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In Brief
A multi-institutional integrative clinical sequencing analysis reveals that the majority of affected individuals with metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer harbor clinically actionable molecular alterations, highlighting the need for genetic counseling to inform precision medicine in affected individuals with advanced prostate cancer.
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INTRODUCTION

Prostate cancer is among the most common adult malignancies, with an estimated 220,000 American men diagnosed yearly (American Cancer Society, 2015). Some men will develop metastatic prostate cancer and receive primary androgen deprivation therapy (ADT). However, nearly all men with metastatic prostate cancer develop resistance to primary ADT, a state known as metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer (mCRPC). Multiple “second generation” ADT treatments, like abiraterone acetate (de Bono et al., 2011; Ryan et al., 2013) and enzalutamide (Beer et al., 2014; Scher et al., 2012), have emerged for mCRPC affected individuals; however, nearly all affected individuals will also develop resistance to these agents. In the U.S., an estimated 30,000 men die of prostate cancer yearly.

Multiple studies have identified recurrent somatic mutations, copy number alterations, and oncogenic structural DNA rearrangements (chromoplexy) in primary prostate cancer (Baca et al., 2013; Barbieri et al., 2012; Berger et al., 2011; Cooper et al., 2015; Pflueger et al., 2011; Taylor et al., 2010; Tomlins et al., 2007; Wang et al., 2011). These include point mutations in SPOP, FOXA1, and TP53; copy number alterations involving MYC, RB1, PTEN, and CHD1; and E26 transformation-specific (ETS) fusions, among other biologically relevant genes. Although certain primary prostate cancer alterations or signatures have prognostic clinical significance (Hieronymus et al., 2014; Lalonde et al., 2014), the therapeutic impact of primary prostate cancer genomic events has not yet been realized.

Genomic studies of metastatic prostate cancers demonstrated additional alterations in AR (Taplin et al., 1995) and in the androgen signaling pathway (Beltran et al., 2013; Grasso et al., 2012; Gundem et al., 2015; Hong et al., 2015), although these studies were performed predominantly using autopsy samples or preclinical models with limited cohort sizes. Prospective genomic characterization of fresh biopsy samples from living mCRPC affected individuals has been limited due to challenges in obtaining adequate tumor tissue, especially from bone biopsies (Mehra et al., 2011; Van Allen et al., 2014a), which is the most common site of metastatic disease. Thus, the landscape of genomic alterations in mCRPC disease remains incompletely characterized. Moreover, the low frequency of actionable genomic alterations in primary prostate cancer has limited the inclusion of mCRPC among cohorts wherein precision cancer medicine approaches have been piloted to guide treatment or clinical trial enrollment.

We conducted a systematic and multi-institutional study of mCRPC tumors obtained from living affected individuals to determine the landscape of somatic genomic alterations in this cohort, dissect genomic differences between primary prostate cancer and mCRPC, and discover the potential relevance of these findings from a biological and clinical perspective.

RESULTS

Clinical, Biopsy, and Pathology Parameters

An international consortium consisting of eight academic medical center clinical sites was established to capture fresh clinical mCRPC affected individual samples as part of standard-of-care approaches or through a cohort of prospective clinical trials (Figures 1A and 1B). Standard-of-care approaches for mCRPC included abiraterone acetate or enzalutamide. Clinical trials included in this study focused on combination strategies involving abiraterone acetate or enzalutamide, inhibitors of poly ADP ribose polymerase (PARP), or inhibitors of aurora kinase. Here, we report the results of genomic profiling from...
mCRPC biopsy samples obtained at time of entry into the cohort study. Future reports will include longitudinal clinical data such as treatment response. The consortium utilized two sequencing and analysis centers, one centralized digital pathology review center, and one centralized data visualization portal (Cerami et al., 2012; Gao et al., 2013; Robinson et al., 2011; Thorvaldsdóttir et al., 2013). Cross-validation of sequencing data from the two original sequencing sites demonstrated comparable variant calls for adequately powered genetic loci (E.M.V.A., D.R., C. Morrissey, C.C.P., S.L. Carter, M. Rosenberg, A. McKenna, A.M.C., L.A.G., and P.S.N., unpublished data).

