Distal gene regulation mediated by non-coding RNAs contributes to germline risk for breast and prostate cancer

Nolan Cole¹, Paige Lee², Tommer Schwarz^{3,4}, Pan Zhang⁵, Matthew L. Freedman^{6,7}, Alexander Gusev⁶, Sara Lindström^{10,11}, Michael J. Gandal^{5,12,13}, Bogdan Pasaniuc^{4,12,13}, Arjun Bhattacharya^{4,14*}

1. Department of Statistics, Brigham Young University, Provo, UT, United States
2. Department of Statistics, University of California, Los Angeles, CA, United States
3. Bioinformatics Interdepartmental Program, University of California, Los Angeles, CA, United States
4. Department of Pathology and Laboratory Medicine, David Geffen School of Medicine, University of California, Los Angeles, CA, United States
5. Department of Psychiatry, Semel Institute, David Geffen School of Medicine, University of California, Los Angeles, CA, USA
6. Department of Medical Oncology, The Center for Functional Cancer Epigenetics, Dana Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, MA, USA
7. The Center for Cancer Genome Discovery, Dana Farber Cancer Institute, Boston, MA, USA
8. Program in Neurobehavioral Genetics, Semel Institute, David Geffen School of Medicine, University of California, Los Angeles, CA, USA
9. Department of Human Genetics, David Geffen School of Medicine, University of California, Los Angeles, CA, USA
10. Department of Epidemiology, School of Public Health, University of Washington, Seattle, WA, USA
11. Public Health Sciences Division, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, WA, USA
12. Department of Human Genetics, David Geffen School of Medicine, University of California, Los Angeles, CA, USA
13. Department of Computational Medicine, David Geffen School of Medicine, University of California, Los Angeles, CA, USA
14. Institute of Quantitative and Computational Biosciences, David Geffen School of Medicine, University of California, Los Angeles, CA, USA

*Corresponding author: Arjun Bhattacharya (abtbhatt@ucla.edu)

ABSTRACT

Genome-wide association studies (GWAS) have identified numerous genetic loci associated with breast and prostate cancer risk, suggesting that germline genetic dysregulation influences tumorigenesis. However, the biological function underlying many genetic associations is not well-understood. Previous efforts to annotate loci focused on protein-coding genes (pcGenes) largely ignore non-coding RNAs (ncRNAs) which account for most transcriptional output in human cells and can regulate transcription of both pcGenes and other ncRNAs. Though the biological roles of most ncRNAs are not well-defined, many ncRNAs are involved in cancer development. Here, we explore one regulatory hypothesis: ncRNAs as *trans*-acting mediators of gene expression regulation in non-cancerous and tumor breast and prostate tissue. Using germline genetics as a causal anchor, we categorize distal (>1 Megabase) expression quantitative trait loci (eQTLs) of pcGenes significantly mediated by local-eQTLs of ncRNAs (within 1 Megabase). We find over 300 mediating ncRNAs and show the linked pcGenes are enriched for immunoregulatory and cellular organization pathways. By integrating eQTL and cancer GWAS results through colocalization and genetically-regulated expression analyses, we detect overlapping signals in nine known breast cancer loci and one known prostate cancer locus, and multiple novel genetic associations. Our results suggest a strong transcriptional impact of ncRNAs in breast and prostate tissue with implications for cancer etiology. More broadly, our framework can be systematically applied to functional genomic features to characterize genetic variants distally regulating transcription through *trans*-mechanisms.

SIGNIFICANCE

This study identifies non-coding RNAs that potentially regulate gene expression in *trans*-pathways and overlap with genetic signals for breast and prostate cancer susceptibility, with implications for interpretation of cancer genome-wide association studies.

INTRODUCTION

Genome-wide association studies (GWAS) of cancer risk have revealed risk-associated alleles at hundreds of genetic loci, with breast and prostate cancer GWAS yielding the largest number of associations (1,2). Through integration with transcriptomic and functional genomics datasets, the proposed target genes for many of these risk loci have been found in protein-coding regions of the genome (1–4). However, many risk variants fall in non-coding regions of the genome and, for these variants, identifying the likely biological mechanism is challenging. One proposed mechanism for GWAS-identified risk variants is *trans*-acting pathways: a GWAS variant affects a regulatory feature, like a transcription factor, in proximity, which then affects genes located far away from the GWAS variant. Particularly, one study identified GWAS risk variants for breast cancer that confer *trans*-effects through transcription factors, like *ESR1*, *MYC*, and *KLF4* (5). Another potential mechanism by which GWAS variants in non-coding regions affect risk is mediation of *trans*-acting effects of genetic variants through non-coding RNAs (ncRNAs).

Although ncRNAs do not code for proteins, they account for nearly 60% of transcriptional output in human cells and interact with a complex network of genes, transcripts, and proteins with widespread effects on cell biology (6,7). Some ncRNAs, like microRNAs (miRNAs), target and degrade mRNA transcripts of specific genes and link to regulatory networks that include multiple ncRNAs and protein-coding genes (pcGenes). These complex interactions between ncRNAs and pcGenes support the hypothesis that ncRNAs have key roles in cellular pathways (6,8,9). Specific ncRNAs have been shown to leave their transcription site and regulate gene expression at genomic regions far from their transcription start site (8,9). However, regulatory impacts of ncRNAs on transcription of pcGenes are generally uncategorized, especially in a systematic fashion (8).

ncRNAs have shown associations with the onset and progression of different cancers, are enriched in multiple tumor types, and are even therapeutic targets, as they act as regulators of genes in important tumorigenic or progressive networks (10). For example, the long ncRNA *XIST* exerts oncogenic and metastatic effects in multiple cancer types (11). Profiling and deep sequencing of ncRNAs have shown that perturbing ncRNA biogenesis affects amplification, deletion, and normal epigenetic and transcriptional regulation (10,12–14); accordingly, ncRNAs can act as oncogenes or antagonize tumor suppressors.

However, as most ncRNA mechanisms in cancer tumorigenesis or progression have been categorized on a case-by-case basis (13,14), mechanistic impacts of ncRNAs have not been explored systematically. Bioinformatics analyses that leverage high-throughput genomics have investigated the role of ncRNAs through computational target prediction or differential expression analyses. Although these computational methods have elucidated potential roles of ncRNAs in cancer, they have limitations, including computational feasibility and functional translation of sequence similarity methods (15) and reverse causality for differential expression analyses (i.e., differential expression more likely reflects consequences of disease) (16).

One systematic approach to identifying potential *trans*-mechanisms of regulation is to use genetic variants as causal anchors. A prevailing thought is that distal expression quantitative trait loci (eQTLs) of genes, where the genetic variant is far away from the gene (more than 1 Megabase, or Mb), are often themselves local-, or *cis*-acting, QTLs of a regulatory feature (17–22). We emphasize that the modifiers “local” and “distal” refer merely to distances in the genome (i.e., within or outside 1 Mb, respectively), whereas *cis*- and *trans*-acting refer to the biological mechanism (i.e., direct or indirect interaction, respectively). Molecular features, like ncRNAs, that have potential *trans*-acting regulatory effects can be identified through mediation analyses, either at variant- or gene-level (18,21,23,24). Not only can these analyses point to

distal relationships between ncRNAs and pcGenes, but they can point to genetic variants associated with disease etiology with potential distal effects in the transcriptome.

Here, we systematically map distal-eQTLs of pcGenes that are potentially mediated by local-eQTLs of ncRNAs in non-cancerous and tumor prostate and breast tissue, using data from the Genotype Tissue-Expression (GTEx) Project (25) and The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) (26). We then employ colocalization (27) and genetically-regulated expression analysis (28) to identify overlaps in eQTLs and GWAS signals for both overall and molecular subtype-specific breast (2) and overall prostate (1) cancer risk. In total, our work shows the widespread transcriptomic impact of genetically-mediated portion of ncRNAs and that this impact has key associations with cancer susceptibility. This approach provides a rigorous framework to not only categorize functional hypotheses of distal regulatory effects of ncRNAs but also other regulatory molecular features.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

A graphical representation of our methods is provided in **Supplemental Figure S1**.

Data acquisition and processing

We used pre-processed genotype, transcriptomic, and covariate data for non-cancerous mammary and prostate tissue from the Genotype-Tissue Expression Project (GTEx) v8 (25) and breast and prostate tumor tissue from The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) (26). We included only individuals of European ancestry due to the small sample sizes available for other demographics ($N = 337$ for GTEx breast, $N = 186$ for GTEx prostate, $N = 437$ for TCGA breast, $N = 349$ for TCGA prostate). For both GTEx and TCGA, we only consider SNPs and genes on autosomes, restricted to SNPs with minor allele frequency greater than or equal to 1%, and excluded SNPs that deviated from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium at $P < 10^{-6}$.

We used the BioConductor package *biomaRt* for ENSEMBL gene biotype annotations (29). Using these annotations, we defined pcGenes as those labeled “protein-coding” and non-coding RNAs (ncRNAs) as those labeled otherwise; we exclude transcripts labelled as “pseudogenes”. These annotations included 16,582 pcGenes and 5,650 ncRNAs in GTEx breast, 16,827 pcGenes and 5,862 ncRNAs in GTEx prostate, 21,648 pcGenes and 1,261 ncRNAs in TCGA breast, and 15,773 pcGenes and 548 ncRNAs in TCGA prostate. We considered all provided GTEx covariates: 5 genotype-based principal components (PCs), up to 60 probabilistically-estimated expression residuals (PEER) factors, age, sex, and sequencing platform and protocol (25). For TCGA, we calculated genotype PCs using PLINK v1.93 (30), calculated up to 50 hidden components of expression (HCP) using *Rhcpp* (31,32), and included the following covariates: age, estrogen receptor subtype, menopausal status, and disease pathological stage. For prostate tumors, we include the following covariates: age, sequencing platform, and protocol.

We integrated eQTL results with GWAS summary statistics for overall and subtype-specific breast and overall prostate cancer risk. We obtained European-ancestry specific overall and subtype-specific GWAS summary statistics for breast cancer risk from the BCAC Consortium (2). We studied 5 intrinsic breast cancer molecular subtypes, defined by combinations of estrogen (ER)-, progesterone (PR)-, and human epidermal growth factor receptor (HER2) and tumor grade (2): Luminal A-like (ER + and/or PR + , HER2-, grade 1 or 2); (2) luminal B-like/HER2-negative (ER + and/or PR + , HER2-, grade 3); (3) luminal B-like/HER2-positive (ER + and/or PR + , HER2 +); (4) HER2-positive/non-luminal (ER- and PR-, HER2+), and (5) TNBC (ER-, PR-, HER2-). We obtained European-ancestry specific GWAS summary statistics for prostate cancer risk from the PRACTICAL Consortium (1).

eQTL mapping

We used a multiple linear regression model in *MatrixEQTL* to detect local- and distal-eQTLs (33). Here, we define a local-eQTL as a variant within 1 Mb of the gene body and a distal-eQTL as a variant outside the 1 Mb window. eQTLs outside this 1 Mb window are unlikely to have direct effects on the promoters or enhancers of the gene and are more likely to have *trans*-acting mechanisms (17,18).

