Published in final edited form as:

Anticancer Drugs. 2011 October ; 22(9): 864–874. doi:10.1097/CAD.0b013e328349311e.

EMMPRIN as a novel target for pancreatic cancer therapy

Hyunki Kim^{a,b,g,h}, Guihua Zhai^a, Zhiyong Liu^c, Sharon Samuel^a, Nemil Shah^d, Emily E. Helman^c, Joseph A. Knowles^c, Cecil R. Stockard^e, Naomi S. Fineberg^f, William E. Grizzle^{e,g}, Tong Zhou^{d,g}, Kurt R. Zinn^{a,d,g}, and Eben L. Rosenthal^{c,g}

^aThe Department of Radiology, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, Alabama 35294

^bThe Department of Biomedical Engineering, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, Alabama 35294

^cThe Department of Surgery, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, Alabama 35294

^dThe Department of Medicine, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, Alabama 35294

^eThe Department of Pathology, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, Alabama 35294

^fThe Department of Biostatistics, University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, Alabama 35294

^gComprehensive Cancer Center University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, Alabama 35294

Abstract

The objective of this study was to evaluate extracellular matrix metalloproteinase (EMMPRIN) as a novel target in orthotopic pancreatic-cancer murine models. MIA PaCa-2 human pancreatic tumor cells were implanted in groups 1 and 3-7, while MIA PaCa-2 EMMPRIN knockdown cells were implanted in group 2. Dosing with anti-EMMPRIN antibody started immediately after implantation for groups 1-3 (residual tumor model) and at 21 days after cell implantation for groups 4-7 (established tumor model). Groups 3, 5, and 7 were treated with anti-EMMPRIN antibody (0.2-1.0 mg) twice weekly for 2-3 weeks, while the other groups served as the control. In residual tumor model, tumor growth of anti-EMMPRIN treated group was successfully arrested for 21 days ($15 \pm 4 \text{ mm}^3$), significantly lower than that of EMMPRIN knockdown group ($80 \pm 15 \text{ mm}^3$; $p=0.001$) or control group ($240 \pm 41 \text{ mm}^3$; $p<0.001$). In established tumor model, anti-EMMPRIN therapy lowered tumor-volume increase about 40% compared with control regardless of dose amount. Ki67-expressed cell densities of group 5 was $939 \pm 150 \text{ mm}^{-2}$, significantly lower than that of group 4 ($1709 \pm 145 \text{ mm}^{-2}$; $p=0.006$). Microvessel density of group 5 ($30 \pm 6 \text{ mm}^{-2}$) was also significantly lower than that of group 4 ($53 \pm 5 \text{ mm}^{-2}$; $p=0.014$), while the microvessel size of group 5 ($191 \pm 22 \mu\text{m}^2$) was significantly larger than that of group 4 ($113 \pm 26 \mu\text{m}^2$; $p=0.049$). These data show the high potential of anti-EMMPRIN therapy for pancreatic cancer, and support its clinical translation.

Keywords

EMMPRIN; Targeted therapy; Pancreatic cancer

^hTo whom requests for reprints should be addressed G082C Volker Hall, 1670 University Blvd., Birmingham, AL 35294-0012. (Phone: 205-996-4088, fax: 205-975-6522, hyunki@uab.edu).

INTRODUCTION

Pancreatic cancer results in the highest fatality rate of all cancers, and is the fourth leading cause of cancer death regardless of gender and race in the United States. Pancreatic cancer presents with non-specific and various symptoms, which may lead to late-stage disease at diagnosis, and therefore about 85% of newly diagnosed pancreatic cancers are unresectable [1]. Median life expectancy from the time of diagnosis is about 3-6 months, and only 4% of patients survive more than 5 years.

Gemcitabine is the first-line treatment agent for unresectable pancreatic cancer, but its therapeutic efficacy is modest [2]. Although radiation therapy may provide a small benefit of patient survival when combined with gemcitabine [3], dual combination chemotherapy with gemcitabine and any gastrointestinal chemotherapeutic agent like 5-FU, cisplatin, irinotecan or oxaliplatin did not improve survival [4-7]. The triple therapy with 5FU, irinotecan, and oxaliplatin presented the significant improvement of survival over gemcitabine monotherapy, but the benefit was still minimal [8]. More recently, targeted therapies via anti-EGFR (epidermal growth factor receptor) and anti-VEGF (vascular endothelial growth factor) approaches were investigated. However, cetuximab (anti-EGFR antibody) or bevacizumab (anti-VEGF antibody) in combination with gemcitabine did not present any additive efficacy over gemcitabine monotherapy [9, 10], while erlotinib (a small molecule targeting EGFR) together with gemcitabine modestly improved the survival [11].

EMMPRIN, also designated CD147 or basigin, is a membrane-bound glycoprotein, highly expressed on most cancer cells but limited in normal cells [12]. The detailed mechanisms of EMMPRIN are not clearly revealed [13-15], but it has been well known that EMMPRIN stimulates the production of matrix metalloproteinases (MMPs) from surrounding stromal cells [16-18]. EMMPRIN promotes MMP production in an autocrine fashion as well [19]. MMPs play a pivotal role to degrade extracellular matrix (ECM) components in pancreatic cancer, leading to tumor cell invasion and metastasis [20]. EMMPRIN also elevates urokinase-type plasminogen activator (uPA) and uPA receptor of both endothelial and tumor cells, actively involving with ECM degradation process [21]. Furthermore, EMMPRIN derives tumor neovascularization through stimulating VEGF isoforms and their receptor VEGFR-2 by stimulating hypoxia-inducible factor (HIF) [22]. In one study, EMMPRIN expression was positively correlated with tumor progression and decreased tumor-specific survival [23]. Of interest, pancreatic cancer expresses high levels of EMMPRIN (87%) [12], and surrounded by extremely rich and dense fibrotic stroma [19, 24]. Anti-EMMPRIN therapy inhibits the expression and function of monocarboxylate transporters, which prevents the lactate production from cells and thereby reduce the tumor invasion [25]. Efficacy of the anti-EMMPRIN approach using monoclonal antibody (CNTO3899, Centocor Ortho Biotech Inc., Horsham, PA) was recently confirmed for head and neck squamous cell carcinoma [26, 27]. All of these findings strongly suggest EMMPRIN as a promising target for effective pancreatic-cancer treatment.

