Published in final edited form as:

Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev. 2008 August ; 17(8): 2101–2108. doi:
10.1158/1055-9965.EPI-08-0134.

Association of Genetic Variation in Genes Implicated in the β -Catenin Destruction Complex with Risk of Breast Cancer

Xianshu Wang¹, Ellen L. Goode², Zachary S. Fredericksen², Robert A. Vierkant², V. Shane Pankratz², David N. Rider³, Celine M. Vachon², James R. Cerhan², Janet E. Olson², and Fergus J. Couch¹

¹Department of Laboratory Medicine and Pathology, Mayo Clinic, Rochester MN

²Department of Health Sciences Research, Mayo Clinic, Rochester MN

³Bioinformatics Core, Mayo Clinic, Rochester MN

Abstract

Aberrant Wnt/ β -catenin signaling leading to nuclear accumulation of the oncogene product β -catenin is observed in a wide spectrum of human malignancies. The destruction complex in the Wnt/ β -catenin pathway is critical for regulating the level of β -catenin in the cytoplasm and in the nucleus. Here we report a comprehensive study of the contribution of genetic variation in six genes encoding the β -catenin destruction complex (*APC*, *AXIN1*, *AXIN2*, *CSNK1D*, *CSNK1E* and *GSK3B*) to breast cancer using a Mayo Clinic Breast Cancer Case-Control Study. A total of 79 candidate functional and tagSNPs were genotyped in 798 invasive cases and 843 unaffected controls. Of these, rs454886 in the *APC* tumor suppressor gene was associated with increased breast cancer risk (per-allele odds ratio (OR) = 1.23; 95% CI, 1.05–1.43; $P_{\text{trend}} = 0.01$). In addition, five SNPs in *AXIN2* were associated with increased risk of breast cancer ($P_{\text{trend}} < 0.05$). Haplotype-based tests identified significant associations between specific haplotypes in *APC* ($P \leq 0.03$) and *AXIN2* ($P = 0.03$) and breast cancer risk. Further characterization of the *APC* and *AXIN2* variants suggested that *AXIN2* rs4791171 was significantly associated with risk in premenopausal ($P_{\text{trend}} = 0.0002$; $q = 0.02$) but not in postmenopausal women. The combination of our findings and numerous genetic and functional studies showing that *APC* and *AXIN2* perform crucial tumor suppressor functions suggest that further investigation of the contribution of *AXIN2* and *APC* SNPs to breast cancer risk are needed.

Keywords

APC; *AXIN2*; Wnt/ β -catenin signaling; destruction complex; single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP); haplotype; breast cancer risk

Introduction

Wnt/ β -catenin signaling is an essential intracellular pathway in early embryonic development and multiple other physiological processes. During development, it is involved in body axis formation. In adult tissues it controls homeostatic self-renewal. Wnts are secreted glycoproteins that signal across the membrane through binding to trans-membrane receptors of the Frizzled (Fz) family (FZD1 to FZD10 in humans) and low-density-lipoprotein-related protein (LRP) family (LRP5 and LRP6) (1). In the presence of Wnt, Wnt-Fz-LRP complexes at the cell surface

induce stabilization and nuclear localization of β -catenin by compromising its destruction complex (APC complex) in the cytoplasm, which is composed mainly of adenomatosis polyposis coli (APC), casein kinase 1 (CK1), glycogen synthase kinase 3- β (GSK3 β) and scaffold proteins AXIN1 and AXIN2 (2). As a result, β -catenin accumulates in the nucleus and associates with T cell factor/lymphocyte enhancer factor (TCF/LEF) to activate a number of target genes that promote cell growth, proliferation and survival. In the absence of Wnt ligands, GSK3 β and CK1 kinases phosphorylate β -catenin in the destruction complex leading to ubiquitination and proteosomal degradation.

In the multiprotein destruction complex, APC acts as a scaffold protein providing the binding sites for the AXIN1 scaffold protein and β -catenin (3,4). GSK3 β associates with the destruction complex through the binding site in AXIN1 and phosphorylates β -catenin that is subsequently targeted for proteosomal degradation (5,6). AXIN2, the homolog of AXIN1, encodes a protein with 60% amino acid identity to AXIN1 and both proteins contain the same putative conserved domains for binding to APC, GSK3 β , CK1 and β -catenin (3). Although tissue distribution and transcriptional regulation of these two genes are significantly different, the two proteins are functionally equivalent *in vivo* (7). CK1 kinase consists of several isoforms including CK1 α , CK1 δ , CK1 ϵ and CK1 γ . CK1 δ/ϵ positively regulate Wnt signaling by mediating phosphorylation of the APC, AXIN1 and β -catenin, components of the destruction complex leading to dissociation of the complex and stabilization of β -catenin (8,9). The function of CK1 α in Wnt signaling is not yet clear and its role in secondary axis formation in *Xenopus* embryos is still controversial (8,10). CK1 γ is not directly bound to the destruction complex. It activates Wnt signaling via phosphorylation of LRP6 increasing its affinity for AXIN and recruiting the protein to the cell surface receptor away from the complex (11).

