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Roles of Breast Cancer Susceptibility Genes BRCA’s in Mammary Epithelial Cell Differentiation

BRCA1 exerts transcriptional repression through interaction with CtIP in the C-terminal BRCT domain and ZBRK1 in the central domain. A dozen of genes including angiopoietin-1 (ANG1), a secreted angiogenic factor, are co-repressed by BRCA1 and CtIP based on microarray analysis of mammary epithelial cells in 3-D culture. BRCA1, CtIP and ZBRK1 form a complex that coordinately represses ANG1 expression via a ZBRK1 recognition site in ANG1 promoter. Impairment of this complex upregulates ANG1, which stabilizes endothelial cells forming capillary-like network structure. Consistently, Brca1-deficient mouse mammary tumors exhibit accelerated growth, pronounced vascularization and overexpressed ANG1. These results suggest, besides its role in maintaining genomic stability, BRCA1 directly regulates the expression of angiogenic factors to modulate the tumor microenvironment.

15. SUBJECT TERMS
breast tumor, mammary epithelial cells, acinus, BRCA1, differentiation, angiogenesis, angiopoietin-1
Table of Contents

Introduction........................................... 4

Body.................................................. 4

Key Research Accomplishments.......... 11

Reportable Outcomes......................... 12

Conclusions....................................... 12

References......................................... 13

Appendices........................................ 14
INTRODUCTION

BRCA1 plays an essential role in DNA damage response and cell-cycle checkpoint control. Little is known how an impaired function of BRCA1 is correlated with accelerated growth and progression of hereditary and sporadic breast cancer. Previously, we reported that BRCA1 is involved in acinus differentiation of mammary epithelial cells (MECs). In the past year, we examined the genes with altered expression profiles in the absence of BRCA1 and its C-terminal binding partner CtIP, in MECs grown in 3-D culture. The published research article is attached as an appendix. We show that BRCA1 forms a repressor complex with CtIP and ZBRK1 at a ZBRK1 responsive element of the angiopoietin-1 promoter in mammary epithelial cells, and a defect of this complex formation derepresses ANG1 transcription promoting endothelial cell survival and vascular enlargement in a paracrine fashion. This enhanced angiogenesis contributes to exacerbated malignancy of Brca1-deficient mouse mammary tumors. Furthermore, ANG1 overexpression in MECs impaired acinus differentiation and promoted cell proliferation in 3-D culture. Thus, our study unveils that through transcriptional repression of ANG1 BRCA1 modulates the tumor microenvironment and protects the differentiation potential of MECs. This study summarizes the data associated with tasks outlined in Aim1, 2 and 3.

BODY

RESEARCH DESIGN, METHODS AND DATA

1. Determine the requirement of BRCA for MEC differentiation.

1a. Establish MCF10A human MEC transiently or stably expressing the BRCA siRNA to knockdown the cognate gene.
1b. Perform the 3-D morphogenesis assays on MEC with the knockdowned BRCA expression.
1c. Test if the normal phenotype of the mammary acinar structure is restored by the ectopically expressed wild-type or point mutant forms of the siRNA-resistant BRCA.

As described in the previous report, we examined if BRCA1 is involved in MEC differentiation and how its dysfunction pertains to breast tumor pathogenesis. In the work published in PNAS (2005), we demonstrated that BRCA1 mediates acinar differentiation of MEC using 3-D culture. Reduction of BRCA1 by RNAi impairs acinus formation but enhances proliferation. Such aberrations can be rescued by expression of wild-type BRCA1 as well as a mutant in the central domain but not in the C-terminal BRCT domain, suggesting that the BRCT domain has a critical role in this process.

2. Identify the downstream effectors regulated by BRCA during the differentiation of MEC.

2a. Collect the gene transcripts/cell lysates from the MEC grown in the 3-D cultures and compare the gene/protein expression profiles between the cells in the presence and in the absence of BRCA using microarrays/2-D PAGE.
2b. Identify the genes/proteins with significantly altered expression levels in the absence of BRCA and prepare their antibodies.
2c. Monitor the expression patterns of the effectors during MEC differentiation.

ANG1 expression is co-repressed by BRCA1 and CtIP in MECs. As described in the previous report, BRCA-depleted MCF10A cells placed in the 3-D matrix, a close mimicry to the in vivo microenvironment, undergo vigorous proliferation but fail in acinus differentiation, reflecting a phenotype similar to breast tumorigenesis. Using microarray, we found that depletion of BRCA1 up-regulates the gene expression for proliferation but down-regulates that for differentiation. Interestingly, depletion of CtIP, a BRCA1-interacting transcriptional co-repressor, evokes a similar phenotype of MECs in 3-D culture (unpublished data). Then, to identify the genes involved in mammary acinus
differentiation, we screened the genes directly co-regulated by the two proteins during this process. We performed microarray analyses on MCF10A cells depleted of BRCA1 or CtIP by adenoviral RNAi and grown in 3-D culture for 15h. Among over a hundred genes with altered expression profiles, only a dozen were concomitantly upregulated (fold > 2, \( p < 0.05 \)) in both sets of experiments (Table 1), suggesting that they are co-repressed by BRCA1 and CtIP. At least five of them, the upregulations of which were confirmed by RT-PCR, are proliferation markers including \textit{ANG1}, \textit{bFGF}, \textit{HMGA2}, \textit{LIMK1} and \textit{RFC1}\(^5-9\) (Fig.1).

We were particularly intrigued by \textit{ANG1}, a secreted angiogenic factor modulating the tumor microenvironment. \textit{ANG1} promotes tubular formation and survival of endothelial cells and enhances blood vessel growth and maturation upon binding to Tie2 receptor tyrosine kinase on the endothelial cell surface\(^10-12\). Dysfunction of BRCA1 is correlated with accelerated growth and progression of breast tumors\(^13,14\), often displaying microvascular proliferation\(^15\). Consistently, we observed that \textit{Brca1}-deficient mouse mammary tumors exhibit pronounced growth and extensive enlargement of vasculature (Table 2, see below). To verify our microarray data showing that a decrease of BRCA1 (-7.9 fold) or CtIP (-3.9 fold) in MCF10A cells evoked a significant increase of \textit{ANG1} (+2.7 or +2.4 fold, respectively) (Fig.2A,B), we performed RT-PCR on MCF10A cells in 3-D culture. Reduced expression of BRCA1 or CtIP paralleled increased \textit{ANG1} expression (Fig.2C,D), suggesting that a deficiency of either BRCA1 or CtIP upregulates \textit{ANG1} expression.

\textbf{Aim3.} Investigate how BRCA regulates the expression of the effectors during MEC differentiation.

\textbf{3a. Test the involvement of the effector genes in MEC differentiation by gene KD or overexpression.}

\textit{ANG1} overexpression in MECs impairs acinus differentiation but promotes proliferation in 3-D matrix. Most studies of \textit{ANG1} illustrate its angiogenic action on endothelial cells for blood vessel growth\(^10-12\). Nevertheless, we

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene symbol</th>
<th>Gene name</th>
<th>\textbf{BRCA1-KD}</th>
<th>\textbf{CtIP-KD}</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTR1A</td>
<td>ARIP actin-related protein 1 homolog A, contractin (\alpha)</td>
<td>+2.08</td>
<td>-2.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANG1*</td>
<td>angiotensin-1</td>
<td>+2.69</td>
<td>+2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCP2</td>
<td>decapping enzyme hDCp2</td>
<td>+2.19</td>
<td>+2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRRM</td>
<td>downregulated in liver malignancy</td>
<td>+2.10</td>
<td>+2.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGF2*</td>
<td>fibroblast growth factor 2 (basic; FGF)</td>
<td>+2.06</td>
<td>+2.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMGA2*</td>
<td>high mobility group AT-hook 2</td>
<td>+4.55</td>
<td>+4.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IL1R1</td>
<td>interleukin 1 receptor, type 1</td>
<td>+2.02</td>
<td>+2.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LMK1*</td>
<td>LIM domain kinase 1</td>
<td>+2.12</td>
<td>+2.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC1*</td>
<td>replication factor C (activator 1) 1, 14kDa</td>
<td>+2.07</td>
<td>+2.07</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLC1A4*</td>
<td>solute carrier family 16 (monocarboxylic acid transporters), member 4</td>
<td>+2.63</td>
<td>+2.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TAK1P</td>
<td>T cell activation kash type protein</td>
<td>+2.17</td>
<td>+2.17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Confirmed by RT-PCR (Figure S1).

Table 1. Genes coexpressed by BRCA1 and CtIP in 3D cultured MCF10A cells
hypothesize that upregulation of ANG1 in MECs by either BRCA1 or CtIP depletion is correlated with their differentiation-defective, proliferative phenotype in 3-D matrix. To test the possibility, we generated ANG1-overexpressing MCF10A cell line (MCF10A/ANG1, see Fig.5A) and monitored their 3-D morphogenesis. We found that MCF10A/ANG1 cells were unable to organize into acinus structures (Fig.3) but instead proliferated about 4 fold more than the control MCF10A cells (Fig.4). This phenotype of MCF10A/ANG1 cells was rescued by depletion of ANG1 by RNAi, allowing the acinus structure to form in a manner similar to the control cells (Fig.4,5). The result suggests that ANG1 overexpression in MECs impairs differentiation and promotes proliferation of MECs. Since we found that ANG1 transcription is repressed by BRCA1, coordinately with its binding partners CtIP and ZBRK1 (see Fig.7,8), this may serve as a safeguard to protect the differentiation potential of MECs and to suppress the tumorigenicity.

