Integrative genomic analysis reveals somatic mutations in pheochromocytoma and paraganglioma
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Pheochromocytomas and paragangliomas are neuroendocrine tumors that occur in the context of inherited cancer syndromes in ~30% of cases and are linked to germline mutations in the VHL, RET, NF1, SDHA, SDHB, SDHC, SDHD, SDHAF2 and TMEM127 genes. Although genome-wide expression studies have revealed some of the mechanisms likely to be involved in pheochromocytoma/paraganglioma tumorigenesis, the complete molecular distinction of all subtypes of hereditary tumors has not been solved and the genetic events involved in the generation of sporadic tumors are unknown. With these purposes in mind, we investigated 202 pheochromocytomas/paragangliomas, including 75 hereditary tumors, using expression profiling, BAC array comparative genomic hybridization and somatic mutation screening. Gene expression signatures defined the hereditary tumors according to their genotype and notably, led to a complete subseparation between SDHx- and VHL-related tumors. In tumor tissues, the systematic characterization of somatic genetic events associated with germline mutations in tumor suppressor genes revealed loss of heterozygosity (LOH) in a majority of cases, but also detected point mutations and copy-neutral LOH. Finally, guided by transcriptome classifications and LOH profiles, somatic mutations in VHL or RET genes were identified in 14% of sporadic pheochromocytomas/paragangliomas. Overall, we found a germline or somatic genetic alteration in 45.5% (92/202) of the tumors in this large series of pheochromocytomas/paragangliomas. Regarding mutated genes, specific molecular pathways involved in tumorigenesis mechanisms are identified. Altogether, these new findings suggest that somatic mutation analysis is likely to yield important clues for personalizing molecular targeted therapies.
INTRODUCTION

Paragangliomas are neuroendocrine tumors that originate from neural crest-derived cells. They arise from sympathetic or parasympathetic paraganglia tissues, whereas tumors that arise from the adrenal medulla are called pheochromocytomas. Pheochromocytomas and paragangliomas can occur in the context of inherited cancer syndromes in ~30% of cases (1), including multiple endocrine neoplasia type 2 (MEN2), neurofibromatosis type 1 (NF1), von Hippel Lindau (VHL) disease, hereditary paraganglioma and familial pheochromocytoma (2–3). MEN2 is caused by germline activating mutations in the RET proto-oncogene, whereas germline loss-of-function mutations in the NF1 and VHL tumor suppressor genes cause the NF1 and VHL diseases, respectively. The susceptibility genes for the paraganglioma/pheochromocytoma syndromes encompass the tumor suppressor genes SDHB, SDHC and SDHD (4–6) as well as the recently reported SDHAF2 (previously reported as the PGL2 locus) and SDHA genes for hereditary paraganglioma and the TMEM127 gene for familial pheochromocytoma (7–9). Previous genome-wide expression studies performed on hereditary and sporadic pheochromocytomas/paragangliomas have revealed two dominant groups that could be separated by unsupervised classification (10–12). The first group included tumors carrying VHL and SDHx mutations and accounted for 30% of the sporadic tumors [referred to as Cluster 1 by Dahia et al. (10–12)]. The second group contained the RET- and NF1-related pheochromocytomas and included 70% of the sporadic tumors (Cluster 2). The VHL- and SDH/ D-associated tumors in Cluster 1 were characterized by transcription signatures indicating reduced oxidoreductase activity and increased angiogenesis and hypoxia (11). The gene expression signatures of Cluster 2-related tumors included genes that mediate translation initiation, protein synthesis, adrenergic metabolism, neural/neuroendocrine differentiation and kinase signaling. Transcriptome analysis of a series of head and neck paragangliomas showed that SDHAF2-related tumors presented gene expression profiles very similar to SDHx-linked tumors (13). In the study reported by Dahia et al., some tumors without an identified mutation and which clustered with RET- and NF1-pheochromocytomas were subsequently found to have TMEM127 mutations (9,14), which now explain 2% of pheochromocytoma/paraganglioma (15).

Despite the characterization of these two main groups (VHL/SDHx versus RET/NF1), a comprehensive molecular distinction between VHL- and SDHx-related tumors on one hand, and RET- and NF1-related tumors on the other hand, has not been achieved. However, indications that VHL tumors could be distinguished from SDHx tumors by transcription profiling were recently provided using of restricted lists of genes involved in hypoxic (7,12) or glycolytic (16) pathway.

Moreover, an understanding of the genetic events leading to the classification of sporadic tumors either in Cluster 1 or in Cluster 2 was also missing. Particularly, previous expression studies did not investigate the presence of somatic mutations in sporadic tumors.

