

Differences in mutational processes and intratumour heterogeneity between organs: the local selective filter hypothesis.

Mathieu Giraudeau, Tuul Sepp, Beata Ujvari, Francois Renaud, Aurélie Tasiemski, Benjamin Roche, Jean-Pascal Capp, Frédéric Thomas

► To cite this version:

Mathieu Giraudeau, Tuul Sepp, Beata Ujvari, Francois Renaud, Aurélie Tasiemski, et al.. Differences in mutational processes and intratumour heterogeneity between organs: the local selective filter hypothesis.. *Evolution, Medicine, and Public Health*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, inPress, 10.1093/emph/eoz017/5512491 . hal-02265363

HAL Id: hal-02265363

<https://hal.archives-ouvertes.fr/hal-02265363>

Submitted on 9 Aug 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

Differences in mutational processes and intratumour heterogeneity between organs: the local selective filter hypothesis.

Mathieu GIRAUDEAU*¹, Tuul SEPP^{2*}, Beata UJVARI^{3, 4}, François RENAUD¹, Aurélie TASIEMSKI⁵, Benjamin ROCHE¹ & Jean-Pascal CAPP^{6*} Frédéric THOMAS^{1*}

*Equal contribution

1 CREEC/ MIVEGEC, UMR IRD 224-CNRS 5290-Université de Montpellier, Montpellier, France

2 Institute of Ecology and Earth Sciences, University of Tartu, Vanemuise 46, 51014 Tartu, Estonia

3 School of Natural Sciences, University of Tasmania, Private Bag 55, Hobart, Tasmania, 7001, Australia.

4 Centre for Integrative Ecology, School of Life and Environmental Sciences, Deakin University, Waurn Ponds, Victoria, 3216, Australia.

5 Université de Lille-sciences et technologies, UMR 8198 Evo-Eco-Paleo, Villeneuve d'Ascq/CNRS/INSERM/CHU Lille, Institut Pasteur de Lille, U1019-Unité Mixte de Recherche 8204, Lille.

6 INSA/Université Fédérale de Toulouse, Laboratoire d'Ingénierie des Systèmes Biologiques et des Procédés, UMR CNRS 5504, UMR INRA 792, Toulouse, France

Heading title: Intratumour heterogeneity between organs

Word count: Abstract 172, text 3262, 0 table, 0 figure and 2 boxes

ABSTRACT

Extensive diversity (genetic, cytogenetic, epigenetic and phenotypic) exists within and between tumors, but reasons behind these variations, as well as their consistent hierarchical pattern between organs, are poorly understood at the moment. We argue that these phenomena are, at least partially, explainable by the evolutionary ecology of organs' theory, in the same way that environmental adversity shapes mutation rates and level of polymorphism in organisms. Organs in organisms can be considered as specialized ecosystems that are, for ecological and evolutionary reasons, more or less efficient at suppressing tumours. When a malignancy does arise in an organ applying strong selection pressure on tumours, its constituent cells are expected to display a large range of possible surviving strategies, from hyper mutator phenotypes relying on bet-hedging to persist (high mutation rates and high diversity), to few poorly variable variants that become invisible to natural defences. In contrast, when tumour suppression is weaker, selective pressure favouring extreme surviving strategies is relaxed, and tumours are moderately variable as a result. We provide a comprehensive overview of this hypothesis.

Extensive genetic, cytogenetic and epigenetic variation, as well as phenotypic diversity exist between and within tumors (i.e. inter- and intratumour heterogeneity respectively, the latter being called ITH thereafter) [1] [2] [3] [4]. Three main types of stochastic phenomena leading to ITH can be distinguished. The most well-known and by far most studied is genetic variability resulting from mutational processes [5]; a more recent but also intensively studied field is epigenetic variability [6]; and finally the most largely unexplored is gene expression variability [7]. The implications and clinical importance of these different sources of ITH are considerable since ITH may underlie incomplete treatment responses, acquired and/or innate resistance, and disease relapse in response to chemotherapy and targeted agents [8] [9] [10] [11] [12]. Because ITH is an important clinical determinant of patient outcomes, its origins have been the subject of much discussion by investigators. While genomic instability seems to be *the* major proximate process generating ITH [13], no consensus has however emerged between the several (non-mutually exclusive) hypotheses proposed to explain its establishment and maintenance [14] [15] (Box 1). Interestingly, several studies have also highlighted that both mutational processes and ITH between cancer types display a relatively constant hierarchical pattern between organs, with for instance melanoma and lung cancers being on average the most heterogenous cancers [16] [17] [18] [19]. Despite extensive research, the processes behind this hierarchy remain unclear as well.

