Gene-gene Interaction of AhR with and within the Wnt Cascade Affects Susceptibility to Lung Cancer

Albert Rosenberger (✉ arosenb@gwdg.de)

Universitätsmedizin Göttingen <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-7848-1332>

Nils Muttray

Universitätsmedizin Göttingen: Universitätsmedizin Göttingen

Rayjean J Hung

Lunenfeld-Tanenbaum Research Institute

David C Christiani

Harvard University T H Chan School of Public Health

Neil E Caporaso

National Cancer Institute Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics

Geoffrey Liu

Princess Margaret Hospital Cancer Centre

Stig E Bojesen

Herlev Hospital

Loic Le Marchand

University of Hawai'i at Mānoa John A Burns School of Medicine: University of Hawai'i at Manoa John A Burns School of Medicine

Demetrios Albanes

National Cancer Institute

Melinda C Aldrich

Vanderbilt University Medical Center

Adonina Tardon

University of Oviedo Faculty of Medicine: Universidad de Oviedo Facultad de Medicina y Ciencias de la Salud

Guillermo Fernández-Tardón

University of Oviedo: Universidad de Oviedo

Gad Rennert

Carmel Medical Center

John K Field

Roy Castle International Centre for Lung Cancer Research: University of Liverpool North West Cancer Research Centre

Michael P.A. Davies

Roy Castle International Centre for Lung Cancer Research: University of Liverpool North West Cancer Research Centre

Triantafillos Liloglou

Roy Castle International Centre for Lung Cancer Research: University of Liverpool North West Cancer Research Centre

Lambertus A Kiemeney

Radboud Universiteit Nijmegen: Radboud Universiteit

Philip Lazarus

Washington State University - Spokane

Bernadette Wendel

Universitätsmedizin Göttingen

Aage Haugen

National Institute of Occupational Health

Shanbeh Zienolddiny

National Institute of Occupational Health

Stephen Lam

British Columbia Cancer Agency

Matthew B Schabath

H Lee Moffitt Cancer Center and Research Center Inc International Plaza

Angeline S Andrew

Dartmouth College Geisel School of Medicine

Eric J Duell

Catalan Institute of Oncology: Institut Catala d' Oncologia

Susanne M Arnold

Markey Cancer Center

Gary E Goodman

Swedish Medical Group

Chu Chen

Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center

Jennifer A Doherty

Huntsman Cancer Institute Cancer Hospital: University of Utah Health Huntsman Cancer Institute

Fiona Taylor

University of Sheffield English Language Teaching Centre: The University of Sheffield English Language Teaching Centre

Angela Cox

University of Sheffield Health Sciences Library: The University of Sheffield Faculty of Medicine Dentistry and Health

Penella J Woll

University of Sheffield

Angela Risch

University of Salzburg and Cancer Cluster Salzburg

Thomas R Muley

University Hospital Heidelberg: UniversitätsKlinikum Heidelberg

Mikael Johansson

Umea Universitet

Paul Brennan

IARC: International Agency for Research on Cancer

Maria Teresa Landi

National Cancer Institute

Sanjay S Shete

The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center Pathology Department

Christopher I Amos

Baylor College of Medicine: Dan L Duncan Comprehensive Cancer Center

Heike Bickeböller

Universitätsklinikum Göttingen: Universitätsmedizin Göttingen

INTEGRAL-ILCCO consortium

Lunenfeld-Tanenbaum Research Institute

Research

Keywords: susceptibility, association, prediction, polygenic risk score, decision trees

Posted Date: September 23rd, 2021

DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21203/rs.3.rs-658360/v2>

License: This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License.

[Read Full License](#)

AdditGene-gene interaction of AhR with and within the Wnt cascade affects susceptibility to lung cancer

Albert Rosenberger¹, Nils Muttray¹, Rayjean J Hung^{2,3}, David C Christiani⁴, Neil E Caporaso⁵, Geoffrey Liu^{6,7}, Stig E Bojesen^{8,9,10}, Loic Le Marchand¹¹, Demetrios Albanes⁵, Melinda C Aldrich¹², Adonina Tardon¹³, Guillermo Fernández-Tardón¹³, Gad Rennert¹⁴, John K Field¹⁵, Michael P.A. Davies¹⁵, Triantafillos Liloglou¹⁵, Lambertus A Kiemeny¹⁶, Philip Lazarus¹⁷, Bernadette Wendel¹, Aage Haugen¹⁸, Shanbeh Zienolddiny¹⁸, Stephen Lam¹⁹, Matthew B Schabath²⁰, Angeline S Andrew²¹, Eric J Duell²², Susanne M Arnold²³, Gary E Goodman²⁴, Chu Chen²⁵, Jennifer A Doherty²⁶, Fiona Taylor²⁷, Angela Cox²⁷, Penella J Woll²⁷, Angela Risch²⁸, Thomas R Muley^{29,30}, Mikael Johansson³¹, Paul Brennan³², Maria Teresa Landi⁵, Sanjay S Shete³³, Christopher I Amos³⁴, Heike Bickeböllér¹ on behalf of the INTEGRAL-ILCCO consortium

1. Department of Genetic Epidemiology, University Medical Center, Georg-August-University Göttingen, Göttingen, Germany.
2. Lunenfeld-Tanenbaum Research Institute, Sinai Health System, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
3. Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, Canada
4. Department of Environmental Health, Harvard T.H. Chan School of Public Health and Massachusetts General Hospital/Harvard Medical School, Boston, Massachusetts, USA.
5. Division of Cancer Epidemiology and Genetics, National Cancer Institute, US National Institutes of Health, Bethesda, Maryland, USA.
6. Medical Oncology and Medical Biophysics, Princess Margaret Cancer Centre, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
7. Medicine and Epidemiology, Dalla Lana School of Public Health, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario, Canada.
8. Department of Clinical Biochemistry, Herlev and Gentofte Hospital, Copenhagen University Hospital, Copenhagen, Denmark.
9. Faculty of Health and Medical Sciences, University of Copenhagen, Copenhagen, Denmark.
10. Copenhagen General Population Study, Herlev and Gentofte Hospital, Copenhagen, Denmark.
11. Epidemiology Program, University of Hawaii Cancer Center, Honolulu, Hawaii, USA.
12. Department of Thoracic Surgery, Division of Epidemiology, Vanderbilt University Medical Center, Nashville, Tennessee, USA.
13. University of Oviedo, ISPA and CIBERESP, Faculty of Medicine, Oviedo, Spain.
14. Clalit National Cancer Control Center at Carmel Medical Center and Technion Faculty of Medicine, Haifa, Israel.
15. Roy Castle Lung Cancer Research Programme, The University of Liverpool, Department of Molecular and Clinical Cancer Medicine, Liverpool, UK.
16. Departments of Health Evidence and Urology, Radboud University Medical Center, Nijmegen, the Netherlands.
17. Department of Pharmaceutical Sciences, College of Pharmacy, Washington State University, Spokane, Washington, USA.
18. National Institute of Occupational Health, Oslo, Norway.
19. British Columbia Cancer Agency, Vancouver, British Columbia, Canada.
20. Department of Cancer Epidemiology, H. Lee Moffitt Cancer Center and Research Institute, Tampa, Florida, USA.
21. Department of Epidemiology, Geisel School of Medicine, Hanover, New Hampshire, USA.
22. Unit of Biomarkers and Susceptibility, Oncology Data Analytics Program, Catalan Institute of Oncology (ICO), Bellvitge Biomedical Research Institute (IDIBELL), Barcelona, Spain.
23. Markey Cancer Center, University of Kentucky, Lexington, Kentucky, USA.
24. Swedish Medical Group, Seattle, Washington, USA
25. Program in Epidemiology, Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center, Seattle, Washington, USA.
26. Huntsman Cancer Institute, Department of Population Health Sciences, University of Utah, Salt Lake City, Utha, USA
27. Department of Oncology and Metabolism, University of Sheffield, Sheffield, UK.
28. University of Salzburg and Cancer Cluster Salzburg, Salzburg, Austria.
29. Translational Lung Research Center (TLRC) Heidelberg, Member of the German Center for Lung Research (DZL), Heidelberg, Germany.
30. Translational Research Unit, Thoraxklinik, University Hospital Heidelberg,, Heidelberg, Germany.
31. Department of Radiation Sciences, Umeå University, Umeå, Sweden.
32. International Agency for Research on Cancer, World Health Organization, Lyon, France.
33. Department of Biostatistics, Division of Basic Sciences, The University of Texas MD Anderson Cancer Center, Houston, Texas, USA
34. Dan L Duncan Comprehensive Cancer Center, Baylor College of Medicine, Houston, Texas, USA.

