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Abstract

Background

High-grade serous ovarian cancer (HGSOC) is a highly lethal gynecologic cancer, in part due to resistance to platinum-based chemotherapy reported among 20% of patients. This study aims to characterize the biological mechanisms underlying chemotherapy resistance, which remain poorly understood.

Methods

Sequencing data (mRNA and microRNA) from HGSOC patients were analyzed to identify differentially expressed genes and co-expressed transcript networks associated with chemotherapy response. Analyses used datasets from The Cancer Genome Atlas and were replicated in two independent ovarian cancer cohorts. Moreover, transcript expression datasets and genomics data (i.e. single nucleotide polymorphisms) were integrated to determine potential regulation of the associated mRNA networks by microRNAs and expression quantitative trait loci (eQTLs).

Results

We identified 196 differentially expressed mRNAs enriched for adaptive immunity and translation, and 21 differentially expressed microRNAs associated with angiogenesis. Co-expression network analysis identified two mRNA networks associated with chemotherapy response, which were enriched for ubiquitination and lipid metabolism, as well as three associated microRNA networks enriched for lipoprotein transport and oncogenic pathways. These network modules replicated in two independent ovarian cancer cohorts. Moreover, integrative analyses of the mRNA, microRNA and genomics datasets revealed potential regulation of the mRNA networks by the associated microRNAs and SNPs (i.e. eQTLs).

Conclusions

We report novel transcriptional networks and biological pathways associated with resistance to platinum-based chemotherapy among HGSOC patients. These results improve our understanding of the effector networks and regulators of chemotherapy response, which will help to elucidate novel therapeutic targets for ovarian cancer.

Introduction

High-grade serous ovarian cancer (HGSOC) is a highly lethal gynecologic cancer, in part due to resistance to first-line, platinum-based chemotherapy treatment among 20% of patients [1]. Chemotherapy resistant patients have a significantly shorter overall survival (OS) than sensitive patients, and many experience tumor recurrence within six months of completing chemotherapy [2]. There is currently no strategy for predicting response to platinum-based chemotherapy, which reflects our limited understanding of the underlying molecular mechanisms of chemoresistance [3].

The majority of earlier studies reporting gene expression signatures associated with platinum-based chemotherapy resistance in ovarian cancer patients had used univariate analysis methods on transcriptomic data alone [4]. These methods assume that chemotherapy response is driven by a single gene. However, it is well established that chemotherapy response, like other drug response outcomes, is a complex multifactorial trait
modulated by multiple genes contributing to common biological pathways [5, 6]. To date, few studies have investigated chemotherapy response in ovarian cancer using multivariate methods to identify underlying gene networks or pathways [7-11]. Fewer still incorporated additional types of ‘omics data such as microRNA (miRNA) expression and genomics data to study regulation of the gene networks [12, 13]. Finally, earlier multivariate transcriptomics studies used RNA microarray data, which do not allow for discovery of novel transcript isoforms [14, 15]. In contrast, RNA-sequencing data using next-generation technology include gene transcripts that may have been missed by traditional microarray profiling.

In this study, we apply both univariate and multivariate analysis methods to high-throughput RNA sequencing data from tumors, as well as integrative analysis of germline polymorphisms, in order to identify novel biological pathways and networks associated with chemotherapy response in HGSOC patients. We further determine miRNAs and polymorphisms (i.e. expression quantitative trait loci, eQTLs) correlated with the expression of the associated gene transcripts. These findings are validated using two independent ovarian cancer cohorts and improve our understanding of the biological mechanisms underlying resistance to platinum-based chemotherapy in HGSOC patients.

Materials And Methods

Chemotherapy response classification

Sequencing of mRNA and miRNA was derived from chemotherapy-naïve tumors of 191 and 205 HGSOC patients of TCGA, respectively [16]. Patients who received platinum-based adjuvant chemotherapy were selected and classified for chemotherapy response based on their platinum-free interval. Sensitive patients remained cancer-free for at least 12 months after chemotherapy completion, whereas resistant patients experienced cancer recurrence within 6 months (Table 1; Additional File 1).

