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Abstract
Pheochromocytomas (PHEOs) and paragangliomas (PGLs) related to mutations in the mitochondrial succinate dehydrogenase (SDH) subunits A, B, C, and D, SDH complex assembly factor 2, and the von Hippel-Lindau (VHL) genes share a pseudohypoxic expression profile. However, genotype-specific differences in expression have been emerging. Development of effective new therapies for distinctive manifestations, e.g., a high rate of malignancy in SDHB- or predisposition to multifocal PGLs in SDHD patients, mandates improved stratification. To identify mutation/location-related characteristics among pseudohypoxic PHEOs/PGLs, we used comprehensive microarray profiling (SDHB: \( n = 18 \), SDHD-abdominal/thoracic (AT): \( n = 6 \), SDHD-head/neck (HN): \( n = 8 \), VHL: \( n = 13 \)). To avoid location-specific bias, typical adrenal medulla genes were derived from matched normal medulas and cortices (\( n = 8 \)) for data normalization. Unsupervised analysis identified two dominant clusters, separating SDHB and SDHD-AT PHEOs/PGLs (cluster A) from VHL PHEOs and SDHD-HN PGLs (cluster B). Supervised analysis yielded 6937 highly predictive genes (misclassification error rate of 0.175). Enrichment analysis revealed that energy metabolism and inflammation/fibrosis-related genes were most pronouncedly changed in clusters A and B, respectively. A minimum subset of 40 classifiers was validated by quantitative real-time polymerase chain reaction (quantitative real-time polymerase chain reaction vs. microarray: \( r = 0.87 \)). Expression of several individual classifiers was identified as characteristic for VHL and SDHD-HN PHEOs and PGLs. In the present study, we show for the first time that SDHD-HN PGLs share more features with VHL PHEOs than with SDHD-AT PGLs. The presented data suggest novel subclassification of pseudohypoxic PHEOs/PGLs and implies cluster-specific pathogenic mechanisms and treatment strategies.


Introduction
Predispositions to certain tumors have been linked to an ever-increasing number of mutations. To date, mutations in 11 different genes have been associated with development of paragangliomas (PGLs), which are catecholamine-producing, chromaffin cell tumors, including adrenal pheochromocytomas (PHEOs). Initially, discovery of mutations was guided by syndromic presentation and family history; however, more recently discovered mutations can present in seemingly sporadic fashion. Known PHEO/PGL susceptibility genes are von Hippel-Lindau (VHL) and neurofibromatosis 1 (NF1) in the homonymous syndromes (VHL and NF1, respectively), RET proto-oncogene in multiple endocrine neoplasia type 2, succinate dehydrogenase \( D \) (SDHD) in familial PGL type 1 (PGL1) and Carney-Stratakis Syndrome (CSS), SDHC in PGL3 and CSS, SDHB in PGL4 and CSS, SDH complex assembly factor 2 (SDHAF2) in PGL2, prolyl hydroxylase 2 (PHD2/EGLN1), transmembrane protein 127 (TMEM127), kinesin family member 1B, SDHA, and MYC-associated factor X (reviewed in [1]). Most recently, activating mutations in hypoxia-inducible factor 2a (HIF\( \alpha \)) have been associated with PGL and polycythemia [2].

Notwithstanding the multitude of susceptibility genes, mutation-derived PHEOs/PGLs separate into merely two main clusters, one containing SDHA, SDHB, SDHC, SDHD, SDHAF2, and VHL and the other consisting of NF1, RET proto-oncogene, TMEM127, kinesin family member 1B, and MYC-associated factor X (reviewed in [1,3]). The PHEOs/PGLs of the first mentioned cluster are characterized by a pseudohypoxic phenotype, i.e., inappropriate stabilization of HIF\( \alpha \) subunits under normoxia (reviewed in [1,3]).

Under normoxia, hydroxylation of HIF\( \alpha \) by PHDs (PHD1/EGLN2, PHD2/EGLN1, and PHD3/EGLN3) designates them for VHL-dependent ubiquitylation and subsequent degradation [4]. Accordingly, VHL mutations can promote HIF\( \alpha \) stabilization. Similarly, SDH dysfunction causes HIF stabilization by succinate or reactive oxygen species accumulation-mediated PHD inhibition [5,6].

Despite increasing evidence for differences within the pseudohypoxic cluster [7–9], the molecular basis for distinct clinical behaviors including the preferential site of tumor development, biochemical phenotype, or metastatic potential remains largely unknown. Mutations in SDHB have been associated with extra-adrenal PGLs and high risk of malignancy [1,3]. SDHD mutations, however, predispose to multifocal PHEOs/PGLs, primarily from the head and neck (HN) region, with low metastatic risk [3]. However, HN PGL can be inoperable, or surgery can lead to severe side effects due to close vicinity to major blood vessels and nerves. VHL mutation–derived PHEOs/PGLs are almost always adrenal, non-metastatic, but frequently bilateral and/or recurrent, thus adrenal sparing treatment options are of high importance [3]. SDHA, SDHC, and SDHAF2 mutation–derived PHEOs/PGLs are rare and have not yet been characterized in detail. Large cohort studies including PHEO/PGL patients revealed that SDHA, SDHC, and SDHAF2 are extremely rare (0.1–0.5%, 0.4–2.2%, and non-detectable, respectively) [9–13]. In a Dutch population of HN PGL patients, SDHAF mutations were found in 4% and SDHC mutations in 0.4% of cases (SDHA not tested) [14].