Corresponding author: Albert Rosenberger, PhD
Universitätsmedizin Göttingen
Institut für Genetische Epidemiologie
Humboldtallee 32, 37073 Göttingen, Germany
Tel: +49 551 3914044;
Fax: +49 551 3914094;
Email: arosenb@gwdg.de
ORCID: 0000-0001-7848-1332

Running title: AhR/Wnt genes in Lung Cancer

Key words: susceptibility, association, prediction, polygenic risk score, decision trees

Funding The National Institutes of Health (7U19CA203654-02/ 397 114564-5111078 Integrative Analysis of Lung Cancer Etiology and Risk) supported this work. CARET is funded by the National Cancer Institute, National Institutes

of Health through grants U01 CA063673, UM1 CA167462, R01 CA 111703, RO1 CA 151989, U01 CA167462 and funds from the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center. The Boston Lung Cancer Study was funded by NCI grant 5U01CA209414. Other individual funding for participating studies and members of INTEGRAL-ILCCO are listed elsewhere. [1] The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript. We acknowledge support by the Open Access Publication Funds of the Göttingen University.

Conflict of interest The authors declare no conflict of interest.

Abstract

Background: Aberrant *Wnt* signalling, regulating cell development and stemness, influences the development of many cancer types. The Aryl hydrocarbon receptor (*AhR*) mediates tumorigenesis of environmental pollutants. Complex interaction patterns of genes assigned to *AhR/Wnt*-signalling were recently associated with lung cancer susceptibility. **Aim:** To assess the association and predictive ability of *AhR/Wnt*-genes with lung cancer in cases and controls of European descent. **Methods:** Odds ratios (OR) were estimated for genomic variants assigned to the *Wnt* agonist and the antagonistic genes *DKK2*, *DKK3*, *DKK4*, *FRZB*, *SFRP4* and *Axin2*. Logistic regression models with variable selection were trained, validated and tested to predict lung cancer, at which other previously identified SNPs that have been robustly associated with lung cancer risk could also enter the model. Further, decision trees were created to investigate variant x variant interaction. All analyses were performed for overall lung cancer and for subgroups. **Results:** No genome-wide significant association of *AhR/Wnt*-genes with overall lung cancer was observed, but within the subgroups of ever smokers (e.g. marker rs2722278 *SFRP4*; OR=1.20; 95%-CI: 1.13-1.27; $p=5.6 \cdot 10^{-10}$) and never smokers (e.g. marker rs1133683 *Axin2*; OR=1.27; 95%-CI: 1.19-1.35; $p=1.0 \cdot 10^{-12}$). Although predictability is poor, *AhR/Wnt*-variants are unexpectedly overrepresented in optimized prediction scores for overall lung cancer and for small cell lung cancer. Remarkably, the score for never-smokers contained solely two *AhR/Wnt*-variants. The optimal decision tree for never smokers consists of 7 *AhR/Wnt*-variants and only two lung cancer variants. **Conclusions:** The role of variants belonging to *Wnt/AhR*-pathways in lung cancer susceptibility may be underrated in main-effects association analysis. Complex interaction patterns in individuals of European descent have moderate predictive capacity for lung cancer or subgroups thereof, especially in never smokers.

Background

Genome-wide association studies (GWAS) have identified dozens of susceptibility loci throughout the genome that are associated with lung cancer (LC) or one of its histological subtypes. [1–8] Genes related to *Wnt* signalling, one of the key pathway regulating cell development and stemness, were not detected as being associated to LC susceptibility in individuals of European descent so far, unlike *TERT* (5p15.33) that was one of the first for which a robust association was observed.[9] Aberrant *Wnt* signalling is often observed in expression profiles of many cancers, but to date no association of *Wnt/Ahr* genes with susceptibility to cancer of any type has been observed.[10–12] Administration of RNAi against *Wnt* was shown to reduce tumour burden in lung adenocarcinoma (adenoLC). [13] In non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC), overexpressed *miR-582-3p* maintains stemness features by negatively targeting the regulators of *Wnt* signalling *Axin2*, *DKK3* and *SRP1* for degradation, thereby increasing β -catenin mediated *Wnt* activity. [14] *TERT* expression was found to be directly enhanced by binding of β -catenin to its promoter region and thereby links telomerase activity to *Wnt* signalling. [10] This is inasmuch important, as *TERT* is one of the first and most robust susceptibility genes for LC identified by GWAS. [15, 16] The tight regulatory machinery of the *Wnt* pathway has several major antagonists, such as Secreted Frizzled related protein (*sFRP*), Dickkopf 5 (*DKK*) protein and *Axin2* protein. [17] Evidence also exists for a crosstalk between *AhR* and *Wnt* signalling.[18]

Aryl hydrocarbon receptor (7p21.1; *AhR*) is a ligand induced transcription factor, which is translocated into the nucleus. It is known to mediate the toxicity and tumorigenesis of a variety of environmental pollutants, including for NSCLC. *AhR* upregulates the enzyme CYP1A1 when cells are exposed to carcinogenic metabolites, such as some polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons (PAHs) found in cigarette smoke. The CYP1A1 coding gene is discussed as a susceptibility gene for LC. *AhR* is a major determinant in the process of smoking driven LC. [19–21] The complexity of both the *AhR* signalling pathway and the *Wnt* signalling cascade is reflected by interaction effects of genomic variants within genes, which control their function. [22] Recently, the association of the *Wnt*-genes *DKK4* (8p11.21), *DKK3* (11p15.3), *DKK2* (4q25), *FRZB* (2q32.1, also known as *sFRP3*), *SFRP4* (7p14.1), *Axin2* (17q24.1) and a potential interaction with *AhR* was investigated with respect to the susceptibility to LC in a sample of 600 subjects from North India. [22, 23] A notable association with LC, e.g. for the *SFRP4* variant rs1802073 (OR=3.19; 95%-CI 1.81-5.63), was

reported. Classification And Regression Tree (CART) analysis revealed an interaction of *DKK2* and *SFRP4* polymorphisms to be the best (off all investigated) predictors for LC; especially within smokers. They also reported to have identified several high-risk subgroups in smokers, e.g. characterised by *DKK2* (rs17037102 / rs419558) and *Axin2* (rs9915936). A similar picture was observed in a sample of 270 subjects from Istanbul, Turkey. [24] A two-way interaction between *DKK3* (rs3206824) and *SFRP4* (rs1802074) was found to be predictive of LC.

We aimed to assess a possible association of *AhR* pathway and *Wnt* signalling cascade with LC within the large-scale series of cases and controls of European descent hold by the International Lung Cancer Consortium (ILCCO) / Integrative analysis of Lung Cancer Etiology and Risk (INTEGRAL). To do this, we also evaluated the contribution of these genes to genetic prediction of LC as a complement to known LC-related markers.

Methods

The work presented has been reviewed and approved by the ILCCO Steering Committee.

Cases and Controls

Phenotype and genotype data of 58,181 entries of the data repository of ILCCO were extracted. Details of the repository is described previously.[1, 25] QC control samples, individuals without information on smoking status or age, and samples of poor genotyping quality or sex discrepancies, were excluded, To avoid population stratification, this analysis is focused on European-ancestry population (defined as more than 95% probability of being of European descent). 14,068 incident LC-cases and 12,390 cancer-free controls of European descent remained for analysis. Those genotyped with other genome-wide array in addition to OncoArray were separated to form an independent validation set (2nd validation set) of size (n=4,359, including 2,360 LC-cases and 1,999 controls).

