# 1 Prognostic significance of protein-coding and long non-coding RNA expression profile in T-cell

# 2 acute lymphoblastic leukemia

Deepak Verma<sup>1</sup>, Shruti Kapoor<sup>7</sup>, Disha Sharma<sup>7</sup>, Jay Singh<sup>1</sup>, Gunjan Sharma<sup>6</sup>, Sarita Kumari<sup>1</sup>, 3 Mohit Arora<sup>6</sup>, Sameer Bakhshi<sup>2</sup>, Rachna Seth<sup>3</sup>, Baibaswata Nayak<sup>5</sup>, Atul Sharma<sup>2</sup>, Raja 4 Pramanik<sup>2</sup>, Jayanth Kumar Palanichamy<sup>6</sup>, Sridhar Siyasubbu<sup>7</sup>, Vinod Scaria<sup>7</sup>, Rajiye Kumar<sup>8</sup>, 5 Anita Chopra<sup>1\*</sup> 6 7 8 9 <sup>1</sup>Laboratory Oncology, Dr BRAIRCH, All India Institute of Medical Science, New Delhi, India 10 <sup>2</sup>Medical Oncology, Dr BRAIRCH, All India Institute of Medical Science, New Delhi, India 11 <sup>3</sup>Department of Pediatrics, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, India 12 <sup>4</sup>Department of Biostatistic, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, India <sup>5</sup>Department of Gastroenterology, All India Institute of Medical Science, New Delhi, India 13 <sup>6</sup>Department of Biochemistry, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi, India 14 15 <sup>7</sup>CSIR- Institute of Genomics and Integrative Biology, New Delhi, India 16 <sup>8</sup>Mahavir Cancer Institute & Research Centre, Patna, India 17 18 19 \*Corresponding Author: Anita Chopra, Laboratory Oncology, Dr BRAIRCH, All India Institute 20 of Medical Science, New Delhi, India 21 22 Email: dranitachopra@aiims.edu, chopraanita2005@gmail.com 23 24 Abstract

25 T-acute lymphoblastic leukemia (T-ALL) is an aggressive hematological malignancy associated with 26 poor outcome. To unravel gene-expression profile of immunophenotypic subtypes of T-ALL, we did 27 transcriptome analysis in 35 cases. We also analyzed the prognostic relevance of 23 targets: protein-28 coding genes, histone modifiers and long non-coding RNA (lncRNA) expression profile, identified on 29 RNA sequencing, on an independent cohort of 99 T-ALL cases. We found high expression of MEF2C to 30 be associated with prednisolone resistance (p=0.048) and CD34 expression (p=0.012). BAALC expression 31 was associated with expression of CD34 (p=0.032) and myeloid markers (p=0.021). XIST and KDM6a 32 expression levels were higher in females (p=0.047 and 0.011, respectively). Post-induction minimal 33 residual disease (MRD) positivity was associated with high lncRNA PCAT18 (p=0.04), HHEX (p=0.027) 34 and MEF2C (p=0.007). Early thymic precursor (ETP-ALL) immunophenotype was associated with high 35 expression of *MEF2C* (p=0.003), *BAALC* (p=0.003), *LYL1* (p=0.01), *LYN* (p=0.01), *XIST* (p=0.02) and low levels of *ST20* (*p*=0.007) and *EML4* (*p*=0.03). On survival analysis, *MEF2C* high expression
emerged as significant predictor of 3-year event free survival (EFS) (low 71.78±6.58% vs high
36.57±10.74%, HR 3.5, *p*=0.0003) and overall survival (OS) (low 94.77±2.96% vs high 78.75±8.45%,
HR 4.88, *p*=0.016) in our patients. LncRNA MALAT1 low expression also emerged as predictor inferior
OS (low 76.02±10.48 vs high 94.11±3.31, HR 0.22, *p*=0.027).

## 6 Keywords

7 RNA-Sequencing, T-cell acute lymphoblastic Leukemia, Early thymic precursor, LncRNA, Gene
8 expression profile.

# 9 Introduction

T-lineage acute lymphoblastic leukemia (T-ALL) accounts for ~25% of adults and 10%–15% of pediatric ALL cases<sup>1</sup>. In the past several years immunological, cytogenetic and genomic approaches have been extensively utilized for a better understanding of the genomic organization of functional elements and their alterations in leukemia. This, combined with techniques of cell biology, applied to T-ALL has led to major advances in our understanding of this disease and has allowed the development of novel therapeutic approaches.

16 The malignant transformation that culminates in T-ALL is a multi-step process, in which both genetic and

17 epigenetic alterations of key cellular pathways coordinate to produce the T-ALL phenotype (Peirs et al.,

18 2015; Girardi et al., 2017). T-ALL pathogenesis is characterized by an abnormality with highly variable

19 gene expression profiles. The genetic alterations and transcriptomic signatures are often used for

20 classification of T-ALL patients into molecular subtypes exhibiting distinct clinical outcomes which are

21 partly determined by their underlying oncogenic signalling pathways, such as *IL7R/JAK/STAT*,

22 *PI3K/AKT*<sup>5-7</sup> and *RAS/MEK/ERK*<sup>8</sup> signaling. Aberrant expression of a diverse group of transcription

- 23 factors such as LYL1, LMO1, LMO2, TAL1, TLX1, TLX3, HOXA, NKX2.1, NKX2.2, NKX2.5, MYC, MYB
- 24 and *SPI1* has been reported in distinct T-ALL subtypes<sup>3,4</sup>. Some of the less understood facets in T-ALL

include epigenetic deregulation, ribosomal dysfunction, and altered expression of oncogenic miRNAs and
 long non-coding RNA. Apart from the genetic alterations, epigenetic alterations such as DNA
 methylation, histone modifications, chromosomal remodelling are chromosomal topology have also been
 shown to be involved in T-ALL pathogenesis and modulation of clinical response (Van der Meulen et al.,
 2014; Kloetgen et al., 2020).

6 More recently, a greater understanding of molecular pathophysiology and immunophenotyping methods

7 led to the refinement of classification of T-ALL but the clinical relevance of these subtypes remains

8 controversial<sup>1,9-11</sup>. The only subtype of T-ALL which has got a place in the 2016 revision of WHO, is

9 early thymic precursor ALL (ETP-ALL)<sup>11,12</sup>. In this study, we analyzed the relevance of T-ALL

10 immunophenotyping and the expression pattern of protein-coding genes, epigenetic modifiers and long

11 non-coding RNAs in T-ALL classification and also determined their association with patient prognosis.

### 12 Materials and Methods

13 A total of 134 T-ALL cases, newly diagnosed based on morphology, cytochemistry and

14 immunophenotyping, were enrolled in this study. These cases were immunophenotypically classified into

15 immature (pro T- and pre T-), cortical and mature T-ALL based on the EGIL criteria<sup>13</sup>. ETP-ALL was

16 recognized based on the previously defined criteria<sup>12</sup>. The Patients were divided into 2 cohorts: discovery

17 (n=35) and validation cohort (n=99). Total RNA sequencing was done in the discovery cohort. The

18 clinical and prognostic relevance of transcriptomic features identified in the discovery cohort were tested

19 in the validation cohort. All patients or guardians gave informed consent for blood/bone marrow

20 collection and biological analyses, in agreement with the Declaration of Helsinki. The study was

21 approved by the Institutional Ethical Committee, All India Institute of Medical Sciences, New Delhi,

22 India. Transcriptome data of pooled RNA extracted from 5 normal human thymus samples were used as a

23 non-cancer control (kind courtesy Dr Jan Cools, Belgium).

24 Discovery cohort

1	In the discovery cohort (n=35), there were 13 immature (including 5 ETP-ALL), 17 cortical and 5 mature
2	T-ALL cases with a median age of 14 years (range,1 to55 year). There were 26 males (19 pediatrics,
3	7adults) and 9 females (7 pediatrics, 2 adults).

4

### 5 RNA sequencing and analysis of the discovery cohort

6 RNA was extracted from freshly isolated patient blood samples by the TRIzol method (Thermo Fisher 7 Scientific, Massachusetts, USA). Transcriptome data of pooled total RNAs from 5 normal human thymus 8 was used as a control (kindly gifted by Dr Jan Cools, Belgium) for analysis of epigenetic modifiers and 9 miRNA. Paired-end whole transcriptome sequencing was performed on the Illumina HiSeq2000 platform 10 using Truseq RNA sample preparation kit (Illumina, San Diego, California, U.S.). Sequence reads were 11 processed to identify the expression profile of protein-coding and non-coding RNAs by supervised and 12 unsupervised approaches (supplementary methods). To investigate the role of histone modifiers in T-13 ALL development, transcript abundance of epigenetic modifiers was measured across mature, cortical, 14 and immature subtypes of T-ALL (supplementary methods). To know the novel lncRNA transcript, a 15 computational pipeline combining Open Reading Frame (ORF) prediction coupled with coding potential 16 calculator (CPC algorithm) to annotate the *protein-coding* potential of transcripts, was used 17 (supplementary methods). Biomart was utilized to identify the annotated miRNA and transcripts. 18 Transcripts with  $\geq 2$ -FC were selected as differentially expressed putative coding and non-coding 19 transcripts in the given subgroup and heatmap were plotted using MeV. Gene Ontology enrichment and 20 KEGG pathway analyses were used to explore the potential biological processes, cellular components, 21 and molecular functions of differentially expressed genes (DEG). Gene functional analysis was done on 22 DAVID 6.8 database<sup>14,15</sup>. To predict the functions of highly overexpressed validated genes for the protein-23 coding genes, histone modifiers, lncRNA in all three subgroups of T-ALL, a correlation network analysis 24 was performed using the Rcorr package in R based on Spearman correlation and visualized using 25 Cytoscape<sup>16</sup>. Detailed methods are described in the supplementary methods.

1	Validation cohort: Candidate genes found differentially expressed in the discovery cohort were further
2	validated through real-time PCR in an independent cohort of 99 {46 immature (including 15 ETP-ALL),
3	43 cortical, 10 mature} T-ALL cases including 70 pediatrics (61 males, 9 females), 29 adults (25 males, 4
4	females). The age of the patients ranged from 3 to 65 years with a median age of 12 years. The expression
5	levels of 23 targets: BAALC, HHEX, MEF2C, FAT1, LYL1, LMO2, LYN, TAL1, DOT1L, XIST, PCAT18,
6	PCAT14, LNC202, LNC461, LNC648, MEF2C-AS1, ST20, RAG, EP300, EML4, EZH2, MALAT1 and
7	KDM6A were compared with patient characteristics and survival. (Supplementary Methods). The
8	relative quantitation method by real-time PCR was used to calculate the fold change in gene
9	expression relative to housekeeping gene ABL1. Consistently selected genes from discovery and
10	validation cohort followed the similar distribution of expression. Detailed experimental plan used
11	to study the discovery and validation cohorts is mentioned in Supplementary Methods.
12	Treatment
12 13	<b>Treatment</b> In the discovery cohort, 14 patients were treated with ICICLE protocol, 3 with Berlin-Frankfurt-Munster-
12 13 14	Treatment In the discovery cohort, 14 patients were treated with ICICLE protocol, 3 with Berlin-Frankfurt-Munster- 90 (BFM-90) protocol, 1 with INCTR, 1 with Holzer's protocol and 3 with hyper CVAD. 13 patients did
12 13 14 15	Treatment In the discovery cohort, 14 patients were treated with ICICLE protocol, 3 with Berlin-Frankfurt-Munster- 90 (BFM-90) protocol, 1 with INCTR, 1 with Holzer's protocol and 3 with hyper CVAD. 13 patients did not receive treatment/succumbed to the disease before taking treatment.
12 13 14 15 16	TreatmentIn the discovery cohort, 14 patients were treated with ICICLE protocol, 3 with Berlin-Frankfurt-Munster-90 (BFM-90) protocol, 1 with INCTR, 1 with Holzer's protocol and 3 with hyper CVAD. 13 patients didnot receive treatment/succumbed to the disease before taking treatment.In the validation cohort, seventy-one patients were treated with ICICLE protocol, 15 with Berlin-
12 13 14 15 16 17	TreatmentIn the discovery cohort, 14 patients were treated with ICICLE protocol, 3 with Berlin-Frankfurt-Munster-90 (BFM-90) protocol, 1 with INCTR, 1 with Holzer's protocol and 3 with hyper CVAD. 13 patients didnot receive treatment/succumbed to the disease before taking treatment.In the validation cohort, seventy-one patients were treated with ICICLE protocol, 15 with Berlin-Frankfurt-Munster-90 (BFM-90) protocol and 3 with Hyper CVAD. Ten patients did not take any
12 13 14 15 16 17 18	TreatmentIn the discovery cohort, 14 patients were treated with ICICLE protocol, 3 with Berlin-Frankfurt-Munster-90 (BFM-90) protocol, 1 with INCTR, 1 with Holzer's protocol and 3 with hyper CVAD. 13 patients didnot receive treatment/succumbed to the disease before taking treatment.In the validation cohort, seventy-one patients were treated with ICICLE protocol, 15 with Berlin-Frankfurt-Munster-90 (BFM-90) protocol and 3 with Hyper CVAD. Ten patients did not take anytreatment. Two patients died during induction chemotherapy. Complete remission was defined as bone
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19	Treatment In the discovery cohort, 14 patients were treated with ICICLE protocol, 3 with Berlin-Frankfurt-Munster-90 (BFM-90) protocol, 1 with INCTR, 1 with Holzer's protocol and 3 with hyper CVAD. 13 patients did not receive treatment/succumbed to the disease before taking treatment. In the validation cohort, seventy-one patients were treated with ICICLE protocol, 15 with Berlin-Frankfurt-Munster-90 (BFM-90) protocol and 3 with Hyper CVAD. Ten patients did not take any treatment. Two patients died during induction chemotherapy. Complete remission was defined as bone marrow blasts <5% with a recovery of blood counts at the end of 4 weeks of induction chemotherapy.
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20	TreatmentIn the discovery cohort, 14 patients were treated with ICICLE protocol, 3 with Berlin-Frankfurt-Munster-90 (BFM-90) protocol, 1 with INCTR, 1 with Holzer's protocol and 3 with hyper CVAD. 13 patients didnot receive treatment/succumbed to the disease before taking treatment.In the validation cohort, seventy-one patients were treated with ICICLE protocol, 15 with Berlin-Frankfurt-Munster-90 (BFM-90) protocol and 3 with Hyper CVAD. Ten patients did not take anytreatment. Two patients died during induction chemotherapy. Complete remission was defined as bonemarrow blasts <5% with a recovery of blood counts at the end of 4 weeks of induction chemotherapy.
12 13 14 15 16 17 18 19 20 21	Treatment         In the discovery cohort, 14 patients were treated with ICICLE protocol, 3 with Berlin-Frankfurt-Munster-         90 (BFM-90) protocol, 1 with INCTR, 1 with Holzer's protocol and 3 with hyper CVAD. 13 patients did         not receive treatment/succumbed to the disease before taking treatment.         In the validation cohort, seventy-one patients were treated with ICICLE protocol, 15 with Berlin-         Frankfurt-Munster-90 (BFM-90) protocol and 3 with Hyper CVAD. Ten patients did not take any         treatment. Two patients died during induction chemotherapy. Complete remission was defined as bone         marrow blasts <5% with a recovery of blood counts at the end of 4 weeks of induction chemotherapy.