Processing of sequencing data

Sequencing reads from mRNA were downloaded as FASTQ files (i.e. level 1 data from TCGA), filtered for base-quality, aligned, and quantified (detailed in Additional File 1). Sequencing of miRNA data were downloaded as quantified expression files (i.e. level 3 data from TCGA). Both mRNA and miRNA datasets underwent outlier detection, normalization, and non-specific filtering, resulting in 49,116 mRNA and 4,479 miRNA transcripts for further analyses.

Differential expression analysis

Differentially expressed mRNA and miRNA transcripts were detected between sensitive and resistant patients using a negative binomial generalized linear model (GLM) in the DESeq2 R package [17]. This analysis controlled for patients’ ages at diagnosis, as resistant patients were significantly older (Table 1). The Benjamini-Hochberg method corrected for multiple testing.

Weighted correlation network analysis

The weighted correlation network analysis (WGCNA) R package [18] was used to identify modules of coexpressed mRNA and miRNA transcripts using an unsupervised machine learning approach. The first principal component of expression values was calculated for each transcript module, resulting in an eigengene value.
Module eigengenes were used to determine association with chemotherapy response using a GLM, adjusted for patients’ age as a covariate (Additional File 1).

Pathway enrichment analysis

Pathway enrichment analysis was used to determine over-representation of biological pathways from lists of differentially expressed transcripts (mRNA and miRNAs) and co-expression networks (Additional File 1).

eQTL analysis

Germline single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs) from TCGA-HGSOC patients were imputed as described by Choi et al.[13] before undergoing quality control and linkage disequilibrium-based pruning, retaining 1,722,608 common SNPs for analysis. SNPs were integrated with patient mRNA-seq data (n=167) and miRNA-seq data (n=178) to identify correlations with transcript expression (eQTLs) using the MatrixEQTL R package [19] (Additional File 1).

mRNA-microRNA integration

Potential regulation of mRNA networks by miRNAs was tested using data from 165 patients by applying the Spearman correlation of module eigengenes from the mRNA and miRNA co-expression networks. Results were validated using miRNet [20], a database of experimentally validated mRNA-miRNA interactions, and miRGate [21], a database of predicted mRNA-miRNA interactions based on ribonucleotide motif matching.

Replication cohort and analysis

Our results were replicated using two independent ovarian cancer cohorts. First, mRNA results were replicated in the Australian Ovarian Cancer Study cohort (AOCS; GSE9891; n=285) [22]. Next, miRNA results were replicated in the Multicenter Italian Trial in Ovarian cancer cohort (MITO; GSE25204; n=130) [23]. Replication of differentially expressed transcripts used the auto cut-off Kaplan-Meier analysis method from the KM Plotter tool [24] to test the association of each transcript with progression-free survival (PFS) in the AOCS and MITO cohorts. Validation of transcript networks used the Prognostic Index estimation method from the SurvExpress tool [25] to test the association of mRNA and miRNA networks with PFS in the above cohorts (Additional File 1).

Results

Differentially expressed mRNAs and miRNAs between sensitive and resistant patients

Differential expression analysis identified 196 mRNAs associated with chemotherapy response (adjusted p < 0.05) that map to 190 unique genes (Figure 1A, Additional File 2). Pathway enrichment analysis of these associated transcripts indicated enrichment of 41 annotation terms, including B-cell receptor regulation, complement activation, and peptide chain elongation (Additional File 3).

Differential miRNA expression analysis revealed 21 differentially expressed miRNA isoforms (adjusted p < 0.05), which map to 16 unique miRNAs (Figure 1B, Additional File 4). Pathway enrichment analysis of these miRNA isoforms revealed 16 pathways, such as blood vessel morphogenesis and negative regulation of autophagy (Additional File 3).
mRNA co-expression networks involved in protein ubiquitination and fatty acid metabolism associated with chemotherapy response

