Contents lists available at ScienceDirect

# Clinical and Translational Radiation Oncology

journal homepage: www.elsevier.com/locate/ctro

Original Research Article

# P4HA1: A single-gene surrogate of hypoxia signatures in oral squamous cell carcinoma patients



Matthias Kappler<sup>a,\*</sup>, Johanna Kotrba<sup>a,1</sup>, Tom Kaune<sup>a</sup>, Matthias Bache<sup>b</sup>, Swetlana Rot<sup>a</sup>, Daniel Bethmann<sup>c</sup>, Henri Wichmann<sup>a</sup>, Antje Güttler<sup>b</sup>, Udo Bilkenroth<sup>d</sup>, Susanne Horter<sup>a</sup>, Lisa Gallwitz<sup>e</sup>, Jacqueline Kessler<sup>b</sup>, Thomas Greither<sup>e</sup>, Helge Taubert<sup>f</sup>, Alexander W. Eckert<sup>a,2</sup>, Dirk Vordermark<sup>b,2</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Plastic Surgery, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, Halle (Saale), Germany

<sup>b</sup> Department of Radiotherapy, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, Halle (Saale), Germany

<sup>c</sup> Institute of Pathology, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, Halle (Saale), Germany

<sup>d</sup> Institute of Pathology, Eisleben, Germany

<sup>e</sup> Center for Reproductive Medicine and Andrology, Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg, Germany

<sup>f</sup>Clinic of Urology and Pediatric Urology, University Hospital Erlangen, Erlangen, Germany

### ARTICLE INFO

Article history: Received 15 May 2017 Revised 24 May 2017 Accepted 24 May 2017 Available online 27 June 2017

Keywords: P4HA1 Survival Hypoxia OSCC Recurrence

# ABSTRACT

*Background and purpose:* Hypoxia gene expression signatures are of high prognostic value for head and neck cancer patients. Recently, the prognostic information of a multiple-gene hypoxia signature was found to be provided by the mRNA level of *P4HA1* alone (Tawk et al., 2016). Therefore, we studied the prognostic value of *P4HA1* in an independent cohort of oral squamous cell carcinoma (OSCC) patients. *Material and methods:* Frozen tumor samples of 118 adult OSCC patients were analysed for *P4HA1* mRNA level by quantitative real-time TaqMan<sup>™</sup> PCR analysis. Kaplan-Meier analysis and Cox's regression analysis were performed to characterize the prognostic impact of *P4HA1* mRNA level in OSCC patients. *Results:* The analyzed patient cohort was divided into four subgroups according to the quartiles of the *P4HA1* mRNA levels. The highest intratumoral *P4HA1* mRNA level was significantly correlated with a poor overall survival (RR = 2.2; *P* = 0.04) and an increased risk of locoregional recurrence (RR = 4.8; *P* = 0.02). In patients who received radiotherapy (*n* = 82) highest intratumoral *P4HA1* mRNA level was significantly correlated with a poor overall survival (RR = 3.4; *P* = 0.01) and an increased risk of locoregional recurrence (RR = 10.3; *P* = 0.005). Moreover, significant correlations between the *P4HA1* mRNA level and the mRNA level of several EMT and stem cell markers were found.

*Conclusions:* A high *P4HA1* mRNA level, as a single-gene surrogate of hypoxia, is an independent prognostic marker for the overall survival and locoregional recurrence of OSCC patients.

© 2017 The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ireland Ltd on behalf of European Society for Radiotherapy and Oncology. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/ licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

### Introduction

Head and neck squamous cell carcinoma (HNSCC) is one of the ten most common cancers worldwide with an incidence of 780.000 per year, whereby most of the HNSCC are oral squamous cell carcinomas (OSCC) [1,2]. The 5-year overall survival time has stagnated since years at about 40–50% [3]. In OSCC, tumor hypoxia is a characteristic feature as shown by the overexpression of the transcription factor hypoxia-inducible factor 1 (HIF-1) [4,5].

http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ctro.2017.05.002

sue and the adverse prognostic consequences in head and neck cancer have led to the evaluation of hypoxia gene signatures. Recently, the clinical relevance of three common hypoxia signature studies was established [6–8]. However, prolyl 4-hydroxylase (*P4HA1*), which is the only gene common to all identified hypoxia signatures, was found to provide a similar prognostic information regarding overall survival of head and neck cancer patients as the full signatures [9]. In human fibroblasts the transcriptional activity of HIF1 on P4HA1 had an impact on matrix stiffness, extracellular matrix production and cell-matrix interaction that affects cancer cell adhesion and invasion [3,10]. *P4HA1* expression has consistently been described as stably increased under hypoxia on the mRNA as well as on the protein level [11,12].

Efforts to characterize the extent of hypoxia within a tumor tis-

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author at: Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Plastic Surgery, University of Halle-Wittenberg, Ernst-Grube-Str. 40, D-06097 Halle(S), Germany. *E-mail address:* matthias.kappler@medizin.uni-halle.de (M. Kappler).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup> Present address: Institute of Molecular and Clinical Immunology, Otto-von-Guericke-University. Magdeburg. Germany.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Sub-

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup> Both authors contributed equally.

<sup>2405-6308/© 2017</sup> The Authors. Published by Elsevier Ireland Ltd on behalf of European Society for Radiotherapy and Oncology. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/).

The prolyl 4-hydroxylase (P4HA1) gene is coding for a protein involved in the hydroxylation of proline residues in posttranslational collagen synthesis. The human prolyl 4-hydroxylases are tetrameric isoenzymes composed of two  $\beta$  subunits (encoded by *P4HB*) and two (catalytic)  $\alpha$  subunits. There are three different α subunits encoded by P4HA1, P4HA2 and P4HA3 [13]. The knockout of P4HA1 in mice is lethal and is associated with overall developmental delay, due to the lack of collagen IV in the extracellular matrix and a disrupted basement membrane [14]. Recently, P4HA1 was found to be overexpressed in gliomas and the expression correlated with tumor microvessel density. That fact demonstrated that P4HA1 influences the neovascularization in gliomas, whereas a knockdown of P4HA1 decreases the levels of collagen IV and disrupts the vascular basement membrane [15]. The authors believe P4HA1 may have a role in the transdifferentiation process of glioma stem cells into endothelial cells [15].

To evaluate the prognostic potential of *P4HA1* in an independent data set, we studied its mRNA level in the tumor tissue of 118 OSCC patients and determined its association with overall survival and locoregional control as well as with mRNA levels of selected epithelial mesenchymal transition (EMT) and stem cell markers.