Here, we describe 150 affected individuals with metastatic disease with complete integrative clinical sequencing results (whole-exome, matched germline, and transcriptome data) (Figure 1C) and summarized in Table S1. 189 affected individuals were enrolled in the study, and 175 cases were sequenced after pathology review and assessment of tumor content. Of these, 150 biopsies had >20% tumor content as defined by computational analysis, based on mutant allele variant fractions and zygosity shifts. The biopsies sequenced were from lymph node (42%), bone (28.7%), liver (12.7%), and other soft tissues (16.7%). Baseline clinical information is available in Table S2. A majority of cases (96.4%) displayed typical high-grade prostate adenocarcinoma features, whereas 2.9% of cases showed neuroendocrine differentiation. One case (0.7%) exhibited small-cell neuroendocrine features (Epstein et al., 2014) (Figure 1D).

**Landscape of mCRPC Alterations**

Somatic aberrations in a panel of 38 statistically or clinically significant genes are illustrated in Figure 2. Mean target coverage for tumor exomes was 160× and for matched normal exomes was 100×. Although the average mutation rate for mCRPC was 4.4 mutations/Mb, there were four cases that exhibited a mutation rate of nearly 50 per Mb, three of which are likely due to alterations in the mismatch repair genes MLH1 and MSH2, as discussed later.
Frequent copy number gains of 8q, as well as copy number losses of 8p, 13q, 16q, and 18q, were also observed. The mean number of identified biologically relevant genetic aberrations per case was 7.8 (Figure 2). All mutations identified are presented in Table S3. The landscape of copy number alterations demonstrated expected recurrent amplification peaks (frequent AR, 8q gain) and deletion peaks (CHD1, PTEN, RB1, TP53) (Figure 3A). Additional frequent focal amplifications were observed in regions encompassing CCND1 and PIK3CA and PIK3CB. A new recurrent focal homozygous deletion event was observed in chr11q23, encompassing the transcriptional repressor ZBTB16.

To identify gene fusions, analysis of 215 transcriptome libraries derived from the 150 tumor RNAs was performed and identified 4,122 chimeras with at least 4 reads spanning the fusion junction. These fusion junctions resulted from 2,247 gene pairs, an average of 15 gene fusions per tumor (Table S4). Among chimeric fusion transcripts identified, recurrent ETS fusions (Tomlins et al., 2005) were observed in 84 cases (56%), of which the majority were fused to ERG and others to FLI1, ETV4, and ETV5 (Figure 3B). In addition, potential clinically actionable fusions (involving BRAF, RAF1, PIK3CA/B, or RSPO2) were seen in eight cases (Figure S1 and covered subsequently).

To place the mCRPC mutation landscape in the context of primary prostate cancer somatic genomics, we performed a selective enrichment analysis to compare somatic point mutations and short insertion/deletions observed in this cohort with those observed in somatic whole-exome mutation data from 440 primary prostate cancer exomes (Barbieri et al., 2012; The Cancer
Genome Atlas, 2015 (Figure 3C and Table S5). Focusing on genes previously implicated in cancer (n = 550), somatic TP53 mutations were the most selectively mutated \( (q < 0.001; \text{Benjamini-Hochberg}) \), followed by AR, KMT2D, APC, BRCA2, and GNAS \( (q < 0.1; \text{Benjamini-Hochberg}; \text{Table S6}) \). Both AR and GNAS were mutated exclusively in mCRPC. We found no genes selectively mutated in primary prostate cancer compared to mCRPC.

We identified an established biological “driver” aberration in a cancer-related gene (i.e., known oncogene or tumor suppressor; Table S7) in nearly all the cases (Figure 3D). Although 99% of the mCRPC cases harbored a potential driver single-nucleotide variant (SNV) or indel, other classes of driver aberrations were also highly prevalent. These include driver gene fusions in 60%, driver homozygous deletions in 50% and driver amplifications in 54%. Although informative mutations were present in virtually all mCRPC cases, 63% harbored aberrations in AR, an expected finding in castrate-resistant disease but with higher frequency than in prior reports (Figure 3E). Interestingly, even when AR was not considered, 65% of cases harbored a putatively clinically actionable alteration (defined as predicting response or resistance to a therapy, having diagnostic or prognostic utility across tumor types) (Table S8) (Roychowdhury et al., 2011; Van Allen et al., 2014c).

Non-AR related clinically actionable alterations included aberrations in the PI3K pathway (49%), DNA repair pathway (19%), RAF kinases (3%), CDK inhibitors (7%), and the WNT pathway (5%). In addition to somatic alterations, clinically actionable pathogenic germline variants were seen in 8% of mCRPC affected individuals, potentially emphasizing the need for genetic counseling in affected individuals with prostate cancer.