To determine a set of covariates that maximizes the number of detected distal-eQTLs for pcGenes, we iterated on eQTL mapping using SNPs on Chromosome 22. For breast tumor tissue, we found that the optimized covariate set for local-eQTL mapping included all of the clinical covariates (age, estrogen receptor subtype, menopause status, and disease pathological stage), the first 3 PCs, and the first 8 HCPs. For prostate tumor tissue, we included age, sequencing platform, protocol as covariates and used 5 genotype PCs and 10 HCPs as the optimized set of covariates (31). For data from GTEx, we used the full set of provided covariates for non-cancerous breast and prostate tissue local- and distal-eQTL mapping. We then run genome-wide eQTL mapping with these optimized sets of covariates.

Mediation analysis for distal-eQTL mapping

We first identify a testing triplet, consisting of (1) a SNP s , (2) a distal pcGene G associated with SNP s with nominal $P < 10^{-6}$, and (3) a set of local ncRNAs $m_1, \dots, m_M$, all associated with SNP s with nominal $P < 10^{-6}$. As in previous distal-eQTL studies, we use a liberal P-value threshold to increase the number of testing triplets subjected to rigorous permutation-based mediation analysis (18,21,23). Next, we fit the following two sets of linear regressions for mediation analysis (21,23):

$$Y_G = X_s \beta_s + M \beta_M + X_C \beta_C + \epsilon_G, \quad \epsilon_G \sim N(0, \sigma^2 I_n)$$

where Y_G is a vector of expression for gene G , X_s is a vector of dosages for SNP s , β_s is the effect size of SNP s on gene G , M is the expression matrix of m ncRNAs, β_M is the effects of the M ncRNAs on Y_G , X_C is a matrix of covariates, and ϵ_G is a random error term. The j th ncRNA is modeled as

$$M_j = X_s \alpha_{M_j} + X_C \alpha_{C,j} + \epsilon_{M_j}, 1 \leq j \leq m, \quad \epsilon_{M_j} \sim N(0, \sigma_{M_j}^2 I_n)$$

where M_j is the vector of expression for the j th ncRNA, α_{M_j} is a vector of effects of SNP s on mediator M_j , X_C is a matrix of covariates, $\alpha_{C,j}$ is a vector of covariate effects on the mediator, and ϵ_{M_j} represents a random error term.

We define the total mediation effect (TME) as $TME = \alpha_M \cdot \beta_M$ and the mediation proportion (MP) as $MP = \min(1, \frac{\alpha_M \cdot \beta_M}{\beta_s + \alpha_M \cdot \beta_M})$. We test $H_0: TME = 0$ vs. $H_1: TME \neq 0$ via permutation testing with 10,000 draws.

Gene-based association testing (GBAT)

We applied GBAT (24) with modifications to identify ncRNAs with genetically-regulated expression (GReX) associated with distal pcGenes. First, we removed multi-mapped reads using previously provided annotations (34). Then, we estimated the heritability of ncRNA expression using GCTA v1.93 (35), excluding genes with limited evidence of heritability ($P > 0.05$). Next, using leave-one-out cross-validation, we constructed the ncRNA GReX using SNPs within 1 Mb using elastic net, LASSO (36) and SuSiE (37), excluding ncRNAs with cross-validation $R^2 < 0.01$. We then employed MatrixEQTL to estimate the association between the ncRNA GReX and distal pcGene expression, adjusting for the optimized set of covariates from eQTL mapping (33). Lastly, to identify a set of SNPs that best explains distal ncRNA-pcGene association, we used SuSiE fine-mapping with default parameters to define a 90% credible set (37).

Colocalization with cancer risk

To identify any potentially overlapping signals between local-eQTLs of ncRNAs, ncRNA-mediated distal-eQTLs of pcGenes, and cancer risk, we employed the Bayesian colocalization method, *coloc* (27). *coloc* estimates the posterior probability that the same SNP explains both the eQTL and the GWAS signal at a given locus. We used standard parameters with default priors ($p_1 = 10^{-4}$, $p_2 = 10^{-4}$, and $p_{12} = 10^{-6}$) to estimate the colocalization posterior probability. We considered an eQTL signal to colocalize with a GWAS signal if the posterior probability of colocalization through one SNP (PP.H4 in Giambartolomei et al) was greater than 0.75 (27).

Genetically-regulated expression analysis of ncRNAs

We identified any cancer associations for the genetically-regulated expression (GReX) of any ncRNAs that showed significant mediation of multiple distal-eQTLs of distant pcGenes. First, using elastic net regression, linear mixed modeling, and SuSiE, we built predictive models of ncRNAs in both GTEx and TCGA data across breast and prostate tissue and select only models with 5-fold cross-validation McNemar's adjusted $R^2 > 0.01$ (28,36–38). We then employed the weighted burden test and permutation test from the FUSION TWAS framework to detect a trait association with the GReX of an ncRNA (28). We define transcriptome-wide significance as $P < 2.5 \times 10^{-6}$ and permutation test $P < 0.05$.

Data Availability

GTEx v8 data were obtained through dbGAP Study Accession phs000424.v8.p2. TCGA genotype were obtained through dbGAP Study Accession phs000178.v11.p8 and expression and covariate data was obtained from the Broad GDAC Firehose repository (<https://gdac.broadinstitute.org>). Prostate cancer GWAS summary statistics were obtained from the Prostate Cancer Association Group to Investigate Cancer Associated Alterations in the

Genome (PRACTICAL) Consortium: http://practical.icr.ac.uk/blog/wp-content/uploads/uploadedfiles/oncoarray/MetaSummaryData/meta_v3_onco_euro_overall_Chromosome_All_1_release.zip. Breast cancer GWAS summary statistics were obtained from the Breast Cancer Association Consortium (BCAC): <https://bcac.ccge.medschl.cam.ac.uk/bcacdata/oncoarray/oncoarray-and-combined-summary-result/gwas-summary-associations-breast-cancer-risk-2020/>. Sample code for this analysis is available at <https://github.com/ColetheStatistician/ncRNAInBreastCancer/>.

RESULTS

In this work, we uncover hidden mechanisms contributing to genetic risk for breast and prostate cancer mediated by ncRNAs, systematically exploring one regulatory hypothesis: distal mediation of pcGene expression regulation in non-cancerous and tumor breast and prostate tissue (**Figure 1**). Specifically, we identify distal-eQTLs of protein-coding genes (pcGenes) that are significantly mediated by ncRNAs local to these distal-eQTLs and assess if they overlap with genetic signal for cancer risk.

Multiple ncRNAs mediate distal-eQTLs in breast and prostate tissue

Distal-eQTL mapping through mediation analysis

We conducted distal-eQTL mapping through ncRNA mediation in GTEx (25) and TCGA (26). The number of distal-eQTLs of pcGenes that are significantly mediated by ncRNAs are reported in **Table 1** and **Supplemental Table S1-2**. Distributions of TME and MP in tumor tissue showed a larger range than in non-cancerous tissue for both breast and prostate, and median TME and MP were higher in tumor tissue (**Supplemental Figure S2**).

In non-cancerous breast tissue, pcGenes with cross-chromosomal distal-eQTLs with large ncRNA-mediated effects included *PUM1* and *PCBP1* (**Figure 2A**), both of which influence

tumorigenesis (39–41). In breast tumors, we found *MT4* and *GPRC6A* have large mediated distal effects. *MT4* belongs to the metallothionein family involved in breast cancer carcinogenesis (42,43), and *GPRC6A* is a part of the androgen receptor signaling pathway (44,45). In non-cancerous prostate tissue, we detected large distal mediation effects for genes such as *RAF1*, a proto-oncogene (46) and *LGR5*, a gene associated with prostatic regeneration and overexpressed in prostate tumors (47). We also detected a number of olfactory receptors (*OR2T1*, *OR10G8*, *OR10S1*) with large mediated effects in prostate tumor. Olfactory receptors are associated with prostate cancer progression but generally have low expression in prostate tumors (48,49).

Owing mainly to a larger set of nominally-significant distal-eQTLs in tumor tissues and larger sample sizes in TCGA than GTEx, we found nearly four times as many significantly mediated distal-eQTLs in tumor tissue compared to non-cancerous tissue. Among distal-eQTLs detected in tumor samples, we observed that multiple ncRNAs mediated distal-eQTLs with many different pcGenes (vertical bands in **Figure 2A**). One such ncRNA in breast tumors is *LINC00301*, showing significant mediation of 1,103 distal-eQTLs across 53 unique SNPs and 53 unique pcGenes. Many of these pcGenes belong to the GAGE protein family, which promotes breast cancer cell invasion and has shown evidence of distal genetic regulation (50,51). *LINC00301* itself has been implicated in facilitating tumor progression and immune suppression, albeit in lung cancer (52). Another example of such an ncRNA in breast tumors is *miR-548f-4*, a commonly mutated microRNA in multiple cancers (53), mediating more than 300 distal-eQTLs for 16 unique pcGenes, including *GUCA2B*, upregulated in breast cancer metastases (54), and *CYP2C9*, a target of tamoxifen (55). In contrast, only two ncRNAs in non-cancerous breast tissue showed significant mediation of more than 50 distal pcGenes. One of these genes, *FAM106A*, mediated distal-eQTLs of 13 pcGenes, including *BTN3A2*, a prognostic marker for breast cancer (56). In both non-cancerous and tumor breast tissue, three pcGenes (*PRCC1*,

CYP2C9, and *ATG14*) showed significant mediation through ncRNAs, though the sets of pcGene targets across non-cancerous and tumor tissue are distinct.

In prostate tumors, *LINC02903* showed significant mediation with the most distal-eQTLs (177 eQTLs across 8 pcGenes). These pcGenes include *FABP9*, an upregulated gene in prostate carcinomas with prognostic value (57), and *MTNR1B*, a gene harboring nominal risk variants for prostate cancer (58). Another ncRNA with significant TME for nearly 100 distal-eQTLs across 20 pcGenes was *SDHAP2*. Many of these pcGenes have been implicated in prostate cancer and metastasis pathways, including *TMEM207*, *FADS6*, *MTNR1B*, *SLC26A8*, and *FGF23* (59–61). Similar to breast tissue, only two ncRNAs showed significant mediation of more than 20 distal eQTLs in prostate tissue: *FBXO30-DT* and *SNHG2*, which has been implicated in tumorigenesis and proliferation in multiple cancers (62–64). A majority (22/26) of distal-eQTLs mediated by *FBXO30-DT* are for *OVCH2*, which has been implicated in prostate risk through GWAS (65,66). The majority of distal-eQTLs mediated by *SNHG2* are for *RAF1*, a therapeutic target for multiple cancers (46). We did not detect any shared ncRNAs or pcGenes across non-cancerous and tumor prostate tissue.

