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Gene fusions involving ETS family transcription factors (TFs) (mainly ERG and ETV1) have been identified in ~50% of prostate cancer cases. To address their roles in prostate cancer, we generated multiple Tmprss2-ETS knockin mouse models. The goal of this project is to identify oncogenic pathways cooperating with ETS fusions using these knockin models. During the three-year grant period, we found that: 1) Tmprss2-ETS fusions cooperate with Pten-loss, but not with Nkx3.1-loss, to promote development of localized prostate cancer. 2) Genes deleted in the interstitial region between Tmprss2 and Erg cooperate with Pten-loss, or Pten-loss plus ectopic Tmprss2-Erg expression (at the early stage), leading to development of invasive prostate cancer with features of epithelial-mesenchymal transition. We identified several interstitial genes, including ETS2, HMGN1 and BACE2, as candidate tumor suppressors and confirmed that loss of one copy of Ets2 was sufficient for prostate cancer progression under a Pten-null background. 3) Another ETS family TF, ETV6, which is deleted in some prostate cancer cases (including TMPRSS2-ERG fusion positive case), is also a tumor suppressor in prostate cancer and it may contribute to prostate tumorigenesis via the PRC2 complex (thus similar to ERG). Overall, our work has unveiled several oncogenic pathways (due to loss of tumor suppressors) in prostate cancer under the context of TMPRSS2-ETS gene fusions.
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INTRODUCTION:
During prostate tumorigenesis, multiple oncogenic pathways cooperate to drive disease progression. Identification of these cooperating pathways is the key for defining novel therapeutic targets and for combined therapeutic interventions for treating advanced prostate cancer. Gene fusions involving the ETS family transcription factors (TFs), particularly ERG and ETV1, have been identified in at least 40-50% of human prostate cancer cases [1, 2]. Coding regions of these ETS genes are often rearranged to control regions of several androgen-responsive genes, particularly the TMPRSS2 gene, leading to aberrant expression of ETS genes. In animal models, aberrant ERG or ETV1 expression in mouse prostates under the control of the Probasin (Pb) promoter [3-6] leads to either a minor phenotype [i.e., Prostatic intraepithelial neoplasia (PIN) lesions] or almost no observable abnormalities. However, ectopic ERG expression can cooperate with Pten loss to drive prostate cancer development [7, 8]. Consistent with this, in a tissue reconstitution model, lentiviral overexpression of ERG in prostate cells collaborates with activation of the PI3K pathway or the androgen receptor (AR) pathway to induce distinct prostate carcinomas. These observations suggest that although aberrant expression of ETS factors alone in prostates is insufficient for prostate cancer, it sensitizes prostate epithelial cells for cooperation with additional oncogenic mutations to drive full-blown prostate cancer. The main hypothesis of this study is that aberrant ERG or ETV1 expression in prostate cells may cooperate with multiple alternative oncogenic pathways to drive prostate tumorigenesis. Since TMPRSS2-ETS fusions (particularly those with the interstitial deletion) are highly prevalent in advanced, castration-resistant (CR) prostate tumors [9, 10], understanding cooperative interactions between ETS fusions and other oncogenic pathways would be the key to develop novel combined therapies for treating this deadly disease. Since mouse models with aberrant ETS expression alone do not develop prostate cancer but serve as a sensitized system, the main purpose of this research is to identify additional oncogenic pathways that may cooperate with ETS gene fusions, leading to prostate cancer. This will be achieved by genetic approaches (e.g., genetic screens; crosses with existing mouse models) under the background of various Tmprss2-ETS knockin models we have generated. Novel tumor suppressors may be identified from this study that may cooperate with ETS fusions (upon their loss) to drive prostate cancer development, and pathways affected by their loss will be determined.
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OVERALL PROJECT SUMMARY:
The major goal of this research project is to identify oncogenic pathways that cooperate with TMPRSS2-ETS gene fusions, leading to prostate cancer formation. During the three-year grant period, we further characterized several Tmprss2-ETS knockin mouse models we generated [Tmprss2-ERG knockin (T-ERG), Tmprss2-ETV1 knockin (T-ETV1), Tmprss2-loxP-3Mb-loxP-Erg knockin (3Mb refers to the 3Mb interstitial region between Tmprss2 and Erg loci; before excision T-3Mb-Erg, after excision T-Δ-Erg)] and have identified several oncogenic pathways (e.g., due to loss of tumor suppressors such as ETS2 and ETV6) in prostate cancer under the context of TMPRSS2-ETS gene fusions. Below is a detailed summary of our research activity addressing Tasks 1-5 in the SOW:

Tasks 1-2:
These two tasks were proposed to further characterize various Tmprss2-ETS knockin mouse models we generated as the starting materials for searching for and testing oncogenic cooperation, and to establish and optimize the prostate cancer reconstitution model.
Further characterization of the Tmprss2-ETS knockin mouse models

The majority portion of this work was published in *Genes & Development* in 2013 (Baena et al., *Genes Dev.* 27:683-98) and is provided in the Appendix. The major conclusion from this study is that both Tmprss2-ERG and Tmprss2-ETV1 gene fusions can cooperate with loss of a single copy of Pten, leading to localized cancer (PIN lesions), but only ETV1 appeared to support development of invasive adenocarcinoma under the background of full Pten loss. Furthermore, these two types of ETS fusions appear to cooperate with Pten-loss in different ways: ERG negatively regulates the androgen receptor (AR) transcriptional program and thus it may cooperate with Pten-loss, which also downregulates the AR program, in leading to an immature phenotype and increased proliferation. In contrast, ETV1 appears to enhance AR signaling and reprogram the metabolism of prostate cells, and it may cooperate with Pten-loss by further enhancing metabolic reprogramming, in particular, by favoring steroid biosynthesis, a pathway critical for invasive adenocarcinoma cells. Thus, our initial work has provided mechanistic insights into how different ETS gene fusions cooperate with other oncogenic pathway in leading to development of prostate cancer.

Establish and optimize the prostate cancer reconstitution model based on Pten knockdown in Tmprss2-ETS knockin prostate epithelial cells

We have established the renal capsule reconstitution assay and performed reconstitution experiments by transplanting wild type (WT), or T-ETV1, or T-ERG prostate cells (lineage-negative cells enriched by MACS beads) infected with shRNA lentivirus for Pten to recipient mice. Compared to WT, we saw certain degree of cooperation between T-ETV1 and Pten knockdown, but only very slight cooperation (if any) between T-ERG and Pten knockdown (Figure 1). This could be due to the fact that ETV1 is robustly expressed from the T-ETV1 knockin allele whereas ERG is only weakly expressed from the endogenous Tmprss2 promoter from the T-ERG knockin allele, as described in more details in the attached paper (Baena et al., *Genes Dev.* 27:683-98). This could also be due to insufficient lentiviral infection of prostate cells and/or insufficient Pten knockdown. To determine these possibilities, we used an alternative reconstitution approach. In this approach, we first generated prostate cells carrying homozygous Pten conditional knockout alleles (i.e., *Pten*-/- prostate cells) with or without the T-ERG knockin allele; we then infected these prostate cells with Cre-expressing adenovirus (Adeno-Cre) *in vitro* to disrupt Pten and transplanted the resulting Pten-null (with or without T-ERG) prostate cells to recipient male mice. In addition to this alternative strategy, we have also further optimized the reconstitution assays: (1) we determined the lowest number of UGSM stromal cells required to support prostate cell reconstitution (~2.5 x 10⁵ cells); (2) we found that using dissociated prostate sphere cells (rather than fresh primary prostate cells) was much more efficient for reconstitution assay; (3) we also found that we had more success when using the subcutaneous implantation (with Matrigel), rather than using renal capsule (where the cells were suspended in collagen). Based on the Adeno-Cre approach, we found that Pten-null only prostate cells formed outgrowths that exhibited infrequent regions with features of low-grade PIN (LG-PIN) lesions, whereas Pten-null prostate cells with T-ERG formed outgrowths resembling high-grade PIN (HG-PIN) lesions (Figure 8). Thus, the weak-to-no cooperation of Pten knockdown with T-ERG knockin in our reconstitution assay when using lentiviral shRNA for Pten was most likely due to insufficient Pten knockdown and/or insufficient lentiviral infection of primary prostate cells.

Tasks 3-5:

These tasks were proposed to perform a small-scale RNAi-based genetic screen with pooled shRNAs for candidate tumor suppressors, validate shRNA hits from the screen, and then validate the affected candidate oncogenic pathways for their potential cooperation with the Tmprss2-ERG fusion. As described in our previous annual progress report, since the expected oncogenic cooperation of T-ERG with Pten knockdown by shRNA was supposed to serve as the positive control for our *in vivo* shRNA screen, yet the cooperation phenotype was too weak to score (as positive) (Figure 1), we were concerned that our originally proposed genetic screen based on shRNA library (even a small customized shRNA library) might not work, as we could not reliably score our
“positive control” in this assay. In addition, recent progress in the field suggested that the prostate reconstitution assay might not be the most ideal system for searching for ETS-cooperating pathways, as this assay is heavily biased toward basal cells (i.e., prostate luminal cells cannot engraft well in this assay), and although both luminal and basal cells could serve as cells of origin of prostate cancer, luminal cells could initiate prostate cancer much more effectively than basal cells, and that the barrier for basal cells to serve as the cellular origin was the need for them to differentiate into luminal cells first [11]. Thus, it appears that prostate luminal cells may serve as the main cellular origin for prostate cancer. We therefore more favor a strategy to search for ETS-cooperating mutations in prostate luminal cells. As stated in the previous annual reports, we favor an alternative approach for the genetic screen by using the potentially more sensitive insertional mutagenesis approach based on the Sleeping Beauty (SB) transposon-based somatic mutagenesis system. However, this approach would require more time and most likely additional funding. To fulfill our originally proposed goal of identifying additional oncogenic pathways that may cooperate with ETS fusions within the funded time window, we used a backup approach. In our original proposal, we proposed to construct a small customized shRNA library containing shRNA hairpins targeting known or predicted tumor suppressors that have been described in literature (e.g., Nkx3.1, TEL/ETV6) or genes that are frequently deleted in human prostate cancer samples (e.g., microdeletion of the interstitial region between TMPRSS2 and ERG on human chromosome 21, which harbors a potential tumor suppressor ETS2). Some of these candidate tumor suppressor genes have knockout or conditional knockout mouse alleles available. Among them, we focused on those that have evidence for potential cooperation with ETS fusions, including Nkx3.1, TEL/ETV6, interstitial deletion between TMPRSS2 and ERG (e.g., ETS2). We determined whether their loss could contribute to prostate tumorigenesis and what candidate oncogenic pathways resulted from their loss would be involved, by both prostate reconstitution assay and mouse genetics. We summarize our research efforts and key findings for candidate/oncogenic pathway validation below, which are related to Tasks 4-5 (validation experiments) in the SOW:

**Candidate #1: Nkx3.1**

**Test whether Tmprss2-ETS fusions cooperate with Nkx3.1-loss**

In addition to ETS gene fusions and aberrant genetic alterations that activate the PI3K pathway (e.g., PTEN-loss), another frequent mutational event in prostate cancer is loss of regions within chromosome 8p21, to which the homeobox gene Nkx3.1 maps [12, 13]. Strong evidence supports the notion that loss of Nkx3.1 is an early event in prostate carcinogenesis, as it occurs in up to 85% of PIN lesions and early invasive cancers [14]. Nkx3.1 is one of the earliest known genes expressed in the developing prostate and subsequent studies have validated its importance in prostate epithelial cell differentiation [14]. Previously expression profiling has defined three subtypes of prostate cancer and among these, the subtype-2 prostate cancer cases, which often exhibit a more aggressive phenotype, have been found to harbor deletions at 8p21 (Nkx3.1) and 21q22 (resulting in TMPRSS2-ERG fusion) [13]; thus, loss of Nkx3.1 has been predicted to synergize with TMPRSS2-ERG fusion to promote prostate tumorigenesis, but this has not been validated experimentally. Furthermore, it has also been reported that ERG could lead to epigenetic silencing of Nkx3.1 in prostate cancer cells through induction of the histone methyltransferase EZH2 [15].

