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CHAPTER 1
INTRODUCTION

In the early 1980s mammalian homologues of oncogenic viral, Harvey and Kirsten RAS genes were identified in normal rat cells. These genes termed the Ha-RAS and Ki-RAS respectively, demonstrated the potential to transform normal mammalian cells. In 1983, an additional homolog, N-RAS was identified from neuroblastoma and leukemic cells. By 1984, oncogenic mutations in the RAS genes were discovered in many human cancer cells, establishing RAS as a pre-eminent family of oncogenes. Over the years there has been a concerted effort to understand RAS biology and its role in the oncogenic process.

The RAS-GTPase cycle

RAS genes encode a family of small GTPases that transduce extracellular growth signals by cycling between a GTP-bound activated state and a GDP-bound basal state. The cycling of RAS proteins between inactive and active states constitutes a molecular switch through which a number of cellular signaling pathways are regulated. Extracellular growth factor mediated membrane receptor activation (for example upon mitogenic stimulation) tethers RAS to the plasma membrane where proteins termed as Guanine nucleotide Exchange Factor (GEFs) like SOS (Son of Seveless), can activate RAS proteins by exchanging RAS bound GDP with GTP, thereby activating RAS (Figure 1.1). Activated RAS is then brought back to ground state through hydrolysis of GTP to GDP by intrinsic GTPase activity of RAS proteins, greatly
enhanced through interaction with GTPase activating proteins (GAPs) like Neurofibromatosis 1 (NF1).

**RAS mutations in cancer**

Approximately 30% of all human cancers harbor oncogenic mutations in RAS. Although H/N/K-RAS genes are highly homologous, the frequency and types of mutations observed in different human cancers is varied with **KRAS** being the most frequently mutated RAS gene, followed by **NRAS** and **HRAS**. **KRAS** mutations are most frequently observed in pancreatic (90%), lung (30%) and colon cancers (50%); mutations in **NRAS** are frequently observed in the cancers of skin (30%) and hematopoietic and lymphoid malignancies (12%). **HRAS** mutations are more prevalent in bladder (15%) and head and neck cancers (8%)⁴. Mutations in **RAS** genes predominantly involve one of three highly conserved amino acid residues - **G12**, **G13** or **Q61** (Figure 1.2). A preference for one of the three amino acid substitutions is specific for each **RAS** family member and is also dependent on the cancer type (for example **NRAS Q61** mutations are frequently observed in melanoma while **NRAS G12/NRAS G13** mutations are more prevalent in leukemia). Further, the range of mutations in **KRAS** at a single amino acid have varied prognosis in lung and colon cancers. Together this suggests that the three **RAS** proteins have different etiologies in the development of cancer which is dependent on the position and type of alteration observed in a specific cell of origin⁵.⁶.

Multiple studies have shown that mutations in the **RAS** genes increase cell proliferation rates and can initiate neoplastic transformation⁷-⁹. In addition, it has been shown in multiple cancer models using genetically engineered mice, that **RAS** mutations are also required for tumor maintenance, such that ablation of the defective **RAS** gene leads to tumor regression in these
models\textsuperscript{10-12}. This establishes the “oncogenic driver” status of the mutated \textit{RAS} genes and makes it one of the most highly validated targets for therapeutic intervention in cancers.

**RAS mutations in developmental disorders and RASopathies**

Besides somatic \textit{RAS} mutations in cancer, germline mutations in the \textit{RAS} genes or \textit{RAS} regulators are known to be responsible for certain developmental disorders collectively referred as RASopathies\textsuperscript{13,14}. These include Neurofibromatosis type I, Noonan Costello, and Cardio Facio Cutaneous syndromes amongst others. Aberrant RAS signaling due to \textit{RAS} mutation or activation of RAS through loss of RAS regulation (like NF1/SOS1 mutations) or increased downstream signaling (for example, through BRAF mutations) have been shown to be responsible for several of these developmental abnormalities. Since all these aberrations ultimately result in increased RAS-GTP levels, these diseases are collectively referred to as RASopathies. A discussion of the various RASopathies allows understanding of RAS regulators in the developmental context which may have a bearing on some of the observations made in this thesis.

Neurofibromatosis type I is a familial cancer syndrome, caused due to dominantly transmitted loss of function mutations in the \textit{NF1} gene. As alluded to earlier, NF1 is a tumor suppressor GTPase activating protein (GAP), that when mutated prevents the cycling of the RAS-GTP to inactive GDP bound form. Patients harboring germline mutations of NF1 gene are predisposed to a variety of cancers like neurofibromas, astrocytomas and juvenile myelomonocytic leukemia (JMML)\textsuperscript{15,16}. Mutations in \textit{PTPN11}/SHP-2 phosphatases account for about 50% of Noonan syndrome cases\textsuperscript{17}, an autosomal dominant developmental disorder characterized by facial anomalies, heart and skeletal defects and hematological disorders.
PTPN11 is a non-receptor type 2 phosphatase that activates the RAS/MAPK signaling pathway downstream of several receptor tyrosine kinases. Study of the missense germline mutations of *PTPN11* suggests the residues that maintain the structurally inactive conformation are frequently mutated keeping PTPN11 in an active conformation, resulting in the neurological disease. Somatic mutations in PTPN11, relatively less well characterized at present, have been reported in leukemia that are distinct from the germline mutations and show more pronounced RAS signaling through effector activation.

Germline KRAS mutations in residues other than frequently observed in cancers (namely, Val<sup>14</sup>, Thr<sup>58</sup>, Val<sup>152</sup> and Asp<sup>153</sup>) also account for 2% of cases with Noonan syndrome. HRAS mutations restricted to Gly<sup>12</sup> and Gly<sup>13</sup>, which are less frequent in cancers, account for the majority of cases with Costello syndrome, a disease of mental retardation, distinctive facial appearance and cardiovascular abnormalities. Distinct mutations in the *RAS/RAF* pathway genes in developmental disorders and their somatic counterparts in cancers point to a widespread requirement for cell/tissue and/or developmental specific roles for the different RAS genes in these distinct diseases.

**RAS structure**

The RAS family of proteins belong to a class of small GTPases, encompassing 39 different proteins characterized by a phosphate binding motif (P-loop) and multiple G domains (GTP binding domains), as shown in Figure 1.3. These proteins also share nucleotide sensitive Switch I and Switch II domains which interact with various effectors depending on the GDP/GTP bound state of the molecule. The small GTPases are known to play a key role in multiple cellular
processes, including growth, cytoskeletal rearrangements, motility, adhesion and cellular differentiation.

Sequence alignment of the three RAS proteins shows that the N-terminal 80 amino acids which encompass the P-loop, the Switch I and II domains are identical, between H/N and KRAS proteins. A high degree of homology exists until amino acids 166, after which the C-terminal 25 amino acids constitute the hypervariable regions of different RAS proteins effecting differential post translational modifications and membrane anchoring properties.

Crystallographic structures of HRAS \(^{24}\) bound to GDP/GTP homologs \(^{25}\) were determined in 1990. RAS was described as a heart shaped structure with a hydrophobic core of six beta strands and five alpha helices interconnected by loops. GTP hydrolysis was found to be determined largely by five loops on one side of the protein with Q61 being the most critical residue for the GTPase catalytic activity \(^{26}\). In its GTP bound state, only small structural changes in the Switch I (amino acids 32-40) and Switch II (amino acids 62-70) are observed when compared to the GDP bound state. Oncogenic mutations at G12/G13 positions (with their large side groups) interfere directly with the GTPase ‘active conformation’ of the protein and also interfere with the nucleophilic attack of the gamma phosphate of GTP preventing GTP hydrolysis. These small structural aberrations resulting from the substitution of critical amino acids suffice to keep RAS locked in its GTP bound state and have proved to be challenging for therapeutic targeting.

**RAS signaling**

RAS in its active conformation is now known to activate a number of cellular pathways but it wasn’t until 1993 that yeast two-hybrid and *in vitro* interaction analyses helped demonstrate a
direct interaction between RAF1 and activated RAS\textsuperscript{13,27}. Subsequently, RAF1 was extensively characterized, and shown to activate the extracellular signal-regulated kinase (ERK) or the mitogen-activated protein kinase (MAPK) pathway which in turn phosphorylates and activates nuclear factors like the E26 transformation-specific (ETS transcription factors)\textsuperscript{28} which associate with different nuclear factors to initiate transcription for cell proliferation/differentiation. This signaling from the GTP-bound RAS at the plasma membrane to the nucleus has been demonstrated to be sufficient and necessary for RAS induced transformation\textsuperscript{29,30}. Detailed mapping of the RAS-RAF1 interaction that initiates the MAPK cascade\textsuperscript{17} showed that the HRAS effector domain within the Switch I domain (amino acids 32-40) associates with RAS binding domains within the N terminal of RAF1/BRAF and are critical for RAS transformation. Although the crystal structure of full length RAF bound to RAS has not yet been determined, the critical role of RAS Switch I binding to RAF1 was demonstrated in a study involving the RAS related protein RAP1A and RAS binding domain (RBD) of RAF1\textsuperscript{31}. Furthermore, the structure of HRAS Q61L mutant bound to RAF1-RBD\textsuperscript{32}, recently revealed that the switch II domain of Q61L is rigid compared to wild type RAS and acquires an anti-catalytic conformation, suggesting that at least for this mutant, RAF binding has allosteric effects on the Switch II domain.

The next class of RAS effectors were identified through experiments to delineate whether the Class I phosphoinositide 3-Kinase (PI3K) activity that co-immunoprecipitates with RAS\textsuperscript{33} is a RAS regulator or effector of diverse RAS signaling\textsuperscript{34}. The p110 catalytic unit of PI3K was found to associate with RAS only in its active GTP-bound form, qualifying it as an effector, however like the GTPase activating protein NF-1, PI3K binding required both the RAS Switch I and II domains. Specifically, the RAS-PI3K interface makes contact with the Switch I effector
domain (amino acid residues 32-40) as well as extensive contacts with the Switch II domain with Y64 being the critical residue\(^\text{35}\). Like RAF, PI3K binding to RAS-GTP activates PI3K activity and was required for NIH3T3 cellular transformation\(^\text{26}\). In a highly conserved signaling pathway, RAS activation of PI3K results in the conversion of phosphatidylinositol (3,4)-bisphosphate (PIP2) lipids to phosphatidylinositol (3,4,5)-trisphosphate (PIP3). At the plasma membrane PKB/Akt binds PIP3, where Akt phosphorylation activates the mammalian Target of Rapamycin C1 (mTORC1) and mTOR pathways which in turn phosphorylate the eukaryotic translation initiation factor 4E binding protein (4EBP1) and protein S6 (S6K1), directly promoting protein synthesis and cell proliferation. The prevalence of mutations in the RAF and PI3K genes in cancer further underscores the critical roles of these pathways in oncogenesis.

Additionally, the Ral-GDS effector pathway also plays a distinct role in regulating cell proliferation and apoptosis through the RalA and RalB GTPases \(^\text{36}\). As can be seen in Figure \text{1.4} several RAS effectors that regulate diverse cellular functions have been described. Phospholipase C\(\varepsilon\) was identified as an effector that binds the Switch I domain of HRAS\(^\text{35}\), its activation leading to hydrolysis of phosphatidylinositol 4,5-bisphosphate in a GTP-dependent manner \(^\text{37}\). With a guanine exchange factor (GEF) domain, PLC\(\varepsilon\) also serves as a bifunctional phospholipase that activates the MAP kinase pathway \(^\text{38}\). The T-cell lymphoma invasion and metastasis-1 (TIAM1) is a Rac GTPase GEF that binds HRAS in a GTP dependent manner to mediate Rac activation by RAS \(^\text{39}\). TIAM1 was also shown to be required for RAS transformation in a mouse model of skin carcinogenesis \(^\text{40}\). The lesser characterized RAS effectors like the AF-6 \(^\text{41}\) also bound HRAS in its GTP bound state.

Among the RAS regulators the RIN1 protein was shown to interact directly with HRAS-GTP and unlike RAF, interferes with RAS function in the yeast model \(^\text{42}\). RIN1 is a GEF for the
Rab 5 GTPase that was shown to stimulate the endocytosis of receptor tyrosine kinases upon its association with activated HRAS\textsuperscript{43}.

A non-catalytic adaptor protein, RASSF5 (Ras association (RalGDS/AF-6 domain family member 1) was identified as an effector that binds the Switch I domain of HRAS in a GTP dependent manner\textsuperscript{44}. A more recent study showed that mutant KRAS engaged RASSF5/MST1 (mammalian sterile-20-like-protein kinase-1complex) to initiate apoptosis of HEK293 cells\textsuperscript{45}. RASSF2, a member of the same family was shown to have preferential binding to KRAS-GTP compared to HRAS-GTP\textsuperscript{46} and like RASSF1 was characterized as a tumor suppressor\textsuperscript{47}. HRAS-GTP was more recently shown to bind an E3 ubiquitin ligase IMP (Impedes Mitogenic signal Propagation) and negatively regulate MAP kinase activity by limiting the engagement of RAF-MEK complex in the presence of activated RAS\textsuperscript{48}. Lesser characterized effectors like Grb7\textsuperscript{49}, RAPH1 or PDZ-GEF\textsuperscript{50}, have been reported but their role in mammalian RAS signaling remains to be investigated.

As may be noted, most of the studies cited above have used mutant HRAS as a bait for the search of effectors and to demonstrate the role of these effectors in RAS signaling. With an increasing appreciation of distinct differences in oncogenic potential across the RAS family members, a search for mutant KRAS specific interactions using mass spectrometric approach, uncovered a novel RNA binding protein effector, HNRNPA2B1 which associates with mutant KRAS in a phosphorylation and GTP dependent manner and potentiates AKT/mTOR pathway signaling to promote pancreatic tumor growth in cell line and mouse models\textsuperscript{51}. The search for new regulators and effectors through which the different RAS proteins, especially KRAS, exert their effects on signaling cascades in cancer is the core component of this thesis.
RAS regulation

Temporal regulation of RAS expression

Of the four RAS genes (HRAS, NRAS and the two KRAS splice variants, KRAS4A and KRAS4B) only KRAS4B is known to be essential for embryogenesis\textsuperscript{52} with partial functional overlap with NRAS. In genetic ablation studies, knockout of HRAS or NRAS had no significant effects on mouse development and only KRAS was reported as essential and sufficient for normal growth and development\textsuperscript{53}. However, expression of HRAS from the KRAS locus (to replace KRAS expression) led to normal development\textsuperscript{54}, suggesting that other RAS proteins can compensate for KRAS functions but distinct spatial/temporal expression program may define their role in embryogenesis (Figure 1.5).

Post Transcriptional Gene Regulation of RAS transcripts

Apart from temporal and context dependent regulation, RAS expression is also controlled post transcriptionally (Figure 1.5). MicroRNAs are small 21-22 nucleotide RNA molecules that bind target transcripts (in their 3’untranslated regions (UTR) or coding regions) and lead to repression or degradation by the RNA silencing machinery\textsuperscript{55}. In 2005, conserved let-7 microRNA binding sites were identified in the 3’UTR of RAS transcripts which were shown to regulate RAS protein levels. Although this study focused on the role of let-7 in vulval development in C. elegans, let-7a regulation of NRAS and KRAS transcripts were clearly demonstrated using luciferase reporter assays \textsuperscript{56}. Multiple studies have since shown that let-7 family represents tumor suppressor microRNAs and their levels are reduced in lung cancers\textsuperscript{57,56}.

Genetic evidence for KRAS/let-7 regulation was established when a single nucleotide polymorphism (SNP) in the let-7 binding sites in the 3’UTR of KRAS (termed KRAS-LCS6) was
shown to elevate KRAS levels and was associated with increased risk for lung cancer\textsuperscript{58–59}. \textit{KRAS-LCS6} also increased risk for triple negative breast cancers\textsuperscript{60} and shown to have prognostic value in colon cancers\textsuperscript{61}.

Recently, a simple, elegant analysis of the coding sequences of the RAS genes has revealed an intriguing level of RAS regulation at the level of translation. Despite the similarity of the RAS proteins at the protein level, the nucleotide sequence coding for the proteins are highly divergent such that rare codons present in the \textit{KRAS} transcript limit protein expression and reduce its oncogenic potential in a carcinogenic mouse model, known to be resistant to oncogene induced stress\textsuperscript{62}. Paradoxically, the \textit{KRAS} alleles encoding synonymous codons that optimize expression failed to generate tumors in a \textit{de novo} lung carcinogenesis model\textsuperscript{63}, suggesting that codon bias determines protein expression levels, consequently affecting its oncogenic potential only in a context dependent manner.

Although the post transcriptional gene silencing of \textit{RAS} transcripts through microRNA regulation is the least studied the recently discovered rare codons inherent to \textit{KRAS} transcript is an emerging field.

This thesis provides insights into a novel mechanism by which mutant KRAS may control the expression of its transcript levels through direct interactions with a key component of the RNA silencing machinery.

**Trafficking of RAS family of proteins**

Nascent RAS proteins undergo differential post translation modifications for attachment to the plasma membrane\textsuperscript{64}. The hypervariable region of RAS proteins consisting of 25/26 amino acids with the C-terminal CAAX motif (Figure 1.2) are critical for its association with the inner
membrane. Both the C-terminal polylysine stretch and farnesylation of the KRAS4B protein are sufficient for membrane association, whereupon it undergoes proteolytic cleavage of the AAX sequence, catalyzed by RAS-converting enzyme (RCE1). The terminal cysteine residue is then subject to carboxymethylation by isoprenylecysteine carboxymethyltransferase-1 (ICMT). The HRAS, NRAS and KRAS4A proteins all lack the polylysine stretch and therefore require palmitoylation besides prenylation for efficient membrane association. Unlike KRAS4B, prenylated HRAS and NRAS proteins traffic to the Golgi compartment, but require additional modification prior to plasma membrane anchoring. For HRAS, monopalmitoylation at residue 181 and 184 is sufficient while NRAS requires a second targeting sequence for its movement from the Golgi endomembrane to the plasm membrane. More recent studies have identified PDEδ, a guanine nucleotide dissociation inhibitor-like (GDI-like) solubilization factor that binds endomembrane associated farnesylated KRAS or depalmitoylated HRAS/NRAS in a nucleotide independent manner, solubilizes them and redirects these proteins to the plasma membrane.

EGFR mediated clathrin dependent localization of KRAS (but not HRAS/NRAS) to early and late endosomes has been reported, where it engages different effectors for signaling. A PKC dependent phosphorylation event targeting Serine 181 of KRAS leads to its translocation to the mitochondria, where it was shown to associate with Bcl-XL to induce apoptosis.

Ubiquitination of about 2% of plasma membrane bound HRAS/NRAS, but not KRAS proteins leads to increased targeting to the endosomal membranes where it limits ERK activation. More recently mono-ubiquitination of KRAS was shown to increase the stability of the proteins and activate signaling through its effector pathways. Recently, we have also demonstrated that the SMURF2:UBCH5 complex, components of the ubiquitination pathway, may regulate the stability of KRAS.
Together these studies portray a picture of a highly complex interplay of compartmentalized signaling modules regulated by RAS family proteins’ expression, post translational modifications, trafficking through different intracellular membranes, and turnover, with NRAS, HRAS and KRAS (isoform 4A, and 4B), playing distinct as well as shared roles.

**Biochemical regulation of RAS activity**

As discussed extensively in earlier sections, apart from intrinsic nucleotide binding and hydrolysis, RAS activation through SOS-GEFs and inactivation through GAPs further control the dynamic equilibrium of GDP/GTP bound states of RAS\(^2\). Modulation of the RAS GTPase cycle at the plasma membrane is probably the most studied aspect of RAS regulation (**Figure 1.1**).

Yet, while RAS activation through oncogenic mutations have been known to increase cell proliferation in many models, activated RAS also induces cell cycle arrest and senescence unless accompanied with collateral mutations in tumor suppressor genes in a cell context dependent manner\(^74\). This oncogene induced senescence is thought to be due to Reactive Oxygen Species (ROS) activation of p38 MAPK pathway which ultimately results in the repression of E2F target genes\(^75\).

In this thesis, intersections of KRAS with novel pathways were identified at three different levels.

At the chromosomal level, using an integrative genomics approach called Amplification Breakpoint Ranking and Assembly (ABRA) analysis, we nominated *KRAS* as a gene fusion with the ubiquitin-conjugating enzyme *UBE2L3* (**CHAPTER 2**). Although the *UBE2L3-KRAS* gene fusion was identified only in one prostate cancer cell line, DU145, and shown to promote cellular
transformation, in a larger context, it could represent genetic evidence for the close proximity of KRAS with the proteasome, which is a recurrent theme in various synthetic lethal screens of KRAS\textsuperscript{73,76-78}.