To date, genetic testing presents an important diagnostic tool for risk assessment of PHEO/PGL patients and their families. However, genetic testing is cost intensive and targeted therapeutic options for...
the distinct subtypes of PHEOs/PGLs are not yet available. Detection of novel therapeutic targets for the particular PHEO/PGL subtypes mandates the identification of subtype-specific characteristics, e.g., by gene expression profiling.

In the present study, gene expression profiles of pseudohypoxic PHEOs/PGLs were compared among each other and to normal adrenal medulla (NAM) to identify new signatures for disease stratification. The study was designed to decrease variability as much as possible by using homogeneous sample groups of SDHB, SDHD, and VHL mutation–derived PHEOs/PGLs as has been previously recommended [15]. Due to limited access to an appropriate number of samples, no SDHA, SDHC, and SDHAF2 mutation–derived PHEOs/PGLs were included. Association of specific pathways or genes with the distinct phenotypes of pseudohypoxic PHEOs/PGLs may lead to identification of new diagnostic markers and potential therapeutic targets.

Materials and Methods

Tissue

PHEO/PGL tissue was collected with informed consent at Dutch and US centers: the National Institutes of Health (Bethesda, MD), Tufts Medical Center: (Boston, MA), Baylor College of Medicine (Houston, TX), Radboud University Nijmegen Medical Centre (Nijmegen, The Netherlands), and Erasmus MC (Rotterdam, The Netherlands). NAMs were collected from acceptable tissue donors at Tufts Medical Center and Comenius University (Bratislava, Slovakia) after confirmed brain death or during radical nephrectomy. Tissues were collected under a protocol that was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the respective institutions. Genetic testing was performed with informed consent, following established guidelines for testing [1].

Normal medulla and cortex from the same adrenals (n = 8) were separated as previously described [16]. In total, snap-frozen tissue of 45 histopathologically confirmed PHEOs/PGLs was used. The samples were grouped according to genetic/syndromic background and tumor location: SDHB (n = 18), SDHD-abdominal/thoracic (AT; n = 6), SDHD-HN (n = 8), and VHL PGLs (n = 13). Patient information is summarized in Table 1.

Microarray Processing

RNA extraction was performed as previously described [16]. RNA quality and quantity was ensured using BioAnalyzer (Agilent Technologies, Inc, Santa Clara, CA) and NanoDrop (Thermo Scientific, Wilmington, DE), respectively. Samples were processed following the recommended Affymetrix protocol. Fragmented and labeled cDNA was hybridized onto GeneChip Human Gene 1.0 ST Arrays (Affymetrix, Santa Clara, CA). Staining of biotinylated cDNA and scanning of arrays were performed according to the manufacturer’s recommendations. All data are available at the GEO database (GSE 39716).

Bioinformatic Analysis

Raw CEL files were imported into Expression Console 1.0 (Affymetrix). Only “core” probe sets were used to perform “gene-level” probe set summarization, background subtraction, and quantile normalization using the RMA option in the software. Data analysis was performed using R packages from the Bioconductor project (http://www.bioconductor.org) [17].

To avoid bias due to potential cortical contamination, genes with at least two-fold greater expression in cortex than medulla were determined cortex-specific and removed from the data sets, resulting in 31,202 transcripts. For each sample, a ratio of the expression profile to the mean expression profile of normal medulla was computed. Gene-wise Z-score normalization across all samples was applied to adjust for technical variation [18]. Differential expression analysis was performed using significance analysis of microarray (SAM) [19] with two- or multiclass option. False discovery rates were estimated with 1000-fold sample permutations and significant gene changes were arbitrarily selected at ≤ .02. Hierarchical clustering, principal component analysis, between-group analysis, Kyoto Encyclopedia of Genes and Genomes (KEGG) annotation, and overrepresentation analysis (P value cutoff, .05) were performed using the R packages “stats,” “made4” and “GSA.” Gene network analysis and functional categorization was performed with Ingenuity Pathway Analysis (IPA; www.ingenuity.com). Class prediction analysis using prediction analysis for microarray (PAMR) [20] was done to identify 10-fold cross-validated gene expression predictors for the four subtypes of PHEOs/PGLs.

Quantitative Real-Time Polymerase Chain Reaction

RNA from a subset of tissues as indicated (Table 1) was used to generate cDNA (SuperScript III First-Strand Synthesis SuperMix; Life Technologies, Grand Island, NY) according to the manufacturer’s recommendations. The following TaqMan primer probe sets (Life Technologies) were used: 18S: 4319413E, ABCC9: hs00245832_m1, ALDH1A1: hs00946916_m1, ARPL1: hs00218475_m1, C7: hs00175109_m1, CARTPT: hs00182861_m1, CHC: hs00627373_m1, CGLN1: hs00262671_m1, DNAH14: hs00376554_m1, EGLN3: hs00222966_m1, elongation of very long chain fatty acid protein 7 (ELOVL7): hs00405150_m1, F13A1: hs00173388_m1, F8: hs00258234_m1, FCGR1A: hs00174081_m1, FCGR1B: hs00417598_m1, FGF11: hs00182803_m1, GABRA4: hs00168058_m1, GPC3: hs00170471_m1, GYG2: hs00418496_m1, HOXC6: hs00171690_m1, KCNN2: hs0022059_m1, LGR5: hs00173664_m1, MPP6: hs00212785_m1, NEFM: hs00606024_m1, OLFML2B: hs00295836_m1, PLTP: hs01067287_m1, RAB3B: hs01001137_m1, RARRES2: hs00161209_g1, SCIN: hs00263961_m1, SLCO1A1: hs00161839_m1, SLC9A7: hs00261601_m1, SLC22A7: hs00905715_m1, TMEM130: hs00905715_m1, VSNL1: hs02386966_m1. Cycling conditions were as previously described [16]. Relative expression to 18S and normal medulla was estimated by the ΔΔCt method. Concordance between quantitative real-time polymerase chain reaction (qRT-PCR) validation data and microarray data was tested using the correlation of correlation index [21]. Statistical evaluation of expression differences for each of the classifiers between the groups were analyzed by analysis of variance (ANOVA) with Student-Neuman-Keuls post-hoc analysis adjusted for multiple comparisons.

