

AD _____

Award Number: W81XWH-10-1-0614

TITLE: Laser Capture Microdissection Assisted Identification of Epithelial MicroRNA Expression Signatures for Prognosis of Stage I NSCLC

PRINCIPAL INVESTIGATOR: Saikrishna Yendamuri, M.D.

CONTRACTING ORGANIZATION: Health Research, Inc.
Roswell Park Cancer Institute Division
Buffalo, NY 14263

REPORT DATE: October 2011

TYPE OF REPORT: Annual

PREPARED FOR: U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command
Fort Detrick, Maryland 21702-5012

DISTRIBUTION STATEMENT: Approved for Public Release;
Distribution Unlimited

The views, opinions and/or findings contained in this report are those of the author(s) and should not be construed as an official Department of the Army position, policy or decision unless so designated by other documentation.

REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE				Form Approved OMB No. 0704-0188	
Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing this collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden to Department of Defense, Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports (0704-0188), 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302. Respondents should be aware that notwithstanding any other provision of law, no person shall be subject to any penalty for failing to comply with a collection of information if it does not display a currently valid OMB control number. PLEASE DO NOT RETURN YOUR FORM TO THE ABOVE ADDRESS.					
1. REPORT DATE October 2011		2. REPORT TYPE Annual		3. DATES COVERED 7 September 2010 – 6 September 2011	
4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE Laser Capture Microdissection Assisted Identification of Epithelial MicroRNA Expression Signatures for Prognosis of Stage I NSCLC				5a. CONTRACT NUMBER	
				5b. GRANT NUMBER W81XWH-10-1-0614	
				5c. PROGRAM ELEMENT NUMBER	
6. AUTHOR(S) Saikrishna Yendamuri, M.D. E-Mail: Sai.Yendamuri@RoswellPark.org				5d. PROJECT NUMBER	
				5e. TASK NUMBER	
				5f. WORK UNIT NUMBER	
7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) Health Research, Inc. Roswell Park Cancer Institute Division Buffalo, NY 14263				8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION REPORT NUMBER	
9. SPONSORING / MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES) U.S. Army Medical Research and Materiel Command Fort Detrick, Maryland 21702-5012				10. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S ACRONYM(S)	
				11. SPONSOR/MONITOR'S REPORT NUMBER(S)	
12. DISTRIBUTION / AVAILABILITY STATEMENT Approved for Public Release; Distribution Unlimited					
13. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES					
14. ABSTRACT The primary aim of this project is to laser microdissect stage I lung cancer samples, perform microRNA profiling of the epithelial and stromal components and develop component specific signatures of prognosis. This report summarizes the work performed on the project so far. A significant body of work has been performed to optimize the extraction of RNA from formalin fixed paraffin embedded lung cancer tissue and a working protocol established. These findings are useful to the scientific community and have been submitted for publication. Fifty seven of the proposed 77 stage I lung cancer samples have been microdissected this far into their epithelial and stromal component separated. Enough dissection has been performed to successfully acquire 400 ng of total RNA from each component.					
15. SUBJECT TERMS Lung cancer; microRNA, prognosis, biomarkers, laser microdissection					
16. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION OF:			17. LIMITATION OF ABSTRACT	18. NUMBER OF PAGES	19a. NAME OF RESPONSIBLE PERSON
a. REPORT	b. ABSTRACT	c. THIS PAGE			USAMRMC
U	U	U	UU	40	19b. TELEPHONE NUMBER (include area code)

Table of Contents

	<u>Page</u>
Introduction.....	4
Body.....	4
Key Research Accomplishments.....	7
Reportable Outcomes.....	7
Conclusion.....	7
References.....	7
Appendices.....	8


Introduction:

Even stage I lung cancer patients have an unacceptably high rate of recurrence (~35%)¹. A prognostic assay can help identify patients for intensified treatment such as adjuvant chemotherapy. Our previous data has demonstrated the potential of microRNA profiling of whole tumors to prognosticate early non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC)². However, some of the prognostic “signal” may be masked by varying composition of whole tumors with respect to their epithelial and stromal components. In this project, we intend to perform laser capture microdissection of lung cancer specimens to separate out the epithelial and stromal components of tumors and perform microRNA profiling of these separate components to try to improve our prognostic assay and to identify specific cancer epithelial microRNA of biological import.

Progress report:

A) Optimization of LMD protocol for microRNA quantitation by microarray:

In our preliminary data submitted in the proposal, the feasibility of microRNA profiling using laser capture microdissected specimens was established using 100 ng input RNA from a few samples with quantification of the RNA being performed by absorbance at 260 nm using the Nanodrop device. However, before embarking on this major project, we sought to optimize variables that may influence miRNA quantification by microarray and to set up a feasible workflow to enable a reasonably high throughput processing of tissue. One of the first variables tested was the





amount of total RNA input needed for reproducible microarray quantification. In order to do this, 250 or 400 ng of the same RNA sample obtained by LCM was labeled with the Hy3 dye and hybridized in duplicate to miRCURYTM (Exiqon Inc, Denmark). With both amounts, ~56% of the 1291 microRNAs detectable by the microarrays were identified as expressed. Not surprisingly, microarray signals were stronger with higher RNA

input (Figure 1). However, interduplicate correlation analyses clearly demonstrated


A

microRNA quantifications were more accurate and less noisy when 400 ng of RNA was used. As demonstrated in the inset in Figure 1, reliable quantitation of a much greater number of microRNAs are found with 400 ng than with 250 ng, a finding not apparent when only the number of microRNA considered expressed is measured. This finding was clearly important to our proposed project. While an increase in total RNA input can be simply increased by an increase in the total area of dissection performed, a fourfold increase in the area of dissection is not practical, given that, in some specimens, 6-8 hours of dissection is required to obtain 100 ng of total RNA. Therefore, we evaluated individual variables affecting RNA yield from microdissectates and in a series of experiments to boost our yield. A summary of the results from our experiments is summarized below:

- 1) RNA yield is best estimated by Ribogreen assay measurements and not by absorbance at 260 nm. This conclusion was based on measurement of correlation between RNU6-2 levels and RNA quantification performed by either method in 23 dissectates (Figure 2). The Pearson correlation coefficient was 0.91 ($P < 0.01$) for Ribogreen and statistically not significant ($P = 0.15$) for absorbance.
- 2) Comparison of the use of H&E (hematoxylin and eosin) and CV (cresyl violet) demonstrated that RNA extracted after CV stain was 2-3 times higher than that with H&E. However, recognition of key histological elements was better with H & E and therefore, a decision to continue to use H & E was made (Figure 3).
- 3) Comparison of the use of glass fiber based columns and silica carbide based columns demonstrated 4-7 times higher yield with silica carbide columns when compared to the glass fiber columns, an impressive difference (Figure 3).
- 4) It is often difficult to prep slides and dissect them the same day. While this



delay decreases the quality of mRNA when frozen sections are used, such an effect may not exist with FFPE samples, such as those used in our experiments. We compared the RNA yield in samples cut on day 0, day 3 and day 7 and did



not find significant differences in RNA yield. Similarly, after dissection, storage at room temperature, -80 C either in a dry state or in the tissue lysis buffer did not affect RNA yield.

