

Contents

| | | |
|-----------|--|----------|
| 1 | Introduction | 1 |
| 1.1 | Cancer Research in the Post-Genomic Era | 1 |
| 1.1.1 | Cancer as a Global Health Concern | 2 |
| 1.1.1.1 | The Genetics and Molecular Biology of Cancers | 3 |
| 1.1.2 | The Human Genome Revolution | 6 |
| 1.1.2.1 | The First Human Genome Sequence | 6 |
| 1.1.2.2 | Impact of Genomics | 7 |
| 1.1.3 | Technologies to Enable Genetics Research | 7 |
| 1.1.3.1 | DNA Sequencing and Genotyping Technologies | 7 |
| 1.1.3.2 | Microarrays and Quantitative Technologies | 8 |
| 1.1.3.3 | Massively Parallel “Next Generation” Sequencing . . . | 9 |
| 1.1.3.3.1 | Molecular Profiling with Genomics Technology . | 11 |
| 1.1.3.3.2 | Sequencing Technologies | 11 |
| 1.1.3.4 | Bioinformatics as Interdisciplinary Genomic Analysis . | 12 |
| 1.1.4 | Follow-up Large-Scale Genomics Projects | 13 |
| 1.1.5 | Cancer Genomes | 14 |
| 1.1.5.1 | The Cancer Genome Atlas Project | 15 |
| 1.1.5.1.1 | Findings from Cancer Genomes | 15 |
| 1.1.5.1.2 | Genomic Comparisons Across Cancer Tissues . | 17 |
| 1.1.5.1.3 | Cancer Genomic Data Resources | 18 |
| 1.1.6 | Genomic Cancer Medicine | 18 |
| 1.1.6.1 | Cancer Genes and Driver Mutations | 18 |
| 1.1.6.2 | Personalised or Precision Cancer Medicine | 19 |
| 1.1.6.2.1 | Molecular Diagnostics and Pan-Cancer Medicine | 20 |
| 1.1.6.3 | Targeted Therapeutics and Pharmacogenomics | 21 |
| 1.1.6.3.1 | Targeting Oncogenic Driver Mutations | 21 |
| 1.1.6.4 | Systems and Network Biology | 22 |
| 1.1.6.4.1 | Network Medicine, and Polypharmacology . . . | 24 |
| 1.2 | A Synthetic Lethal Approach to Cancer Medicine | 25 |
| 1.2.1 | Synthetic Lethal Genetic Interactions | 26 |
| 1.2.2 | Synthetic Lethal Concepts in Genetics | 26 |
| 1.2.3 | Studies of Synthetic Lethality | 27 |
| 1.2.3.1 | Synthetic Lethal Pathways and Networks | 28 |
| 1.2.3.1.1 | Evolution of Synthetic Lethality | 29 |
| 1.2.4 | Synthetic Lethal Concepts in Cancer | 29 |

| | | |
|----------|---|-----------|
| 1.2.5 | Clinical Impact of Synthetic Lethality in Cancer | 31 |
| 1.2.6 | High-throughput Screening for Synthetic Lethality | 33 |
| 1.2.6.1 | Synthetic Lethal Screens | 34 |
| 1.2.7 | Computational Prediction of Synthetic Lethality | 37 |
| 1.2.7.1 | Bioinformatics Approaches to Genetic Interactions | 37 |
| 1.2.7.2 | Comparative Genomics | 38 |
| 1.2.7.3 | Analysis and Modelling of Protein Data | 41 |
| 1.2.7.4 | Differential Gene Expression | 43 |
| 1.2.7.5 | Data Mining and Machine Learning | 44 |
| 1.2.7.6 | Bimodality | 47 |
| 1.2.7.7 | Rationale for Further Development | 48 |
| 1.3 | E-cadherin as a Synthetic Lethal Target | 48 |
| 1.3.1 | The <i>CDH1</i> gene and it's Biological Functions | 48 |
| 1.3.1.1 | Cytoskeleton | 49 |
| 1.3.1.2 | Extracellular and Tumour Micro-Environment | 49 |
| 1.3.1.3 | Cell-Cell Adhesion and Signalling | 49 |
| 1.3.2 | <i>CDH1</i> as a Tumour (and Invasion) Suppressor | 50 |
| 1.3.2.1 | Breast Cancers and Invasion | 50 |
| 1.3.3 | Hereditary Diffuse Gastric Cancer and Lobular Breast Cancer | 50 |
| 1.3.4 | Somatic Mutations | 52 |
| 1.3.4.1 | Mutation Rate | 52 |
| 1.3.4.2 | Co-occurring Mutations | 52 |
| 1.3.5 | Models of <i>CDH1</i> loss in cell lines | 53 |
| 1.4 | Summary and Research Direction of Thesis | 54 |
| 2 | Methods and Resources | 58 |
| 2.1 | Bioinformatics Resources for Genomics Research | 58 |
| 2.1.1 | Public Data and Software Packages | 58 |
| 2.1.1.1 | Cancer Genome Atlas Data | 59 |
| 2.1.1.2 | Reactome and Annotation Data | 60 |
| 2.2 | Data Handling | 61 |
| 2.2.1 | Normalisation | 61 |
| 2.2.2 | Sample Triage | 61 |
| 2.2.3 | Metagenes and the Singular Value Decomposition | 63 |
| 2.2.3.1 | Candidate Triage and Integration with Screen Data | 63 |
| 2.3 | Techniques | 64 |
| 2.3.1 | Statistical Procedures and Tests | 64 |
| 2.3.2 | Gene Set Over-representation Analysis | 65 |
| 2.3.3 | Clustering | 66 |
| 2.3.4 | Heatmap | 66 |
| 2.3.5 | Modeling and Simulations | 66 |
| 2.3.5.1 | Receiver Operating Characteristic (Performance) | 67 |
| 2.3.6 | Resampling Analysis | 68 |
| 2.4 | Pathway Structure Methods | 69 |
| 2.4.1 | Network and Graph Analysis | 69 |
| 2.4.2 | Sourcing Graph Structure Data | 70 |