Gene-based distal-eQTL mapping

Next, we conducted gene-level distal eQTL mapping using GBAT (24) to identify ncRNAs that are regulated by multiple weak local genetic effects and may have distal effects on pcGenes; these ncRNAs are likely to be missed by the mediation framework. Comparing to mediated pcGenes from mediation analysis (**Table 1**), we found a similar order of magnitude of pcGenes with distal associations with ncRNAs using GBAT (**Table 2**). We again detected far more distal ncRNA-pcGene directional associations in tumor compared to non-cancerous tissue (**Table 2**, **Supplemental Table S1-2**). In addition, the distribution of ncRNA-pcGene effect sizes is shifted downwards in tumor tissue, compared to non-cancerous tissue, though the number of effect

sizes in these distributions are far less for non-cancerous tissue distal associations (Supplemental Figure S2). In breast tumors, we found large distal genetic associations with pcGenes like *OXNAD1*, an RNA-binding protein that is associated with pan-cancer survival rates and involved with tumor invasion and metastasis (66,67), and *LCN9*, part of the lipocalin family that promotes breast cancer metastasis (68). In prostate tumors, we detected multiple large distal genetic associations with genes in the pro-proliferative keratin-associated protein family (*KRTAP13-3*, *KRTAP13-4*, *KRTAP10-8*) (69) (Figure 2).

Though distal genetic effects of ncRNAs in non-cancerous breast or prostate tissue were sparse, we found three ncRNAs with genetic associations with pcGenes across both breast and prostate tissue: *LINC01678*, *FAM106A*, and *AP001056.1*. These ncRNAs also target the same pcGenes (*LOC102724159*, *CCDC144A*, *GATD3B*, and a paralog to *TRAPPC10*), all with no catalogued functions in cancer.

Again, in tumor-specific gene-gene associations, many ncRNAs had associations with multiple pcGenes, leading to vertical bands in the location plots in Figure 2B. For example, in breast tumors, *LINC000906*, a predicted miRNA sponge in breast tumors (70), was associated with 115 pcGenes. The largest association was with *MS4A5*, whose hypomethylation is shown to be prognostic for multiple cancer types (71,72). Another ncRNA associated with multiple different pcGenes is *LINC00115*, a known promoter of breast cancer metastasis and progression (73–75). Many of these targets are related to interferons (*IFNA17* and *IFNW1*), immune system cytotoxicity (*RAC2* and *DDB2*), or secretory proteins (*PRH1* and *PRH2*).

In prostate tumors, *FAM138F* showed distal genetic associations with 57 distinct pcGenes, many of which are involved in amino acid activation in prostate cancer (*HDAC2*, *NT5DC1*, *NUS1*, and *PREP*) and protein stability (*PDCD2*, *TCP1*). Additionally *TDRG1*, shown to be

associated with progression and metastases in multiple cancers (76,77), showed multiple distal genetic associations with pcGenes, including the cancer-initiating pluripotency factor *PRDM14* (78) and multiple genes related to olfactory stimulus (*OR10H3*, *OR2T1*, *OR51V1*, and *UGT2A1*) (49). Taken together, these distal eQTL mappings suggest the ncRNAs have strong influences on gene expression of multiple pcGenes in both non-cancerous and tumor tissue.

Overlap of miRNA-pcGene pairs with target prediction databases

For in-silico validation, we queried TargetScan (79,80), a database that curates computationally predicted RNA targets of miRNAs, for any miRNAs that our analysis detected to mediate distal-eQTLs of pcGenes. Out of 522 pairs of miRNAs and pcGenes across 72 unique miRNAs identified through our analysis, we found that 184 pairs were included in the TargetScan database (**Supplemental Table S3**). miRNA-pcGene pairs identified in our eQTL analysis are found in TargetScan at an enrichment ratio of 8.2 (95% CI: [6.68, 10.09]), compared to the universe of all miRNA-target pairs in TargetScan (approximately 3.56 million) and roughly 159,000 miRNA-target pairs in TargetScan for the 72 miRNA families identified. A majority of these miRNAs (82% of miRNAs detected in eQTLs) are conserved only across humans and mice but well-annotated. Though this intersection with TargetScan does not implicate the miRNA in distal regulation of the proposed pcGene, it provides some computational validation of this relationship using different methodology (sequence similarity vs. eQTL mapping).

Distal-eGenes are enriched for tumorigenesis and cancer progression gene pathways

To assess enriched biological processes or pathways by sets of prioritized pcGenes (called distal-eGenes), we conducted gene ontology enrichments (81). Overall, compared to all expressed pcGenes in the transcriptome, distal-eGenes in non-cancerous tissue (combining breast and prostate) were significantly enriched (FDR-adjusted $P < 0.05$) for many relevant ontologies: immune processes, genes targeted by epigenetic regulation, microRNA targets in

cancer, and oxidoreductase activity. In comparison, distal-eGenes detected in tumor tissue showed enrichments mainly for chemical and sensory receptors and intermediate filament cytoskeleton (**Supplemental Figure S3-4**). Comparing tissue-prioritized distal-eGenes (breast-specific or prostate-specific pcGenes to the protein-coding transcriptome), we found distal-eGenes enrichments detected in prostate tissue for immune pathway ontologies, including the multiple activations of immune cells, and known tumorigenic pathways, like the JAK-STAT cascade and PI3K-Akt signaling (82,83). We did not detect any significant enrichments for the breast-specific distal-eGenes (**Supplemental Figure S5**).

We also conducted comparisons of distal-eGenes between non-cancerous and tumor state in both breast and prostate tissue (**Figure 3**). We find that, compared to distal-eGenes prioritized in breast tumors, non-cancerous breast distal-eGenes were enriched for cytokine and leukocyte production, response, and function, as well as membrane transport and binding. We observed similar enrichments when we compared non-cancerous prostate distal-eGenes to those from prostate tumors, with additional cell death and morphogenesis ontologies enrichments. In contrast, across both breast and prostate tissue, tumor-specific distal-eGenes, compared to non-cancerous distal-eGenes, mainly showed enrichments for olfactory and chemical stimulus response, intermediate filament cytoskeleton localization, and epidermis development. These ontologies are consistent with cancer progression, as olfactory receptors have been validated as prognostic biomarkers in prostate cancers and are overexpressed in more aggressive breast tumors (48,49,84,85), more aggressive breast cancers are enriched for genes that influence epidermal growth (86) and cytoskeletal dysregulation is key to cancer cell invasion, progression, and metastasis (87–89).

Distal-eQTLs overlap with genetic signal for breast and prostate cancer risk

Lastly, we integrated these eQTL results with GWAS summary statistics for overall prostate and overall and molecular subtype-specific breast cancer risk (1,2). A total of 84 detected ncRNAs are within 0.5 Mb of a GWAS SNP at $P < 5 \times 10^{-8}$, the majority for overall prostate and breast cancer risk, which have the largest GWAS sample sizes (**Figure 4A, Supplemental Table S1-2**). Among pairs of ncRNAs and pcGenes where the ncRNA is 0.5 Mb from a GWAS SNP for either breast or prostate cancer risk, we identified 30 pairs (15 for overall breast cancer and 10 for LumA breast cancer, five for prostate cancer) where at least one of the ncRNA local-eQTL or pcGene distal-eQTL colocalized with the GWAS signal at the locus with $PP.H4 \geq 0.75$ (**Supplemental Figure S6, Supplemental Table S4**). In total, we detected 10 independent overall or LumA-specific breast cancer risk GWAS signals and one independent prostate cancer risk GWAS signal may be, in part, explained by distal genetics effects on pcGenes mediated by local-ncRNAs.

We found that distal-eQTLs of *CSH1* mediated by *RFPL1S* strongly colocalize with GWAS signal for prostate cancer risk. ($PP.H4 = 0.913$) (**Figure 4B**). *CSH1* codes for a somatotropin hormone with paracrine signaling functions promoting cell division and growth in glands (90). Using non-cancerous breast tissue eQTLs, we found strong colocalization with overall breast cancer risk with local-eQTLs of *RUSC1-AS1* and distal-eQTLs of *SH2B1* (**Figure 4C**). Two different SNPs carried the largest posterior probability of colocalization for the local- (rs2297480) and distal-eQTLs (rs2075571), which are in moderate, yet statistically significant, linkage disequilibrium ($D' = 0.51$, $R^2 = 0.131$, $P < 0.001$). *RUSC1-AS1* has shown evidenced silencing of genes through epigenetic signaling and is correlated with breast cancer progression (91,92). Additionally, *SH2B1* is involved with cytokine signaling in cell proliferation and migration (93). We also found strong colocalization with LumA-specific breast cancer risk with local-eQTLs of *THBS3-AS1* and distal-eQTLs of *SLC39A13* in non-cancerous breast tissue. The same SNP showed the maximum posterior probability for colocalization with both the local- and

distal-eQTL signal. Though the ncRNA has not been implicated in cancer risk or progression, *SLC39A13* facilitates metastasis in ovarian cancer by activating the Src/FAK signaling pathway (94).

For overall breast cancer risk, we also detect strong colocalization between eQTLs and GWAS signals at the 17q21.31 locus. This locus houses a large, common inversion polymorphism associated with breast and ovarian cancer prognosis (95–97), as well as widespread associations with multiple phenotypes (98–101). In particular, we found that the ncRNA *KANSL1-AS1* potentially mediates distal-eQTLs of multiple pcGenes. All but one of these pcGenes are on Chromosome 17, near the end of the 17q21.31 region; the last pcGene we detected is *TXNRD3* at 3q21.3. We were interested in disentangling effects of the H2 inversion on gene expression and breast cancer risk, with the proposed causal diagram presented in **Figure 5A**. First, we estimated haplotypes of the H2 inversion in GTEx (102). We found that *KANSL1-AS1* and the associated pcGenes near 17q21.31 all have significant associations with the H2 inversion (**Figure 5B**). Next, we reran mediation analysis for SNPs local to *KANSL-AS1* and these detected pcGenes. After accounting for H2, the distal mediation signal of *KANSL-AS1* is attenuated for all pcGenes except *TXNRD3*, suggesting that the inversion may be driving a significant portion of this signal. These analyses support our proposed causal model, that the genetics of the H2 inversion affect expression of the local ncRNA *KANSL-AS1* and the distal pcGenes at the end of the inversion, which induces the eQTL associations (**Figure 5A**).