While mouse models of Nkx3.1-loss do not exhibit signs of prostate cancer [16, 17], they are hyperplastic in their prostates and display cooperativity with Pten-loss for prostate cancer development [18], thus offering a sensitized background to test whether Tmprss2-ETS fusions exhibit a similar synergy. To that end, we crossed our T-ERG knockin mouse line [19] with a previously characterized Nkx3.1-null line [16] and analyzed prostate histopathology in aged cohorts. We observed a slight increase in T-ERG expression after Nkx3.1-loss, consistent with a recent report detailing negative regulation of the TMPRSS2 locus by Nkx3.1 [20] (Figure 2). However, this subtle increase in T-ERG fusion expression coupled with Nkx3.1-loss did not promote prostate tumorigenesis (Figures 3-4). A similar phenotype was observed for our T-ETV1 model [19] under the complete Nkx3.1-loss background (Figure 5). Collectively these results suggest that although there is a genetic interaction between Nkx3.1-loss and Tmprss2-ERG gene fusion (to increase the Tmprss2 promoter activity, Figure 2), this
interaction does not enhance prostate cancer development (Figures 3-5). Our study further highlights the selectivity TMPRSS2-ETS fusions have with cooperating mutations.

Candidate #2: Interstitial deletion between TMPRSS2 and ERG (candidate tumor suppressor, ETS2)

Test potential contribution of genes deleted in the interstitial region between Tmprss2 and Erg to prostate cancer with Tmprss2-Erg gene fusion

The majority of prostate cancer cases with gene rearrangements carry the TMPRSS2-ERG fusion [1]. Both ERG and TMPRSS2 are located ~3Mb apart on human chromosome 21. The predominant mechanism to generate the TMPRSS2-ERG fusion is the intrachromosomal deletion between these two genes [21-26]. The 3Mb interstitial deletion may lead to haploinsufficiency of one or more genes within this region. In fact, previous studies have suggested that several genes in this region may have tumor/metastasis suppression roles. For example, knockout of one of the genes within this region, HMGN1, leads to increased N-cadherin expression [27], which is associated with high-grade prostate cancer [28], and altered G2/M checkpoint [29]. In addition, an ETS family transcription factor gene located in this region, ETS2, appears to serve as a tumor suppressor when expressed at an elevated level, as it represses Apc\textsuperscript{min}-mediated tumors in mouse models of Down Syndrome, but not in normal mice (i.e., three copies of Ets2 in Down Syndrome mouse models versus two copies of Ets2 in normal mice) [30]; Both point mutation (e.g., R437C) and focal deletions of ETS2 have been found in prostate cancer, and overexpression of wild-type ETS2 (but not R437C-mutant ETS2) resulted in decreased migration, invasion and proliferation in VCaP cells [31]. Moreover, an interferon-inducible GTPase, MxA, encoded by MX1, another gene located in this interstitial region, was shown to express in the human prostate carcinoma cell line PC-3, but not in its highly metastatic derivative PC-3M [32]; this protein suppresses metastasis by inhibiting tumor cell motility and invasion. Combining these together, it seems that reduced expression of one or more genes within this interstitial region may promote prostate tumor progression and metastasis. To date, clinical data regarding potential involvement of the interstitial deletion in prostate tumorigenesis remains contradictory. In a study involving primary prostate cancers and hormone naïve lymph node metastasis, TMPRSS2-ERG rearranged tumors through interstitial deletion (the so-called Edel subtype) were found to significantly associate with higher tumor stage and the presence of metastatic disease involving pelvic lymph nodes [25]. In another study, patients with prostate tumors with a duplication of TMPRSS2-ERG in combination with deletion of 5’-ERG (the 2+Edel subtype) exhibited poor cause specific survival [33]. Furthermore, it has been reported that in androgen-independent metastatic lethal prostate cancers, all metastatic sites harboring the TMPRSS2-ERG fusion were associated with the Edel subtype [34]. These studies strongly suggest that the Edel subtype of TMPRSS2-ERG fusion is a distinct and aggressive molecular subtype of prostate cancer.

Tmprss2-Erg fusion allele with interstitial deletion more strongly cooperates with Pten-loss

In our two Tmprss2-Erg knockin models, one was generated by knocking in the N-terminus-truncated ERG cDNA directly to the mouse Tmprss2 locus (thus without the interstitial deletion, i.e., the T-ERG model), the other was generated by Cre-mediated excision of the interstitial region and subsequent rearrangement of the Erg coding region to the Tmprss2 promoter (i.e., T-3Mb-Erg model before excision, T-A-Erg after excision of the interstitial region). In the presence of biallelic Pten inactivation mediated by Pb-Cre, however, nearly all Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;Pten\textsuperscript{L/L} male mice developed large poorly differentiated prostate tumors in dorsolateral and ventral lobes by 12 months of age [19]. To determine whether this advanced prostate cancer phenotype is caused by Tmprss2-Erg fusion expression or interstitial deletion, or both, we similarly generated Pb-Cre;T-ERG;Pten\textsuperscript{L/L} males and characterized their prostate phenotype at 12 months of age. Intriguingly, none of the Pb-Cre;T-ERG;Pten\textsuperscript{L/L} males developed poorly differentiated prostate adenocarcinoma at this age (Figure 6A) [compared to almost 100% penetrance for Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;Pten\textsuperscript{L/L} males to develop such advanced prostate cancers (Figure 6B)]. The prostate lesions developed in these mice were very similar to those high-grade PIN (HG-PIN) lesions often observed in Pb-Cre;Pten\textsuperscript{L/L} control males at this age, although quite surprisingly, HG-PIN lesions developed in many Pb-Cre;T-ERG;Pten\textsuperscript{L/L} mice lacked robust stromal proliferation, a common phenotype in the Pb-Cre;Pten\textsuperscript{L/L} model [35] (Figure 6A). Furthermore, control Pb-Cre;Pten\textsuperscript{L/L} males and Pb-
Cre;T-ERG;Pten$^{L/L}$ males only displayed signs of local invasion, which was confirmed through immunohistochemistry (IHC) staining of smooth muscle actin (SMA) (Figure 6A). In stark contrast, Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;Pten$^{L/L}$ males generated invasive prostate tumors that lacked expression of SMA and basal marker p63 (Figure 6A). Such large poorly differentiated prostate adenocarcinomas developed in Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;Pten$^{L/L}$ males were positive for the prostate luminal epithelial marker Keratin 8 (K8), but are negative for the basal epithelial markers Keratin 5 (K5) (Figure 6C); these males also possessed typical HG-PIN lesions composed of K8$^+$ luminal cells surrounded by K5$^+$ basal cells that are often observed in the control Pb-Cre;Pten$^{L/L}$ males (Figure 6C), as well as localized invasive cancers with microducts mainly composed of K8$^+$ prostate luminal cells [with almost no K5$^+$ basal cells (Figure 6C), and almost no SMA and p63 expression]. Poorly differentiated adenocarcinomas were never observed in control Pb-Cre;Pten$^{L/L}$ or Pb-Cre;T-ERG;Pten$^{L/L}$ males whereas presence of invasive microducts consistent with moderately differentiated adenocarcinoma were infrequently detected.

Erg overexpression is required for early PIN formation but not advanced tumor progression

The more advanced prostate cancer phenotype observed in Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;Pten$^{L/L}$ mice could be due to cooperation of Pten-loss with haploinsufficiency of interstitial genes (since one copy of all these interstitial genes is deleted when Cre-mediated recombination converts the T-3Mb-Erg allele to T-A-Erg allele), or with both interstitial deletion and Erg overexpression. To determine these possibilities, we first examined Erg expression levels in these animal models. Interestingly, in the Pb-Cre;T-ERG;Pten$^{L/L}$ model, despite the fact that these mice had largely indistinguishable histology from that of the control Pb-Cre;Pten$^{L/L}$ mice, they exhibited strong Erg overexpression in epithelial cells of all prostate lobes (Figure 7A). Conversely, poorly differentiated adenocarcinomas from Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;Pten$^{L/L}$ mice almost completely lacked Erg expression in their prostate tumor cells (Figure 7A). This loss of Erg staining in the more advanced lesions was not attributed to a lack of androgen receptor (AR) expression, which is believed to be positively correlated with TMPRSS2-ERG expression in human patient data [21, 25], as even these poorly differentiated tumors are AR positive (Figure 7A). Interestingly, a striking negative correlation of Erg immunostaining was observed with severity of lesions in Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;Pten$^{L/L}$ mice (Figure 7B). Approximately half of epithelial cells within HG-PIN lesions expressed ERG, yet this frequency was lower in invasive microducts (Figure 7C), which lacked basal keratin expression (Figure 7C) and are generally considered to be moderately differentiated adenocarcinomas [35]. Nearly all Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;Pten$^{L/L}$ prostates had these invasive prostate cancer lesions, yet they were only rarely detected in control Pb-Cre;Pten$^{L/L}$ or Pb-Cre;T-ERG;Pten$^{L/L}$ prostates. Of note, HG-PIN lesions in Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;Pten$^{L/L}$ mice tended to exhibit mosaic Erg overexpression, whereas moderately differentiated adenocarcinoma foci in these mice were homogenously Erg positive or negative (Figure 7B). This suggested that these early prostate cancer lesions were clonally derived, yet only Erg negative lesions might advance to become poorly differentiated adenocarcinoma.

Our data, as well as those from other investigators, demonstrate that Erg overexpression may provide an advantage only during PIN development in the context of Pten-loss [7, 8, 19], yet it may not be further required during progression from PIN to prostate adenocarcinoma. To further validate the early requirement of Erg expression during prostate tumorigenesis, we performed a prostate regeneration assay [36]. For this approach Pb-Cre-negative prostate cells carrying these conditional alleles were grown as prostate spheres, dissociated, then infected with adenovirus encoding CMV-Cre (Ad-CMV-Cre). Both T-ERG;Pten$^{L/L}$ and T-3Mb-Erg;Pten$^{L/L}$ prostate epithelial cells used for this assay formed outgrowths resembling HG-PIN lesions, which were larger and more expansive than outgrowths control from Pten$^{L/L}$ cell, which exhibited infrequent regions consistent with LG-PIN (Figure 8). All cells from these outgrowths highly expressed phosphorylated Akt (pAkt), thus confirming Pten-loss due to Cre-mediated excision after adenovirus infection (data not shown). This data thus further confirmed that Erg overexpression is critical for early transformation events. This is in line with human prostate cancer data, where TMPRSS2-ERG acquisition has been suggested as an early event in tumorigenesis [37, 38].
Adenocarcinomas and HG-PINs developed in Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;Pten\textsuperscript{L/L} mice exhibited Cre-mediated interstitial deletion

Since prostate lesions developed in Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;Pten\textsuperscript{L/L} mice exhibited progressive loss of Erg overexpression (Figure 7B-C), we wanted to rule out a possibility in which loss of Erg expression was due to reduced efficiency in generating Tmprss2-Erg gene fusion from Cre-mediated interstitial deletion. To determine this, we performed laser capture microdissection to isolate epithelial cells from well-defined regions of either HG-PIN (Erg positive) or poorly differentiated adenocarcinoma (Erg negative). We then extracted genomic DNA from these isolated tissues as well as from the whole prostates (i.e., containing both Erg positive and negative lesions) and by genomic DNA PCR analysis (Figure 9A), we verified that in both types of tissues, the Tmprss2-Erg gene fusion was generated effectively via Cre-mediated interstitial deletion, despite the lack of Erg overexpression in adenocarcinomas (Figure 9B). Together, these data suggest that by itself Erg overexpression exerts a weaker selective pressure during prostate cancer progression, whereas deletion of the interstitial genes, some of which are likely haploinsufficient, may play a more important role during progression from PIN to adenocarcinoma.