In this paper, we propose that variation in mutational patterns and ITH result from the evolutionary ecology of organs' theory [20], and are therefore explained by the same rules than those governing mutational patterns and polymorphism in organisms living in more or less adverse habitats [21] [22]. For instance, genomic diversity is generally positively correlated with abiotic and biotic stress levels (e.g. [23] [21] [24]), leading sometimes to the selection of hyper-mutator phenotypes [25] [26]. Beyond a high-threshold level of stress, the

diversity may also sometimes decline to a few adapted genotypes potentially displaying strong evolutionary convergence [27] [28]. Organs in organisms can be considered as specialized ecosystems in a living landscape, whose ecologies are more or less favourable to cancer progression. The evolutionary ecology of organs' theory predicts that the evolution of organ specific resistance to malignant emergence and/or progression should be governed by their level of exposure to oncogenic factors together with the host's evolutionary responses in relation with the direct or indirect fitness importance of each organ [20]. Here, assuming that the number of mutations typically found in a cancer is an indicator of the diversity of molecular characteristics of cancer cells, we discuss the extent to which this hypothesis could explain inter organ variability in mutational and ITH hierarchy patterns, as well as examine whether it could explain the predilection for metastatic site(s) by different cancer types.

The local selective filter hypothesis

Recently, Vittecoq et al. [29] argued that a promising research direction for discovering novel anticancer therapies consist in exploring cancer suppressive mechanisms in animals living in environments that favour cancer emergence and/or progression. Indeed, the same way as the lack of correlation between body size/life expectancy and cancer incidence led to Peto's paradox [30], a lack of correlation between exposure to oncogenic factors and cancer incidence might suggest that evolution has produced solutions to avoid and/or control malignant problems in those species. From an evolutionary perspective, a similar conceptual framework can be applied at the organs' level [31] [32]. Concretely, we expect that selection has locally shaped powerful natural defences against malignant emergence/progression, and hence mostly aggressive neoplasms (i.e. higher mutational and ITH levels), or conversely few invisible ones succeed in emerging and developing in organs strongly exposed to mutagenic substances. In contrast, organs that are less exposed to oncogenic factors have been less

optimised by selection to be efficient at controlling malignant developments, and as a result, less aggressive neoplasms (i.e. lower mutational and ITH levels) may regularly emerge and progress in these tissues. These predictions seem in accordance with the hierarchical patterns observed for both mutational processes and ITH. Indeed, skin, lung or the digestive tract are, all things being equal, for instance undoubtedly more exposed to mutagenic substances than breast, pancreas or thyroid [33] [34] [35]. This phenomenon is of course exacerbated in our modern world [36]. Similarly, differential exposures to injuries and/or to infections, which can promote secondarily carcinogenesis, exists between organs [37].

Following the same idea, it has been long accepted in evolutionary immunology that strong immunological defences are also costly at the organ and tissue levels in terms of oxidative damage, since increased level of reactive oxygen species (ROS) is a by-product of elevated metabolism associated with an immune response, but also a defence mechanism used by immune cells [38] [39]. The level of these oxidative costs (or the strength of protection against these costs) can be organ-specific, as has been demonstrated in several studies on wild animals (e.g. [40] [41]). Accordingly, organs that are more efficient at controlling early-stage malignant emergence at the level of immune responses could be more vulnerable to tumor-promoting inflammation and mutations caused by ROS on the genomic level, resulting in higher ITH of neoplasms in these organs. Thus, tumor-promoting inflammation and antitumor immunity coexist at different points along the path of tumor progression, and environmental and microenvironmental conditions should dictate the balance between the two [42].

Carcinogenesis also typically occurs within the spatial constraints of the epithelial layer of the organ. In the breast and pancreas, for example, this involves tumour growth within a narrow duct while in the colon, premalignant lesions (e.g. polyps) grow into the lumen of the bowel and on the skin. The cell-cell interaction network is another factor that could explain the differential sensitivity of organs and tissues to neoplasm development.

Indeed, it could be a major contributor among the cancer suppressive mechanisms in animals. When examining the connectivity of 144 cell types in terms of ligands and receptors, recent works found that hematopoietic lineages are outliers because they are far less connected than all other cell types [43]. These lineages are also known to be the less mutated [43] and seem to not necessitate strong genetic instability, suggesting that a major suppressive force might be situated at the level of the cell-cell interaction network. Nevertheless, apart from blood cancers, brain cancers such as glioma can also be characterized by low mutational load. Interestingly, gliomas are also the ones with the highest ITH among solid tumors [19], suggesting that the low mutational load in these cases is compensated by high ITH. As previously discussed (Box 2), if tissue disruption is an initiator event in oncogenesis [44] [45], a strong and dense cell-cell-interaction network is expected to more efficiently prevent malignant development. Thus, the more cells are connected in a tissue or an organ, higher ITH is necessary for oncogenesis to occur, at least during the first steps of tumorigenesis. On the contrary, less connected tissues are expected to contribute to cancer types with the lowest ITH levels. Interestingly, works in ecology revealed a correlation between the connectivity between species in an ecosystem and the resistance to invaders [46], suggesting again that homology between species in ecological niches and cell types in organs could be relevant.