# Material and methods

# Tissue samples and histopathological data

We examined frozen primary tumor samples of 118 OSCC patients. All patients had been treated with surgery at the Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Plastic Surgery, Martin Luther University Halle Wittenberg, Germany. The tissue samples were cut by a cryocut microtome and the first and the last histologic sections were stained with hematoxylin and eosin. Experienced pathologists (UB, DB) verified the sections. We defined samples as tumor tissue when >70% of the first and the last histologic sections were tumor tissue. All patients gave written informed consent. The study was carried out in compliance with the Helsinki Declaration, and it was approved by the Ethics Committee of the Medical Faculty of Martin Luther University Halle-Wittenberg.

51 patients were alive after a median observation time of 31 months (mean 33 months), whereas 67 patients died after a median time of 13 months (mean 16 months) after diagnosis. The histopathological and clinical data have been summarized in Tables 1 and 2.

# Cell culture

To study the hypoxic P4HA1 mRNA level in relevant *in vitro* models, we analyzed the human cell lines CAL-33 (derived from a primary tumor of the tongue; Deutsche Sammlung von Mikroorganismen und Zellkulturen GmbH, Braunschweig, Germany), SAS (derived from a primary tumor of the tongue; Deutsches Krebsforschungszentrum, Heidelberg, Germany) and XF354 (derived from a primary SCC of the floor of the mouth; Deutsches Krebsforschungszentrum, Heidelberg, Germany). The cells were cultured as monolayers in RPMI 1640 medium (Lonza, Walkersville, MD, USA) containing 10% fetal calf serum, 1% sodium pyruvate, 180 U/ml penicillin and 180  $\mu$ g/ml streptomycin. The cultures were maintained at 37 °C in a humidified atmosphere supplemented with 5% CO<sub>2</sub>.

Cells were cultured in RPMI medium containing glutamine and 10% fetal calf serum overnight under normoxic (21% oxygen) or hypoxic conditions (<1% oxygen) which was achieved using a gas generator system as described previously [16]. Cells were then harvested by treatment with trypsin and RNA was isolated.

#### **RNA-Isolation**

Snap-frozen tumor samples were cut into  $20 \ \mu m$  tissue sections and RNA was isolated by Trizol reagent according to the manufacturer's protocol (Invitrogen, Karlsruhe, Germany). The RNA of treated cell lines was isolated equally. DNA contaminations were removed by DNAse I digestion (Qiagen, Hilden, Germany). The RNA concentration was determined using a Nanodrop spectrophotometer (Thermo Scientific, Karlsruhe, Germany).

# Quantitative RT-PCR

6 μg of total RNA was used for cDNA synthesis (tissue samples) and 1 μg for cell line samples according to standard protocols (Fermentas, St. Leon-Rot, Germany) as previously described [17]. The cDNA was amplified by automated real-time quantitative TaqMan<sup>TM</sup> assays for *P4HA1* and *RPII* as a housekeeping gene using kits from Thermo Fisher Scientific (Darmstadt, Germany). *P4HA1* transcript amounts were normalized to *RPII* transcript amounts using the ΔΔCt method [18].

Moreover, the same cDNA was used to analyze the normalized mRNA levels of the EMT-markers *ZEB2*, *Twist*, *TGF* $\beta$ , *MMP7*, *CTGF*, the stem cell markers *Oct3/4*, *Snai1*, *Snai2*, *LGR4*, *LGR5FL*, the structure proteins *CDH1*, *vimentin*, *KRT13* the hypoxic markers *CA9*, *VEGF*, *Glut1*, *HIF1* $\alpha$  and mRNA of *MDM2*, *survivin*, *HER2*, *EGFR*, *PDL-1* and *Osteopontin* using TaqMan<sup>TM</sup> assays (Thermo Fisher Scientific (Darmstadt, Germany) or as previously described [19,20]. The primers for the analysis of *CTGF* were: fw: 5'gag cag ctg caa gta cca gt, rw: 5'gtc ttc cag tcg gta agc cg. The mRNA-level of *P4HA1* was correlated with those markers via Spearman's rank correlation (see Table 3).

# Statistical analysis

Cox's regression hazard model and Kaplan-Meier analysis were used to estimate a correlation of P4HA1 mRNA with overall survival of OSCC patients. Cox's regression hazard model for analysis of overall survival and locoregional control was adjusted for the prognostic effect of covariates (T-stage and N-stage and grading), and the relative risk (RR) was calculated. Survival times were calculated from the day of tumor diagnosis. The end point for the overall survival analysis was the time of death of the patient. The end point for the locoregional control analysis was the first recurrence. The interrelationships between the different mRNA levels were tested with the Spearman's rank correlation (rs, correlation coefficient). The correlation of the P4HA1 mRNA level, T-stage, N-stage, grading and gender of the patients were tested with the Kruskal Wallis test. A probability (P) of <0.05 was defined as significant. Statistical analyses were carried out using SPSS software version 20.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, USA).

# Results

# Correlation of the P4HA1 mRNA level with the survival of OSCC patients

The *P4HA1* mRNA level of 118 OSCC samples was normalized to the *RPII* mRNA level. The OSCC cohort was than divided into quartiles (low *P4HA1* mRNA level, <75.7; moderate *P4HA1* mRNA level, 75.71–131.9; high *P4HA1* mRNA level, 131.91–174.1 and very high *P4HA1* mRNA level, >174.1). The transcript ratios of 118 OSCC samples ranged from 13 to 565. (mean 162; median 127.5).

The 3-year overall survival rate was 70% for patients with a low, 45% with a moderate, 45% with a high and 33% with a very high intratumoral *P4HA1* mRNA level. OSCC patients with a very high

#### Table 1

Clinicopathological data of OSCC patients.

