptomycin) for ~7 d. When the lattices were of the required size (~4-fold contraction), 3 x 10^5 H16N2 cells from the desired lines were seeded on top and the lattices and incubated as submerged cultures for 4 d in H16N2 media. To induce invasion, the lattices were raised to the air/liquid interface and incubated for a further 7 d before the lattices were fixed in 10% phosphate buffered formalin and wax embedded.

Usage of tumour material was approved by the Lothian Research Ethics Committee (08/S1101/41).

2.2. Image acquisition

Immunofluorescence was performed using methods previously described using the AQUA system (HistoRx) [28]. Pan-cytokeratin rabbit polyclonal antibody (Dako, 1:150) was used to identify epithelial cells. The epithelial compartment was then visualised with anti-rabbit-Cy3 (Invitrogen, 1:25). DAPI (4’,6-
diamidino-2-phenylindole) counterstain (Invitrogen) was used to identify nuclei.

Monochromatic high-resolution (1024 × 1024 pixel, 0.5-μm resolution) images of each invasion assay were captured at × 20 objective using an Olympus AX-51 epifluorescence microscope.

2.3. Immunohistochemistry

Antigen retrieval for vimentin staining (Sigma, 1:400) was performed using sodium citrate buffer (18 μM citric acid, 82 μM sodium citrate, pH 6.0). Standard immunohistochemistry protocol was performed using the REAL EnVision mouse kit (Dako), according to manufacturer’s instructions.

2.4. Automated cell delineation

Images were analysed with the Cognition Network Technology (CNT) Definiens Cellenger modular application framework [29]. This framework allows the simultaneous existence of image “objects” at different orders of magnitude in a hierarchical organisation [30] (Fig. 1). In this study, a “Nucleus Level”, was first generated. Nucleus objects were formed using the DAPI signal (blue image channel) via semi-adaptive background thresholding, followed by an adapted watershed transformation and constrained growth of intermediary image objects. These nucleus objects were used as seed points to grow surrounding cytoplasm objects from the cellular pan-cytokeratin mask (green image channel, Supplementary Figure 1), using an automatic adaptive threshold. This process resulted in the formation nucleus and cytoplasm objects at the Nucleus Level. These were combined to create cell objects at the “Cell Level”, containing of nucleus and cytoplasm “sub objects”. The cell objects represented all epithelial (nucleus’ cytokeratin”) cells within a given immunofluorescence image, fully delineated for further morphological analysis. All stromal cells (cytokeratin”) were excluded at this stage.

We further developed the CNT hierarchy to define group objects at a top “Group Level” (see Results). These groups were classified into tumour invasion types and were the base unit from which morphological measurements were made.

![Fig. 1. Cell segmentation and group size analysis using CNT. (a) A typical imaging field used for CNT-based analysis. (b) Flow-chart of cell and group segmentation using CNT. (c) Resulting cell and group delineation, including exclusion of origin (in blue).](image-url)
“Roundness” of an invading cell group describes how similar the group is to an ellipse. A perfectly round object has the value of 0. The roundness value is higher for non-round objects.

“Roughness” (or “shape index”) of an invading cell group describes the ratio between the group border length and optimal border length (as defined by the group length). A perfectly smooth object has the value of 1. A group with jagged borders or with cell projections will have a higher roughness value.

2.5. Bayesian network analysis

Bayesian networks are a method to visualise statistical dependencies, drawn as lines between variables. Among a set of highly correlated variables, they will only connect those with direct statistical dependence (i.e., not mediated through other measured variables) [31]. The dependencies can be annotated with information about the type of relationship: positive (meaning high values in one correspondence with high values in another, and low with low), negative (high values in one correspond with low in another), or non-monotonic (such as U- or hump-shaped relationships); relative strengths are available for positive and negative relationships (scaled between 0 and 1; [32]).

We applied the publicly available Bayesian network software BANJO (http://www.cs.duke.edu/~amink/software/banjo; [33]) to construct Bayesian networks of selected morphological variables and tumour invasion types. The data was first discretised with quantile discretisation using three levels [32]. The software was then applied with the following settings: static
networks, equivalent sample size equal to one, greedy search with random resets every 3000 iterations, quantile discretisation with three levels, maximum parent count equal to three (maximal number allowed by data amount [34]), relationships among tumour invasion types disallowed (mutually exclusive categories), and a consensus network generated from the top 100 networks. Because direction of statistical relationship had no biological meaning, results are shown as consensus networks with undirected relationships to ease interpretation.