WGCNA of the mRNA transcripts resulted in 58 co-expression modules, of which two were associated with platinum-based chemotherapy (Additional File 5). First, the lavenderblush3 module is negatively associated with chemotherapy resistance ($p = 0.016$, log OR = -5.40). This module contains 39 transcripts, mapping to 31 unique genes (Figure 2A, Additional File 6). Pathway analysis indicates enrichment of biological pathways related to protein ubiquitination, and the binding motif for the transcription factor GABP-alpha (Additional File 3). Second, the darkolivegreen module is significantly upregulated in chemoresistant patients ($p = 0.032$, log OR = 13.63) and contains 82 transcripts mapping to 80 unique genes (Figure 2A, Additional File 6). This module is significantly enriched for the protein-containing complex term, as well as for 8 pathways involved in fatty acid metabolism with nominal significance (Additional File 3).

miRNA co-expression networks involved in lipid transport and oncogenic pathways associated with chemotherapy response

WGCNA analysis of the miRNA dataset constructed 100 co-expression modules (Additional File 7), of which three are associated with chemotherapy response. The ivory ($p = 0.0098$, log OR = -5.67) and lightcoral ($p = 0.042$, log OR = -4.36) modules are negatively associated with chemotherapy resistance, while the third plum network ($p = 0.045$, log OR = 4.29) is positively associated with chemotherapy resistance. The ivory network consisted of 25 miRNA isoforms mapping to 11 unique miRNAs (Figure 2B, Additional File 8), which are enriched for 7 pathways and functions, including regulation of lipoprotein transport and cholesterol efflux (Additional File 3). The lightcoral module consists of 17 isoforms of miR-187 and the plum network consists of 17 isoforms of miR-221 and miR-222 (Figure 2B, Additional File 8). While no pathway annotations were derived for the lightcoral module, the plum module is enriched for 18 pathways and oncogenic functions, such as inhibition of the TRAIL-activated apoptotic pathway and inflammatory cytokine production, and up-regulation of protein kinase B signaling (Additional File 3).

Germline eQTLs may regulate the expression of associated mRNAs, miRNAs, and networks

Integrative analysis with germline SNP data identified 268 unique cis-eQTLs associated with the expression of significant mRNAs and miRNAs (Additional File 9). A total of 248 SNPs are associated with the expression of 55 significant mRNAs, and 20 SNPs are associated with the expression of 7 significant miRNAs. Of the 268 eQTLs, 118 are novel whereas 126 are previously known, and 24 are not yet recorded in the annotation database. The majority (227) are predicted to alter regulatory motifs, and 67 are associated with 94 human phenotypes from published genome-wide association studies. The most common phenotypes are related to triglycerides, high-density lipoprotein (HDL), and low-density lipoprotein (LDL) cholesterol.

Network integration reveals miRNA-mediated regulation of chemotherapy response mechanisms

Integration of the associated mRNA and miRNA networks determine that the plum miRNA network significantly correlates with the lavenderblush3 mRNA network (Spearman’s $\rho = -0.26$, $p < 0.001$), and the ivory miRNA network significantly correlates with the darkolivegreen mRNA network (Spearman’s $\rho = -0.17$, $p = 0.023$). Annotations using miRNet and miRGate determined that 20 of these mRNA-miRNA interactions are experimentally validated, while 15 others are supported by in silico predictions (Table 2, Additional File 10).
Combined with the potential cis-eQTL regulation of mRNAs and miRNAs in these networks, these results reveal an integrative, multi-omics view of transcriptional networks associated with chemotherapy response in ovarian cancer (Figure 3).

Replication of study results in two independent ovarian cancer cohorts

Replication analysis of the mRNA results used RNA microarray data from the AOCs cohort. In total, 144 microarray probes in the AOCs dataset (73.46%) matched to differentially expressed genes from TCGA-HGSOC, 9 (6.25%) of which replicated with the same direction of effect (Additional File 11). In addition, the lavenderblush3 and darkolivegreen mRNA network modules replicated in the AOCs cohort (p = 1.6e-10, log HR = -1.27 and p= 1.3e-10, log HR = -1.27, respectively) (Figure 4A, B).

Replication of the miRNA findings used miRNA-seq data from the BLCA cohort of TCGA. Of the 16 differentially expressed miRNAs isoforms in the HGSOC data, 15 (93.75%) were available in the MITO data and 4 (26.66%) replicated with the same direction of effect (Additional File 12). In addition, the ivory and plum miRNA network modules replicated in the MITO cohort (p = 6.1e-4, log HR = -0.78 and p = 0.022, log HR = -0.52, respectively), while the lightcoral module reached nominal significance (p = 0.057, log HR = -0.43) (Figure 4C-E).