Selected Markers

For this investigation we extracted the genotypes of 113 genomic variants (markers) assigned to 58 genes, previously robustly associated with the risk for LC or one of its histological subtypes [1–8] or proxies thereof (called *LC-marker*), and 296 markers assigned to 7 genes involved in *Wnt* signalling and listed in Bahl et al. [22, 23] and Yilmaz et al. [24] (called *AhR/Wnt-marker*). Thus, we focused this analysis to genes previously investigated with respect to LC. Fifty of these 409 markers were eliminated before analysis due to a MAF<1% (minor allele frequency), or departure from

HWE (Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium) in genotypes (unaffected $p < 10^{-7}$, affected $p < 10^{-12}$), or low imputation accuracy (info < 0.8). Seventy-eight of the remaining *LC-markers* were genotyped with the OncoArray (44 thereof are proxy SNPs identified using LDlink [26]) and 32 had to be imputed. Two-hundred twenty-one of the remaining *AhR/Wnt-markers* were genotyped and 28 have been imputed. A list of these markers extracted from ILCCO OncoArray repository is given in the appendix.

Association analysis

We first performed association analysis for each marker separately using the program PLINK. [27, 28] Crude (model 1) and adjusted odds ratios (ORs) were estimated along with 95%-confidence intervals within log-additive models. Sex, age and smoking status and the first 3 principal components (PCs) to adjust for population stratification (model 2); and in addition the 6 most significantly associated *LC-markers* (rs55781567, 15q25.1 *CHRNA5*; rs11780471, 8p21.2 *CHRNA2*; rs7705526, 5p15.33 *TERT*; rs56113850, 19q13.2 *CYP2A6*; rs71658797, 1p31.1 *AK5*; rs11571833, 13q13.1 *BRCA2*) (model 3) were included in adjusted models. ORs were estimated for overall LC, small cell LC (SCLC), squamous cell LC (SqCLC), adenocarcinoma LC (adenoLC), ever smokers, never smokers and young individuals (21 to 55 years of age) as subgroups. We generated QQ-plots for the *AhR/Wnt-markers* and estimated the genomic inflation factor λ . To account for multiple testing, genome-wide statistical significance was considered to correspond to a p-value of 10^{-7} or lower, suggestive significance to a p-value between 10^{-5} and 10^{-7} and nominal significance to a p-value between 0.05 and 10^{-5} .

Logistic Regression - Predicting models with model selection

We fitted logistic regression models with variable selection to find appropriate polygenic risk scores (PRS) in order to predict the disease (LC) status (affected or unaffected). Any *AhR/Wnt-marker* or the *LC-marker* could be included in the model without preference. To avoid multi-collinearity we removed one of two SNPs in LD to another ($R^2 > 0.8$, pruning). The remaining entered the models as potential predictors. We performed forward selection until the Bayesian information criterion (BIC, most stringent selection), the *Akaike* information criterion (AIC, less stringent selection, contains in general more predictors) or the sample size corrected AIC (AICC) indicate a best solution (and 10 more selection steps). The resulting PRSs are called BIC-, AIC- and AICC-scores. Note, that for the purpose of model building, the AIC-selection is asymptotically equivalent to cross-validation (CV).[29, 30] To avoid overfitting,

we assigned individuals to a training or a validation set (to build a score) and a testing set (to examine the score performance) with a 1/3 probability each. For comparison, we also generated a BIC^{LC} -score with at least one marker, only allowing *LC-markers* to enter the model building. To compare the importance for LC prediction of the sets *g* of *LC-makers* and *AhR/Wnt-markers*, respectively, we contrasted the importance-values defined as $I_g = \sum_{m \in g} |\beta_m| \cdot MAF_m$ for each score (MAF_m the minor allele frequency and β_m the logistic regression coefficient of marker *m*). The superiority of the AIC-scores over the BIC^{LC} -score and the BIC-score was tested applying the nonparametric test of DeLong, DeLong, and Clarke-Pearson 1988 (1-sided) on AUCs of ROC (area under the receiver operation characteristic curve). [31] In addition, a corresponding precision-recall plot was created for the SCLC.

Decision trees

Decision trees were created to examine marker x marker interaction with respect to the LC prediction. Any *AhR/Wnt-marker* or the *LC-marker* could be included in a tree without preference. This was accomplished in the entire sample and in all subgroups defined above. The R packages *rpart* and *DescTools* were used. [32, 33] To avoid trees being formed by spurious epistasis we removed one of two SNPs in LD to another ($R^2 > 0.8$, pruning). Since overfitting is a point of concern when building decision trees, the complexity parameter was first optimized applying 10-fold cross-validation, grading the performance on the validation set by Somers' D (concordance of true and predicted LC-status). The ability of the optimal trees to predict the LC-status was then tested within the independent sample of 4,359 cases and controls. True positive (TP) and true negative (TN) rates are given.

All statistical analyses were performed with SAS® 9.4, PLINK 1.90 and 2.0 or R 4.0.2.

Gene Expression

We extracted information on gene expression from the *Human Protein Atlas* [34, 35] and *LungGENS* [36, 37].

Results

Sample description

The analysed sample consists of 14,068 LC-cases and 12,390 controls with median age of 63. Sixty-three percent were male, 52% of cases and 28% of controls were current smokers. The most frequent histological subtype is adenocarcinoma (38%), followed by squamous cell carcinoma (SqCLC) (26%) and small cell lung cancer (SCLC) (10%). The

proportion of never-smokers was largest within the subgroup of adenocarcinoma cases (14%), but almost the same between younger (<55 years; 10%) and older (9%) cases. Details on smoking status and histological subtypes are presented in Table 1.

Table 1 Smoking by LC status and subgroups

Association analysis

We first performed association analysis for each *Wnt/AhR-marker* separately. The p-values for an association of *AhR/Wnt-markers* with LC range from 0.005 (rs12115174; 8p11.21 *DKK4*; OR=0.9211) to 1 (model 2; adjusted for sex, age, smoking status and population stratification); with a negligible genomic inflation ($\lambda=1.02$). A nominally significant association ($10^{-5} < p \leq 0.05$) was observed for only 8 of the 249 markers (~3%). The corresponding point estimates of OR range from 0.88 (rs1053070054; 8p11.21 *DKK4*; p=0.007) to 1.12 (rs74596148; 7p14.1 *SFRP4*; p=0.25). A QQ-plot indicates that achieved p-values almost perfectly agree with the expectation of no associated marker (see Figure 1). P-values and OR are in moderate agreement between the models (e.g. model 2 to model 3; additionally adjusted by *LC-markers*: Kendall's $\rho_p=0.75$, $\rho_{OR}=0.78$).

Figure 1: Association of *AhR/Wnt-marker*

Subgroup analysis: When dividing the cases according to histological subtypes (SCLC; SqCLC and adenoLC) the observation of no detectable association for *WNT/AhR-markers* remains. Merely the number of nominally significant association ($10^{-5} < p \leq 0.05$) increases to 12 (5%) or 21 (8%) of the 249 markers for SqCLC and SCLC, respectively, hence close to the expected type 1 error. (Additional file 1: S-Table 2). When dividing the cases and controls according to their smoking behaviour (ever and never smokers), genome-wide significance ($p \leq 10^{-7}$) was achieved for 7 and 8 markers, respectively. Another 12 and 3 markers, respectively, were found suggestively significant ($10^{-7} < p \leq 10^{-5}$) (see Additional file 1: S-Figure 1) for ever and never smokers. Those markers found associated among ever smokers have mainly been directly genotyped and are assigned to *SFRP4* and *DKK4*. E.g. for marker rs2722278 we estimated an OR=1.20 (95%-CI: 1.13-1.27), yielding a p-value of $5.6 \cdot 10^{-10}$. Those markers found associated among never smokers have mainly been imputed and are mostly assigned to *Axin2*, but also to *AHR*, *FRZB* and *DKK2*. Marker rs17037102, assigned to *DKK2*, was the only one found associated with LC by Bahl et al. and in this analysis (see Table 2 and Additional file 1: S-Table 3). Interestingly, the ORs of these markers estimated by model 3 (additionally

adjusted for selected *LC-marker*) differ from that estimated by model 2. They are closer to one and no more significant. E.g. for rs1133683 (*Axin2*) we observe an OR=1.27 (95%-CI: 1.19-1.35, $p=1 \times 10^{-12}$) fitting model 2, but OR=0.95 (95%-CI: 0.86-1.06, $p=0.3586$) fitting model 3.