**Genomically Aberrant Pathways in mCRPC**

Integrative analysis using both biological and statistical frameworks (Lawrence et al., 2013, 2014) of somatic point mutations,
short insertion/deletions, copy number alterations, fusion transcripts, and focused germline variant analysis identified discrete molecular subtypes of mCRPC (Figure 2). These subtypes were classified based on alteration clustering and existing biological pathway knowledge and implicated the AR signaling pathway, phosphatidylinositol-4,5-bisphosphate 3-kinase (PI3K), WNT, DNA repair, cell cycle, and chromatin modifier gene sets, among others. The most frequently aberrant genes in mCRPC included AR (62.7%), ETS family (56.7%), TP53 (53.3%), and PTEN (40.7%) (Figure 2).

AR Signaling Pathway
In aggregate, 107/150 (71.3%) of cases harbored AR pathway aberrations, the majority of which were direct alterations affecting AR through amplification and mutation (Figure 4A).

Figure 4B summarizes the key genes altered in AR signaling, including AR itself, FOXA1 as a pioneer transcription factor, NCOR1/2 as negative regulators of AR, SPOP as a putative androgen receptor transcriptional regulator (Geng et al., 2013), and ZBTB16 as an AR inducible target gene that may also negatively regulate AR. Recurrent hotspot mutations in AR were observed at residues previously reported to confer agonism to AR antagonists such as flutamide (T878A) and bicalutamide (W742C), as well as to glucocorticoids (L702H). Some, but not all, of these affected individuals had documented prior exposures that could explain enrichment for these mutations. Additional clinical data collection is ongoing (Figure 4C). Rare AR mutations not previously described were seen in our cohort, although these are of unclear functional significance. Furthermore, one affected individual (Case 89) harbored two putatively

Figure 4. Aberrations in the AR Pathway Found in mCRPC
(A) Cases with aberrations in the AR pathway. Case numbering as in Figure 2.
(B) Key genes found altered in the AR pathway of mCRPC. DHT, dihydrotestosterone.
(C) Point mutations identified in AR. Amino acids altered are indicated. NTAD, N-terminal activation. DBD, DNA-binding. LBD, ligand binding.
(D) Splicing landscape of AR in mCRPC. Specific splice variants are indicated by exon boundaries, and junction read level is provided. SU2C, this mCRPC cohort.
functional AR mutations (T878A and Q903H), which may further suggest intra-tumor heterogeneity emerging in the CRPC setting (Carreira et al., 2014). Analysis of AR splice variants from RNA-seq data demonstrated a distribution of splice variants observed throughout these mCRPC tumor cases (Figure 4D). Analysis of the TCGA prostate dataset revealed that many of these variants were also present at varying levels in primary prostate cancer and benign prostate tissue. AR-V7, which has been implicated in abiraterone acetate and enzalutamide resistance (Antonarakis et al., 2014), was observed in a majority of pre-abiraterone/enzalutamide cases but at very low ratios relative to full length AR. Implications for treatment response are unknown at this time.

In addition to AR mutations itself, we observed alterations in AR pathway members (Figure 4A). These included known alterations in NCOR1, NCOR2, and FOXA1 that have been previously reported in primary prostate cancers and mCRPC (Barbieri et al., 2012; Grasso et al., 2012). In this cohort, truncating and missense mutations in FOXA1 form a cluster near the end of the Forkhead DNA binding domain (Figure S2).

Recurrent homozygous deletions of the androgen-regulated gene ZBTB16 (also known as PLZF) were seen in 8 (5%) cases (Figure 4E) not previously reported in clinical mCRPC biopsies. Analysis of the minimally deleted region seen in this cohort narrowed the candidate genes in the chr11q23 region to ZBTB16 (Figure S3). ZBTB16 has been previously implicated in prostate cancer tumorigenesis and androgen resistance in preclinical models (Cao et al., 2013; Kikugawa et al., 2006), with loss of ZBTB16 upregulating the MAPK signaling pathway (Hsieh et al., 2015).

New PI3K Pathway Discoveries
The PI3K pathway was also commonly altered, with somatic alterations in 73/150 (49%) of mCRPC affected individuals (Figure 5A). This included biallelic loss of PTEN, as well as hotspot mutations, amplifications and activating fusions in PIK3CA, and p.E17K activating mutations in AKT1 (Figure S2). Of note, PIK3CA amplifications resulted in overexpression compared to the remaining cohort (Figure S3).

