Published in final edited form as:

Biochem Biophys Res Commun. 2015 February 13; 457(3): 404–411. doi:10.1016/j.bbrc.2015.01.004.

Differential effects of estrogen-dependent transactivation vs. transrepression by the estrogen receptor on invasiveness of HER2 overexpressing breast cancer cells *

Mugdha Patki^{1,2}, Marcela d'alincourt Salazar^{2,3}, Robert Trumbly², and Manohar Ratnam¹

¹Department of Oncology, Barbara Ann Karmanos Cancer Institute, 4100 John R., Detroit, MI, 48201

²Department of Biochemistry and Cancer Biology, University Medical Center, Toledo, OH, 43614

³Division of Translational Research, Beckman Research Institute, City of Hope, Duarte, CA, 91010

Abstract

Estrogen (E₂) supports breast cancer cell growth but suppresses invasiveness and both actions are antagonized by anti-estrogens. As a consequence, anti-estrogen treatment may increase the invasive potential of estrogen receptor (ER)+ tumor cell sub-populations that are endocrine resistant due to HER2 amplification. Either transactivation or transrepression by E₂/ER could lead to both up- and down-regulation of many genes. Inhibition of the transactivation function of ER is adequate to inhibit E₂-dependent growth. However, the impact of inhibiting E₂-dependent transactivation vs. transrepression by ER on regulation of invasiveness by E₂ is less clear. Here we dissect the roles of ER-mediated transactivation and transrepression in the regulation of invasiveness of ER+/HER2+ breast cancer cells by E₂. Knocking down the general ER co-activators CBP and p300 prevented activation by E₂ of its classical target genes but did not interfere with the ability of E₂ to repress its direct target genes known to support invasiveness and tumor progression; there was also no effect on invasiveness or the ability of E₂ to regulate invasiveness. On the other hand, overexpression of a co-repressor binding site mutant of ER (L372R) prevented E₂-dependent transrepression but not transactivation. The mutant ER abrogated the ability of E₂ to suppress invasiveness. E₂ can partially down-regulate HER2 but knocking down HER2 below E₂-regulated levels did not affect invasiveness or the ability of E₂ to regulate invasiveness, although it did inhibit growth. Therefore, in ER+/HER2+ cells, the E₂-dependent transrepression by ER rather than its transactivation function is critical for regulation of invasiveness and this is independent of HER2 regulation by E₂. The findings suggest that selective

© 2015 Elsevier Inc. All rights reserved.

To whom correspondence should be addressed: Manohar Ratnam, Ph.D., Barbara Ann Karmanos Cancer Institute, 4100 John R., Detroit, MI, USA 48201-2013, Tel.: 313-576-8612, Fax: 313-579-8928, ratnamm@karmanos.org.

Conflict of interest

We wish to confirm that there are no known conflicts of interest associated with this publication and there has been no significant financial support for this work that could have influenced its outcome.

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.

inhibitors of transactivation by ER may be more beneficial in reducing tumor progression than conventional anti-estrogens that also antagonize E₂-dependent transrepression.

Keywords

Estrogen receptor; Tamoxifen; Anti-estrogens; Invasiveness; Breast cancer; HER2

INTRODUCTION

Estrogen receptor type α (ER)-positive breast cancer accounts for up to 75% of all breast cancer cases [1]. Estrogen, predominantly in the form of estradiol (E₂), binds to ER to drive tumor cell growth through up-regulation of genes that support mitosis and cell cycle progression [2]. Tamoxifen and raloxifene inhibit breast tumor growth primarily by antagonizing E₂ whereas aromatase inhibitors, given post-menopause, act by blocking peripheral and intratumoral E₂ synthesis [3]. Tamoxifen is also used as a chemopreventive agent in women at risk for breast cancer [4]. In ER+ breast cancer, a 5-year adjuvant treatment with tamoxifen given to inhibit residual tumor growth decreases recurrence by about 50 percent [5]. Breast tumors however can become growth adapted to attenuated E₂ signaling through dysregulated alternative signaling pathways [6]. Intrinsic or acquired resistance derives from subpopulations of cells within the tumor with an aggressive growth phenotype and migratory capacity [7] ultimately leading to tumor recurrence, drug resistance and metastasis [8]. In up to 90 percent of the cases however, when the primary tumor is ER+, lymph node and distant metastases retain ER expression even though their growth may have escaped hormonal control [9]. Notably, about 15 % of invasive and ER+ breast tumors also overexpress HER2 [10] which may confer estrogen-independent growth; in those cases, the role of estrogen signaling in tumor biology is unclear.