The Bayesian network provides two types of information based on its structure. First, invasion types sharing links with the same morphological variables are likely to be similar. Second, variables directly connected to invasion types are the most important for those types. To confirm the latter, we applied Student’s $t$-test to evaluate whether the means of morphological variables differed for invasion types within each cell line; reported $p$-values have been Bonferroni-corrected over all tests.

3. Results

3.1. Construction of model system

As an in vitro invasion model, we used H16N-2 breast cells expressing the C35 protein in a collagen lattice invasion model. C35 is an oncogene co-amplified with HER2 in breast cancers and is capable of inducing mammary epithelial cell invasion in vitro [26, 27]. While empty vector expressing cells (Null) did not significantly invade the lattice, expression of C35 in cells led to invasion [27]. The C35 transfectant pool (C35pool), which has variable, intermediate levels of C35 expression, invades mostly as large clusters of cells, maintaining overall levels of cell-cell contact molecules, including E-cadherin [27]. In 3-dimensional (3D) organotypic culture, C35pool cells display an invasive morphology with high nuclear grade, comparable to moderately-differentiated breast cancers (E. Katz and Jeremy S. Thomas, unpublished observations). A clone which expresses C35 at high levels (C35hi) shows complete transition to spindle cell phenotype, with individual cells invading deep into the lattice. Invading C35hi cells are comparable to EMT-enriched claudin-low breast cancers [35]. This model system enables comparison of multiple invasion types in similar genetic, cellular and environmental contexts.

3.2. Developing “Group Level” in CNT analysis

A constrained fusion of cell objects was performed to cluster formations of cells into compact groups, forming a “Group Level”. Firstly, all cell objects with a common border were fused together and small enclosing holes filled to provide contiguous objects. A shape splitting algorithm was then applied to the fused cells, which cut the objects satisfying local conditions (constrained by the minimum concave angle over the border of 25 degrees, the length of the border over which the object was to be cut, 20 pixels, and the maximum length over which objects would be cut, 50 pixels), creating group objects. This resulted in objects representing groups of cells. However, it was necessary to differen-

![Graph](image)

Fig. 3. Profiles of C35-induced invasion. (a) Frequencies of group sizes (by cell number) in C35pool and C35hi cells. (b) Distribution of cells amongst different invasion types (averaged across all imaging fields examined) in C35pool and C35hi cells.
tiate groups attaching and/or proliferating on top of the collagen lattice from groups of invading cells. Therefore, we first defined groups belonging to an origin object (Fig. 1c). The origin was identified by finding a characteristic seed group object (using a high length to width ratio). Similar origin cell objects were then identified using a fuzzy logic approach, using a combination of area, similarity in direction to the origin seed and length to width, to identify the remaining origin cell objects. A series of local and constrained merging steps fused group objects with similar positional and/or border lengths greater than 22% with the origin to finalise the origin structure. This resulted identification of invading groups which were not part of the origin. These groups could be either completely disjoint from the origin or separated via a short common border.

Invading groups were classified into four tentative invasion types by examination of 2-dimensional sections of cultures, following the Christofori model [2]: single cells (type I), 2–5 cells/group (type II), 6–10 cells/group (type III) and >10 cells/group (type IV). Type II consists of groups too small (<6 cells) to be cohorts by the Christofori definition, but are not single cells. Such small groups have been documented in vivo [36].

Examples of group classification using CNT in C35pool and C35hi cells are shown in Fig. 2a. Overall, most groups in the C35hi were categorised as type I or II (Fig. 2b). C35pool groups were divided into four types (Fig. 2c). Overall profiles of invading group sizes are shown in Fig. 3.

3.3. Choice of morphological variables

The CNT software package offers >100 object-based variables that can be measured. Of those, we used...
six candidate variables with clear potential biological implications. Variables were calculated on the invading group objects and allow comparison of the behaviour of invasive cells regardless of invasion type employed. Five variables were intrinsic properties of the invasive groups: their area (in pixels), length/width ratio, roundness and surface roughness. The first two parameters are thought to be detrimental in the epithelial to mesenchymal transition underlying individual cell invasion [37]. Another variable calculated was the mean of cell-cell contact (the border between cell objects) found in the invasive group. An additional variable was “relative border to origin”, an indication of how much contact exists between the invading group and the origin, that is cells seeded on the surface of the gel. Christofori et al. suggested that the value for this variable is high in coordinated invasion, but low in other invasion modes such as cohort invasion [2].

