p-STAT3 expression in breast cancer correlates negatively with tumor size and HER2 status

Yan Wang, MM^a, Qian Wang, MS^b, Chih-Hsin Tang, PhD^{c,d,e}, Hua-Dong Chen, MS^f, Gui-Nv Hu, MB^g, Jun-Kang Shao, MB^b, Xiao-Fang Dong, MB^a, Lu-Lu Jin, MB^h, Chao-Qun Wang, MM^{b,*}

Abstract

Although some studies have reported the expression and clinical significance of phosphorylated signal transducer and activator of transcription 3 (p-STAT3) in breast cancer tissues, it is still controversial whether p-STAT3 play a role in promoting or suppressing cancer. Here, we used immunohistochemistry analysis to explore expression of p-STAT3 in 407 cases of breast cancer, and analyzed the relationship between p-STAT3 expression and the clinicopathological characteristics and prognosis of breast cancer patients. Positive p-STAT3 expression was seen in 112 cases (27.5%) of breast cancer. p-STAT3 expression was negatively correlated with tumor size, tumor stage and human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2) status, and the positive rate of p-STAT3 was lowest in HER2-enriched subtype breast cancer (15.3%), while other subtypes were luminal B (23.0%), luminal A (30.2%), and triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC) (37.5%). Logistic regression model multivariate analysis showed that the independent correlation factor of p-STAT3 expression in breast cancer was tumor size (OR=0.187, 95% CI=0.042–0.839, P=.029) and HER2 status (OR=0.392, 95% CI=0.216–0.710, P=.002). In this study, no clear relationship was observed between patients' prognosis and expression of p-STAT3. Therefore, we suggest that p-STAT3 expression in breast cancer is negatively correlated with tumor size and HER2 status, but appears to have no effect on survival.

Abbreviations: ER = estrogen receptor, HER2 = human epidermal growth factor receptor 2, OS = overall survival, PR = progesterone receptor, p-STAT3 = phosphorylated STAT3, RFS = relapse-free survival, STAT3 = signal transducer and activator of transcription 3, TNBC = triple-negative breast cancer.

Keywords: breast cancer, human epidermal growth factor receptor 2, immunohistochemistry, phosphorylated STAT3

Editor: Gaurav Sharma.

YW and QW contributed equally to this manuscript.

CQW and CHT contributed equally to this manuscript.

This work was supported by grants from National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 81802660) and Zhejiang Public Welfare Technology Application Social Development Project (No. LGF19H160003).

The authors have no conflicts of interests to disclose.

All data generated or analyzed during this study are included in this published article [and its supplementary information files].

^a Department of Medical Oncology, ^b Department of Pathology, Affiliated Dongyang Hospital of Wenzhou Medical University, Dongyang, Zhejiang, People's Republic of China, ^c Graduate Institute of Basic Medical Science, ^d Department of Pharmacology, School of Medicine, China Medical University, ^e Department of Biotechnology, College of Health Science, Asia University, Taichung, Taiwan, ^f Department of Pharmacy, ^g Department of Surgical Oncology, ^h Laboratory of Biomedicine, Affiliated Dongyang Hospital of Wenzhou Medical University, Dongyang, Zhejiang, People's Republic of China.

^{*} Correspondence: Chao-Qun Wang, Department of Pathology, Affiliated Dongyang Hospital of Wenzhou Medical University, 60 Wu Ning Xi Road, Dongyang 322100, China (e-mail: chaoqunw869@163.com).

Copyright © 2021 the Author(s). Published by Wolters Kluwer Health, Inc. This is an open access article distributed under the terms of the Creative Commons Attribution-Non Commercial License 4.0 (CCBY-NC), where it is permissible to download, share, remix, transform, and buildup the work provided it is properly cited. The work cannot be used commercially without permission from the journal.

How to cite this article: Wang Y, Wang Q, Tang CH, Chen HD, Hu GN, Shao JK, Dong XF, Jin LL, Wang CQ. p-STAT3 expression in breast cancer correlates negatively with tumor size and HER2 status. Medicine 2021;100:10(e25124).