It is well known that in ER+ breast cancer cells, E₂ also inhibits invasiveness and tumor progression, *in vitro* and *in vivo*, whether or not their growth is hormone-sensitive [11,12,13,14,15,16,17]. This is believed to be the reason that primary luminal breast tumors are less aggressive than basal-like tumors. Indeed, recent studies have revealed that, in postmenopausal women with prior hysterectomy, hormone replacement with estrogen as a monotherapy is actually associated with a persistent decrease in the frequency of invasive breast cancer [18]. Understanding mechanisms underlying the effects of E₂ and anti-estrogens on breast tumor cell invasiveness is potentially highly significant in addressing the problem of tumor progression within subpopulations of cells, such as ER+/HER2+ cells that are resistant to anti-estrogens. This is because in ER+ tumors, anti-estrogen treatment could produce the undesirable collateral effect of suppressing the ability of E₂ to inhibit invasiveness in the resistant (e.g., ER+/HER2+) cells. This is a particularly significant issue because breast tumor cells could migrate at a relatively early stage from the primary tumor to distal sites [7].

The ERBB2 gene product, HER2 supports invasive and metastatic properties in several types of cancer and, in breast cancer, its amplification enables tumors to grow independent of estrogen. In one study, ectopic overexpression of HER2 in the ER-negative MDA-

MB-435 cells enhanced their invasiveness [19]. In a second study, ectopic overexpression of HER2 increased brain metastasis in the ER-negative MDA-MD-231 cells [20]. Brain metastases of breast tumors are enriched for HER2 expression [20]. As the ERBB2 gene is known to be repressed by E₂ in ER+ breast cancer cells [21], it has been suggested that down-regulation of HER2 by E₂ might contribute to the relatively low invasiveness of luminal breast tumors [14]. However, in this case, a causal link to HER2 downregulation has not been demonstrated. Indeed, although HER2 amplification supports E₂-independent growth in ER+ breast cancer cells and a basal level of HER2 may support invasiveness of ER+ cells, a role for overexpression of endogenous HER2 in invasiveness has not been established in ER+ breast cancer cells [22].

When bound to E₂, ER could either transactivate or transrepress its direct target genes. In either case, this could directly or indirectly result in both up-regulation and down-regulation of a host of genes that have diverse roles in breast tumor growth and progression. The mode of direct interaction of agonist bound ER with target genes that it transrepresses is fundamentally different from its interaction with genes that it transactivates, as gene repression involves agonist-induced recruitment of co-repressors rather than co-activators [23,24]. The mechanistic difference between transactivation vs. transrepression by E₂-bound ER offers an opportunity for mechanism-based targeting of E₂ action in a more functionally selective manner. The E₂-induced and co-activator dependent transactivation by ER is known to be necessary for E₂-dependent tumor cell growth. However, the relative importance of E₂-dependent transactivation vs. transrepression by ER in the ability of E₂ to regulate invasiveness is unclear.