5) One of the important steps involved in sample processing involves proteinase K digestion. RNA yield increases 1.5 fold when digestion time is increased from 15 min at 55 C to 3 hours. Further this yield increases by 1.7 times when the treatment time is extended from 3 to 20 hours.

6) Estimation of RNA yield by area of dissection: RNA yield from dissection can vary a great deal and it is important to have an idea of how much dissection is required to obtain a given amount of RNA. Based on the first 27 cases, we have determined that, using our protocol, an average yield of 84 ng of total RNA can be obtained from mm² of dissection.

s, and
. Total
ectates
n day-
ones,
l laser
plicate
without
(filled
s) and
ectates
for 0.5,
lotted.
were
values
Total
oxylin-
silicon

As demonstrated above, a number of experiments were performed to optimize our protocol before dissection of valuable human specimens was even started. This is due to the paucity of published data and protocols that could be readily used for our project. While this has delayed our project modestly, the information gained from our protocol optimization is valuable to the scientific community in general. This data has currently been submitted for publication (Appendix 1). Our current protocol for processing of these samples is detailed

in Appendix 2.

B) LMD of clinical samples: So far, LMD of 57 of the proposed 77 samples has been completed. A summary of the histology of the samples, area dissected and RNA yield is presented in Appendix 3. Twenty additional samples are currently being processed. Our current work flow enables processing of 3-5 samples /wk. Therefore, this work is slated to be completed in 4-6 weeks.

Reconciliation with statement of work: According to our previously submitted statement of work, the LMD work was scheduled to be completed in the first 6 months, followed by microarray hybridization and data analysis over the next 6 months. Given the large amount of protocol optimization that was needed to be performed, we are delayed by about 3-4 months. Apart from this delay, we do not propose any alteration in the statement of work.

Key Research Accomplishments:

- Optimization of RNA yield from laser microdissectates of paraffin embedded non-small cell lung cancer specimens – these methods are useful to the scientific community engaged in this kind of research

Reportable Outcomes:

- Manuscript submission attached (Appendix 1)

Conclusion:

In the first year of this grant, we have optimized methods to greatly improve the yield of RNA from laser microdissectates of paraffin embedded non-small cell lung cancer tissues. We have also completed LMD and RNA extraction of 57 of the proposed 77 samples and are well underway to complete the first specific aim of the proposal. The methodological refinements that we have developed are of use to researchers conducting similar studies.

References:

1. Goldstraw P, Crowley J, Chansky K, et al: The IASLC Lung Cancer Staging Project: proposals for the revision of the TNM stage groupings in the forthcoming (seventh) edition of the TNM Classification of malignant tumours. J Thorac Oncol 2:706-14, 2007
2. Patnaik SK, Kannisto E, Knudsen S, et al: Evaluation of microRNA expression profiles that may predict recurrence of localized stage I non-small cell lung cancer after surgical resection. Cancer Res 70:36-45, 2010

APPENDIX

- 1) Manuscript: Factors affecting the yield of microRNAs from laser microdissectates of formalin-fixed tissue sections
- 2) LCM RNA extraction protocol summary
- 3) Histology, area dissected and RNA yield of samples in the first 57 samples

Factors affecting the yield of microRNAs from laser microdissectates of formalin-fixed tissue sections

--Manuscript Draft--

Manuscript Number:	
Article Type:	Research Article
Full Title:	Factors affecting the yield of microRNAs from laser microdissectates of formalin-fixed tissue sections
Short Title:	MicroRNAs from laser microdissected FFPE tissue
Corresponding Author:	Santosh Kumar Patnaik, Ph.D., M.D. Roswell Park Cancer Institute Buffalo, NY UNITED STATES
Keywords:	cresyl violet; formalin-fixed tissue; hematoxylin-eosin; laser microdissection; microRNA; RNA isolation
Abstract:	Quantification of microRNAs in specific cell populations microdissected from tissues can be used to define their biological roles, and to develop and deploy biomarker assays. In this study, a number of variables were examined for their effect on the yield of microRNAs in samples obtained from formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissues by laser microdissection. MicroRNA yield was improved by using cresyl violet instead of hematoxylin-eosin to stain tissue sections in preparation for microdissection, silicon carbide instead of glass fiber as matrix in RNA-binding columns, and overnight digestion of dissected samples with proteinase K. Storage of slides carrying stained tissue sections at room temperature for up to a week before microdissection, and storage of the microdissectates at room temperature for up to a day before RNA extraction did not adversely affect microRNA yield. These observations should be of value for the efficient isolation of microRNAs from microdissected formalin-fixed tissues with a flexible workflow.
All Authors:	Santosh Kumar Patnaik, Ph.D., M.D. Eric Kannisto Sai Yendamuri
Suggested Reviewers:	Patricia Meitner Rhode Island Hospital, Providence, RI, USA pmeitner@lifespan.org Dr. Meitner has worked and published on RNA isolation from FFPE tissue microdissectates. Xiaowei Xu Associate Professor, University of Pennsylvania School of Medicine, Philadelphia, PA, USA xug@mail.med.upenn.edu Has published on microRNA isolation from FFPE tissues
Opposed Reviewers:	

1
2
3
4 1st September 2011
5

6
7 To PLoS ONE
8

9 We are hereby submitting our manuscript entitled "Factors affecting the yield of
10 small RNAs from laser microdissectates of formalin-fixed tissue sections" by
11 Patnaik, et al., for consideration for publication in *PLoS ONE*.
12

13
14 To the best of our knowledge, this is the first systematic study of variables of
15 practical importance affecting the yield of microRNAs and other small RNAs from
16 microdissected tissue specimens. Quantification of microRNAs in such
17 specimens is of value for biomarker discovery as well as biological studies, and
18 we believe our work will be of interest to many.
19
20

21 We thank you and the journal for considering this manuscript.
22

23
24 Sincerely, and on behalf of all authors,
25

26 Santosh Patnaik, MD, PhD
27

28 Assistant Professor
29 Department of Thoracic Surgery
30 Roswell Park Cancer Institute
31 Buffalo, NY, USA
32
33

34 Phone: 1-716-8458364
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Factors affecting the yield of microRNAs from laser microdissectates of formalin-fixed tissue sections

Santosh Kumar Patnaik¹, Eric Kannisto¹, Sai Yendamuri¹

¹Department of Thoracic Surgery, Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Elm and Carlton Streets, Buffalo, NY 14203, USA.

Correspondence

Santosh Patnaik, Department of Thoracic Surgery, Roswell Park Cancer Institute, Elm and Carlton Streets, Buffalo, NY 14263, USA. Phone: 716-8458364; fax: 716-8458922; email: santosh.patnaik@roswellpark.org.

