RESEARCH ARTICLE

Long non-coding RNA NEAT1 serves as a novel biomarker for treatment response and survival profiles via microRNA-125a in multiple myeloma

Haifeng Yu^{1,2,3} | Shuailing Peng^{1,2,3} | Xi Chen^{1,2,3} | Shuiyun Han^{1,2,3} | Jialin Luo^{1,2,3} \bigcirc

¹Department of Lymphatic Medical Oncology, Cancer Hospital of the University of Chinese Academy of Sciences (Zhejiang Cancer Hospital), Hangzhou, China

²Department of Lymphatic Medical Oncology, Institute of Cancer and Basic Medicine (IBMC), Chinese Academy of Sciences, Hangzhou, China

³Department of Radiotherapy, Cancer Hospital of the University of Chinese Academy of Sciences (Zhejiang Cancer Hospital), Hangzhou, China

Correspondence

Jialin Luo, Department of Lymphatic Medical Oncology, Cancer Hospital of the University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, 1 East Banshan Road, Hangzhou 310022, China. Email: jiqian7744983@163.com

Funding information

Natural Science Foundation of Zhejiang Province, Grant/Award Number: LY19C080001

Abstract

Background: The present study aimed to explore the association of long non-coding RNA nuclear paraspeckle assembly transcript 1 (IncRNA NEAT1) with multiple myeloma (MM) risk and further investigate its correlation with clinical features, treatment response, survival profiles, and its interaction with microRNA-125a (miR-125a) in MM patients.

Methods: Totally, 114 de novo symptomatic MM patients and 30 healthy donors (as controls) were recruited. Their bone marrow samples were collected before treatment (MM patients) and at enrollment (healthy donors), respectively. Subsequently, plasma cells were isolated from bone marrow for detection of IncRNA NEAT1 and miR-125a expression via reverse transcription quantitative polymerase chain reaction.

Results: IncRNA NEAT1 was upregulated in MM patients compared with healthy donors and presented with excellent value in distinguishing MM patients from healthy donors. In MM patients, IncRNA NEAT1 positively associated with International Staging System (ISS) stage, beta-2 microglobulin (β2-MG), and lactate dehydrogenase (LDH), but not correlated with core cytogenetics and other clinical features. Furthermore, IncRNA NEAT1 negatively associated with complete remission (CR), overall remission rate (ORR), progression-free survival (PFS), and overall survival (OS). Moreover, IncRNA NEAT1 negatively associated with miR-125a in MM patients. MiR-125a was downregulated in MM patients compared with healthy donors, and it negatively associated with ISS stage, β 2-MG, and LDH, but positively correlated with CR, ORR, PFS, and OS in MM patients.

Conclusion: IncRNA NEAT1 might interact with miR-125a, and serves as a novel biomarker for treatment response and survival profiles in MM, indicating its clinical value for MM management.

KEYWORDS

long non-coding RNA NEAT1, microRNA-125a, multiple myeloma, survival, treatment response

This is an open access article under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits use, distribution and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

© 2020 The Authors. Journal of Clinical Laboratory Analysis Published by Wiley Periodicals LLC

1 | INTRODUCTION

Multiple myeloma (MM) is a systemic malignant disease of the blood characterized by the production of nonfunctional intact immunoglobulins or immunoglobulin chains as well as the uncontrolled proliferation of monoclonal plasma cells in the bone marrow.¹ According to the global statistics report, MM is the third most commonly occurred hematological malignancy, accounting for approximately 1% of all cancer cases, and its incidence has undergone an increment in recent decades.² The common treatment approaches for MM consist of chemotherapy, autologous stem cell transplants, targeted therapy, and immunotherapy; however, the treatment efficacy is limited and the drug resistance is increasing due to the various chromosomal abnormalities, contributing to poor treatment response and undesirable survival profiles in MM patients.³⁻⁶ Therefore, discovering novel prognostic biomarker is a necessity for MM management, which can help to estimate treatment response and predict prognosis in MM patients.

Long non-coding RNA (IncRNA) is one type of RNA longer than 200 nucleotides in length with limited protein-coding ability, and accumulating evidence has been reported that IncRNA is implicated in the tumorigenesis of various cancers.⁷ Among the discovered carcinogenic IncRNAs, IncRNA nuclear paraspeckle assembly transcript 1 (IncRNA NEAT1) is upregulated and serve as an oncogene during the onset and progression of various hematopoietic malignancies, such as myeloid leukemia and lymphoblastic leukemia.⁸⁻¹¹ As for in MM, mechanically, one cellular experiment demonstrates that IncRNA NEAT1 knockdown inhibits cell proliferation, but promotes cell-cycle arrest and apoptosis via regulating PI3K/AKT pathway.¹² Another one indicates that IncRNA NEAT1 promotes M2 macrophage polarization, hence accelerating MM progression.¹³ In addition, based on miRanda database analysis and previous studies, one of IncRNA NEAT1 target microRNAs is microRNA-125a (miRNA-125a), and miRNA-125a is shown to suppress MM progression.¹⁴⁻¹⁶ According to these evidences and the result of our preliminary study with small sample size, which indicated that IncRNA NEAT1 was upregulated in MM patients compared with healthy controls, the hypothesis was raised that IncRNA NEAT1 was involved in MM development and prognosis via interaction with miR-125a; however, the related research is limited. Therefore, we performed the present study to explore the association of IncRNA NEAT1 with MM risk and further investigate its correlation with clinical features, treatment response, survival profiles, and its interaction with miR-125a in MM patients.