LowModerateHighVery highTotal Gender11830292930Men9419 (63%)23 (79%)24 (83%)28 (93%)Women2411 (37%)6 (21%)5 (17%)2 (7%)Age (years)<606717 (57%)18 (62%)17 (57%)15 (50%)>605113 (43%)11 (38%)12 (41%)4 (13%)T-stageI196 (20%)5 (17%)4 (14%)4 (13%)II358 (27%)10 (35%)12 (41%)5 (17%)III217 (23%)7 (24%)3 (10%)4 (13%)IV439 (30%)7 (24%)3 (10%)4 (13%)N-stageN04411 (37%)14 (48%)10 (35%)9 (30%)N1-37419 (63%)2 (7%)2 (7%)3 (10%)2125 (17%)2 (7%)2 (7%)3 (10%)3225 (17%)7 (24%)3 (10%)7 (23%)32219 (63%)20 (69%)24 (43%)19 (63%)3225 (17%)7 (24%)3 (10%)7 (23%)3225 (17%)7 (24%)3 (10%)7 (23%)3225 (17%)7 (24%)3 (10%)7 (23%)3225 (17%)7 (24%)3 (10%)7 (23%)3225 (17%)7	Category	Number of cases	P4HA1 mRNA leve	P4HA1 mRNA level			
Total Gender11830292930Gender9419 (63%)23 (79%)24 (83%)28 (93%)Women2411 (37%)6 (21%)5 (17%)2 (7%)Age (years) $    -$ <606717 (57%)18 (62%)17 (57%)15 (50%)>605113 (43%)11 (38%)17 (57%)15 (50%) $-$ Stage $   -$ I196 (20%)5 (17%)4 (14%)4 (13%)II358 (27%)10 (35%)12 (41%)5 (17%)III217 (23%)7 (24%)3 (10%)4 (13%)IV439 (30%)7 (24%)10 (35%)9 (30%)N-stage $   -$ No4411 (37%)14 (48%)10 (35%)9 (30%)N1-37419 (63%)15 (52%)19 (65%)21 (70%)Grading $   -$ 1125 (17%)2 (7%)3 (10%)7 (23%)3225 (17%)7 (24%)3 (10%)7 (23%)3225 (37%)001 (30%)210 (35%)20 (69%)24 (83%)19 (65%)3225 (17%)7 (24%)3 (10%)7 (23%)3225 (3%)5 (19%)4 (14%)6 (23%)No249 (36%)5 (19%)4 (14%)6 (23%)No<			Low	Moderate	High	Very high	
Men9419 (63%)23 (79%)24 (83%)28 (93%)Women2411 (37%)6 (21%)5 (17%)2 (7%)Age (years) $\cdot$ $\cdot$ $\cdot$ $\cdot$ <506717 (57%)18 (62%)17 (57%)15 (50%)>605113 (43%)11 (38%)12 (41%)15 (50%) $-560$ 5196 (20%)5 (17%)4 (14%)4 (13%) $T$ -stage $    -$ 1196 (20%)5 (17%)12 (41%)5 (17%)101358 (27%)10 (35%)12 (41%)5 (17%)111217 (23%)7 (24%)3 (10%)4 (13%)112139 (30%)7 (24%)3 (10%)4 (13%)11319 (63%)19 (63%)10 (35%)9 (30%)9 (30%)N-stage $    -$ 112125 (17%)14 (48%)10 (35%)9 (30%)N-37419 (63%)15 (52%)10 (35%)9 (30%)13225 (17%)7 (24%)3 (10%)7 (23%)210 (33%)0013 (30%)013 (30%)1314 (48%)10 (35%)20 (77%)9 (63%)19 (63%)19 (63%)141213 (37%)14 (48%)10 (35%)19 (63%)19 (63%)1314 (38%)10 (35%)20 (77%)10 (35%)10 (35%)10 (35%)141213	Total Gender	118	30	29	29	30	
Women2411 (37%) $6$ (21%) $5$ (17%) $2$ (7%)Age (years) $  -$ <	Men	94	19 (63%)	23 (79%)	24 (83%)	28 (93%)	
Age (years)<60	Women	24	11 (37%)	6 (21%)	5 (17%)	2 (7%)	
<60 $67$ $17 (57%)$ $18 (62%)$ $17 (57%)$ $15 (50%)$ $>60$ $51$ $13 (43%)$ $11 (33%)$ $12 (41%)$ $15 (50%)$ $T$ -stage $V$ $V$ $V$ $V$ $V$ $V$ $V$ $I$ $19$ $6 (20%)$ $5 (17%)$ $10 (35%)$ $4 (14%)$ $4 (13%)$ $II$ $35$ $8 (27%)$ $10 (35%)$ $12 (41%)$ $5 (17%)$ $III$ $21$ $7 (23%)$ $7 (24%)$ $3 (10%)$ $4 (13%)$ $IV$ $43$ $9 (30%)$ $7 (24%)$ $10 (35%)$ $9 (30%)$ $N$ -stage $V$ $V$ $11 (37%)$ $14 (48%)$ $10 (35%)$ $9 (30%)$ $N-stage$ $V$ $V$ $19 (63%)$ $15 (52%)$ $19 (65%)$ $21 (70%)$ $N-3$ $74$ $19 (63%)$ $15 (52%)$ $19 (65%)$ $21 (70%)$ $Crading$ $V$ $V$ $2 (17%)$ $2 (7%)$ $2 (7%)$ $3 (10%)$ $2$ $2$ $5 (17%)$ $2 (7%)$ $2 (7%)$ $3 (10%)$ $7 (23%)$ $3$ $2$ $2 (17%)$ $2 (7%)$ $2 (7%)$ $3 (10%)$ $7 (23%)$ $X$ $2$ $1 (3%)$ $0$ $0$ $1 (3%)$ $1 (3%)$ $0$ $N$ $2$ $2 (17%)$ $2 (18%)$ $2 (86%)$ $2 0 (77%)$ $N$ $2$ $2 (3%)$ $3 (10%)$ $2 (20 (7%)$ $3 (10%)$ $3 (10%)$ $3 (20%)$ $N$ $3$ $2 (2)$ $3 (10%)$ $3 (10%)$ $3 (10%)$ $3 (20 (7%)$ $3 (10%)$ $3 (20 (7%)$ <	Age (years)						
>605113 (43%)11 (38%)12 (41%)15 (50%) $T$ -stage	<60	67	17 (57%)	18 (62%)	17 (57%)	15 (50%)	
T-stageI196 (20%)5 (17%)4 (14%)4 (13%)II358 (27%)10 (35%)12 (41%)5 (17%)III217 (23%)7 (24%)3 (10%)4 (13%)IV439 (30%)7 (24%)10 (35%)17 (57%)N-stageIIIII (37%)14 (48%)10 (35%)9 (30%)N1-37419 (63%)15 (52%)19 (65%)21 (70%)CradingI5 (17%)2 (7%)2 (7%)3 (10%)1125 (17%)2 (7%)2 (7%)3 (10%)2225 (17%)7 (24%)3 (10%)7 (23%)3225 (17%)7 (24%)3 (10%)7 (23%)X216 (64%)21 (81%)25 (86%)20 (77%)No249 (36%)5 (19%)4 (14%)6 (23%)Median dose (Gy)54I16 (64%)21 (81%)25 (86%)20 (77%)Median dose (Gy)54I10 (23*)10 (23*)10 (23*)X1010 (23*)10 (23*)10 (23*)10 (23*)No249 (36%)5 (19%)4 (14%)10 (23*)Median dose (Gy)54I10 (23*)10 (23*)X1010 (23*)10 (23*)10 (23*)10 (23*)No14-72I10 (23*)10 (23*)10 (23*)X1010 (23*)10 (23*)10 (23*)10 (23*)	>60	51	13 (43%)	11 (38%)	12 (41%)	15 (50%)	
I19 $6(20\%)$ $5(17\%)$ $4(14\%)$ $4(13\%)$ II35 $8(27\%)$ $10(35\%)$ $12(41\%)$ $5(17\%)$ III21 $7(23\%)$ $7(24\%)$ $3(10\%)$ $4(13\%)$ IV43 $9(30\%)$ $7(24\%)$ $10(35\%)$ $17(57\%)$ N-stageN044 $11(37\%)$ $14(48\%)$ $10(35\%)$ $9(30\%)$ N1-374 $19(63\%)$ $15(52\%)$ $19(65\%)$ $21(70\%)$ GradingI12 $5(17\%)$ $2(7\%)$ $2(7\%)$ $3(10\%)$ 282 $19(63\%)$ $20(69\%)$ $24(83\%)$ $19(63\%)$ 322 $5(17\%)$ $7(24\%)$ $3(10\%)$ $7(23\%)$ X2 $10(35\%)$ $20(69\%)$ $24(83\%)$ $19(63\%)$ 322 $5(17\%)$ $7(24\%)$ $3(10\%)$ $7(23\%)$ X2 $10(3\%)$ $0$ $0$ $1(3\%)$ Radiation therapy $106$ $1(3\%)$ $25(86\%)$ $20(77\%)$ No24 $9(36\%)$ $5(19\%)$ $4(14\%)$ $6(23\%)$ Median dose (Gy) $54$ $4-72$ $Rauge (Gy)$ $14-72$ $Recurrence until 3 years after diagnosts10(23\%)Variant for the start of the start of$	T-stage						
II35 $8 (27\%)$ $10 (35\%)$ $12 (41\%)$ $5 (17\%)$ III21 $7 (23\%)$ $7 (24\%)$ $3 (10\%)$ $4 (13\%)$ IV43 $9 (30\%)$ $7 (24\%)$ $10 (35\%)$ $17 (57\%)$ N-stage	Ι	19	6 (20%)	5 (17%)	4 (14%)	4 (13%)	
