1 **Convergent mutations in tissue-specific regulatory** 2 **regions reveal novel cancer drivers**

3 Nasa Sinnott-Armstrong¹, Jose A. Seoane^{1,2,3}, Richard Sallari⁴, Jonathan K.
4 Pritchard^{1,5}, Christina Curtis^{1,2,3#*}, Michael P. Snyder^{1#*}

5 1 Department of Genetics, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, California,
6 USA

7

8 2 Department of Medicine, Division of Oncology, Stanford University School of
9 Medicine, Stanford, CA

10 3 Stanford Cancer Institute, Stanford University School of Medicine, Stanford, CA

11 4 Axiotl Inc, Cleveland, OH

12 5 Department of Biology, Stanford University, Stanford, CA

13 * Correspondence: cncurtis@stanford.edu (lead contact) and mpsnyder@stanford.edu

14 # These authors contributed equally

15 **Abstract**

16 Although much effort has been devoted to identifying coding mutations across cancer
 17 types, regulatory mutations remain poorly characterized. Here, we describe a
 18 framework to identify non-coding drivers by aggregating mutations in cell-type specific
 19 regulatory regions for each gene. Application of this approach to 2,634 patients across
 20 11 human cancer types identified 60 pan-cancer, 22 pan-breast and 192 cancer specific
 21 candidate driver genes that were enriched for expression changes. Analysis of
 22 high-throughput CRISPR knockout screens revealed large, cancer specific growth
 23 effects for these genes, on par with coding mutations and exceeding that for promoter
 24 mutations. Amongst the five candidate drivers selected for further analysis, four (*IPO9*,
 25 *MED8*, *PLEKHA6*, and *OXNAD1*) were associated with survival across multiple cancer
 26 types. These studies demonstrate the power of our cell-type aware, convergent
 27 regulatory framework to define novel tissue specific cancer driver genes, considerably
 28 expanding evidence of functional non-coding mutations in cancer.

29 Introduction

30 To date, much effort has been devoted to the analysis of coding regions within the
 31 human genome to define somatic alterations associated with tumor growth and
 32 progression (Bailey et al., 2018; Lawrence et al., 2014; Zehir et al., 2017). While many
 33 recurrent clonal coding mutations have been defined, non-coding elements (including
 34 promoters and enhancers) implicated in malignancy have been far more elusive due to
 35 the need for large cohorts with whole genome sequencing (WGS) data and new analytic
 36 approaches. Indeed, attempts to locate regulatory elements enriched for functional
 37 mutations (Araya et al., 2016; Feigin et al., 2017; Melton et al., 2015; Weinhold et al.,
 38 2014; Zhu et al., 2020) have revealed only a handful of target genes, most of which are
 39 associated with core promoter variants. An example is the canonical oncogene *TERT*,
 40 where promoter mutations can induce c-Myc activation and telomeric immortalization
 41 (Berger et al., 2012; Huang et al., 2013; Wu et al., 1999). However, the vast majority of
 42 genes are regulated by promoters as well as proximal and distal enhancer elements
 43 (Schmidt et al., 2010), suggesting that the latter may harbor as of yet undiscovered
 44 mutations. Indeed, the long non-coding RNA (lncRNA) gene *PVT1* was recently
 45 identified as a tissue-specific tumor suppressor DNA boundary element that regulates
 46 *MYC* transcription (Cho et al., 2018), demonstrating a role for regulatory sequences of
 47 lncRNAs in malignancy. A recent paper by Rheinbay et al identified a small number
 48 (4–5) of driver mutations when combining coding and non-coding genomic elements per
 49 cancer genome. However, even in this most recent study, analyses suggest that
 50 discovery of noncoding mutations and driver genes is far from complete (Rheinbay et
 51 al., 2020).

52
 53 The tissue-specific epigenomic landscape of a cell dictates its response to oncogenic
 54 cues and influences the selection of somatic alterations during tumor initiation
 55 (Lawrence et al., 2014; Lowdon and Wang, 2017; Sack et al., 2018). Accordingly, we
 56 reasoned that tissue-specific annotations may increase the power and interpretability of
 57 cancer driver gene discovery. As evidenced by their enrichment in genome-wide
 58 association studies (GWAS), expression quantitative trait loci (eQTLs), and
 59 cross-species conservation analyses, sequence alterations in regulatory elements are
 60 associated with functional changes in the expression of downstream target genes and
 61 disease phenotypes (Maurano et al., 2012; Schaub et al., 2012; Zhou et al., 2020).
 62 Meanwhile, putative regulatory element mutations have been shown to affect cancer
 63 driver gene expression in relevant tissues (Takeda et al., 2018; Zhang et al., 2018).
 64 Therefore, the systematic analysis of regulatory variants within active elements of the

65 corresponding cell type of origin may improve the power to detect non-coding cancer
66 associated mutations.

67

68 Here, we leverage these principles to develop a generalizable analytic framework to
69 characterize cell-type-specific regulatory landscapes and non-coding mutational burden
70 across 2,634 patients spanning 11 cancer types (Supplemental Table 1). We focused on
71 regulatory variants within active elements in the cell type of origin, defined by the
72 chromatin state of the corresponding *enhancer* or *promoter*. To increase the power to
73 detect disease-associated variants, we aggregated regulatory information across all
74 elements for each gene, similar to recent work examining the *ESR1* locus in breast
75 cancer (Bailey et al., 2016) and prostate cancer (Sallari et al., 2017). Using this
76 approach, we found both known and novel recurrently mutated regulatory regions, the
77 majority of which were associated with dysregulated expression of nearby genes and
78 differential survival outcomes. In particular, we identify *IPO9* as a novel regulatory driver
79 mutation in breast cancer. Using high-throughput CRISPR screen data across cancer
80 cell lines (Meyers et al., 2017), we demonstrate that genes harboring recurrent
81 regulatory mutations, including *IPO9*, *GUK1*, *MED8*, and *OXNAD1*, were associated
82 with larger *in vitro* growth effects on average than genes enriched for coding mutations.
83 Together, these results highlight the power of aggregating regulatory information and the
84 use of cell-type-aware models to define novel oncogenic drivers across diverse cancers.

85 **Results**

86 ***Analytical Framework***

87

88 We reasoned that the power to discover novel regulatory regions as well as driver
89 genes would be improved by combining regulatory information for each gene,
90 analogous to burden tests aggregating exonic information for coding sequences (Figure
91 1A). In order to capture information relevant for each cancer type, we used cell type
92 specific epigenetic data available from the ENCODE and Roadmap Epigenome
93 projects. We estimated mutational enrichment within regulatory regions of each gene by
94 permutation testing (Methods). To implement this approach, we first linked the distal
95 enhancer elements defined by the Roadmap Epigenomics Consortium (Roadmap
96 Epigenomics Consortium et al., 2015) to each of the 18,729 GENCODE genes using
97 the correlation-based links from Roadmap (Figure 1B). Each distal element can be
98 assigned to one or more genes. To verify the quality of these enhancer-promoter links,
99 we counted the number of linked genes present at each enhancer element
100 (Supplemental Figure 1C). Each distal element linked to ~5 genes on average,
101 consistent with other studies (Fishilevich et al., 2017).

102

103 To assess the quality of our regulatory links, we next intersected these links with
104 chromatin states from the corresponding cell type, producing a canonical
105 enhancer-enriched distribution of regulatory activity (Supplemental Figure 1D,
106 Supplemental Table 2). We compared the chromatin state annotations within each
107 cancer type on each side of a regulatory link and discovered an enrichment of
108 repressed regulatory elements linked to repressed promoters and active regulatory
109 elements linked to active promoters, consistent with expectations of domain-level
110 activation (Rao et al., 2014) (Supplemental Figure 1E). These results indicate that both
111 chromatin states and enhancer-gene links are stable and high quality.

112

113 To evaluate mutational enrichment in regulatory regions of all genes, we used SNV and
114 indel calls from WGS data from the International Cancer Genome Consortium (ICGC)
115 focusing on 11 cancer types with a minimum of n=90 individuals and tissue matched
116 epigenetic data (Figure 1C, Supplemental Table 1). In addition, the breast cancer cohort
117 was sufficiently large to enable evaluation of the etiologically distinct Basal, Luminal,
118 and HER2+ subgroups (Nik-Zainal et al., 2016). The variants from each cohort were
119 normalized for regional patient mutation rate (Methods), chromatin state, and cancer
120 type, intersected with each gene's aggregated regulatory regions and evaluated for
121 mutational enrichment. Enrichment was assessed by permutation testing (as in (Sallari
122 et al., 2017); 5000+ iterations), where a matching background set of regulatory
123 elements were randomly assigned to each gene (maintaining mutation rate and
124 chromatin state) and the number of mutations scored (Methods).

125

126 *Excess mutational burden in aggregate distal regulatory regions in breast cancer*

127

128 We first evaluated this approach in a WGS dataset composed of 560 breast cancers
129 stratified by three major subtypes: Basal (n = 167), Luminal (n = 320), and HER2+ (n =
130 73) (Nik-Zainal et al., 2016). We performed enrichment tests on 57,534
131 FANTOM-derived promoters for 20,209 Ensembl-annotated genes, where promoters for
132 the same gene were concatenated when evaluating enrichments (Methods). Consistent
133 with previous results, we observed an enrichment in mutations in the shared promoter
134 of *RMRP* and *CCDC107* across the individual breast cancer cohorts (Nik-Zainal et al.,
135 2016; Rheinbay et al., 2017). Combining p-values across the three breast cancer
136 subtypes via Fisher's method revealed enrichment of promoter mutation in *TP53* and
137 *CCDC107*, as previously reported. When considering only active promoter elements, we
138 identify enrichments in *WDR74*, *ZNF143*, *MFSD11*, *SRSF2*, *VMA21*, *CDC42BPB*, and
139 *TMEM189* (Supplemental Table 3). Thus, analysis of single regulatory elements reveals

140 excess mutational burden in numerous previously identified drivers, as well as novel
141 candidate drivers.