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| 2.4.3 | Constructing Pathway Subgraphs | 70 |
| 2.4.4 | Network Analysis Metrics | 70 |
| 2.5 | Implementation | 71 |
| 2.5.1 | Computational Resources and Linux Utilities | 71 |
| 2.5.2 | R Language and Packages | 73 |
| 2.5.3 | High Performance and Parallel Computing | 75 |
| 3 | Methods Developed During Thesis | 77 |
| 3.1 | A Synthetic Lethal Detection Methodology | 77 |
| 3.2 | Synthetic Lethal Simulation and Modelling | 80 |
| 3.2.1 | A Model of Synthetic Lethality in Expression Data | 80 |
| 3.2.2 | Simulation Procedure | 84 |
| 3.3 | Detecting Simulated Synthetic Lethal Partners | 87 |
| 3.3.1 | Binomial Simulation of Synthetic lethality | 87 |
| 3.3.2 | Multivariate Normal Simulation of Synthetic lethality | 89 |
| 3.3.2.1 | Multivariate Normal Simulation with Correlated Genes | 92 |
| 3.3.2.2 | Specificity with Query-Correlated Pathways | 99 |
| 3.3.2.3 | Importance of Directional Testing | 99 |
| 3.4 | Graph Structure Methods | 101 |
| 3.4.1 | Upstream and Downstream Gene Detection | 101 |
| 3.4.1.1 | Permutation Analysis for Statistical Significance | 102 |
| 3.4.1.2 | Hierarchy Based on Biological Context | 103 |
| 3.4.2 | Simulating Gene Expression from Graph Structures | 104 |
| 3.5 | Customised Functions and Packages Developed | 108 |
| 3.5.1 | Synthetic Lethal Interaction Prediction Tool | 108 |
| 3.5.2 | Data Visualisation | 109 |
| 3.5.3 | Extensions to the iGraph Package | 112 |
| 3.5.3.1 | Sampling Simulated Data from Graph Structures | 112 |
| 3.5.3.2 | Plotting Directed Graph Structures | 112 |
| 3.5.3.3 | Computing Information Centrality | 113 |
| 3.5.3.4 | Testing Pathway Structure with Permutation Testing | 113 |
| 3.5.3.5 | Metapackage to Install iGraph Functions | 114 |
| 4 | Synthetic Lethal Analysis of Gene Expression Data | 115 |
| 4.1 | Synthetic Lethal Genes in Breast Cancer | 116 |
| 4.1.1 | Synthetic Lethal Pathways in Breast Cancer | 118 |
| 4.1.2 | Expression Profiles of Synthetic Lethal Partners | 119 |
| 4.1.2.1 | Subgroup Pathway Analysis | 122 |
| 4.2 | Comparing Synthetic Lethal Gene Candidates | 125 |
| 4.2.1 | Primary siRNA Screen Candidates | 125 |
| 4.2.2 | Comparison with Correlation | 126 |
| 4.2.3 | Comparison with Primary Screen Viability | 128 |
| 4.2.4 | Comparison with Secondary siRNA Screen Validation | 129 |
| 4.2.5 | Comparison to Primary Screen at Pathway Level | 131 |
| 4.2.5.1 | Resampling Genes for Pathway Enrichment | 133 |
| 4.2.6 | Integrating Synthetic Lethal Pathways and Screens | 136 |

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| 4.3 | Metagene Analysis | 138 |
| 4.3.1 | Pathway Expression | 139 |
| 4.3.2 | Somatic Mutation | 141 |
| 4.3.3 | Synthetic Lethal Pathway Metagenes | 145 |
| 4.3.4 | Synthetic Lethality in Breast Cancer | 146 |
| 4.4 | Replication in Stomach Cancer | 147 |
| 4.4.1 | Synthetic Lethal Genes and Pathways | 147 |
| 4.4.2 | Synthetic Lethal Expression Profiles | 149 |
| 4.4.3 | Comparison to Primary Screen | 151 |
| 4.4.3.1 | Resampling Analysis | 152 |
| 4.4.4 | Metagene Analysis | 153 |
| 4.5 | Global Synthetic Lethality | 153 |
| 4.5.1 | Hub Genes | 155 |
| 4.5.2 | Hub Pathways | 156 |
| 4.6 | Replication in the Cancer Cell Line Encyclopaedia | 157 |
| 4.7 | Discussion | 160 |
| 4.7.1 | Strengths of the SLIPT Methodology | 160 |
| 4.7.2 | Synthetic Lethal Pathways for E-cadherin | 161 |
| 4.7.3 | Replication and Validation | 163 |
| 4.7.3.1 | Integration with siRNA Screening | 163 |
| 4.7.3.2 | Replication across Tissues and Cell lines | 163 |
| 4.8 | Summary | 164 |
| 5 | Synthetic Lethal Pathway Structure | 164 |
| 5.1 | Synthetic Lethal Genes in Reactome Pathways | 164 |
| 5.1.1 | The PI3K/AKT Pathway | 165 |
| 5.1.2 | The Extracellular Matrix | 167 |
| 5.1.3 | G Protein Coupled Receptors | 170 |
| 5.1.4 | Gene Regulation and Translation | 170 |
| 5.2 | Network Analysis of Synthetic Lethal Genes | 171 |
| 5.2.1 | Gene Connectivity and Vertex Degree | 172 |
| 5.2.2 | Gene Importance and Centrality | 173 |
| 5.2.2.1 | Information Centrality | 173 |
| 5.2.2.2 | PageRank Centrality | 175 |
| 5.3 | Relationships between Synthetic Lethal Genes | 177 |
| 5.3.1 | Hierarchical Pathway Structure | 177 |
| 5.3.1.1 | Contextual Hierarchy of PI3K | 177 |
| 5.3.1.2 | Testing Contextual Hierarchy of Synthetic Lethal Genes | 177 |
| 5.3.2 | Upstream or Downstream Synthetic Lethality | 181 |
| 5.3.2.1 | Measuring Structure of Candidates within PI3K | 181 |
| 5.3.2.2 | Resampling for Synthetic Lethal Pathway Structure | 183 |
| 5.4 | Discussion | 185 |
| 5.5 | Summary | 187 |

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| 6 | Simulation and Modeling of Synthetic Lethal Pathways | 190 |
| 6.1 | Comparing methods | 191 |
| 6.1.1 | Performance of SLIPT and χ^2 across Quantiles | 192 |
| 6.1.1.1 | Correlated Query Genes affects Specificity | 195 |
| 6.1.2 | Alternative Synthetic Lethal Detection Strategies | 197 |
| 6.1.2.1 | Correlation for Synthetic Lethal Detection | 197 |
| 6.1.2.2 | Testing for Bimodality with BiSEp | 199 |
| 6.2 | Simulations with Graph Structures | 201 |
| 6.2.1 | Performance over a Graph Structure | 202 |
| 6.2.1.1 | Simple Graph Structures | 202 |
| 6.2.1.2 | Constructed Graph Structures | 204 |
| 6.2.2 | Performance with Inhibitions | 208 |
| 6.2.3 | Synthetic Lethality across Graph Structures | 214 |
| 6.2.4 | Performance within a Simulated Human Genome | 218 |
| 6.3 | Simulations over pathway-based graphs | 224 |
| 6.3.1 | Pathway Structures in a Simulated Human Genome | 226 |
| 6.4 | Discussion | 229 |
| 6.4.1 | Simulation Procedure | 229 |
| 6.4.2 | Design and Performance of SLIPT | 230 |
| 6.4.3 | Simulations from Graph Structures | 232 |
| 6.5 | Summary | 233 |
| 7 | Discussion | 236 |
| 7.1 | Synthetic Lethality and <i>CDH1</i> Biology | 236 |
| 7.1.1 | Established Functions of <i>CDH1</i> | 237 |
| 7.1.2 | The Molecular Role of <i>CDH1</i> in Cancer | 237 |
| 7.2 | Significance | 238 |
| 7.2.1 | Synthetic Lethality in the Genomic Era | 238 |
| 7.2.2 | Clinical Interventions based on Synthetic Lethality | 240 |
| 7.3 | Evaluating the Synthetic Lethality Prediction Tool | 241 |
| 7.3.1 | Strength of the Synthetic Lethality Prediction Tool | 241 |
| 7.3.2 | Limitations of the Synthetic Lethality Prediction Tool | 241 |
| 7.3.3 | Comparisons to Alternative Methods | 241 |
| 7.3.3.1 | Combined with Experimental Screening | 241 |
| 7.3.3.2 | Differences to Computational Methods | 241 |
| 7.4 | Future Directions | 241 |
| 7.4.1 | Refinements Synthetic Lethality Prediction Methods | 243 |
| 7.4.1.1 | Wider Use of Synthetic Lethality Prediction | 243 |
| 7.4.2 | Validation of Synthetic Lethal Genes and Pathways | 243 |
| 7.4.2.1 | Pre-clinical and Clinical Testing | 243 |
| 7.4.3 | Application to Further Genes and Pathways | 243 |
| 8 | Conclusion | 244 |
| | References | 248 |