III21 $7 (23\%)$ $7 (24\%)$ $3 (10\%)$ $4 (13\%)$ IV43 $9 (30\%)$ $7 (24\%)$ $10 (35\%)$ $17 (57\%)$ <i>N-stage</i>	II	35	8 (27%)	10 (35%)	12 (41%)	5 (17%)	
IV43 $9(30\%)$ $7(24\%)$ $10(35\%)$ $17(57\%)$ N-stage	III	21	7 (23%)	7 (24%)	3 (10%)	4 (13%)	
N-stageN04411 (37%)14 (48%)10 (35%)9 (30%)N1-37419 (63%)15 (52%)19 (65%)21 (70%)Grading $11$ 125 (17%)2 (7%)2 (7%)3 (10%)28219 (63%)20 (69%)24 (83%)19 (63%)3225 (17%)7 (24%)3 (10%)7 (23%)3225 (17%)7 (24%)3 (10%)7 (23%)X21 (3%)001 (3%)Radiation therapy106 $24$ (83%)20 (77%)8220 (77%)No249 (36%)5 (19%)4 (14%)6 (23%)Median dose (Gy)54 $14-72$ $14-72$ $2$ (24%)12 (41%)10 (23%)	IV	43	9 (30%)	7 (24%)	10 (35%)	17 (57%)	
N04411 (37%)14 (48%)10 (35%)9 (30%)N1-37419 (63%)15 (52%)19 (65%)21 (70%)Grading $I$ $I$ $I$ $S$ $S$ (17%) $2 (7\%)$ $2 (7\%)$ $3 (10\%)$ 28219 (63%) $20 (69\%)$ $24 (83\%)$ 19 (63%)322 $5 (17\%)$ $2 (0 (69\%)$ $24 (83\%)$ 19 (63%) $3$ 22 $5 (17\%)$ $7 (24\%)$ $3 (10\%)$ $7 (23\%)$ $X$ 2 $1 (3\%)$ 0 $0$ $1 (3\%)$ Radiation therapy106 $24$ $9 (36\%)$ $5 (19\%)$ $4 (14\%)$ $6 (23\%)$ No24 $9 (36\%)$ $5 (19\%)$ $4 (14\%)$ $6 (23\%)$ Median dose (Gy) $54$ $44 - 72$ $7 (24\%)$ $12 (41\%)$ $10 (23\%)$ Recurrence until 3 years after diagnosis $3 (10\%)$ $7 (24\%)$ $12 (41\%)$ $10 (23\%)$	N-stage						
N1-37419 (63%)15 (52%)19 (65%)21 (70%)Grading $I$ 125 (17%)2 (7%)2 (7%)3 (10%)28219 (63%)20 (69%)24 (83%)19 (63%)3225 (17%)7 (24%)3 (10%)7 (23%)X2106 $I$ $I$ $I$ $I$ Yes8216 (64%)21 (81%)25 (86%)20 (77%)No249 (36%)5 (19%)4 (14%)6 (23%)Median dose (Gy)54 $I$ $I$ $I$ $I$ $I$ $I$ Recurrence until 3 years after diagnosis $I$ Ves $3$ (10%) $7$ (24%) $12$ (41%) $I$	NO	44	11 (37%)	14 (48%)	10 (35%)	9 (30%)	
Grading112 $5(17\%)$ $2(7\%)$ $2(7\%)$ $3(10\%)$ 28219(63\%) $20(69\%)$ $24(83\%)$ 19(63\%)322 $5(17\%)$ $7(24\%)$ $3(10\%)$ $7(23\%)$ X2 $1(3\%)$ $0$ $0$ $1(3\%)$ Radiation therapy106 $21(81\%)$ $25(86\%)$ $20(77\%)$ No249(36\%) $5(19\%)$ $4(14\%)$ $6(23\%)$ Median dose (Gy)54 $14-72$ $7(24\%)$ $12(41\%)$ $10(23\%)$	N1-3	74	19 (63%)	15 (52%)	19 (65%)	21 (70%)	
112 $5(17\%)$ $2(7\%)$ $2(7\%)$ $3(10\%)$ 28219(63\%)20(69\%)24(83\%)19(63\%)322 $5(17\%)$ $7(24\%)$ $3(10\%)$ $7(23\%)$ X2 $1(3\%)$ 001(3\%)Radiation therapy106 $21(81\%)$ $25(86\%)$ $20(77\%)$ Yes8216(64\%) $21(81\%)$ $25(86\%)$ $20(77\%)$ No249(36\%) $5(19\%)$ $4(14\%)$ $6(23\%)$ Median dose (Gy)54 $14-72$ $7(24\%)$ $12(41\%)$ $10(23\%)$ Recurrence until 3 years after diagnosis $3(10\%)$ $7(24\%)$ $12(41\%)$ $10(23\%)$	Grading						
28219 (63%)20 (69%)24 (83%)19 (63%)322 $5 (17\%)$ 7 (24%) $3 (10\%)$ 7 (23%)X21 (3%)001 (3%)Radiation therapy106 $0$ 1 (3%)20 (77%)Yes8216 (64%)21 (81%)25 (86%)20 (77%)No249 (36%)5 (19%)4 (14%)6 (23%)Median dose (Gy)54 $14-72$ $7 (24\%)$ $12 (41\%)$ $10 (23\%)$	1	12	5 (17%)	2 (7%)	2 (7%)	3 (10%)	
322 $5(17\%)$ $7(24\%)$ $3(10\%)$ $7(23\%)$ X2 $1(3\%)$ 0 $1(3\%)$ $1(3\%)$ Radiation therapy106 $21(81\%)$ $25(86\%)$ $20(77\%)$ No24 $9(36\%)$ $5(19\%)$ $4(14\%)$ $6(23\%)$ Median dose (Gy)54 $14-72$ $25(86\%)$ $20(77\%)$ Recurrence until 3 years after diagnosts $3(10\%)$ $7(24\%)$ $12(41\%)$ $10(23\%)$	2	82	19 (63%)	20 (69%)	24 (83%)	19 (63%)	
X   2   1 (3%)   0   1 (3%)     Radiation therapy   106   1   108   108     Yes   82   16 (64%)   21 (81%)   25 (86%)   20 (77%)     No   24   9 (36%)   5 (19%)   4 (14%)   6 (23%)     Median dose (Gy)   54   7 (24%)   12 (41%)   10 (23%)     Recurrence until 3 years after diagnost   3 (10%)   7 (24%)   12 (41%)   10 (23%)	3	22	5 (17%)	7 (24%)	3 (10%)	7 (23%)	
Radiation therapy   106     Yes   82   16 (64%)   21 (81%)   25 (86%)   20 (77%)     No   24   9 (36%)   5 (19%)   4 (14%)   6 (23%)     Median dose (Gy)   54     Range (Gy)   14-72     Recurrence until 3 years after diagnosts   3 (10%)   7 (24%)   12 (41%)   10 (23%)	Х	2	1 (3%)	0	0	1 (3%)	
Yes     82     16 (64%)     21 (81%)     25 (86%)     20 (77%)       No     24     9 (36%)     5 (19%)     4 (14%)     6 (23%)       Median dose (Gy)     54      7 (24%)     6 (23%)       Range (Gy)     14-72      7 (24%)     12 (41%)     10 (23%)	Radiation therapy	106					
No     24     9 (36%)     5 (19%)     4 (14%)     6 (23%)       Median dose (Gy)     54     7 (24%)     6 (23%)     6 (23%)       Range (Gy)     14–72     7 (24%)     12 (41%)     10 (23%)	Yes	82	16 (64%)	21 (81%)	25 (86%)	20 (77%)	
Median dose (Gy)   54     Range (Gy)   14–72     Recurrence until 3 years after diagnosis   3 (10%)     Yes   7 (24%)   12 (41%)   10 (22%)	No	24	9 (36%)	5 (19%)	4 (14%)	6 (23%)	
Range (Gy)     14–72       Recurrence until 3 years after diagnosis     3 (10%)     7 (24%)     12 (41%)     10 (22%)	Median dose (Gy)	54					
Recurrence until 3 years after diagnosis	Range (Gy)	14-72					
$V_{ec}$ $3(10\%)$ $7(24\%)$ $12(41\%)$ $10(22\%)$	Recurrence until 3 years after	diagnosis					
$1000 \qquad 1000 \qquad 10000 \qquad 1000 \qquad$	Yes		3 (10%)	7 (24%)	12 (41%)	10 (33%)	
No 27 (90%) 22 (76%) 17 (59%) 20 (67%)	No		27 (90%)	22 (76%)	17 (59%)	20 (67%)	