How ANG1 produced by MECs exerts its action on MECs themselves to debilitate differentiation is currently under vigorous investigations in our laboratory. Although ANG1-Tie2 receptor signaling has been well characterized for angiogenesis of endothelial cells10-12, it may also have another activity on MECs. Or, another receptor may participate in this process. Conversely, ANG1 produced in MECs may mediate certain intrinsic signaling. These different possibilities will be tested to better understand the novel function of ANG1.

Expression of ANG1 from MEC is essential for the stability of capillary-like network structure formed by neighboring endothelial cells in 3-D matrix. Since ANG1 is a potent angiogenic factor, we investigated how upregulated ANG1 expression by MECs influences the tissue microenvironment. To assess a biological consequence of derepressed ANG1 expression, we co-cultured MCF10A cells with human umbilical endothelial cells (HUVEC) in 3-D matrix. HUVEC alone formed a thin layer of capillary-like network structure in a day but soon came to disintegrate and died in a week under this experimental condition (Fig.5B.a). When HUVEC were co-cultured with luciferase-RNAi/GFP treated adenoviral CtIP-RNAi/GFP infection at 20 MOI for 24h; c,d. MCF10A cells pretreated with luciferase (c) or ANG1 (d) siRNA prior to adenoviral luciferase-RNAi/GFP infection at 20 MOI for 24h; d F. HUVEC co-cultured with MCF10A/ANG1 cells pretreated with luciferase or ANG1 siRNA. Adenoviral RNAi infection was performed at 20 MOI for 24 h. Scale bar: 50 μm.
MCF10A cells, they formed a well-defined thin layer of capillary-like structure in a day; however, the endothelial cells, indicated as non-fluorescent cells, started to die in 3 days and the capillary-like structure disintegrated in a week (Fig.5B.b). When HUVEC unlabeled (Fig.5B.e) or labeled with histone H2B/GFP (Fig.5B.f) were co-cultured with MCF10A/ANG1 cells that stably express ANG1 by retroviral infection (Fig.5A), they formed a thick layer of capillary-like structure, which sustained over a week. When HUVEC were co-cultured with MCF10A cells infected with BRCA1-RNAi/GFP (Fig.5B.c) or CtIP-RNAi/GFP (Fig.5B.d) adenovirus, they formed a thick layer of capillary-like structure, which maintained for a week in a manner similar to those co-cultured with MCF10A/ANG1 cells. To validate the essential role of ANG1 in the survival of co-cultured endothelial cells, we treated MCF10A cells with ANG1 siRNA, which was shown by western analysis to completely deplete ANG1 in MCF10A/ANG1 cells after 36h (Fig.5C). HUVEC co-cultured with ANG1 siRNA-treated MCF10A/ANG1 cells formed a thin layer of capillary-like structure in a day but soon came to disintegrate and died after a week (Fig.5D.h) in a manner similar to those co-cultured with Luc-RNAi/GFP infected MCF10A cells (Fig.5D.a,b). Likewise, when HUVEC were co-cultured with MCF10A cells treated with ANG1 siRNA prior to BRCA1- (Fig.5D.d) or CtIP-RNAi/GFP (Fig.5D.f) adenoviral infection, they formed a thin layer of capillary-like structure in a day, but the endothelial cells, indicated as non-fluorescent cells, started to disintegrate after 3 days and died in a week, leaving aggregates of fluorescent MEC. Based on these observations, upregulated expression of ANG1 from MEC, either by the overexpression construct or by depletion of BRCA1 or CtIP, is essential for the stability of capillary-like structure formed by the co-cultured endothelial cells in 3-D matrix.

**Brca1-deficient mouse mammary tumors exhibit an accelerated growth and harbor enlarged blood vessels along with upregulated Ang1 expression.** To test if these in vitro observations gain supports from animal studies, we examined mammary tumor samples from Brca1-deficient mice. BRCA1-associated tumorigenesis is often linked to a loss of p53\(^{14}\). To recapitulate the BRCA1-related tumor pathogenesis, we used a mouse model inactivated in both Brca1 and p53 genes (Brca1\(^{−/−}\)/p53\(^{−/−}\)) (n = 17) in comparison to mice inactivated only in p53 gene (p53\(^{−/−}\)) (n = 14) as a control\(^{14,16}\). *Brca1*-deficient tumors exhibited a substantially shorter latency than control tumors (6.1 ± 1.3 vs. 18.3 ± 2.2 months) to reach a comparable size (0.996 ± 0.460 vs. 1.072 ± 0.588 ml, respectively) (Table 2). In general, *Brca1*-deficient tumors displayed an ensanguined appearance, noticeably distinct from control tumors with the same size.
(Fig.6A). To examine the blood vessel status of these tumor specimens, they were stained against CD31, an endothelial cell marker\textsuperscript{17}. Apparently, \textit{Brca1}-deficient tumors contained larger blood vessels compared to control tumors (Fig.6B,C). The blood vessel luminal area of \textit{Brca1}-deficient tumor was almost three times the size of control tumor (224.2 ±135.0 vs. 82.8 ±33.9 μm\textsuperscript{2}, \textit{p}<0.001) (Table 2) while microvascular density (/mm\textsuperscript{2}) did not significantly differ between the two sets of tumors (\textit{p} = 0.22, data not shown), consistent with a finding that ANG1 causes vessel enlargement without angiogenic sprouting during development\textsuperscript{18}. Interestingly, analogous regulatory elements including a ZBRK1 recognition site were found in the mouse Ang1 promoter region (Fig.6D), suggesting that at mouse Ang1 expression may be subjected to a similar mode of regulation as human. Consistently, Ang1 expression was mostly upregulated in \textit{Brca1}-deficient tumors, but not in control tumors (Fig.6E). Taken together, these results support a notion that inactivation of \textit{BRCA1} in MEC upregulates ANG1 expression to support formation of large blood vessels.

\textbf{3b. Perform reporter assays to test the transcriptional regulations of the effector genes by ectopically expressed BRCA1.}

\textbf{3c. Determine the region of BRCA responsible for the transcriptional regulation of the effector genes by reporter assays using different BRCA point mutants.}

The interaction between BRCA1 and CtIP is required for transcriptional repression of the ANG1 promoter. BRCA1 and CtIP both serve as transcriptional co-repressors and interact with each other. To determine a potential transcriptional regulation of ANG1 by BRCA1 and CtIP, we measured the luciferase reporter activity of ANG1 promoter constructs with different lengths (Fig.7A) after BRCA1 or CtIP was depleted in MCF10A cells by adenoviral RNAi. Only construct C, encoding a 3 kb-full length ANG1 promoter, showed a significant increase in the activity as BRCA1 level decreased by increasing adenoviral RNAi (Fig.7B,C), suggesting that the region –3040 to –1799 is essential for transcriptional repression by BRCA1. Similar results were obtained in both 2-D monolayer and 3-D cultures, independent of the experimental systems. Likewise, as CtIP was depleted by adenoviral RNAi, construct C showed a comparable increase in the activity (Fig.7D). These results imply that the region (–3040/-1799) of ANG1 promoter is subject to co-repression by BRCA1 and CtIP.

\begin{table}[h]
\centering
\begin{tabular}{|c|c|c|c|}
\hline
\textbf{Genotype} & \textbf{Mouse ID} & \textbf{Tumor vol.\textsuperscript{a} (ml)} & \textbf{Latency} (months) & \textbf{Blood vessel luminal area\textsuperscript{b} (μm\textsuperscript{2})} \\
\hline
\textit{p53}\textsuperscript{\textit{△5-6/△5-6}} & 9108 & 1.767 & 16.5 & 93.0 (±58.6) \\
& 9128 & 0.666 & 18.0 & 84.5 (±55.8) \\
& 9133 & 0.762 & 16.5 & 66.2 (±39.4) \\
& 9207 & 0.635 & 15.0 & 62.4 (±32.1) \\
& 9268 & 0.831 & 21.2 & 41.0 (±15.6) \\
& 9270 & 0.831 & 1.64 & 49.8 (±15.0) \\
& 9288 & 0.606 & 17.3 & 59.4 (±28.2) \\
& 9311 & 0.697 & 19.2 & 69.1 (±31.1) \\
& 9323 & 0.762 & 16.2 & 94.0 (±45.8) \\
& 9326 & 0.762 & 17.1 & 90.0 (±40.3) \\
& 9339 & 0.888 & 21.4 & 164.4 (±88.9) \\
& 9342 & 2.145 & 21.5 & 141.2 (±95.5) \\
& 9345 & 2.145 & 20.5 & 79.5 (±60.1) \\
& 9349 & 0.635 & 19.0 & 64.1 (±36.2) \\
\hline
\textbf{mean} & 1.072 & 19.3 & 82.0* \\
\hline
\textbf{SD} & ±0.588 & ±2.2 & ±33.9 \\
\hline
\end{tabular}
\caption{Blood vessel area of \textit{p53}\textsuperscript{\textit{△5-6/△5-6}} and \textit{Brca1}\textsuperscript{\textit{△11/△11};\textit{p53}\textsuperscript{\textit{△5-6/△5-6}} mouse mammary tumors.}
\end{table}
To test if the interaction of BRCA1 and CtIP is required for ANG1 repression, we generated RNAi-resistant BRCA1 and CtIP expression plasmids which are either wild-type or point mutants: C61G (RING domain), Q356R (central region) and M1775R (BRCT domain) for BRCA1; and S327A for CtIP. A mutation of BRCA1 at M1775R impairs binding of a group of BRCT domain-interacting proteins including CtIP, whereas a mutation of CtIP at S327A impedes BRCA1 binding\textsuperscript{19,20}. Treatment of MCF10A cells with an RNAi-resistant BRCA1 (Fig.7E) or CtIP (Fig.7F) plasmid prior to the cognate adenoviral RNAi infection effectively rescued their expressions. As the luciferase activity of construct C was measured under this context (Fig.7G), cells expressing RNAi-resistant wild-type BRCA1 or CtIP endured the repression despite the increasing adenoviral RNAi. In contrast, cells expressing RNAi-resistant BRCA1M1775R or CtIPS327A mutant failed to repress the activity even at the lowest dose (5 MOI) of adenoviral infection, suggesting that the interaction of BRCA1 and CtIP is essential for repressing ANG1 transcription. Interestingly, BRCA1Q356R mutant, but not BRCA1C61G mutant, also failed to repress ANG1 transcription, indicating that the central region of BRCA1 is also involved in this process.

