Published in final edited form as:

Steroids. 2011 July ; 76(8): 797–801. doi:10.1016/j.steroids.2011.02.039.

Mechanical Phenotype is Important for Stromal Aromatase Expression

Sagar Ghosh, Tao Kang, Howard Wang¹, Yanfen Hu, and Rong Li*

Department of Molecular Medicine, Institute of Biotechnology, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio, San Antonio, TX 78245, USA

¹ Division of Plastic Surgery, Department of Medicine, University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio, San Antonio, TX 78245, USA

Abstract

Evidence that aromatase expression in tumor-associated breast stroma is elevated, provides a rationale for use of aromatase inhibitors (AIs) in breast cancer treatment. However, regulation of local aromatase expression in cancer-free breast stroma is poorly understood. Recent clinical work indicates that stromal cells in dense breast tissue tend to express higher levels of aromatase than their counterpart from non-dense tissue. Consistent with the clinical observation, our cell culture-based study indicated that cell density, cell shape, and extracellular matrix (ECM) significantly induced stromal aromatase expression via a distinct signal transduction pathway. In addition, we identified a number of cell surface markers that are commonly associated with aromatase-expressing stromal cells. As mammographic density is one of the strongest and most prevalent risk factors for breast cancer, these findings provide a potential mechanistic link between alterations in tissue composition of dense breast tissue and increased stromal aromatase expression. Further exploration of the *in vitro* model system may advance understanding of an important problem in breast cancer biology.

Keywords

aromatase; mechanical phenotype; cell shape; cell density; ECM; mammographic density

INTRODUCTION

Estrogen biosynthesis in breast stroma is a significant source of estrogens in the tumor microenvironment [1–3]. For example, concentrations of local estradiol in breast tumors were similarly high in pre- and post-menopausal women [4, 5]. Furthermore, the efficacy of aromatase inhibitors (AIs) for ER+ post-menopausal breast cancer clearly demonstrates the importance of aberrant extra-ovarian estrogen biosynthesis in breast cancer development and progression [6–8].

© 2011 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

*Corresponding author: Department of Molecular Medicine, Institute of Biotechnology, 15355 Lambda Drive, University of Texas, Health Science Center at San Antonio, San Antonio, TX 78245, Telephone: 210-567-7215, Fax: 210-567-7324, lir3@uthscsa.edu.

Publisher's Disclaimer: This is a PDF file of an unedited manuscript that has been accepted for publication. As a service to our customers we are providing this early version of the manuscript. The manuscript will undergo copyediting, typesetting, and review of the resulting proof before it is published in its final citable form. Please note that during the production process errors may be discovered which could affect the content, and all legal disclaimers that apply to the journal pertain.

It has been well documented that tumor cell-derived factors such as cytokines and prostaglandin E₂ (PGE₂) stimulate stromal expression of aromatase (*Cyp19*), the rate-limiting enzyme in estrogen biosynthesis, in adipose stromal cells (ASCs) [9–12]. Subsequent promotion of the growth of estrogen-dependent tumor cells by elevated estrogen levels completes a “vicious cycle” for ER+ breast cancer progression [5, 13]. Despite extensive studies of intratumoral stromal aromatase expression, relatively little is known about dysregulation of aromatase expression and local estrogen production in cancer-free microenvironment. However, there is a substantial individual-based variation in stromal aromatase expression [5, 14, 15]. Furthermore, forced expression of aromatase in mouse mammary gland results in hyperplasia [16] and increased incidence of chemical-induced tumor growth [17], supporting the notion that prolonged exposure to aberrant local estrogen biosynthesis can promote breast cancer.

Mammographic density refers to the extent of radiologically dense regions on a mammogram. Dense regions are enriched with epithelium and stroma [18]. The latter consists of various stromal cells and extracellular matrix (ECM) proteins [19, 20]. In contrast, non-dense tissue is enriched with adipocytes. High mammographic density is a strong and prevalent risk factor for breast cancer [21–23]. Compared with those women with little or no mammographic density, women with mammographic density in more than 75% of the breast have 3–5 times higher risk of breast cancer [21, 24–29].