The local selective filter hypothesis not only provides an explanation for the different levels of mutations and ITH observed between cancer types and organs, but also support the fact that cancer could initiate when this selective filter at the tissue and organ levels is broken down. Interestingly, genes linked to multicellularity are systematically repressed in solid cancers while those that are more associated with unicellularity are upregulated [47]. This observation, which is concordant with the atavism hypothesis [48] [49], suggests that cancer cells transit to a more “selfish” unicellular mode of life through an active and directed process driven by selection [48]. Especially, genes linked to the extracellular matrix and adhesion as

well as signaling and cell communication are mostly downregulated. Among the 7 cancer types studied, those (breast and prostate) that have the most similar expression profile of multicellularity associated genes to normal tissue are also the least mutated [50], suggesting again that the level of genetic instability could be dependent on the need to break down the network of dense cellular interactions.

Finally, the nature and frequency of cancer stem cells are still a controversial debate. Inconsistencies in the numbers of such cells reported in the literature can be a consequence of the different definitions used by researchers. As suggested below (Box 2), oncogenesis could result from tissue disruption that generates differentiation problems because of the lack of tissue control^{42,43}. In our opinion, cancer stem cells have to be considered as cells acquiring highly unstable and variable phenotypes similar the ones of normal stem cells (due to high gene expression noise), but without the normal control normally exerted by the microenvironment.

If cancer development depends especially on the ability to counteract the cell-cell interaction network, it could be assumed that dedifferentiation (from differentiated cells) or failure of differentiation (from adult stem cells) are the best way to generate cells that are no more submitted to microenvironmental control because of the intrinsic plasticity and instability of such cancer stem-like cells[44] [51]. Consequently, the more cells of a tissue are under the control of their environment, the more they would need to acquire stem-cell like properties (and in higher number) to overcome this local selective filter. Tumors in tissues with stronger local selective filter would logically contain more cells with such unstable phenotypes. Thus this framework could explain the differences in the frequency of cancer stem cells between tumors. As these cells are themselves a source of phenotypic heterogeneity, this would be also associated to higher non-genetic ITH in these tumors.

Metastatic predilection site

Due to higher mutation rates, cancerous cell communities originating from neoplasias in organs with high resistance to malignant emergence should be able to produce metastases in a wider variety of organs compared to less diverse tumour cell communities. The understanding that metastasis results when tumour cells interact with a specific organ's microenvironment stems from the "seed and soil" hypothesis, stating that certain tumour cells ('seed') have specific affinity for the milieu of certain organs ('soil'), and metastases form only when the seed and soil are compatible [52] [53]. Although this hypothesis has been one of the most persistent in the study of cancer, and supported by a wide range of experimental evidence [53], it has not been linked to the mutation and ITH patterns. At the same time, it is logical to assume that the most lethal metastatic "seeds" evolve as a result of selective pressure in the primary tumor [54], and the selective pressure assumed to be the highest in organs that are most protected against malignant developments.

For example, while melanoma (rated highest on mutational processes by [50] and 2nd by [17]) cells introduced in mouse circulation can cause tumor development in a wide variety of tissue types[55], human ovarian cancer (ranked 14th at ITH by [50] and 19th by [17]) cells, despite continuous entry of millions of tumour cells into the circulation, rarely cause metastases even to the lung, the first capillary bed encountered [56]. Similarly, prostate cancer (ranked 15th by [50] and 21st by [17]) "seeds" have a very low probability to find a compatible "soil" in any tissues, but colorectal cancer (1st by [17], 7th by [50]) "seeds" readily give metastasis in a number of organs, exhibiting a cascading spread of gastro-intestinal tumors, where metastases in secondary sites spread "seeds" to the organs that follow the blood drain route [57].

Concluding remarks

We only see cancers that succeed in their development and this fraction corresponds to malignancies that bypass our natural defences. As soon as defences are unequal between the different parts of the body, the fraction of successful cancers is also expected to vary accordingly. By suggesting that the efficiency of natural defenses against cancer development is organ-specific and that it explains the hierarchy in mutation load and ITH between organs, our hypothesis highlights the role of the cellular environment in shaping the tumoral genomic and epigenomic content. In standard models of cancer, the cellular environment is destroyed as a consequence of cancer progression, thus has also a passive role and no driver role in tumor evolution. On the contrary, our hypothesis considers that the level of diversity needed for cancer development is precisely dependent on and the consequence of the ability of an organ to suppress this development. It contributes to the continuously growing body of works that place major influences in oncogenesis at higher levels of organization than the genomic level while not denying the major contribution of genetic and epigenetic instability in cancer progression.

An evolutionary theory needs to consider more than just humans, and needs to consider "historical" cancer patterns that would be more in line with the selective pressure experienced by our ancestors (which largely determined our genetic makeup and tumour suppressive strategies). While historical cancer data are undoubtedly difficult to find, we encourage scientists to explore our hypothesis using different datasets among various animal species. We also encourage researchers to perform experimental studies specifically designed to test whether cells with high mutation rate are, as proposed here, more likely to metastasize than others.