Short title

MicroRNAs from laser microdissected FFPE tissue

Joint first authorship

SKP and EK contributed equally to this work

Abstract

Quantification of microRNAs in specific cell populations microdissected from tissues can be used to define their biological roles, and to develop and deploy biomarker assays. In this study, a number of variables were examined for their effect on the yield of microRNAs in samples obtained from formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissues by laser microdissection. MicroRNA yield was improved by using cresyl violet instead of hematoxylin-eosin to stain tissue sections in preparation for microdissection, silicon carbide instead of glass fiber as matrix in RNA-binding columns, and overnight digestion of dissected samples with proteinase K. Storage of slides carrying stained tissue sections at room temperature for up to a week before microdissection, and storage of the microdissectates at room temperature for up to a day before RNA extraction did not adversely affect microRNA yield. These observations should be of value for the efficient isolation of microRNAs from microdissected formalin-fixed tissues with a flexible workflow.

Keywords

cresyl violet; formalin-fixed tissue; hematoxylin-eosin; laser microdissection; microRNA; RNA isolation

Introduction

Laser microdissection (LMD) [1] is commonly used for the selective isolation of cell populations from tissues for molecular analyses. LMD is performed under microscopy, and cells are dissected out using a laser beam after they are identified by features such as histologic morphology. Quantification of the ultrashort, non-coding microRNAs in microdissected cells is an effective approach to understand the physiological roles of microRNAs [2,3,4,5] as well as to characterize microRNA dysregulation in diseases [6,7,8,9,10]. Unlike the much longer transcript mRNAs, microRNAs are resistant to fragmentation, and this permits the use of archived tissue material like formalin-fixed and paraffin-embedded (FFPE) specimens instead of fresh-frozen ones for reliable microRNA measurements for various studies [11,12,13]. Many of the variables that affect the recovery of microRNAs from macroscopic FFPE tissues have been identified [14,15,16,17]. However, the amount of cellular material obtained with LMD is minute, and the technique itself introduces conditions such as the presence of histologic dyes in the dissectates. In this study, we have examined some such factors of practical importance that can affect the yield and quality of microRNAs from LMD microdissectates of FFPE tissues for downstream analysis.

Materials and Methods

Ethics statement

This project was approved by the Institutional Review Board of the Roswell Park Cancer Institute (RPCI).

Tissues and microdissection

FFPE tissues of human non-small cell lung cancer and their xenografts in immunodeficient mice were kindly provided by, respectively, the core pathology facility of RPCI, and Dr. Bonnie Hylander of the Department of Immunology, RPCI. Tissue blocks were cut on a CUT4055 rotary microtome (Triangle Biomedical Sciences®, Durham, NC) into 8 µm-thick sections, which were placed on glass slides covered with a polyethylene naphthalate membrane (PEN; Leica®, Wetzlar, Germany). Slides were dried overnight, de-paraffinized with xylene and rehydrated using a graded ethanol series (100%, 99%, 75%, and 50%, by volume in water) for staining with either cresyl violet (CV; 5 mg/ml in 20% ethanol and 1.5% acetic acid at pH 2.5; Ambion®, Austin, TX), or hematoxylin and eosin (H&E) using Harris hematoxylin (Polysciences®, Warrington, PA) followed by eosin Y (5 mg/ml; Fisher Scientific®, Pittsburgh, PA) according to protocols provided by the manufacturers. Slides were then dehydrated using a reverse graded ethanol series and xylene, and used for laser microdissection within a day. LMD was performed with a pulsed ultraviolet laser on an LMD6000 system (Leica®) at 50x-200x magnification with laser power, speed and specimen-balance settings of 98, 2 and 11, respectively, in a room with >35% humidity. Dissectates were collected in 0.5 ml polypropylene tubes. The duration of LMD to obtain a dissectate sample varied from 15 to 120 minutes. Dissectates were also obtained by manually excising tissue sections along with the PEN membrane with a scalpel blade. Morphologically identical quadrants of serial sections were cut for replicate samples. All work was done with precautions to maintain an RNase-free environment.

Isolation of RNA

Total RNA was isolated using protocols and reagents supplied with the RecoverAll™ Total Nucleic Acid Isolation (product number AM1975; Ambion®), miRCURY™ Cell and Plant Tissue RNA Isolation (product number 300110; Exiqon®, Vedbaek, Denmark), and FFPE RNA Purification (product number 25300; Norgen Biotek®, Thorold, Canada) kits. All three kits contain spin columns with an RNA-binding matrix: ~0.01 g silica or glass fiber (GF) in case of RecoverAll™, and ~0.1 g carborundum or silicon carbide (SiC) powder in the other two. The columns provided with the kits of Exiqon® and Norgen Biotek® are identical as Exiqon® procures the columns from Norgen Biotek®. Lysis of tissues and treatment with proteinase K at 55° C before a lysate was loaded on columns were done using reagents and instructions provided with the FFPE RNA Purification or the High Pure™ miRNA Isolation (product number 05 080 576 001; Roche®, Indianapolis, IN) kits. The concentration of proteinase K in the reactions set up as per the methods recommended for the two kits were 0.65 and 5.7 µg/µl respectively. Loading of lysates on a column and column washes were done using solutions and protocols supplied with the kit for that column. RNA was eluted from a column using either 50 or 100 µl water with the same volume used for all elutions in any given experiment.

Semi-quantification of RNAs by reverse transcription-PCR (RT-PCR)

TaqMan™ MicroRNA RT-PCR assay (Applied Biosystems®, Foster City, CA), with identification number 391, was used to measure microRNA *miR-16*. A similar assay was designed as per principles outlined in previous studies [18,19], validated (figure S2),

1
2
3
4 and used to quantify the small nucleolar RNA *RNU6-2* (also known as *U6B*). Sequences
5
6 (and final concentrations in reactions) of the RT, and forward and reverse PCR primers,
7
8 and the TaqMan™ probe were, respectively, GTCGTA TCCAGT GCAGGG TCCGAG
9
10 GTATTC GCACTG GATACG ACAAAA ATAT (50 nM), GTGCAG GGTCCG AGGT (1
11
12 μM), GCAAGG ATGACA CGCAAA T (1 μM) and TATGGA ACGCTT CACGA (200 nM).
13
14 For the RT-PCR assays, 5 μl each of RNA preparations were reverse transcribed using
15
16 RNA-specific primers and reagents provided with the TaqMan™ MicroRNA Reverse
17
18 Transcription Kit (Applied Biosystems®). RT reactions were used as templates in 40
19
20 cycle-PCR reactions on a 7900HT real-time PCR machine (Applied Biosystems®).
21
22 Quantification cycle (C_q) values, approximately inversely proportional to $\log_2$ values of
23
24 analyte RNA concentrations, were obtained with SDS™ software (version 2.4; Applied
25
26 Biosystems®). The average of C_q values of triplicate PCR reactions was used for
27
28 analysis. C_q values were >40 for negative controls, for which RT reactions were
29
30 performed without RNA. C_q values were subtracted from 40 to obtain measurements
31
32 directly proportional to $\log_2$ values of analyte RNA concentrations.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40
41
42

43 *RNA quantification using RiboGreen assay*

44
45 Nucleic acid concentration in RNA preparations was quantified in duplicate with Quant-
46
47 it™ RiboGreen RNA reagent (Invitrogen®) as per the method suggested by the
48
49 manufacturer. Yeast tRNA (Ambion®) was used to prepare standards of known RNA
50
51 concentration. RNA samples (1-4 μl) were diluted to 100 μl using 10 mM tris
52
53 hydrochloride with 1 mM ethylenediaminetetraacetic acid at pH 7.5 (CellGro®,
54
55 Manassas, VA), and mixed with 100 μl of the buffer with 200- or 2000-fold diluted
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

RiboGreen (for high- and low-range assays, respectively). Fluorescence at 535 nm following excitation at 485 nm was measured for 0.1 s on a Victor Wallac™ 1420 plate reader (Perkin Elmer®, Waltham, MA). Unknown RNA concentrations were extrapolated from standard curves generated for yeast tRNA.