Hyperactivity of the Wnt/ β -catenin signaling cascade as a result of genetic changes in major components of the pathway contributes to numerous types of human cancers (12). Inactivating mutations have been detected in *APC*, *AXIN1* and *AXIN2*, all of which encode the core of the destruction complex. Activating mutations in *APC* are the early and initiating events in over 80% of the familial colorectal cancers (CRCs) (13). Somatic mutations in *AXIN2* gene are also found in some CRC cases with defective mismatch repair and germline *AXIN2* mutations appear to predispose to CRC (14,15). Biallelic mutations in *AXIN1* have been identified in hepatocellular carcinomas (HCCs). Critical serine/threonine residues at the N-terminus of β -catenin that affect the stability of the protein are mutated in a wide variety of human cancers including colon, liver, kidney, ovary and pancreas (12). Surprisingly, such genetic mutations have rarely been detected in either familial or sporadic breast cancers. However, the development of mammary tumors in Wnt1, Wnt3 and Wnt10b transgenic mice suggests a link between the Wnt pathway and breast cancer (16,17). Moreover, certain mouse strains carrying *Apc* truncating mutations show enhanced sensitivity to carcinogen induced mammary tumors and transgenic mice expressing stabilized β -catenin in the mammary glands develop carcinomas (18). Furthermore biochemical and immunohistochemical analysis of human breast cancer specimens has shown elevation of cytoplasmic and/or nuclear β -catenin and enhanced β -catenin transcriptional activity in more than 60% of the primary tumor tissues (19,20). Thus the Wnt/ β -catenin pathway appears to play a significant role in the development and progression of human breast cancer. Given the role of the pathway in breast cancer and the absence of mutations in the destruction box genes, we conducted an association study to determine whether common genetic variations in six genes (*APC*, *AXIN1*, *AXIN2*, *CSNK1D*, *CSNK1E* and *GSK3B*) that encode the destruction complex of the Wnt/ β -catenin signaling pathway account in part for the contribution of the pathway to breast cancer risk.

Materials and Methods

Study Population

Details concerning the collection of cases and controls used in the Mayo Clinic Breast Cancer Case-Control Study have been described previously (21). Briefly, this population is a clinic-based six-state series of breast cancer cases and unaffected controls from Minnesota, Iowa, Wisconsin, North and South Dakota and Illinois recruited from 2002 to 2005. All cancer patients were newly diagnosed with invasive breast cancer and had no prior history of cancer, other than non-melanoma skin cancer. Controls with no history of cancer were recruited in parallel from women attending the Department of Internal Medicine at the Mayo Clinic for a prescheduled general medical exam. Controls were frequency matched to cases by age, menopausal status and state of residence. Eligible women provided informed consent and a sample of blood as a source of DNA and completed a risk factor questionnaire. Participation rates were 69% and 71% for cases and controls, respectively. Genomic DNA from 805 Caucasian invasive cases and 843 matched Caucasian controls were used in this study. Estrogen receptor (ER) status, progesterone receptor (PR) status and HER2 status of tumors was available for 483 (60%), 437 (54%) and 127 (16%) of cases, respectively.

SNP Selection

SNPs in the genomic region from 5 kb upstream to 5 kb downstream of each of the six destruction box genes with minor allele frequency (MAF) > 0.05 in Caucasian populations were selected from the Hapmap Consortium Stage II release (22). TagSNPs representing SNPs with pairwise correlation of $r^2 \geq 0.8$ were chosen by ldSelect. Preference was given to SNPs with high probability of assay conversion on the Illumina Goldengate Platform (23). Functional SNPs were downloaded from the Ensembl website (<http://www.ensembl.org>) (NCBI35) and included synonymous and nonsynonymous coding SNPs, 5' and 3' UTR SNPs, and 5' upstream (promoter region) SNPs within 1000 bp of the transcriptional start site of each gene. From among the functional SNPs, only those with MAF > 0.05 in the Caucasian population were selected. A total of 70 tagSNPs and nine functional SNPs were genotyped.

Biospecimen Processing and Genotyping

Blood samples obtained from participating cases and controls were processed by the Biospecimen Accessioning and Processing Shared Resource in the Mayo Clinic Cancer Center. Genomic DNA was resuspended in TE buffer at a uniform concentration of 0.25 $\mu\text{g}/\mu\text{l}$, and stored at -20°C . A total of 1,748 samples (805 cases, 843 controls, 100 duplicates) were assayed on an Illumina BeadLab using the Illumina GoldenGate genotyping assay. Five cases were later found to have non-invasive tumors and were excluded, while DNAs from two additional cases that failed genotyping were also omitted from analyses (798 cases included in statistical analysis).

Statistical Analysis

Departures from Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium (HWE) for each SNP were examined using Pearson goodness-of-fit chi-square statistics, or exact tests when MAF < 0.05. Pairwise linkage disequilibrium (LD) was estimated using r^2 and D-prime statistics and graphically displayed using the Haploview software (24). Unconditional logistic regression analysis was used to estimate odds ratios (OR) and 95% confidence intervals (95% CI) for risk of breast cancer associated with each SNP (25), while adjusting for the matching variables of age and state of residence, as well as other covariates. Primary tests of association between genotype and breast cancer status assumed a multiplicative (log-additive) structure for each SNP, equivalent to the Armitage test for trend in the absence of covariate adjustment. To aid in interpretability, ORs and 95% CIs were estimated for individuals with 1- and 2-copies of the minor allele relative

to those with zero copies. In order to obtain a measure of the degree to which the findings reported here might be false positive results, q-values were obtained. A q-value estimates the probability that a p-value as small, or smaller, than the one observed is a false positive. Therefore, it can be interpreted to reflect the probability that a test of significance is a false positive result (26–28). Additional analyses assessed SNP associations with risk of breast cancer within subsets defined by menopausal status and by ER, PR, and HER2 status of tumors. Risk factors that were significantly associated ($p < 0.05$) with case-control status were included in all multivariate analyses. These included age, state of residence, age at menarche, oral contraceptive use, age at first childbirth, menopausal status, hormone replacement therapy, and pack-years of smoking.

Gene level associations were assessed between inferred haplotypes and breast cancer status using the score test implemented in Haplo.Stats comparing each haplotype to all others combined (29). In addition, haplotype blocks within each of the six genes of interest were defined using the method of Gabriel et al (30) implemented in Haploview and associations between haplotypes in haplotypes blocks and risk were evaluated. All analyses were carried out using SAS (SAS Institute, Cary, NC) and S-plus (Insightful Corporation, Seattle, WA) software.