The molecular cause for mammographic density-associated breast cancer risk remains poorly understood. Studies indicate that increased collagen density can promote cancer cell proliferation and invasiveness [30, 31]. It has also been proposed that increased breast density could lead to aberrant production of hormones and growth factors, which in turn may stimulate proliferation of mammary epithelial cells [32–34]. Consistent with this notion, Vachon and coworkers recently showed that dense breast tissue expressed higher aromatase protein than non-dense tissue [35]. In the current study, we used cell culture models to investigate the potential impact of mechanical phenotype including cell number, cell shape, and ECM proteins on the aromatase-expressing capability of ASCs isolated from cancer-free individuals. Findings of our *in vitro* work offer some potential molecular and cellular explanations for the elevated aromatase expression in dense breast tissue.

EXPERIMENTAL

Cell culture

Primary human adipose stromal cells (ASCs) were isolated from patients undergoing abdominal liposuction and reduction mammoplasty at the University of Virginia and University of Texas Health Science Center at San Antonio, respectively. The methods for tissue procurement and cell isolation were previously published and approved by the institutional Human Investigation Committees [36]. ASCs were cultured in DMEM/F-12 medium with 10% FBS and 1% antibiotic-antimycotic solution [36]. Sub-confluent and confluent ASC cultures were plated at 0.75×10^5 and 2×10^5 /well in 6 well plates, respectively. To assess the effect of shape change, cells were cultured in ultra-low attachment plate (Corning) at 2×10^5 /well in 6 well plates. For culturing ASCs in ECM, 2×10^5 cells were suspended in 125 μ l of growth medium, mixed with the same volume of Matrigel (with low growth factor, Invitrogen) and cultured in 24 well plates for 2 days.

RNA isolation, cDNA preparation, and quantitative RT-PCR

Total RNA was isolated using TRIzol Reagent (Invitrogen) according to the manufacturer's instructions. RNA was reverse-transcribed using the ImPrompII kit (Promega). Real-time PCR was carried out using the fluorescent dye SYBR-Green and an ABI 7900 Real-Time

PCR System (Applied Biosystems). Primers used for GAPDH and aromatase were previously reported [37].

Gene knockdown with siRNA

Gene-specific knockdown by siRNA oligonucleotides were conducted using Lipofectamine reagent RNAiMAX (Invitrogen). The knockdown experiment was performed as previously described [38]. Briefly, cells at an approximate density of 60% were transfected with siRNA oligos at a final concentration of 10 nM and incubated for 72 h before they were harvested for RNA isolation.

Flow cytometry

For flow cytometry study, 5×10^5 cells were trypsinized and centrifuged for 3 min at 4,000 rpm at 40°C. They were subsequently resuspended in 100 μ l of suspension buffer (1X PBS with 2% FBS), and incubated on ice with respective fluorescence-conjugated antibodies for 20 min. All antibodies were purchased from eBioscience. Samples were centrifuged, washed once with 1 ml suspension buffer, and suspended in 250 μ l of suspension buffer. The cell surface marker analysis was performed by using a FACScalibur flow cytometer (Becton Dickinson).

RESULTS

Primary ASCs used in published studies are usually isolated from reduction mammaplasty or liposuction, and therefore are subject to individual-based sample variation. The lack of defined cell surface marker-based verification in standard protocols for ASC isolation could further contribute to inconsistency in laboratory findings. To address this technical caveat, we conducted an extensive marker-based characterization of primary ASCs from ten donors. As shown in Table 1, we found that aromatase-expressing ASCs isolated per our established protocol [36] reached at least 80% enrichment for the following cell surface markers: CD31⁺, CD45⁺, CD61⁺, CD140a⁺, CD29⁺, and CD90⁺. These markers provide useful tools for verifying the purity of primary aromatase-expressing ASCs.