3.4. Bayesian network analysis of invasion types and morphological variables

Bayesian network analysis was applied to the output of the image analysis in order to examine which morphological variables could be important for categorisation of tumour invasion types. We originally attempted to classify invading groups into four categories based on group size (types I, II, III and IV). A consensus Bayesian network was created containing the six selected parameters as described above and

![Graphs showing length/width ratio distribution](image)

Fig. 5. Length/width ratio does not differ between individual and collective invasion. Distributions of length/width ratio value shown for C35pool (top panels) and C35hi cells (bottom panels) shown are histograms depicting counts of measurements taken which fall inside the range of the bar on x-axis. p-values show significance of tests between individual and collective for each cell line, corresponding to Bonferroni-corrected t-test (corrected for the 8 tests in Figs 5–8).
four Christofori types (Fig. 4). Neither length/width
nor relative border to origin were directly related to any
invasion type suggesting they are less characteristic
than other variables of invasion type. The relationships
to other morphological variables, however, revealed
that Christofori types I and II could be classified as
individual and types III and IV as collective: individ-
ually invading groups (type I and II) have a negative
relationship with surface roughness, while collective
invasion (types III and IV) had a positive relationship
to group area. All types were highly related to cell-cell
contact.

Next, we examined how these variables revealed as
important in the Bayesian network analysis on data
from both cell lines combined can be generalised to
differences within individual cell lines. Some mor-
phological variables are more connected to tumour
invasion types (Fig. 4) and we expect this to corre-
spond to a significant difference in their distributions
between invasion types within a cell line (Supple-
mentary Table 1). As a control, we first examined
length/width ratio, which was not directly connected
to any invasion type. Individual cell invasion is usually
associated with mesenchymal spindle-like morphol-
y [37, 38] implying a length/width ratio significantly
greater than 1. However, the Bayesian network analysis
on this dataset suggested that this morphological vari-
able is rather marginal. Indeed, it showed no significant
difference between individual and collective invasion
for the two cell lines (Fig. 4, \( p \geq 0.15 \)). We found ratios

![Fig. 6. Cell-cell contact is greater in collective than individual invasion. Distributions of cell-cell contact value shown for C35pool (top panels) and C35hi cells (bottom panels). Shown are histograms depicting counts of measurements taken which fall inside the range of the bar on x-axis. p-values show significance of tests between individual and collective for each cell line, corresponding to Bonferroni-corrected t-test (corrected for the 8 tests in Figs 5–8).](image-url)
as high as 5 in some of the invading groups, but these were not restricted to any particular group, either individual or collective. Recent findings in border cells of the Drosophila ovary also suggest that invading group elongation (i.e. high length/width ratio) can also be found in collectively invading cells [39]. In contrast to length/width ratio, the three variables prominent in the Bayesian network analysis across both cell lines were significantly different between individual and collective invasion also within the same cell line: cell-cell contact, group area and surface roughness. The high statistical significance observed in all of these variables (all \( p \) values <0.0001) strongly supports the notion that these morphological variables can be used to define invasion modes in cancer.

Typically, individually invading cells, down-regulate cell-cell contact molecules part of their epithelial to mesenchymal transition [16]. Collectively invading cells maintain their cell-cell contacts as they invade [8]. As expected, cell-cell contact was significantly greater in collectively invading groups than individually invading groups (Fig. 6). The maintenance of cell-cell contacts in collectively invading cells is not dependent on E-cadherin levels, as they are very low in all C35hi group types (data not shown). Group area was significantly greater in collective invasion compared to individual invasion (Fig. 7). This is sensible as more cells make for a greater area, however, it is not necessarily trivial (as cell size could have been smaller [37]), and thus provides useful mor-

![Fig. 7](image-url)
3.5. Roughness as a morphological characteristic of collectively invading cells

The surface roughness of groups was significantly less in individual compared to collective invasion (Fig. 8). This implies that single or small groups of cells (1–5 cells, type I/II) may invade in groups with smoother surface than those invading in larger collective groups (>5 cells, type III/IV).

In order to better understand the source of roughness, we probed C35pool cells for the invadopodia component vimentin. Invadopodia are most common mechanism employed by cells invading 3D matrices [14]. Vimentin is a critical component of these invasive structures [40] and it is expressed in cells at the front of collective invading groups (Fig. 9a). Interestingly, a similar pattern of vimentin expression was found in a metastatic breast tumours (n=5; a representative tumour shown in Fig. 9b). In both cases, these structures were also positive for MT1-MMP (data not shown), consistent with invadopodia as described elsewhere [14].