#### Table 2

Survival analysis of OSCC patients.

Category	No. of pts	Overall survival (OS)		Locoregional control (LRC)		
		Univariate analyses	Multivariate analyses	Univariate analyses	Multivariate analyses	
		RR (95% CI) p-value	RR (95% CI) p-value	RR (95% CI) p-value	RR (95% CI) p-value	
T-stage						
I + II	54	1.0 (reference)	1.0 (reference)	1.0 (reference)	1.0 (reference)	
II + IV	64	2.5 (1.5–4.2) $p = 0.001$	2.4 (1.3–4.4) $p = 0.003$	1.5(0.8-3.1)p = 0.24	1.9(0.8-4.1)p = 0.13	
N-stage						
NO	44	1.0 (reference)	1.0 (reference)	1.0 (reference)	1.0 (reference)	
N1-3	74	1.9 $(1.1-3.3) p = 0.014$	1.3(0.7-2.4)p = 0.37	1.3(0.6-2.7)p = 0.43	1.0(0.4-2.2)p = 0.99	
Grading (b)						
1	12	1.0 (reference)	1.0 (reference)	1.0 (reference)	1.0 (reference)	
2	82	0.7(0.3-1.5)p = 0.36	0.6(0.3-1.1)p = 0.13	1.0(0.3-3.2)p = 0.93	0.5(0.2-1.9)p = 0.33	
3	22	0.7 (0.3 - 1.6) p = 0.37	0.5(0.2-1.4)p = 0.1.9	1.3(0.3-4.9)p = 0.73	0.7(0.2-2.9)p = 0.61	
P4HA1 mRNA level						
Low	30	1.0 (reference)	1.0 (reference)	1.0 (reference)	1.0 (reference)	
Moderate	29	1.5(0.7-3.3) p = 0.27	1.8 (0.9-4.0) p = 0.12	2.6(0.7-10.0) p = 0.17	2.6(0.7-10.3) p = 0.16	
High	29	1.6(0.7-3.3)p = 0.24	2.0(0.9-4.3)p = 0.07	4.9(1.4-17.4)p = 0.014	5.8 $(1.5-21.3)$ p = 0.008	
Very high	30	1.9 (0.9–4.0) <i>p</i> = 0.08	2.2 (1.0–4.8) <i>p</i> = 0.039	4.4 (1.2–16.0) <i>p</i> = 0.025	4.8 (1.2–18.7) p = 0.023	

b- information not available for 2 patients.

