NQO1 promotes an aggressive phenotype in hepatocellular carcinoma via amplifying ERK-NRF2 signaling
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Abstract
Patients with hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) are usually diagnosed at the later stages and have poor survival outcomes. New molecules are urgently needed for the prognostic predication and individual treatment. Our study showed that high levels of NQO1 expression frequently exist in HCC with an obvious cancer-specific pattern. Patients with NQO1-high tumors are significantly associated with poor survival outcomes and serve as independent predictors. Functional experiments showed that NQO1 promotes the growth and aggressiveness of HCC in both in vitro and in vivo models, and the underlying mechanism involved NQO1-derived amplification of ERK/p38-NRF2 signaling. Combined block of ERK and NRF2 signaling generated stronger growth inhibition compared with any single block, especially for HCC with high-NQO1. Therefore, NQO1 is a potential biomarker for HCC early diagnosis and prognosis prediction, and also attractive for cancer-specific targets for HCC treatment.
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Liver cancer is one of the most commonly diagnosed cancers, an estimated 782 500 new cases and 745 500 deaths occurred in 2012 worldwide.\(^1\) More than 75% of the cases occur in the Asia-Pacific region and China alone accounted for 50% of cases and deaths.\(^1\)

Most (70% to 90%) primary liver cancers are hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC). The prognosis of patients with HCC is significantly different among patients with local, regional, and distance lesions, with 5-y survival rates of 30%, 11%, and 3%, respectively.\(^1,2\) However, only 40% of patients with HCC are discovered with local lesions.\(^2\) Moreover, the heterogeneity and evolution of HCC have forced the recognition of the profound importance of stratifying patients for clinical management at an individual level.\(^3,5\) Therefore, it is important to search for more effective biomarkers for early diagnosis and individual treatment.

NAD(P)H quinone oxidoreductase 1 (NQO1) is a flavoenzyme, capable of catalyzing obligatory two-electron reductions of a wide range of quinones to hydroquinones in an NAD(P)H-dependent manner.\(^6,7\) It is also a key player in the cellular defense mechanism against oxidative stress, and substantially increases in response to various stimuli.\(^6,9\) The generation of stable hydroquinones by NQO1 is believed to be a detoxification mechanism because this process can avoid one-electron reductions.\(^6,9\) In some patients, rather than detoxifying, NQO1-related reduction can bioactivate certain antitumor quinines into potent cytotoxic compounds.\(^6,12\) Beyond its catalytic function, NQO1 also has a critical role in protecting various regulatory proteins containing intrinsically unstructured domains from degradation by the 20S proteasome,\(^6,13-17\) such as p53, p73a, p33, p63g, c-Fos, HIF1a, and the translation initiation factor (eIF) 4GI, many of which are very important for cell survival and cancer progression.

Interest in NQO1 has largely been sparked by its overexpression in many tumors,\(^5,9,18-21\) at levels 5-200-folds above that in normal tissues. The elevated activity of NQO1 is closely associated with tumor progression, resistance to chemotherapy, and poor survival.\(^6,7,18-21\) Although some effort has been made to explore the small molecule inhibitor of NQO1 as an anticancer strategy, little success has been achieved. Recently, it was found that some specific substrates for NQO1 generate superoxide substances that may be used for cancer early diagnosis and treatment.\(^7\) Drugs may be more effective when combined with PARP inhibitors for cancers with high levels of NQO1.\(^10,12\) However, the significance of NQO1 changes in HCC are poorly understood and controversial.\(^22-27\) In the present study, we found that NQO1 expression was elevated significantly in HCC, significantly associated with hypomethylation of NQO1 and/or mutations of NRF2 (a key transcription factor of NQO1), and high levels of NQO1 were associated with poor prognosis. Furthermore, NQO1 can significantly affect the growth and/or aggressiveness of HCC cells both in vitro and in vivo. An alternative mechanism for NQO1 in HCC is its action on amplifying ERK/p38-NRF2 signaling, supported by the evidence that combined block of NRF2 and ERK has a stronger inhibitory effect on HCC growth than any single block. Therefore, our results indicated that NQO1 plays a crucial role in HCC and may be a promising prognostic biomarker and therapeutic target.