Nuclease treatment of RNA preparations

Bovine pancreas RNase A (DNase- and protease-free) and recombinant DNase I (RNase-free) were obtained from Fermentas® (Glen Burnie, MD). Ten µl of nuclease reactions were set up at 37 °C for 1 h using 1 U of either enzyme, buffer provided by Fermentas® for use with DNase I, and 8 µl of RNA preparation containing <0.1 µg RNA as per RiboGreen assay. Control reactions using yeast tRNA (0.1-0.2 µg) confirmed completeness of the RNase reactions and absence of RNase activity in the DNase I stock.

MicroRNA profiling using locked nucleic acid (LNA) microarrays

This work was performed as a commercial service by Exiqon® (Vedbaek, Denmark) using their 6th generation miRCURY™ LNA™ microarrays. Each array had more than 2383 LNA capture probes for multiple RNAs of human, mouse, rat, and some viruses printed in quadruplicate on randomly distributed spots of 105 µm diameter with an inter-spot distance of 210 µm. A total of 1304 probes targeted 1291 human microRNAs, including 66 proprietary ones (miRPlus™, Exiqon®), and 23 non-microRNA human small RNAs with <200 nucleotides, including the 5S ribosomal RNA and the *RNU6-2* small nucleolar RNA (*U6B*). Every microRNA was recognized by only one of the 1276

1
2
3
4 probes for microRNAs. Eight probes recognized two microRNAs each, and three and
5
6
7 six microRNAs were recognized by one probe each. For simplicity, the signals from
8
9 such probes were considered as representing single microRNAs. Before hybridization to
10
11 a microarray, 0.25 or 0.4 µg of an RNA sample, reduced in volume at room temperature
12
13 in a speed-vacuum apparatus, and a human 'universal reference' total RNA preparation
14
15 made by mixing the RNA pools provided in the FirstChoice® Human Total RNA Survey
16
17 Panel (product number AM6000, Ambion®, Austin, TX) were 3'- or 5'-end-labeled with
18
19 Cy3-like Hy3™ or Cy5-like Hy5™ (Exiqon®) dyes, respectively, using miRCURY™
20
21 LNA™ microRNA Hi-Power Labeling kits (Exiqon®). Microarrays were scanned for
22
23 analysis using ImaGene® software (version 9; BioDiscovery®, Los Angeles, CA).
24
25
26 Examinations of the scans and analyses of microarray signal values for 52 spiked-in
27
28 synthetic, small RNAs showed that all labeling reactions and hybridizations were of
29
30 good quality. Hy3™ and Hy5™ signal values were processed with the limma [20]
31
32 Bioconductor package (version 3.6.9) for R (version 2.12). Correction for background
33
34 noise was done using the normexp method [21] with an 'offset' value of 10, and was
35
36 followed by within-array normalization using the global loess regression method with a
37
38 'span' value of 1/3 [22]. Microarray signal values were then identified as summarized
39
40 Hy3™ values which were the means of values from the quadruplicate probe-spots when
41
42 the maximum was <1.5 times the minimum, or the medians if otherwise. MicroRNAs
43
44 recognized by probes for which the microarray signal values were >3 times the
45
46 summarized microarray signal value for probe-less empty microarray spots (1108 total)
47
48 were considered as expressed.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Other

Unless specified otherwise, statistical analyses and graphical plotting were done in Prism™ software (version 5.0d; GraphPad Software®, La Jolla, CA), P value of 0.05 was the cut-off for deciding significance, and t tests were two-tailed, assumed equal variances, and used paired samples when possible.

Results and Discussion

We obtained FFPE tissues of human lung cancers or their xenografts grown in mice for this work. Tissues were cut into 8 µm-thick sections, which were then placed on glass slides covered with PEN membrane. The sections were deparaffinized and stained with either H&E or CV, and used for LMD within a day with a pulsed ultraviolet laser on an LMD6000 system (Leica®). For some experiments, areas of tissue sections were dissected out along with PEN membrane by hand using a surgical blade. To obtain replicate samples, morphologically identical quadrants of stained serial sections were cut. Dissectates were lysed with proteinase K and total RNA was extracted by affinity chromatography using the RecoverAll™ Total Nucleic Acid Isolation (Ambion®) or FFPE RNA Purification (Norgen Biotek®) kits that respectively use GF or SiC as the RNA-binding matrix. Total RNA in RNA extractions was quantified using RiboGreen dye in a fluorescence assay [23], or by measuring absorbance at 260 nm. Identical volumes of different RNA preparations were used for TaqMan™ microRNA assays (Applied Biosystems®), based on RT-PCR [18], for microRNA *miR-16*, an abundant and ubiquitous microRNA [e.g., 24], and *RNU6-2 (U6B)*, a 45 base-long, housekeeping nucleolar RNA. Inter-group differences were analyzed using t tests assuming equal

variances. P values determined in different statistical tests were two-tailed and a cut-off of 0.05 was used to appraise significance.

An analysis of RNA preparations from 23 different dissectates from xenografts showed that *RNU6-2* levels correlated well with total RNA estimations by RiboGreen assay with a Pearson coefficient of 0.91 (95% confidence interval = 0.79-0.96; $P < 0.01$) whereas there was no significant correlation with total RNA quantifications by absorbance at 260 nm ($P = 0.15$; figure 1). RiboGreen assay was thus deemed as more precise than absorbance spectrophotometry for RNA samples of low concentration, as has been observed by others [25], and was used to assess total RNA for the rest of the study. H&E and CV are nucleic acid-binding stains that can possibly interfere with RNA extraction, and their use can differentially affect RNA degradation during the processing steps of staining [26,27,28]. To evaluate this, we compared small RNA yields from H&E- or CV-stained replicate dissectates from three xenografts by measuring *RNU6-2* and *miR-16* levels. In RNA extracted using GF columns, *RNU6-2* and *miR-16* levels respectively were an average of 2.1 and 3.0 times higher with CV than H&E (figure 2A). With SiC columns too, *RNU6-2* and *miR-16* levels were, respectively, on average 2.6 and 2.0 times higher with CV than H&E. In paired t tests disregarding the column-type, the improvements in *RNU6-2* and *miR-16* yields were significant (P values of 0.02 and 0.01, respectively). Because of convenience, we decided to use H&E stain for the rest of the experiments of this study. The efficacies of the two types of columns were also compared. For this, proteinase K lysates were prepared from dissectates from three xenografts and divided into two equal portions, each of which was used for the two types of columns. As shown in figure 2B, with CV-stained dissectates, *RNU6-2* and