A single ZBRK1 recognition site in ANG1 promoter mediates BRCA1 and CtIP co-repression. BRCA1 interacts at the central region (aa 341-748) with ZBRK1, which mediates BRCA1-dependent transcriptional repression of certain genes by directly binding to a consensus motif (GGGxxxCAAxxxxTTT)\textsuperscript{21}. If a ZBRK1 recognition site is indeed present in ANG1 promoter, a chimeric transactivator, a ZBRK1 DNA binding domain fused to a VP16 transactivation domain, would recognize this sequence and upregulate the ANG1 promoter activity\textsuperscript{21}. As shown in Fig.8A, the presence of this chimeric ZBRK1 promoted the luciferase reporter activity of construct C, but not A or B, suggesting that the region –3040 to –1799 contains potential ZBRK1 recognition sites involved in transcriptional repression of ANG1 by ZBRK1. Sequence analyses revealed that this region contains a total of five potential ZBRK1 binding sites. To map a functional ZBRK1 binding site, we generated deletion mutants in the first three ZBRK1 binding sites (C1: ∆ –2600/-2200), the last two sites (C2: ∆ –2200/-1800) and all the five sites (C3: ∆ –2600/-1800) (Fig.8B). Reporter assays showed that C1 and C3, but not C2, were repression-defective and neither BRCA1- (Fig.8C) nor CtIP-depletion (Fig.8D) further derepressed the activities. Sequence analysis of the first three potential sites revealed a nearly canonical ZBRK1 consensus motif (-2310/-2296: GAGxxxCAAxxxxTTT). We then generated a mutant construct.
C-mt-Z, by substituting the five essential nucleotides (GTTxxTTGxxxTTT) (Fig. 8B) and found that this mutant responded to repression by neither BRCA1 (Fig. 3C), CtIP (Fig. 8D) nor ZBRK1 (Fig. 8A), suggesting that this putative site (-2310/-2296) is a strong candidate for a ZBRK1 binding site.

To test whether ZBRK1 directly binds to this putative site, a 33-mer radiolabeled oligonucleotide probe (-2319/-2287) harboring the ZBRK1 recognition site (-2310/-2296) (Fig. 8B) was used to perform EMSA using either GST-fused ZBRK1 eight-Zn finger domain21 or nuclear extract. We included a non-labeled wt-(wt-Z) or point mutant ZBRK1 (mt-Z) binding sequence of ANG1 promoter and AP12, a canonical consensus ZBRK1 binding sequence21 for competition experiments. As expected, a non-labeled wild-type ANG1 or AP12 competitor, but not mutant ANG1, competed with a labeled wild-type probe for binding ZBRK1, suggesting that ZBRK1 directly binds to this site (-2310/-2296) (Fig. 8E). To further demonstrate that this ZBRK1 recognition site is functional in vivo, we generated a heterologous reporter construct with a 800-bp fragment (-2600/-1800) containing a wild-type (3P-26-wt-Z) or mutant (3P-26-mt-Z) ZBRK1 binding site (-2310/-2296) (Fig. 8F). Reporter assay showed that the activity increased as ZBRK1 level decreased by increasing adenoviral ZBRK1 RNAi (see below Fig. 9A), whereas a mutant ZBRK1 site was repression-defective (Fig. 8F), further confirming that this site is an authentic ZBRK1 recognition site.

ZBRK1, BRCA1 and CtIP form a repressor complex on ANG1 promoter. Since BRCA1/CtIP co-repress ANG1 expression via a single ZBRK1 recognition element in the promoter. A: Relative luciferase activity of ANG1 reporter constructs A-C and C-mt-Z, a point mutant in a putative ZBRK1 binding site (+310/-2296), in MCF10A cells expressing a chimeric (CM) ZBRK1 where KRAB repression domain is replaced with VP16 activation domain. B: Schematics of ANG1 reporter constructs derived from construct C. C-wt: wild-type (-3040/+199) containing five potential ZBRK1 binding sites; C-mt-Z: a point mutant in a putative ZBRK1 binding site (+2310/-2296); C1: a deletion of the first three binding sites (+2600/-2296); C2: a deletion of the last two binding sites (+2100/-1800); and C3: a deletion of all the five binding sites (+2600/-1800). C: Relative luciferase activity of reporter construct C derivatives in MCF10A cells after infected with adenoviral BRCA1-RNAi for 24h. D: Relative luciferase activity of reporter construct C derivatives in MCF10A cells after infected with adenoviral CtIP-RNAi for 24h. E: Relative luciferase activity of reporter construct C derivatives in MCF10A cells after infected with adenoviral ZBRK1-RNAi for 24h. F: Relative luciferase activity of reporter construct C derivatives in MCF10A cells after infected with adenoviral CtIP-RNAi for 24h.
form a complex. Next, we mixed a radiolabeled oligonucleotide probe containing a wild-type (wt-Z or AP12) or mutant (mt-Z) ZBRK1 binding sequence with nuclear extract for immunoprecipitation. Antibodies against ZBRK1, BRCA1 as well as CtIP brought down a wild-type (wt-Z or AP12), but not mutant (mt-Z), oligonucleotide specifically (**Fig.9C**). Finally, to demonstrate that this complex is associated with *ANG1* promoter *in vivo*, we performed ChIP assay on a 300 bp fragment around the ZBRK1 site (-2400/-2100). As shown in **Fig.9D**, ZBRK1, BRCA1 and CtIP co-localized on *ANG1* promoter, while an individual depletion of either protein by RNAi completely abolished the association of all the three proteins with the promoter, suggesting that the three participants are all essential for the complex formation. Taken together, these data substantiate that BRCA1, CtIP and ZBRK1 coordinately form a repressor complex tethered at the ZBRK1 recognition site in *ANG1* promoter.

**Tasks in Progress:**

**Aim3.** Investigate how BRCA regulates the expression of the effectors during MEC differentiation.

3a. Test the involvement of the effector genes in MEC differentiation by gene KD or overexpression.

We have found that ANG1 overexpression in MECs impairs acinus differentiation and promote proliferation in 3-D matrix. Since ANG1 transcription is repressed by BRCA1, coordinately with its binding partners CtIP and ZBRK1, this may serve to protect the differentiation potential of MECs and to suppress the tumorigenicity. Nevertheless, how ANG1 produced by MECs exerts its action on MECs themselves to debilitating differentiation processes is currently unknown. If this activity is mediated through its interaction with the Tie2 receptor, which is predominantly found on the surface of endothelial cells, this will be a novel ANG1 activity, distinct from its angiogenic action. The second possibility is that ANG1 action on MECs is mediated through another receptor that transduces a completely different signaling. Conversely, ANG1 produced in MECs may mediate certain intrinsic signaling. These different possibilities will be tested to better understand the novel function of ANG1. We will test these possibilities in order to fully understand the molecular mechanism by which a loss of BRCA1 and thereby ANG1 de-repression impair MEC differentiation.

**KEY RESEARCH ACCOMPLISHMENTS**

- We demonstrated that BRCA1, coordinately with its interacting partners CtIP and ZBRK1, represses the transcription of ANG1 in MEC.
- We found that these three proteins form a repressor complex on the ANG1 promoter via a ZBRK1 binding element.
- We showed that a defect of the repressor complex formation de-represses ANG1 expression in MECs.
- We found that ANG1 overexpressing MECs are defective in acinus differentiation and vigorously proliferated in 3-D matrix, reflecting a phenotype similar to breast tumorigenesis.
- Furthermore, we found that upregulated ANG1 expression by MECs stabilizes adjacent endothelial cells in 3-D co-culture, allowing for the formation of capillary-like network structures.
- We confirmed the above-described in vitro observations in animal studies. *Brca1-deficient*...
Mouse mammary tumors exhibit accelerated growth, pronounced vascularization and overexpressed ANG1.

**REPORTABLE OUTCOMES**

- **Publications:**

- **Presentations:**
  - UCI Biological Chemistry Departmental Annual Research Seminar: oral presentation 1st prize (June, 2005)
  - UCI Biological Chemistry Departmental Annual Retreat: oral presentation 2nd prize (Oct. 2005)

**CONCLUSIONS**

BRCA1 plays an essential role in DNA damage response and cell-cycle checkpoint control which are intimately linked to a restraint of cancer initiation. Additional functions of BRCA1 remain to be further characterized. In this report, we revealed that BRCA1, in coordination with CtIP and ZBRK1, exerts a transcriptional repression on ANG1 that pertains to cancer progression. To mimic in vivo conditions, we depleted BRCA1 and CtIP in normal MECs cultured in extracellular matrix. Microarray analyses identified a dozen of genes co-repressed by BRCA1 and CtIP. We focused on ANG1 since it may participate in cancer progression through angiogenesis. Our results demonstrated that BRCA1 and CtIP, along with ZBRK1, form a repressor complex on ANG1 promoter via a ZBRK1 recognition element and that Brca1-deficient mouse mammary tumors exhibit prominent vascularization and accelerated growth along with Ang1 upregulation. This suggests that derepressed ANG1 expression in MEC in the absence of BRCA1 is a pathogenic drive for neoplastic growth.