In the present report, we determined the gene expression profile and mapped the losses of heterozygosity (LOH) for a cohort of 202 pheochromocytomas/paragangliomas, including 75 hereditary tumors, collected by the COMETE network. Gene expression signatures defined the hereditary tumors according to their genotype. Each set of tumors was characterized by the alterations found in specific signaling pathways, which yielded important clues for understanding the oncogenesis of pheochromocytomas/paragangliomas. Moreover, guided by the transcriptome classifications and LOH profiles, we demonstrated that ~14% of the sporadic tumors had resulted from somatic mutations in the VHL or RET genes.

RESULTS

Patient and tumor characteristics

A total of 190 patients recruited by the COMETE network over 15 years (1993–2008) were included in the study (Table 1). We identified germline mutations in 57 patients (Supplementary Material, Table S1): 9 mutations were in the RET gene (4.7% of the cohort), 25 in the VHL gene (13.2%), 1 in TMEM127 (0.5%) and 22 in an SDHx gene (11.6%; 1 in SDHA, 16 in SDHB, 2 in SDHC and 3 in SDHD). Nine patients were clinically diagnosed with NF1 (4.7% of the cohort). We found no germline mutations in the 124 remaining patients (65.3%).

From these patients, we analyzed 202 tumor samples (10 NF1-, 10 RET-, 29 VHL-, 1 TMEM127-, 1 SDHA-, 18 SDHB-, 2 SDHC-, 4 SDHD-related tumors and 127 tumors that lacked a germline mutation, referred to as ‘sporadic’ tumors). We obtained microarray data for 188 samples and BAC array comparative genomic hybridization (CGH) data for 201 samples (Table 1).

LOH mapping guides the identification of diverse somatic events in hereditary pheochromocytomas/paragangliomas

We used BAC array CGH to assess whether each tumor associated with a germline mutation in a tumor suppressor gene had lost the corresponding wild-type allele and thus had undergone LOH.

LOH was found in 25/28 VHL-, 17/18 SDHB-, 8/10 NF1-, 4/4 SDHD-, 1/2 SDHC-, 1/1 SDHA- and 1/1 TMEM127-related

Table 1. Genetic features of COMETE network patients and tumors included in the study

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Germline mutation carriers</th>
<th>Yes (%)</th>
<th>Tumor samples, n = 202</th>
<th>Microarray data, n = 188</th>
<th>BAC array CGH data, n = 201</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NF1</td>
<td>66 (35%)</td>
<td>75 (37%)</td>
<td>69 (37%)</td>
<td>74 (37%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RET</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHL</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TMEM127</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDHA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDHB</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDHC</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDHD</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
tumors (Fig. 1A and Supplementary Material, Table S1). BAC array CGH results were not available for one VHL-related tumor but LOH was revealed in this sample by using multiplex ligation-dependent probe amplification (MLPA). In the two NF1-related tumors where BAC array CGH failed to identify the corresponding loss of the 17q11.2 locus, we identified LOH through microsatellite analysis (Fig. 1B). In all the SDHD-related paragangliomas, the entire chromosome 11 had been lost.

In one SDHC-related tumor that had a germline deletion of the third exon, no LOH but gain of the entire 1q arm was found. The MLPA profile obtained from the DNA of this tumor showed a homozygous deletion of SDHC exon 3, which suggested that the mutated allele had been duplicated.

For the other tumors with germline mutations and without a loss or gain of the corresponding locus (three VHL- and one SDHB-related tumors), we tested the hypothesis that a somatic point mutation or a large deletion in the corresponding second allele was the second hit. We identified VHL missense somatic variants in two VHL patients (c.250G>C corresponding to p.Val84Leu and c.302T>A corresponding to p.Leu101Gln) (Supplementary Material, Table S1). The p.Val84Leu mutation and two mutations at codon 101 (p.Leu101Gly and p.Leu101Arg) were already reported in patients affected by VHL disease (17). In silico analysis of the p.Leu101Gln variant predicted it to have a protein-damaging effect (ALAMUT® software).

In the SDHB tumor, we found a SDHB intronic variant (c.541-7dup in intron 5) that was not a known polymorphism contained in the TCA Cycle Gene Mutation Database (18). Although there was not enough material to confirm the functionality of this variant at the RNA level, in silico predictions (Human Splicing Finder software, http://www.umd.be/HSF/) suggested that this mutation disrupted an acceptor splice site and created a cryptic splice site that would consequently alter the reading frame (19).

Altogether, we demonstrated biallelic inactivation of the corresponding susceptibility genes for all but one tumor (Supplementary Material, Table S1).