2 | METHODS

2.1 | Participants

From January 2016 to June 2019, 114 de novo MM patients treated in Cancer Hospital of the University of Chinese Academy of Sciences were consecutively enrolled in this prospective study. The inclusion criteria were as follows: (a) newly diagnosed as MM according to the "International Myeloma Working Group updated criteria for the diagnosis of multiple myeloma"¹⁷; (b) identified as primary symptomatic MM (primary MM patients with clonal bone marrow plasma cells ≥ 10% or biopsy-proven bony or extramedullary plasmacytoma with the presence of hyper-calcemia, renal failure, anemia, and bone lesion)¹; (c) aged 18-80 years; (d) not complicated with other malignancies; and (e) able to be followed up regularly. The exclusion criteria were as follows: (a) secondary (patients diagnosed as other malignancies before) or mixed (patients diagnosed as both MM and other malignancies) MM; (b) history of radiation and chemotherapy; (c) history of other hematopoietic diseases, lymphoid tissue diseases, or solid tumors; and (d) pregnant or lactating women. In addition, 30 healthy bone marrow donors who were admitted to our hospital and donated their bone marrow were recruited as controls in this study during the same period. This study was approved by the Institutional Review Board of Cancer Hospital of the University of Chinese Academy of Sciences. All patients and healthy donors provided the written informed consents before recruitment.

2.2 | Clinical data collection

Patients' age, gender, immunoglobulin subtype, bone lesion status, renal impairment status, Durie-Salmon stage, International Staging System (ISS) stage, biochemical indexes, and cytogenetics status were recorded post-diagnostic examinations. The Durie-Salmon stage was assessed according to the criteria of Durie-Salmon stage system for MM.¹⁸ The ISS stage was evaluated referring to the criteria of ISS for MM.¹⁹

2.3 | Sample collection and determination

Before therapy, bone marrow samples of patients were collected; also, the bone marrow samples were collected from healthy donors after recruitment. For the isolation of plasma cells, all bone marrow samples were treated by density-gradient centrifugation and purified by CD138-coated magnetic beads (Miltenyi Biotec). Subsequently, reverse transcription quantitative polymerase chain reaction (RT-qPCR) was performed to detect the relative expressions of lncRNA NEAT1 and miR-125a in the plasma cells. Total RNA was extracted from plasma cells using TRIzoI[™] Reagent (Thermo Fisher Scientific) and then reversely transcribed using PrimeScript[™] RT reagent Kit (Perfect Real Time) (Takara). Following that, qPCR was performed using SYBR[®] Premix DimerEraser[™] (Takara) to quantify lncRNA NEAT1 and miR-125a expressions. In addition, the expressions of lncRNA NEAT1 and miR-125a were calculated using 2^{-ΔΔCt} method with GAPDH and U6 as internal references, respectively. Primers were listed in the Table S1.

2.4 | Response and survival evaluation

Patients' therapy in this study was not intervened, which was decided by attending physician based on patients' clinical conditions in accordance

Items	MM patients (N = 114)
Age (years), mean ± SD	54.7 ± 8.6
Gender, No. (%)	
Female	46 (40.4)
Male	68 (59.6)
Immunoglobulin subtype, No. (%)	
lgG	62 (54.4)
IgA	27 (23.7)
Others	25 (21.9)
Bone lesion, No. (%)	
No	27 (23.7)
Yes	87 (76.3)
Renal impairment, No. (%)	
No	68 (59.6)
Yes	46 (40.4)
Durie-Salmon stage, No. (%)	
П	15 (13.2)
III	99 (86.8)
ISS stage, No. (%)	
I	29 (25.4)
П	27 (23.7)
III	58 (50.9)
Biochemical indexes, median (IQR)	
Hb (g/L)	98.0 (82.0-113.0)
Calcium (mg/dL)	9.7 (8.4-11.2)
Scr (mg/dL)	1.8 (1.4-2.2)
ALB (g/L)	34.0 (29.0-38.0)
β2-MG (mg/L)	5.6 (3.0-10.0)
LDH (U/L)	210.8 (175.0-249.5)
t(4; 14), No. (%)	
No	99 (86.8)
Yes	15 (13.2)
t(14; 16), No. (%)	
No	109 (95.6)
Yes	5 (4.4)
Del(17p), No. (%)	
No	100 (87.7)
Yes	14 (12.3)