Given that dense breast tissues are enriched with stromal cells and ECM proteins, we hypothesized that increased density of stromal cells and matrix proteins might alter the stromal expression of aromatase. Using primary ASCs from cancer-free individuals, we made the initial observation that high cell density increased aromatase mRNA level up to 500 fold (Fig. 1A) [15]. This was at least partly due to confluency-induced changes in cell shape, as physical alterations of cell shape by plating cells in low-attachment plates can also stimulate aromatase gene expression (Fig. 1B) [15]. The striking elevation in aromatase transcript upon cell density increase correlated with increases in aromatase protein and enzymatic activity [15]. Because the ASCs used in our study had not been exposed to any tumor milieu or changes in culture medium, our findings indicate that mechanical phenotype such as cell density and change in cell shape alone can markedly induce aromatase expression in ASCs. This can apparently occur in the absence of any tumor-associated factors or other exogenous stimuli. Using ASC-conditioned medium, we further showed that cell density-induced estrogen production in ASCs significantly stimulated estrogen-dependent transcription in ER-positive breast cancer cells [15].

Our published work on cell density and cell shape-induced aromatase expression was conducted in a 2-D system where ASCs were cultured on a plastic surface [15]. To explore the impact of ECM on stromal aromatase expression, we embedded ASCs in laminin-rich ECM (lrECM). When seeded with the same number, ECM-embedded ASCs express several orders of magnitude more aromatase mRNA than their counterparts cultured in 2-D (Fig.

1C). Interestingly, increasing cell density with a constant ECM concentration resulted in further elevation of aromatase transcription (Fig. 1D), indicating that the stimulatory effects of cell density and matrix are additive. Our published work identified I κ B kinase β (IKK β) as a key player in the cell density/shape-triggered aromatase induction [15]. IKK β is a kinase that plays a critical role in chronic inflammation and cancer development [39, 40]. Importantly, ECM-stimulated aromatase expression in rECM-embedded ASCs is also dependent on IKK β , as IKK β knockdown substantially reduced the aromatase mRNA level in the 3D system (Fig. 2). Taken together, our findings support the notion that densities of stromal cells and ECM proteins both contribute to activation of stromal aromatase expression.

DISCUSSION

Changes in mechanical phenotype in tumor microenvironment have long been associated with cancer progression [41]. For example, breast tumors are often detected initially based on the stiffness of the affected tissue. From the mechanistic perspective, dysregulation of actomyosin contractility and actin dynamics alters cell shape and facilitates aggressive tumor cell growth, survival, and invasion via the RhoGTPase-dependent pathway [42–46]. Likewise, increased mechanical force from ECM due to changes in its density, crosslinking, and topology can affect behaviors of tumor cells via the integrin-dependent pathways [47, 48]. However, much less is known about the relationship between mechanical homeostasis and hormone metabolism in breast stroma. As altered mechanical homeostasis in breast tumor affects both epithelial and stromal compartments of the same tumor microenvironment, there is a need to integrate the studies of the impact of mechanical forces on tumor and the surrounding stromal cells.

High mammographic density, which correlates with increased cell/ECM density, is a well-recognized and prevalent risk factor for breast cancer [22, 23]. By recapitulating the microenvironment of dense breast tissue *in vitro*, the cell culture systems used in our initial studies provide an excellent *in vitro* model to delineate the impact of dense tissue on regulation of aromatase gene expression. Our data suggest that cell density/shape changes significantly influence aromatase gene expression and estrogen biosynthesis in ASCs [15]. Furthermore, we show in the current study that matrix proteins also substantially stimulate stromal aromatase transcription. Importantly, our study identifies IKK β as an important signaling molecule in mediating the mechanical phenotype-induced aromatase transcription. More extensive investigation in future will uncover additional regulatory molecules that transduce the mechanical signals to the transcriptional machinery responsible for aromatase gene activation.