142

143 We hypothesized that aggregating distal regulatory elements would yield increased
144 power to detect candidate driver genes. For each of the 18,729 GENCODE genes we
145 aggregated the promoter-interacting regulatory elements and tested for an excess or
146 overburdening of distal mutations. In order to resolve cell-type-specific effects, we
147 examined combinations of different chromatin states that represent the regulatory profile
148 of mammary epithelial cells (e.g. poised enhancers, active enhancers, promoters,
149 Supplemental Table 2). Using this approach, we identify 22 putative distal regulatory
150 driver genes with FDR < 10%, spanning numerous regulatory states. These candidates
151 included known driver genes such as *MSL3* (Leiserson et al., 2013) and *HLE* (Osborne
152 et al., 2010) (Supplemental Table 4). In addition, we found significant enrichment for
153 mutations in regulatory regions of 17 novel genes, most notably *IPO9*, which was
154 specifically enriched in enhancer marked chromatin (Figure 2C). Mutations in regulatory
155 regions of *IPO9* were significantly overburdened in basal subtype tumors where 15
156 patients harbored 16 mutations, compared to an expectation of ~3.6 patients (4.2-fold
157 enrichment, permutation p-value < 3.2e-6, Methods). An additional 3 patients across the
158 other subgroups exhibited *IPO9* mutations, bringing the total to 18 (Fisher combined,
159 FDR adjusted q-value across all three breast cancer subtypes = 0.068). Additionally,
160 *PYCR2* exhibited an excess of regulatory mutations (23 mutations across 22 patients,
161 q-value = 0.002) in active promoter & strong enhancer (H3K4me3)-marked regions, as
162 did *SDE2* (18 mutations across 17 patients, q-value = 0.023), *SRP9* (24 mutations in 23
163 patients, q-value = 0.02), and *PLEKHA6* (22 mutations in 21 patients, q-value = 0.04,
164 Supplemental Figure 2C). *PYCR2* catalyzes the last step of proline synthesis from
165 glutamate in the mitochondrion (De Ingeniis et al., 2012); *SDE2* is a telomere repair
166 gene implicated in cell cycle regulation (Jo et al., 2016); *SRP9* binds and inhibits *Alu*
167 element translation (Chang et al., 1996); and *PLEKHA6* is poorly characterized. Also of
168 note, luminal tumors comprise a heterogeneous group that can be stratified based on
169 genomic features (Rueda et al., 2019), hence it is not surprising that mutational
170 enrichment is weaker than observed in Basal and HER2+ tumors (Figure 2D).

171

172 We further evaluated mutational burden in topological domains from the progenitor
173 human mammary epithelial (HMEC) cells, the closest normal breast cell type with
174 comprehensive epigenomic data (Rao et al. 2014) and observed a significant
175 enrichment in promoter variants for the topological domain containing *PLEKHA6*
176 (Supplemental Figure 2D). The differences between the enhancer-gene linked
177 enrichments and topological domain enrichments is likely because many regulatory
178 regions in a given topological domain do not contribute globally to the expression of

179 genes that reside within that domain (Degner et al., 2012; Gasperini et al., 2019;
180 Kasowski et al., 2013; Kilpinen et al., 2013; McVicker et al., 2013).

181

182 ***Identification of IPO9 as a putative breast cancer oncogene***

183

184 We next sought to evaluate whether individuals with mutations in *IPO9* regulatory
185 regions had altered *IPO9* expression. *IPO9* was highly expressed in MCF-7, which
186 contains a mutation in the *IPO9* regulatory region, but not in HMEC cells, consistent
187 with its dysregulation in malignancy. In the independent METABRIC cohort, *IPO9*
188 expression was higher in Basal subtype tumors (Supplemental Figure 3A). Additionally,
189 *IPO9* (1q32) is amplified in 26% of early stage breast cancers in the METABRIC cohort
190 and 22% of advanced breast cancers in the Metastatic Breast Cancer Project (Figure
191 3A). Among the 560 breast cancer patients with WGS data, only a subset (n=268) had
192 matched RNA-seq data, four of which had *IPO9* mutations. While underpowered to
193 detect an eQTL signal, *IPO9* expression was higher in patients with *IPO9* regulatory
194 mutations (Supplemental Figure 3B). In addition, when examining three validation
195 cohorts of whole genome sequenced tumors, we observed an additional 19 individuals
196 mutated in DNase regions of enhancer-marked chromatin at *IPO9* (Figure 3B).
197 Collectively, these data suggest that increased *IPO9* expression can occur through a
198 variety of mechanisms, including gene amplification, distal regulatory mutations, and
199 proximal mutations at the promoter, consistent with known oncogenes.

200

201 The epigenetic landscape of breast cancer surrounding the *IPO9* locus is complex and
202 includes large open chromatin regions (defined using DNase-seq), actively transcribed
203 genes (RNA-seq), and regulatory elements (H3K27ac ChIP-seq; Figure 3C). Hi-C data
204 from HMEC cells (Rao et al. 2014) suggests that *IPO9* lies at the boundary of two
205 topological domains, similar to that reported for other regulatory mutations in cancer
206 (Flavahan et al., 2016; Hnisz et al., 2016). We next examined individual regulatory
207 elements containing mutations. One such highly mutated element was located in an
208 intron of *NAV1*, approximately 50Kb away from the *IPO9* promoter and 120Kb away
209 from the *NAV1* promoter (Figure 3D). This element contains a CTCF binding site, active
210 H3K27ac and H3K4me1 marks, as well as a number of conserved regions and DNase
211 hypersensitivity sites. Across all tumors with WGS, there were four breast cancer
212 patients each with a single mutation in this enhancer: one mutation located in a
213 conserved region ~800bp away, a second located directly adjacent to the CTCF binding
214 site, and two more with mutations located in the DNase hypersensitivity site that is
215 associated with increased STAT3 and FOS binding upon estrogen stimulation in
216 MCF-10A cells (ENCODE Project Consortium, 2012). A similar trend was observed in
217 the *IPO9* UTR, where four regulatory mutations were also present (Supplemental Figure

218 3C). Together, these data implicate somatic alterations in *IPO9* regulatory elements in
219 breast cancer pathogenesis, as further explored below.

220

221 ***Pan-cancer aggregate regulatory analysis discovers functional driver genes***

222

223 We next expanded our analyses to catalogue pan-cancer regulatory driver mutations.
224 We first individually examined the same 20,209 genes used in the breast cancer
225 analysis. As a baseline, when considering all chromatin states rather than restricting to
226 active states, canonical non-coding variants in the *TERT* promoter were observed, as
227 previously reported (Horn et al., 2013; Huang et al., 2013; Vinagre et al., 2013).
228 Enrichment was even stronger when analyses were restricted to active promoters for
229 the cancer type of interest (28-fold versus 14.9-fold enriched). Therefore, for each
230 cancer type we examined the mutational enrichment in the TSS regions using the
231 corresponding active chromatin state information for that type of cancer (Methods). This
232 analysis revealed enrichment in the promoters of the canonical oncogenes *BCL2*, *TP53*,
233 *TERT*, and *CXCR4*. We also aggregated the enrichment information across cancer
234 types, which revealed an overlapping, but distinct, set of promoters, including those for
235 *BTG1*, *CCL15*, *TERT*, and *TP53* (Supplemental Figure 4C). Thus aggregating promoter
236 mutations across cell types validates canonical driver genes, including *TP53* and *TERT*.
237

238 We subsequently performed an aggregated distal regulatory element analysis, where
239 we initially employed a parametric approximation (Methods) and then validated
240 significant results with permutation testing. In contrast to methods that focus exclusively
241 on canonical promoter mutations, by aggregated distal regulatory state-specific
242 mutations, we identify numerous novel associations, including both cancer-specific (n =
243 183) and pan-cancer (n = 40) mutated gene landscapes (Figure 4A, FDR of 10%,
244 Supplemental Tables 5-6). For genes with at least one cancer-specific enrichment, we
245 quantified the significance across more than one cancer type via increasingly stringent
246 FDR cutoffs (Figure 4B).

247

248 One example of a hypermutated distal region was a segment associated with *OXNAD1*
249 and *GALNT15*, located 30kb apart. The aggregated distal regions for these genes were
250 specifically overburdened by mutations in CLL and melanoma (enrichment = 4.5 and
251 1.63-fold, FDR-adjusted q-value = 0.058 and 0.078), and *OXNAD1* was previously
252 reported to be overburdened with promoter mutations in melanoma (Denisova et al.,
253 2015). Additionally, regulatory elements of the non-coding RNA transcript AC090953.1
254 located within an intron of *GALNT15* was also overburdened with mutations (enrichment
255 = 2.76, q-value = 0.078), though the enhancers overlap substantially with that of
256 *OXNAD1* (Supplemental Table 7). Similar to germline expression QTLs (Tong et al.,

257 2017), co-regulation might mediate this shared enrichment signal. The *TCERG1* gene
258 similarly harbored more mutations (n=27) than expected by chance (n=3.8; $q < 0.094$)
259 across diverse cancer types, with enrichment in melanoma, esophageal, and ovarian
260 cancers. *TCERG1* is a pro-apoptotic transcriptional elongation factor (Montes et al.,
261 2015) implicated in cancer progression (Bailey et al., 2018; Forbes et al., 2017; Gao et
262 al., 2013) with two mutational hotspots in nearby coding regions of the gene
263 (Supplemental Figure 4G).

264

265 We further noted that the distribution of mutations varied significantly between promoter
266 and distal elements for putative drivers. For instance, *OXNAD1* primarily harbored
267 promoter state mutations, whereas *IFI16* and *PYHIN1* share an enhancer element
268 (chr1:158968600-158969600) with mutations in 11 esophageal cancer patients
269 (Supplemental Table 8). Both of these sites would likely be detected with methods that
270 examine individual regulatory elements. However, other genes, such as *BRCA1/NBR2*
271 (Figure 4E) and *CDH13* (Figure 4F), were overburdened with variants distributed across
272 multiple elements (e.g. promoters and distal elements), and hence would be overlooked
273 using conventional approaches, including those put forth in recent state-of-the-art single
274 element analyses (Rheinbay et al., 2020).

275

276 We further sought to evaluate whether our aggregated non-coding cell-type aware
277 driver discovery method can also recover known pan-cancer drivers of disease in
278 coding regions and UTRs. To this end, we focused on mutations in the “transcribed”
279 chromatin state, corresponding to active genes (Joshi and Struhl, 2005). After removing
280 genes for which the whole gene body lacked H3K36me3, and using Fisher’s method to
281 combine p-values across cancer types, we confirmed the significant enrichment of
282 mutations in known driver genes *TP53*, *BRAF*, *NRAS*, *SMAD4*, and *MUC3*
283 (Supplemental Figure 4C, Supplemental Table 9-11, all but *MUC3* reported in Rheinbay
284 et al., 2020). We also observed associations the UTR of *NOTCH1* in CLL (Lobry et al.,
285 2011) (4 patients, 48-fold enriched, $q < 0.055$), and *AHSA2* and *USP34* in pediatric
286 brain cancers (7 and 6 patients, 20.5-fold and 41-fold enriched, $q < 0.0248$ and $q <$
287 0.0245). Overall, driver genes discovered using a cell type aware model overlapped
288 with those reported previously, but represent only a subset of those discovered using
289 aggregated noncoding elements, highlighting the power of our method to expand the
290 non-coding mutational landscape of cancer.