Note: Continuous variables were expressed as mean \pm SD or median (IQR). Categorical variables were expressed as count and percentage. Abbreviations: ALB, albumin; Hb, hemoglobin; IgA, immunoglobulin A; IgG, immunoglobulin G; IQR: interquartile range; ISS, International Staging System; LDH, lactate dehydrogenase; MM, multiple myeloma; Scr, serum creatinine; SD, standard deviation; β 2-MG, beta-2 microglobulin.

with clinical practice guidelines.²⁰ The patients' response to the induction therapy was evaluated in line with the criteria recommended by NCCN clinical practice guidelines in Oncology: Multiple Myeloma (2015. V4), which included complete response (CR), very good partial response (VGPR), and partial response (PR). Overall response rate (ORR) was defined as CR + VGPR + PR. Patients were followed up by telephone or clinical visit until 2019/6/30, during which, patients' survival status was documented for the assessment of progression-free survival (PFS) and overall survival (OS). The PFS was defined as the duration from initial treatment to disease progression or death, and the OS was defined as the duration from initial treatment to death. The patients not known whether the disease had progressed or whether they had died at the last follow-up date were censored on the date of last visit or the date last known to be alive.

2.5 | Statistical analysis

SPSS 22.0 (IBM) and GraphPad Prism 6.01 (GraphPad Software) were used for statistical analyses and figures making. Data were described as mean and standard deviation (SD), median and interquartile range (IQR), or number (percentage). Comparison of continuous variables and ordered categorical variables between two groups was determined by Wilcoxon's rank sum test. Comparison of unordered categorical variables between two groups was determined by chi-square test. The correlation analysis was determined by Spearman's rank correlation test. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curve and the area under curve (AUC) with 95% confidence interval (CI) were used to evaluate the value of variables in differentiating different subjects. PFS and OS were presented using Kaplan-Meier curves, and the difference of PFS and OS between two groups was determined by the log-rank test. *P* value < .05 was considered as statistically significant.

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | Clinical characteristics in MM patients

The mean age of MM patients was 54.7 ± 8.6 years, and there were 46 (40.4%) females and 68 (59.6%) males. As for immunoglobulin subtype, the number of MM patients with IgG, IgA, and other subtypes were 62 (54.4%), 27 (23.7%), and 25 (21.9%), respectively. There were 15 (13.2%) MM patients at Durie-Salmon stage II and 99 (86.8%) MM patients at Durie-Salmon stage III. Furthermore, the number of patients at ISS stages I, II, and III was 29 (25.4%), 27 (23.7%), and 58 (50.9%), respectively. More detailed information of clinical characteristics of MM patients was shown in Table 1.

3.2 | IncRNA NEAT1 expression between MM patients and health donors

IncRNA NEAT1 expression was increased in MM patients (2.787 [2.132-4.293]) compared with healthy donors (1.029 [0.402-1.524]) (P < .001) (Figure 1A). ROC analysis exhibited that IncRNA NEAT1

presented with excellent value in distinguishing MM patients from healthy donors (AUC: 0.939, 95% CI: 0.901-0.977) (Figure 1B). These data suggested that high IncRNA NEAT1 expression was associated with increased MM risk.

3.3 | Correlation of IncRNA NEAT1 with immunoglobulin subtype and stages in MM patients

According to the median of IncRNA NEAT1 expression in MM patients, all MM patients were divided into the low IncRNA NEAT1 patients (n = 57) and high IncRNA NEAT1 patients (n = 57). Among low IncRNA NEAT1 patients, there were 34 (59.6%) patients with IgG, 11 (19.3%) patients with IgA, and 12 (21.1%) patients with others; among high IncRNA NEAT1 patients, there were 28 (49.1%) patients with IgG, 16 (28.1%) patients with IgA, and 13 (22.8%) patients with others, and there was no difference of immunoglobulin subtype between low IncRNA NEAT1 patients and high IncRNA NEAT1 patients (P = .461) (Figure 2A). Furthermore, among low IncRNA NEAT1 patients, there were 8 (14.0%) patients at Durie-Salmon stage II and 49 (86.0%) patients at Durie-Salmon stage III; among high IncRNA NEAT1 patients, there were 7 (12.3%) patients at Durie-Salmon stage II and 50 (87.7%) patients at Durie-Salmon stage III, and there existed no difference of Durie-Salmon stage between low IncRNA NEAT1 patients and high IncRNA NEAT1 patients (P = .782) (Figure 2B). In addition, among low IncRNA NEAT1 patients, the number of patients at ISS stages I, II, and III was 22 (38.6%), 15 (26.3%), and 20 (35.1%) respectively; among high IncRNA NEAT1 patients, the number of patients at ISS stages I, II, and III was 7 (12.3%), 12 (21.0%), and 38 (66.7%), respectively, and high IncRNA NEAT1 patients have increased ISS stage compared to low IncRNA NEAT1 patients (P < .001) (Figure 2C).