Unsupervised hierarchical clustering analysis classifies hereditary pheochromocytomas/paragangliomas according to their genotype

Unsupervised hierarchical clustering analysis of 188 hereditary (n = 69) or sporadic (n = 119) pheochromocytomas/paragangliomas according to their genotype revealed distinct clusters of tumors based on their genotype. The analysis highlighted the genetic heterogeneity within these tumors, allowing for the identification of subgroups with distinct genetic profiles. This approach provided insights into the molecular mechanisms underlying tumor development and could be useful for targeted therapeutic strategies.
paragangliomas generated five main clusters (Fig. 2). Cluster 1A included 23/23 SDHx-related and two sporadic tumors. Cluster 1B encompassed 26/27 VHL-related and 16 sporadic tumors. Cluster 2A contained 78 tumors including 9/9 NF1-, 8/9 RET-, 1/1 TMEM127-related and 60 sporadic tumors. Cluster 2B was composed of 29 sporadic tumors. Finally, Cluster 2C comprised 1/27 VHL-, 1/9 RET-related and 12 sporadic tumors. Thus, except for two samples (one RET and one VHL), all hereditary tumors (67/69) were remarkably classified according to their initial molecular defect into three clusters defining an ‘SDHx’ group (Cluster 1A), a ‘VHL’ group (Cluster 1B) and a ‘RET/NF1/TMEM127’ group (Cluster 2A).

Hence, as previously reported by others (12,14), we were not able to distinguish RET- from NF1-related pheochromocytomas, confirming the similarities of their respective tumorigenesis pathways. In contrast, our study led to the first partitioning of the SDHx- and VHL-related pheochromocytomas into two groups having independent expression signatures.

Supervised analysis identifies differentially expressed genes in SDHx, VHL and RET/NF1/TMEM127 groups of tumors

In order to better characterize the molecular specificities of each group of tumors, supervised analysis was performed on the 69 hereditary tumors (Fig. 3A). The 451 genes retained for this analysis were classified into six groups (A–F) depending on their expression patterns in the three tumor classes (Fig. 3A and Supplementary Material, Table S2). Comparison of the three tumor groups was also performed through pathways analysis (Supplementary Material, Tables S3 and S4).

Twenty-two genes were specifically overexpressed in SDHx tumors compared with other hereditary tumor groups (group A, Supplementary Material, Table S2). These genes are involved in transcription regulation (DDIT3, NR1H3, MEIS3, PAWR, SIX1, SIX4, TRIB3), protein transport (GOSR2, HCN3, LAPTM4B, SLC16A10, SLC35F2), proliferation (ESRRA), energy metabolism (NOXA1) and cell adhesion (DSP, CNTN4). In contrast, the 78 genes found to be specifically downregulated in SDHx tumors were very diverse and could not be associated according to any particular cell functions (group E, Supplementary Material, Table S2).

As expected, the SDHx- and VHL- pheochromocytomas/paragangliomas shared high levels of expression for several genes involved in angiogenesis (VEGFA) (Fig. 3B) and hypoxic pathways (EPAS1, NOX4, LOXL2) (group B, Supplementary Material, Tables S2 and S3).

Eighty-seven different genes (group C, Supplementary Material, Table S2), including two involved in glycolysis (ENO1, SLC2A1), as well as EGLN3 and KISS1R were highly expressed in VHL-related tumors only (Fig. 3B). Pathway analysis also revealed the specific activation of
glycolysis in this set of tumors (Supplementary Material, Table S3).

The RET/NF1/TMEM127-related pheochromocytomas were characterized by high expression levels of genes involved in cell signaling, the mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK) pathway or neuroendocrine differentiation with PNMT (Fig. 3B), NCAM2 and CADPS (group D, Supplementary Material, Table S2). The up-regulation of MAPK signaling...
was also confirmed by pathways analysis (Supplementary Material, Table S3).

Group F contained genes whose levels of expression increased progressively from the SDHx- to the VHL- and finally to the RET/NF1/TMEM127-related tumors. For example, RET was expressed weakly in SDHx-related tumors, moderately in VHL-related tumors and strongly in RET/NF1/TMEM127-pheochromocytomas (Fig. 3B).

Group F also contained genes involved in neuronal differentiation (SHANK2, GDF10) and insulin signaling, and a metastasis suppressor gene (TIP30) (Supplementary Material, Tables S2 and S3).

Genome-wide studies lead to identify somatic mutations in 14% of the sporadic pheochromocytomas/paragangliomas

The unsupervised hierarchical cluster analysis of the entire patient cohort (188 samples) classified 78 of the 119 sporadic tumors (65%) with hereditary tumors, i.e. in Cluster 1A (two tumors, referred to as ’pseudo-SDHx’), Cluster 1B (16 tumors, referred to as ’pseudo-VHL’) or Cluster 2A (60 tumors, referred to as ’pseudo-RET/NF1’). An unsupervised hierarchical analysis of the 78 hereditary and sporadic tumors included in Cluster 2A was performed in order to distinguish potential ’pseudo-RET’ from potential ’pseudo-NF1’ (data not shown).