REFERENCES

1. Fidler IJ. Tumor Heterogeneity and the Biology of Cancer Invasion and Metastasis.

- Cancer Res. 1978;38: 2651–2660. doi:10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-16-1330
2. Marusyk A, Polyak K. Tumor heterogeneity: causes and consequences. *Biochim Biophys Acta*. 2010;1805: 105–17. doi:10.1016/j.bbcan.2009.11.002
 3. Marusyk A, Almendro V, Polyak K. Intra-tumour heterogeneity: A looking glass for cancer? *Nature Reviews Cancer*. 2012. pp. 323–334. doi:10.1038/nrc3261
 4. Yates LR, Campbell PJ. Evolution of the cancer genome. *Nature Reviews Genetics*. 2012. pp. 795–806. doi:10.1038/nrg3317
 5. Greaves M, Maley CC. Clonal evolution in cancer. *Nature*. 2012. doi:10.1038/nature10762
 6. Mazor T, Pankov A, Song JS, Costello JF. Intratumoral Heterogeneity of the Epigenome. *Cancer Cell*. 2016. pp. 440–451. doi:10.1016/j.ccell.2016.03.009
 7. Park Y, Lim S, Nam JW, Kim S. Measuring intratumor heterogeneity by network entropy using RNA-seq data. *Sci Rep*. 2016;6. doi:10.1038/srep37767
 8. Pribluda A, De La Cruz CC, Jackson EL. Intratumoral heterogeneity: From diversity comes resistance. *Clin Cancer Res*. 2015;21: 2916–2923. doi:10.1158/1078-0432.CCR-14-1213
 9. Allison KH, Sledge GW. Heterogeneity and Cancer. *Oncology (Williston Park)*. 2014;28: 1–9.
 10. Mengelbier LH, Karlsson J, Lindgren D, Valind A, Lilljebjörn H, Jansson C, et al. Intratumoral genome diversity parallels progression and predicts outcome in pediatric cancer. *Nat Commun*. 2015;6. doi:10.1038/ncomms7125
 11. Maley C. Multistage carcinogenesis in Barrett's esophagus. *Cancer Lett*. 2007;245: 22–32. doi:10.1016/j.canlet.2006.03.018
 12. Sophie F. Roerink, Nobuo Sasaki, Henry Lee-Six, Matthew D. Young, Ludmil B. Alexandrov SB, Thomas J. Mitchell, Sebastian Grossmann, Howard Lightfoot, David

- A. Egan, Apollo Pronk NS, Joost van Gorp, Elizabeth Anderson, Stephen J. Gamble, Chris Alder, Marc van de Wetering PJC, Clevers MRS& H. Intra-tumour diversification in colorectal cancer at the single-cell level. *Nature*. 2018;
13. Burrell RA, McGranahan N, Bartek J, Swanton C. The causes and consequences of genetic heterogeneity in cancer evolution. *Nature*. 2013. pp. 338–345.
doi:10.1038/nature12625
 14. Michor F, Polyak K. The origins and implications of intratumor heterogeneity. *Cancer Prevention Research*. 2010. pp. 1361–1364. doi:10.1158/1940-6207.CAPR-10-0234
 15. Thomas F, Ujvari B, Gidoin C, Tasiemski A, W. Ewald P, Roche B. Toward an Ultimate Explanation of Intratumor Heterogeneity. *Ecology and Evolution of Cancer*. 2017. pp. 219–222. doi:10.1016/B978-0-12-804310-3.00017-X
 16. Alexandrov LB, Nik-Zainal S, Wedge DC, Aparicio S a JR, Behjati S, Biankin A V, et al. Signatures of mutational processes in human cancer. *Nature*. 2013;500: 415–21.
doi:10.1038/nature12477
 17. Vormehr M, Diken M, Boegel S, Kreiter S, Türeci Ö, Sahin U. Mutanome directed cancer immunotherapy. *Current Opinion in Immunology*. 2016. pp. 14–22.
doi:10.1016/j.coi.2015.12.001
 18. Andor N, Graham TA, Jansen M, Xia LC, Aktipis CA, Petritsch C, et al. Pan-cancer analysis of the extent and consequences of intratumor heterogeneity. *Nat Med*. 2016;
doi:10.1038/nm.3984
 19. McGranahan N, Swanton C. Clonal Heterogeneity and Tumor Evolution: Past, Present, and the Future. *Cell*. 2017. pp. 613–628. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2017.01.018
 20. Thomas F, Nesse RM, Gatenby R, Gidoin C, Renaud F, Roche B, et al. Evolutionary Ecology of Organs: A Missing Link in Cancer Development? *Trends in Cancer*. 2016. pp. 409–415. doi:10.1016/j.trecan.2016.06.009