We developed a novel murine, monomeric monoclonal antibody (IgG1 kepa; clone name: 1A6) specifically targeting human EMMPRIN, and the subject of this report was to test the feasibility of anti-EMMPRIN therapy for pancreatic cancer using animal models longitudinally with ultrasound imaging (USI), T2-weighted magnetic resonance imaging (T2W MRI), and diffusion weighted imaging (DWI). Although high anti-cancer effect of CNTO3899 was demonstrated in *in vitro* [26] or *ex vivo* setups [27], these do not provide the tumor microenvironment affecting to blood supply, neovascularization, tumor-cell invasion, etc. Also, orthotopic implantation is important to reflect the aforementioned unique environment of primary pancreatic cancer, which may improve the predictability of

human tumor response. We employed two orthotopic pancreatic-cancer xenograft animal models, a post-surgical residual tumor model and an established solid tumor model.

High-frequency B-mode 2-dimensional (2D) USI is a time and cost efficient non-invasive *in vivo* imaging method, enabling longitudinal measurement of abdominal tumor volume [28], and was previously used to measure the sizes of orthotopic pancreatic tumor xenografts following anti-DR5 therapy and chemotherapy [29, 30]. T2W MRI is also a non-invasive imaging technique to assess tumor volume [31]. Unlike 2D USI, T2W MRI can capture the 3-dimensional image of the entire tumor mass. The accuracy of tumor volume measurement via T2W MRI was compared with that via USI. DWI is a physiologic MRI technique; the extracellular water is increased during early apoptosis and/or necrosis of cancer cells, raising intratumoral apparent-diffusion coefficient (ADC) values, which can be measured by DWI in high sensitivity [32-35]. DWI was successfully applied for orthotopic pancreatic-cancer xenografts to evaluate early therapy response [36]. Increased apoptosis was recently observed in head and neck squamous cell carcinoma responding to anti-EMMPRIN therapy [27]. DWI and subsequent histologic validation were performed to assess whether apoptosis is induced by anti-EMMPRIN therapy in the established pancreatic cancer murine model.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Reagents and cell lines

All reagents were from Fisher (Pittsburg, PA) unless otherwise specified. Purified monomeric monoclonal anti-EMMPRIN antibody (mouse origin IgG1 K) was provided by Dr. Tong Zhou (UAB, Birmingham, AL). Fresh Tc-99m pertechnetate was purchased from Birmingham Nuclear Pharmacy (Birmingham, AL). The human pancreatic cell line, MIA PaCa-2, was gift from Dr. M. Hollingsworth (University of Nebraska). MIA PaCa-2 cell were cultured in DMEM (Mediatech Inc, Herndon VA) supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (Hyclone, Logan, UT).

EMMPRIN reduction (knockdown) in MIA PaCa-2 cells

shRNA lentiviral particle delivery system was used to generate EMMPRIN knockdown MIA PaCa-2 tumor cell lines according to the manufacturer's instructions (Clontech, Mountain View, CA) as follows. DNA oligo nucleotide (listed below) specifically targeting EMMPRIN was cloned into pLVX-shRNA1 vector. The vector with EMMPRIN shRNA was subsequently packaged into lentiviral particles. The lentiviral particles were then transduced into MIA PaCa-2 cells, while the control MiaPaCa-2 cells were transduced with an empty vector control plasmid. MiaPaCa-2 cells with either vector control or shRNA EMMPRIN were derived from pools of cells resistant to puromycin. After selection under puromycin (1 µg/ml), the drug resistant cells were assessed by flow cytometer (Accuri® C6, Accuri Cytometers Inc., Ann Arbor, MI) for EMMPRIN expression and further confirmed by Western blot. DNA sequences used for targeting EMMPRIN are as follows: SiE: GCAGCACCAGAATGACAAATTCAAGAGATTTGTCATTCTGGTGCTGCTTTTTTG

HYNIC conjugation and radiolabeling

HYNIC conjugation and radiolabeling were conducted for *in vitro* binding assay via Scatchard analysis. A fresh 1.8 mmol/L solution of succinimidyl 6-hydrazinonicoinate (HYNIC; courtesy of Dr. Gary Bridger, AnorMED Inc., Langley, British Columbia) in dimethylformamide was prepared. Forty picomoles was transferred to glass vials, followed by freezing at -90°C, then the solutions were vacuum-dried using Advantage Bench top Freeze Dryer (Virtis Co. Inc., Gardiner, NY) with the shelf temperature at -75°C and trap at -90°C. The vials were sealed under vacuum, and kept frozen at -80°C until use. Each vial was reconstituted with 1.0 mL of sodium phosphate buffer [0.15 mol/L (pH 7.80)]

containing 1 mg of anti-EMMPRIN antibody (HYNIC/antibody molar ratio = 6). After a 3-hour incubation at room temperature, the mixture was transferred to Slide-A-Lyzer dialysis cassette with a molecular weight cutoff of 10,000 (Pierce, Rockford, IL) and then immersed into 1,000 mL of PBS (pH 7.4) overnight at 4°C. The radiolabeling yield was about 60%. The HYNIC-modified anti-EMMPRIN antibody was labeled with Tc-99m using SnCl₂/tricine as the transfer ligand [37], and the unbound Tc-99m was removed by G-25 Sephadex size exclusion chromatography. The protein concentrations of the collected fractions were measured by Lowry assay [38]. The level of Tc-99m binding to anti-EMMPRIN antibody was greater than 95%, as measured by TLC using separate strips eluted with saturated saline and methyl ethyl ketone.