Table 2 Significantly associated *Ahr/Wnt-markers* within never and ever smokers

Logistic Regression - Predicting models with model selection

We further fit logistic regression models with variable selection to evaluate the contribution of *Ahr/Wnt-markers* to a polygenic risk scores (PRS), but without postulating the usefulness of the score as such. Eight *LC-markers* from only eight *LC-genes* (*CYP2A6*, *CHRNA5*, *TERT*, *AMICA1*, *CHRNA3*, *COPS2*, *HCG4* and *CHRNA2*) were selected for the BIC-score (most stringent selection) to predict overall LC. Hence, the BIC-score and the BIC^{LC}-score are identical. In contrast, the AIC-score (for overall LC identical to the AICC-score) includes 20 *LC-markers* and remarkable 17 *Ahr/Wnt-markers*, with *LC-markers* being more important than the *Ahr/Wnt-markers* (importance ratio 0.56: 0.34) (see Figure 2, Additional file 1: S-Figure 3 and S-Table 4). The ability to distinguish cases and controls from susceptibility genes only was, as expected, poor for each of the scores (see Additional file 1: S-Table 5). In the training set the performance of the AIC/AICC-score (AUC=0.607) exceeded those of the BIC/BIC^{LC}-score (AUC=0.582) significantly ($p<0.001$). Within the test set (AUCs: 0.577 and 0.576) and the 2nd validation set (AUCs: 0.553 and 0.548), the higher complexity with additional *Ahr/Wnt-markers* did not improve discriminability for overall LC ($p=0.87$ and $p=0.35$).

Similar score composition and performance was observed for most subgroups. The BIC-scores in the subgroups adenoLC (involved marker LC:*Ahr/Wnt*=6:--), SCLC (3:--) and smokers (7:--) contained *LC-markers* only, whereas *Ahr/Wnt-markers* are included even under this stringent variable selection in the subgroups SqCLC (5:1) and Young (2:2). However, between 14 and 31 *Ahr/Wnt-markers* entered these subgroup's AIC-scores. For these subgroups, the importance of the LC-markers for the AIC-score is higher than that of the included *Ahr/Wnt-markers*.

Figure 2: Comparison of score composition

Most important, we observed a significantly higher predictive accuracy (larger AUCs) of the *Ahr/Wnt-markers* enriched AIC-scores compared to BIC^{LC}-score in the subgroup of **SCLC** patients ($p=0.019$; AUC_{AIC}=0.577 AUC_{BIC}=0.546) within the test set (see Additional file 1: S-Figure 4). For this subgroup, the selected *Ahr/Wnt-markers* contribute to

the AIC-score more than twice as much as the *LC-markers* (importance ration 0.60: 1.49). The precision-recall plot of Figure 3 indicates that a positive SCLC prediction based on the AIC-score can be trusted more than that based on *LC-markers* alone (BIC^{LC} -score). In the 2nd validation set the score-specific AUCs were similar but no more significantly different ($p=0.08$; $AUC_{AIC}=0.564$ vs. $AUC_{BIC}=0.531$). The AIC-score of this SCLC-subgroup is composed of 12 *LC-markers* (assigned to *CHRNA5*, *HCG4*, *DNAJB4* (4x each), *CYP2A6*, *CHRNA3*, *CHRNA2*, *AMICA1*, *KCNJ4*, *AS1*, *BRCA2*, *EGFL8* and *WNK1* (2x each)) and 27 *AhR/Wnt-markers* (assigned to all *AhR/Wnt*-genes except *DKK3*). However, only one LC patient in the test set ($n=434$) and one in the 2nd validation set ($n=164$) was recognized as a patient at a threshold of 50% case probability.

Figure 3: ROC and precision-recall-plot: SCLC

Interestingly the BIC-score for **never smokers** was built by only two *AhR/Wnt-markers* (assigned to *Axin2* and *SFRP4*) but not a single LC-marker. Further, the *LC-markers* are the minority in the composite of the AIC-score (15:23). They also contribute less to the AIC-score than the *AhR/Wnt-markers* (importance ratio of 0.96 : 1.46). The median predicted case probability, in the test set (24.8%) and 2nd validation set (25.6%), exceeds that of controls by 1%- to 2%- points. However, AUC differed neither in the test set ($p=0.13$; $AUC_{AIC}=0.540$ $AUC_{BIC}=0.514$) nor in the 2nd validation set ($p=0.36$; $AUC_{AIC}=0.535$ $AUC_{BIC}=0.526$) significantly. Nevertheless, this observation highlights the value of the *AhR/Wnt-markers* in the subgroup of never smokers.

Decision trees

Finally, we generated decision trees to evaluate the contribution of *AhR/Wnt-markers* to LC prediction that allow for a complex interaction structure, but without postulating the usefulness of the trees as such. The decision tree for overall LC (whole sample) consists off solely a single decision node (rs55781567 assigned to *CHRNA5*), achieving a Somers' concordance index $D=0.0565$ in the 2nd validation set (see Additional file 1: S-Table 6 and S-Figure 2). A single-node decision-tree was also found optimal for young participants (split: rs1051730 assigned to *CHRNA3*), achieving a Somers' concordance index $D=0.096$. These two, unsophisticated trees are characterised by balanced TP- (about 62%) and TN-rates (about 44%).

The decision trees for ever smokers, SCLC and SqCLC were more complex achieving Somers' concordance indexes D of 0.007, -0.0005 and 0.0126, respectively. The trees for SCLC and SqCLC are characterised by an extreme TP-rate

<5% and TN-rate >99%; the tree for Ever Smokers by a TP-rate >99% and TN-rate <5%. Remarkably, a marker assigned to *CHRNA5* was always chosen as the first and most important split for the trees for ever smokers, for SCC and SqCLC. However, markers assigned to *AhR/Wnt-genes* (smoker: *DKK2*; *SCLC*: *FRZB*; *SqCLC*: *DKK2* and *DKK3*) appear at lower-level decision-nodes (Additional file 1: S-Figure 5, 6, 7 and 8). With the same program settings, no decision tree could be created for adenocarcinoma.

Most notable is the optimal decision tree for the 5,242 **never smokers** (75% LC-cases, 25% controls), the only one that does not contain a marker belonging to the *CHRN* (*Cholinergic receptors nicotinic subunits*) gene group (see Figure 4). The tree is built from only two *LC-markers* but 7 *AhR/Wnt-markers*, achieving a Somers' concordance index $D=-0.002$. One can make out three branches of this tree. Branch I covers two thirds of individuals ($n=754$, 66% of 1141 in the 2nd validation set): All of these are graded as "unaffected" based on only the two *LC-markers*: first decision node (rs885518 assigned to *MTAP*) and second decision node (rs7705526 assigned to *TERT* that links telomerase activity to *Wnt signalling*). For branch II an additional node (rs17214897 assigned to *DKK2*) is taken into account, covering a further tenth (9.9%) of never smokers. In this branch, very few subjects of the training set (1.7% within branch II eq. 0.17% of all never smokers) are graded "affected". However, one in four individuals of the 2nd validation set belonging to both branches, I and II, is truly "affected" but has not been detected (TP-rate=0%, TN-rate=100%). Rated as "affected" appears in the test set only in the third branch III, covering the remaining fourth of never smokers ($n=284$ of the 2nd validation set). This third branch requires genotypes of several *AhR/Wnt-markers* assigned to *AHR*, *Axin2*, *DKK2* and/or *SFRP4*. Herein, one in three ($n=97$ of the 2nd validation set) is truly "affected" and is given a chance to be correctly identified, which appears in 8 LC-cases (TP-rate=9%, TN-rate=88%). We also noted that the histological subtypes are equally distributed between the branches (see Additional file 1: S-Table 7).