4. Discussion

Studying invasion in human cancer is difficult, and biomarkers are few. In some animal studies in vivo imaging has been used, but there is a dearth of robust
Fig. 9. Invadopodia as a source of surface roughness in collectively invading groups. Examples of vimentin staining in (a) C35pool and (b) high-grade breast tumour. In lower panels, arrows indicate prominent vimentin + protrusions. Original magnification: ×40.
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biomarkers for quantifying effects of new treatments on invasion. Mathematical models factoring common events such as proliferation and cell death predict uneven tumour border, associated with tumour invasiveness [41–43]. Many 3D culture approaches also suggest that the behaviour of cells in ECM is predictive of their in vivo behaviour [44–46]. Nonetheless, even extensive studies rely in their interpretation on the overall appearance of cell clusters without direct correlation to an invasion measurement [41, 45]. Ultimately, these observations led to a proposal of four types of invasion: single cells, small groups of cells, cohorts and collective invasion [2]. This study analyses invasion using cell morphology, discriminating between possible different modes of invasion and reliably identifies two categories rather than four. This approach is particularly pertinent due to our growing understanding that tumour cells are capable of switching between different invasion modes, even within the same tumour [8, 13]. We evaluated a total of six morphological variables, most intrinsic to the invading group (e.g., cell-cell contact), another showing the relationship to surrounding cells or the origin from which the invasion started. Our Bayesian network analysis determined that morphologically two modes of invasion exist. These modes, individual and collective, are distinct by three biomarkers: cell-cell contact, invading group size and group surface roughness.

We observed here that collectively invading groups have significantly rougher surfaces than those invading individually (1–5 cells). Mathematical modelling suggests roughness in collective invasion could be stemming from tumour cell interactions with the ECM [47], generating to invadopodia or similar cellular processes [48, 49]. We found that some of C35pool cells express vimentin, an important component of
invadopodia [40]. These processes were found around collectively invading cell groups. We are currently exploring what mechanisms may drive roughness in collective invasion. Interestingly, we did not find that these include generation of peripheral actomyosin forces by Rho kinases ([50] and data not shown).

It is possible that down-regulation of cell junctions and cytokeratins which typifies individually invading cells paradoxically enables them to maintain a more smooth morphology than those invading collectively. Some evidence exists that motile, individually invading cancer cells have a smoother appearance than non-motile cells in vivo [51]. Furthermore, invasive lobular carcinomas of the breast also contain round and smooth invading single cells [17].

An additional variable highlighted by Bayesian network analysis is that only collectively invading groups (≥5 cells) are similarly linked to the overall group area. This implies that unlike what is predicted in the Christofori model, division into cohorts of 6–10 cells and bigger coordinated groups has no morphological grounds. This conclusion is strengthened by the absence of any direct links between both type III (presumed “cohorts”) or IV (presumed “coordinated”) and the variable describing relative border to origin. This would not be the case if coordinated groups were indeed keeping contact with the tumour origin.

Morphological examination of cancer cells is regularly used in clinical pathological practice to determine tumour grade. Until now, morphological analysis has not been used extensively in the study of cancer invasion in vitro. We show here that using our approach only two distinct modes of invasion are consistently found. Morphological differences between those invasion modes could now be exploited in both organotypic cell lines models and human cancer specimens to measure changes in tumour progression or drug response. Recent studies suggest that findings from organotypic models such as this used here could be directly translated to the in vivo setting [46].
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Supplementary Figure 1. Examples of pan-cytokeratin outlining of invasion in (a) C35pool cells and (b) C35hi cells. The cytokeratin mask (green) was used to determine cell morphology in subsequent image analysis.
Table 1

Summary of statistical analysis for Figs 4–7. ms, not significant

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>n</th>
<th>p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Numbers of group object analysed</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C35pool</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>498</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collective</td>
<td>290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C35hi</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collective</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Corrected p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Length/width</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C35pool</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>1.68</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collective</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.67</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C35hi</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collective</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.58</td>
<td>1.72</td>
<td>0.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cell-cell contact</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C35pool</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.19</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collective</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.08</td>
<td>0.65</td>
<td>0.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C35hi</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collective</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.11</td>
<td>0.53</td>
<td>0.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C35pool</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>355.81</td>
<td>255.78</td>
<td>1956.52</td>
<td>1243.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collective</td>
<td>236.40</td>
<td>176.51</td>
<td>1085.98</td>
<td>575.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C35hi</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>355.81</td>
<td>255.78</td>
<td>1956.52</td>
<td>1243.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collective</td>
<td>236.40</td>
<td>176.51</td>
<td>1085.98</td>
<td>575.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Roughness</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C35pool</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>1.335</td>
<td>0.189</td>
<td>1.543</td>
<td>0.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collective</td>
<td>1.543</td>
<td>0.272</td>
<td>1.543</td>
<td>0.272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C35hi</td>
<td>individual</td>
<td>1.392</td>
<td>0.179</td>
<td>1.712</td>
<td>0.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>collective</td>
<td>1.712</td>
<td>0.201</td>
<td>1.712</td>
<td>0.201</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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