

# Contents

<b>Glossary</b>	<b>xiii</b>
<b>Acronyms</b>	<b>xv</b>
<b>1 Introduction and Literature Review</b>	<b>1</b>
1.1 Cancer Research in the Post-Genomic Era . . . . .	1
1.1.1 Cancer is a Global Health Issue . . . . .	2
1.1.1.1 The Genetics and Molecular Biology of Cancers . . . . .	3
1.1.2 The Genomics Revolution in Cancer Research . . . . .	3
1.1.2.1 High-Throughput Technologies . . . . .	4
1.1.2.2 Bioinformatics and Genomic Data . . . . .	5
1.1.3 Genomics Projects . . . . .	5
1.1.3.1 The Cancer Genome Project . . . . .	6
1.1.3.2 The Cancer Genome Atlas Project . . . . .	6
1.1.4 Genomic Cancer Medicine . . . . .	8
1.1.4.1 Cancer Genes and Driver Mutations . . . . .	8
1.1.4.2 Precision Cancer Medicine . . . . .	9
1.1.4.3 Molecular Diagnostics and Pan-Cancer Medicine . . . . .	9
1.1.4.4 Targeted Therapeutics and Pharmacogenomics . . . . .	10
1.1.5 Systems and Network Biology . . . . .	11
1.2 Synthetic Lethal Cancer Medicine . . . . .	12
1.2.1 Synthetic Lethal Genetic Interactions . . . . .	13
1.2.2 Synthetic Lethal Concepts in Genetics . . . . .	13
1.2.3 Synthetic Lethality in Model Systems . . . . .	15
1.2.3.1 Synthetic Lethal Pathways and Networks . . . . .	15
1.2.3.2 Evolution of Synthetic Lethality . . . . .	16
1.2.4 Synthetic Lethality in Cancer . . . . .	17
1.2.5 Clinical Impact of Synthetic Lethality in Cancer . . . . .	18
1.2.6 High-throughput Screening for Synthetic Lethality . . . . .	20
1.2.6.1 Synthetic Lethal Screens . . . . .	21
1.2.7 Computational Prediction of Synthetic Lethality . . . . .	22
1.2.7.1 Bioinformatics Approaches to Genetic Interactions . . . . .	22
1.2.7.2 Comparative Genomics . . . . .	23
1.2.7.3 Analysis and Modelling of Protein Data . . . . .	26
1.2.7.4 Differential Gene Expression . . . . .	28
1.2.7.5 Data Mining and Machine Learning . . . . .	29

1.2.7.6	Mutual Exclusivity and Bimodality . . . . .	32
1.2.7.7	Rationale for Further Development . . . . .	33
1.3	E-cadherin as a Synthetic Lethal Target . . . . .	33
1.3.1	The <i>CDH1</i> gene and its Biological Functions . . . . .	34
1.3.1.1	Cytoskeleton . . . . .	34
1.3.1.2	Extracellular and Tumour Micro-environment . . . . .	34
1.3.1.3	Cell-Cell Adhesion and Signalling . . . . .	35
1.3.2	<i>CDH1</i> as a Tumour (and Invasion) Suppressor . . . . .	35
1.3.2.1	Breast Cancers and Invasion . . . . .	35
1.3.3	Hereditary Diffuse Gastric (and Lobular Breast) Cancer . . . . .	36
1.3.4	Cell Line Models of <i>CDH1</i> Null Mutations . . . . .	37
1.4	Summary and Research Direction of Thesis . . . . .	38
1.4.1	Thesis Aims . . . . .	39
<b>2</b>	<b>Methods and Resources</b>	<b>40</b>
2.1	Bioinformatics Resources for Genomics Research . . . . .	40
2.1.1	Public Data and Software Packages . . . . .	40
2.1.1.1	Cancer Genome Atlas Data . . . . .	41
2.1.1.2	Reactome and Annotation Data . . . . .	42
2.2	Data Handling . . . . .	42
2.2.1	Normalisation . . . . .	42
2.2.2	Sample Triage . . . . .	43
2.2.3	Metagenes and the Singular Value Decomposition . . . . .	43
2.2.4	Candidate Triage and Integration with Screen Data . . . . .	45
2.3	Techniques . . . . .	46
2.3.1	Statistical Procedures and Tests . . . . .	46
2.3.2	Gene Set Over-representation Analysis . . . . .	47
2.3.3	Clustering . . . . .	47
2.3.4	Heatmap . . . . .	47
2.3.5	Modelling and Simulations . . . . .	48
2.3.5.1	Receiver Operating Characteristic Curves . . . . .	49
2.3.6	Resampling Analysis . . . . .	49
2.4	Pathway Structure Methods . . . . .	50
2.4.1	Network and Graph Analysis . . . . .	50
2.4.2	Sourcing Graph Structure Data . . . . .	51
2.4.3	Constructing Pathway Subgraphs . . . . .	51
2.4.4	Network Analysis Metrics . . . . .	52
2.5	Implementation . . . . .	53
2.5.1	Computational Resources and Linux Utilities . . . . .	53
2.5.2	R Language and Packages . . . . .	54
2.5.3	High Performance and Parallel Computing . . . . .	57
<b>3</b>	<b>Methods Developed During Thesis</b>	<b>59</b>
3.1	A Synthetic Lethal Detection Methodology . . . . .	59
3.2	Synthetic Lethal Simulation and Modelling . . . . .	61
3.2.1	A Model of Synthetic Lethality in Expression Data . . . . .	62

3.2.2	Simulation Procedure . . . . .	66
3.3	Detecting Simulated Synthetic Lethal Partners . . . . .	69
3.3.1	Binomial Simulation of Synthetic Lethality . . . . .	69
3.3.2	Multivariate Normal Simulation of Synthetic Lethality . . . . .	71
3.3.2.1	Multivariate Normal Simulation with Correlated Genes . . . . .	73
3.3.2.2	Specificity with Query-Correlated Pathways . . . . .	81
3.4	Graph Structure Methods . . . . .	83
3.4.1	Upstream and Downstream Gene Detection . . . . .	83
3.4.1.1	Permutation Analysis for Statistical Significance . . . . .	84
3.4.1.2	Hierarchy Based on Biological Context . . . . .	85
3.4.2	Simulating Gene Expression from Graph Structures . . . . .	86
3.5	Customised Functions and Packages Developed . . . . .	90
3.5.1	Synthetic Lethal Interaction Prediction Tool . . . . .	90
3.5.2	Data Visualisation . . . . .	91
3.5.3	Extensions to the iGraph Package . . . . .	93
3.5.3.1	Sampling Simulated Data from Graph Structures . . . . .	93
3.5.3.2	Plotting Directed Graph Structures . . . . .	93
3.5.3.3	Computing Information Centrality . . . . .	94
3.5.3.4	Testing Pathway Structure with Permutation Testing . . . . .	94
3.5.3.5	Metapackage to Install iGraph Functions . . . . .	95
<b>4</b>	<b>Synthetic Lethal Analysis of Gene Expression Data</b>	<b>96</b>
4.1	Synthetic Lethal Genes in Breast Cancer . . . . .	97
4.1.1	Synthetic Lethal Pathways in Breast Cancer . . . . .	98
4.1.2	Expression Profiles of Synthetic Lethal Partners . . . . .	100
4.1.2.1	Subgroup Pathway Analysis . . . . .	103
4.2	Comparing Synthetic Lethal Gene Candidates . . . . .	105
4.2.1	Primary siRNA Screen Candidates . . . . .	105
4.2.2	Comparison with Correlation . . . . .	105
4.2.3	Comparison with Primary Screen Viability . . . . .	108
4.2.4	Comparison with Secondary siRNA Screen Validation . . . . .	110
4.2.5	Comparison to Primary Screen at Pathway Level . . . . .	111
4.2.5.1	Resampling Genes for Pathway Enrichment . . . . .	113
4.2.6	Integrating Synthetic Lethal Pathways and Screens . . . . .	118
4.3	Synthetic Lethal Pathway Metagenes . . . . .	119
4.4	Replication in Stomach Cancer . . . . .	121
4.5	Discussion . . . . .	122
4.5.1	Strengths of the SLIPT Methodology . . . . .	122
4.5.2	Synthetic Lethal Pathways for E-cadherin . . . . .	123
4.5.3	Replication and Validation . . . . .	125
4.5.3.1	Integration with siRNA Screening . . . . .	125
4.5.3.2	Replication across Tissues . . . . .	126
4.6	Summary . . . . .	126

<b>5</b>	<b>Synthetic Lethal Pathway Structure</b>	<b>128</b>
5.1	Synthetic Lethal Genes in Reactome Pathways . . . . .	128
5.1.1	The PI3K/AKT Pathway . . . . .	129
5.1.2	The Extracellular Matrix . . . . .	131
5.1.3	G Protein Coupled Receptors . . . . .	134
5.1.4	Gene Regulation and Translation . . . . .	134
5.1.5	Gene Connectivity and Vertex Degree . . . . .	135
5.1.6	Gene Importance and Centrality . . . . .	137
	5.1.6.1 Information Centrality . . . . .	137
	5.1.6.2 PageRank Centrality . . . . .	139
5.2	Relationships between Synthetic Lethal Genes . . . . .	141
5.2.1	Hierarchical Pathway Structure . . . . .	141
	5.2.1.1 Contextual Hierarchy of PI3K . . . . .	141
	5.2.1.2 Testing Contextual Hierarchy of Synthetic Lethal Genes . . . . .	141
5.2.2	Upstream or Downstream Synthetic Lethality . . . . .	144
	5.2.2.1 Measuring Structure of Candidates within PI3K . . . . .	145
	5.2.2.2 Resampling for Synthetic Lethal Pathway Structure . . . . .	147
5.3	Discussion . . . . .	148
5.4	Summary . . . . .	150
<b>6</b>	<b>Simulation and Modelling of Synthetic Lethal Pathways</b>	<b>152</b>
6.1	Synthetic Lethal Detection Methods . . . . .	153
6.1.1	Performance of SLIPT and $\chi^2$ across Quantiles . . . . .	154
	6.1.1.1 Correlated Query Genes affects Specificity . . . . .	157
6.1.2	Alternative Synthetic Lethal Detection Strategies . . . . .	159
	6.1.2.1 Correlation for Synthetic Lethal Detection . . . . .	160
	6.1.2.2 Testing for Bimodality with BiSEp . . . . .	161
6.2	Simulations with Graph Structures . . . . .	162
6.2.1	Performance over Graph Structures . . . . .	163
	6.2.1.1 Simple Graph Structures . . . . .	163
	6.2.1.2 Constructed Graph Structures . . . . .	166
6.2.2	Performance with Inhibitions . . . . .	168
6.2.3	Synthetic Lethality across Graph Structures . . . . .	174
6.2.4	Performance within a Simulated Human Genome . . . . .	177
6.3	Simulations in More Complex Graph Structures . . . . .	182
6.3.1	Simulations over Pathway-based Graphs . . . . .	183
6.3.2	Pathway Structures in a Simulated Human Genome . . . . .	185
6.4	Discussion . . . . .	188
6.4.1	Simulation Procedure . . . . .	188
6.4.2	Comparing Methods with Simulated Data . . . . .	189
6.4.3	Design and Performance of SLIPT . . . . .	190
6.4.4	Simulations from Graph Structures . . . . .	192
6.5	Summary . . . . .	193

<b>7</b>	<b>Discussion</b>	<b>195</b>
7.1	Synthetic Lethality and <i>CDH1</i> Biology . . . . .	195
7.1.1	Established Functions of <i>CDH1</i> . . . . .	196
7.1.2	The Molecular Role of <i>CDH1</i> in Cancer . . . . .	196
7.2	Significance . . . . .	197
7.2.1	Synthetic Lethality in the Genomic Era . . . . .	197
7.2.2	Clinical Interventions based on Synthetic Lethality . . . . .	199
7.3	Future Directions . . . . .	200
7.4	Conclusions . . . . .	202
	<b>References</b>	<b>204</b>
<b>A</b>	<b>Sample Quality</b>	<b>228</b>
A.1	Sample Correlation . . . . .	228
A.2	Replicate Samples in TCGA Breast Cancer Data . . . . .	231
<b>B</b>	<b>Software Used for Thesis</b>	<b>235</b>
<b>C</b>	<b>Mutation Analysis in Breast Cancer</b>	<b>244</b>
C.1	Synthetic Lethal Genes and Pathways . . . . .	244
C.2	Synthetic Lethal Expression Profiles . . . . .	245
C.3	Comparison to Primary Screen . . . . .	248
C.3.1	Resampling Analysis . . . . .	250
C.4	Compare SLIPT genes . . . . .	252
<b>D</b>	<b>Metagene Analysis</b>	<b>254</b>
D.1	Pathway Signature Expression . . . . .	254
D.2	Somatic Mutation . . . . .	263
D.3	Synthetic Lethal Reactome Metagenes . . . . .	264
D.4	Expression of Somatic Mutations . . . . .	266
<b>E</b>	<b>Intrinsic Subtyping</b>	<b>269</b>
<b>F</b>	<b>Stomach Expression Analysis</b>	<b>271</b>
F.1	Synthetic Lethal Genes and Pathways . . . . .	271
F.2	Comparison to Primary Screen . . . . .	275
F.2.1	Resampling Analysis . . . . .	277
F.3	Metagene Analysis . . . . .	279
<b>G</b>	<b>Synthetic Lethal Genes in Pathways</b>	<b>280</b>
<b>H</b>	<b>Pathway Connectivity for Mutation SLIPT</b>	<b>288</b>
<b>I</b>	<b>Information Centrality for Gene Essentiality</b>	<b>292</b>
<b>J</b>	<b>Pathway Structure for Mutation SLIPT</b>	<b>295</b>