1
2
3
4 *miR-16* levels respectively were an average of 3.9 and 7.0 times higher with SiC
5
6 columns than GF columns. When H&E was the stain, *RNU6-2* and *miR-16* levels were,
7
8 respectively, on average 3.7 and 7.9 times higher with SiC columns than GF columns.
9
10 These improvements in *RNU6-2* and *miR-16* yields, significant in paired t tests
11
12 disregarding the histologic stain (both P values <0.01), could be because of differences
13
14 in column design and not necessarily because of a better efficacy of the SiC matrix per
15
16
17
18
19 se.
20

21 To test effect on RNA yield of duration of storage of stained slides at room
22
23 temperature before dissection and RNA extraction, replicate sections from three
24
25 xenografts were used for dissection on the same day (day 0) the slides were prepared
26
27 or after a period of 3-7 days. RiboGreen and *miR-16* assays of the RNA preparations
28
29 showed that RNA yields were not reduced at day 4 compared to day 0, or at day 7
30
31 compared to day 3 (figure 3A). This observation indicates that slides can be prepared
32
33 and stored for at least a week before LMD is performed without an adverse effect on
34
35 microRNA yield. The effect of different storage conditions for dissectates before RNA
36
37 extraction was also examined (figure 3B). There was no significant difference in RNA
38
39 yield as measured by RiboGreen assay between LMD samples kept at room
40
41 temperature for a day in a dry state, or at -80 °C either in a dry state or in the tissue
42
43 lysis buffer provided with the RNA extraction kit.
44
45
46
47
48
49

50 As expected from previous studies on RNA extraction from FFPE tissues [e.g.,
51
52 16], RNA yield improved significantly when the duration of proteinase K treatment was
53
54 extended (figure 3C). RiboGreen, *RNU6-2* and *miR-16* measurements respectively
55
56 were on average 1.5, 2.3 and 1.3 times higher when the duration was increased to 3 h
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 at 55 °C from 15 min at 55 °C followed by 15 min at 80 °C (P values of 0.02, 0.04 and
5
6 0.36, respectively). Extending treatment time from 3 to 20 h resulted in 1.7, 3.8 and 1.8
7
8 times higher RiboGreen, *RNU6-2* and *miR-16* measurements, respectively (P values of
9
10 <0.01, <0.01 and 0.03, respectively).
11
12

13
14 To assess the relation of dissectate quantity and RNA yield, epithelial
15
16 compartments of 27 human non-small cell lung cancers were isolated by LMD from
17
18 H&E-stained FFPE tissue sections, and digested with proteinase K at 55 °C overnight.
19
20 RNA from the lysates was prepared using the kit from Norgen Biotek®. As shown in
21
22 figure 4A, there was a significant Pearson correlation ($r = 0.71$, 95% confidence interval
23
24 = 0.45-0.86) between cross-sectional areas of dissectates and RiboGreen
25
26 measurements of RNA prepared from them, with an average of 84 ng RNA obtained per
27
28 mm^2 area. RiboGreen assay of four different RNA preparations that were treated with
29
30 DNase I, RNase A or neither at 37 °C for 1 h showed that 37%-39% of the nucleic acids
31
32 in the RNA preparations was DNA and not RNA (figure 4B). To assess the suitability of
33
34 the RNA for microRNA quantification using microarrays, 250 or 400 ng of one RNA
35
36 sample was labeled with Hy3™ dye and hybridized in duplicate to miRCURY™ locked
37
38 nucleic acid microarrays (Exiqon®). With both 250 and 400 ng input, about 56% of the
39
40 1291 microRNAs detectable by the microarrays were identified as expressed. However,
41
42 microarray signals were stronger with higher RNA input (figure 4C). E.g., 21% of
43
44 expressed microRNAs had signal values of >200 for with 400 ng RNA whereas the
45
46 value was 17% for 250 ng. Inter-duplicate correlation analyses showed that microarray
47
48 signals were likely more accurate and less noisy when more RNA was used (figure 4C).
49
50 Comparison of microarray signal from RNA prepared from microdissectates with that
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 from the commercially available human 'universal reference' RNA, which was used for
5
6 the reference channel of the two-color microarrays, showed that the microRNA isolation
7
8 method did not adversely affect RNA labeling and hybridization for microarray analysis
9
10 (figure S2).
11
12
13

14 To summarize, this study suggests that microRNA yields from LMD samples
15
16 obtained from FFPE tissues can be improved by using CV instead of H&E as histologic
17
18 stain, SiC instead of GF as matrix in RNA-binding columns, and overnight digestion with
19
20 proteinase K. Storage of stained slides at room temperature for up to a week before
21
22 LMD, and storage of LMD samples at room temperature for up to a day before RNA
23
24 extraction does not seem to adversely affect microRNA yield. RNA prepared as per the
25
26 methods used in this study, though containing DNA as well, appear to be suitable for
27
28 microRNA quantification by RT-PCR or microarray hybridization. These observations
29
30 should allow for efficient isolation of microRNAs from microdissectates prepared from
31
32 FFPE tissues with a more manageable and flexible workflow.
33
34
35
36
37
38
39
40

41 **Acknowledgements**

42
43 We thank Wiam Bshara, Zahra Fayazi, Angela Omilian and Melanie Kresin of the
44
45 Department of Pathology, RPCI for slide preparation and assistance with LMD.
46
47
48
49

50 **References**

51
52
53 1. Emmert-Buck MR, Bonner RF, Smith PD, Chuaqui RF, Zhuang Z, et al. (1996) Laser
54
55 capture microdissection. Science 274: 998-1001.
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

2. Balakrishnan A, Stearns AT, Park PJ, Dreyfuss JM, Ashley SW, et al. (2010) MicroRNA mir-16 is anti-proliferative in enterocytes and exhibits diurnal rhythmicity in intestinal crypts. *Exp Cell Res* 316: 3512-3521.
3. Junker A, Krumbholz M, Eisele S, Mohan H, Augstein F, et al. (2009) MicroRNA profiling of multiple sclerosis lesions identifies modulators of the regulatory protein CD47. *Brain* 132: 3342-3352.
4. Katakowski M, Zheng X, Jiang F, Rogers T, Szalad A, et al. (2011) MiR-146b-5p suppresses EGFR expression and reduces in vitro migration and invasion of glioma. *Cancer Invest* 28: 1024-1030.
5. Zhang X, Ladd A, Dragoescu E, Budd WT, Ware JL, et al. (2009) MicroRNA-17-3p is a prostate tumor suppressor in vitro and in vivo, and is decreased in high grade prostate tumors analyzed by laser capture microdissection. *Clin Exp Metastasis* 26: 965-979.
6. Hannafon BN, Sebastiani P, de Las Morenas A, Lu J, Rosenberg CL (2011) Expression of microRNA and their gene targets are dysregulated in preinvasive breast cancer. *Breast Cancer Res* 13: R24.
7. Buller B, Liu X, Wang X, Zhang RL, Zhang L, et al. (2010) MicroRNA-21 protects neurons from ischemic death. *FEBS J* 277: 4299-4307.
8. du Rieu MC, Torrisani J, Selves J, Al Saati T, Souque A, et al. (2010) MicroRNA-21 is induced early in pancreatic ductal adenocarcinoma precursor lesions. *Clin Chem* 56: 603-612.