H2 inversion-adjusted colocalization analyses also support this model. A salient example is shown in **Figure 5D**, with Manhattan plots from colocalization analysis of overall breast cancer risk, local-eQTLs of *KANSL-AS1*, and distal-eQTLs of *CRHR1*. Colocalization analysis unadjusted for H2, showed nearly-perfect colocalization for both eQTL signals with GWAS (PP.H4 > 0.98 for both eQTLs), but after adjustments, the eQTL signals are completely

removed. In fact, the standardized effect sizes for local-eQTLs of *KANSL1-AS1* showed strong correlation with the standardized effect sizes for local-QTLs of the H2 inversion (**Figure 5E**), and the local-QTL signal for the H2 inversion strongly colocalized (PP.H4 = 0.99) with the GWAS signal in the locus (**Figure 5F**). These results illustrate that the structural inversion in the locus likely accounts for both *cis*-genetic control of *KANSL1-AS1* and the associated pcGenes further downstream on Chromosome 17. Furthermore, we emphasize further examination of the H2 inversion and other structural variants in the locus for its impact on local and distal gene expression, as well as cancer susceptibility, especially to elucidate if SNPs with widespread local or distal associations with gene expression are affected by confounding due to structural variants or other aberrations.

We also studied the cancer risk associations of ncRNAs with predicted large transcriptomic effects using a genetically-regulated expression (GReX) approach (**Methods**). At $P < 2.5 \times 10^{-6}$ and permutation $P < 0.05$, we identify 33 ncRNA-level associations (**Figure 6, Supplemental Table S5**), predominantly for overall and subtype-specific breast cancer risk. Only one ncRNA, *SDHAP2*, showed an association with overall prostate cancer risk (**Figure 6**); as we restrict to ncRNAs mediating distal-eQTLs and not necessarily in known prostate cancer GWAS loci, we do not recover any ncRNAs detected by Guo et al's analysis of long-ncRNAs in prostate cancer (103). A couple ncRNAs prioritized in associations of breast cancer risk using ncRNA GReX in non-cancerous breast tissues have been previously noted. Common non-synonymous SNPs in *HCG9* have previously been implicated in breast cancer GWAS (104). In addition, *CEROX1*, a cataloged post-transcriptional regulator of mitochondrial catalytic activity, has been implicated in distal alterations of metabolic pathways in breast cancers (14,105). ncRNAs prioritized in breast tumor GReX-associations with breast cancer risk mainly included micro- and snoRNAs. Of these, *miR-519d* has been shown to suppress breast cancer cell growth by targeting distal

molecular features(106,107). GReX associations prioritize these ncRNAs for further investigation of their functional effects in breast and prostate tissue.

DISCUSSION

In this work, we systematically identify distal-eQTLs of pcGenes that are mediated by ncRNAs in non-cancerous and tumor breast and prostate tissue. We then show that many of these ncRNA-mediated distal-eQTLs of pcGenes overlap with GWAS signals for breast and prostate cancer, both with known GWAS loci and novel genetic loci undetected by GWAS. Taken together, our results suggest that distal genetic effects on pcGenes mediated by ncRNAs may be a common mechanism underlying genetic signals and ncRNAs have a widespread role as distal transcriptional regulators in prostate and breast tissue. We observed more distal ncRNA-pcGene directional associations in tumor than non-cancerous tissue, suggesting that tumor tissues have multiple activated gene regulatory networks with potential effects on disease pathogenesis or progression. Our results implicating distal interactions between ncRNAs and pcGenes are attractive for further in silico and experimental study.

We find many colocalized eQTL signals for ncRNAs and pcGenes in the 17q21.31 region, many of which have been prioritized by previous genetic association studies. For example, a transcriptome-wide association study (TWAS) of estrogen receptor subtype-specific breast cancer, identified ncRNA *KANSL-AS1* (108), which has also been associated with ovarian cancer (109). In our analysis, *KANSL-AS1* mediated multiple breast cancer-associated pcGenes further downstream on Chromosome 17 and colocalized almost perfectly with the GWAS association, suggesting widespread distal effects of *KANSL-AS1* (108,110–114). However, after accounting for the large and common H2 inversion in the 17q21.31 locus, the distal effects of *KANSL1-AS1* were largely attenuated, pointing to correlated effects of large structural aberrations on gene expression and disease etiology in this region (115–118). These results

also suggest that structural aberrations, like the 17q21.31 H2 inversion, have large effects on gene expression, not only locally, but also distally. Our results also serve as a cautionary tale: future gene expression analyses must delineate the eQTL signal in a locus from chromosomal aberrations, especially when integrating with GWAS signals. Comprehensive analyses of the transcriptomic effects of genomic aberrations in tumor tissue are needed.

We conclude with limitations of our study. First, we rely on Ensembl annotations of gene biotypes to define our sets of ncRNAs and pcGenes. These annotations may be incomplete, and accordingly, we may have ignored multiple non-coding transcripts (119). Next, as our local- and distal-eQTL signals are the same cohort, we were unable to use multi-trait colocalization methods, like *moloc* or *Primo* (120,121). A more flexible framework that allows for shared molecular QTL signal could be developed to fully interrogate the mediated-distal QTL signal, in the context of complex trait etiology. Next, we do not account for copy number variation or structural variation to disentangle these potentially disparate signals. Future studies should consider corrections for inversions, translocations, or genomic imbalances. Lastly, due to limited sample sizes in TCGA, we could not assess the effects of molecular subtype heterogeneity on eQTL mapping in tumor tissue. Previously, subtype-specific genetic architecture of gene expression regulation has been suggested by previous studies (5,122,123), with some distal genetic associations detected for genes that are highly predictive of molecular subtypes (124). Robust subtype-specific analyses in breast cancer can be informative for both subtype-specific risk and outcomes.

Our study provides evidence supporting *trans*-acting regulation by ncRNAs as a potential biological mechanism relevant to breast and prostate cancer etiology. Particularly, our results emphasize that larger samples of tissue- and tumor-specific transcriptomics datasets need to be

collected to study often ignored transcripts and explore more complex regulatory hypotheses to interpret GWAS risk loci for cancer.

REFERENCES

1. Schumacher FR, Al Olama AA, Berndt SI, Benlloch S, Ahmed M, Saunders EJ, et al. Association analyses of more than 140,000 men identify 63 new prostate cancer susceptibility loci. *Nature Genetics*. Nature Publishing Group; 2018;50:928–36.
2. Zhang H, Ahearn TU, Lecarpentier J, Barnes D, Beesley J, Qi G, et al. Genome-wide association study identifies 32 novel breast cancer susceptibility loci from overall and subtype-specific analyses. *Nature Genetics*. Nat Genet; 2020;52:572–81.
3. Michailidou K, Lindström S, Dennis J, Beesley J, Hui S, Kar S, et al. Association analysis identifies 65 new breast cancer risk loci. *Nature*. Europe PMC Funders; 2017;551:92–4.
4. Mancuso N, Gayther S, Gusev A, Zheng W, Penney KL, Kote-Jarai Z, et al. Large-scale transcriptome-wide association study identifies new prostate cancer risk regions. *Nature Communications* [Internet]. Nature Publishing Group; 2018;9. Available from: <https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pmc/articles/PMC6172280/>
5. Li Q, Seo JH, Stranger B, McKenna A, Pe’Er I, Laframboise T, et al. A novel eQTL-based analysis reveals the biology of breast cancer risk loci. *Cell*. NIH Public Access; 2013;152:633–633.
6. Kopp F, Mendell JT. Functional classification and experimental dissection of long noncoding RNAs. *Cell*. NIH Public Access; 2018;172:393–393.
7. Abascal F, Acosta R, Addleman NJ, Adrian J, Afzal V, Aken B, et al. Expanded encyclopaedias of DNA elements in the human and mouse genomes. *Nature*. Nature Research; 2020;583:699–710.

- 513 8. Statello L, Guo CJ, Chen LL, Huarte M. Gene regulation by long non-coding RNAs and its
514 biological functions. *Nature Reviews Molecular Cell Biology* 2020 22:2. Nature Publishing
515 Group; 2020;22:96–118.
- 516 9. Vance KW, Ponting CP. Transcriptional regulatory functions of nuclear long noncoding
517 RNAs. *Trends in Genetics*. Elsevier; 2014;30:348–348.
- 518 10. Anastasiadou E, Jacob LS, Slack FJ. Non-coding RNA networks in cancer. *Nature Reviews*
519 *Cancer* 2017 18:1. Nature Publishing Group; 2017;18:5–18.
- 520 11. Chen DL, Chen LZ, Lu YX, Zhang DS, Zeng ZL, Pan ZZ, et al. Long noncoding RNA XIST
521 expedites metastasis and modulates epithelial–mesenchymal transition in colorectal
522 cancer. *Cell Death & Disease* 2017 8:8. Nature Publishing Group; 2017;8:e3011–e3011.
- 523 12. Slack FJ, Chinnaiyan AM. The Role of Non-coding RNAs in Oncology. *Cell. Cell*;
524 2019;179:1033–55.
- 525 13. Arun G, Diermeier SD, Spector DL. Therapeutic Targeting of Long Non-Coding RNAs in
526 Cancer. *Trends in molecular medicine*. NIH Public Access; 2018;24:257–257.
- 527 14. Kamada S, Takeiwa T, Ikeda K, Horie-Inoue K, Inoue S. Long Non-coding RNAs Involved
528 in Metabolic Alterations in Breast and Prostate Cancers. *Frontiers in Oncology*. Frontiers
529 Media S.A.; 2020;10:2119–2119.
- 530 15. Peterson SM, Thompson JA, Ufkin ML, Sathyanarayana P, Liaw L, Congdon CB. Common
531 features of microRNA target prediction tools. *Frontiers in Genetics*. Frontiers Research
532 Foundation; 2014;5:23–23.
- 533 16. Porcu E, Sadler MC, Lepik K, Auwerx C, Wood AR, Weihs A, et al. Differentially expressed
534 genes reflect disease-induced rather than disease-causing changes in the transcriptome.
535 *Nature Communications* 2021 12:1. Nature Publishing Group; 2021;12:1–9.
- 536 17. Pierce BL, Tong L, Chen LS, Rahaman R, Argos M, Jasmine F, et al. Mediation Analysis
537 Demonstrates That Trans-eQTLs Are Often Explained by Cis-Mediation: A Genome-Wide
538 Analysis among 1,800 South Asians. *PLoS Genetics*. Public Library of Science; 2014;10.