# 23 Statistical analyses

1 Fisher's exact test for categorical data and the nonparametric Mann-Whitney U for continuous variables 2 were used to compare baseline clinical variables across groups in the validation cohort. A P-value < 0.053 (two-sided) was considered significant. Event-free survival (EFS) was defined as the time from diagnosis 4 to the date of the last follow-up in complete remission or the first event (i.e., induction failure, relapse, 5 secondary neoplasm, or death from any cause). Failure to achieve remission due to non-response was 6 considered an event at time zero. Survival was defined as the time from diagnosis to death or the last 7 follow-up. Patients lost to follow-up were censored at the last contact. The last follow up was carried out 8 on April 2020. The Kaplan-Meier method was used to estimate survival rates, with the differences 9 compared using a two-sided log-rank test. Univariate and multivariate Cox proportional hazard models were constructed for EFS and OS. Covariates included sex, WBC ( $<50X10^9/L$ ,  $>50X10^9/L$ ), age (<1210 11 years vs. >12 years), gene expression, immunophenotype and response to prednisolone treatment and 12 presence of minimal residual disease after the end of induction chemotherapy. Patients with high and low 13 expression were delineated using maximally selected rank statistics as implemented in the maxstat R 14 package (http://cran.r-project.org/web/packages/maxstat/ index.html) for each target (BAALC, HHEX, 15 MEF2C, FAT1, LYL1, LMO2, LYN, TAL1, DOT1L, XIST, PCAT18, PCAT14, LINC00202, LINC00461, 16 LINC00648, MEF2C-AS1, ST20, RAG1, EP300, EML4, EZH2, MALAT1 and KDM6A). Statistical 17 analyzed were performed using the SPSS statistical software package (version 20.0), STATA software 18 (version 11) and R statistical software (version). 19 **Data Availability** 20 The RNA-Seq raw data that support the findings of this study are available from the corresponding author 21 upon reasonable request. 22 23 RESULTS

- 24 A. Discovery cohort
- 25 Distinct profiling of differentially expressed genes expression among T-ALL immunophenotype

1	Comparison of gene expression profile among the three different subtypes defined by
2	immunophenotyping revealed a total of 2,318 genes to be differentially expressed (Figure 2a)
3	(supplementary1-4). In immature T-ALL subtype, transcription factors which control early
4	hematopoiesis, such as MEF2C, TP63, HHEX, RUNX2, HOXA10, HOXA9, RUNX1T1 and ZBTB16;
5	homeobox gene like HOPX; LYL1, LMO2 and LYN (a tyrosine kinase coding gene) were highly
6	expressed. Interestingly, LMO2 was previously reported to be expressed under the presence of
7	LYL1 gene only but in our data LMO2 was found upregulated in the absence of significant
8	overexpression of LYL1, a gene reported to be critical for oncogenic functions of LMO2. BAALC
9	and MN1 genes, previously reported in AML <sup>17</sup> , were overexpressed. BAALC associated genes like
10	<i>IGFBP7</i> and <i>PROM1</i> (CD133), which are known to confer chemoresistance, were also overexpressed <sup>18</sup> .
11	Also, MAML3, NT5E (CD73) and ARID5B had significant overexpression in immature T-ALL.
12	Moreover, genes not previously described in T-ALL like PLD4 and TP63, were overexpressed. In
13	cortical T-ALL, the cortical thymocytes - defining CD1A gene was overexpressed. Homeobox domain
14	genes, NKX2-1, TLX1, TLX3, involved in T-cell development were overexpressed. Also, FAT1, FAT3,
15	RAG1, EREG, CD1C, AKAP-2, IL-4, PRTG, TCL-6, ZP1 and TRAV genes were overexpressed.
16	Comparison of CD1a+/sCD3+ and CD1a+/sCD3- groups, revealed that <i>TLX1</i> , in contrast to reported
17	literature (Ferrando 2002), was overexpressed in the former group whereas TLX3 was overexpressed in
18	the latter. In mature T-ALL, APC2, BCL3, CCR4, CDKN2A, EML4, HIST1H4G, HIST2H2B, NCOR2,
19	ST20 and TRAV22 genes were overexpressed (figure 2a). TAL1 expression was seen in T-ALL cases with
20	mature immunophenotype. A complete list of DEG is shown in the supplementary file.
21	Unsupervised immunophenotype analysis segregates mixed T-ALL gene expression profile
22	into three distinct clusters
23	Principal component analysis (PCA) was performed to determine variabilities in gene expression profiles

24 (GEPs) in T-ALL concerning normal thymus tissue (kind courtesy, Dr Jan Cools, Belgium). We observed

that these GEPs could be broadly separated in 3 major clusters (figure 2b), in which **Cluster 1**, **Cluster 2** 

1	and Cluster 3 comprised 5, 9 and 19 cases, respectively. Three samples including one normal thymus
2	were not present in any cluster. In major cluster 1, all 9 samples had immature T-ALL immunophenotype
3	and further encompassed 2 sub-clusters consisting of 4 samples each while one remaining sample did not
4	fall in any of the two sub-clusters. In 1 <sup>st</sup> sub-cluster, 3 samples had ETP-ALL CD5 <sup>-</sup> immunophenotype
5	and one sample were $CD5^+$ near-ETP-ALL (pre-T-ALL). In $2^{nd}$ sub-cluster, three samples were near-
6	ETP-ALL (pre/pro-T-ALL) and one sample was ETP-ALL. Major cluster 2 consisted of 5 samples, all
7	were cortical T-ALL. In major cluster 3, out of 19 samples, 3 were immature, 4 mature and the remaining
8	were cortical T-ALL. Three samples that did not fall into any of the major clusters consisted of normal
9	thymus, immature and mature T-ALL, respectively. Interestingly, principal component analysis
10	placed the mixed T-ALL cases into three distinct categories of T-ALL subclasses.
11	mRNA expression profiling of epigenetic modifiers in T-ALL
12	Analysis of genes which are primarily involved in the epigenetic regulation revealed overexpression of
13	SETD2, ATM, ASHIL, KDM6A, PHF6, SUZ12 and HDAC4 in all subtypes of T-ALL concerning normal
14	thymic tissue. Furthermore, In immature T-ALL, HDAC9 and SMYD3 were overexpressed while EZH2
15	was under-expressed. HDAC10 was under-expressed in cortical T-ALL. In mature T-ALL, EP300,
16	PKN1, EML4, DOT1L were overexpressed while HDAC7 was under-expressed in immature and cortical
17	T-ALL. (figure 3b)
18	Functional gene annotation and pathway analysis
19	To determine the biological role of DEG, which were observed during comparison of GEP in different
20	subtypes, we performed gene ontology analysis. These DEG were strongly involved in the various
21	biological processes including pathways involved in the inflammatory response, immune response, T cell
22	co-stimulation, positive regulation of interferon-gamma production, signal transduction, cell-cell
23	signaling, cell adhesion and migration. Their involvement may lead to abnormal function of various
24	cellular components comprising plasma membrane, cell surface, extracellular space, an integral
25	component of the plasma membrane, extracellular region, transcription factor complex, an

1 integral component of the membrane and secretory granules. A complete list of biological processes 2 and cell components are mentioned in figure 4a,b. We further tried to disintegrate the molecular pathways 3 by KEGG in which the immunophenotype associated DEG could be involved. This analysis demonstrated 4 enrichment of cellular pathways such as hematopoietic cell lineage, allograft rejection, transcriptional 5 dysregulation in cancer, toll-like receptor signaling pathway, graft-versus-host disease, cytokine-cytokine 6 receptor interaction, cell adhesion molecules (CAMs). Detailed pathways information showed in figure 7 4c. **Co-expression network analysis** 8 9 Co-expression networks were constructed for differentially expressed genes between the immature, 10 cortical and mature subgroups (with correlation score $\geq 0.9$ ). The genes included in the analysis 11 were highly expressed in our RNA seq data of T-ALL patients. Table 1 shows the relation among 12 the protein-coding and non-coding genes. Coexpression networks of BAALC, MEF2C, lncRNA and 13 epigenetic modifiers are described in supplimentry figures 1a-b, 2a-b respectively. 14 Long non-coding RNA (IncRNA) 15 RNA-seq analysis post annotation and differential expression analysis resulted in 2,243 lncRNAs 16 which were expressed in the T-ALL samples. A total of 223 lncRNAs were filtered based on the 17 criteria of >2FPKM scores. We observed differentially enriched lncRNA in the subgroup of T-ALL such 18 as HOTTIP in immature T-ALL; LINC01221, LINC00202, LINC00461, LINC00648 in cortical T-ALL 19 and MALAT1, ST20 and TRBV11 in mature T-ALL, to be overexpressed. Interestingly, these lncRNAs 20 have not been earlier reported in T-ALL (figure 3a). X-inactive specific transcript (XIST), which is known 21 to have a role in multiple cancers, was expressed in both immature and cortical T-ALL<sup>19</sup>. LUNAR1, 22 which is known to be a specific NOTCH1-regulated lncRNA, was expressed in cortical and mature T-23 ALL<sup>20</sup>. The co-expression network for HOTTIP, which was highly expressed in immature T-ALL, was 24 constructed and observed to exhibit a strong positive correlation with important transcription factors, 25 having a role in/ previously reported to be involved in T-ALL pathogenesis. (supplimentry figure 2a). In

comparison with normal thymus transcriptome, we found lncRNAs, PCAT14 and PCAT18, to be
 significantly overexpressed in T-ALL cases.

In addition to the annotated lncRNA though less explored in T-ALL, we also identified 1,290 novel putative *non-coding* transcripts or lncRNA in our data. All transcripts which overlapped coding potential were removed from the analysis as these could potentially contribute to falsepositive annotations.

- 7
- 8 Validation cohort

# 9 Correlation between gene expression, response to chemotherapy and outcome

10 The mRNA expression levels of differentially expressed 23 targets selected from discovery cohort based

11 on their variable expression pattern in distinct immunophenotype, including protein-coding genes,

12 epigenetic modifiers and lncRNA transcripts: BAALC, HHEX, MEF2C, FAT1, LYL1, LMO2, LYN, TAL1,

13 DOT1L, XIST, PCAT18, PCAT14, LNC202, LNC461, LNC648, MEF2C-AS1, ST20, RAG, EP300, EML4,

14 EZH2, MALAT1 and KDM6A. These genes were further validated in the validation cohort to assess their

15 clinical significance. Interestingly inconsistency to the results obtained in RNA seq analysis we observed

16 the similar pattern of overexpression in distinct immunophenotypes in the validation cohort. High

17 expression of BAALC (p=0.001), MEF2C (p=0.002), LYL1 (0.018), HHEX (p=0.007) and low expression

18 of *EZH2* (*p*=0.005) were found significantly associated with the immature T-ALL immunophenotype.

19 *RAG1* and FAT1 expression were higher in cortical T-ALL (*p*=0.004 and 0.033, respectively). *DOT1L* 

20 expression was higher in mature T-ALL (p=0.025). ETP-ALL immunophenotype was associated with

21 high levels of BAALC (p=0.003), MEF2C (p=0.003), LYL1 (p=0.01), LYN (p=0.01), XIST (p=0.02) and

lower levels of ST20 (p=0.007) and EML4 (p=0.03). We also observed an association between CD34

positivity on immunophenotyping with expression levels of BAALC (p=0.032) and MEF2C (p=0.012).