Interestingly, mutations in another member of the PI3K catalytic subunit, PIK3CB, were observed in this cohort for the first time, at equivalent positions to canonical activating mutations in PIK3CA (Figure 5B). PIK3CB mutations appeared in the context of PTEN-deficient cases, which is consistent with a previous report demonstrating that some PTEN-deficient cancers are dependent on PIK3CB, rather than PIK3CA (Wee et al., 2008). Furthermore, two affected individuals harbored fusions involving PIK3CA/B, with these events resulting in overexpression of the gene relative to other tumors in the cohort (Figures 5C and 5D).

New Wnt Pathway Discoveries
27/150 (18%) of our cases harbored alterations in the Wnt signaling pathway (Figure 6A). Hotspot activating mutations in CTNNB1 were seen (Figure 6B), as previously described (Voeller et al., 1998). Notably, recurrent alterations in APC were also observed, which have not been previously described in clinical mCRPC affected individuals. This prompted a broader examination of Wnt signaling genes (Figure 6B). Through integrative analysis, we identified alterations in RNF43 and ZNRF3, which were recently described in colorectal, endometrial, and adrenal cortical cancers (Assié et al., 2014; Giannakis et al., 2014) and were mutually exclusive with APC alterations (Figure 6A). Moreover, we also discovered R-spondin fusions involving RSP02, as previously observed in colorectal carcinoma (Seshagiri et al., 2012) in association with RSPO2 overexpression in these cases (Figure 6C). RSP02 is a key factor in prostate cancer organoid methodology (Gao et al., 2014). Affected individuals with aberrations in RNF43, ZNRF3, or RSP02 (overall 6% of affected individuals) are predicted to respond to porcupine inhibitors (Liu et al., 2013).

Cell-Cycle Pathway
We observed RB1 loss in 21% of cases (Figure S4). Expanding the scope of cell-cycle genes implicated in mCRPC, we noted focal amplifications involving CCND1 in 9% of cases, as well as less common (<5%) events in CDKN2A/B, CDKN1B, and CDK4 (Figure S4). Cell-cycle derangement, such as through CCND1 amplification or CDKN2A/B loss, may result in enhanced response to CDK4 inhibitors in other tumor types (Finn et al., 2015), and preclinical mCRPC models predict similar activity in prostate cancer (Comstock et al., 2013).

DNA Repair Pathway
Integrative analysis of both the somatic and pathogenic germline alterations in BRCA2 identified 19/150 (12.7%) of cases with loss of BRCA2, of which ~90% exhibited biallelic loss (Figure 7A). This was commonly a result of somatic point mutation and loss of heterozygosity, as well as homozygous deletion. One of the clinical trials in our consortium is evaluating poly(ADP-ribose) polymerase (PARP) inhibition in unselected mCRPC affected individuals. Importantly, multiple affected individuals in this trial who experienced clinical benefit harbored biallelic BRCA2 loss, providing further evidence of clinical actionability (Mateo et al., 2014). Eight affected individuals (5.3%) harbored pathogenic germline BRCA2 mutations (Figure 7B) with a subsequent somatic event that resulted in biallelic loss, revealing a surprisingly high frequency relative to primary prostate cancer.

We therefore expanded the focus to other DNA repair/recombination genes and identified alterations in at least 34/150 (22.7%) of cases. These include recurrent biallelic loss of ATM (Figure 7B), including multiple cases with germline pathogenic alterations. ATM mutations were also observed in affected individuals who achieved clinical responses to PARP inhibition (Mateo et al., 2014). In addition, we noted events in BRCA1, CDK12, FANCA, RAD51B, and RAD51C. If aberrations of BRCA2, BRCA1, and ATM all confer enhanced sensitivity to PARP inhibitors, 29/150 (19.3%) of mCRPC affected individuals would be predicted to benefit from this therapy. Interestingly, three out of four mCRPC tumors exhibited hypermutation and harbored alterations in the mismatch repair pathway genes (Figures 2 and 7C), corroborating a recent report identifying structural alterations in MSH2 and MSH6 mismatch repair genes in hypermutated prostate cancers (Pritchard et al., 2014).
DISCUSSION

