Cell Genomics, Volume 4

Supplemental information

Long-read sequencing of an advanced

cancer cohort resolves rearrangements, unravels

haplotypes, and reveals methylation landscapes

Kieran O'Neill, Erin Pleasance, Jeremy Fan, Vahid Akbari, Glenn Chang, Katherine
Dixon, Veronika Csizmok, Signe MacLennan, Vanessa Porter, Andrew Dixon, Veronika Csizmok, Signe MacLennan, Vanessa Porter, Andrew Galbraith, Cameron J. Grisdale, Luka Culibrk, John H. Dupuis, Richard Corbett, James Hopkins, Reanne Bowlby, Pawan Pandoh, Duane E. Smailus, Dean Cheng, Tina Wong, Connor Frey, Yaoqing Shen, Eleanor Lewis, Luis F. Paulin, Fritz J. Sedlazeck, Jessica M.T. Nelson, Eric Chuah, Karen L. Mungall, Richard A. Moore, Robin Coope, Andrew J. Mungall, Melissa K. McConechy, Laura M. Williamson, Kasmintan A. Schrader, Stephen Yip, Marco A. Marra, Janessa Laskin, and Steven J.M. Jones

Supplemental Data Tables and Figures

Long-read sequencing of an advanced cancer cohort resolves rearrangements, unravels haplotypes, and reveals methylation landscapes

Kieran O'Neill^{1*}, Erin Pleasance^{1*}, Jeremy Fan^{1*}, Vahid Akbari^{1,5*}, Glenn Chang^{1*}, Katherine Dixon^{1*}, Veronika Csizmok^{1*}, Signe MacLennan^{1,5,8}*, Vanessa Porter^{1,5,8}, Andrew Galbraith¹, Cameron J. Grisdale¹, Luka Culibrk¹, John H. Dupuis¹, Richard Corbett¹, James Hopkins¹, Reanne Bowlby¹, Pawan Pandoh¹, Duane E. Smailus¹, Dean Cheng¹, Tina Wong¹, Connor Frey², Yaoqing Shen¹, Eleanor Lewis¹, Luis F. Paulin³, Fritz J. Sedlazeck³, Jessica M.T. Nelson¹, Eric Chuah¹, Karen L. Mungall¹, Richard A. Moore¹, Robin Coope¹, Andrew J. Mungall¹, Melissa K. McConechy¹, Laura M. Williamson¹, Kasmintan A. Schrader^{4,5}, Stephen Yip⁶, Marco A. Marra^{1,5,8}, Janessa Laskin⁷, Steven J.M. Jones^{1,5+}

1 Canada's Michael Smith Genome Sciences Centre at BC Cancer, Vancouver, Canada

2 Department of Medicine, University of British Columbia, Vancouver

3 Human Genome Sequencing Center, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, TX, USA

4 Hereditary Cancer Program, BC Cancer, Vancouver BC, Canada

5 Department of Medical Genetics, University of British Columbia, Vancouver BC, Canada

6 Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, University of British Columbia, Vancouver BC, Canada

7 Department of Medical Oncology, BC Cancer, Vancouver, Canada

8 Michael Smith Laboratories, University of British Columbia, Vancouver, BC, Canada *Contributed equally

+Corresponding author

Table S2. Summary of event counts for somatic SVs, related to Figure 2. Values are presented as median (interquartile range, 25th–75th percentile) per sample. LQ = Low Quality. HQ = High Quality.

Table S3. **Clinically-relevant fusion events and their causal SVs, as called in Illumina data, related to Figure 2.** All 8 were recapitulated in the lower-coverage ONT data.

Table S4a. Structural variant events called only in ONT (not in Illumina), including notes from manual review, related to Figure 2. Only those overlapping cancer genes were reviewed and included.

*This event was called two times in the same biopsy sequenced twice, at different times.

Table S4b. Structural variant events called only in Illumina (not in ONT), including notes from manual review, related to Figure 2. Only those overlapping cancer genes were reviewed and included. In 3/4 cases, this was due to low coverage of the ONT sequencing.

Table S5. Insertion events involving an OncoKB gene unique to Nanopore with manual review comments, related to Figure 2.

Table S6. TERT mutations in long-read POG cohort and associated expression and allelespecific methylation, related to Figure 5.

Figure S1. Cohort and sequencing information, related to Figure 1. (A-B) Overall survival for Long-read POG cohort by tumour type from date of advanced disease (A) and from date of biopsy (B). (C) Workflow for Nanopore sample preparation highlighting steps automated on the Nimbus96 liquid handler. (D) Nimbus96 robot deck layout for magnetic bead purification.

Figure S2. Per-sample counts of all SV calls (including germline) by type for all tumours, related to Figure 2. (A) Consensus calls between cuteSV and sniffles. (B) SV calls further broken down by caller across the cohort (cuteSV vs sniffles, vs calls shared between both callers).

Figure S3. Insertion events called in long-read data but not in short-read, related to Figure 2. (a) Putative false positive intronic 90 bp insertion event on *EGFR* at chr7:55167011 in POG049 called by nanomonSV with no visible read based support for a 90 bp event. (b) Intronic 328 bp insertion event on *KDM2B* at chr12:121524684 called by nanomonSV in POG111, miscalled by Illumina as a 111,113 bp inversion around chr12:121413571-121524684.