24 Myeloid markers (CD13/CD33) expression on immunophenotyping was associated with high BAALC

(p=0.021) and low ST20 (p=0.007) and low KDM6A (p=0.026). We did not find any significant

1	association between T-ALL subtype and expression levels of PCAT14, PCAT18, TAL1, LMO2, XIST,
2	ST20, EP300, EML4, KDM6A, LINC00202, LINC00461 and LINC00648. Of the 99 T-ALL patients in
3	the validation cohort, RNA sample was inadequate quality and quantity was available for the
4	determination of MEF2C in 99; BAALC, HHEX, LYL1, TAL1, FAT1, XIST and TAL1 in 87 cases; LMO2,
5	DOT1L and LYN in 78; LINC00648, PCAT18 and LINC00461 in 72; MEF2C-AS1, PCAT14 and
6	LINC00202 in 76; ST20, RAG1, EP300 and EML4 in 84; EZH2 and KDM6A in 82 and MALAT1 in 81
7	cases due to inadequacy of the samples.

## 8 Association of protein and non-coding RNAs levels with patient variables

9 On analysis of the potential association of patient's characteristics with expression levels of protein and

10 non-coding RNAs, we found an association between RAG1 expression and age of the patients. RAG1

11 expression was higher in patients <12 years as compared to age  $\geq$ 12 years (p=0.034). XIST and KDM6A

12 expression were higher in females (p=0.047; 0.011, respectively). We did not find any association

13 between WBC count at diagnosis and all parameters tested. Patients with low *XIST* expression and high

14 *TAL1* more frequently had NCI high risk (*p*=0.01). Prednisolone resistance was associated with high

15 *MEF2C* expression (p=0.048). Post-induction MRD positivity ( $\geq 0.01\%$ ) was associated with high

16 expression of PCAT18 (p=0.04), *HHEX* (p=0.027) and *MEF2C* (p=0.007). (Table 2)

#### 17 Survival analysis

- 18 Complete remission was achieved in 78 (87.64%) patients with induction chemotherapy. Median follow
- 19 up was 22 months. The 3 year EFS ( $\pm$ SE) and OS ( $\pm$ SE) was 62.23 $\pm$ 5.86% and 90.40 $\pm$ 3.24%,
- 20 respectively. On univariate analysis, we observed high *MEF2C* expression (low 71.78+6.58% vs high
- 21 36.57+10.74, HR 3.5, 95% confidence interval 1.67-7.3, *p*=0.0003), high *LYL1* expression (low
- 22 63.14+6.65% vs 26.67+15.9%, HR 2.69, 95% confidence interval 1.08-6.69, *p*=0.029), low *ST20* (low
- 23 43.21<u>+</u>13.56 vs high 61.02<u>+</u>7.26, HR 0.45, 95% confidence interval 0.19-1.03, *p*=0.049), low *RAG1*
- 24 expression (low  $41.67\pm12.9$  vs high  $61.24\pm7.49$ , HR 0.45, 95% confidence interval 0.20-0.99, p=0.037),

1	low <i>EML4</i> expression (low 45.29+8.92 vs 83.33+8.78, HR 0.26, 95% confidence interval 0.078-0.88,
2	p=0.018) and low <i>KDM6A</i> expression (low 50.48+7.58 vs high 83.33+8.78, HR 0.27, 95% confidence
3	interval 0.062-1.12, $p=0.049$ ) were significantly associated with poor 3-year EFS (Table 3). In addition,
4	age≥12 years and ETP-ALL immunophenotype were also associated with poor 3-year EFS (Table 3). We
5	also found high <i>MEF2C</i> expression (low 94.77+2.96 vs high 78.75+8.45, HR 4.88, 95% confidence
6	interval 1.16-20.40, <i>p</i> =0.016), low <i>DOT1L</i> expression (low 68.38 <u>+</u> 3.15 vs high 92.64 <u>+</u> 3.55, HR 0.22,
7	95% confidence interval 0.06-0.88, $p=0.019$ ), low RAG1 expression (low 75±10.83 vs high 92.54±3.6,
8	HR 0.25, 95% confidence interval 0.06-0.98, $p=0.03$ ) and low MALAT1 expression (low 76.02+10.48 vs
9	high 94.11 $\pm$ 3.31, HR 0.22, 95% confidence interval 0.048-0.97, $p$ =0.027) to be significantly associated
10	with poor 3-year OS (Table 3). On multivariate analysis for EFS, we found high MEF2C expression (HR
11	3.25, $p=0.017$ ) to be significantly associated with inferior EFS (Table 4a). We also found <i>MEF2C</i>
12	expression (HR 6.73, $p=0.04$ ) and low MALAT1 expression (HR 0.16, $p=0.031$ ) to be significantly
13	associated with inferior OS (Table 4b).

## 14 Discussion

15 With the advancement of molecular techniques, T-ALL has been extensively molecularly characterized.

16 Although genetically heterogeneous, T-ALL can be categorized into various subtypes based on gene

17 expression profiles. Although, unlike B-ALL, molecular features in T-ALL have not been utilized for risk

18 stratification in clinical practice. Furthermore, only a limited number of studies have recently reported

19 prognostic relevance of lncRNAs and epigenetic modifiers in T-ALL. In this study on 134 T-ALL cases,

20 we performed high throughput RNA sequencing in the discovery cohort (n=35) and identified several

21 protein-coding and non-coding transcripts which exhibit differential expression among

22 immunophenotypic subtypes of T-ALL viz. immature, cortical and mature T-ALL. Furthermore, we also

validated the expression of 23 identified targets in T-ALL patients and assessed their clinical significance.

24 The key genes which served as transcription factors in early hematopoiesis like *MEF2C*, *LYL1*, *LMO2*,

25 HHEX, RUNX2, HOXA10, HOXA9, RUNX1T1 and ZBTB16 were upregulated in immature T-ALL.

1	<i>MEF2C</i> dysregulation has been previously shown in immature T-ALL <sup>21-27</sup> . Our previous study also
2	showed the clinical importance of MEF2C in predicting prognosis of the ETP-ALL T-ALL patient (Singh
3	et al 2020). Colomer-Lahiguera S, et al <sup>22</sup> , reported that <i>MEF2C</i> dysregulation in T-ALL is associated with
4	CDKN1B deletion and poor response to prednisolone therapy. We also found an association between
5	prednisolone resistance and high MEF2C expression. Starza et al <sup>28</sup> showed its upregulation in T-ALL
6	cases with interstitial deletion of 5q. Nagel et $al^{27}$ proposed distinct mechanisms for aberrant <i>MEF2C</i>
7	gene expression, either by NKX2-5 signaling or by chromosomal deletion of 5q. They also showed that
8	MEF2C inhibits BCL2-regulated apoptosis by inhibition of NR4A1/NUR77 <sup>27</sup> . In addition to this,
9	Kawashima-Goto et al, 2015 <sup>23</sup> , reported that BCL2 inhibitors may be useful for treating T-ALL with high
10	expression levels of MEF2C. On network analysis, MEF2C gene expression was found to interact with
11	protein and non-protein-coding partners: HOPX, KIT, BAALC, HHEX, EMP1, LYL1, BCL, SMYD3,
12	HDAC9, HOTTIP, HOTAIR, LINC01021, XIST, MIR3142HG, MIR3132, MIR4741, SNORD100,
13	SNORD101.
14	In our study, MN1, BAALC and IGFBP7 were overexpressed in immature T-ALL. The upregulation of

15 these genes is believed to arise from T-cell progenitors retaining myeloid differentiation potential<sup>29-31</sup>.

16 Previous studies suggest that overexpression of these genes is associated with poor outcome and

17 resistance to chemotherapy $^{29,32-35}$ . Baldus et al, 2007<sup>33</sup>, reported that high *BAALC* expression was

18 associated with poor long-term survival in T-ALL. On contrary to their observation, we did not find any

19 significant association between BAALC expression and prednisolone sensitivity. Like previous studies, we

20 found *BAALC* overexpression to be associated with the expression of CD34 and myeloid markers<sup>29,31</sup>.

21 However, we did not find any association between *BAALC* expression and patient outcome. We also

22 found overexpression of ZBTB16 (PLZF) in our patients of immature T-ALL, although not stressed in

23 previous western studies, was a notable finding in a recently reported study<sup>21,36</sup>. *ZBTB16* (or

24 promyelocytic leukemia zinc finger, PLZF) contains one BTB domain and nine zinc finger motifs. Its

25 overexpression was shown in this study to be a result of ZBTB16-ABL1 translocation and occurred in

1	different patients along with other mutations, including NOTCH1, ZEB2, PTEN, MYCN, and PIK3CD.
2	Laboratory studies with both in vitro and mouse model suggest ZBTB16-ABL1 be a driver leukemogenic
3	lesion that causes increased proliferation and a heightened protein tyrosine kinase (PTK) activity that is
4	amenable to tyrosine kinase inhibitor (TKI) activity <sup>21</sup> . These findings indicate that our ZBTB16-
5	expressing patients have the same translocation. Our finding is of significance also because along with
6	LYN overexpression, T-ALL patients with ZBTB16 overexpression may also benefit from TKIs.
7	Apart from these known genes, we identified aberrantly expression of some genes which have not been
8	reported in T-ALL patients such as RUNX1T1, RUNX2, PLD4, NT5E (CD73), HOPX, TP63, HOXA11-
9	AS. A role for RUNX2 in T-ALL has been suggested in a study by Nagel et al, 2011, who, to uncover
10	additional target genes, investigated in detail the aberrant expression of MEF2C mediated by complex
11	deletion at 5q, $del(5)(q14)$ in T-ALL cell line <sup>26</sup> . This could be an evidential proof where RUNX2 instead
12	of RUNX1 could be involved in the manifestation of ETP-ALL that allows in vivo functional evaluation
13	of putative oncogenes and allows preclinical drug testing.
14	Further, some of the observed differentially expressed gene in cortical T-ALL such as CD1A, CD1C,
15	CD4, CFTR, FAT3, NKX2-1, TLX1, TLX3 and RAG1 have been previously reported while we observed
16	three additional genes, EREG, PAX and, ZIC2 to be upregulated in the present study.
17	Neumann et al 2013, in a study of adult ETP-ALL, showed that cadherins FAT1 (25%) and FAT3
18	(20%) were mutated, implicating alterations in cell adhesion, and activation of the Wnt
19	pathway <sup>37</sup> . Neumann et al, $2014^{38}$ , showed that <i>FAT1</i> expression was correlated with a more
20	mature leukemic immunophenotype in T-ALL, with 74% patients with thymic T-ALL being
21	FAT1 positive compared with 45% of patients with mature T-ALL and only 4% of early T-ALL
22	patients. This is in line with our results, as we observed that FAT1 was associated with cortical
23	immunophenotype in our study. Like previous study <sup>38</sup> , we did not find any correlation between
24	FAT1 expression and patient outcome.

1 Mature T-ALL is a rare subgroup and immunophenotypically diagnosed by CD1a- and sCD3+.

- 2 Molecularly *TAL1* has been identified as a driver gene for late cortical T-ALL<sup>1</sup>. We observed *TAL1* be
- 3 overexpressed in both mature and cortical T-ALL in our study. Among the protein-coding genes, APC2,
- 4 BCL3, CCR4, ST20, EML4 and NCOR2 were some of the key upregulated genes.

5 Aberrant histone modifications are the hallmark for cancer and are associated with dysregulated 6 expression of histone modifiers. Therefore, we also studied their expression pattern of epigenetic 7 modifiers to identify a set of histones modifying enzymes to be upregulated or downregulated specifically 8 to the subtype of T-ALL. EZH2, a member of the polycomb repressor complex, which is known to be 9 under-expressed in our immature T-ALL cases. This may be related to their previously reported mutations 10 in immature T-ALL<sup>39</sup>. Danis et al<sup>40</sup>, mechanistically linked *EZH2* inactivation to stem-cell-associated 11 transcriptional programs and increased growth/survival signaling, features that convey an adverse 12 prognosis in patients. However, we did not observe the association between EZH2 expression and clinical 13 outcome. Loss-of-function mutations and deletions in SETD2 have been shown to lead to chemotherapy 14 tolerance and clonal survival by cell cycle arrest followed by apoptosis. Further, overexpression of 15 SETD2 has been demonstrated to confer chemotherapy resistance in a variety of cancers including 16 leukemias<sup>39,41-43</sup>. We also observed overexpression of *SETD2* in T-ALL as compared to the normal 17 thymus. Therefore, the potential role of SETD2 overexpression in therapeutic resistance in T-ALL 18 requires further investigation. In pediatric cases, higher expression of HDAC7 and HDAC9 in ALL is 19 associated with poor prognosis. In our study, we observed overexpression of HDAC9 in our immature and 20 cortical cases. CREBBP, EP300, ASH1L, ATM, PKN1, KDM2B, KDM4B and DOT1L showed 21 significant differential expression in mature T-ALL. In the context of transcription coactivation, *EP300* and *CREBBP* have lysine acetyltransferase activity<sup>44-47</sup>. Targeted histone lysine 22 acetylation of *EP300* and *CREBBP* can influence chromatin conformation<sup>46</sup>, and concomitant 23 binding of *EP300* and acetylation of H3K27 is a hallmark of promoter or enhancer activation<sup>48</sup>. 24

We also found low expression of *ST20* (figure 5c) and *EML4*(figure 5e) to be associated with
 poor EFS. This has not been reported before.