Received: 13 August 2020 / Received in final form: 30 January 2021 / Accepted: 16 February 2021

http://dx.doi.org/10.1097/MD.00000000025124

1. Introduction

Breast cancer is one of the most common types of cancers worldwide, and is the leading cause of cancer-related death among women.^[1] Overexpression of the human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2) protein or amplification of the HER2 gene occurs in ~15% to 20% of all breast cancers.^[2,3] HER2-positive breast cancer has a worse prognosis and having an increased risk of recurrence and a more aggressive disease course.^[4-6] Signal transducer and activator of transcription 3 (STAT3) belongs to the transcription factor family and is usually abnormally activated in malignant tumors, causing STAT3 to play an important role in tumor growth, invasion and metastasis.^[7,8] The activation of STAT3 in breast cancer has received widespread attention.^[9,10] Although several papers have previously reported on the levels of phosphorylated STAT3 (p-STAT3) expression and their clinical significance in human breast cancer tissue specimens, the evidence is controversial as to whether p-STAT3 activation promotes or suppresses cancer.[11-16]

Medicine

In this study, we performed an immunohistochemical analysis to detect p-STAT3 expression in breast cancer tissue samples obtained from 407 Chinese Han women. We sought to determine the clinicopathological and prognostic significance of p-STAT3 expression levels in breast cancer.

2. Materials and methods

2.1. Patients and tissue samples

Breast cancer tissue samples were obtained from 407 untreated Chinese Han women who underwent breast cancer surgery in the Affiliated Dongyang Hospital of Wenzhou Medical University (Dongyang, Zhejiang, China) between 2007 and 2019. Inclusion criteria: patients diagnosed with invasive breast cancer by pathological diagnosis; exclusion criteria: anti-tumor therapy such as chemotherapy, immunotherapy and radiotherapy before surgery. Patients aged 26 to 90 years, with a median age of 50 years. A pathohistological diagnosis was made according to the breast tumor classification criteria of the World Health Organization.^[17] Histological grading was based on the Scarff-Bloom-Richardson system.^[18] According to estrogen receptor (ER), progesterone receptor (PR), human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER2), and Ki-67 status, the samples were classified into 4 subtypes^[19-21]: luminal A (ER⁺/PR⁺ [>20%]/ HER2⁻, Ki67 <14%); luminal B, containing hormone receptorpositive cases that did not meet the conditions of luminal A; HER2-enriched (ER⁻, PR⁻, HER2⁺); or triple-negative breast cancer (TNBC) (ER⁻, PR⁻, HER2⁻). Follow-up information was available for 235 patients with breast cancer with a median follow-up time of 60 months (range, 6-72 months). The Ethics Committee of the Affiliated Dongyang Hospital of Wenzhou Medical University approved this study. All study methods satisfied the relevant guidelines and regulations issued by the Affiliated Dongyang Hospital of Wenzhou Medical University.

2.2. Tissue array preparation

We followed the methods of C-Q. Wang et al 2020.^[22] In brief, the Quick-Ray UT-06 (Unitma Co., Ltd., Seoul, Korea) tissue microarray system and the Quick-Ray premade recipient block (UB-06) wax model were used to prepare tissue specimens (1 mm in diameter). Two representative sites from each breast cancer tissue sample were selected for sampling.

2.3. IHC analysis

Immunohistochemical analysis was conducted as described previously.^[20] The primary antibodies used were anti-p-STAT3 mouse monoclonal antibody (clone M9C6; diluted at 1:75; Cell Signaling Technology, Boston, USA), Hercep Test (Dako), ready-to-use anti-ER rabbit monoclonal antibody (clone SP1, Dako), ready-to-use anti-PR mouse monoclonal antibody (clone PgR636, Dako), and ready-to-use anti-Ki-67 mouse monoclonal antibody (clone MIB-1, Dako).