3.4 | Correlation of IncRNA NEAT1 with core cytogenetics in MM patients

The number of patients with t(4;14) was 4 (7.0%) in low lncRNA NEAT1 patients and 11 (19.3%) in high IncRNA NEAT1 patients, and there was no difference of t(4;14) occurrence between low lncRNA NEAT1 patients and high IncRNA NEAT1 patients (P = .052) (Figure 3A). The number of patients with t(14; 16) was 2 (3.5%) in low IncRNA NEAT1

patients and 3 (5.3%) in high IncRNA NEAT1 patients, and there was no difference of t(14; 16) occurrence between high IncRNA NEAT1 patients and low IncRNA NEAT1 patients (P = .647), either (Figure 3B). Besides, the number of patients with Del (17p) was 6 (10.5%) in low IncRNA NEAT1 patients and 8 (14.0%) in high IncRNA NEAT1 patients, and there was no difference of Del (17p) occurrence between high IncRNA NEAT1 patients and low IncRNA NEAT1 patients (P = .568) (Figure 3C).

3.5 | Correlation of IncRNA NEAT1 with biochemical indexes in MM patients

The level of hemoglobin (Hb), calcium, serum creatinine (Scr), albumin (ALB), beta-2 microglobulin (β 2-MG), and lactate dehydrogenase (LDH) was 97.0 (75.5-114.0) g/L, 9.7 (8.3-11.7) mg/dL, 1.8 (1.4-2.3) mg/dL, 35.0 (31.0-39.0) g/L, 4.1 (2.5-6.7) mg/L, and 192.1 (169.9-235.8) U/L in low IncRNA NEAT1 patients, and 100.0 (84.0-113.0) g/L, 9.7 (8.5-11.7) mg/dL, 2.0 (1.5-2.7) mg/dL, 33.0 (28.0-37.0) g/L, 7.2 (4.1-11.8) mg/L, and 221.4 (192.1-292.8) U/L in high IncRNA NEAT1 patients, respectively (Table 2). IncRNA NEAT1 was positively associated with β 2-MG (P = .002) and LDH (P = .002); however, there was no correlation of lncRNA NEAT1 with Hb (P = .431), calcium (P = .807), Scr (P = .212), or ALB (P = .078) in MM patients (Table 2).

3.6 | Correlation of IncRNA NEAT1 with CR and **ORR** in MM patients

There were 26 (22.8%) CR patients, 88 (77.2%) non-CR patients, 79 (69.3%) ORR patients, and 35 (30.7%) non-ORR patients in MM patients (Figure 4A). The number of CR and non-CR patients was 18 (31.6%) and 39 (68.4%) in low IncRNA NEAT1 patients, respectively, and was 8 (14.0%) and 49 (86.0%) in high IncRNA NEAT1 patients, respectively (Figure 4B). The number of ORR and non-ORR patients was 46 (80.7%) and 11 (19.3%) in low IncRNA NEAT1 patients, respectively, and was 33 (57.9%) and 24 (42.1%) in high IncRNA NEAT1 patients, respectively (Figure 4C). Further analysis revealed that IncRNA NEAT1 was negatively associated with CR (P = .026) and ORR (P = .008) in MM patients (Figure 4B-C).

1.0



FIGURE 1 IncRNA NEAT1 in MM patients and healthy donors. Comparison of IncRNA NEAT1 between MM patients and healthy donors (A). The performance of IncRNA NEAT1 in distinguishing MM patients from healthy donors (B). MM, multiple myeloma; IncRNA NEAT1, long non-coding RNA nuclear paraspeckle assembly transcript 1; AUC: area under curve; CI: confidence interval





FIGURE 2 Comparison of immunoglobulin subtype and stages between high IncRNA NEAT1 MM patients and low IncRNA NEAT1 MM patients. Correlation of IncRNA NEAT1 with immunoglobulin subtype (A). Correlation of IncRNA NEAT1 with Durie-Salmon stage (B). Correlation of IncRNA NEAT1 with ISS stage (C). MM, multiple myeloma; IncRNA NEAT1, long non-coding RNA nuclear paraspeckle assembly transcript 1; ISS, International Staging System



FIGURE 3 Comparison of cytogenetics between high IncRNA NEAT1 MM patients and low IncRNA NEAT1 MM patients. Correlation of IncRNA NEAT1 with t(4;14) occurrence (A). Correlation of IncRNA NEAT1 with t(14;16) occurrence (B). Correlation of IncRNA NEAT1 with Del(17p) occurrence (C). MM, multiple myeloma; IncRNA NEAT1, long non-coding RNA nuclear paraspeckle assembly transcript 1

TABLE 2 Comparison of biochemical indexes between high IncRNA NEAT1 patients and low IncRNA NEAT1 patients

	IncRNA NEAT1		
Biochemical indexes	Low expression patients (n = 57)	High expression patients (n = 57)	P value
Hb (g/L), median (IQR)	97.0 (75.5-114.0)	100.0 (84.0-113.0)	.431
Calcium (mg/dL), median (IQR)	9.7 (8.3-11.7)	9.7 (8.5-11.7)	.807
Scr (mg/dL), median (IQR)	1.8 (1.4-2.3)	2.0 (1.5-2.7)	.212
ALB (g/L), median (IQR)	35.0 (31.0-39.0)	33.0 (28.0-37.0)	.078
β 2-MG (mg/L), median (IQR)	4.1 (2.5-6.7)	7.2 (4.1-11.8)	.002
LDH (U/L), median (IQR)	192.1 (169.9-235.8)	221.4 (192.1-292.8)	.002

Note: Comparison was determined by Wilcoxon's rank sum test.

