

Contents

Glossary	xiii
Acronyms	xiv
1 Introduction and Literature Review	1
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 genomic Revolution in Cancer Research	4
1.1.2.1 High-Throughput Technologies	4
1.1.2.2 Bioinformatics and Genomic Data	6
1.1.3 Genomics Projects	6
1.1.3.1 The Cancer Genome Project	6
1.1.3.2 The Cancer Genome Atlas Project	7
1.1.4 Genomic Cancer Medicine	8
1.1.4.1 Cancer Genes and Driver Mutations	9
1.1.4.2 Precision Cancer Medicine	9
1.1.4.3 Molecular Diagnostics and Pan-Cancer Medicine	10
1.1.4.4 Targeted Therapeutics and Pharmacogenomics	10
1.1.5 Systems and Network Biology	11
1.1.5.1 Network Medicine and Polypharmacology	13
1.2 A Synthetic Lethal Approach to Cancer Medicine	14
1.2.1 Synthetic Lethal Genetic Interactions	14
1.2.2 Synthetic Lethal Concepts in Genetics	15
1.2.3 Synthetic Lethality in Model Systems	16
1.2.3.1 Synthetic Lethal Pathways and Networks	16
1.2.3.2 Evolution of Synthetic Lethality	17
1.2.4 Synthetic Lethality in Cancer	18
1.2.5 Clinical Impact of Synthetic Lethality in Cancer	19
1.2.6 High-throughput Screening for Synthetic Lethality	21
1.2.6.1 Synthetic Lethal Screens	22
1.2.7 Computational Prediction of Synthetic Lethality	25
1.2.7.1 Bioinformatics Approaches to Genetic Interactions	25
1.2.7.2 Comparative Genomics	26
1.2.7.3 Analysis and Modelling of Protein Data	29
1.2.7.4 Differential Gene Expression	31

1.2.7.5	Data Mining and Machine Learning	32
1.2.7.6	Mutually Exclusive Bimodality	35
1.2.7.7	Rationale for Further Development	35
1.3	E-cadherin as a Synthetic Lethal Target	36
1.3.1	The <i>CDH1</i> gene and its Biological Functions	36
1.3.1.1	Cytoskeleton	36
1.3.1.2	Extracellular and Tumour Micro-environment	37
1.3.1.3	Cell-Cell Adhesion and Signalling	37
1.3.2	<i>CDH1</i> as a Tumour (and Invasion) Suppressor	37
1.3.2.1	Breast Cancers and Invasion	38
1.3.3	Hereditary Diffuse Gastric Cancer and Lobular Breast Cancer	38
1.3.4	Cell Line Models of <i>CDH1</i> Null Mutations	39
1.4	Summary and Research Direction of Thesis	40
1.4.1	Thesis Aims	42
2	Methods and Resources	43
2.1	Bioinformatics Resources for Genomics Research	43
2.1.1	Public Data and Software Packages	43
2.1.1.1	Cancer Genomes Atlas Data	44
2.1.1.2	Reactome and Annotation Data	45
2.2	Data Handling	45
2.2.1	Normalisation	45
2.2.2	Sample Triage	46
2.2.3	Metagenes and the Singular Value Decomposition	46
2.2.3.1	Candidate Triage and Integration with Screen Data	48
2.3	Techniques	49
2.3.1	Statistical Procedures and Tests	49
2.3.2	Gene Set Over-representation Analysis	50
2.3.3	Clustering	50
2.3.4	Heatmap	50
2.3.5	Modeling and Simulations	51
2.3.5.1	Receiver Operating Characteristic (Performance)	52
2.3.6	Resampling Analysis	52
2.4	Pathway Structure Methods	53
2.4.1	Network and Graph Analysis	53
2.4.2	Sourcing Graph Structure Data	54
2.4.3	Constructing Pathway Subgraphs	54
2.4.4	Network Analysis Metrics	55
2.5	Implementation	56
2.5.1	Computational Resources and Linux Utilities	56
2.5.2	R Language and Packages	57
2.5.3	High Performance and Parallel Computing	60