- 539 18. Pierce BL, Tong L, Argos M, Demanelis K, Jasmine F, Rakibuz-Zaman M, et al. Co-
540 occurring expression and methylation QTLs allow detection of common causal variants and
541 shared biological mechanisms. *Nature Communications*. Nature Publishing Group;
542 2018;9:1–12.
- 543 19. Yang F, Gleason KJ, Wang J, Duan J, He X, Pierce BL, et al. CCmed: cross-condition
544 mediation analysis for identifying replicable trans-associations mediated by cis-gene
545 expression. *Bioinformatics*. Oxford Academic; 2021;37:2513–20.
- 546 20. Yang F, Wang J, Pierce BL, Chen LS. Identifying cis-mediators for trans-eQTLs across
547 many human tissues using genomic mediation analysis. *Genome Research*. Cold Spring
548 Harbor Laboratory Press; 2017;27:1859–71.
- 549 21. Bhattacharya A, Li Y, Love MI. MOSTWAS: Multi-Omic Strategies for Transcriptome-Wide
550 Association Studies. Zhu X, editor. *PLoS Genetics*. 2021;17:e1009398–e1009398.
- 551 22. Bhattacharya A, Freedman AN, Avula V, Harris R, Liu W, Pan C, et al. Placental genomics
552 mediates genetic associations with complex health traits and disease. *Nat Commun*.
553 Nature Publishing Group; 2022;13:706.
- 554 23. Shan N, Wang Z, Hou L. Identification of trans-eQTLs using mediation analysis with
555 multiple mediators. *BMC Bioinformatics*. BioMed Central Ltd.; 2019;20.
- 556 24. Liu X, Mefford JA, Dahl A, He Y, Subramaniam M, Battle A, et al. GBAT: a gene-based
557 association test for robust detection of trans-gene regulation. *Genome Biology*. Genome
558 Biology; 2020;21:211–211.
- 559 25. Aguet F, Barbeira AN, Bonazzola R, Brown A, Castel SE, Jo B, et al. The GTEx
560 Consortium atlas of genetic regulatory effects across human tissues. *Science*. American
561 Association for the Advancement of Science; 2020;369:1318–30.
- 562 26. Weinstein JN, Collisson EA, Mills GB, Shaw KRM, Ozenberger BA, Ellrott K, et al. The
563 cancer genome atlas pan-cancer analysis project. *Nature Genetics*. Nature Publishing
564 Group; 2013;45:1113–20.

- 565 27. Giambartolomei C, Vukcevic D, Schadt EE, Franke L, Hingorani AD, Wallace C, et al.
566 Bayesian Test for Colocalisation between Pairs of Genetic Association Studies Using
567 Summary Statistics. Williams SM, editor. PLoS Genetics. Public Library of Science;
568 2014;10:e1004383–e1004383.
- 569 28. Gusev A, Ko A, Shi H, Bhatia G, Chung W, Penninx BWJH, et al. Integrative approaches
570 for large-scale transcriptome-wide association studies. Nature Genetics. 2016;48:245–52.
- 571 29. Durinck S, Spellman PT, Birney E, Huber W. Mapping identifiers for the integration of
572 genomic datasets with the R/Bioconductor package biomaRt. Nature Protocols 2009 4:8.
573 Nature Publishing Group; 2009;4:1184–91.
- 574 30. Purcell S, Neale B, Todd-Brown K, Thomas L, Ferreira MAR, Bender D, et al. PLINK: A
575 Tool Set for Whole-Genome Association and Population-Based Linkage Analyses. Am J
576 Hum Genet. 2007;81:559–75.
- 577 31. Mostafavi S, Battle A, Zhu X, Urban AE, Levinson D, Montgomery SB, et al. Normalizing
578 RNA-Sequencing Data by Modeling Hidden Covariates with Prior Knowledge. PLoS ONE.
579 Public Library of Science; 2013;8:e68141–e68141.
- 580 32. van Iterson M. mvaniterson/Rhcpp: A fast R implementation using Rcpp based on the
581 original matlab HCP method for Normalizing RNA-Sequencing Data by Modeling Hidden
582 Covariates with Prior Knowledge [Internet]. 2020. Available from:
583 <https://github.com/mvaniterson/Rhcpp>
- 584 33. Shabalin AA. Gene expression Matrix eQTL: ultra fast eQTL analysis via large matrix
585 operations. Bioinformatics (Oxford, England). Oxford University Press; 2012;28:1353–8.
- 586 34. Saha A, Battle A. False positives in trans-eQTL and co-expression analyses arising from
587 RNA-sequencing alignment errors [version 2; peer review: 3 approved]. F1000Research.
588 F1000 Research Ltd; 2019;7:1860–1860.
- 589 35. Yang J, Lee SH, Goddard ME, Visscher PM. GCTA: a tool for genome-wide complex trait
590 analysis. American journal of human genetics. Elsevier; 2011;88:76–82.

- 591 36. Friedman J, Hastie T, Tibshirani R. Regularization Paths for Generalized Linear Models via
592 Coordinate Descent. *Journal of Statistical Software*. 2010;33:1–22.
- 593 37. Wang G, Sarkar A, Carbonetto P, Stephens M. A simple new approach to variable
594 selection in regression, with application to genetic fine mapping. *Journal of the Royal*
595 *Statistical Society: Series B*. Blackwell Publishing Ltd; 2020;82:1273–300.
- 596 38. Endelman JB. Ridge Regression and Other Kernels for Genomic Selection with R Package
597 rrBLUP. *The Plant Genome*. 2011;4:250–5.
- 598 39. Carrasco AM, Acosta O, Ponce J, Cotrina J, Aguilar A, Araujo J, et al. PUM1 and RNase P
599 genes as potential cell-free DNA markers in breast cancer. *Journal of Clinical Laboratory*
600 *Analysis*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2021;35:e23720–e23720.
- 601 40. Shi P, Zhang J, Li X, Li W, Li H, Fu P. Long non-coding RNA NORAD inhibition upregulates
602 microRNA-323a-3p to suppress tumorigenesis and development of breast cancer through
603 the PUM1/eIF2 axis. <https://doi.org/10.1080/1538410120211934627>. Taylor & Francis;
604 2021;20:1295–307.
- 605 41. Shi H, Li H, Yuan R, Guan W, Zhang X, Zhang S, et al. PCBP1 depletion promotes
606 tumorigenesis through attenuation of p27Kip1 mRNA stability and translation. *Journal of*
607 *Experimental & Clinical Cancer Research* 2018 37:1. BioMed Central; 2018;37:1–18.
- 608 42. Goulding H, Jasani B, Pereira H, Reid A, Galea M, Bell J, et al. Metallothionein expression
609 in human breast cancer. *British Journal of Cancer* 1995 72:4. Nature Publishing Group;
610 1995;72:968–72.
- 611 43. Si M, Lang J. The roles of metallothioneins in carcinogenesis. *Journal of Hematology &*
612 *Oncology* 2018 11:1. BioMed Central; 2018;11:1–20.
- 613 44. Michmerhuizen AR, Spratt DE, Pierce LJ, Speers CW. ARe we there yet? Understanding
614 androgen receptor signaling in breast cancer. *npj Breast Cancer* 2020 6:1. Nature
615 Publishing Group; 2020;6:1–19.

- 616 45. Masi M, Garattini E, Bolis M, Di Marino D, Maraccani L, Morelli E, et al. OXER1 and
617 RACK1-associated pathway: a promising drug target for breast cancer progression.
618 Oncogenesis 2020 9:12. Nature Publishing Group; 2020;9:1–15.
- 619 46. Zhang L, Pattanayak A, Li W, Ko H-K, Fowler G, Gordon R, et al. A Multifunctional Therapy
620 Approach for Cancer: Targeting Raf1- Mediated Inhibition of Cell Motility, Growth, and
621 Interaction with the Microenvironment. Molecular Cancer Therapeutics. American
622 Association for Cancer Research; 2020;19:39–51.
- 623 47. Wang B, Wang X, Long JE, Eastham-Anderson J, Firestein R, Junttila MR. Castration-
624 Resistant Lgr5+ Cells Are Long-Lived Stem Cells Required for Prostatic Regeneration.
625 Stem Cell Reports. Elsevier; 2015;4:768–768.
- 626 48. Abaffy T, Bain JR, Muehlbauer MJ, Spasojevic I, Lodha S, Bruguera E, et al. A
627 Testosterone Metabolite 19-Hydroxyandrostenedione Induces Neuroendocrine Trans-
628 Differentiation of Prostate Cancer Cells via an Ectopic Olfactory Receptor. Frontiers in
629 Oncology. Frontiers; 2018;0:162–162.
- 630 49. Neuhaus EM, Zhang W, Gelis L, Deng Y, Noldus J, Hatt H. Activation of an Olfactory
631 Receptor Inhibits Proliferation of Prostate Cancer Cells. The Journal of Biological
632 Chemistry. American Society for Biochemistry and Molecular Biology; 2009;284:16218–
633 16218.
- 634 50. Maine EA, Westcott JM, Precht AM, Dang TT, Whitehurst AW, Pearson GW. The cancer-
635 testis antigens SPANX-A/C/D and CTAG2 promote breast cancer invasion. Oncotarget.
636 Impact Journals, LLC; 2016;7:14708–14708.
- 637 51. Quiroz-Zárate A, Harshfield BJ, Hu R, Knoblauch N, Beck AH, Hankinson SE, et al.
638 Expression Quantitative Trait loci (QTL) in tumor adjacent normal breast tissue and breast
639 tumor tissue. Wong K-K, editor. PLOS ONE. Public Library of Science; 2017;12:e0170181–
640 e0170181.

- 641 52. Sun C-C, Zhu W, Li S-J, Hu W, Zhang J, Zhuo Y, et al. FOXC1-mediated LINC00301
642 facilitates tumor progression and triggers an immune-suppressing microenvironment in
643 non-small cell lung cancer by regulating the HIF1 α pathway. *Genome Medicine* 2020 12:1.
644 BioMed Central; 2020;12:1–27.
- 645 53. Tuna M, Machado AS, Calin GA. Genetic and epigenetic alterations of microRNAs and
646 implications for human cancers and other diseases. *Genes Chromosomes and Cancer*.
647 Blackwell Publishing Inc.; 2016;55:193–214.
- 648 54. Xiao L, Zhou J, Liu H, Zhou Y, Chen W, Cui W, et al. RNA Sequence Profiling Reveals
649 Unique Immune and Metabolic Features of Breast Cancer Brain Metastases. *Frontiers in*
650 *Oncology*. Frontiers; 2021;0:3213–3213.
- 651 55. MC B, U Y, MO B, O S, A B. Tamoxifen inhibits cytochrome P450 2C9 activity in breast
652 cancer patients. *Journal of chemotherapy (Florence, Italy)*. *J Chemother*; 2006;18:421–4.
- 653 56. Cai P, Lu Z, Wu J, Qin X, Wang Z, Zhang Z, et al. BTN3A2 serves as a prognostic marker
654 and favors immune infiltration in triple-negative breast cancer. *Journal of Cellular*
655 *Biochemistry*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2020;121:2643–54.
- 656 57. MS AF, X G, SS F, W A-J, Z B, PR R, et al. The increased expression of fatty acid-binding
657 protein 9 in prostate cancer and its prognostic significance. *Oncotarget*. *Oncotarget*;
658 2016;7:82783–97.
- 659 58. MJ M, S L, NE A, CA H, D A, A B, et al. Association of type 2 diabetes susceptibility
660 variants with advanced prostate cancer risk in the Breast and Prostate Cancer Cohort
661 Consortium. *American journal of epidemiology*. *Am J Epidemiol*; 2012;176:1121–9.
- 662 59. Marín-Aguilera M, Reig Ò, Lozano JJ, Jiménez N, García-Recio S, Erill N, et al. Molecular
663 profiling of peripheral blood is associated with circulating tumor cells content and poor
664 survival in metastatic castration-resistant prostate cancer. *Oncotarget*. *Impact Journals*,
665 LLC; 2015;6:10604–10604.

