

**Supplemental Table S1:** Primers for polymerase chain reaction amplification and sequencing.

Gene	Forward	Reverse
BRAF exon 15	AG-CATCTCAGGGCCAAAAAT	TGCTTGCTCTGA-TAGGAAAATG
KIT exon 11	CTCTCCAGAG-TGCTCTAATGAC	AGCCACTGGAG-TTCCTTAAAG
KIT exon 13	CGGCCATGACTGTCGCTG-TAA	CAATAAAAGGCAGCTT-GGACACG
KIT exon 17	CACAG-GAAACAATTTTATCGAAA GTTGAAC	TGAATTAAATGGTTTCTT TTCTCCTCCAAC
NRAS exon 1	GATGTGGCTCGCCAATTAA C	CCGACAAGTGAGAGA-CAGGA
NRAS exon 2	TTGCATTCCCTGTGGTTTT	TGGTAAC-CTCATTCCCCATA
SF3B1 codon 625 (exon 14)	CCAACTCATGACTGTCCTT CTT	TGCCAGGACTTCTGCTTT
SF3B1 codon 666 (exon 14)	TTTGCTGTTGTAGCCTCTGC	CAACTTAC-CATGTTCAATGATTTC
SF3B1 codon 700 (exon 15)	TTGAGAGAACCTGGATGA-TATTGTG	GGCGGATACCCTTCCA-TAAA
IGF2R exon 2	TGTAAAACGACGGCCAG-Taactagagagaagttaattttga	CAGGAAACAGCTATGAC-Cgcaaaattgggaaatcata
IGF2R exon 6	TGTAAAACGACGGCCAG-Tgtctaagggtacgtgtgatt	CAGGAAACAGC-TATGACCcaggccttgctggagat
IGF2R exon 8	TGTAAAACGACGGCCAGTt-gcattaagctgcatgaaaca	CAGGAAACAGC-TATGACCcctctcgatcccttc
IGF2R exon 16	TGTAAAACGACGGCCAG-Tcagccctggagtgcctctg	CAGGAAACAGC-TATGACCcccaccacaggcatgag-tat
IGF2R exon 43	TGTAAAACGACGGCCAGTg-cagtctcccttatgtctgg	CAGGAAACAGC-TATGACCcggcattgctggtaattt
IGF2R exon 46	TGTAAAACGACGGCCAG-Tctgtggcagcaggaccac	CAGGAAACAGC-TATGACCaaaactgacccaa-gattagc

**Supplemental Table S2:** IGF2R methods. In order to select promising variants for further experimental validation, we performed the hard filtering according to GATK good practices with the criteria as follows:

For the single nucleotide variants:

Variant Confidence/Quality by Depth < 2.0

Phred-scaled p-value using Fisher's exact test to detect strand bias > 60;

RMS Mapping Quality < 40;

Z-score From Wilcoxon rank sum test of Alt vs. Ref read mapping qualities < -12.5;

Z-score from Wilcoxon rank sum test of Alt vs. Ref read position bias < -8.0.

For the indels:

Variant Confidence/Quality by Depth < 2.0;

Phred-scaled p-value using Fisher's exact test to detect strand bias > 200;

Z-score from Wilcoxon rank sum test of Alt vs. Ref read position bias < -20.

Afterward, we selected only the variants characterized by QUAL >= 30 (Phred-scaled quality score) and DP >= 5 (read depth at particular position). Finally, we focused only on variants present in coding sequences of particular genes. Only detected variants with a high score for predicted pathogenicity were chosen for verification in the mucosal melanoma sample cohort, as shown in the table below.

Primary site	IGF2R variants
Vulvovaginal	c.4855A>G   p.Arg1619Gly; c.6059A>G   p.Asn2020Ser; c.7376C>T   p.Ala2459Val c.4687G>A   p.Val1563Met c.2609T>A   p.Val870Glu
Sinonasal	c.259G>A   p.Asp87Asn c.685C>T   p.Pro229Ser c.754C>G   p.Leu252Val c.6329T>C   p.Ile2110Thr c.2156G>C   p.Arg719Thr c.923A>G   p.Tyr308Cys c.910T>C   p.Ser304Pro c.6913G>C   p.Ala2305Pro
Anorectal	c.6833G>T   p.Cys2278Phe

**Supplemental Table S3:** The single nucleotide variants and indel gene targets covered by the next-generation sequencing tests are as follows (exons).