3 DOT1-like (DOT1L) histone lysine methyltransferase methylates H3K79 and plays an important 4 role in embryogenesis and hematopoiesis (Ref). Its aberrant activation is associated with acute leukemias<sup>49,50</sup>, but Its function is unknown in T-ALL. *DOT1L* catalytic activity depends on the 5 6 mono-ubiquitination of lysine120 in histone H2B (H2BK120Ub), which provides crosstalk between various histone post-translational modifications<sup>51</sup>. Recent studies suggested the role of 7 8 DOT1L in H3K79 methylation and mono-ubiquitination of lysine (H2BK120Ub) that may pave the way for the development of novel *DOT1L*-driven anti-leukemia therapies.<sup>52-56</sup>. *DOT1L* was 9 10 overexpressed in our mature T-ALL patients and it may be worth investigating if they could be 11 subjects for DOT1L-driven anti-leukemia therapy. We found DOT1L low expression to be 12 associated with poor OS. This has never been reported before. 13 Apart from proteins, non-coding transcript's/RNA repertoire forms another layer of regulatory paradigm 14 in normal cell hemostasis. Using RNA-seq, we identified the differentially expressed non-coding RNAs 15 especially lncRNAs which have been very well documented earlier for their role in cancers. Our analysis 16 revealed 223 lncRNAs, showing differential expression among various T-ALL subtypes. NOTCH1regulated lncRNA, LUNAR1, was overexpressed in cortical and mature T-ALL<sup>20</sup>. This may be related to 17 18 a higher incidence of activating *NOTCH1* mutations in this T-ALL subtypes<sup>1</sup>. HOTTIP and *MEF2C*-19 AS1 were overexpressed in immature; LINC00202, LINC0648, LINC00461 in cortical T-ALL and 20 MALAT1 in mature T-ALL. These have not been reported in T-ALL before in the English literature. We 21 did not find any significant association between their expression with immunophenotypic subtypes. 22 HOTTIP has been reported to be aberrantly activated in AML. It promotes hematopoietic stem cell renewal leading to AML-like disease in mice.<sup>57</sup> This may explain its overexpression in immature T-ALL 23 24 which has myeloid potential in our study. MALAT1 is known to be involved in a plethora of

1	biological processes ranging from alternative splicing, nuclear organization, epigenetic
2	regulation of gene expression. It is also associated with various pathological complications like
3	breast cancer, lung adenocarcinomas, hepatocellular carcinomas, bladder cancers and diabetes
4	etc <sup>58-60</sup> . Several studies suggest MALAT1 expression as a prognostic marker for various cancer
5	types <sup>61</sup> . At a molecular level, MALAT1 plays an important role in modulating several signaling
6	pathways like MAPK/ERK, PI3K/AKT, WNT and NF-kB leading to a modification of
7	proliferation, cell death, cell cycle, migration, invasion, immunity, angiogenesis, and
8	tumorigenicity. The exact mechanism of how MALAT1 helps in cancer development and
9	progression is not fully known. MALAT1 can be a therapeutic target, potential diagnostic and
10	prognosis biomarker for cancers <sup>59,62,63</sup> .
11	Out of the 23 targets tested, we found that MEF2C gene expression emerged as a significant predictor of
12	EFS and OS(figure 5a ans 6a). Although MEF2C overexpression is associated with chemoresistance and
13	poor outcome in AML, its prognostic relevance in T-ALL has not been reported to the best of our
14	knowledge. MALAT1 low expression also emerged as a marker for the poor OS. This has also not been
15	reported before. Apart from these, the prognostic relevance of other markers like, ST20(figure 5c)
16	DOT1L, RAG1(figure 5d), EML4 (figure 5e) and KDM6a (figure 5f) should be studied in a larger number
17	of patients. Previous studies on the utilization of high throughput sequencing and microarray gene
18	expression have shown that the immature gene signature is associated with inferior survival in T-ALL.
19	Both of these methods are time, labour and cost-intensive. Based on our results, we recommend MEF2C
20	gene expression analysis by real-time PCR is a reliable and cheap alternative, therefore, can be easily
21	integrated into routine clinical practice.
22	Taken together, our study provides a comprehensive transcriptional map of coding as well as long
23	noncoding RNAs. We have identified unique gene signatures that were not discovered in the western
24	population. This may be related to the ethnic variation of Indian patients. Along with protein-coding
25	genes, we identified novel as well as known lncRNAs which were differentially expressed in T-ALL

1	patients. Experimental validation and survival analysis for some of the candidates confirmed the RNA-seq			
2	results while co-expression analysis gave an insight into the putative functional roles and pathways			
3	involved in T-ALL. <i>MEF2C</i> high expression emerged as a significant predictor of poor EFS and OS.			
4	Acknowledgements			
5	None			
6	Conflict of Interest			
7	The authors declare that there are no competing interests.			
8	Ethics approval and consent to participate			
9	I confirm all relevant ethical guidelines have been followed, and necessary ethical approval approvals			
10	(IESC/T-395/28-11-2014) have been obtained from Institute Ethics Committee For Post Graduate			
11	Research, All India Institute of Medical Sciences New Delhi.			
12	Author Contribution			
13	DV performed the wetlab experiments related to RNA-Seq and also analyzed the data with SKp,			
14	DS. JS, GS, SKr, MA performed the validation experiments and data collection. SB, RS, BN,			
15	AS, RP, JP, RK contributed to project design, clinical data, patient recruitment, and experiment			
16	management. SS,VS supported through highthroughput computing facility. AC is the principal			
17	project investigator.			
18	References			
19	1. Belver, L. and A. Ferrando (2016). "The genetics and mechanisms of T cell acute lymphoblastic			
20	leukaemia." Nature Reviews Cancer16: 494.			
21	2. Van Vlierberghe, P., A. Ambesi-Impiombato, K. De Keersmaecker, M. Hadler, E. Paietta, M. S.			
22	Tallman, J. M. Rowe, C. Forne, M. Rue and A. A. Ferrando (2013). "Prognostic relevance of			
23	integrated genetic profiling in adult T-cell acute lymphoblastic leukemia." Blood122(1): 74.			
24	3. Gianni F, Belver L, Ferrando A. The Genetics and Mechanisms of T-Cell Acute Lymphoblastic			

25 Leukemia. Cold Spring Harb Perspect Med. 2020 Mar 2;10(3). pii:a035246.

1	4.	Van Vlierberghe, P. and A. Ferrando (2012). "The molecular basis of T cell acute lymphoblastic
2		leukemia." J Clin Invest122(10): 3398-3406.
3	5.	Correia, N. C., A. Girio, I. Antunes, L. R. Martins and J. T. Barata (2014). "The multiple layers of
4		non-genetic regulation of PTEN tumour suppressor activity." Eur J Cancer50(1): 216-225.
5	6.	Fragoso, R. and J. T. Barata (2014). "PTEN and leukemia stem cells." Advances in Biological
6		Regulation56: 22-29.
7	7.	Fragoso, R. and J. T. Barata (2015). "Kinases, tails and more: Regulation of PTEN function by
8		phosphorylation." Methods77-78:75-81.
9	8.	Martelli, A. M., G. Tabellini, F. Ricci, C. Evangelisti, F. Chiarini, R. Bortul, J. A. McCubrey and
10		F. A. Manzoli (2012). "PI3K/AKT/mTORC1 and MEK/ERK signaling in T-cell acute
11		lymphoblastic leukemia: New options for targeted therapy." Advances in Biological
12		Regulation52(1): 214-227.
13	9.	Girardi T, Vicente C, Cools J, De Keersmaecker K. The genetics and molecular biology of T-
14		ALL. Blood. 2017 Mar 2;129(9):1113-1123.
15	10.	Iacobucci I, Mullighan CG. Genetic Basis of Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia. J Clin Oncol. 2017
16		Mar 20;35(9):975-983.
17	11.	Taylor J, Xiao W, Abdel-Wahab O. Diagnosis and classification of hematologic malignancies on
18		the basis of genetics. Blood. 2017 Jul 27;130(4):410-423.
19	12.	Coustan-Smith, E., C. G. Mullighan, M. Onciu, F. G. Behm, S. C. Raimondi, D. Pei, C. Cheng,
20		X. Su, J. E. Rubnitz, G. Basso, A. Biondi, CH. Pui, J. R. Downing and D. Campana (2009).
21		"Early T-cell precursor leukaemia: a subtype of very high-risk acute lymphoblastic leukaemia."
22		The Lancet Oncology10(2): 147-156.
23	13.	Bene MC, Castoldi G, Knapp W, Ludwig WD, Matutes E, Orfao A, van't Veer MB. Proposals for
24		the immunological classification of acute leukemias. European Group for the Immunological
25		Characterization of Leukemias (EGIL). Leukemia. 1995 Oct;9(10):1783-6.

1	14.	Huang da, W., B. T. Sherman and R. A. Lempicki (2009). "Bioinformatics enrichment tools:
2		paths toward the comprehensive functional analysis of large gene lists." Nucleic Acids Res37(1):
3		1-13.
4	15.	Huang da, W., B. T. Sherman and R. A. Lempicki (2009). "Systematic and integrative analysis of
5		large gene lists using DAVID bioinformatics resources." Nat Protoc4(1): 44-57.
6	16.	Shannon, P., A. Markiel, O. Ozier, N. S. Baliga, J. T. Wang, D. Ramage, N. Amin, B.
7		Schwikowski and T. Ideker (2003). "Cytoscape: a software environment for integrated models of
8		biomolecular interaction networks." Genome Res13(11): 2498-2504.
9	17.	Haferlach C, Kern W, Schindela S, Kohlmann A, Alpermann T, Schnittger S, Haferlach T. Gene
10		expression of BAALC, CDKN1B, ERG, and MN1 adds independent prognostic information to
11		cytogenetics and molecular mutations in adult acute myeloid leukemia. Genes Chromosomes
12		Cancer. 2012 Mar;51(3):257-65.
13	18.	Heesch, S., C. Schlee, M. Neumann, A. Stroux, A. Kuhnl, S. Schwartz, T. Haferlach, N.
14		Goekbuget, D. Hoelzer, E. Thiel, W. K. Hofmann and C. D. Baldus (2010). "BAALC-associated
15		gene expression profiles define IGFBP7 as a novel molecular marker in acute leukemia."
16		Leukemia24(8): 1429-1436.
17	19.	Yin S, Dou J, Yang G, Chen F. Long non-coding RNA XIST expression as a prognostic factor in
18		human cancers: A meta-analysis. Int J Biol Markers. 2019 Dec;34(4):327-333.
19	20.	Trimarchi T, Bilal E, Ntziachristos P, Fabbri G, Dalla-Favera R, Tsirigos A, Aifantis I. Genome-
20		wide mapping and characterization of Notch-regulated long noncoding RNAs in acute leukemia.
21		Cell. 2014 Jul 31;158(3):593-606.
22	21.	Chen B, Jiang L, Zhong ML, Li JF, Li BS, Peng LJ, Dai YT, Cui BW, Yan TQ, Zhang WN, Weng
23		XQ, Xie YY, Lu J, Ren RB, Chen SN, Hu JD, Wu DP, Chen Z, Tang JY, Huang JY, Mi JQ, Chen
24		SJ. Identification of fusion genes and characterization of transcriptome features in T-cell acute
25		ymphoblastic leukemia. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A. 2018 Jan 9;115(2):373-378.

1	22.	Colomer-Lahiguera S, Pisecker M, König M, Nebral K, Pickl WF, Kauer MO, Haas OA,
2		Ullmann R, Attarbaschi A, Dworzak MN, Strehl S. MEF2C-dysregulated pediatric T-cell acute
3		lymphoblastic leukemia is associated with CDKN1B deletions and a poor response to
4		glucocorticoid therapy. Leuk Lymphoma. 2017 Dec;58(12):2895-2904.
5	23.	Kawashima-Goto S, Imamura T, Tomoyasu C, Yano M, Yoshida H, Fujiki A, Tamura S, Osone
6		S, Ishida H, Morimoto A, Kuroda H, Hosoi H. BCL2 Inhibitor (ABT-737): A Restorer of
7		Prednisolone Sensitivity in Early T-Cell Precursor-Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia with High
8		MEF2C Expression? PLoS One. 2015 Jul 14;10(7):e0132926.
9	24.	Zuurbier L, Gutierrez A, Mullighan CG, Canté-Barrett K, Gevaert AO, de Rooi J, Li Y, Smits
10		WK, Buijs-Gladdines JG, Sonneveld E, Look AT, Horstmann M, Pieters R, Meijerink JP.
11		Immature MEF2C-dysregulated T-cell leukemia patients have an early T-cell precursor acute
12		lymphoblastic leukemia gene signature and typically have non-rearranged T-cell receptors.
13		Haematologica. 2014 Jan;99(1):94-102.
14	25.	Homminga I, Pieters R, Langerak AW, de Rooi JJ, Stubbs A, Verstegen M, Vuerhard M, Buijs-
15		Gladdines J, Kooi C, Klous P, van Vlierberghe P, Ferrando AA, Cayuela JM, Verhaaf B, Beverloo
16		HB, Horstmann M, de Haas V, Wiekmeijer AS, Pike-Overzet K, Staal FJ, de Laat W, Soulier J,
17		Sigaux F, Meijerink JP.Integrated transcript and genome analyses reveal NKX2-1 and MEF2C as
18		potential oncogenes in T cell acute lymphoblastic leukemia. Cancer Cell. 2011 Apr 12;19(4):484-
19		97.
20	26.	Nagel S, Venturini L, Meyer C, Kaufmann M, Scherr M, Drexler HG, Macleod RA.
21		Transcriptional deregulation of oncogenic myocyte enhancer factor 2C in T-cell acute
22		lymphoblastic leukemia. Leuk Lymphoma. 2011 Feb;52(2):290-7.
23	27.	Nagel S, Meyer C, Quentmeier H, Kaufmann M, Drexler HG, MacLeod RA. MEF2C is activated
24		by multiple mechanisms in a subset of T-acute lymphoblastic leukemia cell lines. Leukemia.
25		2008 Mar;22(3):600-7.