The present study shows that BRCA1-deficiency modulates the tissue microenvironment by derepression of ANG1 that promotes the growth of adjacent vasculature in a paracrine fashion to nourish a neoplasm. Moreover, an aberrant activity of a BRCA1-interacting partner, CtIP tumor suppressor, also deregulates ANG1 expression, which may likewise pertain to the etiology of tumor growth in Ctip heterozygous mice. Apparently, these two tumor suppressors possess an additional role in tumor suppression, via a ZBRK1 element, by regulating the intercellular signaling within the tissue microenvironment besides maintaining the genomic stability within the cell. This view will extend their tumor suppression functions to the surroundings that influence the fate of neighboring cells and fortify the pathogenic relevance of their defect to neoplastic growth.
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**APPENDIX**

Removal of BRCA1/CtIP/ZBRK1 repressor complex on ANG1 promoter leads to accelerated mammary tumor growth contributed by prominent vasculature

Saori Furuta,1,2 Ju-Ming Wang,1,2 Shuanzeng Wei,1 Yung-Ming Jeng,1 Xianzhi Jiang,1 Bingnan Gu,1 Phang-Lang Chen,1 Eva Y.-H.P. Lee,1 and Wen-Hwa Lee1,*

1 Department of Biological Chemistry, College of Medicine, University of California, Irvine, Irvine, California 92697
2 These authors contributed equally to this work.
*Correspondence: whlee@uci.edu

Summary
BRCA1 exerts transcriptional repression through interaction with CtIP in the C-terminal BRCT domain and ZBRK1 in the central domain. A dozen genes, including angiopoietin-1 (ANG1), a secreted angiogenic factor, are corepressed by BRCA1 and CtIP based on microarray analysis of mammary epithelial cells in 3D culture. BRCA1, CtIP, and ZBRK1 form a complex that coordinately represses ANG1 expression via a ZBRK1 recognition site in the ANG1 promoter. Impairment of this complex upregulates ANG1, which stabilizes endothelial cells that form a capillary-like network structure. Consistently, Brca1-deficient mouse mammary tumors exhibit accelerated growth, pronounced vascularization, and overexpressed ANG1. These results suggest that, besides its role in maintaining genomic stability, BRCA1 directly regulates the expression of angiogenic factors to modulate the tumor microenvironment.

Introduction
Mutations in the breast cancer susceptibility gene BRCA1 account for up to 50% of hereditary breast cancer and for almost all cases of hereditary breast and ovarian cancer syndrome (Couch et al., 1997; Easton et al., 1993). Also, reduced BRCA1 expression is often correlated with accelerated progression and growth of sporadic breast cancer (Thompson et al., 1995). BRCA1 participates in DNA damage repair, cell cycle checkpoint control, and transcriptional regulation, serving as a tumor suppressor to maintain genomic stability. The BRCA1 gene encodes a 220 kDa nuclear phosphoprotein of 1863 amino acids (Chen et al., 1996; Miki et al., 1994), characterized by distinctive protein-protein interaction surfaces. The N-terminal RING finger domain dimerizes with BARD1 for ubiquitin ligase activity (Hashizume et al., 2001), while the C terminus possesses two tandem copies of the BRCT motif that interact with several cellular proteins, including CtIP (Li et al., 1999; Zheng et al., 2000a). The central region, mainly encoded by exon 11, contains two nuclear localization signals (Chen et al., 1995) and interacts with a DNA damage repair complex, Rad50/Mre11/NBS1 (Zhong et al., 1999), and transcription repressor, ZBRK1 (Zheng et al., 2000b).

BRCA1 is also involved in developmental and differentiation processes and exhibits a temporal and spatial expression pattern (Furuta et al., 2005; Lane et al., 1995). Developmental defects and early embryonic death (E6.5) are observed in Brca1 homozygous knockout mice (Hakem et al., 1996; Liu et al., 1996). BRCA1 facilitates differentiation of mammary epithelia and is upregulated in rapidly dividing, differentiating cells (Marquis et al., 1995), whereas its depletion impairs differentiation and promotes cellular proliferation (Furuta et al., 2005). Consistently, in mouse mammary tissue a conditional Brca1 knockout displays abnormal ductal morphogenesis and mammary tumor (Xu et al., 1999).

BRCA1 confers a transcriptional repression on stress-responsive genes p21 and GADD45 through interaction with CtIP at the C-terminal BRCT domain (aa 1651–1863) (Li et al., 1999, 2001; Yu et al., 1998). CtIP is an 897 amino acid protein that was originally identified as a cofactor of CtBP, a C-terminal binding protein of human adenovirus E1A protein, and is involved in transcriptional repression (Chinnadurai, 2006). CtIP interacts with different proteins via discrete modules, including a PLDLS motif (aa 490–494) for CtBP (Schaerer et al., 1998), a region aa 299–345, phosphorylated at S327, for BRCA1 (Yu and Chen, 2004), and a LECEE motif (aa 153–157) for retinoblastoma (RB) tumor...
suppressor (Fusco et al., 1998). Certain tumor-linked mutations of the BRCT domain abolish Ctip association and prevent BRCA1-dependent transcriptional repression (Li et al., 1999; Yu et al., 1998). Moreover, Ctip null mouse embryos die at E4.0 as blastocysts fail in S phase entry, while the heterozygotes are short-lived and develop various kinds of tumors that retain a single wild-type (wt) allele, indicative of haploid insufficiency, suggesting that Ctip is a bona fide tumor susceptibility gene (Chen et al., 2005).

Two interacting tumor suppressors, BRCA1 and Ctip, coordinate in certain transcriptional regulatory pathways, namely, DNA damage response and cell cycle checkpoint control (Li et al., 1999, 2001). However, it is largely unknown whether they cooperate in a transcriptional repression beyond the stress-inducible pathways. In the present study, we have identified a dozen genes corepressed by BRCA1 and Ctip in MCF10A mammary epithelial cells (MECs) in 3D culture using microarray analyses. Among them, we have examined angiopoietin-1 (ANG1), a factor secreted to stimulate angiogenesis of neighboring endothelial cells (Suri et al., 1996), for a BRCA1- and Ctip-dependent transcriptional repression. We demonstrate that BRCA1, Ctip, and ZBRK1 form a repressor complex at a recognition site of ZBRK1 in ANG1 promoter, and a defect of this repressor complex formation derepresses ANG1 expression in MECs that promotes survival of the neighboring endothelial cells to form a capillary-like structure. Consistently, Brca1-deficient mouse mammary tumors display a high level of Ang1 expression, prominent vascularization, and accelerated growth.

Results

**ANG1 expression is corepressed by BRCA1 and Ctip in MECs**

We previously demonstrated that MECs depleted of BRCA1 in 3D matrix, a close mimicry to the in vivo microenvironment, undergo vigorous proliferation but fail in acinar differentiation (Furuta et al., 2005), reflecting a phenotype similar to breast tumorigenesis. Depletion of Ctip evokes a similar phenotype (unpublished data). To identify the genes that are directly coregulated by the two proteins during this process, we performed microarray analyses on MCF10A cells depleted of BRCA1 or Ctip by adenoiral RNAi and grown in 3D culture for 15 hr. Among over a hundred genes with altered expression profiles, only a dozen were concomitantly upregulated (fold > 2; p < 0.05) in both sets of experiments (Table 1), suggesting that they are corepressed by BRCA1 and Ctip. At least five of them, the up-regulations of which were confirmed by RT-PCR (Figure S1 in the Supplemental Data available with this article online), are proliferation markers, including ANG1, bFGF, HMGA2, LIMK1, and RFC1 (Caine et al., 2003; Cullmann et al., 1995; Davila et al., 2003; Imura et al., 2004; Tessari et al., 2003). We were particularly intrigued by ANG1, a secreted angiogenic factor modulating the tumor microenvironment. ANG1 promotes tubular formation and survival of endothelial cells and enhances blood vessel growth and maturation upon binding to Tie2 receptor tyrosine kinase on the endothelial cell surface (Hayes et al., 1999; Kwak et al., 1999; Suri et al., 1996). Dysfunction of BRCA1 is correlated with accelerated growth and progression of breast tumors (Stoppa-Lyonnet et al., 2000; Xu et al., 1999), often displaying microvascular proliferation (Goffin et al., 2003). Consistently, we observed that Brca1-deficient mouse mammary tumors exhibit pronounced growth and extensive enlargement of vasculature (Table 2).

To verify our microarray data showing that a decrease of BRCA1 (−7.9-fold) or Ctip (−3.9-fold) in MCF10A cells evoked a significant increase of ANG1 (+2.7- or +2.4-fold, respectively) (Figures 1A and 1B), we performed RT-PCR on MCF10A cells in 3D culture. Reduced expression of BRCA1 or Ctip paralleled increased ANG1 expression (Figures 1C and 1D), suggesting that a deficiency of either BRCA1 or Ctip upregulates ANG1 expression.