Discussion

In this study, we analyzed mRNA and miRNA sequencing data from chemotherapy-naïve tumors of HGSOC patients to identify transcripts and networks associated with chemotherapy response. Our findings implicate novel and known biological pathways that replicated in independent cancer cohorts. In addition, we identified potential interactions among miRNAs and mRNAs, as well as eQTLs that potentially regulate the associated transcripts. Thus, our results provide an integrative, multi-omics view of biological networks associated with chemotherapy response.

We identified one mRNA co-expression network (lavenderblush3) significantly upregulated in platinum sensitive patients, which replicated in the AOCs. This module consists of genes involved in ubiquitin-mediated proteolysis in the endoplasmic reticulum (ER). We also detected a significant downregulation of genes responsible for translation initiation in sensitive patients. These findings suggest that the unfolded protein response (UPR), a cellular process responsible for resolving ER stress, may be increasingly activated in sensitive patients compared to resistant cases. The UPR alleviates ER stress through several pathways, including increased ER-associated protein degradation (ERAD) to remove misfolded proteins, and inhibition of translation to reduce protein load in the ER [26]. ER stress promotes cisplatin resistance in OC cell lines [27] and the upregulation of ERAD genes such as VCP in the lavenderblush3 module is associated with longer OS and platinum sensitivity in HGSOC cohorts [13, 28]. The lavenderblush3 genes VCP, DNAJA1, and TOPORS are overexpressed in platinum-sensitive HGSOC patients as part of a cell cycle and damage response-associated network [12]. Finally, 18 of 31 module genes were also reported in an earlier study of microarray data from the same TCGA-HGSOC cohort [13].

We identified a second mRNA co-expression network associated with chemotherapy resistance in our HGSOC cohort that replicated in the AOCs. The darkolivegreen module included genes associated with fatty acid metabolism (SREBF1, ACAA1, ACADVL), and the protein kinase B oncogene (AKT1), which promotes de-novo lipid biosynthesis in cancer [29]. SREBF1 is a key enzyme for cholesterol and fatty acid synthesis, and an essential gene for OC tumor growth [30]. Specifically, SREBF1 is activated by AKT1, promoting fatty acid
synthesis [31], which favors cell proliferation in OC [32]. Expression of \textit{ACADVL}, involved in the $\beta$-oxidation of long-chain fatty acids, is linked to OC metastasis and cell survival [33]. Our findings indicate the upregulation of these lipid metabolism genes among chemotherapy resistant patients. Lipid metabolism dysregulation activates the UPR, which triggers lipid metabolism-based adaptations in the cell through several pathways, including \textit{SREBF1} regulation [34]. The interaction of these pathways may present a link between our two gene co-expression modules and warrants further study.

Differential expression analysis identified a downregulation of mRNA transcripts involved in the adaptive immune system, which is associated with chemoresistance. Previous studies reported that a high tumor immune score is a strong predictor of chemosensitivity in HGSOC [35]. In addition, there are potential links between this immune response activation, UPR and lipid metabolism. ER stress can induce pro-inflammatory cytokine production and UPR activation in tumor cells [36], which can disrupt dendritic cell function in the OC tumor microenvironment [37]. Moreover, dendritic cell function can also be inhibited by increased lipid uptake in various cancers [38].

The \textit{ivory} miRNA co-expression network module, associated with chemotherapy sensitivity in HGSOC and BLCA, is involved in the negative regulation of lipid transport. This enrichment is mainly mediated by miR-128-1 and miR-128-2, which play a key role in cholesterol and lipid homeostasis through their suppression of the ABCA1 cholesterol efflux transporter and the low-density lipoprotein receptor (LDLR) [39, 40]. MiR-148a is also a regulator of these key genes [39], which is significantly downregulated in resistant patients. The overexpression of \textit{ABCA1} is associated with reduced survival in OC patients [41], and levels of LDLR are increased in chemoresistant OC cell lines [42]. In addition, overexpression of miR-128 promotes sensitivity to cisplatin in previously resistant OC cells [43]. Our results are consistent with the chemosensitivity-promoting role of miR-128 and its potential activity in cholesterol efflux inhibition alongside miR-148a in this cohort.