Results

Individual SNPs associated with breast cancer risk

The characteristics of the Mayo Clinic Breast Cancer Case-Control Population used in this study have been previously reported (21). We selected a total of 79 SNPs from six genes encoding the core components of the β -catenin destruction complex (*APC*, *AXIN1*, *AXIN2*, *CSNK1D*, *CSNK1E* and *GSK3B*) (Table 1). Among these, 70 were tagging SNPs and nine were putatively functional SNPs (four 5' upstream, three 3'UTR and two nonsynonymous SNPs) with $MAF > 0.05$. The coverage of the genetic variation in each gene by the tagSNPs, based on the HapMap database (NCBI Build 34), is shown in Table 1. Genotyping data for 71 of the 79 SNPs (19 *APC*, 21 *AXIN1*, 11 *AXIN2*, 2 *CSNK1D*, 7 *CSNK1E* and 11 *GSK3B* SNPs) on 798 breast cancer cases and 843 controls was obtained and used for further statistical analysis. These SNPs displayed high call rates ($>95\%$), $MAF > 0.05$ and did not diverge significantly from HWE (Supplementary Table S1).

SNPs in the *APC* and *AXIN2* genes were significantly associated with breast cancer risk ($P_{\text{trend}} < 0.05$, Table 2) under a log-additive model. These SNPs were estimated to have a probability of being true positives of approximately 85% ($q = 0.15$). In the *APC* gene, the minor allele of rs454886 was associated with an increased risk of breast cancer ($OR = 1.23$, 95% CI, 1.05–1.43, $P_{\text{trend}} = 0.01$). The minor alleles of the other 10 *APC* SNPs shown in the table were significantly associated with decreased risk of breast cancer (OR ranged from 0.77 to 0.85). Five SNPs from *AXIN2* gene were significantly associated with an increased risk of breast cancer (OR s ranged from 1.18 to 1.28) (Table 2). In addition to the primary analyses based on the log-additive model, we also evaluated the statistical significance of associations with one and two copies of these SNPs. OR s and P values for minor allele heterozygotes and homozygotes were similar to those observed under the log-additive model (Supplementary Table S2). No associations with breast cancer risk reached statistical significance for any of the SNPs in *AXIN1*, *CSNK1D*, *CSNK1E* or *GSK3B*. All 16 SNPs from *APC* and *AXIN2* displaying significant associations with risk (Table 2) were noncoding tagSNPs (Figure 1).

Gene level associations with breast cancer risk

Gene-specific haplotype analyses were also performed on all six genes to determine whether regions of genes and/or combinations of SNPs in genes were associated with breast cancer risk.

Initially, we considered all *APC* SNPs together and applied the haplo.stat approach (31), using a combination of all other haplotypes with frequency >2% in the gene as the referent group. One individual combination of *APC* SNPs (111111211111111111) was significantly associated with an increased risk (Hap-Score = 2.68; $P = 0.008$). Since Only the minor allele of rs454886 is present the suggestion is that the effect is predominantly driven by this single SNP. Likewise a single combination of *AXIN2* SNPs displayed a marginally significant association with risk (Hap-Score = 1.97; $P = 0.05$) (Supplementary Table S3). However, because these combinations of SNPs do not reflect actual haplotypes we further divided the genes into haplotype blocks using HaploView, an LD-based partitioning algorithm (27). Specific haplotypes in *APC* (block 1 and 2) and *AXIN2* (block 1) were significantly associated ($P < 0.05$) with risk (Table 3). In *APC* block 1, one haplotype (1111112) containing the minor allele of rs454886 was significantly associated with increased risk (Hap-Score = 2.73; [R7] $P = 0.006$). This was consistent with the observation that the minor allele of rs454886 was associated with an increased risk of disease (Table 2). Interestingly, we also found that haplotype 1122221 in the same block was associated with decreased risk (Hap-Score = -2.16; $P = 0.03$). This is consistent with the apparent protective effect of the minor alleles of several of these *APC* SNPs (Table 2). Similarly, the haplotype consisting of all the major alleles in *APC* block 2, 1111111, was associated with increased risk (Hap-Score = 2.33; $P = 0.02$), when using all other haplotypes of frequency >2% as a referent group (Table 3). To further explore this association we evaluated the influence of the various *APC* block 2 haplotypes on risk using the wildtype (1111111) haplotype as the referent group (data not shown). In this setting the haplotype (2122221) was significantly associated with a decreased risk (Hap-Score = 0.74; $P = 0.05$), which is consistent with the finding that the minor alleles of most of the SNPs in this haplotype block reduce risk of cancer (Table 2). In *AXIN2* block 1, haplotype 11212 (Hap-Score = 2.20; $P = 0.03$) was associated with increased risk as a result of the minor alleles of rs7591 and rs7210356. The finding that variation in *APC* and *AXIN2* at the haplotype level was associated with breast cancer risk provided consistent evidence in support of a role for these genes in breast cancer.

Effects of menopausal status and tumor pathology on associations with breast cancer

In an effort to assess the influence of hormonal factors on these associations, data were stratified according to menopausal status (Table 4). The *APC* SNPs rs13167522 ($P_{\text{trend}} = 0.02$, $q = 0.17$) and rs17290456 ($P_{\text{trend}} = 0.02$, $q = 0.17$) displayed approximately 50% decreased risk and rs11241183, rs2431512, rs4116 and rs448475 exhibited approximately 25% decreased risk in premenopausal women. In contrast, the *APC* rs2439591, rs2431238, rs501250, and rs2229992 SNPs showed significantly decreased risk in postmenopausal women. None of the other *APC* SNPs previously associated with risk in this study population reached statistical significance in either menopausal stratum. For *AXIN2*, four out of five SNPs previously associated with risk in the overall population, along with rs7591 that previously failed to reach significance, were significantly associated with increased risk in pre-menopausal but not in postmenopausal women (Table 4). Notably, the strength and the significance of the association between *AXIN2* rs4791171 and risk was substantially enhanced, and the probability of the association being a false positive result was low (OR = 1.84, 95% CI, 1.34–2.53, $P_{\text{trend}} = 0.0002$, $q = 0.02$), among pre-menopausal cases and controls.