Results

Purity of Adrenal Medulla Tissue

Separating human adrenal medulla from cortex is challenging due to a convoluted border and cortical cell islands within the medulla. To determine and exclude genes of cortical origin from the medulla
samples, we used a computational approach. Of the total transcripts 4.73% (1551/32,740) were associated with adrenal cortex \((P < 0.001)\) (Figure 1A). Gene set enrichment analyses for cortex and medulla samples with KEGG pre-compiled gene modules were performed [22]. Significant enrichment \((at \ P \leq 0.05)\) of steroid hormone, androgen, and estrogen metabolism was evident for cortex, while tyrosine metabolism and neuronal functions were associated with medulla (Figure 1B).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sample ID</th>
<th>Chip ID</th>
<th>Generic Backgr.</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Age at Surgery</th>
<th>Age at First Presentation</th>
<th>Age at Dgn.</th>
<th>Loc.</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>MA</th>
<th>qRT-PCR</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>01M/01C</td>
<td>PKh_03*</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>61.0</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>01M*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02M/02C</td>
<td>PKh_04*</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>nk</td>
<td>nk</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>02M*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>03M/03C</td>
<td>PKh_05*</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>03M*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-1M/04-1C</td>
<td>PKh_06*</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>04-1M*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>04-2M/04-2C</td>
<td>PKh_07*</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>f</td>
<td>72.0</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td>04-2M*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>05M/05C</td>
<td>PKh_42*</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>65.0</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>06M/06C</td>
<td>PKh_43*</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>56.0</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>07M/07C</td>
<td>PKh_44*</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>m</td>
<td>62.0</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>dna</td>
<td>x</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Patient Information.

A indicates adrenal; f, female; backgr., background; Bi, bilateral; dgn., diagnosis; dna, does not apply; E, extra-adrenal; ID, identifier; loc., location; m, male; M, metastatic; MA, microarray; met, metastases; Ml, multifocal primary; nk, not known; NM, non-metastatic; Pr, primary; Rec, recurrent; SDHD, SDHD-polyorphism; x indicates sample used in experiment specified by column heading; patients 25, 31, and 40 were first-degree relatives to 35, 33, and 47, respectively.

*Applies to normal medulla samples.
†Included for ACTR10, EGLN3, F8, LGR5, MMP6, NEFM, SLC16A1, TMEM130, and VSNL1.

**Gene Expression Profiles Classify Mutation/Location Subtypes**

Initial screening by SAM yielded a total of 7366 differentially expressed transcripts. Principal component analysis of samples grouped by mutation/location showed clear separation of VHL and SDHD-HN from each other as well as from the partly overlapping SDHB and SDHD-AT PGLs (Figure 2A). In agreement, unsupervised average linkage hierarchical clustering of significant genes using pairwise Pearson correlation revealed separation of the tumors into...
two main clusters (Figure 2B), cluster A consisting of SDHB and SDHD-AT PGLs and cluster B containing VHL and SDHD-HN PHEOs/PGLs. Cluster B is further divided into separate VHL and SDHD-HN PHEO/PGL subclusters.

Supervised PAMR was used to narrow down the genes of interest under maintenance of optimal classification capabilities. Ten-fold cross-validation yielded 6937 transcripts with an overall misclassification rate of 0.175 (Figure 2C and Table W1). SDHD-HN PGLs were classified with high confidence (zero misclassifications). Sample discrimination by cluster analysis based on the 6937 genes maintained the assignment into two major clusters (data not shown).

Enriched Functions in PAMR Analysis

To determine which functional themes corresponded to the gene expression profiles of the two main clusters, we performed a series of comparisons using IPA. Cluster A was associated with 425 and cluster B with 1270 upregulated genes. Canonical pathway analysis by IPA identified 17 and 121 significantly changed pathways ($P < .05$), respectively (Table W2). Fourteen pathways (82%) selected for cluster A were found to be involved in metabolism. The top cluster A pathways included oxidative phosphorylation (OXPHOS), mitochondrial dysfunction, ubiquinone biosynthesis, and citrate cycle (Table W2).
In cluster B, 91 (75%) of the 121 significantly changed pathways were found to be involved in hepatic fibrosis and immune function (Table W2). Hierarchical clustering using the differentially expressed genes from the top IPA functions, i.e., 14 OXPHOS (cluster A) and 44 hepatic fibrosis genes (cluster B), led to clear separation of PHEOs/PGLs according to mutation/location (Figure 3A).