At the level of gene expression, we identified frequent ‘outlier kinases’, like \textit{MET}, \textit{MST1R}, \textit{AKT2}, \textit{EPHA2}, \textit{AXL}, and \textit{PLK2} in pancreatic cancer cell lines, which impart cell line specific dependency in both \textit{in vitro} and \textit{in vivo} models. Particularly, a subset of \textit{KRAS}-dependent pancreatic cancer cell lines display outlier expression of polo-like kinases (PLKs) (\textbf{CHAPTER 3}) and show increased sensitivity to PLK inhibition using BI6727 in combination with KRAS knockdown. PLK1, a serine/threonine kinase is a key player in mitosis\textsuperscript{79} and forms an integral part of both the anaphase-promoting complex (APC) and, incidentally, the proteasome pathway was identified as a synthetic lethal partner of \textit{KRAS}\textsuperscript{78}.

At the level of the protein, an unbiased mass spectrometric analysis identified Argonaute 2 (AGO2) as a RAS interacting protein, which we characterized (\textbf{CHAPTER 4}). Further, we provide evidence for the phenotypic consequence of the RAS-AGO2 interaction in cellular transformation, and delve into the mechanistic aspects of this interaction (\textbf{CHAPTER 5}), that portends a bearing on RAS biology in normal cell physiology as well. This most surprising intersection of the signaling networks of KRAS with the RNA silencing machinery through its interaction with its core component protein, AGO2, offers new insights into RAS biology.
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Figure 1.1 The RAS-GTPase cycle. RAS proteins cycle between an inactive GDP or active GTP bound form. In its activated state, RAS-GTP triggers various effector pathways that trigger cell proliferation.
Figure 1.2 Frequency of mutations at amino acid 12, 13 and 61 in different RAS proteins in human cancers (COSMIC analysis, 2015)
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Syndrome</th>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Protein</th>
<th>Protein Function</th>
<th>Mutation Frequency (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Noonan</td>
<td>PTPN11</td>
<td>SHP2</td>
<td>Phosphatase</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SOS1</td>
<td>SOS1</td>
<td>SHP2</td>
<td>RasGEF</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRAS</td>
<td>KRAS</td>
<td>KRAS</td>
<td>GTPase</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF1</td>
<td>RAF1</td>
<td>CRAF</td>
<td>Kinase</td>
<td>17%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP2K1</td>
<td>MEK1</td>
<td>Kinase</td>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cardiofaciocutaneous</td>
<td>KRAS</td>
<td>KRAS</td>
<td>GTPase</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIT1</td>
<td>RIT1</td>
<td>RIT1</td>
<td>GTPase</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP2K1</td>
<td>MEK1</td>
<td>Kinase</td>
<td>75%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MAP2K2</td>
<td>MEK2</td>
<td>Kinase</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Costello</td>
<td>HRAS</td>
<td>HRAS</td>
<td>GTPase</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>KRAS</td>
<td>KRAS</td>
<td>KRAS</td>
<td>GTPase</td>
<td>6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Type-1 Neurofibromatosis</td>
<td>NF1</td>
<td>Neurofibrin</td>
<td>RasGAP</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legius</td>
<td>SPRED1</td>
<td>SPRED1</td>
<td>MAPK signaling</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LEOPARD</td>
<td>PTPN11</td>
<td>SHP2</td>
<td>Phosphatase</td>
<td>90%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RAF1</td>
<td>RAF1</td>
<td>CRAF</td>
<td>Kinase</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BRAF</td>
<td>BRAF</td>
<td>Kinase</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capillary malformation-arteriovenous</td>
<td>RASA1</td>
<td>P120GAP</td>
<td>RasGEF</td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 1. Germline mutations of RAS/MAPK pathway in developmental disorders
Figure 1.3 Structural motifs of the RAS-GTPase
Figure 1.4 RAS signaling. Mitogenic signals translocate RAS to the plasma membrane and activate various signaling pathways. Adapted from Dragging Ras Back in the Ring. Cancer Cell 25, March 17, 2014
Figure 1.5 Regulation of RAS. RAS undergoes transcriptional, post transcriptional and post translational regulation. Post translational modification further traffic RAS to various cellular compartments for differential signaling outputs.
CHAPTER 2

CHARACTERIZATION OF KRAS REARRANGEMENTS IN METASTATIC PROSTATE CANCER

SUMMARY

Using an integrative genomics approach called Amplification Breakpoint Ranking and Assembly (ABRA) analysis, we nominated KRAS as a gene fusion with the ubiquitin-conjugating enzyme UBE2L3 in the DU145 cell line- which was originally derived from a metastatic prostate cancer to the brain. Interestingly, analysis of tissues revealed that 2 out of 62 metastatic prostate cancers harbored aberrations at the KRAS locus. In DU145 cells, UBE2L3-KRAS produces a fusion protein and specific knock-down of the fusion attenuates cell invasion and xenograft growth. Ectopic expression of the UBE2L3-KRAS fusion protein exhibits transforming activity in NIH 3T3 fibroblasts and RWPE prostate epithelial cells in vitro and in vivo. In NIH 3T3 cells, UBE2L3-KRAS attenuates the MEK/ERK pathway, which is commonly engaged by oncogenic mutant KRAS, and instead diverts signaling to the AKT and p38 MAPK pathways. This is the first report of a gene fusion involving Ras family genes and suggests that this aberration may drive metastatic progression in a subset of prostate cancers.
INTRODUCTION

To date, oncogenic alterations in the RAS oncogenes have been restricted to activating point mutations including the most commonly observed substitutions in codon 12, 13 and 61 of the different RAS isoforms \(^1-^3\). Gene fusions involving RAS genes have thus far not been described as a class of cancer-related aberrations.

Consolidating the characteristic features of driving gene fusions in cancer, previously we carried out a large-scale integrative analysis of cancer genomic datasets matched with gene rearrangement data \(^4\). As part of this analysis, we observed that in many instances, a small subset of tumors or cancer cell lines harboring an oncogenic gene fusion, often display characteristic amplification at the site of genomic rearrangements \(^5-^9\). High level copy number changes that result in the marked over-expression of oncogenes usually encompass the target genes at the center of overlapping amplifications across a panel of tumor samples. In contrast, amplification loci usually include only a portion of fusion genes, and are considered secondary genetic lesions associated with disease progression, drug resistance, and/or poor prognosis\(^5,^7-^11\). Thus, a “partially” amplified cancer gene may be indicative that this gene participates in a genomic fusion event important in cancer progression. This is the result of several independent genetic accidents including the formation of the gene fusion and subsequent amplification, suggesting possible selective pressure in cancer cells for this aberration. To systematically analyze this aspect, we developed an integrative genomic approach called amplification breakpoint ranking and assembly (ABRA) to discover causal gene fusions from cancer genomic datasets.

To uncover driving gene fusions contributing to prostate cancer progression, we applied ABRA analysis to genomic data from ten prostate cancer cell lines. Most interestingly, this led to the identification of a KRAS gene fusion in a rare subset of metastatic prostate cancer. This is the
first description of a mutant chimeric version of KRAS and may represent a new class of RAS aberrations.

RESULTS

According to the fusion breakpoint principle previously described \(^4\), amplifications associated with gene fusions usually involve the 5’ region of 5’ partners, and 3’ region of 3’ partners. Further, the amplification levels of 5’ and 3’ fusion genes will be similar due to their co-amplification as a single fusion gene. This rationale was used to assemble putative gene fusions associated with amplification breakpoints by matching the amplification levels of candidate 5’ and 3’ partners. We initially focused this analysis on cancer cell lines, as breakpoint analyses are more reliable in uniform cellular populations as opposed to tumors, which are often admixed with non-malignant cells, diluting genomic aberration profiles.

The ABRA approach was tested using a high resolution single nucleotide polymorphism microarray (aSNP) dataset \(^5\) generated from 36 leukemia cell lines including the K-562 chronic myeloid leukemia cell line known to harbor the amplified \(BCR-ABL1\) fusion \(^14\). We inferred the relative DNA copy number data and identified all 5’ and 3’ amplified genes from the 36 cell lines (≥2 copies). In this dataset, \(ABL1\) was the top ranking gene with a 3’ copy number increase. The amplification levels of all 5’ amplified genes in K-562 were then matched with \(ABL1\) to nominate potential 5’ partners. In total, six 5’ amplified genes were found in K-562 and five matched the level of \(ABL1\) 3’ amplification. After curation of the amplification breakpoints, \(BCR\) and \(NUP214\) were nominated as \(ABL1\) fusion partner candidates. This demonstrated the feasibility of this method in nominating driver gene fusions from genomic datasets.
To nominate novel gene fusions in advanced prostate cancer cells, we applied this method to an array comparative genomic hybridization (aCGH) dataset of 10 prostate cancer cell lines. Interestingly, the top candidate nominated in the ETS gene fusion-negative prostate cancer cell line, DU145, was the KRAS locus exhibiting a clear breakpoint accompanied by a 3’ amplification of KRAS (Figure 2.1a, left panel). This result was particularly intriguing considering that activating point mutations of KRAS are rarely seen in prostate cancer 13. Interestingly, the activation of downstream signaling intermediaries of the RAS-MAPK pathway have been observed in prostate cancer by a number of studies 15-17. To assemble amplification breakpoints in the KRAS gene with more confidence, we carried out replicate array CGH hybridizations for DU145. Matching the amplification level of KRAS with the 5’ amplified genes from DU145 cells we identified 10 potential 5’ partner candidates that were suggested by either of the two array CGH hybridizations. After curation, C14orf166, SOX5 and UBE2L3 were shortlisted as the top 5’ partner candidates for KRAS (Figure 2.1a, right panel).

To experimentally assess the predicted fusions of C14orf166-KRAS, SOX5-KRAS and UBE2L3-KRAS, we designed primer pairs from the first exons of candidate 5’ partners and last exon of KRAS, as well as the exons across the breakpoints. Reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) analysis of DU145 cells identified a specific fusion band for UBE2L3-KRAS but not for the other candidates. Sequencing of the RT-PCR product confirmed the fusion of the UBE2L3 exon 3 to the KRAS exon 2, schematically depicted in Figure 2.1b. To assess the expression level of the UBE2L3-KRAS fusion transcripts, we analyzed a panel of prostate cell lines by SYBR green quantitative PCR (QPCR) (Figure 2.1c) and RNase protection assay. UBE2L3-KRAS was highly expressed in DU145 cells but not in the other prostate cancer cell lines; this was further confirmed by paired-end transcriptome sequencing of DU145 cells.
Importantly, RNAseq also confirmed that the fusion allele of KRAS from DU145 cells did not harbor canonical activating mutations, suggesting that the fusion may represent the oncogenic aberration in this sample.

To characterize the chromosomal rearrangements involving UBE2L3 and KRAS loci in DU145, we carried out fluorescence in situ hybridization (FISH) analysis. Using KRAS split probe and UBE2L3-KRAS fusion probe, DU145 cells clearly showed a rearrangement at the KRAS genomic locus and fusion with UBE2L3 (Figure 2.1d). In addition, we also observed low level amplification (3 copies) of the UBE2L3-KRAS fusion consistent with its nomination by the ABRA approach. To extend our studies to prostate cancer tissues we carried out a combination of KRAS split probe FISH (n= 103 total cases) and array CGH breakpoint analysis (n=218 total cases) of 259 clinically localized prostate cancers, and 62 metastatic prostate cancers from the University of Michigan and Memorial Sloan Kettering Cancer Center (MSKCC). Interestingly, while clinically localized cases did not show aberrations at the KRAS locus, we identified 2 out of 62 metastatic prostate cancers that harbored a rearrangement at the KRAS locus (Figure 2.1d). One of the index cases, PCA0216, which was a soft tissue metastasis, was validated by both array CGH and FISH; while the other index PCA0211 was a bone metastasis and was validated by arrayCGH (but optimal hybridization for FISH analysis was not achieved following decalcification protocol) (Figure 2.1d). Interestingly, the available gene and exon expression data for case PCA0211 suggested that this case was ETS fusion negative, and exhibited high expression of KRAS Exons 2-6 (not Exon 1) similar to the DU145 cell line.

We next examined expression of the UBE2L3-KRAS protein. The predicted 296 amino acid fusion protein trims 17 amino acids from the C-terminus of UBE2L3 (Figure 2.2a). The full length KRAS protein is preserved, with a 4 amino acid insertion between UBE2L3 and KRAS.
Using both a monoclonal antibody raised against the Ras family and a polyclonal antibody specific to KRAS, we detected a 33 kDa fusion protein in addition to the 21 kDa band corresponding to wild-type KRAS in DU145 cells (Figure 2.2b). Specificity of the band corresponding to the predicted UBE2L3-KRAS protein was confirmed by siRNA based knock down of KRAS, UBE2L3 and the chimeric junction of UBE2L3-KRAS. The UBE2L3-KRAS protein was found specifically in DU145 cells and not in a panel of other prostate cell lines (Figure 2.2c). Specific expression of the protein was also independently confirmed by mass spectrometric assessment of DU145 cells using a multiple reaction monitoring (MRM) assay (which does not require antibody based detection) (Figure 2.2d). Over-expression of UBE2L3-KRAS in HEK293 cells, however, did not result in detectable fusion protein. Interestingly, in the presence of the proteosomal inhibitor, bortezomib, expression of the fusion protein was clearly apparent suggesting decreased stability of the fusion protein in the over-expression system (Figure 2.2c).

UBE2L3 is a ubiquitin-conjugating enzyme (E2) \(^{18}\) and may account for the apparent instability of the fusion protein. We therefore attempted to detect possible ubiquitination of UBE2L3-KRAS protein. We identified a Rat anti-Ras monoclonal antibody which precipitated the 33kDa UBE2L3-KRAS protein as well as additional bands in the 40-55kDa region which were specific to HEK 293T cells expressing the fusion. These shifted bands are recognized by both anti-Ras and anti-HA tagged ubiquitin antibodies, and their molecular weights match the prediction for ubiquitinated fusion proteins. We further detected these ubiquitinated UBE2L3-KRAS proteins in DU145 cells. These data suggest that the UBE2L3-KRAS protein is ubiquitinated, which may contribute to its decreased stability.
To determine the function of the UBE2L3-KRAS fusion, we over-expressed it in NIH 3T3 cells, a system classically used to study RAS biology\textsuperscript{1,19}. Of note, enforced expression of UBE2L3-KRAS induced loss of fibroblast morphology, increased cell proliferation and foci formation (Figure 2.3a-b). Cell cycle analysis revealed an increase in the S phase fraction of cells. To determine the effects of UBE2L3-KRAS expression on tumor growth \textit{in vivo} we implanted nude mice with the stable NIH 3T3 vector control cells or NIH 3T3 \textit{UBE2L3-KRAS} fusion expressing cells. We observed robust tumor formation by the UBE2L3-KRAS expressing cells but not the vector transfected cells (Figure 2.3c). To interrogate the potential RAS-related signaling pathways engaged by UBE2L3-KRAS in NIH 3T3 cells we carried out a series of immunoblot analyses on key signaling intermediaries. As reported in the literature for NIH 3T3 cells, KRAS is a stronger inducer of the MEK/ERK cascade; whereas HRAS is a stronger activator of the PI3K/AKT pathway\textsuperscript{6}. Interestingly, UBE2L3-KRAS over-expression resulted in attenuated endogenous MEK and ERK phosphorylation (Figure 2.3d) in NIH 3T3 cells, instead, the signaling was directed to AKT and p38 MAP Kinase cascades, both of which have been implicated in prostate cancer\textsuperscript{15,17}.

As activation of the MEK-ERK pathway is dependent on membrane attachment of Ras proteins, we investigated their sub-cellular localization using immunofluorescence assays. Interestingly, Ras proteins, which are normally distributed in the cytoplasm, were found to be highly enriched in the late endosome after ectopic expression of UBE2L3-KRAS fusion in NIH3T3 cells. We speculate that this relocation of Ras proteins may decrease their association with the cellular membrane, and possibly enhance the growth-factor receptor signaling in the endosome.
To investigate the role of the $\text{UBE2L3-KRAS}$ fusion in a prostate background, we over-expressed the fusion in RWPE prostate epithelial cells. The expression of the fusion protein was enhanced by incubation with bortezomib (Figure 2.4a, insert). Over-expression of the $\text{UBE2L3-KRAS}$ fusion in RWPE cells led to increased cell invasion, proliferation, and a transient increase of tumor growth in nude mice (Figure 2.4a). It is notable that in the RWPE model, signaling pathway analysis did not reveal inhibition of the MEK/ERK pathway or activation of AKT/p38 MAPK, (data not shown). Although the MEK inhibitor U0126 inhibits the invasion of RWPE cells over-expressing either wild type or mutant KRAS, treatment of RWPE cells over-expressing the fusion continued to exhibit invasive properties in the presence of U0126, suggesting that downstream effectors other than MEK/ERK may be engaged by the fusion in the prostate context.

To further confirm the function of endogenous UBE2L3-KRAS in DU145 cells, we performed stable knock-down of UBE2L3-KRAS fusion and generated chicken embryo chorioallantoic membrane and mouse xenograft models. This resulted in decreased cell invasion and proliferation in vitro, as well as the inhibition of tumor formation in the in vivo models (Figure 2.4b-c).

**DISCUSSION**

The addiction of cancer cells to causal gene fusions often results in in vivo amplification, which may be exploited to reveal unbalanced recurrent gene rearrangements. Based on this rationale, we developed an integrative genomic-based approach called ABRA to explore driving gene fusions contributing to the progression of prostate cancer. This led to the nomination of the $\text{UBE2L3-KRAS}$ fusion in DU145 prostate cancer cells. This fusion encodes a protein
encompassing most of the UBE2L3 protein and full length KRAS, which is ubiquitinated in DU145 cells. Importantly, recurrent genomic rearrangements at the KRAS locus were found in 2 out of 62 metastatic prostate tumors in addition to the DU145 metastatic prostate cancer cell line. While a number of oncogenic activating point mutations of KRAS have been identified, this is the first description of a mutant chimeric version of KRAS that is oncogenic and thus may represent a new class of cancer-related alteration. Consistent with this finding, we recently described gene fusions of BRAF and RAF1 in 1-2 % of prostate tumors, further implicating the RAS-RAF-MAPK signaling pathway in subsets of prostate cancer.

While both KRAS G12V and UBE2L3-KRAS exhibit an oncogenic phenotype in vitro and in vivo, UBE2L3-KRAS over-expression leads to attenuation, rather than activation, of the MEK-ERK pathway in NIH 3T3 cells. Instead, it appears that the KRAS fusion enriches Ras proteins in the endosome, and switches signaling to the AKT and p38 MAPK cascades. This observation may have important implications in understanding the biology of this most studied proto-oncogene. Future studies will be needed to elucidate the details of how chimeric KRAS engages endogenous RAS-related signaling pathways in the context of prostate cancer.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Amplification Breakpoint Ranking and Assembly. The microarray CGH data from prostate cancer cell lines were segmented by the circular binary segmentation (CBS) algorithm, and the genomic position of each amplification breakpoint was mapped with the genomic regions of all human genes. The 3’ amplified genes were rated by their rConSig Score, which identify KRAS as the top candidate. Matching the amplification level of 3’ KRAS with 5’ amplified genes from DU145 nominated UBE2L3, SOX5 and C14orf166 as 5’ partner candidates.
Reverse Transcription PCR, Nuclease protection assay and Fluorescence In Situ Hybridization. RT-PCR with the fusion primers confirmed the UBE2L3-KRAS fusion in DU145 cells. Fusion qPCR was performed on a panel of prostate cancer cell lines (StepOne Real Time PCR system, Applied Biosystems). Ribonuclease protection assays were performed utilizing a 230 bp fragment spanning the UBE2L3-KRAS fusion junction. Interphase FISH was done on cell lines, paraffin-embedded tissue sections, and tissue microarrays using bacterial artificial chromosome probes.

Western Blotting and Multiple Reactions Monitoring Mass Spectrometry. Lysates from DU145, PrEC, RWPE, 22RV1, VCaP and PC3 cells, either untreated or treated with 500nM bortezomib for 12 hours, were probed with anti-RAS monoclonal (Millipore) and anti-KRAS rabbit polyclonal antibodies (Proteintech Group Inc). Cell lysates from DU145 and LnCaP cells treated with bortizomib were analyzed by Multiple Reactions Monitoring Mass Spectrometry to identify the fusion peptides.

In Vitro Overexpression and Stable Knockdown of UBE2L3-KRAS Fusion. Expression plasmids for UBE2L3-KRAS were generated with the pDEST40 (with or without 5’ FLAG) and pLenti-6 vectors (without 5’FLAG). The expression plasmids were introduced into HEK (5’ FLAG-UBE2L3-KRAS pDEST40 vector), NIH/3T3 (UBE2L3-KRAS pDEST40 vector) and RWPE cells (UBE2L3-KRAS pLenti-6 vector) using standard protocols. The prostate cancer cell line DU145 was infected with lentiviruses with scrambled shRNA or UBE2L3-KRAS shRNA, and stable cell lines were generated by selection with puromycin (Invitrogen).