It was therefore undertaken to directly examine the role of E₂-dependent transactivation vs. transrepression by ER in regulation of invasiveness by E₂ in ER+/HER2+ breast cancer cells.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Chemicals and reagents

Cell culture media, charcoal-stripped fetal bovine serum, reagents for real time PCR, primers and TaqMan probes were from Life Technologies (Carlsbad, CA). 17 β -estradiol (E₂) and 4-hydroxytamoxifen (4-OHT) were from Sigma Aldrich (St. Louis, MO). Phenol red-free growth factor reduced Matrigel (356231) and Calcein AM Fluorescent Dye (354216) were from BD Biosciences (San Jose, CA). Affinity purified anti-human ER (sc-543), anti-human Neu (sc-33684) and anti-human GAPDH antibodies (sc-44724) were from Santa Cruz Biotechnologies (Santa Cruz, CA).

siRNA

The small interfering RNAs (siRNA) for HER2 (#J-003126-20), ESR1 (#J-003401-12), CREBBP (#J-003477-08), EP300 (#J-003486-11) and Non-targeting siRNA (#D-001810-02) were from Thermo Fisher Scientific (Waltham, MA).

Cell culture and hormone depletion

BT474 breast cancer cells (American Type Culture Collection) were cultured in DMEM supplemented with FBS (10%), penicillin (100unit/ml), streptomycin (100µg/ml) and L-glutamine (2mM). For hormone depletion, the cells were cultured in phenol red-free DMEM medium supplemented with 10% charcoal-stripped FBS (v/v) and incubated at 37°C with 5% CO₂ for 48 h to 72 h prior to treatments.

Transfection

Hormone depleted cells were plated to 20% confluence in phenol red-free DMEM medium supplemented with 10% charcoal-stripped FBS and transfected with the appropriate siRNA using Dharmafect 1 (Thermo Fisher Scientific, Waltham, MA) according to the vendor's protocol.

Mutagenesis

The ER-L372R mutant was generated by creating a point mutation in ERα cDNA at nucleotide position 1116 by converting the codon CTC to CGC using the QuickChange II Site-Directed Mutagenesis kit (Agilent Technologies, Santa Clara, CA). The wild type ER cDNA and ER- L372R mutant cDNA were inserted in the pCDH lentiviral vector at the SalI site in the polylinker.

Lentiviral transduction

Lentiviral particles containing the appropriate pCDH plasmid were generated as described [25]. 48 h before transduction, BT474 cells were plated in phenol red-free DMEM medium with 10% heat inactivated charcoal-stripped FBS at 25% confluence. Cells were transduced with either pCDH-ER lentivirus or pCDH-ER-L372R lentivirus with polybrene (8µg/mL) for 5 h followed by a similar second lentiviral transduction for an additional 5 h. After the second transduction, the virus was replaced with fresh phenol red-free medium containing 10% charcoal-stripped FBS.

Western blot analysis

Western blots were carried out as previously described [25].

RNA isolation, reverse transcription PCR and real time PCR

Total RNA was isolated and reverse transcribed as described [25]. cDNA was measured by quantitative real time PCR using the StepOne Plus Real time PCR System (Life Technologies, Carlsbad, CA). All of the mRNA measurements were carried out using biological triplicate samples and C_T values were normalized to those of GAPDH.

Cell proliferation assay

BT474 cells were seeded in 96-well plates at 20% confluence (1×10⁴ cells/well) in phenol-red free media supplemented with 10% charcoal-stripped FBS (v/v) and incubated at 37°C with 5% CO₂. The cells were treated with vehicle (ethanol) or E₂ (1nM). Cell viability was determined using the MTT assay, as previously described [25].

Transwell invasion assay

1×10^5 cells were suspended in serum-free/phenol red-free DMEM medium and added in the top chamber of fluoroblok cell culture inserts (#351152; 8 μ M pore membrane; BD Biosciences, Bedford, MA) coated with matrigel (0.2 mg/mL). 20% FBS in phenol-red free DMEM media was used as the chemoattractant. The appropriate treatments were included in both the top and the bottom chambers. Cells were allowed to invade for 24 h. Invaded cells on the bottom surface of the insert were labeled with Calcein AM (2 μ g/ml – 4 μ g/ml) for 1 h at 37°C in the dark and imaged using a fluorescent microscope. The invasion assay for each treatment was performed in triplicate wells. Images were captured from each well from five fields of view using a 4x objective. The images were processed using the Image J software [26] and the number of cells invaded was quantified on the basis of brightness and pixel size.