Previously published work from several groups has clearly demonstrated that tumor-secreted soluble factors such as prostaglandin E₂ (PGE₂) can stimulate aromatase transcription in ASCs [9, 11, 12]. Furthermore, PGE₂, via its membrane-associated receptors [49, 50] activate both protein kinase C (PKC) and cAMP-dependent protein kinase A (PKA) [51, 52]. In light of the current finding, we propose that mechanical phenotype-induced signaling pathway is distinct from, and perhaps synergistic with, the previously characterized PGE₂ signaling pathway that mediates tumor factor-stimulated aromatase transcription (Fig. 3). A comprehensive understanding of the mechanical phenotype-mediated signaling pathway and its potential crosstalk with the PGE₂ signaling may provide new information instrumental to cancer etiology and novel therapeutics. Quantifiable metrics for assessment of tissue stiffness may also be useful in assessment of cancer risk. In addition, combinatorial targeting of both aromatase-activating signaling pathways may represent a novel concept in breast cancer prevention and treatment.

Acknowledgments

We thank Dr. Adam Katz for some of the ASC samples used in the current study. The work was supported by grants to R.L. (CA93506) and Y.H. (CA118578) from the National Institutes of Health.

References

1. Chen S, Zhou D, Yang C, Okubo T, Kinoshita Y, Yu B, Kao Y-C, Itoh T. Modulation of aromatase expression in human breast tissue. *J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol*. 2001; 79:35–40.
2. Simpson ER, Misso M, Hewitt KN, Hill RA, Boon WC, Jones ME, Kovacic A, Zhou J, Clyne CD. Estrogen--the good, the bad, and the unexpected. *Endocr Rev*. 2005; 26:332–330.
3. Simpson ER, Clyne C, Rubin G, Boo WC, Robertson K, Britt K, Speed C, Jones M. Aromatase-a brief overview. *Annu Rev Physiol*. 2002; 64:93–127. [PubMed: 11826265]
4. Sasano H, Harada N. Intratumoral aromatase in human breast, endometrial, and ovarian malignancies. *Endocrine Rev*. 1998; 19:583–607. [PubMed: 9793758]
5. Bulun SE, Lin Z, Imir G, Amin S, Demura M, Yilmaz B, Martin R, Utsunomiya H, Thung S, Gurates B, Tamura M, Langoi D, Deb S. Regulation of aromatase expression in estrogen-responsive breast and uterine disease: from bench to treatment. *Pharmacol Rev*. 2005; 57:359–383. [PubMed: 16109840]
6. Brodie A, Lu Q, Long B. Aromatase and its inhibitors. *J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol*. 1999; 69:205–10. [PubMed: 10418994]
7. Morales L, Neven P, Paridaens R. Choosing between an aromatase inhibitor and tamoxifen in the adjuvant setting. *Curr Opin Oncol*. 2005; 17:559–565. [PubMed: 16224233]
8. van Landeghem AA, Poortman J, Nabuurs M, Thijssen JH. Endogenous concentration and subcellular distribution of estrogens in normal and malignant human breast tissue. *Cancer Res*. 1985; 45:2900–6. [PubMed: 3986816]
9. Meng L, Zhou J, Sasano H, Suzuki T, Zeitoun KM, Bulun SE. Tumor necrosis factor alpha and interleukin 11 secreted by malignant breast epithelial cells inhibit adipocyte differentiation by selectively down-regulating CCAAT/enhancer binding protein alpha and peroxisome proliferator-activated receptor gamma: mechanism of desmoplastic reaction. *Cancer Res*. 2001; 61:2250–2255. [PubMed: 11280794]
10. Richards SK, Parton LE, Leclerc I, Rutter GA, Smith RM. Over-expression of AMP-activated protein kinase impairs pancreatic {beta}-cell function in vivo. *J Endocrinol*. 2005; 187:225–35. [PubMed: 16293770]
11. Brueggemeier RW, Richards JA, Petrel TA. Aromatase and cyclooxygenases: enzymes in breast cancer. *J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol*. 2003; 86:501–507. [PubMed: 14623550]
12. Zhou J, Suzuki T, Kovacic A, Saito R, Miki Y, Ishida T, Moriya T, Simpson ER, Sasano H, Clyne CD. Interactions between prostaglandin E(2), liver receptor homologue-1, and aromatase in breast cancer. *Cancer Res*. 2005; 65:657–663. [PubMed: 15695411]
13. Zhou J, Gurates B, Yang S, Sebastian S, Bulun SE. Malignant Breast Epithelial Cells Stimulate Aromatase Expression via Promoter II in Human Adipose Fibroblasts: An Epithelial-Stromal Interaction in Breast Tumors Mediated by CCAAT/Enhancer Binding Protein beta. *Cancer Research*. 2001; 61:2328–2334. [PubMed: 11280806]
14. Quinn AL, Burak WE Jr, Brueggemeier RW. Effects of matrix components on aromatase activity in breast stromal cells in culture. *J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol*. 1999; 70:249–56. [PubMed: 10622415]
15. Ghosh S, Choudary A, Ghosh S, Musi N, Hu Y, Li R. IKK{beta} Mediates Cell Shape-Induced Aromatase Expression and Estrogen Biosynthesis in Adipose Stromal Cells. *Mol Endocrinol*. 2009
16. Mandava U, Kirma N, Tekmal RR. Aromatase overexpression transgenic mice model: cell type specific expression and use of letrozole to abrogate mammary hyperplasia without affecting normal physiology. *Steroid Biochem Molec Biol*. 2001; 79:27–34.
17. Keshava N, Mandava U, Kirma N, Tekmal RR. Acceleration of mammary neoplasia in aromatase transgenic mice by 7,12-dimethylbenz[a]anthracene. *Cancer Letters*. 2001; 167:125–33. [PubMed: 11369132]