Cell Proliferation, Invasion and Pathway Analysis, Xenograft Mice Model. Cell counting analysis and basement membrane matrix invasion assays were performed as described previously. Protein lysates from NIH/3T3 stable cell lines expressing UBE2L3-KRAS, V600E mutant
BRAF, G12V mutant KRAS, and vector controls were probed with phospho and total MEK1/2, p38 MAPK, Akt, and ERK antibodies (Cell Signaling Technologies). The stable NIH/3T3 and RWPE cells expressing UBE2L3-KRAS, and pooled or single clone population of DU145 cells with the stable knockdown of UBE2L3-KRAS were implanted subcutaneously into nude mice.
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Figure 2.1. Identification and characterization of a novel KRAS rearrangement in metastatic prostate cancer. (a) Left panel, amplification breakpoint analysis and ConSig scoring of 3' amplified genes from a panel of advanced prostate cancer cell lines nominated KRAS as a top fusion gene candidate with 3' amplification in the DU145 prostate cancer cells. The ConSig scores are depicted by the yellow line and the level of 3' amplification for each 3' fusion gene candidate is depicted by red columns. Right panel, matching the amplification level of 5' amplified genes in DU145 cells nominates SOX5, C14orf166, and UBE2L3 as 5' fusion partner candidates for KRAS. The relative quantification of DNA copy number data from the genomic regions 1Mb apart from the candidate fusion genes is shown. The x axis indicates the physical position of the genomic aberrations. The fusion partners are indicated by grey arrows. (b) Schematic of sequencing result from Reverse Transcription PCR revealing fusion of UBE2L3 with KRAS in DU145. Structures for the UBE2L3 and KRAS genes have their basis in the Genbank reference sequences. The numbers above the exons (indicated by boxes) indicate the last base of each exon. Open reading frames are shown in darker shades. The exons of UBE2L3-KRAS fusion are numbered from the original reference sequences. Line graphs show the position and DNA sequencing of the fusion junction. (c) A panel of prostate cancer cell lines was analyzed for UBE2L3-KRAS mRNA expression by SYBR assay with the fusion primers. * NPP, normal prostate pool. (d) Left panel, the genomic organizations of UBE2L3 and KRAS loci were shown in the schematic, with red and green bars indicating the location of BAC clones. Genes are shown with the direction of transcription indicated by the arrows and exons indicated by bars. Right panel, FISH assay (upper) and copy number data analysis (lower) confirms the fusion of UBE2L3 to KRAS in DU145 cells and recurrent rearrangements at the KRAS locus. Left FISH figure shows three copies of fusion signals as indicated by yellow arrows, using co-localizing probes for the fusion. Right FISH figure shows triplicate KRAS 3' signals in DU145, and 3' deletion of KRAS in a metastatic prostate tumor, PCA0216, using probes that tightly encompass the KRAS locus. Relative quantification of copy number array CGH data at the KRAS locus in DU145, metastatic prostate tumors PCA0211 and PCA0216 are shown in the lower panel.
Figure 2.2. Characterization of the UBE2L3-KRAS fusion protein. (a) Schematic representations of UBE2L3, KRAS and the predicted UBE2L3-KRAS fusion protein. (b) Expression of the UBE2L3-KRAS fusion protein in DU145 cells. Immunoblot analysis of DU145 cells using an anti-RAS mouse monoclonal antibody and an anti-KRAS rabbit polyclonal antibody detects a 33kDa fusion protein specific to DU145 cells. siRNA duplexes employed are indicated. β-actin was used to demonstrate equal loading. (c) Survey of the UBE2L3-KRAS fusion protein in a panel of prostate cancer cell lines and stabilization of protein expression with a proteosomal inhibitor, bortezomib. Cell lines are indicated and treated in the presence or absence of 500nM bortezomib for 24 hours. HEK293 cells were transfected with an expression construct encoding UBE2L3-KRAS. Immunoblot analysis was carried out using KRAS polyclonal and RAS monoclonal antibodies. (d) Mass spectrometric assay for the detection of the UBE2L3-KRAS protein in DU145 cells. An MRM-MS assay was developed to detect the UBE2L3-KRAS fusion protein. Upper panel, sequence of the UBE2L3-KRAS fusion protein with amino acids colored in red from UBE2L3 and colored in green from KRAS. Tryptic peptides used for MRM-MS analysis are underlined. Matrix represents positive measurement (highlighted in red) of peptides from corresponding gel fraction of DU145, LNCaP and VCaP whole cell lysates.
Figure 2.3. Transforming activities of the UBE2L3-KRAS fusion in NIH 3T3 cells. (a) Overexpression of UBE2L3-KRAS in NIH 3T3 cells increases cellular proliferation. pDEST40 represents an empty vector. (b) Overexpression of UBE2L3-KRAS induces foci formation in NIH 3T3 cells. Oncogenic KRAS G12V was used as a positive control with respective empty vectors as negative controls (pDEST40 and pBABE). Photographs of representative plates are shown in the upper panel and quantification of foci formation is shown in the bar graph of the lower panel. (c) The UBE2L3-KRAS transfected NIH 3T3 cells form tumors in nude mice. Stable polyclonal populations of NIH 3T3 cells expressing either the vector or UBE2L3-KRAS fusion gene were injected subcutaneously into nude mice. Tumor growth was monitored from day 7 to day 15 as indicated. The insert shows the presence of the fusion protein in the stably transfected NIH 3T3 cells which is further stabilized upon bortezomib treatment. (d) Investigation of the downstream signaling pathways engaged by the UBE2L3-KRAS fusion in NIH 3T3 cells. Lysates prepared from stably transfected NIH 3T3 polyclonal populations and vector controls were subject to immunoblot analysis for phospho- and total MEK, ERK, AKT and p38 MAPK. Oncogenic BRAFV600E and KRASG12V were included as controls. β-actin was used as a loading control.
Figure 2.4. The oncogenicity of UBE2L3-KRAS fusion in the prostate context. (a) Expression of the UBE2L3-KRAS fusion in RWPE benign prostate epithelial cells leads to increased cellular proliferation and invasion. Left, the results of cell proliferation assays using stable RWPE cell clones infected with either the pLenti-6 vector or UBE2L3-KRAS. The inset shows the 33kd fusion protein detected only in the fusion transfected cells treated with bortezomib to enhance protein stability (data from a representative clone is shown (Clone 2)). Right, modified Boyden chamber-matrigel assays using the pLenti-6 vector and the fusion expressing cells (Clone 2). Invading cells were stained with crystal violet and quantitated. DU145 prostate cancer cells were used as a positive control. (b) Knockdown of the UBE2L3-KRAS fusion reduces cell proliferation and invasion in DU145 cells. Left, cell growth relative to the control shRNA was monitored using WST-1 assay for 6 days. Insert shows the immunoblot analysis for the 33kd fusion protein detected using Ras monoclonal antibody. Right, results of matrigel invasion assay for DU145 pool and clone with UBE2L3-KRAS knock-down. Scrambled shRNA duplexes are used as control. (c) Knock-down of the UBE2L3-KRAS fusion attenuates prostate tumor growth in mouse xenograft models. The figure shows a plot of mean tumor volume trajectories over time for mice inoculated with DU145 pool (red) or single clone (green) after UBE2L3-KRAS stable knock-down. Error bars represent the standard error of the mean at each time point. (d) A summary of RAS-RAF signaling pathways in relation to recurrent gene fusions characterized in prostate cancer. Genes that participate in fusion events are indicated in red. In parenthesis are the percentage of prostate cancers harboring aberrations in the ETS family, RAF family, and KRAS gene locus. * ETS family members involved in gene fusions include ERG, ETV1, 4, and 5. Figure adapted and modified from: Gioeli, Kraus, Weber et al, Current Clinical Oncology: Prostate Cancer.
CHAPTER 3

OUTLIER KINASES IN INDIVIDUAL CANCER SAMPLES REPRESENT PERSONALIZED THERAPEUTIC TARGETS

SUMMARY

Cancer-specific oncogene ‘dependence’ provides the basis for targeted therapeutic approaches. Protein kinases provide some of the most effective targets in personalized cancer treatment; therefore determination of tumor-specific kinase aberrations is a major objective of cancer genomic analyses. In this study, we analyzed high-throughput transcriptome sequencing data from a compendium of 485 cancer and benign samples from 25 different tissue types to delineate sample-specific ‘kinome’ expression profiles. Comparing gene expression data across different sample sets, we identified distinct ‘outlier kinases’ in individual cancer samples, defined as genes showing the highest levels of absolute and differential expression. In pancreatic cancer, frequent outlier kinases included therapeutic targets like MET, MST1R, AKT2, EPHA2, AXL, and PLK2, distinct from breast cancer where predominant outlier kinases included ERBB2, RET, and FGFR4 etc.. These outlier kinases were found to impart sample-specific dependencies in various cell lines tested by siRNA knockdown or therapeutic inhibition, both in vitro and in vivo. Interestingly, we observed that a subset of KRAS-dependent pancreatic cancer cell lines display outlier expression of polo-like kinases (PLKs) and show increased sensitivity to the PLK inhibitor BI6727 in combination with KRAS knockdown. Together, our results suggest that outlier kinases represent effective personalized therapeutic targets that are readily identifiable through clinical RNA-sequencing of tumors.
INTRODUCTION

The dependence of cancers on a primary driver gene known as ‘oncogene addiction’ forms the guiding principle of targeted therapy that has had some outstanding successes, such as imatinib for BCR-ABL-positive chronic myeloid leukemia, Herceptin and lapatinib for ERBB2-positive breast cancers, gefitinib for lung cancers with kinase domain mutations in EGFR, and more recently crizotinib for lung cancers with ALK gene fusions. Evidently, protein kinases are the mainstay of a majority of the current targeted therapeutic strategies for cancers, and inhibitors of several common driver kinases such as AKT, BRAF, CDKs, KIT, RET, SRC, MAPKs, MET, PIK3CA, PLKs, AURKs, S6Ks, and VEGFR are under various stages of clinical use, trials or development. While activating somatic mutations or amplifications are associated with some of these genes, overexpression of kinases (presumably resulting from underlying cancer genomic aberrations) is often a strong indicator of increased activity that may impart dependence on cancer cells.

Pancreatic cancer is the 4th leading cause of cancer related deaths in the U.S., with the worst prognosis (5 year survival < 3%) of all major malignancies, attributed to diagnosis of the disease at an advanced, unresectable stage and poor responsiveness to chemo-/ radiation-therapy. The overarching oncogenic driver of pancreatic cancer is mutant-KRAS that has eluded therapeutic interventions, spurring the search for alternative targets. The identification of distinct kinases in independent screens for synthetic lethal interactors of KRAS led us to systematically explore potential ‘personalized kinase targets’ in a panel of pancreatic cancer cell lines, based on kinome expression profiling.

Next-generation sequencing of cancer transcriptomes affords a direct readout of gene expression that offers significant advantages over microarrays in terms of throughput,
eliminating probe bias, and simultaneous monitoring of diverse components of transcriptome biology, including gene expression, alternative splicing, chimeric/-readthrough transcripts and non-coding transcripts. Here, we set out to use transcriptome data from a compendium of 485 cancer and benign samples from 25 different tissue types to carry out gene expression profiling of the complete complement of kinases in the human genome, the kinome, to identify ‘individual sample-specific outlier kinases’ inspired by the concept of cancer outlier profile analysis (COPA). Importantly, while COPA analysis was used to identify subsets of samples displaying outlier expression of candidate genes, here we interrogated individual samples to identify outlier genes, focusing on kinases that display the highest levels of absolute expression among all the kinases in a sample and the highest levels of differential expression compared to the median level of expression of the respective gene(s) across the compendium. We hypothesized that such sample-specific outlier kinases may impart ‘dependence’ on the cells due to extremely high expression and thus potentially provide personalized therapeutic targets.

Here, we analyzed the expression profiles of breast and pancreatic cancer kinomes to identify sample-specific outlier kinases. Focusing on cell lines displaying outlier expression of kinases with available therapeutics, we tested their dependence on specific outlier kinases compared with random targets using siRNA/ small molecule inhibitors to test their effects on cell proliferation. Using this approach we identified several cell line-specific dependencies as well as kinase targets showing enhanced effects with ERBB2-inhibition in breast and KRAS-knockdown in pancreatic cancer cells.

RESULTS

Delineation of cancer specific kinome outlier profiles using transcriptome sequencing data
Taking advantage of the direct and unbiased readout of gene expression in terms of defined RNA-Seq reads, we carried out a systematic analysis of the human kinome expression in cancer. RNA-Seq-based normalized read-counts of all 468 kinases available in our transcriptome compendium, comprised of 485 samples from 25 different tissue types, revealed distinct kinases expressed at very high levels- both in absolute terms and in the context of their typical range of expression levels- in virtually all samples examined. Querying individual breast cancer samples (123 samples) for kinases that display the highest levels of absolute expression among all the kinases in an individual sample (>20 RPKM) and the highest levels of differential expression compared to the median level of expression of the respective gene(s) across the compendium of non-breast samples (>5 fold), we identified common outlier kinases across the cohort of breast cancer samples (Figure 3.1A). Thus, for example, all breast cancer cell lines known to be ERBB2-positive scored an outlier expression of ERBB2. Interestingly, many ERBB2-positive cell lines also displayed outlier expression of additional therapeutic target kinases like RPS6KB1, FGFR4, and RET, among others (Figure 3.1A, inset; Figure 3.2). Multiple outlier kinases in individual cancer samples could represent multiple therapeutic avenues and were thus explored further. Similarly, kinome expression data from 22 pancreatic cancer cell lines and 18 tissues revealed a set of kinases specifically overexpressed in pancreatic cancers as compared to other tissues and cell lines (Figure 3.1B). Assessment of outlier kinases in pancreatic and breast cancer cohorts revealed distinct outlier kinase profiles between the two diseases. For example, common outlier kinases in breast cancer included ERBB2, FGFR4, and RET, while kinases displaying outlier expression across multiple pancreatic cancer samples included EPHA2, MST1R, MET, PLK2, and AKT2. Interestingly, AXL and EGFR demonstrated outlier expression in both pancreatic and breast cancer samples.
FGFR4 as a targetable outlier kinase in ERBB2-positive breast cancer cell lines

Among the ERBB2-positive breast cancer cell lines analyzed, ZR-75-30 exhibited singular outlier kinase expression of ERBB2, whose knockdown resulted in a strong growth inhibition, while knockdown of RPS6KB1, another oncogenic kinase with potent activity in the mTOR signaling pathway, did not have any effect on the proliferation rate of ZR-75-30 cells (Figure 3.2). Among the additional kinases showing outlier expression in ERBB2-positive samples, FGFR4 was observed frequently, such as in MDA-MB-361 and MDA-MB-453 (Figure 3.2), as well as in MDA-MB-330, HCC202, and HCC1419. To assess the significance of FGFR4 outlier expression in the backdrop of ERBB2 overexpression, MDA-MB-361 and MDA-MB-453 cells were treated with Herceptin and or short hairpin RNA-encoding lentiviral constructs against FGFR4. In MDA-MB-361 cells, targeting ERBB2 using Herceptin had no effect on cell proliferation, while shRNA-mediated knockdown of FGFR4 impaired the growth rate of these cells significantly (Figure 3.2). In MDA-MB-453 cells, both Herceptin treatment and FGFR4 knockdown diminished cell proliferation rates significantly, but an even greater effect was obtained with combined treatment, demonstrating dependence on both FGFR4 and ERBB2 in this cell line.

To further examine the dependency of a subset of ERBB2-positive cells on FGFR4, we generated Herceptin-resistant sub-lines for MDA-MB-453 cells and BT474, an ERBB2-positive breast cancer cell line that does not exhibit FGFR4 outlier expression (Figure 3.3A). Consistent with the experiment using Herceptin combined with shRNA-mediated FGFR4 inhibition (Figure 3.2), MDA-MB-453 cells were found to be independently responsive to both Herceptin and PD170374, a small molecule inhibitor of FGFR, with the strongest effect on cell proliferation seen upon combined treatment with the two reagents (Figure 3.3B, left). Interestingly, the
MDA-MB-453 cells grown to be resistant to Herceptin, continued to display responsiveness to the FGFR inhibitor PD170374 (Figure 3.3B, right), suggesting that FGFR4 represents an independent therapeutic target in a subset of ERBB2-positive breast cancer cells. Similar effect was obtained using another FGFR inhibitor Dovinitib, which significantly decreased cell proliferation in both the MDA-MB-453 parental and Herceptin-resistant sub-lines (Figure 3.3C, left) but did not affect BT-474 parental or Herceptin-resistant sub-lines (Figure 3.3C, right). Taken together, these results suggest that a subset of ERBB2-positive breast cancers that display outlier expression of FGFR4 may respond to combined treatment more effectively compared to only ERBB2-directed therapy.

Pancreatic cancer cell lines are sensitive to knockdown of cell-specific outlier kinases

Extending the kinome outlier analysis to pancreatic cancer, a tumor type critically lacking in rational therapeutic targets, particularly in the realm of actionable kinases, kinome expression profiles of individual pancreatic cancer cell lines were used to identify sample-specific outlier kinases (Figure 3.4, left). Next, the pancreatic cancer cell lines were tested for effect on cell proliferation following siRNA-based knockdown of sample-specific outlier and non-outlier kinases. Knockdown of the sample-specific outlier kinases for example EGFR in L3.3, PLK2 in MIA-PaCa-2, MET in BxPC-3 and AKT2 in PANC-1 cells, inhibited the proliferation of respective cells, (Figure 3.4, middle). A similar growth inhibition was observed following knockdown of MET in HPAC and AXL in Panc08.13 and PL45 cells. Conversely, knockdown of the non-outlier kinases AXL in L3.3 and BxPC-3 cells, MET in MIA-Paca-2, and PLK2 in PANC-1 cells did not significantly affect cell growth (Figure 3.4, right), as well as PLK2 in BxPC-3 and L3.3 cells -despite comparable levels of siRNA-mediated knockdown of target
genes. These observations strongly support the notion that outlier kinases represent potential therapeutic targets in individual cancer samples.

Notably, knockdown of the outlier kinase PLK2 in MIA-PaCa-2 cells did not have as profound an effect on cell proliferation as outlier kinase-targeting in many other samples. We hypothesized that this could be due to a pervasive influence of oncogenic KRAS in these cells, and therefore tested the effect of KRAS knockdown in pancreatic cancer cell lines with PLK outlier expression.

**Effect of KRAS knockdown combined with PLK inhibition**

The impact of KRAS knockdown in the context of PLK outlier expression in pancreatic cancer cell lines (**Figure 3.5, left**) was assessed using pooled clones of pancreatic cancer cell lines stably transduced with two different inducible shRNAs against KRAS. Following induction by doxycycline, the cells expressing KRAS-shRNAs were distinguished by red fluorescence (resulting from red fluorescent protein co-expressed with the shRNA) (**Figure 3.5, middle**). KRAS knockdown efficiency of 50% or more was obtained in all the cells tested. Of the cell lines tested, knockdown of KRAS significantly inhibited the proliferation of L3.3, MIA-PaCa-2, and Panc-03.27, which all harbor oncogenic mutations in KRAS and were designated as KRAS-dependent (in the context of sensitivity to KRAS knockdown) (**Figure 3.5A, right**). The BxPC-3 cells with wild type KRAS as well as HPAC and PANC-1 cells, with mutant KRAS, were not affected by KRAS knockdown and were categorized as KRAS-independent (**Figure 3.5B, right**).

Incidentally, all three PLK outlier cell lines tested here, L3.3, MIA-PaCa-2 and Panc-03.27, were found to be KRAS-dependent, based on their reduced proliferation upon KRAS
knockdown (Figure 3.5A). Treatment with the PLK inhibitor BI6727 alone significantly inhibited cell proliferation only those cell lines with PLK outlier expression (Figure 3.5A, right) but had no effect in cell lines without PLK outlier expression (Figure 3.5B, right). The decrease in cell proliferation following BI6727 treatment was associated with increased apoptosis, as measured by flow cytometric analysis of Annexin V/Propidium Iodide-stained cells (Supplemental figure S2A) Further, treatment with BI6727 in combination with knockdown of KRAS enhanced the inhibition of cell proliferation in the KRAS-dependent, PLK outlier cells (Figure 3.5A, right) but had no effect in the KRAS-independent cells without PLK outlier expression (Figure 3.5B, right). Investigating the likely reason for intriguing lack of sensitivity to KRAS knockdown in a subset of pancreatic cancer cells harboring oncogenic KRAS, we observed that following KRAS knockdown, the levels of phospho-ERK, one of the major effector proteins in the RAS signaling pathway, were reduced in the KRAS-dependent cell lines L3.3 and MIA-PaCa-2 but not in the KRAS-independent cell line PANC-1, in which kinase activity was likely sustained by other outlier kinases. Interestingly, the KRAS-independent cell lines BxPC-3 and PANC-1 did respond to inhibition of their respective outlier kinases, both in vitro (Figure 3.4, middle) as well as in vivo, described below.

