Polygenic hazard score predicts aggressive and fatal prostate cancer in multi-ethnic populations

Minh-Phuong Huynh-Le[1,2]
Chun Chieh Fan[2]
Roshan Karunamuni[1,2]
Maria Elena Martinez[3,4]
Rosalind A. Eeles[5,6]
Zsofia Kote-Jarai[5]
Kenneth Muir[7,8]
UKGPCS collaborators [9]
Johanna Schleutker[10,11]
Nora Pashayan[12,13,14]
Jyotsna Batra[15,16]
APCB (Australian Prostate Cancer BioResource)[17,18]
Henrik Grönberg[19]
David E. Neal[20,21,22]
Jenny L. Donovan[23]
Freddie C. Hamdy[24,25]
Richard M. Martin[23,26,27]
Sune F. Nielsen[28,29]
Børge G. Nordestgaard[30,31]
Fredrik Wiklund[32]
Catherine M. Tangen[33]
Graham G. Giles[34,35,36]
Alicja Wolk[37,38]
Demetrius Albanes[39]
Christopher A. Haiman[40]
Ruth C. Travis[41]
William J. Blot[42,43]
Wei Zheng[44]
Maureen Sanderson[45]
Janet L. Stanford[46,47]
Lorelei A. Mucci[48]
Catharine M. L. West[49]
Adam S. Kibel[50]
Olivier Cussenot[51,52]
Sonja I. Berndt[53]
Stella Koutros[53]
Karina Dalsgaard Sørensen[54,55]
Cezary Cybulski[56]
Eli Marie Grindedal[57]
Florence Menegaux[58,59]
Kay-Tee Khaw[60]
Jong Y. Park[61]
Sue A. Ingles[62]
Christiane Maier[63]
Robert J. Hamilton[64,65]
Stephen N. Thibodeau[66]
Barry S. Rosenstein[67,68]
Yong-Jie Lu[69]

Stephen Watya[70]
Ana Vega[71,72,73]
NC-LA PCaP Investigators [74,75,76]
The IMPACT Study Steering Committee and Collaborators [77]
Manolis Kogevinas[78,79,80]
Kathryn L. Penney[81]
Chad Huff[82]
Manuel R. Teixeira[83,84]
Luc Multigner[85]
Robin J. Leach[86]
Lisa Cannon-Albright[87,88]
Hermann Brenner[89,90,91]
Esther M. John[92]
Radka Kaneva[93]
Christopher J. Logothetis[94]
Susan L. Neuhausen[95]
Kim De Ruyck[96]
Hardev Pandha[97]
Azad Razack[98]
Lisa F. Newcomb[46,99]
Canary PASS Investigators [46,99]
Jay Fowke[100]
Marija Gamulin[101]
Nawaid Usmani[102,103]
Frank Claessens[104]
Manuela Gago-Dominguez[105,106]
Paul A. Townsend[107]
William S. Bush[108]
Shiv Srivastava[109,110]
Monique J. Roobol [111]
Marie-Élise Parent[112,113]
Jennifer J. Hu[114]
The Profile Study Steering Committee [115]
Ian G. Mills[116]
Ole A. Andreassen[117]
Anders M. Dale[118]
Tyler M. Seibert[1,2,119]
The PRACTICAL Consortium *

[1]Department of Radiation Medicine and Applied Sciences, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA
[2]Center for Multimodal Imaging and Genetics, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA
[3]Department of Family Medicine and Public Health, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA 92093-0012, USA
[4]Moores Cancer Center, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA
[5]The Institute of Cancer Research, London, SM2 5NG, UK
[6]Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust, London, SW3 6JJ, UK
[7]Division of Population Health, Health Services Research and Primary Care, University of Manchester, Oxford Road, Manchester, M13 9PL, UK
[8]Warwick Medical School, University of Warwick, Coventry, UK

[9]http://www.icr.ac.uk/our-research/research-divisions/division-of-genetics-and-epidemiology/oncogenetics/research-projects/ukgpcs/ukgpcs-collaborators
[10]Institute of Biomedicine, Kiinamyllynkatu 10, FI-20014 University of Turku, Finland
[11]Department of Medical Genetics, Genomics, Laboratory Division, Turku University Hospital, PO Box 52, 20521 Turku, Finland
[12]University College London, Department of Applied Health Research, London,UK
[13]Centre for Cancer Genetic Epidemiology, Department of Oncology, University of Cambridge, Strangeways Laboratory, Worts Causeway, Cambridge, CB1 8RN, UK
[14]Department of Applied Health Research, University College London, London, WC1E 7HB, UK
[15]Australian Prostate Cancer Research Centre-Qld, Institute of Health and Biomedical Innovation and School of Biomedical Sciences, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane QLD 4059, Australia
[16]Translational Research Institute, Brisbane, Queensland 4102, Australia
[17]Australian Prostate Cancer Research Centre-Qld, Queensland University of Technology, Brisbane; Prostate Cancer Research Program, Monash University, Melbourne; Dame Roma Mitchell Cancer Centre, University of Adelaide, Adelaide; Chris O'Brien Lifehouse and The Kinghorn Cancer Centre, Sydney, Australia
[18]Translational Research Institute, Brisbane, Queensland, Australia
[19]Department of Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Karolinska Institute, Stockholm, Sweden
[20]Nuffield Department of Surgical Sciences, University of Oxford, Room 6603, Level 6, John Radcliffe Hospital, Headley Way, Headington, Oxford, OX3 9DU, UK
[21]University of Cambridge, Department of Oncology, Box 279, Addenbrooke's Hospital, Hills Road, Cambridge CB2 0QQ, UK
[22]Cancer Research UK, Cambridge Research Institute, Li Ka Shing Centre, Cambridge UK
[23]Population Health Sciences, Bristol Medical School, University of Bristol, BS8 2PS, UK
[24]Nuffield Department of Surgical Sciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX1 2JD, UK
[25]Faculty of Medical Science, University of Oxford, John Radcliffe Hospital, Oxford, UK
[26]National Institute for Health Research (NIHR) Biomedical Research Centre, University of Bristol, Bristol, BS8 1TH, UK
[27]Medical Research Council (MRC) Integrative Epidemiology Unit, University of Bristol, Bristol, BS8 2BN, UK.
[28]Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Copenhagen, 2200 Copenhagen, Denmark
[29]Department of Clinical Biochemistry, Herlev and Gentofte Hospital, Copenhagen University Hospital, Herlev, 2200 Copenhagen, Denmark
[30]Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Copenhagen, 2200 Copenhagen, Denmark
[31]Department of Clinical Biochemistry, Herlev and Gentofte Hospital, Copenhagen University Hospital, Herlev, 2200 Copenhagen, Denmark
[32]Department of Medical Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Karolinska Institute, SE-171 77†Stockholm, Sweden
[33]SWOG Statistical Center, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, WA, USA
[34]Cancer Epidemiology Division, Cancer Council Victoria, 615 St Kilda Road, Melbourne, VIC 3004, Australia
[35]Centre for Epidemiology and Biostatistics, Melbourne School of Population and Global Health, The University of Melbourne, Grattan Street, Parkville, VIC 3010, Australia
[36]Precision Medicine, School of Clinical Sciences at Monash Health, Monash University, Clayton, Victoria 3168, Australia
[37]Division of Nutritional Epidemiology, Institute of Environmental Medicine, Karolinska Institutet, SE-171 77†Stockholm, Sweden
[38]Department of Surgical Sciences, Uppsala University, 75185 Uppsala, Sweden
[39]Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics, National Cancer Institute, NIH, Bethesda, MD 20892, USA