291

292 ***Recurrently mutated regulatory regions are associated with cell growth defects***

293

294 Our regulatory mutation analysis revealed a novel set of genes implicated in cancer. To
295 determine whether these genes are important for cell proliferation, we used

genome-wide CRISPR screen data from Project Achilles (Meyers et al., 2017). These analyses indicate that genes enriched for distal mutations tend to be highly deleterious (Figure 5A). Although both distal- and promoter-mutated genes were enriched for deleterious effects (Figure 5B, Supplemental Table 12), knockout of genes with distal regulatory mutations had effects on cell growth comparable to coding mutations. Some genes were essential in nearly all cancer cell lines, including *MED8*, *GUK1*, and *SDE2* (Figure 5C), whereas others had cancer type specific growth effects (mostly deleterious). For example, *TMEM189* had severe growth defects in leukemia (intercept -0.2 across all lines; leukemia average -0.52, $p = 0.038$, Supplemental Table 13) and *MAPK1* was less deleterious in myeloma and kidney cell lines (intercept -0.36 across all lines; kidney average 0.044, $p = 0.049$ and myeloma average 0.12, $p = 0.038$, Supplemental Table 14). Others were subtype specific - most notable was *PAX5*, where the intercept across cell lines was 0.04 ($p = 0.70$), but in lymphoid neoplasms, the regression effect was -0.40 ($p = 1.8\text{e-}18$, Supplemental Table 15). In fact, putative drivers were both more primary cancer type specific (Wilcoxon rank-sum test $W = 708190$, $p = 0.037$) and had greater dependency scores (median dependency of -0.125 vs -0.06, Wilcoxon rank-sum test $W = 754210$, $p = 0.009$) than other genes.

This suggests that the genes identified through aggregate regulatory mutation analysis have strongly deleterious phenotypic consequences and confer selective advantages through altered gene regulation commensurate with that of coding variants. While strong pan-cancer tumor suppressor genes, such as *PTEN* and *OXNAD1* (newly discovered) (Supplemental Figure 5C), exhibited positive effects on growth, there were very few regulatory genes with positive effects, whereas many genes, such as *IPO9* and the canonical oncogene *MTOR*, showed consistent negative growth effects across all cell lines in Avana (Figure 5D).

Fine-mapping at the IPO9 locus implicates RNA splicing and processing

IPO9 knockouts exhibited dramatically reduced proliferation and this gene was pan-essential in both the GeCKO and Avana screens. Indeed, the effect of *IPO9* knockout on proliferation was far larger than other genes in the region (Figure 6A) and persisted across cell types in the independent GeCKO screens (Supplemental Figure 6A). A similar decrease in proliferation was noted for *TIMM17A* in pleural and upper digestive cancers (Supplemental Figure 6B).

This essentiality is further supported by the ExAC database (Lek et al., 2016), where there was a significant depletion of missense variants ($z = 3.11$) in *IPO9* and the germline probability of loss of function intolerance (pLI) was 1.0. Motivated by this

335 observation, we looked for rare cancer-associated regulatory variants at the locus using
336 the Oxford Brain Imaging Genetics Server (Elliott et al., 2018), and found a variant,
337 rs150641471, in an intron of *NAV1* 50kb from the *IPO9* promoter, which was associated
338 with malignant thyroid neoplasm (OR = 1.05, $p = 3e-22$), diffuse large cell lymphoma
339 (OR = 1.1, $p = 6.6e-12$), and leukaemia (OR = 1.004, $p = 2.2e-6$). This is consistent with
340 transposon screens in mice, which have implicated *IPO9* in hematopoietic malignancy
341 (Guo et al., 2016).

342

343 To further characterize the role of *IPO9* in cancer progression, we correlated the
344 gene-level growth effects for *IPO9* with all other genes (Figure 5G-H) following
345 normalization, as previously described (Boyle et al., 2018) (Methods, Supplemental
346 Table 16). Gene ontology (GO) analysis of the 168 genes for which proliferation across
347 cell lines had a correlation greater than 0.3 with *IPO9* revealed the striking enrichment
348 of non-coding RNA metabolic processes (7.29-fold, FDR adjusted $q = 7.55e-16$,
349 Supplemental Table 6) and catalytic activity on RNA (5.32-fold, $q = 1.02e-4$). Meanwhile,
350 the most negatively correlated genes include those involved in mRNA splicing via
351 transesterification (4.24-fold enriched in 1000 most negatively correlated genes, $q =$
352 $1.36e-16$; Figure 5I). These results implicate *IPO9* in RNA splicing and processing.

353

354 ***Recurrently mutated regulatory regions are associated with patient outcomes***

355

356 Since mutations in regulatory regions often result in gene expression changes, we next
357 examined the association between the expression of genes with recurrently mutated
358 regulatory regions and clinical outcome. We evaluated the specificity of survival
359 associations across 27 cancer types with sufficient clinical information and follow-up
360 duration from the TCGA Pan-Cancer Atlas, the largest compendium of cancer genomes
361 that did not overlap with our non-TCGA ICGC discovery cohort (Bailey et al., 2018; Liu
362 et al., 2018) (Supplemental Figure 6G). In order to limit the number of hypotheses
363 tested, we only evaluated the association between *IPO9*, *MED8*, *OXNAD1*, *PLEKHA6*,
364 and *GUK1* expression and survival. While the trends varied between cancer types,
365 *IPO9* (expression-increasing, risk-increasing), *MED8* (expression-increasing,
366 risk-increasing), and *OXNAD1* (expression-increasing, risk-decreasing) were associated
367 with survival across multiple cancer types (Figure 7A-D, Supplemental Tables 17-18,
368 Supplemental Figure 7F,H-I, after adjusting for key clinical covariates and copy number
369 at that locus, Methods). In addition, increased *PLEKHA6* expression was protective in
370 bladder cancer and lung squamous cell cancer, and risk-increasing in clear cell renal
371 cell cancer.

372

Next, we sought to evaluate cell-type specific driver effects and their prognostic associations. We initially focused on breast cancer, given the large sample size and long-term clinical follow-up available in the METABRIC cohort (Curtis et al., 2012; Rueda et al., 2019). *IPO9* expression was significantly associated with relapse free survival (RFS) in Kaplan Meier analysis ($p < 0.0001$) and remained significant in a Cox proportional hazard analysis adjusted for age, tumor grade and size, subtype, and copy number (HR = 1.31 [1.03, 1.7], $p = 0.027$, Supplemental Figure 7D, Supplemental Tables 19-22) (Methods). We further evaluated this association after stratifying for breast cancer subgroups, revealing an even more striking relationship between *IPO9* expression and relapse-free survival in luminal breast cancers (HR = 1.80 [1.29, 2.51], $p < 0.001$, Figure 7E, Supplemental Figure 7E, Supplemental Tables 23-26).

Encouraged by this result, we evaluated the association between the expression of all genes ($n = 50$) harboring recurrent regulatory or coding mutations from TCGA and outcome in the METABRIC breast cancer cohort, for. A clear inflation of p-values is noted, suggesting a number of genes are associated with survival. In the METABRIC cohort (Supplemental Figure 7F-H), *IPO9* was the fourth most significant gene, with *SDE2*, which also exhibited large CRISPR growth effects, being the most significant distal association. Of note, *IPO9* expression was most strongly associated with relapse free survival in luminal cases (Figure 7F). The distribution was similar for overall survival, disease specific survival, and distant relapse (Supplemental Figure 7A-C). These findings indicate that genes harboring recurrent regulatory mutations are associated with patient prognosis, cementing their relevance in human cancers.

Discussion

Here we present a powerful framework to identify non-coding cancer driver genes based on two key principles: aggregation of cell type specific regulatory elements and cell type specific activity to identify novel non-coding driver gene mutations across diverse cancer types. This approach defines driver mutations in multiple regulatory elements simultaneously. Indeed, many regions and associated genes were not identified previously. We demonstrate that mutations in the promoter of *OXNAD1* are likely oncogenic, consistent with previous claims (Denisova et al., 2015). Further, we identify a *IPO9*, a nuclear actin transporter, implicated in mRNA metabolism and alternative splicing, as a putative oncogene in breast cancer, melanoma, bladder cancer, and mesothelioma. In addition to *IPO9*, other newly identified regulatory driver genes, including *SRSF2* and *TCERG1*, also modulate alternative splicing (Koedoot et al., 2019; Montes et al., 2015; Pearson et al., 2008), suggesting a shared functional

411 basis for these enrichments, similar to that also seen for alternative splicing in coding
412 mutations (Watson et al., 2013).

413

414 Previous work has implicated *IPO9* in nuclear actin remodeling and adherence of
415 keratinocytes (Sharili et al., 2016), as well as in transcriptional control (Dopie et al.,
416 2012) and interferon signaling (Matsumiya et al., 2013). More recently, nuclear actin has
417 been implicated in the transport of homologous recombination double stranded breaks
418 to the periphery, where they can be efficiently repaired (Caridi et al., 2018). In addition,
419 nuclear actin dynamics, mediated by *IPO9* and *XPO6*, have the potential to modulate
420 mRNA splicing through disruption of *SMN2* (Viita et al., 2019). Alternative splicing and
421 other co-transcriptional metabolic processes acting on RNA are important for cancer
422 development (David and Manley, 2010; Koedoot et al., 2019), suggesting a multitude of
423 direct targets in promoting the hallmarks of cancer (Hanahan and Weinberg, 2011).
424 These diverse roles of nuclear actin in cellular proliferation and transcription are
425 consistent with our findings of mutational enrichment in *IPO9* regulatory regions and the
426 association between elevated expression of *IPO9* and shorter relapse-free and overall
427 survival in multiple cancer types. Together, this motivates further investigation of the
428 mechanism and diversity of nuclear actin as a class of oncogenes using high-content
429 imaging platforms with drug libraries and/or CRISPR tools.

430

431 More broadly, our method has uncovered a unique set of recurrently mutated genes not
432 identified through conventional means, including recent large-scale non-coding
433 analyses (Rheinbay et al., 2020). The observation that aggregated regulatory signals
434 harbor enrichment not evident from the analysis of individual elements is reminiscent of
435 progress in exome testing. Initial studies first evaluated individual coding variants, and
436 later found increased power in gene-level burden tests. This suggests that applying
437 novel approaches to the analysis of non-coding regions, including the development of
438 specific driver detection tools, is of value.

439

440 The strong growth phenotypes of these genes identified via CRISPR/Cas9 screens
441 suggests that they might be constrained for coding variation, and that distal regulatory
442 elements with slight expression-altering mutations might jointly control expression at
443 multiple loci, akin to polygenic models in genome-wide association studies. These
444 findings also highlight the power of large scale genetic screens to inform driver gene
445 discovery and we identify an excess number of mutated genes with large deleterious
446 growth effects. It is worth noting, however, that loss of large-effect tumor suppressors
447 during serial passaging is anticipated, and such genes would not be identified in this
448 analysis. Finally, we illustrate how loss of function genetic screens can be used to fine

map causal genes, evaluate cancer type specificity and determine functional mechanisms, including direct annotation of pathways.

In sum, we present a general approach to identify regulatory regions enriched for mutations while simultaneously correcting for background mutation rates. The application of this approach to WGS data from 11 cancer types, lead to the identification of multiple novel non-coding driver genes, supported by orthogonal validation of their pan-cancer growth effects and prognostic associations. Of note, these findings likely represent just the beginning, and we anticipate that additional non-coding drivers will be identified through the application of this new cell-type aware, analytic framework to the increasing number of WGS cancer datasets being generated with implications for personal genome interpretation and prognosis. Together, we believe that improved methods like these, as well as additional genomic and other omics data, will begin a new large-scale effort to discover and interrogate regulatory drivers in cancer.

