# **Supplementary Information**

# **Alterations in Homologous Recombination Repair Genes in Prostate Cancer Brain Metastases**

Antonio Rodriguez-Calero<sup>1,2 §</sup>, John Gallon<sup>3 §</sup>, Dilara Akhoundova<sup>1,4</sup>, Sina Maletti<sup>1</sup>, Alison Ferguson<sup>1,5</sup>, Joanna Cyrta<sup>6</sup>, Ursula Amstutz<sup>7</sup>, Andrea Garofoli<sup>8</sup>, Viola Paradiso<sup>8</sup>, Scott A. Tomlins<sup>9</sup>, Ekkehard Hewer<sup>2,10</sup>, Vera Genitsch<sup>2</sup>, Achim Fleischmann<sup>2,11</sup>, Erik Vassella<sup>2</sup>, Elisabeth J. Rushing<sup>12</sup>, Rainer Grobholz<sup>13</sup>, Ingeborg Fischer<sup>13</sup>, Wolfram Jochum<sup>14</sup>, Gieri Cathomas<sup>15</sup>, Adeboye O. Osunkoya<sup>16</sup>, Lukas Bubendorf<sup>8</sup>, Holger Moch<sup>17</sup>, George Thalmann<sup>18</sup>, Charlotte K.Y. Ng<sup>1</sup>, Silke Gillessen<sup>19,20,21#</sup>, Salvatore Piscuoglio<sup>3,8 #\*</sup>, and Mark A. Rubin<sup>1,22 #\*</sup>

\* these authors contributed equally (first co-authorship)

# senior co-authorship

\* Correspondence: s.piscuoglio@unibas.ch and mark.rubin@dbmr.unibe.ch

- <sup>1</sup> Department for BioMedical Research, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland<br><sup>2</sup> Institute of Pathology, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland<br><sup>3</sup> Viscousl Survey and Drasjier, Madising Departy Labertany, Department
- 
- <sup>3</sup> Visceral Surgery and Precision Medicine Research Laboratory, Department of Biomedicine, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland
- <sup>4</sup> Department of Medical Oncology and Hematology, University Hospital Zurich, Zurich, **Switzerland**
- <sup>5</sup> Department of Oncology, Ludwig Cancer Centre, University of Lausanne, Lausanne, **Switzerland**
- <sup>6</sup> Department of Pathology, Institut Curie, University Paris Sciences et Lettres, Paris, France
- Department of Clinical Chemistry, Inselspital, Bern University Hospital, University of Bern, Bern, Switzerland
- 8 Institute of Medical Genetics and Pathology, University Hospital Basel, University of Basel, **Switzerland**
- 9 Departments of Pathology and Urology, University of Michigan Medical School, Ann Arbor, Michigan, USA
- $10$  Institute of Pathology, Lausanne University Hospital and University of Lausanne, Lausanne, Switzerland (current address)
- <sup>11</sup> Institute of Pathology, Cantonal Hospital Thurgau, Münsterlingen, Switzerland
- <sup>12</sup> Institute of Neuropathology, University Hospital Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland
- <sup>13</sup> Institute of Pathology, Cantonal Hospital Aarau, Aarau, Switzerland<br><sup>14</sup> Institute of Pathology, Cantonal Hospital St. Callen, St. Callen, Switz
- <sup>14</sup> Institute of Pathology, Cantonal Hospital St. Gallen, St. Gallen, Switzerland<br><sup>15</sup> Institute of Pathology, Cantonal Hospital Baselland, Liestal, Switzerland
- <sup>15</sup> Institute of Pathology, Cantonal Hospital Baselland, Liestal, Switzerland<br><sup>16</sup> Departments of Pathology and Laboratory Modicine, and Urelegy, Emer
- <sup>16</sup> Departments of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, and Urology, Emory University School of Medicine, Atlanta, USA
- <sup>17</sup> Department of Pathology and Molecular Pathology, University Hospital Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland
- <sup>18</sup> Department of Urology, Inselspital, Bern University Hospital, Bern, Switzerland
- <sup>19</sup> Faculty of Biomedical Sciences, USI, Lugano<br><sup>20</sup> Department of Opealogy, Captanal Heopital S
- <sup>20</sup> Department of Oncology, Cantonal Hospital St. Gallen, St. Gallen, Switzerland
- <sup>21</sup> Division of Cancer Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester, United Kingdom<br><sup>22</sup> Dam Cantar for Procision Madising Jusclepital, Para University Usersited University of
- <sup>22</sup> Bern Center for Precision Medicine, Inselspital, Bern University Hospital, University of Bern, **Switzerland**



**PCBM cohort establishment and conducted methods.** For 20 of the 51 patients included, we had both metastatic and matched primary samples. A total of 168 intratumoral regions of interest (ROIs) were selected based on morphology and, whenever enough tissue was available, additional immunohistochemistry. Each defined ROI within metastases (105 ROIs) and primary tumors (63 ROIs) represents one sample of this cohort. All samples underwent whole exome sequencing (WES) and targeted RNA analyses.



