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Abstract
Complete sequences of animal genomes have revealed a remarkably small and conserved toolbox of signalling pathways, such as TGF-β and WNT that account for all biological diversity. This raises the question as to how such a limited set of cues elaborates so many diverse cell fates and behaviours. It is now clear that components of signalling pathways are physically assembled into higher order networks that ultimately dictate the biological output of pathway activity. Intertwining of pathways is thus emerging as a key feature of a large, integrated and coordinated signalling network that allows cells to read a limited set of extrinsic cues, but mount the diverse responses that underpin successful development and homeostasis. Moreover, this design principle confounds the development of effective therapeutic interventions in complex diseases, such as cancer.

The TGF-β and WNT pathways
Transforming growth factor-beta (TGF-β) was initially discovered in a hunt for autocrine factors that might enhance transformation of normal cells [1,2]. Surprisingly, it soon became apparent that this "transforming" factor regulated myriad diverse and often contradictory cellular responses, most famously as both a potent wound-healing factor [3] and a putative tumour-suppressing antiproliferative factor [4]. The rapid expansion of the TGF-β family to include Activins, Nodals and bone morphogenetic proteins (BMPs) led to an explosion of studies showing key roles for these factors in virtually every facet of developmental biology and homeostasis [5-11]. In the 1990s, efforts to identify TGF-β superfamilly receptors and intracellular mediators were anxiously pursued with the expectation that knowledge of the molecular components of the pathway would help illuminate how such diversity in biological responses was achieved. Identification of the TGF-β cell-surface receptors as a family of transmembrane serine/threonine (Ser/Thr) kinases, classified as type I or type II receptors, revealed that engagement of distinct combinations of type I/II receptor complexes, aided in some cases by ancillary proteins such as betaglycan or endoglin [12], provided for some diversity of responses. However, the genome contains surprisingly few very closely related receptors, challenging the notion that diversity of responses might be explained by a similarly diverse set of receptors. Even more streamlined is the Smad family of intracellular proteins [13]. Smads are direct receptor substrates that, upon phosphorylation, accumulate in the nucleus to regulate transcription through interactions with DNA-binding partners. While non-Smad pathways that were subsequently uncovered are important for aspects of cell behaviour such as polarity and motility [14], the Smad pathway is key for directing TGF-β transcriptional responses. Moreover, the limited set of Ser/Thr kinase receptors in fact funnel signals from multiple ligands to one of only two classes of receptor-regulated Smads, R-Smad2/3 for TGF-β-like ligands or R-Smad1, 5 and 8 for BMP-like ligands, confounding efforts to explain complexity through a diversity of signalling pathways.

The first member of the WNT (Wingless-type MMTV integration site) family of secreted factors was described 30 years ago [15], roughly at the same time as TGF-β [1].
One arm of WNT signalling, the so-called canonical pathway, signals through β-catenin, whose protein levels are controlled by a destruction complex comprising proteins that include adenomatous polyposis coli (APC), Axin, Dishevelled and glycogen synthase kinase 3 (GSK3) [16-18]. WNT stimulation induces stabilization of β-catenin that in turn, and like Smads, accumulates in the nucleus, where it promotes transcription in partnership with the DNA binding factors lymphoid enhancer binding factor/T-cell-specific transcription factor (Lef1/TCF). In fact, while the molecular components of morphogen signalling pathways including TGF-β, WNT, Notch, Hedgehog and the Hippo tissue size control pathway discussed below might bear little molecular resemblance, membrane and/or cytosolic regulation of a transcriptional modulator is a shared principle. Similarly, the concept that cellular outcomes are significantly impacted by interactions with other signalling cascades is another common theme. The specific molecular components that mediate inter-pathway communication are varied and a description of these encompasses a huge literature. Here, we will focus on some of the general features of pathway crosstalk using examples from the TGF-β and WNT pathways, and then extend our discussion to recent advances on how these pathways interconnect with the Hippo tissue size and growth control pathway.

Pathways communicate with each other through a variety of mechanisms

Signalling pathway crosstalk allows for maximal plasticity and versatility in cellular responses. There are myriad ways in which crosstalk is molecularly manifested, with points of regulation occurring throughout the signalling cascade from the extracellular space right through to the nucleus. Here, a few illustrative examples of how signalling pathways are integrated will be discussed using TGF-β and WNT as examples, with the details more extensively reviewed elsewhere [19-21].