Acknowledgements

N.S.-A. is supported by the Department of Defense through a National Defense Science and Engineering Grant and by a Stanford Graduate Fellowship. This work was supported by grants from the NIH ENCODE/Production Center for Mapping Regulatory Regions of the Human Genome - 3U54-HG006996-04S1 (M.S.), CEGS/Center for Personal Dynamic Regulomes - 2RM1HG007735-06 (M.S., C.C.), the NIH Director's Pioneer Award - DP1-CA238296 (C.C.) and the NCI Cancer Target Discovery and Development Network - U01 CA217851 (C. C.). This work made use of resources provided by the Genetic and Bioinformatic Service Center at Stanford University School of Medicine. We thank C. Suarez for feedback and tumor epigenome matching and M. Wainberg, A. Sanghi, D. Rothschild, C. Smith, H. Ollila, J. Reuter, J. Gruber, M. Pryzbilla and other members of the Curtis, Pritchard and Snyder labs for feedback on the manuscript. This study makes use of patient data from the ICGC, TCGA, and METABRIC studies, as well as epigenetic data from the ENCODE and Roadmap Epigenomics Project and CRISPR screen data from DepMap. We thank all the individuals who contributed to the creation of these resources, and particularly the patients whose biological samples form the basis of this work. This study was performed on the traditional and unceded lands of the Muwekma Ohlone people, and we are grateful for the opportunity to live and work here.

Author contributions

Conceptualization: N.S.-A. and R.S.
Methodology: N.S.-A., R.S., C.C., and M.P.S.
Software, Analysis, and Validation: N.S.-A. and J.A.S.
Investigation: N.S.-A., J.A.S., C.C. and M.P.S.
Writing and Editing: N.S.-A., J.K.P., C.C. and M.P.S.
Supervision: C.C. and M.P.S.

489

490 **Competing interests**

491 C.C. is a scientific advisor to GRAIL and reports stock options, as well as consulting for GRAIL
492 and Genentech. M.P.S. is a co-founder and SAB member of Personalis.

493

494 **Data & Code Availability**

495 This study makes use of patient data from the ICGC, TCGA, and METABRIC studies, as well as
496 epigenetic data from the ENCODE and Roadmap Epigenomics Project. Data from TCGA are
497 available publicly through the PanCan Atlas portal

498 (<https://gdc.cancer.gov/about-data/publications/pancanatlas>) and via application to dbGaP

499 accession phs000178.v1.p1. Data from ICGC are available on the ICGC website

500 (<http://icgc.org/>). Data from ENCODE and Roadmap are available on the ENCODE website

501 (<http://encodeproject.org>). Data from DepMap are available on the DepMap website

502 (<https://depmap.org/portal/download/>). Data from METABRIC are available at the European

503 Genotype-Phenotype Archive under Accession number EGAS000000000083 and as

504 supplementary tables in the current publication (Rueda et al., 2019).

505

506 The code needed to implement the methods described in this paper will be published along with
507 the accepted manuscript.

508 **Supplemental Tables**

509 Supplemental Table 1: **Tumor samples included in the discovery cohort.** The list of all
510 tumors used for initial discovery of driver mutations, including the aggregated tumor type used
511 for these analyses, the original cohort from ICGC, and the donor ID. Cancer type, cohort name,
512 and donor ID are listed.

513

514 Supplemental Table 2: **Chromatin state definitions.** The abbreviated names, equation (used
515 internally for specifying the definition), chromatin states, and DNase status of aggregated active
516 chromatin used for the analysis.

517

518 Supplemental Table 3: **BRCA combined putative driver list.** List of all putative driver genes
519 discovered in breast cancer using the fisher-combined p-values across cohorts, including the
520 chromatin state tested; resolution of tile resampling employed; mutation rate window; set of
521 chromatin loops evaluated; and expected mutation count across permutations, number of
522 observed mutations, and likewise for number of patients mutated, as well as the empirical
523 p-value and FDR-adjusted q-value. Only genes with a patient q-value < 0.1 are reported.

524

525 Supplemental Table 4: **BRCA combined active promoter and all promoter genes.** List of all
526 genes putatively enriched in promoter mutations, either including all chromatin states or only
527 promoter chromatin annotations (active).

528

529 **Supplemental Table 5: Single-cancer coding driver genes.** List of all genes putatively
530 enriched in coding mutations in each single cohort. Mutation, number of mutations observed;
531 patient, number of patients with mutations; permutations, number of permutations run to
532 evaluate significance; mean_mutation, average number of mutations in permutations;
533 mean_patient, average number of patients mutated in permutations; gtmutation, number of
534 permutations with mutation count exceeding the observed; gtpatient, number of permutations
535 with patient count exceeding the observed; p.pt, empirical p-value of patient mutations; q.pt
536 empirical FDR-adjusted p-value of patient mutations.

537

538 **Supplemental Table 6: Pan-cancer combined coding drivers.** List of all putative coding genes
539 discovered in the pan-cancer analysis using the fisher-combined p-values across cohorts. FDR
540 cutoff of 10% was used to report genes, and each gene was assessed using the
541 permutation-based approach.

542

543 **Supplemental Table 7: Pan-cancer combined coding active drivers.** List of all putative coding
544 genes discovered in the pan-cancer analysis using the fisher-combined p-values across
545 cohorts, but only using mutations located in actively transcribed regions. An FDR cutoff of 10%
546 was used to report genes, and each gene was assessed using the permutation-based
547 approach.

548

549 **Supplemental Table 8: Parametric single-cancer putative drivers.** List of all putative
550 single-cancer aggregate regulatory drivers discovered using the parametric models. Cancer,
551 cancer type; links, regulatory element links used; state, chromatin state tested; rmr, window size
552 (bp) for calculating regional mutation rate; mutated, number of mutations observed, mean,
553 number of mutations expected; z, z-score based test statistic; log10pois, log of the p-value for
554 the poisson test; log10chi, log of the p-value for the chi squared test; log10z, log of the test
555 statistic for the Z test; qchi, FDR-adjusted q-value for the chi square test; qpois, FDR-adjusted
556 q-value for the poisson test; qz, FDR-adjusted q-value for the z test.

557

558 **Supplemental Table 9: Pan-cancer combined putative drivers.** List of all putative driver genes
559 discovered in the pan-cancer analysis using the fisher-combined permutation p-values across
560 cohorts. Only genes that were validated with the permutation-based approach are reported.
561 State, chromatin state tested; mutations, number of observed mutations; patients, number of
562 mutated patients. QC is marked "FAIL" for histone, immunoglobulin, and RNA genes excluded
563 from downstream analysis.

564

565 **Supplemental Table 10: OXNAD1/GALNT15 MELA mutated elements.** List of mutations from
566 the linked regulatory regions of OXNAD1, GALNT15, and the nearby non-coding RNA. Each
567 row represents a mutation-gene combination, with the corresponding chromatin state and
568 regulatory region annotated.

569

570 Supplemental Table 11: **Mutations in a PYHIN1-IFI16 shared enhancer**. List of individual
571 mutations located in the enhancer element shared by PYHIN1 and IFI16 across the esophageal
572 cancer cohort.

573

574 Supplemental Table 12: **Essentiality comparison across genes**. The fraction of gene effects
575 labeled essential for genes associated with coding mutations from TCGA (Bailey et al., 2018);
576 coding, promoter, enhancer, or UTR mutations from PCAWG (Rheinbay et al., 2020); and
577 aggregated regulatory regions in either breast cancer or the pan-cancer cohort (this study).

578

579 Supplemental Table 13: **Cancer type specificity of TMEM189**. Regression specification for the
580 cancer type specificity of TMEM189, adjusted for olfactory gene essentiality principal
581 components 1-5; gender; and source.

582

583 Supplemental Table 14: **Cancer type specificity of MAPK1**. Regression specification for the
584 cancer type specificity of MAPK1, adjusted for olfactory gene essentiality principal components
585 1-5; gender; and source.

586

587 Supplemental Table 15: **Cancer subtype specificity of PAX5**. Regression specification for the
588 cancer type specificity of PAX5, adjusted for olfactory gene essentiality principal components
589 1-5; cancer type; gender; and source.

590

591 Supplemental Table 16: **Essentiality correlation with IPO9**. Table of pairwise batch-corrected
592 correlations between each of the genes evaluated in the Avana screen and IPO9 across all 485
593 cell lines in the Avana dataset.

594

595 Supplemental Table 17: **TCGA per cancer type hazard ratios**. Across each of the 33 cancer
596 types in the PanCanAtlas, the hazard ratio of expression changes for each of the five genes we
597 selected for downstream analysis (*IPO9*, *PLEKHA6*, *GUK1*, *MED8*, and *OXNAD1*).

598

599 Supplemental Table 18: **TCGA combined hazard ratios across cancer types**. Combined
600 hazard ratio for the five genes evaluated in multiple cancer types with adequate sample size.

601

602 Supplemental Table 19: **Overall survival hazard ratios in METABRIC**. Hazard ratios, for each
603 putative breast cancer driver gene, of expression against overall survival when adjusted for
604 standard clinical covariates.

605

606 Supplemental Table 20: **Disease specific survival hazard ratios in METABRIC**. Hazard ratios,
607 for each putative breast cancer driver gene, of expression against disease specific survival
608 when adjusted for standard clinical covariates.

609

610 Supplemental Table 21: **Relapse free survival hazard ratios in METABRIC**. Hazard ratios, for
611 each putative breast cancer driver gene, of expression against relapse free survival when
612 adjusted for standard clinical covariates.

613

614 Supplemental Table 22: **Disease and relapse free survival hazard ratios in METABRIC.**

615 Hazard ratios, for each putative breast cancer driver gene, of expression against disease- and
616 relapse-free survival when adjusted for standard clinical covariates.

617

618 Supplemental Table 23: **Overall survival hazard ratios in METABRIC, luminal cases only.**

619 Hazard ratios, for each putative breast cancer driver gene, of expression against overall survival
620 when adjusted for standard clinical covariates, among luminal cases only.

621

622 Supplemental Table 24: **Disease specific survival hazard ratios in METABRIC, luminal**

623 **cases only.** Hazard ratios, for each putative breast cancer driver gene, of expression against
624 disease specific survival when adjusted for standard clinical covariates, among luminal cases
625 only.

626

627 Supplemental Table 25: **Relapse free survival hazard ratios in METABRIC, luminal cases**

628 **only.** Hazard ratios, for each putative breast cancer driver gene, of expression against relapse
629 free survival when adjusted for standard clinical covariates, among luminal cases only.

630

631 Supplemental Table 26: **Disease and relapse free survival hazard ratios in METABRIC,**

632 **luminal cases only.** Hazard ratios, for each putative breast cancer driver gene, of expression
633 against disease- and relapse-free survival when adjusted for standard clinical covariates,
634 among luminal cases only.