- 1
2
3
4 9. Glud M, Rossing M, Hother C, Holst L, Hastrup N, et al. (2010) Downregulation of
5
6 miR-125b in metastatic cutaneous malignant melanoma. *Melanoma Res* 20: 479-484.
7
8
9
10 10. Gregg JL, Brown KE, Mintz EM, Piontkivska H, Fraizer GC (2010) Analysis of gene
11
12 expression in prostate cancer epithelial and interstitial stromal cells using laser capture
13
14 microdissection. *BMC Cancer* 10: 165.
15
16
17
18 11. Liu A, Tetzlaff MT, Vanbelle P, Elder D, Feldman M, et al. (2009) MicroRNA
19
20 expression profiling outperforms mRNA expression profiling in formalin-fixed paraffin-
21
22 embedded tissues. *Int J Clin Exp Pathol* 2: 519-527.
23
24
25
26 12. Nonn L, Vaishnav A, Gallagher L, Gann PH (2010) mRNA and micro-RNA
27
28 expression analysis in laser-capture microdissected prostate biopsies: valuable tool for
29
30 risk assessment and prevention trials. *Exp Mol Pathol* 88: 45-51.
31
32
33
34 13. Li J, Smyth P, Flavin R, Cahill S, Denning K, et al. (2007) Comparison of miRNA
35
36 expression patterns using total RNA extracted from matched samples of formalin-fixed
37
38 paraffin-embedded (FFPE) cells and snap frozen cells. *BMC Biotechnol* 7: 36.
39
40
41
42 14. Doleshal M, Magotra AA, Choudhury B, Cannon BD, Labourier E, et al. (2008)
43
44 Evaluation and validation of total RNA extraction methods for microRNA expression
45
46 analyses in formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded tissues. *J Mol Diagn* 10: 203-211.
47
48
49
50 15. Xi Y, Nakajima G, Gavin E, Morris CG, Kudo K, et al. (2007) Systematic analysis of
51
52 microRNA expression of RNA extracted from fresh frozen and formalin-fixed paraffin-
53
54 embedded samples. *RNA* 13: 1668-1674.
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

16. Bonin S, Hlubek F, Benhattar J, Denkert C, Dietel M, et al. (2010) Multicentre validation study of nucleic acids extraction from FFPE tissues. *Virchows Arch* 457: 309-317.
17. Okello JB, Zurek J, Devault AM, Kuch M, Okwi AL, et al. (2010) Comparison of methods in the recovery of nucleic acids from archival formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded autopsy tissues. *Anal Biochem* 400: 110-117.
18. Chen C, Ridzon DA, Broomer AJ, Zhou Z, Lee DH, et al. (2005) Real-time quantification of microRNAs by stem-loop RT-PCR. *Nucleic Acids Res* 33: e179.
19. Tang F, Hajkova P, Barton SC, Lao K, Surani MA (2006) MicroRNA expression profiling of single whole embryonic stem cells. *Nucleic Acids Res* 34: e9.
20. Smyth G (2005) Limma: linear models for microarray data. In: Gentleman R, Carey VJ, Huber W, Dudoit S, Irizarry RA, editors. *Bioinformatics and Computational Biology Solutions using R and Bioconductor*. New York: Springer. pp. 397-420.
21. Ritchie ME, Silver J, Oshlack A, Holmes M, Diyagama D, et al. (2007) A comparison of background correction methods for two-colour microarrays. *Bioinformatics* 23: 2700-2707.
22. Berger JA, Hautaniemi S, Jarvinen AK, Edgren H, Mitra SK, et al. (2004) Optimized LOWESS normalization parameter selection for DNA microarray data. *BMC Bioinformatics* 5: 194.

- 1
2
3
4 23. Jones LJ, Yue ST, Cheung CY, Singer VL (1998) RNA quantitation by fluorescence-
5 based solution assay: RiboGreen reagent characterization. Anal Biochem 265: 368-374.
6
7
8
9
10 24. Liang H, Li WH (2009) Lowly expressed human microRNA genes evolve rapidly.
11 Mol Biol Evol 26: 1195-1198.
12
13
14
15 25. Aranda Rt, Dineen SM, Craig RL, Guerrieri RA, Robertson JM (2009) Comparison
16 and evaluation of RNA quantification methods using viral, prokaryotic, and eukaryotic
17 RNA over a 10(4) concentration range. Anal Biochem 387: 122-127.
18
19
20
21
22 26. Bevilacqua C, Makhzami S, Helbling JC, Defrenaix P, Martin P (2010) Maintaining
23 RNA integrity in a homogeneous population of mammary epithelial cells isolated by
24 Laser Capture Microdissection. BMC Cell Biol 11: 95.
25
26
27
28
29
30
31 27. Wang WZ, Oeschger FM, Lee S, Molnar Z (2009) High quality RNA from multiple
32 brain regions simultaneously acquired by laser capture microdissection. BMC Mol Biol
33 10: 69.
34
35
36
37
38
39
40 28. Clement-Ziza M, Munnich A, Lyonnet S, Jaubert F, Besmond C (2008) Stabilization
41 of RNA during laser capture microdissection by performing experiments under argon
42 atmosphere or using ethanol as a solvent in staining solutions. RNA 14: 2698-2704.
43
44
45
46
47
48
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure Legends

Figure 1. Scatter-plots of RNA concentration and RNU6-2 measurements of RNA from dissectates of formalin-fixed tissue sections

Total RNA in 23 samples was quantified by RiboGreen assay (*black*) or absorbance spectrophotometry at 260 nm (*grey*). Level of *RNU6-2* in the RNA preparations was determined as quantification cycle (C_q) values obtained in reverse transcription-PCR assays. The best lines of fit with the least squares method are also shown.

Figure 2. Effect of histologic stain and RNA-binding matrix in spin-columns on RNA yield

Yields with cresyl violet (CV) stain relative to hematoxylin and eosin (H&E) for glass fiber (GF) and silicon carbide (SiC) columns (A), and with SiC relative to GF columns for both stains (B) are plotted as means with their standard errors for dissectates from three tissues. Log₂-transformed *RNU6-2* and *miR-16* levels were determined from C_q values obtained in reverse transcription-PCR assays.