This analysis did not discriminate RET-related from NF1-related pheochromocytomas. Hence, RET genotyping was performed in the 60 sporadic tumors of Cluster 2A and identified a somatic mutation in six benign tumors (Table 2). Four carried the c.2753T>G (p.Met918Thr) missense mutation known to be responsible for MEN2B and two harbored in-frame deletions (c.1893_1898del and c.1894_1899del, respectively) comprising codons 632–633 (Table 2). TMEM127 genotyping was performed in all tumors presenting a LOH in the corresponding locus (2q11) and no additional mutations were found.

Analysis of the two ’pseudo-SDHx’ tumors by BAC array CGH showed losses of the 1p, 1q and 11q regions (encompassing the SDHB, SDHC, SDHD and SDHAF2 loci) in one and loss of the 1p region (encompassing the SDHB locus) in the other. In these two tumors, we did not find any somatic mutations (point mutations or large deletion) in the SDHB, SDHC, SDHD or SDHAF2 genes or point mutations in SDHA. We performed SDHB and SDHA immunohistochemistry on the paraffin-embedded sections of the corresponding tumors and observed normal expression levels for both proteins, which confirmed the absence of a functional mutation in an SDHx gene (7,20,21). However, the classification of these tumors in the SDHx group suggested that a gene encoding a protein involved in a related mitochondrial pathway had been inactivated. We searched for mutations in several such genes (SDHAF1, IDH1 and IDH2) but failed to detect any.

LOH at the VHL locus was observed in all 16 tumors (from 14 different patients) of the ’pseudo-VHL’ group. Direct sequencing of the VHL gene and a search for large deletions revealed 11 somatic mutations (one mutation was found in both tumor samples of a patient presenting an abdominal paraganglioma and a local recurrence of the disease 2 years later) (Table 2). In the five remaining ’pseudo-VHL’ tumors, gene expression data indicated that VHL expression was conserved, which excluded the silencing of the second allele by DNA methylation. No additional somatic VHL mutations were found in any of the sporadic tumors exhibiting LOH at the 3p25 locus classified in the other clusters (1 from Cluster 1A; 11 from Cluster 2A; 2 from Cluster 2B; 1 from Cluster 2C). Thus, our approach allowed us to identify somatic mutations in 14.3% (17/119) of sporadic tumors.

Table 2. Somatic mutations identified in sporadic pheochromocytoma/paraganglioma

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Somatic mutation gene</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age at diagnosis</th>
<th>Benign/ Malignant</th>
<th>Somatic mutation nucleotide</th>
<th>Somatic mutation protein</th>
<th>Number of tumor samples</th>
<th>Tumor type</th>
<th>BAC array CGH dataa</th>
<th>Presence of the mutation in germline DNA</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>RET</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>67 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.1893_1898del</td>
<td>p.Asp631_Leu633delinsGlu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHEO</td>
<td>Normal No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RET</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>52 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.1894_1899del</td>
<td>p.Glu632Leu633del</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHEO</td>
<td>Normal No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RET</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>51 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.2753T&gt;C</td>
<td>p.Met918Thr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHEO</td>
<td>Normal No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RET</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>59 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.2753T&gt;C</td>
<td>p.Met918Thr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHEO</td>
<td>Normal No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RET</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>62 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.2753T&gt;C</td>
<td>p.Met918Thr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHEO</td>
<td>Normal No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RET</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>39 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.2753T&gt;C</td>
<td>p.Met918Thr</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHEO</td>
<td>Normal No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.193T&gt;G</td>
<td>p.Ser65Ala</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHEO</td>
<td>LOH No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.244C&gt;G</td>
<td>p.Arg82Gly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHEO</td>
<td>LOH No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>49 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.244C&gt;G</td>
<td>p.Arg82Gly</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHEO</td>
<td>LOH No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>17 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.245G&gt;T</td>
<td>p.Arg82Leu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHEO</td>
<td>LOH No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>46 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.293A&gt;G</td>
<td>p.Tyr98Cys</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHEO</td>
<td>LOH No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>49 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.360A&gt;C</td>
<td>p.Arg120Ser</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHEO</td>
<td>LOH No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>45 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.462A&gt;T</td>
<td>p.Pro154Pro</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHEO</td>
<td>LOH No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>55 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.475A&gt;G</td>
<td>p.Lys159Glu</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Abdominal PGL</td>
<td>LOH No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHL</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>26 M</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.496G&gt;T</td>
<td>p.Val166Phe</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>PHEO</td>
<td>LOH No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHL</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40 B</td>
<td></td>
<td>c.642A&gt;T</td>
<td>p.X214CysextX15</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>PHEO</td>
<td>LOH No</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PGL, paraganglioma; PHEO: pheochromocytoma.

aBAC array CGH results in the corresponding locus.
DISCUSSION

In this study, we used an integrated genomic and genetic approach to characterize the somatic events that led to tumorigenesis in hereditary pheochromocytomas and paragangliomas, and in a subset of sporadic tumors.