| | | |
|----------|--|------------|
| A | Sample Quality | 269 |
| A.1 | Sample Correlation | 269 |
| A.2 | Replicate Samples in TCGA Breast | 272 |
| B | Software Used for Thesis | 276 |
| C | Mutation Analysis in Breast Cancer | 285 |
| C.1 | Synthetic Lethal Genes and Pathways | 285 |
| C.2 | Synthetic Lethal Expression Profiles | 288 |
| C.3 | Comparison to Primary Screen | 291 |
| C.3.1 | Resampling Analysis | 293 |
| C.4 | Compare SLIPT genes | 295 |
| C.5 | Metagene Analysis | 297 |
| C.6 | Expression of Somatic Mutations | 298 |
| C.7 | Metagene Expression Profiles | 301 |
| D | Intrinsic Subtyping | 304 |
| E | Stomach Expression Analysis | 306 |
| E.1 | Synthetic Lethal Genes and Pathways | 306 |
| E.2 | Comparison to Primary Screen | 309 |
| E.2.1 | Resampling Analysis | 311 |
| E.3 | Metagene Analysis | 313 |
| F | Stomach Mutation Analysis | 314 |
| F.1 | Synthetic Lethal Genes and Pathways | 314 |
| F.2 | Synthetic Lethal Expression Profiles | 317 |
| F.3 | Comparison to Primary Screen | 320 |
| F.3.1 | Resampling Analysis | 322 |
| F.4 | Metagene Analysis | 324 |
| G | Global Synthetic Lethality in Stomach Cancer | 325 |
| G.1 | Hub Genes | 327 |
| G.2 | Hub Pathways | 328 |
| H | Replication in cell line encyclopaedia | 329 |
| J | Synthetic Lethal Genes in Pathways | 338 |
| K | Pathway Connectivity for Mutation SLIPT | 346 |
| L | Information Centrality for Gene Essentiality | 350 |
| M | Pathway Structure for Mutation SLIPT | 353 |
| N | Performance of SLIPT and χ^2 | 356 |
| N.0.1 | Correlated Query Genes affects Specificity | 362 |

| | | |
|----------|---|------------|
| O | Graph Structures | 368 |
| O.1 | Simulations from Graph Structures | 374 |
| O.2 | Simulations from Inhibiting Graph Structures | 379 |
| O.3 | Simulation across Graph Structures | 389 |
| O.4 | Graph Structure Simulations with 20K genes | 393 |
| O.4.1 | Inhibiting Graph Structure Simulations with 20K genes | 400 |
| O.5 | Simations from Pathway Graph Structures | 412 |

List of Figures

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 1.1 | Synthetic genetic interactions | 27 |
| 1.2 | Synthetic lethality in cancer | 30 |
| 2.1 | Read count density | 62 |
| 2.2 | Read count sample mean | 62 |
| 3.1 | Framework for synthetic lethal prediction | 78 |
| 3.2 | Synthetic lethal prediction adapted for mutation | 79 |
| 3.3 | A model of synthetic lethal gene expression | 81 |
| 3.4 | Modeling synthetic lethal gene expression | 82 |
| 3.5 | Synthetic lethality with multiple genes | 83 |
| 3.6 | Simulating gene function | 85 |
| 3.7 | Simulating synthetic lethal gene function | 85 |
| 3.8 | Simulating synthetic lethal gene expression | 86 |
| 3.9 | Performance of binomial simulations | 88 |
| 3.10 | Comparison of statistical performance | 88 |
| 3.11 | Performance of multivariate normal simulations | 90 |
| 3.12 | Simulating expression with correlated gene blocks | 93 |
| 3.13 | Simulating expression with correlated gene blocks | 94 |
| 3.14 | Synthetic lethal prediction across simulations | 95 |
| 3.15 | Performance with correlations | 96 |
| 3.16 | Comparison of statistical performance with correlation structure | 97 |
| 3.17 | Performance with query correlations | 98 |
| 3.18 | Statistical evaluation of directional criteria | 99 |
| 3.19 | Performance of directional criteria | 100 |
| 3.20 | Simulated graph structures | 104 |
| 3.21 | Simulating expression from a graph structure | 106 |
| 3.22 | Simulating expression from graph structure with inhibitions | 107 |
| 3.23 | Demonstration of violin plots with custom features | 110 |
| 3.24 | Demonstration of annotated heatmap | 110 |
| 3.25 | Simulating graph structures | 113 |
| 4.1 | Synthetic lethal expression profiles of analysed samples | 121 |
| 4.2 | Comparison of SLIPT to siRNA | 125 |
| 4.3 | Compare SLIPT and siRNA genes with correlation | 126 |
| 4.4 | Compare SLIPT and siRNA genes with correlation | 127 |
| 4.5 | Compare SLIPT and siRNA genes with viability | 128 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| 4.6 | Compare SLIPT genes with siRNA viability | 129 |
| 4.7 | Resampled intersection of SLIPT and siRNA candidates | 133 |
| 4.8 | Pathway metagene expression profiles | 140 |
| 4.9 | Expression profiles for constituent genes of PI3K | 142 |
| 4.10 | Expression profiles for estrogen receptor related genes | 143 |
| 4.11 | Somatic mutation against the PI3K metagene | 144 |
| 4.12 | Synthetic lethal expression profiles of stomach samples | 150 |
| 4.13 | Synthetic lethal partners across query genes | 154 |
| 5.1 | Synthetic Lethality in the PI3K Cascade | 166 |
| 5.2 | Synthetic Lethality in the Elastic Fibre Formation Pathway | 168 |
| 5.3 | Synthetic Lethality in the Fibrin Clot Formation | 169 |
| 5.4 | Synthetic Lethality and Vertex Degree | 172 |
| 5.5 | Synthetic Lethality and Centrality | 175 |
| 5.6 | Synthetic Lethality and PageRank | 176 |
| 5.7 | Hierarchical Structure of PI3K | 178 |
| 5.8 | Hierarchy Score in PI3K against Synthetic Lethality in PI3K | 179 |
| 5.9 | Structure of Synthetic Lethality in PI3K | 181 |
| 5.10 | Structure of Synthetic Lethality Resampling in PI3K | 182 |
| 6.1 | Performance of χ^2 and SLIPT across quantiles | 193 |
| 6.2 | Performance of χ^2 and SLIPT across quantiles with more genes | 194 |
| 6.3 | Performance of χ^2 and SLIPT across quantiles with query correlation | 195 |
| 6.4 | Performance of χ^2 and SLIPT across quantiles with query correlation and more genes | 196 |
| 6.5 | Performance of negative correlation and SLIPT | 198 |
| 6.6 | Performance of simulations on a simple graph | 203 |
| 6.7 | Performance of simulations is similar in simple graphs | 204 |
| 6.8 | Performance of simulations on a constructed graph | 205 |
| 6.9 | Performance of simulations on a large graph | 207 |
| 6.10 | Performance of simulations on a simple graph with inhibition | 209 |
| 6.11 | Performance is higher on a simple inhibiting graph | 210 |
| 6.12 | Performance of simulations on a constructed graph with inhibition | 212 |
| 6.13 | Performance is affected by inhibition in graphs | 213 |
| 6.14 | Detection of Synthetic Lethality within a Graph Structure | 215 |
| 6.15 | Detection of Synthetic Lethality within a Graph Structure with Inhibitions | 217 |
| 6.16 | Performance of simulations including a simple graph | 219 |
| 6.17 | Performance on a simple graph improves with more genes | 220 |
| 6.18 | Performance on an inhibiting graph with more genes | 221 |
| 6.19 | Performance on an inhibiting graph improves with more genes | 223 |
| 6.20 | Performance of simulations on the PI3K cascade | 225 |
| 6.21 | Performance of simulations including the PI3K cascade | 227 |
| 6.22 | Performance on pathways improves with more genes | 228 |
| A.1 | Correlation profiles of removed samples | 270 |
| A.2 | Correlation analysis and sample removal | 271 |