The interaction between BRCA1 and Ctip is required for transcriptional repression of the ANG1 promoter

BRCA1 and Ctip both serve as transcriptional corepressors and interact with each other. To determine a potential transcriptional regulation of ANG1 by BRCA1 and Ctip, we measured the luciferase reporter activity of ANG1 promoter constructs with different lengths (Figure 2A) after BRCA1 or Ctip was depleted in MCF10A cells by adenoiral RNAi. Only construct C, encoding a 3 kb full-length ANG1 promoter, showed a significant increase in the activity as BRCA1 level decreased by increasing adenoviral RNAi (Figures 2B and 2C), suggesting that the region −3040 to −1799 is essential for transcriptional repression by BRCA1. Similar results were obtained in both 2D monolayer and 3D cultures, independent of the experimental systems. Likewise, as Ctip was depleted by adenoviral RNAi, construct C showed a comparable increase in the activity (Figure 2D). These results

### Table 1. Genes corepressed by BRCA1 and Ctip in 3D cultured MCF10A cells

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gene symbol</th>
<th>Gene name</th>
<th>BRCA1-KD fold</th>
<th>BRCA1-KD p value</th>
<th>Ctip-KD fold</th>
<th>Ctip-KD p value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ACTR1A</td>
<td>ARP1 actin-related protein 1 homolog A, centractin a</td>
<td>+2.08</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>+2.09</td>
<td>0.047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ANG1*</td>
<td>angiopoietin-1</td>
<td>+2.69</td>
<td>0.016</td>
<td>+2.18</td>
<td>0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DCP2</td>
<td>decapping enzyme hDcp2</td>
<td>+2.19</td>
<td>0.027</td>
<td>+2.09</td>
<td>0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DRML</td>
<td>downregulated in liver malignancy</td>
<td>+2.10</td>
<td>0.001</td>
<td>+2.00</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FGFR2*</td>
<td>fibroblast growth factor 2 [basic; bFGF]</td>
<td>+2.03</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>+2.04</td>
<td>0.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HMGA2*</td>
<td>high mobility group A1-hook 2</td>
<td>+4.55</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>+2.55</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ILIR1</td>
<td>interleukin 1 receptor, type I</td>
<td>+2.02</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>+2.09</td>
<td>0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIMK1*</td>
<td>LIM domain kinase 1</td>
<td>+2.12</td>
<td>0.049</td>
<td>+2.06</td>
<td>0.005</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RFC1*</td>
<td>replication factor C (activator 1) 1, 145kDa</td>
<td>+2.07</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>+2.07</td>
<td>0.027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SLC16A4</td>
<td>solute carrier family 16 (monocarboxylic acid transporters), member 4</td>
<td>+2.63</td>
<td>0.002</td>
<td>+2.21</td>
<td>0.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TA-KRP</td>
<td>T cell activation kelch repeat protein</td>
<td>+2.17</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>+2.17</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Confirmed by RT-PCR (Figure S1).
pressing RNAi-resistant BRCA1M1775R or CtIPS327A mutant resisted wild-type BRCA1 or CtIP endured the repression. *p = 0.000672.

Tumor samples used for photographic display (Figure 6) are indicated inFigure 2G), cells expressing RNAi-

\[ \text{Table 2. Blood vessel area of p53}^{	ext{Δ11/1799}} \text{and Brca1}^{	ext{Δ11/1799}, \text{p}53^{	ext{Δ11/1799}}} \text{mouse mammary tumors} \]

| Genotype Mouse ID Tumor vol. \( \text{[ml]} \) Latency (months) Blood vessel luminal area \( \text{[μm}^2] \) |
|---------------------------|-----|-------------------|-------------------|
| p53^Δ11/1799 [n = 14]   |     |                   |                   |
| 9108  1.767  16.5  93.0 (±58.6) |
| 9128  0.666  18.0  84.5 (±55.8) |
| 9133  0.762  16.5  66.2 (±39.4) |
| 9207  0.635  15.0  62.4 (±32.1) |
| [9268] 0.831  21.2  41.0 (±15.6) |
| 9270  0.831  16.4  49.8 (±15.8) |
| 9298  0.606  17.3  59.4 (±28.2) |
| 9311  0.697  19.2  69.1 (±31.1) |
| 9323  0.762  16.2  94.0 (±54.8) |
| 9326  0.762  17.1  90.0 (±40.3) |
| 9339  1.888  21.4  164.4 (±88.9) |
| [9342] 2.145  21.5  141.2 (±95.5) |
| [9345] 2.145  20.5  79.5 (±60.1) |
| [9349] 0.635  19.0  64.1 (±36.2) |
| mean 1.072 18.3 82.8* |
| SD ±0.588 ±2.2 ±33.9 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Brca1^Δ11/1799 p53^Δ11/1799 [n = 17]</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[741]  1.767  3.9  329.8 (±209.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>806  0.831  8.2  161.3 (±81.2)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[820] 2.424  6.5  313.4 (±226.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[824] 1.337  6.2  310.8 (±75.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>847  0.831  6.4  160.3 (±39.9)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>876  0.762  6.4  381.2 (±131.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[905] 0.905  6.9  139.4 (±95.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>913  1.437  6.9  157.6 (±76.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>942  0.905  7.1  90.3 (±21.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>945  1.064  6.5  111.2 (±38.4)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>947  0.905  3.4  206.7 (±90.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>960  0.697  5.9  126.0 (±64.5)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>986  0.762  4.9  182.4 (±63.7)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1043 0.831  4.4  582.3 (±309.1)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1094 0.697  6.8  102.2 (±41.3)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1114 0.831  6.9  95.4 (±43.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1133 0.762  6.4  361.0 (±32.6)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>mean 0.996 6.1 224.2*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SD ±0.460 ±1.3 ±135.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Tumor samples used for photographic display (Figure 6) are indicated in brackets.*p = 0.006672.

Tumor volume = \( m/6 \) \([L + W + D/3]^3\).

Average luminal area of blood vessels (n = 400–600) for each tumor sample (±SD).

imply that the region \((–3040/–1799)\) of ANG1 promoter is subject to corepression by BRCA1 and CtIP.

To test if the interaction of BRCA1 and CtIP is required for ANG1 repression, we generated RNAi-resistant BRCA1 and CtIP expression plasmids that are either wild-type or point mutants: C61G (RING domain), Q356R (central region), and M1775R (BRCT domain) for BRCA1; and S327A for CtIP. A mutation of BRCA1 at M1775R impairs binding of a group of BRCT domain-interacting proteins including CtIP, whereas a mutation of CtIP at S327A impedes BRCA1 binding (Yu and Chen, 2004; Yu et al., 1998). Treatment of MCF10A cells with an RNAi-resistant BRCA1 (Figure 2E) or CtIP (Figure 2F) plasmid prior to the cognate adenoviral RNAi effectively rescued their expressions. As the luciferase activity of construct C was measured under this context (Figure 2G), cells expressing RNAi-resistant wild-type BRCA1 or CtIP endured the repression despite the increasing adenoviral RNAi. In contrast, cells expressing RNAi-resistant BRCA1M1775R or CtIPS327A mutant failed to repress the activity even at the lowest dose (5 MOI) of adenoviral infection, suggesting that the interaction of BRCA1 and CtIP is essential for repressing ANG1 transcription. Interestingly, BRCA1Q356R mutant, but not BRCA1C61G mutant, also failed to repress ANG1 transcription, indicating that the central region of BRCA1 is also involved in this process.

A single ZBRK1 recognition site in ANG1 promoter mediates BRCA1 and CtIP corepression

BRCA1 interacts at the central region (aa 341–748) with ZBRK1, which mediates BRCA1-dependent transcriptional repression of certain genes by directly binding to a consensus motif (GGGxxxCAGxxxTTT) (Zheng et al., 2000b). If a ZBRK1 recognition site is indeed present in ANG1 promoter, a chimeric transactivator, a ZBRK1 DNA binding domain fused to a VP16 transactivation domain, would recognize this sequence and upregulate the ANG1 promoter activity (Zheng et al., 2000b). As shown in Figure 3A, the presence of this chimeric ZBRK1 promoted the luciferase reporter activity of construct C, but not A or B, suggesting that the region \((–3040/–1799)\) contains potential ZBRK1 recognition sites involved in transcriptional repression of ANG1 by ZBRK1. Sequence analyses revealed that this region contains a total of five potential ZBRK1 binding sites. To map a functional ZBRK1 binding site, we generated deletion mutants in the first three ZBRK1 binding sites (C1: \(Δ–2600/–2200\)), the last two sites (C2: \(Δ–2200/–1800\), and all the five sites (C3: \(Δ–2600/–1800\) (Figure 3B). Reporter assays showed that C1 and C3, but not C2, were repression defective, and neither BRCA1 (Figure 3C) nor CtIP depletion (Figure 3D) further derepressed the activities. Sequence analysis of the first three potential sites revealed a nearly canonical ZBRK1 consensus motif \((−2310/−2296\): GAGGxxCAxxxxTTT). We then generated a mutant construct, C-mt-Z, by substituting the five essential nucleotides (GTTxxxTTT) (Figure 3B) and found that this mutant...
responded to repression by neither BRCA1 (Figure 3C), CtIP (Figure 3D), nor ZBRK1 (Figure 3A), suggesting that this putative site (2310/2296) is a strong candidate for a ZBRK1 binding site.