- 666 60. Saigo C, Kito Y, Takeuchi T. Cancerous Protein Network That Inhibits the Tumor
667 Suppressor Function of WW Domain-Containing Oxidoreductase (WWOX) by Aberrantly
668 Expressed Molecules. *Frontiers in Oncology*. Frontiers; 2018;0:350–350.
- 669 61. S F, J W, Y Z, C J C, M I. FGF23 promotes prostate cancer progression. *Oncotarget*.
670 *Oncotarget*; 2015;6:17291–301.
- 671 62. Li Y-L, Tian H, Jiang J, Zhang Y, Qi X-W. Multifaceted regulation and functions of fatty acid
672 desaturase 2 in human cancers. *American Journal of Cancer Research*. e-Century
673 Publishing Corporation; 2020;10:4098–4098.
- 674 63. Chi J-R, Yu Z-H, Liu B-W, Zhang D, Ge J, Yu Y, et al. SNHG5 Promotes Breast Cancer
675 Proliferation by Sponging the miR-154-5p/PCNA Axis. *Molecular Therapy - Nucleic Acids*.
676 Elsevier; 2019;17:138–49.
- 677 64. Damas ND, Marcatti M, Côme C, Christensen LL, Nielsen MM, Baumgartner R, et al.
678 SNHG5 promotes colorectal cancer cell survival by counteracting STAU1-mediated mRNA
679 destabilization. *Nature Communications* 2016 7:1. Nature Publishing Group; 2016;7:1–14.
- 680 65. Wang M, Takahashi A, Liu F, Ye D, Ding Q, Qin C, et al. Large-scale association analysis
681 in Asians identifies new susceptibility loci for prostate cancer. *Nature Communications*
682 2015 6:1. Nature Publishing Group; 2015;6:1–7.
- 683 66. Sinnott-Armstrong N, Seoane JA, Sallari R, Pritchard JK, Curtis C, Snyder MP. Convergent
684 mutations in tissue-specific regulatory regions reveal novel cancer drivers. *bioRxiv*. Cold
685 Spring Harbor Laboratory; 2020;2020.08.21.239954-2020.08.21.239954.
- 686 67. Kang D, Lee Y, Lee J-S. RNA-Binding Proteins in Cancer: Functional and Therapeutic
687 Perspectives. *Cancers*. Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute (MDPI); 2020;12:1–33.
- 688 68. Hu C, Yang K, Li M, Huang W, Zhang F, Wang H. Lipocalin 2: a potential therapeutic target
689 for breast cancer metastasis. *OncoTargets and therapy*. Dove Press; 2018;11:8099–8099.

- 690 69. Sack LM, Davoli T, Li MZ, Li Y, Xu Q, Naxerova K, et al. Profound Tissue Specificity in
691 Proliferation Control Underlies Cancer Drivers and Aneuploidy Patterns. *Cell. NIH Public*
692 *Access*; 2018;173:499–499.
- 693 70. Zhang J, Xu T, Liu L, Zhang W, Zhao C, Li S, et al. LMSM: A modular approach for
694 identifying lncRNA related miRNA sponge modules in breast cancer. *PLOS Computational*
695 *Biology. Public Library of Science*; 2020;16:e1007851.
- 696 71. Smith JC, Sheltzer JM. Genome-wide identification and analysis of prognostic features in
697 human cancers. *bioRxiv. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory*; 2021;2021.06.01.446243-
698 2021.06.01.446243.
- 699 72. Sun L, Zhang Y, Zhang C. Distinct Expression and Prognostic Value of MS4A in Gastric
700 Cancer. *Open Medicine. De Gruyter*; 2018;13:178–178.
- 701 73. Hou R, Jiang L. LINC00115 promotes stemness and inhibits apoptosis of ovarian cancer
702 stem cells by upregulating SOX9 and inhibiting the Wnt/ β -catenin pathway through
703 competitively binding to microRNA-30a. *Cancer Cell International* 2021 21:1. *BioMed*
704 *Central*; 2021;21:1–15.
- 705 74. Li Q, Wang X, Zhou L, Jiang M, Zhong G, Xu S, et al. A Positive Feedback Loop of Long
706 Noncoding RNA LINC00152 and KLF5 Facilitates Breast Cancer Growth. *Frontiers in*
707 *Oncology. Frontiers*; 2021;0:899–899.
- 708 75. Yuan C, Luo X, Duan S, Guo L. Long noncoding RNA LINC00115 promotes breast cancer
709 metastasis by inhibiting miR-7. *FEBS Open Bio. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd*; 2020;10:1230–7.
- 710 76. Ma Y, Xu XL, Huang HG, Li YF, Li ZG. LncRNA TDRG1 promotes the aggressiveness of
711 gastric carcinoma through regulating miR-873-5p/HDGF axis. *Biomedicine &*
712 *Pharmacotherapy. Elsevier Masson*; 2020;121:109425–109425.
- 713 77. Hu X, Mu Y, Wang J, Zhao Y. LncRNA TDRG1 promotes the metastasis of NSCLC cell
714 through regulating miR-873-5p/ZEB1 axis. *Journal of Cellular Biochemistry. John Wiley &*
715 *Sons, Ltd*; 2021;122:969–82.

- Tracey LJ, Justice MJ. Off to a bad start: Cancer initiation by pluripotency regulator PRDM14. Trends in genetics : TIG. NIH Public Access; 2019;35:489–489.
- Agarwal V, Bell GW, Nam J-W, Bartel DP. Predicting effective microRNA target sites in mammalian mRNAs. Izaurralde E, editor. eLife. eLife Sciences Publications, Ltd; 2015;4:e05005.
- McGeary SE, Lin KS, Shi CY, Pham TM, Bisaria N, Kelley GM, et al. The biochemical basis of microRNA targeting efficacy. Science. 2019;366:eaav1741.
- Liao Y, Wang J, Jaehnig EJ, Shi Z, Zhang B. WebGestalt 2019: gene set analysis toolkit with revamped UIs and APIs. Nucleic Acids Research. 2019;47:199–205.
- Thomas SJ, Snowden JA, Zeidler MP, Danson SJ. The role of JAK/STAT signalling in the pathogenesis, prognosis and treatment of solid tumours. British Journal of Cancer 2015 113:3. Nature Publishing Group; 2015;113:365–71.
- Hoxhaj G, Manning BD. The PI3K–AKT network at the interface of oncogenic signalling and cancer metabolism. Nature Reviews Cancer 2019 20:2. Nature Publishing Group; 2019;20:74–88.
- Masjedi S, Zwiebel LJ, Giorgio TD. Olfactory receptor gene abundance in invasive breast carcinoma. Scientific Reports 2019 9:1. Nature Publishing Group; 2019;9:1–12.
- Kalra S, Mittal A, Gupta K, Singhal V, Gupta A, Mishra T, et al. Analysis of single-cell transcriptomes links enrichment of olfactory receptors with cancer cell differentiation status and prognosis. Communications Biology 2020 3:1. Nature Publishing Group; 2020;3:1–10.
- Feng Y, Spezia M, Huang S, Yuan C, Zeng Z, Zhang L, et al. Breast cancer development and progression: Risk factors, cancer stem cells, signaling pathways, genomics, and molecular pathogenesis. Genes & Diseases. Chongqing Medical University; 2018;5:77–77.
- Holle AW, Kalafat M, Ramos AS, Seufferlein T, Kemkemer R, Spatz JP. Intermediate filament reorganization dynamically influences cancer cell alignment and migration. Scientific Reports 2017 7:1. Nature Publishing Group; 2017;7:1–14.

- 742 88. Ong MS, Deng S, Halim CE, Cai W, Tan TZ, Huang RYJ, et al. Cytoskeletal Proteins in
743 Cancer and Intracellular Stress: A Therapeutic Perspective. *Cancers* [Internet].
744 Multidisciplinary Digital Publishing Institute (MDPI); 2020;12. Available from:
745 /pmc/articles/PMC7017214/
- 746 89. Tang Y, He Y, Zhang P, Wang J, Fan C, Yang L, et al. LncRNAs regulate the cytoskeleton
747 and related Rho/ROCK signaling in cancer metastasis. *Molecular Cancer* 2018 17:1.
748 BioMed Central; 2018;17:1–10.
- 749 90. Strous GJ, Almeida ADS, Putters J, Schantl J, Sedek M, Slotman JA, et al. Growth
750 Hormone Receptor Regulation in Cancer and Chronic Diseases. *Frontiers in*
751 *Endocrinology*. Frontiers Media S.A.; 2020;11:867–867.
- 752 91. Hu CC, Liang YW, Hu JL, Liu LF, Liang JW, Wang R. LncRNA RUSC1-AS1 promotes the
753 proliferation of breast cancer cells by epigenetic silence of KLF2 and CDKN1A. *European*
754 *review for medical and pharmacological sciences*. *Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci*;
755 2019;23:6602–11.
- 756 92. Zhu L, Cui K, Weng L, Yu P, Du Y, Zhang T, et al. A panel of 8-lncRNA predicts prognosis
757 of breast cancer patients and migration of breast cancer cells. *PLOS ONE*. Public Library of
758 Science; 2021;16:e0249174–e0249174.
- 759 93. Yousaf N, Deng Y, Kang Y, Riedel H. Four PSM/SH2-B Alternative Splice Variants and
760 Their Differential Roles in Mitogenesis *. *Journal of Biological Chemistry*. Elsevier;
761 2001;276:40940–8.
- 762 94. Cheng X, Wang J, Liu C, Jiang T, Yang N, Liu D, et al. Zinc transporter SLC39A13/ZIP13
763 facilitates the metastasis of human ovarian cancer cells via activating Src/FAK signaling
764 pathway. *Journal of Experimental and Clinical Cancer Research*. BioMed Central Ltd;
765 2021;40:1–15.