***In vitro* binding assay**

MIA PaCa-2 cells (or EMMPRIN knockdown MIA PaCa-2 cells) were plated in separate 24-well plates respectively (500,000 cells per well) and incubated overnight at 37°C in culture medium (DMEM, with 2 mM L-glutamine, 1 mM Na pyruvate, 10% fetal bovine serum; pH 7.4; 0.2 ml/well). The Tc-99m labeled anti-EMMPRIN antibody was diluted in binding buffer (DMEM, with 30 mM Hepes, 2 mM L-glutamine, 1 mM Na pyruvate, 1% bovine serum albumin; pH 7.4) to 7-8 concentrations; the highest incubation concentration was ~1 nM, with twofold subsequent dilutions. Each concentration was in duplicate; a third well at each concentration included excess unlabeled anti-EMMPRIN antibody (41.6 µg per well) for blocking. This control was needed to measure non-specific binding. The Tc-99m-anti-EMMPRIN antibody was incubated with the live, attached cells for 1 hour at 37°C. The free Tc-99m-anti-EMMPRIN antibody (not bound to cells) was washed off with 0.2-ml ice cold Hank's Balanced Salt Solution (HBSS; pH 7.2), and 0.2-ml NaC₂H₃O₂-HBSS (pH 4.0) was added to each well and incubated for 5 minutes at room temperature to isolate the acid-labile component, presumably the surface bound component. After the acid-labile fraction was collected, 0.2-ml NaOH (1 M) was added to each well and incubated for 10 minutes at room temperature to isolate the binding component that was not removed with the original acid wash. This binding component was referred to as the acid-stable component, and was obtained by dissolving the cells. This component would represent internalized antibody, or surface bound antibody that was resistant to the acid washing. All acid-stable fractions were assayed for protein concentration, as were known numbers of cells to determine the protein content. The Tc-99m activity in the samples was measured using a gamma-ray counter (MINAXIγ Auto-gamma® 5000 series Gamma Counter manufactured by Packard Instrument Company, Grove, IL). The binding assays were repeated three times independently per cell line. The data were analyzed using Graphpad Prism (version 4.0, San Diego, CA) after correction of Tc-99m for decay, and after correction for non-specific binding. Data were fitted with non-linear regression analyses assuming one site of binding, enabling the determination of the binding affinity (K_d) and the number of EMMPRIN (assuming 1 antibody per EMMPRIN) [39, 40]. Since total cells were known, the EMMPRIN number per cell could be determined.

Animal modeling

Animal experiments were reviewed and approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee. Seven groups of female SCID BALB/c mice (NCI-Frederick Animal Production Program, Frederick, MD; 4~6 weeks old; n=12 for groups 1 and 2, n=10 for group 3, n=7 for group 4, n=6 for group 5, n=5 for groups 6 and 7) were used. MIA PaCa-2 cells were implanted into groups 1 and 3-7, while EMMPRIN knockdown MIA PaCa-2 tumor cells were implanted into group 2. The procedure for intrapancreatic tumor implantation was the following; a 1-cm incision was made in the left upper quadrant of the abdomen of anesthetized mice, and a solution of 2.5×10^6 MIA PaCa-2 cells (or EMMPRIN knockdown MIA PaCa-2 cells) in 30 µL of DMEM was injected into the tail of the pancreas. The skin

and peritoneum were closed in 1 layer with 2 interrupted 5-0 Prolene sutures. For groups 1-3, dosing and imaging started immediately after cell implantation to model post-surgical residual tumors, whereas, for groups 4-7, those started at 21 days after cell implantation to model established pancreatic tumors. Groups 1-3 were intraperitoneally injected with phosphate-buffered saline (PBS), PBS, anti-EMMPRIN antibody (0.2 mg), respectively twice weekly for 3 weeks with weekly USI. Groups 4 and 5 were intraperitoneally injected with phosphate-buffered saline (PBS; serving as control) and anti-EMMPRIN antibody (0.2 mg) respectively twice weekly for 3 weeks with weekly USI. Groups 6 and 7 were intraperitoneally injected with PBS and anti-EMMPRIN antibody (1 mg) respectively twice weekly for 2 weeks, with weekly USI, T2W MRI, and DWI; USI was applied for all animals of groups 3 and 4, while T2W MRI and DWI were applied for randomly selected animals (n=3 from group 6, n=4 from group 7). All animals were anesthetized using isoflurane gas (1~2%) during imaging.

Ultrasound imaging

Ultrasound imaging was performed using a VisualSonics VEVO 660 high frequency, high-resolution ultrasound instrument with a 40 MHz probe (Toronto, Ontario, Canada). Animals were placed in the supine position for examination with B-Mode imaging [28]. The largest diameter was found in the anterior-posterior plane, and this diameter as well as a transverse diameter was measured. Then the ultrasound probe was rotated 90° to measure the largest diameter in the sagittal plane. The tumor volume was calculated using the following equation, $\text{Volume} = xyz(\pi/6)$, where x , y , and z are the three orthogonal diameters of a tumor. US-image acquisition and analysis were conducted in a blinded manner.

MR imaging

Small animal T2W MRI and DWI were performed on a Bruker BioSpec 9.4T system (Bruker BioSpin Corp., Billerica, MA). The animal was placed in an animal bed equipped with circulating warm water to regulate body temperature during scans. An orthogonally bent plastic board was used to prevent the transfer of the respiratory motion in chest to abdominal area. Tumor was imaged using a combination of a 1H volume resonator/transmitter and a surface coil receiver (Bruker BioSpin Corp., Billerica, MA). An MR-compatible small animal respiratory gating device (SA Instrument, Inc., Stony Brook, NY) was used during scans. T2W MRI was performed using a spin echo sequence (RARE) with the following acquisition parameters: repetition time (TR)/echo time (TE) = 2000/48.8 milliseconds, 128×128 matrix, and a 30×30-mm field of view. Continuous 1-mm thick slices were used to cover the entire tumor region. DWI data were collected using a standard spin echo sequence with four b -factors (5, 300, 600, and 1000 s/mm²). The acquisition parameters are as follows: repetition time (TR)/echo time (TE) = 2500/32 milliseconds, diffusion separation time = 16 ms, diffusion gradient duration = 6 ms, 128×128 matrix, and a 30×30-mm field of view. A total of 3-5 1-mm thick slices were acquired to cover tumor regions of interest in an interlaced mode. Tumor volume was measured by summing all voxels inside of the tumor boundary of T2W MR images. Segmentation of the tumor volume was performed based on the signal intensity between the region of interest (ROI) and the background using ImageJ, version 1.40g (National Institute of Health, Bethesda, MD). The ADC value of each pixel of the segmented tumor region was determined from the best-fitting linear function, $\ln I_b = \ln I_0 - (ADC \times b)$, where I_b was the intensity on the pixel with b , and I_0 was the intensity on the pixel with $b=0$. The final ADC value of a tumor was obtained by averaging all ADC values in the entire tumor region. The ADC and tumor volume quantification were implemented using computer software developed with Labview, version 8.5 (National Instruments Co., Austin, TX).