| | | |
|------|---|-----|
| A.3 | Replicate excluded samples | 272 |
| A.4 | Replicate samples with all remaining | 273 |
| A.5 | Replicate samples with some excluded | 274 |
| C.1 | Synthetic lethal expression profiles of analysed samples | 289 |
| C.2 | Comparison of mtSLIPT to siRNA | 291 |
| C.3 | Compare mtSLIPT and siRNA genes with correlation | 295 |
| C.4 | Compare mtSLIPT and siRNA genes with correlation | 295 |
| C.5 | Compare mtSLIPT and siRNA genes with siRNA viability | 296 |
| C.6 | Somatic mutation against PIK3CA metagene | 298 |
| C.7 | Somatic mutation against PI3K protein | 299 |
| C.8 | Somatic mutation against AKT protein | 300 |
| C.9 | Pathway metagene expression profiles | 301 |
| C.10 | Expression profiles for p53 related genes | 302 |
| C.11 | Expression profiles for BRCA related genes | 303 |
| E.1 | Comparison of SLIPT in stomach to siRNA | 309 |
| F.1 | Synthetic lethal expression profiles of stomach samples | 318 |
| F.2 | Comparison of mtSLIPT in stomach to siRNA | 320 |
| G.1 | Synthetic lethal partners across query genes | 326 |
| J.1 | Synthetic Lethality in the PI3K/AKT Pathway | 338 |
| J.2 | Synthetic Lethality in the PI3K/AKT Pathway in Cancer | 339 |
| J.3 | Synthetic Lethality in the Extracellular Matrix | 340 |
| J.4 | Synthetic Lethality in the GPCRs | 341 |
| J.5 | Synthetic Lethality in the GPCR Downstream | 342 |
| J.6 | Synthetic Lethality in the Translation Elongation | 343 |
| J.7 | Synthetic Lethality in the Nonsense-mediated Decay | 344 |
| J.8 | Synthetic Lethality in the 3' UTR | 345 |
| K.1 | Synthetic Lethality and Vertex Degree | 346 |
| K.2 | Synthetic Lethality and Centrality | 347 |
| K.3 | Synthetic Lethality and PageRank | 348 |
| L.1 | Information centrality distribution | 352 |
| M.1 | Synthetic Lethality and Heirarchy Score in PI3K | 353 |
| M.2 | Heirarchy Score in PI3K against Synthetic Lethality in PI3K | 354 |
| M.3 | Structure of Synthetic Lethality in PI3K | 354 |
| M.4 | Structure of Synthetic Lethality Resampling | 355 |
| N.1 | Performance of χ^2 and SLIPT across quantiles | 356 |
| N.2 | Performance of χ^2 and SLIPT across quantiles | 358 |
| N.3 | Performance of χ^2 and SLIPT across quantiles with more genes | 360 |
| N.4 | Performance of χ^2 and SLIPT across quantiles with query correlation | 362 |
| N.5 | Performance of χ^2 and SLIPT across quantiles with query correlation | 364 |

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| N.6 | Performance of χ^2 and SLIPT across quantiles with query correlation and more genes | 366 |
| O.1 | Simple graph structures | 368 |
| O.2 | Simple graph structure | 369 |
| O.3 | Constructed graph structure | 369 |
| O.4 | Large constructed graph structure. | 370 |
| O.5 | Branching constructed graph structure | 370 |
| O.6 | Complex constructed graph structure | 372 |
| O.7 | Performance of simulations on a simple graph | 375 |
| O.8 | Performance of simulations on a constructed graph | 376 |
| O.9 | Performance of simulations on a branching graph | 377 |
| O.10 | Performance of simulations on a complex graph | 378 |
| O.11 | Performance of simulations on a simple graph with inhibition | 380 |
| O.12 | Performance of simulations on a simple graph with inhibition | 381 |
| O.13 | Performance of simulations on a constructed graph with inhibition | 382 |
| O.14 | Performance of simulations on a large constructed graph with inhibition | 383 |
| O.15 | Performance of simulations on a large constructed graph with inhibition | 384 |
| O.16 | Performance of simulations on a branching graph with inhibition | 385 |
| O.17 | Performance of simulations on a branching graph with inhibition | 386 |
| O.18 | Performance of simulations on a complex graph with inhibition | 387 |
| O.19 | Performance of simulations on a complex graph with inhibition | 388 |
| O.20 | Detection of Synthetic Lethality within a Graph Structure | 389 |
| O.21 | Detection of Synthetic Lethality within an Inhibiting Graph Structure | 391 |
| O.22 | Detection of Synthetic Lethality within an Inhibiting Graph Structure | 392 |
| O.23 | Performance of simulations on a simple graph with more genes | 394 |
| O.24 | Performance of simulations including a simple graph | 395 |
| O.25 | Performance of simulations including a constructed graph | 396 |
| O.26 | Performance of simulations including a large graph | 397 |
| O.27 | Performance of simulations including a branching graph | 398 |
| O.28 | Performance of simulations including a complex graph | 399 |
| O.29 | Performance of simulations including a simple graph with inhibition | 401 |
| O.30 | Performance of simulations including a simple graph with inhibition | 402 |
| O.31 | Performance of simulations including a simple graph with inhibition | 403 |
| O.32 | Performance of simulations including a constructed graph with inhibition | 404 |
| O.33 | Performance of simulations including a constructed graph with inhibition | 405 |
| O.34 | Performance of simulations including a large graph with inhibition | 406 |
| O.35 | Performance of simulations including a large graph with inhibition | 407 |
| O.36 | Performance of simulations including a branching graph with inhibition | 408 |
| O.37 | Performance of simulations including a branching graph with inhibition | 409 |
| O.38 | Performance of simulations including a complex graph with inhibition | 410 |
| O.39 | Performance of simulations including a complex graph with inhibition | 411 |
| O.40 | Performance of simulations on the $G_{\alpha i}$ signalling pathway | 412 |
| O.41 | Performance of simulations including the $G_{\alpha i}$ signalling pathway | 413 |

