

1 **Additional file 2: Supplementary Methods**

2 **TCGA Data**

3 To validate the findings from this study, we identified a subset of 42 (10 LT, 32 ST) HGSOC from
4 TCGA that matched the clinical and survival description of our study cohort using the most complete
5 patient information downloaded on November 1, 2016. Curated and annotated somatic mutations
6 from WES sequencing and segmented copy ratio from Affymetrix 6.0 single nucleotide polymorphism
7 (SNP) arrays for each sample in the TCGA ovarian cancer study were downloaded from Broad GDAC
8 Firebrowse (<http://firebrowse.org/?cohort=OV/>). RNA-seq V2 FASTQ files for each TCGA OV sample
9 was downloaded from Genomic Data Commons Data Portal (<https://portal.gdc.cancer.gov>) with
10 controlled data access permissions and processed through the in-house RNA-seq data pre-processing
11 pipeline as described below.

12 **Whole Exome Analysis**

13 *Library Preparation and Sequencing:* 200 ng from each DNA sample was used to generate libraries
14 following Agilent SureSelect XT target enrichment kit as per protocol. 500ng to 750ng of amplified
15 library from each sample was hybridized for 24 hours using baits from Agilent SureSelect Human All
16 Exon V5 +UTRs. Size distribution of captured libraries was verified using an Agilent Bioanalyzer and
17 concentration measured by qPCR. All libraries were normalized to 10nM and pooled. 12pM of pooled
18 libraries were loaded onto Illumina cBot for cluster generation and the flow cell sequenced using
19 100bp paired-end reads using Illumina HiSeq 2000 or 2500 instruments. Tumor samples were
20 sequenced to achieve 250X coverage and patient matched normal tissue DNA samples 50X coverage
21 at the Princess Margaret Genomics Centre (PMGC).

22 *Data Pre-processing:* Following the Genome Analysis ToolKit (GATK) Best Practices for Somatic SNV
23 Discovery in Whole Genome and Exome Sequence [1–3], raw sequencing reads were aligned to the
24 human genome reference sequence (hg19) using the Burrows-Wheeler Alignment (bwa) tool (version

25 0.7.12) [4].The aligned BAM file was further processed to flag PCR duplicate reads using Picard
26 MarkDuplicates tool (version 1.130). For each tumor and normal tissue data pair, regions with
27 insertions and deletions (Indels) were realigned using GATK IndelRealigner (version 1.130) to
28 minimize number of mismatched bases across all reads. To identify potential sample misannotation
29 between patients, genotype correlation of germline single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) detected
30 using HaplotypeCaller (version 3.0) were compared between all samples sequenced in the study.

31 **RNA-seq Analysis**

32 *Library Preparation and Sequencing:* RNA samples were quantified by Qubit (Life Technologies) and
33 quality by Agilent Bioanalyzer. All samples with RNA integrity (RIN) score above 8 were considered
34 intact. Libraries were prepared using TruSeq Stranded Total RNA kit (Illumina). One hundred fifty
35 nanograms from tumor RNA samples were ribosomal RNA depleted using Ribo-zero Gold rRNA
36 beads, following purification intact RNA was fragmented. RNA samples with Bioanalyzer RIN score
37 between 1-2.8 were not fragmented. The cleaved RNA fragments were copied into first strand cDNA
38 using reverse transcriptase and random primers. This is followed by second strand cDNA synthesis
39 using RNase H and DNA Polymerase I. A single “A” based were added and adapter ligated followed
40 by purification and enrichment with PCR to create cDNA libraries. Final cDNA libraries were size
41 validated using Agilent Bioanalyzer and concentration validated by qPCR. All libraries were
42 normalized to 10nM and pooled together. 11pM of pooled libraries were loaded onto Illumina cBot for
43 cluster generation. Clustered flow cell was then sequenced pair-end 100 cycles V3 using Illumina
44 HiSeq 2000 to achieve a minimum of ~80 million reads per sample at the PMGC.

