Original Article Expression levels of IncRNAs are prognostic for hepatocellular carcinoma overall survival

Chen Xue^{1,2,3}, Yalei Zhao^{1,2,3}, Jianwen Jiang^{3,4}, Lanjuan Li^{1,2,3}

¹State Key Laboratory for Diagnosis and Treatment of Infectious Diseases, ²National Clinical Research Center for Infectious Diseases, ³Collaborative Innovation Center for Diagnosis and Treatment of Infectious Diseases, ⁴Health Management Center, The First Affiliated Hospital, College of Medicine, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310003, China

Received November 21, 2019; Accepted April 7, 2020; Epub May 15, 2020; Published May 30, 2020

Abstract: Studies have demonstrated that long non-coding RNAs (InCRNAs) play important roles in cancer development and progression. However, associations between the expression patterns and prognostic roles of InCRNAs in hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) have not been comprehensively described. In this study, we established a prognostic model of InCRNA expression using public datasets of HCC from The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) and adopted the International Cancer Genome Consortium (ICGC) as an independent cohort to validate the stability of our model. Cox regression analysis was used to explore the independent prognostic factor in both training and validation cohorts. Additionally, we explored the functional roles of InCRNAs using bioinformatic analyses. According to InCRNA consensus clusters, we resolved the distribution of molecular and clinical data and observed that individual InCRNA could function as prognostic biomarkers in HCC. Furthermore, the novel InCRNA molecular subtypes were statistically significant for predicting HCC status, which was validated by nested cross-validation. We found that InCRNA subtypes were partially related to gender, histological grade, and mutations within TP53. The InCRNA subtypes were also consistent with mRNA-based subtypes, and pathway enrichment analysis identified the involvement of multiple signaling pathways. In addition, we observed that upregulated DANCR was significantly associated with poor prognosis in HCC patients. In conclusion, our model based on InCRNA expression is statistically significant as a diagnostic and prognostic indicator for patients with HCC.

Keywords: IncRNAs, hepatocellular carcinoma, overall survival

Introduction

Hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) has an extremely poor prognosis and is one of the most common malignancies worldwide [1, 2]. Despite recent progress made with surgery and targeted therapy, recurrence, distant metastasis, and drug resistance remain clinical challenges that cause poor overall survival (OS) in HCC patients [3, 4]. Thus, it is critical to explore the molecular mechanisms underlying HCC tumorigenesis and progression, and to identify new predictive biomarkers and therapeutic targets for improving HCC patient outcomes.

Increasing evidence has revealed that non-coding RNAs (ncRNAs), including microRNAs, long non-coding RNAs (IncRNAs), and circular RNA, play essential roles in tumorigenesis [5-7]. Previous studies have shown that ncRNAs can modulate target gene expression in cancer [5]. Competing endogenous RNA (ceRNA) networks have been identified as critical regulators in a variety of cancers, including HCC [8, 9]. For example, Wang et al. [10] found that IncRNA MCM3AP-AS1 could play an oncogenic role in promoting HCC progression through the miR-194-5p/FOXA1 axis, and could be a novel prognostic biomarker and therapeutic target for HCC. However, associations between the expression and functional roles of IncRNAs in HCC are still under investigation.

LncRNAs, defined as transcripts of over 200 nucleotides in length, are broadly transcribed in the human genome [11]. Growing evidence suggests that IncRNAs are a category of non-cod-ing RNAs that play essential roles in numerous

biological processes, including gene transcription and mRNA splicing, cancer carcinogenesis and progression, signal transduction, and RNA activation and stability [12, 13]. Deregulated IncRNAs have been implicated in a variety of malignant tumors including breast, bladder, and colorectal cancers, osteosarcoma, glioblastoma, and HCC, illustrating the broad involvement of IncRNAs in tumorigenesis and cancer progression [7, 14, 15]. However, a greater understanding of the significance of IncRNA expression patterns as diagnostic and prognostic biomarkers remains to be established.

In the present study, we explored the expression of IncRNAs and assessed their association with the outcomes of HCC patients. Additionally, we defined novel IncRNA-based HCC subtypes and ascertained their prognostic value. An independent cohort was adopted to validate our model. Moreover, Cox regression analysis was used to explore the independent prognostic factor in both training and validation cohorts. Collectively, our findings reveal a novel approach for prognostic prediction in HCC based on IncRNA expression.

Materials and methods

Patient cohorts

We collected the Liver Hepatocellular Carcinoma (LIHC) dataset from the data portal of The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) (https://gdc.cancer.gov), as described previously [16, 17]. After excluding samples with a survival time of less than 30 days, the TCGA-LIHC cohort included 278 cases with clinical information and expression of IncRNAs available for further analysis. Additionally, we obtained 212 cases from the International Cancer Genome Consortium (IC-GC) with similar data available [18] (https:// dcc.icgc.org/projects/LIRI-JP). After excluding samples with a survival time of less than 30 days, the ICGC-LIHC cohort included 212 cases available as an independent validation cohort. Furthermore, GEPIA (http://gepia.cancer-pku. cn/) database was adopted to detect the expression and function of DANCR.