Our analysis of the somatic events associated with the tumor suppressor gene germline mutations in pheochromocytomas/paragangliomas revealed that classical and expected LOH do not occur systematically (Fig. 4). Secondary genetic events in the form of somatic point mutations were found in one SDHB- and two VHL-related tumors. Interestingly, the two VHL somatic point mutations were found in two patients who had complete or partial VHL germline deletions. The occurrence of somatic point mutations as ‘second hit’ in tumors of patients with VHL germline deletion was previously reported (22). In our cohort, there was another tumor with a complete VHL germline deletion that was not associated with either LOH or a VHL somatic mutation. The prevalence of pheochromocytoma in the VHL disease is believed to be low, especially in case of complete VHL gene deletion (17,23). One hypothesis for this is that complete loss of VHL protein function may not allow the precursor cells that give rise to pheochromocytoma to survive (24). Our results are consistent with this hypothesis because complete germline VHL gene deletion was only compatible with pheochromocytoma development if it was associated with a point mutation and not with LOH. This situation suggests that some basal VHL protein activity leads to a pheochromocytoma risk. Such an observation is of direct clinical significance since it implies that patients with complete or partial VHL gene deletion should not be excluded from pheochromocytoma screening, as has been proposed by others (23).

In 2 out of 10 NF1-related tumors, the deletion of one allele was identified by microsatellite analysis. As BAC array CGH data showed no alterations in the copy number in the NF1 locus, this result suggests that in these two samples, copy-neutral LOH had been generated by mitotic recombination that did not reduce the number of NF1 gene copies. The NF1 somatic inactivation by copy-neutral LOH was previously reported as a frequent mechanism, especially in dermal neurofibromas typically associated with NF1 patients (25–26).

In addition, our results from the four SDHD-linked paragangliomas showed that these tumors were systematically associated with complete losses of chromosome 11, which is in accordance with the hypothesis of Hensen et al. (27) who suggested that tumorigenesis of SDHD-related tumors requires biallelic loss of SDHD combined with the loss of another imprinted tumor suppressor gene located in the 11p15 region.

In recent years, three gene expression studies of hereditary pheochromocytomas/paragangliomas revealed that these tumors could be clustered into two major groups based on their transcriptomes: SDHx/VHL (which have a hypoxic transcriptional signature) and RET/NF1 (which exhibit activation of the Ras-mediated MAPK pathway) (10–12). Using biochemical measurements of catecholamine metabolites, these two groups of patients could be discriminated by the lack (Cluster SDHx/VHL) or the presence (Cluster RET/NF1) of angiogenesis and MAPK signaling.
epinephrine production (28). Furthermore, dopamine production can lead to the distinction of many SDHx from VHL tumors (29).

By comparison with other gene expression analyses, the major strengths of our study are the large size of our sample set (202 tumors), the standardization of tumor collection at the time of surgery and of frozen tumor storage and the availability of detailed clinical data including the long follow-up data and genetic and biological information for all tumors. Within the high quality of this collection, we confirmed the unsupervised classification of two major branches that were described previously (Cluster RET/NF1/TMEM127 and Cluster SDHx/VHL) and their corresponding molecular signatures. We also showed, for the first time, that the SDHx- and VHL-related pheochromocytomas/paragangliomas could be further separated into their respective subgroups using unsupervised hierarchical clustering analysis based on the whole gene expression data (Fig. 4). Gene expression data were available for 69 samples that had a known germline mutation, which included 27 VHL- and 23 SDHx-related tumors. We assume that it was this large number of tumors that allowed us to distinguish VHL- from SDHx-related tumors.

Although VHL- and SDHx-related tumors are associated with a pseudo-hypoxic signature, some hypoxia inducible factor (HIF) target genes were differentially expressed between SDHx- and VHL-related samples. Most of these genes, such as ENO1, BNIP3 or CA9, are considered to be HIF-1α-specific targets and were specifically induced in VHL-related pheochromocytomas/paragangliomas. This observation is identical to that recently reported by Lopez-Jimenez et al. (12) but is nevertheless difficult to interpret. Pollard et al. have indeed reported the expression of HIF-2α to be relatively higher than that of HIF-1α in VHL tumors and that the pattern was reversed in SDHx tumors. In contrast, we have shown high HIF-2α and low HIF-1α expression in both SDHx and VHL-related tumors (16,30). Hence, a clear understanding of the balance between HIF-1α and HIF-2α stabilization and the expression of their respective targets will require further investigations.