To test whether ZBRK1 directly binds to this putative site, a 33-mer radiolabeled oligonucleotide probe (2319/2287) harboring the ZBRK1 recognition site (2310/2296) of ANG1 promoter (wt-Z) was used to perform an electromobility shift assay (EMSA) using either GST-fused ZBRK1 eight-Zn finger domain (Zheng et al., 2000b) or nuclear extract. We included a nonlabeled wt (wt-Z) or point mutant ZBRK1 (mt-Z) binding sequence of ANG1 promoter and AP12, a canonical consensus ZBRK1 binding sequence (Zheng et al., 2000b), for competition experiments. As expected, a nonlabeled wild-type ANG1 or AP12 competitor, but not mutant ANG1, competed with a labeled wild-type probe for binding ZBRK1, suggesting that ZBRK1 directly binds to this site (2310/2296) (Figure 3E).

To further demonstrate that this ZBRK1 recognition site is functional in vivo, we generated a heterologous reporter construct with a 800 bp fragment (2600/1800) containing a wild-type (3P-26-wt-Z) or mutant (3P-26-wt-Z) ZBRK1 binding site (2310/2296) (Figure 3F). Reporter assay showed that the activity increased as ZBRK1 level decreased by increasing ZBRK1 binding sequence (Zheng et al., 2000b), for competition experiments. As expected, a nonlabeled wild-type ANG1 or AP12 competitor, but not mutant ANG1, competed with a labeled wild-type probe for binding ZBRK1, suggesting that ZBRK1 directly binds to this site (2310/2296) (Figure 3E).
adenoviral ZBRK1 RNAi (see below Figure 4A), whereas a mutant ZBRK1 site was repression defective (Figure 3F), further confirming that this site is an authentic ZBRK1 recognition site.

ZBRK1, BRCA1, and CtIP form a repressor complex on ANG1 promoter
Since BRCA1/CtIP corepress ANG1 promoter via a ZBRK1 recognition site, it is expected that depletion of ZBRK1 would derepress ANG1 expression, similar to the effect of BRCA1 and CtIP depletion (Figure 1A). To test this possibility, we depleted ZBRK1 by adenoviral mediated RNAi in MCF10A cells in 3D culture and assessed the ANG1 expression level using RT-PCR. Reduced ZBRK1 expression paralleled increased ANG1 expression (Figure 4A), suggesting that a deficiency of ZBRK1 upregulates ANG1 repression. These results altogether implicate that ZBRK1, BRCA1, and CtIP coordinately repress
ANG1 expression. Since BRCA1 binds CtIP via its BRCT domain (Li et al., 1999) and ZBRK1 via its central domain (Zheng et al., 2000b), it is likely that these three proteins form a repressor complex on the ZBRK1 recognition site. To test this possibility, these three proteins were reciprocally co-immunoprecipitated from nuclear extract (Figure 4B), suggesting that they form a complex. Next, we mixed a radiolabeled oligonucleotide probe containing a wild-type (wt-Z or AP12) or mutant (mt-Z) ZBRK1 binding sequence with nuclear extract for immunoprecipitation. Antibodies against ZBRK1, BRCA1, and CtIP brought down a wild-type (wt-Z or AP12), but not mutant (mt-Z), oligonucleotide specifically (Figure 4C). Finally, to demonstrate that this complex is associated with ANG1 promoter in vivo, we performed a chromatin immunoprecipitation (ChIP) assay on a 300 bp fragment around the ZBRK1 site (−2400/−2100). As shown in Figure 4D, ZBRK1, BRCA1, and CtIP colocalized on ANG1 promoter, while an individual depletion of either protein by RNAi completely abolished the association of all the three proteins with the promoter, suggesting that the three participants are all essential for the complex formation. Taken together, these data substantiate a notion that BRCA1, CtIP, and ZBRK1 coordinately form a repressor complex tethered at the ZBRK1 recognition site in ANG1 promoter.

Expression of ANG1 from MECs is essential for the stability of capillary-like network structures formed by neighboring endothelial cells in 3D matrix

To assess a biological consequence of derepressed ANG1 expression, we cocultured MCF10A cells with human umbilical endothelial cells (HUVECs) in 3D matrix. HUVECs alone formed a thin layer of capillary-like network structure in a day but soon came to disintegrate and died in a week under this experimental condition (Figure 5A). When HUVECs were cocultured with luciferase-RNAi/GFP-treated MCF10A cells, they maintained for a week in a manner similar to those cocultured with MCF10A/ANG1 cells. To validate the essential role of ANG1 in the survival of cocultured endothelial cells, we treated MCF10A cells with ANG1 siRNA, which was shown by Western analysis to completely deplete ANG1 in MCF10A/ANG1 cells after 36 hr (Figure 5C). HUVECs cocultured with ANG1 siRNA-treated MCF10A/ANG1 cells formed a thin layer of capillary-like structure in a day but soon came to disintegrate and died after a week (Figure 5Dh) in a manner similar to those cocultured with Luc-RNAi/GFP-infected MCF10A cells (Figures 5Da and 5Db). Likewise, when HUVECs were cocultured with MCF10A cells treated with ANG1 siRNA prior to BRCA1-RNAi/GFP (Figure 5Dd) or CtIP-RNAi/GFP (Figure 5Df) adenoviral infection, they formed a thin layer of capillary-like structure in a day, but the endothelial cells, indicated as nonfluorescent cells, started to disintegrate after 3 days and died in a week, leaving aggregates of fluorescent MECs. Based on these observations, upregulated expression of ANG1 from MECs, either by the overexpression construct or by depletion of BRCA1 or CtIP, is essential for the stability of capillary-like structures formed by the cocultured endothelial cells in 3D matrix.

Brca1-deficient mouse mammary tumors exhibit an accelerated growth and harbor enlarged blood vessels along with upregulated Ang1 expression

To test if these in vitro observations gain support from animal studies, we examined mammary tumor samples from Brca1-deficient mice. Brca1-associated tumorigenesis is often linked to a loss of p53 (Xu et al., 1999). To recapitulate the Brca1-related tumor pathogenesis, we used a mouse model inactivated in both Brca1 and p53 genes (Brca1<sup>−117/−117</sup>]<sup>p53<sup>[−6/−6]</sup> (n = 17) in comparison to mice inactivated only in p53 gene (p53<sup>[−6/−6]</sup>) (n = 14) as a control (Lin et al., 2004; Xu et al., 1999). Brca1-deficient tumors exhibited a substantially shorter latency than control tumors (6.1 ± 1.3 versus 18.3 ± 2.2 months) to reach a comparable size (0.996 ± 0.460 versus 1.072 ± 0.588 ml, respectively) (Table 2). In general, Brca1-deficient tumors
displayed an ensanguined appearance, noticeably distinct from control tumors with the same size (Figure 6A). To examine the blood vessel status of these tumor specimens, they were stained against CD31, an endothelial cell marker (Machein et al., 2004). Apparently, Brca1-deficient tumors contained larger blood vessels compared to control tumors (Figures 6B and 6C). The blood vessel luminal area of Brca1-deficient tumor was almost three times the size of that of the control tumor (224.2 ± 135.0 versus 82.8 ± 33.9 μm²; p < 0.001) (Table 2), while microvascular density (mm²) did not significantly differ between the two sets of tumors (p = 0.22; data not shown), consistent with a finding that ANG1 causes vessel enlargement without angiogenic sprouting during development (Thurston et al., 2005). Interestingly, analogous regulatory elements, including a ZBRK1 recognition site, were found in the mouse Ang1 promoter region (Figure 6D), suggesting that mouse Ang1 expression may be subjected to a similar mode of regulation as human. Consistently, Ang1 expression was mostly upregulated in Brca1-deficient tumors, but not in control tumors (Figure 6E). Taken together, these results support a notion that inactivation of BRCA1 in MECs upregulates ANG1 expression to support formation of large blood vessels.

Discussion

BRCA1 plays an essential role in DNA damage response and cell cycle checkpoint control, which are intimately linked to a restraint of cancer initiation. Additional functions of BRCA1 remain
to be further characterized. In this communication, we reveal that BRCA1, in coordination with CtIP and ZBRK1, exerts a transcriptional repression on ANG1 that pertains to cancer progression. To mimic in vivo conditions, we depleted BRCA1 and CtIP in normal MECs cultured in extracellular matrix. Microarray analyses identified a dozen genes corepressed by BRCA1 and CtIP. We focused on ANG1 since it may participate in cancer progression through angiogenesis. Our results demonstrated that BRCA1 and CtIP, along with ZBRK1, form a repressor complex on ANG1 promoter via a ZBRK1 recognition site (Figure 6F) and that Brca1-deficient mouse mammary tumors exhibit prominent vascularization and accelerated growth along with Ang1 upregulation. This suggests that derepressed ANG1 expression in MECs in the absence of BRCA1 is a pathogenic drive for neoplastic growth.

Depletion of BRCA1 impairs acinar differentiation but promotes proliferation of MECs into a tumor-like aggregate in 3D culture (Furuta et al., 2005). Strikingly, our preliminary results showed that depletion of CtIP as well as ZBRK1 leads to a phenotype identical to BRCA1 depletion, suggesting that they share at least one common regulation pathway. ZBRK1, a sequence-specific transcriptional repressor that binds to the canonical GGGxxxCAGxxxTTT motif, interacts with the central region of BRCA1 (aa 341–748) and mediates the transcriptional repression activity of BRCA1 (Zheng et al., 2000b). Interestingly, there are five potential ZBRK1 sites in ANG1 promoter due to the degeneracy of the consensus motif, but only one site (nt 2231/2296) has the in cis transcriptional repression function, since point mutations at this site abolished the capacity (Figure 3). Through this recognition site, ZBRK1, BRCA1, and CtIP form a repressor complex on ANG1 promoter. This conclusion was supported by the following observations. First, a defect in BRCA1, CtIP, and ZBRK1 complex formation on ANG1 promoter, caused by lacking one of the participants or their interactions, impairs ANG1 transcriptional repression. Second, BRCA1, CtIP, and ZBRK1 can be coimmunoprecipitated with an oligonucleotide containing the wild-type ZBRK1 recognition sequence. Third, by ChIP analysis, BRCA1, CtIP, and ZBRK1 colocalized at ANG1 recognition site in the promoter.