[40]Center for Genetic Epidemiology, Department of Preventive Medicine, Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern California/Norris Comprehensive Cancer Center, Los Angeles, CA 90015, USA
[41]Cancer Epidemiology Unit, Nuffield Department of Population Health, University of Oxford, Oxford, OX3 7LF, UK
[42]Division of Epidemiology, Department of Medicine, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, 2525 West End Avenue, Suite 600, Nashville, TN 37232 USA.
[43]International Epidemiology Institute, Rockville, MD 20850, USA
[44]Division of Epidemiology, Department of Medicine, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, 2525 West End Avenue, Suite 800, Nashville, TN 37232 USA.
[45]Department of Family and Community Medicine, Meharry Medical College, 1005 Dr. DB Todd Jr. Blvd., Nashville, TN 37208 USA
[46]Division of Public Health Sciences, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, Washington, 98109-1024, USA
[47]Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, University of Washington, Seattle, Washington 98195, USA
[48]Department of Epidemiology, Harvard T. H. Chan School of Public Health, Boston, MA 02115, USA
[49]Division of Cancer Sciences, University of Manchester, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, Radiotherapy Related Research, The Christie Hospital NHS Foundation Trust, Manchester, M13 9PL UK
[50]Division of Urologic Surgery, Brigham and Womens Hospital, 75 Francis Street, Boston, MA 02115, USA
[51]Sorbonne Universite, GRC n∞5 , AP-HP, Tenon Hospital, 4 rue de la Chine, F-75020 Paris, France
[52]CeRePP, Tenon Hospital, Paris, France.
[53]Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics, National Cancer Institute, NIH, Bethesda, MD, USA
[54]Department of Molecular Medicine, Aarhus University Hospital, Palle Juul-Jensen Boulevard 99, 8200 Aarhus N, Denmark
[55]Department of Clinical Medicine, Aarhus University, DK-8200 Aarhus N
[56]International Hereditary Cancer Center, Department of Genetics and Pathology, Pomeranian Medical University, Szczecin, Poland
[57]Department of Medical Genetics, Oslo University Hospital, 0424 Oslo, Norway
[58]Cancer & Environment Group, Center for Research in Epidemiology and Population Health (CESP), INSERM, University Paris-Sud, University Paris-Saclay, 94807 Villejuif Cédex, France
[59]Paris-Sud University, UMRS 1018, 94807 Villejuif Cedex, France
[60]Clinical Gerontology Unit, University of Cambridge, Cambridge, CB2 2QQ, UK
[61]Department of Cancer Epidemiology, Moffitt Cancer Center, 12902 Magnolia Drive, Tampa, FL 33612, USA
[62]Department of Preventive Medicine, Keck School of Medicine, University of Southern California/Norris Comprehensive Cancer Center, Los Angeles, California, USA
[63]Humangenetik Tuebingen, Paul-Ehrlich-Str 23, D-72076 Tuebingen, Germany
[64]Dept. of Surgical Oncology, Princess Margaret Cancer Centre, Toronto ON M5G 2M9, Canada
[65]Dept. of Surgery (Urology), University of Toronto, Canada
[66]Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester, MN 55905, USA
[67]Department of Radiation Oncology and Department of Genetics and Genomic Sciences, Box 1236, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, One Gustave L. Levy Place, New York, NY 10029, USA
[68]Department of Genetics and Genomic Sciences, Icahn School of Medicine at Mount Sinai, New York, NY 10029-5674 , USA.
[69]Centre for Molecular Oncology, Barts Cancer Institute, Queen Mary University of London, John Vane Science Centre, Charterhouse Square, London, EC1M 6BQ, UK
[70]Uro Care, Kampala, Uganda
[71]Fundación Pública Galega Medicina Xenómica, Santiago De Compostela, 15706, Spain.
[72]Instituto de Investigación Sanitaria de Santiago de Compostela, Santiago De Compostela, 15706, Spain.
[73]Centro de Investigación en Red de Enfermedades Raras (CIBERER), Spain