**T-Δ-Erg/Pten-null tumors exhibit an EMT phenotype**

To investigate the biological mechanisms underlying the more aggressive T-Δ-Erg/Pten-null tumors developed in Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;Pten\textsuperscript{L/L} mice, we performed gene expression profiling using laser capture microdissected prostate epithelial cells to reduce stromal contamination. Only cells with round epithelial-like morphology were excised leaving behind spindle-shaped mesenchymal cells. As an internal control for stage specific differences between cancer lesions developed in control Pb-Cre;Pten\textsuperscript{L/L} males (i.e., mainly HG-PIN) and Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;Pten\textsuperscript{L/L} males (i.e., poorly differentiated adenocarcinoma and HG-PIN), we also excised HG-PIN lesions from Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;Pten\textsuperscript{L/L} mice for analysis. Among the genes differentially regulated between these 3 groups, gene set enrichment analysis (GSEA) [39] revealed that multiple previously defined epithelial-to-mesenchymal transition (EMT) signatures were enriched in T-Δ-Erg/Pten-null tumors compared to control Pten-null HG-PIN lesions (Figure 10A). An enrichment of EMT signatures could also be found when comparing T-Δ-Erg/Pten-null HG-PIN lesions to Pten-null HG-PIN lesions, or when comparing T-Δ-Erg/Pten-null tumors to HG-PIN lesions developed in the same mice. These analyses suggested that the EMT signature in the T-Δ-Erg/Pten-null tumors was not simply due to a tumor stage difference (i.e., poorly differentiated adenocarcinoma versus HG-PIN), but was acquired progressively during prostate cancer progression when under the interstitial deletion background. We validated the EMT signature using IHC for E-Cadherin and Vimentin, which display epithelial and stromal compartment restricted expression, respectively (Figure 10B). E-Cadherin was highly expressed in the epithelial compartment in HG-PIN lesions in Pb-Cre;Pten\textsuperscript{L/L}, Pb-Cre;Δ-Erg/Pten\textsuperscript{L/L} and Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;Pten\textsuperscript{L/L} mice, but was downregulated in T-Δ-Erg/Pten-null tumors. Inversely, Vimentin displayed strict stromal-specific expression in all HG-PIN lesions yet was abundant within epithelial cells of the T-Δ-Erg/Pten-null tumors. In these Pb-Cre-based mice, a conditional Cre-reporter Rosa26-STOP-YFP (R26Y, Cre-mediated excision of a floxed STOP cassette in this allele leads to activation of the YFP reporter) was included to track Pb-Cre-expressing cells and their daughter cells (i.e., YFP\textsuperscript{+} prostate epithelial cells). The presence of EMT features was also verified in immunofluorescent (IF) analyses where the epithelial marker K8 and the lineage marker YFP (for genetic marking) overlapped with Vimentin only in tumor cells but not in HG-PIN lesions. This data suggested that although the EMT program was already upregulated in T-Δ-Erg/Pten-null HG-PIN lesions at the transcript level, changes in the expression of key EMT markers at the protein level appeared at later tumor stages. Lastly, to rule out a possibility in which the poorly differentiated tumors with mesenchymal features developed in Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;Pten\textsuperscript{L/L} mice were due to a desmoplastic response in the stroma (as a response to invasive prostate cancers developing nearby), similar to what was reported recently for the Pb-Cre;T-ETV1;Pten\textsuperscript{L/L} mouse model [19], we stained these tumors for YFP expression and found that they were indeed YFP\textsuperscript{+}, thus confirming that these large poorly differentiated tumors developed in Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;Pten\textsuperscript{L/L} mice were derived from Pb-Cre-mediated recombination and therefore of epithelial origin.

Multiple interstitial genes are candidate prostate cancer tumor suppressors
We next examined whether any interstitial genes could function as tumor suppressors during prostate carcinogenesis to explain the more aggressive nature of the T-A-Erg/Pten-null tumors. To do this, we first generated an “Interstitial genes” gene set composed of protein-coding genes between TMPRSS2 and ERG and then performed GSEA using this gene set. We found that this gene set was significantly downregulated in T-A-Erg/Pten-null tumors when compared to either Pten-null HG-PINs (Figure 11A) or T-A-Erg/Pten-null HG-PINs (Figure 11B). Among the downregulated interstitial genes, ETS2 overexpression has previously been shown to decrease proliferation and invasive ability of VCaP prostate cancer cells [31]; however, other genes such as BRWD1 and BACE2 have so far not been implicated in prostate cancer development. Based on the availability of usable antibodies, we further analyzed expression of several interstitial genes, including Ets2, Hmgn1, and Bace2, in T-A-Erg/Pten-null HG-PIN lesions compared to adenocarcinoma at the protein level (Figure 11C). Bace2 was included as it is the most significantly downregulated gene in the above GSEA analysis (Figure 11A-B). Although Hmgn1 failed to show up in the GSEA analysis, since it has been implicated in prostate cancer as a potential tumor suppressor [27, 28], we also included it in our validation. Expression at the protein level from these genes was abundantly detected in nuclei and cytoplasm of epithelial cells in HG-PIN lesions. In advanced tumors, expression levels were dramatically decreased, although weak cytoplasmic staining could still be observed (Figure 11C). Interestingly, in our GSEA analysis, although the “Interstitial genes” gene set was not significantly enriched in any of the two groups when we compared HG-PIN lesions from Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;Pten<sup>LL</sup> mice to those from Pb-Cre;Pten<sup>L/L</sup> control mice, the above-described interstitial genes such as Ets2, Bace2 and Brwd1 all exhibited a trend of downregulation in T-A-Erg/Pten-null HG-PINs. Lastly, using a previously published human prostate cancer cohort [40], we analyzed whether deletion of interstitial genes predicted biochemical relapse to androgen deprivation therapy. Interestingly, only 4 of 17 interstitial genes including ETS2, BRWD1, HMGN1, and BACE2 were significant for prostate cancer progression (when downregulated), regardless of patient fusion status (Figure 11D). Patients possessing downregulation of the remaining set of interstitial genes did not exhibit differences in disease-free survival compared to those with normal expression levels. Similarly, ERG overexpression was not associated with therapy failure (Figure 11D). Together, these analyses suggest that multiple genes within the TMPRSS2-ERG interstitial region might function as tumor suppressors.

Haploinsufficiency of Ets2 contributes to prostate cancer progression

To directly test whether any interstitial gene could indeed function as a tumor suppressor in prostate cancer, we focused on Ets2 for which a conditional knockout allele is available (Ets2<sup>L+<sup>) [41]. We crossed these mice with Pten<sup>LL</sup> line to generate Ets2<sup>L+<sup>;Pten<sup>LL</sup> mice. We then performed the regeneration assay upon ex vivo exposure of their prostate cells with Ad-CMV-Cre. Similar to Figure 8, Ad-CMV-Cre-infected Pten<sup>LL</sup> control cells formed largely normal ducts with occasional areas of hyperplasia (Figure 12A). In contrast, Ad-CMV-Cre-infected Ets2<sup>L+<sup>;Pten<sup>LL</sup> prostate cells formed small proliferating lesions invading into the lumen, consistent with HG-PIN (Figure 12A). This phenotype was notably weaker than that of the regenerated outgrowths from Ad-CMV-Cre-infected T-3Mb-Erg;Pten<sup>LL</sup> prostate cells (Figure 8), suggesting that other deleted interstitial gene(s) may further contribute to the prostate cancer phenotype. Lastly, we generated Pb-Cre;Ets2<sup>L+<sup>;Pten<sup>LL</sup> and matched control Pb-Cre;Pten<sup>LL</sup> male mice. At 6-month of age, we found that although the anterior lobes of both mice developed HG-PIN lesions of similar severity, the phenotype from the dorsolateral and ventral lobes of the Pb-Cre;Ets2<sup>L+<sup>;Pten<sup>LL</sup> male was notably stronger. Haploinsufficiency of Ets2 resulted in larger HG-PIN lesions in both the dorsolateral and ventral lobes while the latter also contained significantly more stromal proliferation and inflammatory infiltrate (Figure 12B). These data are thus consistent with that from our regeneration assay and further confirmed that Ets2 is a tumor suppressor for prostate cancer.

Candidate #3: TEL/ETV6

Test ETV6 as a potential tumor suppressor in prostate cancer

ETV6 (also known as TEL) is another ETS family transcription factor and it undergoes hemizygous deletion in about 25% of prostate cancers, suggesting it may function as a tumor suppressor in prostate cancer [12].
Furthermore, a partial deletion of ETV6 was observed in a hormone naïve metastatic lymph node sample from a TMPRSS2-ERG fusion-positive prostate cancer patient [12]. This gene was therefore also included in our original proposal as a candidate tumor suppressor to test in our genetic screen. We investigated a potential tumor suppressor role of this ETS factor in prostate tumorigenesis by breeding a conditional knockout allele of Etv6 (Etv6<sup>L</sup>) [from Dr. Stuart Orkin’s group [42]] to the Pb-Cre;Pten<sup>L/L</sup> background. We found that although Etv6-loss alone did not appear to affect prostate cells significantly, it cooperated with full Pten-loss (e.g., in Pb-Cre;Etv6<sup>L/+</sup>;Pten<sup>L/L</sup> males), leading to development of locally invasive prostate adenocarcinoma [e.g., loss in smooth muscle actin (SMA) staining and presence of invasive ducts (Figure 13)] by 12-months of age. Biallelic Etv6 loss did not appear to be more aggressive than single copy loss so far (Figure 13). To determine the molecular changes upon Etv6 loss, we performed laser microdissection of HG-PIN lesions from this model and compared their expression profiling to that of Pten loss alone. By GSEA, we found that one of the most profound changes was actually strong negative enrichment of many gene sets for target genes of the histone mark H3K27Me3, which include a gene set generated from prostate cancer PC3 cell line by ChIP-Chip analysis (Figure 14). This would indicate a potential increase in the polycomb complex 2 (PRC2) activity and in the level of the H3K27Me3 histone mark. We performed antibody staining for the H3K27Me3 mark on prostate sections from various male mice. We found that even loss of one copy of Etv6 under the wild-type background already led to global increase in the H3K27Me3 staining intensity (Figure 15). We also observed this increase under the Pten loss background (Figure 15), thus confirmed our microarray analysis observation. Thus our study suggests that loss of Etv6 in prostate cells may increase the activity of the PRC2 complex, this could be due to increased expression of components in the PRC2 complex, including EZH2, EED or SUZ12, which would then lead to increased H3K27Me3 repressive mark and subsequently downregulation of the PRC2 target genes. To determine whether this correlation could be identified in patient tumor samples, we again analyzed the MSKCC cohort [40]. In fact, we found that most of the prostate cancer cases with ETV6 mRNA downregulation also have increased EZH2 mRNA, but not those of other PRC2 members, such as EED and SUZ12 (Figure 15). In addition, we found most of PRC2 target genes either from literature, or from that ChIP-Chip study in PC3 cells, also exhibited downregulation (Figure 16). Thus, we provided definitive evidence to show that ETV6 is a tumor suppressor in prostate cancer. Since previous studies showed that ERG overexpression may upregulate EZH2 and promote EZH2-mediated dedifferentiation [43], loss of ETV6 may cooperate with TMPRSS2-ERG via further downregulation of PRC2 targets.

**KEY RESEARCH ACCOMPLISHMENTS:**

1. Characterized several Tmprss2-ETS knockin mouse models we generated and published our initial work in *Genes and Development*.
2. Demonstrated a genetic interaction between Nkx3.1-loss and Tmprss2-ERG fusion *in vivo* and provided genetic evidence to show that this interaction is not sufficient to cooperate with Tmprss2-ETS fusions for the development of prostate cancer.
3. Obtained genetic evidence to support that the interstitial deletion in TMPRSS2-ERG fusion positive cases (with deletion) also contributes to development of advanced prostate cancer.
4. Validated ETS2 in the interstitial region as a tumor suppressor in prostate cancer.
5. Obtained the genetic evidence to support that ETV6 is a tumor suppressor in prostate cancer.
6. Demonstrated that loss of ETV6 potentially contributes to prostate tumorigenesis via downregulation of PRC2 targets.

