Supplemental Information

Figures S1-S8

Table S8



Figure S1

Figure S1. Clinicopathologic and genomic differences between early-stage metastatic (ES-M) and late-stage metastatic (LS-M) primary tumors, Related to Figure 1. (A) Bar plots comparing clinicopathologic features between ES-M and LS-M groups. (B) Bar plots showing the percentage of samples with gene alterations. (C) Bar plots depicting the percentage of samples with pathway alterations. (D) Bar plots displaying the percentage of samples with APOBEC signatures present. (E) Scatter plot showing *q*-value of gene pairs for co-occurrence and mutual exclusivity in ES-M and LS-M tumors. Dotted lines represent *q*=0.05; significant gene pairs labeled. Statistical analyses: (A-E) Fisher's exact test. **q*<0.05, adjusted for falsediscovery rate (FDR). Hx, history; pStage, pathologic stage; Tx, treatment.



D







IVII 0 - Mazaru Malios											
ALK	0.27	(0.034 – 2.05)	0.204								
BRAF	0.77	(0.290 - 2.03)	0.596								
CDK4	1.15	(0.516 – 2.54)	0.737								
CDKN2A	1.12	(0.556 – 2.27)	0.745								
CDKN2B	2.18	(0.816 – 5.81)	- 0.12								
EGFR	0.34	(0.188 – 0.62)	<0.001 ***								
ERBB2	0.96	(0.442 – 2.09)	0.923								
FOXA1	0.86	(0.086 - 8.67)	0.901								
KEAP1	1.27	(0.699 – 2.31)	0.432								
KRAS	0.97	(0.609 – 1.54)	0.891								
MDM2	2.66	(1.347 – 5.25)	- 0.005 **								
MET	0.81	(0.312 – 2.10)	0.664								
MYC	2.92	(1.298 – 6.58)									
NF1	0.29	(0.089 – 0.98)	0.046 *								
NKX2.1	1.04	(0.141 – 7.62)	0.972								
PIK3CA	2.71	(1.329 – 5.55)	- 0.006 **								
RB1	0.53	(0.161 – 1.75)	0.299								
RBM10	0.83	(0.447 – 1.53)	0.549								
SMARCA4	4.49	(2.358 – 8.54)									
STK11	1.02	(0.589 – 1.78)	0.934								
TERT	1.06	(0.518 – 2.15)	0.883								
TP53	1.91	(1.293 – 2.82)	0.001 **								
# Events: 123; Global p-value (Log-Rank): 0.05 0.1 0.2 0.5 1 2 5 10 2.9601e-08											
AIG. 1429.07, GUICUIUAIICE IIIUEX. 0.72											

MES Hazard Ratios

В

MFS – Hazard Ratios



Figure S2. Clinicopathologic and genomic differences between nonmetastatic (NM) and ever-metastatic (EM) primary tumors, Related to Figure 2. (A) Oncoprint of NM and EM primary tumors from Dana-Farber Cancer Institute in the GENIE-Biopharma Collaborative data set. All genes altered at significantly different frequencies between the two groups in our cohort are displayed. (B) Comparisons of clinicopathologic features between nonmetastatic and metastatic patients in the GENIE validation cohort. (C) Scatter plot of the *q*-values of gene pairs for co-occurrence and mutual exclusivity between NM and EM tumors. The indicated gene pairs are those shared between EM and NM tumors and those private to NM tumors. Dotted lines represent *q*=0.05. (D) Forrest plot showing metastasis-free survival (MFS) for all genes altered in at least 3% of samples (*left*) and genes plus clinicopathologic features (*right*). Statistical analyses: (A-C) Fisher's exact test. (D) Cox-proportional hazards, log-rank test. *p*-values are as indicated. Squares represent hazard ratio (HR) and whiskers display 95% confidence interval (CI).



Figure S3. Comparisons of site-specific non- and ever-metastatic tumors and metastatic burden, Related to Figure 3. (A). Upset plot illustrating abundance of metastatic patterns across patients with at most 3 metastatic sites. (B) Heat map demonstrating co-occurrence and mutual exclusivity between metastatic sites. (C) Bar plots showing the distribution of metastatic burden for clinicopathologic features. (D) Violin plot of the distribution of tumor mutational burden (TMB) and boxplot showing ploidy for tumors with 1, 2, or ≥ 3 distinct metastatic sites. Boxplots display median values, interquartile range (IQR) boxes, and whiskers demonstrating 1.5 x IQR. *p*-values for pairwise comparisons between groups noted. Bar plots demonstrating proportion of patients with whole-genome duplication (WGD) by number of metastatic sites. (E) Bar plot showing the breakdown of age in patients, stratified by metastatic burden, for GENIE validation cohort. (F) Bar plots displaying the breakdown of metastatic burden for TP53 and ERBB2 altered and wild-type (WT) tumors for GENIE validation cohort. (G) Bar plots showing proportion of primary tumors with metastasis to a given site stratified by predominant histologic subtype. Statistical analyses: (B-C, E-G) Fisher's exact test. q-values correct for multiple comparisons using the false-discovery rate (FDR). (D) Wilcoxon rank-sum test for TMB and ploidy; Fisher's exact test for WGD. CNS, central nervous system; Met, metastatic.



Time

Time



Time

Time

Time

Time

Figure S4. Kaplan-Meier Curves for Metastasis-Free Survival (MFS), Related to Figure 3.

(A) Kaplan-Meier curves for MFS for each site stratified by SMARCA4 status. (B) Kaplan-Meier curves for MFS for each site stratified by CDKN2A status. (C) Kaplan-Meier curves for MFS for each site stratified by Hippo pathway status. CNS, central nervous system; WT, wildtype.