Figure 6. Brca1-deficient mouse mammary tumors exhibit enlarged blood vessels and overexpressed ANG1

A: Whole mammary tumors (≈ 1.8 cm in diameter) excised from p53D5–6/D5–6 (Aa) and Brca1D11/D11; p53D5–6/D5–6 (Ab) mice. B: Mammary tumor sections from p53D5–6/D5–6 mice stained for CD31 (brown) and counterstained with hematoxylin. Mouse ID: 9268 (Ba), 9342 (Bb), 9345 (Bc), and 9349 (Bd). Images were captured at 200x (1) and at 1000x (2) magnifications. Scale bar, 50 μm.

C: Mammary tumor sections from Brca1D11/D11; p53D5–6/D5–6 mice stained for CD31 (brown) and counterstained with hematoxylin. Mouse ID: 741 (Ca), 820 (Cb), 824 (Cc), and 905 (Cd). Images were captured at 200x (1) and at 1000x (2) magnifications. Scale bar, 50 μm.

D: ANG1 promoter region in human (Da) and mouse (Db) around a ZBRK1 binding site with conserved transcriptional regulatory elements. AML-1, acute myeloid leukemia protein-1; AP-1, activator protein-1; ETS-1, v-ets erythroblastosis virus E26 oncogene homolog 1; IK-1/2, Ikaros 1/2; NF-kB, nuclear factor kappa B.


F: A schematic for ANG1 transcriptional repression by BRCA1, CtIP, and ZBRK1 via a ZBRK1 recognition site in the promoter.
entire repressor complex including ZBRK1, suggesting that the stability of ZBRK1 binding to the recognition site depends on the integrity of the complex. This is inconsistent with the result from an in vitro binding assay showing that ZBRK1 alone binds to its consensus sequence. How to reconcile this discrepancy remains unclear. Nevertheless, BRCA1 was shown to facilitate ZBRK1 binding to the recognition site in vivo (Tan et al., 2004), and CtIP is also likely to contribute in a similar manner, although the precise architecture of this complex binding to ZBRK1 site remains to be elucidated.

Apparently, the regulation of ANG1 promoter would be more complicated than that by a repressor complex alone. Since a point mutation in the ZBRK1 binding site (−2310/−2296) as well as a deletion in the surrounding region (∆−2600/−1800) upregulated ANG1 transcription (Figure 3), the region −2310 to −2296 must be involved in repression, while the region outside (−3040/−2600) must be involved in activation once the repression is removed. It is probable that derepression of ANG1 in the region −2310/−2296 evokes a subsequent activation of the neighboring region by altering the local chromatin structure to allow the accessibility to certain transactivators. In fact, the region around the ZBRK1 binding site in ANG1 promoter encompasses various conserved transcriptional regulatory elements, such as AML1 (CBF−/−/CBFA2) (Figure 6D), which is responsible for upregulation of ANG1 expression during embryogenesis (Brown et al., 2004; Takakura et al., 2000). Clearly, derepression is the first step for full activation of the promoter. The mechanisms of how the repressor complex is removed from the ZBRK1 site and how these two steps are coordinated in regulating ANG1 promoter warrant further investigation.

Angiogenesis is a critical process for tumor progression. ANG1 promotes tubular formation and survival of endothelial cells (Hayes et al., 1999; Kwak et al., 1999) and enhances blood vessel growth and maturation (Suri et al., 1996). Consistently, we observed that ANG1 expressed from MECs exerts a paracrine action on neighboring endothelial cells for their survival and stability of capillary-like network structures. Brca1−/−/−; p53−/−/−/− mouse mammary tumors, characterized by their accelerated growth and ensanguined appearance, harbor prominently enlarged blood vessels compared to p53−/−/−; mouse mammary tumors. Such a phenotype of Brca1−/−/− mouse mammary tumors may be attributed to derepressed ANG1 expression from MECs, stabilizing the adjacent blood vessels and promoting their growth to provide conduits for supplying nutrition as well as removing waste, consistent with the observation that ANG1 causes vessel enlargement without angiogenic sprouting during development (Thurston et al., 2005). Furthermore, gliomas overexpressing ANG1 exhibit accelerated tumor growth and extensive vasculature (Machein et al., 2004), a phenotype similar to Brca1−/−/−; p53−/−/−/− mouse mammary tumors. Although it is yet to be examined whether BRCA1-associated human breast tumors harbor enlarged blood vessels as observed in mice, these tumors metastasize to a distant site through the bloodstream instead of lymphatic routes (Foulkes et al., 2003), suggesting that they develop blood vessels much earlier than non-BRCA1-associated tumors. Our observation in mice provides a likely explanation of this clinical manifestation.

In addition to ANG1, one of the identified genes bFGF is also involved in angiogenesis (Imura et al., 2004), while several other genes, HMG2A, LIMK1, and RFC1, are involved in proliferation (Cullmann et al., 1995; Davila et al., 2003; Tessari et al., 2003). As the net effect, an impaired transcriptional repression activity of BRCA1 and CtIP will promote angiogenic and proliferative potentials of cells. Currently, we are examining if the remaining genes are regulated under a similar mechanism as ANG1, aiming to further understand the cellular events involved in the progression of BRCA1- and CtIP-associated tumors.

A neoplastic potential due to a dysfunction of BRCA1 tumor suppressor has been largely ascribed to the genomic instability resulting from defects in DNA damage-responsive pathways. However, the present study shows that BRCA1 deficiency modulates the tissue microenvironment by derepression of ANG1 (or bFGF) that promotes the growth of adjacent vasculature in a paracrine fashion to nourish a neoplasm. Moreover, an aberrant activity of a BRCA1-interacting partner, CtIP tumor suppressor, also deregulates ANG1 expression, which may likewise pertain to the etiology of tumor growth in Ctip heterozygous mice (Chen et al., 2005). Apparently, these two tumor suppressors have much broader activities than other tumor susceptibility genes, such as MSH2 and ATM, which exclusively play roles in guarding genomic stability. This study concludes that BRCA1 and CtIP possess an additional role in tumor suppression, via a ZBRK1 element, by regulating the intercellular signaling within the tissue microenvironment besides maintaining the genomic stability within the cell. This view will extend their tumor suppression functions to the surroundings that influence the fate of neighboring cells and fortify the pathogenic relevance of their defect to neoplastic growth.

Experimental procedures

Cell cultures

Human mammary epithelial MCF10A cells and umbilical endothelial cells (HUVECs) were cultured as described (Debnath et al., 2003; Shekhar et al., 2000), respectively.

Adenoviral RNAi construction

The adenovirus-based RNAi vector was generated by cloning an expression cassette of U6 promoter-BRCA1, -CtIP, or -ZBRK1 short hairpin RNA (0.4 kb) into pAdTrack plasmid upstream of a CMV-GFP cassette (1.6 kb) (He et al., 1998; Sui et al., 2002). The target sequences are as follows: BRCA1, 5′-GGCTACAGAAACCCTGCAA-3′; CtIP, 5′-GGGAGCATGACCTTTCTCAGTA-3′; and ZBRK1, 5′-AAACCATGTCATGACATATG-3′. Adnoviruses were produced as described (Furuta et al., 2005). MCF10A cells seeded at 5×10^5 cells/60 mm plate were infected with adenovirus at a designated MOI for 24 hr.

RNAi-resistant BRCA1 and CtIP plasmids

The RNAi-targeted nucleotide sequence in a full-length BRCA1 cDNA, the expression of which was driven by a CMV promoter in ChPL vector (Li et al., 1999), was partially substituted without affecting the amino acid residues (5′-GGCTACCGAAATAGGCGCAA-3′), and a cancer-linked point mutation of BRCA1 at C61G, G356R, or M1775R was introduced into the wild-type RNAi-resistant construct using a site-directed mutagenesis kit (Stratagene). Similarly, the RNAi-targeted nucleotide sequence in GFP-CtIP construct, containing a full-length CtIP cDNA N-terminally fused to GFP (Li et al., 2001), was partially substituted as follows: 5′-GGGAGCGAATGACCTTTGTTCTCAGTA-3′, and a point mutation of CtIP at S327A was introduced into the wild-type RNAi-resistant construct. Correct substitutions were confirmed by sequencing. Respective primer sequences used are shown in Table S1. MCF10A cells seeded at 5×10^5 cells/60 mm plate were transfected with 3 μg of RNAi-resistant construct using FuGene6 (Roche) prior to adenoviral RNAi infection.