- 766 95. Permuth-Wey J, Lawrenson K, Shen HC, Velkova A, Tyrer JP, Chen Z, et al. Identification
767 and molecular characterization of a new ovarian cancer susceptibility locus at 17q21.31.
768 Nature communications. NIH Public Access; 2013;4:1627–1627.
- 769 96. Ruiz-Arenas C, Cáceres A, Moreno V, González JR. Common polymorphic inversions at
770 17q21.31 and 8p23.1 associate with cancer prognosis. Human Genomics. BioMed Central
771 Ltd.; 2019;13:1–9.
- 772 97. Orsetti B, Courjal F, Cuny M, Rodriguez C, Theillet C. 17q21-q25 aberrations in breast
773 cancer: combined allelotyping and CGH analysis reveals 5 regions of allelic imbalance
774 among which two correspond to DNA amplification. Oncogene 1999 18:46. Nature
775 Publishing Group; 1999;18:6262–70.
- 776 98. O'Brien HE, Hannon E, Hill MJ, Toste CC, Robertson MJ, Morgan JE, et al. Expression
777 quantitative trait loci in the developing human brain and their enrichment in
778 neuropsychiatric disorders. Genome Biology [Internet]. BioMed Central; 2018;19. Available
779 from: /pmc/articles/PMC6231252/
- 780 99. Trampush JW, Yang MLZ, Yu J, Knowles E, Davies G, Liewald DC, et al. GWAS meta-
781 analysis reveals novel loci and genetic correlates for general cognitive function: a report
782 from the COGENT consortium. Molecular Psychiatry 2017 22:3. Nature Publishing Group;
783 2017;22:336–45.
- 784 100. Wei XT, Feng GJ, Zhang H, Xu Q, Ni JJ, Zhao M, et al. Pleiotropic genomic variants at
785 17q21.31 associated with bone mineral density and body fat mass: a bivariate genome-
786 wide association analysis. European Journal of Human Genetics 2020 29:4. Nature
787 Publishing Group; 2020;29:553–63.
- 788 101. Bowles KR, Pugh DA, Farrell K, Han N, Tcw J, Liu Y, et al. 17q21.31 sub-haplotypes
789 underlying H1-associated risk for Parkinson's disease are associated with LRRC37A/2
790 expression in astrocytes. bioRxiv. Cold Spring Harbor Laboratory; 2021;860668–860668.

102. Boettger LM, Handsaker RE, Zody MC, Mccarroll SA. Structural haplotypes and recent evolution of the human 17q21.31 region. *Nature genetics*. NIH Public Access; 2012;44:881–881.
103. Guo H, Ahmed M, Zhang F, Yao CQ, Li S, Liang Y, et al. Modulation of long noncoding RNAs by risk SNPs underlying genetic predispositions to prostate cancer. *Nat Genet*. 2016;48:1142–50.
104. Michailidou K, Hall P, Gonzalez-Neira A, Ghoussaini M, Dennis J, Milne RL, et al. Large-scale genotyping identifies 41 new loci associated with breast cancer risk. *Nature Genetics*. 2013;45:353–61.
105. Sirey TM, Roberts K, Haerty W, Bedoya-Reina O, Granados SR, Tan JY, et al. The long non-coding rna cerx1 is a post transcriptional regulator of mitochondrial complex i catalytic activity. *eLife*. eLife Sciences Publications Ltd; 2019;8.
106. Deng X, Zhao Y, Wang B. miR-519d-mediated downregulation of STAT3 suppresses breast cancer progression. *Oncology reports*. *Oncol Rep*; 2015;34:2188–94.
107. Li D, Song H, Wu T, Xie D, Hu J, Zhao J, et al. MiR-519d-3p suppresses breast cancer cell growth and motility via targeting LIM domain kinase 1. *Molecular and cellular biochemistry*. *Mol Cell Biochem*; 2018;444:169–78.
108. Feng H, Gusev A, Pasaniuc B, Wu L, Long J, Abu-full Z, et al. Transcriptome-wide association study of breast cancer risk by estrogen-receptor status. *Genetic Epidemiology*. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd; 2020;44:442–68.
109. Gusev A, Lawrenson K, Lin X, Lyra PC, Kar S, Vavra KC, et al. A transcriptome-wide association study of high-grade serous epithelial ovarian cancer identifies new susceptibility genes and splice variants. *Nature Genetics*. Nature Publishing Group; 2019;51:815–23.

110. Pashirzad M, Fiuji H, Khazei M, Moradi-Binabaj M, Ryzhikov M, Shabani M, et al. Role of Wnt3a in the pathogenesis of cancer, current status and prospective. *Molecular Biology Reports*. Springer Netherlands; 2019;46:5609–16.
111. Wu Y, Ginther C, Kim J, Mosher N, Chung S, Slamon D, et al. Expression of Wnt3 activates Wnt/ β -catenin pathway and promotes EMT-like phenotype in trastuzumab-resistant HER2-overexpressing breast cancer cells. *Molecular cancer research : MCR*. Mol Cancer Res; 2012;10:1597–606.
112. Zhou JX, Yang X, Ning S, Wang L, Wang K, Zhang Y, et al. Identification of KANSARL as the first cancer predisposition fusion gene specific to the population of European ancestry origin. *Oncotarget*. Impact Journals, LLC; 2017;8:50594–50594.
113. Wu W, Li D, Feng X, Zhao F, Li C, Zheng S, et al. A pan-cancer study of selenoprotein genes as promising targets for cancer therapy. *BMC Medical Genomics*. BioMed Central Ltd; 2021;14:1–14.
114. Yu Y, Hu H, Doust AN, Kellogg EA. Divergent gene expression networks underlie morphological diversity of abscission zones in grasses. *New Phytologist*. 2019;nph.16087-nph.16087.
115. de Jong S, Chepelev I, Janson E, Strengman E, van den Berg LH, Veldink JH, et al. Common inversion polymorphism at 17q21.31 affects expression of multiple genes in tissue-specific manner. *BMC Genomics*. BioMed Central; 2012;13:1–6.
116. Lu Y, Beeghly-Fadiel A, Wu L, Guo X, Li B, Schildkraut JM, et al. A transcriptome-wide association study among 97,898 women to identify candidate susceptibility genes for epithelial ovarian cancer risk. *Cancer Research*. Cancer Res; 2018;78:5419–30.
117. Su X, Li W, Lv L, Li X, Yang J, Luo XJ, et al. Transcriptome-Wide Association Study Provides Insights Into the Genetic Component of Gene Expression in Anxiety. *Frontiers in Genetics*. Frontiers Media S.A.; 2021;12:1901–1901.

118. Lee CT, Bendriem RM, Kindberg AA, Worden LT, Williams MP, Drgon T, et al. Functional
Consequences of 17q21.31/WNT3-WNT9B Amplification in hPSCs with Respect to
Neural Differentiation. *Cell Reports*. Cell Press; 2015;10:616–32.
119. Zhang D, Guelfi S, Garcia-Ruiz S, Costa B, Reynolds RH, D'Sa K, et al. Incomplete
annotation has a disproportionate impact on our understanding of Mendelian and
complex neurogenetic disorders. *Science Advances*. American Association for the
Advancement of Science; 2020;6:8299–8299.
120. Giambartolomei C, Liu JZ, Zhang W, Hauberg M, Shi H, Boocock J, et al. A Bayesian
framework for multiple trait colocalization from summary association statistics.
Bioinformatics. Oxford University Press; 2018;34:2538–45.
121. Gleason KJ, Yang F, Pierce BL, He X, Chen LS. Primo: Integration of multiple GWAS and
omics QTL summary statistics for elucidation of molecular mechanisms of trait-associated
SNPs and detection of pleiotropy in complex traits. *Genome Biology*. BioMed Central Ltd;
2020;21:236–236.
122. Bhattacharya A, García-Closas M, Olshan AF, Perou CM, Troester MA, Love MI. A
framework for transcriptome-wide association studies in breast cancer in diverse study
populations. *Genome Biology*. BioMed Central; 2020;21:42–42.
123. Geeleher P, Nath A, Wang F, Zhang Z, Barbeira AN, Fessler J, et al. Cancer expression
quantitative trait loci (eQTLs) can be determined from heterogeneous tumor gene
expression data by modeling variation in tumor purity. *Genome Biology*. BioMed Central;
2018;19:130–130.
124. Patel A, Garcia-Closas M, Olshan AF, Perou CM, Troester MA, Love MI, et al. Gene level
germline contributions to clinical risk of recurrence scores in Black and White breast
cancer patients. *Cancer Research*. American Association for Cancer Research;
2021;canres.1207.2021-canres.1207.2021.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Nicholas Mancuso, Harold Pimentel, Mike Love, Achal Patel, and Kangcheng Hou for engaging conversation during the research process. We also thank the UCLA Bruins-in-Genomics Summer Program for the research opportunities.

The Prostate cancer genome-wide association analyses are supported by the Canadian Institutes of Health Research, European Commission's Seventh Framework Programme grant agreement n° 223175 (HEALTH-F2-2009-223175), Cancer Research UK Grants C5047/A7357, C1287/A10118, C1287/A16563, C5047/A3354, C5047/A10692, C16913/A6135, and The National Institute of Health (NIH) Cancer Post-Cancer GWAS initiative grant: No. 1 U19 CA 148537-01 (the GAME-ON initiative).

Genotyping of the OncoArray was funded by the US National Institutes of Health (NIH) [U19 CA 148537 for ELucidating Loci Involved in Prostate cancer SuscEptibility (ELLIPSE) project and X01HG007492 to the Center for Inherited Disease Research (CIDR) under contract number HHSN268201200008I] and by Cancer Research UK grant A8197/A16565. Additional analytic support was provided by NIH NCI U01 CA188392 (PI: Schumacher).

We would also like to thank the following for funding support: The Institute of Cancer Research and The Everyman Campaign, The Prostate Cancer Research Foundation, Prostate Research Campaign UK (now PCUK), The Orchid Cancer Appeal, Rosetrees Trust, The National Cancer Research Network UK, The National Cancer Research Institute (NCRI) UK. We are grateful for support of NIHR funding to the NIHR Biomedical Research Centre at The Institute of Cancer Research and The Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust.

The breast cancer genome-wide association analyses for BCAC and CIMBA were supported by Cancer Research UK (C1287/A10118, C1287/A16563, C1287/A10710, C12292/A20861, C12292/A11174, C1281/A12014, C5047/A8384, C5047/A15007, C5047/A10692, C8197/A16565), The National Institutes of Health (CA128978, X01HG007492- the DRIVE consortium), the PERSPECTIVE project supported by the Government of Canada through Genome Canada and the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (grant GPH-129344) and the Ministère de l'Économie, Science et Innovation du Québec through Genome Québec and the PSRSIIRI-701 grant, the Quebec Breast Cancer Foundation, the European Community's Seventh Framework Programme under grant agreement n° 223175 (HEALTH-F2-2009-223175) (COGS), the European Union's Horizon 2020 Research and Innovation Programme (634935 and 633784), the Post-Cancer GWAS initiative (U19 CA148537, CA148065 and CA148112 - the GAME-ON initiative), the Department of Defence (W81XWH-10-1-0341), the Canadian Institutes of Health Research (CIHR) for the CIHR Team in Familial Risks of Breast Cancer (CRN-87521), the Komen Foundation for the Cure, the Breast Cancer Research Foundation and the Ovarian Cancer Research Fund. All studies and funders are listed in Zhang H et al (Nat Genet, 2020).