<b>K</b>	<b>Performance of SLIPT and <math>\chi^2</math></b>	<b>298</b>
K.1	Correlated Query Genes affects Specificity . . . . .	304
<b>L</b>	<b>Simulations on Graph Structures</b>	<b>310</b>
L.0.1	Simulations from Inhibiting Graph Structures . . . . .	311
L.1	Simulation across Graph Structures . . . . .	314
L.2	Simulations from Complex Graph Structures . . . . .	318
L.2.1	Simulations from Complex Inhibiting Graphs . . . . .	321
L.3	Simulations from Pathway Graph Structures . . . . .	327

# List of Figures

1.1	Synthetic genetic interactions . . . . .	14
1.2	Synthetic lethality in cancer . . . . .	17
2.1	Read count density . . . . .	44
2.2	Read count sample mean . . . . .	44
3.1	Framework for synthetic lethal prediction . . . . .	60
3.2	Synthetic lethal prediction adapted for mutation . . . . .	61
3.3	A model of synthetic lethal gene expression . . . . .	63
3.4	Modelling synthetic lethal gene expression . . . . .	64
3.5	Synthetic lethality with multiple genes . . . . .	65
3.6	Simulating gene function . . . . .	67
3.7	Simulating synthetic lethal gene function . . . . .	67
3.8	Simulating synthetic lethal gene expression . . . . .	68
3.9	Performance of binomial simulations . . . . .	70
3.10	Comparison of statistical performance . . . . .	70
3.11	Performance of multivariate normal simulations . . . . .	72
3.12	Simulating expression with correlated gene blocks . . . . .	74
3.13	Simulating expression with correlated gene blocks . . . . .	75
3.14	Synthetic lethal prediction across simulations . . . . .	77
3.15	Performance with correlations . . . . .	78
3.16	Comparison of statistical performance with correlation structure . . . . .	79
3.17	Performance with query correlations . . . . .	80
3.18	Statistical evaluation of directional criteria . . . . .	81
3.19	Performance of directional criteria . . . . .	82
3.20	Simulated graph structures . . . . .	86
3.21	Simulating expression from a graph structure . . . . .	88
3.22	Simulating expression from graph structure with inhibitions . . . . .	89
3.23	Demonstration of violin plots with custom features . . . . .	92
3.24	Demonstration of annotated heatmap . . . . .	92
3.25	Simulating graph structures . . . . .	94
4.1	Synthetic lethal expression profiles of analysed samples . . . . .	101
4.2	Comparison of SLIPT with siRNA . . . . .	106
4.3	Comparison of SLIPT and siRNA genes with correlation . . . . .	106
4.4	Comparison of SLIPT and siRNA genes with correlation . . . . .	108
4.5	Comparison of SLIPT and siRNA genes with screen viability . . . . .	109

4.6	Comparison of SLIPT genes with siRNA screen viability . . . . .	109
4.7	Resampled intersection of SLIPT and siRNA candidate genes . . . . .	114
5.1	synthetic lethality in the PI3K cascade . . . . .	130
5.2	synthetic lethality in Elastic Fibre Formation . . . . .	132
5.3	Synthetic lethality in Fibrin Clot Formation . . . . .	133
5.4	Synthetic lethality and vertex degree . . . . .	136
5.5	Synthetic lethality and centrality . . . . .	139
5.6	Synthetic lethality and PageRank . . . . .	140
5.7	Hierarchical structure of PI3K . . . . .	142
5.8	Hierarchy score in PI3K against synthetic lethality in PI3K . . . . .	143
5.9	Structure of synthetic lethality in PI3K . . . . .	144
5.10	Structure of synthetic lethality resampling in PI3K . . . . .	146
6.1	Performance of $\chi^2$ and SLIPT across quantiles . . . . .	155
6.2	Performance of $\chi^2$ and SLIPT across quantiles with more genes . . . . .	156
6.3	Performance of $\chi^2$ and SLIPT across quantiles with query correlation . . . . .	157
6.4	Performance of $\chi^2$ and SLIPT across quantiles with query correlation and more genes . . . . .	158
6.5	Performance of negative correlation and SLIPT . . . . .	161
6.6	Simple graph structures . . . . .	164
6.7	Performance of simulations on a simple graph . . . . .	165
6.8	Performance of simulations is similar in simple graphs . . . . .	166
6.9	Performance of simulations on a pathway . . . . .	167
6.10	Performance of simulations on a simple graph with inhibition . . . . .	169
6.11	Performance is higher on a simple inhibiting graph . . . . .	171
6.12	Performance of simulations on a constructed graph with inhibition . . . . .	172
6.13	Performance is affected by inhibition in graphs . . . . .	173
6.14	Detection of synthetic lethality within a graph structure . . . . .	175
6.15	Performance of simulations including a simple graph . . . . .	179
6.16	Performance on a simple graph improves with more genes . . . . .	180
6.17	Performance on an inhibiting graph improves with more genes . . . . .	181
6.18	Performance of simulations on the PI3K cascade . . . . .	184
6.19	Performance of simulations including the PI3K cascade . . . . .	186
6.20	Performance on pathways improves with more genes . . . . .	187
A.1	Correlation profiles of removed samples . . . . .	229
A.2	Correlation analysis and sample removal . . . . .	230
A.3	Replicate excluded samples . . . . .	231
A.4	Replicate samples with all remaining . . . . .	232
A.5	Replicate samples with some excluded . . . . .	233
C.1	Synthetic lethal expression profiles of analysed samples . . . . .	246
C.2	Comparison of mtSLIPT to short interfering RNA (siRNA) . . . . .	248
C.3	Compare mtSLIPT and siRNA genes with correlation . . . . .	252
C.4	Compare mtSLIPT and siRNA genes with correlation . . . . .	252
C.5	Compare mtSLIPT and siRNA genes with siRNA viability . . . . .	253



D.1	Pathway metagene expression profiles . . . . .	256
D.2	Expression profiles for constituent genes of PI3K . . . . .	258
D.3	Expression profiles for estrogen receptor related genes . . . . .	259
D.4	Pathway metagene expression profiles . . . . .	260
D.5	Expression profiles for p53 related genes . . . . .	261
D.6	Expression profiles for BRCA related genes . . . . .	262
D.7	Somatic mutation against the PI3K metagene . . . . .	263
D.8	Somatic mutation against PIK3CA metagene . . . . .	266
D.9	Somatic mutation against PI3K protein . . . . .	267
D.10	Somatic mutation against AKT protein . . . . .	268
F.1	Synthetic lethal expression profiles of stomach samples . . . . .	273
F.2	Comparison of SLIPT in stomach to siRNA . . . . .	275
G.1	Synthetic lethality in the PI3K/AKT pathway . . . . .	280
G.2	Synthetic lethality in the PI3K/AKT pathway in cancer . . . . .	281
G.3	Synthetic lethality in the Extracellular Matrix . . . . .	282
G.4	Synthetic lethality in the GPCRs . . . . .	283
G.5	Synthetic lethality in the GPCR Downstream . . . . .	284
G.6	Synthetic lethality in the Translation Elongation . . . . .	285
G.7	Synthetic lethality in the Nonsense-mediated Decay . . . . .	286
G.8	Synthetic lethality in the 3' UTR . . . . .	287
H.1	Synthetic lethality and vertex degree . . . . .	288
H.2	Synthetic lethality and centrality . . . . .	289
H.3	Synthetic lethality and PageRank . . . . .	290
I.1	Information centrality distribution . . . . .	294
J.1	Synthetic lethality and heirarchy score in PI3K . . . . .	295
J.2	Heirarchy score in PI3K against synthetic lethality in PI3K . . . . .	296
J.3	Structure of synthetic lethality in PI3K . . . . .	296
J.4	Structure of synthetic lethality resampling . . . . .	297
K.1	Performance of $\chi^2$ and SLIPT across quantiles . . . . .	298
K.2	Performance of $\chi^2$ and SLIPT across quantiles . . . . .	300
K.3	Performance of $\chi^2$ and SLIPT across quantiles with more genes . . . . .	302
K.4	Performance of $\chi^2$ and SLIPT across quantiles with query correlation . . . . .	304
K.5	Performance of $\chi^2$ and SLIPT across quantiles with query correlation . . . . .	306
K.6	Performance of $\chi^2$ and SLIPT across quantiles with query correlation and more genes . . . . .	308
L.1	Performance of simulations on a simple graph . . . . .	310
L.2	Performance of simulations on an inhibiting graph . . . . .	311
L.3	Performance of simulations on a constructed graph with inhibition . . . . .	312
L.4	Performance of simulations on a constructed graph with inhibition . . . . .	313
L.5	Detection of synthetic lethality within a graph structure . . . . .	314
L.6	Detection of synthetic lethality within an inhibiting graph . . . . .	316

L.7	Detection of synthetic lethality within an inhibiting graph . . . . .	317
L.8	Performance of simulations on a branching graph . . . . .	318
L.9	Performance of simulations on a complex graph . . . . .	319
L.10	Performance of simulations on a large graph . . . . .	320
L.11	Performance of simulations on a branching graph with inhibition . . . .	321
L.12	Performance of simulations on a branching graph with inhibition . . . .	322
L.13	Performance of simulations on a complex graph with inhibition . . . . .	323
L.14	Performance of simulations on a complex graph with inhibition . . . . .	324
L.15	Performance of simulations on a large constructed graph with inhibition	325
L.16	Performance of simulations on a large constructed graph with inhibition	326
L.17	Performance of simulations on the $G_{\alpha i}$ signalling pathway . . . . .	327
L.18	Performance of simulations including the $G_{\alpha i}$ signalling pathway . . . .	328

# List of Tables

1.1	Methods for predicting genetic interactions . . . . .	23
1.2	Methods for predicting synthetic lethality in cancer . . . . .	24
1.3	Methods used by Wu <i>et al.</i> (2014) . . . . .	25
2.1	Excluded samples by batch and clinical characteristics. . . . .	43
2.2	Computers used during thesis . . . . .	53
2.3	Linux utilities and applications used during thesis . . . . .	54
2.4	R installations used during thesis . . . . .	55
2.5	R Packages used during thesis . . . . .	55
2.6	R packages developed during thesis . . . . .	57
4.1	Candidate synthetic lethal gene partners of <i>CDH1</i> from SLIPT . . . . .	98
4.2	Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT . . . . .	99
4.3	Pathways for clusters of <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT . . . . .	104
4.4	ANOVA for synthetic lethality and correlation with <i>CDH1</i> . . . . .	107
4.5	Comparison of Synthetic Lethal Interaction Prediction Tool (SLIPT) genes against secondary siRNA screen . . . . .	111
4.6	Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT and siRNA . . . . .	112
4.7	Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT . . . . .	115
4.8	Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT and siRNA primary screen .	116
4.9	Examples of candidate metagenes synthetic lethal for <i>CDH1</i> from SLIPT	120
5.1	ANOVA for synthetic lethality and vertex degree . . . . .	136
5.2	ANOVA for synthetic lethality and information centrality . . . . .	138
5.3	ANOVA for synthetic lethality and PageRank centrality . . . . .	140
5.4	ANOVA for synthetic lethality and PI3K hierarchy . . . . .	144
5.5	Resampling for pathway structure of synthetic lethal detection methods	147
B.1	Complete list of R packages used during this thesis . . . . .	235
C.1	Candidate synthetic lethal gene partners of <i>CDH1</i> from mtSLIPT . . . .	244
C.2	Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from mtSLIPT . . . . .	245
C.3	Pathways for clusters of <i>CDH1</i> partners from mtSLIPT . . . . .	247
C.4	Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from mtSLIPT and siRNA . . . . .	249
C.5	Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from mtSLIPT . . . . .	250
C.6	Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from mtSLIPT and siRNA primary screen	251
D.1	Candidate synthetic lethal metagenes against <i>CDH1</i> from mtSLIPT . .	265

E.1	Comparison of intrinsic subtypes . . . . .	269
F.1	Synthetic lethal gene partners of <i>CDH1</i> from SLIPT in stomach cancer	271
F.2	Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT in stomach cancer . . . . .	272
F.3	Pathways for clusters of <i>CDH1</i> partners in stomach SLIPT . . . . .	274
F.4	Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT and siRNA . . . . .	276
F.5	Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT in stomach cancer . . . . .	277
F.6	Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT in stomach and siRNA . . . .	278
F.7	Synthetic lethal metagenes against <i>CDH1</i> in stomach cancer . . . . .	279
H.1	ANOVA for synthetic lethality and vertex degree . . . . .	291
H.2	ANOVA for synthetic lethality and information centrality . . . . .	291
H.3	ANOVA for synthetic lethality and PageRank centrality . . . . .	291
I.1	Information centrality for genes and molecules in the Reactome network	293
J.1	ANOVA for synthetic lethality and PI3K hierarchy . . . . .	295
J.2	Resampling for pathway structure of synthetic lethal detection methods	297

# Glossary

bioinformatics	Statistical or computational approaches to biological data or research tools.
chemoprevention	The use of drugs to prevent early-stage cancers, generally applied to high-risk mutation carriers.
E-cadherin	Epithelial cadherin (calcium-dependent adhesion), a cell-adhesion protein encoded by <i>CDH1</i> .
essential	A gene which is required to be functional or expressed for a cell or organism to be viable, grow or develop.
familial	A trait recurrently occurring in families, not necessarily with a genetic cause.
functional redundancy	Genes which perform a common function, also known as genetic redundancy.
gene expression	A measure of the relative expression of each gene from the mRNA extracted from (pooled) cells.
genome	All of the DNA sequence in the genome.
genomic	The use of data from all genes in the genome.
graph or network	A mathematical structure modelling or depicting the relationships between elements.
metagene	A consistent signal of expression for a collection of genes such as a biological pathway, derived from singular value decomposition.
mutant	A variant or dysfunctional phenotype arising from a <a href="#">mutation</a> in a gene.
mutation	A change in DNA sequence that disrupts gene function.

oncogene	A gene that potentially causes cancer, typically by over-expression or mutant gene variants.
pleiotropy	When a gene has multiple biological functions.
sporadic cancer	Cancers which do occur in patients with a family history or carry a high-risk genetic variant.
synthetic lethal	Genetic interactions where inactivation of multiple genes is inviable (or deleterious) which are viable if inactivated separately.
targeted therapy	Cancer treatment that specifically acts against a molecular target, in contrast to standard chemotherapy.
treatment	Medical procedures for a disease to improve patient outcomes.
tumour suppressor	A gene potentially causes cancer, typically by disruption of functions which protect the cell from cancer.