A

Figure S4. SV distributions and examples, related to Figure 2. (A) Number of somatic SV events per sample in different call sets. POG111 and POG147 stand out as having much more inversions called in the long-read data than all other cases. POG884 and POG986 stand out as having much more insertions called. (B) Nanopore-only insertion calls in an MSI-H sample POG986, annotated with RepeatMasker. Other repetitive elements such as Alu elements within RepeatMasker are demarcated as "other"

Fragment Size

Figure S5. Examples of complex SVs, related to Figure 2. (A-C) Shatterseek images of patient POG147 (A) and patient POG111 (B,C) with the 'Sniffles' structural variant profiles (top of subplots), and Ploidetect copy number calls (bottom of subplots). Duplication-like SVs are coloured blue, and deletion-like SVs are coloured orange, and highlight the tyfona-like structural variant profile of chromosome 5 (A) and chromosome 8 (B,C).

Figure S6. HPV integration events, related to Figure 2. (a) Gene expression in HPV-integrated samples. (b) Focal chromothripsis-like event at HPV integration site.

Figure S7. Factors affecting phasing in long-read sequenced tumours, related to Figure 3. (A) Effect of germline factors on phasing rate per-gene. SNP density (left) and proportion of the gene body made up of repeats (right) both correlate weakly with phasing rate. (B) Effects of somatic small variants (represented by TMB) on phasing. Neither phase block N50 nor completeness of phasing were significantly correlated. (C) Effect of somatic rearrangements (measured by genomic complexity) on phasing. Both phase block N50 and completeness of phasing were correlated, slightly more so than SNP density and repeats.

Figure S8. ASE in genes with nonsense mutations, related to Figure 3. (A) ASE status of genes containing nonsense mutations. (B) ASE genes with nonsense mutations by major and minor expressed allele. P values are Wilcoxon rank sum test.

Figure S9. Phasing of methylation information, related to Figure 4. (A) Allelic methylation of CpGs across *DUSP22*. Lighter points indicate hypomethylated alleles across the region and darker indicate hypermethylated alleles. Bottom, gene tracks for the top ten expressed transcripts. (C) *DUSP22* gene body methylation of tumour, blood and normal whole genome bisulfate sequencing samples at the sample and allelic level respectively (left two figures). Expression of alleles showing gene body hypermethylation in comparison to those showing hypomethylation (right). (D) Allelic expression of *DUSP22* for the major and minor allele of tumor samples compared to GTEx samples with more than 20 reads to determine major allele frequency. Allelic expression is shown across tissues of origin for cancers and normals and the color of each point indicates the cancer type. Wilcoxon rank-sum test p-values and significance labels are shown above plots (*P*<0.0001: ****, *P*<0.001: ***, *P*>0.05: ns). All samples with loss of heterozygosity or deletions in this gene were filtered out.

Figure S10. Average methylation at a range of regulatory regions in POG cases with either IDH activating or TET-inactivating mutations, related to Figure 4.

Figure S11. Allele-specific DMRs, related to Figure 4. (a) Number of allele-specific DMRs in matched blood and tumour type samples. (b) Upset plot demonstrating mapping of tumour-specific allelic DMRs to different genomic regions. (c) Recurring transcription factor (TF) binding sites with tumour-specific allelic DMR. The plot represents the top 30 TFs with the highest proportion of their binding sites recurrently overlapped to tumour-specific allelic DMR.

Figure S12. Methylation of specific cancer genes, related to Figure 5. (A) *CDKN2A* intragenic promoter methylation of balanced tumour, loss of heterozygosity (LOH) tumour, blood and normal reference samples at the sample (left) and allelic (centre) level. Expression of balanced and LOH tumor samples in comparison to Genotype-Tissue Expression (GTEx) reference expression data for all tissues (right). *P*-values are Wilcoxon rank-sum test. WGBS, whole genome bisulfite sequencing. (B) *CDKN2A* intragenic promoter methylation and expression for balanced and LOH samples (left). Percentile score for immune cell populations inferred by CIBERSORT in comparison to *CDKN2A* expression per sample (right). Spearman R values and corresponding p-values are shown. (C) Average fraction of methylated bases at each CpG in TERT promoter region in POG blood normals.

Figure S13. Methylation at tumour suppressor promoters, related to Figure 6. (a) Somatic mutation status and promoter methylation in *BRCA1* and *RAD51C*. (b) Allele-specific methylation in the *BRCA1* promoter region in three cases, POG277, POG1041, POG650. (c) Allele-specific methylation in the *RAD51C* promoter region in three cases, POG785, POG266, POG044.

Figure S14. Summary of ecDNAs detected across cohort, related to Figure 6. (A) Proportion of ecDNA+ and ecDNA- samples stratified by cancer type and biopsy site. Results obtained from running 189 samples through AmpliconArchitect, a short-read WGS ecDNA detection tool. (B) Molecular correlates of ecDNAs (n = 189). Two-sided Student's *t*-tests were used to judge significance with Bonferroni multiple testing correction. (C) Expression in transcripts per million (TPM) for *NRG1* pathway genes for ecDNA-containing breast cancer sample shown in red (*n*=1) compared to other breast cancer samples in the cohort (*n*=39). Significance assessed via one-vs-all permutation tests, with Bonferroni multiple testing correction.