Statistical analyses

Experimental values are presented as mean $\pm$ s.d. The statistical significance of differences (*P* value) between values being compared was determined using ANOVA. The *P* values are noted in the figures.

RESULTS

Estrogen suppresses invasiveness in HER2-amplified ER+ cells and this is antagonized by tamoxifen

We first confirmed that under our experimental conditions, we were able to reproduce the ability of E₂ to suppress invasiveness in a tamoxifen-sensitive manner in HER2-amplified ER+ breast cancer cells using the well-established BT474 (ER+/PR+/HER2+) cell line model. E₂ strongly inhibited invasiveness in these cells and tamoxifen blocked this effect of E₂ (Figure 1A).

Inhibition of invasiveness by estrogen is dependent on ER in ER+/HER2+ breast cancer cells

Certain cellular effects of E₂ could be mediated by membrane receptors rather than ER. In BT474 cells, depletion of ER (Figure 1B) prevented E₂ mediated activation of its classical target genes (Figure 1C). The ability of E₂ to inhibit invasiveness was also abrogated by knocking down ER (Figure 1D) confirming ER-dependence of this effect. Knocking down ER also increased the basal level of invasiveness (Figure 1D), indicating an additional hormone-independent effect of ER on invasiveness, as observed when ER-negative cells were transfected with ectopic ER [12].

A co-repressor binding site mutant of ER disrupts the ability of estrogen to inhibit invasiveness in ER+/HER2+ breast cancer cells

There is considerable functional redundancy or overlap among ER co-repressors. Therefore the best approach to specifically interrogating the role of E₂-dependent transrepression by ER in regulation of invasiveness by E₂ is to test an ER mutant incapable of co-repressor binding rather than knocking down a co-repressor. Mutation of L372 in ER to R372 is

known to attenuate the ability of ER to interact with the CoRNR box motifs of ER co-repressors without affecting interaction with the LXXLL motifs of ER co-activators [27]. We overexpressed wt ER and the ER L372R mutant in BT474 cells using lentiviral transduction to achieve a 6–8 fold increase in the expression of ER mRNAs, accompanied by increases in protein expression (Figure 2A). The ectopic mutant ER showed the expected dominant-negative effect on gene repression by E₂ on its direct target genes, IGFBP3 and S100P (Figure 2B) without affecting activation of its direct target genes, PGR, GREB1 and pS2 (Figure 2C). In contrast, the control ectopic wt ER retained both the gene repression (Figure 2B) and the gene activation (Figure 2C) by E₂. The transduced mutant ER but not wt ER abrogated inhibition of invasiveness by E₂ (Figure 2D). The results demonstrate a causal link between transrepression by E₂ and the role of the hormone in suppression of invasiveness.

Attenuation of estrogen-dependent transactivation by ER does not affect regulation of invasiveness by estrogen in ER+/HER2+ breast cancer cells

The general ER co-activators, CBP and p300 together support the ability of E₂ to activate most of its direct target genes. In BT474 cells, a partial combined knockdown of CBP and p300 (Figure 3A) was adequate to virtually completely block transactivation by E₂ (Figure 3B) without affecting transrepression (Figure 3C) of its direct target genes. The combined knockdown of CBP and p300 did not affect the ability of E₂ to inhibit invasiveness of BT474 cells (Figure 3D). These results demonstrate that in contrast to the role of E₂-dependent transrepression noted above, E₂-dependent transactivation by ER is not required for regulation of invasiveness by E₂ in ER+/HER2+ breast cancer cells.

Suppression of invasiveness by estrogen is independent of regulation of HER2 in ER+/HER2+ breast cancer cells

Knocking down the overexpressed HER2 in BT474 cells to below its E₂-repressed levels (Figure 4A) did not decrease invasiveness indicating that in these cells high levels of HER2 were not needed for their invasiveness (Figure 4B). Moreover, knocking down HER2 to levels lower than the E₂-repressed levels failed to show any effect on the ability of E₂ to suppress invasiveness (Figure 4B). On the other hand, the reduction in HER2 level did inhibit the growth of BT474 cells (Figure 4C). The results demonstrate that HER2 does not play a role in the regulation of invasiveness by E₂ in ER+/HER2+ cells.