635 **Methods**

636

637 Variant calls and sample inclusion

638 Tumor types with whole genome sequencing as part of the International Cancer Genome

639 Consortium for which a minimum of 90 individuals were profiled and for whom matched

640 epigenomic data was available from the ENCODE and RoadMap Epigenome projects were

641 selected for inclusion. Germline filtered somatic mutational calls based on whole genome

642 sequencing were used for downstream analyses where individuals with fewer than 100 somatic

643 mutations were excluded (due to limitations in defining chromatin-state-specific mutational

644 effects). Each cancer type was treated as a single cohort, with the exception of breast cancer

645 (BRCA) where additional stratified analyses were performed according to major subgroups

646 (Luminal, ERBB2/Her2-positive, and triple negative breast cancers (TNBC)). The full list of

647 ICGC donor IDs and cohorts is included in Supplemental Table 1. A total of 2634 individuals

648 were included across all cancer types.

649

650 METABRIC expression, CNA, clinical, and survival data were downloaded from European

651 Genome-Phenome Archive (EGA). Data from The Cancer Genome Atlas were utilized for

expression-survival validation (Liu et al., 2018) and CRISPR analyses (Bailey et al., 2018) and PCAWG was used for CRISPR analyses (Rheinbay et al., 2020).

Defining chromatin state and open chromatin regions

Chromatin state annotations for all cancer types except prostate were downloaded from the Roadmap Epigenomics Project integrated analyses while DNase hypersensitivity peaks for all cancer types except prostate were downloaded from the ENCODE portal. For prostate cancer, annotations were obtained from GEO:GSE63094 and quantized to chromatin states in 100bp windows using ChromHMM, and used as annotation sources as described previously (Sallari et al., 2017).

We used a stringent filtering step based on sequence uniqueness to avoid miscalling of chromatin states. In brief, three filters were combined to eliminate regions that might have artifactual annotations or missing genotype calls as a result of mappability bias. First, the ENCODE blacklist regions and UCSC hg19 genome assembly gaps were merged together, followed by looking in umap (ENCODE Project Consortium, 2012) and removing non-uniquely-mappable regions. This results in approximately one third of the genome (mostly centromeric and telomeric regions) being masked of repetitive regions.

Regional mutation rate estimation and null model mutation distribution

While replication timing data are available in some relevant cell types through ENCODE, the vast majority of cancer types have no annotations available. As such, the regional mutation rate was used as an estimate of replication timing, given their high correlation and reproducible effects on mutational spectrum (Stamatoyannopoulos et al., 2009). Two distinct windows of mutation counts were used -- 25kb and 250kb -- and the counts were summed across patients normalized by patient count (so that rates are comparable between cancer types), total number of mutations in the patient, and the window size (to achieve comparable distributions for both 25kb and 250kb windows).

At every nucleotide in the genome, on a per-cancer-type basis, covariates were estimated as the chromatin state (reduced to 7 states: promoter, enhancer, transcribed, repressed, bivalent, heterochromatin, and quiescent), DNase hypersensitivity peaks, and estimated regional mutation rate, the calculation of which is described above.

To ensure the robustness of results, all models were repeated with multiple regional mutation rate windows and nucleotide fragment sizes. For the single nucleotide model, we ran models corrected for stranded trinucleotide context (Alexandrov et al., 2013). Using these distributions, we tested for the enrichment of mutations across active chromatin states. We focused on active regulatory regions as these have previously been implicated in cancer development

(Sabarinathan et al., 2016), and because epigenetic alterations in the cell of origin are thought to potentiate cancer development via loss of tumor suppression (Garinis et al., 2002).

Mapping regulatory elements to genes

Regulatory elements were mapped to genes using Hi-C links, described above, as well as with correlation-based links (Rheinbay et al., 2020) that utilize modules of co-activated enhancers and co-expressed genes across the Roadmap RNA-seq profiled samples. In addition, the core promoter region was added to the tests as relevant, using annotations from the FANTOM5 consortium (FANTOM Consortium and the RIKEN PMI and CLST (DGT) et al., 2014). Histone I genes, immunoglobulin genes, HLA genes, non-coding “AC” genes, and RNA genes were excluded from further analyses due to either their repetitive structure or lack of adequate annotation coverage, respectively.

Promoter elements ($n = 57,534$) were defined based on the FANTOM5 consortium CAGE sequencing (FANTOM Consortium and the RIKEN PMI and CLST (DGT) et al., 2014). Promoter BED region definitions were then aggregated within each protein coding gene and intersected with chromatin state annotations. Any elements overlapping with collapsed promoter/strong enhancer (Tss or TssFlnk) chromatin states were labeled as active promoters in downstream analysis.

Estimation of mutational overburdening

Four tests were employed to estimate the overburdening of mutations. In the first approach, a resampling strategy replaced each tile (a region of consecutive bases, between 1bp and 100bp) in the aggregate regulatory landscape with one that has the same reference nucleotide context, regional mutation rate, chromatin state, and open chromatin level. Then the number of mutations is assessed and the significance is calculated through the empirical p-value relative to the genomic background null distribution. This is exact and gives uninflated quantile-quantile plots, but is computationally intensive to calculate, and thus all associations were first run using the parametric models described below, and marginally significant associations were replicated using the permutation test as a final filter. For evaluation of coding gene effects, q-values for enrichment of putative cancer-mutated genes (Lawrence et al., 2014) were downloaded and ordered by their pan-cancer q-value.

As a pre-filter for the pan-cancer runs, where non-parametric tests are prohibitively time consuming, a poisson distribution is used, where the lambda parameter is estimated from the genome-wide distribution of nucleotides that share the same covariates (regional mutation rate, patient, chromatin state, and DNase sensitivity). Every nucleotide is assumed to be independent and the product of the observed values is the overall expectation.

In order to capture putative enriched genes which violate the poisson assumption, a z-score test is used, where the mean mutation count was derived using the same covariates as the Poisson test. Finally, the Cochran-Mantel-Haentzel (CMH) test was used in which chromatin state strata are simultaneously tested for having mutations at an odds ratio other than one. Together, these three tests act as filters to identify only the gene-state-cancer type combinations most likely to be enriched, and those combinations can be further refined using the non-parametric models.

For the non-parametric models, genomic windows of size 1bp, 10bp, or 100bp were stratified by canonical chromatin states and the presence of open chromatin, and within each, normalized regional mutation rate (mutations per megabase per thousand donors) and reference trinucleotide context were recorded. To evaluate a gene, the associated regulatory regions were divided into chromatin states, and the number of tiles of a given size and parameters were tallied. Then, for each permutation, random matched regions were regenerated and tallied from covariate-matched regions of the same length across the genome and summed across the regulatory landscape.

Fisher's method was used to combine p-values across cancer types. Under this model, we assume that the estimates from the cancer types are independent given the lack of individual-level overlap between studies of different cancer types.

Bootstrap validation of mutation enrichment

A validation of the mutation selection process was performed for the Breast cancer association at *IPO9*. Individuals were resampled uniformly at random in the Basal breast cancer subtype and the observed and expected number of mutations were recalculated. Resampling was performed 20 times and the enrichment in both mutation counts (Supplemental Figure 2A) and patient counts (Supplemental Figure 2B) were tallied.

Survival analyses

For the METABRIC cohort, clinical data, including relapse free survival was obtained from (Rueda et al. Nature 2019), and expression and copy number from EGA. Expression of *IPO9* was adjusted by copy number by regressing the copy number value from the expression. Kaplan-Meier plots were generated with the package "survminer", where the top 1/3 and bottom 1/3 expression values for each gene were defined as high versus low, respectively. Cox Proportional Hazards Models were generated using the CoxPH function in the survival package, adjusting for relevant clinical covariates, including age, stage, grade, size, number of lymph nodes positive, estrogen and progesterone receptor status, as well as HER2/ERBB2 status. Estrogen receptor (ER) status was not included in the model for luminal tumors since most are ER-positive. For the TCGA outcome analysis, clinical data (overall survival) was obtained from (Liu et al. Cell 2018), and expression (FPKM, upper quantile) and copy number data from gdc.cancer.gov. Expression was log2 transformed and scale normalized. Cox Proportional

772 Hazards Models were generated similar to that for the METABRIC cohort, again adjusting for
773 clinical covariates (when available) including age, stage, gender and grade. Only tumor types
774 with sufficient numbers and follow-up times were used for the main analyses (Liu et al., 2018).
775

776 CRISPR screen and essentiality analyses

777 CNA-normalized gene effect scores were downloaded from DepMap for the Avana and GeCKO
778 genome wide CRISPR-KO screens (Meyers et al., 2017). These values represent the
779 normalized effect on cell growth for knockout of the given gene, such that negative values are
780 associated with more lethal knockout. However, potential batch effects are present in the
781 reported essentiality scores (Boyle et al., 2018), and we sought to adjust for these in our
782 aggregated analyses. In brief, for the co-essentiality testing with *IPO9* and driver gene list
783 analysis, the whole gene effect score matrix was normalized using a strategy to remove batch
784 effects (Boyle et al., 2018). The matrix was subset to olfactory receptor genes and PCA was
785 performed, followed by removal of the top five principal components of the olfactory receptor
786 gene matrix from the essentiality of every gene. Driver genes from aggregated elements were
787 subset to those with at least three patients mutated and FDR < 20%. For the correlation
788 analysis with *IPO9*, genes were ordered according to observed correlation coefficients across
789 cell lines (using a cutoff of 0.3).

790

791

792 References

793 Alexandrov, L.B., Nik-Zainal, S., Wedge, D.C., Aparicio, S.A.J.R., Behjati, S., Blankin, A.V.,
794 Bignell, G.R., Bolli, N., Borg, A., Børresen-Dale, A.-L., et al. (2013). Signatures of mutational
795 processes in human cancer. *Nature* 500, 415–421.

796 Araya, C.L., Cenik, C., Reuter, J.A., Kiss, G., Pande, V.S., Snyder, M.P., and Greenleaf, W.J.
797 (2016). Identification of significantly mutated regions across cancer types highlights a rich
798 landscape of functional molecular alterations. *Nat. Genet.* 48, 117–125.

799 Bailey, M.H., Tokheim, C., Porta-Pardo, E., Sengupta, S., Bertrand, D., Weerasinghe, A.,
800 Colaprico, A., Wendl, M.C., Kim, J., Reardon, B., et al. (2018). Comprehensive Characterization
801 of Cancer Driver Genes and Mutations. *Cell* 173, 371–385.e18.

802 Bailey, S.D., Desai, K., Kron, K.J., Mazrooei, P., Sinnott-Armstrong, N.A., Treloar, A.E., Dowar,
803 M., Thu, K.L., Cescon, D.W., Silvester, J., et al. (2016). Noncoding somatic and inherited
804 single-nucleotide variants converge to promote ESR1 expression in breast cancer. *Nat. Genet.*
805 48, 1260–1266.

806 Berger, M.F., Hodis, E., Heffernan, T.P., Deribe, Y.L., Lawrence, M.S., Protopopov, A., Ivanova,
807 E., Watson, I.R., Nickerson, E., Ghosh, P., et al. (2012). Melanoma genome sequencing reveals
808 frequent PREX2 mutations. *Nature* 485, 502–506.

809 Boyle, E.A., Pritchard, J.K., and Greenleaf, W.J. (2018). High-resolution mapping of cancer cell

810 networks using co-functional interactions.