**CONCLUSION:**

In conclusion, we have thoroughly characterized three Tmprss2-ETS knockin mouse models we generated. We found that although ectopic expression of ERG or ETV1 sensitizes prostate cells for cooperation with oncogenic
pathways, such as activation of the PI3K pathway (due to \textit{Pten} loss), they do not appear to cooperate with the oncogenic pathway due to \textit{Nkx3.1} loss. In addition to these observations, we found that genes deleted in the interstitial region between \textit{Tmprss2} and \textit{Erg} appear to cooperate with \textit{Pten}-loss, or both \textit{Pten}-loss and ectopic \textit{Tmprss2-Erg} expression (at the early stage), leading to development of invasive prostate cancer. We validated \textit{ETS2}, another ETS family TF gene in the interstitial region as a tumor suppressor in prostate cancer. Furthermore, by focusing on another ETS family transcription factor, \textit{ETV6}, which is deleted in some prostate cancer cases (including \textit{TMPRSS2-ERG} fusion positive case), we found that \textit{ETV6} is also a tumor suppressor in prostate cancer. Although loss of \textit{Etv6} alone did not seem to affect prostate cells, loss of one copy of \textit{Etv6} was sufficient to cooperate with \textit{Pten}-loss, leading to development of invasive prostate cancer. Mechanistic study showed that loss of \textit{ETV6} may contribute to prostate cancer development via downregulation of PRC2 targets. Since both \textit{ETS2} and \textit{ETV6} are ETS family TFs that are normally expressed in prostate epithelial cells (whereas ETS factors involved in gene fusions, such as ERG and ETV1, are not expressed in normal prostate epithelial cells), our study suggests that there may exist a network of ETS family TFs and oncogenic ETS TFs (e.g., ERG and ETV1) may contribute to prostate tumorigenesis by disrupting the normal functions (e.g., via competition) of tumor suppressive ETS TFs (e.g., \textit{ETS2} and \textit{ETV6}).
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Figure 1. Renal capsule reconstitution of transplanted prostate cells. Prostate cells with the indicated genotypes were infected by lentivirus expressing shRNA for Pten before transplantation. Pten knockdown appears to cooperate with T-ETV1 knockin (middle) moderately; but it only appears to cooperate with T-ERG knockin (right) very weakly, if any.
Figure 2. Nkx3.1-loss modestly increases the Tmprss2 promoter activity in vivo.
A. Progressive Nkx3.1 transcript loss was confirmed in wild type (black) and heterozygous (dark gray) and homozygous (light gray) Nkx3.1 knockout mice by real-time RT-PCR (left). Immunohistochemical (IHC) staining using a mouse-specific Nkx3.1 antibody also validated Nkx3.1 protein loss.
B. Real-time RT-PCR showing slight but statistically significant increase in the Tmprss2-ERG expression in T-ERG;Nkx3.1+/− double heterozygous males.
C. Immunohistochemical (IHC) staining showing increase in ectopic ERG expression at the protein level from the T-ERG knockin allele under the Nkx3.1-null background (T-ERG;Nkx3.1−/−).
D. FACS analysis showing progressive increase in the percentage of GFP⁺ cells in the prostates of T-ERG;Nkx3.1+/− and T-ERG;Nkx3.1−/− males, compared to those of males with T-ERG alone.
Statistics: p values from Student t-test are indicated; ns = not significant. Scale bars represent 50μm.
Figure 3. Heterozygous Nkx3.1-loss does not strongly cooperate with Pten-loss and Tmprss2-ERG expression.

A. Representative histology of male mice with the indicated combinations of Nkx3.1<sup>+-</sup>, Pten<sup>+-</sup>, and T-ERG knockin. Red arrows: HG-PIN lesions due to cooperation between Pten<sup>+-</sup> and T-ERG. Scale bars represent 100μm.

B. Histology summary of aged Pten<sup>+-</sup> (left) and Pten<sup>+-</sup>;Nkx3.1<sup>+-</sup> (right) male mice with or without the T-ERG knockin allele. Notable cooperation was detected with T-ERG (p=0.05 under the Pten<sup>+-</sup> background and p=0.04 under the Pten<sup>+-</sup>;Nkx3.1<sup>+-</sup> background). HG-PIN in any prostate lobe was diagnosed by a trained rodent pathologist.
Figure 4. Total Nkx3.1-loss does not cooperate with Tmprss2-ERG gene fusion to promote prostate tumorigenesis.
A. Representative histology of Nkx3.1<sup>−/−</sup> (left) and T-ERG;Nkx3.1<sup>−/−</sup> (right) mouse prostates stained with H&E. Scarce pleomorphic nuclei are evident (red arrows). Scale bars represent 100 μm.
B. Graphical summary of histological findings of Nkx3.1<sup>−/−</sup> and T-ERG;Nkx3.1<sup>−/−</sup> male mice. There was no significant difference in anterior lobe (AP) hyperplasia frequency (p=0.63). Histology was diagnosed by a trained rodent pathologist.
C. IF staining for respective basal keratin 5 (K5, red) and luminal keratin 8 (K8, green) to visualize prostate architecture in Nkx3.1<sup>−/−</sup> and T-ERG;Nkx3.1<sup>−/−</sup> mice. Nuclei counterstained with DAPI (blue). Scale bars represent 50 μm.
Figure 5. *Nkx3.1*-loss does not cooperate with *Tmprss2-ETV1* expression.
A. Representative histology of *T-ETV1;Nkx3.1* 
+ and *Nkx3.1* 
− prostates in aged mice. H&E stained anterior prostate (AP) is shown. Scale bar represents 100 μm.
B. Graphical summary of histology results from all animals analyzed as shown in A.
Figure 6. Tmprss2-Erg gene fusion generated through interstitial deletion more strongly cooperates with Pten-loss.

A. Representative haematoxylin and eosin (H&E) staining (top row), SMA IHC staining (middle row), and p63 IHC staining (bottom row) of prostate sections from mice with the indicated genotypes. Green arrow denotes discontinuous SMA staining and emergence of epithelial cells through basement membrane. Loss of basal marker p63 was used to validate adenocarcinoma. Red arrows denote p63-expressing (p63⁺) basal cells. Scale bars are 100μm for H&E and 50μm for SMA and p63 staining.

B. Graphical summary of dominant histological lesions observed in aged mouse models of Tmprss2-Erg fusions with (T-3Mb-Erg) or without (T-ERG) interstitial deletion.

C. Progressive lesions developed in Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;Pten⁻/⁻ mice. IF staining for luminal marker K8 (green), basal marker K5 (red), and DAPI (blue) showing loss of K5⁺ basal cells in moderately and poorly differentiated adenocarcinomas. Scale bars are 50μm.
Figure 7. Erg overexpression required for early PIN formation but not for advanced tumor progression.
A. IHC staining depicting Erg (top row) and AR (bottom row) expression in typical prostate lesions from various Tmprss2-Erg models. Erg-positive endothelial cells (i.e., brown cells in section from Pb-Cre;Pten$^{L/L}$ control) serve as an internal control for Erg staining in all models. Scale bars are 100μm.
B. Progressive lesions developed in Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;Pten$^{L/L}$ mice. IHC staining for Erg showing progressive loss of Erg positivity in advanced cancer lesions. Scale bars are 50μm.
C. Summary of percentage of Erg-positive epithelial cells in T-ERG;Pten-null and T-Δ-Erg;Pten-null lesions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Genotype</th>
<th>Tissue type</th>
<th>Erg positivity (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pb-Cre, T-ERG, Pten$^{L/L}$</td>
<td>HG-PIN</td>
<td>1160/1245 = 93.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pb-Cre, T-3Mb-Erg, Pten$^{L/L}$</td>
<td>HG-PIN</td>
<td>1514/3104 = 48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>MD adenocarcinoma</td>
<td>732/2306 = 31.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PD adenocarcinoma</td>
<td>3/1569 = 0.002%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 8. Prostate regeneration assay showing cooperation of ectopic Erg expression with Pten-loss.
Prostate regeneration assay using Pten$^{L/L}$, T-ERG;Pten$^{L/L}$ or T-Δ-Erg;Pten$^{L/L}$ cells infected with Cre-expressing adenovirus prior to implantation. Blue arrows denote low-grade PIN (LG-PIN) while red arrows denote high-grade (HG-PIN) lesions. Scale bars are 50μm.
Figure 9. Confirmation of Cre-mediated deletion in T-∆-Erg;Pten-null lesions
A. Schematic diagram showing PCR strategy (primers 1+2) to detect Cre-mediated excision of the 3Mb interstitial region and generation of the Tmprss2-Erg fusion at the same time.
B. PCR analysis of genomic DNA prepared from HG-PIN lesions (Erg+) or large poorly differentiated adenocarcinomas (Erg-) isolated from Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;Pten<sup>L/L</sup> prostates by laser-capture microdissection confirmed Cre-mediated excision and creation of the Tmprss2-Erg gene fusion (detected by primers 1 and 2); primers specific for the wild type Tmprss2 allele and the unexcised T-3Mb-Erg allele were used as controls. All three mice (Mouse #1-3) were Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;Pten<sup>L/L</sup> males.
Figure 10. **T-Δ-Erg/Pten-null tumors exhibit an EMT phenotype.**

A. GSEA results showing highly significant (FDR<0.25) enrichment of multiple EMT gene sets in T-Δ-Erg/Pten-null tumors in relation to HG-PIN lesions in Pb-Cre;Pten<sup>L/L</sup> control males. The gene sets are from the c2 CGP (chemical and genetic perturbations) collection of MSigDB (http://www.broadinstitute.org/gsea/msigdb/index.jsp).

B. IHC confirmation of EMT features in T-Δ-Erg/Pten-null tumors using E-cadherin (top rows) and Vimentin (bottom rows) staining. Control Pten-null and T-ERG/Pten-null HG-PINs (left panels), T-Δ-Erg/Pten-null HG-PIN (middle panel, black arrows), and T-Δ-Erg/Pten-null tumors (middle panel, red arrows; right panel) are shown. Scale bars are 50μm.
Figure 11. Multiple interstitial genes are candidate prostate cancer tumor suppressors.

A-B. GSEA for the “Interstitial genes” showing significant (FDR<0.25) negative enrichment (i.e., downregulation) of this gene set in T-Δ-Erg/Pten-null tumors in relation to Pten-null HG-PINs (A) or T-Δ-Erg/Pten-null HG-PINs (B). In A and B, Enrichment plots are shown on the left, heat maps are shown on the right.

C. Expression of select interstitial genes, Ets2, Hmgn1, and Bace2 were significantly lower in adenocarcinoma (bottom row) compared to HG-PIN lesions (top row) in Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;PtenL/L mice. Scale bars are 50μm.

D. Kaplan-Meier curves of human patient data reveals that downregulation of several interstitial genes (top row) predict biochemical relapse from androgen deprivation therapy, whereas some do not (bottom row). Blue lines depict patients with normal expression while patients with downregulation are red lines.
Figure 12. Haploinsufficiency of *Ets2* contributes to prostate cancer progression under the *Pten*-null background.

**A.** Prostate regeneration assay using *Pten*\(^{L/L}\) or *Ets2*\(^{L/+};Pten*\(^{L/L}\) prostate cells infected with *Ad-CMV-Cre* adenovirus prior to implantation. Red arrow denotes a lesion resembling HG-PIN. Scale bars are 50\(\mu m\).

**B.** H&E staining showing enhanced Prostate cancer phenotype in a 6-month old *P\(b\)-Cre;Ets2*\(^{L/+};Pten*\(^{L/L}\) male compared to its matched *P\(b\)-Cre;Pten*\(^{L/L}\) control male, particularly in the dorsolateral and ventral lobes. Scale bars are 100\(\mu m\).
**Figure 13.** *Etv6*-loss cooperates with *Pten*-loss to drive development of invasive prostate cancer.

Top row shows H&E staining of prostate sections from male mice with the indicated genotypes. Arrow: invasive ducts; Stars: locally invasive prostate cancers. Lower row shows IHC staining of smooth muscle actin (SMA), which is a basal marker. Arrows: regions with loss of SMA+ basal cells (a sign of invasive prostate cancer).
Negative enrichment of many gene sets for H3K27Me3 targets in PbCre,Etv6\textsuperscript{\textless/\textless};Pten\textsuperscript{\textless/\textless} HGPINs vs. PbCre;Pten\textsuperscript{\textless/\textless} HGPINs - due to increase in PRC2 activity (lead to increased H3K27Me3)?

Figure 14. GSEA analysis showing downregulation of multiple gene sets for H3K27Me3 target genes in prostate HG-PIN lesions with Etv6-loss (negative correlation).