Figure 4: Decision tree for never smoker

Gene Expression

AHR, *Axin2*, *DKK3* are ubiquitously expressed, with RNA expression detected in many tissues and evidence for protein expression. *Axin2* and *DKK3* are moderately to highly expressed in normal lung tissues according to the Human Protein Atlas. [34] *AhR* is expressed at low levels in macrophage cells of the lung. No expression is reported for other

Wnt/AhR-genes. (see Additional file 1: S-Figure 9 and S-Table 9). Significant differential expression is listed in *Lung-GENS* for *AhR*, *Axin2*, *DKK2*, *DKK3* and *SFRP4* [36] (see Additional file 1: S-Table 8). Further, AhR is reported to be abundantly expressed in solid lung tumours, especially in adenocarcinomas. AhR overexpression was associated with upregulation of IL-6 secretion, which is critical for lung cancer initiation. [38] Detailed information on gene expression is given in the Appendix. In addition, the *DKK1* serum level was seen as significantly lower in NSCLC and SCLC patients compared to healthy controls. [39] Significant upregulation of *DKK2* expression was found in *APC* (adenomatous polyposis coli)-mutated non-SCLC lung cancers. [40]

Discussion

This investigation was intended to discover association of the *Wnt*-genes *DKK4* (8p11.21), *DKK3* (11p15.3), *DKK2* (4q25), *FRZB* (2q32.1, also known as *sFRP3*), *SFRP4* (7p14.1), *Axin2* (17q24.1) and a potential interaction with *AhR*-genes, to LC in a large sample of 26,458 individuals of European descent. No marginal association of *AhR/Wnt*-markers with overall LC was observed. Interestingly, an accumulation of associated markers was observed splitting the sample by smoking status, where respective markers in ever smokers are assigned to *SFRP4*. On the other hand, association analysis in never smokers reflects complex gene-gene interactions, as markers of several *AhR/Wnt*-genes were found to be genome-wide associated with LC. This complexity is also visible through the decision tree analysis.

Recently, marginal associations of the *AhR/Wnt*-markers were reported for lung cancer case from North India, although in a much smaller sample of about 600 individuals. [22, 23] A notable association with LC, e.g. for the *SFRP4* variant rs1802073 (OR=3.19; 95%-CI 1.81-5.63), was observed. Classification and Regression Tree (CART) analysis revealed an interaction of *DKK2* and *SFRP4* polymorphisms to be the best (off all investigated) predictors for LC; especially within smokers. They also reported several high-risk subgroups in smokers, e.g. characterised by *DKK2* (rs17037102 / rs419558) and *Axin2* (rs9915936). A similar picture has also been observed in a sample of 270 subjects from Istanbul, Turkey. [24]

We failed to directly replicate the single marker associations reported by Bahl et al. [22, 23] (North India) and Yilmaz et al. [24] (Turkey). The Indian population is known to be a mixture of several subpopulations [41], which can result in spurious associations. E.g. for rs7396187 assigned to *DKK3* Bahl et al. reported a protective effect (OR_{GC+CC vs}

cc=0.63, 95%-CI: 0.44–0.91, p=0.01); however, along with a significant departure from HWE in controls ($\chi^2=15.11$, df=2, p=0.001). In contrast, our analysed sample was carefully examined for ethnic homogeneity and principal components were used to adjust for population stratification. The reports by Bahl et al. and Yilmaz et al. are themselves contradictory in some details.

Yilmaz et al. reported a two-way interaction between *DKK3* (rs3206824) and *SFRP4* (rs1802074) to be predictive of LC. Among other constellations, Bahl et al. reported that *DKK3* and *SFRP4* were placed closely to each other by a Multifactor dimensionality reduction (MDR) for overall LC, while two markers of *SFRP4* were closely placed within smokers. In contrast, markers assigned to *Axin2*, but also to *AHR*, *FRZB* and *DKK2* were observed as associated within never smokers. According to Bahl et al. markers of *Axin2* and *DKK2* were in never smokers closely placed by a MDR, too. The discrepancy between the total sample and the subsample association estimates point to smoking mediated associations.

Our analysis agrees with both previous studies in that complex interaction patterns between the investigated genes contribute to LC susceptibility as entirety or within specific subgroups. To discover patterns of *Ahr/Wnt-genes* involved in LC genesis we further changed the focus from significance of association to inclusion in prediction models, and followed two approaches: First, we searched for polygenic risk scores (PRS). Doing so, we add up marker main effects to construct multidimensional scores, optimising model fit (instead of marker preselection by p-value below some threshold), in order to discriminate cases from controls in a somehow ideal way. Complex gene x gene (GxG) interactions are not modelled.

Nevertheless, the proportion of *Ahr/Wnt-genes* entering *some of the predictive* models was remarkable large, given that these markers are not, all other candidates however genome-wide significantly associated to LC. This was particularly noticeable for SCLC, since *Ahr/Wnt-markers* contribute more than twice as much to the prediction score as *LC-markers*. It is known, that within current smokers, tobacco consumption is strongest associated to SCLC. [42] Moreover, within never smokers, a stringed defined score is made up from only two *Ahr/Wnt-markers*, assigned to *Axin2* and *SFRP4*. However, the discriminative ability of PRSs for LC, contributing markers with significance for main effect at different levels, is in general poor. The AUC of the BIC^{LC} score for overall LC (0.58 in the test set and 0.55 in the 2nd validation set) corresponds to the AUC=0.54 based on four top *LC-genes* in a simulated population, as given

by the GWAS-ROCS Database (<https://gwasrocs.ca/>). This may be due to other overpowering risk factors, since models including e.g. age, sex and smoking variables achieve higher AUCs (0.62 to 0.79). [43]

Recently two polygenic risk scores (PRSs) for overall-LC had been developed, validated and assessed with respect to improving eligibility to low-dose computed tomography (LDCT) as the only recommended screening test for lung cancer. Jia et al. [44, 45] build a PRS on 19 genome-wide associated SNPs ($p < 0.5 \cdot 10^{-8}$). Hung et al. [46], integrated their PRS on 128 SNPs (35 “known” LC-related loci, 93 suggestive associated loci selected by LASSO-regression model) into the PLCO_{all2014} risk model. Both approaches have been validated using data from the UK Biobank. For both scores, the mean PRS differed only slightly between LC cases and cancer-free controls (Jia: effect size ~ 0.19 ; Hung: effect size ~ 0.22). For both scores, no substantial increase in discriminability of cases from controls is reported, when adding the PRS to existing risk models (Jia: family history – AUC=0.589, family history + PRS – AUC=0.615; Hung: PLCO_{all2014}–AUC=0.828, PLCO_{all2014}+ PRS – AUC=0.832). However, both were able to show that the age at which a smoker crosses the recommended screening threshold of 1.5% for the 5-year LC risk depends on the genetic background, which is sufficiently quantified by the PRS examined. Some smokers will be eligible by <50 years of age, others by > 60 years of age. Hence, constructing reliable PRS, even with small discriminability, may help to improve the performance of LDCT.

Two- and multiway GxG interaction can also contribute to LC susceptibility, rather than just markers with observed (marginal) main effects. GxG interaction is in general less commonly investigated, not only because this requires much larger samples. However, Li et al. [47] found RGL1:RAD51B in overall LC and non-SCLC, SYNE1:RNF43 in adenocarcinoma and FHIT:TSPAN8 in SqCLC to interactively contribute to LC susceptibility. As in the presented data analysis, the impact of these genes would also have been overlooked considering main effects only. Another reason could be that LC itself is just a generic term of several subcategories that differ in terms of LC initiation and require separate PRSs. [43, 48] A third reason of the poor performance may be due to the exclusively concentration on genetic effects, rather than modelling lifelong interaction with the environment as well. E.g. GxE interaction effects for LC have been observed smoking [49], exposure to asbestos fibres [50, 51] and exposure to radon [52, 53].

With this in mind, the data analysis presented shows that the complex interaction of Wnt-related genes has the potential to be part of an adequate risk assessment for never-smokers or in relation to certain histological subtypes of LC.