811 Caridi, C.P., D'Agostino, C., Ryu, T., Zapotoczny, G., Delabaere, L., Li, X., Khodaverdian, V.Y.,
812 Amaral, N., Lin, E., Rau, A.R., et al. (2018). Nuclear F-actin and myosins drive relocalization of
813 heterochromatic breaks. *Nature* 559, 54–60.

814 Chang, D.Y., Hsu, K., and Maraia, R.J. (1996). Monomeric scAlu and nascent dimeric Alu RNAs
815 induced by adenovirus are assembled into SRP9/14-containing RNPs in HeLa cells. *Nucleic
816 Acids Res.* 24, 4165–4170.

817 Cho, S.W., Xu, J., Sun, R., Mumbach, M.R., Carter, A.C., Chen, Y.G., Yost, K.E., Kim, J., He, J.,
818 Nevins, S.A., et al. (2018). Promoter of lncRNA Gene PVT1 Is a Tumor-Suppressor DNA
819 Boundary Element. *Cell* 173, 1398–1412.e22.

820 Curtis, C., Shah, S.P., Chin, S.-F., Turashvili, G., Rueda, O.M., Dunning, M.J., Speed, D., Lynch,
821 A.G., Samarajiwa, S., Yuan, Y., et al. (2012). The genomic and transcriptomic architecture of
822 2,000 breast tumours reveals novel subgroups. *Nature* 486, 346–352.

823 David, C.J., and Manley, J.L. (2010). Alternative pre-mRNA splicing regulation in cancer:
824 pathways and programs unhinged. *Genes Dev.* 24, 2343–2364.

825 Degner, J.F., Pai, A.A., Pique-Regi, R., Veyrieras, J.-B., Gaffney, D.J., Pickrell, J.K., De Leon,
826 S., Michelini, K., Lewellen, N., Crawford, G.E., et al. (2012). DNase I sensitivity QTLs are a
827 major determinant of human expression variation. *Nature* 482, 390–394.

828 De Ingeniis, J., Ratnikov, B., Richardson, A.D., Scott, D.A., Aza-Blanc, P., De, S.K., Kazanov,
829 M., Pellecchia, M., Ronai, Z. 'ev, Osterman, A.L., et al. (2012). Functional specialization in
830 proline biosynthesis of melanoma. *PLoS One* 7, e45190.

831 Denisova, E., Heidenreich, B., Nagore, E., Rachakonda, P.S., Hosen, I., Akrap, I., Traves, V.,
832 García-Casado, Z., López-Guerrero, J.A., Requena, C., et al. (2015). Frequent DPH3 promoter
833 mutations in skin cancers. *Oncotarget* 6, 35922–35930.

834 Dopie, J., Skarp, K.-P., Rajakylä, E.K., Tanhuanpää, K., and Vartiainen, M.K. (2012). Active
835 maintenance of nuclear actin by importin 9 supports transcription. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.*
836 109, E544–E552.

837 Elliott, L.T., Sharp, K., Alfaro-Almagro, F., Shi, S., Miller, K.L., Douaud, G., Marchini, J., and
838 Smith, S.M. (2018). Genome-wide association studies of brain imaging phenotypes in UK
839 Biobank. *Nature* 562, 210–216.

840 ENCODE Project Consortium (2012). An integrated encyclopedia of DNA elements in the
841 human genome. *Nature* 489, 57–74.

842 FANTOM Consortium and the RIKEN PMI and CLST (DGT), Forrest, A.R.R., Kawaji, H., Rehli,
843 M., Baillie, J.K., de Hoon, M.J.L., Hablerle, V., Lassmann, T., Kulakovskiy, I.V., Lizio, M., et al.
844 (2014). A promoter-level mammalian expression atlas. *Nature* 507, 462–470.

845 Feigin, M.E., Garvin, T., Bailey, P., Waddell, N., Chang, D.K., Kelley, D.R., Shuai, S., Gallinger,
846 S., McPherson, J.D., Grimmond, S.M., et al. (2017). Recurrent noncoding regulatory mutations

847 in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma. *Nat. Genet.* **49**, 825–833.

848 Ferrari, A., Vincent-Salomon, A., Pivot, X., Sertier, A.-S., Thomas, E., Tonon, L., Boyault, S.,
849 Mulugeta, E., Treilleux, I., MacGrogan, G., et al. (2016). A whole-genome sequence and
850 transcriptome perspective on HER2-positive breast cancers. *Nat. Commun.* **7**, 12222.

851 Fishilevich, S., Nudel, R., Rappaport, N., Hadar, R., Plaschkes, I., Iny Stein, T., Rosen, N.,
852 Kohn, A., Twik, M., Safran, M., et al. (2017). GeneHancer: genome-wide integration of
853 enhancers and target genes in GeneCards. *Database* **2017**.

854 Flavahan, W.A., Drier, Y., Liao, B.B., Gillespie, S.M., Venteicher, A.S., Stemmer-Rachamimov,
855 A.O., Suvà, M.L., and Bernstein, B.E. (2016). Insulator dysfunction and oncogene activation in
856 IDH mutant gliomas. *Nature* **529**, 110–114.

857 Forbes, S.A., Beare, D., Boutselakis, H., Bamford, S., Bindal, N., Tate, J., Cole, C.G., Ward, S.,
858 Dawson, E., Ponting, L., et al. (2017). COSMIC: somatic cancer genetics at high-resolution.
859 *Nucleic Acids Res.* **45**, D777–D783.

860 Gao, J., Aksoy, B.A., Dogrusoz, U., Dresdner, G., Gross, B., Sumer, S.O., Sun, Y., Jacobsen,
861 A., Sinha, R., Larsson, E., et al. (2013). Integrative analysis of complex cancer genomics and
862 clinical profiles using the cBioPortal. *Sci. Signal.* **6**, I1.

863 Garinis, G.A., Patrinos, G.P., Spanakis, N.E., and Menounos, P.G. (2002). DNA
864 hypermethylation: when tumour suppressor genes go silent. *Hum. Genet.* **111**, 115–127.

865 Gasperini, M., Hill, A.J., McFaline-Figueroa, J.L., Martin, B., Kim, S., Zhang, M.D., Jackson, D.,
866 Leith, A., Schreiber, J., Noble, W.S., et al. (2019). A Genome-wide Framework for Mapping
867 Gene Regulation via Cellular Genetic Screens. *Cell* **176**, 377–390.e19.

868 Guo, Y., Updegraff, B.L., Park, S., Durakoglugil, D., Cruz, V.H., Maddux, S., Hwang, T.H., and
869 O'Donnell, K.A. (2016). Comprehensive Ex Vivo Transposon Mutagenesis Identifies Genes That
870 Promote Growth Factor Independence and Leukemogenesis. *Cancer Res.* **76**, 773–786.

871 Hanahan, D., and Weinberg, R.A. (2011). Hallmarks of cancer: the next generation. *Cell* **144**,
872 646–674.

873 Hnisz, D., Weintraub, A.S., Day, D.S., Valton, A.-L., Bak, R.O., Li, C.H., Goldmann, J., Lajoie,
874 B.R., Fan, Z.P., Sigova, A.A., et al. (2016). Activation of proto-oncogenes by disruption of
875 chromosome neighborhoods. *Science* **351**, 1454–1458.

876 Horn, S., Figl, A., Rachakonda, P.S., Fischer, C., Sucker, A., Gast, A., Kadel, S., Moll, I.,
877 Nagore, E., Hemminki, K., et al. (2013). TERT promoter mutations in familial and sporadic
878 melanoma. *Science* **339**, 959–961.

879 Huang, F.W., Hodis, E., Xu, M.J., Kryukov, G.V., Chin, L., and Garraway, L.A. (2013). Highly
880 recurrent TERT promoter mutations in human melanoma. *Science* **339**, 957–959.

881 ICGC/TCGA Pan-Cancer Analysis of Whole Genomes Consortium (2020). Pan-cancer analysis
882 of whole genomes. *Nature* **578**, 82–93.

883 Jo, U., Cai, W., Wang, J., Kwon, Y., D'Andrea, A.D., and Kim, H. (2016). PCNA-Dependent

- 884 Cleavage and Degradation of SDE2 Regulates Response to Replication Stress. *PLoS Genet.*
885 *12*, e1006465.
- 886 Joshi, A.A., and Struhl, K. (2005). Eaf3 chromodomain interaction with methylated H3-K36 links
887 histone deacetylation to Pol II elongation. *Mol. Cell* *20*, 971–978.
- 888 Kasowski, M., Kyriazopoulou-Panagiotopoulou, S., Grubert, F., Zaugg, J.B., Kundaje, A., Liu, Y.,
889 Boyle, A.P., Zhang, Q.C., Zakharia, F., Spacek, D.V., et al. (2013). Extensive variation in
890 chromatin states across humans. *Science* *342*, 750–752.
- 891 Kilpinen, H., Waszak, S.M., Gschwind, A.R., Raghav, S.K., Witwicki, R.M., Orioli, A.,
892 Migliavacca, E., Wiederkehr, M., Gutierrez-Arcelus, M., Panousis, N.I., et al. (2013).
893 Coordinated effects of sequence variation on DNA binding, chromatin structure, and
894 transcription. *Science* *342*, 744–747.
- 895 Koedoot, E., Wolters, L., van de Water, B., and Dévédec, S.E.L. (2019). Splicing regulatory
896 factors in breast cancer hallmarks and disease progression. *Oncotarget* *10*, 6021–6037.
- 897 Lawrence, M.S., Stojanov, P., Mermel, C.H., Robinson, J.T., Garraway, L.A., Golub, T.R.,
898 Meyerson, M., Gabriel, S.B., Lander, E.S., and Getz, G. (2014). Discovery and saturation
899 analysis of cancer genes across 21 tumour types. *Nature* *505*, 495–501.
- 900 Leiserson, M.D.M., Blokh, D., Sharan, R., and Raphael, B.J. (2013). Simultaneous identification
901 of multiple driver pathways in cancer. *PLoS Comput. Biol.* *9*, e1003054.
- 902 Lek, M., Karczewski, K.J., Minikel, E.V., Samocha, K.E., Banks, E., Fennell, T., O'Donnell-Luria,
903 A.H., Ware, J.S., Hill, A.J., Cummings, B.B., et al. (2016). Analysis of protein-coding genetic
904 variation in 60,706 humans. *Nature* *536*, 285–291.
- 905 Liu, J., Lichtenberg, T., Hoadley, K.A., Poisson, L.M., Lazar, A.J., Cherniack, A.D., Kovatich,
906 A.J., Benz, C.C., Levine, D.A., Lee, A.V., et al. (2018). An Integrated TCGA Pan-Cancer Clinical
907 Data Resource to Drive High-Quality Survival Outcome Analytics. *Cell* *173*, 400–416.e11.
- 908 Lobry, C., Oh, P., and Aifantis, I. (2011). Oncogenic and tumor suppressor functions of Notch in
909 cancer: it's NOTCH what you think. *J. Exp. Med.* *208*, 1931–1935.
- 910 Lowdon, R.F., and Wang, T. (2017). Epigenomic annotation of noncoding mutations identifies
911 mutated pathways in primary liver cancer. *PLoS One* *12*, e0174032.
- 912 Matsumiya, T., Xing, F., Ebina, M., Hayakari, R., Imaizumi, T., Yoshida, H., Kikuchi, H., Topham,
913 M.K., Satoh, K., and Stafforini, D.M. (2013). Novel role for molecular transporter importin 9 in
914 posttranscriptional regulation of IFN- ϵ expression. *J. Immunol.* *191*, 1907–1915.
- 915 Maurano, M.T., Humbert, R., Rynes, E., Thurman, R.E., Haugen, E., Wang, H., Reynolds, A.P.,
916 Sandstrom, R., Qu, H., Brody, J., et al. (2012). Systematic localization of common
917 disease-associated variation in regulatory DNA. *Science* *337*, 1190–1195.
- 918 McVicker, G., van de Geijn, B., Degner, J.F., Cain, C.E., Banovich, N.E., Raj, A., Lewellen, N.,
919 Myrthil, M., Gilad, Y., and Pritchard, J.K. (2013). Identification of genetic variants that affect
920 histone modifications in human cells. *Science* *342*, 747–749.