3	Methods Developed During Thesis	62
3.1	A Synthetic Lethal Detection Methodology	62
3.2	Synthetic Lethal Simulation and Modelling	65
3.2.1	A Model of Synthetic Lethality in Expression Data	65
3.2.2	Simulation Procedure	69
3.3	Detecting Simulated Synthetic Lethal Partners	72
3.3.1	Binomial Simulation of Synthetic Lethality	72
3.3.2	Multivariate Normal Simulation of Synthetic Lethality	74
3.3.2.1	Multivariate Normal Simulation with Correlated Genes	77
3.3.2.2	Specificity with Query-Correlated Pathways	84
3.3.2.3	Importance of Directional Testing	84
3.4	Graph Structure Methods	86
3.4.1	Upstream and Downstream Gene Detection	86
3.4.1.1	Permutation Analysis for Statistical Significance	87
3.4.1.2	Hierarchy Based on Biological Context	88
3.4.2	Simulating Gene Expression from Graph Structures	89
3.5	Customised Functions and Packages Developed	93
3.5.1	Synthetic Lethal Interaction Prediction Tool	93
3.5.2	Data Visualisation	94
3.5.3	Extensions to the iGraph Package	97
3.5.3.1	Sampling Simulated Data from Graph Structures	97
3.5.3.2	Plotting Directed Graph Structures	97
3.5.3.3	Computing Information Centrality	98
3.5.3.4	Testing Pathway Structure with Permutation Testing	98
3.5.3.5	Metapackage to Install iGraph Functions	99
4	Synthetic Lethal Analysis of Gene Expression Data	100
4.1	Synthetic Lethal Genes in Breast Cancer	101
4.1.1	Synthetic Lethal Pathways in Breast Cancer	103
4.1.2	Expression Profiles of Synthetic Lethal Partners	104
4.1.2.1	Subgroup Pathway Analysis	107
4.2	Comparing Synthetic Lethal Gene Candidates	110
4.2.1	Primary siRNA Screen Candidates	110
4.2.2	Comparison with Correlation	110
4.2.3	Comparison with Primary Screen Viability	112
4.2.4	Comparison with Secondary short interfering RNA (siRNA) Screen Validation	114
4.2.5	Comparison to Primary Screen at Pathway Level	116
4.2.5.1	Resampling Genes for Pathway Enrichment	118
4.2.6	Integrating Synthetic Lethal Pathways and Screens	121
4.3	Metagene Analysis	123
4.3.1	Pathway Expression	124
4.3.2	Somatic Mutation	126
4.3.3	Synthetic Lethal Pathway Metagenes	130
4.3.4	Synthetic Lethality in Breast Cancer	131
4.4	Replication in Stomach Cancer	132

4.5	Discussion	133
4.5.1	Strengths of the SLIPT Methodology	133
4.5.2	Synthetic Lethal Pathways for E-cadherin	134
4.5.3	Replication and Validation	136
4.5.3.1	Integration with siRNA Screening	136
4.5.3.2	Replication across Tissues	137
4.6	Summary	137
5	Synthetic Lethal Pathway Structure	139
5.1	Synthetic Lethal Genes in Reactome Pathways	139
5.1.1	The PI3K/AKT Pathway	140
5.1.2	The Extracellular Matrix	142
5.1.3	G Protein Coupled Receptors	145
5.1.4	Gene Regulation and Translation	145
5.2	Network Analysis of Synthetic Lethal Genes	146
5.2.1	Gene Connectivity and Vertex Degree	147
5.2.2	Gene Importance and Centrality	148
5.2.2.1	Information Centrality	148
5.2.2.2	PageRank Centrality	150
5.3	Relationships between Synthetic Lethal Genes	152
5.3.1	Hierarchical Pathway Structure	152
5.3.1.1	Contextual Hierarchy of PI3K	152
5.3.1.2	Testing Contextual Hierarchy of Synthetic Lethal Genes	152
5.3.2	Upstream or Downstream Synthetic Lethality	156
5.3.2.1	Measuring Structure of Candidates within PI3K	156
5.3.2.2	Resampling for Synthetic Lethal Pathway Structure	158
5.4	Discussion	160
5.5	Summary	162
6	Simulation and Modeling of Synthetic Lethal Pathways	164
6.1	Synthetic Lethal Detection Methods	165
6.1.1	Performance of SLIPT and χ^2 across Quantiles	165
6.1.1.1	Correlated Query Genes affects Specificity	169
6.1.2	Alternative Synthetic Lethal Detection Strategies	171
6.1.2.1	Correlation for Synthetic Lethal Detection	171
6.1.2.2	Testing for Bimodality with BiSEp	173
6.2	Simulations with Graph Structures	174
6.2.1	Performance over a Graph Structure	175
6.2.1.1	Simple Graph Structures	175
6.2.1.2	Constructed Graph Structures	177
6.2.2	Performance with Inhibitions	180
6.2.3	Synthetic Lethality across Graph Structures	185
6.2.4	Performance within a Simulated Human Genomes	189
6.3	Simulations in More Complex Graph Structures	193
6.3.1	Simulations over Pathway-based Graphs	194
6.3.2	Pathway Structures in a Simulated Human Genomes	197

