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Prostate cancer is the second most common cancer in men worldwide and causes over 250,000 deaths each year (Jemal et al., 2011). However, many men with prostate cancer do not develop symptomatic disease. Overtreatment of indolent tumors may result in significant morbidity. A deeper understanding of the genomic differences between lethal and indolent prostate cancer, as well as elucidation of “druggable” effectors dysregulated by genetic alterations, should improve patient stratification and speed the development of targeted therapies. With the advance of genomic characterization technologies over the last two decades, the somatic alterations that may drive prostate tumors have come into sharper focus. In this mini-review, we survey the field of prostate cancer genomics, highlight recent findings, and discuss prospects for future research.

THE MUTATIONAL SPECTRUM OF PROSTATE CANCER

All categories of DNA sequence alterations contribute to prostate tumorigenesis, including point mutations, small insertions or deletions, copy number changes, and chromosomal rearrangements (Figure 1). An overview of each category of alteration, and discussion of prospects for future research.

POINT MUTATIONS AND SMALL INSERTIONS–DELETIONS

Most prostate cancers exhibit somatic copy number alterations (SCNAs), with genomic deletions outnumbering amplifications in early stages of disease (Visakorpi et al., 1995). Early studies relied on cytogenetics, fluorescence in situ hybridization and molecular genetic approaches to map candidate cancer genes to regions of SCNAs (Brothman et al., 1999). In recent years, comparative genomic hybridization and high-density single nucleotide polymorphism arrays have allowed high-resolution genome-wide analysis of SCNAs. Statistical analyses of genome-wide copy number data have narrowed the boundaries of recurrent alterations considerably and have pinpointed novel cancer genes in these regions (Beroukhim et al., 2007; Taylor et al., 2010; Robbins et al., 2011).

The extent of SCNA is generally modest in pre-cancerous prostate intraplastic neoplasia (PIN), but becomes increasingly prevalent along the spectrum from localized adenocarcinoma to metastatic disease (Zinzulbinger et al., 2003). Particular recurrent SCNAs are enriched in advanced tumors. For example, tumors that fail androgen ablation therapy show frequent amplification of chromosomes 7, 8q and X (Visakorpi et al., 1995; Ahtes et al., 2000; Holcomb et al., 2009). Animal models of prostate cancer indicate that genes in these regions, such as the androgen receptor gene (X) and the MYC proto-oncogene (8q), contribute to cancer progression (discussed in detail below).
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et al., 2010; Kumar et al., 2011; unpublished data). It remains to be determined whether the high levels of mutation in these tumors are caused by MMR deficiency, and whether hyper-mutated cancers reflect different environmental etiology or biological behavior as well. Activating mutations in KRAS or metastatic tumors (Eastham et al., 1995; Tricoli et al., 1996; Cairns et al., 1997) while the androgen receptor is mutated only in metastatic or treatment-resistant disease (Linja and Visakorpi, 2004; Taylor et al., 2010). Ethnicity may influence mutation prevalence as well. Activating mutations in KRAS and BRAF occur in ∼10% of Asian patients but are rare in Caucasian men, perhaps reflecting different environmental etiology or biological behavior of cancers in these populations (Watanabe et al., 1994; Komishi et al., 1997; Cho et al., 2006).

Defects in DNA mismatch repair (MMR) machinery have been reported in prostate cancers and may accelerate progression to castration-independence (Dahiya et al., 1997; Chen et al., 2001). Some tumors display “closed chains” of balanced rearrangements, in which multiple DNA breaks occur throughout the genome and the resulting fragments are shuffled and rejoined to one another. These rearrangements may arise when the affected genetic loci are physically proximal to each other, possibly due to co-regulation by transcriptional machinery or nuclear co-localization in open- or closed-chromatin compartments (Osborne et al., 2004; Berger et al., 2011). Consistent with this hypothesis, androgen stimulation can induce physical co-localization of TMPRSS2 and ERG and permit fusion of these genes de novo via a topoisomerase 2B-mediated mechanism (Haffner et al., 2010).

The diverse categories of genomic aberrations underscore the need for comprehensive genomic analyses both to understand tumor biology and to direct targeted therapies on a genotype-specific basis (Roychowdhury et al., 2011).

**CELLULAR PATHWAYS DYSREGULATED BY RECURRENT PROSTATE CANCER GENOMIC ALTERATIONS**

Genomic alterations in prostate cancer can increasingly be conceptualized in terms of the molecular processes and pathways on which they impinge (Taylor et al., 2010). Mutations in prostate cancer may affect signal transduction pathways that regulate growth and proliferation, as well as genes involved in the normal development of the prostate. Below, we highlight several themes and pathways that provide a framework for understanding genomic alterations in prostate cancer.