Abbreviations: ALB, albumin; Hb, hemoglobin; IQR: interquartile range; LDH, lactate dehydrogenase; Scr, serum creatinine; β 2-MG, Beta-2-microglobulin.

3.7 | Correlation of IncRNA NEAT1 with PFS and OS in MM patients

PFS was decreased in high IncRNA NEAT1 patients compared with low IncRNA NEAT1 patients (P = .030) (Figure 5A). Similarly, OS was also reduced in high IncRNA NEAT1 patients compared with low IncRNA NEAT1 patients (P = .014) (Figure 5B).

3.8 | Correlation of miR-125a with IncRNA NEAT1, clinical features and prognosis in MM patients

IncRNA NEAT1 was negatively associated with miR-125a in MM patients (r = -.419, P < .001) (Figure 6). Furthermore, miR-125a expression was decreased in MM patients compared with healthy donors (P < .001) (Figure 7A). ROC analysis revealed that miR-125a presented with good value in distinguishing MM patients from healthy donors (AUC: 0.874, 95% CI: 0.807-0.941) (Figure 7B). Further analysis detecting the association of miR-125a with clinical features in MM patients indicated that miR-125a was negatively associated with ISS stage (P = .001), β 2-MG (P = .002), and LDH (P = .002), while there was no association of miR-125a with immunoglobulin subtype (P = .445), Durie-Salmon stage (P = .406), t(4;14) (P = .406) t(14;16) (P = .170), Del (17p) (P = .087), Hb (P = .363), calcium (P = .080), Scr (P = .270), or ALB (P = .197) (Table 3). In addition, the correlation of miR-125a with prognosis in MM patients was determined, and we found that miR-125a was positively associated with CR (P = .026) (Figure 7C) and ORR



FIGURE 4 Comparison of CR/ORR between high IncRNA NEAT1 MM patients and low IncRNA NEAT1 MM patients. The percentage of CR, non-CR, ORR, and non-ORR patients (A). Correlation of IncRNA NEAT1 with CR (B). Correlation of IncRNA NEAT1 with ORR (C). MM, multiple myeloma; IncRNA NEAT1, long non-coding RNA nuclear paraspeckle assembly transcript 1; CR, complete remission; ORR, overall remission rate



FIGURE 5 Comparison of PFS/OS between high IncRNA NEAT1 MM patients and Iow IncRNA NEAT1 MM patients. Comparison of PFS between high IncRNA NEAT1 MM patients and Iow IncRNA NEAT1 MM patients (A). Comparison of OS between high IncRNA NEAT1 MM patients and Iow IncRNA NEAT1 MM patients (B). MM, multiple myeloma; IncRNA NEAT1, Iong non-coding RNA nuclear paraspeckle assembly transcript 1; PFS, progression-free survival; OS, overall survival



FIGURE 6 IncRNA NEAT1 correlated with miR-125a in MM patients. MM, multiple myeloma; IncRNA NEAT1, long non-coding RNA nuclear paraspeckle assembly transcript 1; miR-125a, microRNA-125a

(P = .026) (Figure 7D) in MM patients. Besides, PFS (P = .003) (Figure 7E) and OS (P = .001) (Figure 7F) were increased in miR-125a high patients compared to miR-125a low patients.

4 | DISCUSSION

In the present study, we found that (a) IncRNA NEAT1 was upregulated in MM patients compared with healthy donors, and presented excellent value in predicting MM risk. (b) IncRNA NEAT1 was positively correlated with ISS stage, β 2-MG, and LDH in MM patients. (c) IncRNA NEAT1 was negatively associated with prognosis in MM patients. (d) In MM patients, IncRNA NEAT1 was negatively associated with IncRNA NEAT1, and further analysis indicated that miR-125a was associated with decreased MM risk, Iower ISS stage, β 2-MG, LDH, and better prognosis.

IncRNA NEAT1 is an indispensable structural component of paraspeckles, which participates in the stress response, and has regulatory effect to control the progression of transcription, pre-mRNA splicing, and nuclear mRNA editing via mediating exposure to stress events.²¹ In last decades, accumulating researches have disclosed the sectional pathophysiological relevance of IncRNA NEAT1 and reveal that IncRNA NEAT1 might function as an oncogenic gene in the pathology of various hematopoietic malignancies.⁸⁻¹¹ Regarding the involvement of IncRNA NEAT1 in MM, it is reported to be upregulated in BM samples of MM patients compared to healthy donors,