6.4	Discussion	200
6.4.1	Simulation Procedure	200
6.4.2	Comparing Methods with Simulated Data	201
6.4.3	Design and Performance of SLIPT	202
6.4.4	Simulations from Graph Structures	204
6.5	Summary	205
7	Discussion	207
7.1	Synthetic Lethality and <i>CDH1</i> Biology	207
7.1.1	Established Functions of <i>CDH1</i>	208
7.1.2	The Molecular Role of <i>CDH1</i> in Cancer	208
7.2	Significance	209
7.2.1	Synthetic Lethality in the Genomic Era	209
7.2.2	Clinical Interventions based on Synthetic Lethality	211
7.3	Future Directions	212
7.4	Conclusions	214
	References	216
A	Sample Quality	240
A.1	Sample Correlation	240
A.2	Replicate Samples in The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) Breast	243
B	Software Used for Thesis	247
C	Mutation Analysis in Breast Cancer	256
C.1	Synthetic Lethal Genes and Pathways	256
C.2	Synthetic Lethal Expression Profiles	259
C.3	Comparison to Primary Screen	262
C.3.1	Resampling Analysis	264
C.4	Compare Synthetic Lethal Interaction Prediction Tool (SLIPT) genes	266
C.5	Metagene Analysis	268
C.6	Expression of Somatic Mutations	269
C.7	Metagene Expression Profiles	272
D	Intrinsic Subtyping	275
E	Stomach Expression Analysis	277
E.1	Synthetic Lethal Genes and Pathways	277
E.2	Comparison to Primary Screen	281
E.2.1	Resampling Analysis	283
E.3	Metagene Analysis	285
F	Synthetic Lethal Genes in Pathways	286
G	Pathway Connectivity for Mutation SLIPT	294

H	Information Centrality for Gene Essentiality	298
I	Pathway Structure for Mutation SLIPT	301
J	Performance of SLIPT and χ^2	304
J.1	Correlated Query Genes affects Specificity	310
K	Graph Structures	316
K.1	Simulations from Simple Graph Structures	316
K.1.1	Simulations from Inhibiting Graph Structures	318
K.2	Simulation across Graph Structures	321
K.3	Simulations from Complex Graph Structures	325
K.3.1	Simulations from Complex Inhibiting Graphs	328
K.4	Simulations from Pathway Graph Structures	334