21. Nevo E. Evolution of genome-phenome diversity under environmental stress. *Proc Natl Acad Sci*. 2001; doi:10.1073/pnas.101109298
22. Hedrick PW. Genetic Polymorphism in Heterogeneous Environments: The Age of Genomics. *Annu Rev Ecol Evol Syst*. 2006; doi:10.1146/annurev.ecolsys.37.091305.110132
23. Galhardo RS, Hastings PJ, Rosenberg SM. Mutation as a stress response and the regulation of evolvability. *Critical Reviews in Biochemistry and Molecular Biology*. 2007. doi:10.1080/10409230701648502
24. Woodford N, Ellington MJ. The emergence of antibiotic resistance by mutation. *Clinical Microbiology and Infection*. 2007. doi:10.1111/j.1469-0691.2006.01492.x
25. Waine DJ, Honeybourne D, Smith EG, Whitehouse JL, Dowson CG. Association between hypermutator phenotype, clinical variables, mucoid phenotype, and antimicrobial resistance in *Pseudomonas aeruginosa*. *J Clin Microbiol*. 2008; doi:10.1128/JCM.00357-08
26. Swings T, van Den Bergh B, Wuyts S, Oeyen E, Voordeckers K, Verstrepen KJ, et al. Adaptive tuning of mutation rates allows fast response to lethal stress in *Escherichia coli*. *Elife*. 2017; doi:10.7554/eLife.22939
27. Kis-Papo T, Kirzhner V, Wasser SP, Nevo E. Evolution of genomic diversity and sex at extreme environments: fungal life under hypersaline Dead Sea stress. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A*. 2003; doi:10.1073/pnas.2036284100
28. Pan S, Zhang T, Rong Z, Hu L, Gu Z, Wu Q, et al. Population transcriptomes reveal synergistic responses of DNA polymorphism and RNA expression to extreme environments on the Qinghai–Tibetan Plateau in a predatory bird. *Mol Ecol*. 2017; doi:10.1111/mec.14090
29. Vittecoq M, Giraudeau M, Sepp T, Marcogliese DJ, Klaassen M, Renaud F, et al.

- Turning natural adaptations to oncogenic factors into an ally in the war against cancer. *Evolutionary Applications*. 2018. doi:10.1111/eva.12608
30. Caulin AF, Maley CC. Peto's Paradox: Evolution's prescription for cancer prevention. *Trends in Ecology and Evolution*. 2011. pp. 175–182. doi:10.1016/j.tree.2011.01.002
 31. Nunney L. Lineage selection and the evolution of multistage carcinogenesis. *Proc R Soc B Biol Sci*. 1999; doi:10.1098/rspb.1999.0664
 32. Noble R, Kaltz O, Hochberg ME. Peto's paradox and human cancers. *Philos Trans R Soc Lond B Biol Sci*. 2015;370: 20150104-. doi:10.1098/rstb.2015.0104
 33. D'Orazio J, Jarrett S, Amaro-Ortiz A, Scott T. UV radiation and the skin. *International Journal of Molecular Sciences*. 2013. doi:10.3390/ijms140612222
 34. Wakabayashi K, Nagao M, Esumi H, Sugimura T. Food-derived mutagens and carcinogens. *Cancer Research*. 1992.
 35. Wogan GN, Hecht SS, Felton JS, Conney AH, Loeb LA. Environmental and chemical carcinogenesis. *Seminars in Cancer Biology*. 2004. doi:10.1016/j.semcancer.2004.06.010
 36. Aktipis CA, Nesse RM. Evolutionary foundations for cancer biology. *Evolutionary Applications*. 2013. pp. 144–159. doi:10.1111/eva.12034
 37. Ewald PW, Swain Ewald HA. Toward a general evolutionary theory of oncogenesis. *Evol Appl*. 2013; doi:10.1111/eva.12023
 38. Klasing KC. Nutrition and the immune system. *Br Poult Sci*. 2007;48: 525–537. doi:10.1080/00071660701671336
 39. Hasselquist D, Nilsson JÅ. Physiological mechanisms mediating costs of immune responses: What can we learn from studies of birds? *Animal Behaviour*. 2012. pp. 1303–1312. doi:10.1016/j.anbehav.2012.03.025
 40. Yang D-B, Xu Y-C, Wang D-H, Speakman JR. Effects of reproduction on immuno-