We, and others, have previously demonstrated significant associations between SDHB mutations, malignancy and the poor prognosis of pheochromocytomas/paragangliomas, but the molecular bases for these associations are still poorly understood (31–32). Among the genes specifically overexpressed in SDHB tumors, we found a number of genes that could explain part of the SDHB gene’s role in pheochromocytoma/paraganglioma malignancy, including: (i) MMP24, which encodes a matrix metalloproteinase involved in metastatic transformation and invasiveness (33–34); (ii) DSP, which was previously associated with poor prognosis in patients with stage I non-small cell lung cancer (35); (iii) SIX1, which was implicated by shRNA interference studies to the proliferation and invasiveness of hepatocellular carcinomas (36); (iv) LGR5, a β-catenin target gene strongly expressed in a subset of aggressive adenocortical cancers (37); and (v) LAPT4B, which plays a role in the invasive potential, tumor recurrence and poor prognosis of various types of cancer (38–39). Furthermore, the mRNA levels of the metastasis suppressor gene TIP30 were progressively higher in the SDHx, VHL and RET/NF1/TMEM127 tumor groups. Low levels of TIP30 expression were reported to promote tumor metastasis in lung cancer and have been associated with poor prognosis in hepatocellular and gastric cancers (40–42). In our study, TIP30 expression appeared to be inversely correlated with the risk of metastatic transformation. Thus, all of these genes should be considered as predictive markers of malignancy.

In the RET/NF1/TMEM127 tumor group, the overexpression of genes involved in neuroendocrine (especially PNMT) and neuronal differentiation (as SHANK2 and RET) is in accordance with the conclusions of Huynh et al. (43) who suggested that VHL and SDHx tumors were dedifferentiated (with the loss of PNMT expression leading to an almost exclusive production of norepinephrine) and/or that they developed at different stages of neural crest differentiation.

Thanks to large cohort studies, we and others have previously established that apparently sporadic pheochromocytomas or paragangliomas can be caused by germline mutation in a pheochromocytoma/paraganglioma susceptibility gene in ~12–16% of these cases (2,44,45). Using large genome-wide studies, we have established here that somatic mutations can make an equivalent contribution to pheochromocytoma/paraganglioma tumorigenesis. Previously, the frequency of somatic mutations in VHL and RET genes in pheochromocytomas/paragangliomas was reported to be low (46–47). In our series of 202 pheochromocytomas and paragangliomas, 75 presented a germline mutation in one of the NF1, RET, VHL, TMEM127 or SDHx genes and 17 carried a somatic mutation in VHL or RET genes (Fig. 4). In this cohort, a genetic cause for the disease was thus established for 45.5% (92/202) of the tumors.

In conclusion, this study has allowed us to identify the genetic cause of almost half of the tumors of our large cohort of inherited and sporadic pheochromocytomas/paragangliomas. These findings might have important clinical consequences for therapeutic targeting in the near future. For example, hereditary and sporadic pheochromocytomas with a RET mutation could benefit from tyrosine kinase inhibitors targeting specifically RET protein or from metabolic radiotherapy based on the ability of these tumors to process catecholamines. In contrast, SDHx- and VHL-inherited tumors, as well as sporadic pheochromocytomas/paragangliomas with a somatic VHL mutation, like sporadic renal cell carcinoma, would likely respond to antiangiogenic therapy targeting proteins involved in the vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF) pathway. In different cancer types, treatment is now targeted to subgroups of patients according to the presence or absence of somatic genetic alterations. For example, in patients with metastatic colorectal cancer, the search for KRAS somatic mutations is routinely performed before treatment decisions are made, with respect to anti-epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) therapy. In KRAS wild-type populations, objective response rates have also been improved by additional genotyping of the BRAF, NRAS and PIK3CA mutations (48–49). Similarly, in non-small cell lung cancer, activating mutations in EGFR are associated with a positive response to tyrosine kinase inhibitor therapy, while PIK3CA and KRAS mutations seem to be indicators of resistance (50). In malignant pheochromocytoma/paraganglioma, 131-I-metaiodobenzyl guanidine, tyrosine kinase
inhibitors or anti-VEGF therapies could be considered. Thus, our data suggest that germline but also a somatic genetic testing should be proposed for patients with metastatic pheochromocytoma/paraganglioma who, according to the identified mutations, could benefit from molecular targeted therapeutics.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Patients**

Ethical approval for the study was obtained from the institutional review board (CPP Paris-Cochin, January 2007). All patients provided written informed consent for the collection of samples and subsequent analyses.