- 921 Melton, C., Reuter, J.A., Spacek, D.V., and Snyder, M. (2015). Recurrent somatic mutations in
922 regulatory regions of human cancer genomes. *Nat. Genet.* 47, 710–716.
- 923 Meyers, R.M., Bryan, J.G., McFarland, J.M., Weir, B.A., Sizemore, A.E., Xu, H., Dharia, N.V.,
924 Montgomery, P.G., Cowley, G.S., Pantel, S., et al. (2017). Computational correction of copy
925 number effect improves specificity of CRISPR-Cas9 essentiality screens in cancer cells. *Nat.*
926 *Genet.* 49, 1779–1784.
- 927 Montes, M., Coiras, M., Becerra, S., Moreno-Castro, C., Mateos, E., Majuelos, J., Oliver, F.J.,
928 Hernández-Munain, C., Alcamí, J., and Suñé, C. (2015). Functional Consequences for
929 Apoptosis by Transcription Elongation Regulator 1 (TCERG1)-Mediated Bcl-x and Fas/CD95
930 Alternative Splicing. *PLoS One* 10, e0139812.
- 931 Nik-Zainal, S., Davies, H., Staaf, J., Ramakrishna, M., Glodzik, D., Zou, X., Martincorena, I.,
932 Alexandrov, L.B., Martin, S., Wedge, D.C., et al. (2016). Landscape of somatic mutations in 560
933 breast cancer whole-genome sequences. *Nature* 534, 47–54.
- 934 Osborne, N.J., Gurrin, L.C., Allen, K.J., Constantine, C.C., Delatycki, M.B., McLaren, C.E.,
935 Gertig, D.M., Anderson, G.J., Southey, M.C., Olynyk, J.K., et al. (2010). HFE C282Y
936 homozygotes are at increased risk of breast and colorectal cancer. *Hepatology* 51, 1311–1318.
- 937 Pearson, J.L., Robinson, T.J., Muñoz, M.J., Kornblihtt, A.R., and Garcia-Blanco, M.A. (2008).
938 Identification of the cellular targets of the transcription factor TCERG1 reveals a prevalent role in
939 mRNA processing. *J. Biol. Chem.* 283, 7949–7961.
- 940 Rao, S.S.P., Huntley, M.H., Durand, N.C., Stamenova, E.K., Bochkov, I.D., Robinson, J.T.,
941 Sanborn, A.L., Machol, I., Omer, A.D., Lander, E.S., et al. (2014). A 3D map of the human
942 genome at kilobase resolution reveals principles of chromatin looping. *Cell* 159, 1665–1680.
- 943 Rheinbay, E., Parasuraman, P., Grimsby, J., Tiao, G., Engreitz, J.M., Kim, J., Lawrence, M.S.,
944 Taylor-Weiner, A., Rodriguez-Cuevas, S., Rosenberg, M., et al. (2017). Recurrent and functional
945 regulatory mutations in breast cancer. *Nature* 547, 55–60.
- 946 Rheinbay, E., Nielsen, M.M., Abascal, F., Wala, J.A., Shapira, O., Tiao, G., Hornshøj, H., Hess,
947 J.M., Juul, R.I., Lin, Z., et al. (2020). Analyses of non-coding somatic drivers in 2,658 cancer
948 whole genomes. *Nature* 578, 102–111.
- 949 Roadmap Epigenomics Consortium, Kundaje, A., Meuleman, W., Ernst, J., Bilenky, M., Yen, A.,
950 Heravi-Moussavi, A., Kheradpour, P., Zhang, Z., Wang, J., et al. (2015). Integrative analysis of
951 111 reference human epigenomes. *Nature* 518, 317–330.
- 952 Rueda, O.M., Sammut, S.-J., Seoane, J.A., Chin, S.-F., Caswell-Jin, J.L., Callari, M., Batra, R.,
953 Pereira, B., Bruna, A., Ali, H.R., et al. (2019). Dynamics of breast-cancer relapse reveal
954 late-recurring ER-positive genomic subgroups. *Nature* 567, 399–404.
- 955 Sabarinathan, R., Mularoni, L., Deu-Pons, J., Gonzalez-Perez, A., and López-Bigas, N. (2016).
956 Nucleotide excision repair is impaired by binding of transcription factors to DNA. *Nature* 532,
957 264–267.
- 958 Sack, L.M., Davoli, T., Li, M.Z., Li, Y., Xu, Q., Naxerova, K., Wooten, E.C., Bernardi, R.J., Martin,

- 959 T.D., Chen, T., et al. (2018). Profound Tissue Specificity in Proliferation Control Underlies
960 Cancer Drivers and Aneuploidy Patterns. *Cell* 173, 499–514.e23.
- 961 Sallari, R.C., Sinnott-Armstrong, N.A., French, J.D., Kron, K.J., Ho, J., Moore, J.H., Stambolic,
962 V., Edwards, S.L., Lupien, M., and Kellis, M. (2017). Convergence of dispersed regulatory
963 mutations predicts driver genes in prostate cancer.
- 964 Schaub, C., Nagaso, H., Jin, H., and Frasch, M. (2012). Org-1, the Drosophila ortholog of Tbx1,
965 is a direct activator of known identity genes during muscle specification. *Development* 139,
966 1001–1012.
- 967 Schmidt, D., Wilson, M.D., Ballester, B., Schwalie, P.C., Brown, G.D., Marshall, A., Kutter, C.,
968 Watt, S., Martinez-Jimenez, C.P., Mackay, S., et al. (2010). Five-vertebrate ChIP-seq reveals
969 the evolutionary dynamics of transcription factor binding. *Science* 328, 1036–1040.
- 970 Sharili, A.S., Kenny, F.N., Vartiainen, M.K., and Connelly, J.T. (2016). Nuclear actin modulates
971 cell motility via transcriptional regulation of adhesive and cytoskeletal genes. *Sci. Rep.* 6, 33893.
- 972 Stamatoyannopoulos, J.A., Adzhubei, I., Thurman, R.E., Kryukov, G.V., Mirkin, S.M., and
973 Sunyaev, S.R. (2009). Human mutation rate associated with DNA replication timing. *Nat. Genet.*
974 41, 393–395.
- 975 Takeda, D.Y., Spisák, S., Seo, J.-H., Bell, C., O'Connor, E., Korthauer, K., Ribli, D., Csabai, I.,
976 Solymosi, N., Szállási, Z., et al. (2018). A Somatic Acquired Enhancer of the Androgen
977 Receptor Is a Noncoding Driver in Advanced Prostate Cancer. *Cell* 174, 422–432.e13.
- 978 Tong, P., Monahan, J., and Prendergast, J.G.D. (2017). Shared regulatory sites are abundant in
979 the human genome and shed light on genome evolution and disease pleiotropy. *PLoS Genet.*
980 13, e1006673.
- 981 Viita, T., Kyheröinen, S., Prajapati, B., Virtanen, J., Frilander, M.J., Varjosalo, M., and Vartiainen,
982 M.K. (2019). Nuclear actin interactome analysis links actin to KAT14 histone acetyl transferase
983 and mRNA splicing. *J. Cell Sci.* 132.
- 984 Vinagre, J., Almeida, A., Pópulo, H., Batista, R., Lyra, J., Pinto, V., Coelho, R., Celestino, R.,
985 Prazeres, H., Lima, L., et al. (2013). Frequency of TERT promoter mutations in human cancers.
986 *Nat. Commun.* 4, 2185.
- 987 Wagle, N., Painter, C., Krevalin, M., Oh, C., Anderka, K., Larkin, K., Lennon, N., Dillon, D.,
988 Frank, E., Winer, E.P., et al. (2016). The Metastatic Breast Cancer Project: A national
989 direct-to-patient initiative to accelerate genomics research. *J. Clin. Orthod.* 34,
990 LBA1519–LBA1519.
- 991 Watson, I.R., Takahashi, K., Futreal, P.A., and Chin, L. (2013). Emerging patterns of somatic
992 mutations in cancer. *Nat. Rev. Genet.* 14, 703–718.
- 993 Weinhold, N., Jacobsen, A., Schultz, N., Sander, C., and Lee, W. (2014). Genome-wide analysis
994 of noncoding regulatory mutations in cancer. *Nat. Genet.* 46, 1160–1165.
- 995 Wu, K.J., Grandori, C., Amacker, M., Simon-Vermot, N., Polack, A., Lingner, J., and

996 Dalla-Favera, R. (1999). Direct activation of TERT transcription by c-MYC. *Nat. Genet.* 21,
997 220–224.

998 Zehir, A., Benayed, R., Shah, R.H., Syed, A., Middha, S., Kim, H.R., Srinivasan, P., Gao, J.,
999 Chakravarty, D., Devlin, S.M., et al. (2017). Mutational landscape of metastatic cancer revealed
1000 from prospective clinical sequencing of 10,000 patients. *Nat. Med.* 23, 703–713.

1001 Zhang, W., Bojorquez-Gomez, A., Velez, D.O., Xu, G., Sanchez, K.S., Shen, J.P., Chen, K.,
1002 Licon, K., Melton, C., Olson, K.M., et al. (2018). A global transcriptional network connecting
1003 noncoding mutations to changes in tumor gene expression. *Nat. Genet.* 50, 613–620.

1004 Zhou, S., Hawley, J.R., Soares, F., Grillo, G., Teng, M., Madani Tonekaboni, S.A., Hua, J.T.,
1005 Kron, K.J., Mazrooei, P., Ahmed, M., et al. (2020). Noncoding mutations target cis-regulatory
1006 elements of the FOXA1 plexus in prostate cancer. *Nat. Commun.* 11, 441.

1007 Zhou, X., Li, D., Zhang, B., Lowdon, R.F., Rockweiler, N.B., Sears, R.L., Madden, P.A.F.,
1008 Smirnov, I., Costello, J.F., and Wang, T. (2015). Epigenomic annotation of genetic variants using
1009 the Roadmap Epigenome Browser. *Nat. Biotechnol.* 33, 345–346.