Histologic analyses

At day 42, TUNEL, Ki67, and CD31 staining were performed for tumor tissues of groups 4 and 5 (n=5 selected randomly per group), with the same procedure as reported previously [41, 42]. Two digital microphotographs were taken away from areas of necrosis but were otherwise randomly selected for each tumor slice that had undergone TUNEL (X100), Ki67 (X100), or CD31 (X200) staining, using SPOT camera on an Olympus 1×70 microscope (Olympus Optical Co., Tokyo, Japan), interfaced with personal computer and SPOT software. The apoptotic (TUNEL) or proliferating (Ki67 expressing) cells were segmented by the signal-intensity difference between the target cells and background in each photograph, while the intensity and minimum particle-size thresholds were determined manually. Then the target cells were counted, and the cell density (cell number/mm²) was calculated. The cell densities of the two photographs for each tumor slide were averaged. The CD31-stained area was segmented in the same way, and the area fraction (CD31-stained area/total area), considered as endothelial-cell density, was calculated. Further, the number and size of microvessels were quantified, and the microvessel density (vessel number/mm²) and microvessel size (μm²) are presented. The image analysis was performed using ImageJ, version 1.40g (National Institute of Health, Bethesda, MD).

Statistical analyses

One-way analyses of variance (ANOVA) was carried out using SAS®, version 9.2 (SAS Institute Inc., Cary, NC) to compare MIA PaCa-2 versus EMMPRIN knockdown MIA PaCa-2 cells for binding affinity of Tc-99m-anti-EMMPRIN antibody (K_d) and EMMPRIN number per cell [43]. ANOVA was also used for comparison of proliferating or apoptotic cell densities. SPSS version 16.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL) was employed to compare tumor volume (or ADC) changes among groups over 2~3 weeks using two-way repeated measures analysis of variance (RM ANOVA) [44]. *p* values less than 0.05 were considered significant. Data are presented as means ± SE (standard error).

RESULTS

Flow cytometry and Western blotting analyses

To evaluate the function of EMMPRIN in pancreatic tumor growth and progression, MIA PaCa-2 stably silenced for EMMPRIN expression (SiE), as well as cells with vector as control (VC) were generated. The EMMPRIN expression of these cells was verified by flow cytometry and western blot (Fig. 1A and B). EMMPRIN level of SiE silenced cells are 29.3% of that of VC cells, which is generated by comparison of immunofluorescence and western blot band densities.

In vitro binding assay

In vitro binding assay determined the specific binding affinity (K_d) of Tc-99m labeled anti-EMMPRIN antibody and the number of EMMPRIN per cell for MIA PaCa-2 or EMMPRIN knockdown MIA PaCa-2 cells. Figure 2 shows representative Scatchard plots for Tc-99m-anti-EMMPRIN antibody binding to EMMPRIN expressed on (A) MIA PaCa-2 and (B) EMMPRIN knockdown MIA PaCa-2 cells, after correction for non-specific binding (insets are saturation binding curves). The K_d for the acid-stable binding component in MIA PaCa-2 cell line was 4.31±0.59 nM, which was not significantly different from that in EMMPRIN knockdown MIA PaCa-2 cell line (2.83±0.27 nM; *p*=0.084). However, the number of EMMPRIN per cell was 582,000±56,000 for MIA PaCa-2 cells, which was significantly higher than for EMMPRIN knockdown MIA PaCa-2 cells (220,000±89,000; *p*=0.026). The acid-labile binding components were too small to be quantitatively assessed in both the cell lines (data not shown).

***In vivo* USI**

In vivo USI detected high therapeutic efficacy of anti-EMMPRIN antibody for both the post-surgical residual and established MIA PaCa-2 tumor models. Figure 3A shows the representative ultrasound image of an orthotopic pancreatic tumor xenograft, showing two orthogonal dimensions and tumor boundary with a white dotted circle. Figure 3B shows the tumor volume changes of groups 1-3 (post-surgical residual tumor model) for 3 weeks after therapy initiation. The tumor volumes of groups 1-3 on day 15 were 66 ± 17 , 21 ± 5 , and 4 ± 2 mm³ respectively, and 240 ± 41 , 80 ± 15 , and 15 ± 4 mm³ respectively on day 21; tumor growth of group 3 treated with anti-EMMPRIN antibody was significantly lower than that of control group (group 1; $p < 0.001$) or EMMPRIN knockdown group (group 2; $p = 0.001$), while tumor growth of group 2 was also significantly lower than that of group 1 ($p = 0.002$).

Figure 3C shows the tumor volume changes of groups 4 and 5 (established tumor model) for 3 weeks after therapy initiation, when the tumor volumes were normalized to the values on day 21; the mean tumor volume of the two groups on day 21 was 85 ± 9 mm³ without statistical difference ($p = 0.500$). The tumor volume changes of group 4 were $182 \pm 33\%$, $395 \pm 107\%$, and $625 \pm 166\%$ on days 28, 35, and 42 respectively, while those of group 5 were $91 \pm 7\%$, $163 \pm 27\%$, and $329 \pm 39\%$ respectively during the same time. The tumor volume increase was about 40% reduced by anti-EMMPRIN therapy in average, but not statistically significant ($p = 0.083$).

Figure 3D shows the tumor-volume changes of groups 6 and 7 for 2 weeks after therapy initiation, testing the higher dose of anti-EMMPRIN antibody (1 mg) in the established tumor model; the tumor volumes were normalized to the values on day 21, and the mean tumor volume of the two groups was 142 ± 11 mm³ on day 21 without statistical difference ($p = 0.230$). The tumor volume changes of group 6 were $217 \pm 55\%$ and $405 \pm 96\%$ on days 28 and 35 respectively, while those of group 7 were $89 \pm 27\%$ and $144 \pm 41\%$ respectively during the same time. The tumor volume increase of group 7 was about 46% lower than that of group 6 with statistical significance ($p = 0.043$).