List of Tables

| | | |
|------|--|-----|
| 1.1 | Methods for Predicting Genetic Interactions | 38 |
| 1.2 | Methods for Predicting Synthetic Lethality in Cancer | 39 |
| 1.3 | Methods used by Wu <i>et al.</i> (2014) | 40 |
| 2.1 | Excluded Samples by Batch and Clinical Characteristics. | 63 |
| 2.2 | Computers used during Thesis | 72 |
| 2.3 | Linux Utilities and Applications used during Thesis | 72 |
| 2.4 | R Installations used during Thesis | 73 |
| 2.5 | R Packages used during Thesis | 73 |
| 2.6 | R Packages Developed during Thesis | 75 |
| 4.1 | Candidate synthetic lethal gene partners of <i>CDH1</i> from SLIPT | 117 |
| 4.2 | Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT | 119 |
| 4.3 | Pathway composition for clusters of <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT | 123 |
| 4.4 | Analysis of variance (ANOVA) for Synthetic Lethality and Correlation with <i>CDH1</i> | 127 |
| 4.5 | Comparing SLIPT genes against secondary siRNA screen in breast cancer | 130 |
| 4.6 | Pathway composition for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT and siRNA screen- ing | 132 |
| 4.7 | Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT | 135 |
| 4.8 | Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT and siRNA primary screen . | 137 |
| 4.9 | Candidate synthetic lethal metagenes against <i>CDH1</i> from SLIPT | 146 |
| 4.10 | Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT in stomach cancer | 149 |
| 4.11 | Query synthetic lethal genes with the most SLIPT partners | 155 |
| 4.12 | Pathways for genes with the most SLIPT partners | 157 |
| 4.13 | Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT in CCLE | 158 |
| 4.14 | Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT in breast CCLE | 159 |
| 5.1 | ANOVA for Synthetic Lethality and Vertex Degree | 173 |
| 5.2 | ANOVA for Synthetic Lethality and Information Centrality | 175 |
| 5.3 | ANOVA for Synthetic Lethality and PageRank Centrality | 177 |
| 5.4 | ANOVA for Synthetic Lethality and PI3K Hierarchy | 180 |
| 5.5 | Resampling for pathway structure of synthetic lethal detection methods | 184 |
| B.1 | R Packages used during Thesis | 276 |
| C.1 | Candidate synthetic lethal gene partners of <i>CDH1</i> from mtSLIPT | 286 |
| C.2 | Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from mtSLIPT | 287 |

| | | |
|-----|--|-----|
| C.3 | Pathway composition for clusters of <i>CDH1</i> partners from mtSLIPT . . | 290 |
| C.4 | Pathway composition for <i>CDH1</i> partners from mtSLIPT and siRNA . . | 292 |
| C.5 | Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from mtSLIPT | 293 |
| C.6 | Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from mtSLIPT and siRNA primary screen | 294 |
| C.7 | Candidate synthetic lethal metagenes against <i>CDH1</i> from mtSLIPT . . | 297 |
| D.1 | Comparison of Intrinsic Subtypes | 304 |
| E.1 | Synthetic lethal gene partners of <i>CDH1</i> from SLIPT in stomach cancer | 307 |
| E.2 | Pathway composition for clusters of <i>CDH1</i> partners in stomach SLIPT | 308 |
| E.3 | Pathway composition for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT and siRNA screen- ing | 310 |
| E.4 | Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT in stomach cancer | 311 |
| E.5 | Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT in stomach and siRNA screen | 312 |
| E.6 | Candidate synthetic lethal metagenes against <i>CDH1</i> from SLIPT in stomach cancer | 313 |
| F.1 | Synthetic lethal gene partners of <i>CDH1</i> from mtSLIPT in stomach cancer | 315 |
| F.2 | Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from mtSLIPT in stomach cancer | 316 |
| F.3 | Pathway composition for clusters of <i>CDH1</i> partners in stomach mtSLIPT | 319 |
| F.4 | Pathway composition for <i>CDH1</i> partners from mtSLIPT and siRNA . . | 321 |
| F.5 | Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from mtSLIPT in stomach cancer | 322 |
| F.6 | Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from mtSLIPT in stomach and siRNA screen | 323 |
| F.7 | Candidate synthetic lethal metagenes against <i>CDH1</i> from mtSLIPT in stomach cancer | 324 |
| G.1 | Query synthetic lethal genes with the most SLIPT partners | 327 |
| G.2 | Pathways for genes with the most SLIPT partners | 328 |
| H.1 | Candidate synthetic lethal gene partners of <i>CDH1</i> from SLIPT in CCLE | 330 |
| H.2 | Candidate synthetic lethal gene partners of <i>CDH1</i> from SLIPT in breast CCLE | 331 |
| H.3 | Candidate synthetic lethal gene partners of <i>CDH1</i> from SLIPT in stom- ach CCLE | 332 |
| H.4 | Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT in stomach CCLE | 333 |
| H.5 | Pathways for <i>CDH1</i> partners from SLIPT in breast and stomach CCLE | 333 |
| K.1 | ANOVA for Synthetic Lethality and Vertex Degree | 349 |
| K.2 | ANOVA for Synthetic Lethality and Information Centrality | 349 |
| K.3 | ANOVA for Synthetic Lethality and PageRank Centrality | 349 |
| L.1 | Information centrality for genes and molecules in the Reactome network | 351 |
| M.1 | ANOVA for Synthetic Lethality and PI3K Hierarchy | 353 |
| M.2 | Resampling for pathway structure of synthetic lethal detection methods | 355 |

Chapter 7

Discussion

This thesis combines analysis of gene expression data from The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) with experimental screening results (Telford *et al.*, 2015) to demonstrate synthetic lethal discovery for *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, Synthetic Lethal Interaction Prediction Tool (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 hered-

itary 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 short interfering ribonucleic acid (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 genome-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” genome 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 aiming 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 amend-

able 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.

