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Supplemental Figure 2 Comparison of ERBB2 gene expression and ERBB2 copy number from a subset of the 158 training samples for the USO 01062 trial

## PR+ (Allred>=4)



Supplemental Figure 3 Multivariate variable importance measures (VIM) by random forests for PR prediction. PR positivity was defined as Allred score $\geq 4$. Y axes are $-\log 10$ based P values of the two group t-test between central IHC positive and negative groups, and (Bonferroni) adjusted P value 0.05 is marked with gray lines. Genes with two sample t-test adjusted $p$ values $\leq 0.05$ and fold change $\geq 2$ were marked with gene symbols


Supplemental Figure 4 Distribution of ERBB2, ESR1 and PGR mRNA of test set 2, a commercially procured sample set of 136 HR+ breast cancers. Black, red and green marks are samples predicted by RFP to be triple negative, HER2+HR-, and HR+ breast cancers

Supplemental Table 1 Performance of the different multivariate prediction methods in terms of predicting local IHC status for an additional set of USO 01062 study samples

|  | Accuracy | Specificity | Sensitivity |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| HER2 |  |  |  |
| $\boldsymbol{R F}$ | $0.92(579 / 628)$ | $0.99(538 / 545)$ | $0.49(41 / 83)$ |
| RF+KNN | $0.92(580 / 628)$ | $0.98(536 / 545)$ | $0.52(43 / 83)$ |
| PAM | $0.91(571 / 628)$ | $0.99(541 / 545)$ | $0.36(30 / 83)$ |
| TGP | $0.92(575 / 628)$ | $0.99(540 / 545)$ | $0.42(35 / 83)$ |
| ER |  |  |  |
| RF | $0.92(586 / 634)$ | $0.90(249 / 277)$ | $0.94(337 / 357)$ |
| RF+KNN | $0.90(572 / 634)$ | $0.86(239 / 277)$ | $0.93(333 / 357)$ |
| PAM | $0.90(570 / 634)$ | $0.84(232 / 277)$ | $0.95(338 / 357)$ |
| TGP | $0.93(591 / 634)$ | $0.92(255 / 277)$ | $0.94(336 / 357)$ |
| PR |  |  |  |
| $\boldsymbol{R F}$ | $0.82(517 / 634)$ | $0.72(246 / 340)$ | $0.92(271 / 294)$ |
| $\boldsymbol{R F + K N N}$ | $0.82(519 / 634)$ | $0.73(249 / 340)$ | $0.92(270 / 294)$ |
| PAM | $0.81(516 / 634)$ | $0.72(244 / 340)$ | $0.93(272 / 294)$ |
| $\boldsymbol{T G P}$ | $0.82(571 / 634)$ | $0.72(245 / 340)$ | $0.92(270 / 294)$ |

Supplemental Table 2 Prediction performance of test datasets 2 and 3

|  |  | Accuracy | TN | HER2+HR- | HR+ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{ᄃ}{ㅇ} \\ & \stackrel{U}{U} \\ & \text { U } \\ & \hline \bar{O} \\ & + \\ & \stackrel{+}{1} \end{aligned}$ | RFP | 0.95 | 5 | 2 | 129 |
|  | PAM | 0.96 | 4 | 2 | 130 |
|  | RF-KNN | 0.94 | 6 | 2 | 128 |
|  | TGP | 0.94 | 8 | 2 | 126 |
|  | RFP | 0.92 | 34 | 2 | 1 |
|  | PAM | 0.73 | 27 | 2 | 7 |
|  | RF-KNN | 0.92 | 34 | 2 | 1 |
|  | TGP | 0.84 | 31 | 2 | 4 |