Perhaps the simplest form of signal integration occurs when activation of one signalling pathway regulates the transcription of the ligand or key components of the second pathway, thereby amplifying or attenuating signalling. For instance, in numerous developmental contexts, BMP and WNT ligands cross-regulate each other, thus controlling the extracellular milieu, or “niche”, and hence cellular responses [22-24]. However, this type of “crosstalk at a distance” probably does not provide sufficiently dynamic mechanisms to allow for the complex contextual responses that are required by sophisticated biological systems. For this, more intimate pathway integration is required, and many studies have uncovered a wealth of direct physical interactions between pathway components. One way in which these physical links modulate responses is via synergistic convergence of pathways on a common target. Indeed, TGF-β-regulated Smads and the WNT mediator β-catenin can interact and converge on a common DNA binding partner, Lef/TCF to cooperatively induce expression of genes that control cell fate. For instance, simultaneous stimulation of Smads and β-catenin, whose pathways display overlapping activation in the Xenopus Spemann organizer, serves to localize and control expression of organizer-specific genes such as Siamois and XTwn during gastrulation [25,26], while in mammalian cells, examples of cooperative Smad/β-catenin targets include Mx2, Myc and CTGF [27-29]. This type of cooperativity is particularly important for ensuring that expression of master regulators that initiate cell fate decisions is tightly constrained to the appropriate time and place.

Sharing, however, can also be a means of inhibiting pathway responsiveness in the context of integrated signalling. For example, distinct arms of a signalling pathway may use the same component. In the case of WNT, Dishevelled proteins are important for both the canonical β-catenin and the non-canonical β-catenin-independent planar cell polarity (PCP) arms of the pathway [30-32], while in the TGF-β family, the common Smad Smad4 is required for both the BMP and TGF-β branches of the Smad cascade. Component sharing between distinct pathways is also well known, an example being the WNT negative regulator Axin, a core component of the β-catenin destruction complex, which has also been reported to associate with various Smads to modulate TGF-β signalling [33,34]. Competition for limiting levels of these common components has been proposed to mediate inhibitory crosstalk, such as the well-described ability of non-canonical WNT signalling to inhibit the canonical β-catenin pathway and the antagonistic interactions between TGF-βs and BMPs. However, it is important to note that identification of a point of crosstalk does not equate to a universal mechanism of cross-regulation. For instance, β-catenin is also a functional component of cell-cell adhesion complexes and is localized to the plasma membrane, but this function appears to be distinct from its role in WNT signalling [35]. Similarly, GSK3-mediated phosphorylation of β-catenin is required for promoting β-catenin degradation, and phosphorylation of GSK3 on a serine within its amino terminus by phosphatidylinositide-3 (PI3) kinase-activated pathways inhibits GSK3 activity [36]. This might lead to the assumption that PI3 kinase must always modulate WNT signalling. However, several studies indicate that there are distinct pools of GSK3 that compartmentalize its function and, thus, PI3 kinase-dependent inhibition is not universally manifested in all GSK3 activities [37-40].
Degradation of key signalling components is another commonly reiterated theme in the context of pathway crosstalk. The E3 HECT-domain ubiquitin ligases, Smurfs, were originally characterized for their ability to mediate degradation of Smads and receptor complexes in the TGF-β pathway [41-43]. Interestingly, Smurf antagonism of Smad signalling also synergizes with mitogen-activated protein (MAP) kinase signalling which, together with WNT/GSK3, leads to hyperphosphorylation of Smads, which then promotes Smurf association and Smad degradation [44,45]. Importantly, this link is critical for modulating Smad activity in certain biological contexts, such as epidermal and neural patterning in Xenopus and osteoblast differentiation in mammalian cells. Smurfs can also associate with Par6, a complex that functions both in TGF-β-induced epithelial to mesenchymal transitions and in the non-canonical WNT pathway to induce localized degradation of PCP pathway components [46,47], thus providing a key node that coordinates cell fate with planar polarity. In summary, these examples of multiple and diverse contacts between TGF-β and WNT pathways point to a molecular framework of pathway integration that is structured to allow for maximal plasticity and versatility in cellular responses.

**Hippo, TGF-β and WNT crosstalk is context-dependent**

In order to properly form tissues and organs, cells must not only integrate morphogenic signals provided by TGF-β, WNTs and other factors but also must incorporate information on the status of control pathways that govern overall cell and tissue growth. The Hippo pathway, initially identified in Drosophila, but well conserved in mammals, is one such pathway that acts as a major regulator of tissue growth and organ size [48-54]. Activation of the Hippo pathway, such as through cell-cell contact or upon polarization of epithelial cells, activates a cascade comprising the core kinases MST1/2 (encoded by the STK3 and STK4 genes) and LATS1/2 (Large tumor suppressor, homolog 1/2) that leads to phosphorylation of the related proteins TAZ (transcriptional co-activator with PDZ-binding motif) and YAP (Yes-associated protein), resulting in their cytoplasmic retention. In the absence of Hippo signalling, TAZ/YAP accumulate in the nucleus and in complex with various DNA binding factors, including TEADs (TEA domain family members) and Runx2 (runt related transcription factor 2), amongst others, that promote transcription of numerous target genes. Thus, unlike the TGF-β and WNT pathways that promote the nuclear activity of their respective mediators, Smads and β-catenin, activation of the Hippo pathway serves to turn off the nuclear functions of TAZ/YAP (see Figure 1). However, similar to the TGF-β and WNT pathways, a key transcriptional role for TAZ/YAP, primarily in cooperation with TEADS, in regulating stem and progenitor cell maintenance and differentiation has emerged [55-66].