**PI3K and MAPK SIGNALING**

The phosphoinositide 3-kinase (PI3K) pathway is a central mediator of cellular proliferation and growth that is aberrantly activated in prostate cancer. In response to pro-proliferative signals, PI3K catalyzes the formation of phosphatidylinositol (3,4,5)-triphosphate (PIP3), which recruits Akt to the plasma membrane. Upon phospho-activation at the plasma membrane, Akt phosphor-ylates a wide array of substrates that promote proliferation and cell survival.

Prostate tumors achieve activation of PI3K signaling most frequently via inactivation of the tumor-suppressor gene PTEN (Figure 2). PTEN encodes a lipid–protein phosphatase that counteracts signaling by PI3K via dephosphorylation of PIP3. Loss of heterozygosity at the PTEN locus is found in up to 70% of primary prostate cancers and inactivating mutations occur in 5–10%
FIGURE 2 | Somatic alterations in the PI3K pathway in prostate cancer. Selected genes in the PI3K pathway are depicted, alongside the mechanisms by which they are altered in prostate cancer. Putative proto-oncogenes are boxed in red and tumor-suppressor genes in blue. PI3K signaling is frequently activated by deletion of PTEN. PHLPP1 encodes a phosphatase that dephosphorylates activated Akt, and is frequently co-deleted with PTEN in metastatic tumors (Chen et al., 2011). Genomic rearrangements disrupt MAGI2, which encodes a scaffolding protein that stabilizes PTEN (Guay et al., 2005; Berger et al., 2011). Recurrent deletions inactivate the FOND1A gene, which encodes a transcription factor substrate of Akt that mediates PI3K signaling. Although rare, oncogenic mutations in the receptor tyrosine kinase EGFR or AKT1 may activate the pathway upstream or downstream of PI3K (Cai et al., 2006; Boomsma et al., 2005). The expression of most pathway members is dysregulated at the transcript level as well.

Amplification of PIK3CA, which encodes the catalytic subunit of PI3K, occurs in 13–39% of primary tumors and 50% of castration-resistant tumors (Edwards et al., 2003; Sun et al., 2009; Agell et al., 2011). Activating mutations have been observed in ~5% of primary tumors (Sun et al., 2009; Barbieri et al., 2012). PIK3CA activation and PTEN loss tend to be mutually exclusive, which suggests functional redundancy — although larger sample sizes are needed to assess this relationship robustly (Sun et al., 2009). Interestingly, PTEN loss and PIK3CA activation co-occur in endometrial cancer, suggesting that multiple lesions are required to activate the pathway, or that these events engage disparate oncogenic mechanisms (Das et al., 2005). In support of the latter possibility, oncogenic Akt-independent signaling downstream of mutant PIK3CA has been observed in both primary tumors and cancer cell lines (Vasudevan et al., 2009).

The PI3K pathway may be activated by genomic alterations at additional pathway nodes and dysregulated expression of constituent genes (Figure 2; Dong et al., 2006; Cai et al., 2008; Taylor et al., 2010). Determining whether these lesions predict sensitivity or resistance to PI3K pathway inhibitors has become an active area of translational research.

The mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK) pathway also plays a role in prostate cancer pathogenesis, especially in advanced and castration-resistant tumors. MAPK pathway activation is associated with higher tumor stage and grade and recurrent disease (Gao et al., 1999). In the setting of castration resistance, PI3K and MAPK signaling are often coordinately dysregulated (Gao et al., 2006; Kinkade et al., 2008). Evidence for collaboration between...
which encodes a ubiquitin ligase that targets p27Kip1 for proteasomal degradation (Koivisto et al., 1997; Linja and Visakorpi, 2004). AR point mutations allow promiscuous activation by steroid hormones such as estrogens, progestins, glucocorticoids, and androgen antagonists in 10–30% of refractory cases (Caddipati et al., 1994; Linja and Visakorpi, 2004). Alteration of androgen signaling may participate in localized disease as well: several AR-interacting genes are mutated or dysregulated in primary tumors, including NCOA2, NRIP1, TNK2, and EP300 (Taylor et al., 2010). NKX3-1 encodes a prostate-specific transcription factor that is required for normal development of the prostate and is deleted or down-regulated in up to 90% of prostate cancers (Emmert-Buck et al., 1995; Vocke et al., 1996; Asatiani et al., 2005). Inactivation via hemizygous deletion of chromosome 8p appears to occur early and can be observed in PIN lesions (Emmert-Buck et al., 1995; Asatiani et al., 2005). NKX3-1-deficient mice exhibit defective branching morphogenesis of the prostate gland and develop PIN-like lesions with age (Bhatia-Gaur et al., 1999). In addition, NKX3-1 appears to protect the differentiated prostate epithelium from oxidative DNA damage (Ouyang et al., 2005; Bowen and Gelmann, 2010). Therefore, loss of NKX3-1 may both disrupt terminal differentiation and foster the mutational inactivation of collaborating cancer genes such as PTEN (Kim et al., 2002).