intratumoral *P4HA1* mRNA level died in median 20 months earlier compared to patients with lower intratumoral *P4HA1* expression. Multivariate Cox's regression hazard analysis revealed an increased risk of earlier death (RR = 2.2; *P* = 0.039) (see Table 2, see Fig. 1) for patients with a very high intratumoral *P4HA1* mRNA level compared to patients with a low intratumoral *P4HA1* mRNA level (see Table 2, see Fig. 1, Supplemental Fig. 1).

Cox's regression analysis also identified a higher intratumoral P4HA1 mRNA level as associated with a higher risk of locoregional recurrence. The risk of recurrence was calculated as RR = 2.6

(P = 0.16) for a moderate, RR = 5.8 (P = 0.008) for a high and RR = 4.8 (P = 0.023) for a very high intratumoral P4HA1 mRNA expression compared to the control group (low level). (see Fig. 2, Table 2, Supplemental Fig. 3).

Moreover, multivariate Cox's regression hazard analysis of those OSCC patients of the same cohort received a radiotherapy after surgery (n = 82; see Table 1) showed an increased risk of earlier death (RR = 3.4; P = 0.009) (see Supplemental Fig. 2) for patients with a very high intratumoral *P4HA1* mRNA level compared to patients with a low intratumoral *P4HA1* mRNA level.

#### Table 3

Bivariate correlations between *P4HA1* level in tumor tissues and clinicopathological parameters of OSCC patients (Kruskal Wallis test) or mRNA level of different biomarkers (Spearman's Rho test) (r<sub>s</sub>-correlation coefficient).

	Γs	P-value	n				
Clinicopathological parameters							
T-stage		0.081	118				
Gender		0.005	118				
N-stage		0.599	118				
Grading		0.486	118				
EMT-markers							
ZEB 2	0.250	0.009	108				
Twist	0.406	0.008	108				
TGFβ	0.548	<0.001	108				
MMP7	0.216	0.070	71				
CTGF	0.341	0.004	69				
Stem cell marker							
Oct3/4	0.253	0.033	71				
Snai1	0.360	0.002	71				
Snai2	0.292	0.014	71				
LGR4	0.171	0.077	108				
LGR5FL	0.308	0.010	69				
Structure proteins							
CDH	0.011	0.912	108				
Vimentin	0.356	0.002	71				
KRT13	-0.251	0.039	71				
Hypoxic markers							
CA9	0.063	0.604	71				
VEGFa	0.118	0.329	71				
Glut1	0.084	0.488	71				
HIF1alpha	-0.037	0.765	69				
Others							
MDM2	0.391	0.001	71				
Survivin	0.322	0.006	71				
HER2	-0.420	<0.001	69				
EGFR	-0.112	0.36	69				
PDL-1	0.427	<0.001	105				
Osteopontin	0.461	<0.001	69				

The patients received a radiotherapy after surgery had a risk to have a recurrence calculated as RR = 2.8 (P = 0.22) for a moderate, RR = 5.4 (P = 0.032) for a high and RR = 10.3 (P = 0.005) for a very high intratumoral *P4HA1* mRNA expression compared to the control group (low level) (Supplemental Fig. 2).

# Correlation of P4HA1 mRNA level with tumor-specific parameters and other molecular markers of OSCC patients

The *P4HA1* mRNA level narrowly missed the significance threshold when correlated with the T-stage (P = 0.081) but correlated with the gender of the patients (P = 0.005), whereas no correlation was found between the *P4HA1* mRNA level and the grade of the tumor, or the nodal status using Kruskal-Wallis test (see Table 1).

Using Spearman's rank correlation as a bivariate correlation we found significant associations between the intratumoral *P4HA1* mRNA level and the intratumoral mRNA level of EMT markers like *ZEB2, TWIST, TGF* $\beta$  or *CTGF* or stem cell markers like *Oct3/4, Snai1* and *2* and *LGR5FL*. However, no correlations to the intratumoral mRNA level of hypoxic marker like *CA9, VEGFA* and *Glut1* were found (see Table 3). Moreover, Spearman's rank analyses showed significant correlations between the intratumoral *P4HA1* mRNA level and the mRNA level of *vimentin, KRT13, MDM2, survivin, HER2, PDL-1* and osteopontin (see Table 3).

# mRNA level of P4HA1 in OSCC cell lines cultivated under different oxygen conditions

To validate the hypoxic increase of the *P4HA1* mRNA level *in vitro*, we determined the level of *P4HA1* in three different OSCC -cell lines cultivated 24 h under (I) normoxic (21% oxygen) and (II) hypoxic conditions (0.1% oxygen). As expected, the mRNA level of *P4HA1* was massively increased in those cell lines cultivated under



**Fig. 1.** Multivariate Cox's hazard regression model: association of *P4HA1* mRNA expression level and survival of OSCC patients. The model was adjusted to patients tumor stage, lymph status (N-stage) and grading of the tumor. The OSCC cohort was divided into four groups (quartiles) according to the intratumoral *P4HA1* mRNA level (low, moderate, high, very high). The patients risk of death was calculated as RR = 1.8 (*P* = 0.12) for a moderate, RR = 2.0 (*P* = 0.075) for a high and RR = 2.2 (*P* = 0.039) for a very high intratumoral *P4HA1* mRNA expression compared to the control group (low level).



**Fig. 2.** Multivariate Cox's hazard regression model: association of *P4HA1* mRNA expression level and locoregional recurrence of OSCC patients. The model was adjusted to patients tumor stage, lymph status (N-stage) and grading of the tumor. The OSCC cohort was divided into two groups according to the median intratumoral *P4HA1* mRNA levels. The risk of recurrence was calculated as RR = 2.6 (P = 0.16) for a moderate, RR = 5.8 (P = 0.008) for a high and RR = 4.8 (P = 0.023) for a very high intratumoral *P4HA1* mRNA expression compared to the control group (low level).

hypoxic conditions. In the cell lines CAL-33, XF354 and SAS the *P4HA1* mRNA level was increased due to oxygen deprivation by a factor of 10.9, 9.8 and 4.8, respectively (see Fig. 3).