- suppression and oxidative damage, and hence support or otherwise for their roles as mechanisms underpinning life history trade-offs, are tissue and assay dependent. *J Exp Biol.* 2013;216: 4242–4250. doi:10.1242/jeb.092049
41. Tkachenko H, Kurhaluk N, Grudniewska J, Andriichuk A. Tissue-specific responses of oxidative stress biomarkers and antioxidant defenses in rainbow trout *Oncorhynchus mykiss* during a vaccination against furunculosis. *Fish Physiol Biochem.* 2014;40: 1289–1300. doi:10.1007/s10695-014-9924-9
 42. Grivennikov SI, Greten FR, Karin M. Immunity, Inflammation, and Cancer. *Cell.* 2010. pp. 883–899. doi:10.1016/j.cell.2010.01.025
 43. Ramilowski JA, Goldberg T, Harshbarger J, Kloppman E, Lizio M, Satagopam VP, et al. A draft network of ligand-receptor-mediated multicellular signalling in human. *Nat Commun.* 2015;6. doi:10.1038/ncomms8866
 44. Capp JP. Tissue disruption increases stochastic gene expression thus producing tumors: Cancer initiation without driver mutation. *International Journal of Cancer.* 2017. pp. 2408–2413. doi:10.1002/ijc.30596
 45. Liggett LA, DeGregori J. Changing mutational and adaptive landscapes and the genesis of cancer. *Biochim Biophys Acta - Rev Cancer.* 2017; doi:10.1016/j.bbcan.2017.01.005
 46. Smith-Ramesh LM, Moore AC, Schmitz OJ. Global synthesis suggests that food web connectance correlates to invasion resistance. *Global Change Biology.* 2017. pp. 465–473. doi:10.1111/gcb.13460
 47. Trigos AS, Pearson RB, Papenfuss AT, Goode DL. Altered interactions between unicellular and multicellular genes drive hallmarks of transformation in a diverse range of solid tumors. *Proc Natl Acad Sci.* 2017;114: 6406–6411. doi:10.1073/pnas.1617743114

48. Vincent M. Cancer: A de-repression of a default survival program common to all cells?: A life-history perspective on the nature of cancer. *BioEssays*. 2012;34: 72–82. doi:10.1002/bies.201100049
49. Thomas F, Ujvari B, Renaud F, Vincent M. Cancer adaptations: Atavism, de novo selection, or something in between? *BioEssays*. 2017. doi:10.1002/bies.201700039
50. Alexandrov LB, Nik-Zainal S, Wedge DC, Campbell PJ, Stratton MR. Deciphering Signatures of Mutational Processes Operative in Human Cancer. *Cell Rep*. 2013;3: 246–259. doi:10.1016/j.celrep.2012.12.008
51. Liu J, Martin-Yken H, Bigey F, Dequin S, François JM, Capp JP. Natural yeast promoter variants reveal epistasis in the generation of transcriptional-mediated noise and its potential benefit in stressful conditions. *Genome Biol Evol*. 2015; doi:10.1093/gbe/evv047
52. Paget S. THE DISTRIBUTION OF SECONDARY GROWTHS IN CANCER OF THE BREAST. *Lancet*. 1889;133: 571–573. doi:10.1016/S0140-6736(00)49915-0
53. Fidler IJ. The pathogenesis of cancer metastasis: The “seed and soil” hypothesis revisited. *Nature Reviews Cancer*. 2003. pp. 453–458. doi:10.1038/nrc1098
54. de Groot AE, Roy S, Brown JS, Pienta KJ, Amend SR. Revisiting Seed and Soil: Examining the Primary Tumor and Cancer Cell Foraging in Metastasis. *Mol Cancer Res*. 2017;15: 361–370. doi:10.1158/1541-7786.MCR-16-0436
55. Hart IR, Fidler IJ. Role of organ selectivity in the determination of metastatic patterns of b16 melanoma. *Cancer Res*. 1980;40: 2281–2287. doi:10.1158/0008-5472.can-07-0605
56. Tarin D, Price JE, Kettlewell MGW, Souter RG, Vass ACR, Crossley B. Mechanisms off Human Tumor Metastasis Studied in Patients with Peritoneovenous Shunts. *Cancer Res*. 1984;44: 3584–3592.

57. Riihimäki M, Hemminki A, Sundquist J, Hemminki K. Patterns of metastasis in colon and rectal cancer. *Sci Rep.* 2016;6: 29765. doi:10.1038/srep29765
58. Pfeifer GP. Environmental exposures and mutational patterns of cancer genomes. *Genome Medicine.* 2010. doi:10.1186/gm175
59. Ling S, Hu Z, Yang Z, Yang F, Li Y, Lin P, et al. Extremely high genetic diversity in a single tumor points to prevalence of non-Darwinian cell evolution. *Proc Natl Acad Sci.* 2015; 1519556112-. doi:10.1073/pnas.1519556112
60. Waclaw B, Bozic I, Pittman ME, Hruban RH, Vogelstein B, Nowak M a. Spatial model predicts dispersal and cell turnover cause reduced intra-tumor heterogeneity. *Nature.* 2015;525: 261–267. doi:10.1101/016824
61. Campbell LL, Polyak K. Breast tumor heterogeneity: Cancer stem cells or clonal evolution? *Cell Cycle.* 2007. pp. 2332–2338. doi:10.4161/cc.6.19.4914
62. Gerlinger M, Swanton C. How Darwinian models inform therapeutic failure initiated by clonal heterogeneity in cancer medicine. *British Journal of Cancer.* 2010. pp. 1139–1143. doi:10.1038/sj.bjc.6605912
63. Lloyd MC, Cunningham JJ, Bui MM, Gillies RJ, Brown JS, Gatenby RA. Darwinian dynamics of intratumoral heterogeneity: Not solely random mutations but also variable environmental selection forces. *Cancer Res.* 2016;76: 3136–3144. doi:10.1158/0008-5472.CAN-15-2962
64. Verduzco D, Lloyd M, Xu L, Ibrahim-Hashim A, Balagurunathan Y, Gatenby RA, et al. Intermittent hypoxia selects for genotypes and phenotypes that increase survival, invasion, and therapy resistance. *PLoS One.* 2015; doi:10.1371/journal.pone.0120958
65. Chen A, Sceneay J, Gödde N, Kinwel T, Ham S, Thompson EW, et al. Intermittent hypoxia induces a metastatic phenotype in breast cancer. *Oncogene.* 2018; doi:10.1038/s41388-018-0259-3