Subtype discovery and further validation

We adopted an unsupervised learning approach for subtype discovery, and then utilized

K-medoids clustering algorithm. Our optimal number of cluster (k = 2 to 10) was adopted, and we observed that k = 2 was selected utilizing a weighted silhouette index. The results of the clustering algorithm are described in <u>Table S1</u> and <u>Figure S1</u>, with protocols described previously [19].

Probably Approximately Correct (PAC) method was a non-deterministic architecture for information retrieval, applied to determine and correct the optimal cluster number. M is used to calculate the consensus moment. This PAC-learning method extracts the data of the lower triangle of the consensus matrix, and then we use this correction method to generate a curve fit to calculate the area between 0.1 and 0.9. The minimum area corresponding to k is the optimal k, which was k = 2 (Table S1).

Nested cross-validation and IncRNA subtype

We adopted a 10-fold cross-validation on our data, and the training and test datasets were divided randomly for each round as described previously [20, 21]. We first adopted an unsupervised learning method on the training set, and utilized labels to train the random forest model. Similar methods were performed on the test dataset to validate our model.

Clustering of mRNA expression data

A clustering scheme similar to the IncRNA expression-based subtype identification was used for mRNA expression data clustering. We removed samples with read counts equal to zero and used a log2 read count value to normalize the data. Consistent clustering of genomic information identified that k was a robust cluster varying between 2 and 10 clusters. For each value of k, we performed Monte Carlo subsampling 1,000 times on the samples and features. We then aggregated the clustering labels of different subsampling rounds to establish a consistent matrix, and clustered samples based on this matrix. Similar to the IncRNA subtype identification, PAC method was used to find the optimal cluster number in the mRNA expression data set, in which k = 2.

Statistical analysis

All data are shown as the mean \pm standard deviation (SD). Chi-squared tests were per-

Number of patients	278
Sex	
Male	193 (69.42%)
Female	85 (30.58%)
Age	
Median (range)	59 (18-82)
aged < 60	141 (50.72%)
AJCC stage	
I	139 (50.00%)
II	67 (24.10%)
III	69 (24.82%)
IV	3 (1.08%)
Invasion	
Invasion	77 (27.70%)
None	201 (72.30%)
Mutations	
APOB	34 (12.23%)
CSMD3	33 (11.87%)
MUC16	65 (23.38%)
MUC4	43 (15.47%)
PCLO	38 (13.67%)
RYR2	37 (13.31%)
TP53	89 (32.01%)

Table 1. Description of TCGA-LIHC cohort

formed for association analyses. Statistical significance was calculated with R software version 3.6. Kaplan-Meier analysis was performed to analyze the correlation between lncRNA expression and survival time. Univariable and multivariable Cox regression models were adopted to analyze independent prognostic factors. A two-sided P < 0.05 was identified as statistically significant.

Results

Characteristics of IncRNA in TCGA-LIHC cohort

To characterize IncRNA expression in the TCGA-LIHC cohort, we utilized RNA sequencing and the MiTranscriptome database to annotate IncRNAs. Two subtypes of IncRNA were discovered based on expression in 278 cases of HCC using the consensus cluster method. This was validated in another independent cohort (ICGC-LIHC). A description of the notated and evaluated characteristics within the TCGA-LIHC cohort is shown in **Table 1**. The distribution of molecular and clinical data through an analysis of the IncRNA consensus clusters is also included (**Figure 1**). Individual IncRNA as a prognostic biomarker in HCC

We next explored the extent to which individual IncRNA were related to the outcomes of HCC patients in the TCGA-LIHC cohort. Univariate Cox regression models were adopted for individual IncRNA using time on-study as the time scale, adjusting for age, sex, tumor grade, tumor metastasis, and mutation status of APOB, CSMD3, MUC16, MUC4, PCLO, RYR2, and TP53 as covariates in the models. We found that 45 IncRNAs could serve as prognostic biomarkers of overall survival (OS) in HCC with statistical significance (Figure 2). After analyzing the data in the ICGC-LIHC cohort for validation, six IncRNAs (LINC00324, LINC015-54, MIR99AHG, DNMBP-AS1, SNHG22, and DANCR) were found to be statistically significant (Figure S2), and DANCR was the only independent risk factor in two cohorts. Taken together, our results indicated that these IncRNAs could serve as novel biomarkers for prognostic prediction.

Novel molecular subtypes and prognostication based on IncRNA expression in HCC

To further resolve the role of IncRNAs in HCC. we investigated whether subgroups of HCC cases in the TCGA-LIHC cohort shared common multivariate IncRNA expression levels. We discovered two distinct IncRNA subtypes using an unsupervised learning approach based on IncRNA expression profiles. Results of consensus clustering revealed a high degree of coclustering of subjects within these two groups (Figure S1). This demonstrated that patients from the TCGA-LIHC cohort could be divided into two distinct subtypes according to IncRNA expression. We next explored the prognostic value of the IncRNA subtypes with respect to HCC patient OS. Kaplan-Meier analysis concluded that there was a significant difference in the prognostic value for the two IncRNA-based subtypes, with Group 1 (n = 131) having a worse survival outcome than Group 2 (n = 147) (Figure 3A). To validate the prognostic value of these IncRNA subtypes, we analyzed the independent ICGC-LIHC cohort and again found the IncRNA subtypes to be statistically significant, with patients in Group 2 (n = 99) having a better OS (Figure 3B). Moreover, multivariable Cox proportional hazards models were established for both the TCGA-LIHC (Figure 3C) and ICGC-



Figure 1. Distribution map of molecular and clinical data based on IncRNA consensus clustering. Four subtypes were identified based on IncRNA expression patterns, clinicopathological factors, and somatic mutations.