[74]Lineberger Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA
[75]Lineberger Comprehensive Cancer Center, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, 450 West Drive, CB 7295, Chapel Hill, NC 27599, USA
[76]Department of Epidemiology, University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill, Chapel Hill, NC, USA
[77]http://impact.icr.ac.uk
[78]ISGlobal, Barcelona, Spain
[79]IMIM (Hospital del Mar Medical Research Institute), Barcelona, Spain
[80]Universitat Pompeu Fabra (UPF), Barcelona, Spain
[81]Channing Division of Network Medicine, Department of Medicine, Brigham and Women's Hospital/Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA 02184, USA
[82]The University of Texas M. D. Anderson Cancer Center, 1515 Holcombe Blvd., Houston, TX 77030, USA
[83]Department of Genetics, Portuguese Oncology Institute of Porto (IPO-Porto), Porto, Portugal
[84]Biomedical Sciences Institute (ICBAS), University of Porto, Porto, Portugal
[85]Univ Rennes, Inserm, EHESP, Irset (Institut de recherche en santé, environnement et travail) - UMR_S 1085, Rennes, France
[86]Department of Urology, Mays Cancer Center, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio, San Antonio Texas
[87]Division of Epidemiology, Department of Internal Medicine, University of Utah School of Medicine, Salt Lake City, Utah, USA
[88]George E. Wahlen Department of Veterans Affairs Medical Center, Salt Lake City, Utah 84148, USA
[89]Division of Clinical Epidemiology and Aging Research, German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ), D-69120, Heidelberg, Germany
[90]German Cancer Consortium (DKTK), German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ), D-69120 Heidelberg, Germany
[91]Division of Preventive Oncology, German Cancer Research Center (DKFZ) and National Center for Tumor Diseases (NCT), Im Neuenheimer Feld 460 69120 Heidelberg, Germany
[92]Department of Medicine, Division of Oncology, Stanford Cancer Institute, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, 780 Welch Road, CJ250C, CA 94304-5769
[93]Molecular Medicine Center, Department of Medical Chemistry and Biochemistry, Medical University of Sofia, Sofia, 2 Zdrave Str., 1431 Sofia, Bulgaria
[94]The University of Texas M. D. Anderson Cancer Center, Department of Genitourinary Medical Oncology, 1515 Holcombe Blvd., Houston, TX 77030, USA
[95]Department of Population Sciences, Beckman Research Institute of the City of Hope, 1500 East Duarte Road, Duarte, CA 91010, 626-256-HOPE (4673)
[96]Ghent University, Faculty of Medicine and Health Sciences, Basic Medical Sciences, Proeftuinstraat 86, B-9000 Gent
[97]The University of Surrey, Guildford, Surrey, GU2 7XH
[98]Department of Surgery, Faculty of Medicine, University of Malaya, 50603 Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia
[99]Department of Urology, University of Washington, 1959 NE Pacific Street, Box 356510, Seattle, WA 98195, USA
[100]Department of Medicine and Urologic Surgery, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, 1211 Medical Center Drive, Nashville, TN 37232, USA
[101]Division of Medical Oncology, Urogenital Unit, Department of Oncology, University Hospital Centre Zagreb, University of Zagreb, School of Medicine, 10 000 Zagreb, Croatia
[102]Department of Oncology, Cross Cancer Institute, University of Alberta, 11560 University Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 1Z2
[103]Division of Radiation Oncology, Cross Cancer Institute, 11560 University Avenue, Edmonton, Alberta, Canada T6G 1Z2

[104]Molecular Endocrinology Laboratory, Department of Cellular and Molecular Medicine, KU Leuven, BE-3000, Belgium
[105]Genomic Medicine Group, Galician Foundation of Genomic Medicine, Instituto de Investigacion Sanitaria de Santiago de Compostela (IDIS), Complejo Hospitalario Universitario de Santiago, Servicio Galego de Sa˙de, SERGAS, 15706, Santiago de Compostela, Spain
[106]University of California San Diego, Moores Cancer Center, La Jolla, CA 92037, USA
[107]Division of Cancer Sciences, Manchester Cancer Research Centre, Faculty of Biology, Medicine and Health, Manchester Academic Health Science Centre, NIHR Manchester Biomedical Research Centre, Health Innovation Manchester, Univeristy of Manchester, M13 9WL
[108]Case Western Reserve University, Department of Population and Quantitative Health Sciences, Cleveland Institute for Computational Biology, 2103 Cornell Road, Wolstein Research Building, Suite 2527, Cleveland, OH, 44106 USA
[109]Uniformed Services University, 4301 Jones Bridge Rd, Bethesda, MD 20814, USA
[110]Center for Prostate Disease Research, 1530 East Jefferson Street, Rockville, MD 20852, USA
[111]Department of Urology, Erasmus University Medical Center, 3015 CE Rotterdam, The Netherlands[112]Epidemiology and Biostatistics Unit, Centre Armand-Frappier santé Biotechnologie, Institut national de la recherche scientifique, 531 Boul. des Prairies, Laval, QC, Canada H7V 1B7
[113]Department of Social and Preventive Medicine, School of Public Health, University of Montreal, Montreal, QC, Canada
[114]The University of Miami School of Medicine, Sylvester Comprehensive Cancer Center, 1120 NW 14th Street, CRB 1511, Miami, Florida 33136, USA
[115]http://www.cancerresearchuk.org/about-cancer/find-a-clinical-trial/a-study-find-out-looking-gene-changes-would-be-useful-in-screening-for-prostate-cancer-profile-pilot
[116]Nuffield Department of Surgical Sciences, University of Oxford, Oxford, UK
[117]NORMENT, KG Jebsen Centre, Oslo University Hospital and University of Oslo, Oslo, Norway
[118]Department of Radiology, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA
[119]Department of Bioengineering, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, CA, USA

* Additional members from the *Prostate Cancer Association Group to Investigate Cancer Associated Alterations in the Genome* consortium (PRACTICAL, http://practical.icr.ac.uk/) are provided in the Supplemental Material.

Key words: prostate cancer; ethnicity; genetics; precision medicine; survival; hazard; risk factors

Corresponding Author:
Tyler M. Seibert, MD, PhD
Assistant Professor
Department of Radiation Medicine and Applied Sciences
Department of Bioengineering
University of California San Diego
9500 Gilman Dr. Mail Code 0861
La Jolla, CA 92093-0861
tseibert@ucsd.edu

Abstract

Background: Prostate cancer causes substantial morbidity and mortality worldwide. Recently, a polygenic hazard score (PHS_1)—the weighted sum of 54 single-nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) genotypes—was developed and validated to predict age of aggressive prostate cancer onset in Caucasians. We evaluated the performance of the PHS for prediction of aggressive prostate cancer and of death from prostate cancer across diverse ethnic populations.

Methods: 80,491 men of various self-reported race/ethnicities were included (30,575 controls, 49,916 cases. Previously determined genetic ancestries for these men were: 71,856 European, 6,253 African, and 2,382 Asian. Where applicable, age of prostate cancer diagnosis, age at last follow-up, TNM stage, PSA, Gleason score, and cause of death were also determined. Median age at last follow-up was 70 years (IQR 63-76). 3,983 men died from prostate cancer, 5,806 died from non-prostate cancer causes, and 70,702 were still alive at the end of follow-up. Patient samples were previously genotyped on a cancer-specific array; PHS_1 was adapted for compatibility with this array (PHS_2) and tested in the multi-ethnic dataset via Cox proportional hazards models for age of aggressive prostate cancer onset and for age at prostate-cancer-specific death.

Results: PHS_2 had 46 SNPs: 24 directly genotyped and 22 acceptable proxies ($r^2 \geq 0.94$). PHS_2 was predictive of age of aggressive prostate cancer onset in the independent, multi-ethnic dataset ($z=48$, $p<10^{-16}$) and in each genetic ancestry: European ($z=46$, $p<10^{-16}$), Asian ($z=44$, $p<10^{-16}$), and African ($z=24$, $p<10^{-16}$). PHS_2 was also predictive of age of prostate cancer death in the multi-ethnic dataset ($z=16$, $p<10^{-16}$). Comparing the 80th and 20th percentiles of genetic risk, men with high PHS had a hazard ratio of 5.9 for aggressive prostate cancer and 5.7 for prostate cancer death. Within each genetic ancestry group, analogous hazard ratios for aggressive prostate cancer were 5.6, 5.2, and 2.4 for men of European, Asian, and African ancestry, respectively.