The tumor and blood samples were prospectively collected by the French ‘Cortico et Médullosurrénale: les Tumeurs Endocrines’ (COMETE) network. The procedures used for pheochromocytoma/paraganglioma diagnosis were in accordance with institutional guidelines and have been described previously (51). Diagnosis was confirmed by histology in every case. Clinical and hormonal data obtained during work-up and follow-up were available for each patient. Tumor samples were obtained from patients with pheochromocytomas and/or abdominal or thoracic paragangliomas. Fresh tumor samples collected during surgery were immediately frozen and stored in liquid nitrogen until processed. A total of 202 tumor samples from 190 different and consecutive patients recruited in the COMETE network from 1993 to 2008 (133 collected by the Georges Pompidou European Hospital and 57 by the Cochin Hospital) were included in the study. Among them, 165 were adrenal pheochromocytomas, 26 were paragangliomas (23 developed in the abdomen and 3 in the thorax), 6 were ganglionic metastasis and 5 were undetermined (e.g. had more than one tumor removed during the surgery and/or the tumor’s exact location was unspecified by the pathologist).

**Nucleic acids extraction**

Germline DNA was extracted from leukocytes according to standard protocols. Tumor samples were powdered in liquid nitrogen (30–50 mg for DNA extraction and 20–30 mg for RNA extraction). Tumor DNA was extracted using a QIAamp DNA mini kit or an AllPrep kit (Qiagen). RNAs were extracted using an RNeasy mini kit (Qiagen), analyzed by electrophoresis on a Bioanalyzer 2100 (Agilent Technologies) and quantified using a NanoDrop ND-1000 spectrophotometer (Labtech). Stringent criteria for RNA quality were applied to rule out degradation, especially a 28S/18S ratio above 1.5.

**Genetic testing**

NF1 diagnosis was based on clinical criteria. Mutation analysis for RET, VHL, SDHB, SDHC and SDHD genes was performed by direct sequencing of germline DNA for each patient. When direct sequencing was negative, VHL, SDHB, SDHC and SDHD were also analyzed for the presence of large deletions using the MLPA (SALSA MLPA P016® version C1 for VHL and SALSA MLPA P226® version B1 for SDHx, MRC Holland, The Netherlands) method as described previously (44). Mutation analyses for SDHA and TMEM127 were performed retrospectively by direct sequencing and were limited to patients whose tumor presented a LOH assessed by BAC array CGH at the corresponding locus (5p15 for SDHA and 2q11 for TMEM127) (7,52). As mutations in the SDHAF2 gene were only described in patients with familial head and neck paragangliomas, we did not systematically analyze the SDHAF2 gene in this study. Mutation analysis for SDHAF1, IDH1 and IDH2 genes was performed by direct sequencing in candidate tumor samples.

**Gene expression and array CGH**

Except where indicated, all transcriptome and genome analyses were carried out using either an assortment of R system software (http://www.R-project.org, V2.9.1) packages including those of Bioconductor (53) (V1.8) or the original R code. R packages and versions are indicated where appropriate.

**Microarray analyses**

Microarray analyses were performed using 3 µg of total RNA for each sample as the starting material and 10 µg cRNA per hybridization (GeneChip Fluidics Station 400; Affymetrix, Santa Clara, CA, USA). Total RNA was amplified and labeled following the manufacturer’s one-cycle target labeling protocol (http://www.affymetrix.com). The labeled cDNA was then hybridized to HG-U133 Plus 2.0 Affymetrix GeneChip arrays (Affymetrix). Chips were scanned with a GCOS 1.4. We used the fHyQCReport R package to generate a QC report for all chips (CEL files) from the CIT discovery series. All the chips that did not pass this QC filtering step were removed from further analyses. Raw feature data from the Affymetrix HG-U133A Plus 2.0 GeneChip microarrays were normalized using the Robust Multi-array Average (RMA) method (R package affy). Complete data sets are available online as ArrayExpress entry E-MTAB-733 (http://www.ebi.ac.uk/arrayexpress/).

**Array CGH analyses**

Array CGH was performed on human Integrachip V7 slides (Intergen SA, Evry, France, http://www.intergen.com). Integrachip V7 is composed of 5878 BAC clones with a median of 0.5 Mb between clones. BAC clones are spotted in quadruplicate. A pool of 19 normal DNAs was used as reference DNA. DNA was labeled by random priming with cyanine 5 (Cy5) for reference DNA and cyanine 3 (Cy3) for tumor DNA. Hybridizations were performed according to the manufacturer’s recommendations. Slides were scanned with an Axon 4000B scanner (Axon Instruments Inc., Union City, CA, USA) and acquired images were analyzed with GenePix Pro 5.1 image analysis software to perform segmentation and to determine the mean intensities for the Cy3 and Cy5 signals of each BAC clone.