The \textit{plum} miRNA co-expression network consists of miR-221 and miR-222 isoforms, which have been implicated in the development of chemotherapy resistance in OC. Expression of miR-221/miR-222 transcripts is high in cisplatin-resistant OC cell lines, and their inhibition increases cellular sensitivity [44]. Over-expression of miR-221 and miR-222 promotes proliferation of OC cell lines [45, 46] and reduced disease-free and overall survival [45]. Thus, our findings are consistent with earlier studies showing increased activity of miR-221 and miR-222 in chemoresistant tumors.

Integrative analysis of mRNA-seq and miRNA-seq datasets identified potential interactions of the associated transcript co-expression modules. The overexpression of miR-221/222 in resistant patients may be inhibiting the chemosensitivity-associated \textit{lavenderblush3} mRNA network, revealing a novel potential mechanism of chemotherapy resistance. This finding, combined with the accumulating evidence of miR-221/miR-222 involvement in chemoresistance, may point to a promising avenue for therapeutic intervention. However, overexpression of miR-221/miR-222 promotes UPR-induced apoptosis in hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) cells [47]. Additionally, ER stress suppresses miR-221/miR-222 in HCC, promoting resistance to apoptosis. The contribution of this mechanism to chemotherapy response in HGSOC is currently unclear and presents an area for future investigation.

We also identified potential regulation of the \textit{darkolivegreen} mRNA module by the \textit{ivory} miRNA network, which may inhibit lipid metabolism in chemotherapy sensitive patients. As increased lipid metabolism by cancer cells
is a known mechanism of chemoresistance in HGSOC, this miRNA-mediated inhibition may present a novel mechanism of chemotherapy sensitivity.

Finally, cis-eQTL analysis identified known and novel genomic variants correlated with the expression of mRNAs and miRNAs, which are associated with lipid-related phenotypes. High HDL and triglyceride levels have been correlated with increased cancer stage at diagnosis in OC patients [48]. In addition, advanced-stage OC patients with high LDL levels have a shorter PFS than patients with normal levels [49]. Further investigation of these eQTLs is necessary to further elucidate their role in platinum-based chemotherapy resistance and HGSOC prognosis.

**Conclusion**

Our study provides novel insight of the underlying mechanisms modulating resistance to platinum-based chemotherapy in HGSOC. Specifically, we conducted whole-transcriptome analysis of mRNA-seq and miRNA-seq data to generate novel mechanistic hypotheses using both univariate and network methods. Moreover, we integrated this data with miRNA-seq and genome-wide SNPs to determine potential regulation of the associated transcripts and networks. Our findings implicate novel and known signaling pathways and networks associated with chemotherapy response in HGSOC as well as regulators, which could become novel drug targets. Further studies are needed to validate these findings in other cancers.
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Tables
Table 1. Characteristics of the HGSOC patient cohorts with mRNA-Seq and miRNA-Seq data from TCGA.