2.4. Assessment of staining

The entire tissue array section was scanned and scored separately by 2 pathologists. A case was considered to be p-STAT3-positive, ER-positive or PR-positive if the percentage of positive invasive cancer cells (nuclear staining) was $\geq 1\%$.^[23] HER2 status was assessed according to the 2018 American Society of Clinical Oncology/College of American Pathologists guidelines for HER2 testing in breast cancer.^[24]

2.5. Patient follow-Up

We followed the methods of C-Q. Wang et al 2020.^[22]

2.6. Statistical analysis

Statistical analyses were conducted using SPSS software version 19.0 (SPSS Inc, Chicago, IL). Between-group differences were compared using a Pearson's Chi-Squared test for qualitative variables. The correlation between p-STAT3 and HER2 protein expression was assessed by Spearman's correlation analysis. The independent correlation factor of p-STAT3 expression in breast cancer was assessed by logistic regression model multivariate analysis. Relapse-free survival (RFS) and overall survival (OS) rates were estimated by the Kaplan–Meier method and compared using log-rank testing. Multivariate analysis using the Cox proportional hazard model was performed to investigate independent factors prognostic of RFS and OS. P < .05 was considered to be statistically significant.

3. Results

3.1. Expression of p-STAT3 in breast cancer tissue and its relationship with clinicopathological characteristics of patients

p-STAT3 was expressed in the nuclei of breast cancer cells. The proportion of positive p-STAT3 expression in breast cancer tissue specimens was 27.5% (112/407). As shown in Table 1, p-STAT3 expression was significantly and negatively associated with tumor size (P=.016) and stage (P=.027). We observed significantly higher levels of p-STAT3 expression in breast

Table 1

Association of p-STAT3 expression with clinicopathological parameters in breast cancer patients.

Parameters	No. of patients	p-STAT3 positive expression, n (%)	P value
<35	23	6 (26.1%)	.902
	242	65 (26.9%)	
>55	142	41 (28.9%)	
Tumor size (cm)		· · · /	
<2	181	61 (33.7%)	.016
	205	49 (23.9%)	
>5	21	2 (9.5%)	
Lymph node metastases		· · · ·	
No	204	59 (28.9%)	.525
Yes	203	53 (26.1%)	
Tumor grade		· · · · ·	
	21	6 (28.6%)	.393
II	260	77 (29.6%)	
Ш	126	29 (23.0%)	
Tumor stage		· · · ·	
1	105	39 (37.1%)	.027
II	203	52 (25.6%)	
Ш	99	21 (21.2%)	
IV	0	0 (0.00)	
Estrogen receptor			
Negative	173	48 (27.7%)	.930
Positive	234	64 (27.4%)	
Progesterone receptor			
Negative	215	56 (26.0%)	.482
Positive	192	56 (29.2%)	
HER2 expression			
Negative (0-1+)	195	68 (34.9%)	.004
Equivocal (2+)	111	26 (23.4%)	
Positive (3+)	101	18 (17.8%)	
Molecular classification			
Luminal A	139	42 (30.2%)	.008
Luminal B	100	23 (23.0%)	
HER2-enriched	72	11 (15.3%)	
Triple-negative breast cancer	96	36 (37.5%)	



Figure 1. A tendency of negative protein levels between HER2 and p-STAT3 in breast cancer. Human breast cancer tissue microarrays were immune-stained with anti-HER2 and anti-p-STAT3 antibodies. Representative staining pictures of tumors are shown.

cancer tissue specimens from cases that were HER2-negative (0-1+) (34.9%, 68/195) compared with those that were HER2equivocal (2+) (23.4%, 26/111) or HER2-positive (3+) (17.8%, 18/101; P = .004) (Fig. 1). Spearman correlation analysis revealed a significantly negative correlation between HER2-positive and p-STAT3-positive expression in breast cancer tissue specimens (R= $^{-}0.164$, P=.001). p-STAT3-positive rates were lowest in HER2-enriched breast cancer (15.3%, 11/72), and the rates were 23.0% for luminal B (23/100), 30.2% for luminal A (42/139), and 37.5% for TNBC (36/96) (P=.008).