Figure 3. Effect of age of slides and dissectates, and proteinase K treatment duration on RNA yield

A. Total RNA and *miR-16* yields from laser microdissectates from three tissues prepared from four or seven day-old slides relative to zero or three day-old ones, respectively. B. Total RNA yield from identical laser dissectates from zero day-old slides stored in duplicate at room temperature (RT), or at -80 °C with or without buffer (*buff.*) for a day. C. Total RNA yield (*filled circles*) and levels of *RNU6-2* (*black empty circles*) and *miR-16* (*grey empty circles*) from identical dissectates treated in triplicate with

1
2
3
4 proteinase K (*prot. K*) for 0.5, 3 or 20 h. Means and their standard errors are plotted.
5
6 Log₂-transformed *RNU6-2* and *miR-16* levels were determined from quantification cycle
7
8 (*C_q*) values obtained in reverse transcription-PCR assays. Total RNA was quantified by
9
10 RiboGreen assay. Hematoxylin-eosin was used as the histologic stain, and silicon
11
12 carbide columns were used for RNA isolation.
13
14
15
16
17
18

19 *Figure 4. Assessment of RNA prepared from FFPE tissue microdissectates*

20
21 A. Scatter-plot of area and RNA yield as per RiboGreen assay for 27 tissue samples
22
23 obtained by laser microdissection (LMD). The best line of fit with the least squares
24
25 method is shown. B. Measurements in RiboGreen assay following treatment of four
26
27 RNA preparations with RNase A or DNase I enzyme relative to treatment without either.
28
29 Means with their standard errors are shown. C. Microarray signal values (*dots*) and
30
31 inter-duplicate Pearson correlation coefficient, *r* (*lines*) for 747 microRNAs measured in
32
33 duplicate using 250 (*grey*) or 400 ng (*black*) of RNA prepared from an LMD sample. A
34
35 rolling window of width 99 along the X axis was used for calculating value of *r* at the
36
37 mid-window abscissa.
38
39
40
41
42
43
44

45 **Supporting Information Legends**

46
47 *Figure S1*

48
49
50 *Validation of a custom reverse transcription (RT)-PCR assay for RNU6-2. A.*

51
52 Quantification cycle (*C_q*) values were determined for 40, 15 or 5 ng total RNA isolated
53
54 from cells derived from the A549 human lung cancer cell-line. The TaqMan™ microRNA
55
56 RT-PCR assay with ID 1093 from Applied Biosystems® (*ABI*) or a similar but custom
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

1
2
3
4 assay for the *RNU6-2* nucleolar RNA were used. The two assays were different for only
5
6 the primers and probes. The linear regression line (ordinary least squares method) for
7
8 the scatter-plot is also shown. The Pearson correlation coefficient is >0.99 ($P = 0.02$). *B.*
9
10 An ethidium bromide-stained agarose gel (2%) after electrophoresis of the RT-PCR
11
12 products for the assays with 40 ng RNA input was transilluminated with ultraviolet light
13
14 and photographed. Sizes of DNA molecular weight markers (Invitrogen®, Carlsbad, CA)
15
16 in base-pairs (*bp*) are shown. The RT-PCR product expected in the custom assay has a
17
18 size of 75 bp.
19
20
21
22
23
24
25

26 *Figure S2*

27
28 *Labeling of RNA prepared from dissectates and hybridization to microarrays.* Two-
29
30 hundred-fifty or 400 ng each of a human 'universal reference' total RNA (Ambion®) and
31
32 RNA prepared from laser microdissected tissue using FFPE RNA Purification kit
33
34 (Norgen Biotek®) were respectively labeled with the Hy5™ and Hy3™ dyes, and co-
35
36 hybridized to a locked nucleic acid microarray (Exiqon®). Fifty-two different synthetic
37
38 artificial microRNAs were exogenously added to the RNAs before labeling. Scatter-plots
39
40 of the Hy5™ and Hy3™ microarray signal values for the 52 spike-ins, and their linear
41
42 regression lines (ordinary least squares method) are shown. The slopes of the lines are
43
44 0.70 and 0.81 for 250 and 400 ng RNA input, respectively, suggesting that the method
45
46 used to isolate RNA from dissectates did not negatively affect the labeling and
47
48 hybridization of the RNA.
49
50
51
52
53
54
55
56
57
58
59
60
61
62
63
64
65

Figure 1
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 2
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 3
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure 4
[Click here to download high resolution image](#)




Figure S1

[Click here to download Supporting Information: figS1.tif](#)

Figure S2

[Click here to download Supporting Information: figS2.tif](#)

APPENDIX 2

LCM RNA extraction protocol summary

LCM slides were prepared with 8µm tissue sections from FFPE blocks and stored covered at room temperature. After staining with hematoxylin and eosin, slides were cut within a week of being prepared on a Leica LMD6000 with settings of laser power: 98, laser speed: 2 at magnifications ranging from 5-20x. Epithelial and stroma sections were collected in separate tubes from 3-6 slides for each sample. Once recovered, the dissected tissue was stored in 300µL digestion buffer (Norgen[®] FFPE RNA purification kit) at -80°C for up to 1 week before being extracted. For RNA extraction, samples were thawed at room temperature and 10µL of proteinase K (supplied by manufacturer) was added. Samples were vortexed to mix and stored at 55°C overnight. The following day RNA was extracted using FFPE RNA purification kit (Norgen[®]), eluted in 100µL nuclease-free water according to manufacturer protocol on a QIAvac[™] (Qiagen[®]) and stored at -80°C.

RNA was quantified using Quant-It[™] Ribogreen[®] RNA reagent (Invitrogen[™]) according to manufacturer protocol. Briefly, RNA samples were diluted 1:200 in 1X TE buffer, pH 8.0 (CellGro[®]) and 100µL is added to duplicate wells of a 96 well plate. Standards were made using yeast tRNA (Ambion[®]) to known concentrations in 1X TE buffer and 100µL was added to duplicate wells on the same 96 well plate. Ribogreen reagent was diluted 1:2000 in 1X TE buffer and 100µL was mixed with standards and RNA samples. Samples were excited at 485nm and fluorescence was measured at 535nm for 0.1 seconds on a Victor Wallac[™] 1420 plate reader (Perkin Elmer[®]).

Appendix 3. Histology, area dissected and RNA yield of samples in the first 57 samples. Samples without RNA yield information have not had the RNA quantified.