|                      | mRNA-Seq cohort |                | miRNA-Seq cohort |                |
|----------------------|-----------------|----------------|------------------|----------------|
|                      | Sensitive       | Resistant      | P value          | All cases      | Sensitive       | Resistant      | P value          | All cases      |
| **Age**              |                 |                |                  |                |                 |                |                  |                |
| Mean                 | 57.15           | 61.98          | **0.0043** a     | 59.22          | 57.76           | 61.52          | **0.018** a     | 59.26          |
| Range                | 30 - 87         | 38 - 87        |                  | 30 - 87        | 30 - 87         | 38 - 87        |                  | 30 - 87        |
| **Grade**            |                 |                |                  |                |                 |                |                  |                |
| G2                   | 18 (15.93%)     | 8 (10.26%)     | **0.27** b       | 26 (13.61%)    | 23 (18.70%)     | 8 (9.76%)      | **0.14** b      | 31 (15.12%)    |
| G3/4                 | 95 (84.07%)     | 69 (88.46%)    |                  | 164 (85.86%)   | 99 (80.49%)     | 73 (89.02%)    |                  | 172 (83.90%)   |
| Ungraded             | 0 (0.00%)       | 1 (1.28%)      |                  | 1 (0.52%)      | 1 (0.81%)       | 1 (1.22%)      |                  | 2 (0.98%)      |
| **Stage**            |                 |                |                  |                |                 |                |                  |                |
| II                   | 7 (6.19%)       | 2 (2.56%)      | **0.48** b       | 9 (4.71%)      | 8 (6.50%)       | 2 (2.44%)      | **0.41** b      | 10 (4.88%)     |
| III                  | 91 (80.53%)     | 67 (85.9%)     |                  | 158 (82.72%)   | 99 (80.49%)     | 67 (81.71%)    |                  | 166 (80.98%)   |
| IV                   | 15 (13.27%)     | 9 (11.54%)     |                  | 24 (12.57%)    | 16 (13.01%)     | 13 (15.85%)    |                  | 29 (14.15%)    |
| **Cytoreductive**    |                 |                |                  |                |                 |                |                  |                |
| surgery outcome      |                 |                |                  |                |                 |                |                  |                |
| Optimal (≤ 10mm)     | 73 (64.60%)     | 54 (69.23%)    | **0.23** c       | 127 (66.49%)   | 77 (62.60%)     | 56 (68.29%)    | **0.21** c      | 133 (64.88%)   |
| Suboptimal (> 10mm)  | 26 (23.01%)     | 20 (25.64%)    |                  | 46 (24.08%)    | 29 (23.58%)     | 21 (25.61%)    |                  | 50 (24.39%)    |
| Unknown              | 14 (12.39%)     | 4 (5.13%)      |                  | 18 (9.42%)     | 17 (13.82%)     | 5 (6.10%)      |                  | 22 (10.73%)    |
| **Overall survival** |                 |                |                  |                |                 |                |                  |                |
| Number of mortality  | 48 (42.48)      | 60 (76.92)     | **2.35E-06** c    | 108 (56.54)    | 55 (44.72)      | 66 (80.49)     | **0.0002** c    | 121 (59.02)    |
| events               |                 |                |                  |                |                 |                |                  |                |
|                          | %)   | %)   | %)   | %)   | %)   | %)   |
|--------------------------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| Median months            | 52.04| 28.20| 6.97E-10<sup>a</sup> | 39.87| 51.91| 28.20| 1.13E-10<sup>a</sup>| 39.50|
| 95% CI                   | 50.07-54.01| 26.22-30.18| 37.90-41.85| 49.94-53.88| 26.23-30.18| 37.53-41.47|
| **Adjuvant chemotherapy regimen** |     |      |      |      |      |      |
| Platinum agent only      | 4 (3.54%) | 3 (3.85%) | 1<sup>b</sup> (3.66%) | 7 (3.25%) | 4 (4.88%) | 0.71<sup>b</sup> (3.90%) | 8 (3.90%) |
| Platinum/Taxane combination | 109 (96.46%) | 75 (96.15%) | 184 (96.34%) | 119 (96.75%) | 78 (95.12%) | 197 (96.10%) |
| **Primary tumor mRNA subtype** |     |      |      |      |      |      |
| Differentiated           | 37 (32.74%) | 22 (28.21%) | 0.49<sup>b</sup> (30.89%) | 59 (34.15%) | 24 (29.27%) | 0.68<sup>c</sup> (32.20%) | 66 (32.20%) |
| Immunoreactive           | 23 (20.35%) | 10 (12.82%) | 33 (17.28%) | 24 (19.51%) | 13 (15.85%) | 37 (18.05%) |
| Mesenchymal              | 22 (19.47%) | 18 (23.08%) | 40 (20.94%) | 24 (19.51%) | 18 (21.95%) | 42 (20.49%) |
| Proliferative            | 30 (26.55%) | 27 (34.62%) | 57 (29.84%) | 33 (26.83%) | 27 (32.93%) | 60 (29.27%) |
| Subtype unknown          | 1 (0.88%) | 1 (1.28%) | 2 (1.05%) | 0 (0.00%) | 0 (0.00%) | 0 (0.00%) |
| Total patients           | 113 | 78 | 191 | 123 | 82 | 205 |