To further explore the relationship between the *APC* and *AXIN2* SNPs and tumor histology we also conducted stratified analyses based on ER, PR and HER2/neu status using all controls. We did not conduct analyses for the ER– and PR– subgroups because of limited sample size. Interestingly, the *APC* rs454886 that was significantly associated with risk in the overall study population was also significantly associated with risk in the ER+ group (OR = 1.20, 95% CI, 1.00–1.44, $P_{\text{trend}} = 0.04$) but not in the PR+ and HER2+ groups (Table 5). None of the other *APC* SNPs displayed significant associations with risk of breast cancer in the stratified

analyses. The *AXIN2* rs7210356 SNP was significantly associated with risk in ER+ (OR = 1.34, 95% CI, 1.03–1.73, $P_{\text{trend}} = 0.03$) and PR+ (OR = 1.38, 95% CI, 1.06–1.80, $P_{\text{trend}} = 0.02$) categories but not in the HER2+ group, while the *AXIN2* rs11079571 displayed significance in all three categories (Table 5). None of the other *AXIN2* SNPs maintained significant associations with breast cancer in the subgroup analyses.

Discussion

APC and *AXIN2* are important tumor suppressors that function in the Wnt signaling pathway by regulating the level of β -catenin. APC and *AXIN2* are essential interacting components of the β -catenin destruction complex that function to down-regulate β -catenin through feedback inhibition (32,33). Although germline and somatic *APC* mutations are infrequent in human primary breast tumors (34,35), the predisposition of the ApcMin mouse model provides strong evidence in support of a role for APC in breast cancer (18). Specifically, the Apc deficient murine mammary glands develop metaplasia and rapidly progress to neoplasia in the presence of p53 mutations (36). Similarly, Axin2 knockout mice are more prone to carcinogen-induced neoplasia. In addition, epithelial-to-mesenchymal transition in invasive human breast cancers is associated with an *AXIN2*-dependent pathway that stabilizes β -catenin and GSK3 β and regulates SNAIL1 activity (37). These observations led to the hypothesis that genetic variation influencing the expression and/or function of the APC and *AXIN2* tumor suppressors influences breast cancer risk.

In this study we successfully genotyped 71 SNPs from six destruction complex genes of the canonical Wnt/ β -catenin signaling pathway in 798 invasive breast cancer cases and 843 unaffected controls collected from the Mayo Clinic. We found that five *AXIN2* SNPs displayed significant associations with an increased risk of breast cancer as individual SNPs and as a common haplotype. Several of these SNPs were in high LD in the Mayo Clinic study population, as shown in Figure 1, suggesting that a single variant in *AXIN2* may account for this effect. We also found that the *APC* SNP rs454886 was significantly associated with an increased risk of breast cancer. However, ten other *APC* SNPs were individually associated with a decreased risk of breast cancer. Further analysis showed that a common haplotype containing the minor allele of only the rs454886 SNP was significantly associated with increased risk of breast cancer whereas common haplotypes containing the minor alleles of several of the other significantly associated SNPs were protective. These data suggest the existence of haplotypes within APC that have opposite effects on breast cancer risk.

To better understand the relationship between these genes and breast cancer risk we examined *APC* and *AXIN2* SNPs in pre- and postmenopausal subgroups of the Mayo Clinic Breast Cancer Study. Importantly, we observed a substantial increase in the significance of the association for several *AXIN2* SNPs in pre-menopausal women. Five of 13 *AXIN2* SNPs displayed significant associations with breast cancer in the premenopausal population whereas no significant associations were observed when restricting to postmenopausal women. The five SNPs included the rs7591 SNP that did not reach significance in the overall study population. Strikingly, rs4791171 displayed a 100 fold enrichment in the significance of the association with risk ($P_{\text{trend}} = 0.0002$ versus 0.03, $q = 0.02$ versus 0.15) and maintained significance even when accounting for multiple testing by Bonferroni correction ($P_{\text{trend}} = 0.01$). These data strongly suggest that genetic variation in *AXIN2* contributes to breast cancer in premenopausal women. Further studies will be needed to better define the contribution of age and hormonal exposure to this effect.

Ten *APC* SNPs again showed significance when restricting to pre-menopausal and postmenopausal populations. A series of SNPs in high LD in the 3' end of the gene (rs13167522 - rs17290456) appeared to be more protective in pre-menopausal women than in the overall

population and were not significantly associated with breast cancer in postmenopausal women. In contrast, a series of SNPs in high LD in the 5' end of the gene were significantly associated with a protective effect in the post-menopausal population. In addition, although non-significant, the rs4548867 SNP displayed the same increased risk of breast cancer in both subgroups. When considering these data in conjunction with the haplotype results, the suggestion is that the *APC* gene has two independent regions/haplotypes that decrease risk of breast cancer and a single SNP in limited LD with the other tagSNPs that increases risk. Interestingly, none of these effects were observed when stratifying by the ER, PR and HER2 status of tumors.