FIGURE 7 The value of MiR-125a in predicting MM risk and its association with clinical features and prognosis in MM patients. Comparison of miR-125a between MM patients and healthy donors (A). The performance of miR-125a in distinguishing MM patients from healthy donors (B). Correlation of miR-125a with CR (C), ORR (D) in MM patients. Correlation of miR-125a with PFS (E) and OS (F) in MM patients. MM, multiple myeloma; miR-125a, microRNA-125a; CR, complete remission; ORR, overall remission rate; PFS, progression-free survival; OS, overall survival; AUC: area under curve; CI: confidence interval

and mechanically, its knockdown inhibits M2 macrophage polarization via dysregulating JAK2/STAT3 signaling, further accelerating MM development and progression.¹³ According to aforementioned evidence, IncRNA NEAT1 might present with clinical significance in MM management. We enrolled MM patients and healthy donors, whose BM samples were collected for detecting IncRNA NEAT1 expression, and found that IncRNA NEAT1 was upregulated in MM patients compared with healthy donors and present excellent value in distinguishing MM patients from healthy donors. This was consistent with the previous studies, suggesting that IncRNA NEAT1 was an oncogenic gene in MM pathology and has potential to be a biomarker for predicting MM risk.^{12,22,23}

Subsequently, we observed that IncRNA NEAT1 was positively associated with ISS stage, β 2-MG, and LDH in MM patients, suggesting the correlation of IncRNA NEAT1 with poor systematic disease condition. The possible reasons might include that (a) according to the previous study, IncRNA NEAT1 promotes MM cell proliferation, but decreases cell-cycle arrest via regulating PI3K/AKT signaling pathway, suggesting the accelerating role of AKIP1 in MM progression. Therefore, patients with high IncRNA NEAT1 expression presented poor systematic disease condition.¹² (b) Based on the previous studies, the downstream targeted genes of IncRNA NEAT1 is involved in the DNA repair machinery; therefore, IncRNA NEAT1 dysregulation is associated with massive DNA damage, further leading to diverse genetic abnormalities, which lead to the high risk of MM progression.^{21,23} (c) According to the previous study, β 2-MG concentration was used to reflect the kidney function, and IncRNA NEAT1 aggravated lipopolysaccharide-induced kidney injury via activating inflammation-related pathway (such as NF-KB pathway); therefore, IncRNA NEAT1 might be associated with level of β 2-MG via inducing renal function.^{24,25} (d) Based on the previous evidence that elevated LDH is correlated with increased level of beta-2 micro-globulin, IncRNA NEAT1 might be correlated with LDH via affecting with β 2-MG.²⁶

Regarding the predictive role of IncRNA NEAT1 in treatment response and survival profiles in MM, there is still no research reported yet. Therefore, we assessed the treatment response to the induction therapy and calculated the survival data in MM patients. Following that, the related analysis indicated that IncRNA NEAT1 was negatively associated with CR, ORR, PFS, and OS in MM patients, suggesting the potential of IncRNA NEAT1 as a prognostic biomarker in MM. The possible reason might be that according to the prior studies, IncRNA NEAT1 is involved in p53-dependent DNA damage response network, which has connection with increased chemotherapy resistance in MM patients.^{21,27} Furthermore, considering our data that patients with high IncRNA NEAT1 expression presented poor systematic disease condition, MM patients with high IncRNA NEAT1 had poor treatment response and unfavorable survival.

IncRNAs compete with other RNA molecules to bind specific miRNA, and miRNA-medicated competing endogenous regulatory mechanisms are reported to play essential role in pathogenesis of malignancies.^{28,29} There exists evidence that IncRNA NEAT1 facilitates disease progression via interaction with miR-125a; moreover, miR-125a serves as a potential malignancy suppressor and targets MM-related oncogenic genes, further suppressing MM progression.^{14,15,30} Therefore, we speculated that IncRNA NEAT1 might be implicated in the MM pathology via suppressing miR-125a. In order

TABLE 3	Comparison of clinical characteristics between high
miR-125a pa	itients and low miR-125a patients

	MiR-125a					
Items	Low expression patients (n = 57)	High expression patients (n = 57)	P value			
Immunoglobulin subtype, No. (%)						
IgG	28 (49.1)	34 (59.6)	.445			
IgA	14 (24.6)	13 (22.9)				
Others	15 (26.3)	10 (17.5)				
Durie-Salmon stage, No. (%)						
П	6 (10.5)	9 (15.8)	.406			
Ш	51 (89.5)	48 (84.2)				
ISS stage, No. (%)						
I	9 (15.8)	20 (35.1)	.001			
П	10 (17.5)	17 (29.8)				
Ш	38 (66.7)	20 (35.1)				
t(4; 14), No. (%)						
No	48 (84.2)	51 (89.5)	.406			
Yes	9 (15.8)	6 (10.5)				
t(14; 16), No. (%)						
No	53 (93.0)	56 (98.2)	.170			
Yes	4 (7.0)	1 (1.8)				
Del(17p), No. (%)						
No	47 (82.5)	53 (93.0)	.087			
Yes	10 (17.5)	4 (7.0)				
Biochemical indexes, median (IQR)						
Hb (g/L)	100.0 (82.0-116.5)	97.0 (82.0-11.0)	.363			
Calcium (mg/dL)	9.5 (8.0-10.6)	10.0 (8.8-11.7)	.080			
Scr (mg/dL)	1.9 (1.6-2.7)	1.7 (1.3-2.3)	.270			
ALB (g/L)	34.0 (27.5-37.5)	34.0 (29.5-38.5)	.197			
β2-MG (mg/L)	6.6 (4.4-11.7)	4.0 (2.3-7.2)	.002			
LDH (U/L)	221.4 (192.5-281.6)	192.1 (167.6-239.3)	.002			

Note: Comparison was determined by chi-square test or Wilcoxon's rank sum test.