Gene Set: KONDO_PROSTATE_CANCER_WITH_H3K27ME3
Top 200 genes with high histone H3 trimethylation mark at K27 (H3K27me3) in PC3 cells (prostate cancer), by ChIP-chip assay on an 88K microarray (all promoters)
Figure 15. IHC staining showing increased H3K27Me3 histone mark signal (brown cells) upon Etv6-loss.
Figure 16. cBioPortal analysis showing downregulation of EZH2 target genes in prostate cancer cases (from the MSKCC cohort) with downregulation of ETV6 and upregulation of EZH2.
ETV1 directs androgen metabolism and confers aggressive prostate cancer in targeted mice and patients
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Distinguishing aggressive from indolent disease and developing effective therapy for advanced disease are the major challenges in prostate cancer research. Chromosomal rearrangements involving ETS transcription factors, such as ERG and ETV1, occur frequently in prostate cancer. How they contribute to tumorigenesis and whether they play similar or distinct in vivo roles remain elusive. Here we show that in mice with ERG or ETV1 targeted to the endogenous \textit{Tmprss2} locus, either factor cooperated with loss of a single copy of \textit{Pten}, leading to localized cancer, but only ETV1 appeared to support development of invasive adenocarcinoma under the background of full \textit{Pten} loss. Mechanistic studies demonstrated that ERG and ETV1 control a common transcriptional network but largely in an opposing fashion. In particular, while ERG negatively regulates the androgen receptor (AR) transcriptional program, ETV1 cooperates with AR signaling by favoring activation of the AR transcriptional program. Furthermore, we found that ETV1 expression, but not that of ERG, promotes autonomous testosterone production. Last, we confirmed the association of an ETV1 expression signature with aggressive disease and poorer outcome in patient data. The distinct biology of ETV1-associated prostate cancer suggests that this disease class may require new therapies directed to underlying programs controlled by ETV1.
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Prostate cancer is a heterogeneous disease. Recent studies show little benefit from prostate-specific antigen (PSA) screening and radical prostatectomy for men with lower-risk disease [Wilt et al. 2012]. A central challenge in management is identification of those men with prostate cancer whose disease will eventually progress to the lethal castration-resistant stage. Understanding molecular events leading to castration-resistant prostate cancer (CRPC) is critical for the development of improved therapies for such patients.

Chromosomal rearrangements involving genes encoding ETS transcription factors [notably, ERG and ETV1] are found in $\sim$50% of human prostate cancer cases and likely constitute the most frequent gene rearrangements in human malignancies [Tomlins et al. 2005; Gopalan et al. 2009]. The translocations place the coding regions of \textit{ERG} or \textit{ETV1} under the control of androgen-responsive promoters, such as \textit{Tmprss2}, thereby activating expression in response to androgens. \textit{Tmprss2} has been reported as the principal 5’ fusion partner of \textit{ERG}, whereas more heterogeneous 5’ fusion partners, such as \textit{Tmprss2}, \textit{Scl4A3}, or \textit{AcsL3}, have been described for \textit{ETV1} [Tomlins et al. 2007; Attard et al. 2008b]. The majority of these 5’ fusion
partners are also androgen-responsive genes. As ETS proteins, ERG and ETV1 are involved in regulation of cell growth, proliferation, differentiation, and apoptosis through activation or repression of target genes [Oikawa and Yamada 2003]. Although functional overlap among different members of the ETS family exists, individual ETS factors also serve distinct roles. Thus, the expression pattern of ETS members through development varies, along with their repertoire of target genes, biological processes regulated, and oncogenic potentials [Seth and Watson 2005; Kunderfranco et al. 2010; Wei et al. 2010; Hollenhorst et al. 2011].

Clinical studies of the prevalence and prognostic significance of ETS fusions in prostate cancer have yielded discrepant results, possibly related to differences in the genetics of the evaluated populations and diversity in methods used. Several studies suggest that ETS fusions are associated with a worse prognosis [Deminichis et al. 2007; Nam et al. 2007; Attard et al. 2008a], whereas others have failed to confirm the correlation [Gopalan et al. 2009; Hermans et al. 2009; Minner et al. 2011]. Cases with ETS fusions are generally grouped together for patient stratification. However, considering all ETS translocations as a single entity risks obscuring possible differences in the contribution of each to disease outcome. For example, effects of TMPRSS2-ERG, the most common translocation, may bias findings of aggregate studies. Studies to date have not specifically addressed the biology of individual ETS fusions and their associated outcomes.

In this study, we used knock-in mouse modeling and comprehensive genome-wide approaches to characterize the functional specificities of ERG and ETV1 in prostate cancer. Our data indicate that ERG and ETV1 regulate a common set of genes, such as androgen receptor (AR) target genes, but in an opposing direction. In particular, ETV1, but not ERG, up-regulates expression of AR target genes as well as genes involved in steroid biosynthesis and metabolism. This ETV1-driven oncogenic program predisposes prostate cells for cooperation with other oncogenic events, such as PTEN loss, leading to more aggressive disease in murine models and human patients. Our findings further establish different biological subtypes of human prostate cancer based on distinct ETS factor-driven signatures.

**Results**

**Tmprss2-ETV1 cooperates with total Pten loss, leading to invasive adenocarcinoma**

As a step toward defining the roles of ETS fusions in prostate cancer, several groups have generated transgenic mouse strains that express ERG or ETV1 ectopically under the control of the Probasin (Pb) promoter [Pb-ERG or Pb-ETV1] [Tomlins et al. 2007, 2008; Klezovitch et al. 2008; Carver et al. 2009; King et al. 2009; Shin et al. 2009]. Interpretation of results has varied. Prostatic intraepithelial neoplasia (PIN)-like lesions have been described in prostates of Pb-ERG and Pb-ETV1 transgenic males [Tomlins et al. 2007, 2008; Klezovitch et al. 2008; Shin et al. 2009]. However, others have reported that Pb-ERG transgenic males are normal [Carver et al. 2009; King et al. 2009]. Discrepant findings may be related to mouse strain differences, to different transgene integration sites, or in the precise portions of the ETS cDNAs that were expressed. We reasoned that mice engineered to express ETS factors from an endogenous promoter in the proper chromosomal configuration might provide a more relevant biological context. Moreover, prior transgenic models cannot address potential contributions of haploinsufficiency or loss of genes deleted between TMPRSS2 and ERG to prostate tumorigenesis, such as occurs in patients with a TMPRSS2-ERG fusion generated through an interstitial deletion of chromosome 21.

We engineered knock-in mouse models to recapitulate TMPRSS2-ETS fusions [with or without the interstitial deletion] in prostate cancer. We used two strategies. In the first strategy, we knocked in N terminus-truncated human ERG or ETV1 cDNA, together with an ires-GFP cassette, into exon 2 of the mouse Tmprss2 locus [referred to as T-ERG or T-ETV1 hereafter], which shares ~80% homology as well as at least two conserved AR-binding sites with those of the human TMPRSS2 [Fig. 1A; Supplemental Fig. S1; Jacquinet et al. 2000]. The resultant fusion transcripts recapitulate the TMPRSS2-ERGa or TMPRSS2-ETV1a fusions in patients [Tomlins et al. 2005]. In the second strategy, we used sequential gene targeting to introduce loxP sites into the Tmprss2 and Erg loci on the same chromosome [Fig. 1A, Supplemental Fig. S2A,B]. Cre-mediated recombination deletes the ~3-Mb intragenic region and generates the Tmprss2-Erg fusion gene [Supplemental Fig. S2C,D], which approximates the TMPRSS2-ERGa fusion subtype [Tomlins et al. 2005]. Since most genes in this interstitial region are syntenic between humans and mice [Supplemental Fig. S2E], this unique knock-in model also permits assessment of the contribution of the interstitial deletion to prostate cancer development [referred to as T-3Mb-Erg or T-Δ-Erg before or after Cre-mediated excision of the interstitial region, respectively] [Fig. 1A]. In all three knock-in alleles [i.e., T-ETV1, T-ERG, and T-Δ-Erg] we confirmed expression of their corresponding fusion transcripts in prostates [Fig. 1B]. By immunohistochemistry (IHC), we detected moderate expression of Erg protein in the knock-in prostates [Fig. 1C]. Despite multiple efforts, we were unable to validate an antibody that faithfully detects ETV1 protein by IHC. Therefore, we used IHC staining for GFP as a surrogate for ETV1 expression, as the knock-in GFP reporter is under the same transcriptional control [Fig. 1A]. With this approach, we detected robust GFP [ETV1] expression in prostate epithelial cells but not in stromal cells [Fig. 1D]. In all three knock-in strains, prostate appeared largely normal, and we did not observe prostatic intraepithelial neoplasia (PIN) lesions or cancer [Fig. 1E]. However, in a portion of T-ETV1 males (four out of 11), in particular those at old ages (≥18 mo; three out of three), we observed varying degrees of inflammation [Fig. 1E]. In addition, pathological analysis in several exceptional T-Δ-Erg males [four out of 21 but in none of the T-ERG
males) revealed some hyperplasia and foci of cells with lightly stained cytoplasm and loss of polarity (Fig. 1E). Despite these minor phenotypes, we conclude that expression of ERG or ETV1 from the endogenous Tmprss2 promoter, even in the presence of the interstitial deletion (for Erg fusion), is insufficient to initiate prostate tumorigenesis.

Overexpression of ERG or ETV1 from the Pb promoter or through lentiviral transduction in prostate cells has been previously reported to cooperate with activation of the PI3K pathway to drive a more aggressive prostate cancer phenotype (Carver et al. 2009; King et al. 2009; Zong et al. 2009). To determine whether this is also the case when ETV1 or ERG is expressed from the endogenous Tmprss2 promoter, we bred mice containing the knock-in alleles with Pten+/- mice. We found that within the time frame monitored (up to 15 mo of age), prostates of all aged T-ETV1;Pten+/-, T-ERG;Pten+/-, and T-D-Erg;Pten+/- double-mutant males developed PIN lesions that stain positive for phosphorylated AKT (pAKT), whereas prostates of Pten+/- alone mice appeared largely normal (Fig. 2A; Supplemental Fig. S3). In the above cohort, PIN lesions from double-mutant males maintained relatively uniform and high levels of ETV1 (GFP) or ERG expression (Fig. 2B); this is particularly notable for ERG, as in the prostates of ERG knock-in alone, ERG expression was
initially relatively weak and heterogeneous (Fig. 1C). Thus, overexpression of ETV1 or ERG correlates with the observed localized premalignant phenotype.

To test cooperation of Tmprss2-ETS with total loss of Pten (Wu et al. 2001) to inactivate a conditional knockout allele of Pten (Lesche et al. 2002) and generated Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;PtenL/L males and Pb-Cre; TETV1;PtenL/L males. Prostate cancer development in these models was tracked by pAKT expression (Supplemental Fig. S4). Under our housing and genetic background (mixed C57/BL6-129), Pb-Cre;PtenL/L males developed localized PIN lesions that slowly progressed to prostate adenocarcinomas. In contrast, the Pten loss-driven prostate cancer phenotype in Pb-Cre;TETV1;PtenL/L males was markedly enhanced. The majority of Pb-Cre; TETV1;PtenL/L males died before 1 yr of age, possibly due in part to large prostatic cyst formation [Supplemental Fig. S5]. In contrast, the majority of Pb-Cre;PtenL/L and Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;PtenL/L males survived to at least 1 yr of age (Fig. 2C). On histology, we observed aggressive GFP+ (from the T-ETV1 allele) prostate adenocarcinoma cells invading into stroma in Pb-Cre;TETV1;PtenL/L prostates [Fig. 2D, panels c,d]. Prostate cancer cells metastasized locally to the urogenital area (e.g., in lymphatic vessel)
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that of the prostate phenotype appeared indistinguishable from Pb-Cre;T-3Mb-Erg;PtenL/L Pten loss background. In contrast, ETV1 expression appeared strictly needed in invasive cancers under the total loss for the development of invasive adenocarcinomas (Fig. 2D, panel d). In summary, we found that while both Tmprss2-ETV1 and Tmprss2-ERG cooperate with loss of a single copy of Pten in the development of localized prostate cancer, only Tmprss2-ETV1 appears to cooperate with full loss of Pten, leading to invasive prostate adenocarcinoma and decreased survival.

ERG and ETV1 regulate distinct programs in immortalized nontumorigenic prostate cells

The genetically engineered knock-in mice distinguished ETV1 from ERG in supporting invasive adenocarcinoma. To gain mechanistic insights into this difference, we performed an integrated genomic analysis to identify their respective target genes. First, we ectopically expressed ETV1 or ERG in immortalized human non-tumorigenic prostate epithelial cells, RWPE-1 cells. Thus, RWPE-1 cells were engineered to express full-length ERG or ETV1 cDNA carrying a substrate tag that permits in vivo biotinylation by coexpressed Escherichia coli biotin ligase BirA [bioERG and bioETV1] [Supplemental Fig. S8A,B]. RWPE-1 cells overexpressing bioERG [R.ERG] or bioETV1 [R.ETV1] proliferated normally compared with controls [Supplemental Fig. S8C]. Microarray expression profiling data strongly overlapped with those previously reported [ERG [Gupta et al. 2010] and ETV1 [Tomlins et al. 2007] in RWPE-1 cells [Supplemental Fig. S8D,E] and yielded two findings. First, a set of genes was uniquely regulated by either ERG or ETV1. Second, both factors also regulated a common set of genes but in a largely opposing fashion [Fig. 3A]. This latter observation is depicted by the quantitative two-dimensional comparison of the ERG and ETV1 data sets, which illustrates a statistically significant correlation between ERG-driven up-regulated genes and ETV1-driven down-regulated genes and vice versa [Fig. 3B]. Gene ontology [GO] and Ingenuity pathway analysis [IPA] implicated genes up-regulated upon ERG expression and down-regulated upon ETV1 expression that are associated with cell proliferation. In contrast, genes down-regulated on ERG expression and up-regulated by ETV1 are correlated with cell motility and lipid metabolism [Supplemental Fig. S9]. As revealed by quantitative RT-PCR of select common genes, ETV1 expression induced up-regulation of genes involved in AR signaling [TMPRSS2 and SOX9] or invasion and lipid metabolism [VIMENTIN, ADRB2, and ACSL3] as well as down-regulation of cell cycle genes [E2F1 and BRCA1] [Fig. 3C]. In contrast, these genes exhibited largely an opposite expression pattern in ERG-expressing RWPE-1 cells [Fig. 3C]. Thus, these data point to distinct regulatory programs driven by ERG and ETV1 in nontumorigenic prostate cells.