***In vivo* MRI**

In vivo T2W MRI presented that the tumor volume change after anti-EMMPRIN treatment was significantly lower than that of control group in higher accuracy than USI did, although intratumoral ADC increase was not detected. Figure 4A shows a representative set of DW images at four b values (5, 300, 600, 1000 s/mm²) with the same gray scaling, and the ADC map calculated from the DW images; tumor location is indicated with a white arrow in the first subfigure. Figure 4B shows the tumor volume changes of mice randomly selected from groups 6 ($n=3$) and 7 ($n=4$) for 2 weeks post dose initiation, analyzed using T2W MR images. The tumor volume changes of group 6 were $153 \pm 30\%$ and $334 \pm 52\%$ on days 28 and 35 respectively, while those of group 7 were $46 \pm 11\%$ and $112 \pm 11\%$ respectively during the same time, with statistical difference between the two groups ($p = 0.002$); the averaged coefficient of variation (COV) of tumor volume changes on each time point relative to day 21 was 0.32 ± 0.06 ($n=4$; $n=2$ per each time point), which was significantly lower than that analyzed by USI shown in Fig. 3D (0.61 ± 0.04 ; $p = 0.005$), showing the improved accuracy of tumor volume assessment. Figure 4C shows the intratumoral ADC changes of groups 6 and 7 for 2 weeks after treatment initiation; the mean ADC value of the two groups on day 21 was 0.00100 ± 0.00008 mm²/s without statistical difference ($p = 0.437$). The averaged ADC values of both the groups decreased over time, while the magnitude of ADC decrease of group 6 was about 10% lower than that of group 7 on either day, but was not statistically different ($p = 0.383$).

Histologic analysis

Histologic analysis detected the significantly reduced tumor cell proliferation and microvessel density due to anti-EMMPRIN therapy, but did not detect the change of apoptotic-cell density. Figure 5A shows the representative microphotographs of Ki67, TUNEL, and CD31 stained tumor slices (5- μ m thickness) of groups 4 and 5, while the proliferating (Ki67 stained), apoptotic (TUNEL stained), and endothelial (CD31 stained) cells are indicated with black arrows in each subfigure. Figure 5B shows the Ki67-expressed cell densities (cell number/mm²) of groups 4 and 5 (n=5 per group), and that of group 4 was 1709 ± 145 mm⁻², which was significantly higher than that of group 5 (939 ± 150 mm⁻²; $p=0.006$). Figure 5C shows the TUNEL-stained cell densities (cell number/mm²) of groups 4 and 5, and that of group 4 (81 ± 14 mm⁻²) was not statistically different from that of group 5 (81 ± 15 mm⁻²; $p=0.994$). Figure 5D shows the microvessel densities (vessel number/mm²) and microvessel size (μ m²) of groups 4 and 5; microvessel density of group 5 (60 ± 11 mm⁻²) was significantly lower than that of group 4 (106 ± 10 mm⁻²; $p=0.014$), whereas the microvessel size of group 5 (323 ± 37 μ m²) was significantly larger than that of group 4 (190 ± 43 μ m²; $p=0.049$). The endothelial cell density of group 5 ($1.07 \pm 0.12\%$) was also significantly lower than that of group 4 ($1.62 \pm 0.16\%$; $p=0.0376$).

DISCUSSION

To our knowledge, this is the first report of anti-EMMPRIN therapy in pancreatic cancer murine models. Of note, higher anti-tumor effect was demonstrated in the post-surgical residual tumor model. Anti-EMMPRIN therapy prevents remodeling of extracellular matrix (ECM) for neovascularization [22], and therefore avascular tumor growth can be effectively constrained. However, once a tumor enters vascular phase and the surrounding ECM is degraded, the growth control via anti-EMMPRIN approach might be diminished. Thus anti-EMMPRIN therapy will be presumably most effective in adjuvant setting or for tumor prevention. The EMMPRIN knockdown tumor cells had a 62% reduction in the number of EMMPRIN per cell on average by *in vitro* assay, which is comparable with *in vivo* data showing a 67% smaller size on average of EMMPRIN knockdown tumors than those of control tumors on either day 15 or 21. These data support the proposed mechanism that the anti-tumor growth effect was mainly dependent upon blocking the extracellular signaling of EMMPRIN. Biodistribution study of anti-EMMPRIN antibody was performed, and no significantly higher uptakes were noticed in any normal organs except spleen (data not shown). This may represent that anti-EMMPRIN antibody has cross reactivity on murine monocyte and potential toxicity against it, but more studies will need to be followed to validate it.

Anti-EMMPRIN therapy lowered pancreatic cancer-cell proliferation and microvessel density; 43% of microvessel density was reduced, which is fairly comparable with 45% decrease of cell proliferation, which may represent the anti-angiogenic effect induced by anti-EMMPRIN antibody could be a major cause for the growth suppression of the established tumors. Of interest, the mean microvessel size was significantly larger when treated with anti-EMMPRIN antibody. This is primarily due to the suppression of neovascularization; the averaged vessel size would be larger when small vessels were not present. Further, anti-neovascularization may release the tumor interstitial pressure, and thereby expand the compressed vessels.

However, anti-EMMPRIN therapy did not induce apoptosis as shown in ADC and histological analyses. We also implemented *in vitro* cell viability assay using two different human pancreatic cancer cell lines, MIA PaCa-2 and PANC1, but no cytotoxic efficacy of anti-EMMPRIN therapy was measured (data not shown). However, activated caspase-3 and DNA fragmentation were increased when EMMPRIN was knocked down in breast cancer

cells [45], and, more recently, increased apoptosis after anti-EMMPRIN therapy was observed in 17 human head and neck tumor tissues among a total of 22 samples (77%) [27]. Bougateg *et al* demonstrated that EMMPRIN inhibited melanoma-cell apoptosis, while promoting migration and proliferation of these cells by up-regulating VEGFR-2 [46]. Perhaps EMMPRIN may minimally function for apoptosis control in pancreatic cancer cells, while future studies with various pancreatic cancer cell lines should be followed for better understanding of this data inconsistency. The decrease of intratumoral mean ADC values over time is presumably due to the increase of cell density in pancreatic tumor xenografts, which was observed in our previous study as well [36].

We used only one human pancreatic cancer cell line, MIA PaCa-2, in the *in vivo* animal studies for comparison with our previous anti-DR5 and anti-EGFR studies using the same cell line [36, 47]. However, since the therapeutic effect of anti-EMMPRIN antibody is modest in the established solid tumor model, the antibody effect for non-resectable pancreatic tumors may need to be further validated using more human pancreatic cancer cell lines. Ideally, it will be necessary to employ a pancreatic tumorgraft model to predict human cancer response with greater accuracy; the tumors directly transferred from patients into animals without culturing process, called tumorgraft, closely mirror the primary tumors. The tumorgrafts created by Fiebig *et al* predicted sensitive response in 90% and resistant response in 97% of patients [48], and we are currently developing the pancreatic tumorgraft modes for evaluating anti-EMMPRIN antibody.