Abbreviations: ALB, albumin; Hb, hemoglobin; IgA, immunoglobulin A; IgG, immunoglobulin G; IQR: interquartile range; ISS, International Staging System; LDH, lactate dehydrogenase; Scr, serum creatinine; β 2-MG, beta-2 microglobulin.

to further investigate the regulatory role of IncRNA NEAT1 in MM, we explored the association of IncRNA NEAT1 with miR-125a in MM and observed that there existed negative correlation between IncRNA NEAT1 and miR-125a. In addition, miR-125a was associated with decreased MM risk, and presented negative correlation with ISS stage, β 2-MG, LDH, unfavorable treatment response, and survival profiles. The possible reason might include that miR-125a was a negative regulator of PI3K/Akt/mTOR and NF-kB signaling pathways, which IncRNA NEAT1 had stimulating effect on; therefore,

miR-125a was negatively associated with MM risk, ISS stage, biochemical indexes (β 2-MG, LDH), and prognosis in MM patients.^{31,32} The previous data implied the clinical significance of IncRNA NEAT1/ miR-125a complex in MM management.

However, there still exist some limitations in our present study. (a) Considering that this was a study with a small sample population, further studies with a larger sample size from multiple regions were needed for validation. (b) Our study did not explore the underlying mechanism of interaction between lncRNA NEAT1 and miR-125a in MM, which needed to be investigated via cellular experiments. (c) As we excluded secondary or mixed MM, further studies were needed to investigate the association of lncRNA NEAT1 and miR-125a with clinical indexes and prognosis in these patients.

In conclusion, IncRNA NEAT1 might interact with miR-125a and serves as a novel biomarker for treatment response and survival profiles in MM, indicating its clinical value for MM management.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This study was supported by the Natural Science Foundation of Zhejiang Province (LY19C080001).

CONFLICT OF INTEREST

The author declared no potential conflicts of interest with respect to the research, authorship, and/or publication of this article.

ORCID Jialin Luo D https://orcid.org/0000-0002-3818-9289

REFERENCES

- Gerecke C, Fuhrmann S, Strifler S, Schmidt-Hieber M, Einsele H, Knop S. The diagnosis and treatment of multiple myeloma. *Dtsch Arztebl Int*. 2016;113(27–28):470-476.
- Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, Siegel RL, Torre LA, Jemal A. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. *CA Cancer* J Clin. 2018;68(6):394-424.
- Liang L, Li J, Fu H, Liu X, Liu P. Identification of high serum apolipoprotein A1 as a favorable prognostic indicator in patients with multiple myeloma. J Cancer. 2019;10(20):4852-4859.
- Landgren O, Iskander K. Modern multiple myeloma therapy: deep, sustained treatment response and good clinical outcomes. J Intern Med. 2017;281(4):365-382.
- 5. Rajkumar SV. Multiple myeloma: 2016 update on diagnosis, risk-stratification, and management. *Am J Hematol.* 2016;91(7):719-734.
- Kumar SK, Rajkumar SV. The multiple myelomas current concepts in cytogenetic classification and therapy. *Nat Rev Clin Oncol.* 2018;15(7):409-421.
- Cui YS, Song YP, Fang BJ. The role of long non-coding RNAs in multiple myeloma. *Eur J Haematol.* 2019;103(1):3-9.
- Deng L, Jiang L, Tseng KF, et al. Aberrant NEAT1_1 expression may be a predictive marker of poor prognosis in diffuse large B cell lymphoma. *Cancer Biomark*. 2018;23(2):157-164.
- Ghafouri-Fard S, Taheri M. Nuclear enriched abundant transcript 1 (NEAT1): a long non-coding RNA with diverse functions in tumorigenesis. *Biomed Pharmacother*. 2019;111:51-59.
- 10. Zhao C, Wang S, Zhao Y, et al. Long noncoding RNA NEAT1 modulates cell proliferation and apoptosis by regulating miR-23a-3p/SMC1A in acute myeloid leukemia. *J Cell Physiol*. 2019;234(5):6161-6172.