Differential Expression of Selected OXPHOS Genes

To elaborate the differences in OXPHOS complex expression, we compared the shrunken centroid scores from the PAMR model between the PHEO/PGL subtypes (Figure 3B). Overall, expression of OXPHOS genes appeared decreased in VHL, close to normal in SDHD-HN, and increased in SDHD-AT and SDHB PHEOs/PGLs. Seventeen and seven of 25 mitochondrial complex I genes were above normal in SDHD-AT and SDHB PHEOs/PGLs, respectively, while decreased expression prevailed in VHL PHEOs (22/25 genes). Similarly, mitochondrial complex IV genes were below normal in VHL (8/10) and above normal in SDHD-AT (8/10) and SDHB (2/10). Patterns for the other complexes were analogous.

Differential Expression of Selected Hepatic Fibrosis Genes

Upregulated genes typically associated with tissue fibrosis from cluster B (Table W2) included fibrillar collagens COL1A2 and COL3A1, matrix metalloprotease 2 (MMP2), metalloprotease inhibitor A2M, the chemotactic protein CCL2, the contractile proteins MYL9, growth factor signaling–related transcripts (IGF1, IGFBP4, IGFBP5, CTGF/IGFBP8, VEGFC, FLT1/VEGFR1, FLT4/VEGFR3, KDR/VEGFR2, PGF, PDGFA, PDGFRα, PDGFB, PDGFRβ, HGF, and EGFR), and the transcriptional regulator NFKB1, including several players of nuclear factor κB (NFκB) activation (IL1RI, IL1RAP, IL1RL2, EGFR, and TLR4). As mentioned above, 44 genes of the hepatic fibrosis pathway have been identified to be upregulated in cluster B by enrichment analysis, including several genes involved in NFκB signaling. For this reason, we matched the list of 6937 genes from PAMR to a published list of NFκB target genes (source: http://bioinfo.lifl.fr/NF-KB/). In total, 53 genes from our PAMR data were identified as NFκB targets, most of which were upregulated in cluster B tumors (Figure 3C).

Among others, activation of NFκB has been shown to induce epithelial-to-mesenchymal transition (EMT). EMT markers have been recognized as indicators of poor prognosis or aggressive behavior and recent reports have proposed important EMT genes such as TWIST1 and SNAI1 as markers of malignancy in PHEOs/PGLs [23,24]. Thus, we performed a cluster analysis of our samples based on a list of 92 EMT genes [24], 44 of which mapped to our SAM list. Several key players in EMT (e.g., TWIST1, TCF3, and MMP11) were not part of our SAM list, because a difference in expression between the groups was not present or not sufficient to withstand permutation analysis. On the basis of the heatmap of 44 EMT genes, we found that up-regulation of certain EMT genes may play a role in some metastatic SDHB tumors; however, the same EMT genes are elevated...
in a number of non-metastatic samples and thus do not qualify as stand-alone markers of malignancy in our sample set (Figures W2 and W3). Cluster analysis based on EMT genes essentially confirmed the pattern described above, although group separation was not quite as clear as when based on all SAM genes or OXPHOS and hepatic fibrosis (Figure W3).

Minimum Subset of Classifiers

To identify the most characteristic genes for each of the PHEO/PGL subtypes, we selected a minimum set of top 10 genes with strongest group association for each of the mutation/location classes from the PAMR data (including upregulated and downregulated genes). The choice of this selection is heuristic and we found that less than 10 genes from any class resulted in higher misclassifications (data not shown). Surprisingly, the minimum subset of classifiers improved classification capabilities compared to the 6937 PAMR-selected genes (overall error rate: 0.066, SDHB: 0.05, SDHD-AT: 0.16, SDHD-HN: 0.00, VHL: 0.07). A heatmap (Figure 4A) and a profile plot (Figure 4B) show relative expression scores of the 40 classifiers (36 unique genes). To validate proper characterization and to potentially identify stand-alone markers for each group, qRT-PCR for 35 of the 36 genes of interest was performed. Comparison between microarray and qRT-PCR data showed an overall correlation of correlation coefficient of 0.87 (SDHB: 0.87, SDHD-AT: 0.97, SDHD-HN: 0.92, VHL: 0.57). Thus, the qRT-PCR results essentially confirmed the microarray data (Figure 5A).

Subgroup Classification Based on Individual Genes

Classification of cluster B tumors based on individual genes was feasible for both subgroups. qRT-PCR confirmed discriminatory capacity of 8/10 candidates for VHL PHEOs. Six of them were more highly expressed in VHL (TFAP2C, EGLN3, GPC3, FGF11, CGNL1, and F8), and two were least expressed in VHL PHEOs (LGR5 and ELVOL7; Figure 6). Interestingly, the latter were significantly elevated in all SDHx mutation–derived PHEOs/PGLs. In addition, one gene predicted to characterize SDHB was most highly expressed in VHL tumors (ABCC9). Thus, we identified nine genes that showed distinct expression in VHL PHEOs from the other groups. Three of them also qualified as classifiers for another tumor group (CGNL1 for SDHD-AT; ABCC9 and FGF11 for SDHD-HN).

Significantly different expression in SDHD-HN PGLs compared to all other groups was evident for seven of nine candidates. Two genes showed increased (SUCNR1 and OLFML2B) and five genes showed decreased expression (SLC18A1, NEFM, CARTPT, TMEM130, and HOXC6) in SDHD-HN PGLs (Figure 6). As mentioned above, FGF11 and ABCC9 levels also distinguished SDHD-HN PGLs from all other groups. SCIN and CFH levels in SDHD-HN were significantly different from the other PHEO/PGL subtypes. Thus, in total, we identified 11 characteristic genes for SDHD-HN PGLs.