1	28. La Starza R, Barba G, Demeyer S, Pierini V, Di Giacomo D, Gianfelici V, Schwab C, Matteucci
2	C, Vicente C, Cools J, Messina M, Crescenzi B, Chiaretti S, Foà R, Basso G, Harrison CJ,
3	Mecucci C. Deletions of the long arm of chromosome 5 define subgroups of T-cell acute
4	lymphoblastic leukemia. Haematologica. 2016 Aug;101(8):951-8.
5	29. Heesch S, Bartram I, Neumann M, Reins J, Mossner M, Schlee C, Stroux A, Haferlach T,
6	Goekbuget N, Hoelzer D, Hofmann WK, Thiel E, Baldus CD. Expression of IGFBP7 in acute
7	leukemia is regulated by DNA methylation. Cancer Sci. 2011 Jan;102(1):253-9.
8	30. Neumann M, Heesch S, Gökbuget N, Schwartz S, Schlee C, Benlasfer O, Farhadi-Sartangi N,
9	Thibaut J, Burmeister T, Hoelzer D, Hofmann WK, Thiel E, Baldus CD. Clinical and molecular
10	characterization of early T-cell precursor leukemia: a high-risk subgroup in adult T-ALL with a
11	high frequency of FLT3 mutations. Blood Cancer J. 2012 Jan;2(1):e55.
12	31. Heesch S, Schlee C, Neumann M, Stroux A, Kühnl A, Schwartz S, Haferlach T, Goekbuget N,
13	Hoelzer D, Thiel E, Hofmann WK, Baldus CD. BAALC-associated gene expression profiles
14	define IGFBP7 as a novel molecular marker in acute leukemia. Leukemia. 2010 Aug;24(8):1429-
15	36.
16	32. Carow, C. E., M. Levenstein, S. H. Kaufmann, J. Chen, S. Amin, P. Rockwell, L. Witte, M. J.
17	Borowitz, C. I. Civin and D. Small (1996). "Expression of the hematopoietic growth factor
18	receptor FLT3 (STK- 1/Flk2) in human leukemias." Blood87(3): 1089.
19	33. Baldus, C. D., P. Martus, T. Burmeister, S. Schwartz, N. Gokbuget, C. D. Bloomfield, D.
20	Hoelzer, E. Thiel and W. K. Hofmann (2007). "Low ERG and BAALC expression identifies a
21	new subgroup of adult acute T-lymphoblastic leukemia with a highly favorable outcome." J Clin
22	Oncol25(24): 3739-3745.
23	34. Baldus, C. D., S. M. Tanner, D. F. Kusewitt, S. Liyanarachchi, C. Choi, M. A. Caligiuri, C. D.
24	Bloomfield and A. d. l. Chapelle (2003). "BAALC, a novel marker of human hematopoietic
25	progenitor cells." Experimental Hematology31(11): 1051-1056.

1	35. Heuser, M., B. Argiropoulos, F. Kuchenbauer, E. Yung, J. Piper, S. Fung, R. F. Schlenk, K.
2	Dohner, T. Hinrichsen, C. Rudolph, A. Schambach, C. Baum, B. Schlegelberger, H. Dohner, A.
3	Ganser and R. K. Humphries (2007). "MN1 overexpression induces acute myeloid leukemia in
4	mice and predicts ATRA resistance in patients with AML." Blood110(5): 1639.
5	36. Ferrando, A. A., D. S. Neuberg, J. Staunton, M. L. Loh, C. Huard, S. C. Raimondi, F. G. Behm,
6	CH. Pui, J. R. Downing, D. G. Gilliland, E. S. Lander, T. R. Golub and A. T. Look (2002).
7	"Gene expression signatures define novel oncogenic pathways in T cell acute lymphoblastic
8	leukemia." Cancer Cell1(1): 75-87.
9	37. Neumann, M., E. Coskun, L. Fransecky, L. H. Mochmann, I. Bartram, N. F. Sartangi, S. Heesch,
10	N. Gokbuget, S. Schwartz, C. Brandts, C. Schlee, R. Haas, U. Duhrsen, M. Griesshammer, H.
11	Dohner, G. Ehninger, T. Burmeister, O. Blau, E. Thiel, D. Hoelzer, W. K. Hofmann and C. D.
12	Baldus (2013). "FLT3 mutations in early T-cell precursor ALL characterize a stem cell like
13	leukemia and imply the clinical use of tyrosine kinase inhibitors." PLoS One8(1): e53190.
14	38. Neumann, M., M. Seehawer, C. Schlee, S. Vosberg, S. Heesch, E. K. von der Heide, A. Graf, S.
15	Krebs, H. Blum, N. Gökbuget, S. Schwartz, D. Hoelzer, P. A. Greif and C. D. Baldus (2014).
16	"FAT1 expression and mutations in adult acute lymphoblastic leukemia." Blood Cancer Journal4:
17	e224.
18	39. Zhang, J., L. Ding, L. Holmfeldt, G. Wu, S. L. Heatley, D. Payne-Turner, J. Easton, X. Chen, J.
19	Wang, M. Rusch, C. Lu, S. C. Chen, L. Wei, J. R. Collins-Underwood, J. Ma, K. G. Roberts, S.
20	B. Pounds, A. Ulyanov, J. Becksfort, P. Gupta, R. Huether, R. W. Kriwacki, M. Parker, D. J.
21	McGoldrick, D. Zhao, D. Alford, S. Espy, K. C. Bobba, G. Song, D. Pei, C. Cheng, S. Roberts,
22	M. I. Barbato, D. Campana, E. Coustan-Smith, S. A. Shurtleff, S. C. Raimondi, M. Kleppe, J.
23	Cools, K. A. Shimano, M. L. Hermiston, S. Doulatov, K. Eppert, E. Laurenti, F. Notta, J. E. Dick,
24	G. Basso, S. P. Hunger, M. L. Loh, M. Devidas, B. Wood, S. Winter, K. P. Dunsmore, R. S.
25	Fulton, L. L. Fulton, X. Hong, C. C. Harris, D. J. Dooling, K. Ochoa, K. J. Johnson, J. C.
26	Obenauer, W. E. Evans, C. H. Pui, C. W. Naeve, T. J. Ley, E. R. Mardis, R. K. Wilson, J. R.

1	Downing and C. G. Mullighan (2012). "The genetic basis of early T-cell precursor acute
2	lymphoblastic leukaemia." Nature481(7380): 157-163.
3	40. Danis E, Yamauchi T, Echanique K, Zhang X, Haladyna JN, Riedel SS, Zhu N, Xie H, Orkin SH,
4	Armstrong SA, Bernt KM, Neff T. EZH2 Controls an Early Hematopoietic Program and Growth
5	and Survival Signaling in Early T Cell Precursor Acute Lymphoblastic Leukemia. Cell Rep. 2016
6	Mar 1;14(8):1953-65.
7	41. Mar, B. G., L. B. Bullinger, K. M. McLean, P. V. Grauman, M. H. Harris, K. Stevenson, D. S.
8	Neuberg, A. U. Sinha, S. E. Sallan, L. B. Silverman, A. L. Kung, L. Lo Nigro, B. L. Ebert and S.
9	A. Armstrong (2014). "Mutations in epigenetic regulators including SETD2 are gained during
10	relapse in paediatric acute lymphoblastic leukaemia." Nat Commun5: 3469.
11	42. Zhu, X., F. He, H. Zeng, S. Ling, A. Chen, Y. Wang, X. Yan, W. Wei, Y. Pang, H. Cheng, C.
12	Hua, Y. Zhang, X. Yang, X. Lu, L. Cao, L. Hao, L. Dong, W. Zou, J. Wu, X. Li, S. Zheng, J.
13	Yan, J. Zhou, L. Zhang, S. Mi, X. Wang, L. Zhang, Y. Zou, Y. Chen, Z. Geng, J. Wang, J. Zhou,
14	X. Liu, J. Wang, W. Yuan, G. Huang, T. Cheng and Qf. Wang (2014). "Identification of
15	functional cooperative mutations of SETD2 in human acute leukemia." Nature Genetics46: 287.
16	43. Wang, S., X. Yuan, Y. Liu, K. Zhu, P. Chen, H. Yan, D. Zhang, X. Li, H. Zeng, X. Zhao, X.
17	Chen, G. Zhou and S. Cao (2019). "Genetic polymorphisms of histone methyltransferase SETD2
18	predicts prognosis and chemotherapy response in Chinese acute myeloid leukemia patients." J
19	Transl Med17(1): 101.
20	44. Ait-Si-Ali, S., S. Ramirez, F. X. Barre, F. Dkhissi, L. Magnaghi-Jaulin, J. A. Girault, P. Robin,
21	M. Knibiehler, L. L. Pritchard, B. Ducommun, D. Trouche and A. Harel-Bellan (1998). "Histone
22	acetyltransferase activity of CBP is controlled by cycle-dependent kinases and oncoprotein E1A."
23	Nature396(6707): 184-186.
24	45. Iyer, N. G., H. Ozdag and C. Caldas (2004). "p300/CBP and cancer." Oncogene23(24): 4225-
25	4231.

1	46. Liu, X., L. Wang, K. Zhao, P. R. Thompson, Y. Hwang, R. Marmorstein and P. A. Cole (2008).
2	"The structural basis of protein acetylation by the p300/CBP transcriptional coactivator."
3	Nature451(7180): 846-850.
4	47. Qian, M., H. Zhang, S. K. Kham, S. Liu, C. Jiang, X. Zhao, Y. Lu, C. Goodings, T. N. Lin, R.
5	Zhang, T. Moriyama, Z. Yin, Z. Li, T. C. Quah, H. Ariffin, A. M. Tan, S. Shen, D. Bhojwani, S.
6	Hu, S. Chen, H. Zheng, C. H. Pui, A. E. Yeoh and J. J. Yang (2017). "Whole-transcriptome
7	sequencing identifies a distinct subtype of acute lymphoblastic leukemia with predominant
8	genomic abnormalities of <i>EP300</i> and CREBBP." Genome Res27(2): 185-195.
9	48. Vo, N. and R. H. Goodman (2001). "CREB-binding protein and p300 in transcriptional
10	regulation." J Biol Chem276(17): 13505-13508.
11	49. Bernt, Kathrin M., N. Zhu, Amit U. Sinha, S. Vempati, J. Faber, Andrei V. Krivtsov, Z. Feng, N.
12	Punt, A. Daigle, L. Bullinger, Roy M. Pollock, Victoria M. Richon, Andrew L. Kung and
13	Scott A. Armstrong (2011). "MLL-Rearranged Leukemia Is Dependent on Aberrant H3K79
14	Methylation by DOT1L." Cancer Cell20(1): 66-78.
15	50. Zhang, Y. and T. G. Kutateladze (2019). "Methylation of Histone H3K79 by Dot1L Requires
16	Multiple Contacts with the Ubiquitinated Nucleosome." Mol Cell74(5): 862-863.
17	51. McGinty, R. K., J. Kim, C. Chatterjee, R. G. Roeder and T. W. Muir (2008). "Chemically
18	ubiquitylated histone H2B stimulates hDot1L-mediated intranucleosomal methylation."
19	Nature453: 812.
20	52. Anderson, C. J., M. R. Baird, A. Hsu, E. H. Barbour, Y. Koyama, M. J. Borgnia and R. K.
21	McGinty (2019). "Structural Basis for Recognition of Ubiquitylated Nucleosome by Dot1L
22	Methyltransferase." Cell Rep26(7): 1681-1690 e1685.
23	53. Jang, S., C. Kang, H. S. Yang, T. Jung, H. Hebert, K. Y. Chung, S. J. Kim, S. Hohng and J. J.
24	Song (2019). "Structural basis of recognition and destabilization of the histone H2B ubiquitinated
25	nucleosome by the DOT1L histone H3 Lys79 methyltransferase." Genes Dev33(11-12): 620-625