ERG and ETV1 have shared and distinct chromatin targets

To interrogate further similarities and differences of ERG and ETV1 transcriptional programs, we performed ChIP [chromatin immunoprecipitation] on-chip analysis. We identified ERG ChIP targets in VCaP cells [harboring TMPRSS2-ERG] by an anti-ERG antibody. As a ChIP-quality antibody for ETV1 is not available, we used the bio-ChIP approach [Supplemental Fig. S10A; de Boer et al. 2003; Wang et al. 2006; Kim et al. 2008] on LNCaP cells [harboring ETV1 fusions] ectopically expressing bioETV1 and the E. coli biotin ligase BirA [Supplemental Fig. S10B]. On comparison of ERG and ETV1 ChIP targets, we identified three subsets: ERG–ETV1 common targets, ERG-only targets, and ETV1-only targets [Fig. 4A], which are consistent with reported ChIP-seq [ChIP combined with deep sequencing] data in RWPE-1 cells [Hollenhorst et al. 2011]. Bound regions for each factor were typically in close proximity to the transcription start sites [TSSs] [Supplemental Fig. S10C,D]. We confirmed that ERG–ETV1 common target regions were occupied by both ERG and ETV1. As anticipated, ETS-binding motifs are the most statistically significant enriched motifs within the predicted targets [Fig. 4B]. Further analysis of the defined target subsets revealed clear differences of motif enrichment at common versus unique targets [Fig. 4B]. Supplemental Fig. S10E), consistent with expression profiling data indicating distinct biological processes regulated by ERG and ETV1 in prostate cells [Supplemental Figs. S9A,B, S10F].
Interestingly, IPA analysis indicated that nuclear receptor signaling pathways, including those associated with estrogen, androgen, and glucocorticoid receptor signaling, were significantly enriched in ERG–ETV1 common targets (Fig. 4C). In contrast, the ERG-only subset correlated with the cell cycle network. Intriguingly, the lipid metabolism biological network as well as the Oncostatin M and IL-3 signaling pathways, which have been correlated with increased cell motility and invasiveness (Dentelli et al. 1999; Holzer et al. 2004), were enriched in the ETV1-only subset (Fig. 4C). Taken together, our combined gene expression and ChIP-on-chip analyses argue that ERG and ETV1 control distinct transcriptional programs in prostate cells.

**ERG and ETV1 interact differentially with the AR signaling pathway**

The AR pathway is a critical driver of tumorigenic prostate development in both androgen-dependent (AD) and castration-resistant stages (Wang et al. 2009). Our data suggest that genes associated with AR signaling belong to the ERG–ETV1 common target category (Fig. 4C, Supplementary Fig. S11A). To address potential cross-talk of ERG and ETV1 common targets with the AD program, we defined an improved androgen-driven signature from AD VCaP and LNCaP cell lines that mitigates differences among diverse expression-based gene sets (Supplemental Fig. S12). Gene set enrichment analysis (GSEA) (Subramanian et al. 2005) revealed that this signature was significantly depleted after ETV1 knockdown in LNCaP cells [Fig. 5A] but enhanced in VCaP cells upon ERG silencing [Fig. 5B]. This finding was confirmed by quantitative RT–PCR for select AR-driven genes in LNCaP and VCaP cells [Figure 5C,D]. ChIP analysis further demonstrated that, while androgen stimulated AR and ETV1 binding to the enhancers and promoters of two established AR targets, PSA and TMPRSS2, androgen decreased ERG occupancy to these AR target genes (Supplemental Fig. S11B,C). These data indicate that ETV1 cooperates with activation of AR signaling, while ERG negatively modulates the AR transcriptional program.

To determine whether ERG and ETV1 also regulate AR signaling differentially in vivo, we examined GFP expression in T-ERG and T-ETV1 males, as the reporter serves as a surrogate for the in vivo activity of the Tmprss2 promoter in these identically engineered mice. GFP expression was readily detected in T-ETV1 prostates but barely detected in T-ERG prostate cells. GFP expression was down-regulated in T-ERG prostate cells. This finding was confirmed by quantitative RT–PCR for select AR-driven genes in LNCaP and VCaP cells [Figure 5C,D]. ChIP analysis further demonstrated that, while androgen stimulated AR and ETV1 binding to the enhancers and promoters of two established AR targets, PSA and TMPRSS2, androgen decreased ERG occupancy to these AR target genes (Supplemental Fig. S11B,C). These data indicate that ETV1 cooperates with activation of AR signaling, while ERG negatively modulates the AR transcriptional program.

To ascertain whether elevated AR signaling up-regulates the Tmprss2 promoter activity in vivo, we bred T-ERG and T-ETV1 males to transgenic mice that express a mutated version of AR (E231G) expressed from the Pb promoter (Pb-AR) (Han et al. 2005). In Pb-AR T-ERG double-transgenic males, we detected a strong GFP signal in the prostate [Fig. 5E]. The Pb-AR transgene is most
active in the ventral prostate lobes [Han et al. 2005]. In accord with this, we observed stronger staining for ERG in the ventral lobes of Pb-AR;T-ERG prostates, compared with barely detectable ERG staining in T-ERG prostates (Fig. 5F). Furthermore, we measured expression levels of select AR targets in mouse prostates. In the Pb-AR background, most AR targets were down-regulated in T-ERG males, whereas AR targets were typically up-regulated in T-ETV1 males, thus illustrating the opposite regulation of AR signaling by ERG and ETV1 in vivo (Fig. 5G). Despite elevated AR signaling, prostates of Pb-AR-alone as well as those of Pb-AR;T-ERG and Pb-AR;T-ETV1 males appeared largely normal. Taken together, human prostate cancer cell and mouse model data indicate that differential regulation of the AR pathway by ETV1 and ERG occurs not only in vitro, but, importantly, also under the physiological setting.

**ETV1 directs androgen metabolism in prostate epithelial cells**

In addition to the opposing regulation of common targets by ETV1 and ERG, we hypothesized that unique targets controlled by ETV1 might contribute to the aggressive phenotype seen in association with ETV1 expression. To gain mechanistic insights into programs selectively regulated by ETV1 we sorted GFP<sup>+</sup> [thus, ETV1-expressing] prostate luminal cells from T-ETV1 knock-in males and compared them with luminal cells from wild-type prostates by microarray expression profiling (Fig. 6A,B). We confirmed the luminal cell expression pattern in both sorted samples [Supplemental Fig. S14]. By GSEA, we identified several cancer-associated metabolic pathways that were enriched in T-ETV1 luminal cells (Supplemental Fig. S15A). Of note, cholesterol and steroid biosynthesis pathways, both of which are strongly related to prostate tumorigenesis [Twiddy et al. 2010; Zadra et al. 2010], were most highly enriched (Fig. 6C,D). On analysis of a patient cohort with CRPCs metastatic to bone [Stanbrough et al. 2006], we observed that genes associated with the steroid hormone biosynthesis pathway and androgen and estrogen metabolism are significantly enriched in tumors with higher ETV1 expression [Supplemental Fig. S15A]. *HSD17B7*, a gene shared by steroid biosynthesis and steroid hormone biosynthesis pathways, was up-regulated in both T-ETV1 luminal cells and ETV1-high bone metastases [Supplemental Fig. S15B]. *HSD17B7* as well as other HSD17B enzyme genes (*HSD17B4* and *HSD17B10*) are ChIP targets of ETV1 in prostate cancer cells and are components of the lipid metabolism.
network enriched in ETV1-only ChIP targets (Fig. 4C; Supplemental Fig. S15C). By independent ChIP analysis, we validated ETV1, but not ERG, binding to the HSD17B7 and HSD17B4 promoters (Fig. 6E; Supplemental Fig. S15D). Expression of HSD17B7 in LNCaP cells was reduced upon ETV1 depletion (Fig. 6F). In ETV1-over-expressing RWPE-1 cells, HSD17B7 expression trended upward (although not statistically significant) (Supplemental Fig. S16A). We also confirmed higher Hsd17b7 expression in lineage-depleted T-ETV1 prostate cells (Fig. 6G). Since HSD17B7 is critical in converting less active forms of estrogen and androgen to more active forms (Fig. 6H; Krazeisen et al. 1999), and Tmprss2 is an androgen and estrogen dual-responsive gene, we reasoned that up-regulation of the steroid biosynthesis pathway by ETV1 may provide prostate cells with an intrinsic source of steroids. If this supposition were correct, such cells might be intrinsically castration-resistant. To test this prediction, T-ETV1 knock-in males as well as T-ERG and wild-type control males were castrated. We observed that almost half of prostate cells from the castrated T-ETV1 mice were GFP+ (Supplemental Fig. S16B), consistent with a recent study and possibly reflecting the existence of a subpopulation of Tmprss2+ prostate cells that are intrinsically castration-resistant.

**Figure 5.** ERG and ETV1 regulate AR signaling in an opposite manner. (A) Androgen-induced genes are depleted in ETV1-silenced LNCaP cells upon 16-h androgen stimulation [left] no androgen stimulation, [right] with androgen stimulation. The androgen-induced signature was obtained from the common AR ChIP targets in LNCaP and VCaP cells that were up-regulated in them upon androgen stimulation. (B) Androgen-induced genes are significantly enriched in ERG-silenced VCaP cells upon 16-h androgen stimulation compared with controls [left] no androgen stimulation, [right] with androgen stimulation. (C,D) ETV1 silencing specifically decreases expression of AR-associated genes (C), whereas ERG silencing increases their expression (D). Mean, n = 3; error bars, SEM; t-test: (*) P < 0.05; (**) P < 0.01. If no P-value is indicated, P > 0.05. (E) Flow cytometry analysis demonstrating robust GFP+ population in the T-ETV1 prostates but not in the T-ERG prostates. However, in the presence of the Pb-AR transgene, GFP expression can be readily detected in Pb-AR;T-ERG prostates; in addition, GFP expression in Pb-AR;T-ETV1 prostates appear to be further elevated. (F) IHC staining showing weak ERG staining in the ventral lobe of a T-ERG knock-in male (blue arrow; compared with strong Erg staining in the endothelial cells [black arrow]) but much stronger ERG staining in the ventral lobe of a Pb-AR;T-ERG male (blue arrow; almost comparable with ERG staining in endothelial cells in the same section [black arrow]). Bars, 50 μm. (G) Real-time PCR quantification showing up-regulation of most AR target genes in Pb-AR;T-ETV1 prostates and slight down-regulation of them in Pb-AR;T-ERG prostates in relation to those of Pb-AR-alone prostates. Mean, n = 3; error bars, SEM; t-test: (*) P < 0.05, (**) P < 0.01. If no P-value is indicated, P > 0.05.
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**Figure 6.** ETV1 regulates steroid metabolism in prostate cells. (A, right plot) Flow cytometry profiles and gating strategies showing GFP+ prostate luminal cells (Lin Sca-1 CD49fmed) sorted from T-ETV1 knock-in males used for microarray analysis. (Left plot) The Lin Sca-1 CD49fmed prostate luminal cells sorted from wild-type (WT) control males were used as the control. (B) Real-time PCR quantification confirming ectopic ETV1 expression in sorted GFP+ prostate luminal cells from T-ETV1 knock-in mice (mean, n = 3 samples per group; error bars, SEM). (C, D) Steroid and cholesterol biosynthesis pathways are the top pathways significantly enriched in T-ETV1 knock-in prostate luminal cells compared with controls. Note that a critical enzyme in the steroid biosynthesis pathway, HSD17B7, is also a key enzyme in the steroid hormone biosynthesis pathway, which is enriched in metastatic prostate cancers (Supplemental Fig. S15). (E) ChIP-PCR validation of ETV1 binding to HSD17B7 [pB7], HSD17B4 [pB4], and HSD17B10 [pB10] promoters (mean, n = 5; error bars, SEM). (F) Only HSD17B7 levels significantly decreased upon knockdown of ETV1 (k/d) (mean, n = 3, error bars, SEM) under both the androgen-deprivation condition [CH-T] charcoal-treated] and the regular condition in the presence of serum (FBS). Conversely, HSD17B7 expression increased upon ETV1 overexpression in RPWE-1 cells (Supplemental Fig. S16A). t-test: (***) P < 0.001. If no P-value is indicated, P > 0.05. (G) ETV1 overexpression in RWPE-1 cells promoted the elevation of the endogenous testosterone level, while no changes were observed upon ERG overexpression (mean, n = 4; error bars, SEM). Testosterone levels per 10⁶ cells (R.ETV1 mean = 642.16 pg/μL; R.ERG mean = 0.49 pg/μL; R.CTL mean = 1.89 pg/μL). t-test: (***) P < 0.001. (H) Schematic diagram showing the key role of 17-β HSD enzymes, including HSD17B7, in converting androgen and estrogen from their less active forms to active forms. (I) ETV1 overexpression in RWPE-1 cells promoted the elevation of the endogenous testosterone level, while no changes were observed upon ERG overexpression (mean, n = 4; error bars, SEM). Testosterone levels per 10⁶ cells (R.ETV1 mean = 642.16 pg/μL; R.ERG mean = 0.49 pg/μL; R.CTL mean = 1.89 pg/μL). t-test: (***) P < 0.001. (J) Testosterone levels were reduced in androgen-deprived (charcoal-treated) LNCaP cells upon stable ETV1 silencing (k/d) as compared with controls (mean, n = 3; error bars, SEM). (NSC) Nonsilencing shRNA control. Testosterone levels per 10⁶ cells (NSC mean = 74.69 pg/μL; R.ERG mean = 0.49 pg/μL; ETV1k/d mean = 0.56 pg/μL). t-test: (***) P < 0.001.