Identification of characteristic individual genes was less successful for cluster A PHEOs/PGLs. While CGNL1, OLFML2B, GABRA1, and KCNN2 expression of SDHD-AT PHEOs/PGLs was distinct from that of all groups except normal medulla (Figure 6), expression of none of the top ranked genes for SDHB was significantly different.
from SDHD-AT PHEOs/PGLs. However, DNAH14, C7, and NEFM were significantly differentially expressed in SDHB PHEOs/PGLs compared to NAMs, SDHD-HN PGLs, and VHL PHEOs (Figure 6).

Expression levels of three evaluated genes were characteristic for NAM (C7, F13A1, and DNAH14; Figure 6). In addition, DNAH14 clearly separated cluster A and B tumors. Graphs of additional tested genes are depicted in Figure W1.

Discussion

Previous studies revealed divergent expression patterns in pseudo-hypoxic PHEOs/PGLs, which allowed genotype discrimination [7–9]. Commonly, SDHx PHEOs/PGLs have been grouped together, preventing detection of differences. Mining for disease-relevant characteristics requires normalization to healthy tissue. Thus, we evaluated the gene expression profiles of pseudo-hypoxic PHEOs/PGLs associated with SDHB, SDHD, and VHL mutations in relation to NAM. Our major new findings are that SDHD-HN PGLs are different from SDHD-AT PGLs and more closely resemble VHL PHEOs. These observations indicate that expression profiles of pseudo-hypoxic PHEOs/PGLs depend on tumor location as well as underlying mutation.

Purity of Adrenal Medulla Tissue

Computational analysis determined the content of cortical genes within the medulla samples at 4.73%. This agrees with our previous study, where cortical contamination of the medulla samples was estimated to be less than 5% [16]. Although this represents a reasonable degree of purity, in “-omics” type studies ~5% contamination may cause significant bias. Thus, we excluded cortical genes from the medulla data sets.

Mutation and Location Determine Expression Profiles

Unsupervised analysis revealed similarities in the expression patterns of SDHB- with SDHD-AT PHEOs/PGLs and SDHD-HN PGLs with VHL-derived PHEOs, respectively. This indicates that SDH-derived PHEOs/PGLs differ depending on the tissue of origin. Remarkably, two SDHD-HN PGLs and one PHEO from the same patient clearly separated into the different clusters.

In agreement with our findings, HN PGLs clustered in close vicinity to VHL PHEOs upon unsupervised analysis in a previous study involving sporadic and hereditary PHEOs/PGLs [8]. Contrary to our results, no separation into distinct VHL PHEO and HN PGL subclusters has been observed. The good separability of our sample set may be due to the stringent sample selection criteria, i.e., well-defined, homogenous subgroups of pseudo-hypoxic PHEOs/PGLs. The study of Lopez-Jimenez et al. involved HN PGLs of different genetic backgrounds (SDHB, SDHC, and SDHD mutations and apparently sporadic), which clustered in close proximity to each other but apart from AT PGLs with underlying mutations in the same genes [8]. Consistently, a different study reported that gene expression of HN PGLs appeared uniform, independent of hereditary background (PGL1/SDHD, PGL2/SDHAF2, or sporadic) [25]. Thus, mutational background appears to have less influence on the expression pattern of PHEOs/PGLs than their location.

Figure 4. Minimum subset of classifiers for separation of the different mutation/location types. (A) Unsupervised hierarchical clustering of the gene expression data of the minimum subset of 40 classifiers. The different tumor types (red, SDHB; blue, SDHD-HN; green, SDHD-AT; cyan, VHL) are distinguished by the pattern of up-regulation (red) and down-regulation (blue). Separation into two main clusters, a shared SDHB and SDHD-AT cluster and one that further subclusters into VHL and SDHD-HN PGLs, is evident. (B) Profile plot depicting expression levels (shrunk centroid scores) for the minimum subset of classifiers, i.e., 10 top scoring genes for each class. Bars facing right represent positive and those facing left represent negative shrunk centroid scores indicating increased and decreased expression relative to normal medulla and the other PHEO/PGL subtypes.
While distinct expression profiles in SDHD-HN and SDHD-AT PHEOs/PGLs are unexpected because of mutual SDH dysfunction, prominent differences in their biochemical phenotypes are well known. Only a subset of HN PGLs may secrete catecholamines (29%) [26], while almost all AT PHEOs/PGLs are biochemically active [27]. The distinct secretory characteristics probably reflect different cells of origin for sympathetic AT PHEOs/PGLs and parasympathetic HN PGLs. Thus, despite the same genetic background, differences in gene expression patterns seem plausible. However, parallels between sympathetic VHL PHEOs and parasympathetic HN PGLs currently appear limited.

To our surprise, SDHD-AT and SDHB PHEOs/PGLs did not separate into distinct subclusters. In addition, the different types of SDHB samples involved did not cluster according to their characteristics (metastases, primary metastatic, or primary non-metastatic). Seven of nine SDHB-metastatic samples fell into cluster A. However, the same cluster contained 14 non-metastatic SDHB and SDHD-AT PHEOs/PGLs. Thus, we do not see an indication that the composition of cluster A reflects aggressive or malignant potential of the included PHEOs/PGLs. Despite involving 50% metastatic SDHB samples, no gene signature of metastatic PHEOs/PGLs could be identified. Subgrouping SDHB samples into metastatic \( n = 9 \), i.e., \( n = 6 \) metastases and \( n = 3 \) primary metastatic) and primary non-metastatic \( n = 9 \) gave unacceptable error rates of 44.4% for SDHB–non-metastatic and 55.6% for SDHB-metastatic (see Table W3). We thus concluded that the differences between SDHB-metastatic and SDHB–non-metastatic samples were less pronounced than those to the other groups, possibly because only a few genes discriminate SDHB-metastatic and SDHB–non-metastatic samples. However, we cannot exclude that the poor classification was based on the relatively small sample number for each of the subgroups \( n = 9 \) each. Since a very large proportion of SDHB PHEO/PGL patients develop metastases, and classification of SDHB tumors as non-metastatic can only be based on the fact that metastases have not (yet) presented, we decided to abstain from subgrouping of the SDHB samples.