As a second approach, we constructed decision trees, which mainly depict GxG interaction patterns. Although, the ability to discriminate cases from controls is again poor, *CHRNA5* was in general the most important first node for overall LC and in many subgroups. *Ahr/Wnt-genes* play a complex but important role in at least one quarter of never smokers, as seen before. Remarkably, *TERT*, which links telomerase activity to *Wnt* signalling, was central in that branch and important for the remaining three quarters of never smoker. This corresponds to a concentration of relevant genes for this subgroup in the *CLPTM1L-TERT* region on chromosome 5, as previously reported by Hung et al.. [54] Our observations confirm the suspicion, that LC in never smokers is a different entity, justified beforehand on differences in epidemiological, clinical and molecular characteristics. [48]

We would like to emphasize that this study was not intended to provide a definitive and reliable risk assessment, but rather aimed to examine in depth the LC-relevant complex interaction pattern of *Ahr/Wnt-genes* hypnotized by Bahl et al.. Indeed, considering prediction instead of association provides weaker evidence for this, but is valid in view of the large amount of external evidence. The importance of the *Wnt*-signalling pathway and its antagonist's *sFRP*, *DKKs* and *Axin2* for cancer is outlined in the introduction. One can also assume a connection with the molecular functionality, since involved genes are expressed ubiquitously or in lung tissues. In summary, we were unable to replicate previously reported associations of *Wnt/Ahr-markers* with LC. However, we observed a small but significant impact of these genomic variants on PRSs or decision trees to predict LC.

Conclusions

The role of markers belonging to *Wnt* signalling and the *Ahr* pathway in LC susceptibility may be underrated in main-effects association analysis. Complex interaction patterns in individuals of European decent have moderate predictive capacity for LC or subsets thereof, especially in never smokers.

List of abbreviations

AhR Aryl hydrocarbon receptor

386	GWAS	genome-wide association studies
387	LC	lung cancer
388	NSCLC	non-small cell lung cancer
389	SCLC	small cell lung cancer
390	SqCLC	squamous cell lung cancer
391	adenoLC	adenocarcinoma lung cancer
392	OR	odds ratio
393	CART	classification and regression tree
394	AUCs of ROC	area under the receiver operation characteristic curve
395	ILCCO	International Lung Cancer Consortium
396	INTEGRAL	Integrative analysis of Lung Cancer Etiology and Risk
397	PRS	polygenic risk scores
398	BIC	Bayesian information criterion
399	AIC	Akaike information criterion
400	CV	cross validation
401	MAF	minor allele frequency
402	TP	true positive rate
403	TN	true negative rate
404	LDCT	low-dose computed tomography

Declarations

Ethics approval and consent to participate

All participants in this study signed an informed consent, approved by the local internal review board or ethics committee and administered by trained personnel. All consortium research received approval from the Dartmouth Committee for Protection of Human Subjects on 7/30/2014 with id STUDY00023602. All experimental protocols and other methods used comply with institutional, national, or international guidelines.

Consent for publication

Not applicable

Availability of data and materials

The data that support the findings of this study are available from ILCCO/INTEGRAL but restrictions apply to the availability of these data, which were used under license for the current study, and so are not publicly available. Data are however available from the authors upon reasonable request and with permission of ILCCO/INTEGRAL.

Competing interests

The authors declare that they have no competing interests

Funding

The National Institutes of Health (7U19CA203654-02/ 397 114564-5111078 Integrative Analysis of Lung Cancer Etiology and Risk) supported this work. CARET is funded by the National Cancer Institute, National Institutes of Health through grants U01 CA063673, UM1 CA167462, R01 CA 111703, RO1 CA 151989, U01 CA167462 and funds from the Fred Hutchinson Cancer Research Center. Other individual funding for participating studies and members of INTEGRAL-ILCCO are listed elsewhere [10, 30]. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Authors' contributions

A. R. designed the investigation, carried out parts of the formal analysis and wrote the main manuscript text. N.M. carried out parts of the formal analysis, prepared figures and critical reviewed and revised the manuscript. B.W. carried out parts of the formal analysis. R.J.H. and C.I.A. coordinate the research activity of the consortium, including

data curation and funding acquisition. H.B: supervised the investigation, including funding acquisition. R.J.H., H.B., L.L.M., C.I.A. and L.A.K. critical reviewed and revised the manuscript. A.C., A.H., A.R., A.S.A., A.T., C.C., D.A., D.C.C., E.J.D., F.T., G.E.G., G.F.-T., G.L., G.R., H.B., J.A.D., J.K.F., L.A.K., L.L.M., M.B.S., M.C.A., M.J., M.P.A.D., M.T.L., N.E.C., P.B., P.J.W., P.L., R.J.H., S.E.B., S.L., S.M.A., S.S.S., S.Z., T.L. and T.R.M. collected and provided study materials and data.

Acknowledgements

Not applicable

Supplementary Information

“Additional file 1.pdf” contains additional information on a) which marker were extracted from ILCCO OncoArray repository, b) single marker association, c) Polygenic Risk Scores (PRS) and Decision Trees and d) gene expression in normal tissue.

Tables and figures

Table 1 Smoking by LC status and subgroups

			Never smoker		Ever smoker					
Total			never		former		current		ever ^{\$}	
N			n	%	n	%	n	%	n	%
control	teenager	6	3	50%	--	--	3	50%	--	--
	young	2,756	948	34%	698	25%	893	32%	217	8%
	old	9,628	2,960	31%	3,572	37%	2,568	27%	528	5%
	all	12,390	3,911	32%	4,270	34%	3,464	28%	745	6%
case	SqCLC	3,692	138	4%	1,257	34%	2,158	58%	139	4%
	SCLC	1,450	48	3%	383	26%	965	67%	54	4%
	other LC	3,629	405	11%	1,200	33%	1,820	50%	204	6%
	AdenoLC	5,297	740	14%	1,989	38%	2,401	45%	167	3%
	young	2,765	281	10%	452	16%	1,945	70%	87	3%
	old	11,303	1,050	9%	4,377	39%	5,399	48%	477	4%
	all	14,068	1,331	9%	4,829	34%	7,344	52%	564	4%
total		26,458	5,242	20%	9,099	34%	10,808	41%	1,309	5%

[§] ..as recorded; SCLC: small cell lung cancer, SqCLC : squamous cell lung cancer, AdenoLC: adenocarcinoma of the lung, other LC: other histo-

logical subtypes; teenager: <21 young: years of age , 21 to 55 years of age, old: >55 years of age;

Figure 1: Association of *AhR*/*Wnt*-marker

Left panel: QQ-Plot for model 2 (adjusted for sex, age and smoking status and the first three principal components); right panel: matrix of p-values generated by model 1 (crude), model 2 (adjusted for sex, age and smoking status and the first three principal components) and model 3 (additionally adjusted for 6 selected *LC*-markers), genome-wide significance: $p\text{-value} \leq 10^{-7}$, suggestive significance: $10^{-7} < p\text{-value} \leq 10^{-5}$, nominal significance: $10^{-5} < p\text{-value} \leq 0.05$.

Table 2 Significantly associated *AhR*/*Wnt*-markers within never and ever smokers