LIHC (**Figure 3D**) cohorts using the identified IncRNA prognostic factors, with both models providing statistically significance prognostic values.

Assessing the reproducibility of novel IncRNA HCC subtypes

To verify the consistency of the two IncRNA subtypes for HCC, we adopted a training set for a nested cross-validation experiment and an independent test set for model evaluation with respect to the prognostic value as described [22]. The overall correct classification rate based on test set cases was 0.9, as showed in **Figure 4A**. We concluded that the IncRNA subtypes were reliable as prognostic factors.

To further evaluate the reproducibility of these novel IncRNA HCC subtypes, we established a random forest model for subtype classification using an independent trained ICGC-LIHC

Am J Transl Res 2020;12(5):1873-1883

IncRNA	p value	HR (95%CI)	TCGA	-LIHC	
FAM225B	0.00010	1.317(1.146-1.531)		—	
MIMT1	0.00027	1.380(1.161-1.641)			
FAM225A	0.00081	1.283(1.109-1.484)			
LINC00324	0.00156	0.675(0.529-0.861)	—		
LINC01554	0.00195	0.904(0.848-0.964)	H O -1		
HCG27	0.00232	0.709(0.569-0.885)			
LINC00200	0.00274	1.207(1.067-1.366)			
FLJ36000	0.00343	1.236(1.072-1.424)		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
A1BG-AS1	0.00466	0.743(0.604-0.913)			
BX255923-2	0.00476	1.481(1.128-1.945)		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
LINC00839	0.00606	1.616(1.043-1.291)		——— ———	
RAPGEF4-AS1	0.00738	1.421(1.099-1.838)		• •	-
LINC01018	0.00876	0.929(0.880-0.982)		-	
HPN-AS1	0.01199	0.837(0.729-0.962)		1	
C9orfl163	0.01405	0.763(0.615-0.947)			
MIR99AHG	0.01497	0.850(0.746-0.969)		4	
DNMBP-AS1	0.01558	0.853(0.750-0.970)		•	
C8orf31	0.01802	1.178(1.028-1.349)			
LINC00652	0.01865	1.388(1.056-1.824)		•	•
HHPN1-AS1	0.01890	1.252(1.038-1.510)			
UMODL1-AS1	0.02083	1.511(1.065-2.145)		•	
USP27X-AST	0.02111	1.203(1.028-1.408)			
LINC00304	0.02253	1.335(1.042-1.711)		• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	
PDXDC2P	0.02528	0.795(0.650-0.972)		1	
	0.03098	0.001(0.000-0.900)		1	
	0.03131	1 406(1 031 1 018)			
SNUC15	0.03133	1 210(1 017 1 440)			
SNHG22	0.03172	0.815(0.676-0.983)			
FIRRE	0.03217	1 191(1 013-1 400)			
ST7-AS1	0.03404	0.820(0.682-0.987)			
VIDIR-AS1	0.03562	1.164(1.010-1.342)			
LINC00731	0.03787	1 181(1 009-1 381)			
LINC00426	0.03800	0 826(0 689-0 990)			
LINC00661	0.03913	1,153(1,007-1,320)			
AL391244-1	0.03975	0.675(0.464-0.982)		-	
RMRP	0.04017	0.859(0.743-0.993)		-	
DHRS4-AS1	0.04038	0.811(0.664-0.991)		-	
DANCR	0.04038	1.187(1.008-1.397)			
DICER1-AS1	0.04266	0.799(0.643-0.993)		-	
AC010931-2	0.04336	1.202(1.006-1.438)			
AC005224-4	0.04357	1.125(1.003-1.262)			
AL359313-1	0.04767	1.140(1.001-1.297)			
LINC01138	0.04777	1.265(1.002-1.597)		• • •	
PARD6G-AS1	0.04893	0.859(0.738-0.999)			
			0.5	10 15	20
				1.0 1.0	2.0
				Hazard ratio	

Figure 2. Multivariate time-to-event analysis (overall survival) of individual IncRNAs (adjusting for established risk factors) in the TCGA-LIHC cohort, and validation of 45 prognoses of IncRNAs which correlated with overall survival.

cohort. Based on IncRNA expression in 212 cases by the consensus cluster method, we discovered two subtypes (**Figure 4B**). In the ICGC-LIHC cohort, the prognostic value of the two IncRNA subtypes was similar to TCGA-LIHC, and the OS of patients in Group 2 was significantly longer (**Figure 3C**). Moreover, we established a model based on multivariable Cox proportional hazards, including age, sex, and the prognostic factors above from TCGA clinical and mutation data (**Figure 3D**). The value of this established model was confirmed to be remarkably significant (P < 0.05).