45 *Data Pre-processing:* FASTQ files containing paired-end raw reads are aligned to human genome
46 reference GRCh37 with transcript annotation GENCODE v19 using STAR (version 2.4.2a) [5] two-
47 pass method. Gene-wise transcript abundances are quantified using RSEM (version 1.2.29) [6] into
48 units of transcripts per million (TPM). RNA-seq data quality for each sample was assessed based on
49 total number of unique read fragments sampled (estimated # unique reads). RNA-seq data from all

50 FFPE preserved tumor samples were excluded from whole transcriptome analysis due to low data
51 quality.

52 ***TP53 Targeted Deep Sequencing***

53 *Library Preparation and Sequencing:*

54 Sequencing libraries were prepared for 7 DNA samples from tumors lacking detectable *TP53* mutation
55 by exome sequencing. DNA samples were first sheared to 300ng, and 100ng of DNA was used to
56 generate libraries using the KAPA Hyper Prep Kit protocol v5.16. Adapter ligation was completed
57 overnight using NEXTflex adapters and 5 cycles were completed in library amplification. Library DNA
58 samples were pooled by sample type: FFPE DNA and Fresh Frozen (FF) DNA. 143ng of each FF
59 library DNA sample were pooled together for a total of ~1000ng capture sample. 100-110ng of each
60 FFPE library DNA were pooled together for a total of 630ng capture sample. Target capture was
61 completed using the IDT Hybridization capture of DNA libraries using custom xGen Lockdown Probes
62 (covering all exons of *TP53*, *KRAS*, *CDKN2A*, and *SMAD4*) and Reagents v.2 protocol. 0.616pmol of
63 custom designed capture probes was added to each capture, followed by overnight hybridization (~15
64 hours). Post capture PCR enrichment for FFPE and FF captures was set to 16 cycles. Libraries were
65 pooled and loaded onto Illumina cBot for cluster generation and the flow cell sequenced using V4
66 125bp paired-end reads using Illumina HiSeq 2500 to a total of 40 million reads at the PMGC.

67 **DNA Mutation Analysis**

68 Germline mutations in known DNA repair genes in ovarian cancer (*BRCA1*, *BRCA2*, *RAD51*, *RAD51C*,
69 *RAD51D*) were identified using GATK HaplotypeCaller (version 1.130) from normal tissue BAM files
70 with default settings. Germ-line mutation calls were annotated using Oncotator (version 1.5.3) [7].
71 Variants in DNA repair genes were matched to variants described in the NCBI ClinVar Database
72 (version 12.03.20) and prioritized according to reported clinical significance.

73 The complete somatic sequence mutation profile for each tumor sample is generated using MuTect
74 (version 1.1.4) for single nucleotide variations (SNVs) and Strelka (version 1.0.14) [8] for small
75 insertions and deletions (Indels) on paired normal and tumor tissue BAM files. Variants are annotated
76 using Oncotator (version 1.5.3). Variants with low variant allelic frequency ($VAF < 0.10$) are excluded
77 from subsequent analysis in concordance with the variant detection threshold used in the TCGA OV
78 study. Wong *et al.* [9] have demonstrated, by conducting deep targeted sequencing of DNA from
79 formalin treated samples, that the majority of the formalin-treatment induced single nucleotide
80 changes occur at allele frequency of less than 10%. By applying this threshold, we did not detect any
81 statistical significant difference in the total number of SNVs detected in formalin-treated compared to
82 untreated samples (Additional file: Fig. S17). In addition, although more formalin-treated samples were
83 included within the long-term survivors cohort as compare to the short-term survivors group, we did
84 not observe an association between mutation burden and formalin-treatment that would explain our
85 mutation burden finding between the two survival groups (Additional file 1: Fig. S18). Recurrently
86 mutated genes by SNVs and Indels were identified separately for each survival cohort using
87 MutSigCV (version 1.4) [10] from Oncotator output.

88 As a denominator for calculating mutation frequency, we defined a bed file describing genomic
89 intervals for mutation calling from all overlapping regions between coding exon regions (Human
90 genome reference GRCh37 RefGene UCSC Track) with 2 base pair padding at start and end with
91 genomic intervals targeted by SureSelect Human All Exons + UTR V5 probe design. Mutations were
92 identified using MuTect (version 1.1.4) from paired normal and tumor exome sequence bam files. To
93 calculate mutation rate, the denominator describes the total number of bases with sufficient coverage
94 (7 in normal and 14 in tumor) for mutation call by MuTect within coding exonic intervals +/- 2 bases
95 (mean 30 Mbp). The numerator contains all non-synonymous somatic mutations detected the covered
96 coding genomic regions with minor allele frequency exceeding 5%.