## 2 | MATERIALS AND METHODS

### 2.1 | Bioinformatics analysis

Raw data from 3 microarray data sets (GSE14520, GSE36376 and GSE62944) were downloaded from the Gene Expression Omnibus (GEO) (https://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/geo/). The expression profiles of the first 2 datasets were extracted using the FDR package\(^28\) and expression profiles of GSE62944, containing all RNA sequencing data from The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA), were processed from feature count data to obtain the log2-based values. Then, all 3 datasets were used to investigate the differential expression of NQO1 between cancerous and normal tissues, and the datasets of GSE14520 and TCGA-LIHC, annotated with survival and clinical information, were used to perform survival analysis. Associations between mRNA expression and copy number or DNA methylation of NQO1 were assessed using the processed data of TCGA-LIHC from the UCSC Xena online database (http://xena.ucsc.edu/). The associations between NQO1 mRNA expression and the mutation sites of NRF2 or KEAP1 were also examined using the processed data of TCGA-LIHC from cBioportal database (http://www.cbioportal.org/), and the annotation information of the constructed domains of NRF2 and KEAP1 were retrieved from previous reports.\(^29,30\) We also examined the association between gene dependence and NQO1 expression status (high or low) across more than 17 000 genes among 325 cell lines (containing 14 HCC cells) using information from the CERES database.\(^31\)

### 2.2 | Patients and follow-up

Pathologically confirmed formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded (FFPE) specimens from 296 HCC patients, containing 296 cancerous tissues and 262 adjacent normal tissues, were collected from Eastern Hepatobiliary Surgery Hospital, Second Military Medical University, Shanghai between 2007 and 2009. Two tissue cores with diameters of 1.0 mm were taken from each FFPE block. Baseline information on the specimen donors, including age, sex, liver function, tumor grade, tumor size, vessel invasion, satellite lesions and the status of hepatitis B virus (HBV) infection (HBsAg and HBeAg), was also documented, as shown in Table S1. Follow-up information on patients with HCC was collected following a standard procedure as previously described.\(^32\) In this study, the outcomes of interest were disease-free survival (DFS) and overall survival (OS). DFS was defined as the months from the date of surgery to the date of HCC relapse, and OS was defined as the months from the date of surgery to the date of death due to any disease. All patients provided written informed
consent, and the study had also been approved by the hospital (Research ID: EHBHKY2019-01-001).

### 2.3 Immunohistochemistry (IHC)

Tissue microarrays (TMAs) from the FFPE specimens of patients were commercially developed (Outdo Biotech). Rabbit polyclonal antibody against NQO1 (1:200, HPA007308, Sigma) was used according to the manufacturer’s protocol. Immune staining was performed simultaneously on all arrays to eliminate interassay variation. Levels of NQO1 staining were evaluated using an H-score method, as previously described, and results were recorded as staining intensity (0, negative; 1, weakly positive; 2, moderately positive; 3, strongly positive) multiplied by the percent of tumor-positive area (0%-100%). Two observers (YY and JZ) blinded to the clinical status of the donor independently assessed the H-score of each tissue dot, and the scores of the 2 observers were averaged for analysis. Any controversial cases (defined as a difference in IHC scores more than 10% of the average score) were jointly re-evaluated until a consensus was reached.

### 2.4 Cell lines, quantitative RT-PCR and western blot analysis

Human HCC cells (Huh7, Hep3B and HepG2) were purchased from the Cell Bank of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (Shanghai, China). All cell lines were authenticated using short tandem repeat (STR) analysis. Details regarding cell culture, quantitative RT-PCR and western blot analysis are included in Supplementary Material 2.

### 2.5 Knockdown or overexpression of NQO1 in HCC cells

The control siRNAs and siRNAs targeting NQO1 transcripts, as shown in Table S2, were synthesized by Shanghai Invitrogen. Using the Lipofectamine RNAiMAX reagent (Invitrogen), the siRNAs were transfected into HCC cells at a final concentration of 20 nmol/L. Based on the NQO1-siRNA sequence, microRNA (miR)-30-mediated shRNA (Table S2) was designed and synthesized as previously described. The template was subjected to PCR amplification with primers containing XhoI or EcoRI restriction sites. PCR products were purified and cloned into the pInducer 10 vector. For the process of overexpression of NQO1, the complete cDNA sequence of NQO1 (NCBI reference sequence: NM_000903) was first synthesized and confirmed commercially (Obio Technology). cDNA products were subcloned into the pENTR™ 3C entry vector, and the NQO1 sequence was then Gateway-recombined into the pinducer 10 vector. Then, lentiviral particles were produced in HEK293T cells using the Lenti-X™ HTX Packaging System (Clontech Laboratories, Inc) and titrated with HCC cells in medium to achieve optimal knockdown or overexpression of the target protein with minimal viral load. Finally, NQO1 expression in cells with NQO1 knocked down or overexpressed was verified by qPCR (primers shown in Table S2) and western blot analysis, respectively.