- Pouyanrad S, Rahgozar S, Ghodousi ES. Dysregulation of miR-335-3p, targeted by NEAT1 and MALAT1 long non-coding RNAs, is associated with poor prognosis in childhood acute lymphoblastic leukemia. *Gene.* 2019;692:35-43.
- Xu H, Li J, Zhou ZG. NEAT1 promotes cell proliferation in multiple myeloma by activating PI3K/AKT pathway. *Eur Rev Med Pharmacol Sci.* 2018;22(19):6403-6411.
- Gao Y, Fang P, Li WJ, et al. LncRNA NEAT1 sponges miR-214 to regulate M2 macrophage polarization by regulation of B7–H3 in multiple myeloma. *Mol Immunol*. 2020;117:20-28.
- Wu L, Zhang C, Chu M, et al. miR-125a suppresses malignancy of multiple myeloma by reducing the deubiquitinase USP5. *J Cell Biochem.* 2020;121(1):642-650.
- Li P, Duan S, Fu A. Long noncoding RNA NEAT1 correlates with higher disease risk, worse disease condition, decreased miR-124 and miR-125a and predicts poor recurrence-free survival of acute ischemic stroke. J Clin Lab Anal. 2019;e23056.34(2):e23056.
- Chen JX, Xu X, Zhang S. Silence of long noncoding RNA NEAT1 exerts suppressive effects on immunity during sepsis by promoting microRNA-125-dependent MCEMP1 downregulation. *IUBMB Life*. 2019;71(7):956-968.
- 17. Rajkumar SV, Dimopoulos MA, Palumbo A, et al. International Myeloma Working Group updated criteria for the diagnosis of multiple myeloma. *Lancet Oncol.* 2014;15(12):e538-548.
- Durie BG, Salmon SE. A clinical staging system for multiple myeloma. Correlation of measured myeloma cell mass with presenting clinical features, response to treatment, and survival. *Cancer*. 1975;36(3):842-854.
- 19. Greipp PR, San Miguel J, Durie BG, et al. International staging system for multiple myeloma. *J Clin Oncol*. 2005;23(15):3412-3420.
- Moreau P, San Miguel J, Ludwig H, et al. Multiple myeloma: ESMO clinical practice guidelines for diagnosis, treatment and follow-up. Ann Oncol. 2013;24 (Suppl 6):vi133-vi137.
- Adriaens C, Standaert L, Barra J, et al. p53 induces formation of NEAT1 IncRNA-containing paraspeckles that modulate replication stress response and chemosensitivity. *Nat Med.* 2016;22(8):861-868.
- Blume CJ, Hotz-Wagenblatt A, Hullein J, et al. p53-dependent non-coding RNA networks in chronic lymphocytic leukemia. *Leukemia*. 2015;29(10):2015-2023.
- Taiana E, Favasuli V, Ronchetti D, et al. Long non-coding RNA NEAT1 targeting impairs the DNA repair machinery and triggers anti-tumor activity in multiple myeloma. *Leukemia*. 2020;34(1):234-244.
- 24. Chen Y, Qiu J, Chen B, et al. Long non-coding RNA NEAT1 plays an important role in sepsis-induced acute kidney injury by

targeting miR-204 and modulating the NF-kappaB pathway. *Int Immunopharmacol.* 2018;59:252-260.

- 25. Yun JP, Suh C, Lee E, et al. Comparison of serum beta 2-microglobulin and 24 hour urinary creatinine clearance as a prognostic factor in multiple myeloma. *J Korean Med Sci.* 2006;21(4):639-644.
- Teke HU, Basak M, Teke D, Kanbay M. Serum level of lactate dehydrogenase is a useful clinical marker to monitor progressive multiple myeloma diseases: a case report. *Turk J Haematol.* 2014;31(1):84-87.
- Munawar U, Roth M, Barrio S, et al. Assessment of TP53 lesions for p53 system functionality and drug resistance in multiple myeloma using an isogenic cell line model. *Sci Rep.* 2019;9(1):18062.
- Liu Y, Xue M, Du S, et al. Competitive endogenous RNA is an intrinsic component of EMT regulatory circuits and modulates EMT. *Nat Commun.* 2019;10(1):1637.
- Russo F, Fiscon G, Conte F, Rizzo M, Paci P, Pellegrini M. Interplay between long noncoding RNAs and MicroRNAs in cancer. *Methods Mol Biol.* 2018;1819:75-92.
- 30. Alzrigat M, Jernberg-Wiklund H. The miR-125a and miR-320c are potential tumor suppressor microRNAs epigenetically silenced by the polycomb repressive complex 2 in multiple myeloma. *RNA Dis.* 2017;4(2):e1529
- Chen D, Huang X, Lu S, et al. miRNA-125a modulates autophagy of thyroiditis through PI3K/Akt/mTOR signaling pathway. *Exp Ther Med.* 2019;17(4):2465-2472.
- Niu W, Sun B, Li M, Cui J, Huang J, Zhang L. TLR-4/microR-NA-125a/NF-kappaB signaling modulates the immune response to Mycobacterium tuberculosis infection. *Cell Cycle*. 2018;17(15):1931-1945.

SUPPORTING INFORMATION

Additional supporting information may be found online in the Supporting Information section.

How to cite this article: Yu H, Peng S, Chen X, Han S, Luo J. Long non-coding RNA NEAT1 serves as a novel biomarker for treatment response and survival profiles via microRNA-125a in multiple myeloma. *J Clin Lab Anal*. 2020;34:e23399. <u>https://doi.</u> org/10.1002/jcla.23399