**Enriched Biologic Functions in Cluster A**

Cluster A was associated with metabolic pathways, such as OXPHOS, mitochondrial dysfunction, ubiquinone biosynthesis, and citric acid cycle. Disturbances in the mitochondrial energy metabolism are anticipated in tumors with mutations in the mitochondrial SDH complex. As enzyme of the citric acid cycle, SDH converts succinate into fumarate. Simultaneously, electrons are donated to ubiquinone, an essential electron carrier of the OXPHOS. Here, we report a potentially compensatory up-regulation of pathways that are directly connected to SDH function in AT PGLs with underlying SDHB and SDHD mutations.

**Differential Expression of Selected OXPHOS Genes**

Up-regulation of OXPHOS transcripts was prevalent in SDHB and SDHD-AT PGLs, supporting our previous finding of increased expression of several OXPHOS subunits in SDHB compared to VHL mutation–derived PHEOs/PGLs [28]. Which subunits were upregulated was rarely mutual between both subgroups. Thus, SDHB and SDHD mutations apparently both influence OXPHOS gene expression in AT PHEOs/PGLs but not SDHD-HN PGLs.

Favier et al. reported low expression of several OXPHOS genes in SDHx PHEOs/PGLs [7]. Discrepancy with our data may again be due to differences in sample selection. The SDHx group of Favier et al. contained HN PGLs, which in our study did not show increased OXPHOS subunit expression. Furthermore, SDHB, SDHC, and SDHD mutation–derived PGLs were grouped together. The limited agreement in OXPHOS subunit expression between SDHB, SDHD-AT, and SHD-HN PGLs mentioned above may have concealed their distinct expression profiles.

Decreased expression of OXPHOS subunits related to VHL mutations has been previously reported and indicates decoupling of glycolysis and OXPHOS [7,29].

Compensatory up-regulation to rescue an impaired energy metabolism in consequence of SDHx dysfunction seems probable. However, the regulatory mechanism remains to be elaborated. Possibly up-regulation occurs in a disconcerted manner, which may fail to enhance OXPHOS capacity or even increase reactive oxygen species generation. Special attention should be given to the finding that despite underlying SDHD mutations, no up-regulation of OXPHOS genes was evident in HN PGLs.

**Enriched Biologic Functions in Cluster B**

In cluster B, hepatic fibrosis and immune functions were among the top enriched pathways. Tissue fibrosis is excessive accumulation of extracellular matrix (ECM) components, which is the physiologic response to injury and is facilitated by inflammatory mediators. Tissue
Figure 6. Relative expression of selected genes of the minimum subset of 35 genes to NAM. The genes are arranged into clusters according to their capabilities as classifiers (VHL vs. all, SDHD-HN vs. all, SDHD-AT vs. all, NAM vs. all). Overlapping indicates that the respective genes show characteristic expression in two of the tumor groups. Overall significance has been evaluated for each gene by ANOVA (value given for each gene in the upper left corner). Significant differences between each group and (a) NAM, (b) SDHB, (c) SDHD-AT, (d) SDHD-HN, and (e) VHL are indicated above each applicable column. Replications of the letter specify the level of significance (xxx, $P < .001$; xx, $P < .01$; x, $P < .05$).
fibrosis and inflammation initiation have been shown to be direct or HIF stabilization–dependent consequences of VHL mutations. In hepatic cells, VHL mutations have reportedly caused fibrosis and promoted inflammation in an HIF-2α–dependent manner [30]. Transgenic HIF-2α stabilization has also been shown to promote renal fibrosis [31]. In addition, direct interaction of pVHL with the ECM component collagen IV has been described [32,33]. VHL mutations disrupt this interaction and cause improper collagen matrix assembly. Faulty ECM assembly due to VHL mutations has been accompanied by increased expression of MMP2 [34], which was also elevated in our cluster B tumors (Figure 4C). Kurban et al. reported that inappropriate ECM assembly in consequence of VHL mutations facilitates angiogenesis, tumor development, and invasion. Thus, disrupted interaction between VHL and ECM components appears to be a crucial HIF-independent tumorigenic trait. Tissue fibrosis and inflammation genes were overexpressed in VHL and, even more so, SDHD-HN PGLs. To our knowledge, these pathways are currently entirely unexplored in SDHD-HN PGLs. HIF-2α–mediated initiation of tissue fibrosis and inflammation may be common to all pseudohypoxic PHEOs/PGLs. Similar expression of HIF-2α in VHL– and SDHx-derived PHEOs/PGLs [7] and predominance of HIF-1α in the latter have both been observed [35]. In any case, the reason for normal expression of tissue fibrosis and inflammation genes in SDHx-AT compared to SDHD-HN and VHL PHEOs/PGLs remains to be determined.