The limited expression of EMMPRIN in normal cell types may allow anti-EMMPRIN therapy in combination with other chemotherapeutic agents like gemcitabine in an acceptable level of side effect [12]. Furthermore, the suppressed angiogenesis via anti-EMMPRIN antibody may improve the normalization of tumor microvasculature leading to the decrease of tumor interstitial fluid pressure [14], which may enhance the delivery efficiency of a drug when used in combination [49]. Improved drug delivery may result in therapeutic synergy [50]. Anti-EMMPRIN therapy may lead to synergy in combination with DR5-targeted therapy by inducing apoptosis while preventing tumor invasion and metastasis, because anti-DR5 therapy induces DR5 aggregation triggering apoptosis [51] and high levels of DR5 expression were observed in pancreatic cancer stem cells [52].

USI assessed the volume of orthotopic pancreatic tumor xenografts longitudinally with good accuracy. The tumor volume changes measured by USI were not significantly different from those by T2W MRI, but the COV was about twice higher. The statistical significance between groups 4 and 5 could be detected if T2W MRI were used to assess tumor volume, as histological analysis validated the significantly reduced cell proliferation after anti-EMMPRIN therapy. Since 2D USI produces a cross-sectional image of an object at an arbitrary angle, higher variability of the size measurement is inevitable. Instead, the hand-free 2D array scanning technique using a 2D USI probe would be employed for capturing the whole tumor-volume image with extended acquisition and analysis time, or a 3-dimensional (3D) US imager could be also utilized to improve the measurement accuracy [53].

Acknowledgments

Authors thank Lin Belt, Sharon Samuel, Lee Whitworth, and Amber Martin for assistance with growing cells, *in vitro* assays, animal monitoring, and imaging. All experiments complied with current regulatory requirements (including ethics requirements) and laws of the United States of America.

Grant support: AACR-PANCAN Career Development Award; HSF-GEF Scholar Award; National Cancer Institute (R01CA142637 and 5K08CA102154); UAB small animal imaging shared facility (5P30CA013148).

REFERENCES

1. Wray CJ, Ahmad SA, Matthews JB, Lowy AM. Surgery for pancreatic cancer: recent controversies and current practice. *Gastroenterology*. 2005; 128:1626–1641. [PubMed: 15887155]
2. Burris HA III, Moore MJ, Andersen J, et al. Improvements in survival and clinical benefit with gemcitabine as first-line therapy for patients with advanced pancreas cancer: a randomized trial. *J Clin Oncol*. 1997; 15:2403–2413. [PubMed: 9196156]
3. Loehrer PJ, Powell ME, Cardenes HR, et al. A randomized phase III study of gemcitabine in combination with radiation therapy versus gemcitabine alone in patients with localized, unresectable pancreatic cancer: E4201. *J Clin Oncol*. 2008; 26(suppl):4506.
4. Berlin JD, Catalano P, Thomas JP, Kugler JW, Haller DG, Benson AB 3rd. Phase III study of gemcitabine in combination with fluorouracil versus gemcitabine alone in patients with advanced pancreatic carcinoma: Eastern Cooperative Oncology Group Trial E2297. *J Clin Oncol*. 2002; 20:3270–3275. [PubMed: 12149301]
5. Heinemann V, Quietzsch D, Gieseler F, et al. Randomized phase III trial of gemcitabine plus cisplatin compared with gemcitabine alone in advanced pancreatic cancer. *J Clin Oncol*. 2006; 24:3946–3952. [PubMed: 16921047]
6. Rocha Lima CM, Green MR, Rotche R, et al. Irinotecan plus gemcitabine results in no survival advantage compared with gemcitabine monotherapy in patients with locally advanced or metastatic pancreatic cancer despite increased tumor response rate. *J Clin Oncol*. 2004; 22:3776–3783. [PubMed: 15365074]
7. Louvet C, Labianca R, Hammel P, et al. Gemcitabine in combination with oxaliplatin compared with gemcitabine alone in locally advanced or metastatic pancreatic cancer: results of a GERCOR and GISCAD phase III trial. *J Clin Oncol*. 2005; 23:3509–3516. [PubMed: 15908661]
8. Conroy T, Desseigne F, Ychou M, et al. Randomized phase III trial comparing FOLFIRINOX (F: 5FU/leucovorin [LV], irinotecan [I], and oxaliplatin [O]) versus gemcitabine (G) as first-line treatment for metastatic pancreatic adenocarcinoma (MPA): Preplanned interim analysis results of the PRODIGE 4/ACCORD 11 trial. *J Clin Oncol*. 2010; 28:15s.
9. Xiong HQ, Rosenberg A, LoBuglio A, et al. Cetuximab, a monoclonal antibody targeting the epidermal growth factor receptor, in combination with gemcitabine for advanced pancreatic cancer: a multicenter phase II Trial. *J Clin Oncol*. 2004; 22:2610–2616. [PubMed: 15226328]
10. Kindler HL, Friberg G, Singh DA, et al. Phase II trial of bevacizumab plus gemcitabine in patients with advanced pancreatic cancer. *J Clin Oncol*. 2005; 23:8033–8040. [PubMed: 16258101]
11. Moore MJ, Goldstein D, Hamm J, et al. Erlotinib plus gemcitabine compared with gemcitabine alone in patients with advanced pancreatic cancer: a phase III trial of the National Cancer Institute of Canada Clinical Trials Group. *J Clin Oncol*. 2007; 25:1960–1966. [PubMed: 17452677]
12. Riethdorf S, Reimers N, Assmann V, et al. High incidence of EMMPRIN expression in human tumors. *Int J Cancer*. 2006; 119:1800–1810. [PubMed: 16721788]
13. Rosenthal EL, Vidrine DM, Zhang W. Extracellular matrix metalloproteinase inducer stimulates fibroblast-mediated tumor growth in vivo. *Laryngoscope*. 2006; 116:1086–1092. [PubMed: 16826041]
14. Tang Y, Nakada MT, Kesavan P, et al. Extracellular matrix metalloproteinase inducer stimulates tumor angiogenesis by elevating vascular endothelial cell growth factor and matrix metalloproteinases. *Cancer Res*. 2005; 65:3193–3199. [PubMed: 15833850]
15. Zhang W, Matrisian LM, Holmbeck K, Vick CC, Rosenthal EL. Fibroblast-derived MT1-MMP promotes tumor progression in vitro and in vivo. *BMC Cancer*. 2006; 6:52. [PubMed: 16515711]
16. Caudroy S, Polette M, Nawrocki-Raby B, et al. EMMPRIN-mediated MMP regulation in tumor and endothelial cells. *Clin Exp Metastasis*. 2002; 19:697–702. [PubMed: 12553375]
17. Braundmeier AG, Fazleabas AT, Lessey BA, Guo H, Toole BP, Nowak RA. Extracellular matrix metalloproteinase inducer regulates metalloproteinases in human uterine endometrium. *J Clin Endocrinol Metab*. 2006; 91:2358–2365. [PubMed: 16522689]
18. Dalberg K, Eriksson E, Enberg U, Kjellman M, Backdahl M. Gelatinase A, membrane type 1 matrix metalloproteinase, and extracellular matrix metalloproteinase inducer mRNA expression:

- correlation with invasive growth of breast cancer. *World J Surg.* 2000; 24:334–340. [PubMed: 10658069]
19. Zucker S, Hymowitz M, Rollo EE, et al. Tumorigenic potential of extracellular matrix metalloproteinase inducer. *Am J Pathol.* 2001; 158:1921–1928. [PubMed: 11395366]
 20. Ellenrieder V, Alber B, Lacher U, et al. Role of MT-MMPs and MMP-2 in pancreatic cancer progression. *Int J Cancer.* 2000; 85:14–20. [PubMed: 10585576]
 21. Quemener C, Gabison EE, Naimi B, et al. Extracellular matrix metalloproteinase inducer up-regulates the urokinase-type plasminogen activator system promoting tumor cell invasion. *Cancer Res.* 2007; 67:9–15. [PubMed: 17210677]
 22. Bougateg F, Quemener C, Kellouche S, et al. EMMPRIN promotes angiogenesis through hypoxia-inducible factor-2 α -mediated regulation of soluble VEGF isoforms and their receptor VEGFR-2. *Blood.* 2009; 114:5547–5556. [PubMed: 19837976]
 23. Reimers N, Zafra K, Assmann V, et al. Expression of extracellular matrix metalloproteases inducer on micrometastatic and primary mammary carcinoma cells. *Clin Cancer Res.* 2004; 10:3422–3428. [PubMed: 15161697]
 24. Seymour AB, Hruban RH, Redston M, et al. Allelotype of pancreatic adenocarcinoma. *Cancer Res.* 1994; 54:2761–2764. [PubMed: 8168108]
 25. Schneiderhan W, Scheler M, Holzmann KH, et al. CD147 silencing inhibits lactate transport and reduces malignant potential of pancreatic cancer cells in in vivo and in vitro models. *Gut.* 2009; 58:1391–1398. [PubMed: 19505879]
 26. Dean NR, Newman JR, Helman EE, et al. Anti-EMMPRIN monoclonal antibody as a novel agent for therapy of head and neck cancer. *Clin Cancer Res.* 2009; 15:4058–4065. [PubMed: 19509148]
 27. Dean NR, Knowles JA, Helman EE, et al. Anti-EMMPRIN antibody treatment of head and neck squamous cell carcinoma in an ex-vivo model. *Anticancer Drugs.* 2010; 21:861–867. [PubMed: 20700044]
 28. Pezold JC, Zinn K, Talbert MA, Desmond R, Rosenthal EL. Validation of ultrasonography to evaluate murine orthotopic oral cavity tumors. *ORL J Otorhinolaryngol Relat Spec.* 2006; 68:159–163. [PubMed: 16465070]
 29. Derosier LC, Buchsbaum DJ, Oliver PG, et al. Combination Treatment with TRA-8 Anti Death Receptor 5 Antibody and CPT-11 Induces Tumor Regression in an Orthotopic Model of Pancreatic Cancer. *Clin Cancer Res.* 2007; 13:5535s–5543s. [PubMed: 17875786]
 30. Derosier LC, Vickers SM, Zinn KR, et al. TRA-8 anti-DR5 monoclonal antibody and gemcitabine induce apoptosis and inhibit radiologically validated orthotopic pancreatic tumor growth. *Mol Cancer Ther.* 2007; 6:3198–3207. [PubMed: 18089714]
 31. Haider MA, van der Kwast TH, Tanguay J, et al. Combined T2-weighted and diffusion-weighted MRI for localization of prostate cancer. *AJR Am J Roentgenol.* 2007; 189:323–328. [PubMed: 17646457]
 32. Chenevert TL, Stegman LD, Taylor JM, et al. Diffusion magnetic resonance imaging: an early surrogate marker of therapeutic efficacy in brain tumors. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2000; 92:2029–2036. [PubMed: 11121466]
 33. Moffat BA, Chenevert TL, Meyer CR, et al. The functional diffusion map: an imaging biomarker for the early prediction of cancer treatment outcome. *Neoplasia.* 2006; 8:259–267. [PubMed: 16756718]
 34. Woodhams R, Matsunaga K, Kan S, et al. ADC mapping of benign and malignant breast tumors. *Magn Reson Med Sci.* 2005; 4:35–42. [PubMed: 16127252]
 35. Kartalis N, Lindholm TL, Aspelin P, Permert J, Albiin N. Diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging of pancreas tumours. *Eur Radiol.* 2009; 19:1981–1990. [PubMed: 19308414]
 36. Kim H, Morgan DE, Buchsbaum DJ, et al. Early therapy evaluation of combined anti-death receptor 5 antibody and gemcitabine in orthotopic pancreatic tumor xenografts by diffusion-weighted magnetic resonance imaging. *Cancer Res.* 2008; 68:8369–8376. [PubMed: 18922909]
 37. Larsen SK, Solomon HF, Caldwell G, Abrams MJ. [99mTc]tricine: a useful precursor complex for the radiolabeling of hydrazinonicotinate protein conjugates. *Bioconjug Chem.* 1995; 6:635–638. [PubMed: 8974465]