# Acronyms

ANOVA	Analysis of Variance.
DNA	Deoxyribonucleic Acid.
GPCR	G Crotein Coupled Receptor.
HDGC	Hereditary Diffuse Gastric Cancer.
mtSLIPT	Synthetic Lethal Interaction Prediction Tool (against mutation).
NMD	Nonsense-Mediated Decay.
RNAi	RNA Interference.
siRNA	Short Interfering RNA.
SLIPT	Synthetic Lethal Interaction Prediction Tool.
TCGA	The Cancer Genome Atlas (genomics project).
UTR	Untranslated Region (of mRNA).

# Chapter 7

## Discussion

This thesis combines analysis of [gene expression](#) data from [The Cancer Genome Atlas \(TCGA\)](#) with experimental screening results ([Telford \*et al.\*, 2015](#)) to demonstrate [synthetic lethal](#) discovery for partners of *CDH1*. Together these findings further elucidate the functions of *CDH1* in the cell, [functional redundancy](#) in cancer, and represent potential targets against loss of *CDH1* function. These candidate [synthetic lethal](#) genes were further investigated for relationships within [synthetic lethal](#) pathways, developing a network-based approach to compare genes identified in [genomics](#) experiments and analyses in the process.

The [synthetic lethal](#) detection methodology, [SLIPT](#), was applied to [gene expression](#) data throughout this thesis and was evaluated with simulated data. A simulation procedure was developed to stringently generate [gene expression](#) data from known [synthetic lethal](#) partners in simulated data. These simulations included simple and complex correlation structures and modelling [synthetic lethal](#) genes within pathways. Together, these results demonstrate [SLIPT](#) as a robust widely applicable [gene expression](#) analysis procedure (for which an R package has been released) for discovery of [synthetic lethal](#) partner genes. Performance of [SLIPT](#) on simulated data also highlights the strengths of the procedure and future directions to improve upon it.

### 7.1 Synthetic Lethality and *CDH1* Biology

The *CDH1* [tumour suppressor](#) gene was the focus of identifying [synthetic lethal](#) partners to demonstrate the novel [SLIPT](#) methodology. This gene is important in [sporadic breast and stomach cancers](#), in addition to [familial syndromes](#), such as [hereditary diffuse gastric cancer \(HDGC\)](#). The analysis of [synthetic lethal](#) partners of *CDH1* in breast and stomach cancers was enabled by the availability of molecular data ([Bass](#)



*et al.*, 2014; Koboldt *et al.*, 2012) and a [synthetic lethal](#) screen conducted in MCF10A breast cells (Chen *et al.*, 2014; Telford *et al.*, 2015).

Synthetic lethal interactions arise due to [functional redundancy](#) (Boone *et al.*, 2007; Fece de la Cruz *et al.*, 2015; Kaelin, Jr, 2005) and as such the [synthetic lethal](#) partners of *CDH1* indicates the wide-ranging biological functions that [E-cadherin](#) is involved in. The diverse [synthetic lethal](#) pathways identified supports the known pleiotropic nature of the *CDH1* gene by detecting established functions of *CDH1*, replicating candidates from an experimental screen (Telford *et al.*, 2015), and identifying novel interactions with candidate genes and pathways for further investigation. The highly pleiotropic functions of [E-cadherin](#) was also consistent with *CDH1* being a [tumour suppressor](#) gene.

### 7.1.1 Established Functions of *CDH1*

The *CDH1* has established functions in cell-cell communication and maintaining the cytoskeleton, specifically with cell-cell adhesion by forming tight junctions and the adherens complex. More recently, additional functions of *CDH1* in the extracellular matrix and fibrin clotting have also been identified. [Synthetic lethal](#) interactions within biological pathways (i.e., partners in the same pathway as the query gene) are expected according to previous [synthetic lethal](#) experiments (Boone *et al.*, 2007; Kelley and Ideker, 2005). [Synthetic lethal](#) interactions identified in these pathways are consistent with these being functions of *CDH1*, in addition to potentially actionable targets against cancers.

### 7.1.2 The Molecular Role of *CDH1* in Cancer

The involvement of *CDH1* in the extracellular matrix is important in cancers as it indicates a mechanism by which *CDH1* loss may affect the tumour microenvironment, contributing to its role as a tumour and invasion suppressor. Furthermore, perturbations in the extracellular matrix and tumour microenvironment present a means by which to specifically inhibit (cancerous) *CDH1*-deficient cells, in addition to those currently being considered. These may be further supported in further investigations with 3D cell culture, “organoid”, or mouse xenograft cancer models.

In contrast, many of the pathways involved in cell signalling, including [G protein coupled receptors](#), were identified by [SLIPT](#) in addition to the experimental screen (Telford *et al.*, 2015). These support the previous results in cell line models, that these pathways are [essential](#) to the growth of *CDH1*-deficient cancers and present a potential vulnerability specific to these (cancerous) cells. Furthermore, the replication of

**synthetic lethality** of *CDH1* with cell signalling pathways in **TCGA** data across cancer types and genetic backgrounds robustly supports these pathways being clinically applicable beyond the genetic background of the model system of *CDH1*<sup>-/-</sup> MCF10A cells (Chen *et al.*, 2014). While the specific **synthetic lethal** genes were not as consistently detected between the **SLIPT** analyses and **siRNA** screen (Telford *et al.*, 2015), they were sufficient to identify **synthetic lethal** pathways for further experimental investigation, which are more likely to be replicated between genetic backgrounds (Dixon *et al.*, 2008). Together these results demonstrate how **SLIPT** can be integrated with an experimental screen to triage potential therapeutic targets for further pre-clinical investigation.

The analysis of **expression** data with **SLIPT** is also indicative of additional biological mechanisms of **synthetic lethality** in pathways beyond those identified in screening experiments (Telford *et al.*, 2015). In particular, translation and regulatory pathways, involving 3' **untranslated regions** (UTRs) and **nonsense-mediated decay** (NMD), were identified as candidate **synthetic lethal** pathways with *CDH1* by **SLIPT**. These pathways represent downstream targets regulated by the putative **synthetic lethal** signalling pathways which cancer cells are dependent on for sustained protein expression to proliferate and evade host defense processes such as apoptosis and immune responses (Gao and Roux, 2015) .

## 7.2 Significance

### 7.2.1 Synthetic Lethality in the Genomic Era

Development of an effective **synthetic lethal** discovery tool for **bioinformatic** analysis has a wide range of applications in genetics research including functional **genomics**, medical and agricultural applications. The **SLIPT** approach demonstrated in this thesis is widely applicable to other genes and biological questions. In addition to further query of cancer genes, including other tissues, **synthetic lethal** gene functions are also of wider interest for their implications for **genetic redundancy**. Highly redundant genes, and the genetically robust systems they give rise to, are of further relevance to evolutionary, developmental, and systems biology to understand how these change over time and play a role in fundamental development of cell types, in addition to cancers (Boone *et al.*, 2007; Nowak *et al.*, 1997; Tischler *et al.*, 2008).

Developmental genes in particular, are highly evolutionary conserved and subject to high rates of **redundancy** (Fromental-Ramain *et al.*, 1996; Kockel *et al.*, 1997; Nowak

*et al.*, 1997). These are often difficult to study with conventional functional genetics since individual knockouts of redundant genes do not necessarily have a **mutant** phenotype. Identifying genes with a common function is therefore also important to the study of developmental genes with unknown functions. **Synthetic lethal** discovery methods such as **SLIPT** provide a **genomic** approach to further systematic characterisation of gene function including such highly redundant developmental genes.

Similarly, variants of unknown significance and modifier loci are a major concerns in human genetics, including “monogenic” and “rare” diseases. Many of these could potentially be difficult to characterise individually due to **synthetic lethal** interactions where additional loci contribute to the disease (or only compensate for some variants). As such systematic identification of **synthetic lethal** interactions also has applications in the study of such “oligogenic” diseases along with similar applications in the study of heritability for traits including agricultural **genomic** selection.

**Genetic redundancy** is also a concern in pharmacology. Polypharmacology and network medicine are rationales to account for this by using drugs with multiple (known and specific) targets (*Barabási et al.*, 2011; *Hopkins*, 2008). Further characterisation of **synthetic lethal** genes will be valuable to the design of effective multi-target drugs or combination therapies in a range of therapeutic applications including molecular targeted therapies against cancer for which combination therapies are a popular solution for acquired resistance against individual targeted therapies. Characterisation of genetic interactions and combination therapies also has the potential to expand pharmacogenomic investigations. These may elucidate the impact of genotypes at multiple loci, which lead to adverse effects in a subset of the population due to variants in **synthetic lethal** genes.

Furthermore, redundant functions and **synthetic lethal** interactions also present a means to expand upon the concept of the “minimal” **genome** (*Hutchison et al.*, 2016). It is important to account for **essential** gene functions that are performed by redundant genes (or in combination with **pleiotropic** genes), rather than simply those that are perturbed by individual genes. An **essential** gene approach is likely to produce an underestimate that does not account for **synthetic lethal** interactions.

**Synthetic lethal** interactions are fundamentally important throughout genetics. Further understanding of them in a **genomic** context, facilitated by methods such as **SLIPT**, would contribute towards deeper understanding of gene functions and their role in traits or diseases in the post-genomic era. Genes do not function in isolation and understanding them in the context of the complexity of a cell and across genetic

backgrounds is [essential](#) to further characterise their functions and ensure that findings can be validated or applied beyond experimental systems.

## 7.2.2 Clinical Interventions based on Synthetic Lethality

Synthetic lethal discovery with [SLIPT](#) is of particular interest in cancer research as a complementary approach to discovery of [synthetic lethal](#) drug targets. The cancer research community relies on cell line and mouse models for screening and validation experiments ([Fece de la Cruz \*et al.\*, 2015](#)) which would benefit from integration with [gene expression](#) analysis as demonstrated for *CDH1* and the screen conducted by [Telford \*et al.\* \(2015\)](#). [Synthetic lethal](#) drug design against cancer [mutations](#), including gene loss or over-expression, could lead to a revolution in cancer [therapy](#) and [chemoprevention](#). Such [therapeutics](#) would enable personalised treatment for cancer patients and high risk individuals. Examples of the [synthetic lethal](#) strategy ([Bryant \*et al.\*, 2005](#); [Farmer \*et al.\*, 2005](#)) for cancer treatment have been shown to be clinically effective [McLachlan \*et al.\* \(2016\)](#). Many large-scale [RNA interference \(RNAi\)](#) screens have been conducted recently, aiming to discover gene function and drug targets for similar application with other cancer genes, including cancers in other tissues ([Fece de la Cruz \*et al.\*, 2015](#)).

While [SLIPT](#) analysis and [RNAi](#) screens represent a significant step towards anti-cancer medicines, further validation is required to ensure that the [synthetic lethal](#) candidate genes and pathways identified for *CDH1* in breast and stomach cancer are applicable against *CDH1*-deficient cancers in the clinic. Validation with [RNAi](#) or pharmacological inhibitors is needed since false positives may occur in [SLIPT](#) analysis or [siRNA](#) screens. These candidates will need to be tested in pre-clinical models (cell lines and mouse xenografts) before proceeding to clinical trials. A therapeutic intervention will also require a [targeted therapeutic](#) to develop developed or repurposed against the [synthetic lethal](#) partner. Drug targets could be triaged from [synthetic lethal](#) genes by functions known to be amenable to drugs or structure with conserved specific sites that are not homologous to other genes, or those with existing drugs approved in trial for other applications. Both structure-aided drug design and compound screening are viable ways to target [synthetic lethal](#) partners.

[Targeted therapeutics](#) designed based on [synthetic lethal](#) interactions could expand the applications of “precision medicine” against molecular targets. [Synthetic lethality](#) expands the range of cancer genes which can be (indirectly) targeted to include [tumour suppressor](#) genes with loss of function, such as *CDH1*. [Oncogenes](#) with disrupted functions that are over-expressed or highly homologous to non-cancerous proto-oncogenes,

such as *MYC*, *EGFR* or *KRAS*, may also be targeted by [synthetic lethality](#). Applications against [tumour suppressor](#) genes is particularly important, as these cannot be approached by careful dosing. [Synthetic lethal](#) drug design has the benefit of being highly specific against a particular genotype (such as *CDH1*<sup>-/-</sup>) with the potential for [targeted therapies](#) with a wide therapeutic index and few adverse effects, in contrast to many current anti-cancer drug regimens ([Hopkins, 2008](#); [Kaelin, Jr, 2009](#)). These properties are highly desirable for [chemoprevention](#) applications, such as treatment against *CDH1*-deficient in HDGC patients ([Guilford \*et al.\*, 2010](#)), as an alternative to monitoring or surgery.