TMB FGA WGD Metastatic Site		
TP53	62%	
*EGFR	34%	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,
*KRAS	27%	
*CDKN2A	24%	
KEAP1	8%	
STK11	16%	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
NKX2-1	13%	
*TERT	11%	
FOXA1	9%	
MYC	9%	
*RBM10	7%	
MET	7%	
SMARCA4	7%	
RB1	7%	
MDM2	6%	
NF1	6%	
*ALK	5%	
CTNNB1	4%	
*PIK3CA	5%	
*BRAF	5%	
CDK4	5%	
ARID1A	5%	
ATM	4%	
SMAD4	4%	
MGA	5%	and the second
ERBB2	4%	
SETD2	4%	

Genetic Alteration Inframe Mutation (putative driver) Missense Mutation (putative driver) Splice Mutation (putative driver) Truncating Mutation (putative driver) Amplification Deep Deletion No alterations TMB 0 10.4 FGA 0.01 1 WGD No Yes Metastatic Site Adrenal Bone CNS Liver LN Lung Pleura *q <0.10 for at least one metastatic site





А

Figure S5. Genomic comparisons between metastatic lesions from different sites, Related to Figure 4. (A) Oncoprint of metastatic lesions (ML) stratified by anatomic site displaying genomic features and all genes altered in \geq 3% of cohort. *q<0.10 for at least one metastatic site. (B) Violin plots of the distribution of tumor mutational burden (TMB) and fraction of genome altered (FGA) for seven metastatic sites. Boxplots display median values, interquartile range (IQR) boxes, and whiskers demonstrating 1.5 x IQR. *Right*: Bar plots showing frequency of whole genome duplication (WGD) across each site. (C) Heat map listing percentage of samples with a given gene or pathway alteration, stratified by metastatic site. *q<0.10, red * indicates alteration enriched in metastatic site, blue * indicates alteration depleted in metastatic site. Y, yes - metastatic lesions from indicated anatomic site; N, no - metastatic lesions from all other anatomic sites. Statistical analyses: (A, C) Fisher's exact test comparing site of interest to all other sites. *q*-values correct for multiple comparisons using the false-discovery rate (FDR). **q*<0.10. (B) Wilcoxon rank-sum test for TMB and FGA; Fisher's exact test for WGD. CNS, central nervous system; LN, lymph node.



Þ

Α

* p < 0.05 ** q < 0.05

Figure S6. Comparison of alterations between primaries and metastases in GENIE validation cohort and mutation signatures for MSK-IMPACT samples, Related to Figure 4. (A) GENIE validation cohort. *Left*: Violin plot showing differences in mutational burden between primary and metastatic samples. Boxplots display median values, interquartile range (IQR) boxes, and whiskers demonstrating 1.5 x IQR. *Right*: Dot plot comparing differences in gene-level copy number alterations called between primary and metastases. (B) Oncoprint of primary and metastatic tumors in GENIE validation cohort. (C) Frequencies of IMPACT samples with APOBEC-related signatures present according to metastatic site. Statistical analyses: (A) Wilcoxon rank-sum test. (B-C) Fisher's exact test. *q*-values account for multiple tests through false-discover rate (FDR) correction.



В

Figure S7. Comparison of sample-level genomic features for samples sequenced with MSK-IMPACT and whole-exome sequencing (WES), Related to Figure 4. (A) Scatter plot highlighting correlation between tumor mutational burden (TMB) reported by MSK-IMPACT (x-axis) and number of mutations detected by WES (y-axis). (B) Fraction of genome altered (FGA) estimated from MSK-IMPACT (x-axis) versus FGA estimated from WES (y-axis). (C) Percentage of samples with similar or differing calls for whole-genome duplication (WGD) based on data from MSK-IMPACT and WES. In our cohort, 121 samples were sequenced by next-generation sequencing (MSK-IMPACT) and WES. We observed agreement between the two methods in ~88% of whole-genome duplication calls. Statistical analyses: (A-B) Pearson correlation with correlation coefficients and p-values as indicated.



Figure S8. Patient-level comparisons in paired primary and metastatic samples in IMPACT samples and whole-exome sequencing (WES), Related to Figure 5. (A) *Top:* Bar plot illustrating fraction of alterations shared and private between matched primary and metastases. *Bottom:* Bar plots showing the distribution of actionable, oncogenic, and variants of unknown significance (VUS) separated by alterations private to primary, shared alterations, and alterations private to metastasis. (B) Comparison of cancer cell fraction (CCF) for individual mutations in paired WES primary and metastatic samples. Each point represents an individual mutation. Mutations considered oncogenic per OncoKB are highlighted by displaying name of their associated gene. (C) Comparison of mutational signatures for paired WES primary and metastatic samples. (D) Quantification of differences in selected mutational signatures from panel C. CNS, central nervous system.

			Cohort			
Analysis	NM	ES-M	LS-M	ML	MP-M	WES
1. Features associated with metastasis in primary tumors	Х	Х	Х			
2. Features associated with MFS in surgical patients	Х	Х				
3. Patterns of metastasis and metastatic burden		Х	Х			
4. Features associated with site-specific metastasis		Х	Х			
5. Time-to-event site-specific metastasis		Х				
6. Comparisons of metastases across sites				Х		
7. Analysis of mutational signatures	Х	Х	Х	Х		Х
8. Comparisons of unmatched metastases and primary tumors		Х	Х	Х		
9. Comparisons of matched primary tumors and metastases					Х	Х

Table S8. Overview of cohorts used in specific analyses, Related to STAR Methods

ES-M, early-stage metastatic; LS-M, late-stage metastatic; MFS, metastasis-free survival; ML, metastatic lesion; MP-M, matched primary-metastasis; NM, nonmetastatic; WES, whole-exome sequencing.