LncRNA subtypes were partially related to HCC pathological factors

We next performed association studies to determine whether the IncRNA subtypes were related to clinical characteristics and known genes mutation within HCC. Using the ICGC-LIHC cohort, we found a significant difference between the two IncRNA subtypes (Table 2). We observed that number of stage I patients in Group 1 was significant more than Group 2 (P = 0.0082), while number of stage III patients in Group 2 were significant more than Group 1 (P = 0.0124). These results were consistent with the findings that Group 1 had poorer OS. Additionally, we observed that TP53 mutations were strongly linked with the IncRNA subtypes, in that Group 1 contained a higher percentage of TP53 mutations (41.98%) and poorer prognosis compared with Group 2. In summary, IncRNA subtypes could provide additional levels of stratification for HCC patients.



Figure 3. Multivariate survival analysis (Cox proportional hazards model) of IncRNA subtypes, including clinicopathological factors and mutations, for the TCGA-LIHC and ICGC-LIHC cohorts. LncRNA expression level and the roles for IncRNA-associated survival in HCC are exhibited in (A and B). LncRNA expression-based subtypes and overall survival (OS) in the TCGA-LIHC and ICGC-LIHC cohorts are illustrated in (C and D).



fied several significant pathways involved (**Figure 5A**), including "HPV infection" and "Neuroactive ligand-receptor interaction". Gene ontology (GO) analysis into molecular function in cellular processes showed involvement in "Transmembrane transporter activity", "Catabolic process", and "Synapse and channel complex" (**Figure 5B-D**).

Figure 4. HCC model validation through the ICGC-LIHC cohort. A. Nested crossvalidation cluster analysis was utilized to validate the cohort. B. Consensus clustering and unsupervised classification for profiling matrix for two groups in ICGC-LIHC (model selection results for k = 2).

Pathway analysis of genes associated with IncRNA subtypes

To demonstrate which genes were related to the IncRNA subtypes, we integrated mRNA into our bioinformatic analysis. Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes (KEGG) analysis identiConsistency between IncRNA and mRNA subtyping

To assess the degree that IncRNA subtypes were consistent with mRNA subtypes, we performed an identical unsupervised learning method to evaluate mRNA expression clusters similar to the IncRNA analysis, and divided mRNA expression into two groups. Despite a few cases that appeared to cross groups, most

Cluster	Group 1 (%)	Group 2 (%)	p-value (Chi-squared test)	Significance
Patients	131 (47.12%)	147 (52.88%)		
Sex				
Male	66 (50.38%)	127 (86.39%)	1.8273e-10	* * *
Female	65 (49.62%)	20 (13.61%)		
Age				
Median (range)	57 (18-81)	61 (41.50%)	0.8276	
aged > 60	55 (41.98%)	86 (58.50%)		
AJCC stage				
I	54 (41.22%)	85 (57.82%)	0.0082	**
II	34 (25.95%)	33 (22.45%)	0.5881	
III	42 (32.06%)	27 (18.37%)	0.0124	*
IV	1 (0.76%)	2 (1.36%)	0.9200	
Invasion				
Invasion	41 (31.30%)	36 (24.49%)	0.2055	
None	90 (68.70%)	111 (75.51%)		
Mutations				
APOB	12 (9.16%)	22 (14.97%)	0.1965	
CSMD3	17 (12.98%)	16 (10.88%)	0.7243	
MUC16	35 (26.72%)	30 (20.41%)	0.2719	
MUC4	21 (16.03%)	22 (14.97%)	0.9371	
PCLO	13 (9.92%)	25 (17.01%)	0.1233	
RYR2	19 (14.50%)	18 (12.24%)	0.7065	
TP53	55 (41.98%)	34 (23.13%)	0.0012	**

Table 2. Description of ICGC-LIHC cohort

Abbreviations: *P < 0.05, **P < 0.01, ***P < 0.001.

belonged to the same group (**Figure 6A**). These results showed that there was a significant relationship between the two models, demonstrating consistency between the mRNA and IncRNA expression profiles.

High DANCR expression correlates with HCC patient prognosis

Considering that DANCR was the only independent risk factor in the TCGA and ICGC cohorts, we investigated the expression and function of DANCR in HCC. As shown in **Figure 6B**, we observed that DANCR expression was significantly elevated in HCC tissues compared to normal tissues. Moreover, we found that the expression of DANCR was much higher in advanced TNM staging (**Figure 6C**). Kaplan-Meier analysis showed that OS of HCC patients was significantly worse with high dancer DANCR expression than low expression (**Figure 6D**). Collectively, our results demonstrated that DANCR expression was elevated and contributed to poor prognosis in HCC patients.