**Mutational burden in PCBM cohort. a.** Summary of tumor mutational burden for SNVs, insertions and deletions in PCBM primary, TCGA PCa primary, CRPC500 metastatic, and PCBM metastatic samples. **b**. Mean mutational burden for samples as from **a**. **c.** As in **b** but comparing only PCa primary with high grade (GG >3) TCGA samples. PCa n = 63, TCGA n = 495, TCGA GG>3 n = 286, PCBM n = 105,  $CRPC500 = 431$ . Horizontal lines in boxplots show mean, hinges show interquartile range, whiskers show 1.5 x interquartile range, points beyond 1.5 x IQR past hinge are shown Two-sided Wilcox test, FDR corrected *P* values. Source data are provided as a Source Data file.



**Differences in TMB are robust to technical differences across cohorts, and the absence of matched normal for a subset of PCBM cases. a**) Mean TMB in PCBM samples, with and without adjusting for depth by increasing threshold of # supporting reads 1.6 fold above the threshold used in the CRPC500 i.e. 16 reads. PCBM samples are compared to the CRPC500 cohort (metastases) or TCGA (primary PCa) PCBM primary  $n = 63$ , TCGA  $n = 495$ , PCBM metastases  $n = 105$ , CRPC500 = 431. **b**) Mean TMB in PCBM samples, with and without adjusting for depth by increasing thresholds for VAF and # supporting reads 2.58-fold, compared to the CRPC500 cohort (metastases) or TCGA (primary PCa). PCBM primary n = 63, TCGA n = 495, PCBM metastases n = 105, CRPC500 = 431. **c**) Mean TMB in PCBM samples (whole cohort), or only those for which matched normal tissue was available, compared to the TCGA (PCa) or CRPC500 cohort (metastases). PCBM primary  $n = 63$ . matched primary  $n = 61$ , TCGA  $n = 495$ , PCBM metastases  $n = 105$ , matched metastases  $n = 62$ , CRPC500 n = 431). Horizontal lines in boxplots show mean, hinges show interquartile range, whiskers show 1.5 x interquartile range, points beyond 1.5 x IQR past hinge are shown. Two-sided Wilcoxon test, FDR adjusted *P* values.



**Microsatellite instability.** MSI was assessed for patient 39 (a) and 48 (b) from primary tumor, brain metastasis and matched benign tissue by using five microsatellite loci recommended by the Bethesda panel plus BAT40. PCR products were analyzed by capillary electrophoresis using a 3500 genetic analyzer (Applied Biosystems). Both patients showed high microsatellite instability (MSI-H) status in the tumor components, primary tumor and metastasis, compared with the matched benign tissue.



**Mutational signatures present in the PCBM cohort. a.** Relative contribution of mutational signatures in the PCBM cohort, ordered by mean contribution. Signatures with relative contribution > 0.15 in at least one sample are shown. Signatures were calculated as the average from deconstructSigs and Mutational Patterns. Horizontal lines in boxplots show median, hinges show interquartile range, whiskers show 1.5 x interquartile range, points beyond 1.5 x IQR past hinge are shown **b.** Percentage of patients in which each signature was detected. Signatures with relative contribution > 0.15 in at least one sample are shown. N=51 patients. Source data are provided as a Source Data file.



**Comparison of SBS3 signature score in PCa primary samples from the PCBM cohort and high grade TCGA samples.** Points show mean, lines show data range. TCGA n = 286, PCa n = 20. Source data are provided as a Source Data file.



**Frequency of HRR gene alterations and presence of SBS3 across cohorts. a**. PCBM and CRPC500 non-brain metastases. PCBM n = 51, CRPC500 n = 416. **b.** Primaries from PCBM cohort and TCGA high grade samples (PCa n=20, TGCA n=281). Source data are provided as a Source Data file and in Supplementary Table 4 and 5.