DISCUSSION

The ability of anti-estrogens to oppose regulation of invasiveness of breast tumor cells by E₂ may be expected to negatively impact the outcome of anti-estrogen adjuvant therapy when the treated tumor contains ER+ cells that have intrinsic or acquired resistance to the therapy. As HER2 amplification represents a well-established mechanism of resistance of ER+ breast cancer cells to anti-estrogen therapy, we used the ER+/HER2+ BT474 cell line as a model for this study. It is well known that E₂-dependent transactivation by ER is critical for the ability of E₂ to support the growth of hormone-dependent breast cancer cells as demonstrated by the need for ER coactivators to support tumor growth [28,29]. In this study of ER+/HER2+ breast cancer cells, knocking down the general ER coactivators CBP and

p300 did prevent transactivation by E₂/ER but did not affect the ability of E₂ to suppress invasiveness. Further, a causative link between the agonist-dependent transrepression mechanism of ER and the inhibition of invasiveness by E₂ was established in the ER+/HER2+ cells by taking advantage of the co-repressor dependence of ER for repression of its direct target genes. A mutation in the co-repressor binding site of ER abrogated both the gene repression and inhibition of invasiveness by E₂ but not E₂-dependent transactivation. The results indicate that the ability of E₂ to induce transrepression by ER is critical for suppression of invasiveness by the hormone rather than its ability to induce transactivation.

E₂ is known to partially repress the ERRB2 gene in ER+ breast cancer cells [21]. By testing the effect of reducing endogenous HER2 to a level below the E₂-regulated level in BT474 cells, this study demonstrated that the partial downregulation of HER2 by E₂ could not account for the ability of E₂ to regulate invasiveness and that this must occur through other E₂ target genes.

The mode of E₂-dependent transrepression by ER is fundamentally different from that of transactivation by ER in that it involves agonist-induced co-repressor recruitment by ER, but there could also be additional mechanistic differences. We have previously demonstrated a mechanistically distinct aspect of gene repression by E₂ wherein, the hormone caused ER and co-repressor recruitment to the target folate receptor α (FR α) gene by TAFII30 [23]. In contrast to the classical mechanism of tamoxifen action, tamoxifen dissociated ER from the FR α gene; moreover, placing a classical estrogen response element (ERE) upstream of the FR α gene promoter caused a switch to gene activation by E₂ [23]. The studies suggested possible mechanistic differences between gene repression and the classical model of gene activation, both with respect to E₂ action and the manner in which tamoxifen antagonized it. This view is also supported by the observation from global chromatin binding studies that, in contrast to E₂ activated genes, E₂ repressed genes are not enriched for associated canonical EREs [30]. Mechanistic differences between transactivation and transrepression by E₂-bound ER could potentially be exploited to develop agents that would selectively antagonize this transactivation component of E₂ action.

In conclusion, this study provides new insights into possible mechanisms contributing to emergence of more invasive ER+ tumor cells in the course of anti-estrogen therapy. The ability of anti-estrogens to antagonize E₂ induced transactivation of its direct target genes by ER is known to be critical for their anti-tumor effect; however, we conclude that in the anti-estrogen resistant ER+/HER2+ breast cancer cells, hormone-induced transactivation by ER does not impact the ability of E₂ to regulate invasiveness. On the other hand, in ER+/HER2+ breast cancer cells, E₂-induced transrepression by ER is critical for suppression of invasiveness by the hormone and therefore antagonism of this function of ER would encourage an invasive phenotype. Therefore, a superior treatment for ER+ breast cancer may require drugs that would selectively inhibit the hormone-dependent transactivation function of ER without disrupting transrepression of direct E₂ target genes. The agents could include novel selective ER modulators or selective inhibitors of the binding of certain co-activators to ER. Such drugs would inhibit E₂-dependent tumor growth without compromising suppression of invasiveness by E₂.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by NIH grant 5R01CA140690 and The Harold & Helen McMaster endowment to M.R. Yanfang Huang provided technical assistance.