**XL184 treatment in BxPC-3 and PANC-1 pancreatic cancer xenografts**

To test the effect of inhibiting sample-specific outlier kinases in vivo, we examined tumor xenografts of the KRAS-independent pancreatic cancer cell lines BxPC-3 and PANC-1 established in NOD/SCID mice, treated with the MET inhibitor XL184. As predicted, growth of BxPC-3 cells, which display outlier expression of MET, was significantly inhibited, as measured by tumor volume and weight (Figure 3.6A-C). However, growth of PANC-1 cells, which do not harbor MET outlier expression, was also significantly inhibited.
As PANC-1 displays significant outlier expression of and dependence on AKT2 (Figure 3.4), we queried whether the profound inhibitory effect of XL184 on PANC-1 in vivo was mediated by non-specific targeting of AKT2. Western blot analysis of PANC-1 xenograft tumor lysates revealed markedly decreased phospho-AKT expression after XL184 treatment (Figure 3.6D). This suggests that XL184 suppresses PANC-1 proliferation through inhibition of AKT signaling. Importantly, there was no difference in body weight between treated and untreated BxPC-3 and PANC-1 xenografts, demonstrating that XL184 had no significant in vivo toxicity.

DISCUSSION

The advent of high-throughput sequencing enables a comprehensive characterization of the genomic and transcriptomic landscape of individual cancer samples, inexorably leading to the challenge of defining and prioritizing clinically relevant findings to translate into improved diagnostic and therapeutic options 23,24. Clinical sequencing of cancers aims to identify actionable genomic aberrations and match patients with available therapies. Protein kinases, being central to biological and disease processes, including cancer, and being therapeutically targetable, comprise a large proportion of available and potential targets; thus any novel disease-specific kinase aberrations are of great clinical interest. This study proposes and tests the hypothesis that specific kinases showing outlier expression in individual cancer samples impart ‘dependence’ on the cells, which may be targeted in combination with existing treatment modalities. Importantly, a case is made for considering the entire profile of kinome aberrations to prioritize potentially effective targets.
The ‘sample-centric’ analysis of kinome expression revealed unique profiles of outlier kinases that were tested for dependency. Importantly, this approach uncovers multiple potent targets in an unbiased manner. For example, the well-known ‘ERBB2-positive’ breast cancer cell lines MDA-MB-361 and MDA-MB-453 were found to display outlier expression of the additional therapeutic target FGFR4. Notably, a subset of ERBB2-positive primary breast cancer tissues was found to display outlier expression of FGFR4 in Oncomine (data not shown). Targeting outlier FGFR4 in ERBB2-positive breast cancer samples was found to confer independent as well as additive effects upon their combined knockdown (Figure 3.2), highlighting the potential of combining two or more therapeutic targets in treating cancer, even in cases with a predominant driver such as ERBB2. Interestingly, we also showed that even after the ERBB2-positive cell line MDA-MB-453 becomes resistant to Herceptin treatment, cell proliferation still remained dependent on FGFR4 and responded to FGFR inhibitors (Figure 3.3). Our results suggest that the ERBB2-positive breast cancers may be partly dependent on additional drivers, such as FGFR4, RET, EGFR, and MET, which may sustain these cancers despite elimination of ERBB2 activity. Another important corollary to our observations is that combinatorial targeting of ERBB2 and additional outlier kinases at the outset may be much more effective than approaching one target at a time. Further, each cancer sample needs to be investigated individually to rationally determine patient-specific target combinations.

Next, we extended the approach of nominating sample-specific outlier kinases to pancreatic cancer, which is characterized by a bleak prognosis due to presentation at an advanced stage and resistance to traditional chemoradiation therapy in the setting of its pancreatic cancer sanctuary, encompassing tumor stroma, extracellular matrix, tumor infiltrating immune cells, and cancer stem cells. Given the paucity of effective targets in pancreatic cancer, the strong response
of pancreatic cancer cell lines to knockdown/inhibition of *a priori* designated outlier kinases is a promising lead. Our results also underscore the importance of matching sample-specific actionable targets with the appropriate therapeutics. For example targeting MET was found to be more effective in pancreatic cancer cell lines with MET outlier expression compared to non-outlier samples. Notably, many of our experimental results are consistent with several anecdotal studies using kinase inhibitors against EGFR, MET and AKT2.\(^1\text{25-29}\) Considering the outlier kinases in pancreatic cancer in the context of the predominant oncogenic KRAS mutation, our results suggest that subsets of KRAS-dependent cells are significantly affected upon combined inhibition of KRAS and the PLK outlier kinases. Previously Luo et al, demonstrated a synthetic lethal interaction between mutant KRAS and PLK in lung and colorectal cancer cell lines.\(^9\) Further, successful demonstration of the dependence of pancreatic cancer cells on outlier kinases in an *in vivo* setting provides a platform to carry out pre-clinical investigations of primary human tumors in mouse ‘avatars’ with unique outlier kinase profiles. Overall, our study provides a metric to define and prioritize personalized target spectra specific to individual tumors.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**Kinome analysis**

Transcriptome sequencing data from 485 cancer and benign samples from 25 different tissue types previously generated on Illumina GA and GAII platforms, was mapped using Bowtie against UCSC genes in hg18 human genome assembly (http://genome.ucsc.edu). Unique best match hit sequences normalized for the number of reads per kb transcript per million total reads in the given sequencing run (RPKM)\(^1\text{3}\) were used to generate gene expression data matrix for the
entire compendium. The expression data for the complete list of kinase genes was used to identify ‘outlier kinases’ in individual samples based on their absolute expression (>20 RPKM) within the sample and differential expression (>5 fold) across the compendium, as well as separately for breast and pancreatic cancer samples.

**Cell culture**

All human breast and pancreatic cancer and benign epithelial cell lines were procured from the American Type Culture Collection (ATCC), except the benign immortalized pancreatic epithelial cell line HPDE provided by Dr. Diane Simeone and the pancreatic adenocarcinoma cell line L3.3 obtained from the University of Texas MD Anderson Characterized Cell Line Core (Houston, TX). All cell lines were grown in recommended culture media and maintained at 37°C in 5% CO₂. To ensure cellular identities, a panel of cell lines was genotyped at the University of Michigan Sequencing Core using Profiler Plus (Applied Biosystem) and compared with the short-tandem repeat (STR) profiles of respective cell lines available in the STR Profile Database (ATCC).

**Transcript knockdowns and cell proliferation assays**

ON-TARGETplus siRNA against AKT2, AXL, EGFR, MET, PLK2, and non-targeted control (siNTC) from Dharmacon were used at 100nM. Cells were transfected in 6-well plates at a density of 50,000 cells per well using Oligofectamine (Invitrogen), as per the manufacturer’s protocol. Transfection was repeated 24 hours later, the cells grown for an additional 48 hours, and the cells replated at a density of 5,000 cells per well in 24-well plates. Cells were counted over a period of 1 to 6 days using Beckman Coulter cell counter (Beckman Coulter).
Transient transductions with shRNA against ERBB2, RPS6KB1, FGFR4, or non-targeted control (shNTC) were carried out in 6-well plates in the presence of 8μg/mL Polybrene (Sigma). For Herceptin (Trastuzumab; Roche) experiments, cells were grown for 3 days in 24-well plates with and without Herceptin (100μg/mL), in combination with FGFR inhibitors PD173074 (TOCRIS Bioscience) at 1μM or TKI-258 (Dovitinib; Selleck Chemicals) at 0.1 μM.

Herceptin-resistant cell lines were generated from MDA-MB-453 and BT-474 by maintaining the cells in the continuous presence of 100ug/mL Herceptin over 1 month. Cell proliferation assays were carried out over a period of 1 to 7 days using Beckman Coulter cell counter and growth curves were plotted using GraphPadPrism software. Standard deviation was calculated by one-way ANOVA.

**Generation of stable cell lines with doxycycline-inducible KRAS-shRNA lentiviral constructs**

Doxycycline-inducible shRNAmir-TRIPZ lentiviral constructs targeting KRAS or non-targeted control (Open Biosystems) were used to transduce a panel of pancreatic cell lines in the presence of 8μg/mL Polybrene. Constructs were marked by red fluorescence protein (RFP) expression. Forty-eight hours post-transduction, cells were selected in medium containing 1μg/mL puromycin (Invitrogen) for 4 days. shRNA expression was induced by growing cells in medium containing 1μg/mL doxycycline (Sigma) for 72 hours. The enrichment of stable cells and efficiency of shRNA induction were assessed by measuring the percentage of cells displaying red fluorescence by flow cytometry (FACSaria Cell Sorter BD Biosciences). Experiments with stable cell lines were performed in the presence of 1μg/mL doxycycline, refreshed daily. Experiments with the PLK inhibitor BI6727 (Volasertib; Selleck Chemicals) were carried out
with cells plated in 96-well culture plates at a density of 3000-4000 cells/well and treated with 10nM BI6727 or DMSO. This concentration was selected based on IC50 values calculated from prior proliferation assays using 1-500nM BI6727 (data not shown). At 0, 1, 3, and 5 days following drug treatment, viable cells were quantified using WST-1 reagent (Roche) and absorbance measured at 440nm, as per the manufacturer’s protocol. Growth curves were plotted using GraphPadPrism software. Standard deviation was calculated by one-way ANOVA.

**Quantitative real-time PCR assay**

RNA was isolated from cell lysates by the RNeasy Micro Kit (Qiagen), and cDNA was synthesized from 1µg RNA, using SuperScript III (Invitrogen) and Random Primers (Invitrogen), as per the manufacturer's protocol. SYBR Green (Invitrogen)-based quantitative real-time PCR (qPCR) was carried out on StepOne Real Time PCR system (Applied Biosystems) using gene specific primers designed with Primer-BLAST and synthesized by IDT Technologies. QPCR data were analyzed using relative quantification method and plotted as average fold-change compared to control siRNA/shRNA treatments. GAPDH was used as an internal reference.

**Apoptosis assay**

Apoptosis assay was carried out using ApoScreen Annexin V Apoptosis Kit (Southern Biotech), as per the manufacturer’s protocol. Briefly, cells treated for 48 hours with DMSO or increasing concentrations of BI6727 were washed with cold PBS, suspended in cold 1X binding buffer, stained with Annexin V and Propidium Iodide (PI), and subjected to flow cytometry by FACSArray Cell Sorter (BD Biosciences). Results were analyzed and plotted using Summit 6.0 Software (Beckman Coulter).
Western blot

10µg cell or tissue lysates were separated on 4-12% SDS polyacrylamide gels (Novex) and blotted on PVDF membranes (Amersham) by semi-dry transfer. Antibodies to phospho-AKT, total AKT, phosho-ERK, and total ERK (Cell Signaling) were used at 1:1000 dilutions for standard immunoblotting and detection by enhanced chemiluminescence (ECL Prime), as per the manufacturer’s protocol.

In Vivo Tumorigenicity Studies

Six-week-old male NOD/SCID mice (Taconic) were housed under pathogen-free conditions approved by the American Association for Accreditation of Laboratory Animal Care in accordance with current regulations and standards of the US Department of Agriculture and Department of Health and Human Services. Animal experiments were approved by the University of Michigan Animal Care and Use Committee and performed in accordance with established guidelines. Mice anesthetized with an intra-peritoneal injection of xylazine (9 mg/kg) and ketamine (100 mg/kg) were implanted with 1x10^6 BxPC-3 or PANC-1 cells suspended in 50 µL 1:1 mixture of Media 199 and Matrigel (BD Biosciences) injected subcutaneously into their flanks using a 30-gauge needle.

When tumors reached 0.4 mm, mice were randomized into control and treatment groups (n=8 per group). The MET inhibitor XL184 (Selleck Chemicals) was orally administered at 30mg/kg twice per week for three weeks. Tumor growth was monitored weekly. Tumor caliper
measurements were converted into tumor volumes using the formula: $\frac{1}{2}[\text{length} \times (\text{width})^2]$ mm$^3$ and plotted using GraphPadPrism software. Standard deviation was calculated by one-way ANOVA. At three weeks of treatment, mice were weighed and euthanized and the tumors harvested. Statistical comparisons were conducted using one-way ANOVA.
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Figure 3.1: Scatter plot representation of outlier kinases in (A) breast and (B) pancreatic cancer samples. Kinases displaying an absolute expression >20 RPKM (reads per kilobase transcript per million total reads) and differential expression >5 fold (versus non-breast or non-pancreas samples, respectively) were designated as outliers. The colored circles represent salient kinases displaying outlier expression in multiple samples. Examples of sample-specific kinome profiles are shown in the insets (BT-474 breast cancer and AsPC-1 pancreatic cancer cell lines), with kinases displaying high outlier expression highlighted in red.
Figure 3.2: Sample-wise outlier kinases in ERBB2-positive breast cancer cell lines. (Left) The scatter plots display kinome expression profiles of individual breast cancer cell lines. Kinases targeted for knockdown are shown in color. (Right) Growth curves show the effect of targeting outlier (ERBB2) versus non-outlier (RPS6KB1) kinases in ZR-75-30 cells and the effects of Herceptin and/or knockdown of the outlier FGFR4 in MDA-MB-361 and MDA-MB-453 cells. Values represent mean ± SD. **, *P*<0.01; ****, *P*<0.0001.
Figure 3.3. Herceptin-resistant cell lines respond to targeting of the outlier kinase FGFR4. (A) The growth curves show the effect of Herceptin treatment on MDA-MB-453 and BT-474 (left) and their Herceptin-resistant sublines (right). (B) The bar graphs demonstrate the individual and combined effects of Herceptin and the FGFR inhibitor PD170374 on cell proliferation in MDA-MB-453 (left) and its Herceptin-resistant subline (right). (C) The bar graphs display the effect of the FGFR inhibitor Dovitinib on parental and Herceptin-resistant sublines of MDA-MB-453 (with FGFR4 outlier expression) and BT-474 (without FGFR4 outlier expression). Values represent mean ± SD. ***, $P<0.001$; ****, $P<0.0001$. 
Figure 3.4. Pancreatic cancer cell lines are sensitive to knockdown of outlier kinases. Scatter plots display kinome profiles of select pancreatic cancer cell lines; kinases targeted for knockdown are shown in color (left). The growth curves display the effects of siRNA-mediated knockdown of sample-specific outliers (middle) and non-outliers (right) for each cell line. Values represent mean ± SD. ****, *P*<0.0001.
Figure 3.5. Knockdown of KRAS combined with PLK inhibition reduces cell proliferation in indicated KRAS-dependent cell lines (A) but not in KRAS-independent cell lines (B). The scatter plots demonstrate the absolute and differential expressions of PLK1/2 for each cell line (left). The flow cytometric profiles of doxycycline-induced cells expressing KRAS shRNA with RFP expression (red) versus un-induced cells (gray) are displayed (middle). The growth curves show the individual and combined effects of KRAS shRNA and the PLK inhibitor BI6727, using WST-1 assay (right). Values represent mean ± SD. ****, P<0.0001.
Figure 3.6. XL184 treatment suppresses tumor growth in BxPC-3 and PANC-1 pancreatic cancer xenografts. (A) The growth curves demonstrate the effect of the MET inhibitor XL184 on tumor growth in BxPC-3 and PANC-1 xenografts. (B) BxPC-3 and PANC-1 xenograft tumors after 3 weeks of XL184 treatment are shown as compared to the controls. The bar graphs display tumor weight (C) and total body weight (D) after 3 weeks of XL184 treatment. Values represent mean ± SE. **, P<0.01; ***, P<0.001; ****, P<0.0001. (E) The western blot shows the effect of XL184 treatment on phospho-AKT levels in PANC-1 xenografts.
CHAPTER 4

MASS SPECTROMETRIC ANALYSIS IDENTIFIES ARGONAUTE-2 AS A RAS INTERACTING PARTNER

SUMMARY

Since the discovery of RAS family of small GTPases over thirty years ago, targeting RAS still remains an intractable therapeutic target. To potentially expand therapeutic avenues for blocking RAS function, we explored endogenous interactors of RAS in a panel of cancer cell lines using co-immunoprecipitation mass spectrometry (co-IP MS) and discovered a specific interaction between RAS and Argonaute 2 (AGO2), a key component of RNA silencing pathways. In fractionated cell lysates, RAS protein co-sediments with AGO2 in membrane fractions, whereas in situ the two proteins co-localize in intracellular membrane organelles. Using antibodies that bind the Switch regions in RAS, we determined that the Switch II domain was critical for AGO2 interaction. We also demonstrate a direct, nucleotide independent binding of KRAS and AGO2 in vitro, using purified components, with the conserved Y64 residue as a critical amino acid. Further interaction analysis revealed that the N-terminal “wedge” domain of AGO2 (amino acids, aa 112-114) was essential for RAS binding only to the RAS Switch II domain, suggesting that unlike RAF, AGO2 is likely not a RAS effector.
INTRODUCTION

Despite extensive characterization of the RAS/GAP molecular switch (es) and downstream signaling axes, therapeutic targeting of RAS driven cancers remains elusive, suggesting potential gaps in our understanding of the spectrum of RAS mediated signaling\textsuperscript{1-3}.

RAS effectors bind RAS through the conserved Switch I and Switch II domains, and drive cellular transformation by activating downstream kinases and GTPase signaling modules. These interactors have been identified using conventional approaches of yeast two hybrid analysis\textsuperscript{4} and ectopically expressed epitope-tagged RAS constructs \textsuperscript{5,6}. Recently, we performed co-immunoprecipitation followed by mass spectrometry (co-IP MS) to analyze the endogenous interactome of oncogenic ERG in the prostate cancer cell line VCaP that harbors the TMPRSS2-ERG gene fusion, and discovered interactions with PARP and DNAPK\textsuperscript{7}. Here, we employed a RAS antibody for a similar co-IP MS based strategy to investigate endogenous interactors of RAS in a panel of lung and pancreatic cancer cell lines representing the spectrum of KRAS mutation status and dependency. Surprisingly, the most prominent interacting protein, across all cell lines analyzed, was EIF2C2, commonly known as Argonaute 2 (AGO2), a key effector of the RNA silencing pathway. Recent studies have demonstrated a role for AGO2 in RAS induced senescence\textsuperscript{8,9}. Multiple reports also showed that phosphorylation of AGO2 by MAPK/PI3K pathway activators alters its microRNA related function through different mechanisms \textsuperscript{10-13}, portending that signaling molecules may have direct effects on RNA silencing mechanisms\textsuperscript{14}. Considering the potential functional implications of RAS-AGO2 interaction, here we corroborated and characterized this interaction in detail.

RESULTS

Endogenous interaction of RAS and AGO2
To analyze RAS-interacting proteins in an endogenous setting, we first used the pan-RAS antibody RAS10, which efficiently immunoprecipitates RAS proteins by binding to the Switch I domain (amino acids, aa, 32-40) (Figure 4.1A-C). Co-immunoprecipitation of RAS followed by tandem mass spectrometry (RAS co-IP-MS) was performed using NIH3T3 cells ectopically overexpressing human wild-type or mutant KRAS and a panel of ten lung and pancreatic cancer cell lines of known KRAS mutation status, according to the schema in Figure 4.1D. As expected, the spectral counts of peptide fragments obtained through MS analyses showed robust detection of the bait protein (RAS) in all of the 12 cell lines analyzed. Intriguingly the RAS co-IP MS identified peptides spanning EIF2C2, commonly known as Argonaute 2 (AGO2), the catalytic component of the RNA-induced silencing complex (RISC) in NIH3T3 cells expressing KRAS\textsuperscript{WT} or KRAS\textsuperscript{G12V}, as well as all of the ten cancer cell lines tested (Figure 4.2A). Remarkably, only the RAS and AGO2 peptides were consistently detected in every cell line tested, with cumulative spectral counts of 576 and 253, for RAS and AGO2 peptides respectively. Analyzing the RAS co-IP MS data further, we noted that peptides mapping uniquely to KRAS, NRAS and HRAS were readily detected in most cell lines (Figure 4.2B). By contrast, among all AGO family proteins only AGO2 peptides were observed in all of the 12 cell lines (only one peptide uniquely mapped to AGO1 in a single sample) (Figure 4.2B).

The putative endogenous interaction between RAS and AGO2 was corroborated by reciprocal IPs of RAS and AGO2 using two different antibodies for each, in two different lung cancer cell lines, H358 and H460 harboring distinct KRAS mutations (Figure 4.2C). Further, consistent with the co-IP MS analyses (Figure 4.2A), the RAS-AGO2 interaction was readily detected by co-IP followed by immunoblot analysis in two cell lines with wild-type KRAS and representative lung and pancreatic cancer cells harboring various activating mutations of KRAS.
The RAS-AGO2 interaction was robustly maintained even under a highly stringent condition of 1 M NaCl (Figure 4.3A). Furthermore, this interaction was unaffected in the presence of RNase (considering that AGO2 is RNA bound), suggesting that the RAS-AGO2 is not RNA-dependent (Figure 4.3B-C). RAS was also detected in FLAG immunoprecipitates when FLAG-tagged AGO2 construct was expressed in HEK293 cells (Figure 4.3D), further corroborating the endogenous co-IP MS observations.