66. Patel AP, Tirosh I, Trombetta JJ, Shalek AK, Gillespie SM, Wakimoto H, et al. Single-cell RNA-seq highlights intratumoral heterogeneity in primary glioblastoma. *Science* (80-). 2014;344: 1396–1401. doi:10.1126/science.1254257
67. Amir EAD, Davis KL, Tadmor MD, Simonds EF, Levine JH, Bendall SC, et al. ViSNE enables visualization of high dimensional single-cell data and reveals phenotypic heterogeneity of leukemia. *Nat Biotechnol.* 2013;31: 545–552. doi:10.1038/nbt.2594
68. Efroni S, Duttagupta R, Cheng J, Dehghani H, Hoepfner DJ, Dash C, et al. Global Transcription in Pluripotent Embryonic Stem Cells. *Cell Stem Cell.* 2008;2: 437–447. doi:10.1016/j.stem.2008.03.021
69. Richard A, Boullu L, Herbach U, Bonnafox A, Morin V, Vallin E, et al. Single-Cell-Based Analysis Highlights a Surge in Cell-to-Cell Molecular Variability Preceding Irreversible Commitment in a Differentiation Process. *PLoS Biol.* 2016;14. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.1002585
70. Moussy A, Cosette J, Parmentier R, da Silva C, Corre G, Richard A, et al. Integrated time-lapse and single-cell transcription studies highlight the variable and dynamic nature of human hematopoietic cell fate commitment. *PLoS Biol.* 2017;15. doi:10.1371/journal.pbio.2001867
71. Ohnishi Y, Huber W, Tsumura A, Kang M, Xenopoulos P, Kurimoto K, et al. Cell-to-cell expression variability followed by signal reinforcement progressively segregates early mouse lineages. *Nat Cell Biol.* 2014;16: 27–37. doi:10.1038/ncb2881
72. Peláez N, Gavalda-Miralles A, Wang B, Navarro HT, Gudjonson H, Rebay I, et al. Dynamics and heterogeneity of a fate determinant during transition towards cell differentiation. *Elife.* 2015;4. doi:10.7554/eLife.08924
73. Featherstone K, Hey K, Momiji H, McNamara A V., Patist AL, Woodburn J, et al. Spatially coordinated dynamic gene transcription in living pituitary tissue. *Elife.*

2016;5. doi:10.7554/eLife.08494

BOX 1- Current hypotheses for the establishment and the maintenance of different types of intratumour heterogeneity (ITH)

Several non-mutually exclusive models have been recently published to explain the establishment and maintenance of ITH. For certain cancer/organ combination, it has been argued that a significant proportion of somatic mutations result from **exposures to mutagens**, e.g. ultraviolet light in skin cancers, or tobacco smoking in lung cancers [58]. While this process undoubtedly contributes to generate ITH, it cannot account, alone, for the extreme ITH values frequently observed in certain organs, especially in tiny tumors (e.g. [59]). Waclaw *et al.* [60] proposed a model for tumour evolution suggesting that **cell turnover** together with short-range migration can account for rapid cell mixing within the tumour. Alternatively, according to the **cancer stem cell hypothesis**, ITH results from the differentiation of few cells with stem cell properties (e.g. unrestricted self-renewal abilities) that produce various cell types in the tumour [61]. In parallel, the **linear clonal evolution hypothesis** suggests that ITH is due to the accumulation of various hereditary changes over time that confer selective advantages to some premalignant and malignant cells [62]. Finally, the **plasticity cell hypothesis** postulates that the majority of tumour cells, depending on microenvironmental conditions and/or cell intrinsic stochasticity, display varying degrees of stem cell-like characteristics [14]. In accordance with this idea, Lloyd *et al.* [63] suggested that (at least some) intratumour heterogeneity in the molecular properties of cancer cells is governed by predictable regional variations in environmental selection forces. In fact, a common point in these hypotheses is to argue that because ITH plays a crucial role in neoplasia, cancer progression and therapeutic resistance, its persistence, once initiated, is supported by various selective costs and benefits. Although realistic in many cases, this

hypothesis has however some limitations because environments change unpredictably and evolution cannot anticipate the future. It is therefore challenging to explain the occurrence of ITH at the very first steps of the tumorigenesis. Genetic ITH can be so extreme even in tiny tumors, that Ling *et al.* [59] recently argued that evolution under a “non-Darwinian mode” is plausible, because genetic diversity observed would be orders of magnitude lower than predicted by simple classic Darwinian selection.