resistant (Casey et al. 2012). As expected, the castration-resistant GFP+ cells in T-ETV1 males exhibited higher Hsd17b7 levels than controls (Supplemental Fig. S16C).
of endogenous testosterone in control, ETV1-expressing, and ERG-expressing human RWPE-1 cells. Remarkably, ETV1-expressing RWPE-1 cells showed much higher levels (>300-fold higher) of endogenous testosterone compared with ERG-expressing and control RWPE-1 cells (Fig. 6f, Supplemental Fig. S17A,B). Conversely, ETV1 knockdown in LNCaP cells reduced testosterone production under conditions of androgen deprivation (Fig. 6j). To further characterize this observation, we quantified the intra-prostatic levels of testosterone in wild-type, T-ETV1, and T-ERG mice under noncastrated and castrated conditions. As expected, noncastrated mice showed very low concentrations of testosterone in their prostate cells. Interestingly, castrated T-ETV1 mice indeed exhibited higher testosterone levels than those of castrated wild-type and T-ERG prostate samples [Supplemental Fig. S17C]. These results indicate that ETV1 expression directly regulates androgen production in prostate cells.

ETV1-only gene sets associate with an aggressive phenotype in patients

Data to this point suggest that ETV1 and its unique oncogenic program contribute to invasive prostate cancer. To relate these findings to patients, we analyzed data from a patient cohort that includes 22 primary localized and 29 metastatic samples, of which ~50% carried the TMPRSS2-ERG fusion [ETV1 rearrangement status not characterized] (Stanbrough et al. 2006). In this cohort, samples exhibiting higher ETV1 expression correlated with localized tumors, whereas high ETV1 expression enriched for metastases [Fig. 7A]. We repeated the analysis with an independent cohort of 150 prostate tumor samples from patients at Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Center [MSKCC] (Taylor et al. 2010). A correlation between high ETV1 expression and metastases and the presence of more localized prostate tumors in the high ERG expression group were confirmed in this second cohort [Fig. 7B]. Samples with high ERG or high ETV1 expression did not overlap, consistent with a strong tendency to mutual exclusivity in both primary and metastatic samples [Supplemental Fig. S18A,B]. We next interrogated whether ERG and ETV1 cooperate similarly with PTEN deletion in the MSKCC cohort by analyzing the outcome of patients carrying deletion of PTEN and overexpression of ERG or ETV1. High ERG expression with PTEN loss failed to correlate with the worse outcome [Fig. 7C]. In contrast, high ETV1 expression cooperated with PTEN loss, as shown by much poorer disease-free survival [Fig. 7D]. These data are consistent with a previous report correlating greater disease recurrence with high ETV1 levels (Shin et al. 2009).

We next evaluated for the first time whether ERG- and ETV1-specific gene signatures serve as tumor biomarkers or as a predictor of aggressive behavior. We analyzed ERG and ETV1 signatures defined in our analysis of ERG and ETV1 ChIP and expression profiling data in the Swedish watchful waiting and MSKCC cohorts [Setlur et al. 2008; Taylor et al. 2010], including 362 localized prostate cancer samples and 150 patients with localized and metastatic prostate cancer, respectively. Of note, ETV1-specific signatures, comprised of genes directly bound by ETV1 and up-regulated upon ETV1 expression, are associated with a high Gleason score (>7) in both cohorts and with lethality in the MSKCC cohort, again highlighting a correlation between ETV1 expression and a worse disease prognosis [Fig. 7E, Supplemental Fig. S18C]. Taken together, data from three independent patient cohorts concur in validating that ETV1 drives a transcriptional program in prostate cells that is distinct from that of ERG. Moreover, our data suggest for the first time that the ETV1-driven program dictates a poorer outcome in patients with prostate cancer.

Discussion

Our multidisciplinary studies reveal distinct transcription programs regulated by ERG and ETV1 in prostate cells. In particular, we show that they control overlapping gene targets but largely in an opposing fashion, they also control unique targets and pathways. Overall, the networks regulated by ERG are associated with cell cycle and DNA replication, whereas those controlled by ETV1 are related to synthesis of lipids and other metabolic pathways. These networks are distinct and contribute to different pathogenic consequences. These conclusions are validated by findings in novel knock-in mouse models and by patient outcome analysis.

AR signaling is a common pathway regulated by ERG and ETV1 but in an opposite manner

AR signaling is central to prostate development and tumorigenesis. Indeed, AR has recently been implicated in double-strand breaks that favor the formation of translocations involving androgen-driven promoters and ETS family members [Lin et al. 2009; Haffner et al. 2010]. We observed a complex relationship between ERG- or ETV1-regulated networks and AR signaling. In agreement with prior findings, we observed negative regulation of AR signaling by ERG [Yu et al. 2010]. In contrast, ETV1 cooperates with AR signaling by favoring activation of the AR transcriptional program [Fig. 5]. Upon androgen stimulation, ETV1 recruitment to the established PSA and TMPRSS2 regulatory elements correlates with AR binding, suggesting coordinate regulation of androgen-driven genes by ETV1 and AR.

We validated divergent regulation of AR signaling by ERG and ETV1 in vivo in knock-in mice. As Tmprss2 is an AR target, the transcriptional output from the Tmprss2 promoter serves as a reporter for AR activity. In T-ERG knock-in mice, ERG expression appears to down-regulate AR target genes, including Tmprss2, which would lead to down-regulation of its own expression, thus forming a negative regulatory loop, consistent with prior findings [Yu et al. 2010]. In contrast, in T-ETV1 knock-in males, ETV1 expression positively cooperated with AR signaling, leading to further enhancement of expression of AR targets, including Tmprss2, which would then support robust expression of ETV1 and the GFP reporter, reflecting a
positive regulatory loop. These mechanistic differences account for the striking difference in GFP intensity in the two knock-in strains, which were identically engineered (Fig. 5E). Of note, the negative loop in the T-ERG knock-in is overridden by elevated AR signaling in vivo. Indeed, the only consistent association between the TMPRSS2-ERG fusion and clinical parameters identified thus far is the association of this fusion (in particular when ERG expression was measured by IHC) with a high level of AR signaling (Minner et al. 2011; Hoogland et al. 2012). Last, in human prostate tumors with ETV1 fusions, several 5’ fusion partners other than TMPRSS2 are also involved.

Figure 7. ETV1, rather than ERG, expression and the program it drives are associated with advanced prostate cancer in multiple patient cohorts. (A) Heat map showing ERG and ETV1 expression pattern in localized and bone metastatic prostate cancer samples using the Beth-Israel [BI] cohort data set [Stanbrough et al. 2006]. Heat map generated by hierarchical clustering and by applying Pearson correlation and the complete linkage rule. Heat map showing differentially expressed select genes (fold change, >2; FDR, <0.05). (B) Graph showing ERG and ETV1 expression along prostate cancer progression from localized to metastatic samples in the MSKCC cohort [Taylor et al. 2010]. The graph reveals that the number of patients carrying ETV1 overexpression (fold change, >3), PTEN deletion, and AR alterations (amplification and expression fold change, >3) increased in metastatic samples compared with localized prostate tumors, while patients carrying high levels of ERG (fold change, >3) did not increase over time (also in Supplemental Fig. S18B).

t-test: (*) P-value < 0.05; (**) P-value < 0.01. If no P-value is indicated, P > 0.05. (C) Disease-free survival plot showing that among all patients in the MSKCC cohort with PTEN deletion (n = 21), those with ERG overexpression (n = 4) exhibited no survival difference from the rest of patient with PTEN deletion. P = 0.553 by log-rank test. (D) Disease-free survival plot showing that among all patients in the MSKCC cohort with PTEN deletion (n = 21), those with ETV1 overexpression (n = 8) exhibited much worse survival compared with remaining patients with PTEN deletion. (*) P = 0.015 by log-rank test. (E) Correlation between ERG- and ETV1-associated gene sets with patient prognosis. Overlap between genes enriched in patient samples associated with indolent or aggressive prostate cancer from the MSKCC cohort [Taylor et al. 2010] and ETV1 or ERG gene sets defined in Figures 3 and 4. ETV1-associated genes are enriched in patients with a higher Gleason score in the Swedish cohort [also in Supplemental Fig. S18C; Sethur et al. 2008]. "UP" represents those genes up-regulated in the shown category with a fold change of >1.5. The significance of overlap of these gene sets was calculated by the Fisher exact test and visualized as connecting line width (cutoff, P = 0.01). (Red) Aggressive prostate cancer-associated; (green) ETV1-associated gene sets; (blue) TMPRSS2-ERG fusion-associated gene sets; (purple) ERG signature-associated gene sets; (yellow) AR-associated gene sets; (orange) common targets of ERG and ETV1. (F) Model illustrating the differential contribution by ERG and ETV1 to prostate tumorigenesis under the PTEN loss background. See the text for details.
Since the majority of these 5’ fusion partners are also androgen-responsive genes [Tomlins et al. 2007; Attard et al. 2008b], we reason that a similar positive regulatory loop may be operative in such tumors to enhance AR signaling and ETV1 expression. In addition, AR has been reported to regulate the endogenous ETV1 locus as well [Cai et al. 2007], suggesting a positive feedback between both the endogenous and rearranged ETV1, thus predisposing affected prostate cells for prostate cancer development.

ETV1, but not ERG, reprograms metabolic pathways in normal prostate epithelial cells

Among the unique genes up-regulated by ETV1, those encoding for enzymes involved in cholesterol and steroid biosynthesis and in cancer-associated metabolic pathways [e.g., glycolysis] [Supplemental Fig. S15A] are of particular interest. In particular, we were able to demonstrate increased production of endogenous testosterone upon ETV1 expression in both human prostate cells and T-ETV1 knock-in mice (upon castration) [Fig. 6I, Supplemental Fig. S17C]. Due to the increased testosterone level, we anticipated observing higher levels of androstenedione or dihydrotosterone as well; however, none were detected, possibly due to technical limitations. However, decreased levels of estrone were detected in ETV1-expressing RWPE-1 cells, probably due to the promotion of testosterone synthesis [Supplemental Fig. S17B].