Colocalization of RAS and AGO2 in Membrane Organelle Fractions

RAS proteins are restricted to the plasma membrane and membranes of various intracellular organelles like the endoplasmic reticulum, Golgi, multi-vesicular bodies and the mitochondria and it is generally accepted that distinct RAS localization affects signaling outputs 16,17. On the other hand, AGO2 is known to assemble into cytoplasmic messenger ribonucleoprotein particles (mRNPs) 18, and AGO2 is also known to function inside the nucleus 19,20. Studies have also detected functional AGO2 complexes in organelle structures like the endoplasmic reticulum 21, multi vesicular bodies 22 and mitochondria 23. To investigate the cellular compartment where RAS and AGO2 could interact we performed cell fractionation analysis using H358 cells. As expected, AGO2 was detected in the cytoplasm, slightly enriched in the membrane/organelle fraction and within the nucleus (Figure 4.4A). The RAS10 antibody detected RAS only in the membrane/organelle enriched fraction, indicating that RAS and AGO2 may reside in intracellular organellar structures. Further, AGO2 is also known to form low to high molecular weight complexes depending on its association with RNA 18. Similar sucrose density sedimentation analysis of H358 cells showed the presence of total RAS as well as KRAS predominantly in smaller molecular weight fractions (Complex I) with AGO2 and AGO1
To demonstrate endogenous RAS and AGO2 co-localization using immunofluorescence, we used RAS10 antibody for immunostaining in H358 (KRAS$^{G12C}$) cells (Figure 4.5A) and determined the specificity of the RAS10 Ab staining using RAS peptides recognized by the antibody prior to immunostaining. As seen in Figure 4.5B, the immunostaining by RAS10 was abrogated upon pre-incubation with a RAS peptide that spans the RAS10 Ab epitope in the Switch I effector domain (aa 30-39) (right) but not by a RAS peptide spanning aa 34-43 (left). To validate the specificity of AGO2 antibodies for immunofluorescence analyses, we performed AGO2 immunofluorescence in mouse embryonic fibroblast (MEFs) with homozygous knockout of AGO2 (AGO2$^{-/-}$ MEF) and in AGO2$^{-/-}$ MEF cells expressing AGO2 (AGO2$^{-/-}$ MEF +AGO2). As expected, AGO2 was detected only in MEF AGO2$^{-/-}$ +AGO2 cells (Figure 4.5C), mostly in the intracellular fraction and weaker nuclear staining. Using these experimentally validated, highly specific antibodies, we performed co-localization analyses for RAS and AGO2 in two independent lung cancer cell lines, H358 (KRAS$^{G12C}$) and H1793 (KRAS$^{WT}$) (Figure 4.5C-D) and observed a significant overlap in the immunofluorescence signals localized within intracellular organelles. The acquired images were analyzed using ImageJ software (version 1.41) and as a measure of co-localization, Manders coefficient was used to evaluate the overlap in fluorescence. The Manders coefficient for RAS and AGO2 was assessed as 0.4 and 0.6 in H358 and H1793 cells respectively (a value of 0.99 is considered as complete overlap while 0 or below signifies no overlap). Together these data suggests that a considerable fraction of RAS and AGO2 co-localize in intracellular organelles.

AGO2 binds RAS through the wedge domain within its N-terminus
Next, to identify specific region(s) in AGO2 involved in the interaction with RAS, a panel of FLAG-epitope tagged AGO2 expression constructs (summarized in the schematic in Figure 4.6A) was employed. RAS co-IP analysis of the FLAG tagged AGO2 deletion constructs showed that the N-terminal domain of AGO2 was necessary (Figure 4.6B) and sufficient (Figure 4.6C) for RAS binding. Further analysis of a panel of deletion constructs spanning the N-terminal domain suggested that the region spanning 50-139 amino acids was critical for RAS binding (Figure 4.7A). Interestingly, this stretch of amino acids was recently shown to be part of the so called “wedging” domain, important for microRNA duplex unwinding prior to RISC assembly.

To further define AGO2 residues critical for interaction with RAS, we focused on amino acid residues within the aa 50-139 stretch that are unique to AGO2 (as compared to AGO1, 3 and 4), considering that amongst the Argonaute family proteins, AGO2 was almost singularly represented in the RAS co-IP MS data. ClustalW alignment of all human Argonaute proteins (AGO1-4) was used to identify the amino acid residues that are unique to AGO2 in the wedging domain (Figure 4.7B). Alanine substitution of each of the 10 residues unique to AGO2 within the aa 50-139 stretch was followed by RAS co-IP analysis, and amino acids K112 and E114 of AGO2 were found to be critical for a direct association with RAS (Figure 4.7C).

**Y64 residue within the Switch II domain of RAS is critical for direct AGO2 binding**

In parallel analyses aiming to define the residues in RAS that are critical for AGO2 association, we first employed the two antibodies that exclusively bind to the Switch I (RAS10 mAb) or the Switch II (Y13-259) domains in RAS (summarized in Figure 4.8A). Using H358 cell lysates for RAS IP we observed that in contrast to the Switch I specific RAS10 Ab, the Switch II specific
Y13-259 Ab failed to co-immunoprecipitate AGO2 (Figure 4.8B), strongly suggesting that the Switch II domain in RAS may be critical for AGO2 interaction.

Next, we sought to determine the specific residues in the RAS Switch II region involved in its interaction with AGO2, using in vitro co-IP analyses with a panel of mutations flanking the Y64 residue in the switch domain, known to be important for interactions with multiple effector/regulator proteins. First to validate the in vitro co-IP assay, purified recombinant KRASG12V or KRASWT proteins incubated with varying concentrations of AGO2 protein, followed by RAS immunoprecipitation showed a concentration dependent, direct interaction between recombinant AGO2 and RAS proteins (Figure 4.8C). Next, co-IP of recombinant AGO2 protein with the panel of Switch II mutant RAS proteins including and flanking the Y64 residue, showed that altering the Y64 residue (but not the adjoining amino acids) significantly reduced KRAS binding to AGO2 (Figure 4.8D).

To assess if GDP/GTP loading of KRAS may influence AGO2 interaction in vitro, we also carried out in vitro co-IP analyses using KRASWT and KRASG12V proteins loaded with GDP/GTPγS, and as seen in Figure 4.9A, AGO2 binding was seen to be independent of nucleotide loading on KRAS. To further substantiate this observation, and to obviate potential technical concerns inherent in antibody based co-IP, we carried out an antibody-independent pull down assay using His-tagged AGO2 protein bound to Co-NTA beads. Similar to the antibody based assay, both the KRASWT and KRASG12V proteins were observed to bind to His-tagged AGO2, independent of the nucleotide loading on KRAS (Figure 4.9B). To validate the efficiency and specificity of nucleotide loading onto KRAS in our experiments, we performed RAF-RBD pull down assays and observed the expected differential between GDP and GTP bound KRAS with respect to RAF-RBD binding (Figure 4.9C). Also, consistent with the in vitro
co-IP analyses, the His-tagged AGO2 pull down assay also showed specific dependency of AGO2-RAS binding on the Y64 residue (Figure 4.9D). Thus, these data define the amino acids in RAS (Y64) and AGO2 (K112/E114) as critical for the RAS-AGO2 interaction.

Lastly, we reasoned that if the RAS-AGO2 interaction is limited to Switch II domain we may be able to detect AGO2 in the RAS-GTP complexed with RAF on RAS binding domain of RAF (RBD) agarose beads which only involves the Switch I domain. As expected, we were able to detect AGO2 on RAS-GTP bound to RBD-agarose in H358 (KRASG12C) cells (Figure 4.9E), further suggesting that AGO2 binds through the Switch II domain with no involvement of the effector domain.

DISCUSSION

RAS, one of the earliest proto-oncogenes identified, has emerged as one of the most prevalent cancer aberrations with extensively characterized oncogenic driver functions, that remains a pertinent but as yet an unsuccessful therapeutic target. In recent years, there is a renewed interest in targeting RAS to alter its status from undruggable to druggable. In this context, discovery of novel endogenous interactors of RAS could potentially advance our understanding of RAS biology as well as provide novel therapeutic avenues.

In this study, we identify a novel interaction of RAS with AGO2, a key mediator of RNA-based gene silencing. The RAS-AGO2 interaction is independent of the mutation status of RAS (and thus, to GDP/GTP loading status in vitro), the two proteins co-localize in intracellular membrane organelles, sites that are known for RAS trafficking and AGO2 activity. The RAS-AGO2 interaction involves the Switch II domain of RAS (particularly the Y64 residue), and the N-terminal Wedge domain of AGO2 (K112-E114 residues).
Our study focused on analyzing endogenous interactors of RAS, common across a panel of cancer cells spanning the spectrum of KRAS mutation profiles. To the best of our knowledge, this is the first study using endogenous RAS as bait for mass spectrometric analyses; previous co-IP MS analyses used N-terminal epitope-tagged-HRAS, -MRAS, or -RRAS ectopically expressed in NIH3T3 cells \(^5,6\). Studies using tagged AGO2 as bait for mass spectrometry have also been reported\(^{34,35}\), and as a 25kDa cutoff was employed for analyses, may have missed the detection of the 21 kDa RAS protein. In our study, the pull-down of AGO2 using multiple independent antibodies, consistently co-precipitated RAS (Figure 4.2D) and we found that this interaction is direct, as assessed using purified components (Figures 4.8-4.9). Endogenously, the RAS-AGO2 interaction is readily detected in both cancer and benign cells, independent of RAS mutation status (Figure 4.2E), together suggesting a more general role for this interaction in the cell.

Since the RAS-AGO2 interaction is restricted to the intracellular membrane bound organelles, we believe that the endogenous RAS interacts with AGO2 within membranous organelles, before it reaches the plasma membrane. While effector binding of activated RAS is extensively studied and restricted to the plasma membrane, the function of RAS in other organelles remains unappreciated. Since both RAS\(^{16}\) and AGO2\(^{23}\) associate with different proteins depending on their location in the cell, compartmentalized association of the two molecules could therefore have an effect both on RAS signaling and AGO2 silencing mechanisms.

The N-terminal domain represents the most distinct region in the highly conserved AGO protein family, that regulates the endonucleolytic activity unique to AGO2 \(^{36}\). Interestingly, the RAS interaction observed with AGO2, involves residues in the N-terminal, unique to AGO2. A
recent report suggests that the region we identified in AGO2 as critical for RAS binding (i.e., the ‘wedge domain’), is important for small RNA duplex unwinding, a prerequisite for RISC assembly. It is possible that mutant KRAS interaction directly involving the residues in the wedge domain attenuates AGO2 function through its effect on RISC assembly. Furthermore, AGO2 as a preferred RISC component among AGO family members suggests that unique properties of AGO2 such as endonucleolytic activity and its ability to bind open reading frames of mRNA transcripts may play an important role during oncogenic stress.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Cell lines, specimen collection and DNA constructs
Lung and pancreatic cancer cell lines were purchased from the American Type Culture Collection (ATCC). No further testing for Mycoplasma was performed in the lab. PDX1319 cells were obtained through the Xenograft Core, University of Michigan, directed by Dr. Diane Simeone, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor. Cells were grown in specified media supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum and antibiotics (Invitrogen).

Coimmunoprecipitation and Tandem Mass Spectrometric analysis
Methods used for immunoprecipitation with RAS/control IgG followed by Tandem Mass Spectrometric analysis and database searching are schematically outlined in. Clustal W analysis was performed using the online program, http://www.ebi.ac.uk/Tools/services/web/toolform.ebi?tool=clustalo with peptide sequences obtained from RAS co-IP MS analysis of H358 lung cancer cells.

Immunoprecipitation (IP) and Western blot Analysis
Fresh protein extracts were prepared by lysis of cells in K buffer (10mM Tris HCl, 0.1%, 150mM NaCl, 1% Triton X100 and protease inhibitors). After brief sonication, debris were removed by centrifugation. For IP, 50-400 µg of lysates were pre-cleared with Protein A/G agarose beads (Pierce) for 1 hour and treated overnight at 4°C with 1-10 µg of control or specific antibody as indicated. The immune complexes were then precipitated with Protein A/G agarose beads, washed with K buffer and resuspended in sample loading buffer. RAS10 monoclonal antibody immunoprecipitates were routinely washed at 500mM NaCl for increased stringency and a final wash was carried out with buffer containing 150mM NaCl prior to SDS-PAGE analysis. RNase/DNase treatments of lysates were performed prior to pre-clearing of lysates followed by IP. After SDS-PAGE separation, proteins were transferred onto nitrocellulose membranes for immunoblot analysis. For IP using FLAG tagged constructs, FLAG M2 agarose beads (Sigma) were used as per manufacturers’ protocol.

**Sucrose Density Co-sedimentation analysis**

Sucrose gradient fractionation was performed as described earlier\(^1\). Briefly, cells were lysed in buffer containing 25 mM Tris–HCl (pH 7.4), 150 mM KCl, 0.5% NP-40, 2 mM EDTA, 1 mM NaF, 0.5 mM dithiothreitol and protease inhibitors (Roche) and centrifuged at 10,000 g for 10 min at 4°C. For fractionations, gradients from 15% (w/v) to 55% (w/v) sucrose in 150 mM KCl, 25 mM Tris (pH 7.4) and 2 mM EDTA were used. Lysates were separated by centrifugation at 30,000 r.p.m. for 18 h in an SW41 rotor at 4°C. For each lysate 22 fractions of 0.5ml each were collected, 45ul of which was used for immunoblot analysis.

**KRAS and AGO2 plasmid constructs**

Full length FH-AGO2 and mutant KRAS\(^{G12V}\) constructs were obtained from Addgene (pIRESneo-FLAG/HA-AGO2 corrected plasmid 10822, PI:Thomas Tuschl; FLAG-AGO2 plasmid 21538:}
PI: Edward Chan and plasmid 12544 PI: Channing Der). Deletion constructs of AGO2 spanning different domains (indicated in the figures) were subcloned as FLAG-tagged expression plasmids in pDEST40 (Life Technologies) vector backbone. Site directed mutagenesis was performed on AGO2 encoded plasmid 10822 to obtain the constructs described in Figure 3C. Wild-type KRAS4A was cloned for mammalian expression in pDEST40 vector.

**Cell transfection**

NIH3T3 or HEK293T cells were transfected with the indicated plasmid constructs using Fugene HD (Promega) according to standard protocols.

**Recombinant KRAS and AGO2 proteins**

Human derived KRASWT and KRASG12V full length coding regions were cloned as HIS-SUMO tagged proteins in a pET21d plasmid backbone described earlier\(^39\). Site directed mutagenesis was used to introduce the specific mutations described in the figures. Individual recombinant KRAS proteins were transformed into Rosetta cells for bacterial expression (further details awaited).

His tagged KRASG12D (1-166aa) and KRASG12DY64G (1-166aa) were provided by Gideon Bollag (Plexxikon Inc.). His-tagged AGO2 was cloned in baculoviral vector and purified using Ni-NTA columns.

**In vitro co-immunoprecipitation**

100ng of baculoviral AGO2 or AGO1 proteins (Sino Biologicals) and 50ng of the indicated KRAS protein, were incubated in the above mentioned K-buffer with the addition of 0.2% BSA. After 2 hours of incubation at 4\(^\circ\)C, 1µg of IgG (RAS or control) was added and incubated further for 2 hours. 10ul of Protein A/G agarose beads (50% slurry) equilibrated in K buffer were then
added to pull down the immune complexes, washed five times at RT and resolved using SDS-PAGE.

**His-AGO2 pull down assay**

30 µg of his-AGO2 (made in house) protein was incubated with 600ul of Ni-NTA beads, 50% slurry (Qiagen) resuspended in Ni-NTA buffer (20 mM Tris-HCl (pH.8), 0.1% beta-mercaptoethanol, 150 mM NaCl,0.5% Triton X-100). Loading performed at 4°C for 1hr. Spin and wash the beads using Ni-NTA buffer and incubate 25 µl of control/His-AGO2 loaded beads with KRAS proteins in Ni-NTA buffer containing 0.2% BSA. Incubate for 1.5 h at 4 °C and wash 5 times. All washes were at room temperature with rotation for 5 minutes and spin at 4000 rpm for 2 min. Binding was assessed by immunoblot analysis (using RAS10 and AGO2, polyclonal antibodies).

**RAS-GTP pull down assay**

The RAS-RAF interaction was studied using the RBD agarose beads as per manufacturer’s instructions (Millipore). Pull down assays were performed using the cell lysates as indicated. The pull down of RAS by RBD agarose beads indicates the presence of active GTP-bound RAS interacting with RAF1.