Logistic regression multivariate analysis showed that the independent predictors of p-STAT3 expression in breast cancer included larger tumor size (OR = 0.187, 95% CI = 0.042-0.839, P=.029) and HER2-positive status (0.392, 0.216-0.710, P = .002).

We analyzed the relationship between p-STAT3 expression and tumor size and HER2 status in different stages of breast cancer. In stage II tumors, we also observed significantly higher levels of p-STAT3 expression in tissue specimens from cases that were HER2-negative (32.7%, 34/104) compared with those that were HER2-equivocal (22.2%, 12/54) or HER2-positive (13.3%, 6/45; P=.036). Spearman correlation analysis revealed a significantly negative correlation between HER2-positive and p-STAT3-positive expression in stage II breast cancer tissue specimens (R=0.180, P=.010). Higher levels of p-STAT3 expression were observed in stage II breast cancer tissue specimens from cases that tumor size were $\leq 2 \text{ cm}$ (36.6%, 15/ 41) compared with those that were 2 to 5 cm (23.2%, 36/155) or >5 cm (14.3%, 1/7), but the between-group difference was not statistically significant (P = .172). Logistic regression multivariate analysis showed that the independent predictor of p-STAT3 expression in stage II breast cancer was HER2-positive status (0.317, 0.122–0.821, P = .018). In stage I and stage III tumors, there is no correlation between p-STAT3 expression and tumor size and HER2 status, and logistic regression multivariate analysis showed that tumor size and HER2 status are not the independent risk factors for p-STAT3 expression.

3.2. No association between p-STAT3 expression and survival of patients with breast cancer

To assess the potential impact p-STAT3 expression on patient survival, we analyzed p-STAT3 expression in relation to RFS and OS rates in patients with breast cancer. As shown in Figures 2A and 2B, no clear associations were observed between p-STAT3 expression and these survival variables (P > .05 for each comparison).

In Cox proportional hazards regression analysis, patient age (hazard ratio [HR]=0.124, 95% CI=0.043-0.355, P < .001) and tumor stage (8.161, 1.840-36.206, P=.006) were independent predictors for RFS. Patient age (HR=0.184, 95% CI=0.049-0.683, P=.011) and tumor stage (12.519, 1.554-100.868, P=.018) also independently predicted OS.



Figure 2. p-STAT3 expression not associated with the survival of patients with breast cancer. The associations of p-STAT3 expression with relapse-free survival (RFS) (A) and overall survival (OS) (B) are shown.

We analyzed the effect of p-STAT3 expression on the prognosis of stage I, stage II, and stage III tumors. The prognosis of tumors that were p-STAT3-positive, did not differ significantly from p-STAT3-negative group in stage I, stage II, and stage III disease.

4. Discussion

Several papers have previously described different levels of p-STAT3 expression in breast cancer tissue specimens, but without confirming whether p-STAT3 plays a role in promoting or suppressing cancer.^[11–16] Some reports have shown that p-STAT3 expression is significantly associated with a good prognosis and features such as smaller tumor size, lower grade, ER-positivity, PR-positivity, and the luminal A subtype.^[13,14,16] Other reports have found that p-STAT3 expression is positively correlated with adverse prognostic factors such as lymph node metastasis and higher tumor stage^{11,12}, while still other researchers have found no correlations between p-STAT3 expression and patients' prognosis or tumor size.^[12,15] We speculate that differences between the research populations and the evaluation criteria used to determine p-STAT3 expression is the main reason for these inconsistent findings.

In this study, we determined levels of p-STAT3 expression in 407 breast cancer tissue samples obtained from Chinese Han women. p-STAT3 expression was significantly lower in women whose tumors were larger, of a higher stage, HER2-positive, or HER2-enriched. The lower expression of p-STAT3 in HER2enriched and luminal B tumors compared with levels of p-STAT3 expression in luminal A and TNBC tumors is because all HER2enriched and some luminal B cases are HER2-positive. Further analysis showed that tumor size and HER2 status are independent correlation factor for p-STAT3 expression in breast cancer. A survival analysis revealed no apparent association between p-STAT3 expression and survival of patients with breast cancer. These results suggest that p-STAT3 expression in breast cancer is negatively correlated with tumor size and HER2 status. This study echo other reports describing tumor size is not an independent prognostic factor for breast cancer.^[25,26] Therefore, although p-STAT3 is negatively correlated with tumor size, it does not translate to improved overall survival.