# Discussion

A negative prognostic impact of tumor hypoxia has been described for different tumor entities [21,22], including tumors of the head and neck region. Furthermore, we demonstrated a negative prognostic impact of a higher intratumoral *P4HA1* mRNA level for the overall survival and locoregional control in a cohort of 118 OSCC patients (see Tables 1 and 2; see Figs. 1 and 2). In bivariate correlation analyses the *P4HA1* mRNA level of OSCC samples correlated significantly with the mRNA level of EMT or stem cell markers like *ZEB2*, *Twist*, *TGF* $\beta$ , *Oct3/4*, *Snai1*, *Snai2* and *LGR5FL*. Our findings indicate an association of P4HA1 with different EMT and stem cell markers. That is remarkable, because other authors believe that *P4HA1* may have a role in the transdifferentiation process of e.g. glioma stem cells into endothelial cells [15].

However, no correlation of the *P4HA1* mRNA level with the mRNA level of hypoxic induced markers like *CA9*, *VEGFA* and *Glut1* was found (see Table 3). Hence, we analyzed the mRNA level of the hypoxia-associated marker *P4HA1* in three OSCC cell lines and compared its expression level under hypoxic and normoxic culture conditions (see Fig. 3). This *in vitro* analysis showed an increased mRNA level of *P4HA1* under hypoxic conditions (see Fig. 3). Moreover, we found a hypoxia specific increase of the mRNA level of *CA9*, *VEGFA* and *Glut1* (data not shown). These data demonstrate that correlations of biomarkers in *in vivo* samples do not necessarily reflect the *in vitro* situation, as it was found for the mRNA level of *P4HA1* and *CA9*, *VEGFA*, *Glut1* (*HIF1*-target genes) in the three analysed OSCC cell lines.

In the literature, *P4HA1* has previously been shown to be transcriptionally regulated by HIF1. [10,23,24]. Prolyl 4-hydroxylases are associated with hypoxic processes during osteoarthritis [25].



**Fig. 3.** *P4HA1* mRNA expression level of the OSCC cell lines CAL-33, XF354 and SAS. Cells were cultivated for 24 h under culture conditions of 21% oxygen (normoxia) or 0.1% oxygen (hypoxia). The mRNA level in the cell lines CAL-33, XF354 and SAS were upregulated, when cells were cultivated under hypoxic conditions by the factor of 10.8, 9.8 and 4.8, respectively.

Moreover, the collagen prolyl hydroxylase *P4HA1* was found to be associated with lymphatic and lung metastasis in breast cancer patients [26]. In addition, *P4HA1* is transcriptionally regulated by E2F, which was described for an E2F knock-out mouse model in which knock-out of E2F decreased the level of P4HA1 and led to remodelling of the extracellular matrix and supported the process of metastasis. [27]. In our analysis, *P4HA1* mRNA was not significantly increased in tumor samples of patients with nodal metastasis. The observation that *P4HA1* mRNA and protein levels are stably upregulated via hypoxia suggests *P4HA1* as a clinically useful and prognostic relevant marker to identify hypoxic tumors [12]. A meta-analysis of genome–wide RNA sequencing data identified this hypoxic marker as a unique prognostic marker for hypoxic tumors [9]. Tawk et al. analysed three different hypoxia gene signatures studies in a set of 302 head and neck tumor patients [6–9]. Our data confirmed the prognostic power of *P4HA1* in an independent cohort of 118 OSCC patients.

The possible cause for that finding might be the transcriptional impact of HIF1 on the level of hypoxic P4HA1 [10,24]. However, due to the short half-life time of HIF1, indirect measurements of its transcriptional activity such as P4HA1 may be the ideal surrogate indicators of hypoxic gene expression. Tumor hypoxia is associated with HIF1 activation, metastasis, and resistance to chemotherapy and radiotherapy, as well as poor patient survival [28]. Rankin and Giaccia concluded that HIF1 promotes each step during metastasis including the remodelling of the ECM, which implies the activity of P4HA1 [28]. HIF1 promotes signalling in the primary tumor which contributes to the expression of secreted factors that are involved in formation of the premetastatic niche [28] which then not only modifies the ECM but also affects the activity of the immune system [3]. These findings are supported by the correlation of the P4HA1 mRNA level with the mRNA level of stem cell markers or genes associated with EMT, like ZEB2, Twist, *LGR4*, *LGR5* and *TGF* $\beta$  (see Table 3). These results are in accordance with the regulation of multiple steps within the metastatic cascade by HIF1. Although, ZEB2, Twist, LGR4, LGR5 and TGF $\beta$  are not HIF1regulated they are also strongly associated with epithelial mesenchymal transition (EMT), a mechanism essential for metastasis [29–33]. In addition the correlation of the *P4HA1* mRNA level with the transcript levels of HER2 and PDL1 could help to stratify OSCC patients for future targeting and/or immunotherapies.

# Conclusion

In this study, we showed for the first time that *P4HA1* is an independent prognostic factor for overall survival of OSCC patients and is associated with a higher risk of locoregional recurrence. The data confirm the potential use of *P4HA1* as a single-gene surrogate of multiple-gene hypoxia signatures in head-and-neck cancer, whereby different tumor-specific and hypoxic independent processes like EMT may influence the expression of *P4HA1*, too.

# **Conflict of interest statement**

On behalf of all co-authors, the corresponding author declare, that there is no conflict of interest.

#### Acknowledgments

We thank our colleagues from the Department of Radiotherapy and Department of Oral and Maxillofacial Plastic Surgery for contributing to this study and for their continuous support, especially for the technical support done by Gabriele Thomas. This work was supported by the Wilhelm Sander-Stiftung (grant number: FKZ: 2013.090.1).

### Appendix A. Supplementary data

Supplementary data associated with this article can be found, in the online version, at http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.ctro.2017.05.002.

#### References

- Choi K-K, Kim M-J, Yun P-Y, et al. Independent prognostic factors of 861 cases of oral squamous cell carcinoma in Korean adults. Oral Oncol 2006;42:208–17.
  Lemaire F, Millon R, Young J, et al. Differential expression profiling of head and neck squamous cell carcinoma (HNSCC). Br J Cancer 2003;89:1940–9.
- [3] Eckert AW, Wickenhauser C, Salins PC, Kappler M, Bukur J, Seliger B. Clinical relevance of the tumor microenvironment and immune escape of oral squamous cell carcinoma. [Transl Med 2016;14:85.