### 7.3 Future Directions

While further validation and pre-clinical testing is required to translate the findings for *CDH1* to cancer therapy or prevention, there are also further avenues for research into the detection of [synthetic lethality](#) in [gene expression](#) and other [genomics](#) data. The [SLIPT](#) methodology is amenable to wider application against a range of genes for which loss of function is deleterious, including other cancer genes in breast cancer or other tissues. [Synthetic lethal](#) interactions are functionally informative, particularly for mode-of-action of known drug targets, and are also relevant for identifying functions of newly characterised genes in [genomics](#) studies and designing specific interventions against cells with loss of function in cancer and other diseases. Thus [synthetic lethal](#) detection using [SLIPT](#) in [expression](#) data could be further used for many other genes, including others relevant to human health and disease.

These investigations do not need to be limited to [expression](#) data. While [expression](#) as a measure of gene function has been the focus of this thesis, other [genomics](#) data could be used for a similar purpose for [SLIPT](#) analysis. These include [DNA](#) copy number, [DNA](#) methylation, histone activation, [mutation](#) status, protein abundance, and protein activation state. For some applications or genes, these molecular profiles may be more informative of gene function and [synthetic lethal](#) relationships. However, [expression](#) was the focus of the investigations thus far as a widely accepted measure of gene function which has widely available [genomics](#) data. [SLIPT](#) is compatible with each of these data types (if the thresholds are selected appropriately) and may perform better for some applications with these molecular profiles or a weighted combination of these. As demonstrated, [SLIPT](#) is also suitable for future investigations with pathway [metagenes](#) and other summary data as well.

It may also be possible to improve the performance of [SLIPT](#) with refinements to the statistical or computational approach. This thesis has focused on rational query-based approach which computes relatively quickly, even in R ([R Core Team, 2016](#)), and is relatively intuitive to interpret. These computations are compatible with parallel computing and the computational resources may be further reduced by using a different computing language. The `slipt` R package has been documented and released open-source (as described in [Section 3.5](#)) to facilitate further development, wider adoption, or comparison with other scientific software for similar purposes.

Alternative methods may be also improve on the statistical performance of [SLIPT](#). In particular, the sensitivity was generally as issue with higher numbers of [synthetic lethal](#) partners in simulated data. While approaches using continuous data such as Pearson correlation and linear regression did not perform as well as [SLIPT](#), they could be improved. A least squares regression approach in particular, enables multiple measures of relationships such as the coefficients of the fitted curve and significance of the fit (computed from the residuals). A linear modelling approach using regression is also amenable to refinement such as extending from fitting a linear relationship to a polynomial or logistic regression. Another benefit to fitting linear models is that these would enable the conditioning of known [synthetic lethal](#) partners to identify subtle signatures of further interacting partners.

This approach could also be applied iteratively on the strongest candidates from previous [synthetic lethal](#) analyses in further rounds of prediction conditioned upon them. Similarly, [synthetic lethal](#) prediction could also be approached with a Bayesian framework which is also amenable to Bayesian priors on known or previously predicted [synthetic lethal](#) partners. Either of these approaches has the potential to improve upon the [synthetic lethal](#) predictions which have been demonstrated as possible and biologically relevant by [SLIPT](#).

## 7.4 Conclusions

Synthetic lethal interactions are important for understanding gene function and development of highly specific targeted anti-cancer treatments. Synthetic lethality could expand the repertoire of applications for precision cancer medicine to indirectly targeting loss of function in tumour suppressor genes. Synthetic lethal discovery with experimental screening is error prone and limited by the model systems in which it is performed. There is a need for bioinformatics tool to predict synthetic lethal interactions from gene expression data facilitates rapid identification of synthetic lethal candidates to augment functional genetic screens and cancer drug target triage. I present the original Synthetic Lethal Interaction Prediction Tool (SLIPT) methodology as a statically robust procedure which performs this analysis.

The SLIPT methodology has been demonstrated to identify biologically relevant genes and pathways. An comprehensive analysis of synthetic lethal partners of the *CDH1* was performed in TCGA breast cancer data (Koboldt *et al.*, 2012) with many of these findings replicated in stomach cancer data (Bass *et al.*, 2014). These genes clustered into several distinct groups, with distinct biological functions and elevated expression in different clinical subtypes. These analyses identified of synthetic lethal candidates in the  $G_{\alpha i}$  signalling, cytoplasmic microfibres, and extracellular fibrin clotting pathways which were validated in an siRNA screen performed by Telford *et al.* (2015) and consistent with the known cytoskeletal and cell signalling roles of E-cadherin. These findings support interventions against these pathways being applicable to specific cancer therapeutics beyond the pre-clinical cell line models in which they were validated. SLIPT has also identified synthetic lethal partners in novel pathways for *CDH1* including the regulation of immune signalling and translational elongation which extend the range of pleiotropic functions of *CDH1* and present further biological mechanisms to investigate the malignancy and vulnerabilities of *CDH1*-deficient cancers.

While some of these pathways are not expected to be detected in an isolated experimental cell line model, pathway structure may have accounted for this disparity. Thus synthetic lethal candidates detected by SLIPT and siRNA were compared within graph structures of the candidate synthetic lethal pathways. However, this did not generally account for differences between detection by these approaches. Neither synthetic lethal detection methodology preferentially detected genes of more importance or connectivity in pathway structures using established network metrics. Nor could it



be generally established that **SLIPT** gene candidates were upstream or downstream of **siRNA** gene candidates in **pathway** structures across biological pathways.

Pathway **graph** structures were also included in investigations with simulated data to ascertain whether the **SLIPT** procedure performed desirably in data with complex correlation structures derived based on biological pathways. A simulation procedure was developed based on a statistical model of **synthetic lethality** which generates multivariate normal data with known **synthetic lethal** partners and correlation structures. The **SLIPT** methodology had high statistical performance, particularly when detecting few **synthetic lethal** genes, with large sample sizes, and a background of many non **synthetic lethal** genes to distinguish true partners from. This method had high specificity, performed better than Pearson correlation or the  $\chi^2$ -test, and had had optimal performance across simulation parameter combinations for the thresholds used throughout this thesis. These findings were robust across correlation structures, including those derived from complex **pathway** structures containing strong positive and negative correlations between genes. Together, these findings support the release of the **SLIPT** software R packages and the application of the method to identify **synthetic lethal** genes within pathways and use candidate **synthetic lethal** genes to identify **synthetic lethal** pathways as demonstrated in this thesis.

Therefore, I present a widely applicable **synthetic lethal** procedure using **gene expression** data for wider use in **genomics** research, including the development of precision cancer medicine. This methodology is supported by the release of a software package in R, simulation results based on a statistical model of **synthetic lethality**, the demonstration of **bioinformatics** and network biology investigations into interactions with the *CDH1* gene in breast and stomach cancers.



# References

- Aarts, M., Bajrami, I., Herrera-Abreu, M.T., Elliott, R., Brough, R., Ashworth, A., Lord, C.J., and Turner, N.C. (2015) Functional genetic screen identifies increased sensitivity to wee1 inhibition in cells with defects in fanconi anemia and hr pathways. *Mol Cancer Ther*, **14**(4): 865–76.
- Abeshouse, A., Ahn, J., Akbani, R., Ally, A., Amin, S., Andry, C.D., Annala, M., Aprikian, A., Armenia, J., Arora, A., *et al.* (2015) The Molecular Taxonomy of Primary Prostate Cancer. *Cell*, **163**(4): 1011–1025.
- Adler, D. (2005) *vioplot: Violin plot*. R package version 0.2.
- Akbani, R., Akdemir, K.C., Aksoy, B.A., Albert, M., Ally, A., Amin, S.B., Arachchi, H., Arora, A., Auman, J.T., Ayala, B., *et al.* (2015) Genomic Classification of Cutaneous Melanoma. *Cell*, **161**(7): 1681–1696.
- Akobeng, A.K. (2007) Understanding diagnostic tests 3: receiver operating characteristic curves. *Acta Pdiatrica*, **96**(5): 644–647.
- American Cancer Society (2017) Genetics and cancer. <https://www.cancer.org/cancer/cancer-causes/genetics.html>. Accessed: 22/03/2017.
- Anjomshoaa, A., Lin, Y.H., Black, M.A., McCall, J.L., Humar, B., Song, S., Fukuzawa, R., Yoon, H.S., Holzmann, B., Friederichs, J., *et al.* (2008) Reduced expression of a gene proliferation signature is associated with enhanced malignancy in colon cancer. *Br J Cancer*, **99**(6): 966–973.
- Araki, H., Knapp, C., Tsai, P., and Print, C. (2012) GeneSetDB: A comprehensive meta-database, statistical and visualisation framework for gene set analysis. *FEBS Open Bio*, **2**: 76–82.

- Ashburner, M., Ball, C.A., Blake, J.A., Botstein, D., Butler, H., Cherry, J.M., Davis, A.P., Dolinski, K., Dwight, S.S., Eppig, J.T., *et al.* (2000) Gene ontology: tool for the unification of biology. The Gene Ontology Consortium. *Nat Genet*, **25**(1): 25–29.
- Ashworth, A. (2008) A synthetic lethal therapeutic approach: poly(adp) ribose polymerase inhibitors for the treatment of cancers deficient in dna double-strand break repair. *J Clin Oncol*, **26**(22): 3785–90.
- Ashworth, A., Lord, C.J., and Reis-Filho, J.S. (2011) Genetic interactions in cancer progression and treatment. *Cell*, **145**(1): 30–38.
- Audeh, M.W., Carmichael, J., Penson, R.T., Friedlander, M., Powell, B., Bell-McGuinn, K.M., Scott, C., Weitzel, J.N., Oaknin, A., Loman, N., *et al.* (2010) Oral poly(adp-ribose) polymerase inhibitor olaparib in patients with *BRCA1* or *BRCA2* mutations and recurrent ovarian cancer: a proof-of-concept trial. *Lancet*, **376**(9737): 245–51.
- Babyak, M.A. (2004) What you see may not be what you get: a brief, nontechnical introduction to overfitting in regression-type models. *Psychosom Med*, **66**(3): 411–21.
- Bamford, S., Dawson, E., Forbes, S., Clements, J., Pettett, R., Dogan, A., Flanagan, A., Teague, J., Futreal, P.A., Stratton, M.R., *et al.* (2004) The COSMIC (Catalogue of Somatic Mutations in Cancer) database and website. *Br J Cancer*, **91**(2): 355–358.
- Barabási, A.L. and Albert, R. (1999) Emergence of scaling in random networks. *Science*, **286**(5439): 509–12.
- Barabási, A.L., Gulbahce, N., and Loscalzo, J. (2011) Network medicine: a network-based approach to human disease. *Nat Rev Genet*, **12**(1): 56–68.
- Barabási, A.L. and Oltvai, Z.N. (2004) Network biology: understanding the cell’s functional organization. *Nat Rev Genet*, **5**(2): 101–13.
- Barrat, A. and Weigt, M. (2000) On the properties of small-world network models. *The European Physical Journal B - Condensed Matter and Complex Systems*, **13**(3): 547–560.

- Barretina, J., Caponigro, G., Stransky, N., Venkatesan, K., Margolin, A.A., Kim, S., Wilson, C.J., Lehar, J., Kryukov, G.V., Sonkin, D., *et al.* (2012) The Cancer Cell Line Encyclopedia enables predictive modelling of anticancer drug sensitivity. *Nature*, **483**(7391): 603–607.
- Barry, W.T. (2016) *safe: Significance Analysis of Function and Expression*. R package version 3.14.0.
- Baryshnikova, A., Costanzo, M., Dixon, S., Vizeacoumar, F.J., Myers, C.L., Andrews, B., and Boone, C. (2010a) Synthetic genetic array (sga) analysis in *saccharomyces cerevisiae* and *schizosaccharomyces pombe*. *Methods Enzymol*, **470**: 145–79.
- Baryshnikova, A., Costanzo, M., Kim, Y., Ding, H., Koh, J., Toufighi, K., Youn, J.Y., Ou, J., San Luis, B.J., Bandyopadhyay, S., *et al.* (2010b) Quantitative analysis of fitness and genetic interactions in yeast on a genome scale. *Nat Meth*, **7**(12): 1017–1024.
- Bass, A.J., Thorsson, V., Shmulevich, I., Reynolds, S.M., Miller, M., Bernard, B., Hinoue, T., Laird, P.W., Curtis, C., Shen, H., *et al.* (2014) Comprehensive molecular characterization of gastric adenocarcinoma. *Nature*, **513**(7517): 202–209.
- Bates, D. and Maechler, M. (2016) *Matrix: Sparse and Dense Matrix Classes and Methods*. R package version 1.2-7.1.
- Bateson, W. and Mendel, G. (1909) *Mendel's principles of heredity, by W. Bateson*. University Press, Cambridge [Eng.].
- Becker, K.F., Atkinson, M.J., Reich, U., Becker, I., Nekarda, H., Siewert, J.R., and Hfler, H. (1994) E-cadherin gene mutations provide clues to diffuse type gastric carcinomas. *Cancer Research*, **54**(14): 3845–3852.
- Bell, D., Berchuck, A., Birrer, M., Chien, J., Cramer, D., Dao, F., Dhir, R., DiSaia, P., Gabra, H., Glenn, P., *et al.* (2011) Integrated genomic analyses of ovarian carcinoma. *Nature*, **474**(7353): 609–615.
- Benjamini, Y. and Hochberg, Y. (1995) Controlling the false discovery rate: A practical and powerful approach to multiple testing. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B (Methodological)*, **57**(1): 289–300.