97 Composition of previously defined mutational signatures for each sample was inferred from somatic
98 SNVs with variant allele frequency greater than 10% using the DeconstructSigs R-package (version
99 1.8.0) [11]. By default, all scores greater than 2% were reported in the analysis output.

100 **Power Analysis**

101 We conducted power analysis for our study. Considering that this study is exploratory and
102 hypothesis generating, all statistical tests will be two-sided with the significance level defined as 0.05.
103 Give the 20 LT and 21 ST subjects, assuming a strong effect (mean difference between LT and ST
104 groups) to be 1.2 standard deviation (SD) of the biomarker, with two-sided significance level at 0.05,
105 our study will provide 96% power to detect statistically significant association. However, if assuming a
106 moderate effect (mean difference between LT and ST groups) to be 1.0 SD of the biomarker, with two-
107 sided significance level at 0.05, our study will provide 87% power to detect statistically significant
108 association. For a weak effect with 0.5 SD of the biomarker, our study will have very low power (35%)
109 to detect statistically significant association.

110 **References**

- 111 1. DePristo MA, Banks E, Poplin R, Garimella KV, Maguire JR, Hartl C, et al. A framework for variation
112 discovery and genotyping using next-generation DNA sequencing data. *Nat Genet.* 2011;43:491–8.
- 113 2. McKenna A, Hanna M, Banks E, Sivachenko A, Cibulskis K, Kernytsky A, et al. The Genome
114 Analysis Toolkit: a MapReduce framework for analyzing next-generation DNA sequencing data.
115 *Genome Res.* 2010;20:1297–303.
- 116 3. Van der Auwera GA, Carneiro MO, Hartl C, Poplin R, Del Angel G, Levy-Moonshine A, et al. From
117 FastQ data to high confidence variant calls: the Genome Analysis Toolkit best practices pipeline. *Curr*
118 *Protoc Bioinforma.* 2013;43:11.10.1–33.
- 119 4. Li H, Durbin R. Fast and accurate long-read alignment with Burrows-Wheeler transform. *Bioinforma*
120 *Oxf Engl.* 2010;26:589–95.
- 121 5. Dobin A, Davis CA, Schlesinger F, Drenkow J, Zaleski C, Jha S, et al. STAR: ultrafast universal
122 RNA-seq aligner. *Bioinforma Oxf Engl.* 2013;29:15–21.
- 123 6. Li B, Dewey CN. RSEM: accurate transcript quantification from RNA-Seq data with or without a
124 reference genome. *BMC Bioinformatics.* 2011;12:323.
- 125 7. Ramos AH, Lichtenstein L, Gupta M, Lawrence MS, Pugh TJ, Saksena G, et al. Oncotator: cancer
126 variant annotation tool. *Hum Mutat.* 2015;36:E2423–9.

- 127 8. Saunders CT, Wong WSW, Swamy S, Becq J, Murray LJ, Cheetham RK. Strelka: accurate somatic
128 small-variant calling from sequenced tumor-normal sample pairs. *Bioinforma Oxf Engl*. 2012;28:1811–
129 7.
- 130 9. Wong SQ, Li J, Tan AY-C, Vedururu R, Pang J-MB, Do H, et al. Sequence artefacts in a
131 prospective series of formalin-fixed tumours tested for mutations in hotspot regions by massively
132 parallel sequencing. *BMC Med Genomics*. 2014;7:23.
- 133 10. Lawrence MS, Stojanov P, Polak P, Kryukov GV, Cibulskis K, Sivachenko A, et al. Mutational
134 heterogeneity in cancer and the search for new cancer-associated genes. *Nature*. 2013;499:214–8.
- 135 11. Rosenthal R, McGranahan N, Herrero J, Taylor BS, Swanton C. deconstructSigs: delineating
136 mutational processes in single tumors distinguishes DNA repair deficiencies and patterns of
137 carcinoma evolution. *Genome Biol* [Internet]. 2016 [cited 2017 Jun 19];17:31. Available from:
138 <http://dx.doi.org/10.1186/s13059-016-0893-4>

139