A number of studies have previously evaluated the contribution of genetic variation in *APC* and *AXIN2* to breast cancer. Trevor et al. reported that the I1307K nonsynonymous SNP in *APC* conferred a modestly elevated breast cancer risk in Ashkenazi Jewish Caucasians (38). However, the effect was not observed in non-Ashkenazi Caucasians because of the rarity of the I1307K allele. Furthermore, results from follow-up studies in Ashkenazi Jewish women with breast/ovarian cancer were contrary to the initial report (39,40). In a separate association study of 640 SNPs in 111 genes including seven *APC* SNPs in a Spanish breast cancer case-control population, no association with breast cancer risk for the *APC* SNPs was observed (41). However, because these seven SNPs do not account for the known genetic variation within *APC* (we selected 13 tagging SNPs in the *APC* gene based on genotyping data for the Caucasian population from HapMap), it remains possible that associations with breast cancer were overlooked. In addition, population heterogeneity associated with differences in the Spanish and Mayo Clinic populations may also account for the absence of an observed significant association ($p < 0.05$). SNPs in *APC* and *AXIN2* have also been evaluated for associations with breast cancer risk in the Cancer Genetic Markers of Susceptibility (CGEMS) genome-wide association study. None of the associations with *APC* and *AXIN2* SNPs observed in our clinic-based case-control series were replicated in Stage 1 of the CGEMS study though ORs of rs454886 was indeed in the same direction (CGEMS heterozygote risk OR = 1.18; $P = 0.15$). However, this result may be due to intrinsic heterogeneity between these two populations since the cohort used in the CGEMS study was primarily of postmenopausal women with invasive cancer (42). This is particularly relevant to SNPs in *AXIN2* which we found to be most significantly associated with risk in premenopausal women. While our report provides the first evidence to link the Wnt/ β -catenin signaling pathway genes and their SNPs to breast cancer risk, the discrepancies between our results and CGEMS data further underscore the need for independent replication of our findings.

We took a comprehensive and systematic approach to this study. First, the genes selected for the study encoded protein components that form a well characterized complex that is directly implicated in many cancers. Second, a homogeneous population restricted to a six state demographic region around the Mayo Clinic was used to minimize potential population stratification effect, and third, the number of case and control subjects genotyped ensured that the study had sufficient statistical power to identify moderate to weak associations with risk. Moreover, genotyping of tagSNPs in combination with functional SNPs ($MAF > 0.05$) ensured a detailed and comprehensive coverage of genetic variation in the genes. However, despite the strengths of this study, we recognize that additional studies that focus on replication of our findings in independent case-control series, particularly in premenopausal women, with more detailed coverage of variation within these genes, are needed.

Supplementary Material

Refer to Web version on PubMed Central for supplementary material.

References

1. Cadigan KM, Liu YI. Wnt signaling: complexity at the surface. *J Cell Sci* 2006;119:395–402. [PubMed: 16443747]
2. Clevers H. Wnt/beta-catenin signaling in development and disease. *Cell* 2006;127:469–480. [PubMed: 17081971]
3. Behrens J, Jerchow BA, Wurtele M, et al. Functional interaction of an axin homolog, conductin, with beta-catenin, APC, and GSK3beta. *Science* 1998;280:596–599. [PubMed: 9554852]
4. Hart MJ, de los Santos R, Albert IN, Rubinfeld B, Polakis P. Downregulation of beta-catenin by human Axin and its association with the APC tumor suppressor, beta-catenin and GSK3 beta. *Curr Biol* 1998;8:573–581. [PubMed: 9601641]
5. Winston JT, Strack P, Beer-Romero P, Chu CY, Elledge SJ, Harper JW. The SCFbeta-TRCP-ubiquitin ligase complex associates specifically with phosphorylated destruction motifs in IkappaBalpha and beta-catenin and stimulates IkappaBalpha ubiquitination in vitro. *Genes Dev* 1999;13:270–283. [PubMed: 9990852]
6. Liu C, Kato Y, Zhang Z, Do VM, Yankner BA, He X. beta-Trcp couples beta-catenin phosphorylation-degradation and regulates *Xenopus* axis formation. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1999;96:6273–6278. [PubMed: 10339577]
7. Chia IV, Costantini F. Mouse axin and axin2/conductin proteins are functionally equivalent in vivo. *Mol Cell Biol* 2005;25:4371–4376. [PubMed: 15899843]
8. Sakanaka C, Leong P, Xu L, Harrison SD, Williams LT. Casein kinase iepsilon in the wnt pathway: regulation of beta-catenin function. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1999;96:12548–12552. [PubMed: 10535959]
9. Gao ZH, Seeling JM, Hill V, Yochum A, Virshup DM. Casein kinase I phosphorylates and destabilizes the beta-catenin degradation complex. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2002;99:1182–1187. [PubMed: 11818547]
10. Peters JM, McKay RM, McKay JP, Graff JM. Casein kinase I transduces Wnt signals. *Nature* 1999;401:345–350. [PubMed: 10517632]
11. Davidson G, Wu W, Shen J, et al. Casein kinase 1 gamma couples Wnt receptor activation to cytoplasmic signal transduction. *Nature* 2005;438:867–872. [PubMed: 16341016]
12. Polakis P. Wnt signaling and cancer. *Genes Dev* 2000;14:1837–1851. [PubMed: 10921899]
13. Kinzler KW, Vogelstein B. Lessons from hereditary colorectal cancer. *Cell* 1996;87:159–170. [PubMed: 8861899]
14. Liu W, Dong X, Mai M, et al. Mutations in AXIN2 cause colorectal cancer with defective mismatch repair by activating beta-catenin/TCF signalling. *Nat Genet* 2000;26:146–147. [PubMed: 11017067]
15. Lammi L, Arte S, Somer M, et al. Mutations in AXIN2 cause familial tooth agenesis and predispose to colorectal cancer. *Am J Hum Genet* 2004;74:1043–1050. [PubMed: 15042511]
16. Nusse R, Varmus HE. Many tumors induced by the mouse mammary tumor virus contain a provirus integrated in the same region of the host genome. *Cell* 1982;31:99–109. [PubMed: 6297757]
17. Lee FS, Lane TF, Kuo A, Shackleford GM, Leder P. Insertional mutagenesis identifies a member of the Wnt gene family as a candidate oncogene in the mammary epithelium of int-2/Fgf-3 transgenic mice. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1995;92:2268–2272. [PubMed: 7892260]
18. Moser AR, Mattes EM, Dove WF, Lindstrom MJ, Haag JD, Gould MN. ApcMin, a mutation in the murine Apc gene, predisposes to mammary carcinomas and focal alveolar hyperplasias. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 1993;90:8977–8981. [PubMed: 8415640]
19. Lin SY, Xia W, Wang JC, et al. Beta-catenin, a novel prognostic marker for breast cancer: its roles in cyclin D1 expression and cancer progression. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2000;97:4262–4266. [PubMed: 10759547]
20. Ryo A, Nakamura M, Wulf G, Liou YC, Lu KP. Pin1 regulates turnover and subcellular localization of beta-catenin by inhibiting its interaction with APC. *Nat Cell Biol* 2001;3:793–801. [PubMed: 11533658]
21. Cox A, Dunning AM, Garcia-Closas M, et al. A common coding variant in CASP8 is associated with breast cancer risk. *Nat Genet* 2007;39:352–358. [PubMed: 17293864]
22. A haplotype map of the human genome. *Nature* 2005;437:1299–1320. [PubMed: 16255080]