### 2.6 Cell growth, migration, and invasion assays

Cells with knocked down or overexpressed NQO1 were used in a series of experiment for function assays. Details regarding the assay of cell viability, colony formation, wound healing, migration, and invasion for HCC cells in vitro are included in Supplementary Material 2. Three inhibitors, including ML385 (HY-100523, MCE), SCH772984 (HY-50846, MCE) and SB202190 (HY-10295, MCE), were also used to examine the functional associations between NQO1 expression and NRF2, ERK, or p38 signaling based on the assays above.

### 2.7 In vivo tumor growth

Male BALB/c nude mice (5-6 wk old) were purchased from SLAC Laboratory Animal Co. Prior to being injected with HCC cells, the mice were acclimated in a pathogen-free facility. Then, constructed Hep3B cells with stable shNQO1 or shCont expression and constructed HepG2 with stable overexpression of NQO1 or controls were injected subcutaneously into the flanks of nude mice (5 × 10^6 cells/mouse), respectively. These mice constituted the treatment and control groups (5 mice per group). Inhibitor of NRF2 signaling (ML385, 30 mg/kg) and/or the inhibitor of ERK signaling (SCH772984, 25 mg/kg) were also used to treat the tumors. At 10 d after cell injection, tumor size was determined by external measurements every 3 or 4 d and tumor volume was calculated using the following formula: tumor volume = 1/2(length (mm) × width (mm))^3. The mice were sacrificed after 24-28 d, and tumor xenografts were harvested. All procedures were performed according to the National Research Council’s Guide for the Care and Use of Laboratory Animals.

### 2.8 Statistical analysis

To compare NQO1 expression between HCC and adjacent normal tissues, we used independent-sample t tests for non-paired samples and paired t tests for paired samples. Categorical data, such as sex and tumor differentiation grade were compared and analyzed using a χ² test or Mann-Whitney U test. In the survival analysis, patient subgroups, which were divided using maxstat software according to NQO1 mRNA or protein levels, were evaluated using Kaplan-Meier curves and Cox proportional hazards models. A log-rank test was used to test the statistical significance of the Kaplan-Meier curves. Boolean analysis was also used to explore the association between the status of NQO1 expression and the dependence scores of each of more than 17 000 genes across 325 cells based on the CERES database. All statistical tests were
two-sided and were performed using R software v.3.3.0 and SPSS v.16.0.2 for Windows (SPSS). Statistical significance was set at \( P < .05 \).

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | Elevated NQO1 expression in HCC

The expression pattern of NQO1 in HCC was first explored with a bioinformatics method among 3 data sets (GSE14520, GSE36376, and TCGA-LIHC) with transcriptional profiling. As shown in Figure 1A, NQO1 expression was consistently elevated in HCC tissues (all \( P < .001 \)) compared with that in normal tissues among the 3 cohorts. Using the 97.5% quantile of NQO1 expression among normal tissues as the cut-off values, we found that 44.8%, 36.3% and 39.8% of the patients in the GSE14520, GSE36376, and TCGA-LIHC cohorts had NQO1 expression levels greater than the corresponding cutoffs, which indicated a significant cancer-specific expression pattern. Considering the significance of different cancer types, we found that the differential expression of NQO1 between HCC and corresponding normal tissues was one of the most significant changes observed among 14 cancer types based on TCGA database (Figure S1). Expression profiles of whole tissues may distort information about NQO1 expression in liver epithelial cells due to the presence of transcripts from mixed cell populations. We further examined the expression pattern of NQO1 in epithelial cells and investigated the IHC staining profile of the NQO1 protein in tissue specimens. Based on the IHC examination, we found that the NQO1 protein was mainly expressed in the cytoplasm of liver epithelial cells (Figure 1B). The IHC scores of NQO1 protein in HCC cells (\( n = 296 \)) were significantly elevated (\( P < .01 \)) compared with those in noncancerous cells (\( n = 262 \)) (Figure 1C), and 262 paired cancerous and normal cells also showed significant differences for NQO1 in IHC scores (Figure 1D). The results at both the transcript and protein levels in tissue specimens consistently showed that NQO1 may be involved in the development of HCC.