Consideration of Selected Hepatic Fibrosis-Related Genes

The hepatic fibrosis pathway is interrelated with several other pathways, including NfkB, vascular endothelial growth factor (VEGF), platelet-derived growth factor (PDGF), and insulin-like growth factor 1 (IGF1) signaling, which have been previously shown to play a role in PHEOs/PGLs or other tumors.

For instance, VHL negatively regulates NfkB [36], and accordingly, VHL mutations strengthen NfkB activity, which causes apoptosis resistance, increased angiogenesis, and therapy resistance in renal cell carcinomas. Recently, inhibition of NfkB signaling in a murine PHEO model has been shown to cause cell death and significant decrease in metastatic spread [37]. Similarly, NfkB inhibition showed promising results in treatment of renal cell carcinomas [38]. Our data indicate that particularly in cluster B PHEOs/PGLs targeting the NfkB pathway provides a promising new therapeutic approach.

Pseudohypoxic PHEOs/PGLs often appear highly vascular, and anti-angiogenic treatment has been suggested [39]. Induction of angiogenic transcripts/VEGF signaling has been described in response to NfkB as well as HIF activation. Here, we report increased expression of VEGF signaling–related transcripts in cluster B tumors, i.e., VEGFC, FLT1/VEGFR1, KDR/VEGFR2, and FLT4/VEGFR3. Increased expression of VEGF, FLT1/VEGFR1, and KDR/VEGFR2 has been previously reported for a group of PHEOs/PGLs, including one VHL case [40]. While potentially all pseudohypoxic PHEOs/PGLs show elevated expression of angiogenesis genes, the particular genes mentioned here appear to be exclusively upregulated in VHL and SDHD-HN PGLs. Thus, targeting VEGFR1, 2, and 3 in cluster B PHEOs/PGLs appears to be a promising approach.

As an aspect of hepatic fibrosis, PDGF signaling showed several elevated players in cluster B. PDGFB is a well-described oncogene [41] and targeting PDGFRB and VEGF led to symptom relieve and tumor shrinkage in a VHL patient with multiple tumors, including a metastatic PGL [42]. Activating mutations in PDGFRα is often seen in gastrointestinal stromal tumors.

IGF signaling has been previously shown to play a role in the pathogenesis of PHEOs/PGLs. Here, we show elevated expression of IGF1 and several binding proteins (IGFBP4, IGFBP5, and CTGF/IGFBP8) in cluster B tumors. Fottner et al. have previously reported increased expression of IGF1 receptor (IGFRI/FCGR1A) in human PHEOs, including three VHL cases [43]. Inactivation of VHL has been shown to cause increased IGFRI/FCGR1A expression [44], which contributes to renal tumor development. Increased IGFRI/FCGR1A levels have been associated with chemoresistance and IGF1 signaling inhibition improved treatment outcome in renal cancer [45]. Differences in IGFRI/FCGR1A expression between the two clusters was not evident; however, IGFRI/FCGR1A was selected into the minimum subset of classifiers for characterization of SDHB PHEOs/PGLs. QRT-PCR revealed significantly elevated expression in SDHD-HN compared to SDHD-AT PGLs (Figure W1). Expressions of IGF1 itself as well as several regulating IGF-binding proteins however were elevated in cluster B tumors. Up-regulation of IGFBP4 in nine PHEOs of unknown genetic background has been reported [46]. Fernandez et al. observed that IGF1 signaling is crucial in cell proliferation and tumor maintenance in a mouse model based on mouse PHEO cells [47]. Further studies are mandated to explore the role of IGF signaling in cluster B tumors and its potential value as a therapeutic target.

Minimum Subset of Genes to Characterize PHEO/PGL Subtypes

Selected genes of the minimum subset will be discussed here for their potential role in the distinct pseudohypoxic PHEOs/PGLs. In agreement with previous reports, we detected increased EGLN3/PHD2 transcript in VHL PHEOs compared to the other groups [8,48]. EGLN3 protein level however did not differ between VHL and SDHB PHEOs/PGLs [8]. Inhibition of EGLN3-mediated culling has been proposed as a common mechanism in PHEO/PGL development [49]. Thus, despite its elevated mRNA expression in VHL-derived PHEOs, EGLN3 function may be inhibited, either due to JUNB-mediated inhibition or inadequate protein expression.

In addition to a role in mediating apoptosis, EGLN3/PHD2 also acts as HIF PHD. As HIF target gene, particularly responding to HIF2α stabilization, EGLN3 induction is thus not surprising in VHL-derived tumors [50]. However, despite HIF stabilization EGLN3/PHD2 transcript levels appear normal in other pseudohypoxic PHEOs/PGLs [7,9]. Elevation of EGLN3/PHD2 mRNA levels exclusively in VHL PHEOs/PGLs further supports distinct manifestations of pseudohypoxia.

In further agreement with our data, differential expression between VHL and SDHB PHEOs/PGLs has been previously reported for RARE2, CGNL1, and ELOVL7 [8].

Two genes that we found to be significantly decreased in SDHD-HN PGLs compared to all other groups were SLC18A1, the chromaffin granule amine transporter also known as VMAT1, and the intermediate neurofilament NEFM (also called NFM, NF-M, or NF3). Previously, varying levels of SLC18A1/VMAT1 expression have been reported for PHEOs/PGLs [51,52]. In agreement with our data, SLC18A1/VMAT1 has been previously shown to be more highly expressed in VHL PHEOs than normal adrenal [53]. NEFM may be mandatory in carcoid body maturation under hypoxia [54] and has been proposed as marker for neuroendocrine tumors [55].