- [4] Semenza GL. Targeting HIF-1 for cancer therapy. Nat Rev Cancer 2003;3:721–32.
- [5] Eckert AW, Schutze A, Lautner MHW, Taubert H, Schubert J, Bilkenroth U. HIF-1alpha is a prognostic marker in oral squamous cell carcinomas. Int J Biol Markers 2010;25:87–92.
- [6] Toustrup K, Sorensen BS, Lassen P, Wiuf C, Alsner J, Overgaard J. Gene expression classifier predicts for hypoxic modification of radiotherapy with nimorazole in squamous cell carcinomas of the head and neck. Radiother Oncol 2012;102:122–9.
- [7] Eustace A, Mani N, Span PN, et al. A 26-gene hypoxia signature predicts benefit from hypoxia-modifying therapy in laryngeal cancer but not bladder cancer. Clin Cancer Res 2013;19:4879–88.
- [8] Lendahl U, Lee KL, Yang H, Poellinger L. Generating specificity and diversity in the transcriptional response to hypoxia. Nat Rev Genet 2009;10:821–32.
- [9] Tawk B, Schwager C, Deffaa O, et al. Comparative analysis of transcriptomics based hypoxia signatures in head- and neck squamous cell carcinoma. Radiother Oncol 2016;118:350–8.
- [10] Gilkes DM, Bajpai S, Chaturvedi P, Wirtz D, Semenza GL. Hypoxia-inducible factor 1 (HIF-1) promotes extracellular matrix remodeling under hypoxic conditions by inducing P4HA1, P4HA2, and PLOD2 expression in fibroblasts. J Biol Chem 2013;288:10819–29.
- [11] Fahling M, Mrowka R, Steege A, et al. Translational control of collagen prolyl 4hydroxylase-alpha(I) gene expression under hypoxia. J Biol Chem 2006;281:26089–101.
- [12] Staudacher JJ, Naarmann-de Vries IS, Ujvari SJ, et al. Hypoxia-induced gene expression results from selective mRNA partitioning to the endoplasmic reticulum. Nucleic Acids Res 2015;43:3219–36.
- [13] Hatzimichael E, Lo Nigro C, Lattanzio L, et al. The collagen prolyl hydroxylases are novel transcriptionally silenced genes in lymphoma. Br J Cancer 2012;107:1423–32.
- [14] Holster T, Pakkanen O, Soininen R, et al. Loss of assembly of the main basement membrane collagen, type IV, but not fibril-forming collagens and embryonic death in collagen prolyl 4-hydroxylase I null mice. J Biol Chem 2007;282:2512–9.
- [15] Zhou Y, Jin G, Mi R, et al. Knockdown of P4HA1 inhibits neovascularization via targeting glioma stem cell-endothelial cell transdifferentiation and disrupting vascular basement membrane. Oncotarget 2017;8:35877–89.
- [16] Kappler M, Rot S, Taubert H, et al. The effects of knockdown of wild-type survivin, survivin-2B or survivin-delta3 on the radiosensitization in a soft tissue sarcoma cells in vitro under different oxygen conditions. Cancer Gene Ther 2007;14:994–1001.
- [17] Kappler M, Pabst U, Rot S, et al. Normoxic accumulation of HIF1alpha is associated with glutaminolysis. Clin Oral Invest 2017;21:211–24.
- [18] Livak KJ, Schmittgen TD. Analysis of relative gene expression data using realtime quantitative PCR and the 2(-Delta Delta C(T)) Method. Methods 2001;25:402–8.
- [19] Rot S, Taubert H, Bache M, et al. A novel splice variant of the stem cell marker LGR5/GPR49 is correlated with the risk of tumor-related death in soft-tissue sarcoma patients. BMC Cancer 2011;11:429.
- [20] Guttler A, Giebler M, Cuno P, et al. Osteopontin and splice variant expression level in human malignant glioma: radiobiologic effects and prognosis after radiotherapy. Radiother Oncol 2013;108:535–40.
- [21] Vaupel P, Mayer A. Hypoxia in cancer: significance and impact on clinical outcome. Cancer Metastasis Rev 2007;26:225–39.
- [22] Bache M, Kappler M, Said HM, Staab A, Vordermark D. Detection and specific targeting of hypoxic regions within solid tumors: current preclinical and clinical strategies. Curr Med Chem 2008;15:322–38.
- [23] Takahashi Y. Hypoxic induction of Prolyl 4-hydroxylase alpha (I) in cultured cells. J Biol Chem 2000;275:14139–46.
- [24] Hofbauer K-H, Gess B, Lohaus C, Meyer HE, Katschinski D, Kurtz A. Oxygen tension regulates the expression of a group of procollagen hydroxylases. Eur J Biochem 2003;270:4515–22.
- [25] Grimmer C, Balbus N, Lang U, et al. Regulation of type II collagen synthesis during osteoarthritis by prolyl-4-hydroxylases: possible influence of low oxygen levels. Am J Pathol 2006;169:491–502.
- [26] Gilkes DM, Chaturvedi P, Bajpai S, et al. Collagen prolyl hydroxylases are essential for breast cancer metastasis. Cancer Res 2013;73:3285–96.
- [27] Hollern DP, Honeysett J, Cardiff RD, Andrechek ER. The E2F transcription factors regulate tumor development and metastasis in a mouse model of metastatic breast cancer. Mol Cell Biol 2014;34:3229–43.
- [28] Rankin EB, Giaccia AJ. Hypoxic control of metastasis. Science 2016;352:175–80.
- [29] Berx G, van Roy F. Involvement of members of the cadherin superfamily in cancer. Cold Spring Harbor Perspect Biol 2009;1:a003129.
- [30] de Lau W, Peng WC, Gros P, Clevers H. The R-spondin/Lgr5/Rnf43 module: regulator of Wnt signal strength. Genes Dev 2014;28:305–16.
- [31] Moustakas A, Heldin C-H. Mechanisms of TGFbeta-induced epithelialmesenchymal transition. J Clin Med 2016;5.
- [32] Gregory PA, Bracken CP, Smith E, et al. An autocrine TGF-beta/ZEB/miR-200 signaling network regulates establishment and maintenance of epithelialmesenchymal transition. Mol Biol Cell 2011;22:1686–98.
- [33] Chen C, Zimmermann M, Tinhofer I, Kaufmann AM, Albers AE. Epithelial-tomesenchymal transition and cancer stem(-like) cells in head and neck squamous cell carcinoma. Cancer Lett 2013;338:47–56.