Discussion

A growing number of studies show that poor outcomes in HCC can be attributed to late diagnosis, tumor recurrence, and unsatisfactory treatment [23]. Therefore, it is urgent to develop powerful diagnostic and novel therapeutic strategies to improve the diagnosis and treatment of HCC. Studies have shown that expression levels of IncRNAs could regulate mRNA expression and act in critical roles to regulate HCC pathogenesis [9]. HOXD-AS1, MCM3AP-AS1, CASC2, and RMRP were found to promote HCC progression [10, 24-26], providing novel insight into prognostic biomarker exploration. Emerging evidence shows that cancer-related IncRNAs could be diagnostic or predictive biomarkers to predict OS in HCC patients [27, 28], but the functional roles of cancer-related IncRNAs has not been fully characterized for HCC.

In the present study, we characterized IncRNA expression by accessing the TCGA database to analyze a TCGA-LIHC cohort of 278 HCC pa-

IncRNAs predict OS in HCC



Figure 5. Pathway enrichment and GO analyses of IncRNAs in HCC samples. A. KEGG analysis. B. GO analysis for molecular function assessment. C. GO analysis for biological process assessment. D. GO analysis for cellular component assessment.

tients in order to ascertain if particular IncRNAs correlated with HCC status, and if prognostic subtypes of HCC-based IncRNAs could be delineated. Our findings were then validated in a separate ICGC-LIHC cohort. DANCR was found to be the only independent risk factor in two cohorts [29-31]. Similar to our findings, studies have shown DANCR as a potential cancer-related IncRNA in different malignancies, including hepatocellular carcinoma. Yuan et al. [32] found that DANCR was overexpressed in stem-like HCC cells, and could function as a prognostic biomarker in HCC.

In the TCGA-LIHC cohort, we observed that 45 individual IncRNA could serve as independent prognosticators of OS in HCC. In previous studies, it has been determined that gene expres-

sion characteristics and prognostic models based on molecular features that drive pathogenesis were an effective means for predicting clinical outcomes [33-35]. There is increasing evidence that IncRNAs possess the potential to offer critical forecasting in the survival of HCC patients, with more IncRNAs thought to affect the evolution of HCC through their own molecular mechanisms [36, 37]. Through our exploration of RNA sequencing data from the TCGA database, 23 IncRNAs were found to be of good predictive value for HCC prognosis. Further validation in the ICGC-LIHC cohort confirmed the value of IncRNAs as a new prognostic biomarker.

Our study also identified two robust IncRNA subtypes as prognostic indicators of HCC OS. In



Figure 6. LncRNA and mRNA model validation and DANCR analyses. A. Sankey diagram of the relationship between mRNA-defined (right) and IncRNA-defined (left) subtype classifications. B. DANCR expression was significantly elevated in HCC tissues in a TCGA data analysis. C. LACTB expression was much higher in advanced TNM stages. D. Kaplan-Meier analysis showing that HCC patient OS is significantly worse with high DANCR expression than low expression.

both the TCGA-LIHC and ICGC-LIHC cohorts. the survival time in Group 2 was longer than Group 1, illustrating the consistency of this subtype discovery and predictive modeling. We also trained a random forest model based on the TCGA data for subtype classification to assess the reproducibility of newly discovered HCC subtypes. Our analysis showed that IncRNA subtypes were consistent with mRNA subtypes, indicating that there may be a correlation between IncRNA and mRNA subtypes to be leveraged for diagnostics and treatment. Furthermore, the related pathways were identified through KEGG and GO analysis, indicating that IncRNAs may play special roles through specific signaling pathways in HCC. Further investigation into these signaling pathways could provide support toward the discovery of novel HCC targets.

In summary, by taking advantage of public databases to probe IncRNAs from TCGA-LIHC and ICGC-LIHC cohorts, we created a valid predictive model and identified IncRNA-based subtypes of HCC which could become novel prognostic biomarkers. Further investigation beyond this study is required to prove the clinical potential of its findings. In addition, the molecular mechanisms and biological functions of these newly identified IncRNAs must be explored further through *in vitro* and *in vivo* experiments.

Conclusions

In this study, we detected the expression of IncRNAs and assessed their association with the OS of HCC patients. We defined novel HCC subtypes based on IncRNA and ascertained their prognostic value. An independent cohort was also utilized to validate our model. Additionally, Cox regression analysis was used to explore the independent prognostic factors in both training and validation cohorts. Collectively, our findings reveal a novel approach of predicting HCC status based on IncRNA expression.

Acknowledgements

We thank Dr. Weiwei Zhu (The First affiliated Hospital, School of Medicine, Zhejiang University) for help in literatures collection, and the patients and investigators who participated in TCGA, ICGC and GEPIA for providing data. This study was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (81902832 and 81672422); Open Project in State Key Laboratory for Diagnosis and Treatment of Infectious Disease (2015KF03); Zhejiang Province Health Department Program (2017KY322), and National S&T Major Project of China (2018ZX10-301201).

Disclosure of conflict of interest

None.