1	54.	Valencia-Sanchez, M. I., P. De Ioannes, M. Wang, N. Vasilyev, R. Chen, E. Nudler, J. P.
2		Armache and K. J. Armache (2019). "Structural Basis of Dot1L Stimulation by Histone H2B
3		Lysine 120 Ubiquitination." Mol Cell74(5): 1010-1019 e1016.
4	55.	Worden, E. J., N. A. Hoffmann, C. W. Hicks and C. Wolberger (2019). "Mechanism of Cross-
5		talk between H2B Ubiquitination and H3 Methylation by Dot1L." Cell176(6): 1490-1501 e1412.
6	56.	Yao, T., W. Jing, Z. Hu, M. Tan, M. Cao, Q. Wang, Y. Li, G. Yuan, M. Lei and J. Huang (2019).
7		"Structural basis of the crosstalk between histone H2B monoubiquitination and H3 lysine 79
8		methylation on nucleosome." Cell Res29(4): 330-333.
9	57.	Luo H, Zhu G, Xu J, Lai Q, Yan B, Guo Y, Fung TK, Zeisig BB, Cui Y, Zha J, Cogle C, Wang F,
10		Xu B, Yang FC, Li W, So CWE, Qiu Y, Xu M, Huang S. HOTTIP IncRNA Promotes
11		Hematopoietic Stem Cell Self-Renewal Leading to AML-like Disease in Mice. Cancer Cell. 2019
12		Dec 9;36(6):645-659.e8.
13	58.	Yoshimoto, R., A. Mayeda, M. Yoshida and S. Nakagawa (2016). "MALAT1 long non-coding
14		RNA in cancer." Biochimica et Biophysica Acta (BBA) - Gene Regulatory Mechanisms1859(1):
15		192-199.
16	59.	Jianghua Liu, WX., Peng, Yin-Yuan Mo, Dianzhong Luo (2017). "MALAT1-mediated
17		tumorigenesis." Frontiers in Bioscience.
18	60.	Sun, W., Y. Yang, C. Xu and J. Guo (2017). "Regulatory mechanisms of long noncoding RNAs
19		on gene expression in cancers." Cancer Genetics216: 105-110.
20	61.	Wei, Y. and B. Niu (2015). "Role of MALAT1 as a Prognostic Factor for Survival in Various
21		Cancers: A Systematic Review of the Literature with Meta-Analysis." Disease markers2015:
22		164635-164635.
23	62.	Zhao, M., S. Wang, Q. Li, Q. Ji, P. Guo and X. Liu (2018). "MALAT1: A long non-coding RNA
24		highly associated with human cancers." Oncology letters16(1): 19-26.
25	63.	Li, Z. X., Q. N. Zhu, H. B. Zhang, Y. Hu, G. Wang and Y. S. Zhu (2018). "MALAT1: a potential
26		biomarker in cancer." Cancer Manag Res10(1179-1322 (Print)): 6757-6768.

# 1 Legends to Tables and figures

- 2 **Table 1:** Co-expression network analysis of few selected protein-coding and non-coding genes
- 3 **Table 2:** Association of expression of various protein and non-protein coding RNAs with
- 4 patients' characteristics
- 5 **Table 3:** Association of patients' characteristics with EFS and OS
- 6 **Table 4: (a)** Multivariate Cox regression analysis for EFS (b) Multivariate Cox regression
- 7 analysis of OS
- 8 **Figure 1**: Workflow for identification and validation of molecular markers in T-ALL patients.
- 9 Figure 2: (a) Radar graph of Differentially expressed genes among T-ALL subgroups: immature
- 10 (Blue), cortical (Green), mature (Gray). each circle represents the fold change for the
- 11 differentially expressed genes. (b) PCA analysis of Gene expression: Figure depicts the
- 12 clustering of samples in 3 major clusters according to their normalized FPKM count. Cluster 1
- 13 comprises of 9, Cluster 2 comprises 5 and Cluster 3 comprises 19 T-ALL samples.
- 14 **Figure 3:** (a) Hierarchical clustering of differential expressed lncRNA among three T-ALL
- 15 subgroups. (b) Hierarchical clustering differentially expressed epigenetic modifiers in T-ALL.;
- 16 Each raw represents gene symbol. The "heat map" indicates high (red) or low (green) level of
- 17 expression according to the scale shown.
- 18 **Figure 4:** Enriched gene ontology functions of deferentially expressed genes, DAVID results
- 19 the number of involved genes from differentially expressed genes in T-ALL for biological
- 20 process (a), cellular components (b) and KEGG pathways(c). (p<0.005). Complete list of genes
- 21 involved in the biological process and cellular component of are shown in Supplementary
- 22 Figure 5. Kaplan Meier analysis for event free survival for expression of a. *MEF2C*, b. *LYL1*, c.
- 23 *ST20*, **d.** *RAG1*, **e.** *EML4* and **f.** *KDM6A* genes.

- 1 Figure 6. Kaplan Meier analysis for overall survival for expression of a. *MEF2C*, b. *DOT1L*, c.
- 2 *RAG1*, **d.** *MALAT1*.



Validation of RNAseq data on discovery cohort









#### **Biological Process: T-ALL**



#### **Cellular component: T-ALL**

b

С



**KEGG Pathways: T-ALL** 







Co-expression network	Protein-coding genes	Non-coding genes
BAALC	MEF2C, HOPX, IGFBP7, LYL1, HDAC9,	HOTTIP, HOTAIR, SNORD101,
	LMO2, BCL2, FLT3, LYN, KIT	MIR6804, MIR939, XIST
HHEX	MEF2C, FLT3, KIT, LYL1, LMO2,	HOTTIP, HOTAIR, LINC01021,
	TRGC1, HOPX	XIST, SNORD86C, SNORD88A,
		SNORD104, MIR629, MIR3132,
		MIR3692, MIR600
MEF2C	HOPX, KIT, BAALC, HHEX, EMP1, LYL1,	HOTTIP, HOTAIR, LINC01021,
	BCL, SMYD3, HDAC9	XIST, MIR3142HG, MIR3132,
		MIR4741, SNORD100,
		SNORD101
FGR	LEF1, RAG1, CD4, CD8, TRBV2,	LINC01221, LINC01225,
		LINC01226, SNORA50A,
		SNORA21, SNORA31
FAT1	PRC1, PLK44, RAD51, LMO1,	LINCOO977, SNOR79,
	HIST2H2BF, HIST1H2BB, HIST1H4L	LINC01572, LNIC1934
EML4	CDKN2A, NCOR2, TRAV30, CRIP, TBP,	LINC00672, LINC00664,
	BACH2RNF-4, TGFB1	SNORA78, SNORD30, MIR3960,
		MIR562, MIR573
HOTTIP	LYL1, BAALC, TRGC1, LMO2, HHEX,	LNC01021, XIST, HOTAIR),
	MEF2C, FLT3, EMP1, IGFBP7, KIT,	miRNA (MIR5692C2, MIR3917,
	GBP1, TLR1, HDAC9, SMYD3	MIR3692, MIR6658

# Table 1: Co-expression network analysis of few selected protein-coding and non-coding genes

# Table 2: Association of expression of various protein and non-protein coding RNAs with patients' characteristics

$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	P Low High												
(n-42) $(n-44)$ $(n-42)$ $(n-44)$ $(n-42)$ $($		Р											
$\left[ \left( 1-43 \right) \left( 1-43 \right) \left( 1-43 \right) \left( 1-44 \right) \right] \left( 1-43 \right) \left( 1-20 \right) \left( 1-20 \right) \left( 1-20 \right) \left( 1-10 \right) \left( 1-10 \right) \left( 1-43 \right) \left( 1-43 \right) \left( 1-43 \right) \left( 1-44 \right) \left( 1-44 \right) \left( 1-60 \right) \left( 1-11 \right) \left( 1-10 \right) \left( $	(n=17) (n=6	1)											
(%)         (%) <td>(%) (%)</td> <td></td>	(%) (%)												
Age (in years) $12 - 22 - 23 - 23 - 23 - 23 - 23 - 23 - $													
$ \begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	0.52 7 31	0.59											
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(41.2) (50.8	)											
$ \begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	10 30	<u>`</u>											
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	(38.8) (49.2	)											
Ock         Male         37         38         1         63         23         1         66         9         1         37         38         0.36         37         38         1         57         10	1 14 53	0.69											
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(82.4) (86.9	)											
Female         6         6         6         10         3         11         1         8         4         6         6         10         1	3 8	/											
(14) (13.6) (14) (13.6) (13.7) (11.5) (14.3) (10) (17.8) (9.5) (14) (13.6) (14.9) (9.1)	(17.6) (13.1	)											
TLC (X10 <sup>9</sup> /L)													
<50       22     27     0.39     23     26     0.67     40     19     0.16     43     6     0.19     28     21     0.29     25     24     0.83     39     5	0.52 10 34	1											
(51.2)         (61.4)         (53.5)         (59.1)         (54.8)         (73.1)         (55.8)         (60)         (62.2)         (50         (58)         (54.5)         (58.2)         (45.5)	(58.8) (55.7	)											
<b>EVALUATE: EVALUATE: EVALUATE: EVALUATE: EVALUATE: EVALUATE: EVALUATE: EVALUAT: EVA</b>	7 27												
(48.8)         (38.6)         (46.5)         (40.9)         (45.2)         (26.9)         (44.2)         (40)         (37.8)         (50)         (41.9)         (45.5)         (41.8)         (45.5)	(41.2) (44.3	)											
		0.45											
Standard 8 6 0.5/2 8 6 0.5/ 14 5 1 11 3 1 11 3 0.04 4 10 0.14 11 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		0.45											
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	(3.9) (18)												
High         55         56         57         54         50         100         7 $(814)$ $(864)$ $(814)$ $(864)$ $(808)$ $(877)$ $(70)$ $(755)$ $(970)$ $(907)$ $(773)$ $(825)$ $(909)$	10   50   (9/1)   (82)												
ETP-ALLIPT	$\frac{(\delta 1.4) (\delta 0.4) (\delta 1.4) (\delta 0.4) (\delta 0.4) (\delta 0.4}{(\delta 0.4) (\delta 0.4) (\delta 0.8) (\delta 0.8) (\delta 0.7) (70} (70) (75.6) (92.9) (90.7) (77.3) (83.6) (90.9) (94.1) (82)}{\mathbf{FTP}_{\mathbf{A},\mathbf{I},\mathbf{I},\mathbf{I},\mathbf{I},\mathbf{I},\mathbf{I},\mathbf{I},I$												
$N_0$ 41 31 0.003 39 33 0.08 67 17 0.003 67 5 0.012 34 38 0.09 34 38 0.41 54 10	0.68 12 52	0.17											
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(70.6) (85.2	)											
Yes         2         13         4         11         6         9         10         5         11         4         9         6         13         1	5 9	,											
(4.7)         (29.5)         (9.3)         (25)         (8.2)         (34.6)         (13)         (50)         (24.4)         (9.5)         (20.9)         (13.6)         (19.4)         (9.1)	(29.4) (14.2	)											
CD34													
Negative         28         18         0.032         27         19         0.08         44         8         0.012         41         5         1         21         25         0.28         23         1         32         8	0.194 10 30	0.59											
(65.1)         (40.9)         (88.4)         (43.2)         (60.3)         (30.8)         (53.3)         (50)         (46.7)         (59.5)         (53.5)         (52.3)         (47.8)         (72.7)	(58.8) (49.2	)											
Positive 15 26 16 25 29 18 36 5 24 17 20 21 35 3	7 31												
(34.9) (39.1) (37.2) (56.8) (39.7) (69.2) (46.8) (50) (55.3) (40.5) (46.5) (47.7) (52.2) (27.3)	(41.2) (50.8	)											
Myelola markers	0.69 16 49	0.28											
$\begin{array}{c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c $	(94.1) (78.7	0.20											
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$		)											
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(5.9) (21.3	)											
Prednisolone sensitivity		/											
Sensitive 23 21 0.441 24 20 0.018 41 12 0.048 39 5 1 22 22 0.60 21 23 0.79 34 7	1 7 34	0.31											
(71.9)         (61.8)         (82.8)         (54)         (77.4)         (54.5)         (67.2)         (62.9)         (71)         (63.6)         (69.7)         (68)         (70)	(53.8) (72.3	)											
Resistant         9         13         5         17         12         10         19         3         13         9         12         10         16         3	6 13												
$\begin{array}{ c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	(46.2) (21.3	)											
Post-induction MRD													
Negative         21         16         0.107         21         16         0.027         38         6         0.007         32         5         1         17         20         0.59         16         21         0.11         29         6	1 6 29	1.00											
$\begin{array}{c ccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(60) (63)												
POSILIVE     7     14     5     10     12     10     19     2     12     9     14     7     18     3 $(25)$ $(467)$ $(172)$ $(50)$ $(24)$ $(625)$ $(373)$ $(286)$ $(414)$ $(31)$ $(467)$ $(25)$ $(383)$ $(333)$	$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 1/\\ (40) & (37) \end{pmatrix}$												