- Berx, G., Cleton-Jansen, A.M., Nollet, F., de Leeuw, W.J., van de Vijver, M., Cornelisse, C., and van Roy, F. (1995) E-cadherin is a tumour/invasion suppressor gene mutated in human lobular breast cancers. *EMBO J*, **14**(24): 6107–15.
- Berx, G., Cleton-Jansen, A.M., Strumane, K., de Leeuw, W.J., Nollet, F., van Roy, F., and Cornelisse, C. (1996) E-cadherin is inactivated in a majority of invasive human lobular breast cancers by truncation mutations throughout its extracellular domain. *Oncogene*, **13**(9): 1919–25.
- Berx, G. and van Roy, F. (2009) Involvement of members of the cadherin superfamily in cancer. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol*, **1**: a003129.
- Bitler, B.G., Aird, K.M., Garipov, A., Li, H., Amatangelo, M., Kossenkov, A.V., Schultz, D.C., Liu, Q., Shih Ie, M., Conejo-Garcia, J.R., *et al.* (2015) Synthetic lethality by targeting ezh2 methyltransferase activity in arid1a-mutated cancers. *Nat Med*, **21**(3): 231–8.
- Blake, J.A., Christie, K.R., Dolan, M.E., Drabkin, H.J., Hill, D.P., Ni, L., Sitnikov, D., Burgess, S., Buza, T., Gresham, C., *et al.* (2015) Gene Ontology Consortium: going forward. *Nucleic Acids Res*, **43**(Database issue): D1049–1056.
- Boettcher, M., Lawson, A., Ladenburger, V., Fredebohm, J., Wolf, J., Hoheisel, J.D., Frezza, C., and Shlomi, T. (2014) High throughput synthetic lethality screen reveals a tumorigenic role of adenylate cyclase in fumarate hydratase-deficient cancer cells. *BMC Genomics*, **15**: 158.
- Boone, C., Bussey, H., and Andrews, B.J. (2007) Exploring genetic interactions and networks with yeast. *Nat Rev Genet*, **8**(6): 437–49.
- Borgatti, S.P. (2005) Centrality and network flow. *Social Networks*, **27**(1): 55 – 71.
- Boucher, B. and Jenna, S. (2013) Genetic interaction networks: better understand to better predict. *Front Genet*, **4**: 290.
- Bozovic-Spasojevic, I., Azambuja, E., McCaskill-Stevens, W., Dinh, P., and Cardoso, F. (2012) Chemoprevention for breast cancer. *Cancer treatment reviews*, **38**(5): 329–339.
- Breiman, L. (2001) Random forests. *Machine Learning*, **45**(1): 5–32.

- Brin, S. and Page, L. (1998) The anatomy of a large-scale hypertextual web search engine. *Computer Networks and ISDN Systems*, **30**(1): 107 – 117.
- Brouxhon, S.M., Kyrkanides, S., Teng, X., Athar, M., Ghazizadeh, S., Simon, M., O'Banion, M.K., and Ma, L. (2014) Soluble E-cadherin: a critical oncogene modulating receptor tyrosine kinases, MAPK and PI3K/Akt/mTOR signaling. *Oncogene*, **33**(2): 225–235.
- Brückner, A., Polge, C., Lentze, N., Auerbach, D., and Schlattner, U. (2009) Yeast two-hybrid, a powerful tool for systems biology. *Int J Mol Sci*, **10**(6): 2763–2788.
- Bryant, H.E., Schultz, N., Thomas, H.D., Parker, K.M., Flower, D., Lopez, E., Kyle, S., Meuth, M., Curtin, N.J., and Helleday, T. (2005) Specific killing of *BRCA2*-deficient tumours with inhibitors of polyadprbose polymerase. *Nature*, **434**(7035): 913–7.
- Bussey, H., Andrews, B., and Boone, C. (2006) From worm genetic networks to complex human diseases. *Nat Genet*, **38**(8): 862–3.
- Butland, G., Babu, M., Diaz-Mejia, J.J., Bohdana, F., Phanse, S., Gold, B., Yang, W., Li, J., Gagarinova, A.G., Pogoutse, O., *et al.* (2008) esga: E. coli synthetic genetic array analysis. *Nat Methods*, **5**(9): 789–95.
- cBioPortal for Cancer Genomics (cBioPortal) (2017) cBioPortal for Cancer Genomics. <http://www.cbioportal.org/>. Accessed: 26/03/2017.
- Cerami, E.G., Gross, B.E., Demir, E., Rodchenkov, I., Babur, O., Anwar, N., Schultz, N., Bader, G.D., and Sander, C. (2011) Pathway Commons, a web resource for biological pathway data. *Nucleic Acids Res*, **39**(Database issue): D685–690.
- Chen, A., Beetham, H., Black, M.A., Priya, R., Telford, B.J., Guest, J., Wiggins, G.A.R., Godwin, T.D., Yap, A.S., and Guilford, P.J. (2014) E-cadherin loss alters cytoskeletal organization and adhesion in non-malignant breast cells but is insufficient to induce an epithelial-mesenchymal transition. *BMC Cancer*, **14**(1): 552.
- Chen, S. and Parmigiani, G. (2007) Meta-analysis of BRCA1 and BRCA2 penetrance. *J Clin Oncol*, **25**(11): 1329–1333.
- Chipman, K. and Singh, A. (2009) Predicting genetic interactions with random walks on biological networks. *BMC Bioinformatics*, **10**(1): 17.

- Christofori, G. and Semb, H. (1999) The role of the cell-adhesion molecule E-cadherin as a tumour-suppressor gene. *Trends in Biochemical Sciences*, **24**(2): 73 – 76.
- Ciriello, G., Gatza, M.L., Beck, A.H., Wilkerson, M.D., Rhie, S.K., Pastore, A., Zhang, H., McLellan, M., Yau, C., Kandoth, C., *et al.* (2015) Comprehensive Molecular Portraits of Invasive Lobular Breast Cancer. *Cell*, **163**(2): 506–519.
- Clark, M.J. (2004) Endogenous Regulator of G Protein Signaling Proteins Suppress G o-Dependent  $\mu$ -Opioid Agonist-Mediated Adenylyl Cyclase Supersensitization. *Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics*, **310**(1): 215–222.
- Collingridge, D.S. (2013) A primer on quantitized data analysis and permutation testing. *Journal of Mixed Methods Research*, **7**(1): 81–97.
- Collins, F.S. and Barker, A.D. (2007) Mapping the cancer genome. Pinpointing the genes involved in cancer will help chart a new course across the complex landscape of human malignancies. *Sci Am*, **296**(3): 50–57.
- Collisson, E., Campbell, J., Brooks, A., Berger, A., Lee, W., Chmielecki, J., Beer, D., Cope, L., Creighton, C., Danilova, L., *et al.* (2014) Comprehensive molecular profiling of lung adenocarcinoma. *Nature*, **511**(7511): 543–550.
- Costanzo, M., Baryshnikova, A., Bellay, J., Kim, Y., Spear, E.D., Sevier, C.S., Ding, H., Koh, J.L., Toufighi, K., Mostafavi, S., *et al.* (2010) The genetic landscape of a cell. *Science*, **327**(5964): 425–31.
- Costanzo, M., Baryshnikova, A., Myers, C.L., Andrews, B., and Boone, C. (2011) Charting the genetic interaction map of a cell. *Curr Opin Biotechnol*, **22**(1): 66–74.
- Courtney, K.D., Corcoran, R.B., and Engelman, J.A. (2010) The PI3K pathway as drug target in human cancer. *J Clin Oncol*, **28**(6): 1075–1083.
- Creighton, C.J., Morgan, M., Gunaratne, P.H., Wheeler, D.A., Gibbs, R.A., Robertson, A., Chu, A., Beroukhi, R., Cibulskis, K., Signoretti, S., *et al.* (2013) Comprehensive molecular characterization of clear cell renal cell carcinoma. *Nature*, **499**(7456): 43–49.
- Croft, D., Mundo, A.F., Haw, R., Milacic, M., Weiser, J., Wu, G., Caudy, M., Garapati, P., Gillespie, M., Kamdar, M.R., *et al.* (2014) The Reactome pathway knowledge-base. *Nucleic Acids Res*, **42**(database issue): D472D477.

- Crunkhorn, S. (2014) Cancer: Predicting synthetic lethal interactions. *Nat Rev Drug Discov*, **13**(11): 812.
- Csardi, G. and Nepusz, T. (2006) The igraph software package for complex network research. *InterJournal, Complex Systems*: 1695.
- Dai, X., Li, T., Bai, Z., Yang, Y., Liu, X., Zhan, J., and Shi, B. (2015) Breast cancer intrinsic subtype classification, clinical use and future trends. *Am J Cancer Res*, **5**(10): 2929–2943.
- Davierwala, A.P., Haynes, J., Li, Z., Brost, R.L., Robinson, M.D., Yu, L., Mnaimneh, S., Ding, H., Zhu, H., Chen, Y., *et al.* (2005) The synthetic genetic interaction spectrum of essential genes. *Nat Genet*, **37**(10): 1147–1152.
- De Leeuw, W.J., Berx, G., Vos, C.B., Peterse, J.L., Van de Vijver, M.J., Litvinov, S., Van Roy, F., Cornelisse, C.J., and Cleton-Jansen, A.M. (1997) Simultaneous loss of E-cadherin and catenins in invasive lobular breast cancer and lobular carcinoma in situ. *J Pathol*, **183**(4): 404–11.
- De Santis, G., Miotti, S., Mazzi, M., Canevari, S., and Tomassetti, A. (2009) E-cadherin directly contributes to PI3K/AKT activation by engaging the PI3K-p85 regulatory subunit to adherens junctions of ovarian carcinoma cells. *Oncogene*, **28**(9): 1206–1217.
- Demir, E., Babur, O., Rodchenkov, I., Aksoy, B.A., Fukuda, K.I., Gross, B., Sumer, O.S., Bader, G.D., and Sander, C. (2013) Using biological pathway data with Pax-tools. *PLoS Comput Biol*, **9**(9): e1003194.
- Deshpande, R., Asiedu, M.K., Klebig, M., Sutor, S., Kuzmin, E., Nelson, J., Piotrowski, J., Shin, S.H., Yoshida, M., Costanzo, M., *et al.* (2013) A comparative genomic approach for identifying synthetic lethal interactions in human cancer. *Cancer Res*, **73**(20): 6128–36.
- Dickson, D. (1999) Wellcome funds cancer database. *Nature*, **401**(6755): 729.
- Dijkstra, E.W. (1959) A note on two problems in connexion with graphs. *Numerische Mathematik*, **1**(1): 269–271.
- Dixon, S.J., Andrews, B.J., and Boone, C. (2009) Exploring the conservation of synthetic lethal genetic interaction networks. *Commun Integr Biol*, **2**(2): 78–81.

- Dixon, S.J., Fedyszyn, Y., Koh, J.L., Prasad, T.S., Chahwan, C., Chua, G., Toufighi, K., Baryshnikova, A., Hayles, J., Hoe, K.L., *et al.* (2008) Significant conservation of synthetic lethal genetic interaction networks between distantly related eukaryotes. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*, **105**(43): 16653–8.
- Dong, L.L., Liu, L., Ma, C.H., Li, J.S., Du, C., Xu, S., Han, L.H., Li, L., and Wang, X.W. (2012) E-cadherin promotes proliferation of human ovarian cancer cells in vitro via activating MEK/ERK pathway. *Acta Pharmacol Sin*, **33**(6): 817–822.
- Dorsam, R.T. and Gutkind, J.S. (2007) G-protein-coupled receptors and cancer. *Nat Rev Cancer*, **7**(2): 79–94.
- Erdős, P. and Rényi, A. (1959) On random graphs I. *Publ Math Debrecen*, **6**: 290–297.
- Erdős, P. and Rényi, A. (1960) On the evolution of random graphs. In *Publ. Math. Inst. Hung. Acad. Sci*, volume 5, 17–61.
- Eroles, P., Bosch, A., Perez-Fidalgo, J.A., and Lluch, A. (2012) Molecular biology in breast cancer: intrinsic subtypes and signaling pathways. *Cancer Treat Rev*, **38**(6): 698–707.
- Farmer, H., McCabe, N., Lord, C.J., Tutt, A.N., Johnson, D.A., Richardson, T.B., Santarosa, M., Dillon, K.J., Hickson, I., Knights, C., *et al.* (2005) Targeting the dna repair defect in BRCA mutant cells as a therapeutic strategy. *Nature*, **434**(7035): 917–21.
- Fawcett, T. (2006) An introduction to ROC analysis. *Pattern Recognition Letters*, **27**(8): 861 – 874. {ROC} Analysis in Pattern Recognition.
- Fece de la Cruz, F., Gapp, B.V., and Nijman, S.M. (2015) Synthetic lethal vulnerabilities of cancer. *Annu Rev Pharmacol Toxicol*, **55**: 513–531.
- Ferlay, J., Soerjomataram, I., Dikshit, R., Eser, S., Mathers, C., Rebelo, M., Parkin, D.M., Forman, D., and Bray, F. (2015) Cancer incidence and mortality worldwide: sources, methods and major patterns in GLOBOCAN 2012. *Int J Cancer*, **136**(5): E359–386.
- Fisher, R.A. (1919) Xv.the correlation between relatives on the supposition of mendelian inheritance. *Earth and Environmental Science Transactions of the Royal Society of Edinburgh*, **52**(02): 399–433.