List of Figures

1.1	Synthetic genetic interactions	15
1.2	Synthetic lethality in cancer	19
2.1	Read count density	47
2.2	Read count sample mean	47
3.1	Framework for synthetic lethal prediction	63
3.2	Synthetic lethal prediction adapted for mutation	64
3.3	A model of synthetic lethal gene expression	66
3.4	Modeling synthetic lethal gene expression	67
3.5	Synthetic lethality with multiple genes	68
3.6	Simulating gene function	70
3.7	Simulating synthetic lethal gene function	70
3.8	Simulating synthetic lethal gene expression	71
3.9	Performance of binomial simulations	73
3.10	Comparison of statistical performance	73
3.11	Performance of multivariate normal simulations	75
3.12	Simulating expression with correlated gene blocks	78
3.13	Simulating expression with correlated gene blocks	79
3.14	Synthetic lethal prediction across simulations	80
3.15	Performance with correlations	81
3.16	Comparison of statistical performance with correlation structure	82
3.17	Performance with query correlations	83
3.18	Statistical evaluation of directional criteria	84
3.19	Performance of directional criteria	85
3.20	Simulated graph structures	89
3.21	Simulating expression from a graph structure	91
3.22	Simulating expression from graph structure with inhibitions	92
3.23	Demonstration of violin plots with custom features	95
3.24	Demonstration of annotated heatmap	95
3.25	Simulating graph structures	98
4.1	Synthetic lethal expression profiles of analysed samples	106
4.2	Comparison of SLIPT to siRNA	110
4.3	Compare SLIPT and siRNA genes with correlation	111
4.4	Compare SLIPT and siRNA genes with correlation	112
4.5	Compare SLIPT and siRNA genes with viability	113

4.6	Compare SLIPT genes with siRNA viability	114
4.7	Resampled intersection of SLIPT and siRNA candidates	118
4.8	Pathway metagene expression profiles	125
4.9	Expression profiles for constituent genes of PI3K	127
4.10	Expression profiles for estrogen receptor related genes	128
4.11	Somatic mutation against the PI3K metagene	129
5.1	Synthetic Lethality in the PI3K Cascade	141
5.2	Synthetic Lethality in the Elastic Fibre Formation Pathway	143
5.3	Synthetic Lethality in the Fibrin Clot Formation	144
5.4	Synthetic Lethality and Vertex Degree	147
5.5	Synthetic Lethality and Centrality	150
5.6	Synthetic Lethality and PageRank	151
5.7	Hierarchical Structure of PI3K	153
5.8	Hierarchy Score in PI3K against Synthetic Lethality in PI3K	154
5.9	Structure of Synthetic Lethality in PI3K	156
5.10	Structure of Synthetic Lethality Resampling in PI3K	157
6.1	Performance of χ^2 and SLIPT across quantiles	167
6.2	Performance of χ^2 and SLIPT across quantiles with more genes	168
6.3	Performance of χ^2 and SLIPT across quantiles with query correlation	169
6.4	Performance of χ^2 and SLIPT across quantiles with query correlation and more genes	170
6.5	Performance of negative correlation and SLIPT	172
6.6	Simple graph structures	175
6.7	Performance of simulations on a simple graph	176
6.8	Performance of simulations is similar in simple graphs	178
6.9	Performance of simulations on a pathway	179
6.10	Performance of simulations on a simple graph with inhibition	181
6.11	Performance is higher on a simple inhibiting graph	182
6.12	Performance of simulations on a constructed graph with inhibition	183
6.13	Performance is affected by inhibition in graphs	185
6.14	Detection of Synthetic Lethality within a Graph Structure with Inhibitions	187
6.15	Performance of simulations including a simple graph	190
6.16	Performance on a simple graph improves with more genes	191
6.17	Performance on an inhibiting graph improves with more genes	193
6.18	Performance of simulations on the PI3K cascade	196
6.19	Performance of simulations including the PI3K cascade	198
6.20	Performance on pathways improves with more genes	199
A.1	Correlation profiles of removed samples	241
A.2	Correlation analysis and sample removal	242
A.3	Replicate excluded samples	243
A.4	Replicate samples with all remaining	244
A.5	Replicate samples with some excluded	245
C.1	Synthetic lethal expression profiles of analysed samples	260