The Wnt pathway regulates embryological development, and its contribution to prostate cancer is becoming increasingly recognized (Yardy and Brewster, 2005). Key pathway genes including APC, AXIN, and the β-catenin gene CTNNB1 may be mutated at low frequency (Voelkel et al., 1998; Cheshire et al., 2000; Yardy et al., 2009). APC undergoes LOH in roughly 20% of primary cancers and promoter CpG methylation in up to 90% (Brewster et al., 1994; Phillips et al., 1994; Yegnasubramanian et al., 2004). β-Catenin may promote proliferation through co-activation of AR-mediated transcription (Trusca et al., 2000; Cronauer et al., 2005). Additional mutations in Wnt pathway genes were recently documented in the progression to castration-resistant disease (Kumar et al., 2011). More pairs of pre- and post-release samples should be analyzed to clarify the importance of this pathway in refractory disease.

**GENOMIC HETEROGENEITY OF PROSTATE CANCER**

Prostate cancer is a clinically and genetically heterogeneous disease. Independent cancerous foci with distinct morphological features often coexist in a single prostate. The course of disease also varies widely: some cancers remain indolent for decades while others rapidly progress to lethality. Distinct molecular features appear to underlie the clinical and histological differences. Identifying genomic determinants of aggressive disease might improve experimental modeling and stratification of patients with intermediate-risk prostate cancer.

Prostate cancer may arise in multiple foci from independent precursor cells that are driven to neoplastic transformation by carcinogenic exposures or genetic predisposition (Andreoiu and Pett, 2008). The presence of genomic lesions can vary between foci, including TMPRSS2-ERG fusion, MYC amplification, and TP53 mutation (Mirandani et al., 1985; Jenkins et al., 1997; Meijer et al., 2007). Multiple distinct clones can be identified in a single biopsy (Ruiz et al., 2011), but most metastatic prostate cancers appear to originate from a single clone within a primary
Among other lesions, subclonal mutations may define cells in the primary tumor with metastatic potential (Michaud et al., 2004; Nakamura et al., 1999). Intratumoral heterogeneity complicates efforts to define prognostic mutations or expression signatures from primary tumors, because the subclone within a primary tumor that gives rise to metastatic disease must be adequately sampled (Shoemaker et al., 2010).

Despite the challenges posed by tumor heterogeneity, expression signatures have been delineated that have potential prognostic, predictive, and therapeutic implications. Some genomic alterations appear to have prognostic value as well. The TMR3SS2-ERG fusion, MTC amplification, and PTEN or TP53 deletion predict cancer-specific death in at least some patient cohorts (Sato et al., 1999; DeMichele et al., 2007; Siracusa et al., 2004). In some cases, a mutational signature may underlie expression-based sub-classifications (Lapointe et al., 2004).

PROSTATE CANCER IN THE ERA OF GENOMICS-DRIVEN MEDICINE

High-throughput genomic profiling has advanced the understanding, prognostication, and treatment of several tumor types. For example, identification of mutations in BAP1 in uveal melanoma (Habbour et al., 2010) or IDH1 in glioblastoma and acute myeloid leukemia (Parsons et al., 2008; Muris et al., 2009) demonstrated the power of genome sequencing to pinpoint novel cancer-driving mutations. Risk-predictive transcriptional signatures have been proposed that delineate histologically indistinguishable tumors that give rise to metastatic disease must be adequately sampled (Sboner et al., 2010). Further efforts to define prognostic mutations or expression signatures will be required to determine whether these mutations engage known molecular pathways relevant to prostate cancer or reflect novel mechanisms of oncogenesis.

Several hurdles must be overcome for prostate cancer genomics to impact the clinical management of this disease. For instance, biopsies produce scarce material for clinical genotyping and may not fully capture the relevant molecular heterogeneity within a tumor. Expression signatures have not yet demonstrated sufficient prognostic value to merit widespread use. In addition, recurrent genomic lesions identified thus far are largely not considered “druggable.”

These challenges can likely be surmounted by new approaches. For example, genomic characterization may identify opportunities to leverage synthetic lethality by inhibiting targets that are essential in the setting of a particular mutation, such as poly (ADP-ribose) polymerase in ET3 fusion-positive prostate cancer (Brenner et al., 2011). The analysis of multiple samples from a primary tumor and perhaps from circulating tumor cells may also allow aggressive tumor subclones to be identified. Ultimately, new paradigms for clinical trials may be required that incorporate cancer genomic information. In spite of these challenges, genomic profiling is likely to play a critical role in the clinical management of prostate cancer and ultimately in the clinical management of this malignancy.
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