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 before they are detectable during screening.

7.3 Evaluating the Synthetic Lethality Prediction Tool

7.3.1 Strength of the Synthetic Lethality Prediction Tool

7.3.2 Limitations of the Synthetic Lethality Prediction Tool

7.3.3 Comparisons to Alternative Methods

7.3.3.1 Combined with Experimental Screening

7.3.3.2 Differences to Computational Methods

7.4 Future Directions

Such a bioinformatically-informed synthetic lethal screening and validation strategy could be integrated into existing and future screens for synthetic lethality in cancer.

Possible improvements to the SLIPT method include developing a Bayesian inference method or simulations and modelling to account for pathway structure among

synthetic lethal genes. Another extension would be to test for higher order synthetic lethal interactions, where 3 or more genes perform a redundant function.

The synthetic lethal discovery strategy could be adapted to any form of gene inactivation or disruption such as changes to gene expression, regulation, epigenetics, DNA sequence, or copy number which could plausibly induce cell death due to SL interactions. Further applications of synthetic lethal interactions such as analysis of gene networks, tissue specificity, evolutionary conservation, or drug target feasibility are possible with synthetic lethal candidates predicted with confidence on a large scale.

Further development of the synthetic lethal model and simulation is needed to explore the parameters, ensure relevance to empirical data analysis, and understanding the implications of findings so far. An example of more complex correlation structure is shown in supplementary Figures S1 and S2 with genes correlated to the Query genes (showing need for directional synthetic lethal condition) and correlated with other non-synthetic lethal genes (showing the predictions are robust to other correlation structure). The impact of these modifications on model performance in a large number of genes or simulation replicates is yet to be seen or whether such correlation structure reflects the correlation structure of empirical data (as shown in Figure 3 with the row dendrogram for correlation distance between genes), known biological pathways, or known synthetic lethal interactions. Correlation between synthetic lethal genes could also be considered.

Comparing the findings of modelling and simulation with public gene expression analysis and experimental screen targets is still needed to identify putative synthetic lethal interactions. This application will be tested with the example of CDH1 as a query gene in breast cancer for follow up to earlier results, relevance to ongoing research in the Cancer genetics Laboratory, and comparison to the experimental screen data of MCF10A cells by Telford et al. (2015). While this methodology is intended to be widely applicable, particularly to other cancer genes and will be made available to the research community (manuscript and code release in preparation).

There are several avenues for further research on synthetic lethality in breast cancer. The main alternative themes are network analysis with a focus on tissue specificity or drug feasibility with an emphasis on pharmacogenomics, biological pathways, and whether candidate targets could be inactivated by compounds with favourable pharmacokinetic properties. Either approach remains within the scope of the project, although each will require adoption of new computational tools, which is important

topic for consideration in the meeting and changes to the project direction later in the year.

7.4.1 Refinements Synthetic Lethality Prediction Methods

7.4.1.1 Wider Use of Synthetic Lethality Prediction

7.4.2 Validation of Synthetic Lethal Genes and Pathways

7.4.2.1 Pre-clinical and Clinical Testing

7.4.3 Application to Further Genes and Pathways

Chapter 8

Conclusion

Synthetic lethal interactions are important for understanding gene function and development of targeted anti-cancer treatments. Synthetic lethal discovery with experimental screening is error prone and limited by the model systems in which it is performed. A bioinformatics tool to predict synthetic lethal interactions from genomics data would greatly benefit the cancer research community (and wider genetics research community). Several such tools exist, including one we have developed, but they have conflicting design and results are often inconsistent with experimental screen data. Therefore, modelling and simulation of synthetic lethality in gene expression data is needed to ensure the statistical validity of predictions. We have developed a model with correlation structure based on a Multivariate Normal distribution for which simulations detect synthetic lethality with high performance in simple cases and which has the potential to be developed to model complex correlation structure, biological pathways, or patterns observed in empirical gene expression data. The modelling, public data analysis, and experimental screen data approaches will be combined to further examine the example of CDH1 in breast cancer. Analysis of gene networks, tissue specificity, biological pathways, or drug targets remain options to explore tool development and implications for synthetic lethal cancer research in the future.

Aims

- To develop a statistical approach to detect synthetic lethal gene pairs in cancer from expression data
- To apply this methodology to public cancer gene expression data against *CDH1* and analyse pathway structure with comparisons to experimental screen data
- To construct a statistical model of synthetic lethality in multivariate normal expression data
- To develop a simulation pipeline of expression with pathway structure on a high-performance computing cluster
- To examine the statistical performance of the methodology with simulated expression including pathways and compare it to other approaches
- To release the synthetic lethal detection methodology and pathway simulation procedure as R software packages

Summary

- We have developed a Synthetic Lethal detection method that generates a high number of synthetic lethal candidates
- Pathways in cell signalling, extracellular matrix, and cytoskeletal functions were supported with experimental candidates and the known functions of E-cadherin
- Several candidate pathways were supported by mutation analysis and replicated across breast and stomach cancer
- Translation and immune functions were uniquely detected by the computational approach which may be explained by differences between patient samples and cell line models
- There remains the need to identify actionable genes within these pathways, relationships with experimental candidates, and how these pathways may affect viability when lost
- Synthetic Lethal genes were explored within a graph structures for key pathways identified previously
- In some cases these graph structures appeared to have relationships between synthetic lethal genes
- However, no existing network metrics of importance and connectivity with the networks were elevated significantly for Synthetic Lethal genes
- Nor was there significant evidence of upstream and downstream relationships between SLIPT and siRNA Candidates in a shortest path permutation analysis
- We have designed a straight-forward rational query-based synthetic lethal detection method with the example of application to *CDH1* in cancer gene expression
- We have developed a simulation pipeline to generate continuous gene expression with pathway structure including a procedure to simulate synthetic lethality

- Our simulation procedure is robust across pathway structures and has desirable performance compared to other statistical techniques

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 weel 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.
- Adamski, M.G., Gumann, P., and Baird, A.E. (2014) A method for quantitative analysis of standard and high-throughput qPCR expression data based on input sample quantity. *PLoS ONE*, **9**(8): e103917.
- Adler, D. (2005) *vioplot: Violin plot*. R package version 0.2.
- Agarwal, S., Deane, C.M., Porter, M.A., and Jones, N.S. (2010) Revisiting date and party hubs: Novel approaches to role assignment in protein interaction networks. *PLoS Comput Biol*, **6**(6): e1000817.
- Agrawal, N., Akbani, R., Aksoy, B.A., Ally, A., Arachchi, H., Asa, S.L., Auman, J.T., Balasundaram, M., Balu, S., Baylin, S.B., *et al.* (2014) Integrated genomic characterization of papillary thyroid carcinoma. *Cell*, **159**(3): 676–690.
- 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 Paediatrica*, **96**(5): 644–647.
- American Cancer Society (2017) Genetics and cancer. <https://www.cancer.org/cancer/cancer-causes/genetics.html>. Accessed: 22/03/2017.