Sample	Type	Tissue	Total area (μm^2)	ng RNA (in 100 μL DDW)
E1	SCC	Epithelia	11,889,137	778.2
S1		Stroma	10,195,533	606.6
E2	SCC	Epithelia	6,336,667	526.1
S2		Stroma	8,172,244	664.3
E3	SCC	Epithelia	6,970,549	540.0
S3		Stroma	3,067,083	436.4
E4	AC	Epithelia	6,489,975	732.5
S4		Stroma	6,832,705	468.6
E5	AC (mucinous)	Epithelia	3,585,262	462.9
E6		Epithelia	7,386,451	679.2
S6	SCC	Stroma	14,173,228	553.1
E7		Epithelia	4,436,510	651.3
S7	SCC	Stroma	5,531,488	527.5
E8		Epithelia	6,564,047	669.1
S8	Bronchiolo-alveolar carcinoma	Stroma	7,499,256	512.4
E9		Epithelia	6,756,473	731.0
S9	AC	Stroma	7,933,855	539.1
E10		Epithelia	8,921,590	410.7
S10	SCC	Stroma	13,135,022	107.1
E10a		Epithelia	7,613,816	451.7
S10a	SCC	Stroma	15,834,363	433.8
E11		Epithelia	4,660,802	513.8
S11	AC	Stroma	3,717,275	260.7
E11a		Epithelia	9,507,825	
S11a	AC	Stroma	4,877,403	
E12		Epithelia	6,089,080	276.7
S12	AC	Stroma	5,864,063	484.7
E12a		Epithelia	2,438,439	466.6
S12a	AC	Stroma	2,475,640	471.1
E13		Epithelia	7,121,877	791.2
S13	AC	Stroma	5,613,407	614.1
E14		Epithelia	10,014,712	833.3
S14	AC	Stroma	5,452,384	633.8
E15		Epithelia	7,158,702	496.1
S15	Bronchiolo alveolar adenocarcinoma	Stroma	3,324,505	401.5
E16		Epithelia	5,823,184	533.1
S16	SCC	Stroma	6,949,284	510.8
E17		Epithelia	12,212,901	1251.0
S17	SCC	Stroma	9,327,528	661.8
E18		Epithelia	33,568,594	1207.3
S18	SCC	Stroma	11,881,325	520.1
E19		Epithelia	7,776,541	418.2
S19	AC	Stroma	5,134,259	392.4
E19a		Epithelia	26,587,354	
S19a	AC	Stroma	9,863,967	
E20		Epithelia	19,989,848	1496.5
S20	AC	Stroma	14,165,658	604.2
E21		Epithelia	36,214,523	2466.3

Appendix 3. Histology, area dissected and RNA yield of samples in the first 57 samples. Samples without RNA yield information have not had the RNA quantified.

Sample	Type	Tissue	Total area (μm^2)	ng RNA (in 100 μL DDW)
S21	AC	Stroma	17,993,940	575.1
E22		Epithelia	12,724,641	591.9
S22		Stroma	10,205,653	541.2
E23		Epithelia	13,338,701	602.9
S23		Stroma	10,555,984	348.2
E23a	Bronchiolo alveolar adenocarcinoma	Epithelia	6,982,869	605.6
S23a		Stroma	4,855,874	545.9
E24		Epithelia	33,419,779	1066.4
S24		Stroma	20,235,708	745.9
E25		Epithelia	4,304,297	309.8
S25	SCC	Stroma	3,247,737	334.3
E25a		Epithelia	2,483,175	
S25a		Stroma	2,199,418	
E26		Epithelia	4,417,796	292.3
S26		Stroma	2,523,781	265.1
E26a	AC (mucin producing)	Epithelia	13,945,809	
S26a		Stroma	4,433,235	
E27		Epithelia	48,980,212	3665.6
S27		Stroma	27,215,417	1251.2
E28		Epithelia	29,368,036	1490.3
S28	SCC	Stroma	17,170,347	1037.3
E29		Epithelia	13,422,037	1192.4
S29		Stroma	12,759,225	726.8
E30		Epithelia	9,904,198	878.0
S30		Stroma	3,800,906	410.0
E31	Bronchiolo alveolar adenocarcinoma	Epithelia	14,047,871	983.6
S31		Stroma	6,634,291	444.4
E32		Epithelia	13,012,456	485.2
S32		Stroma	14,393,574	569.1
E33		Epithelia	~5,000,000	766.0
S33	AC	Stroma	4,643,523	406.6
E34		Epithelia	4,958,524	708.8
S34		Stroma	3,553,901	325.4
E34a		Epithelia	4,985,359	682.3
S34a		Stroma	2,566,021	421.4
E35	AC	Epithelia	10,950,192	632.2
S35		Stroma	9,603,913	460.0
E36		Epithelia	5,404,904	502.9
S36		Stroma	10,074,331	709.9
E37		Epithelia	6,645,826	704.2
S37	SCC	Stroma	8,934,385	572.0
E38		Epithelia	6,874,579	562.8
S38		Stroma	8,474,903	519.3
E39		Epithelia	10,176,394	1145.8
S39		Stroma	11,100,795	931.9
E40	Bronchiolo alveolar adenocarcinoma	Epithelia	12,153,127	900.7
S40		Stroma	5,769,434	406.7
E41		Epithelia	3,357,060	480.6

Appendix 3. Histology, area dissected and RNA yield of samples in the first 57 samples. Samples without RNA yield information have not had the RNA quantified.

Sample	Type	Tissue	Total area (μm^2)	ng RNA (in 100 μL DDW)
S41		Stroma	4,885,662	506.2
E42	Bronchiolo alveolar adenocarcinoma	Epithelia	10,500,000	646.6
S42		Stroma	5,378,919	476.3
E43	AC	Epithelia	3,687,867	345.7
S43		Stroma	4,007,605	442.2
E43a		Epithelia	3,695,170	593.7
S43a		Stroma	3,909,939	525.4
E44	AC with mixed subtypes	Epithelia	10,109,261	1176.1
S44		Stroma	5,620,523	446.0
E45	AC	Epithelia	6,000,000	1342.9
S45		Stroma	2,500,000	486.7
E46	AC	Epithelia	7,342,487	692.9
S46		Stroma	6,501,621	419.8
E47	AC	Epithelia	3,105,778	454.4
S47		Stroma	3,115,846	389.7
E48	Bronchiolo alveolar adenocarcinoma	Epithelia	8,844,916	726.5
S48		Stroma	6,632,574	728.8
E49	SCC	Epithelia	9,606,216	1439.2
S49		Stroma	5,591,155	542.2
E50	Bronchiolo alveolar adenocarcinoma	Epithelia	7,483,638	525.6
S50		Stroma	4,300,734	414.8
E51	Bronchiolo alveolar adenocarcinoma	Epithelia	6,361,522	596.0
S51		Stroma	6,905,457	430.4
E52	Bronchiolo alveolar adenocarcinoma	Epithelia	9,963,150	492.7
S52		Stroma	6,140,914	560.6
E53		Epithelia	5,585,836	660.2
S53		Stroma	5,763,095	556.9
E54	SCC	Epithelia	9,395,108	1180.6
S54		Stroma	5,495,302	629.5
E55	SCC	Epithelia	9,846,328	1153.8
S55		Stroma	4,951,730	462.2
E56	Bronchiolo alveolar adenocarcinoma	Epithelia	5,033,958	567.5
S56		Stroma	3,074,020	370.4
E56a		Epithelia	3,883,261	
S56a		Stroma	2,326,786	
E57	SCC	Epithelia	3,724,888	475.9
S57		Stroma	3,952,248	504.3
E58	AC	Epithelia	3,985,825	522.3
S58		Stroma	3,732,852	520.7