We speculate that activation of STAT3 signaling pathway in breast cancer may be mutually exclusive with the HER2 pathway, and that in HER2-negative breast cancer, other signaling pathways may be mutually exclusive with the STAT3 pathway. Therefore, in primary untreated breast cancer, the STAT3 pathway may not play a major role in its development. Studies have confirmed in vitro that activation of STAT3 mediates HER2 targeted therapy resistance, including trastuzumab or trastuzumab-emtansine (T-DM1).^[27,28] So we think when a patient's oncology treatment inhibits the mutually exclusive pathway with STAT3, such as HER2, this may lead to activation of the STAT3 pathway and increase p-STAT3 expression, with eventual drug resistance. Solving these problems has enormous value for understanding drug resistance mechanisms and improve the efficacy of breast cancer treatment in the future.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank Iona J. MacDonald from China Medical University for her English language revision of this manuscript.

Author contributions

CQW designed the experiments. YW, QW, and LLJ performed the experiments. CQW, HDC, and XFD analyzed the data. GNH and JKS were responsible for management of the clinical samples. The manuscript was written by CQW and revised by CHT. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

Conceptualization: Chao-Qun Wang.

- Data curation: Hua-Dong Chen, Xiao-Fang Dong, Chao-Qun Wang.
- Funding acquisition: Chao-Qun Wang.
- Methodology: Yan Wang, Qian Wang, Lu-Lu Jin.
- Resources: Gui-Nv Hu, Jun-Kang Shao.
- Writing original draft: Chao-Qun Wang.
- Writing review & editing: Chih-Hsin Tang, Chao-Qun Wang.

References

- Bray F, Ferlay J, Soerjomataram I, et al. Global cancer statistics 2018: GLOBOCAN estimates of incidence and mortality worldwide for 36 cancers in 185 countries. CA: Cancer J Clin 2018;68:394–424.
- [2] Wolff AC, Hammond ME, Hicks DG, et al. Recommendations for human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 testing in breast cancer: American Society of Clinical Oncology/College of American Pathologists clinical practice guideline update. J Clin Oncol 2013;31:3997–4013.
- [3] Ruschoff J, Lebeau A, Kreipe H, et al. Nicht-interventionelle Untersuchung HERSGAssessing HER2 testing quality in breast cancer: variables that influence HER2 positivity rate from a large, multicenter, observational study in Germany. Mod Pathol 2017;30:217–26.
- [4] Slamon DJ, Clark GM, Wong SG, et al. Human breast cancer: correlation of relapse and survival with amplification of the HER-2/neu oncogene. Science 1987;235:177–82.
- [5] Slamon DJ, Godolphin W, Jones LA, et al. Studies of the HER-2/neu proto-oncogene in human breast and ovarian cancer. Science 1989;244:707–12.
- [6] Huang TH, Wu F, Loeb GB, et al. Up-regulation of miR-21 by HER2/neu signaling promotes cell invasion. J Biol Chem 2009;284:18515–24.
- [7] Pencik J, Pham HT, Schmoellerl J, et al. JAK-STAT signaling in cancer: From cytokines to non-coding genome. Cytokine 2016;87:26–36.
- [8] Groner B, von Manstein V. Jak Stat signaling and cancer: opportunities, benefits and side effects of targeted inhibition. Mol Cell Endocrinol 2017;451:1–4.
- [9] Banerjee K, Resat H. Constitutive activation of STAT3 in breast cancer cells: a review. Int J Cancer 2016;138:2570–8.
- [10] Wang T, Fahrmann JF, Lee H, et al. JAK/STAT3-regulated fatty acid beta-oxidation is critical for breast cancer stem cell self-renewal and chemoresistance. Cell Metab 2018;27:1357.
- [11] Li Y, Wang Y, Shi Z, et al. Clinicopathological and prognostic role of STAT3/p-STAT3 in breast cancer patients in China: a meta-analysis. Sci Rep 2019;9:11243.
- [12] Zhang N, Ma ZP, Wang J, et al. Human papillomavirus infection correlates with inflammatory Stat3 signaling activity and IL-17 expression in patients with breast cancer. Am J Transl Res 2016;8:3214–26.
- [13] Sonnenblick A, Salgado R, Brohee S, et al. p-STAT3 in luminal breast cancer: integrated RNA-protein pooled analysis and results from the BIG 2-98 phase III trial. Int J Oncol 2018;52:424–32.
- [14] Liu Y, Huang J, Li W, et al. Meta-analysis of STAT3 and phospho-STAT3 expression and survival of patients with breast cancer. Oncotarget 2018;9:13060–7.
- [15] Liu C, Zhou S, Ke CS, et al. Activation and prognostic significance of AKT, NF-kappaB and STAT3 in breast cancer with lymph node metastasis and estrogen receptor expression. Ai zheng = Aizheng = Chinese journal of cancer 2007;26:929–36.
- [16] Aleskandarany MA, Agarwal D, Negm OH, et al. The prognostic significance of STAT3 in invasive breast cancer: analysis of protein and mRNA expressions in large cohorts. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2016;156:9–20.
- [17] Lakhani SREI, Schnitt SJ, Tan PH, et al. WHO Classification of Tumours of the Breast, Fourth Edition. Lyon: IARC Press; 2012.