References

1. Dunnwald LK, Rossing MA, Li CI. Hormone receptor status, tumor characteristics, and prognosis: a prospective cohort of breast cancer patients. *Breast Cancer Res.* 2007; 9:R6. [PubMed: 17239243]
2. Feigelson HS, Henderson BE. Estrogens and breast cancer. *Carcinogenesis.* 1996; 17:2279–2284. [PubMed: 8968038]
3. Wong ZW, Ellis MJ. First-line endocrine treatment of breast cancer: aromatase inhibitor or antiestrogen? *Br J Cancer.* 2004; 90:20–25. [PubMed: 14710200]
4. Hershman D, Sundararajan V, Jacobson JS, Heitjan DF, Neugut AI, Grann VR. Outcomes of tamoxifen chemoprevention for breast cancer in very high-risk women: a cost-effectiveness analysis. *J Clin Oncol.* 2002; 20:9–16. [PubMed: 11773148]
5. Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group. Tamoxifen for early breast cancer: an overview of the randomised trials. *Lancet.* 1998; 351:1451–1467. [PubMed: 9605801]
6. Ring A, Dowsett M. Mechanisms of tamoxifen resistance. *Endocr Relat Cancer.* 2004; 11:643–658. [PubMed: 15613444]
7. Husemann Y, Geigl JB, Schubert F, Musiani P, Meyer M, Burghart E, Forni G, Eils R, Fehm T, Riethmüller G, Klein CA. Systemic spread is an early step in breast cancer. *Cancer Cell.* 2008; 13:58–68. [PubMed: 18167340]
8. Tredan O, Galmarini CM, Patel K, Tannock IF. Drug resistance and the solid tumor microenvironment. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2007; 99:1441–1454. [PubMed: 17895480]
9. Gomez-Fernandez C, Daneshbod Y, Nassiri M, Milikowski C, Alvarez C, Nadji M. Immunohistochemically determined estrogen receptor phenotype remains stable in recurrent and metastatic breast cancer. *Am J Clin Pathol.* 2008; 130:879–882. [PubMed: 19019763]
10. Clarke CA, Keegan TH, Yang J, Press DJ, Kurian AW, Patel AH, Lacey JV Jr. Age-specific incidence of breast cancer subtypes: understanding the black-white crossover. *J Natl Cancer Inst.* 2012; 104:1094–1101. [PubMed: 22773826]
11. Lin KH, Wang WJ, Wu YH, Cheng SY. Activation of antimetastatic Nm23-H1 gene expression by estrogen and its alpha-receptor. *Endocrinology.* 2002; 143:467–475. [PubMed: 11796500]
12. Platet N, Cathiard AM, Gleizes M, Garcia M. Estrogens and their receptors in breast cancer progression: a dual role in cancer proliferation and invasion. *Crit Rev Oncol Hematol.* 2004; 51:55–67. [PubMed: 15207254]
13. Clemons M, Goss P. Estrogen and the risk of breast cancer. *N Engl J Med.* 2001; 344:276–285. [PubMed: 11172156]
14. Beauchemin D, Lacombe C, Van Themsche C. PAX2 is activated by estradiol in breast cancer cells of the luminal subgroup selectively, to confer a low invasive phenotype. *Mol Cancer.* 2011; 10:148. [PubMed: 22168360]
15. Rochefort H, Platet N, Hayashido Y, Derocq D, Lucas A, Cunaat S, Garcia M. Estrogen receptor mediated inhibition of cancer cell invasion and motility: an overview. *J Steroid Biochem Mol Biol.* 1998; 65:163–168. [PubMed: 9699869]
16. Guttilla IK, Adams BD, White BA. ERalpha, microRNAs, and the epithelial-mesenchymal transition in breast cancer. *Trends Endocrinol Metab.* 2012; 23:73–82. [PubMed: 22257677]
17. Sisci D, Maris P, Cesario MG, Anselmo W, Coroniti R, Trombino GE, Romeo F, Ferraro A, Lanzino M, Aquila S, Maggiolini M, Mauro L, Morelli C, Ando S. The estrogen receptor alpha is the key regulator of the bifunctional role of FoxO3a transcription factor in breast cancer motility and invasiveness. *Cell Cycle.* 2013; 12:3405–3420. [PubMed: 24047697]
18. LaCroix AZ, Chlebowski RT, Manson JE, Aragaki AK, Johnson KC, Martin L, Margolis KL, Stefanick ML, Brzyski R, Curb JD, Howard BV, Lewis CE, Wactawski-Wende J. Health outcomes after stopping conjugated equine estrogens among postmenopausal women with prior hysterectomy: a randomized controlled trial. *JAMA.* 2011; 305:1305–1314. [PubMed: 21467283]