- Fong, P.C., Boss, D.S., Yap, T.A., Tutt, A., Wu, P., Mergui-Roelvink, M., Mortimer, P., Swaisland, H., Lau, A., O'Connor, M.J., *et al.* (2009) Inhibition of poly(adenosine) polymerase in tumors from BRCA mutation carriers. *N Engl J Med*, **361**(2): 123–34.
- Fong, P.C., Yap, T.A., Boss, D.S., Carden, C.P., Mergui-Roelvink, M., Gourley, C., De Greve, J., Lubinski, J., Shanley, S., Messiou, C., *et al.* (2010) Poly(adenosine)-ribose polymerase inhibition: frequent durable responses in BRCA carrier ovarian cancer correlating with platinum-free interval. *J Clin Oncol*, **28**(15): 2512–9.
- Forbes, S.A., Beare, D., Gunasekaran, P., Leung, K., Bindal, N., Boutselakis, H., Ding, M., Bamford, S., Cole, C., Ward, S., *et al.* (2015) COSMIC: exploring the world's knowledge of somatic mutations in human cancer. *Nucleic Acids Res*, **43**(Database issue): D805–811.
- Fraser, A. (2004) Towards full employment: using RNAi to find roles for the redundant. *Oncogene*, **23**(51): 8346–52.
- Fromental-Ramain, C., Warot, X., Lakkaraju, S., Favier, B., Haack, H., Birling, C., Dierich, A., Dollé, P., and Chambon, P. (1996) Specific and redundant functions of the paralogous Hoxa-9 and Hoxd-9 genes in forelimb and axial skeleton patterning. *Development*, **122**(2): 461–472.
- Futreal, P.A., Coin, L., Marshall, M., Down, T., Hubbard, T., Wooster, R., Rahman, N., and Stratton, M.R. (2004) A census of human cancer genes. *Nat Rev Cancer*, **4**(3): 177–183.
- Futreal, P.A., Kasprzyk, A., Birney, E., Mullikin, J.C., Wooster, R., and Stratton, M.R. (2001) Cancer and genomics. *Nature*, **409**(6822): 850–852.
- Gao, B. and Roux, P.P. (2015) Translational control by oncogenic signaling pathways. *Biochimica et Biophysica Acta*, **1849**(7): 753–65.
- Gatza, M.L., Kung, H.N., Blackwell, K.L., Dewhirst, M.W., Marks, J.R., and Chi, J.T. (2011) Analysis of tumor environmental response and oncogenic pathway activation identifies distinct basal and luminal features in HER2-related breast tumor subtypes. *Breast Cancer Res*, **13**(3): R62.

- Gatza, M.L., Lucas, J.E., Barry, W.T., Kim, J.W., Wang, Q., Crawford, M.D., Datto, M.B., Kelley, M., Mathey-Prevot, B., Potti, A., *et al.* (2010) A pathway-based classification of human breast cancer. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, **107**(15): 6994–6999.
- Gatza, M.L., Silva, G.O., Parker, J.S., Fan, C., and Perou, C.M. (2014) An integrated genomics approach identifies drivers of proliferation in luminal-subtype human breast cancer. *Nat Genet*, **46**(10): 1051–1059.
- Gentleman, R.C., Carey, V.J., Bates, D.M., Bolstad, B., Dettling, M., Dudoit, S., Ellis, B., Gautier, L., Ge, Y., Gentry, J., *et al.* (2004) Bioconductor: open software development for computational biology and bioinformatics. *Genome Biol*, **5**(10): R80.
- Genz, A. and Bretz, F. (2009) Computation of multivariate normal and t probabilities. In *Lecture Notes in Statistics*, volume 195. Springer-Verlag, Heidelberg.
- Genz, A., Bretz, F., Miwa, T., Mi, X., Leisch, F., Scheipl, F., and Hothorn, T. (2016) *mvtnorm: Multivariate Normal and t Distributions*. R package version 1.0-5. URL.
- Glaire, M.A., Brown, M., Church, D.N., and Tomlinson, I. (2017) Cancer predisposition syndromes: lessons for truly precision medicine. *J Pathol*, **241**(2): 226–235.
- Globus (Globus) (2017) Research data management simplified. <https://www.globus.org/>. Accessed: 25/03/2017.
- Goodwin, S., McPherson, J.D., and McCombie, W.R. (2016) Coming of age: ten years of next-generation sequencing technologies. *Nat Rev Genet*, **17**(6): 333–351.
- Grady, W.M., Willis, J., Guilford, P.J., Dunbier, A.K., Toro, T.T., Lynch, H., Wiesner, G., Ferguson, K., Eng, C., Park, J.G., *et al.* (2000) Methylation of the CDH1 promoter as the second genetic hit in hereditary diffuse gastric cancer. *Nat Genet*, **26**(1): 16–17.
- Graziano, F., Humar, B., and Guilford, P. (2003) The role of the E-cadherin gene (*CDH1*) in diffuse gastric cancer susceptibility: from the laboratory to clinical practice. *Annals of Oncology*, **14**(12): 1705–1713.
- Guaragnella, N., Palermo, V., Galli, A., Moro, L., Mazzoni, C., and Giannattasio, S. (2014) The expanding role of yeast in cancer research and diagnosis: insights into the function of the oncosuppressors p53 and BRCA1/2. *FEMS Yeast Res*, **14**(1): 2–16.

- Güell, O., Sagus, F., and Serrano, M. (2014) Essential plasticity and redundancy of metabolism unveiled by synthetic lethality analysis. *PLoS Comput Biol*, **10**(5): e1003637.
- Guilford, P. (1999) E-cadherin downregulation in cancer: fuel on the fire? *Molecular Medicine Today*, **5**(4): 172 – 177.
- Guilford, P., Hopkins, J., Harraway, J., McLeod, M., McLeod, N., Harawira, P., Taite, H., Scoular, R., Miller, A., and Reeve, A.E. (1998) E-cadherin germline mutations in familial gastric cancer. *Nature*, **392**(6674): 402–5.
- Guilford, P., Humar, B., and Blair, V. (2010) Hereditary diffuse gastric cancer: translation of *CDH1* germline mutations into clinical practice. *Gastric Cancer*, **13**(1): 1–10.
- Guilford, P.J., Hopkins, J.B., Grady, W.M., Markowitz, S.D., Willis, J., Lynch, H., Rajput, A., Wiesner, G.L., Lindor, N.M., Burgart, L.J., *et al.* (1999) E-cadherin germline mutations define an inherited cancer syndrome dominated by diffuse gastric cancer. *Hum Mutat*, **14**(3): 249–55.
- Guo, J., Liu, H., and Zheng, J. (2016) SynLethDB: synthetic lethality database toward discovery of selective and sensitive anticancer drug targets. *Nucleic Acids Res*, **44**(D1): D1011–1017.
- Hajian-Tilaki, K. (2013) Receiver Operating Characteristic (ROC) Curve Analysis for Medical Diagnostic Test Evaluation. *Caspian J Intern Med*, **4**(2): 627–635.
- Hall, M., Frank, E., Holmes, G., Pfahringer, B., Reutemann, P., and Witten, I.H. (2009) The weka data mining software: an update. *SIGKDD Explor Newsl*, **11**(1): 10–18.
- Hammerman, P.S., Lawrence, M.S., Voet, D., Jing, R., Cibulskis, K., Sivachenko, A., Stojanov, P., McKenna, A., Lander, E.S., Gabriel, S., *et al.* (2012) Comprehensive genomic characterization of squamous cell lung cancers. *Nature*, **489**(7417): 519–525.
- Hanahan, D. and Weinberg, R.A. (2000) The hallmarks of cancer. *Cell*, **100**(1): 57–70.
- Hanahan, D. and Weinberg, R.A. (2011) Hallmarks of cancer: the next generation. *Cell*, **144**(5): 646–674.

- Hanna, S. (2003) Cancer incidence in new zealand (2003-2007). In D. Forman, D. Bray F Brewster, C. Gombe Mbalawa, B. Kohler, M. Piñeros, E. Steliarova-Foucher, R. Swaminathan, and J. Ferlay (editors), *Cancer Incidence in Five Continents*, volume X, 902–907. International Agency for Research on Cancer, Lyon, France. Electronic version <http://ci5.iarc.fr> Accessed 22/03/2017.
- Hansford, S., Kaurah, P., Li-Chang, H., Woo, M., Senz, J., Pinheiro, H., Schrader, K.A., Schaeffer, D.F., Shumansky, K., Zogopoulos, G., *et al.* (2015) Hereditary Diffuse Gastric Cancer Syndrome: CDH1 Mutations and Beyond. *JAMA Oncol*, **1**(1): 23–32.
- Heiskanen, M.A. and Aittokallio, T. (2012) Mining high-throughput screens for cancer drug targets-lessons from yeast chemical-genomic profiling and synthetic lethality. *Wiley Interdisciplinary Reviews: Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, **2**(3): 263–272.
- Hell, P. (1976) Graphs with given neighbourhoods i. problèmes combinatoires at theorie des graphes. *Proc Coil Int CNRS, Orsay*, **260**: 219–223.
- Higgins, M.E., Claremont, M., Major, J.E., Sander, C., and Lash, A.E. (2007) CancerGenes: a gene selection resource for cancer genome projects. *Nucleic Acids Res*, **35**(Database issue): D721–726.
- Hillenmeyer, M.E. (2008) The chemical genomic portrait of yeast: uncovering a phenotype for all genes. *Science*, **320**: 362–365.
- Hoadley, K.A., Yau, C., Wolf, D.M., Cherniack, A.D., Tamborero, D., Ng, S., Leiserson, M.D., Niu, B., McLellan, M.D., Uzunangelov, V., *et al.* (2014) Multiplatform analysis of 12 cancer types reveals molecular classification within and across tissues of origin. *Cell*, **158**(4): 929–944.
- Hoehndorf, R., Hardy, N.W., Osumi-Sutherland, D., Tweedie, S., Schofield, P.N., and Gkoutos, G.V. (2013) Systematic analysis of experimental phenotype data reveals gene functions. *PLoS ONE*, **8**(4): e60847.
- Holm, S. (1979) A simple sequentially rejective multiple test procedure. *Scandinavian Journal of Statistics*, **6**(2): 65–70.
- Hopkins, A.L. (2008) Network pharmacology: the next paradigm in drug discovery. *Nat Chem Biol*, **4**(11): 682–690.

- Hu, Z., Fan, C., Oh, D.S., Marron, J.S., He, X., Qaqish, B.F., Livasy, C., Carey, L.A., Reynolds, E., Dressler, L., *et al.* (2006) The molecular portraits of breast tumors are conserved across microarray platforms. *BMC Genomics*, **7**: 96.
- Huang, E., Cheng, S., Dressman, H., Pittman, J., Tsou, M., Horng, C., Bild, A., Iversen, E., Liao, M., Chen, C., *et al.* (2003) Gene expression predictors of breast cancer outcomes. *Lancet*, **361**: 1590–1596.
- Hutchison, C.A., Chuang, R.Y., Noskov, V.N., Assad-Garcia, N., Deerinck, T.J., Ellisman, M.H., Gill, J., Kannan, K., Karas, B.J., Ma, L., *et al.* (2016) Design and synthesis of a minimal bacterial genome. *Science*, **351**(6280): aad6253.
- International HapMap 3 Consortium (HapMap) (2003) The International HapMap Project. *Nature*, **426**(6968): 789–796.
- Jeanes, A., Gottardi, C.J., and Yap, A.S. (2008) Cadherins and cancer: how does cadherin dysfunction promote tumor progression? *Oncogene*, **27**(55): 6920–6929.
- Jerby-Arnon, L., Pfetzer, N., Waldman, Y., McGarry, L., James, D., Shanks, E., Seashore-Ludlow, B., Weinstock, A., Geiger, T., Clemons, P., *et al.* (2014) Predicting cancer-specific vulnerability via data-driven detection of synthetic lethality. *Cell*, **158**(5): 1199–1209.
- Joachims, T. (1999) Making large-scale support vector machine learning practical. In S. Bernhard, I. Kropf, J.C.B. Christopher, and J.S. Alexander (editors), *Advances in kernel methods*, 169–184. MIT Press.
- Ju, Z., Liu, W., Roebuck, P.L., Siwak, D.R., Zhang, N., Lu, Y., Davies, M.A., Akbani, R., Weinstein, J.N., Mills, G.B., *et al.* (2015) Development of a robust classifier for quality control of reverse-phase protein arrays. *Bioinformatics*, **31**(6): 912.
- Kaelin, Jr, W. (2005) The concept of synthetic lethality in the context of anticancer therapy. *Nat Rev Cancer*, **5**(9): 689–98.
- Kaelin, Jr, W. (2009) Synthetic lethality: a framework for the development of wiser cancer therapeutics. *Genome Med*, **1**: 99.
- Kamada, T. and Kawai, S. (1989) An algorithm for drawing general undirected graphs. *Information Processing Letters*, **31**(1): 7–15.