Conclusions: PHS_2 is highly predictive of both age of onset of aggressive prostate cancer and age of prostate-cancer-specific death in a multi-ethnic dataset. Genetic risk stratification via PHS could guide individualized screening and treatment strategies for fatal and potentially fatal prostate cancer for men of European, Asian, and African genetic ancestry.

Introduction

Prostate cancer is a prominent international public health challenge. It is the second most common cancer diagnosed in men worldwide, causing substantial morbidity and mortality[1]. Screening for prostate cancer may reduce morbidity and mortality[2–5], but to avoid the harms of overdiagnosis and overtreatment of indolent disease[6–9], it should be targeted to men at risk of developing aggressive or fatal forms of the disease. Predicting age of onset of prostate cancer is important for clinical decisions regarding if and when to initiate screening for an individual man[10,11]. Survival is another key endpoint in men diagnosed with prostate cancer and is the American Joint Committee on Cancer's recommended endpoint for predictive models[12].

Genetic risk stratification is promising for identifying patients with greater predisposition for developing cancer[13–16], including aggressive prostate cancer[17]. While rare genetic variants predict increased cancer risk, their low prevalence limits utility in screening decisions[18]. Polygenic models use common variants—identified in genome-wide association studies—whose combined effects can predict overall risk of disease development[18,19]. Recently, a polygenic hazard score (PHS) was developed as a weighted sum of 54 single-nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) that predicts a man's genetic predisposition for the development of aggressive prostate cancer[13]. Validation testing was done using data from the ProtecT trial[2] and demonstrated the PHS as an independent predictor of age of onset of aggressive prostate cancer[13]. However, the development and validation datasets were limited to men of European ancestry alone. While genetic risk models may be important clinical tools to predict patient diagnoses and outcomes, using them may actually worsen health disparities[20–24] because most models are constructed using Eurocentric data and may underrepresent genetic variants important in persons of non-European ancestry[20–24]. Indeed, this is of particular concern in prostate cancer, as race/ethnicity is an important risk factor for development of prostate cancer; diagnostic, treatment, and outcomes disparities continue to exist between men of different races/ethnicities[25,26].

The aim of the present work is to evaluate the performance of the PHS in a multi-ethnic dataset—which includes individuals of European, African, and Asian genetic ancestry. A subset of this multi-

ethnic dataset also includes long-term follow-up and survival information, affording an opportunity to evaluate PHS as a genetic predictor of fatal prostate cancer.

Methods

Participants

We obtained data from the OncoArray project[27]; all data had undergone quality control steps described previously[19]. This dataset includes 91,480 men with genotype and phenotype data from 64 studies (**Supplemental Methods**). Individuals whose data were used in the prior development or validation of the original PHS model were excluded[13], leaving 80,491 in the independent dataset used here. **Table 1** describes available data in detail. Individuals not meeting the endpoint for each analysis were censored at age at last follow-up.

Polygenic Hazard Score (PHS)

The original PHS (PHS_1) was developed to predict age of aggressive prostate cancer onset (age of onset defined here as age at clinical onset, i.e. diagnosis). It used a continuous survival analysis of data from men of European ancestry; details were published elsewhere[13]. Aggressive prostate cancer was defined as intermediate-risk disease, or above. PHS is calculated as the vector product of a patient's genotype (X_i) for n selected SNPs and the corresponding parameter estimates (β_i) from a Cox proportional hazards regression:

$$PHS = \sum_i^n Xi\beta i \qquad (1)$$

The 54 SNPs in the model were selected using data from the PRACTICAL consortium and genotyped with a custom array (iCOGS, Illumina, San Diego, CA)[13].

Genetic Ancestry Determination

Self-reported race/ethnicities in this dataset included European, East Asian, African American, Hawaiian, Hispanic American, South Asian, Black African, Black Caribbean, and Other (**Supplemental**

Methods). Genetic ancestry (European, African, or Asian) for all individuals in the dataset was determined previously[27,28] and used for the present analyses because they are objective and may be more informative than self-reported race/ethnicities[29]. Briefly, genetic data from 2,318 ancestry informative markers were mapped into a two-dimensional space representing the first two principal components. The distance from the individual's mapping to the three reference clusters, consisting of Europeans, Africans, and Asians, was then used to estimate the genetic ancestry of the individual (**Table 1**).

Adapting the PHS to OncoArray

Genotyping was performed using a commercially-available, cancer-specific array (OncoArray, Illumina, San Diego, CA)[19]. Twenty-four of the 54 SNPs in PHS_1 were directly genotyped on OncoArray; to adapt the PHS to OncoArray, we identified proxy SNPs for those not directly genotyped and re-calculated the SNP weights in the same dataset used for the original development of PHS_1[13] (**Supplemental Methods**).

The performance of this new, adapted PHS (PHS_2), was compared to that of PHS_1 in the ProtecT dataset originally used to validate PHS_1 (n=6,411). PHS_2 was calculated for all patients in the ProtecT validation set and was tested as the sole predictive variable in a Cox proportional hazards regression model (R version 3.5.1, "survival" package[30]) for age of aggressive prostate cancer diagnosis. Performance was assessed by the metrics reported during the development of PHS_1[13]: *z*-score and hazard ratio ($HR_{98/50}$) for aggressive prostate cancer between men in the highest 2% of genetic risk ($\geq 98^{th}$ percentile) vs. those with average risk (30th-70th percentile). 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for the HRs were determined by bootstrapping 1,000 random samples from the ProtecT dataset, while maintaining the same number of cases/controls.

Prediction of Aggressive Prostate Cancer

We tested the performance of PHS_2 for accurate prediction of age of onset of aggressive prostate cancer in the multi-ethnic dataset. For prediction of aggressive prostate cancer, we included prostate cancer cases that had known T stage, Gleason score, and PSA at diagnosis (n=60,617 cases, **Table 1**).

Aggressive prostate cancer cases were those that met any of the following previously-defined criteria for aggressive disease[6,13]: Gleason score ≥7, PSA ≥10 ng/mL, T3-T4 stage, nodal metastases, or distant metastases. PHS_2 was calculated for all patients in the multi-ethnic dataset and used as the sole predictive variable in Cox proportional hazards regressions for the endpoint of age at aggressive prostate cancer onset. Due to the potential for Cox proportional hazards results to be biased by a higher number of cases in our dataset than in the general population, sample weight corrections were applied to all Cox models using previously described methods[13,31] (**Supplemental Methods**). Significance was set at $\alpha=0.01$, and p-values reported were truncated at $<10^{-16}$, if applicable[13].

