

Comprehensive Analysis of The Expression and Prognostic Value for SNRP Members in Hepatocellular Carcinoma

Ziwei Guo, Jun Liang

Supplementary Description

In supplementary materials, we split patients by auto select best cutoff for OS, PFS, and RFS in Figure S1, S4, S7, and the prognostic value of PFS and RFS were showed in Figure S2, S5, the subgroup analyses shown in Figure S3, S6. Interaction network of SNRPs at the gene and protein levels in HCC patients in Figure S8.



Figure S1: We split patients by auto select best cutoff [20] in each member by KM plotter and the corresponding cutoff can be seen based on Figure 4. (Can be checked in original manuscript)





Figure S2: Prognostic value of mRNA expression of relative SNRPs in HCC patients (Kaplan–Meier plotter). The PFS survival curves were plotted using the Kaplan–Meier plotter database at p-value of <0.05.





Figure S3: The subgroup analyses for PFS in each member by KM plotter in R version 3.6.1 (http://www.r-pro gect.org/).





Figure S4: We split patients by auto select best cutoff [20] in each member by KM plotter and the corresponding cutoff can be seen based on Figure S2. (Refer above)

HUMAN BIOLOGY 2024, VOL. 94, ISSUE 1 SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION





Figure S5: Prognostic value of mRNA expression of relative SNRPs in HCC patients (Kaplan–Meier plotter). The RFS survival curves were plotted using the Kaplan–Meier plotter database at p-value of <0.05.

^a Uni_cox	P value	HR (95% CI)		b	Mult_cox	P value	HR (95% CI)				
SNRPE	0.043	1.247 (1.007, 1.543)	⊢ → I		SNRPE	0.754	0.947 (0.675, 1.330)		-		
SNRPG	0.001	1.507 (1.128, 2.013)	++	-	SNRPG	0.861	1.050 (0.605, 1.823)	ب		ł.	
SNRPF	0.015	1.348 (1.060, 1.716)	⊢		SNRPF	0.983	1.005 (0.645, 1.564)	⊢			
SNRPD1	0.005	1.398 (1.107, 1.767)	⊢− ♦−−−1		SNRPD1	0.754	1.088 (0.642, 1.842)	ب ا		4	
SNRPD2	0.004	1.299 (1.088, 1.551)	⊢− ♦−−−1		SNRPD2	0.773	1.048 (0.761, 1.445)	⊢	-		
SNRPB	0.002	1.382 (1.126, 1.697)	⊢ ♦ 1		SNRPB	0.631	1.107 (0.730, 1.679)	⊢ ♦			
SNRPD3	0.014	1.456 (1.081, 1.963)	⊢	H	SNRPD3	0.819	1.049 (0.695, 1.584)	⊢			
Age	0.622	0.997 (0.984, 1.010)	•		Age	0.769	0.998 (0.984, 1.012)				
Gender	0.385	1.170 (0.821, 1.667) 🛏			Gender	0.326	1.209 (0.828, 1.766)	⊢ ♦			
pT_stage	< 0.0001	1.679 (1.397, 2.018)	⊢ ♦	-	pT_stage	< 0.001	1.752 (1.317, 2.330)		⊢		-
pTNM_stag	e 6e-05	1.471 (1.219, 1.775)	⊢		pTNM_stage	0.555	0.918 (0.691, 1.219)	⊢ ∳1			
Grade	0.141	1.178 (0.947, 1.464)	⊢_		Grade	0.435	1.104 (0.861, 1.416)	۰.	-		
-			1 15	 2			0.60	111 1 1507 1	1.5	2	2.5
			Hazard Ratio	-		Hazard Ratio					

Figure S6: The subgroup analyses for RFS in each member by KM plotter in R version 3.6.1 (http://www.r-pro gect.org/).





Figure S7: We split patients by auto select best cutoff [20] in each member by KM plotter and the corresponding cutoff can be seen based on Figure S5. (Refer above)



Figure S8: Interaction network of SNRPs at the gene and protein levels in HCC patients. (a) Gene–gene interaction network among SRNPs in the Gene MANIA dataset. (b) Protein–protein interaction network among SNRPs in the STRING dataset linking to Cytoscape.