- Kawai, J., Shinagawa, A., Shibata, K., Yoshino, M., Itoh, M., Ishii, Y., Arakawa, T., Hara, A., Fukunishi, Y., Konno, H., *et al.* (2001) Functional annotation of a full-length mouse cDNA collection. *Nature*, **409**(6821): 685–690.
- Kelley, R. and Ideker, T. (2005) Systematic interpretation of genetic interactions using protein networks. *Nat Biotech*, **23**(5): 561–566.
- Kelly, S.T. (2013) *Statistical Predictions of Synthetic Lethal Interactions in Cancer*. Dissertation, University of Otago.
- Keshava Prasad, T.S., Goel, R., Kandasamy, K., Keerthikumar, S., Kumar, S., Mathivanan, S., Telikicherla, D., Raju, R., Shafreen, B., Venugopal, A., *et al.* (2009) Human Protein Reference Database–2009 update. *Nucleic Acids Res*, **37**(Database issue): D767–772.
- Kim, N.G., Koh, E., Chen, X., and Gumbiner, B.M. (2011) E-cadherin mediates contact inhibition of proliferation through Hippo signaling-pathway components. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, **108**(29): 11930–11935.
- Koboldt, D.C., Fulton, R.S., McLellan, M.D., Schmidt, H., Kalicki-Veizer, J., McMichael, J.F., Fulton, L.L., Dooling, D.J., Ding, L., Mardis, E.R., *et al.* (2012) Comprehensive molecular portraits of human breast tumours. *Nature*, **490**(7418): 61–70.
- Kockel, L., Zeitlinger, J., Staszewski, L.M., Mlodzik, M., and Bohmann, D. (1997) Jun in drosophila development: redundant and nonredundant functions and regulation by two mapk signal transduction pathways. *Genes & Development*, **11**(13): 1748–1758.
- Kozlov, K.N., Gursky, V.V., Kulakovskiy, I.V., and Samsonova, M.G. (2015) Sequence-based model of gap gene regulation network. *BMC Genomics*, **15**(Suppl 12): S6.
- Kranthi, S., Rao, S., and Manimaran, P. (2013) Identification of synthetic lethal pairs in biological systems through network information centrality. *Mol BioSyst*, **9**(8): 2163–2167.
- Kroepil, F., Fluegen, G., Totikov, Z., Baldus, S.E., Vay, C., Schauer, M., Topp, S.A., Esch, J.S., Knoefel, W.T., and Stoecklein, N.H. (2012) Down-regulation of CDH1 is associated with expression of SNAI1 in colorectal adenomas. *PLoS ONE*, **7**(9): e46665.

- Lander, E.S. (2011) Initial impact of the sequencing of the human genome. *Nature*, **470**(7333): 187–197.
- Lander, E.S., Linton, L.M., Birren, B., Nusbaum, C., Zody, M.C., Baldwin, J., Devon, K., Dewar, K., Doyle, M., FitzHugh, W., *et al.* (2001) Initial sequencing and analysis of the human genome. *Nature*, **409**(6822): 860–921.
- Langmead, B., Trapnell, C., Pop, M., and Salzberg, S.L. (2009) Ultrafast and memory-efficient alignment of short DNA sequences to the human genome. *Genome Biol*, **10**(3): R25.
- Latora, V. and Marchiori, M. (2001) Efficient behavior of small-world networks. *Phys Rev Lett*, **87**: 198701.
- Laufer, C., Fischer, B., Billmann, M., Huber, W., and Boutros, M. (2013) Mapping genetic interactions in human cancer cells with RNAi and multiparametric phenotyping. *Nat Methods*, **10**(5): 427–31.
- Law, C.W., Chen, Y., Shi, W., and Smyth, G.K. (2014) voom: precision weights unlock linear model analysis tools for RNA-seq read counts. *Genome Biol*, **15**(2): R29.
- Le Meur, N. and Gentleman, R. (2008) Modeling synthetic lethality. *Genome Biol*, **9**(9): R135.
- Le Meur, N., Jiang, Z., Liu, T., Mar, J., and Gentleman, R.C. (2014) Slgi: Synthetic lethal genetic interaction. r package version 1.26.0.
- Lee, A.Y., Perreault, R., Harel, S., Boulier, E.L., Suderman, M., Hallett, M., and Jenna, S. (2010a) Searching for signaling balance through the identification of genetic interactors of the rab guanine-nucleotide dissociation inhibitor gdi-1. *PLoS ONE*, **5**(5): e10624.
- Lee, I., Lehner, B., Vavouri, T., Shin, J., Fraser, A.G., and Marcotte, E.M. (2010b) Predicting genetic modifier loci using functional gene networks. *Genome Research*, **20**(8): 1143–1153.
- Lee, I. and Marcotte, E.M. (2009) Effects of functional bias on supervised learning of a gene network model. *Methods Mol Biol*, **541**: 463–75.

- Lee, M.J., Ye, A.S., Gardino, A.K., Heijink, A.M., Sorger, P.K., MacBeath, G., and Yaffe, M.B. (2012) Sequential application of anticancer drugs enhances cell death by rewiring apoptotic signaling networks. *Cell*, **149**(4): 780–94.
- Lehner, B., Crombie, C., Tischler, J., Fortunato, A., and Fraser, A.G. (2006) Systematic mapping of genetic interactions in *caenorhabditis elegans* identifies common modifiers of diverse signaling pathways. *Nat Genet*, **38**(8): 896–903.
- Li, B., Ruotti, V., Stewart, R.M., Thomson, J.A., and Dewey, C.N. (2010) RNA-Seq gene expression estimation with read mapping uncertainty. *Bioinformatics*, **26**(4): 493–500.
- Li, X.J., Mishra, S.K., Wu, M., Zhang, F., and Zheng, J. (2014) Syn-lethality: An integrative knowledge base of synthetic lethality towards discovery of selective anticancer therapies. *Biomed Res Int*, **2014**: 196034.
- Linehan, W.M., Spellman, P.T., Ricketts, C.J., Creighton, C.J., Fei, S.S., Davis, C., Wheeler, D.A., Murray, B.A., Schmidt, L., Vocke, C.D., *et al.* (2016) Comprehensive Molecular Characterization of Papillary Renal-Cell Carcinoma. *N Engl J Med*, **374**(2): 135–145.
- Lokody, I. (2014) Computational modelling: A computational crystal ball. *Nature Reviews Cancer*, **14**(10): 649–649.
- Lord, C.J., Tutt, A.N., and Ashworth, A. (2015) Synthetic lethality and cancer therapy: lessons learned from the development of PARP inhibitors. *Annu Rev Med*, **66**: 455–470.
- Lu, X., Kensche, P.R., Huynen, M.A., and Notebaart, R.A. (2013) Genome evolution predicts genetic interactions in protein complexes and reveals cancer drug targets. *Nat Commun*, **4**: 2124.
- Lu, X., Megchelenbrink, W., Notebaart, R.A., and Huynen, M.A. (2015) Predicting human genetic interactions from cancer genome evolution. *PLoS One*, **10**(5): e0125795.
- Lum, P.Y., Armour, C.D., Stepaniants, S.B., Cavet, G., Wolf, M.K., Butler, J.S., Hinshaw, J.C., Garnier, P., Prestwich, G.D., Leonardson, A., *et al.* (2004) Discovering modes of action for therapeutic compounds using a genome-wide screen of yeast heterozygotes. *Cell*, **116**(1): 121–137.



- Luo, J., Solimini, N.L., and Elledge, S.J. (2009) Principles of Cancer Therapy: Oncogene and Non-oncogene Addiction. *Cell*, **136**(5): 823–837.
- Machado, J., Olivera, C., Carvalh, R., Soares, P., Berx, G., Caldas, C., Sercuca, R., Carneiro, F., and Sorbrinho-Simoes, M. (2001) E-cadherin gene (*CDH1*) promoter methylation as the second hit in sporadic diffuse gastric carcinoma. *Oncogene*, **20**: 1525–1528.
- Markowetz, F. (2017) All biology is computational biology. *PLoS Biol*, **15**(3): e2002050.
- Masciari, S., Larsson, N., Senz, J., Boyd, N., Kaurah, P., Kandel, M.J., Harris, L.N., Pinheiro, H.C., Troussard, A., Miron, P., *et al.* (2007) Germline E-cadherin mutations in familial lobular breast cancer. *J Med Genet*, **44**(11): 726–31.
- Mattison, J., van der Weyden, L., Hubbard, T., and Adams, D.J. (2009) Cancer gene discovery in mouse and man. *Biochim Biophys Acta*, **1796**(2): 140–161.
- McLachlan, J., George, A., and Banerjee, S. (2016) The current status of parp inhibitors in ovarian cancer. *Tumori*, **102**(5): 433–440.
- McLendon, R., Friedman, A., Bigner, D., Van Meir, E.G., Brat, D.J., Mastrogiannis, G.M., Olson, J.J., Mikkelsen, T., Lehman, N., Aldape, K., *et al.* (2008) Comprehensive genomic characterization defines human glioblastoma genes and core pathways. *Nature*, **455**(7216): 1061–1068.
- Miles, D.W. (2001) Update on HER-2 as a target for cancer therapy: herceptin in the clinical setting. *Breast Cancer Res*, **3**(6): 380–384.
- Muzny, D.M., Bainbridge, M.N., Chang, K., Dinh, H.H., Drummond, J.A., Fowler, G., Kovar, C.L., Lewis, L.R., Morgan, M.B., Newsham, I.F., *et al.* (2012) Comprehensive molecular characterization of human colon and rectal cancer. *Nature*, **487**(7407): 330–337.
- Nagalla, S., Chou, J.W., Willingham, M.C., Ruiz, J., Vaughn, J.P., Dubey, P., Lash, T.L., Hamilton-Dutoit, S.J., Bergh, J., Sotiriou, C., *et al.* (2013) Interactions between immunity, proliferation and molecular subtype in breast cancer prognosis. *Genome Biol*, **14**(4): R34.
- Neeley, E.S., Kornblau, S.M., Coombes, K.R., and Baggerly, K.A. (2009) Variable slope normalization of reverse phase protein arrays. *Bioinformatics*, **25**(11): 1384.

- Novomestky, F. (2012) *matrixcalc: Collection of functions for matrix calculations*. R package version 1.0-3.
- Nowak, M.A., Boerlijst, M.C., Cooke, J., and Smith, J.M. (1997) Evolution of genetic redundancy. *Nature*, **388**(6638): 167–171.
- Oliveira, C., Senz, J., Kaurah, P., Pinheiro, H., Sanges, R., Haegert, A., Corso, G., Schouten, J., Fitzgerald, R., Vogelsang, H., *et al.* (2009) Germline *CDH1* deletions in hereditary diffuse gastric cancer families. *Human Molecular Genetics*, **18**(9): 1545–1555.
- Oliveira, C., Seruca, R., Hoogerbrugge, N., Ligtenberg, M., and Carneiro, F. (2013) Clinical utility gene card for: Hereditary diffuse gastric cancer (HDGC). *Eur J Hum Genet*, **21**(8).
- Pandey, G., Zhang, B., Chang, A.N., Myers, C.L., Zhu, J., Kumar, V., and Schadt, E.E. (2010) An integrative multi-network and multi-classifier approach to predict genetic interactions. *PLoS Comput Biol*, **6**(9).
- Parker, J., Mullins, M., Cheung, M., Leung, S., Voduc, D., Vickery, T., Davies, S., Fauron, C., He, X., Hu, Z., *et al.* (2009) Supervised risk predictor of breast cancer based on intrinsic subtypes. *Journal of Clinical Oncology*, **27**(8): 1160–1167.
- Pereira, B., Chin, S.F., Rueda, O.M., Vollan, H.K., Provenzano, E., Bardwell, H.A., Pugh, M., Jones, L., Russell, R., Sammut, S.J., *et al.* (2016) Erratum: The somatic mutation profiles of 2,433 breast cancers refine their genomic and transcriptomic landscapes. *Nat Commun*, **7**: 11908.
- Perou, C.M., Sørlie, T., Eisen, M.B., van de Rijn, M., Jeffrey, S.S., Rees, C.A., Pollack, J.R., Ross, D.T., Johnsen, H., Akslen, L.A., *et al.* (2000) Molecular portraits of human breast tumours. *Nature*, **406**(6797): 747–752.
- Polyak, K. and Weinberg, R.A. (2009) Transitions between epithelial and mesenchymal states: acquisition of malignant and stem cell traits. *Nat Rev Cancer*, **9**(4): 265–73.
- R Core Team (2016) *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. R version 3.3.2.
- Ritchie, M.E., Phipson, B., Wu, D., Hu, Y., Law, C.W., Shi, W., and Smyth, G.K. (2015) limma powers differential expression analyses for RNA-sequencing and microarray studies. *Nucleic Acids Research*, **43**(7): e47.