The upstream components and mechanisms whereby Hippo pathway activation is linked to cell density sensing are still under intensive investigation, but convergence of this pathway with those of TGF-β and WNT has been firmly established [50,51,53,67,68]. TAZ/YAP interact with the TGF-β-regulated Smads and, when Hippo is activated, the cytoplasmically localized TAZ/YAP prevents Smad nuclear accumulation and transcriptional activity [69]. In epithelial cells, this is critically dependent on the assembly of the Crumbs complex, which is a late event during establishment of apical-basal polarity and, thus, provides a sensor of cell density [70-76]. Consequently, in dense cells, Hippo activation and sequestration of TAZ/YAP and, in turn, Smads blunts transcriptional responses to TGF-β to prevent epithelial-to-mesenchymal transitions. Other components of polarity complexes, such as Scribble and cadherins [77-79], have also been linked to regulation of TAZ/YAP, indicating an intimate link

---

**Figure 1. Integration of Cell Signalling Pathways into Higher Order Networks Sculpts Transcriptional Landscapes**

A simplified schematic of Hippo, TGF-β and WNT pathway interactions is shown. Each of the indicated pathways converge on transcriptional modulators that act in the nucleus to regulate transcription of target genes by interacting with DNA-binding partners, a selection of which are indicated (lowest cluster). Extensive physical interactions between Smads, β-catenin and TAZ/YAP (nuclear halo of components) describe a network of extensive crosstalk that provides for contextual transcriptional responses. In the presence of Hippo pathway activity, TAZ/YAP are sequestered in the cytosol, where they limit both TGF-β and WNT-β-catenin activity.
between cell-cell adhesion, polarity and Hippo pathway activity. Similar to observations in cultured cells, during early embryogenesis in mice, TAZ/YAP localization varies. In the blastocyst, TAZ/YAP is nuclear in trophectoderm precursors where it induces Cdx2 and the trophoblast fate, while in the inner cell mass it is cytosolic [55]. Importantly, this differential localization reflects and defines regions of active nuclear Smad complexes in inner cells that are exposed to the TGF-β-like ligand called Nodal [73]. Thus, interference with Hippo activity in the inner cell mass leads to concomitant nuclear accumulation of both TAZ/YAP and Smads. In the nucleus, a second important function of pathway crosstalk is manifested as TAZ/YAP cooperate with Smads to promote activation of specific target genes. Many of these cooperative targets control maintenance of stem cell pluripotency or induce differentiation. In human embryonic stem (ES) cells, cooperation of TAZ with Smad2/3 is required for TGF-β-like ligands to maintain pluripotency [69], while YAP, in partnership with Smad1, supports BMP maintenance of mouse ES cells and is required for BMP-induced osteoblastic differentiation of mesenchymal stem cells [56,80].

The composition of these Smad and TAZ/YAP-containing activation complexes, particularly with respect to the DNA-binding partners that are responsible for recruitment to specific target genes, is an important question requiring further investigation. However, it is known that TAZ recruits the mediator complex [69] and the TGF-β-regulated CTGF gene is induced by a YAP-TEAD4-Smad3-p300 promoter-bound complex [81]. Thus, by functioning to both control Smad nuclear accumulation and synergize transcriptionally in the nucleus, TAZ/YAP provides a mechanism to couple TGF-β Smad activity to Hippo pathway activity and cell density sensing.