3.2 | High levels of NQO1 expression in HCC predict poor survival

NQO1 protein immunostaining and survival information from the Shanghai cohort were used to investigate the prognostic value of NQO1. With the maxstat algorithm focused on DFS, we identified an IHC score of 75 as the optimal cut-value to define patient subgroups with high (\( n = 101 \)) or low NQO1 protein expression levels (\( n = 195 \)), which have the most significant discriminatory ability for determining survival. Using this cut-off value, NQO1 expression was found to be significantly associated with multiple nodes (\( P = .015 \)), satellite lesions (\( P = .022 \)) and microvessel invasion (\( P = .020 \)), as shown in supplementary Table S1, all of which indicate the aggressiveness of HCC. Kaplan-Meier analysis showed that patients with a NQO1-high tumor (IHC score > 75) had shorter DFS and OS compared with patients with NQO1-low tumor (IHC score ≤ 75) (Figure 2). Stronger NQO1 immunostaining intensity, positive HBsAg, positive HBeAg, less differentiation grade, larger tumor size, greater tumor number, and the presence of microvessel invasion are all risk factors for poor DFS and OS, as shown in Table 1. The multivariate Cox model analysis, containing the significant factors listed above, showed that high expression of NQO1 was an independent risk factor for DFS and OS, with a hazard ratio (HR) of 2.032 (95% confidence interval (CI), 1.483-2.785; \( P < .001 \)) and 1.507 (95% CI, 1.059-2.144; \( P = .023 \)), respectively, as shown in Table 1.

The prognostic value of NQO1 expression in HCC was further verified in 2 publicly available data sets (TCGA-LIHC and GSE14520). With the maxstat algorithm, we identified the optimal cut-off values of NQO1 transcript levels independently for the 2 cohorts considering the survival outcomes; the patients in each cohort were classified into subgroups with high or low levels of NQO1 expression according to the identified cut-off values. For the TCGA-LIHC survival cohort (\( n = 365 \)), Kaplan-Meier analysis showed that patients with NQO1-high tumors (log2 based expression >4.129) had shorter OS compared with patients with NQO1-low tumors (log2 based expression ≤4.129) (Figure 2). However, there was no significant difference regarding the DFS in the cohort. For the cohort of GSE14520 (\( n = 221 \)), Kaplan-Meier analysis showed that patients with NQO1-high tumors (log2 based expression >6.943) had shorter DFS and OS compared with patients with NQO1-low tumors (log2 based expression ≤6.943) (Figure 2). The results from the 2 cohorts were almost consistent with those obtained from the Shanghai cohort.

3.3 | Elevated NQO1 expression is significantly associated with DNA hypomethylation of NQO1 and NRF2 mutations

Elevated NQO1 expression in HCC may be caused by genetic and/or epigenetic variations of NQO1 and the aberrant activities of its upstream genes such as those in the KEAP1-NRF2 pathway.\(^{29,30,38}\) Based on TCGA-LIHC data from the UCSC Xena website, we found...
that there was no significant correlation between DNA copy number variants (CNVs) and the mRNA expression of NQO1 ($r = 0.092$, $P = 0.071$), as shown in supplementary Figure S2A. However, there was a large number of DNA methylation variations located in NQO1 and a significantly negative correlation was found between NQO1 mRNA expression and its DNA methylation sites, as shown in supplementary Figure S2A, indicating that NQO1 DNA hypomethylation may be one of the factors leading to elevated NQO1 expression in HCC. The transcriptional levels of NQO1 may be affected by the expression levels and mutations of KEAP1 or NRF2; therefore, we next investigated the associations between NQO1 expression and the expression levels and mutations of KEAP1 and NRF2. The correlation analysis between NQO1 expression and KEAP1 or NRF2 mRNA expression showed no significant associations (all $P > 0.05$), reflecting the complex regulation mechanism of NQO1 expression via KEAP1 and NRF2 regulators. Mutations of KEAP1/NRF2 are common, so we explored the associations between the somatic mutations of the 2 genes and NQO1 expression in HCC. We found that the specimens with NRF2 mutations, located in the domains that encompass the DLG and ETGE motifs (amino acids 24-34 and 75-82, respectively) that bind KEAP1, had higher NQO1 expression levels compared with those with mutations located other regions ($P = 0.032$, Figure S2B). However, we could not find any obvious associations between KEAP1 mutations and NQO1 expression in HCC, and only observed that the specimens with mutations located at amino acids 271 and 278 had the higher expression levels of NQO1 compared with those with mutations in other locations (Figure S2B). The above results suggested that DNA hypomethylation of NQO1 and some NRF2 mutations may be responsible for the higher expression level of NQO1 in HCC.