Raw log2-ratio feature values were filtered from further analyses using (i) a signal-to-noise threshold of 2.0 for the reference
channel and (ii) individual single intensities for the reference values $< 1.0$ or at saturation (i.e. 65 000). The remaining values were normalized using the loess within-print tip group method (54). For BACs in which more than one feature value remained after filtering and which yielded an inter-feature standard deviation (SD) of $< 0.25$, an average normalized log2-ratio value was calculated. The adaptive weights smoothing technique was then applied to the normalized log2-ratio values [as adapted in the R package GLAD v1.8 (55)]. This yielded segments along the chromosome of homogeneous smoothed log2-ratio values. For each sample, the level $\lambda_0$ of log2 ratio corresponding to a copy number of two was defined as the first mode of the distribution of the normalized log2-ratio values across all chromosomes. The SD of the normalized log2-ratio values within each particular segment was used to define the thresholds ($\lambda_0 \pm$ SD) above and below which the gains and losses were attributed to this segment (based on its smoothed log2-ratio value), respectively. Outliers were analyzed separately and defined as individual clones that yielded normalized log2-ratio values outside the ($\lambda_0 \pm 3$ SD) thresholds. This method allows the smoothed CGH data to be partitioned into three different groups: gain, no change or loss (GLN). We then defined zones of neighboring BAC clones that had the same GNL status for a given sample. This procedure yielded a data set of both zones and individual BAC clones (CGH variables) to which a GNL status had been attributed. Recurrent alterations were defined for the entire population of samples if the identical alteration was present in at least two samples.

**Statistical tests**

On the dendogram representation, the association of the sample subgroups to bioclinical and mutations factors was evaluated by applying a Chi-square test. Supervised analysis of hereditary tumors was based on an ANOVA. Stringently, we retained only probe sets with a $P$ value $< 10^{-13}$.

**Pathways analysis**

KEGG and Biocarta pathways, as well as related genes, were, respectively, obtained from http://www.genome.jp/kegg/pathway.html and from http://www.biocarta.com. The Globaltest method by Goeman et al. (56) implemented in the R package globaltest was used to identify pathways whose genes expression differentials were the most significant. We selected tumors harboring a germline mutation in one of these genes: SDHA, SDHB, SDHC, SDHD, VHL, RET, NF1 and TMEM127. Samples were partitioned into three groups: (i) SDHx mutation, (ii) VHL mutation, and (iii) RET, NF1 or TMEM127 mutation. Globaltest analysis was performed by comparing each of these three groups to the other two, for example SDHx versus (VHL + RET/NF1/TMEM127).

**Unsupervised classification of samples**

Probe sets were selected for clustering based on the following criteria: (i) a $P$-value $< 0.01$ for a variance test and (ii) a robust coefficient of variation (rCV) $< 10$ but greater than the 95th percentile of the rCV. For the variance test, we selected probe sets (P) whose variance across the samples was different from the median of the variances (Varmed) of all the probe sets. The statistic used was $(n - 1)\text{Var}(P)/\text{Varmed}$, where $n$ refers to the number of samples. This statistic was compared with a percentile of the Chi-square distribution with $(n - 1)$ degrees of freedom and yielded a $P$-value for each probe set. This criterion is the same as that used in the filtering tool of the BRB ArrayTools software (http://linus.nci.nih.gov/BRB-ArrayTools.html). The rCV was calculated as follows: having ordered the intensity values of the $n$ samples from minimum to maximum, we eliminated the minimum and maximum values and calculated the coefficient of variation for the remaining values. After filtering, we were left with 459 probe sets, which were used for agglomerative hierarchical clustering using Ward’s linkage and 1-Pearson correlation as a distance metric.

**Microsatellite analysis**

For NF1 copy-neutral LOH investigation, the NF1 intragenic polymorphic D17S2163 (intron 27b) and GDB270136 (intron 38) microsatellites were typed as previously described (57).

**Immunohistochemistry**

Paraffin blocks were cut and sections (6 μm thick) were mounted on Superfrost Plus slides and used for immunohistochemistry as described previously (58). The antibodies used were anti-SDHB (HPA002868, Sigma-Aldrich, 1/500) and anti-SDHA (Abcam, ab14715, 1/1000) (7).

**SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL**

Supplementary Material is available at HMG online.
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