**Clonal evolution in ten PCBM cases with matched primary and metastatic samples**. Trace plots show cancer cell fraction (CCF) for each mutational cluster in each sample from each patient **a**-**j** (P = primary, M = metastasis). Ribbons show 95 % confidence interval, centre of bands show mean cluster CCF estimate. Phylogenetic trees show best solution for evolutionary relationship between clones with different clusters of mutations where each node (numbered) is a cluster of mutations. Numbers on each branch show the number of mutations distinguishing a clone from the previous (all genes). Potential driver genes mutated in the distinction between a clone and the previous are indicated in colours corresponding to the branch. Solid branches show clusters of mutations which become clonal in metastatic samples. Source data are provided as a Source Data file.



**Cancer cell fraction of mutation clusters in six PCBM cases for which tree solutions could not be calculated.** Trace plots **a-f** show CCF for each mutational cluster in each patient sample (P = primary, M = metastasis). Ribbons show 95 % confidence interval, centre of bands shows mean cluster CCF estimate. Source data are provided as a Source Data file.



**Canonical pathways enriched for alterations in metastatic-clonal clusters**. Diagrams from Ingenuity Pathway Analysis showing canonical pathways (**a**) calcium signaling and (**b**) FAT10 signaling enriched for metastatic clonal mutations in PCBM. Altered molecules are highlighted in pink.







#### **Supplementary Table 2. Summary of large cohorts including metastases of prostate cancer within the last 10 years**

Ten large cohorts including molecular analyses of metastatic prostate cancer were reviewed based on available data from cBioPortal or publications (1-10). Overlapping patients were excluded (top). Patients and samples investigated in the current study (bottom). PCBM: including metastases from following locations: brain, dura (also epidural, subdural) and spinal cord. \* 2 patients were previously published in Baca et al, Cell, 2013 (11). \*\* 150 patients were previously published in Robinson et al, Cell, 2015 (12).

#### **References**

**1. Taylor, B.S. et al. Integrative genomic profiling of human prostate cancer. Cancer Cell 18, 11-22 (2010).**

**2. Grasso, C.S. et al. The mutational landscape of lethal castration-resistant prostate cancer. Nature 487, 239-43 (2012).**

**3. Gundem, G. et al. The evolutionary history of lethal metastatic prostate cancer. Nature 520, 353-357 (2015).**

**4. Kumar, A. et al. Substantial interindividual and limited intraindividual genomic diversity among tumors from men with metastatic prostate cancer. Nat Med 22, 369-78 (2016).**

**5. Aggarwal, R. et al. Clinical and Genomic Characterization of Treatment-Emergent Small-Cell Neuroendocrine Prostate Cancer: A Multi-institutional Prospective Study. J Clin Oncol 36, 2492-2503 (2018).**

**6. Abida, W. et al. Genomic correlates of clinical outcome in advanced prostate cancer. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A (2019).**

**7. Beltran, H. et al. Divergent clonal evolution of castration-resistant neuroendocrine prostate cancer. Nat Med 22, 298-305 (2016).**

**8. Abida, W. et al. Prospective Genomic Profiling of Prostate Cancer Across Disease States Reveals Germline and Somatic Alterations That May Affect Clinical Decision Making. JCO Precis Oncol 2017(2017).**

**9. van Dessel, L.F. et al. The genomic landscape of metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancers reveals multiple distinct genotypes with potential clinical impact. Nat Commun 10, 5251 (2019).**

**10. Mateo, J. et al. Genomics of lethal prostate cancer at diagnosis and castration resistance. J Clin Invest 130, 1743-1751 (2020).**

**11. Baca, S.C. et al. Punctuated evolution of prostate cancer genomes. Cell 153, 666-77 (2013).**

**12. Robinson, D. et al. Integrative clinical genomics of advanced prostate cancer. Cell 161, 1215-1228 (2015).** 

## **Supplementary Table 3. Patients fulfilling PROfound criteria\***



**Total of patients: 10/51= 19.6%**

\*According to the Profound criteria: A patient had a qualifying alteration if any deleterious or suspected deleterious alteration was found in the 15 pre-specified genes with a direct or indirect role in HRR. An alteration regarded as deleterious if it results in protein truncation (which includes nonsense, frameshift, or consensus splice site alterations), or select missense alterations well-known to be deleterious in ClinVar/BIC databases. *Furthermore, larger- scale alterations, such as genomic truncating rearrangements or homozygous deletions, were also classified as qualifying.*



