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Carolina Breast Cancer Study

• population-based study among NC women (1993-2013)
• aims of the study at outset:
  – integration of epidemiology and molecular biology
  – identify causes of BC among African-American women (AA) and women of European ancestries (WW)
  – associations between environmental & behavioral factors and BC in relation to specific molecular alterations (germline and tumor)
• young women (20-49 yrs) and self-identified African American women oversampled using randomized recruitment
Carolina Breast Cancer Study

• key considerations for the study:
  – heterogeneity of disease (histopathology, genomics)
  – known racial disparities in incidence and survival in the US
  – small portion of incidence explained by germline susceptibility
  – to what degree does observed variability in disease reflect underlying etiologic heterogeneity?
Carolina Breast Cancer Study

• eligibility criteria:
  – female,
  – first diagnosis of invasive or in situ breast cancer,
  – aged 20–74 years at diagnosis,
  – residence in specified NC counties

• this work: 3,828 women with BC (1,865 AA + 1,963 WW) from phases 1-3 with relevant survival, clinical, genomic variables
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How can genetics inform our questions?

- Just because a gene is differentially expressed (DE) across self-reported race, does not make it a good candidate.
- *PSPHL* is a pseudogene, expressed in tumor at different levels across race.
- Promoter and first three exons are in 30 kb of DNA not in the reference genome.
Rummel et al 2014: PSPHL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>del/del</th>
<th>ins/del</th>
<th>ins/ins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>&lt;5%</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>2/3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW</td>
<td>2/3</td>
<td>1/3</td>
<td>&lt;5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>del/del</th>
<th>ins/del</th>
<th>ins/ins</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>AA</td>
<td>.06</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>.04</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WW</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.04</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>control</td>
<td>.64</td>
<td>.34</td>
<td>.02</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Similar story for stage, ER/HER2 status, grade, size, lymph node status, though small sub-groups
Assayed 400+ genes of interest on Nanostring (no CNA data)

Assayed with OncoArray, ~6 million SNPs after imputation (v3 1000G)
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Assayed 400+ genes of interest on Nanostring (no CNA data)
Tumor expression QTL

Race-stratified tumor expression analysis of 400+ genes from germline genotype

mostly cis-eQTL, esp. for WW, some trans-eQTL for AA

some shared with healthy breast (GTEx), but many not shared
(Germline) genetically regulated tumor gene expression

\[ R^2 \geq 0.01 \]

- AA (37)
- Both (51)
- Neither (28)
- WW (37)

# of genes passing CV R^2 threshold

- 3.1\% variance explained (CV) for WW & AA
- 1\% variance explained (CV)
Expression models weren't generally applicable across race

Exceptions are *PSPHL* and *GSTT2*

This is part of a much larger thread in genetics:

  10.1371/journal.pgen.1007586
  10.1038/s41586-019-1310-4
Predictive accuracy varies by subtype

These CI drawn by inverting permutation test. Due to heterogeneous sub-group size, critical to include variability here.
Back to *PSPHL* example

- Genetically-driven associations after stratifying
- Survival analysis for 46 / 57 genes (AA / WW) in CBCS (admittedly small $n$ for genetic associations)
- Race-stratified cause-specific hazard model on genetically regulated tumor expression (CV imputed)
- Controlling for age at diagnosis, ER status at diagnosis, tumor stage at diagnosis, study phase
Transcriptome-wide association (TWAS): four BC-mortality-associated loci in AA

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Region</th>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Hazard Ratio (90% CI - FDR adj)</th>
<th>Z-Statistic&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>P-value&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
<th>GReX $R^2_{b}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20q13.2</td>
<td>AURKA</td>
<td>0.83 (0.73, 0.95)</td>
<td>-2.52</td>
<td>$1.5 \times 10^{-3}$</td>
<td>0.021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2p23.1</td>
<td>CAPN13</td>
<td>1.22 (1.07, 1.41)</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>$5.4 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3q26.32</td>
<td>PIK3CA</td>
<td>0.85 (0.74, 0.97)</td>
<td>-2.34</td>
<td>$3.2 \times 10^{-3}$</td>
<td>0.013</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18q21.33</td>
<td>SERPINB5</td>
<td>0.82 (0.72, 0.93)</td>
<td>-2.85</td>
<td>$3.4 \times 10^{-4}$</td>
<td>0.010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Collider bias should be a concern: None of these four with genetically regulated tumor expression associated with cancer incidence in AA women available from BCAC using the iCOGs dataset and additional GWAS.
Next steps and CBCS questions

• Genetically regulated tumor expression
  – Collaborate to apply tumor expression models to larger cohorts
  – Local ancestry - better expression models or associations?

• Etiology heterogeneity
  – Why does molecular subtype incidence differ?
  – Subtype-specific risk papers:
  – Outcome disparities within subtype
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eQTL analyses

• We conducted all eQTL analyses stratified by race.
• Age, BMI, postmenopausal status, and the first 5 principal components of the joint AA and WW genotype matrix were included in the models as covariates in C.
• Estimated tumor purity was also included as a covariate to assess its impact on strength and location of eQTLs.
Predictive models

- Gene expression residualized for the covariate matrix
- We estimate $w_g$ with the best predictive of three schemes:
  - (1) elastic-net regularized regression with mixing parameter $a = 0.5$ and penalty parameter tuned over 5-fold cross-validation,
  - (2) linear mixed modeling where the genotype matrix $X_g$ is treated as a matrix of random effects and $\hat{w}_g$ is taken as the best linear unbiased predictor (BLUP) of $w_g$, using rrBLUP, and
  - (3) multivariate linear mixed modeling as described above, estimated using GEMMA v.0.97.
Survival modeling

- We defined a relevant event as a death due to breast cancer. We aggregated all deaths not due to breast cancer as a competing risk. Any subjects lost to follow-up were treated as right-censored observations.
- We estimated the association of GReX with breast cancer survival by modeling the race-stratified cause-specific hazard function of breast cancer-specific mortality, stratifying on race.
- For a given gene $g$, the model has form

$$
\lambda_k(t) = \lambda_{0k}(t)e^{GReX_g \beta_g + Z_C \beta_C},
$$

where $\beta_g$ is the effect size of GReX on the hazard of breast cancer-specific mortality, $Z_C$ represents the matrix of covariates (age at diagnosis, estrogen-receptor status at diagnosis, tumor stage at diagnosis, and study phase), and $\beta_C$ are the effect sizes of these covariates on survival. $\lambda_{k(t)}$ is the hazard function specific to breast cancer mortality, and $\lambda_{0k(t)}$ is the baseline hazard function.
- We test $H_0: \beta_g = 0$ for each gene $g$ with Wald-type tests, as in a traditional Cox proportional hazards model. We correct for genomic inflation and bias using bacon, a method that constructs an empirical null distribution using a Gibbs sampling algorithm by fitting a three-component normal mixture on $Z$-statistics from TWAS tests of association.
This is PC1, linear combination with most variance in this dataset.
“Human population structure is not race” - Birney, Raff, Rutherford, Scally bit.ly/36aId0j
Adam Rutherford, “A Brief History of Everyone Who Ever Lived”
Angela Saini, “Superior: The Return of Race Science”