18. Boyd NF, Lockwood GA, Martin LJ, Knight JA, Byng JW, Yaffe MJ, Tritchler DL. Mammographic densities and breast cancer risk. *Breast Dis.* 1998; 10:113–26. [PubMed: 15687568]
19. Alowami S, Troup S, Al-Haddad S, Kirkpatrick I, Watson PH. Mammographic density is related to stroma and stromal proteoglycan expression. *Breast Cancer Res.* 2003; 5:R129–35. [PubMed: 12927043]
20. Li Z, Bowerman S, Heber D. Health ramifications of the obesity epidemic. *Surg Clin North Am.* 2005; 85:681–701. [PubMed: 16061080]
21. McCormack VA, dos Santos Silva I. Breast density and parenchymal patterns as markers of breast cancer risk: a meta-analysis. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2006; 15:1159–69. [PubMed: 16775176]
22. Boyd NF, Guo H, Martin LJ, Sun L, Stone J, Fishell E, Jong RA, Hislop G, Chiarelli A, Minkin S, Yaffe MJ. Mammographic density and the risk and detection of breast cancer. *N Engl J Med.* 2007; 356:227–236. [PubMed: 17229950]
23. Vachon CM, van Gils CH, Sellers TA, Ghosh K, Pruthi S, Brandt KR, Pankratz VS. Mammographic density, breast cancer risk and risk prediction. *Breast Cancer Res.* 2007; 9:217. [PubMed: 18190724]
24. Boyd NF, Byng JW, Jong RA, Fishell EK, Little LE, Miller AB, Lockwood GA, Tritchler DL, Yaffe MJ. Quantitative classification of mammographic densities and breast cancer risk: results from the Canadian National Breast Screening Study. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 1995; 87:670–675. [PubMed: 7752271]
25. Byrne C, Schairer C, Wolfe J, Parekh N, Salane M, Brinton LA, Hoover R, Haile R. Mammographic features and breast cancer risk: effects with time, age, and menopause status. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 1995; 87:1662–1669.
26. Byrne C, Colditz GA, Willett WC, Speizer FE, Pollak M, Hankinson SE. Plasma insulin-like growth factor (IGF) I, IGF-binding protein 3, and mammographic density. *Cancer Res.* 2000; 60:3744–3748. [PubMed: 10919644]
27. Ursin G. Mammographic density as indicator of breast cancer risk. *Tidsskr Nor Laegeforen.* 2003; 123:3373–6. [PubMed: 14713971]
28. Harvey JA, Bovbjerg VE. Quantitative assessment of mammographic breast density: relationship with breast cancer risk. *Radiology.* 2004; 230:29–41. [PubMed: 14617762]
29. Boyd NF, Rommens JM, Vogt K, Lee V, Hopper JL, Yaffe MJ, Paterson AD. Mammographic breast density as an intermediate phenotype for breast cancer. *Lancet Oncol.* 2005; 6:798–808. [PubMed: 16198986]
30. Provenzano PP, Inman DR, Eliceiri KW, Knittel JG, Yan L, Rueden CT, White JG, Keely PJ. Collagen density promotes mammary tumor initiation and progression. *BMC Med.* 2008; 6:11. [PubMed: 18442412]
31. Provenzano PP, Inman DR, Eliceiri KW, Keely PJ. Matrix density-induced mechanoregulation of breast cell phenotype, signaling and gene expression through a FAK-ERK linkage. *Oncogene.* 2009; 28:4326–43. [PubMed: 19826415]
32. Guo YP, Martin LJ, Hanna W, Banerjee D, Miller N, Fishell E, Khokha R, Boyd NF. Growth factors and stromal matrix proteins associated with mammographic densities. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2001; 10:243–248. [PubMed: 11303594]
33. Diorio C, Pollak M, Byrne C, Masse B, Hebert-Croteau N, Yaffe M, Cote G, Berube S, Morin C, Brisson J. Insulin-like growth factor-I, IGF-binding protein-3, and mammographic breast density. *Cancer Epidemiol Biomarkers Prev.* 2005; 14:1065–1073. [PubMed: 15894654]
34. Bremnes Y, Ursin G, Bjurstam N, Rinaldi S, Kaaks R, Gram IT. Endogenous sex hormones, prolactin and mammographic density in postmenopausal Norwegian women. *Int J Cancer.* 2007; 121:2506–11. [PubMed: 17657735]
35. Vachon CM, Sasano H, Ghosh K, Brandt KR, Watson DA, Reynolds C, Lingle WL, Goss PE, Li R, Aiyar SE, Scott CG, Pankratz VS, Santen RJ, Ingle JN. Aromatase immunoreactivity is increased in mammographically dense regions of the breast. *Breast Cancer Res Treat.*