### 3.4 | NQO1 promotes the growth and aggressiveness of HCC cells

Considering the increased expression of NQO1 in HCC, we first investigated the effects of NQO1 knockdown on HCC cells. The NQO1 siRNA duplexes (siRNA) were tested in Huh7, Hep3B, and HepG2 cells, as shown in Figure 3A, B, and the result showed that NQO1 expression (mRNA and protein) in all cells was markedly inhibited by the siRNAs. Next, we assessed whether the proliferation,
| Variables                                      | DFS                           | OS                           |
|------------------------------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------------------|
|                                                | Univariate analysis           | Multivariate analysis        | Univariate analysis           | Multivariate analysis        |
| NQO1 staining (high vs low)                     | 2.108 (1.561-2.849)           | .001                         | 1.533 (1.087-2.161)           | .015                         |
| Age (>60 vs ≤60 y)                              | 0.934 (0.653-1.334)           | .706                         | 0.804 (0.527-1.227)           | .312                         |
| Gender (female vs male)                         | 0.974 (0.776-1.224)           | .824                         | 0.899 (0.694-1.140)           | .353                         |
| AFP (>400 vs ≤400 ng/mL)                        | 1.291 (0.942-1.768)           | .112                         | 1.138 (0.799-1.620)           | .474                         |
| HBsAg (positive vs negative)                    | 2.248 (1.300-3.886)           | .004                         | 2.447 (1.243-4.815)           | .010                         |
| HBeAg (positive vs negative)                    | 1.616 (1.152-2.267)           | .005                         | 1.585 (1.088-2.310)           | .017                         |
| Liver function (B vs A)                         | 0.859 (0.668-1.103)           | .233                         | 0.830 (0.629-1.094)           | .186                         |
| Differentiation (low/poor vs medium/ high)      | 2.108 (1.144-3.884)           | .017                         | 1.894 (1.001-3.585)           | .050                         |
| Tumor size (>5 vs ≤5 cm)                        | 1.530 (1.126-2.080)           | .007                         | 1.900 (1.327-2.721)           | <.001                        |
| Tumor number (multiple vs single)               | 1.496 (1.050-2.213)           | .026                         | 1.681 (1.143-2.472)           | .008                         |
| Satellite lesion (yes vs no)                    | 1.190 (0.843-1.681)           | .322                         | 1.010 (0.691-1.475)           | .959                         |
| Micro-vessels invasion (yes vs no)              | 1.487 (1.084-2.040)           | .014                         | 1.134 (0.809-1.589)           | .465                         |

Abbreviations: AFP, alpha fetal protein; CI, confidence interval; DFS, disease-free survival; HR, hazard ratio; OS, overall survival. Significance was defined as \( P < 0.05 \) (in bold).
colony formation, migration, and invasion of HCC cells were affected by NQO1 knockdown. The results showed that compared with the effects of control siRNA, NQO1 siRNA significantly reduced the proliferation, colony formation, migration, and invasion abilities of HCC cells (Huh7, Hep3B and/or HepG2) (all \( P < 0.01 \)), as shown in Figure 3C-E. The inhibitory effects on HCC proliferation were also observed when we used the drug dicoumarin, which is an inhibitor of NQO1 (Figure S3). Furthermore, we overexpressed NQO1 in 2 HCC cell lines (Huh7, Hep3B) (Figure S4A,B) to verify the function of NQO1. As shown in Figure S4C-F, overexpression of NQO1 significantly promoted the growth and aggressiveness phenotypes of HCC cells. In addition, the knockdown or overexpression of NQO1 also resulted in delayed or accelerated wound healing of targeted HCC cells, respectively, as shown in Figure S5A,B. Therefore, our data consistently suggested that a high level of NQO1 expression promotes the growth and aggressiveness of HCC cells.