- American Society for Clinical Oncology (ASCO) (2017) The genetics of cancer. <http://www.cancer.net/navigating-cancer-care/cancer-basics/genetics/genetics-cancer>. 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.].
- Beck, T.F., Mullikin, J.C., and Biesecker, L.G. (2016) Systematic Evaluation of Sanger Validation of Next-Generation Sequencing Variants. *Clin Chem*, **62**(4): 647–654.

- 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.
- 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.
- 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 polyadprribose polymerase. *Nature*, **434**(7035): 913–7.
- Burk, R.D., Chen, Z., Saller, C., Tarvin, K., Carvalho, A.L., Scapulatempo-Neto, C., Silveira, H.C., Fregnani, J.H., Creighton, C.J., Anderson, M.L., *et al.* (2017) Integrated genomic and molecular characterization of cervical cancer. *Nature*, **543**(7645): 378–384.
- 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.
- Cancer Research UK (2017) Family history and cancer genes. <http://www.cancerresearchuk.org/about-cancer/causes-of-cancer/inherited-cancer-genes-and-increased-cancer-risk/family-history-and-inherited-cancer-genes>. Accessed: 22/03/2017.
- Cancer Cell Line Encyclopedia (CCLE) (2014) Broad-Novartis Cancer Cell Line Encyclopedia. <http://www.broadinstitute.org/ccle>. Accessed: 07/11/2014.
- 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, K., Yang, D., Li, X., Sun, B., Song, F., Cao, W., Brat, D.J., Gao, Z., Li, H., Liang, H., *et al.* (2015) Mutational landscape of gastric adenocarcinoma in Chinese: implications for prognosis and therapy. *Proc Natl Acad Sci USA*, **112**(4): 1107–1112.
- 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.
- Cherniack, A.D., Shen, H., Walter, V., Stewart, C., Murray, B.A., Bowlby, R., Hu, X., Ling, S., Soslow, R.A., Broaddus, R.R., *et al.* (2017) Integrated Molecular Characterization of Uterine Carcinosarcoma. *Cancer Cell*, **31**(3): 411–423.
- Chipman, K. and Singh, A. (2009) Predicting genetic interactions with random walks on biological networks. *BMC Bioinformatics*, **10**(1): 17.
- Christofori, G. and Semb, H. (1999) The role of the cell-adhesion molecule E-cadherin as a tumour-suppressor gene. *Trends in Biochemical Sciences*, **24**(2): 73 – 76.
- Ciriello, G., Gatza, M.L., Beck, A.H., Wilkerson, M.D., Rhie, S.K., Pastore, A., Zhang, H., McLellan, M., Yau, C., Kandoth, C., *et al.* (2015) Comprehensive Molecular Portraits of Invasive Lobular Breast Cancer. *Cell*, **163**(2): 506–519.
- Clark, M.J. (2004) Endogenous Regulator of G Protein Signaling Proteins Suppress G o-Dependent 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.
- Collins, F.S., Morgan, M., and Patrinos, A. (2003) The Human Genome Project: lessons from large-scale biology. *Science*, **300**(5617): 286–290.
- 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 re-activation 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., Beroukhim, 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.

- Curtis, C., Shah, S.P., Chin, S.F., Turashvili, G., Rueda, O.M., Dunning, M.J., Speed, D., Lynch, A.G., Samarajiwa, S., Yuan, Y., *et al.* (2012) The genomic and transcriptomic architecture of 2,000 breast tumours reveals novel subgroups. *Nature*, **486**(7403): 346–352.
- 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.
- 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 Paxtools. *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.
- 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.
- Ezkurdia, I., Juan, D., Rodriguez, J.M., Frankish, A., Diekhans, M., Harrow, J., Vazquez, J., Valencia, A., and Tress, M.L. (2014) Multiple evidence strands suggest that there may be as few as 19 000 human protein-coding genes. *Human Molecular Genetics*, **23**(22): 5866.
- 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., Rebello, 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(adp-ribose) 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(adp)-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.
- Gilbert, W. and Maxam, A. (1973) The nucleotide sequence of the lac operator. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, **70**(12): 3581–3584.
- Git, A., Dvinge, H., Salmon-Divon, M., Osborne, M., Kutter, C., Hadfield, J., Bertone, P., and Caldas, C. (2010) Systematic comparison of microarray profiling, real-time PCR, and next-generation sequencing technologies for measuring differential microRNA expression. *RNA*, **16**(5): 991–1006.
- Globus (Globus) (2017) Research data management simplified. <https://www.globus.org/>. Accessed: 25/03/2017.
- 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.
- Han, J.D.J., Bertin, N., Hao, T., Goldberg, D.S., Berriz, G.F., Zhang, L.V., Dupuy, D., Walhout, A.J.M., Cusick, M.E., Roth, F.P., *et al.* (2004) Evidence for dynamically organized modularity in the yeast protein-protein interaction network. *Nature*, **430**(6995): 88–93.
- 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.

- 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.
- Herschkowitz, J.I., Simin, K., Weigman, V.J., Mikaelian, I., Usary, J., Hu, Z., Rasmussen, K.E., Jones, L.P., Assefnia, S., Chandrasekharan, S., *et al.* (2007) Identification of conserved gene expression features between murine mammary carcinoma models and human breast tumors. *Genome Biol*, **8**(5): R76.
- 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.
- Illumina, Inc (Illumina) (2017) Sequencing and array-based solutions for genetic research. <https://www.illumina.com/>. Accessed: 26/03/2017.
- International HapMap 3 Consortium (HapMap) (2003) The International HapMap Project. *Nature*, **426**(6968): 789–796.
- International Human Genome Sequencing Consortium (IHGSC) (2004) Finishing the euchromatic sequence of the human genome. *Nature*, **431**(7011): 931–945.
- Jerby-Arnon, L., Pfetzer, N., Waldman, Y., McGarry, L., James, D., Shanks, E., Seashore-Ludlow, B., Weinstock, A., Geiger, T., Clemons, P., *et al.* (2014) Predicting cancer-specific vulnerability via data-driven detection of synthetic lethality. *Cell*, **158**(5): 1199–1209.
- Joachims, T. (1999) Making large-scale support vector machine learning practical. In S. Bernhard, I. Kropf, J.C.B. Christopher, and J.S. Alexander (editors), *Advances in kernel methods*, 169–184. MIT Press.
- Ju, Z., Liu, W., Roebuck, P.L., Siwak, D.R., Zhang, N., Lu, Y., Davies, M.A., Akbani, R., Weinstein, J.N., Mills, G.B., *et al.* (2015) Development of a robust classifier for quality control of reverse-phase protein arrays. *Bioinformatics*, **31**(6): 912.
- Kaelin, Jr, W. (2005) The concept of synthetic lethality in the context of anticancer therapy. *Nat Rev Cancer*, **5**(9): 689–98.
- Kaelin, Jr, W. (2009) Synthetic lethality: a framework for the development of wiser cancer therapeutics. *Genome Med*, **1**: 99.
- Kakiuchi, M., Nishizawa, T., Ueda, H., Gotoh, K., Tanaka, A., Hayashi, A., Yamamoto, S., Tatsuno, K., Katoh, H., Watanabe, Y., *et al.* (2014) Recurrent gain-of-function mutations of RHOA in diffuse-type gastric carcinoma. *Nat Genet*, **46**(6): 583–587.
- Kamada, T. and Kawai, S. (1989) An algorithm for drawing general undirected graphs. *Information Processing Letters*, **31**(1): 7–15.