36. Katz AJ, Tholpady A, Tholpady SS, Shang H, Ogle RC. Cell surface and transcriptional characterization of human adipose-derived adherent stromal (hADAS) cells. *Stem Cells*. 2005; 23:412–23. [PubMed: 15749936]
37. Ghosh S, Lu Y, Katz A, Hu Y, Li R. Tumor Suppressor BRCA1 Inhibits a Breast Cancer-Associated Promoter of the Aromatase Gene (Cyp19) in Human Adipose Stromal Cells. *Am J Physiol Endocrinol Metab*. 2007; 292:246–252.
38. Hu YF, Ghosh S, Amleh A, Yue W, Lu Y, Katz A, Li R. Modulation of aromatase expression by BRCA1: a possible link to tissue-specific tumor suppression. *Oncogene*. 2005; 24:8343–8348. [PubMed: 16170371]
39. Perkins ND. Integrating cell-signalling pathways with NF-kappaB and IKK function. *Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol*. 2007; 8:49–62. [PubMed: 17183360]
40. Karin M. The IkappaB kinase- a bridge between inflammation and cancer. *Cell Res*. 2008; 18:334–342. [PubMed: 18301380]
41. Butcher DT, Alliston T, Weaver VM. A tense situation: forcing tumour progression. *Nat Rev Cancer*. 2009; 9:108–22. [PubMed: 19165226]
42. Gieni RS, Hendzel MJ. Mechanotransduction from the ECM to the genome: are the pieces now in place? *J Cell Biochem*. 2008; 104:1964–87. [PubMed: 17546585]
43. Engler AJ, Griffin MA, Sen S, Bonnemann CG, Sweeney HL, Discher DE. Myotubes differentiate optimally on substrates with tissue-like stiffness: pathological implications for soft or stiff microenvironments. *J Cell Biol*. 2004; 166:877–87. [PubMed: 15364962]
44. Engler AJ, Sen S, Sweeney HL, Discher DE. Matrix elasticity directs stem cell lineage specification. *Cell*. 2006; 126:677–89. [PubMed: 16923388]
45. McBeath R, Pirone DM, Nelson CM, Bhadriraju K, Chen CS. Cell shape, cytoskeletal tension, and RhoA regulate stem cell lineage commitment. *Dev Cell*. 2004; 6:483–95. [PubMed: 15068789]
46. Paszek MJ, Zahir N, Johnson KR, Lakins JN, Rozenberg GI, Gefen A, Reinhart-King CA, Margulies SS, Dembo M, Boettiger D, Hammer DA, Weaver VM. Tensional homeostasis and the malignant phenotype. *Cancer Cell*. 2005; 8:241–254. [PubMed: 16169468]
47. Chrzanowska-Wodnicka M, Burridge K. Rho-stimulated contractility drives the formation of stress fibers and focal adhesions. *J Cell Biol*. 1996; 133:1403–15. [PubMed: 8682874]
48. Levental KR, Yu H, Kass L, Lakins JN, Egeblad M, Erler JT, Fong SF, Csiszar K, Giaccia A, Weninger W, Yamauchi M, Gasser DL, Weaver VM. Matrix crosslinking forces tumor progression by enhancing integrin signaling. *Cell*. 2009; 139:891–906. [PubMed: 19931152]
49. Zhao Y, Agarwal VR, Mendelson CR, Simpson ER. Estrogen biosynthesis proximal to a breast tumor is stimulated by PGE2 via cyclic AMP, leading to activation of promoter II of the CYP19 (aromatase) gene. *Endocrinology*. 1996; 137:5739–5742. [PubMed: 8940410]
50. Richards JA, Brueggemeier RW. Prostaglandin E2 regulates aromatase activity and expression in human adipose stromal cells via two distinct receptor subtypes. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2003; 88:2810–6. [PubMed: 12788892]
51. Mendelson CR, Corbin CJ, Smith ME, Smith J, Simpson ER. Growth factors suppress and phorbol esters potentiate the action of dibutyryl adenosine 3',5'-monophosphate to stimulate aromatase activity of human adipose stromal cells. *Endocrinology*. 1986; 118:968–973. [PubMed: 3004902]
52. Evans CT, Corbin CJ, Saunders CT, Merrill JC, Simpson ER, Mendelson CR. Regulation of estrogen biosynthesis in human adipose stromal cells. Effects of dibutyryl cyclic AMP, epidermal growth factor, and phorbol esters on the synthesis of aromatase cytochrome P-450. *J Biol Chem*. 1987; 262:6914–20. [PubMed: 3032980]