**Immunofluorescence**

Indicated cells were grown on poly-lysine coated cover slips. Cells were washed twice with PBS, fixed with 3.7% paraformaldehyde for 10 min, and then permeabilized with 0.1% (w/v) saponin (Sigma) for 10 min. Cells were co-incubated with primary antibodies against AGO2 and RAS for 12 h at 4 °C, followed by incubation with appropriate Alexa-Fluor-conjugated secondary antibodies for 30 min at 37 °C. Cells were washed and mounted onto glass slides using Vectashield mounting medium (Vector Laboratories, Burlingame, CA) containing DAPI.
Samples were analyzed using a Nikon A1 laser-scanning confocal microscope equipped with a Plan-Apo ×63/1.4 numerical aperture oil lens objective. Acquired images were then analyzed using ImageJ software (version 1.41).
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Figure 4.1. Characterization of RAS10 mAb (which binds the Switch1 domain of RAS) used for mass spectrometric identification of RAS binding proteins (A) Efficiency of the RAS10 mAb in pulling down RAS as seen by immunoblot analysis of RAS immunoprecipitates. The RAS10 mAb was used for both immunoprecipitation (IP) and immunoblot (IB) analysis. (B) Scan of the entire immunoblot using the RAS10 mAb demonstrating the specificity of detection using total cell lysates or immunoprecipitates. Both the IP and immunoblotting were performed using the RAS10 mAb. (C) Immunoblot analysis of RAS bound to RAS binding domain of RAF (RBD) in the presence of different RAS antibodies. RBD agarose beads were added to H358 cell lysates in the presence of RAS10 monoclonal or KRAS polyclonal (KRAS sc-521) antibody. Reduced interaction between RAS-GTP and RBD in the presence of RAS10 antibody indicates that the antibody binds the RAS Switch I domain and interferes with the RAS-RAF interaction. KRAS sc-521 polyclonal antibody, which binds the C-terminal region of KRAS was used as control. RAS10 mAb was used for IB analysis. (D) Schematic of the methodology used for RAS Co-IP MS. Proteins pulled down by the corresponding isotypic control IgG in each cell line were considered as non-specific hits and were excluded from the data obtained from RAS IP.
Figure 4.2. Identification of RAS-AGO2 interaction (A) Spectral counts of RAS and AGO2 peptides detected in RAS co-immunoprecipitation mass spectrometric (co-IP MS) analysis of NIH3T3 cells expressing KRAS WT and KRAS G12V and indicated cancer cell lines. (B) Distribution of peptides mapping to RAS and AGO gene families from RAS co-IP MS based on ClustalW alignments. Representative experiment from H358 cells is shown. Blue boxes indicate peptides mapping to multiple gene family members, and red boxes indicate peptides mapping uniquely to a protein. (C) Immunoprecipitation (IP) of RAS or AGO2 in H358 (left) and H460 (right) lung cancer cells followed by immunoblot analysis using multiple distinct antibodies, as indicated. (D) IP of RAS from a panel of benign and cancer cells with differing mutational status of KRAS (as indicated) followed by immunoblot analysis of AGO2 or RAS. RAS10 mAb was used for both IP and IB.
Figure 4.3. AGO2 associates with RAS proteins in the presence of RNase (A) IP of RAS in H358 and HEK293 FLAG-AGO2 expressing cells under increasing concentrations of salt followed by immunoblot analysis. Immunoblot analysis of RAS10 Ab immunoprecipitates from H358 lung cancer (endogenous) and FLAG-AGO2 overexpressing HEK293 cell lysates treated with RNase (B) and DNase (C). RAS10 mAb was used for both IP and IB. RAS10 mAb was used for both IP and IB. (D) FLAG tagged AGO2 expressed in HEK293 immunoprecipitates RAS. Actin was used as control.
Figure 4.4. Co-sedimentation of RAS and AGO2 (A) Cell fractionation analysis of H358 cells to show enrichment of distinct proteins in the cytosolic/membrane or organelle/nuclear fractions. GAPDH was used as a cytosolic marker while SAM68 and H3 were used as nuclear markers. 2μg of various fractions were assessed for the different protein contents. (B) Sucrose density gradient fractionation of cell lysates from H358 and HEK293 cells followed by immunoblot detection of total RAS, KRAS, AGO1 and AGO2 proteins.
Figure 4.5. Co-localization of RAS and AGO2 proteins in the intracellular compartments (A) Membrane (yellow arrow) and intracellular organelle staining (red arrow) of RAS in H358 KRAS\textsuperscript{G12C} lung cancer cells, using RAS10 mAb that binds the switch I domain. (B) Specificity of the RAS10 mAb is demonstrated by pre-incubating the antibody with switch I domain specific (30-39aa) or non-specific (34-43aa) RAS peptides, prior to immunofluorescence analysis (C) Immunofluorescence analysis of RAS and AGO2 co-localization in AGO2 knock out mouse embryonic fibroblasts (AGO2/- MEF upper panels) and AGO2 knock out MEF cells expressing AGO2 (AGO2/- MEF +AGO2, lower panels). (D) Immunofluorescence analysis shows co-localization of RAS (red) and AGO2 (green) proteins in membrane bound organelles in H1793 KRAS\textsuperscript{WT} lung cancer cells. (E) Intracellular localization by immunofluorescence of RAS (red) and AGO2 (green) proteins in H358 KRAS\textsuperscript{G12C} lung cancer cells. Yellow color in the merged image indicates cytoplasmic co-localization of RAS and AGO2. The nucleus was visualized by DAPI staining (blue). Insets show magnified view of the areas marked.
Figure 4.6. The N-terminal domain of AGO2 interacts with RAS (A) Schematic summary of FLAG tagged AGO2 deletion and mutant constructs used for RAS co-IP analyses (B) Expression of FLAG tagged N-terminal, PAZ, or PIWI domains of AGO2 in HEK293 cells (left panel), followed by RAS IP (right panel). Immunoblot analysis shows that deletion of (1-226aa) N terminal domain in AGO2 abrogates RAS interaction. (C) Expression (left panel) and RAS IP interaction analysis (right panel) of FLAG tagged N-terminal, PAZ, or PIWI domains of AGO2 in HEK293 cells. Immunoblot analysis shows that (1-226aa) N terminal domain is sufficient for RAS interaction using RAS10mAb.
Figure 4.7. Residues 112-114 in AGO2 are critical for its association with RAS. (A) Expression (left panel) and RAS IP analysis (right panel) of various indicated AGO2 N terminal deletion constructs in HEK293 cells. Immunoblot analysis indicates that 50-139 aa in the AGO2 N terminal domain is essential for RAS binding. Both RAS IP and IB were performed using RAS10 mAb. (B) ClustalW alignment of the Argonaute family proteins spanning the “wedge domain” (50-139 aa, marked in grey). Residues marked in yellow were identified as unique to AGO2 and were mutagenized to alanine for binding analysis. The numbers below indicate the amino acid position. AGO2<sup>K98</sup> (marked in green) shared with AGO1 was also changed to alanine to be used as control. AGO2 residues K112 and E114, marked in red were critical for RAS interaction. (C) Expression of indicated AGO2 N terminal point mutant constructs within the wedge domain (50-139aa) in HEK293 cells, followed by RAS co-IP analysis.
Figure 4.8. The Switch II domain of RAS interacts with AGO2  
(A) Schematic summary of the antibodies and recombinant proteins used for RAS-AGO2 co-IP analysis to identify residues in RAS, critical for AGO2 interaction.  
(B) RAS co-IP using antibodies that bind switch I domain (RAS10 Ab) or switch II domain (Y13-259 Ab), followed by immunoblot analysis for RAS and AGO2.  
(C-D) Characterization of direct RAS-AGO2 interaction, in vitro.  
(C) Immunoblot analysis following in vitro co-IP of recombinant KRASG12V (top panel) and KRASWT (bottom panel) in the presence of varying concentrations of recombinant AGO2.  
(D) In vitro co-IP analysis of KRAS-AGO2 interaction using a panel of KRAS mutant proteins spanning amino acid residues 62-65 in the switch II domain.
Figure 4.9. Characterization of direct RAS-AGO2 interaction by in vitro co-IP (A) GDP or GTPγS loading of recombinant KRASWT (top panel) and KRASG12V (bottom panel) proteins prior to RAS-AGO2 in vitro co-IP analysis using RAS10 Ab. (B) In vitro HIS-AGO2 pull down assay after GDP or GTPγS loading of recombinant KRASWT and KRASG12V proteins. (C) RBD pull down assay using recombinant KRASWT and KRASG12V proteins loaded with GDP or GTPγS to demonstrate efficiency and specificity of nucleotide loading. (D) Immunoblot analysis following His-AGO2 pull down assay using Ni-NTA beads upon incubation with different KRAS mutant proteins. (E) RBD pull down assay using lysates from H358 cells followed by immunoblot analysis for RAS (RAS10) and AGO2 (rat AGO2, Sigma). RBD associates only with the active form of RAS (RAS-GTP) which is more abundant in H358 cells (mutated KRAS dependent) compared to H460 cells (mutated KRAS independent).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Cell Line</th>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Tissue</th>
<th>Type</th>
<th>KRAS or AGO2 status</th>
<th>RAS co-IP Mass Spec</th>
<th>RAS co-IP Western</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>A549</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>Lung</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>KRAS G12S</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>H358</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>Lung</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>KRAS G12C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>H441</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>Lung</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>KRAS G12V</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>H727</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>Lung</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>KRAS G12V</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>BXPC3</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>Pancreas</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>KRAS WT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>CAPAN-1</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>Pancreas</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>KRAS G12V</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>MIA PaCa-2</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>Pancreas</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>KRAS G12C</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>PANC-1</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>Pancreas</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>KRAS G12D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>PDX 1319</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>Pancreas</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>KRAS G12D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>PL-45</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>Pancreas</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>KRAS G12D</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>NIH3T3, stable cell line</td>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>Fibroblast</td>
<td>Benign</td>
<td>overexpressing, KRAS WT</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>NIH3T3, stable cell line</td>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>Fibroblast</td>
<td>Benign</td>
<td>overexpressing, KRAS G12V</td>
<td>X</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>H2009</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>Lung</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>KRAS G12A</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>H460</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>Lung</td>
<td>Cancer</td>
<td>KRAS Q61H</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>HPNE</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>Pancreas</td>
<td>Benign</td>
<td>KRAS WT</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>AGO2 MEF-/-</td>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>Embryonic fibroblast</td>
<td>Benign</td>
<td>AGO2 knockout</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>AGO2 MEF-/-+AGO2</td>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>Embryonic fibroblast</td>
<td>Benign</td>
<td>AGO2 knockout overexpressing AGO2</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>HEK293FT</td>
<td>Human</td>
<td>Embryonic kidney</td>
<td>Benign</td>
<td>for transient overexpression as indicated</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>NIH3T3 AGO2-/-</td>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>Fibroblast</td>
<td>Benign</td>
<td>CRISPR/Cas9 for AGO2 knockout</td>
<td>ND</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.1 Cell lines used in the study.** Cell lines used in this study for RAS co-IP MS and/or RAS co-IP Western blot analysis, with their associated KRAS mutation status. NIH3T3 stable lines were generated using plasmids encoding KRAS<sup>WT</sup> or KRAS<sup>G12V</sup>. HEK293 cells were used for transfection for assays in the transient mode. PDX 1319 is a pancreatic cancer derived xenograft cell line. ND: not determined
Table 4.2 Summary of shared peptide hits in RAS coIP mass spectrometry in cancer cell lines.
Spectral counts of peptides detected in at least 5 of 10 cancer cell lines tested by tandem mass spectrometry of RAS co-immunoprecipitation.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Antibody</th>
<th>Vendor</th>
<th>Catalog Number</th>
<th>Experiments</th>
<th>Validation method/s</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Anti-Ras Clone 10</td>
<td>Millipore</td>
<td>05-516</td>
<td>IP, IB, IF</td>
<td>recombinant protein detection, peptide competition</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>K-Ras-2B Antibody (C-19)</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>sc-521</td>
<td>IP, IB</td>
<td>recombinant protein detection, KRAS siRNA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>K-Ras monoclonal Ab</td>
<td>Santa Cruz</td>
<td>sc-30</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>recombinant protein detection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Ago2 rabbit pAb</td>
<td>Millipore</td>
<td>07-590</td>
<td>IB, IF</td>
<td>recombinant protein detection, MEF AGO2/-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>AGO2 mouse mAb, clone 2E12-1C9</td>
<td>Sigma</td>
<td>WH0027161M1</td>
<td>IP, IB, IF</td>
<td>recombinant protein detection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>AGO2, 11A9, rat mAb</td>
<td>Sigma</td>
<td>SAB4200085</td>
<td>IP, IB</td>
<td>recombinant protein detection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Anti-FLAG</td>
<td>Sigma</td>
<td>F1804</td>
<td>IB, IP</td>
<td>FLAG-AGO2 detection in HEK 293 cells</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Y13-259 rat mAb</td>
<td>EMD-Millipore</td>
<td>OP01, Y13-259</td>
<td>IP</td>
<td>recombinant protein detection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Phospho-Akt (S473)</td>
<td>Cell Signaling</td>
<td>9271</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>Phospho-ERK (S473)</td>
<td>Cell Signaling</td>
<td>9101</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Phospho-S6 Ribosomal (S236/236)</td>
<td>Cell Signaling</td>
<td>2211</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>AGO1</td>
<td>Sigma</td>
<td>SAB4200084</td>
<td>IB</td>
<td>recombinant protein detection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>Normal Rat IgG</td>
<td>Abcam</td>
<td>ab18450</td>
<td>control IP</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Normal mouse IgG</td>
<td>Millipore</td>
<td>12-371</td>
<td>control IP</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>Normal rabbit IgG</td>
<td>Millipore</td>
<td>12-370</td>
<td>control IP</td>
<td>ND</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 4.3. Antibodies used in this study.** IB: Immunoblotting, IP: Immunoprecipitation, IF: Immunofluorescence
CHAPTER 5

ARGONAUTE-2 PROMOTES KRAS MEDIATED CELLULAR TRANSFORMATION

SUMMARY
In the earlier chapter we describe a specific interaction between endogenous RAS and AGO2 in cells expressing both wild type and mutant RAS. To probe this interaction at a functional level, we characterized the role of AGO2 in established KRAS mutant cell line models of lung and pancreatic cancer and its effect on cellular transformation using NIH3T3 model. Using shRNA, we demonstrate that knock-down of AGO2 attenuates KRAS-mediated cell proliferation, while KRAS-mediated transformation is enhanced by overexpression of AGO2. Mechanistically, the intracellular KRAS-AGO2 interaction increases mutant KRAS levels and affects signaling outputs through modulation of Akt activation. We also provide evidence that expression of mutant KRAS inhibits the assembly of regulatory messenger ribonucleoprotein particles (mRNPs) in NIH3T3 cells. Employing NIH3T3 AGO2/- cells, we observed that interaction with AGO2 is required for maximal KRAS-mediated transformation, such that cells lacking AGO2 fail to elevate mutant KRAS levels and limit phospho-Akt activation. The repurposing of RNA-based gene silencing by RAS through its interaction with AGO2 expands its range of oncogenic activities, identifies a critical regulator of mutant RAS levels, and suggests a novel avenue for therapeutic intervention.
INTRODUCTION

The discovery of a direct RAS-AGO2 interaction brings to the foreground a direct association of signaling networks and silencing mechanisms. Known functions of AGO2, its interacting partners and role in MAPK pathway are described below.

AGO2: Core component of the RNA silencing pathway

Protein encoding transcripts are transcribed from just 2% of the eukaryotic genome and are further regulated by 21-35 nucleotide containing small non-coding microRNAs which regulate gene expression. These double stranded microRNAs are themselves regulated at the transcriptional level and their biogenesis (from long dsRNA primary transcripts) is largely controlled by the Dicer and Drosha proteins through multiple pathways reviewed in literature\(^1,2\). Once the mature dsRNAs are transported to the cytoplasm, they are loaded onto Argonaute proteins, where the non-complementary or passenger strand is removed and the guide strand helps enhance the affinity of the AGO protein to its target transcript. Perfect complementarity between the small RNA and its target mRNA, as seen with the small interfering RNA or siRNA, results in AGO2 mediated endonucleolytic cleavage of the target transcript. In case of microRNAs (with partial complementarity to its target sequence), the target sequence is either held in a repressive complex preventing translation or deadenylated to prevent degradation\(^3\). While all human Argonaute AGO1, AGO2, AGO3 and AGO4 proteins have overlapping functions and can form such RNA induced silencing complexes or RISC\(^4\), only AGO2 has been shown to have endonucleolytic activity to cleave the target mRNA sequence.

Argonaute proteins have two conserved RNA binding domains called the PAZ (PIWI-Argonaute-Zwille) domain and an RNAse like PIWI domain. The different AGO proteins are
most divergent at their N-terminal. Recently independent groups demonstrated that four catalytic residues in the PIWI domain and critical residues in its N-terminal domain are sufficient for AGO2 endonucleolytic activity. Given that majority of the eukaryotic gene silencing is mediated through microRNAs, the role of the endonucleolytic activity, which requires perfect complementarity of the guide and target sequences, remains unclear.

**Localization and post translational modifications controls AGO2 activity**

Most of the AGO associated activities have been demonstrated in the cytoplasmic compartment of the cell, where it resides in non-membrane bound, ribosome free cytoplasmic structures called Processing bodies (P-bodies) or in stress bodies. Here, untranslated mRNA associates with AGO2 to form miRNA containing RibonucleoProtein (mRNP) complexes such that the transcripts can either be degraded or return for translation. The movement of AGO2 is further regulated by post translational modification such that phosphorylation at tyrosine residue 387, and tyrosine 529 prevents its accumulation in P-bodies, suggesting that phosphorylation of AGO2 is an emerging critical regulator of AGO2 function. Proline residue hydroxylation of AGO2 was also recently identified as important for its stability and efficient RNA silencing activities. Recently, AGO2 was found to be sumolyated by SUMO1 and SUMO2/3 enzymes which results in increased stability of the AGO2 protein. These studies providing clues to the fine tuning of AGO2 function through various mechanisms in different cellular contexts.

Like RAS proteins, AGO2 is also detected in different cellular compartments, but unlike RAS is not restricted to the plasma membrane and membrane bound cytoplasmic organelles. Among the membrane bound structures, the rough endoplasmic reticulum (rER) is a known site for RNA gene silencing by AGO proteins and AGO2 has been detected in late endosomes.
and mitochondria where it associates with different proteins to affect cellular proliferation or differentiation, respectively. Much of the recent literature demonstrates a role for AGO2 within the nucleus where it controls RNA Induced Transcriptional Silencing (RITS), DNA methylation, pre-mRNA splicing and double stranded break repair. Together with silencing activities in the cytoplasmic RISC complexes, these surprising new functions of small RNA bound Argonaute proteins suggest wide-ranging activities within the cell.

**AGO2 interacting proteins**

In 2005, Dicer and TRBP were identified as AGO2 interacting proteins which were later shown to be sufficient for AGO2 mediated RISC activity in vitro. An unbiased comprehensive mass spectrometric analysis of tagged AGO2 immunoprecipitates, showed a large number of RNA binding proteins that interact with AGO2 in either an RNA dependent or independent manner, suggesting that these proteins can either affect RISC activity/assembly or are components of the mRNP complexes, respectively. A functional interaction between AGO2 and P body component, GW182, helped identify localization of AGO2 to the P-bodies and was demonstrated to be a pre-requisite to microRNA mediated repression. AGO2 interacting proteins with roles/putative functions in every step of RISC function including RISC loading, RISC activation, duplex unwinding, AGO recruitment to mRNA targets, stabilization of AGO-mRNA complexes and others have been identified and reviewed. Yet, RAS has not been detected as an AGO2 interacting partner likely because the workflow did not include analysis of proteins below 25kDa.

AGO proteins bound to both the microRNAs and their binding sites in target transcripts are being identified using Photoactivatable Ribonucleoside-Enhanced Crosslinking and
Immunoprecipitation (PAR-CLIP), a transcriptome-wide crosslinking method for RNA binding proteins that incorporate photoactivatable nucleoside analogs which undergo transition during complementary DNA (cDNA) synthesis and reveal precise binding of the RBP\textsuperscript{33}. Global analysis of thousands of such binding sites revealed that AGO proteins bound with equal efficiency to the transcript coding sequences (CDS) and the 3’UTR regions. Using CLIP methodology, arsenite induced stress was also shown to increase AGO2 occupancy of target transcripts (in both the coding and the 3’UTR sequences), accompanied by stronger translation repression\textsuperscript{34}.

**Argonaute 2 in the RAS/MAPK/PI3K pathway**

One of the most intriguing aspects of the RAS-AGO2 interaction is the intersection of the RAS/MAPK pathway to AGO2 and its microRNA mediated function \textbf{(Figure 5.1)}. One of the earliest studies showed that phosphorylation of TRBP, part of the Dicer associated microRNA-generating complex, was activated upon ERK signaling. A coordinated decrease in the tumor suppressor \textit{let-7} microRNA suggested that the signaling mechanism target the microRNA pathway to control biological processes\textsuperscript{35}. A more direct link to the MAPK pathway came into focus when EGFR was shown to phosphorylate AGO2 at tyrosine residue 393, reduced AGO2-Dicer interaction and interfered with microRNA maturation only under hypoxic conditions\textsuperscript{15}.

In a more recent study on oncogene induced senescence, AGO2 demonstrated transcriptional silencing through repression of RB1/E2F-target genes in a \textit{let-7} dependent manner. It is interesting to note that the authors used RAS\textsuperscript{G12V} mutant to induce senescence in these models to establish a tumor suppressor role of AGO2/microRNA axis during senescence\textsuperscript{36}. Similarly, a non-receptor type phosphatase, PTP1B, upon inactivation by reactive oxygen species (ROS), dephosphorylates AGO2 Tyrosine 393 residue and counters the effect of oncogenic HRAS to induce senescence in IMR90 cells\textsuperscript{37}. Together these studies suggest that AGO2 may
have a vital role in RAS induced senescence through strategic control of the microRNA mediated machinery.

In this chapter, using multiple cell line models, we provide evidence for phenotypic consequences of AGO2 modulation in mutant KRAS driven cellular transformation and a requirement for a direct RAS-AGO2 interaction in this process.

RESULTS

*AGO2 positively regulates mutant KRAS levels in mutant KRAS dependent cancer cells*

Next, we set out to analyze functional implications of RAS-AGO2 interaction, particularly in the context of KRAS driven transformation. To this end, we first carried out knockdown of AGO2 in H358 lung cancer cells that harbor a homozygous KRAS mutation and are known to be KRAS-dependent\textsuperscript{38}. Whereas AGO2 is known to negatively regulate wild-type RAS levels \textsuperscript{39}, here, AGO2 knockdown resulted in a remarkable reduction in mutant KRAS protein levels (Figure 5.2A, left panel). Conversely, overexpression of AGO2 in the same cells led to elevated levels of KRAS, implying a positive regulation of mutant KRAS levels by AGO2 in these cells (Figure 5.2A, right panel). Consistent with these observations, knockdowns of AGO2 and/or KRAS in H358 cells showed reduced rates of cell proliferation while AGO2 overexpression resulted in increased cell proliferation (Figure 5.2B). Furthermore, AGO2 knockdown reduced the ability of H358 cells to form colonies in colony formation assays (Figure 5.2C) and resulted in marked reduction in levels of known mediators of KRAS signaling, including p-Akt, p-mTOR and p-RPS6 based on a Pathscan intracellular signaling array (Cell Signaling) (Figure 5.2D). Interestingly, similar AGO2 depletion experiments (using the same shRNAs as described above) in H460 lung cancer cells that harbor mutant KRAS but are known to be KRAS independent, did
not affect KRAS levels, cell proliferation, colony formation (Figure 5.2E) or intracellular signaling (Figure 5.2F). These phenotypic effects upon AGO2 knockdown in the context of KRAS dependency were also observed in pancreatic cancer cell lines where knockdown of either KRAS or AGO2 dramatically reduced cell proliferation in mutant KRAS-dependent MIA PaCa-2 cells but not in mutant KRAS-independent PANC-1 cells (Figure 5.2G). To further explore the dependence of KRAS oncogenic phenotype on AGO2, we tested AGO2 depleted MIA PaCa-2 cells for their ability to establish xenografts in SCID mice. A dramatic reduction in tumor volume in AGO2 depleted cells was observed (Figure 5.2H). Immunoblot analysis showed that similar to H358 lung cancer cells, knockdown of AGO2 in the KRAS dependent pancreatic MIA PaCa-2 cells also results in reduced levels of KRAS protein (Figure 5.2H, inset). These data suggest that KRAS dependent cancer cells manifest a coincident dependence on AGO2 to maintain oncogenic KRAS protein levels. Together, these experiments support a functional role for AGO2 in potentiating the oncogenic activities of mutant KRAS, and led us to further explore mechanistic correlates of the RAS-AGO2 interaction.

**KRAS driven NIH3T3 cellular transformation depends on direct AGO2 binding to inhibit functional RISC assembly**

To address mechanistic underpinnings of the phenotypic effects associated with the mutant KRAS-AGO2 interaction, we employed the classic experimental model system of NIH3T3 cells to ectopically express human KRAS WT or KRAS G12V, with or without AGO2, and carried out transient foci formation assays. As expected, no foci were observed in cells transfected with KRAS WT, as well as in cells with KRAS WT±AGO2. However, NIH3T3 cells transfected with KRAS G12V generated characteristic foci of transformed cells resulting from loss of contact
inhibition. Remarkably, co-transfection of \(KRAS^{G12V}\) but not \(BRAF^{V600E}\) with AGO2 enhanced the number of foci by approximately five-fold, compared to the vector control (Figure 5.3A-B). Consistent with AGO2 overexpression in H358 cells (Figure 5.2A), immunoblot analysis of NIH3T3 cells overexpressing AGO2 showed an increase in KRAS protein levels (Figure 5.3C).

