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**Abstract:**

**Summary:**

The analysis of mutational signatures is becoming increasingly common in cancer genetics, with emerging implications in cancer evolution, classification, treatment decision and prognosis. ~~Mutations that result in cancers are caused by several mutational processes; mutational signature analysis can identify the contribution of these processes to observed mutational patterns.~~ Recently, several packages have been developed for mutational signature analysis, with each using different methodology and yielding significantly different results. Because of the nontrivial differences in tools’ results, researchers may desire to survey and compare the available tools, in order to objectively evaluate the results for their specific research question, such as which mutational signatures are prevalent in different cancer types. There is a need for a software that can aggregate results from different packages and present them in a user-friendly way to facilitate effective comparison of mutational signatures.

**Availability and implementation:**

MetaMutationalSigs is implemented using R and python and is available for installation using Docker and available at: <https://github.com/PalashPandey/MetaMutationalSigs>

Contact:

Palash Pandey (pp535@drexel.edu).

Supplementary information:

More information about the package including test data and results are availab;e at <https://github.com/PalashPandey/MetaMutationalSigs>

**Introduction:**

~~Cancerous~~ Mutational signature analysis provides an operative framework to understand the somatic evolution of cancer from normal tissue [19, 21, 22, 23, 24]. From the earliest phases of neoplastic changes, cells may acquire several types of mutations in the form of single nucleotide variants, insertions and deletions, copy number changes and chromosomal aberrations. These mutations are ~~hypothesized to be~~ caused by multiple mutational processes operative in cancer leaving behind specific footprints in the DNA that can by captured by ~~tumor~~ mutational signature analysis[4,20],. It is becoming increasingly evident that these ~~tumor~~ mutational signatures are not only important for understanding cancer evolution but also may have therapeutic implications, thus this an a very active and important area of research [1,2,3,20].

The basic idea behind mutational signatures is that mutational processes create specific patterns of mutations. Thus, it follows that if one can identify these patterns in a given sample then they can essentially detect the corresponding mutational processes. The possible mutations are grouped into 6 mutation types based on the base where the mutation was observed. These 6 mutation types are C>A, C>G, C>T, T>A, T>C, and T>G. Now, these 6 types of mutations are further divided based on their location, i.e., other bases that are in their immediate proximity giving us the 96 mutation types that are termed the single based substitution context. Alexandrov et al. first developed and applied this idea to The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) [7] data and identified the first iteration of 30 single base substitution (SBS) COSMIC signatures ~~termed as COSMIC signatures~~ [5], which came to be used as the de facto reference for signature refitting. The initial study was then expanded to the analysis of data from the Pan-Cancer Analysis of Whole Genomes (PCAWG) project [7], resulting in two additional ~~signatures using different contexts~~ signature classes/categories with multiple signatures in each class. These new classes are double base substitutions (DBS) signatures and insertions/deletions (indels) signatures, which are in addition to the reference SBS signatures [8].

The mutational signature analysis workflow involves multiple steps that require different amounts of time and processing power. Briefly, the workflow starts from BAM files that are aligned to a reference genome and then proceeds to the variant calling step which outputs the VCF files. These steps are usually very resource-intensive and thus do not allow for much experimentation on personal computers (the downstream steps of variant filtering and annotation are much faster). The final step, the mutational signature analysis, is the least resource-intensive and, therefore, is easier for users to compare multiple methods on their desktop. Therefore, to facilitate comprehensive mutational signature analysis, we developed the package, MetaMutationalSigs. We developed a wrapper for multiple mutational signature packages [10,11,12,13] that are typically used for mutation signature analysis. Here, we have developed a standard format for inputs and outputs for easy interoperability and effective comparison respectively. With our previous experience in visualization of genomic data [18], we have also implemented standard visualizations for the results of all mutational signature packages to ensure easy analysis. MetaMutationalSigs software is easy to install and use through Docker.

**Approach:**

The two major methods typically used for mutational signature analysis are signature refitting and de-novo signature extraction. Signature refitting methods try to reconstruct the observed mutational pattern in the sample (the frequencies of 96 types of mutations) using linear combinations of known signatures (COSMIC 30, SBS, ID, etc.), these methods work quite well on small sample sizes (such as single samples) and are widely used with such data [6]. Signature extraction methods infer signatures from a given dataset ~~of samples~~, and then compare the extracted signatures with known reference signatures. Each extracted signature is assigned to a known signature if their cosine similarity exceeds a set threshold, if the similarity is less than the threshold then [4]. There are a few important caveats to signature extraction as recently discussed in [9]: 1) a novel signature can be very similar to several reference signatures and the assignment is not always perfect and 2) the threshold for assignment plays a crucial role but is not widely agreed upon, using a different threshold can change the assignment. [9]

We chose signature refitting as our primary task and implemented high performing packages as identified in [9] that were implemented in R. We implement DeconstructSigs [10], MutationalPatterns [11], Sigfit [12], Sigminer [13], these tools build up on other tools such as [14, 15]. Our package outputs several data files in CSV format ready for further analysis and visualization using external packages along with visualizations of the signature exposures as described in **Table 1**.