To effectively implement precision cancer medicine, prospective identification of predictive biomarkers should be performed with information derived from the most contemporary tumor assessments that reflect the affected individual’s prior therapies and treatment opportunities. In mCRPC, precision cancer medicine activities have been limited by difficulties obtaining clinical samples from mCRPC affected individuals and a lack of comprehensive genomic data for potentially actionable alterations. By demonstrating the feasibility of prospective genomics in mCRPC and defining the mutational landscape in a focused metastatic clinical cohort, this report may inform multiple genomically driven clinical trials and biological investigations into key mediators of mCRPC. In nearly all of the mCRPC analyzed in this study, we identified biologically informative alterations; almost all harbored at least one driver SNV/indel, and approximately half harbored a driver gene fusion, amplification, or homozygous deletion. Remarkably, in nearly 90% of mCRPC affected individuals, we identified a potentially actionable somatic or germline event.

The high frequency of AR pathway alterations in this cohort strongly implies that the vast majority of mCRPC affected individuals remain dependent on AR signaling for viability. The “second-generation” AR-directed therapies (e.g., abiraterone acetate and enzalutamide) may select for distinct phenotypes that may be indifferent to AR signaling, and prospective...
characterization of such cases will be of particular interest. We hypothesize that affected individuals with acquired AR mutations, including new AR mutations discovered in this cohort, will harbor differential responses to these second-generation ADT therapies. As the number of affected individuals in this cohort with AR mutations increases, we will subsequently be able to link specific AR mutations with clinical phenotypes to determine which mutations confer selective response or resistance to subsequent AR-directed therapy.

Moreover, these data identify multiple therapeutic avenues warranting clinical investigation in the CRPC population. Excluding AR aberrations, 65% of mCRPC have a potentially actionable aberration that may suggest an investigational drug or approved therapy. For example, focusing on the PI3K pathway, PIK3CB-specific inhibitors may have utility in affected individuals with mutation, amplification, and/or fusion of this gene (Schwartz et al., 2015); multiple affected individuals who achieved durable (>1 year) responses to PIK3CB-specific inhibitor harbored activating mutation or amplification in PIK3CB (J.S. de Bono et al., 2015, 106th Annual Meeting of the American Association for Cancer Research, abstract). RAF kinase fusions in 3% of mCPRC affected individuals would suggest the use of pan-RAF inhibitors or MEK inhibitors (Palanisamy et al., 2010).

In addition, the emergence of porcupine inhibitors (Liu et al., 2013) and R-spondin antibodies may warrant investigation in mCRPC tumors harboring Wnt pathway alterations or specifically R-spondin fusions, respectively. These observations will need to be prospectively assessed in the clinical trials.

Additionally, biallelic inactivation of BRCA2, BRCA1, or ATM was observed in nearly 20% of affected individuals. Previous work in other cancer types suggests that these affected individuals may benefit from PARP inhibitors (Fong et al., 2009;...
Kaufman et al., 2015; Weston et al., 2010) or platinum-based chemotherapy, and prior reports have implicated the presence of germline BRCA2 alterations in primary prostate cancer with poor survival outcomes (Castro et al., 2013). Given the incidence of pathogenic germline BRCA2 mutations in this cohort with subsequent somatic events (5%), along with enrichment for somatic BRCA2 alterations in mCRPC (13%), germline genetic testing in mCRPC affected individuals warrants clinical consideration.

The ability to molecularly characterize mCRPC biopsy samples from affected individuals actively receiving therapy will also enable focused studies of resistance to secondary ADT therapies, including neuroendocrine-like phenotypes. This will require iterative sampling of pre-treatment and resistant tumors from matching affected individuals and may warrant multi-regional biopsies from affected individuals (if feasible) given heterogeneity in mCRPC (Carreira et al., 2014; Gundem et al., 2015). Toward that end, in some affected individuals, we observed multiple AR mutations emerging in the same biopsy, which may indicate clonal heterogeneity within these mCRPC tumor samples. Additional genomic alterations discovered in this cohort (e.g., ZBTB16) warrant exploration in prostate cancer model systems, including organoid cultures (Gao et al., 2014).

Broadly, our effort demonstrates the utility of applying comprehensive genomic principles developed for primary malignancies (e.g., TCGA) to a clinically relevant metastatic tumor cohort. Our effort may also catalyze multi-institutional efforts to profile tumors from cohorts of affected individuals with metastatic, treated tumors in other clinical contexts because our results.