Variables		LYN		L	INC00648			PCAT18		L	INC00461		L	INC00202		Μ	EF2C-AS1			XIST			PCAT14	
	Low	High	Р	Low	High	Р	Low	High	Р	Low	High	Р	Low	High	Р	Low	High	Р	Low	High	Р	Low	High	Р
	(n=39)	(n=39)		(n=55)	(n=17)		(n=20)	(n=52)		(n=36)	(n=36)		(n=38)	(n=38)		(n=64)	(n=12)		(n=70)	(n=17)		(n=38)	(n=38)	
	(%)	(%)		(%)	(%)		(%)	(%)		(%)	(%)		(%)	(%)		(%)	(%)		(%)	(%)		(%)	(%)	
Age (in yea	rs)									10												L . =		
<12	15	23	0.11	24	14	1	11	24	0.6	18	17	1	19	17	0.82	27	9	0.06	34	10	0.75	17	19	0.82
. 12	(38.5)	(59)		(43.6)	(82.4)		(55)	(46.2)		(50)	(47.2)		(50)	(44.7)		(42.2)	(75)		(48.6)	(58.8)		(44.7)	(50)	+
<u>&gt;12</u>	24 (61.5)	10 (41)		31 (56.4)	3 (17.6)		9 (45)	28		18 (50)	(52.8)		(50)	21 (55.3)		57 8)	3 (25)		30 (51.4)	(41.2)		21 (55-3)	(50)	
Sev	(01.5)	(41)		(30.4)	(17.0)		(43)	(55.8)		(30)	(32.8)		(30)	(33.3)		(37.8)	(23)		(31.4)	(41.2)		(33.3)	(30)	<u> </u>
Male	34	33	1	47	15	1	16	46	0.45	31	31	1	32	34	0.74	56	10	0.65	66	9	< 0.01	32	34	0.74
White	(87.2)	(84.6)		(85.5)	(88.2)	1	(80)	(88.5)	0.15	(86.1)	(86.1)	1	(84.2)	(89.5)	0.71	(87.5)	(83.3)	0.05	(94.3)	(52.9)	<0.01	(84.2)	(89.5)	0.71
Female	5	6		8	2		4	6		5	5		6	4		8	2		4	8		6	4	1
	(12.8)	(15.4)		(14.5)	(11.8)		(20)	(11.5)		(13.9)	(13.9)		(15.8)	(10.5)		(12.5)	(16.7)		(5.7)	(47.1)		(15.8)	(10.5)	
TLC (X109	/L)																							
<50	22	22	1	29	11	0.42	8	32	0.11	21	19	0.81	22	21	1	36	7	1	40	9	0.19	21	22	1
	(56.4)	(56.4)		(52.7)	(64.7)		(40)	(61.5)		(58.3)	(52.8)		(57.9)	(55.3)		(56.2)	(58.3)		(57.1)	(52.9)		(55.3)	(57.9)	
<u>&gt;</u> 50	17	17		26	6		12	20		15	17		16	17		28	5		30	8		17	16	
NOT	(43.6)	(43.6)		(47.3)	(35.3)		(60)	(38.5)		(41.7)	(47.2)		(42.1)	(44.7)		(43.8)	(41.7)		(42.9)	(47.1)		(44.7)	(42.1)	
NCI risk	4	0	0.25	0	1	0.42	2	7	1	6	4	0.74	6	E	1	10	1	1	0	E	0.01	5	6	1
Standard	4	8 (20.5)	0.35	9 (16.4)	1 (5.0)	0.43	3 (15)	(13.5)	1	0 (167)	4	0.74	0 (15.8)	(13.2)	1	10 (15.6)	1 (8.3)	1	8 (11.4)	0 (35.3)	0.01	(13.2)	0 (15.8)	1
High	(10.3)	(20.3)		(10.4)	(3.9)		(13)	(13.3)		(10.7)	(11.1)		(13.6)	(13.2)		(13.0)	(0.5)		(11.4)	(33.3)		(13.2)	(13.6)	+
Ingn	(897)	(79.5)		(83.6)	(94.1)		(85)	(86.5)		(83.3)	(88.9)		(84.2)	(86.8)		(84.4)	(917)		(88.6)	(647)		(86.8)	(84.2)	
ETP-ALL	(0).1)	(17.5)	1	(05.0)	())		(05)	(00.5)		(05.5)	(00.7)		(01.2)	(00.0)		(01.1)	()1.7)		(00.0)	(01.7)		(00.0)	(01.2)	<u> </u>
No	37	27	0.01	45	14	1	16	43	0.75	31	28	0.54	32	31	1	52	11	0.68	61	11	0.02	31	32	1
	(94.9)	(69.2)		(81.8)	(82.4)		(80)	(82.7)		(86.1)	(77.8)		(84.2)	(81.6)		(81.2)	(91.7)		(87.1)	(64.7)		(81.6)	(84.2)	
Yes	2	12		10	3		4	9		5	8		6	7		12	1		9	6		7	6	
	(5.1)	(30.8)		(18.2)	(17.6)		(20)	(17.3)		(13.9)	(22.2)		(15.8)	(18.4)		(18.8)	(8.3)		(12.9)	(35.3)		(18.4)	(15.8)	
CD34																	•			•				
Negative	21	19	0.82	30	7	0.41	11	26	0.79	23	14	0.06	23	16	0.17	34	5	0.54	38	8	0.85	21	18	0.65
	(53.8)	(48.7)		(54.5)	(41.2)		(55)	(50)		(63.9)	(38.9)		(60.5)	(42.1)		(53.1)	(41.7)		(54.3)	(47.1)		(55.3)	(47.4)	
Positive	18	20		25	10		9	25		13	22		15	22		30	7		32	9		17	20	
	(46.2)	(51.3)		(45.5)	(58.8)		(45)	(50)		(36.1)	(61.1)		(39.5)	(57.9)		(46.9)	(58.3)		(45.7)	(52.9)		(44.7)	(52.6)	<u> </u>
Myeloid ma	arkers	20	0.26	16	1.4	1	17	40	1	22	20	0.24	24	20	0.02	<b>51</b>	10	0.11	50	12	0.75	22	21	1
Negative	34 (87.2)	30 (76 0)	0.38	46 (83.6)	14 (82.4)	1	(85)	43	1	32 (88 0)	28	0.34	34 (80 5)	(76.3)	0.22	51 (707)	12 (100)	0.11	59 (84 3)	13 (76.5)	0.75	32 (84.2)	31 (81.6)	1
Positivo	(87.2)	(70.9)		(83.0)	(02.4)	-	(85)	(82.7)		(00.9)	(77.6)		(89.3)	(70.3)		(79.7)	(100)		(04.3)	(70.5)		(04.2)	(81.0)	+
rositive	(12.8)	(76.9)		(164)	(17.6)		(15)	(17.3)		(11.1)	(22.2)		(10.5)	(23.7)		(20.3)	0		(15.7)	(23.5)		(15.8)	(18.4)	
Prednisolo	ne sensitiv	itv	1	(10.1)	(17.0)		(15)	(17.5)		(11.1)	(22.2)	1	(10.5)	(23.1)		(20.5)			(15.7)	(23.3)		(15.0)	(10.1)	<u> </u>
Sensitive	22	30	0.38	28	11	0.73	12	27	1	22	17	0.55	21	19	1	31	9	0.47	37	7	0.06	20	20	1
	(75.9)	(76.9)		(68.3)	(78.6)		(70.6)	(71.1)		(75.9)	(65.4)		(70)	(67.9)		(66)	(81.8)		(69.8)	(53.8)		(74.1)	(64.5)	
Resistant	5	9		13	3		5	11	1	7	9	1	9	9		16	2		16	6		7	11	0.57
	(12.8)	(23.1)		(31.7)	(21.4)		(29.4)	(28.9)		(24.1)	(34.6)		(30)	(32.1)		(34)	(18.2)		(30.2)	(46.2)		(25.9)	(35.5)	
Post-induct	tion MRD																							
Negative	16	19	0.78	24	7	0.36	14	17	0.04	15	16	0.58	20	14	0.16	28	6	1	30	7	0.37	18	16	0.78
	(59.3)	(65.5)	ļ	(64.9)	(50)	<u> </u>	(82.4)	(50)	<u> </u>	(65.2)	(57.1)		(74.1)	(51.9)		(62.2)	(66.7)		(65.2)	(58.3)		(66.7)	(59.3)	──
Positive	11	10		13	7		3	17		8	12		7	13		17	3		16	5		9	11	1
	(40.7)	(34.5)		(35.1)	(50)		(17.6)	(50)	l	(34.8)	(42.9)		(25.9)	(48.1)		(37.8)	(33.3)	1	(34.8)	(41.7)		(33.3)	(40.3)	

Variables		ST20			RAG			EP300			EML4			EZH2			MALAT1			KDM6A	
	Low	High	Р	Low	High	Р	Low	High	Р	Low	High	Р	Low	High	Р	Low	High	Р	Low	High	Р
	(n=16)	(n=68)		(n=18)	(n=66)		(n=60)	(n=24)		(n=66)	(n=18)		(n=63)	(n=19)		(n=20)	(n=61)		(n=67)	(n=15)	
	(%)	(%)		(%)	(%)		(%)	(%)		(%)	(%)		(%)	(%)		(%)	(%)		(%)	(%)	
Age (in years	5)																				
<12	7	36	0.59	5	38	0.034	31	12	1.00	32	11	0.43	30	12	0.299	8	33	0.31	31	11	0.086
	(43.8)	(52.9)		(27.8)	(57.6)		(51.7)	(50)		(48.5)	(61.1)		(47.6)	(63.2)		(40)	(54)		(46.3)	(73.3)	
<u>≥</u> 12	9	32		13	28		29	12		34	7		33	7		12	28		36	4	
	(56.2)	(47.1)		(72.2)	(42.4)		(48.3)	(50)		(51.5)	(38.9)		(52.4)	(36.8)		(60)	(45.9)		(53.7)	(26.7)	
Sex																					
Male	12	60	0.23	18	54	0.06	51	21	1.00	56	16	1.00	55	15	0.46	18	51	0.72	59	11	0.22
	(75)	(88.2)		(100)	(81.8)		(85)	(87.5)		(84.8)	(88.9)		(87.8)	(78.9)		(90)	(83.6)		(88.1)	(73.3)	
Female	4	8		0	12		9	3		10	2		8	4		2	10		8	4	
	(25)	(11.8)			(18.2)		(15)	(12.5)		(15.2)	(11.1)		(12.7)	(21.1)		(10)	(16.4)		(11.9)	(26.7)	
TLC (X10%	.)								0.10						0.00					~	
<50	12	36	0.16	12	36	0.43	33	15	0.63	36	12	0.43	34	12	0.60	16	30	0.02	37	9	0.78
50	(75)	(52.9)		(66./)	(54.5)		(55)	(62.5)		(54.5)	(66./)		(54)	(63.2)		(80)	(49.2)		(55.2)	(60)	
<u>≥</u> 50	4	32		6	30		27	9		30	6		29			4	31		30	6	
NCI	(25)	(47)		(33.3)	(45.5)		(45)	(37.5)		(45.5)	(33.3)		(46)	(30.8)		(20)	(50.8)		(44.8)	(40)	
NCI FISK	4	10	0.45	2	11	1.00	10	4	1.00	10	2	0.72	0	6	0.09	2	11	1.00	0	6	0.019
Standard	4	10 (14.7)	0.45	3 (167)	(16.7)	1.00	10 (16.7)	4	1.00	(18.2)	$\frac{2}{(11.1)}$	0.72	8 (12.7)	(21.6)	0.08	(15)	(19)	1.00	8	0 (40)	0.018
High	(23)	(14.7)	-	(10.7)	(10.7)		(10.7)	(10.7)		(18.2)	(11.1)		(12.7)	(31.0)		(15)	(18)	-	(11.9)	(40)	
High	12	28 (95-2)		(92.2)	22		50 (82.2)	(82.2)		(01.0)	10		22 (97 5)	15		(95)	50 (82)		(99.1)	(60)	
ETD ALL ID	(73) T	(03.3)		(03.3)	(03.3)		(85.5)	(85.5)		(01.0)	(00.9)		(07.3)	(08.4)		(65)	(82)		(00.1)	(00)	
EIF-ALL IF	0	60	0.007	12	56	0.20	16	23	0.056	51	19	0.033	51	16	1.00	16	50	1.00	55	12	1.00
NO	(56.2)	(88.2)	0.007	(72.2)	(84.8)	0.29	(76.7)	(05.8)	0.050	(77.3)	(100)	0.055	(81)	(84.2)	1.00	(80)	(82)	1.00	(82.1)	(80)	1.00
Ves	(30.2)	8		5	10		14	()3.0)		15	(100)		12	3		(00)	11		12	3	
105	(438)	(11.8)		(27.8)	(15.2)		(23.3)	(42)		(22.7)	0		(9)	(15.8)		(20)	(18)		(17.9)	(20)	
CD34	(45.0)	(11.0)		(27.0)	(15.2)		(23.3)	(4.2)		(22.7)			$(\mathcal{I})$	(15.0)		(20)	(10)		(17.7)	(20)	
Negative	8	36	1.00	9	35	1.00	32	12	0.81	34	10	0.79	32	10	1.00	8	33	0.31	33	9	0.57
rieguire	(50)	(52.9)	1.00	(50)	(53)	1.00	(53.3)	(50)	0.01	(51.5)	(55.6)	0.77	(50.8)	(52.6)	1.00	(40)	(54)	0.51	(49.3)	(60)	0.57
Positive	8	32		9	31		28	12		32	8		31	9		12	28		34	6	
robilite	(50)	(47.1)		(50)	(47)		(46.7)	(50)		(48.5)	(44.4)		(49.2)	(47.4)		(60)	(45.9)		(50.7)	(40)	
Mveloid mar	kers							()													
Negative	9	60	0.007	13	56	0.29	50	19	0.75	54	15	1.00	52	15	0.74	17	49	0.75	58	9	0.026
Ũ	(56.2)	(88.2)		(72.2)	(84.8)		(83.3)	(79.2)		(81.8)	(83.3)		(82.5)	(78.9)		(85)	(80.3)		(86.6)	(60)	
Positive	7	8		5	10		10	5		12	3		11	4		3	12		9	6	
	(43.8)	(11.8)		(27.8)	(15.2)		(16.7)	(20.8)		(18.2)	(16.7)		(17.5)	(21.1)		(15)	(19.7)		(13.4)	(40)	
Prednisolone	e sensitivity																				
Sensitive	7	35	0.343	8	34	0.14	27	15		29	13	0.38	32	8	0.36	8	31	0.37	31	9	
	(53.8)	(68.6)		(50)	(70.8)		(61.4)	(75)		(61.7)	(76.5)		(68.1)	(53.3)		(53.3)	(67.4)		(62)	(75)	
Resistant	6	16		8	14		17	4	0.39	18	4		15	7		7	15		19	3	0.51
	(46.2)	(31.4)		(50)	(29.2)		(38.6)	(21.1)		(38.3)	(23.5)		(31.9)	(46.7)		(46.7)	(32.6)		(38)	(25)	
Post-induction	on MRD					1		0	1		1	1			1						
Negative	4	32	0.16	5	31	0.059	21	15	0.09	23	13	0.077	27	9	0.77	7	29	0.75	27	9	0.75
	(40)	(66.7)	ļ	(38.5)	(68.9)		(53.8)	(78.9)		(54.8)	(81.2)		(64.3)	(60)		(58.3)	(64.4)	ļ	(61.4)	(69.2)	
Positive	6	16		8	14		18	4		19	3		15	6		5	16		17	4	
	(60)	(33.3)		(61.5)	(31.1)		(46.2)	(21.1)		(45.2)	(18.8)		(35.7)	(40)		(41.7)	(35.6)		(38.6)	(30.8)	1