38. Lowry O, Rosebrough N, Farr L, Randall R. Protein measurement with the folin phenol reagent. *J Biol Chem.* 1951; 193:265–275. [PubMed: 14907713]
39. Motulsky, HJ.; Christopoulos, A. Fitting models to biological data using linear and nonlinear regression. GraphPad Software Inc.; San Diego: 2003.
40. Winzor, DJ.; Sawyer, WH. Quantitative characterization of ligand binding. Wiley-Liss; New York: 1995.
41. Kim H, Morgan DE, Zeng H, et al. Breast tumor xenografts: diffusion-weighted MR imaging to assess early therapy with novel apoptosis-inducing anti-DR5 antibody. *Radiology.* 2008; 248:844–851. [PubMed: 18710978]
42. Kim H, Folks KD, Guo L, et al. DCE-MRI detects early vascular response in breast tumor xenografts following anti-DR5 therapy. *Mol Imaging Biol.* 2011; 13:94–103. [PubMed: 20383593]
43. Neter, J.; Kutner, MH.; Nachtsheim, JC.; Wasserman, W. Applied linear statistical models. The McGraw-Hill Companies, Inc.; Columbus: 1996.
44. Hertzog C, Rovine M. Repeated-measures analysis of variance in developmental research: selected issues. *Child Dev.* 1985; 56:787–809. [PubMed: 4042744]
45. Yang JM, O'Neill P, Jin W, et al. Extracellular matrix metalloproteinase inducer (CD147) confers resistance of breast cancer cells to Anoikis through inhibition of Bim. *J Biol Chem.* 2006; 281:9719–9727. [PubMed: 16443928]
46. Bougateg F, Menashi S, Khayati F, et al. EMMPRIN promotes melanoma cells malignant properties through a HIF-2 α mediated up-regulation of VEGF-receptor-2. *PLoS One.* 2010; 5:e12265. [PubMed: 20824203]
47. Kim H, Folks K, Guo L, et al. Early Therapy Evaluation of Combined Anti-EGFR Antibody and Irinotecan in Orthotopic Pancreatic Tumor Xenografts by Dynamic Contrast-Enhanced Magnetic Resonance Imaging. *Mol Imaging.* 2011 in press.
48. Fiebig HH, Maier A, Burger AM. Clonogenic assay with established human tumour xenografts: correlation of in vitro to in vivo activity as a basis for anticancer drug discovery. *Eur J Cancer.* 2004; 40:802–820. [PubMed: 15120036]
49. Escorcía FE, Henke E, McDevitt MR, et al. Selective killing of tumor neovasculature paradoxically improves chemotherapy delivery to tumors. *Cancer Res.* 2010; 70:9277–9286. [PubMed: 21045141]
50. Bhattacharya A, Seshadri M, Oven SD, Toth K, Vaughan MM, Rustum YM. Tumor vascular maturation and improved drug delivery induced by methylselenocysteine leads to therapeutic synergy with anticancer drugs. *Clin Cancer Res.* 2008; 14:3926–3932. [PubMed: 18559614]
51. Ichikawa K, Liu W, Zhao L, et al. Tumoricidal activity of a novel anti-human DR5 monoclonal antibody without hepatocyte cytotoxicity. *Nat Med.* 2001; 7:954–960. [PubMed: 11479629]
52. Rajeshkumar, NV.; Rasheed, Z.; Garcia-Garcia, E., et al. Tigatuzumab (CS-1008), a novel humanized DR5 agonist antibody, eradicates pancreas cancer stem cells and results in long term cures, in combination with gemcitabine, in direct pancreas cancer xenografts. *Proceedings of the 100th Annual Meeting of the American Association for Cancer Research*; 2009. Abstract nr (1069)
53. Fenster A, Downey DB, Cardinal HN. Three-dimensional ultrasound imaging. *Phys Med Biol.* 2001; 46:R67–99. [PubMed: 11384074]

FIGURE 1.

Validation of EMMPRIN expression. (A) EMMPRIN expression evaluated by flow cytometry, when MIA PaCa-2 was transduced by lentiviral particles carrying vectors with EMMPRIN shRNA SiE1 or vector as control (VC). The cells were stained with fluorescein isothiocyanate (FITC) conjugated anti-human EMMPRIN antibodies. (B) Verification of EMMPRIN expression by western blotting assay. Cell lysates from control cells as well as from EMMPRIN silenced cells were subjected to western blotting using antibody against EMMPRIN. β -actin was used as loading control.

FIGURE 2. Representative Scatchard plots of Tc-99m-labeled anti-EMMPRIN antibody binding to (A) MIA PaCa-2 cells or (B) EMMPRIN knockdown MIA PaCa-2 cells (the acid-stable binding components are shown). Inserts are saturation binding curves.

FIGURE 3.

In vivo ultrasound-image analysis of tumor response. (A) Representative 2-dimensional ultrasound image of an orthotopic pancreatic tumor xenograft showing two orthogonal dimensions, while the tumor boundary is indicated with a white dotted circle. (B) Tumor volume change following intraperitoneal injection PBS (groups 1 and 2) or 0.2 mg of anti-EMMPRIN antibody (group 3) twice weekly for 3 weeks when dosing started immediately after cell implantation (post-surgical residual tumor model). (C) Tumor volume changes following intraperitoneal injection of PBS (group 4) or 0.2 mg of anti-EMMPRIN antibody (group 5) twice weekly for 3 weeks, when dosing started at 21 days after cell implantation (established tumor model). (D) Tumor volume changes following intraperitoneal injection of PBS (group 6) or 1 mg of anti-EMMPRIN antibody (group 7) twice weekly for 2 weeks, when dosing started at 21 days after cell implantation. Different Greek letters represent statistical difference among the groups during entire therapy period.

FIGURE 4.

(A) Representative diffusion-weighted images in the same intensity scale at four different b values (5, 300, 600, 1000 sec/mm²) and ADC map of an orthotopically implanted MIA PaCa-2 tumor xenograft, while tumor location is indicated with a white arrow. (B) Tumor volume or (C) intratumoral ADC changes (%) of mice randomly selected from groups 6 (n=3) and 7 (n=4) which were intraperitoneally injected with PBS and anti-EMMPRIN antibody (1.0 mg) twice weekly for 2 weeks respectively. Different Greek letters represent statistical difference between groups 6 and 7 during 2 weeks.

FIGURE 5.

Histologic analysis of tumor response. (A) Representative Ki67 (X100), TUNEL (X100), and CD31 (X200) stained slices of MIA PaCa-2 tumors collected on day 42, when the intraperitoneal injection of PBS (group 4) or 0.2 mg of anti-EMMPRIN antibody (group 5) started on day 21 twice weekly for three weeks. Proliferating (Ki67 stained), apoptotic (TUNEL stained), and endothelial (CD31 stained) cells are indicated with black arrows in each sub slices. (B) Proliferating cell density (cell number/mm²), (C) apoptotic cell density, and (D) microvessel density and size of groups 4 and 5 with p values.