Figure 7. Aberrations in the DNA Repair Pathway Found in mCRPC

(A) Cases with aberrations in the DNA repair pathway. Case numbering as in Figure 2.
(B) Aberrations identified in BRCA2, ATM, and BRCA1. Amino acids altered are indicated. HELC, helical domain. OB, oligonucleotide binding fold. FAT, FRAP-ATM-TRRAP domain. PIK3c, PI3 kinase domain. CC, coiled coil. BRC, Brca repeat.
(C) Microsatellite instability analysis of representative hypermutated CRPC cases and non-hypermutated cases.

demonstrate multiple discoveries within this advanced disease stage that have not been observed in primary tumor profiling. Moreover, this study sets the stage for epigenetic and other profiling efforts in mCRPC not taken in this study, which may enable biological discovery and have immediate therapeutic relevance in mCRPC (Asangani et al., 2014). Overall, our efforts demonstrate the feasibility of comprehensive and integrative genomics on prospective biopsies from individual mCRPC affected individuals to enable precision cancer medicine activities in this large affected individual population.

**EXPERIMENTAL PROCEDURES**

**Affected Individual Enrollment**

Affected individuals with clinical evidence of mCRPC who were being considered for abiraterone acetate or enzalutamide as standard of care, or as part of a clinical trial, were considered for enrollment. Affected individuals with metastatic disease accessible by image-guided biopsy were eligible for inclusion. All affected individuals provided written informed consent to obtain fresh tumor biopsies and to perform comprehensive molecular profiling of tumor and germline samples.

**Biopsies and Pathology Review**

Biopsies of soft tissue or bone metastases were obtained under radiographic guidance. Digital images of biopsy slides were centrally reviewed using the lowess function in R (version 2.13.1) with smoothing parameter f = 0.05. All images were reviewed by genetic tumor oncology pathologists (M.R., J.M.M., L.P.K., S.A.T., R.M., V.R., A.G., M.L., R.L., and M.B.).

**Sequencing and Analysis**

Normal DNAs from buccal swabs,uffy coats, or whole blood were isolated using the Qiagen DNeasy Blood & Tissue Kit. Flash-frozen needle biopsies with highest tumor content for each case, as determined by pathology review, were extracted for nucleic acids. Tumor genomic DNA and total RNA were purified from the same sample using the AllPrep DNA/RNA/mRNA kit (Qiagen) with disruption on a TissueLyser II (Qiagen). RNA integrity was verified on an Agilent 2100 Bioanalyzer using RNA Nano reagents (Agilent Technologies).

Whole-exome capture libraries were constructed from 100 ng to 1 μg of DNA from tumor and normal tissue after sample shearing, end repair, and phosphorylation and ligation to barcoded sequencing adapters. Ligated DNA was size selected for lengths between 200 and 350 bp and subjected to hybrid capture using SureSelect Exome v4 baits (Agilent). Exome sequence data processing and analysis were performed using pipelines at the Broad Institute and the University of Michigan. A BAM file aligned to the hg19 human genome build was produced using Illumina sequencing reads for the tumor and normal sample and the Picard pipeline. Somatic mutation analysis was performed as described previously (Cibulskis et al., 2013; Van Allen et al., 2014c) and reviewed with Integrated Genomics Viewer (IGV) (Robinson et al., 2011).

Copy number aberrations were quantified and reported for each gene as the segmented normalized log2 transformed exon coverage ratios between each tumor sample and matched normal sample (Lonigro et al., 2011). To account for observed associations between coverage ratios and GC content across the genome, lowess normalization was used to correct per-exon coverage ratios prior to segmentation analysis. Mean GC percentage was computed for each targeted region, and a lowess curve was fit to the scatterplot of log2 coverage ratios versus mean GC content across the targeted exome using the lowess function in R (version 2.13.1) with smoothing parameter f = 0.05. The resulting copy ratios were segmented using the circular binary segmentation algorithm (Olshen et al., 2004).

Statistical analysis of recurrently mutated genes was performed using MutSig (Lawrence et al., 2013). Selective enrichment analysis (Van Allen et al., 2014b) of mutations observed in mCRPC compared to primary prostate cancer was performed by tabulating the frequency of affected-individual-normalized mutations observed in either CRPC or primary prostate cancer and performing a two-sided Fisher’s exact test using allelic fraction cut off of 0.1 or greater and a set of biologically relevant cancer genes (n = 550 genes) (Futreal et al., 2004). Multiple hypothesis test correction was performed using Benjamini-Hochberg method.
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