23. Meng Z, Zaykin DV, Xu CF, Wagner M, Ehm MG. Selection of genetic markers for association analyses, using linkage disequilibrium and haplotypes. *Am J Hum Genet* 2003;73:115–130. [PubMed: 12796855]
24. Barrett JC, Fry B, Maller J, Daly MJ. Haploview: analysis and visualization of LD and haplotype maps. *Bioinformatics* 2005;21:263–265. [PubMed: 15297300]
25. Breslow, NE.; Day, NE. Statistical methods in cancer research; IARC Workshop; 25–27 May 1983; IARC Sci Publ. 1987. p. 1-406.
26. Storey JD. A direct approach to false discovery rates. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* 2002;64:479–498.
27. Storey JD, Tibshirani R. Statistical significance for genome-wide experiments. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* 2003;100:9440–9445.
28. Storey JD, Taylor JE, Siegmund D. Strong control, conservative point estimation, and simultaneous conservative consistency of false discovery rates: A unified approach. *Journal of the Royal Statistical Society, Series B* 2004;66:187–205.
29. Lake SL, Lyon H, Tantisira K, et al. Estimation and tests of haplotype-environment interaction when linkage phase is ambiguous. *Hum Hered* 2003;55:56–65. [PubMed: 12890927]
30. Gabriel SB, Schaffner SF, Nguyen H, et al. The structure of haplotype blocks in the human genome. *Science* 2002;296:2225–2229. [PubMed: 12029063]
31. Schaid DJ, Rowland CM, Tines DE, Jacobson RM, Poland GA. Score tests for association between traits and haplotypes when linkage phase is ambiguous. *Am J Hum Genet* 2002;70:425–434. [PubMed: 11791212]
32. Lustig B, Jerchow B, Sachs M, et al. Negative feedback loop of Wnt signaling through upregulation of conductin/axin2 in colorectal and liver tumors. *Mol Cell Biol* 2002;22:1184–1193. [PubMed: 11809809]
33. Ayyanan A, Civenni G, Ciarloni L, et al. Increased Wnt signaling triggers oncogenic conversion of human breast epithelial cells by a Notch-dependent mechanism. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* 2006;103:3799–3804. [PubMed: 16501043]
34. Schlosshauer PW, Brown SA, Eisinger K, et al. APC truncation and increased beta-catenin levels in a human breast cancer cell line. *Carcinogenesis* 2000;21:1453–1456. [PubMed: 10874025]
35. Furuuchi K, Tada M, Yamada H, et al. Somatic mutations of the APC gene in primary breast cancers. *Am J Pathol* 2000;156:1997–2005. [PubMed: 10854222]
36. Meniel V, Hay T, Douglas-Jones A, Sansom OJ, Clarke AR. Mutations in Apc and p53 synergize to promote mammary neoplasia. *Cancer Res* 2005;65:410–416. [PubMed: 15695381]
37. Yook JI, Li XY, Ota I, et al. A Wnt-Axin2-GSK3beta cascade regulates Snail1 activity in breast cancer cells. *Nat Cell Biol* 2006;8:1398–1406. [PubMed: 17072303]
38. Woodage T, King SM, Wacholder S, et al. The APC I1307K allele and cancer risk in a community-based study of Ashkenazi Jews. *Nat Genet* 1998;20:62–65. [PubMed: 9731533]
39. Nathanson KL, Antin-Ozerkis D, Couch FJ, Weber BL. I1307K APC variant in non-Ashkenazi Jewish women affected with breast cancer. *Am J Med Genet* 1999;85:189–190. [PubMed: 10406676]
40. Gershoni-Baruch R, Patael Y, Dagan, et al. Association of the I1307K APC mutation with hereditary and sporadic breast/ovarian cancer: more questions than answers. *Br J Cancer* 2000;83:153–155. [PubMed: 10901363]
41. Milne RL, Ribas G, Gonzalez-Neira A, et al. ERCC4 Associated with Breast Cancer Risk: A Two-Stage Case-Control Study Using High-throughput Genotyping. *Cancer Res* 2006;66:9420–9427. [PubMed: 17018596]
42. Hunter DJ, Kraft P, Jacobs KB, et al. A genome-wide association study identifies alleles in FGFR2 associated with risk of sporadic postmenopausal breast cancer. *Nat Genet* 2007;39:870–874. [PubMed: 17529973]

Figure 1.

Pairwise linkage disequilibrium (LD) for SNPs in the *APC* and *AXIN2* genes arrayed by physical location. Blocks of high LD are outlined as triangles and numbered as indicated in the figure. Shading reflects differences in pairwise LD (white: r^2 =low LD, black: r^2 =near perfect LD). Numbers in squares are estimates of pairwise D-prime, expressed in percentages. Unreported values reflect D-prime of 1.0 (100%).