SNP		Cyto band	MAF	gene		model 2		model 1	model 3		
					p-value	OR	95%-CI	OR	OR		
<i>never smoker</i>											
imputed	rs202198518 ^s	7p21.1	14%	<i>AHR</i>	3.4 10 ⁻¹³	0.72	0.66-0.79	0.71	0.90 ^{n.s.}		
imputed	rs2237297 ^s		14%		9.9 10 ⁻¹⁴	0.71	0.65-0.78	0.71	0.90 ^{n.s.}		
imputed	rs1133683		17q24.1		42%	<i>Axin2</i>	1.0 10 ⁻¹²	1.27	1.19-1.35	1.27	0.95 ^{n.s.}
imputed	rs2240307				5%		7.7 10 ⁻²⁴	0.41	0.34-0.49	0.40	0.62 ^{n.s.}
imputed	rs35285779 ^s		9%		3.2 10 ⁻²²	0.58	0.52-0.65	0.58	1.10 ^{n.s.}		
imputed	rs35415678 ^s		9%		3.7 10 ⁻¹⁹	0.62	0.56-0.69	0.62	1.10 ^{n.s.}		
imputed	rs288326	2q32.1	10%	<i>FRZB</i>	2.5 10 ⁻⁸	1.42	1.25-1.60	1.41	0.98 ^{n.s.}		
imputed	rs17037102	4q25	15%	<i>DKK2</i>	7.4 10 ⁻¹⁵	0.69	0.63-0.76	0.69	1.09 ^{n.s.}		
<i>ever smoker</i>											
genotyped	rs12532321	7p14.1	45%	<i>SFRP4</i>	1.3 10 ⁻⁹	1.14	1.09-1.19	1.15	1.13 ^{s.s.}		
genotyped	rs7811872		36%		1.3 10 ⁻⁸	0.88	0.84-0.92	0.88	0.88 ^{g.w.s.}		
genotyped	rs10226308		42%		1.8 10 ⁻⁸	0.88	0.85-0.92	0.89	0.89 ^{g.w.s.}		
genotyped	rs10488617		42%		1.6 10 ⁻⁸	0.88	0.85-0.92	0.89	0.89 ^{g.w.s.}		
genotyped	rs2722278		16%		5.6 10 ⁻¹⁰	1.20	1.13-1.27	1.16	1.20 ^{g.w.s.}		
genotyped	rs2722279		11%		9.0 10 ⁻⁹	1.22	1.14-1.31	1.17	1.23 ^{g.w.s.}		
genotyped	rs7811420		43%		7.9 10 ⁻⁸	0.89	0.85-0.93	0.89	0.89 ^{g.w.s.}		
imputed	rs2073664		8p11.21		9%	<i>DKK4</i>	9.4 10 ⁻¹¹	1.20	1.14-1.27	1.15	1.08 ^{s.s.}

MAF: minor allele frequency; model 1: crude odds ratio (OR); model 2: adjusted for sex, age and smoking status and the first three principal components; model 3: OR additional adjusted for 6 selected *LC*-markers. ^{g.w.s.} genome-wide significant ($p\text{-value} \leq 10^{-7}$); ^{s.s.} suggestive significant ($10^{-7} < p\text{-value} \leq 10^{-5}$); ^{n.s.} not significant ($p > 0.05$). Only markers are listed for which genome-wide significance ($p\text{-value} \leq 10^{-7}$) was achieved.

^{s, s} pair of markers in LD ($R^2 > 0.8$ in Populations of European decent)

456 **Figure 2: Comparison of score composition**

457

458

459

460

461

462

LC: lung cancer; AIC score: score of a logistic regression model with variant selection according to the Akaike information criterion (AIC); MAF_m : minor allele frequency of variant (marker) m ; β_m regression parameter of variant m ; LC-associated genes: previously reported as associated to LC or one of its histological subtypes; *Ahr/Wnt*-genes: selected genes assigned to Wnt-signalling, including *Ahr*; Smoker: ever, former and current smoker; SCLC: small cell lung cancer, SqCLC : squamous cell lung cancer, young: 21 to 55 years of age; TERT is framed in orange because telomerase activity is related to Wnt signalling.

Figure 3: ROC and precision-recall-plot: SCLC

Small cell lung cancer (SCLC)

The diagnostic performance of the AIC-score compared to the BIC/BIC^{LC}-score in the test-set is presented. Left panel: ROC (receiver operation characteristics); right panel: corresponding precision-recall plot; precision = (true positive cases) / (true positive cases + false positive controls), positive predictive value (PPV) = (sensitivity x pre-test-probability) / [(sensitivity x pre-test-probability) + (1-specificity x 1-pre-test-probability)] for a pre-test-probability of 5%.

469 **Figure 4:** Decision tree for never smoker

470

471 Node information: gene name, marker; split information below the node: threshold for minor allele count; blue split nodes: LC-genes, orange

472 split nodes: Ahr/Wnt-genes, ; TERT is framed in orange because telomerase activity is related to Wnt signalling; decision nodes and bars: green

473 for unaffected; red for affected, TN true negative rate, TP true positive red; the size of gene names, lines and decision notes is proportional to

474 the size of the respective (sub)sample

References

1. McKay JD, Hung RJ, Han Y, et al (2017) Large-scale association analysis identifies new lung cancer susceptibility loci and heterogeneity in genetic susceptibility across histological subtypes. *Nat Genet* 49:1126–1132
2. Timofeeva MN, Hung RJ, Rafnar T, et al (2012) Influence of common genetic variation on lung cancer risk: meta-analysis of 14 900 cases and 29 485 controls. *Human molecular genetics* 21:4980–95
3. Rosenberger A, Sohns M, Friedrichs S, et al (2017) Gene-set meta-analysis of lung cancer identifies pathway related to systemic lupus erythematosus. *PLOS ONE* 12:e0173339
4. Brenner DR, Brennan P, Boffetta P, et al (2013) Hierarchical modeling identifies novel lung cancer susceptibility variants in inflammation pathways among 10,140 cases and 11,012 controls. *Human genetics* 132:579–89
5. Ji X, Bossé Y, Landi MT, et al (2018) Identification of susceptibility pathways for the role of chromosome 15q25.1 in modifying lung cancer risk. *Nature Communications* 9:3221
6. Truong T, Sauter W, McKay JD, et al (2010) International Lung Cancer Consortium: coordinated association study of 10 potential lung cancer susceptibility variants. *Carcinogenesis* 31:625–633
7. Wang Y, Wei Y, Gaborieau V, et al (2015) Deciphering associations for lung cancer risk through imputation and analysis of 12 316 cases and 16 831 controls. *European Journal of Human Genetics* 23:1723–1728
8. Feng Y, Wang Y, Liu H, et al (2018) Novel genetic variants in the P38MAPK pathway gene ZAK and susceptibility to lung cancer. *Mol Carcinog* 57:216–224
9. Landi MT, Chatterjee N, Yu K, et al (2009) A genome-wide association study of lung cancer identifies a region of chromosome 5p15 associated with risk for adenocarcinoma. *American journal of human genetics* 85:679–91
10. Zhan T, Rindtorff N, Boutros M (2016) Wnt signaling in cancer. *Oncogene*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/onc.2016.304>
11. Buniello A, MacArthur JAL, Cerezo M, et al (2019) The NHGRI-EBI GWAS Catalog of published genome-wide association studies, targeted arrays and summary statistics 2019. *Nucleic Acids Res* 47:D1005–D1012
12. (2020) GWAS catalog. In: The NHGRI-EBI Catalog of human genome-wide association studies. <https://www.ebi.ac.uk/gwas/>. Accessed 22 Dec 2020
13. Kerdidani D, Chouvardas P, Arjo AR, et al (2019) Wnt1 silences chemokine genes in dendritic cells and induces adaptive immune resistance in lung adenocarcinoma. *Nat Commun*. <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41467-019-09370-z>
14. Fang L, Cai J, Chen B, et al (2015) Aberrantly expressed miR-582-3p maintains lung cancer stem cell-like traits by activating Wnt/beta-catenin signalling. *Nat Commun* 6:8640
15. Amos CI, Wu X, Broderick P, et al (2008) Genome-wide association scan of tag SNPs identifies a susceptibility locus for lung cancer at 15q25.1. *Nat Genet* 40:616–622
16. Yuan Y, Lu C, Xue L, Ge D (2014) Association between TERT rs2736100 polymorphism and lung cancer susceptibility: evidence from 22 case-control studies. *Tumor Biol* 35:4435–4442
17. Akiyama T (2000) Wnt/beta-catenin signaling. *Cytokine Growth Factor Rev* 11:273–82