We use root mean squared error (RMSE) between the reconstructed and actual signals (a metric commonly used in signal processing [17]] as our performance metric for comparison of these packages.

**Discussion:**

The massive increase in the number of software packages has made managing dependencies quite burdensome, coupled with incompatible data formats for signature matrices can make mutational signature analysis difficult and hard to reproduce. Our package provides an easy way of performing these setup related tasks so one can focus more on the analysis. Investigators should keep in mind that refitting approaches need a priori knowledge about the samples for effective interpretation [16] and the results should not be used as is without a sanity check.

Future work for this project would focus on expanding the tool to work with more packages and keep the reference signatures updated as new versions are released. Due to the open-source nature of the project, we also welcome additional feature requests using the project link on GitHub <https://github.com/PalashPandey/MetaMutationalSigs>

**Abbreviations.**

# Conflict of Interest.

# The authors declare that the research was conducted in the absence of any commercial or financial relationships that could be construed as a potential conflict of interest.Ethics Statement.

Not applicable to this study.

**Author Contributions.**

# Data Availability Statement.

All test data used is open source and is available with the software atGitHub <https://github.com/PalashPandey/MetaMutationalSigs>

**Funding.**

P.P. was supported by xxxxx, Fox Chase Cancer Center Risk Assessment Program Funds. S.A. was supported by DOD W81XWH-18-1-0148 (to S.A.). G.R. were supported by xxx (to G.R).

**References:**

[1] Iqbal, W., Demidova, E., Serrao, S., ValizadehAslani, T., Rosen, G., & Arora, S. (2020). RRM2B is frequently amplified across multiple tumor types: non-oncogenic addiction and therapeutic opportunities. doi: 10.1101/2020.09.10.291567

[2] Campbell, B., Light, N., Fabrizio, D., Zatzman, M., Fuligni, F., & de Borja, R. et al. (2017). Comprehensive Analysis of Hypermutation in Human Cancer. *Cell*, *171*(5), 1042-1056.e10. doi: 10.1016/j.cell.2017.09.048

[3] Chung, J., Maruvka, Y., Sudhaman, S., Kelly, J., Haradhvala, N., & Bianchi, V. et al. (2020). DNA polymerase and mismatch repair exert distinct microsatellite instability signatures in normal and malignant human cells. *Cancer Discovery*, CD-20-0790. doi: 10.1158/2159-8290.cd-20-0790

[4] Alexandrov LB, Nik-Zainal S, Wedge DC, Campbell PJ, Stratton MR. Deciphering Signatures of Mutational Processes Operative in Human Cancer. Cell Reports. 2013;3: 246–259. pmid:23318258

[5] Forbes SA, Beare D, Boutselakis H, Bamford S, Bindal N, Tate J, et al. COSMIC: somatic cancer genetics at high-resolution. Nucleic Acids Research. 2017;45: D777–D783. pmid:27899578

[6] Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network et al. “The Cancer Genome Atlas Pan-Cancer analysis project.” Nature genetics vol. 45,10 (2013): 1113-20. doi:10.1038/ng.2764

[7] The ICGC/TCGA Pan-Cancer Analysis of Whole Genomes Consortium., Campbell, P.J., Getz, G. et al. Pan-cancer analysis of whole genomes. Nature 578, 82–93 (2020)

[8] Alexandrov LB, Kim J, Haradhvala NJ, Huang MN, Ng AW, Boot A, et al. The Repertoire of Mutational Signatures in Human Cancer. bioRxiv. 2018; https://www.nature.com/articles/s41586-020-1943-3[9] Omichessan H, Severi G, Perduca V (2019) Computational tools to detect signatures of mutational processes in DNA from tumours: A review and empirical comparison of performance. PLOS ONE 14(9): e0221235

[10] Rosenthal R, McGranahan N, Herrero J, Taylor BS, Swanton C. deconstructSigs: delineating mutational processes in single tumors distinguishes DNA repair deficiencies and patterns of carcinoma evolution. Genome Biology. 2016;17. pmid:26899170

[11] Blokzijl F, Janssen R, van Boxtel R, Cuppen E. MutationalPatterns: comprehensive genome-wide analysis of mutational processes. Genome Medicine. 2018;10. pmid:29695279

[12] Gori K, Baez-Ortega A. sigfit: flexible Bayesian inference of mutational signatures. bioRxiv. 2018

[13] Wang, Shixiang, et al. “Copy number signature analyses in prostate cancer reveal distinct etiologies and clinical outcomes” medRxiv (2020)