C.2	Comparison of mtSLIPT to siRNA	262
C.3	Compare mtSLIPT and siRNA genes with correlation	266
C.4	Compare mtSLIPT and siRNA genes with correlation	266
C.5	Compare mtSLIPT and siRNA genes with siRNA viability	267
C.6	Somatic mutation against PIK3CA metagene	269
C.7	Somatic mutation against PI3K protein	270
C.8	Somatic mutation against AKT protein	271
C.9	Pathway metagene expression profiles	272
C.10	Expression profiles for p53 related genes	273
C.11	Expression profiles for BRCA related genes	274
E.1	Synthetic lethal expression profiles of stomach samples	279
E.2	Comparison of SLIPT in stomach to siRNA	281
F.1	Synthetic Lethality in the PI3K/AKT Pathway	286
F.2	Synthetic Lethality in the PI3K/AKT Pathway in Cancer	287
F.3	Synthetic Lethality in the Extracellular Matrix	288
F.4	Synthetic Lethality in the GPCRs	289
F.5	Synthetic Lethality in the GPCR Downstream	290
F.6	Synthetic Lethality in the Translation Elongation	291
F.7	Synthetic Lethality in the Nonsense-mediated Decay	292
F.8	Synthetic Lethality in the 3' UTR	293
G.1	Synthetic Lethality and Vertex Degree	294
G.2	Synthetic Lethality and Centrality	295
G.3	Synthetic Lethality and PageRank	296
H.1	Information centrality distribution	300
I.1	Synthetic Lethality and Heirarchy Score in PI3K	301
I.2	Heirarchy Score in PI3K against Synthetic Lethality in PI3K	302
I.3	Structure of Synthetic Lethality in PI3K	302
I.4	Structure of Synthetic Lethality Resampling	303
J.1	Performance of χ^2 and SLIPT across quantiles	304
J.2	Performance of χ^2 and SLIPT across quantiles	306
J.3	Performance of χ^2 and SLIPT across quantiles with more genes	308
J.4	Performance of χ^2 and SLIPT across quantiles with query correlation	310
J.5	Performance of χ^2 and SLIPT across quantiles with query correlation	312
J.6	Performance of χ^2 and SLIPT across quantiles with query correlation and more genes	314
K.1	Performance of simulations on a simple graph	317
K.2	Performance of simulations on an inhibiting graph	318
K.3	Performance of simulations on a constructed graph with inhibition	319
K.4	Performance of simulations on a constructed graph with inhibition	320
K.5	Detection of Synthetic Lethality within a Graph Structure	321
K.6	Detection of Synthetic Lethality within an Inhibiting Graph Structure	323

K.7	Detection of Synthetic Lethality within an Inhibiting Graph Structure .	324
K.8	Performance of simulations on a branching graph	325
K.9	Performance of simulations on a complex graph	326
K.10	Performance of simulations on a large graph	327
K.11	Performance of simulations on a branching graph with inhibition	328
K.12	Performance of simulations on a branching graph with inhibition	329
K.13	Performance of simulations on a complex graph with inhibition	330
K.14	Performance of simulations on a complex graph with inhibition	331
K.15	Performance of simulations on a large constructed graph with inhibition	332
K.16	Performance of simulations on a large constructed graph with inhibition	333
K.17	Performance of simulations on the $G_{\alpha i}$ signalling pathway	334
K.18	Performance of simulations including the $G_{\alpha i}$ signalling pathway	335

List of Tables

1.1	Methods for Predicting Genetic Interactions	26
1.2	Methods for Predicting Synthetic Lethality in Cancer	27
1.3	Methods used by Wu <i>et al.</i> (2014)	28
2.1	Excluded Samples by Batch and Clinical Characteristics.	46
2.2	Computers used during Thesis	56
2.3	Linux Utilities and Applications used during Thesis	57
2.4	R Installations used during Thesis	58
2.5	R Packages used during Thesis	58
2.6	R Packages Developed during Thesis	60
4.1	Candidate synthetic lethal gene partners of <i>CDH1</i> from SLIPT	102
4.2	Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT	104
4.3	Pathway composition for clusters of <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT	108
4.4	Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for Synthetic Lethality and Correlation with <i>CDH1</i>	112
4.5	Comparing SLIPT genes against secondary siRNA screen in breast cancer	115
4.6	Pathway composition for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT and siRNA screen- ing	117
4.7	Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT	120
4.8	Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT and siRNA primary screen .	122
4.9	Candidate synthetic lethal metagenes against <i>CDH1</i> from SLIPT	131
5.1	ANOVA for Synthetic Lethality and Vertex Degree	148
5.2	ANOVA for Synthetic Lethality and Information Centrality	150
5.3	ANOVA for Synthetic Lethality and PageRank Centrality	152
5.4	ANOVA for Synthetic Lethality and PI3K Hierarchy	155
5.5	Resampling for pathway structure of synthetic lethal detection methods	159
B.1	R Packages used during Thesis	247
C.1	Candidate synthetic lethal gene partners of <i>CDH1</i> from mtSLIPT	257
C.2	Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from mtSLIPT	258
C.3	Pathway composition for clusters of <i>CDH1</i> partners from mtSLIPT . .	261
C.4	Pathway composition for <i>CDH1</i> partners from mtSLIPT and siRNA . .	263
C.5	Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from mtSLIPT	264
C.6	Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from mtSLIPT and siRNA primary screen	265
C.7	Candidate synthetic lethal metagenes against <i>CDH1</i> from mtSLIPT . .	268