FUNDING

TS was supported by the National Institute of Neurological Disorders and Stroke of the National Institutes of Health under Award Number T32NS048004. This research was supported by the National Institute of Mental Health of the National Institutes of Health under Award number 5R01MH115676-04. AG was partially supported by R01 CA227237. SL was partially supported by NIH award R01 CA194393. BP were partially supported by NIH awards R01 HG009120, R01 MH115676, R01 CA251555, R01 AI153827, R01 HG006399, R01 CA244670, U01 HG011715. The content is solely the responsibility of the authors and does not necessarily represent the official views of the National Institutes of Health.

917

918 **AUTHOR INFORMATION**

919 *Contributions*

920 AB conceived the study. AB, TS, and PL developed the statistical approaches, performed the
921 analysis, and drafted the paper. AB, TS, and BP provided insight in methodological approaches
922 and analysis. BP provided data resources. AB and BP supervised the study. All authors
923 approved and edited the final manuscript.

924

925 *Corresponding author*

926 Correspondence to Arjun Bhattacharya (abtbhatt@ucla.edu)

927

928 **ETHICS DECLARATION**

929 *Ethics approval and consent to participate*

930 This study was approved by the Office of Human Research Ethics at the University of California,
931 Los Angeles, and written informed consent was obtained from each participant. All experimental
932 methods abided by the Helsinki Declaration.

933

934 *Consent for publication*

935 Not applicable.

936

937 *Competing interests*

938 The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

FIGURES

Regulation via potential gene activation/inhibition

Figure 1: Schematic of mediation analysis to identify ncRNA-mediated distal-eQTLs of protein-coding genes. A SNP *s* is distal to protein-coding gene *G* and local to ncRNA *M*, where *M* has some distal regulatory effect on *G*. We use expression quantitative trait locus mapping to identify the local-eQTL between *s* and *M* (green dotted line) and the distal-eQTL between *s* and *G* (grey dotted line). Using either mediation analysis or gene-level association testing, we estimate the indirect mediation effect of *s* on *G* through effects from *M* (red line). Lastly, we use colocalization and genetically-regulated expression analysis to find any intersecting genetic signal between distal-eQTLs of *G* and genetic associations with breast and prostate cancer risk.

Figure 2: Location plot of distal-eQTL or gene-gene associations across healthy and tumor samples of breast and prostate tissue. **(a)** eSNP (X-axis) position vs. transcription start site (TSS) of pcGene (Y-axis) at FDR-adjusted $P < 0.01$, sized by absolute scaled TME and colored by direction of effect. **(b)** ncRNA TSS (X-axis) vs. pcGene TSS (Y-axis) at FDR-adjusted $P < 0.01$, sized by absolute scaled gene-gene effect and colored by direction of effect. Top cross-chromosomal distal-eGenes with largest effects are labeled.

Figure 3: Over-represented ontologies for tissue-specific eGenes. -log₁₀ P-value of enrichment (X-axis) of over-represented gene sets (Y-axis), with point sized by enrichment ratio and colored by ontology category. Here, for a tissue, we compare the set of pcGenes from healthy or tumor state to the universe of all pcGenes for tissue across both healthy and tumor states.

Figure 4: Colocalization of local-eQTLs of ncRNA and distal-eQTLs of pcGene with GWAS. (a) Barplot of numbers of mediating ncRNAs within 1 Megabase of a GWAS SNP (X-axis) from cancers (Y-axis). **(b-d)** Colocalization results for example ncRNAs and pcGenes, with phenotype in the GWAS, ncRNA, and pcGene provided. Left panel shows scatterplot of absolute Z-scores of GWAS (X-axis) and eQTL associations (Y-axis) with points colored by posterior probability of colocalization (PP.H4). Right panel shows a Manhattan plot of GWAS (top), ncRNA local-eQTL (middle), and pcGene distal-eQTL (bottom) signal, colored by PP.H4.

Figure 5: Impact of H2 inversion on eQTLs in the 17q21.31 locus. (a) Causal diagram of genetic effects in 17q21.31, where strong effects of genetically-determined H2 inversion on ncRNA and pcGene (in black) induces the observed SNP-ncRNA and -pcGene associations (in grey). (b) Forest plot of effect sizes and 95% confidence interval (Y-axis) on H2 inversion on pcGenes or ncRNAs (X-axis). (c) Difference in $-\log_{10}$ permutation P-value (Y-axis) of total mediation effect of ncRNA on pcGene, with or without adjustment for H2 inversion (X-axis). (d) Manhattan plots of GWAS, local-eQTLs of KANSL1-AS1, and distal-eQTLs of CRHR1, unadjusted (left) and adjusted (right) for H2 inversion, colored by per-SNP PP.H4. (e) Scatterplot of Z-score of local-eQTLs on KANSL1-AS1 (X-axis) against Z-score of local-QTLs of H2 inversion. (f) Manhattan plots of GWAS and local-QTLs of H2 inversion, colored by per-SNP PP.H4.

Figure 6: GReX associations with cancer risk for ncRNAs mediating multiple distal-eQTLs of pcGenes. Forest plot of effect size and confidence intervals at significance level of $P = 2.5 \times 10^{-6}$ (Y-axis) of GReX-associations with overall and subtype-specific cancer risk across ncRNAs that showed significant mediation of multiple distal-eQTLs of distinct pcGenes (X-axis) in non-cancerous (**a**) and tumor (**b**) tissue states.

TABLES

Table 1: Summary of local- and distal-eQTL mapping results across breast and prostate non-cancerous and tumor tissue through mediation analysis.

		<i>Breast</i>		<i>Prostate</i>	
		Non-cancerous	Tumor	Non-cancerous	Tumor
Total eQTLs					
	<i>Local</i>	22,832	1,298	12,511	6,368
	<i>Distal</i>	29,512	316,097	31,782	363,587
Total eGenes					
	<i>local-ncRNAs</i>	1,113	87	773	60
	<i>distal-pcGenes</i>	8,849	19,376	8,711	15,560
SNPs associated in both local and distal eQTLs					
	<i>Local</i>	1,569	601	281	6,368
	<i>Distal</i>	1,580	5,089	264	9,259
Mediated distal-eQTLs					
	<i>eSNPs</i>	703	3,017	103	425
	<i>e-ncRNAs</i>	157	45	22	18
	<i>e-pcGenes</i>	173	562	24	107

Table 2: Summary of distal-eQTL mapping results across breast and prostate normal and tumor tissue using GBAT.

	<i>Breast</i>		<i>Prostate</i>	
	Normal	Tumor	Normal	Tumor
<i>Total gene-gene associations</i>	13	1,375	7	297
<i>Unique ncRNAs</i>	9	209	4	84
<i>Unique pcGenes</i>	10	1,127	5	268

SUPPLEMENTAL FIGURES

Supplemental Figure S1: Analysis scheme. We analyze genetic and transcriptomic data from non-cancerous breast and prostate tissue from GTEx and breast and prostate tumors from TCGA. We optimize eQTL mapping using ordinary least squares regression for numbers of genotype principal components and expression hidden covariates with prior to optimize eQTL discovery. We then conduct a genome-wide local and distal eQTL analysis using the optimized set of covariates. Next, we conduct mediation analysis or gene-based association testing to identify distal-eQTLs of pcGenes that are mediated by local-eQTLs of ncRNAs. Lastly, we integrate eQTLs results with GWAS using colocalization and analysis of genetically-regulated expression.

Supplemental Figure S2: Distribution of total mediation effects, mediation proportions, and gene-level distal effect sizes in healthy and tumor breast and prostate tissue.

Supplemental Figure S3: Over-represented ontologies for healthy- or tumor-specific eGenes, compared to all protein-coding genes in the transcriptome. $-\log_{10}$ P-value of enrichment (X-axis) of over-represented gene sets (Y-axis), with point sized by enrichment ratio and colored by ontology category. Here, combining pcGenes with a distal genetic association across breast and prostate tissue, we compare the set of pcGenes from healthy or tumor state to the universe of all pcGenes in the transcriptome.

Supplemental Figure S4: Over-represented ontologies for healthy or tumor state-specific eGenes, compared to all protein-coding genes detected in distal-QTL mapping. -log₁₀ P-value of enrichment (X-axis) of over-represented gene sets (Y-axis), with point sized by enrichment ratio and colored by ontology category. Here, combining pcGenes with a distal genetic association across breast and prostate tissue, we compare the set of pcGenes detected for breast or prostate and compare to the universe of all pcGenes detected across breast and prostate. No enrichments at $P < 0.05$ were detected for breast-specific pcGenes.

Supplemental Figure S5: Over-represented ontologies for breast or prostate-specific eGenes, compared to all protein-coding genes detected in distal-QTL mapping. $-\log_{10}$ P-value of enrichment (X-axis) of over-represented gene sets (Y-axis), with point sized by enrichment ratio and colored by ontology category. Here, combining pcGenes with a distal genetic association across healthy and tumor state, we compare the set of pcGenes detected for breast or prostate and compare to the universe of all pcGenes detected across breast and prostate. No enrichments at $P < 0.05$ were detected for breast-specific pcGenes.

Supplemental Figure S6: Scatterplot of posterior probability of colocalization for local- and distal-eQTLs with cancer risk GWAS. Red lines show PP.H4 = .75.

SUPPLEMENTAL TABLE LEGENDS

Table S1: *Prioritized ncRNA-mediated distal-eQTLs of pcGenes in healthy and tumor prostate tissue.* We provide the tissue state (healthy or tumor), SNP, ncRNA, pcGene, effect size, P-value, method of detection (mediation analysis or GBAT), and closest GWAS risk SNP and P-value.

Table S2: *Prioritized ncRNA-mediated distal-eQTLs of pcGenes in healthy and tumor breast tissue.* We provide the tissue state (healthy or tumor), SNP, ncRNA, pcGene, effect size, P-value, method of detection (mediation analysis or GBAT), and closest GWAS risk SNP and P-value.

Table S3: *In-silico validation of miRNA-pcGene pairs using TargetScan.* For miRNAs detected to mediated distal-eQTLs of pcGenes, we list miRNAs shown to target the pcGene using TargetScan.

Table S4: *Colocalization results for ncRNA-mediated distal-eQTLs with GWAS signal of cancer risk.* We provide the trait, tissue (breast or prostate), tissue state (healthy or tumor), ncRNA and its location, pcGene and its location, posterior probabilities of colocalization between the ncRNA and pcGene with the GWAS signal, and the colocalized SNP for each signal.

Table S5: *GReX analysis results for ncRNAs and cancer risk.* We provide the trait, tissue (breast or prostate), tissue state (healthy or tumor), ncRNA and its location, effect size, standard error, and Z-score of association.