Address correspondence to: Lanjuan Li, State Key Laboratory for Diagnosis and Treatment of Infectious Diseases, The First Affiliated Hospital, College of Medicine, Zhejiang University, No. 79 Qingchun Road, Shangcheng District, Hangzhou 310003, Zhejiang, China. E-mail: Ijli@zju.edu.cn

References

- [1] Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Siegel RL, Torre LA and Jemal A. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. CA Cancer J Clin 2018; 68: 394-424.
- [2] Forner A, Reig M and Bruix J. Hepatocellular carcinoma. Lancet 2018; 391: 1301-1314.
- [3] Bruix J, da Fonseca LG and Reig M. Insights into the success and failure of systemic therapy for hepatocellular carcinoma. Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol 2019; 16: 617-630.
- [4] Zhou ZQ, Tong DN, Guan J, Tan HW, Zhao LD, Zhu Y, Yao J, Yang J and Zhang ZY. Follicular helper T cell exhaustion induced by PD-L1 ex-

pression in hepatocellular carcinoma results in impaired cytokine expression and B cell help, and is associated with advanced tumor stages. Am J Transl Res 2016; 8: 2926-2936.

- [5] Beermann J, Piccoli MT, Viereck J and Thum T. Non-coding RNAs in development and disease: background, mechanisms, and therapeutic approaches. Physiol Rev 2016; 96: 1297-1325.
- [6] Anfossi S, Babayan A, Pantel K and Calin GA. Clinical utility of circulating non-coding RNAs an update. Nat Rev Clin Oncol 2018; 15: 541-563.
- [7] Yan X, Hu Z, Feng Y, Hu X, Yuan J, Zhao SD, Zhang Y, Yang L, Shan W, He Q, Fan L, Kandalaft LE, Tanyi JL, Li C, Yuan CX, Zhang D, Yuan H, Hua K, Lu Y, Katsaros D, Huang Q, Montone K, Fan Y, Coukos G, Boyd J, Sood AK, Rebbeck T, Mills GB, Dang CV and Zhang L. Comprehensive genomic characterization of long non-coding RNAs across human cancers. Cancer Cell 2015; 28: 529-540.
- [8] Bai Y, Long J, Liu Z, Lin J, Huang H, Wang D, Yang X, Miao F, Mao Y, Sang X and Zhao H. Comprehensive analysis of a ceRNA network reveals potential prognostic cytoplasmic IncRNAs involved in HCC progression. J Cell Physiol 2019; 234: 18837-18848.
- [9] Lin P, Wen DY, Li Q, He Y, Yang H and Chen G. Genome-wide analysis of prognostic IncRNAs, miRNAs, and mRNAs forming a competing endogenous RNA network in hepatocellular carcinoma. Cell Physiol Biochem 2018; 48: 1953-1967.
- [10] Wang Y, Yang L, Chen T, Liu X, Guo Y, Zhu Q, Tong X, Yang W, Xu Q, Huang D and Tu K. A novel IncRNA MCM3AP-AS1 promotes the growth of hepatocellular carcinoma by targeting miR-194-5p/FOXA1 axis. Mol Cancer 2019; 18: 28.
- [11] Wang KC and Chang HY. Molecular mechanisms of long noncoding RNAs. Mol Cell 2011; 43: 904-914.
- [12] Engreitz JM, Ollikainen N and Guttman M. Long non-coding RNAs: spatial amplifiers that control nuclear structure and gene expression. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol 2016; 17: 756-770.
- [13] Quinn JJ and Chang HY. Unique features of long non-coding RNA biogenesis and function. Nat Rev Genet 2016; 17: 47-62.
- [14] Wong CM, Tsang FH and Ng IO. Non-coding RNAs in hepatocellular carcinoma: molecular functions and pathological implications. Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol 2018; 15: 137-151.
- [15] Zheng S, Lin F, Zhang M, Mu N, Ge X and Fu J. Long non-coding RNA AK001058 regulates tumor growth and angiogenesis in colorectal cancer via methylation of ADAMTS12. Am J Transl Res 2019; 11: 6117-6123.
- [16] Xue C, He Y, Zhu W, Chen X, Yu Y, Hu Q, Chen J, Liu L, Ren F, Ren Z, Cui G and Sun R. Low ex-

pression of LACTB promotes tumor progression and predicts poor prognosis in hepatocellular carcinoma. Am J Transl Res 2018; 10: 4152-4162.