These Cox proportional hazards regressions (with PHS_2 as the sole predictive variable and age of onset of aggressive prostate cancer as the outcome) were then repeated for subsets of data, broken down by genetic ancestry: European, Asian, and African. Percentiles of genetic risk were calculated as done previously[13], using data from the 9,728 men in the original (iCOGS) development set who were less than 70 years old and did not have prostate cancer. Hazard ratios for each genetic ancestry group were calculated to make the following comparisons for men in each genetic ancestry group: $HR_{98/50}$, men in the highest 2% of genetic risk vs. those with average risk (30th-70th percentile); $HR_{80/50}$, men in the highest 20% vs. those with average risk, $HR_{20/50}$, men in the lowest 20% vs. those with average risk; and $HR_{80/20}$, men in the highest 20% vs. those in the lowest 20%. 95% confidence intervals (CIs) for the HRs were determined by bootstrapping 1,000 random samples from each genetic ancestry group, while maintaining the same number of cases/controls. These hazard ratios and CIs were calculated for age of diagnosis of aggressive prostate cancer separately for each genetic ancestry group. Given that the overall prevalence of prostate cancer in different populations is unclear, we performed a sensitivity analysis of the population case/control numbers, allowing the population prevalence to vary from 25% to 400% of that reported in Sweden (**Supplemental Methods**).

Prediction of Fatal Prostate Cancer

We then evaluated PHS_2 as a possible predictor of age of prostate cancer death in the multi-ethnic dataset. For prediction of fatal prostate cancer, all cases were included (regardless of completeness of staging information), and the endpoint was age at death due to prostate cancer; death analysis was not stratified by genetic ancestry due to low numbers of prostate cancer deaths in the non-European datasets. Cause of death was determined by the investigators of each contributing study using cancer registries and/or medical records (**Supplemental Methods**). There were 3,983 men in the dataset who died from prostate cancer, 5,806 died from non-prostate cancer causes, and 70,702 were still alive at the end of follow-up. The median age at last follow-up was 70 years (IQR 63-76). As before, Cox proportional hazards models and sensitivity analysis were used to assess prediction.

Controlling for Family History

Family history was also tested as a predictor of aggressive or fatal prostate cancer. This was taken as presence or absence of a first-degree relative with a prostate cancer diagnosis. We also evaluated the number of affected first-degree relatives (0, 1, 2, 3, or $\geq$4) as a predictor. There were 46,135 men with data on prostate cancer family history (binary variable), and 17,619 men with data on number of first-degree relatives with disease.

As above, Cox proportional hazards models were used to assess family history or number of relatives as a predictor of each endpoint, among those in the dataset with available family history. To evaluate the relative importance of each, a combined, multivariable model using both family history and PHS was compared to prediction using family history alone, with a log-likelihood test and α=0.01.

Results

Adaption of PHS for OncoArray

Of the 30 SNPs from PHS_1 not directly genotyped on OncoArray, proxy SNPs were identified for 22 (linkage disequilibrium $r^2 \geq 0.94$). Therefore, PHS_2 included a total of 46 SNPs. Prediction of age of onset of aggressive prostate cancer with PHS_2 in ProtecT was similar to that previously reported for PHS_1 (z=22 for PHS_1 and z=21 for PHS_2, $p<10^{-16}$ for each). $HR_{98/50}$ was 4.7 (95% CI: 3.6-6.1) for PHS_2, compared to 4.6 (95% CI: 3.5-6.0) for PHS_1, demonstrating that PHS_2 had similar performance for prediction of age of onset of aggressive prostate cancer.

Prediction of Aggressive Prostate Cancer

PHS_2 was predictive of age of onset of aggressive prostate cancer in all three genetic ancestry groups. **Table 2** shows highly significant z-scores as well as corresponding hazard ratios. Comparing the 80th and 20th percentiles of genetic risk, men with high PHS had a hazard ratio of 5.9 for aggressive prostate cancer; within each genetic ancestry group, men with high PHS had hazard ratios of 5.6, 5.2, and 2.4 for men of European, Asian, and African ancestry, respectively. Sensitivity analyses revealed that large changes in assumed population prevalence had minimal effect on the HRs (up to 1-2% change; **Supplemental Results**).

Family history was also predictive of aggressive prostate cancer in the multi-ethnic dataset (z=32, $p<10^{-16}$). Among those with known family history, the combination of family history and PHS performed better than family history alone (log-likelihood $p<10^{-16}$). This pattern held true when analyses were repeated on each genetic ancestry and when using the number of affected first-degree relatives. Further details of family history analysis for aggressive prostate cancer onset are reported in the **Supplemental Results**.

Prediction of Fatal Prostate Cancer

PHS_2 was predictive of age of death due to prostate cancer for all men in the multi-ethnic dataset (z=16, $p<10^{-16}$). **Table 3** shows highly significant z-scores and corresponding HRs for fatal prostate cancer. Comparing the 80th and 20th percentiles of genetic risk, men with high PHS had a hazard ratio of

5.7 times for prostate cancer death. Sensitivity analyses, shown in the **Supplement**, again demonstrated that large changes in assumed population prevalence had minimal effect (2-3%) on the calculated HRs.

Family history was also predictive of fatal prostate cancer in the multi-ethnic dataset (z=16, $p<10^{-16}$). Among those with known family history, the combination of family history and PHS performed better than family history alone (log-likelihood $p<10^{-16}$). This pattern held true when analyses were repeated on each genetic ancestry and when using the number of affected first-degree relatives. Further details of family history analysis for fatal prostate cancer are reported in the **Supplemental Results**.

Discussion

The results presented here confirm the utility of a PHS for prediction of age of onset of aggressive prostate cancer in Europeans and show that this prediction generalizes to a multi-ethnic dataset, including men of European, Asian, and African genetic ancestry. Moreover, we demonstrate that PHS is also highly predictive of death from prostate cancer. Comparing the highest and lowest quintiles of genetic risk, men with high PHS had a hazard ratio of 5.9 for aggressive disease and a hazard ratio of 5.7 prostate cancer death.