Table 1

SNPs genotyped for the core components of destruction complex genes in Wnt/ β -catenin signaling pathway

Wnt genes	HapMap-CEU* number		Number of Genotyped SNP			TagSNP density SNP per kb
	SNP	Bin	Tagged	Functional	Total	
APC	90	13	13	7	20	0.10
AXIN1	38	23	23	2	25	0.27
AXIN2	15	13	13	0	13	0.26
CSNK1D	4	3	3	0	3	0.06
CSNK1E	8	7	7	0	7	0.15
GSK3B	99	11	11	0	11	0.04

NOTE: TagSNP density was calculated based on chromosome start and end points of the gene in NCBI Build34 plus 5 kb upstream and 5 kb downstream regions.
* HapMap-CEU: Utah HapMap samples (derived from US residents with northern and western European ancestry). HapMap-CEU number includes those SNPs with MAF >0.05.

Table 2

Multivariate analysis of polymorphic variants of *APC* and *AXIN2* genes

Gene Name	rsID	Homozygotes, Major Allele		Heterozygotes		Homozygotes, Minor Allele		OR (95%CI)	<i>P</i> _{trend} *
		Cases	Controls	Cases	Controls	Cases	Controls		
<i>APC</i>	rs11954856	261	229	386	430	150	181	0.84 (0.72–0.97)	0.02
<i>APC</i>	rs11241183	223	190	391	432	184	221	0.84 (0.73–0.97)	0.02
<i>APC</i>	rs2439591	366	333	339	394	93	115	0.85 (0.74–0.99)	0.04
<i>APC</i>	rs2431512	225	192	391	431	182	220	0.84 (0.73–0.97)	0.02
<i>APC</i>	rs2431238	400	360	317	387	81	95	0.85 (0.73–0.99)	0.04
<i>APC</i>	rs454886	358	422	346	355	94	66	1.23 (1.05–1.43)	0.01
<i>APC</i>	rs501250	346	318	352	397	99	127	0.85 (0.73–0.98)	0.03
<i>APC</i>	rs2229992	317	284	362	409	118	149	0.85 (0.74–0.99)	0.04
<i>APC</i>	rs13167522	675	677	117	157	6	9	0.77 (0.60–0.98)	0.04
<i>APC</i>	rs41116	224	192	390	431	184	220	0.85 (0.73–0.98)	0.02
<i>APC</i>	rs448475	224	191	390	430	184	221	0.84 (0.73–0.97)	0.02
<i>AXIN2</i>	rs7210356	626	677	154	159	18	6	1.28 (1.02–1.60)	0.04
<i>AXIN2</i>	rs4791171	383	433	332	349	83	61	1.19 (1.02–1.39)	0.03
<i>AXIN2</i>	rs11079571	533	606	233	221	32	16	1.28 (1.05–1.54)	0.01
<i>AXIN2</i>	rs3923087	458	525	292	278	47	39	1.19 (1.00–1.41)	0.04
<i>AXIN2</i>	rs3923086	238	284	395	419	164	139	1.18 (1.02–1.36)	0.03

NOTE: Logistic regression analysis was adjusted for age, geographical region, menopausal status, age at menarche, oral contraceptive use, age first birth, hormone replacement therapy and pack-years cigarette smoking. rsID, SNP identification number; OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval.

* For these ordinal *P* values, the false positive probability $q = 0.15$ except for rs3923087 ($q = 0.16$)

Table 3 Association of *APC* and *AXIN2* haplotypes with breast cancer risk

Haplotype Blocks	SNP Combinations*	Hap-Frequency [§]	Hap-Score [†]	Haplotype <i>P</i> [‡]
<i>APC</i> block 1	<u>11222221</u>	<u>0.319</u>	<u>-2.16</u>	<u>0.03</u>
	22221211	0.084	-0.53	0.60
	11222211	0.029	-0.07	0.95
	11121211	0.042	-0.06	0.95
	11111111	0.193	-0.02	0.98
	<u>11111112</u>	<u>0.310</u>	<u>2.73</u>	<u>0.006</u>
<i>APC</i> block 2	21222221	0.063	-1.56	0.12
	21222211	0.028	-1.10	0.27
	11221112	0.097	-0.75	0.45
	12222211	0.175	-0.66	0.51
	12222111	0.041	-0.65	0.51
	11221111	0.044	-0.08	0.94
	11222211	0.043	0.68	0.49
	<u>11111111</u>	<u>0.500</u>	<u>2.33</u>	<u>0.02</u>
<i>AXIN2</i> block 1	12111	0.464	-0.93	0.35
	21111	0.141	-0.68	0.49
	11211	0.069	-0.47	0.64
	11221	0.210	0.28	0.78
	<u>11212</u>	<u>0.108</u>	<u>2.20</u>	<u>0.03</u>

NOTE: Haplotypes with frequency > 2% are shown in the table and those with *P* value < 0.05 are underlined.

* 1=major allele, 2=minor allele.

[§] Frequency of each haplotype in the cases and controls;[†] Statistical measurement of association of each specific haplotype with breast cancer risk.[‡] Haplotype of interest compared with all other haplotypes (frequency > 2%) combined.*APC* block 1: rs2464810, rs1882619, rs11954856, rs11241183, rs2439591, rs2431512, rs2431238, rs454886; *APC* block 2: rs13167522, rs459552, rs41116, rs448475, rs397768, rs431287, rs17290456, rs12152991; *AXIN2* block 1: rs12452196, rs11868547, rs7591, rs4074947, rs7210356.