<sup>a</sup>p-value based on t-test; <sup>b</sup>p-value based on Fisher's Exact test; <sup>c</sup>p-value based on Chi-Squared test; CI, Confidence Interval
Table 2. Predicted and validated mRNA - miRNA network interactions.

| Integrated Networks | Gene ID | mRNA ID | miRNA ID | Spearman's ρ | P value  | Interaction type |
|---------------------|---------|---------|----------|--------------|----------|-----------------|
| lavenderblush3 - plum | PSIP1   | ENST00000397519 | hsa-mir-222-3p | -0.32        | 0.000021  | Experimental validation |
|                     | CDC37L1 | ENST00000381854 | hsa-mir-222-3p | -0.31        | 0.000042  | Computational prediction |
|                     | CDC37L1 | ENST00000381854 | hsa-mir-221-3p | -0.27        | 0.00034   | Computational prediction |
|                     | CDC37L1 | ENST00000381854 | hsa-mir-221-5p | -0.27        | 0.00034   | Computational prediction |
|                     | NFIB    | ENST00000380959 | hsa-mir-221-3p | -0.27        | 0.00039   | Experimental validation |
|                     | SMU1    | ENST00000397149 | hsa-mir-221-5p | -0.26        | 0.00082   | Experimental validation |
|                     | VCP     | ENST00000358901 | hsa-mir-222-3p | -0.25        | 0.00089   | Experimental validation |
|                     | CAAP1   | ENST00000333916 | hsa-mir-222-5p | -0.22        | 0.0041    | Computational prediction |
|                     | CAAP1   | ENST00000333916 | hsa-mir-221-5p | -0.21        | 0.0076    | Computational prediction |
|                     | TOPORS  | ENST00000360538 | hsa-mir-221-3p | -0.19        | 0.014     | Experimental validation |
|                     | SLC25A51| ENST00000496760 | hsa-mir-222-3p | -0.19        | 0.016     | Experimental validation |
|                     | PPAPDC2 | ENST00000381883 | hsa-mir-222-5p | -0.18        | 0.021     | Computational prediction |
|                     | VCP     | ENST00000358901 | hsa-mir-221-3p | -0.17        | 0.023     | Experimental validation |
|                     | VCP     | ENST00000358901 | hsa-mir-221-5p | -0.17        | 0.023     | Experimental validation |
|                     | NFX1    | ENST00000379540 | hsa-mir-221-5p | -0.17        | 0.027     | Computational prediction |
| Gene      | Entrez Gene   | Target miRNA   | Expression  | p-value | Classification         |
|-----------|---------------|----------------|-------------|---------|------------------------|
| PPAPDC2   | ENST00000381833 | hsa-mir-221-5p | -0.17       | 0.03    | Computational prediction |
| DNAJA1    | ENST00000330899 | hsa-mir-221-5p | -0.16       | 0.035   | Experimental validation |
| AK3       | ENST00000381809 | hsa-mir-222-5p | -0.16       | 0.037   | Computational prediction |
| RPL18     | ENST00000552347 | hsa-mir-212-3p | -0.29       | 0.00017 | Experimental validation |
| MRPL55    | ENST00000414164 | hsa-miR-1306-5p | -0.25       | 0.001   | Computational prediction |
| FASTK     | ENST00000466855 | hsa-mir-140-3p | -0.25       | 0.0013  | Experimental validation |
| RPL18     | ENST00000552347 | hsa-mir-361-3p | -0.24       | 0.0021  | Experimental validation |
| ACBD4     | ENST00000321854 | hsa-miR-128-2-5p | -0.22       | 0.0041  | Computational prediction |
| OAZ1      | ENST00000581150 | hsa-mir-361-3p | -0.22       | 0.0047  | Experimental validation |
| ACBD4     | ENST00000321854 | hsa-miR-128-1-5p | -0.21       | 0.0059  | Computational prediction |
| MYL12A    | ENST00000578611 | hsa-mir-103a-3p | -0.17       | 0.023   | Experimental validation |
| MYL12A    | ENST00000578611 | hsa-mir-107    | -0.17       | 0.023   | Experimental validation |
| HTRA2     | ENST00000484352 | hsa-mir-1306-5p | -0.17       | 0.029   | Experimental validation |
| ACADVL    | ENST00000579425 | hsa-           | -0.17       | 0.03    | Experimental validation |
| Gene   | ENST Identifier   | miRNA       | Log2 Fold Change | p-value | Validation Method |
|--------|-------------------|-------------|------------------|---------|-------------------|
| ACADVL | ENST00000579425   | hsa-mir-107 | -0.17            | 0.03    | Experimental Validation |
| SOD1   | ENST00000470944   | hsa-mir-140-3p | -0.16           | 0.037   | Experimental Validation |
| RHOT2  | ENST00000569675   | hsa-mir-1306-5p | -0.16           | 0.044   | Experimental Validation |
| TSSK6  | ENST00000360913   | hsa-miR-212-5p | -0.15           | 0.048   | Computational prediction |
| RCC1   | ENST00000373832   | hsa-miR-1306-3p | -0.15           | 0.048   | Computational prediction |
| RCC1   | ENST00000373832   | hsa-miR-1306-5p | -0.15           | 0.048   | Computational prediction |