We found that PHS predicts aggressive prostate cancer in men of European, Asian, and African genetic ancestry (and an even wider range of self-reported race/ethnicities; **Supplemental Methods**). Current guidelines for prostate cancer screening suggest possible initiation at earlier ages for men of African ancestry, given higher incidence rates and worse mortality when compared to men of European ancestry[26]. Using the PHS to risk-stratify men may help patients and their physicians decide when to initiate prostate cancer screening: perhaps a man with African genetic ancestry in the lowest percentiles of genetic risk by PHS could safely delay or forgo screening to decrease the possible harms associated with overdetection and overtreatment[9], while a man in the highest risk percentiles may consider screening at an earlier age. The same reasoning applies to men of all genetic ancestries.

In the current dataset PHS performance is better in those with European and Asian genetic ancestry than in those with African ancestry. For example, comparing the highest and lowest quintiles of

genetic risk, men of European and Asian genetic ancestry with high PHS had comparable hazard ratios for aggressive prostate cancer (5.6 and 5.2 times, respectively), while the hazard ratio for men of African genetic ancestry was 2.4. This suggests the PHS, in its current form, can differentiate men of higher and lower risk in each ancestral group, but the range of predicted risk levels may be narrower in those of African ancestry. Possible reasons for relatively diminished performance include the increased genetic diversity with less linkage disequilibrium in those of African genetic ancestry[32–34]. Known health disparities may also play a role[25], as the availability of—and timing of—PSA results may depend on healthcare access. Alarmingly, there has historically been poor representation of African populations in clinical/genomic research data [20,21]. This pattern is reflected in the present study, where most of men of African genetic ancestry were missing clinical information from diagnosis used to determine disease aggressiveness. That such clinical information is less available for men of African ancestry in our dataset also leaves open the possibility of systematic differences in the diagnostic workup—and therefore age of diagnosis—in the different ancestry populations. Notwithstanding these caveats, the present PHS is already highly predictive in men of African ancestry for age of onset of aggressive prostate cancer, possibly paving the way for more personalized screening decisions for men of African descent.

The first validation study of PHS used data from ProtecT, a large trial of prostate cancer screening[2,13] The screening design of that trial yielded biopsy results from both controls and cases with PSA $\geq$ 3 ng/mL, making it possible to demonstrate improved accuracy and efficiency of prostate cancer screening with PSA testing. Limitations of the ProtecT analysis, though, include the exclusion of advanced cancer, as well as a lack, as yet, of longer observation to reveal which cancers would be fatal[2]. The present study includes long-term observation, with both early and advanced disease[19]. This allowed for evaluation of PHS as a predictor of both aggressive (i.e., potentially fatal) and fatal prostate cancer, and we found PHS to be highly predictive of both outcomes.

Age is critical in clinical decisions of whether men should be offered prostate cancer screening[35,36] and in how to treat men diagnosed with the disease[35,36]. Age may also inform the prognosis for men with prostate cancer[36,37]. Predicting age of cancer onset or cancer mortality is therefore of clinical

interest. We have shown that PHS is highly predictive of age at both aggressive prostate cancer onset and prostate-cancer-specific death. Using a survival analysis, instead of a binary outcome (e.g., with logistic regression) allowed for leveraging all of the available data, with censoring for unknown possible future outcomes in men still alive at time of last observation. Furthermore, prostate cancer death is a hard endpoint with less uncertainty than disease onset (which may vary with screening practices and delayed medical attention). Therefore, this genetic hazard score may help identify men with high (or low) genetic predisposition to develop lethal prostate cancer and could assist physicians deciding when to initiate screening.

Current guidelines suggest taking into account a man's individual cancer risk factors, as well as overall life expectancy and medical comorbidities when making the decision of whether to screen[6]. The most prominent among the risk factors used in clinic are family history and race/ethnicity[6,38,39]. The combination of PHS and family history improved prediction over either alone in the multi-ethnic dataset. This finding is consistent with the prior report that PHS adds considerable predictive power over family history, alone[13]. Thus, PHS may help clinicians considering screening to identify men at highest risks of developing aggressive disease. The clinical relevance of the PHS prediction in prostate cancer is similar or better than prediction tools routinely used in other fields of medicine, such as breast cancer, diabetes, and cardiovascular disease[40–44].

Future development and optimization holds promise for improving upon the encouraging prediction already achieved here. The PHS here may not include all SNPs predictive of onset of aggressive prostate cancer; in fact, more SNPs associated with prostate cancer have been reported since the development of the original PHS[19]. Also, there have been reports of SNPs associated with prostate cancer specifically within non-European populations (including Asian, African, and Latinos)[45–47]. We are currently studying how incorporation of additional SNPs, including ethnicity-specific SNPs, might improve predictive performance—overall, or in men of specific genetic ancestry, particularly African.

Limitations to our work, beyond those discussed above, include that our dataset is heterogenous and comes from multiple, diverse studies with different study designs. This allowed for a large, multi-

ethnic dataset that includes clinical and survival data, but comes with uncertainties that were not an issue in the ProtecT dataset used for original validation. However, the heterogeneity would likely rather reduce the performance of PHS, not systematically inflate the results. Secondly, while the genetic ancestry classifications used here may be more accurate than self-reported race/ethnicity alone[29], they do not lend themselves to assessing possible nuances of admixed genetic ancestry within individuals; future development will consider local ancestry. As noted above, availability of clinical information was not uniform across contributing studies, and there was less clinical information available for men of African genetic ancestry. Finally, we do not have information on how prostate cancer was clinically managed after diagnosis for individual men in this study. Several disease-modifying treatments exist and may have influenced post-diagnosis survival to varying degrees. Despite this possible source of variability in survival among men with fatal prostate cancer, PHS was still predictive of age at death, an objective and meaningful endpoint.

Conclusion

In a multi-ethnic dataset, PHS was highly predictive both of aggressive prostate cancer onset and of death from prostate cancer. Polygenic scores might be useful to inform risk-stratified screening strategies seeking to reduce disparities in prostate cancer mortality in European, Asian and African men.

Table 1. Participant characteristics, n=80,491.

	All	**European**	**Asian**	**African**
Controls	30575	26377	1185	3013
Prostate cancer cases	49916	45479	1197	3240
Aggressive prostate cancer cases	26419	24279	716	1424
Fatal prostate cancer cases	3983	3908	57	18
Known first-degree family history of prostate cancer (binary)	46135	39549	1029	5557
Known first-degree family history of prostate cancer (number of relatives)	17619	17070	185	364
Median age at last follow up (IQR [b])	70 (63, 76)	70 (64, 77)	70 (63, 76)	62 (56, 68)
Median age at diagnosis (IQR)	65 (60, 71)	66 (60, 71)	68 (62, 74)	63 (56, 68)
Median PHS [c] (IQR)	0.49 (0.29, 0.69)	0.50 (0.30, 0.70)	0.41 (0.21, 0.60)	0.41 (0.24, 0.57)

[a] Aggressive prostate cancer defined as Gleason score ≥7, PSA ≥ 10 ng/mL, T3-T4 stage, nodal metastases, or distant metastases.
[c] IQR: interquartile range
[b] PHS: polygenic hazard score

Table 2: PHS prediction of aggressive prostate cancer onset. Hazard ratios (HRs) are shown comparing men in the highest 2% of genetic risk (≥98th percentile of PHS), highest 20% of genetic risk (≥80th percentile), average risk (30th-70th percentile), and lowest 20% of genetic risk (≤20th percentile) across genetic ancestry.