- Roguev, A., Bandyopadhyay, S., Zofall, M., Zhang, K., Fischer, T., Collins, S.R., Qu, H., Shales, M., Park, H.O., Hayles, J., *et al.* (2008) Conservation and rewiring of functional modules revealed by an epistasis map in fission yeast. *Science*, **322**(5900): 405–10.
- Roychowdhury, S. and Chinnaiyan, A.M. (2016) Translating cancer genomes and transcriptomes for precision oncology. *CA Cancer J Clin*, **66**(1): 75–88.
- Rung, J. and Brazma, A. (2013) Reuse of public genome-wide gene expression data. *Nat Rev Genet*, **14**(2): 89–99.
- Ryan, C., Lord, C., and Ashworth, A. (2014) Daisy: Picking synthetic lethals from cancer genomes. *Cancer Cell*, **26**(3): 306–308.
- Schena, M. (1996) Genome analysis with gene expression microarrays. *Bioessays*, **18**(5): 427–431.
- Scheuer, L., Kauff, N., Robson, M., Kelly, B., Barakat, R., Satagopan, J., Ellis, N., Hensley, M., Boyd, J., Borgen, P., *et al.* (2002) Outcome of preventive surgery and screening for breast and ovarian cancer in BRCA mutation carriers. *J Clin Oncol*, **20**(5): 1260–1268.
- Semb, H. and Christofori, G. (1998) The tumor-suppressor function of E-cadherin. *Am J Hum Genet*, **63**(6): 1588–93.
- Sing, T., Sander, O., Beerenwinkel, N., and Lengauer, T. (2005) Rocr: visualizing classifier performance in r. *Bioinformatics*, **21**(20): 7881.
- Slurm development team (Slurm) (2017) Slurm workload manager. <https://slurm.schedmd.com/>. Accessed: 25/03/2017.
- Sørli, T., Perou, C.M., Tibshirani, R., Aas, T., Geisler, S., Johnsen, H., Hastie, T., Eisen, M.B., van de Rijn, M., Jeffrey, S.S., *et al.* (2001) Gene expression patterns of breast carcinomas distinguish tumor subclasses with clinical implications. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, **98**(19): 10869–10874.
- Srihari, S., Singla, J., Wong, L., and Ragan, M.A. (2015) Inferring synthetic lethal interactions from mutual exclusivity of genetic events in cancer. *Biology Direct*, **10**(1): 57.

- Stajich, J.E. and Lapp, H. (2006) Open source tools and toolkits for bioinformatics: significance, and where are we? *Brief Bioinformatics*, **7**(3): 287–296.
- Stratton, M.R., Campbell, P.J., and Futreal, P.A. (2009) The cancer genome. *Nature*, **458**(7239): 719–724.
- Ström, C. and Helleday, T. (2012) Strategies for the use of poly(adenosine diphosphate ribose) polymerase (parp) inhibitors in cancer therapy. *Biomolecules*, **2**(4): 635–649.
- Tarazona, S., Garcia-Alcalde, F., Dopazo, J., Ferrer, A., and Conesa, A. (2011) Differential expression in RNA-seq: a matter of depth. *Genome Res*, **21**(12): 2213–2223.
- Telford, B.J., Chen, A., Beetham, H., Frick, J., Brew, T.P., Gould, C.M., Single, A., Godwin, T., Simpson, K.J., and Guilford, P. (2015) Synthetic lethal screens identify vulnerabilities in gpcr signalling and cytoskeletal organization in E-cadherin-deficient cells. *Mol Cancer Ther*, **14**(5): 1213–1223.
- The 1000 Genomes Project Consortium (1000 Genomes) (2010) A map of human genome variation from population-scale sequencing. *Nature*, **467**(7319): 1061–1073.
- The Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network (TCGA) (2017) The Cancer Genome Atlas Project. <https://cancergenome.nih.gov/>. Accessed: 26/03/2017.
- The Catalogue Of Somatic Mutations In Cancer (COSMIC) (2016) Cosmic: The catalogue of somatic mutations in cancer. <http://cancer.sanger.ac.uk/cosmic>. Release 79 (23/08/2016), Accessed: 05/02/2017.
- The Comprehensive R Archive Network (CRAN) (2017) Cran. <https://cran.r-project.org/>. Accessed: 24/03/2017.
- The ENCODE Project Consortium (ENCODE) (2004) The ENCODE (ENCyclopedia Of DNA Elements) Project. *Science*, **306**(5696): 636–640.
- The National Cancer Institute (NCI) (2015) The genetics of cancer. <https://www.cancer.gov/about-cancer/causes-prevention/genetics>. Published: 22/04/2015, Accessed: 22/03/2017.
- The New Zealand eScience Infrastructure (NeSI) (2017) NeSI. <https://www.nesi.org.nz/>. Accessed: 25/03/2017.
- Tierney, L., Rossini, A.J., Li, N., and Sevcikova, H. (2015) *snow: Simple Network of Workstations*. R package version 0.4-2.

- Tiong, K.L., Chang, K.C., Yeh, K.T., Liu, T.Y., Wu, J.H., Hsieh, P.H., Lin, S.H., Lai, W.Y., Hsu, Y.C., Chen, J.Y., *et al.* (2014) Csnk1e/ctnnb1 are synthetic lethal to tp53 in colorectal cancer and are markers for prognosis. *Neoplasia*, **16**(5): 441–50.
- Tischler, J., Lehner, B., and Fraser, A.G. (2008) Evolutionary plasticity of genetic interaction networks. *Nat Genet*, **40**(4): 390–391.
- Tomasetti, C. and Vogelstein, B. (2015) Cancer etiology. Variation in cancer risk among tissues can be explained by the number of stem cell divisions. *Science*, **347**(6217): 78–81.
- Tong, A.H., Evangelista, M., Parsons, A.B., Xu, H., Bader, G.D., Page, N., Robinson, M., Raghibizadeh, S., Hogue, C.W., Bussey, H., *et al.* (2001) Systematic genetic analysis with ordered arrays of yeast deletion mutants. *Science*, **294**(5550): 2364–8.
- Tong, A.H., Lesage, G., Bader, G.D., Ding, H., Xu, H., Xin, X., Young, J., Berriz, G.F., Brost, R.L., Chang, M., *et al.* (2004) Global mapping of the yeast genetic interaction network. *Science*, **303**(5659): 808–13.
- Tran, B., Dancey, J.E., Kamel-Reid, S., McPherson, J.D., Bedard, P.L., Brown, A.M., Zhang, T., Shaw, P., Onetto, N., Stein, L., *et al.* (2012) Cancer genomics: technology, discovery, and translation. *J Clin Oncol*, **30**(6): 647–660.
- Travers, J. and Milgram, S. (1969) An experimental study of the small world problem. *Sociometry*, **32**(4): 425–443.
- Tunggal, J.A., Helfrich, I., Schmitz, A., Schwarz, H., Gunzel, D., Fromm, M., Kemler, R., Krieg, T., and Niessen, C.M. (2005) E-cadherin is essential for in vivo epidermal barrier function by regulating tight junctions. *EMBO J*, **24**(6): 1146–1156.
- Tutt, A., Robson, M., Garber, J.E., Domchek, S.M., Audeh, M.W., Weitzel, J.N., Friedlander, M., Arun, B., Loman, N., Schmutzler, R.K., *et al.* (2010) Oral poly(adp-ribose) polymerase inhibitor olaparib in patients with *BRCA1* or *BRCA2* mutations and advanced breast cancer: a proof-of-concept trial. *Lancet*, **376**(9737): 235–44.
- University of California, Santa Cruz (UCSC) (2012) Uscs cancer browser. Accessed 29/03/2012.
- van der Meer, R., Song, H.Y., Park, S.H., Abdulkadir, S.A., and Roh, M. (2014) RNAi screen identifies a synthetic lethal interaction between PIM1 overexpression and PLK1 inhibition. *Clinical Cancer Research*, **20**(12): 3211–3221.

- van der Post, R.S., Vogelaar, I.P., Carneiro, F., Guilford, P., Huntsman, D., Hoogerbrugge, N., Caldas, C., Schreiber, K.E., Hardwick, R.H., Ausems, M.G., *et al.* (2015) Hereditary diffuse gastric cancer: updated clinical guidelines with an emphasis on germline CDH1 mutation carriers. *J Med Genet*, **52**(6): 361–374.
- van Steen, K. (2012) Travelling the world of genegene interactions. *Briefings in Bioinformatics*, **13**(1): 1–19.
- van Steen, M. (2010) *Graph Theory and Complex Networks: An Introduction*. Maarten van Steen, VU Amsterdam.
- Vapnik, V.N. (1995) *The nature of statistical learning theory*. Springer-Verlag New York, Inc.
- Vizeacoumar, F.J., Arnold, R., Vizeacoumar, F.S., Chandrashekhar, M., Buzina, A., Young, J.T., Kwan, J.H., Sayad, A., Mero, P., Lawo, S., *et al.* (2013) A negative genetic interaction map in isogenic cancer cell lines reveals cancer cell vulnerabilities. *Mol Syst Biol*, **9**: 696.
- Vogelstein, B., Papadopoulos, N., Velculescu, V.E., Zhou, S., Diaz, L.A., and Kinzler, K.W. (2013) Cancer genome landscapes. *Science*, **339**(6127): 1546–1558.
- Vos, C.B., Cleton-Jansen, A.M., Berx, G., de Leeuw, W.J., ter Haar, N.T., van Roy, F., Cornelisse, C.J., Peterse, J.L., and van de Vijver, M.J. (1997) E-cadherin inactivation in lobular carcinoma in situ of the breast: an early event in tumorigenesis. *Br J Cancer*, **76**(9): 1131–3.
- Waldron, D. (2016) Cancer genomics: A multi-layer omics approach to cancer. *Nat Rev Genet*, **17**(8): 436–437.
- Wang, K., Singh, D., Zeng, Z., Coleman, S.J., Huang, Y., Savich, G.L., He, X., Mieczkowski, P., Grimm, S.A., Perou, C.M., *et al.* (2010) MapSplice: accurate mapping of RNA-seq reads for splice junction discovery. *Nucleic Acids Res*, **38**(18): e178.
- Wang, X. and Simon, R. (2013) Identification of potential synthetic lethal genes to p53 using a computational biology approach. *BMC Medical Genomics*, **6**(1): 30.
- Wappett, M. (2014) Bisep: Toolkit to identify candidate synthetic lethality. r package version 2.0.

- Wappett, M., Dulak, A., Yang, Z.R., Al-Watban, A., Bradford, J.R., and Dry, J.R. (2016) Multi-omic measurement of mutually exclusive loss-of-function enriches for candidate synthetic lethal gene pairs. *BMC Genomics*, **17**: 65.
- Warnes, G.R., Bolker, B., Bonebakker, L., Gentleman, R., Liaw, W.H.A., Lumley, T., Maechler, M., Magnusson, A., Moeller, S., Schwartz, M., *et al.* (2015) *gplots: Various R Programming Tools for Plotting Data*. R package version 2.17.0.
- Watts, D.J. and Strogatz, S.H. (1998) Collective dynamics of 'small-world' networks. *Nature*, **393**(6684): 440–2.
- Weinstein, I.B. (2000) Disorders in cell circuitry during multistage carcinogenesis: the role of homeostasis. *Carcinogenesis*, **21**(5): 857–864.
- Weinstein, J.N., Akbani, R., Broom, B.M., Wang, W., Verhaak, R.G., McConkey, D., Lerner, S., Morgan, M., Creighton, C.J., Smith, C., *et al.* (2014) Comprehensive molecular characterization of urothelial bladder carcinoma. *Nature*, **507**(7492): 315–322.
- Weinstein, J.N., Collisson, E.A., Mills, G.B., Shaw, K.R., Ozenberger, B.A., Ellrott, K., Shmulevich, I., Sander, C., Stuart, J.M., Chang, K., *et al.* (2013) The Cancer Genome Atlas Pan-Cancer analysis project. *Nat Genet*, **45**(10): 1113–1120.
- Wickham, H. and Chang, W. (2016) *devtools: Tools to Make Developing R Packages Easier*. R package version 1.12.0.
- Wickham, H., Danenberg, P., and Eugster, M. (2017) *roxygen2: In-Line Documentation for R*. R package version 6.0.1.
- Wong, S.L., Zhang, L.V., Tong, A.H.Y., Li, Z., Goldberg, D.S., King, O.D., Lesage, G., Vidal, M., Andrews, B., Bussey, H., *et al.* (2004) Combining biological networks to predict genetic interactions. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*, **101**(44): 15682–15687.
- World Health Organization (WHO) (2017) Fact sheet: Cancer. <http://www.who.int/mediacentre/factsheets/fs297/en/>. Updated February 2017, Accessed: 22/03/2017.
- Wu, M., Li, X., Zhang, F., Li, X., Kwoh, C.K., and Zheng, J. (2014) In silico prediction of synthetic lethality by meta-analysis of genetic interactions, functions, and pathways in yeast and human cancer. *Cancer Inform*, **13**(Suppl 3): 71–80.

- Yu, H. (2002) Rmpi: Parallel statistical computing in r. *R News*, **2**(2): 10–14.
- Zhang, F., Wu, M., Li, X.J., Li, X.L., Kwoh, C.K., and Zheng, J. (2015) Predicting essential genes and synthetic lethality via influence propagation in signaling pathways of cancer cell fates. *J Bioinform Comput Biol*, **13**(3): 1541002.
- Zhang, J., Baran, J., Cros, A., Guberman, J.M., Haider, S., Hsu, J., Liang, Y., Rivkin, E., Wang, J., Whitty, B., *et al.* (2011) International cancer genome consortium data portala one-stop shop for cancer genomics data. *Database: The Journal of Biological Databases and Curation*, **2011**: bar026.
- Zhong, W. and Sternberg, P.W. (2006) Genome-wide prediction of c. elegans genetic interactions. *Science*, **311**(5766): 1481–1484.
- Zweig, M.H. and Campbell, G. (1993) Receiver-operating characteristic (roc) plots: a fundamental evaluation tool in clinical medicine. *Clinical Chemistry*, **39**(4): 561–577.