**Figures**

(A)  
(B)  

Figure 1
Differential expression analysis of mRNA and miRNA transcripts. (A) Significant differentially expressed mRNA transcripts (n = 196) are shown in red. The Benjamini-Hochberg adjusted significance threshold is indicated by the dashed line. Transcripts with a positive fold change are upregulated in resistant patients, whereas transcripts with a negative fold change are downregulated in resistant patients. (B) Significant differentially expressed miRNA isoforms (n = 21) are shown in red. The Benjamini-Hochberg adjusted significance threshold is indicated by the dashed line. Transcripts with a positive fold change are upregulated in resistant patients, whereas transcripts with a negative fold change are downregulated in resistant patients.
Weighted correlation network analysis of mRNA and miRNA transcripts. (A) The mRNA modules lavenderblush3 and darkolivegreen are visualized in their respective colors. Each node represents a transcript, and each edge represents a connection or co-expression. The distance between nodes is the connection weight, where more similar transcripts are plotted closer. (B) The miRNA modules lightcoral, plum, and ivory are visualized in their respective colors. Each node represents one miRNA isoform, and each edge represents a connection or co-expression. The distance between nodes is the connection weight, where more similarly expressed transcripts are plotted closer.

Figure 3

Integration of significant networks. The mRNA transcripts (oval nodes) from the lavenderblush3 and darkolivegreen modules are arranged based on co-expression similarity (grey edges). Regulatory interactions (black edges) indicate inhibition (bar-headed arrow) or activation (arrow). The colors of miRNA nodes indicate their membership in the plum and ivory co-expression networks. Four miRNA isoforms (rectangular nodes) were validated (solid edges) or predicted (dashed edges) to regulate the expression of genes in the lavenderblush3 network module. In addition, 6 eQTLs (hexagonal nodes) may regulate the expression of the NFX1 gene. Genes
in the darkolivegreen module have 10 validated or predicted regulatory miRNAs and 97 regulatory eQTLs. Finally, the ivory miRNA miR-140 may be regulated by the miR-QTL rs71397980. eQTL, expression quantitative trait loci; miR-QTL, microRNA expression quantitative trait loci.

**Figure 4**

Replication analysis of significant transcript co-expression networks. (A-B) Kaplan-Meier analysis of patient PFS association with the prognostic index of mRNA networks lavenderblush3 (A) and darkolivegreen (B) in the AOCS cohort. (C-E) Kaplan-Meier analysis of patient PFS association with the prognostic index of miRNA networks ivory (C), plum (D), and lightcoral (E) in the MITO cohort. PFS, progression-free survival; AOCS, Australian Ovarian Cancer Study; MITO, Multicenter Italian Trial in Ovarian cancer.
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