		Hazard ratios [95% CI] comparing percentiles of PHS_2			
Genetic ancestry	***z* (*p*-value)**	**$HR_{20/50}$: ≤20th vs 30-70th**	**$HR_{80/50}$: ≥80th vs 30-70th**	**$HR_{98/50}$: ≥98th vs 30-70th**	**$HR_{80/20}$: ≥80th vs ≤20th**
All (n=58,600)	48 ($p<10^{-16}$)	0.4 [0.4, 0.4]	2.5 [2.4, 2.6]	4.6 [4.3, 4.9]	5.9 [5.5, 6.3]
European (n=53,608)	46 ($p<10^{-16}$)	0.5 [0.4, 0.5]	2.5 [2.4, 2.5]	4.4 [4.1, 4.7]	5.6 [5.2, 6.0]
Asian (n=1,806)	44 ($p<10^{-16}$)	0.5 [0.4, 0.5]	2.3 [2.2, 2.4]	4.1 [3.9, 4.4]	5.2 [4.8, 5.6]
African (n=3,186)	24 ($p<10^{-16}$)	0.6 [0.6, 0.7]	1.6 [1.5, 1.6]	2.2 [2.0, 2.3]	2.4 [2.3, 2.6]

Table 3: PHS prediction of death from prostate cancer. Hazard ratios (HRs) are shown comparing men in the highest 2% of genetic risk (≥98th percentile of PHS), highest 20% of genetic risk (≥80th percentile), average risk (30th-70th percentile), and lowest 20% of genetic risk (≤20th percentile).

		Hazard ratios [95% CI] comparing percentiles of PHS_2			
Genetic ancestry	***z* (*p*-value)**	**$HR_{20/50}$: ≤20th vs 30-70th**	**$HR_{80/50}$: ≥80th vs 30-70th**	**$HR_{98/50}$: ≥98th vs 30-70th**	**$HR_{80/20}$: ≥80th vs ≤20th**
All (n=78,221)	16 ($p<10^{-16}$)	0.4 [0.4, 0.5]	2.5 [2.2, 2.8]	4.5 [3.7, 5.4]	5.7 [4.6, 7.0]

References

1. Torre LA, Bray F, Siegel RL, Ferlay J, Lortet-Tieulent J, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics, 2012. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2015;65(2):87-108. doi:10.3322/caac.21262
2. Hamdy FC, Donovan JL, Lane JA, et al. 10-Year Outcomes after Monitoring, Surgery, or Radiotherapy for Localized Prostate Cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 2016;375(15):1415-1424. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1606220
3. Bill-Axelson A, Holmberg L, Garmo H, et al. Radical Prostatectomy or Watchful Waiting in Prostate Cancer — 29-Year Follow-up. *N Engl J Med*. 2018;379(24):2319-2329. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1807801
4. Bolla M, de Reijke TM, Van Tienhoven G, et al. Duration of Androgen Suppression in the Treatment of Prostate Cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 2009;360(24):2516-2527. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa0810095
5. Jones CU, Hunt D, McGowan DG, et al. Radiotherapy and Short-Term Androgen Deprivation for Localized Prostate Cancer. *N Engl J Med*. 2011;365(2):107-118. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa1012348
6. NCCN Clinical Practice Guidelines in Oncology: Prostate Cancer version 2.2018.
7. Grossman DC, Curry SJ, Owens DK, et al. Screening for prostate cancer: US Preventive Services Task Force recommendation statement. *JAMA*. 2018;319(18):1901-1913. doi:10.1001/jama.2018.3710
8. Wolf AMD, Wender RC, Etzioni RB, et al. American Cancer Society Guideline for the Early Detection of Prostate Cancer: Update 2010. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2010;60(2):70-98. doi:10.3322/caac.20066
9. Ilic D, Neuberger MM, Djulbegovic M, Dahm P. Screening for prostate cancer. *Cochrane Database Syst Rev*. 2013;(1):CD004720. doi:10.1002/14651858.CD004720.pub3
10. Stangelberger A, Waldert M, Djavan B. Prostate cancer in elderly men. *Rev Urol*. 2008;10(2):111-119. http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/18660852. Accessed July 22, 2019.
11. Leitzmann MF, Rohrmann S. Risk factors for the onset of prostatic cancer: Age, location, and

behavioral correlates. *Clin Epidemiol*. 2012. doi:10.2147/CLEP.S16747

12. Kattan MW, Hess KR, Amin MB, et al. American Joint Committee on Cancer acceptance criteria for inclusion of risk models for individualized prognosis in the practice of precision medicine. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2016. doi:10.3322/caac.21339
13. Seibert TM, Fan CC, Wang Y, et al. Polygenic hazard score to guide screening for aggressive prostate cancer: Development and validation in large scale cohorts. *BMJ*. 2018;360:1-7. doi:10.1136/bmj.j5757
14. Witte JS. Personalized prostate cancer screening: Improving PSA tests with genomic information. *Sci Transl Med*. 2010;2(62):62ps55. doi:10.1126/scitranslmed.3001861
15. Chen H, Liu X, Brendler CB, et al. Adding genetic risk score to family history identifies twice as many high-risk men for prostate cancer: Results from the prostate cancer prevention trial. *Prostate*. 2016;76(12):1120-1129. doi:10.1002/pros.23200
16. Michailidou K, Hall P, Gonzalez-Neira A, et al. Large-scale genotyping identifies 41 new loci associated with breast cancer risk. *Nat Genet*. 2013;45(4):353-361. doi:10.1038/ng.2563
17. Fantus RJ, Helfand BT. Germline genetics of prostate cancer: Time to incorporate genetics into early detection tools. *Clin Chem*. 2019;65(1):74-79. doi:10.1373/clinchem.2018.286658
18. Benafif S, Kote-Jarai Z, Eeles RA. A review of prostate cancer Genome-Wide Association Studies (GWAS). *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*. 2018. doi:10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-16-1046
19. Schumacher FR, Al Olama AA, Berndt SI, et al. Association analyses of more than 140,000 men identify 63 new prostate cancer susceptibility loci. *Nat Genet*. 2018;50(7):928-936. doi:10.1038/s41588-018-0142-8
20. Martin AR, Kanai M, Kamatani Y, Okada Y, Neale BM, Daly MJ. Clinical use of current polygenic risk scores may exacerbate health disparities. *Nat Genet*. 2019;51(4):584-591. doi:10.1038/s41588-019-0379-x
21. Duncan L, Shen H, Gelaye B, et al. Analysis of polygenic risk score usage and performance in diverse human populations. *Nat Commun*. 2019;10(1). doi:10.1038/s41467-019-11112-0