19. Tan M, Yao J, Yu D. Overexpression of the c-erbB-2 gene enhanced intrinsic metastasis potential in human breast cancer cells without increasing their transformation abilities. *Cancer Res.* 1997; 57:1199–1205. [PubMed: 9067293]
20. Palmieri D, Bronder JL, Herring JM, Yoneda T, Weil RJ, Stark AM, Kurek R, Vega-Valle E, Feigenbaum L, Halverson D, Vortmeyer AO, Steinberg SM, Aldape K, Steeg PS. Her-2 overexpression increases the metastatic outgrowth of breast cancer cells in the brain. *Cancer Res.* 2007; 67:4190–4198. [PubMed: 17483330]
21. Hurtado A, Holmes KA, Geistlinger TR, Hutcheson IR, Nicholson RI, Brown M, Jiang J, Howat WJ, Ali S, Carroll JS. Regulation of ERBB2 by oestrogen receptor-PAX2 determines response to tamoxifen. *Nature.* 2008; 456:663–666. [PubMed: 19005469]
22. Johnson E, Seachrist DD, DeLeon-Rodriguez CM, Lozada KL, Miedler J, Abdul-Karim FW, Keri RA. HER2/ErbB2-induced breast cancer cell migration and invasion require p120 catenin activation of Rac1 and Cdc42. *J Biol Chem.* 2010; 285:29491–29501. [PubMed: 20595387]
23. Hao H, d'Alincourt-Salazar M, Kelley KM, Shatnawi A, Mukherjee S, Shah YM, Ratnam M. Estrogen-induced and TAFII30-mediated gene repression by direct recruitment of the estrogen receptor and co-repressors to the core promoter and its reversal by tamoxifen. *Oncogene.* 2007; 26:7872–7884. [PubMed: 17599049]
24. Merrell KW, Crofts JD, Smith RL, Sin JH, Kmetzsch KE, Merrell A, Miguel RO, Candelaria NR, Lin CY. Differential recruitment of nuclear receptor coregulators in ligand-dependent transcriptional repression by estrogen receptor-alpha. *Oncogene.* 2011; 30:1608–1614. [PubMed: 21102521]
25. Patki M, Chari V, Sivakumaran S, Gonit M, Trumbly R, Ratnam M. The ETS domain transcription factor ELK1 directs a critical component of growth signaling by the androgen receptor in prostate cancer cells. *J Biol Chem.* 2013; 288:11047–11065. [PubMed: 23426362]
26. Schneider CA, Rasband WS, Eliceiri KW. NIH Image to ImageJ: 25 years of image analysis. *Nat Methods.* 2012; 9:671–675. [PubMed: 22930834]
27. Huang HJ, Norris JD, McDonnell DP. Identification of a negative regulatory surface within estrogen receptor alpha provides evidence in support of a role for corepressors in regulating cellular responses to agonists and antagonists. *Mol Endocrinol.* 2002; 16:1778–1792. [PubMed: 12145334]
28. Karmakar S, Foster EA, Smith CL. Unique roles of p160 coactivators for regulation of breast cancer cell proliferation and estrogen receptor-alpha transcriptional activity. *Endocrinology.* 2009; 150:1588–1596. [PubMed: 19095746]
29. Matthews J, Gustafsson JA. Estrogen signaling: a subtle balance between ER alpha and ER beta. *Mol Interv.* 2003; 3:281–292. [PubMed: 14993442]
30. Bourdeau V, Deschenes J, Laperriere D, Aid M, White JH, Mader S. Mechanisms of primary and secondary estrogen target gene regulation in breast cancer cells. *Nucleic Acids Res.* 2008; 36:76–93. [PubMed: 17986456]