Although ETV1-expressing prostate cells appear ostensibly normal [Fig. 1E], their metabolic programs resemble those of cancer cells. Increased aerobic glycolysis has been observed only in advanced disease, whereas increased sterol and protein synthesis are common features of both primary and advanced prostate cancer [Swinnen et al. 2000; Rossi et al. 2003; Ettinger 2004; Bauer et al. 2005]. In particular, activation of lipid metabolism has been observed in both CRPCs with higher ETV1 expression and T-ETV1 knock-in mice (upon castration) [Fig. 6I, Supplemental Fig. S17C]. Due to the increased testosterone level, we anticipated observing higher levels of androstenedione or dihydrotosterone as well; however, none were detected, possibly due to technical limitations. However, decreased levels of estrone were detected in ETV1-expressing RWPE-1 cells, probably due to the promotion of testosterone synthesis [Supplemental Fig. S17B].

Although ETV1-expressing prostate cells appear ostensibly normal [Fig. 1E], their metabolic programs resemble those of cancer cells. Increased aerobic glycolysis has been observed only in advanced disease, whereas increased sterol and protein synthesis are common features of both primary and advanced prostate cancer [Swinnen et al. 2000; Rossi et al. 2003; Ettinger 2004; Bauer et al. 2005]. In particular, activation of lipid metabolism has been observed in both CRPCs with higher ETV1 expression and T-ETV1 knock-in mice (upon castration) [Fig. 6I, Supplemental Fig. S17C]. Due to the increased testosterone level, we anticipated observing higher levels of androstenedione or dihydrotosterone as well; however, none were detected, possibly due to technical limitations. However, decreased levels of estrone were detected in ETV1-expressing RWPE-1 cells, probably due to the promotion of testosterone synthesis [Supplemental Fig. S17B].

TMPRSS2-ETV1 and TMPRSS2-ERG fusions make distinct contributions to prostate tumorigenesis

Although both Tmprss2-ERG and Tmprss2-ETV1 cooperate with loss of a single copy of Pten in leading to localized PIN lesions, similar to those demonstrated previously in mice overexpressing ERG or ETV1 under the Probasin or viral promoters [Carver et al. 2009; King et al. 2009; Zong et al. 2009] or in mice expressing ERG from an extended human TMPRSS2 promoter [Casey et al. 2012], our mechanistic and animal model studies suggest they do so differently [Fig. 7F]. Ectopic ERG expression likely represses the differentiation program of prostate cells [e.g., represses AR and AR targets and up-regulates Ezh2 and its targets, as suggested previously] [Yu et al. 2010]. Interestingly, it has been reported that Pten loss leads to a castration-like phenotype by suppressing androgen-responsive gene expression through modulation of AR transcriptional activity. Moreover, conditional deletion of AR further promotes proliferation of prostate cells with Pten loss [Mulholland et al. 2011]. We speculate that TMPRSS2-ERG may act in a similar fashion by downregulating AR and, consequently, promoting cell proliferation. Indeed, the ERG expression pattern in our murine models [Figs. 1C, 2B,D] suggests that ERG may be required primarily at early stages of the disease but may be not as functionally relevant at late stages. This may explain our observation that ERG cooperates with Pten haploinsufficiency [i.e., under a more sensitized Pten+/− background], whereas its contribution under the total Pten loss background appears far less. The high levels of ERG expression often observed in localized fusion-positive human prostate cancers may be a secondary consequence of high activity of AR signaling in such tumors in general [i.e., similar to what we observed in Pb-AR;T-ERG prostate] [Fig. 5E–G] rather than a critical requirement of ERG overexpression at this stage. In contrast, ectopic ETV1 expression appears to enhance androgen signaling and reprogram the metabolism of prostate cells, processes critical for both early and advanced stages of the disease. Activation of the PI3K/AKT pathway drives anabolic metabolism and tumorigenesis [Ward and Thompson 2012]. We propose that TMPRSS2-ETV1 cooperates with Pten loss by further enhancing metabolic reprogramming, in particular, by favoring steroid biosynthesis, a pathway critical for invasive adenocarcinoma cells. The cooperation between ETV1 and Pten loss is also consistent with the recent finding that combined loss of Pten and COP1, a ubiquitin ligase that negatively regulates ETV1 levels, leads to more invasive prostate adenocarcinomas [Vitari et al. 2011].

In aged PbCre;T-3Mb-Erg,Pten+/− males, we also observed invasive prostate cancer [Fig. 2E]. Interestingly, in such invasive cancers, we observed a mosaic pattern of Erg expression [Fig. 2E]. Several possibilities can explain this observation. Erg-expressing prostate cells may send signals to Erg-negative cells so that high levels of Erg expression are not needed in all cells of the invasive cancer. Alternatively, Erg may not be critical for the development of advanced cancer, and another genetic or epigenetic change may contribute to advanced disease. One potential genetic change is haploinsufficiency of one or more deleted genes in the interstitial region. Interestingly, ETS2, a gene residing within the interstitial region, was recently proposed to be a tumor suppressor contributing to aggressive prostate cancer cases carrying TMPRSS2-ERG fusions with deletion [Grasso et al. 2012]. Whether haploinsufficiency of the deleted genes [e.g., ETS2] contributes to the advanced cancer phenotype awaits further investigation.
Distinct roles of ETV1 and ERG in prostate tumorigenesis have implications for prostate cancer therapy

Our analysis of gene expression and patient outcome data sets underscores the relevance of different features of ETV1-regulated pathways to invasive adenocarcinoma progression. ETV1-defined, but not ERG-defined, gene sets are associated with high Gleason score and metastasis [Fig. 7E; Supplemental Fig. S18C]. Our observation that ERG expression does not correlate with the worse outcome is consistent with a recent meta-analysis describing no association of ERG with Gleason score, clinical outcome, or recurrence of the disease including 62 cohorts [Pettersson et al. 2012]. Of note, ERG mRNA and protein level analysis [Markert et al. 2011; Pettersson et al. 2012] showed that TMPRSS2-ERG fusion status does not always correlate with the TMPRSS2-ERG transcriptional signature or ERG protein level in prostate cancer patients. Accordingly, most recent clinical studies have supported high ERG expression levels as a favorable prognosis biomarker [Bismar et al. 2012; Kimura et al. 2012; Suh et al. 2012]. Consistent with our findings, however, ETV1 expression at the transcript level has been associated with a greater Gleason score and recurrence of the disease [Attard et al. 2008b; Shin et al. 2009]. Unfortunately, thus far, it has not been possible to study clinical relevance of ETV1 at the protein level due to the lack of satisfactory antibodies. Moreover, ETV1, rather than ERG, is among AR ChIP targets defined recently from primary CRPC patient samples [Sharma et al. 2013]. Last, there is also a high overlap between ETV1-associated, castration-associated, and recurrent prostate tumor signatures [Supplemental Fig. S18E]. Although TMPRSS2-ETV1 fusions are only found in ~1%–2% of all prostate cancer cases, prostate tumors with elevated ETV1 expression [5%–10% of all cases] are enriched in advanced disease [Fig. 7A,B], suggesting that the ETV1-driven oncogenic program may be selected for during prostate cancer progression.

In summary, our data suggest that ETV1 is a novel marker of aggressive prostate cancer, and the oncogenic program it drives may be an important therapeutic target for treating advanced prostate cancer. Metabolic enzymes (such as HSD17B7) that are regulated by ETV1 may be explored as therapeutic targets. Moreover, ETS factors have been described to modulate the Ras/MAPK pathway [Hollenhorst et al. 2011]. Interestingly, ETV1 overexpression, but not that of ERG, is associated with Ras/MAPK activity in a range of tumors, including ETV1-dependent melanoma and gastrointestinal stromal tumor, where ETV1 is a master regulator of lineage [Chi et al. 2010; Jane-Valbuena et al. 2010]. These observations raise the possibility that MAPK inhibitors may be explored to target ETV1-overexpressing tumors. In conclusion, our study suggests that tumors characterized by an ETV1 expression signature through either translocation or other mechanisms represent a distinct biological entity associated with aggressive prostate cancer. Future research should focus on exploring novel therapeutic approaches for this entity.

Materials and methods

Mouse lines

Tmprss2-ETS conditional knock-in mice were generated by standard gene targeting. Pb-Cre [Pb-Cre4] transgenic mice were acquired from the Mouse Models of Human Cancers Consortium (MMHCC) repository. Pten conditional knockout mice [Ptenfl/fl] and Pb-AR [FVB-Tg[Pbsn-Ar*E231G]] transgenic mice were acquired from JAX. Ptenfl/fl mice were generated by crossing Ptenfl/fl mice to Gata1-Cre mice. All studies were approved by the Institutional Animal Care and Use Committee (IACUC).

Pathology, immunostaining, and flow cytometry

Standard protocols were followed.

Cell lines

Cell lines were obtained from American Type Culture Collection and cultured accordingly. ERG or ETV1 overexpression and silencing experiments were performed by standard protocols.

RT–PCR

Real-time RT–PCR was performed according to standard protocols. All primer sequences are listed in Supplemental Table S2.

Gene expression microarray analysis

RWPE-1 stable cell clones [R.ERG, R.ETV1, and R.CTL] were grown under normal conditions. VCaP and LNCaP cells, 24 h after ERG or ETV1 RNAi, respectively, were grown in hormone-depleted conditions for 2 d, and then in the presence or absence of 10 nM DHT for 16 h. Mouse primary prostate cells were FACs-sorted and processed according to standard procedures. Affymetrix HG133 plus 2.0 or Mouse Genome 430 2.0 expression arrays were used for human or mouse samples, respectively. Gene Pattern software [Reich et al. 2006] was used for data normalization, extraction of expression values, and generation of GTC files for GSEA (Subramanian et al. 2005). A bidimensional comparison plot was used to compare differentially expressed genes [P < 0.05 by two-tailed t-test] in RWPE-1 cells upon overexpression of either ETV1 or ERG.

ChIP and ChIP-on-chip

BioChIP-chip for ETV1 was performed as described [Kim et al. 2008], and conventional ChIP-chip reaction for ERG was as described [Kim et al. 2004]. Affymetrix Human Promoter 1.0R array hybridization was performed at the Dana-Farber Cancer Institute Microarray Core Facility. Peak identification was calculated by MAT score [Johnson et al. 2006]. For ChIP-PCR experiments, conventional ChIP reactions were performed. Antibodies used were as follows: anti-AR [N20X], anti-ERG [C17X] and anti-rabbit IgG from Santa Cruz Biotechnology, and anti-ETV1 kindly provided by Dr. Litovchick. The online DAVID functional annotation tool [Huang et al. 2009] and the IPA tool [Ingenuity Systems, Inc.] were used to determine the enrichment for all “FAT” GO terms and canonical pathways/networks in each gene set.

Patient tumor data analysis

Gene sets associated with indolent and aggressive prostate cancer were extracted from the Swedish, MSKCC, Sharma, and
Glinsky cohorts (Glinsky 2004; Setlur et al. 2008; Taylor et al. 2010; Sharma et al. 2013) and analyzed for their mutual overlap between tumor cohort-derived signatures (differentially expressed genes: fold change, >1.5; false discovery rate [FDR], <0.05) and ERG- and ETV1-associated gene sets obtained in our studies. The overlap between gene sets was represented by a connectivity network, where the width of the connector edge was −log10(P-value). The P-value was derived from a hyper-geometric distribution by using Fisher exact test to analyze the significance of the mutual overlap. Cytoscape software version 2.8 (Cline et al. 2007) was used for the visualization of gene sets overlapping the network.

Statistics

All statistics were based on a Student’s t-test, unless otherwise indicated. Dot plots and histograms show data means, and error bars are standard error of the mean [SEM]. All statistics were performed using the data analysis package within Microsoft Excel or the analysis tool within GraphPad Prism 5.0. Kaplan-Meier survival analysis was performed using GraphPad Prism 5.0.

Steroid metabolism measurement

Steroids from RWPE-1 and androgen-deprived LNCaP cells were extracted following Lemmen et al. (2002) and quantified by LC/MS at the Harvard FAS Center for Systems Biology.

Testosterone measurement

The intraprostatic testosterone levels were measured by a mouse testosterone ELISA kit (Calbiotech) based on the manufacturer’s instructions. Briefly, mouse prostates were microdissected in cold PBS and lysed in RIPA buffer. Testosterone levels were calculated as the total amount per gram of total protein.

Accession number

The Gene Expression Omnibus accession number is GSE39388.
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