D.1	Comparison of Intrinsic Subtypes	275
E.1	Synthetic lethal gene partners of <i>CDH1</i> from SLIPT in stomach cancer	277
E.2	Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT in stomach cancer	278
E.3	Pathway composition for clusters of <i>CDH1</i> partners in stomach SLIPT	280
E.4	Pathway composition for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT and siRNA screening	282
E.5	Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT in stomach cancer	283
E.6	Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT in stomach and siRNA screen	284
E.7	Candidate synthetic lethal metagenes against <i>CDH1</i> from SLIPT in stomach cancer	285
G.1	ANOVA for Synthetic Lethality and Vertex Degree	297
G.2	ANOVA for Synthetic Lethality and Information Centrality	297
G.3	ANOVA for Synthetic Lethality and PageRank Centrality	297
H.1	Information centrality for genes and molecules in the Reactome network	299
I.1	ANOVA for Synthetic Lethality and PI3K Hierarchy	301
I.2	Resampling for pathway structure of synthetic lethal detection methods	303

Glossary

synthetic lethal Genetic interactions where inactivation of multiple genes is inviable (or deleterious) which are viable if inactivated separately.

Acronyms

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

Chapter 7

Discussion

n This thesis combines analysis of gene expression data from TCGA with experimental screening results (Telford *et al.*, 2015) to demonstrate synthetic lethal discovery for *CDH1* in expression data generated by genomics technologies with comparisons to existing experimental candidates. Together these findings further elucidate the functions for *CDH1* in the cell, functional redundancy in breast cancer, and potential targets against cancers with loss of *CDH1* function. These candidate synthetic lethal genes were further investigated for relationships within synthetic lethal pathways, developing a network-based approach to comparing genes identified in genomics experiments and analyses in the process.

The synthetic lethal detection methodology, SLIPT, that was applied to gene expression data throughout this thesis was evaluated with simulated data. A simulation procedure was developed to stringently generate gene expression data from known synthetic lethal partners in simulated data, including 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* gene was selected to identify synthetic lethal partners to demonstrate the novel SLIPT methodology as an important tumour suppressor gene in cancers. These include sporadic breast and stomach cancers and the familial syndromes such as hereditary diffuse gastric cancer (HDGC). The analysis of synthetic lethal partners of *CDH1*

in breast and stomach cancers was also enabled by the availability of molecular data (Bass *et al.*, 2014; TCGA, 2012) and a synthetic lethal screen conducted in MCF10A breast cells (Chen *et al.*, 2014; Telford *et al.*, 2015).

Synthetic lethal interactions are generally regarded to 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 as also consistent with *CDH1* being a tumour suppressor gene for which epithelial cells are significantly disrupted at the molecular level and prone to becoming cancerous.

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 and (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 also important in cancers as it indicates a mechanism by which *CDH1* loss may affect the tumour microenvironment, contributing to it's role as a tumour and invasion suppressor. Furthermore, perturbations in the extracellular matrix and tumour microenvironment present an potential means by which to specifically inhibit (cancerous) *CDH1*-deficient cells in addition to those currently being considered. Few genes in extracellular pathways were detected in an experimental screen (Telford *et al.*, 2015) conducted in an isolated cell model (Chen *et al.*, 2014) but these are not expected to be detected in such as system. 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 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*^{-/-} 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), the was 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 lethal 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 present downstream target regulated by the putative synthetic lethal signalling pathways which cancer cells are dependent on for sustained protein expression (Gao and Roux, 2015) to proliferate and evade host defense processes such as apoptosis and immune responses.