- 511 18. Schneider AJ, Branam AM, Peterson RE (2014) Intersection of AHR and Wnt Signaling in Development, Health,
512 and Disease. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences* 15:17852–17885
- 513 19. Chang JT, Chang H, Chen PH, Lin SL, Lin P (2007) Requirement of aryl hydrocarbon receptor overexpression for
514 CYP1B1 up-regulation and cell growth in human lung adenocarcinomas. *Clin Cancer Res* 13:38–45
- 515 20. Lin P, Chang H, Tsai WT, Wu MH, Liao YS, Chen JT, Su JM (2003) Overexpression of aryl hydrocarbon receptor
516 in human lung carcinomas. *Toxicol Pathol* 31:22–30
- 517 21. Wang CK, Chang H, Chen PH, Chang JT, Kuo YC, Ko JL, Lin P (2009) Aryl hydrocarbon receptor activation and
518 overexpression upregulated fibroblast growth factor-9 in human lung adenocarcinomas. *Int J Cancer* 125:807–
519 15
- 520 22. Bahl C, Singh N, Behera D, Sharma S (2017) High-order gene interactions between the genetic polymorphisms
521 in Wnt and AhR pathway in modulating lung cancer susceptibility. *Personalized Medicine*.
522 <https://doi.org/10.2217/pme-2017-0018>
- 523 23. Bahl C, Singh N, Behera D, Sharma S (2017) Association of polymorphisms in Dickkopf (DKK) gene towards
524 modulating risk for lung cancer in north Indians. *Future Oncol* 13:213–232
- 525 24. Yilmaz M, Donmez G, Kacan T, Sari I, Akgül Babacan N, Sari M, Kilickap S (2015) Significant Association Between
526 Polymorphisms of Wnt Antagonist Genes and Lung Cancer: *Journal of Investigative Medicine* 1
- 527 25. Amos CI, Dennis J, Wang Z, et al (2017) The OncoArray Consortium: A Network for Understanding the Genetic
528 Architecture of Common Cancers. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 26:126–135
- 529 26. Machiela MJ, Chanock SJ (2015) LDlink: a web-based application for exploring population-specific haplotype
530 structure and linking correlated alleles of possible functional variants. *Bioinformatics* 31:3555–3557
- 531 27. Chang CC, Chow CC, Tellier LC, Vattikuti S, Purcell SM, Lee JJ (2015) Second-generation PLINK: rising to the
532 challenge of larger and richer datasets. *GigaScience* 4:1–16
- 533 28. Purcell S, Neale B, Todd-Brown K, et al (2007) PLINK: a tool set for whole-genome association and population-
534 based linkage analyses. *American journal of human genetics* 81:559–75
- 535 29. Stone M (1977) An Asymptotic Equivalence of Choice of Model by Cross-Validation and Akaike's Criterion.
536 *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society Series B (Methodological)* 39:44–47
- 537 30. Fang Y (2009) Asymptotic Equivalence between Cross-Validations and Akaike Information Criteria in Mixed-
538 Effects Models. *JDS* 15–21
- 539 31. DeLong ER, DeLong DM, Clarke-Pearson DL (1988) Comparing the areas under two or more correlated receiver
540 operating characteristic curves: a nonparametric approach. *Biometrics* 44:837–845
- 541 32. Andri S (2021) DescTools: Tools for Descriptive Statistics.
- 542 33. Therneau T, Atkinson B, Ripley B (2019) rpart: Recursive partitioning for classification, regression and survival
543 trees.
- 544 34. Uhlén M, Fagerberg L, Hallström BM, et al (2015) Tissue-based map of the human proteome. *Science*.
545 <https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1260419>
- 546 35. The Human Protein Atlas. <https://www.proteinatlas.org/>. Accessed 5 Feb 2021

547 36. LungGENS. <https://research.cchmc.org/pbge/lunggens/>. Accessed 5 Feb 2021

548 37. Du Y, Guo M, Whitsett JA, Xu Y (2015) "LungGENS": a web-based tool for mapping single-cell gene expression
549 in the developing lung. *Thorax* 70:1092–1094

550 38. Xue P, Fu J, Zhou Y (2018) The Aryl Hydrocarbon Receptor and Tumor Immunity. *Front Immunol.*
551 <https://doi.org/10.3389/fimmu.2018.00286>

552 39. Xu H, Wu J, Chen B, et al (2014) Serum Dickkopf-1 (DKK1) is significantly lower in patients with lung cancer but
553 is rapidly normalized after treatment. *Am J Transl Res* 6:850–856

554 40. Shen T, Chen Z, Qiao J, Sun X, Xiao Q (2019) Neutralizing monoclonal antibody against Dickkopf2 impairs lung
555 cancer progression via activating NK cells. *Cell Death Discovery* 5:1–12

556 41. Reich D, Thangaraj K, Patterson N, Price AL, Singh L (2009) Reconstructing Indian Population History. *Nature*
557 461:489–494

558 42. Lee PN, Forey BA, Coombs KJ (2012) Systematic review with meta-analysis of the epidemiological evidence in
559 the 1900s relating smoking to lung cancer. *BMC cancer* 12:385

560 43. Katki HA, Kovalchik SA, Petito LC, Cheung LC, Jacobs J, Jemal A, Berg CD, Chaturvedi AK (2018) Implications of
561 Nine Risk Prediction Models for Selecting Ever-Smokers for Computed Tomography Lung Cancer Screening.
562 *Annals of internal medicine.* <https://doi.org/10.7326/M17-2701>

563 44. Jia G, Lu Y, Wen W, Long J, Liu Y, Tao R, Li B, Denny JC, Shu X-O, Zheng W (2020) Evaluating the Utility of
564 Polygenic Risk Scores in Identifying High-Risk Individuals for Eight Common Cancers. *JNCI Cancer Spectr.*
565 <https://doi.org/10.1093/jncics/pkaa021>

566 45. Jia G, Wen W, Massion PP, Shu X-O, Zheng W (2021) Incorporating Both Genetic and Tobacco Smoking Data
567 to Identify High-Risk Smokers for Lung Cancer Screening. *Carcinogenesis.* <https://doi.org/10.1093/carcin/bgab018>
568

569 46. Hung RJ, Warkentin MT, Brhane Y, et al (2021) Assessing Lung Cancer Absolute Risk Trajectory Based on a
570 Polygenic Risk Model. *Cancer Res* 81:1607–1615

571 47. Li Y, Xiao X, Bossé Y, et al (2019) Genetic interaction analysis among oncogenesis-related genes revealed novel
572 genes and networks in lung cancer development. *Oncotarget* 10:1760–1774

573 48. Sun S, Schiller JH, Gazdar AF (2007) Lung cancer in never smokers--a different disease. *Nature reviews Cancer*
574 7:778–90

575 49. Saccone NL, Culverhouse RC, Schwantes-An T-H, et al (2010) Multiple Independent Loci at Chromosome
576 15q25.1 Affect Smoking Quantity: a Meta-Analysis and Comparison with Lung Cancer and COPD. *PLOS Genet-*
577 *ics* 6:e1001053

578 50. Liu CY, Stucker I, Chen C, Goodman G, McHugh MK, D'Amelio AM Jr, Etzel CJ, Li S, Lin X, Christiani DC (2015)
579 Genome-wide Gene-Asbestos Exposure Interaction Association Study Identifies a Common Susceptibility Var-
580 iant on 22q13.31 Associated with Lung Cancer Risk. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev* 24:1564–73

581 51. Wei S, Wang L-E, McHugh MK, Han Y, Xiong M, Amos CI, Spitz MR, Wei QW (2012) Genome-wide gene-envi-
582 ronment interaction analysis for asbestos exposure in lung cancer susceptibility. *Carcinogenesis* 33:1531–1537

- 583 52. Rosenberger A, Hung RJ, Christiani DC, et al (2018) Genetic modifiers of radon-induced lung cancer risk: a
584 genome-wide interaction study in former uranium miners. *Int Arch Occup Environ Health*.
585 <https://doi.org/10.1007/s00420-018-1334-3>
- 586 53. Lorenzo-González M, Ruano-Ravina A, Torres-Durán M, et al (2019) Residential radon, genetic polymorphisms
587 in DNA damage and repair-related. *Lung Cancer* 135:10–15
- 588 54. Hung RJ, Spitz MR, Houlston RS, et al (2019) Lung Cancer Risk in Never-Smokers of European Descent is Asso-
589 ciated With Genetic Variation in the 5p15.33 TERT-CLPTM1L Region. *J Thorac Oncol* 14:1360–1369
- 590 55. Du Y, Kitzmiller JA, Sridharan A, et al (2017) Lung Gene Expression Analysis (LGEA): an integrative web portal
591 for comprehensive gene expression data analysis in lung development. *Thorax* 72:481–484
- 592

Supplementary Files

This is a list of supplementary files associated with this preprint. Click to download.

- [DKKSupplementV4.1ohneVerweise.pdf](#)