ABL1(4–7), AKT1 (3,6), ALK (21–23,25), APC (16), ARID1A (1–20), ATM (1–63), ATRX(1–35), AURKA (2,5–8), BRAF (11,15), BRCA1 (2–23), BRCA2 (2–27), CCNB1(2,[3-partial],5,[6-partial],7), CCND2 ([2-partial],3-4,[5-partial]), CCND3 (2–5-partial), CCNE1 (3–8,10,12), CDH1 (1–16), CDK4 (2–7), CDK6 (6), CDKN2A (1–3), CIC (1–20), CSF1R (7,22), CTNNB1 (3), DAXX (1–8), DDR2 (12–18), DDX3X (1–17), EGFR (3,7,15,18–21), ERBB2 (8,10,19–21,24), ERBB3 (2–3,7–8), ERBB4 (3–4,6–9,15,23), ESR1 (8), EZH2 (16), FBXW7 (1–11), FGFR1 (4,7–8,13,15,17), FGFR2 (7,9,12,14), FGFR3 (7–9,14–6,18), FLT3 (11,14,16,20), FOXL2 (1), GNA11 (5), GNAQ (4–5), GNAS (6–9), H3F3A (2), HNF1A (3–4), HRAS (2–3), IDH1 (3–4), IDH2 (4), JAK2 (11,13–14,16,19), JAK3 (4,13,16), KDR (6, 7,11,19,21,26–27,30), KEAP1 (2–6), KIT (2,8–11,13–15,17–18), KRAS (2–5), MAP2K1 (2,3,6–7), MAP3K1 (1–20), MDM2 (2–4,6,8,10), MDM4 ([4-partial],5–6,[7,9–11-partial]), MEN1 (2–10), MET (2,11,14,16,19,21), MITF (1-partial), MLH1 (12), MPL (10), MSH6 (1–10), MSI, MYC (1–3), MYCN (3), NF1 (1–58), NF2 (1–5), NKX2-1 (1-partial), NOTCH1 (25–27,34), NPM1 (11), NRAS (2–5), PDGFRA (12,14–15,18,23), PIK3CA (2,5,7–8,10,14,19,21), PIK3R1 (1–10), POLE (9–14), PTCH1 (1–23), PTEN (1–9), PTPN11 (3,13), RB1 (1–27), RET (10–11,13–16), RHOA (2–3), RNF43 (2–10), ROS1 (36–38), SDHB (1–8), SMAD2 (7), SMAD4 (2–12), SMARCA4 (3–36), SMARCB1 (2,4,5,9), SMO (3,5–6,9,11), SRC (14), STAG2 (3–

34), STK11 (1–9), SUFU (1–12), TERT (1), TP53 (1–11), TP63 (1–14), TSC1 (3–23), TSC2 (2–42), TSHR (10), VHL (1–3).

**Supplemental Table S4:** Univariate Cox proportional hazards models.

		Overall survival		Melanoma-specific survival		Progression-free survival	
		Hazard ratio	p value	Hazard ratio	p value	Hazard ratio	p value
<b>NRAS mutation</b>	198	1.70	0.028 *	1.75	0.03*	1.27	0.25
Vulvovaginal	61	2.93	0.032 *	2.74	0.07	1.39	0.36
Sinonasal	93	1.4	0.27	1.55	0.19	1.21	0.58
<b>KIT mutation</b>	197	0.98	0.91	0.89	0.66	0.79	0.24
Vulvovaginal	60	0.72	0.36	0.59	0.19	0.34	0.0021*
<b>BRAF mutation</b>	201	0.90	0.76	0.90	0.76	0.97	0.91
Sinonasal	94	1.33	0.54	1.31	0.61	3.06	0.0045*
<b>SF3B1 mutation</b>	133	0.66	0.27	0.60	0.23	0.59	0.12
<b>IGF2R mutation</b>	138	0.58	0.085	0.62	0.17	0.80	0.41
Stage (3–4 versus 1–2)	213	1.69	0.016 *	2.11	0.0009*	346	<0.001*
Age (> 65 years)	214	1.45	0.048 *	1.24	0.29	0.84	0.28
Ulceration	202	1.65	0.027 *	1.49	0.098	1.08	0.68
Mitoses ( $\geq 2$ )	199	0.94	0.78	0.99	0.97	1.33	0.17
Perineural invasion	209	0.88	0.68	0.87	0.68	1.48	0.099
Lymphovascular invasion	209	0.93	0.78	1.08	0.76	1.53	0.031*
Adjuvant therapy	198	0.96	0.857	1.11	0.63	1.63	0.0052*

\*  $p < 0.05$ , statistical significance

**Supplemental Table S5:** Geographic distribution of NRAS, BRAF, KIT, SF3B1 and IGF2R mutations.

Gene	North America	Europe	Asia	North America versus Europe p value	North America versus Asia p value	Europe versus Asia p value
<b>NRAS</b>	25/114 (22%)	9/41 (22%)	3/43 (7%)	1.0	0.035*	0.65
<b>BRAF</b>	15/117 (13%)	9/41 (22%)	1/43 (2%)	0.21	0.071	0.0066*
<b>KIT</b>	30/119 (25%)	7/35 (20%)	7/43 (16%)	0.65	0.29	0.77
<b>SF3B1</b>	9/64 (14%)	3/29 (10%)	8/40 (20%)	0.75	0.43	0.34
<b>IGF2R</b>	13/66 (20%)	3/31 (10%)	9/41 (22%)	0.26	0.81	0.21

\*  $p < 0.05$ , statistical significance