# **Supplementary Information**

Integrative analysis of long extracellular RNAs reveals a detection panel of structured and circular RNAs for liver cancer 2 **Supplementary Tables** 2 Table S1 | Clinical characteristic of study participants 3 Table S2 | Gene primer sequences used in RT-qPCR for long RNAs **Supplementary Figures** 4 Figure S1 | Overview of integrative analysis and experimental design in liver cancer. 4 Figure S2 | Characteristics of cell-free RNA-seq and exosomal RNA-seq. 5 Figure S3 | Alternative polyadenylation and differential editing events in liver cancer. 6 Figure S4 | RT-qPCR validation of differential expression and alternative splicing RNAs in the same 26 samples as used in the cfRNA-seq dataset. 7 Figure S5 | Machine learning model performances on the 10 candidates in exoRNA-seq and cfRNA data 8 Figure S6 | Comparison of using External RNA Controls Consortium (ERCC) RNA control and glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase (GAPDH) as reference genes for RT-qPCR analysis. 9 Figure S7 | miR-122 expression level for the diagnosis of AFP-negative liver cancer 10

# **Supplementary Tables**

#### Table S1 | Clinical characteristic of study participants

Clinical characteristic of participants in this study involved in the cfRNA sequencing, RTqPCR, and exosome enrichment assay, including age, sex, stage, tumor size, vascular invasion, AFP level, and category/tumor site.

cf-RNA Sequencing				RT-qPCR				Exosome Enrichment Assay									
Healthy Donor (n = 30) Variable No %		Liver Cancer (n = 35) Variable No. %		Healthy Donor (n = 37) Variable No. %		Liver Cancer (n = 68) Variable No. %		Healthy Donor (n = 16) Variable No. %		Liver Cancer (n = 16) Variable No. %							
Age, years	•	-	Age, years	-	-	Age, years	-	-	Age, years		-	Age, years	-	-	Age, years	-	-
Mean	66		Mean	56		Mean	62		Mean	56		Mean	62		Mean	57	
SD	7		SD	12		SD	13		SD	9		SD	9		SD	10	
Sex	Sex Sex		Sex Sex			Sex			Sex								
Male	14	47%	Male	29	83%	Male	15	41%	Male	61	90%	Male	8	50%	Male	13	81%
Female	16	55%	Female	0	1/%0	Female	22	59%	Female	/	10%	Female	8	50%	Female	3	19%
			Stage	4	11%				Stage	0	0				o	0	0
			Δ	26	75%	Chronic	henatiti	R*	Δ	57	84%				Δ	9	56%
			B	4	11%	Cintoine (r	1 = 24	, D	B	6	9%			В	7	44%	
			c	1	3%	Variable	No.	%	c	5	7%				Ċ	0	0
			Tumor size			Age, years	-		Tumor size					Tumor size			
			≤ 3 cm	11	31%	Mean	52		≤ 3 cm	28	41%				≤ 3 cm	4	25%
			> 3 cm	24	69%	SD	11		> 3  cm	40	59%				> 3 cm	12	75%
			Vascular Invasion		Sex			Vascular Invasion					Vascular Invasion				
			Yes	2	6%	Male	11	46%	Yes	3	5%				Yes	1	6%
			No	33	94%	Female	13	54%	No	64	94%				No	15	94%
			No biopsy	0	0				No biopsy	1	1%				No biopsy	0	0
			AFP						AFP						AFP		
			≤400ng/ml	28	80%				≤400ng/ml	58	85%				≤400ng/ml	11	80%
		> 400ng/ml	7	20%				> 400ng/ml	10	15%				> 400ng/ml	5	20%	
	Category/Tumor Site		Category/Tur Site	nor					Category/Tun Site	nor							
			HCC	33	94%				HCC	67	99%				HCC	15	94%
			ICC	0	0				ICC	0	0				ICC	1	6%
			Others	2	6%				Others	1	1%				Others	0	0

### Table1. Clinical characteristic of study participants.

\*: CHB patients were only used in the analysis of Figure 7 and Supplementary Figure 7.