Furthermore, to understand the effects of AGO2 in the RAS signaling pathways, we analyzed protein lysates from NIH3T3 cells stably expressing \(KRAS^{G12V}\)+vector or \(KRAS^{G12V}+AGO2\), using the Pathscan intracellular signaling arrays. Cells expressing \(KRAS^{G12V}+AGO2\) showed a marked increase in the levels of p-Akt, p-mTOR and p-RPS6 (Figure 5.3C bottom panel) suggesting that the increased levels of oncogenic KRASG12V protein signals largely through PI3K activation.

To probe the requirement of mutant KRAS-AGO2 interaction for oncogenic transformation we first performed in vitro RAS co-IP assays using mutant KRASG12D and the double mutant KRASG12DY64G which has previously been shown to have limited oncogenic potential42. We next engineered a retroviral vector in which we introduced the Y64G substitution in the context of oncogenic \(Kras^{G12V}\). Transfecting this \(KRAS^{G12VY64G}\) double mutant into NIH3T3 cells failed to generate foci (Figure 5.3D). As an important corollary to our hypothesis that mutant KRAS-AGO2 interaction leads to elevated mutant KRAS protein levels, the \(KRAS^{G12VY64G}\) stably expressing cells, in which mutant KRAS fails to engage AGO2 also showed much lower levels of KRAS protein as compared to \(KRAS^{G12V}\) expressing cells (Figure 5.3E, top panel). An independent construct encoding \(KRAS^{G12VY64G}\) showed similar results in both the foci formation assay and its inability to express high levels of the KRAS protein despite similar levels of KRAS transcripts. Curiously, \(KRAS^{G12VY64G}\) expression showed activated phospho-Akt and phospho-ERK activation similar to that of \(KRAS^{G12V}\) expressing cells, suggesting that the switch
II domain may play a critical role in KRAS activation through interactions of Y64 with various effectors and regulators. Yet, despite the increased activated ERK/Akt levels, cells expressing KRAS<sup>G12VY64G</sup> failed to show the characteristic morphology of KRAS<sup>G12V</sup> cells (Figure 5.3D, bottom panel). In vivo these cells also failed to establish tumors in the xenograft mouse model (Figure 5.3F), supporting a critical role for Y64 in the Switch II domain, including its association with AGO2, for transformation.

To more directly explore the potential effect of KRAS<sup>G12V</sup> on functional mRNPs, as implicated by its interaction with AGO2, we exploited a recently described method for intracellular single-molecule, high-resolution localization and counting (iSHiRLoC) of microRNAs wherein the mobility of fluorophore labeled let-7a microRNAs was tracked following microinjection into NIH3T3 cells. The diffusion coefficient distribution of single particles as a readout of microRNA assembly into mRNPs (Figure 5.4A) suggests that in NIH3T3 cells expressing wild-type RAS, let-7a assembles into both ‘fast’ (low molecular weight) and ‘slow’ (high molecular weight) mRNPs representing early and late intermediates of the RNA silencing pathway, respectively. By contrast, in cells expressing mutant KRAS<sup>G12V</sup>, the let-7a probe manifested predominantly in fast moving complexes (Figure 5.4A) suggesting that the large mRNPs are reduced in the presence of mutant KRAS<sup>G12V</sup>, presumably due to its interaction with AGO2. Importantly, in the NIH3T3 cells stably expressing KRAS<sup>G12VY64G</sup> wherein the mutant KRAS-AGO2 interaction is abrogated, let-7a again accumulated in both fast and slow mRNPs (Figure 5.4A).

Since AGO proteins, especially AGO2 is known to elevate microRNA levels in general and let-7 in particular, we assessed the levels of let-7 microRNAs in KRAS<sup>G12V</sup> expressing cells and interestingly observed a significant reduction in both let-7a2 and let-7f microRNAs (Figure
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In the same assay, $KRAS^{G12VY64G}$ expressing cells, which do not allow mutant KRAS-AGO2 interaction, showed no change in let-7 levels, providing evidence for a direct role of mutant KRAS in the modulation of microRNA levels in this model. Cognate analysis of the levels of let-7 target transcripts in these cells, showed an almost one log fold change in the mRNA levels of $HMGA1$ and $HMGA2$ (Figure 5.4C), known to be post transcriptionally modulated through multiple let-7 binding sites in their 3’UTR regions. Curiously, we did not observe increased levels of endogenous KRAS or MYCN levels, which are also known to contain let-7 binding sites in their 3’UTR. Together, our data using the $KRAS^{G12VY64G}$ mutant and let-7, as an example of AGO2 regulated microRNA, support the conclusion that mutant KRAS, through its direct association with AGO2, attenuates microRNA levels and prevents microRNA mediated gene silencing.

**AGO2 interaction is required to maximize oncogenic potential of mutant KRAS**

To further underscore the role of AGO2 in $KRAS^{G12V}$ driven oncogenesis, we generated NIH3T3 cells with AGO2 knockout (NIH3T3 $AGO2^{-/-}$) using the CRISPR/Cas9 methodology (Figure 5.5). Validation of AGO2 knockout in NIH3T3 $AGO2^{-/-}$ cells was performed at the DNA, RNA and protein levels (Figure 5.5B-D). Loss of AGO2 in NIH3T3 cells resulted in lower levels of let-7 family microRNAs (Figure 5.5E), consistent with previous studies demonstrating that a loss of AGO2 results in a reduction of absolute levels of all microRNAs. In NIH3T3 $AGO2^{-/-}$ cells, the reduction of let-7 family microRNA levels resulted in a concomitant increase in target $HMGA1/HMGA2$ transcript levels (Figure 5.5F).

Despite reduced levels of microRNAs, mutant KRAS expression in the NIH3T3 $AGO2^{-/-}$ background showed a markedly reduced ability to generate foci compared to parental NIH3T3
Partial rescue of the ability to establish foci in these cells was achieved by overexpression of AGO2 or AGO2^{K98A} (which permits RAS interaction) but not the AGO2^{K112A} mutant (which fails to bind RAS). These observations also support the notion that a direct association of oncogenic KRAS and AGO2 is required for mutant KRAS driven transformation. Further, consistent with the data presented thus far, NIH3T3 AGO2^{-/-} cells stably expressing KRAS^{G12V} showed reduced expression of mutant KRAS compared to that of NIH3T3 cells stably expressing KRAS^{G12V} (Figure 5.6B, top panel). Also consistent with AGO2 overexpression elevating phospho-Akt levels in the presence of activated KRAS (Figure 5.6B), loss of AGO2 reduced phospho-Akt signaling by mutant KRAS and a slight increase in phospho-ERK signaling, suggesting that AGO2 may have an essential role in modulating the signaling outputs of activated KRAS in these cells. In addition, NIH3T3 AGO2^{-/-} cells stably expressing KRAS^{G12V} did not display the characteristic morphology of NIH3T3 KRAS^{G12V} cells (Figure 5.6B, bottom panel). Sucrose density sedimentation analysis of NIH3T3 AGO2^{-/-} showed that in contrast to NIH3T3 parental cells, RAS is restricted largely to the first four fractions of the gradient with minimal overlap with AGO1 complexes, indicating that RAS associates with higher molecular weight fractions through its interaction with AGO2 (Figure 5.6C). Finally, in vivo experiments in a mouse xenograft model showed significantly decreased tumor growth with NIH3T3 AGO2^{-/-} cells expressing KRAS^{G12V} compared to parental NIH3T3 cells expressing KRAS^{G12V}, further demonstrating a requirement for AGO2 for KRAS driven transformation (Figure 5.6D).
DISCUSSION

Functionally, we demonstrate that the RAS-AGO2 interaction is required for KRAS mediated oncogenesis. Mechanistically, mutant KRAS binding appears to attenuate AGO2 assembly into functional mRNP particles and may directly modulate microRNA levels (as demonstrated by let-7 microRNA analysis). We also observed that AGO2 may play an important role in the signaling output mediated by mutant KRAS, particularly AKT-mTOR pathway.

Our data also suggests that binding of mutant KRAS to AGO2 inhibits AGO2 function, as seen by reduced let-7 levels with concomitant increase in target mRNA (HMGA) expression. Importantly, experiments using mutants in both KRAS and AGO2 that abrogate binding of the respective partners, shows that the direct binding of mutant KRAS and AGO2 is necessary to elevate mutant KRAS levels and increased phospho-Akt signaling, leading to increased transformation potential (Figure 5.6A-B). Since we have used mutant KRAS constructs that do not have 3’UTR regions that bind microRNA, it remains unclear how AGO2 association can elevate mutant KRAS levels. Modulation of various microRNAs (other than let-7 microRNA, that we describe here) that can bind open reading frames under stress may have a direct or indirect role in this process 34.

Recently, an association of mutant KRAS with the RNA machinery through binding to HNRNPA2B1 was reported48, which also supports a likely interface of RAS with the RNA processing machinery, including with hub protein AGO2, as observed in our study. While the current study focused on characterization of the KRAS-AGO2 interaction and its role in mutant KRAS mediated transformation, a functional role of this interaction presents an intriguing subject for follow up studies.
The EGFR kinase was recently shown to phosphorylate AGO2 in response to hypoxia leading to inhibition of AGO2-mediated microRNA processing\(^{15,49}\). Similarly, the Akt serine threonine kinase was shown to phosphorylate AGO2 to inhibit AGO2-mediated mRNA endonucleolytic activity \(^{50}\). Interestingly, AGO2 phosphorylation also leads to inhibition of microRNA loading onto RISC complexes in the presence of mutant \(HRAS^{G12V}\)\(^{51}\). The identification of AGO2 as a critical partner of RAS, further provides a direct mechanistic link between RAS oncogenic signaling and RNA silencing. Illumination of such integral effector mechanisms of RAS may inform novel approaches to therapeutically target this frequently mutated cancer pathway.

**MATERIALS AND METHODS**

**shRNA mediated knockdown and cell proliferation assays**

H358, H460, MIA PaCa-2 and Panc-1 cells were treated with two independent shRNAs in viral vectors (validated Mission shRNA lentiviral particles, Sigma) targeting \(KRAS\) (TRCN0000040149, TRCN0000010369, TRCN0000040149) or \(AGO2\) (TRCN0000007865 and TRCN0000011203). After 5 days, cells were trypsinized and plated in triplicate at 5,000 cells per well in 24-well plates. For NIH3T3 stable lines, cells expressing the indicated plasmids were plated as mentioned earlier. The plates were incubated at 37 °C with 5% CO2. Cells were counted using Coulter counter at the indicated times.

**Colony formation assay**

Cells were treated with lentiviral particles expressing \(AGO2\) shRNA sequences in 6 well dishes. To select stably transfected clones, puromycin at 1 \(\mu g/ml\) was added to the cells two days after
transfection and allowed to grow over 10 days. Medium with selection antibiotic was changed every 2 days. Dishes were then stained using crystal violet, washed with water and photographed.

**Focus formation assay**

Foci formation assays were performed by transfecting/co-transfecting (the indicated constructs) 150,000 early passage NIH3T3 cells in 6 well dishes using Fugene HD (Promega). After two days, cells were trypsinized and plated onto 150 mm dishes containing 5% calf serum. The cells were maintained under low serum conditions and medium was refreshed every two days. After 21 days in culture the plates were stained for foci using crystal violet. Foci were also observed under the microscope to see the altered morphology and were counted manually. Three independent experiments were performed for each condition.

**Generation of NIH3T3 stable lines**

Early passage NIH3T3 mouse fibroblast cells were plated to 70% confluency and the indicated constructs were transfected using Fugene HD (Promega). Cells transfected with \( \text{KRAS}^{G12V} \), upon selection with puromycin (1 \( \mu \text{g/ul} \)), showed distinct transformed morphology and continued to proliferate as clusters of cells (unlike naïve NIH3T3 cells). The \( \text{KRAS}^{G12V} \) cells continued to grow in the absence of selection antibiotic and were further transfected with either empty vector (pDEST40) or FLAG-\( \text{AGO2} \) constructs. All the above transfected cells were then selected using G418 (200 \( \mu \text{g/ml} \)).

Site directed mutagenesis was performed to generate Y64G mutation in the \( \text{KRAS}^{G12V} \) plasmid, 12544, described earlier. NIH3T3 cells were transfected with this construct, selected using puromycin to generate polyclonal population of cells stably expressing \( \text{KRAS}^{G12VY64G} \).
Generation of NIH3T3 AGO2-/- line

AGO2-knockout NIH3T3 cells were generated by CRISPR-Cas9-mediated genome engineering. Genomic regions in murine AGO2 between exons 8 and 9, and between exons 11 and 12 were targeted for deletion using primers TCCTTGGTTACCCGATCCTGG and AGAGACTATCTGCAACTATGG, respectively (PAM motif underlined). PCR products were cloned into the BbsI site of pX458 (pSpCas9(BB)-2A-GFP; obtained from the laboratory of Feng Zhang via Addgene (Cambridge, MA; plasmid 48138)) according to the cloning protocol provided by the Zhang lab (http://www.genome-engineering.org). Cells were transfected with the vectors using Lipofectamine 3000 (Life Technologies) according to the manufacturer’s instructions. 48 hours post-transfection, GFP-positive cells were FACS sorted as a single cell into 96-well plate. After culturing for 3 weeks, cells are distributed into two 24 well plates followed by PCR-based genotyping using primers mentioned above. A clone showing deletion of the targeted region in AGO2 was used for further analysis. Single-cell sorted cells obtained after transfection of the empty pSpCas9(BB)-2A-GFP construct was used as a negative control. NIH3T3 AGO2-/- cells were also transfected with the KRASG12V plasmid construct to generate stable cell lines after puromycin selection.

Xenograft Models

Five week-old female C.B17/SCID mice were procured from a breeding colony at University of Michigan. Mice were anesthetized using a cocktail of xylazine (80 mg/kg, intraperitoneal) and ketamine (10 mg/kg, intraperitoneal) for chemical restraint. NIH3T3 cells stably expressing AGO2, KRAS\textsuperscript{WT}, KRAS\textsuperscript{G12V} + vector or KRAS\textsuperscript{G12V} + AGO2 (0.5 or 1 million cells for each implantation site) were resuspended in 100 μL of 1× PBS with 20% Matrigel (BD Biosciences)
and were implanted subcutaneously into flank region on both sides. Eight mice were included in each experimental group. Tumor growth was recorded every two days by using digital calipers, and tumor volumes were calculated using the formula \((\pi/6) (L \times W^2)\), where \(L\) = length of tumor and \(W\) = width. For the Mia PaCa-2 xenograft model, cells were first treated with either scrambled or \(AGO2\) shRNA overnight. After 2 days of puromycin selection the cells in each group were injected in 8 mice and the progression of tumor growth was monitored over time. To study oncogenic potential of NIH3T3 \(KRAS^{G12VY64G}\) and NIH3T3 \(AGO2^{-/-}\) cells \(in vivo\), subcutaneous implantation of cells on both flanks of mice were performed as before (n=5 mice).

Four to five week old female SCID mice were used for all xenograft studies. Based on power calculation (http://www.biomath.info/power/index.htm), we determined that less than 6 mice per group are sufficient to detect significant differences in tumor volumes between two groups. All mouse experiments were done in a blinded fashion with mice being randomly selected for experiments. The person performing the measurements was blinded to the treatment groups. No animals were excluded in any of the xenograft experiments. All experimental procedures involving mice were approved by the University Committee on Use and Care of Animals at the University of Michigan and conform to their relevant regulatory standards.

**Quantitative microRNA and mRNA RT-PCR**

For the quantitation of microRNA levels in the NIH3T3 cells transfected with indicated constructs (from both the transient foci assays and stable lines), total RNA was prepared using the miRNeasy kit (Qiagen). MicroRNA RT-qPCR was performed according to the manufacturer’s instructions (Applied Biosystems). U6 RNA was used as the endogenous control since its Ct values remained consistent. The vector transfected cells were used as reference.
For quantitation of mRNA transcripts, RNA was extracted from the indicated samples and cDNAs were synthesized using SuperScript III System according to the manufacturer’s instructions (Invitrogen). Quantitative RT-PCR was conducted using primers detailed in Table S4 with SYBR Green Master Mix (Applied Biosystems) on the StepOne Real-Time PCR System (Applied Biosystems). Relative mRNA levels of the transcripts were normalized to the expression of the housekeeping gene GAPDH and vector transfected cells were used as reference.

iSHiRLoC analyses

RNA oligonucleotides were purchased from Exiqon and IDT, respectively. RNA oligos were obtained with a 5’ phosphate and, for the let-7-a1 guide strand, with a 3’ Cy5 modification. All oligos were HPLC purified by the appropriate vendor. Oligonucleotide sequences are as follows,

let-7-a1 guide: P-UGA GGU AGU AGG UUG UAU AGU U-Cy5

let-7-a1-passage: P-CUA UAC AAU CUA CUG UCU UUC C

RNA oligos were heat-annealed in a 1:1 ratio in 1x PBS, resulting in duplex RNAs, and were frozen for further use. Cells were cultured in DMEM (GIBCO) supplemented with 10% (v/v) fetal calf serum (FCS, Colorado serum) and 1x penicillin-streptomycin (GIBCO) at 37 °C. 1 - 1.25 x 10^5 cells were seeded onto delta-T dishes (Bioptechs) 4 days prior to microinjection, such that they were ~80% confluent at the time of microinjection. Regular medium was replaced with a minimal medium (HBS), without serum and vitamins, but containing 20 mM HEPES-KOH pH 7.4, 135 mM NaCl, 5 mM KCl, 1 mM MgCl_2, 1.8 mM CaCl_2 and 5.6 mM glucose immediately before microinjection. After microinjection, cells were incubated in phenol red-free DMEM
containing 2% (v/v) FBS in the presence of a 5% CO₂ atmosphere at 37 °C for the indicated amounts of time prior to imaging.

Microinjection was performed with samples containing 1 μM Cy5 labeled let-7-a1 duplexes and 0.05% (w/v) 10 kDa fluorescein dextran (Invitrogen) in PBS. Imaging was performed as described ⁴³,⁴⁴ using a cell-TIRF system based on an Olympus IX81 microscope equipped with a 60x 1.49 NA oil-immersion objective (Olympus), as well as 488 nm (Coherent ©, 100 mW at source, ~38 μW for imaging fluorescein) and 640 nm (Coherent ©, 100 mW at source, 13.5 mW for imaging Cy5) solid-state lasers. A quad-band filter cube consisting of a z405/488/561/640rpc dichroic filter (Chroma) and z405/488/561/640m emission filter (Chroma) was used to filter fluorescence of the appropriate fluorophore from incident light. Emission from individual fluorophores was detected sequentially on an EMCCD camera (Andor Ixon). Particle tracking analysis was performed by using tracks that spanned at least four video frames.