1010 Zhu, H., Uusküla-Reimand, L., Isaev, K., Wadi, L., Alizada, A., Shuai, S., Huang, V.,
1011 Aduluso-Nwaobasi, D., Paczkowska, M., Abd-Rabbo, D., et al. (2020). Candidate Cancer Driver
1012 Mutations in Distal Regulatory Elements and Long-Range Chromatin Interaction Networks. *Mol.*
1013 *Cell.*

1014

- A. **Study overview.** Overview of approach to evaluate aggregate mutational burden in non-coding regulatory regions across cancer types, their functional effects, and clinical outcome associations.
- B. **Convergence model.** Mutations accumulate in coding sequences and promoters, as detected in existing methods, but non-promoter regulatory mutations are likely spread across enhancer elements. Jointly testing specific regulatory regions can therefore increase the signal of mutational burden at a given gene, similar to an exome burden test. Both mutations and regulatory annotations change between tumor types.
- C. **Regulatory mutation distribution.** Ordered distribution of mutation counts per individual for each of the cancer types studied in active and bivalent chromatin state annotations. (x) axis total mutations for a given tumor, and (y) axis number of mutations in a given chromatin state (promoter, enhancer, transcribed, or bivalent) for this tumor. Each point represents a single tumor within each subplot. For breast cancer, the three subtypes analysed separately are individually plotted.

Figure 2: Recurrent regulatory mutations in breast cancer.

A. Breast cancer promoter enriched genes

C. Subgroup combined distal element enriched genes

B. Breast cancer distal element enriched genes

D. Enrichment of mutations across subtypes

- A. **Breast cancer promoter enriched genes.** Quantile-quantile plots of promoter mutations across breast subtypes (Basal, Luminal, HER2+).
- B. **Breast cancer distal element enriched genes.** Quantile-quantile plots of distal regulatory mutations in each breast cancer subtype.
- C. **Subgroup combined distal element enriched genes.** Quantile-quantile plot of different regulatory states, combined across subtypes. Only element-level definitions are shown, either enhancer and DNase (end), promoter or enhancer in DNase (pde), or promoter regardless of DNase status (pro).

D. Enrichment of mutations across subtypes. Enrichment of significantly associated states from the combined analysis. Each dot within a given cancer type represents a single significantly associated gene, and each gene is repeated across all three cohorts to show relative enrichments of associated genes. Only element-level definitions are shown, either enhancer and DNase (end), promoter or DNase enhancer (pde), or promoter regardless of DNase (pro). Note that the promoter chromatin state is frequently observed in highly active enhancer elements as well as promoters themselves.

Figure 3: *IPO9* is recurrently altered in breast cancer.

- A. ***IPO9* is amplified in breast cancer.** *IPO9* is frequently amplified in breast cancer across three non-overlapping cohorts: METABRIC (Curtis et al., 2012; Rueda et al., 2019), the Metastatic Breast Cancer Project (Wagle et al., 2016), and The Cancer Genome Atlas (Gao et al., 2013; Liu et al., 2018). There are very few coding mutations in the Metastatic Breast Cancer Project and TCGA.
- B. **Aggregate regulatory mutate donors in replication cohorts.** *IPO9* regulatory region mutations were evaluated in three whole-genome sequenced validation cohorts: BRCA-UK and BRCA-US from PCAWG (ICGC/TCGA Pan-Cancer Analysis of Whole Genomes Consortium, 2020), and BRCA-FR (HER2+ amplified donors) from ICGC

(Ferrari et al., 2016). Y axis, fraction of donors with regulatory mutations, with number of mutated donors shown above each bar. All three cohorts show a consistent proportion of donors (~9%) with mutations in DNase-hypersensitive, enhancer marked regions associated with the *IPO9* promoter.

- C. **Epigenetic context at the *IPO9* locus.** ChIP-seq of histone modifications and CTCF, and open chromatin measured with DNase-seq, in human mammary epithelial cells (HMECs) are shown, as well as the aggregated chromatin state annotations in the two HMEC samples from Roadmap. In addition, the coding and non-coding elements tested for IPO9 are also indicated in red, and the expression of genes in the region is shown for both HMEC cells and MCF-7 breast cancer cells, showing the striking increased expression in MCF-7. Hi-C of HMEC cells (Rao et al., 2014) reveals a domain spanning the majority of regulatory elements (Zhou et al., 2015).
- D. **Detailed view of *IPO9* enhancer elements.** Detailed view of mutational context at an active element in an intron of *NAV1*. The 4-OHT response ChIP-seq profiles in MCF-7 cells and conservation tracks indicates that mutations are primarily located in regions of high activity or conservation.

Figure 4: Pan-cancer regulatory mutations have downstream effects on gene expression.

- A. Pan-cancer putative regulatory driver genes.** The shared landscape of regulatory alterations. Individual cancer types exhibit some uniquely significant genes, whereas other genes are recurrently mutated across cancer types.
- B. Multiple cancer associations by stringency.** Recurrence of genes across cancer types. Even at increasingly stringent FDR cutoffs, many genes harbor recurrent aggregated regulatory mutations across multiple cancer types.
- C. Expression QTLs for recurrently mutated regulatory regions.** Overall association of recurrently mutated genes with expression changes. The quantile-quantile plot shows significant changes in expression, as inferred from RNA-seq expression data of mutated versus non-mutated individuals.
- D. Pan-cancer lens-and-scallop plot of *NBR2* mutations.** Variants are marked with red lines on the outer circle, with regions around mutated regulatory elements shown. Inner circles depict the chromatin state annotations corresponding to the mutated elements. Innermost black arrows at the gene locus mark promoters of *BRCA1* and *NBR2*.
- E. Pan-cancer lens-and-scallop plot of *CDH13* mutations.** Variants are marked with red lines on the outer circle, with regions around mutated regulatory elements shown. Inner circles depict the chromatin state annotations corresponding to the mutated elements. Intronic elements are shown on gene locus for brevity. Innermost black arrow on gene locus marks promoter of *CDH13*.

- A. **CRISPR dependency scores of distal, promoter, and coding drivers.** Effect on CRISPR growth of known promoters and coding drivers versus novel regulatory drivers. Each distribution is the effects observed across cell lines. Essential gene knockouts have a median dependency score of -1.0, while non-essential gene knockouts have a median dependency score of 0.
- B. **Gene dependency distributions for mutated gene classes.** Across all associated genes, the knockout dependency scores of regulatory, promoter, and coding associated variants relative to the whole genome background. The fraction of gene effects below -0.5 (indicating substantial deleterious effect on proliferation) (Meyers et al., 2017)) are tallied across all genes in the given set. Coding data are from TCGA (Lawrence et al., 2014) and non-aggregate non-coding data are from PCAWG (Rheinbay et al., 2020).
- C. **Cancer type specificity of putative regulatory driver genes.** Each gene was evaluated for cancer type specificity using an F-test (Methods) and the resulting estimates were used to separate genes into those with significant specificity (gold), non-zero aggregate essentiality (orange), both (red), or neither (black).
- D. **Comparison between *IPO9* and known coding genes.** Comparison of coding versus noncoding effects in the Achilles screens. Each dot represents a significant pan- or single-cancer association from Lawrence et al (2014). The red dashed line and bars are the mean estimate and individual estimates of effect for *IPO9*.
- E. **Positive growth effect at *OXNAD1* locus.** Both *GALNT15* and *OXNAD1* have regulatory regions overburdened with mutations, but CRISPR/Cas9 screens reveal a significantly larger positive dependency score for *OXNAD1* compared to *GALNT15* in melanoma and other cell lines.

Figure 6: Regulatory and functional characterization of IPO9 using CRISPR screen data.

A. CRISPR gene effects at the *IPO9* locus B. Strategy for estimating shared effects with *IPO9* across cell lines

D. GO enrichment for splicing and RNA binding in genes correlated with *IPO9*

- A. **CRISPR gene effects at the *IPO9* locus.** Overall distribution of growth effect of *IPO9* versus all other genes at the locus in CRISPR/Cas9 gene knockouts across cancer cell lines (Meyers et al., 2017).
- B. **Strategy for estimating shared effects with *IPO9* across cell lines.** Overall schematic of our method for estimating shared effects across cell lines, similar to previous designs (Boyle et al., 2018).

- C. **Distribution of correlations with *IPO9* across cell lines.** The observed distribution of batch-corrected correlations between *IPO9* and each other genes across Avana and cell lines. Green, negatively correlated genes and orange, positively correlated genes.
- D. **GO enrichment for splicing and RNA binding in genes correlated with *IPO9*.** Volcano plots of enrichment for the ranked gene list correlation with *IPO9*, showing a consistent signal of RNA processing. [inset] Volcano plot of enrichment within tail (correlation threshold 0.3), illustrating a substantial enrichment for RNA splicing related genes. Green, negatively correlated genes and orange, positively correlated genes.

1149 **Figure 7: Recurrently mutated genes are associated with clinical outcome.**

- A. **Hazard plot by cancer type.** Forest plot for *IPO9*, *MED8*, and *OXNAD1* from expression and relapse-free survival Cox proportional hazards in TCGA across 23 well-powered cancer types (breast was excluded due to limited followup duration in TCGA). Data for *GUK1* and *PLEKHA6* are reported in Supplemental Figure 6.
- B. ***IPO9* relapse free survival in melanoma (TCGA).** Kaplan-Meier analysis of the association between *IPO9* expression and relapse free survival in the TCGA melanoma cohort. Cox Proportional Hazards Ratios are also reported. Corresponding forest plot in Supplemental Figure 7, and uncensored counts presented below the axis for each timepoint.
- C. ***OXNAD1* relapse free survival associations in uveal melanoma (TCGA).** Kaplan-Meier analysis of the association between *OXNAD1* expression and relapse free survival in the TCGA uveal melanoma cohort. Cox Proportional Hazards Ratios are also reported. Corresponding forest plot in Supplemental Figure 7, and uncensored counts presented below the axis for each timepoint.
- D. ***MED8* relapse free survival associations in kidney papillary carcinoma (TCGA).** Kaplan-Meier analysis of the association between *MED8* expression and relapse free survival in the TCGA kidney papillary carcinoma cohort. Cox Proportional Hazards Ratios are also reported. Corresponding forest plot in Supplemental Figure 7, and uncensored counts presented below the axis for each timepoint.
- E. ***IPO9* relapse free survival associations in luminal breast cancer (METABRIC).** Kaplan-Meier analysis of the association between *IPO9* expression and relapse free survival in the METABRIC breast cancer cohort. Cox Proportional Hazards Ratios are also reported. Corresponding forest plot and forest plot for all cancers in Supplemental Figure 7, and uncensored counts presented below the axis for each timepoint.
- F. **Luminal breast cancer coding and aggregated drivers.** Quantile-quantile plot of gene expression-survival associations based on disease-free survival in luminal cases in METABRIC. The distribution covers recurrently altered coding variants from TCGA or aggregated regulatory genes from our study (n = 50), revealing enrichment for survival associations. Corresponding plot for all tumors in Supplemental Figure 7.