- [17] Lee H, Palm J, Grimes SM and Ji HP. The cancer genome atlas clinical explorer: a web and mobile interface for identifying clinical-genomic driver associations. Genome Med 2015; 7: 112.
- [18] Zhang J, Bajari R, Andric D, Gerthoffert F, Lepsa A, Nahal-Bose H, Stein LD and Ferretti V. The international cancer genome consortium data portal. Nat Biotechnol 2019; 37: 367-369.
- [19] Damgacioglu H, Celik E and Celik N. Intracluster distance minimization in DNA methylation analysis using an advanced Tabu-based iterative k-medoids clustering algorithm (T-CLUST). IEEE/ACM Trans Comput Biol Bioinform 2018; [Epub ahead of print].
- [20] Baumann D and Baumann K. Reliable estimation of prediction errors for QSAR models under model uncertainty using double cross-validation. J Cheminform 2014; 6: 47.
- [21] Luo Y, McShan D, Ray D, Matuszak M, Jolly S, Lawrence T, Ming Kong F, Ten Haken R and El Naqa I. Development of a fully cross-validated bayesian network approach for local control prediction in lung cancer. IEEE Trans Radiat Plasma Med Sci 2019; 3: 232-241.
- [22] Zhang Y, Wang H, Mao X, Guo Q, Li W, Wang X, Li G and Lin N. A novel gene-expression-signature-based model for prediction of response to Tripterysium glycosides tablet for rheumatoid arthritis patients. J Transl Med 2018; 16: 187.
- [23] Yang JD, Hainaut P, Gores GJ, Amadou A, Plymoth A and Roberts LR. A global view of hepatocellular carcinoma: trends, risk, prevention and management. Nat Rev Gastroenterol Hepatol 2019; 16: 589-604.
- [24] Lu S, Zhou J, Sun Y, Li N, Miao M, Jiao B and Chen H. The noncoding RNA HOXD-AS1 is a critical regulator of the metastasis and apoptosis phenotype in human hepatocellular carcinoma. Mol Cancer 2017; 16: 125.
- [25] Fan JC, Zeng F, Le YG and Xin L. LncRNA CASC2 inhibited the viability and induced the apoptosis of hepatocellular carcinoma cells through regulating miR-24-3p. J Cell Biochem 2018; 119: 6391-6397.
- [26] Hongfeng Z, Andong J, Liwen S, Mingping B, Xiaowei Y, Mingyong L and Aimin Y. IncRNA RMRP knockdown suppress hepatocellular carcinoma biological activities via regulation miRNA-206/TACR1. J Cell Biochem 2020; 121: 1690-1702.
- [27] Liu H, Gu X, Wang G, Huang Y, Ju S, Huang J and Wang X. Copy number variations primed IncRNAs deregulation contribute to poor prognosis in colorectal cancer. Aging (Albany NY) 2019; 11: 6089-6108.

- [28] Song L, Zhang S, Duan C, Ma S, Hussain S, Wei L and Chu M. Genome-wide identification of IncRNAs as novel prognosis biomarkers of glioma. J Cell Biochem 2019; 120: 19518-19528.
- [29] Lu Y, Hu Z, Mangala LS, Stine ZE, Hu X, Jiang D, Xiang Y, Zhang Y, Pradeep S, Rodriguez-Aguayo C, Lopez-Berestein G, DeMarzo AM, Sood AK, Zhang L and Dang CV. MYC targeted long noncoding RNA DANCR promotes cancer in part by reducing p21 levels. Cancer Res 2018; 78: 64-74.
- [30] Thin KZ, Liu X, Feng X, Raveendran S and Tu JC. LncRNA-DANCR: a valuable cancer related long non-coding RNA for human cancers. Pathol Res Pract 2018; 214: 801-805.
- [31] Ma X, Wang X, Yang C, Wang Z, Han B, Wu L and Zhuang L. DANCR acts as a diagnostic biomarker and promotes tumor growth and metastasis in hepatocellular carcinoma. Anticancer Res 2016; 36: 6389-6398.
- [32] Yuan SX, Wang J, Yang F, Tao QF, Zhang J, Wang LL, Yang Y, Liu H, Wang ZG, Xu QG, Fan J, Liu L, Sun SH and Zhou WP. Long noncoding RNA DANCR increases stemness features of hepatocellular carcinoma by derepression of CTNNB1. Hepatology 2016; 63: 499-511.
- [33] Franco HL, Nagari A, Malladi VS, Li W, Xi Y, Richardson D, Allton KL, Tanaka K, Li J, Murakami S, Keyomarsi K, Bedford MT, Shi X, Li W, Barton MC, Dent SYR and Kraus WL. Enhancer transcription reveals subtype-specific gene expression programs controlling breast cancer pathogenesis. Genome Res 2018; 28: 159-170.
- [34] Karamali M, Shafabakhsh R, Ghanbari Z, Eftekhar T and Asemi Z. Molecular pathogenesis of interstitial cystitis/bladder pain syndrome based on gene expression. J Cell Physiol 2019; 234: 12301-12308.
- [35] Zhou N, He Z, Tang H, Jiang B and Cheng W. LncRNA RMRP/miR-613 axis is associated with poor prognosis and enhances the tumorigenesis of hepatocellular carcinoma by impacting oncogenic phenotypes. Am J Transl Res 2019; 11: 2801-2815.
- [36] Zhang H, Liao Z, Liu F, Su C, Zhu H, Li Y, Tao R, Liang H, Zhang B and Zhang X. Long noncoding RNA HULC promotes hepatocellular carcinoma progression. Aging (Albany NY) 2019; 11: 9111-9127.
- [37] Xu X, Gu J, Ding X, Ge G, Zang X, Ji R, Shao M, Mao Z, Zhang Y, Zhang J, Mao F, Qian H, Xu W, Cai H, Wang F and Zhang X. LINCO0978 promotes the progression of hepatocellular carcinoma by regulating EZH2-mediated silencing of p21 and E-cadherin expression. Cell Death Dis 2019; 10: 752.