22. Petrovski S, Goldstein DB. Unequal representation of genetic variation across ancestry groups creates healthcare inequality in the application of precision medicine. *Genome Biol*. 2016;17(1). doi:10.1186/s13059-016-1016-y

23. Grinde KE, Qi Q, Thornton TA, et al. Generalizing polygenic risk scores from Europeans to Hispanics/Latinos. *Genet Epidemiol*. 2019;43(1):50-62. doi:10.1002/gepi.22166

24. Popejoy AB, Fullerton SM. Genomics is failing on diversity. *Nature*. 2016;538(7624):161-164. doi:10.1038/538161a

25. DeSantis CE, Siegel RL, Sauer AG, et al. Cancer statistics for African Americans, 2016: Progress and opportunities in reducing racial disparities. *CA Cancer J Clin*. 2016;66(4):290-308. doi:10.3322/caac.21340

26. Tsodikov A, Gulati R, Carvalho TM de, et al. Is prostate cancer different in black men? Answers from three natural history models. *Cancer*. 2017;123(12):2312. doi:10.1002/CNCR.30687

27. Amos CI, Dennis J, Wang Z, et al. The OncoArray consortium: A network for understanding the genetic architecture of common cancers. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*. 2017;26(1):126-135. doi:10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-16-0106

28. Li Y, Byun J, Cai G, et al. FastPop: A rapid principal component derived method to infer intercontinental ancestry using genetic data. *BMC Bioinformatics*. 2016;17(1). doi:10.1186/s12859-016-0965-1

29. Marini S, Lena UK, Crawford KM, et al. Comparison of genetic and self-identified ancestry in modeling intracerebral hemorrhage risk. *Front Neurol*. 2018;9(514). doi:10.3389/fneur.2018.00514

30. R Core Team. R: A language and environment for statistical computing. In: *Vienna, Austria: R Foundation for Statistical Computing*. ; 2015.

31. Therneau TM, Li H. Computing the Cox Model for Case Cohort Designs. *Lifetime Data Anal*. 1999;5(2):99-112. doi:10.1023/A:1009691327335

32. Rotimi CN, Bentley AR, Doumatey AP, Chen G, Shriner D, Adeyemo A. The genomic landscape

of African populations in health and disease. *Hum Mol Genet*. 2017;26(R2):R225-R236. doi:10.1093/hmg/ddx253

33. Campbell MC, Tishkoff SA. African Genetic Diversity: Implications for Human Demographic History, Modern Human Origins, and Complex Disease Mapping. *Annu Rev Genomics Hum Genet*. 2008;9(1):403-433. doi:10.1146/annurev.genom.9.081307.164258

34. Gomez F, Hirbo J, Tishkoff SA. Genetic variation and adaptation in Africa: Implications for human evolution and disease. *Cold Spring Harb Perspect Biol*. 2014;6(7). doi:10.1101/cshperspect.a008524

35. *NCCN Guidelines Version 1.2019 Older Adult Oncology*.; 2019.

36. Bechis SK, Carroll PR, Cooperberg MR. Impact of age at diagnosis on prostate cancer treatment and survival. *J Clin Oncol*. 2011. doi:10.1200/JCO.2010.30.2075

37. Pettersson A, Robinson D, Garmo H, Holmberg L, Stattin P. Age at diagnosis and prostate cancer treatment and prognosis: A population-based cohort study. *Ann Oncol*. 2018. doi:10.1093/annonc/mdx742

38. Giri VN, Beebe-Dimmer JL. Familial prostate cancer. *Semin Oncol*. 2016;43(5):560-565. doi:10.1053/j.seminoncol.2016.08.001

39. Ankerst DP, Hoefler J, Bock S, et al. Prostate cancer prevention trial risk calculator 2.0 for the prediction of low- vs high-grade prostate cancer. *Urology*. 2014;83(6):1362-1367. doi:10.1016/j.urology.2014.02.035

40. Brentnall AR, Cuzick J, Buist DSM, Bowles EJA. Long-Term accuracy of breast cancer risk assessment combining classic risk factors and breast density. *JAMA Oncol*. 2018;4(9):e180174. doi:10.1001/jamaoncol.2018.0174

41. Yeh HC, Duncan BB, Schmidt MI, Wang NY, Brancati FL. Smoking, smoking cessation, and risk for type 2 diabetes mellitus: A cohort study. *Ann Intern Med*. 2010;152(1):10-17. doi:10.7326/0003-4819-152-1-201001050-00005

42. Wang TJ, Larson MG, Levy D, et al. Plasma Natriuretic Peptide Levels and the Risk of

Cardiovascular Events and Death. *N Engl J Med*. 2004;350(7):655-663. doi:10.1056/NEJMoa031994

43. Yang X, Leslie G, Gentry-Maharaj A, et al. Evaluation of polygenic risk scores for ovarian cancer risk prediction in a prospective cohort study. *J Med Genet*. 2018;55(8):546-554. doi:10.1136/jmedgenet-2018-105313

44. Torkamani A, Wineinger NE, Topol EJ. The personal and clinical utility of polygenic risk scores. *Nat Rev Genet*. 2018;19(9):581-590. doi:10.1038/s41576-018-0018-x

45. Haiman CA, Chen GK, Blot WJ, et al. Characterizing genetic risk at known prostate cancer susceptibility loci in African Americans. *PLoS Genet*. 2011;7(5). doi:10.1371/journal.pgen.1001387

46. Han Y, Signorello LB, Strom SS, et al. Generalizability of established prostate cancer risk variants in men of African ancestry. *Int J Cancer*. 2015;136(5):1210-1217. doi:10.1002/ijc.29066

47. Cheng I, Chen GK, Nakagawa H, et al. Evaluating genetic risk for prostate cancer among Japanese and Latinos. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev*. 2012;21(11):2048-2058. doi:10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-12-0598