- Transactivation by ER is necessary to support estrogen dependent breast cancer growth
- The role of transactivation vs. transrepression by ER in invasiveness is unclear
- Transrepression by ER was critical for suppression of invasiveness by estrogen
- Regulation of invasiveness by estrogen was independent of HER2 regulation
- Selective antagonism of transactivation by ER may reduce progression of ER+/HER2+ cells

FIGURE 1. Effect of E_2 and 4-OHT on invasiveness of BT474 cells and the role of ER

Hormone depleted BT474 cells were treated with either vehicle (ethanol), E_2 (1 nM), 4-OHT (500 nM) or E_2 (1 nM) plus 4-OHT (500 nM) for 72 h. Cells were subjected to the transwell invasion assay with the appropriate treatments (vehicle, E_2 , 4-OHT or E_2 plus 4-OHT) included in both the top and the bottom chambers; FBS (chemoattractant) was excluded in the negative control (*Panel A*). Hormone depleted BT474 cells were transfected with control siRNA or ER siRNA. 24 h after transfection, cells were treated with either vehicle (ethanol) or E_2 (1 nM) for 48 h. Whole cell lysates were extracted to measure ER levels by western blot using GAPDH as the loading control (*Panel B*) and RNA was extracted to measure

mRNA levels for the indicated genes by real time RT-PCR (*Panel C*) or cells were trypsinized and subjected to the transwell invasion assay (*Panel D*). In *Panel D*, FBS (chemoattractant) was excluded in the negative control.

FIGURE 2. Ectopic overexpression of wild-type ER or ER (L372R) in BT474 cells and the effect on regulation of gene expression and invasiveness by E₂

BT474 cells were plated in media containing heat-inactivated charcoal-stripped FBS 48 h prior to lentiviral transduction with wt ER or ER (L372R). 72 h after transduction, cells were treated with either vehicle (ethanol) or E₂ (1 nM). After 48 h of treatment, cells were harvested for RNA extraction and the mRNA expression levels of ER (*Panel A*) and other indicated genes (*Panels B and C*) were measured using real time RT-PCR. Whole cell lysates were also extracted to measure ER levels by western blot using GAPDH as the loading control (*Panel A, inset*). Cells were also trypsinized and subjected to the transwell invasion assay (*Panel D*).

FIGURE 3. Effect of knocking down CBP and p300 on gene regulation by E₂ and regulation of invasiveness by E₂

Hormone depleted BT474 cells were transfected with control siRNA or CBP and p300 siRNA. 24 h after transfection, cells were treated with either vehicle (ethanol) or E₂ (1nM). RNA was extracted after 48 h of treatment to measure mRNA levels for the indicated genes by real time RT-PCR (*Panels A–C*). Cells were also trypsinized and subjected to the transwell invasion assay; FBS (chemoattractant) was excluded in the negative control (*Panel D*).

FIGURE 4. Effect of knocking down HER2 on growth and regulation of invasiveness by E₂ Hormone depleted BT474 cells transfected with either control siRNA or HER2 siRNA. 24 h after transfection, cells were treated with either vehicle (ethanol) or E₂ (1 nM). After 48 h of treatment, whole cell lysates were extracted to measure HER2 levels by western blot using GAPDH as the loading control (*Panel A*). Cells were also trypsinized and subjected to the transwell invasion assay; FBS (chemoattractant) was excluded in the negative control (*Panel B*). 24 h after transfection, cells were trypsinized and seeded in 96-well plates in six replicates. 24 h later, cells were treated with vehicle (ethanol) or E₂ (1nM) for the indicated periods and cell viability was measured by the MTT assay (*Panel C*).