7.2 Significance

7.2.1 Synthetic Lethality in the Genomic Era

Development of an effective synthetic lethal discovery tool for bioinformatics 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.

Developmental genes in particular, are highly evolutionary conserved and subject to high rates of redundancy. 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 genomes-based 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 pharmacogenomics investigations to understanding the impact of genotypes at multiple loci leading to adverse effects in a subset of the population or accounting for why the rest of the population does not experience this adverse effects since their synthetic lethal partner genes do not share the same variants.

Furthermore, redundant functions and synthetic lethal interactions also present a means to expand upon the concept of the “minimal” genomes by accounting 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 as an essential gene approach is likely an underestimate that does not account for synthetic lethal interactions.

Therefore synthetic lethal interactions are a fundamentally important part of genetics and further understanding of them in a genomics context, facilitated by methods such as SLIPT, shows great potential to contribute a deeper understanding of gene

functions and their role in traits or diseases in the post-genomic era. Genes do not function in isolation and so understanding them in the context of the complexity of a cell and across genetic backgrounds (such as the data provided by TCGA) is essential to further characterise their functions and ensure that further applications are reproducible 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). The potential for synthetic lethal drug design against cancer mutations including gene loss or overexpression could lead to a revolution in cancer therapy and chemoprevention with personalised treatment of cancers 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 with many large-scale RNAi screens recently conducted to aim to discover gene function and drug targets for similar application with other cancer genes, including cancers in other tissues.

While SLIPT analysis and RNA interference (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 both the SLIPT analysis and siRNA screen are susceptible to false positives. 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 against the synthetic lethal partner if one has not been developed against another disease (for which it can be re-purposed). Drug targets must be feasible to have effective anti-cancer interventions designed against them, which raises the need for targets with existing drugs in the clinic, trials, or feasible to development with structural analysis or screening. Druggable targets could be selected by gene functions known to be amenable to drugs, with a structure amenable with development, with conserved specific sites without homology to other genes, or with known approval or developing drugs which could be repurposed from other disease applications. Both structure-aided drug design and

compound screening are viable ways to accompany genetic screens and computational analysis with pharmacological investigations.

Targeted therapeutics designed based on synthetic lethal interactions have potential to vastly expand the applications of “precision medicine” against molecular targets, particularly in cancer where many have been cancer genes have been identified. 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*) and oncogenes with disrupted functions that are dysregulated or highly homologous to non-cancerous proto-oncogenes (such as *MYC*, *EGFR* or *KRAS*). Applications against tumour suppressor genes is a particularly important application as these cannot be approached by careful dosing. Synthetic lethal drug design also has the added benefit of being highly specific against a particular genotype (such as *CDH1*^{-/-}) with the potential for target 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 early cancers in HDGC patients (Guilford *et al.*, 2010) before they are detectable during screening.

7.3 Future Directions

While further validation and pre-clinical tested 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 relatively computes quickly (even in R) 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` has been documented and release open-source to facilitate further development, wider adoption, or comparison with other scientific software for similar purposes.

Alternative methods may be also be able to 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 a fitting a linear relationships 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 potential expanding 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 (TCGA, 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's correlation or the χ^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.
- 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.