- [18] Elston CW, Ellis IO. Pathological prognostic factors in breast cancer. I. The value of histological grade in breast cancer: experience from a large study with long-term follow-up. Histopathology 1991;19:403–10.
- [19] Park S, Koo JS, Kim MS, et al. Characteristics and outcomes according to molecular subtypes of breast cancer as classified by a panel of four biomarkers using immunohistochemistry. Breast 2012;21:50–7.
- [20] Wang CQ, Tang CH, Chang HT, et al. Fascin-1 as a novel diagnostic marker of triple-negative breast cancer. Cancer Med 2016;5:1983–8.
- [21] Wang CQ, Li Y, Huang BF, et al. EGFR conjunct FSCN1 as a novel therapeutic strategy in triple-negative breast cancer. Sci Rep 2017; 7:15654.
- [22] Wang CQ, Wang Y, Huang BF, et al. High expression of both resistin and fascin-1 predicts a poor prognosis in patients with colorectal cancer. Biomed Res Int 2020;2020:8753175.
- [23] Nguyen TH, Nguyen VH, Nguyen TL, et al. Evaluations of biomarker status changes between primary and recurrent tumor tissue samples in breast cancer patients. Biomed Res Int 2019;2019:7391237.

- [24] Wolff AC, Hammond MEH, Allison KH, et al. Human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 testing in breast cancer: American Society of Clinical Oncology/College of American Pathologists Clinical Practice Guideline Focused Update. J Clin Oncol 2018;36:2105–22.
- [25] Zhang Y, Qu Q, Mao Y, et al. Effect of body mass index on disease-free and overall survival in Chinese women with breast cancer. Zhonghua zhong liu za zhi [Chinese journal of oncology] 2015;37:395–9.
- [26] Geng WW, Zhang B, Li DH, et al. Analysis of correlation between breast cancer molecular subtypes and prognosis of patients receiving breastconserving therapy. Zhonghua yi xue za zhi 2013;93:1571–3.
- [27] Wang L, Wang Q, Gao M, et al. STAT3 activation confers trastuzumabemtansine (T-DM1) resistance in HER2-positive breast cancer. Cancer Sci 2018;109:3305–15.
- [28] Aghazadeh S, Yazdanparast R. Activation of STAT3/HIF-1alpha/Hes-1 axis promotes trastuzumab resistance in HER2-overexpressing breast cancer cells via down-regulation of PTEN. Biochimica et Biophysica Acta General Subjects 2017;1861:1970–80.