IncRNAs predict OS in HCC

Table S1. Different K values and values o	f
probably approximately correct (PAC)	

probably approximately correct (PAC)				
К	Value of PAC			
2	0.042750			
3	0.460665			
4	0.408903			
5	0.286367			
6	0.258136			
7	0.216269			
8	0.208763			
9	0.194634			
10	0.187596			



Figure S1. Co	nsensus	matrix	for	clustering
---------------	---------	--------	-----	------------

IncRNA	p value	HR (95%CI)	TCGA	LIHC	ICGC-LIHC		p value	HR (95%CI)
FAM225B	0.00010	1.317(1.146-1.531)				//·	0.48304	7.83e-5(2.63e-16-2.33e7)
MIMT1	0.00027	1.380(1.161-1.641)					0.17090	2.071(0.731-5.868)
FAM225A	0.00081	1.283(1.109-1.484)		———			0.28302	0.139(0.004-5.100)
LINC00324	0.00156	0.675(0.529-0.861)					0.03536	0.392(0.163-0.938)
LINC01554	0.00195	0.904(0.848-0.964)	Her		*		0.01146	0,805(0.680-0.952)
HCG27	0.00232	0.709(0.569-0.885)					0.47152	0.750(0.343-1.641)
LINC00200	0.00274	1.207(1.067-1.366)					0.60143	1.135(0.706-1.822)
FLJ36000	0.00343	1.236(1.072-1.424)						
A1BG-AS1	0.00466	0.743(0.604-0.913)			101		0.13667	0.853(0.692-1.052)
BX255923-2	0.00476	1.481(1.128-1.945)						
LINC00839	0.00606	1.616(1.043-1.291)						
RAPGEF4-AS1	0.00738	1.421(1.099-1.838)						
LINC01018	0.00876	0.929(0.880-0.982)	181					
HPN-AS1	0.01199	0.837(0.729-0.962)						
C9orfl163	0.01405	0.763(0.615-0.947)	—— –				0.96039	0.956(0.163-5.624)
MIR99AHG	0.01497	0.850(0.746-0.969)			H B 1		0.01831	0.328(0.130-0.828)
DNMBP-AS1	0.01558	0.853(0.750-0.970)			H.		0.00152	0.103(0.025-0.421)
C8orf31	0.01802	1.178(1.028-1.349)					0.76527	0.743(0.106-5.215)
LINC00652	0.01865	1.388(1.056-1.824)					0.92060	0.941(0.286-3.102)
HHPN1-AS1	0.01890	1.252(1.038-1.510)					0.48163	1.542(0.462-5.149)
UMODL1-AS1	0.02083	1.511(1.065-2.145)			•	// _ _	0.37405	0.003(4.676e-9-1355)
USP27X-AS1	0.02111	1.203(1.028-1.408)						
LINC00304	0.02253	1.335(1.042-1.711)		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		-	0.22891	0.137(0.005-3.487)
PDXDC2P	0.02528	0.795(0.650-0.972)						
SCARNA9	0.03098	0.801(0.655-0.980)					0.08876	1.396(0.951-2.048)
LBX2-AS1	0.03131	0.744(0.569-0.974)						
NDUFB2-AS1	0.03133	1.406(1.031-1.918)		• • •				
SNHG15	0.03172	1.210(1.017-1.440)		 1	H H -1		0.74446	1.062(0.738-1.529)
SNHG22	0.03217	0.815(0.676-0.983)			He		0.01128	1.495(1.095-2.040)
FIRRE	0.03404	1.191(1.013-1.400)					0 77050	1 11 1/2 50 1 0 070
SI/-AS1	0.03549	0.820(0.682-0.987)					0.77859	1.114(0.524-2.370)
VLDLR-AS1	0.03562	1.164(1.010-1.342)					0.07050	0.000/0.000.0.5.40
LINC00731	0.03787	1.181(1.009-1.381)					0.97952	0.998(0.383-2.546)
LINC00426	0.03800	0.826(0.689-0.990)						
	0.03913	1.153(1.007-1.320)						
AL391244-1	0.03975	0.075(0.464-0.962)					0.00570	1 282(2 084 1 670)
DUDGAASI	0.04017	0.009(0.743-0.993)					0.00576	1.202(0.904-1.070)
DANCE	0.04038	1 197(1 009 1 207)					0.00057	0.541(1.111.2.128)
DICEDI ASI	0.04036	0.700/0.642.0.002)					0.00957	0.041(1.111-2.130)
AC010021 2	0.04200	1 202(1 006 1 438)			Here		0.55575	0.808(0.510-1.274)
AC005224.4	0.04357	1 125(1 003 1 262)						
AL 350313.1	0.04767	1 140(1 001-1 202)						
LINC01138	0.04777	1 265(1 002.1 597)					0.87692	1 108(0 302-4 066)
PARD6G-AS1	0.04893	0.859(0.738-0.990)	-				0.01082	1.100(0.002-4.000)
1.11000-701	0.04000	0.000(0.700-0.000)		· · · · ·				
			0.5 1	.0 1.5 2.0	0 1 2 3	4 5 6		
			н	lazard ratio	Hazard	ratio		

Figure S2. Survival analysis of individual IncRNA (adjusting for established risk factors) in the TCGA-LIHC (left and red) and ICGC-LIHC cohort (right and blue).