### 3.5 | NQO1 promotes the growth of HCC in an animal model

To investigate the effect of NQO1 on tumorigenicity in vivo, we first constructed stable Hep3B cells with the NQO1-shRNA and control cells with the vector-shRNA. Knockdown of NQO1 expression was verified, as shown in Figure 4A. Next, we injected Hep3B-NQO1-shRNA cells, and control cells into nude mice, respectively. During the first 6 d from the start time of observation, no significant difference in tumor size was observed between the test and control groups. However, the tumors with NQO1 knocked down appeared...
to grow more slowly starting at approximately the 9th d (Figure 4B)
post-injection compared with the tumors in the control group.
Tumor size (Figure 4B) was significantly smaller in NQO1 shRNA-
expressing mice compared with the control animals from 9 d to 27 d
post-injection, and the final weights obtained for the isolated tumors
confirmed the significant reduction caused by NQO1 knockdown
(Figure 4C). Therefore, low NQO1 expression reduced tumor growth
in vivo. We also constructed cells stably overexpressing NOQ1 in
HepG2 and the corresponding control cells (Figure 4D). Consistent
with above results, higher NQO1 expression in HCC cells resulted in
the rapid growth of the tumors in mice, which was sustained to the
end of the experiment (Figure 4E,F). Therefore, both knockdown and
overexpression of NQO1 in HCC cells consistently supported that
conclusion that NQO1 serves as an oncogene during HCC growth
in vivo.

3.6 | NQO1 accelerates HCC growth by promoting
ERK/p38-NRF2 signaling

To explore the pathways effected by NQO1 expression, we com-
pared the differences in gene dependence scores of more 17 000
genes across 325 cell lines based on the CERES database consid-
ering the expression status of NQO1 (high or low expression).
Interestingly, we found that the cells most sensitive to NRF2 knock-
down were almost all those with high levels of NQO1 expression,
as shown in Figure 5A, and the pattern was reiterated in the re-
main ing 13 HCC cells (Figure 5B). This pattern suggested that the
effect of NRF2 knockdown may depend on expression status of
NQO1. Furthermore, we found that knockdown of NQO1 in HCC
cells significantly reduced the levels of p-NRF2 (Figure 5C) and vice
versa (Figure 5D), indicating that NQO1 may activate NRF2 via a
positive feedback mechanism. Therefore, we explored the effect of
NQO1 on the upstream molecules of NRF2 signaling, such as ERK
and p38. Interestingly, the results showed that NQO1 knockdown
in HCC cells significantly reduced the activation of p-ERK and p-p38
(Figure 5C), and its overexpression increased the levels of these pro-
teins (Figure 5D). As we expected, the xenograft tumors with NQO1
overexpression had higher expression of p-ERK and p-NRF2 com-
pared with that in those tumors with the control NQO1, as shown
in Figure S6. The results above indicated that elevated NQO1 ampli-
fies tNRF2 signaling with a positive feedback through activated ERK
signaling.

3.7 | ERK and NRF2 inhibitors significantly inhibited
HCC especially with NQO1-high

Furthermore, we compared the role of the block of NRF2 and ERK
signaling with their inhibitors on the HCC with overexpressed NQO1
(NQO1-high) or control NQO1 (NQO1-low). As expected, we found
that the xenografts tumors with NQO1-high had the faster growth
compared with those tumors with NQO1-low (Figure 6A). However, inhibition with SCH772984, ML385, or both generated relative more small tumor sizes in the groups with NQO1-high compared with that in the groups with NQO1-low (Figure 6A), indicating more significant effects of these treatments in HCC with NQO1-high expression compared with NQO1-low. Combined block consistently generated the strongest inhibition among all treatment subgroups with either NQO1-high tumors or NQO1-low tumors (Figure 6A). Moreover, the result above was confirmed using the isolated final tumors from all subgroups, as shown in Figure 6B. However, the combined effect of the 2 inhibitors on HCC was more obvious in NQO1-high tumors compared with HCC with NQO1-low. Combined block consistently generated the strongest inhibition among all treatment subgroups with either NQO1-high tumors or NQO1-low tumors (Figure 6A).