		Event free su	ırvival			Overall s	survival	
Variable	3yr-EFS	HR	95% CI	P value	3yr-OS	HR	95%	P value
	(%) <u>+</u> SE				(%) <u>+</u> SE		CI	
Age (in years)								
<12 (n=47)	76.49 <u>+</u> 6.59	1	1.16-	0.0132	90.81 <u>+</u> 4.	1	0.28-	0.88
			5.45		4		4.46	
≥12 (n=42)	42.19 <u>+</u> 9.36	2.52			90.09 <u>+</u> 4. 71	1.11		
TLC (X 10 <sup>9</sup> /L)								
<50 (n=54)	63.36 <u>+</u> 7.27	1	0.51- 2.24	0.86	91.52 <u>+</u> 4. 07	1	0.39- 6.28	0.52
≥50 (n=35)	60.28 <u>+</u> 9.75	1.068			88.38 <u>+</u> 5. 47	1.57		
NCI risk								
Standard	79.9 <u>+</u> 10.59	1	0.74-	0.12	100	1	0	0.15
(n=18)			8.08					
High (n=71)	57.98 <u>+</u> 6.71	2.44			88.01 <u>+</u> 4.	7.43e-		
					0	14		
BAALC	<b>17</b> 0 10		0.7.	0.57			0.00	0.55
Low (n=35)	62.45 <u>+</u> 8.68	1	0.56- 2.51	0.65	90.39 <u>+</u> 5. 31	1	0.33- 5.75	0.66
High (n=42)	56.17 <u>+</u> 887	1.88			88.03 <u>+</u> 5. 02	1.37		
HHEX2								
Low (n=36)	50.73 <u>+</u> 10.53	1	0.43-	0.76	89.99 <u>+</u> 5.	1	0.35-	0.59
High $(n=41)$	63 83+7 87	0.89	1.00		87 80+5	1 47	0.10	
ingii (ii— i i)	03.03 <u>-</u> 7.07	0.07			11	1.17		
MEF2C								
Low (n=65)	71.78 <u>+</u> 6.52	1	1.67- 7 3	0.0003	94.77 <u>+</u> 2. 96	1	1.16- 20.40	0.016
High (n=24)	36.57 <u>+</u> 10.74	3.5	,		78.75 <u>+</u> 8.	4.88	20110	
					45			
LYL1								
Low (n=68)	63.14 <u>+</u> 6.65	1	1.08-	0.024	89.14 <u>+</u> 3.	1	0.14- 9.24	0.91
High (n=9)	26.67 <u>+</u> 15.9	2.69	0.05		88.89 <u>+</u> 1 0.48	1.14	7.24	
TAL1					0.10			
Low (n=39)	52.25 <u>+</u> 9.77	1	0.39-	0.61	85.78 <u>+</u> 5.	1	0.14-	0.48
High(r=20)	64 25 + 9.01	0.612	1./4		95	0.50	2.51	
Hign (n=38)	04.33 <u>+</u> 8.01	0.013			92.11 <u>+</u> 4. 37	0.59		
FAT1								
Low (n=39)	54.78 <u>+</u> 8.62	1	0.36- 1.59	0.45	86.74 <u>+</u> 5. 53	1	0.14- 2.54	0.49
High (n=38)	62.23 <u>+</u> 9.61	0.75			91.58 <u>+</u> 4.	0.61		

# Table 3: Association of patients' characteristics with EFS and OS

					68			
LYN								
Low (n=33)	58.86 <u>+</u> 9.39	1	0.52- 2.41	0.78	86.86 <u>+</u> 6. 19	1	0.22- 3.47	0.84
High (n=36)	58.98 <u>+</u> 8.54	1.12			88.71 <u>+</u> 5. 32	0.87		
LMO2								
Low (n=28)	64.46 <u>+</u> 6.65	1	0.94- 5.33	0.058	89.11 <u>+</u> 4. 2	1	0.38- 9.4	0.42
High (n=41)	29.99 <u>+</u> 15.73	2.24			81.82 <u>+</u> 1 1.63	1.89		
DOT1L								
Low (n=13)	44.87 <u>+</u> 14.14	1	0.25- 1.44	0.25	68.38 <u>+</u> 1 3.15	1	0.06- 0.88	0.019
High (n=56)	62.52 <u>+</u> 6.94	0.61			92.64 <u>+</u> 3. 55	0.22		
LNC648								
Low (n=31)	54.81 <u>+</u> 6.65	1	0.18- 1.55	0.23	87.3 <u>+</u> 4.8 5	1	0.19- 4.81	0.97
High (n=33)	70 <u>+</u> 15.73	0.53			85.94 <u>+</u> 9. 31	0.97		
PCAT18								
Low (n=19)	59.71 <u>+</u> 8.67	1	0.45- 2.14	0.95	89.47 <u>+</u> 7. 04	1	0.26- 6.43	0.75
High (n=45)	56.40 <u>+</u> 9.67	0.98			85.89 <u>+</u> 5. 38	1.29		
LNC461								
Low (n=30)	57.96 <u>+</u> 9.33	1	0.45- 2.16	0.97	86.02 <u>+</u> 6. 50	1	0.23- 3.63	0.89
High (n=34)	58.34 <u>+</u> 9.67	0.99			88.03 <u>+</u> 5. 62	0.91		
LNC202								
Low (n=34)	55.29 <u>+</u> 8.62	1	0.35- 1.67	0.49	82.04 <u>+</u> 6. 65	1	0.07- 1.74	0.18
High (n=33)	59.80 <u>+</u> 9.86	0.77			93.94 <u>+</u> 4. 15	0.35		
MEF2C-AS1								ļ
Low (n=58)	53.92 <u>+</u> 6.94	1	0.028- 1.52	0.082	85.72 <u>+</u> 4. 69	1	0	0.25
High (n=9)	85.71 <u>+</u> 13.23	0.21			100 <u>+</u> 0	1.82e- 16		
PCAT14								
Low (n=34)	54.27 <u>+</u> 8.83	1	0.37- 1.74	0.56	82.04 <u>+</u> 6. 65	1	0.07- 1.74	0.18
High (n=33)	62.14 <u>+</u> 9.32	0.79			93.94 <u>+</u> 4. 15	0.35		
XIST								
Low (n=62)	58.36 <u>+</u> 7.17	1	0.51- 3.11	0.61	91.21 <u>+</u> 3. 78	1	0.59- 10.30	0.21

High (n=16)	61.88 <u>+</u> 12.30	1.26			80.77 <u>+</u> 1	2.45			
ST20									
Low (n=15)	43.21 <u>+</u> 13.56	1	0.19- 1.03	0.049	86.15 <u>+</u> 9. 11	1	0.15- 3.59	0.69	
High (n=59)	61.02 <u>+</u> 7.26	0.45			89.32 <u>+</u> 4. 14	0.72			
RAG									
Low (n=16)	41.67 <u>+</u> 12.9	1	0.20- 0.99	0.037	75 <u>+</u> 10.8 3	1	0.06- 0.98	0.03	
High (n=58)	61.24 <u>+</u> 7.49	0.45			92.54 <u>+</u> 3. 6	0.25			
EP300									
Low (n=51)	46.71 <u>+</u> 9.3	1	0.19- 1.15	0.085	87.75 <u>+</u> 4. 7	1	0.14- 3.42	0.65	
High (n=23)	73.66 <u>+</u> 9.25	0.46			91.1 <u>+</u> 6.0 1	0.69			
EML4									
Low (n=56)	45.29 <u>+</u> 8.92	1	0.078- 0.88	0.018	88.89 <u>+</u> 4. 29	1	0.19- 4.86	0.98	
High (n=18)	83.33 <u>+</u> 8.78	0.26			88.89 <u>+</u> 7. 41	0.98			
EZH2									
Low (n=55)	52.02 <u>+</u> 7.66	1	0.18- 1.51	0.22	90.57 <u>+</u> 4. 02	1	0.24- 6.44	0.79	
High (n=17)	76.02 <u>+</u> 10.48	0.52			87.84 <u>+</u> 8. 07	1.25			
MALAT1									
Low (n=17)	39.93 <u>+</u> 13.66	1	0.23- 1.12	0.081	76.02 <u>+</u> 1 0.48	1	0.048- 0.97	0.027	
High (n=54)	61.73 <u>+</u> 7.62	0.502			94.11 <u>+</u> 3. 31	0.22			
KDM6A									
Low (n=58)	50.48 <u>+</u> 7.58	1	0.062- 1.12	0.049	89.35 <u>+</u> 4. 12	1	0.075- 5.2	0.66	
High (n=14)	85.12 <u>+</u> 9.73	0.27			92.31 <u>+</u> 7. 39	0.63			
ETP-ALL immunophenotype									
No (n=76)	65.80 <u>+</u> 6.25	1	0.99- 5.46	0.043	90.20 <u>+</u> 3. 54	1	0.09- 6.24	0.80	
Yes (n=13)	4 <u>3.96+</u> 14.26	2.32			92.31 <u>+</u> 7. 39	0.76			
MRD									
Negative (n=44)	7 <u>3.78+</u> 7.28	1	0.72- 4.66	0.19	95.01 <u>+</u> 3. 45	1	0.29- 14.89	0.45	
Positive (n=22)	60.78 <u>+</u> 11.15	1.83			90.48 <u>+</u> 6. 41	2.09			

Variable	Hazard ratio	95% CI	P value			
Age (<12 years vs>12	1.21	0.46-3.14	0.703			
years)						
ETP-ALL	1.23	0.39-3.85	0.72			
immunophenotype (yes						
vs no)						
MEF2C expression(low	3.25	1.24-8.56	0.017			
versus high)						
LYL1 expression(low	1.06	0.33-3.42	0.92			
versus high)						
LMO2 expression(low	1.81	0.57-5.71	0.31			
versus high)						
MEF2C- AS1	0.23	0.027-1.93	0.18			
expression(low versus						
high)		0.01.1.07				
ST20 (low versus high)	1.16	0.31-4.35	0.82			
RAG (low versus high)	0.53	0.18-1.51	0.23			
EP300 (low versus	0.53	0.18-1.5	0.23			
high)	0.52	0.10.1.45	0.01			
MALATI (low versus	0.53	0.19-1.45	0.21			
high)	0.40	0.10.2.24	0.25			
KDM6A (low versus	0.48	0.10-2.24	0.35			
nign)	able the Meeltinericte Co		C			
I able 40: Multivariate Cox regression analysis of US       MEEOC server involved (2.72)						
MEF2C expression(low	0.73	1.09-41.52	0.04			
DOT1L average ion(low)	0.16	0.022.1.06	0.058			
vorsus high)	0.10	0.022-1.00	0.038			
L NC202 expression(low	0.10	0.02.1.75	0.14			
versus high)	0.19	0.02-1.75	0.14			
PCAT14	1 12	0 15-8 56	0.91			
expression(low versus	1.12	0.15-0.50	0.71			
high)						
MALAT1	0.16	0.031-0.85	0.031			
expression(low versus	0.10	0.001 0.00	0.001			
high)						
RAG expression (low	1.36	0.21-8.83	0.75			
versus high)						

# Table 4a: Multivariate Cox regression analysis for EFS