Table 4

Association of APC and AXIN2 SNPs with breast cancer risk in pre- and post-menopausal women

Gene Name	rsID	Premenopausal Women (N _{ca} =273, N _{co} =220)			Postmenopausal Women (N _{ca} =480, N _{co} =579)		
		OR (95% CI) Per Allele	P _{trend}	q value	OR (95% CI) Per Allele	P _{trend}	q value
APC	rs11954856	0.79 (0.60–1.03)	0.09	0.24	0.84 (0.70–1.01)	0.06	0.20
APC	rs11241183	0.75 (0.57–0.98)	0.04	0.17	0.86 (0.72–1.03)	0.09	0.24
APC	rs2439591	0.90 (0.68–1.19)	0.44	0.45	0.80 (0.67–0.97)	0.02	0.17
APC	rs2431512	0.74 (0.56–0.97)	0.03	0.17	0.86 (0.72–1.03)	0.10	0.24
APC	rs2431238	0.87 (0.65–1.16)	0.34	0.44	0.81 (0.67–0.98)	0.03	0.17
APC	rs454886	1.26 (0.95–1.69)	0.11	0.25	1.19 (0.98–1.45)	0.07	0.22
APC	rs501250	0.87 (0.66–1.15)	0.33	0.44	0.81 (0.67–0.97)	0.03	0.17
APC	rs2229992	0.85 (0.65–1.12)	0.26	0.40	0.82 (0.69–0.99)	0.04	0.17
APC	rs13167522	0.57 (0.36–0.91)	0.02	0.17	0.86 (0.63–1.17)	0.33	0.44
APC	rs41116	0.76 (0.58–1.00)	0.05	0.19	0.86 (0.72–1.03)	0.11	0.25
APC	rs448475	0.75 (0.57–0.98)	0.04	0.17	0.86 (0.72–1.03)	0.10	0.24
APC*	rs17290456	0.52 (0.30–0.88)	0.02	0.17	0.85 (0.59–1.24)	0.40	0.44
AXIN2*	rs7591	1.46 (1.08–1.96)	0.01	0.17	1.03 (0.85–1.23)	0.79	0.56
AXIN2	rs7210356	1.53 (0.98–2.40)	0.06	0.20	1.19 (0.90–1.57)	0.22	0.35
AXIN2	rs4791171	1.84 (1.34–2.53)	0.0002	0.02	1.01 (0.84–1.23)	0.88	0.59
AXIN2	rs11079571	1.78 (1.21–2.63)	0.004	0.16	1.10 (0.87–1.39)	0.43	0.44
AXIN2	rs3923087	1.62 (1.14–2.28)	0.007	0.17	1.03 (0.83–1.27)	0.79	0.56
AXIN2	rs3923086	1.44 (1.08–1.93)	0.01	0.17	1.08 (0.90–1.29)	0.42	0.44

NOTE: Logistic regression analysis was adjusted for age, geographical region, age at menarche, oral contraceptive use, age first birth, hormone replacement therapy and pack-years cigarette smoking.

rsID: SNP identification number; OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval; N_{ca}, number of cases; N_{co}, number of controls.

* Non-significant association in complete case-control study population

Table 5

Association of SNPs in APC and AXIN2 with breast cancer by ER, PR and HER2 status of tumors

Gene Name	rsID	ER positive (N _{ca} =483, N _{co} =843)			PR positive (N _{ca} =437, N _{co} =843)			HER2 positive (N _{ca} =127, N _{co} =843)		
		OR (95% CI) Per Allele	P _{trend}	*	OR (95% CI) Per Allele	P _{trend}	*	OR (95% CI) Per Allele	P _{trend}	*
APC	rs11954856	0.85 (0.72–1.01)	0.06		0.89 (0.74–1.06)	0.18		0.89 (0.67–1.18)	0.43	
APC	rs11241183	0.87 (0.74–1.03)	0.11		0.91 (0.77–1.09)	0.31		0.91 (0.69–1.20)	0.51	
APC	rs2439591	0.87 (0.73–1.03)	0.10		0.91 (0.76–1.09)	0.30		1.03 (0.78–1.37)	0.83	
APC	rs2431512	0.86 (0.73–1.02)	0.08		0.90 (0.76–1.07)	0.23		0.92 (0.69–1.21)	0.55	
APC	rs2431238	0.84 (0.70–1.00)	0.06		0.88 (0.74–1.06)	0.19		0.98 (0.73–1.32)	0.89	
APC	rs454886	1.20 (1.00–1.44)	0.04		1.16 (0.96–1.39)	0.13		1.16 (0.86–1.56)	0.34	
APC	rs501250	0.86 (0.72–1.02)	0.08		0.90 (0.75–1.07)	0.24		1.03 (0.77–1.36)	0.86	
APC	rs2229992	0.88 (0.75–1.04)	0.15		0.93 (0.78–1.10)	0.40		1.00 (0.76–1.32)	0.99	
APC	rs13167522	0.81 (0.61–1.08)	0.15		0.90 (0.67–1.20)	0.47		0.92 (0.57–1.46)	0.71	
APC	rs41116	0.87 (0.74–1.03)	0.11		0.91 (0.77–1.09)	0.31		0.89 (0.68–1.18)	0.42	
APC	rs448475	0.87 (0.73–1.03)	0.10		0.91 (0.76–1.08)	0.28		0.88 (0.67–1.17)	0.39	
AXIN2	rs7210356	1.34 (1.03–1.73)	0.03		1.38 (1.06–1.80)	0.02		1.10 (0.69–1.73)	0.69	
AXIN2	rs4791171	1.14 (0.95–1.36)	0.17		1.15 (0.95–1.39)	0.14		1.25 (0.92–1.69)	0.15	
AXIN2	rs11079571	1.25 (1.01–1.56)	0.04		1.30 (1.04–1.63)	0.02		1.44 (1.00–2.06)	0.05	
AXIN2	rs3923087	1.10 (0.90–1.34)	0.37		1.12 (0.92–1.38)	0.26		1.30 (0.95–1.79)	0.10	
AXIN2	rs3923086	1.07 (0.91–1.27)	0.40		1.10 (0.93–1.31)	0.27		1.13 (0.85–1.50)	0.39	

NOTE: Logistic regression analysis was adjusted for age, geographical region, menopausal status, age at menarche, oral contraceptive use, age first birth, hormone replacement therapy and cigarette smoking in packyears.

ER, estrogen receptor; PR, progesterone receptor; HER2, human epidermal growth factor receptor 2.

OR, odds ratio; CI, confidence interval; N_{ca}, number of cases; N_{co}, number of controls.

* The false positive probability q values were not calculated.