In combination, the minimum subset of classifiers could not clearly differentiate tumors within cluster A. Nevertheless, four individual genes were characteristic for SDHD-AT relative to all other PHEOs/
PGLs but not normal medulla. Overall, our findings indicate that the differences in expression profiles of SDHB and SDHD-AT PHEOs/PGLs are subtle and identification of distinguishing features may require large analysis groups, perhaps homogenous to the level of particular mutation and/or location.

In disregard of their failure as characteristic genes for one particular subgroup, two candidate genes were more highly expressed in all SDHx cases relative to adrenal medulla and VHL-derived PHEOs. First, LGR5 (aliases: GPR49, HG38, FEX, and GPR67) has been recognized as stem cell marker in multiple adult tissues and cancer [56]. Its increased expression specifically in SDHx-derived PHEOs/PGLs has been previously reported [9]. Contrarily, our data indicate similarly elevated LGR5 levels in SDHB and SDHD PGLs (Figure 6). Due to its cell surface location and potential role in tumor-initiating stem cells, this receptor may provide an excellent therapeutic target in SDHx PHEOs/PGLs. Second, the lipogenic ELOVL7 has been reported to be involved in prostate cancer growth [57].

Summary

Pseudohypoxic PHEOs/PGLs can be stratified according to different hereditary backgrounds and/or tumor locations. Surprisingly, SDHD-AT and SDHD-HN PHEOs/PGLs do not cluster together but with SDHB (cluster A) and VHL PHEOs/PGLs (cluster B), respectively. Despite their distinct risks of malignancy, SDHB and SDHD-AT PHEOs/PGLs failed to separate into distinct subclusters. This indicates surprising agreement in their expression profiles and prevented the identification of distinct gene signatures.

The majority of upregulated pathways were related to energy metabolism for cluster A and to tissue fibrosis and immune function for cluster B. Overall, OXPHOS genes were more highly expressed in cluster A tumors; however, which particular subunits were overexpressed differed for SDHx-AT and SDHB PHEOs/PGLs. Cluster B tumors showed increased tissue fibrosis, including NFκB-, PDGF-, IGF-, IL1-, and VEGF-related gene expression.

Classification based on a minimum subset of 36 genes maintained separability of the groups into two main clusters, with cluster B further dividing into subclusters in agreement with the respective mutation types. Subgroup classification based on the minimum subset of 36 genes improved error rates. Expression levels of 35 genes from the minimum subset of classifiers were essentially confirmed by qRT-PCR. Evaluation of the potential of each of those genes to correctly classify the different subtypes of pseudohypoxic PHEOs/PGLs identified expression of nine transcripts as characteristic for VHL, 11 for SDHD-HN, and four for SDHx-AT PHEOs/PGLs; however, none successfully classified SDHB PHEOs/PGLs.

In conclusion, pseudohypoxic PHEOs/PGLs show distinct expression profiles, which should be taken into account for improvement of diagnosis as well as the development of customized therapeutic options. Special consideration should be given to the apparently distinct manifestations of SDHD mutations in sympathetic and parasympathetic tissues.
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Figure W1. Relative expression of 12 genes of the minimum subset of 35 genes to NAM, which did not confirm the expression pattern predicted by the microarray. Overall significance has been evaluated for each gene by ANOVA (value given for each gene in the upper left corner). Significant differences between each group and (a) NAM, (b) SDHB, (c) SDHD-AT, (d) SDHD-HN, and (e) VHL are indicated above each applicable column. Replications of the letter specify the level of significance (xxx, \( P < .001 \); xx, \( P < .01 \); x, \( P < .05 \)).
Figure W2. Unsupervised hierarchical clustering of EMT genes. Forty-four of 92 EMT genes provided by Loriot et al. [24] were significantly differentially expressed between the mutation/location types (\( P \leq .05 \)) and led to separation of the samples into two main clusters. Color blocks above the heatmap indicate tumor behavior (top row) and mutation/location (bottom row). In the top row, brown and red indicate non-metastatic and metastatic samples, respectively. The colors in the second row indicate the following: red, SDHB; green, SDHD-AT; blue, SDHD-HN; cyan, VHL.
Figure W3. Boxplots of relative expression levels of selected EMT genes as determined by microarray of our sample set. Our sample set does not reproduce the findings of Loriot et al., reporting decreased expression of CDH2 and KRT19 and increased expression of LOXL2, TWIST1, MMP1, and MMP2 in SDHB-metastatic samples compared to all non-metastatic samples [24]. Differential expression of TWIST1, TCF3, and MMP1 between the groups lacked statistical significance by SAM at a threshold P value of .05. This may be because SDHB samples were not subgrouped into metastatic and non-metastatic previous to SAM. In agreement with Loriot et al., we did not observe elevated SNAI1 and SNAI2 mRNA expression in SDHB tumors. Nonetheless, the localization or level of the protein snail and slug may differ between metastatic and non-metastatic PHEOs/PGLs as has been previously reported [23,24].

Table W3. Classification and Cross-Validated Misclassification Error Rates for the Shrunken Centroid Model Including Subgrouping of SDHB Samples into Metastatic (n = 9) and Non-Metastatic (n = 9).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>SDHB-NM</th>
<th>SDHB-M</th>
<th>SDHD-AT</th>
<th>SDHD-HN</th>
<th>VHL</th>
<th>Class Error Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SDHB-NM</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDHB-M</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDHD-AT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SDHD-HN</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>VHL</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overall error rate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.28</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>