- 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.
- Chen, X. and Tompa, M. (2010) Comparative assessment of methods for aligning multiple genome sequences. *Nat Biotechnol*, **28**(6): 567–572.
- 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., Gatz, 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 α -Dependent μ -Opioid Agonist-Mediated Adenylyl Cyclase Supersensitization. *Journal of Pharmacology and Experimental Therapeutics*, **310**(1): 215–222.
- Clough, E. and Barrett, T. (2016) The Gene Expression Omnibus Database. *Methods Mol Biol*, **1418**: 93–110.
- 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.
- Corcoran, R.B., Ebi, H., Turke, A.B., Coffee, E.M., Nishino, M., Cogdill, A.P., Brown, R.D., Della Pelle, P., Dias-Santagata, D., Hung, K.E., *et al.* (2012) Egfr-mediated reactivation of mapk signaling contributes to insensitivity of *BRAF*-mutant colorectal cancers to raf inhibition with vemurafenib. *Cancer Discovery*, **2**(3): 227–235.
- 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.
- Dienstmann, R. and Tabernero, J. (2011) *BRAF* as a target for cancer therapy. *Anti-cancer Agents Med Chem*, **11**(3): 285–95.
- 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.
- Dorogovtsev, S.N. and Mendes, J.F. (2003) *Evolution of networks: From biological nets to the Internet and WWW*. Oxford University Press, USA.
- 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 diphosphate) 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 diphosphate)-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.
- 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.
- 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., Bian, X., Swan, D., and Basu, A. (2014) caArray microarray database in the cancer biomedical informatics gridTM (caBIGTM). *Cancer Research*, **67**(9 Supplement): 3712–3712.
- 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.
- 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.
- Holme, P. and Kim, B.J. (2002) Growing scale-free networks with tunable clustering. *Physical Review E*, **65**(2): 026107.
- 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.
- 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., Pfitzer, 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, Ikonf, 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.
- Kelly, S.T., Single, A.B., Telford, B.J., Beetham, H.G., Godwin, T.D., Chen, A., Black, M.A., and Guilford, P.J. (unpublished) Towards HDGC chemoprevention: vulnerabilities in E-cadherin-negative cells identified by genome-wide interrogation of isogenic cell lines and whole tumors. Submitted to *Cancer Prev Res*.
- 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.
- 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 SNAIL 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, 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., Mastrogianakis, 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.
- Mortazavi, A., Williams, B.A., McCue, K., Schaeffer, L., and Wold, B. (2008) Mapping and quantifying mammalian transcriptomes by RNA-Seq. *Nat Methods*, **5**(7): 621–628.
- 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.
- 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.
- Prahalad, A., Sun, C., Huang, S., Di Nicolantonio, F., Salazar, R., Zecchin, D., Beijersbergen, R.L., Bardelli, A., and Bernards, R. (2012) Unresponsiveness of colon cancer to *BRAF*(v600e) inhibition through feedback activation of egfr. *Nature*, **483**(7387): 100–3.
- R Core Team (2016) *R: A Language and Environment for Statistical Computing*. R Foundation for Statistical Computing, Vienna, Austria. R version 3.3.2.
- Ravnan, M.C. and Matalaka, M.S. (2012) Vemurafenib in patients with *BRAF* v600e mutation-positive advanced melanoma. *Clin Ther*, **34**(7): 1474–86.
- 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.
- Robinson, M.D. and Oshlack, A. (2010) A scaling normalization method for differential expression analysis of RNA-seq data. *Genome Biol*, **11**(3): R25.
- 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.
- Rustici, G., Kolesnikov, N., Brandizi, M., Burdett, T., Dylag, M., Emam, I., Farne, A., Hastings, E., Ison, J., Keays, M., *et al.* (2013) ArrayExpress update—trends in database growth and links to data analysis tools. *Nucleic Acids Res*, **41**(Database issue): D987–990.
- 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.
- Sørlie, 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.
- 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.

- Sun, C., Wang, L., Huang, S., Heynen, G.J.J.E., Prahallad, A., Robert, C., Haanen, J., Blank, C., Wesseling, J., Willems, S.M., *et al.* (2014) Reversible and adaptive resistance to *BRAF*(v600e) inhibition in melanoma. *Nature*, **508**(7494): 118–122.
- 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) (2012) Comprehensive molecular portraits of human breast tumours. *Nature*, **490**(7418): 61–70.
- 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.
- The Pharmaceutical Management Agency (PHARMAC) (2012) Ucsf cancer genomics browser. Accessed 29th March 2012.
- 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.
- Tsai, H.C., Li, H., Van Neste, L., Cai, Y., Robert, C., Rassool, F.V., Shin, J.J., Harbom, K.M., Beaty, R., Pappou, E., *et al.* (2012) Transient low doses of dna-demethylating agents exert durable antitumor effects on hematological and epithelial tumor cells. *Cancer Cell*, **21**(3): 430–46.
- 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.

- 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., Chandrashekhhar, 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.