Gene	Forward Primer	Reverse Primer
UGT2B7	CAGCAACTGGAAAACAAGCA	CTTTCCACAATTCCCAGAGC
CAMK4	GATGGCAACGAGGACATGAAA	AACTTTCTCTAAGGCTTGCACC
circ-0073052	TCACCAGCCAACAGCTAAGA	TTTGTAACTGTCACACTTCTCC
circ-0080695	TGTGCGCCATAAGGAATTTCAA	ACTCCTCCTGGGTGAAATCCA
HULC	ACTCTGAAGTAAAGGCCGGA	TGCCAGGAAACTTCTTGCTTG
LINC01226	CCAGAGCTTCACACAAGCTATC	GAAGCCCCCTCCAATGTC
SNORD3B-1	GAGAAGTTTCTCTGAACGTGTA	AATGGCTGACGGCAGTTG
ADD3 (Full length)	GAACGTAAACAACAAGGCCT	TACCATGACAGGCACTTCCA
ADD3 (Non-ES)	GCCTAGAAGGATGCTGAGCA	CAGCTCATGGTTTTCCTTCTAAT
ADD3 (ES)	AGGCCTAGAAGGAAAACCATGA	ATCCTTGCCATTTACTACCATG
HNRNPH1 (Full length)	GGAAACCTACATCGTTCCTTCT	CAAGATTGAAGTCGAGATGACG
HNRNPH1 (Non-ES)	AAGAAGAGTCCCCCTCCTCATG	AAAGTTATATGGGACACGGGAT
HNRNPH1 (ES)	GAAACATGCCGAATCTCCT	AAAGTTATATGGGACTCTTCTTG
UBE2B1 (Full length)	GACCGCTAGTGAGTATATCGTG	GTCGATTGACACGGTAGAGGA
UBE2B1 (Non-ES)	GACATAGTGACACGTATCCTCG	CACCGACGCCGTACTCCT
UBE2B1 (ES)	AGGAGTACGGCTCATTTTCA	TTGACACGGTAGAGGATGAGGA
GAPDH	GAACGGGAAGCTTGTCATCAA	ATCGCCCCACTTGATTTTGG
ERCC96	CAACGGTGCAATCTCAGCTA	CACGAGGATGTTCCTGTTGA

Table S2 | Gene primer sequences used in RT-qPCR for long RNAs

# **Supplementary Figures**

#### Figure S1 | Overview of integrative analysis and experimental design in liver cancer.

We used 3 discovery sets (exoRNA-seq data from exoRBase, tissue RNA-seq data from TCGA, and self-profiled cfRNA-seq data) to discover candidate biomarkers, and a validation set (RT-qPCR data) to validate the marker in an independent cohort. Multiple types of RNA regulatory events were assayed on exosomal RNA-seq (exoRNA-seq) data to identify RNA variations. Cell-free RNA-seq (cfRNA-seq) data were profiled to find recurrent RNA variations as candidate biomarkers. TCGA data were collected to confirm these candidate biomarkers at tissue level. RT-qPCR experiment validated these candidate biomarkers in an independent cohort. The patients of liver cancer are in four stages: 0, A, B and C.

(HD: Healthy Donors, HCC: hepatocellular carcinoma, CHB: Chronic hepatitis B, \*: CHB patients' data were only used in the analysis of Figure 7 and Supplementary Figure 7.)



#### Figure S2 | Characteristics of cell-free RNA-seq and exosomal RNA-seq.

- (A) Left panel, number of genes identified by cell-free RNA-seq belonging to each RNA species. Right panel, reads distribution of RNA species among all individuals by cell-free RNA-seq.
- (B) Left panel, number of genes identified by exosomal RNA-seq belonging to each RNA species. Right panel, reads distribution of RNA species among all individuals by exosomal RNA-seq.



#### Figure S3 | Alternative polyadenylation and differential editing events in liver cancer.

(A) Alternative polyadenylation events between HCC patients and healthy donors identified in exoRNA-seq data.

(B) Differential editing events between HCC patients and healthy donors identified in exoRNA-seq.





# Figure S4 | RT-qPCR validation of differential expression and alternative splicing RNAs in the same 26 samples as used in the cfRNA-seq dataset.