Recently, Thomas *et al.* [15] argued that generative mechanisms of ITH could also provide selective advantages to cells from the first steps of oncogenesis. In this hypothesis, malignant cells achieve greater success by **cooperating** in the process of tumour construction, providing the other with a common good, rather than by just being proliferative in isolation. There would be a concomitant selection of a bet-hedging strategy during oncogenesis, and hence ITH, because this is necessary to generate the diversity of cell components needed to build, *de novo*, a novel and an intricate cooperative system like the solid tumor is.

Finally, the molecular heterogeneity within tumours could be fundamentally driven by variations in spatial and temporal distribution of blood flow (see for instance [64] [65]), suggesting that variations in patterns of angiogenesis in different organs could be the primary driver of molecular heterogeneity.

BOX 2- ITH on the level of gene expression

Apart from genetic ITH, high heterogeneity in gene expression is observed within cancers [7], even at the single-cell level [66]. Cancer cells harbour a continuum of heterogeneous phenotype states demarcated by gradients of marker expression rather than distinct subpopulations [67]. An early increase in non-genetic ITH, especially in **gene expression variability** from cell-to-cell, has been suggested to account for phenotypic diversification in early steps and ultimately to oncogenesis [44]. Indeed, gene expression

variability is modulated during development and differentiation and many studies showed that following a phase of highly stochastic and widespread gene expression, cells progressively transit towards a more homogeneous, coordinated and restricted gene expression pattern [68] [69] [70]. Cellular interactions are major determinants in constraining and decreasing gene expression variability and seem to be the main “constraints” leading to these stable differentiated states [71] [72]. For instance, direct cell contacts through gap junctions spatially coordinate prolactin gene expression in pituitary adult tissue [73]. Moreover, enzymatic digestion of extracellular proteins or pharmacological inhibition of gap junctions reduced transcriptional coordination between cells [73], showing that perturbation of cell communication can enhance gene expression variability and phenotypic heterogeneity among differentiated cells.

Thus, **tissue disruption** could be the initial source of gene expression ITH [44]⁴³ and genetic instability has been proposed to be caused by this early gene expression ITH⁴⁹. In accordance with this hypothesis, numerous studies have now shown that tissue disruption can be either the inducer or the repressor of the cancerous state [44]^{70 71 72 73}. Therefore, the presence of epigenetic⁷⁴, gene expression⁷⁵, or micro-environmental⁷⁶ alterations that might precede the emergence of genetically abnormal cells further argues for a major role of non-genetic processes in the first steps of oncogenesis.

The early increase in gene expression variability allows another type of bet-hedging that can synergize with genetic ITH to allow phenotypic diversification, the **transcriptional ITH**. When RNA-seq data were used to measure the level of transcriptional ITH, 12 major cancer types showed distinct levels of this type of ITH [7]. Interestingly, when these results were compared with previous data on genetic ITH, a positive correlation between genetic heterogeneity and transcriptional ITH was found [7]. Both types of ITH can thus be considered as relevant forces in a bet-hedging strategy where the level of heterogeneity would

be dependent on the level of cooperation needed in the process of tumor construction to bypass suppressive forces in tissues.

Finally **epigenetic alterations** are also increasingly acknowledged as being able to initiate transformation, as genetic alterations do, by providing the gene expression plasticity necessary to provide stochastic oncogenic epigenetic changes ⁷⁷. Epigenetic instability can also allow phenotypic diversification in the bet-hedging strategy that we proposed here in the early steps of oncogenesis. Interestingly, while the global levels of genetic and epigenetic variations between tumour types are mostly uncorrelated ⁷⁸, when epigenetic and genetic ITH were measured by analysis of DNA methylation and copy number alterations in aggressive prostate cancer, the structure of phylogenetic trees constructed from the epigenetic and genetic data were very close, indicating a similarity in evolutionary process ⁷⁹. Other works revealed such correlation [6]: for instance, the level of DNA methylation ITH within an individual's leukaemia was positively correlated with the level of genetic ITH ⁸⁰. Landau *et al* ⁸¹ also found this correlation in chronic lymphocytic leukaemia between high numbers of sub-clonal mutations and high DNA methylation ITH. Finally, this correlation between genetic and epigenetic heterogeneity was completed in this last work by an additional correlation identified with data from single-cell RNA sequencing: promoters with high methylation ITH showed high cell-to-cell expression heterogeneity of the corresponding gene ⁸¹. Altogether these works reveal that genetic, epigenetic, and gene expression ITH are mostly correlated and suggest that different levels of all these types of ITH, and thus different levels of bet-hedging, are needed depending on the tissue and organ considered. However, despite a diversity of hypotheses that explain why ITH is omnipresent, the reasons governing these different levels of ITH are still unclear.