FIGURE 5  NQO1-regulated NRF2 signaling by a feedback loop. A, Effect of NRF2 knockdown depending on the expression status of NQO1 across 300 cancer cells. B, Effect of NRF2 knockdown depending on the expression status of NQO1 in HCC cells. C, Knockdown of NQO1 suppresses the activation of NRF2 and ERK/p38 signaling in HCC cells. D, Overexpression of NQO1 increases the activation of NRF2 and ERK/p38 signaling in HCC cells.

HepG2 and Huh7 cells consistently showed that the combination of ML385 and SCH772984 generated the strongest inhibition effects among all tested subgroups (Figure 6D), which supported a combined block of NRF2 and ERK signaling in HCC treatments. In addition, we also combined ML385 with SB202190 (an inhibitor for p38 signaling) for the joint effect on the colony formation of HCC, and found that the combination resulted in the strongest inhibition effects among all tested subgroups (Figure S7), supporting that a block of p38 signaling sensitizes the role of NRF2 inhibition on HCC growth suppression.

4 | DISCUSSION

NQO1 is a xenobiotic metabolizing enzyme that detoxifies chemicals and antioxidants, providing protection for normal tissues. However, high expression levels of NQO1 have been reported in multiple human malignancies,6-9,18-23 indicating a role in carcinogenesis and...
In this study, we first explored the differences in NQO1 mRNA expression between HCC tissues and adjacent normal tissues using 3 publicly available data sets (GSE14520, GSE36376 and TCGA-LIHC), and consistently found that NQO1 expression was significantly elevated in cancerous lesions. This pattern of NQO1 expression was further confirmed at the protein level by IHC in samples from the Shanghai cohort. All these results were consistent with those from recent studies.23,26 More importantly, we noticed that approximately 36%-45% of HCC specimens expressed high levels of NQO1, which was much higher than the 97.5% quartile of expression levels in the normal specimen groups, suggesting a strong HCC-specific expression pattern that will provide new opportunities for HCC drugs that are highly efficient and relatively nontoxic.7,8 Recently, certain quinone compounds (such as mitomycin C, E09, RH1 and β-lapachone) have been shown to be cancer-specific drugs in tumors with high-NQO1,6-9 and have provided greater efficiency of treatment when combined with other drugs, such as PARP1 inhibitors.10,12 In addition, some quinone compounds can be marked with chemical fluorescence probes and used in imaging to diagnose cancers with high-NQO1 expression.7

The prognostic value of NQO1 expression was first evaluated in the Shanghai cohort. With an optimal IHC score of NQO1 identified by the maxstat algorithm as a cut-off value, we classified the patients into 2 subgroups, namely, NQO1-high and NQO1-low. The
Kaplan-Meier survival curves and log-rank tests showed that patients with NQO1-high tumors had shorter DFS and OS compared with patients with NQO1-low tumors, suggesting that high expression levels of NQO1 may lead to the aggressive characteristics in HCC. In line with these findings, high NQO1 expression levels were also positively associated with satellite lesions and the presence of microvessel invasion. To avoid distorting the prognostic value of NQO1, we further analyzed the association between NQO1 expression and patient survival with HBsAg status, HBeAg status, differentiation grade, tumor size, tumor number, and the presence of microvessel invasion adjusted for as confounding factors. The results clearly showed that HCC with NQO1-high expression was an independent risk factor for a shorter DFS and OS in the Shanghai cohort. Moreover, the survival analysis results from 2 publicly available HCC cohorts (GSE14520 and TCGA-LIHC) also strongly supported that the expression level of NQO1 served as a prognostic biomarker for HCC prognosis.