[14] Mayakonda, Anand, et al. “Maftools: efficient and comprehensive analysis of somatic variants in cancer.” Genome research 28.11 (2018): 1747-1756

[15] Huang X, Wojtowicz D, Przytycka TM. Detecting presence of mutational signatures in cancer with confidence. Bioinformatics. 2018;34: 330–337

[16] Maura, F., Degasperi, A., Nadeu, F. *et al.* A practical guide for mutational signature analysis in hematological malignancies. *Nature Communications* 10, 2969 (2019)

[17] G. Rosen, "Comparison of Autoregressive Measures for DNA Sequence Similarity," 2007 IEEE International Workshop on Genomic Signal Processing and Statistics, Tuusula, Finland, 2007, pp. 1-4, doi: 10.1109/GENSIPS.2007.4365814

[18] Yemin Lan, J. Calvin Morrison, Ruth Hershberg, Gail L. Rosen, POGO-DB—a database of pairwise-comparisons of genomes and conserved orthologous genes, Nucleic Acids Research, Volume 42, Issue D1, 1 January 2014, Pages D625–D632, <https://doi.org/10.1093/nar/gkt1094>

[19] Robinson, P., Coorens, T., Palles, C., Mitchell, E., Abascal, F., & Olafsson, S. et al. (2020). Elevated somatic mutation burdens in normal human cells due to defective DNA polymerases. doi: 10.1101/2020.06.23.167668

[20] Alexandrov, L., Kim, J., Haradhvala, N., Huang, M., Tian Ng, A., & Wu, Y. et al. (2020). The repertoire of mutational signatures in human cancer. Nature, 578(7793), 94-101. doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-1943-3

[21] Lee-Six, H. et al. The landscape of somatic mutation in normal colorectal epithelial cells. Nature 574, 532–537, doi: 10.1038/s41586-019-1672-7 (2019)

[22] Brunner, S. F. et al. Somatic mutations and clonal dynamics in healthy and cirrhotic human liver. Nature 574, 538–542, doi: 10.1038/s41586-019-1670-9 (2019).

[23] Yoshida, K. et al. Tobacco smoking and somatic mutations in human bronchial epithelium. Nature 578, 266–272, doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-1961-1 (2020).[24] Moore, L. et al. The mutational landscape of normal human endometrial epithelium. Nature 580, 640–646, doi: 10.1038/s41586-020-2214-z (2020).

**Figure Legend.**

**Figure 1. NEED A ONE-LINER TO SUMMARIZE FIG.** A) Workflow for mutational signature analysis. Our tool MetaMutationalSigs is at the final level of analysis. B) Heatmap of Euclidean distance between the predicted exposures of COSMIC legacy signatures by different tools for a sample. C) Heatmap of Euclidean distance between the predicted exposures of COSMIC SBS signatures by different tools for a sample. D) RMSE of the reconstruction error using for each tool and reference signatures, lower is better. Prevalence of SBS:ID:DBS::100:10:1. E) Heatmap of COSMIC legacy signature exposures, one row per sample. F) Heatmap of COSMIC SBS signature exposures, one row per sample.

**Table Legend.**

**Table 1. SAME COMMENT AS ABOVE**

**Table 1. Summary** NEED A ONE-LINER HERE TO DESCRIBE WHAT THIS TABLE IS SHOWING.

|  |  |  |
| --- | --- | --- |
| File Name | Format | Description |
| Heatmap\_exposures\_all\_sigs\_legacy.pdf | pdf | Exposures for all COSMIC 30 signatures. |
| Heatmap\_exposures\_all\_sigs\_SBS.pdf | pdf | Exposures for all COSMIC SBS signatures. |
| Heatmap\_legacy.pdf | pdf | Heatmap for difference between the predicted exposures by different tools. One for each sample. |
| Heatmap\_SBS.pdf | pdf | Heatmap for difference between the predicted exposures by different tools. One for each sample. |
| legacy\_pie\_charts.html | html | Interactive pie charts of 30 legacy signature exposures, per sample and for each tool. |
| sbs\_pie\_charts.html | html | Interactive pie charts of SBS signature exposures, per sample and for each tool. |
| legacy\_rmse\_bar\_plot.png | png | Reconstruction error using 30 legacy COSMIC signatures for each tool. |
| sbs\_rmse\_bar\_plot.png | png | Reconstruction error using COSMIC SBS signatures for each tool. |
| toolname\_results\legacy\_sample\_error.csv | csv | Data used to create the bar plot. |
| toolname\_results\legacy\_sample\_exposure.csv | csv | data used to create heatmap and pie chart. |
| toolname\_results\sbs\_sample\_error.csv | csv | Data used to create the bar plot. |
| toolname\_results\sbs\_sample\_exposure.csv | csv | Data used to create heatmap and pie chart. |



**Figure 1**. Pandey et. al.