- (A) Validation of the seven selected differentially expressed RNA candidates by sequencing data and RT-qPCR results. The RT-qPCR samples are a part of the samples of sequencing data (13 0/A stage liver cancer patients; 13 healthy donors). \*\*\*: P-value < 0.001, \*: P-value < 0.05, Wilcoxon rank sum test. (FC: fold-change)</p>
- (B) Validation of the three selected alternatively spliced RNA candidates by sequencing data and RT-qPCR results. The RT-qPCR samples are a part of the samples of sequencing data (13 0/A stage liver cancer patients; 13 healthy donors). \*\*\*: P-value < 0.001, \*: P-value < 0.01, \*: P-value < 0.05, Wilcoxon rank sum test. (PSI: percent spliced in index)</p>



Figure S5 | Machine learning model performances on the 10 candidates in exoRNA-seq and cfRNA data

- (A) The performance of different classifiers (DT: Decision Tree, SVM: Support Vector Machine, LR: Logistic Regression, RF: Random Forest) on 10 candidates (7 differentially expressed RNAs and 3 alternative splicing events) in exoRNA-seq and cfRNA-seq data. We used 5-fold cross-validation and repeated 10 times by re-shuffling the data.
- (B) The left ROC curve represents the RF model trained on cfRNA-seq data and tested on exoRNA-seq data. AUC values of all stages (0, A, B and C) is labeled for exoRNA-seq. (The exoRNA-seq data do not have stage information.) The right ROC curve represents the RF model trained on exoRNA-seq data and tested on cfRNA-seq data. AUC values of all stages (0, A, B and C) and early stages (0 and A) are labeled for cfRNA-seq.



Figure S6 | Comparison of using External RNA Controls Consortium (ERCC) RNA control and glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase (GAPDH) as reference genes for RT-qPCR analysis.

- (A) Fold change values of expression level by RT-qPCR experiment for the selected five genes using ERCC and GAPDH as indicators between liver cancer patients (0/A stage) and healthy donors, liver cancer patients (B/C stage) and healthy donors.
- (B) P-values of Wilcoxon rank sum test of the expression level by RT-qPCR experiment for the selected five genes using ERCC and GAPDH as indicators between liver cancer patients (0/A stage) and healthy donors, liver cancer patients (B/C stage) and healthy donors.

Α		circ-73052	circ-80695	HULC	LINC01226	SNORD3B-1
ERCC	Liver cancer (0/A)	2.137	2.508	1.970	2.893	2.815
	Liver cancer (B/C)	1.639	0.842	1.478	1.968	1.771
	Liver cancer (0/A)	-0.269	-0.670	-0.038	0.734	0.186
GAFDH	Liver cancer (B/C)	0.877	0.073	1.569	1.582	1.327
					[	Fold Change
D						

D		circ-73052	circ-80695	HULC	LINC01226	SNORD3B-1
ERCC	Liver cancer (0/A)	0.005	0.010	0.031	0.002	0.002
	Liver cancer (B/C)	0.022	0.068	0.020	0.002	0.010
GAPDH	Liver cancer (0/A)	0.523	0.788	0.581	0.084	0.326
	Liver cancer (B/C)	0.268	1.08E-08	0.014	1.30E-04	0.003
					_	P-value
					1	0.05 0

#### Figure S7 | miR-122 expression level for the diagnosis of AFP-negative liver cancer

We use *miR-122* as an example to show that individual marker is not as good as the 3-RNA panel. Although *miR-122* was reported as biomarker for hepatic diseases (e.g., CHB: Chronic hepatitis B), the researches on the detection in chronic viral hepatitis have been inconsistent.<sup>1</sup> Thus, a single marker alone is not as good as the combination of 3 RNAs.

- $\Delta$ Ct values of the *miR-122* expression level by RT-qPCR experiment panel in all samples. The cutoff of - $\Delta$ Ct value is y =0.96, defined by requiring > 95% specificity in the training set (healthy donors, chronic hepatitis B patients and liver cancer patients). (AFP+: AFP positive (AFP > 400 ng/ml) liver cancer patients, AFP-: AFP negative (AFP < 400 ng/ml) liver cancer patients)



#### Reference

1 Zhou, X. *et al.* Diagnostic value of circulating miRNA-122 for hepatitis B virus and/or hepatitis C virus-associated chronic viral hepatitis. *Biosci Rep* **39**, doi:10.1042/BSR20190900 (2019).