The change in the expression of genes in cancer may be caused by various mechanisms. We explored the reason for elevated NQO1 expression in HCC using multiple 'omics data from TCGA-LIHC specimens. Although the association between NQO1 expression and NQO1 CNVs was not significant, NQO1 expression and its DNA methylation were negatively correlated, suggesting that the hypomethylation of NQO1 DNA may contribute to higher expression levels of NQO1 in HCC. This result conflicts with those in previous reports, which have suggested that hypermethylation usually exists in the NQO1 promoter but is not consistent with the pattern of high expression level of NQO1 in HCC. Because NQO1 is a transcriptional target of KEAP1-NRF2, we investigated the association between NQO1 expression and the status of KEAP1 and NRF2. We found that NQO1 mRNA was not significantly associated with mRNA levels of KEAP1 and NRF2, possibly due to inconsistency between the mRNA and protein expression levels of KEAP1 and NRF2. Interestingly, we found that the specimens with mutations in NRF2, which were located in the DLG and the ETGE motifs (which bind KEAP1), had higher levels of NQO1 expression compared with those with mutations located in the other domains of NRF2, and which was consistent with these mutations removing the transcriptional suppression of NRF2 by KEAP1. However, we did not find any association between the mutations in KEAP1 and the mRNA levels of NQO1. Therefore, we hypothesized that DNA hypomethylation of NQO1 and the mutations located in the DLG or ETGE motifs of NRF2 may be responsible for the elevated NQO1 expression level in HCC. The accumulation of p62 in cancer has been verified to stabilize NRF2 and activate its target genes by disrupting the NRF2-KEAP1 interaction. Mutations located in NRF2 and KEAP1 frequently exist in HCC, and will activate NRF2 irrespective of the P62 status. Therefore, the regulation mechanism of NRF2 by p62 in HCC will be more complex and needs further study.

The biological function of NQO1 in HCC was further investigated. Knockdown of the gene significantly reduced the proliferation, colony formation, migration, and invasion abilities of 3 HCC cell lines. These results were consistent with those in a recent report. We also constructed HCC cells with stable overexpression of NQO1 and evaluated their biological function. As expected, the overexpression of NQO1 in HCC cells promoted the proliferation and aggressiveness of HCC cells. Moreover, we also verified the suppression of tumor growth by NQO1 knockdown using mouse xenograft models. These results in a functional assessment were consistent with clinical analysis, confirming the oncogenic function of NQO1 in HCC.

NQO1 is an important transcriptional target of NRF2, however, no study has investigated the effect of NQO1 on the activation of NRF2 transcription. Based on a publicly available database that contains the gene dependence scores of more than 17 000 genes across nearly 400 cells, we found that the sensitivities of cancer cells to the knockdown of NRF2 depended on the status of NQO1 expression and that the same pattern was observed in HCC cells. The results strongly suggested that high levels of NQO1 expression are necessary for the cells that are sensitive to NRF2 knockdown. Interestingly, we further found that NQO1 could elevate the level of p-NRF2 in HCC cells, and the results supported the conclusion that NQO1 plays a role in NRF2 activation via a positive feedback mechanism. Furthermore, in our study, the upstream activators of NRF2, such as ERK and p38, were also found to be activated by NQO1, suggesting that ERK/p38 serves as an important mediator for the feedback activation of NRF2 due to NQO1. Interestingly, a recent study also reported that high NQO1 in HCC may activate ERK and AKT signaling, partly consistent with our results. At the same time, enhanced ERK/p38 signaling also promotes cancer development and progression in combination with other signaling pathways. The results above suggested that the combination of the inhibitors of NRF2 and ERK signaling perhaps more effectively blocked the growth of HCC with NQO1-high tumors. Therefore, we tested the hypothesis with NQO1-high or NQO1-low expressing tumors and found that the combined inhibition with ML385 and SCH772984 generated more obviously inhibited effects on the NQO1-high tumors, although the effects from subgroups with NQO1-low tumors were also significantly. Effects also were observed in the assays of colony formation of 2 cell lines. This evidence further supported the idea that NQO1 may be a key mediator for amplification of NRF2-ERK signaling in HCC.

In summary, we systematically investigated the clinical significance and biological role of NQO1 and provided some clues regarding its elevated expression and function in HCC. NQO1 may be a potential prognostic biomarker for the risk stratification of HCC patients. Significantly higher expression of NQO1 in HCC tissues compared with normal tissues provides many opportunities for early diagnosis and HCC-specific treatment with NQO1–substrate-related chemical probes or drugs. Targeting NQO1 expression reduces the growth and aggressiveness of HCC, suggesting that an oncogenic role is played by NQO1 in HCC tumorigenesis. Notably, NQO1 may amplify ERK/p38-NRF2 signaling, supported by the strongest inhibition effects derived from combined block of NRF2 and ERK signaling among all tested subgroups. We conclude that NQO1 may be a promising prognostic and predictive biomarker with potential use as a therapeutic target in HCC.
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