Pathscan Intracellular signaling array analysis

Pathscan intracellular signaling arrays were purchased from Cell Signaling. Indicated cells from the overexpression model or after knockdown were starved overnight and 40-80 μg of lysates generated from these were applied to the arrays. Arrays were processed according to the manufacturer’s instructions and developed using chemiluminescent substrates. For the analysis ImageJ software was used and control spots indicated in (Figure S10A) were used to normalize the data. The quantitative bar charts shown in the study are for those signaling molecules that show intensity levels of greater than 50 for each of the duplicate spots in any given treatment of overexpression or knockdown.
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Figure 5.1 Components of the microRNA machinery are modulated by the RAS/MAPK pathway.
Figure 5.2 AGO2 enhances mutant KRAS dependent growth by elevating KRAS protein expression (A) Immunoblot analysis of AGO2 and KRAS after knockdown or overexpression of AGO2. (B) Growth curves and (C) colony formation assays of mutant KRAS dependent H358 lung cancer cells, following either knockdown of KRAS/AGO2 using shRNA or AGO2 overexpression. Error bars are based on standard error of mean. *(P<0.05) and ***(P<0.005) denote significant differences in growth at the indicated times compared to either scrambled or vector control. Data obtained from three independent experiments are shown (D) Pathscan intracellular signaling arrays probed with lysates from H358 cells following AGO2 knockdown (E) Growth curves (left) and colony formation assays (right) of mutant KRAS independent H460 lung cancer cells, following knockdown of KRAS/AGO2. Data obtained from three independent experiments are shown. Inset, immunoblot analysis of AGO2 and KRAS after AGO2 knockdown. (F) Intracellular signaling array probed with lysates from H460 following AGO2 knockdown. (G) Growth curves of pancreatic cancer cells, MIA PaCa-2 (mutant KRAS dependent) (left) and PANC-1 (mutant KRAS independent) (right) following knockdown of KRAS or AGO2, as indicated. *(P<0.05) and ***(P<0.005) denote significant differences in growth at the indicated times compared to scrambled control. Data obtained from three independent experiments are shown (H) In vivo growth of Mia PaCa-2 cells transiently treated with either scrambled shRNA or shRNA targeting AGO2 prior to injecting in nude mice. For each group (n=8), one million cells were injected and average tumor volume (in mm³) was plotted on y-axis and days after injection on the x-axis. Right, immunoblot analysis of AGO2 and RAS following AGO2 knockdown in Mia PaCa-2 cells. Indicated P-value was calculated using two sided student t-test for the two groups.
Figure 5.3 Mutant KRAS-AGO2 interaction promotes transformation (A) Representative images of foci formation assays using NIH3T3 cells co-transfected with KRAS\textsuperscript{WT} or KRAS\textsuperscript{G12V} and AGO2 (left panel). Quantitation of foci from two technical replicate experiments (right panel). Foci assays were performed at least three times with similar results. P-value, calculated using two-sided student t-test between the two groups. (B) Representative images of foci formation assays using NIH3T3 cells co-transfected with BRAF\textsuperscript{V600E} with or without AGO2 (left panel). Quantitation of foci from two technical replicate experiments (right panel). Foci assays were performed at least three times with similar results. P-value, calculated using two-sided student t-test between the two groups. (C) Immunoblot analysis shows increased levels of oncogenic KRAS levels in the presence of AGO2. Lower panel, intracellular signaling arrays probed with lysates from NIH3T3 cells stably expressing vector, AGO2, or KRAS\textsuperscript{G12V}±AGO2. The colored circles mark duplicate spots corresponding to p-AKT (S473), p-RPS6 (S235/236) and p-mTOR (S2448). (D) Representative images of foci formation assays using NIH3T3 cells co-transfected with KRAS\textsuperscript{G12V} or KRAS\textsuperscript{G12VY64G}. Quantitation of foci from two independent experiments (right). Indicated P-value was calculated using two-sided student t-test. (E) KRAS immunoprecipitation (using sc-521 pAb) followed by immunoblot analysis (RAS10 mAb) showing low levels of oncogenic KRAS protein expression in NIH3T3 cells stably expressing KRAS\textsuperscript{G12VY64G}, despite similar phospho-Akt activation. Lower panel shows morphology of indicated stable lines grown in 10% serum upon crystal violet staining. (F) In vivo growth of NIH3T3 cells stably overexpressing KRAS\textsuperscript{G12V} and KRAS\textsuperscript{G12VY64G} in nude mice. For each group (n=8), 500,000 cells were injected and average tumor volume (in mm\textsuperscript{3}) was plotted on y-axis and days after injection on the x-axis.
Figure 5.4 *KRAS*<sup>G12V,Y64G</sup> fails to limit *let-7a* in small RNP particles. (A) Distribution of *let-7a*-Cy5 diffusion coefficients at different time points following microinjection in parental NIH3T3, NIH3T3-*KRAS*<sup>G12V</sup> and NIH3T3-*KRAS*<sup>G12V,Y64G</sup> cells, as described earlier. The fast (green) and slow (red) diffusing particles (demarcated by the dotted lines to guide the eye) were defined based on segregation of the two Gaussian distributions 2h after microinjection. Blue shaded region represents the diffusion coefficients lost due to limited time resolution of tracking. Number of particles analyzed is mentioned within each histogram. (B) from NIH3T3 cells stably expressing *KRAS*<sup>WT</sup>, *KRAS*<sup>G12V</sup> or *KRAS*<sup>G12V,Y64G</sup> constructs. U6 RNA and GAPDH mRNA were used as controls to normalize the microRNA and mRNA data respectively and vector transfected cells were used as reference. (C) Target genes HMGA1/2, KRAS and MYCN are known to be regulated by *let-7* microRNA. Error bars show standard error of the mean of 4 replicates and asterisks indicate significant log2 fold changes (two sided t-test, P-value less than 0.05) between the indicated conditions compared to vector control.
Figure 5.5 Generation and characterization of NIH3T3 AGO2-/- cells. (A) Schematic showing the use of the CRISPR/Cas9 methodology to knockout AGO2 in NIH3T3 cells. Validation of AGO2 knockout was performed using genomic PCR (B), RT-qPCR (C), and immunoblot analysis (D). qPCR analysis of let-7 family microRNAs (E) and their target genes (F) in NIH3T3 AGO2-/- cells. Both the microRNA and transcript levels were compared to NIH3T3 cells treated with vector with no guide RNA. Error bars show standard error of the mean of 4 technical replicates and asterisks indicate significant log2 fold changes (two sided t-test, P-value less than 0.05) between the indicated conditions. (G) qPCR analysis of AGO2 transcripts in NIH3T3 (left) and NIH3T3 AGO2-/- (right) cells two days after transfection for foci formation assay, demonstrating similar levels of expression of AGO2 constructs. Error bars show standard error of the mean of 3 technical replicates and asterisks indicate significant log10 fold changes (two sided t-test, P-value less than 0.005) in AGO2 expression over that of the vector control.
Figure 5.6 AGO2 interaction is required for maximal oncogenic potential of mutant KRAS (A) Left, representative images of KRAS<sup>G12V</sup> driven foci in NIH3T3 and NIH3T3 AGO2<sup>-/-</sup> cells upon co-transfection with various AGO2 constructs. Right, quantitation of foci from two replicate experiments. Error bars show standard error of mean and asterisks indicate P values less than 0.005 for the indicated conditions compared to vector control. (B) Upper panel, Immunoblot analysis showing reduced expression of oncogenic KRAS in KRAS AGO2<sup>-/-</sup> stably expressing KRAS<sup>G12V</sup> and the extent of phospho-ERK and phospho-AKT activation in these cells. Lower panel shows crystal violet staining of indicated stable lines grown in 10% serum. (C) Sucrose density gradient fractionation of parental NIH3T3, NIH3T3 KRAS<sup>G12V</sup> and NIH3T3 AGO2<sup>-/-</sup> cell lysates followed by immunoblot detection of RAS, AGO1 and AGO2 proteins. (D) In vivo growth of NIH3T3 or NIH3T3 AGO2<sup>-/-</sup> cells stably expressing KRAS<sup>G12V</sup> in nude mice. For each group (n=8), 500,000 cells were injected and average tumor volume (in mm<sup>3</sup>) was plotted on y-axis and days after injection on the x-axis. Error bars are standard error of mean * P<0.05 and ** P<0.005 at the indicated times. (E) Schematic representation of the N-terminal domain of AGO2 interacting with the switch II domain in RAS.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source</th>
<th>Gene</th>
<th>Primer sequence (5'- 3')</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>AGO2_F</td>
<td>ACCCACCCCCACCGAGTTCGAC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>AGO2_R</td>
<td>AGTGCGAAGGCTGCTTGTC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>GAPDH-F</td>
<td>TTAGTGGAGGTCAATGAGGG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>GAPDH-R</td>
<td>GAGTCCTTCCACGATACCAAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>AGO2_orf_F</td>
<td>GCACTATACGTCTCTGGG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>AGO2_orf_R</td>
<td>GGTGTCACACAGTGCTGAGG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>KRAS_orf_F</td>
<td>ACACAAAACAGGCTAGGACT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>KRAS_orf_R</td>
<td>AGGCATCATCAACACCCCTGT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>KRAS_F</td>
<td>TCGACACAGCGTGCAAGAGAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human</td>
<td>KRAS_R</td>
<td>AGAAAGCCCTCCCCAGTCCTCA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>MYCN</td>
<td>ACAGAACTGATGCGCTGGAAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>MYCN</td>
<td>GGTGAAGCTTACAGTCCCAA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>HMGA1_F</td>
<td>CCTCTGAGCGGTGGTGTTG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>HMGA1_R</td>
<td>TGGGGAAGAGAATAACAGGA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>HMGA2_F</td>
<td>TGTGCCCTCTGACTTCGTT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>HMGA2_R</td>
<td>AGCAAGCCGTCAAGTCACA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>KRAS_F</td>
<td>GTTAGCTCAGTGCCCAAT</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>KRAS_R</td>
<td>ATTCCTAGGTCAGCACA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Table 5.1** PCR primers used in this study. orf: open reading frame
CHAPTER 6

DISCUSSION AND FUTURE DIRECTIONS

The physical association of RAS, a signaling hub, with the core component of RNA silencing complex described here, presents exciting new insights for both RAS and AGO2 function, as well as having wider implications not addressed in this thesis. From the discovery of the RAS-AGO2 interaction to its relevance in normal/oncogenic processes, this concluding chapter attempts to connect the intriguing observations made in this study, with broader cellular processes mediated by the two well characterized entities.

Identification of the RAS-AGO2 interaction

It is the unbiased approach of mass spectrometric analysis of endogenous RAS immunoprecipitates that helped identify AGO2 as an interacting partner (Chapter 4). Use of a well characterized pan-RAS antibody for immunoprecipitation, used by most labs studying RAS, circumvented issues related to ectopic overexpression RAS, its localization, and potential interference of expression tags in protein-protein interactions; this provided us an opportunity to study RAS interacting proteins in a variety of lung and pancreatic cancer cell line models. Importantly, use of this antibody also excluded some of the canonical RAS interacting proteins that involve Switch I domain, facilitating identification of proteins that bind the Switch II domain.
The only previous report of a physical association of Argonaute with a GTPase is that of a PUF-AGO-eEF1A complex\(^1\) which attenuates translation elongation. Lack of evidence for genetic interaction in knockout mouse models of RAS and AGO2 may likely be due to an essential requirement for both KRAS\(^2\) and AGO2\(^3\) in early development. Previous studies using mass spectrometric analysis of AGO2 interactors have used a 25kda cut-off likely narrowly missing the 21kDa small GTPase\(^4\). Further, AGO2 antibodies used to demonstrate endogenous RAS co-immunoprecipitation requires the use of increased salt concentration (300mM) during washing of the immunoprecipitates, suggesting that RNA-dependent mRNP complexes bound indirectly to AGO2 may need to be detached before the fraction that binds RAS is uncovered.

**Is AGO2 a RAS effector?**

The surprising discovery and subsequent validation of RAS and AGO2 peptides in the mass spectrometric analysis in all the cell lines tested, suggested that AGO2 binds RAS in a nucleotide agnostic manner. Indeed, we have demonstrated that both RAS-GDP and RAS-GTP bind AGO2 with equal efficiency, however GTP bound RAS may have distinct effects on AGO2 function, known to be sensitive to magnesium ions\(^5\), which incidentally are also integral to nucleotide exchanges on RAS\(^6\).

Our studies of AGO2 activity in the context of GDP/GTP bound KRAS, suggest that AGO2 function is inhibited when oncogenic KRAS binds AGO2, as evidenced by both reduced *let*-7 levels and lack of *let*-7 in functional mRNPs (**Figure 5.4**). Since AGO2 is known to stabilize microRNA levels\(^7\), oncogenic RAS associated with AGO2 may result in decreased capacity of microRNAs to bind AGO2 and ultimately result in their degradation.
Considering that AGO2 is central to the RNA silencing machinery and thus controls expression of both proliferative and suppressive messages in the cells, local and compartmentalized effects of oncogenic RAS on AGO2 function may elicit specific proliferative signals. Moreover, the binding of mutant RAS to AGO2 under oncogenic conditions in the cell may also restrict movement of AGO2 to P-bodies that are cytoplasmic hubs of gene silencing, thereby increasing cellular protein translation levels in general. Post translational modifications of AGO2\(^8,9\) that are being identified in different signaling contexts may in turn affect its association with RAS.

Considerable work needs to be performed to delineate and tease out AGO2 mechanisms that are direct and indirect consequences of oncogenic KRAS binding.

**Why AGO2?**

Although the four mammalian AGO family members have overlapping functions\(^10\), AGO2 binds microRNA most efficiently, stabilizes microRNAs\(^7\), binds to coding regions of the transcripts\(^11\) and is the only AGO protein that has endonucleolytic activity\(^12\). The AGO proteins differ most in their N-terminal sequences and in AGO2, two motifs in N-domain control the unique endonucleolytic activity of the protein\(^13,14\). We have also narrowed the region of RAS interaction to a stretch of about 100 amino acids (aa 50-141) in between these two motifs such that RAS binding may change the conformation of AGO2 or simply interfere with the endonucleolytic catalytic center of its PIWI domain. Even more fascinating is that the precise stretch involved in RAS binding has been identified as the ‘wedge region’\(^15\) of AGO2 that is involved in removal of the passenger strand of the small RNA duplex, critical for its loading into the RISC. Through
contacts with this unique structural motif of the AGO2 N domain, RAS could have a direct bearing on its microRNA binding and endonucleolytic activity.

Both post translational modifications of KRAS and AGO2 and/or compartment specific protein interactions may provide localized clustering of these proteins for interaction, further suggesting a preference for AGO2 over other clade members of the Argonaute family.

The role of the RAS Switch II domain in AGO2 binding

Both the conserved Switch I and Switch II domains in RAS undergo conformational change upon nucleotide binding. Unlike the RAS-effectors that bind the Switch I domain (RAF, PI3K, RALGDS)\textsuperscript{16} or RAS-regulators that bind the Switch II domain in a nucleotide dependent manner (NF1 only binds RAS-GTP, SOS1 only binds RAS-GDP) our studies show that AGO2 binds RAS in a nucleotide agnostic manner.

Considering that KRASY64 is critical for both SOS1 and AGO2 binding, could AGO2 compete with SOS1 for KRAS binding? If so, what would be the consequences of such competition for KRAS signaling and transformation? If not, are there other residues in the Switch II domain that are critical for AGO2 association. Also importantly, does intracellular compartmentalization of KRAS determine preferred binding to AGO2? AGO2-activity based assays will help determine the effects of wild type versus mutant KRAS binding on AGO2 function.

While we observed that expression of oncogenic KRAS but not “oncogenic KRAS with Y64G mutation”, inhibits AGO2 function (reduced \textit{let}-7 levels and mRNP complexes), expression of the wild type KRAS protein had no such effect. As mentioned earlier, this suggests that mutant RAS binding through the wedge domain of AGO2, possibly interferes with duplex
unwinding and proper RISC assembly\textsuperscript{15}. Whether the structural changes in mutant KRAS caused due to constitutive GTP loading, leads to a direct inhibition of AGO2 function or prevents its shuttling to cellular compartments or simply altersthe profile of its protein/RNA interactions is yet to be determined.

Experiments to elucidate biochemical and functional differences between wild type and mutant KRAS with respect to modulation of AGO2 activity are underway.

\textbf{Role of AGO2 in mutant KRAS driven cellular transformation}

Cellular transformation assays using NIH3T3 mouse fibroblasts, the earliest models to study RAS function, showed that AGO2 potentiates KRAS mediated cellular transformation. Conversely, knockdown of AGO2 using small hairpin RNA silencing molecules also showed a dependency of cellular growth on AGO2 levels in a mutant KRAS dependent manner. While overexpression of AGO2 increases mutant KRAS expression and activates the PI3K/Akt/mTOR pathway, knockdown decreases mutant KRAS levels to reduce signaling.

The oncogenic double mutant used in our study (KRAS\textsuperscript{G12VY64G}) was intriguing in many aspects since it had lost oncogenic potential and yet, showed increased activation of the RAS effector pathways. Most relevant and consistent with our understanding of the KRAS-AGO2 interaction, KRAS\textsuperscript{G12VY64G} expressing cells failed to inhibit RISC formation in the iSHirLoC assay and showed no reduction in \textit{let}-7 levels, suggesting that failure to bind AGO2 abrogates the ability of oncogenic KRAS to inhibit AGO2 function. Yet expression of KRAS\textsuperscript{G12VY64G}, elevates both phospho-Erk and phospho-Akt signaling in cells. While the substitution of Y64 residue in the Switch II domain may have no bearing on the RAF/MEK/Erk pathway, Akt activation through PI3K was predicted to be diminished since PI3K binds KRAS-GTP through
Y64 to elevate phospho-Akt levels. This suggests that indirect mechanisms of Akt/mTOR activation may be responsible for elevated phospho-Akt levels in these cells. Recent work suggests that STAT3 pathway may be more active in the mutant KRAS pancreatic cell context and will need to be explored in these cells.

But the nexus of AGO2 regulating mutant KRAS levels and PI3K pathway was most apparent, when we tested the potential of mutant KRAS to generate tumors in NIH3T3 cells deleted for AGO2 using CRISPR/Cas9 system. In this scenario, cells lacking AGO2, limited both mutant KRAS expression levels and showed reduced activation of phospho-Akt levels, establishing a previously unknown connection between AGO2 and the PI3K pathway.

Can AGO2 be the missing puzzle piece of RAS function?

Despite the vast knowledge of effector function of RAS, the ability to target this function remains limited. Neither inhibitors of downstream RAS effectors, nor inhibitors of RAS membrane targeting mechanisms have yielded benefits to patients with mutant RAS driven tumors. Integrating AGO2 interaction and inhibition of its RNA silencing activities, as one of the functions of mutant KRAS could explain some of the anomalies reported in literature.

Through modulation of the microRNA based machinery, context dependent RAS signaling observed in various models of pancreatic, lung and colon cancer can be explained. Given that microRNA profiles of different cells are distinct, the lack of mutant KRAS specific gene signatures can also be explained through regulation of AGO2 function. Inconsistencies observed in synthetic lethal screens and cell line specific effects also can be attributed to post transcriptional gene silencing mechanisms rather than simple linear effects of RAF/MAPK/ERK or PI3K/Akt/mTOR pathway activation, which are highly conserved and identical in most cells.
Without clear evidence of nuclear reprogramming, the vast number of oncogenic activities of mutant RAS in different models also remains unexplained.

The prevalence of RASopathies suggests that RAS function is compromised during development in these patients. RAS/RAS pathway mutants detected in these patients, show activated RAS-GTP but remain unresponsive to MEK/PI3K inhibition in various models. Activation of RAF/PI3K pathways alone, fails to explain the breadth of the neurological and cytoskeletal deformities observed in these patients.

Differential binding affinities of various RAS mutants to AGO2 or different effects on AGO2 function could also explain how mutant RAS can manipulate the RNA silencing machinery to reprogram cells without direct entry into the nucleus. Given that other regulators like NF1 and SOS1 fail to bind the oncogenic form of RAS (due to conformation change of Switch II region), AGO2 remains the only protein that continues to associate with oncogenic KRAS through its binding to the Switch II domain. In this context, it is intriguing that the new inhibitors of KRAS 18-21 make contacts in the switch II region of KRAS where it is likely that they interfere with AGO2 function.

Exploring RAS-AGO2 interaction in genetic models

The study of functional aspects of the RAS-AGO2 interaction in established genetically engineered lung and pancreatic cancer mouse models of mutant KRAS (crossed with AGO2 conditional lethal mouse models) are still awaited. In parallel, other genetic models like *Saccharomyces cerevisiae, Drosophila melanogaster, Caenorhabditis elegans*, Arabidopsis need to be explored, retrospectively, as experimental models to trace the evolutionary conservation of the RAS-AGO2 interaction. Here, it is interesting to note that *S. cerevisiae* lacks both the
Argonaute mediated RNA silencing pathway \(^{12}\) and the PI3K pathway \(^{22}\), both of which are critical for maximal RAS driven cellular transformation (Figure 5.6). Of the 93 small GTPases found in Arabidopsis, RAS homologs are curiously not conserved, limiting the use of both the *S. cerevisiae* and Arabidopsis as genetic models.

While the *C.elegans* genome encodes RAS GTPase similar to the mammalian form, it has 27 Argonaute protein homologs, which largely perform RNA silencing functions with exogenous or endogenous siRNAs involving various Argonautes with or without endonucleolytic activity\(^{23}\). It is possible that Argonautes using microRNA based RNA silencing may be involved in RAS mediated signaling. Interestingly a *C.elegans* Argonaute protein CSR-1, homolog of mammalian AGO1, was shown to coimmunoprecipitate with translational GTPase, EEF1A, to attenuate translation elongation. Both, the interaction and function, was also conserved in mammalian cells, providing the only evidence of a direct interaction between an Argonaute protein and a GTPase\(^1\). The same Argonaute gene, *csr-1*, was also found to be required in combination with *ksr-1* (kinase suppressor of RAS signaling) providing a genetic evidence for a role for small RNAs and post transcriptional gene silencing in RAS-ERK pathway\(^{24}\). Since AGO2 also regulates KRAS levels through small RNA, alternate approaches using binding competent/incompetent rescue mutants will help tease the direct and indirect effects of the RAS-AGO2 interaction.

The Drosophila eye development as a genetic model remains the best model to extrapolate our findings of a direct interaction between mammalian RAS and AGO2. The fruit fly has both the RAS protein, which shares extensive homology to mammalian RAS and has only 4 Argonaute proteins of which *dAGO1* is closely related to human *AGO2* (even retaining one of the residues required for RAS interaction, identified in our study). Elegant studies using *RAS*
mutants that rescue the lethality associated with $RAS$ null allele have been performed to demonstrate the role of the RAS/RAF/MEK/ERK pathway in eye development $^{25}$. Yet not all functions of RAS could be restored by effector domain mutants that bind differentially to RAF/PI3K and mechanisms controlling the thresholds of RAS effector pathway were shown to specify distinct cellular responses of the same photoreceptor cells. A direct role for Argonaute and small RNA based silencing machinery in these RAS models can be performed once we demonstrate the interaction between RAS and AGO2 in Drosophila cells.

While probing the interaction to better understand human cancers, the study of evolutionarily primitive model organisms with different RAS-like signaling molecules and silencing mechanisms using different Argonaute proteins will provide insights into the evolutionary underpinnings of the RAS-AGO2 interaction.
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