Microarray and RT-PCR

MCF10A cells seeded at 5×10^5 cells/60 mm plate were infected with adenoviral luciferase-, BRCA1-, CtIP-, or ZBRK1-RNAi in duplicate at 20 MOI for...
24 hr. Infected cells were reseeded at 5 × 10^5 cells in a 60 mm plate pre-coated with Growth Factor Reduced Matrigel (BD Biosciences) and covered with the growth medium containing 2% Matrigel at 37ºC for 15 hr. RNA was extracted from these cells with Trizol (Invitrogen), clarified by RNasey spin column (Qiagen), and quality assessed. cDNA synthesized from the harvested RNA using SuperScript Double-Stranded cDNA Synthesis Kit (Invitrogen) served as a template for PCR amplification with respective primers (Table S1), and a portion of it was bioin-labeled using GeneChip IVT Labeling Kit (Affymetrix), hybridized onto Affymetrix HG U133 PLUS 2.0 array (54,676 genes), and stained with streptavidin-phycocerythrin. The hybridized array was analyzed using GeneChip Scanner 3000 and GCOS 1.2 software (Affymetrix) for multiplex pairwise comparison at the UCI Microarray Core service. The statistical significance was evaluated by ANOVA single factor analysis using MS Excel XP, and the fold difference > 2 as well as p value < 0.05 was considered significant. Microarray data are available at Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO; http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/) with the following accession numbers: BRCA1-KD (GSM106933, GSM106968) versus Luc-KD (GSM106971, GSM106972); and CtIP-KD (GSM106974, GSM106975) versus Luc-KD (GSM106976, GSM106977).

Luciferase reporter assay
ANG1 promoter constructs A (−821/+199), B (−1799/+199), and C (−3040/+199), which regulate luciferase expression in pGL2 vector, were from Peter Oettgen (Harvard Institutes of Medicine, MA) (Brown et al., 2004). Construct C was subjected to site-directed mutagenesis (Stratagene) for deletion mutations in ZBRK1 binding sites: C1 (Δ−2600/−2200), C2 (Δ−1200/−1800), and C3 (Δ−2600/−1800); point mutations of a putative ZBRK1 site (−2310/−2296); C-mt-Z; and for generating a fragment containing ZBRK1 binding sites (−2600/−1800): 3P-26-(wt/m7)-Z with respective primers (Table S1). Correct changes were confirmed by sequencing and restriction digestion.

MCF10A cells seeded at 5 × 10^5 cells/60 mm plate were transfected with 3 µg of luciferase reporter and 0.5 µg of β-galactosidase plasmids using Fugene6 prior to adenoviral RNAi infection. Luciferase and β-galactosidase reporter activities were measured using a reporter assay kit (Promega).

EMSA
EMSA was performed as described (Zheng et al., 2000b). A γ^32P-ATP-labeled oligonucleotide probe (6000 cpm) harboring a ZBRK1 site (−2310/−2296) in ANG1 promoter (wt-Z; 5′-ACACACGTTGGAAGACAGTGTATTTAAGTTCCTC-3′; a point mutant of the ZBRK1 site in ANG1 promoter (mt-Z): 5′-ACACACGTTGGAAGACAGTGTATTTAAGTTCCTC-3′; and a canonical ZBRK1 binding sequence (AP12) (Zheng et al., 2000b): 5′-GATCCCAGGAGGCGAGTTTGTTCCTC-3′) was incubated with 50 ng of GST-ZBRK1-Zn protein purified from E. coli or 8 µg of MCF10A nuclear extract of in 40 µl of DNA binding buffer containing 1 µg of poly(dI-dC) at room temperature. For competition experiment, molar excess of an unlabeled wild-type or mutant oligonucleotide was included. The sense oligonucleotides used are from wild-type ZBRK1 site in ANG1 promoter (wt-Z); 5′-ACACACGTTGGAAGACAGTGTATTTAAGTTCCTC-3′; a point mutant of the ZBRK1 site in ANG1 promoter (mt-Z); 5′-ACACACGTTGGAAGACAGTGTATTTAAGTTCCTC-3′; and a canonical ZBRK1 binding sequence (AP12) (Zheng et al., 2000b): 5′-GATCCCAGGAGGCGAGTTTGTTCCTC-3′) (ZBRK1 recognition motifs are shown in italics). The reaction was resolved on 5% native polyacrylamide gel at 4°C and autoradiographed.

D Nanova
DNA immunoprecipitation
DNA immunoprecipitation was performed as described (Zheng et al., 2000b). A radiolabeled oligonucleotide of wt-Z, mt-Z, or AP12 was incubated with 50 µg of nuclear extract in 200 µl of DNA binding buffer containing 1 µg of poly(dI-dC) at room temperature for 30 min. The protein-oligonucleotide complex was precipitated by protein G-Sepharose beads loaded with a respective antibody and resolved on 5% polyacrylamide gel followed by autoradiography.

Immunoprecipitation
One microgram of antibody against HA (Crlt), CtIP, BRCA1, or ZBRK1 was added to 200 µg of unclariﬁed MCF10A nuclear extract and incubated at 4°C overnight. Antibody-protein complex was precipitated by protein G-Sepharose beads and washed with TEN buffer (10 mM Tris-HCl [pH 8.0], 0.25 mM EDTA, 50 mM NaCl). Immunoprecipitates were resolved on 8% SDS-PAGE and detected by Western analysis.

ChIP
ChIP assay was performed as described (Saccani et al., 2001) with a minor modification. Chromatin from 1% formaldehyde-treated MCF10A cells were sonicated to ~500 bp fragments and immunoprecipitated with antibodies against HA, ZBRK1, BRCA1, and CtIP at 4°C overnight. Chromatin-antibody complexes were washed with buffer 1 (0.1% SDS, 0.5% Triton X-100, 2 mM EDTA, 20 mM Tris-HCl [pH 8.0], 150 mM NaCl), buffer 2 (0.1% SDS, 2 mM EDTA, 20 mM Tris-HCl [pH 8.0], 500 mM NaCl) then TE buffer (10 mM Tris-HCl [pH 8.0], 1 mM EDTA). After reversal of cross-linking, immunoprecipitated chromatin was subjected to PCR reaction for a 300 bp fragment (−2400/−2100) of ANG1 promoter around a ZBRK1 binding site with respective primers (Table S1).

ANG1 retrovirus and siRNA
A full-length ANG1 cDNA, KIAA0003 clone (GenBank no. D13628) was from Takahiro Nagase (Kazusa DNA Research Institute, Chiba, Japan) (Nomura et al., 1994). A 1.7 kb coding sequence fragment was obtained by PCR reaction with respective primers (Table S1) and cloned into pQCIHX vector (BD Biosciences). GP2-293 packaging cells were transfected with pQCIHX/ANG1 and pSVG plasmids using Lipofectin, and retrovirus was harvested in the conditioned medium. MCF10A cells were infected with retrovirus using 8 µl of polybrene, and the stable clones (MCF10A/ANG1) were selected with 70 µg/ml Hygromycin B (Roche). Overexpression of ANG1 was confirmed by Western analysis using a rabbit anti-ANG1 antibody (1:500, Alpha Diagnostic). ANG1 siRNA was synthesized against the target sequence: 5′-AAGGCTTGGTTACTCGTCAAA-3′ (Qiagen). MCF10A cells seeded at 5 × 10^5 cells/60 mm plate were transfected with 400 pmol of ANG1 or luciferase siRNA for 24 hr using Oligofectamine (Invitrogen) prior to adenoviral infection.

3D coculture
MCF10A cells (5 × 10^4) and HUVECs (5 × 10^4) were seeded together into each well of a 8-well chamber slide coated with Matrigel and covered with SFM supplemented with EGF and bFGF (Shekhar et al., 2000). Fluorescence imaging was performed with Phase/IFITC filters on a Zeiss Axiovert 200M equipped with Hamamatsu Photonics K.K. Deep Cooled Digital Camera using Axiosvision 4.4 software.

Mice, histology, and immunohistochemistry
Animal experiments were performed under federal guidelines and approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee at UCI. Mice with the p53 gene floxed at exons 5–6 (p53f/f) were generated as described (Lin et al., 2004). Mice with the Brca1 gene floxed on exon 11 (Brca1f11/f11) were from Chu-Xia Deng (NIH) (Xu et al., 1999). Both strains were crossed to obtain Brca1f11/f11;p53f/f mice. p53f/f or Brca1f11/f11;p53f/f mice were crossed with Wap-Cre mice and genotyped to obtain the p53f/f;p53f/f or Brca1f11/f11;p53f/f;p53f/f strain, respectively. Dissected mouse mammary tumors were fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde overnight. Sections (4–5 µm) were deparaffinized, hydrated, and digested in 0.05% trypsin at 37°C. After being blocked with 3% H2O2 and nonimmune horse serum, sections were incubated at room temperature with a rabbit anti-mouse CD31 antibody and link antibodies, followed by peroxidase-conjugated streptavidin complex and diamobenzidine tetrahydrochloride solution as the peroxidase substrate (Vector Laboratories). The sections were counterstained with hematoxylin. Photomicrographs were taken with Zeiss Axioplan 2 Imaging platform and AxioVision 4.4 Software. Six to eight nonoverlapping images for each tumor sample were captured at 200x magnification and analyzed for vascular pathology using AxioVision 4.4. Briefly, each blood vessel was marked and the number within a field of 200x magnification was counted. The lumen of an individual vessel was outlined to compute the area, and the total luminal area of the field was determined. The mean luminal area of a single vessel within a field was calculated and then averaged among multiple fields for each tumor sample. The statistical significance was evaluated by Student’s t test using MS Excel XP. High-magnification images were captured at 1000x magnification.

Supplemental data
The Supplemental Data include one supplemental figure and one supplemental table and can be found with this article online at http://www. cancerrcell.org/cgi/content/full/10/1/13/DC1/.
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Accession numbers

Microarray data are available at Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO; http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/) with the following accession numbers: BRCA1-KD (GSM106933, GSM106968) versus Luc-KD (GSM106971, GSM106972); and CtIP-KD (GSM106974, GSM106975) versus Luc-KD (GSM106976, GSM106977).