Figure 1. Stromal aromatase expression in response to changes in mechanical phenotype ASCs were cultured with different cell density (**A**), on a plastic surface with different cell-attaching features (**B**), and with or without IrECM (**C and D**). Aromatase mRNA levels were measured by real-time RT-PCR.

Figure 2. IKK β is important for matrix-stimulated aromatase transcription
IKK β (A) and aromatase mRNA (B) in control and IKK β -knockdown cells was assessed by real-time PCR.

Figure 3. A model illustrating the mechanical phenotype and PGE₂-stimulated signaling pathways for activating stromal aromatase transcription

Table 1

Characterization of cell surface marker expression in ASCs

	CD34	CD45	CD49d	CD90	CD140a	CD31	CD61	CD29
07L	71.39	1.48	0.58	98	0.04	0.26	1.51	96.69
08L	13.69	0.48	8.73	96.78	2	0.18	0.17	78.68
h6-17	12.9	0.73	3.98	96.22	1.68		0.64	
40504	13.31	0.87	23.68	98	0.38	0.71		80.64
h6-11	27	0.44	2.47	95.34	1.51		0.41	
41229	33.37	0.11	1.85	98.99	0.95			
BSC-5-10	14.97		0.56		0.12			
BSC5	84.56	5	12.45	96.98		0.27	7.44	79.4
BSC28	71.3	0.3	43.9	99.5	13.5	1.2		85.3
BSC29	2.4	0.5	1.8	98.2	3.7	3.1		50.4