- Kandoth, C., Schultz, N., Cherniack, A.D., Akbani, R., Liu, Y., Shen, H., Robertson, A.G., Pashtan, I., Shen, R., Benz, C.C., *et al.* (2013) Integrated genomic characterization of endometrial carcinoma. *Nature*, **497**(7447): 67–73.
- 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., Chen, A., Guilford, P., and Black, M. (2017a) Synthetic lethal interaction prediction of target pathways in E-cadherin deficient breast cancers. Submitted to *BMC Genomics*.
- 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. (2017b) 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*.
- 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.
- 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.
- Lawrence, M.S., Sougnez, C., Lichtenstein, L., Cibulskis, K., Lander, E., Gabriel, S.B., Getz, G., Ally, A., Balasundaram, M., Birol, I., *et al.* (2015) Comprehensive genomic characterization of head and neck squamous cell carcinomas. *Nature*, **517**(7536): 576–582.
- 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., Hinchshaw, 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.
- 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.
- Maxam, A.M. and Gilbert, W. (1977) A new method for sequencing DNA. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Science*, **74**(2): 560–564.
- McCourt, C.M., McArt, D.G., Mills, K., Catherwood, M.A., Maxwell, P., Waugh, D.J., Hamilton, P., O’Sullivan, J.M., and Salto-Tellez, M. (2013) Validation of next generation sequencing technologies in comparison to current diagnostic gold standards for BRAF, EGFR and KRAS mutational analysis. *PLoS ONE*, **8**(7): e69604.
- McLachlan, J., George, A., and Banerjee, S. (2016) The current status of parp inhibitors in ovarian cancer. *Tumori*, **102**(5): 433–440.
- McLendon, R., Friedman, A., Bigner, D., Van Meir, E.G., Brat, D.J., Mastrogiannis, G.M., Olson, J.J., Mikkelsen, T., Lehman, N., Aldape, K., *et al.* (2008) Comprehensive genomic characterization defines human glioblastoma genes and core pathways. *Nature*, **455**(7216): 1061–1068.
- Miles, D.W. (2001) Update on HER-2 as a target for cancer therapy: herceptin in the clinical setting. *Breast Cancer Res*, **3**(6): 380–384.
- 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.
- Peltonen, L. and McKusick, V.A. (2001) Genomics and medicine. Dissecting human disease in the postgenomic era. *Science*, **291**(5507): 1224–1229.
- 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.
- Pleasance, E.D., Cheetham, R.K., Stephens, P.J., McBride, D.J., Humphray, S.J., Greenman, C.D., Varela, I., Lin, M.L., Ordóñez, G.R., Bignell, G.R., *et al.* (2010) A comprehensive catalogue of somatic mutations from a human cancer genome. *Nature*, **463**(7278): 191–196.
- 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.
- Prahallad, 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.
- Robin, J.D., Ludlow, A.T., LaRanger, R., Wright, W.E., and Shay, J.W. (2016) Comparison of DNA Quantification Methods for Next Generation Sequencing. *Sci Rep*, **6**: 24067.
- 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.
- 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.
- Sander, J.D. and Joung, J.K. (2014) Crispr-cas systems for editing, regulating and targeting genomes. *Nat Biotechnol*, **32**(4): 347–55.

- Sanger, F. and Coulson, A. (1975) A rapid method for determining sequences in dna by primed synthesis with dna polymerase. *Journal of Molecular Biology*, **94**(3): 441–448.
- 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.
- Taylor, I.W., Linding, R., Warde-Farley, D., Liu, Y., Pesquita, C., Faria, D., Bull, S., Pawson, T., Morris, Q., and Wrana, J.L. (2009) Dynamic modularity in protein interaction networks predicts breast cancer outcome. *Nat Biotechnol*, **27**(2): 199–204.

- 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) (2017a) The Cancer Genome Atlas Project. <https://cancergenome.nih.gov/>. Accessed: 26/03/2017.
- The Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network (TCGA) (2017b) The Cancer Genome Atlas Project Data Portal. <https://tcga-data.nci.nih.gov/>. Accessed: 06/02/2017 (via cBioPortal).
- The Cancer Society of New Zealand (Cancer Society of NZ) (2017) What is cancer? <https://otago-southland.cancernz.org.nz/en/cancer-information/other-links/what-is-cancer-3/>. Accessed: 22/03/2017.
- 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 International Cancer Genome Consortium (ICGC) (2017) ICGC Data Portal. <https://dcc.icgc.org/>. Accessed: 06/02/2017.
- 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) (2016) Approval of multi-product funding proposal with roche.
- 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.
- 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.
- 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 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.
- Vargas, J.J., Gusella, G., Najfeld, V., Klotman, M., and Cara, A. (2004) Novel integrase-defective lentiviral episomal vectors for gene transfer. *Hum Gene Ther*, **15**: 361–372.
- Vizeacoumar, F.J., Arnold, R., Vizeacoumar, F.S., Chandrashekhar, M., Buzina, A., Young, J.T., Kwan, J.H., Sayad, A., Mero, P., Lawo, S., *et al.* (2013) A negative genetic interaction map in isogenic cancer cell lines reveals cancer cell vulnerabilities. *Mol Syst Biol*, **9**: 696.
- Vogelstein, B., Papadopoulos, N., Velculescu, V.E., Zhou, S., Diaz, L.A., and Kinzler, K.W. (2013) Cancer genome landscapes. *Science*, **339**(6127): 1546–1558.
- Vos, C.B., Cleton-Jansen, A.M., Berx, G., de Leeuw, W.J., ter Haar, N.T., van Roy, F., Cornelisse, C.J., Peterse, J.L., and van de Vijver, M.J. (1997) E-cadherin inactivation in lobular carcinoma in situ of the breast: an early event in tumorigenesis. *Br J Cancer*, **76**(9): 1131–3.
- 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, K., Yuen, S.T., Xu, J., Lee, S.P., Yan, H.H., Shi, S.T., Siu, H.C., Deng, S., Chu, K.M., Law, S., *et al.* (2014) Whole-genome sequencing and comprehensive molecular profiling identify new driver mutations in gastric cancer. *Nat Genet*, **46**(6): 573–582.
- 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 portal a 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.