Intimate connections between the Hippo and WNT/β-catenin pathways have also been delineated, in which Hippo activity antagonizes WNT signalling. Genetic manipulation of Hippo pathway components in both Drosophila and mice showed that this crosstalk is evident in diverse tissue and organ contexts. TAZ knockout mice have polycystic kidneys [82-84] that display increased levels of cytoplasmic β-catenin [85]. Heart-specific knockout of Salvador, [86], an MST1 binding protein, or ablation of the expression of MST1/2 in the intestine [87], result in nuclear accumulation of YAP and increased expression of WNT/β-catenin target genes. Moreover, during intestinal regeneration, transgenic overexpression of YAP restricts WNT signals, while loss of YAP leads to WNT hypersensitivity [88]. In Drosophila, a link between Wingless, a WNT family ligand, and Yorkie, the ortholog of TAZ/YAP, in patterning of imaginal discs has also been established [67,85,89]

Several molecular mechanisms have been proposed to explain how loss of Hippo pathway activity might promote WNT signalling. We described a mechanism in which TAZ binds and inhibits phosphorylation of the cytoplasmically localized WNT/β-catenin pathway component Dishevelled to dampen WNT signalling [85]. In the intestinal regeneration model, YAP binding to Dishevelled was shown to act to restrict Dishevelled nuclear translocation during regenerative growth [88]. Thus, Hippo pathway activation by cell-cell contact, for example, enforces cytoplasmic localization of TAZ/YAP, thereby attenuating WNT signalling through a cytoplasmic mechanism.

In certain developmental contexts, such as trophoderm cells in the blastocyst, or in cancer cells where contact-dependent growth inhibition is bypassed, the absence of Hippo activity results in cells that display high levels of nuclear TAZ/YAP. TAZ/YAP can also interact with β-catenin, and exactly as delineated for TGF-β Smads, in the nucleus it can cooperate with β-catenin to promote the transcriptional activation of a panel of target genes [86,87,90]. Thus, upon loss of Hippo pathway activity, this nuclear activity reinforces WNT-induced gene responses. However, the recurring concept of context-dependence arises yet again, as this transcriptional enhancement cannot be generalized to all gene targets, but rather is only relevant to a subset of genes. For instance, a recent report has shown that in β-catenin-driven cancers, β-catenin and YAP cooperate with TBX5 to transcriptionally activate only a subset of genes, including several anti-apoptotic targets that are essential for cancer cell transformation and survival [90]. Moreover, additional complexity in cellular responsiveness can arise from many other points of communication between WNT and Hippo pathways. The WNT/β-catenin pathway induces expression of CD44, which binds to Neurofibromatosis-2 (NF2; also known as Merlin) that, in turn, promotes Hippo activity to limit cell growth [91,92]. WNT/β-catenin signalling also induces YAP expression in colorectal cancer cells [93]. Also, a recent study reported that WNT signalling directly modulates TAZ, but not YAP, stability via β-catenin [94]. In contrast, in the study of β-catenin-driven cancers referred to above [90], only YAP (but not TAZ) was identified as cooperating with WNT to contribute to transformation. Thus, signalling outcomes may also depend on the relative levels of these two highly related proteins. Shared components such as GSK3 and CK1β/ε that can phosphorylate β-catenin, Dishevelled, TAZ/YAP, as well as βTrCP, the E3 ligase that promotes β-catenin and TAZ/YAP degradation, also provide for additional potential mechanisms of signal integration [84,95].
Thus, while it is clear that the Hippo pathway targets TAZ and YAP converge with TGF-β and WNT signaling pathways, the impact of Hippo activity on cellular responses to these important morphogens is very much dependent on context. Regardless of its complexity, it is clear that pathway crosstalk is key for the diverse cellular responses observed during development and homeostasis. Furthermore, as exemplified above for the TGF-β, WNT and Hippo pathways, even the nature, extent and response to this crosstalk can vary in a context-dependent manner.

**An integrated signalling network rather than individual signalling pathways**

The experimental *modus operandi* for investigating cell signalling still tends to focus on a single pathway. This often leads to disparate observations on biological functions that are highly dependent on the cell type and model system under investigation; for example, TGF-β signalling regulating both ES cell maintenance and cell fate determination. Therefore, it is increasingly clear that understanding biological diversity requires understanding signalling pathways not only as isolated entities but also as integrated higher order networks that form the molecular framework required for contextual responses. The establishment of these contextual signalling environments is what is ultimately critical for allowing cells to robustly mount appropriate biological outcomes in space and time. Moreover, the inherent dynamics of these systems also provide an adaptive reservoir for diseases, such as cancer, to circumvent targeted therapeutics and ultimately thwart our attempts to affect lasting cures. Taking a network-wide view will undoubtedly provide insights that more adequately describe how a limited toolbox of extrinsic cues modulates cellular outcomes and will enhance our understanding of the complex physiological and pathophysiological processes that act to disturb these networks.

**Abbreviations**

BMP, bone morphogenetic protein; GSK3, Glycogen Synthase Kinase 3; LATS1/2, Large tumor suppressor, homolog 1/2; Lef1/TCF, lymphoid enhancer binding factor/T-cell-specific transcription factor; MAP, mitogen-activated protein; PCP, planar cell polarity; PI3, phosphatidylinositide-3; TAZ, transcripational co-activator with PDZ-binding motif; TEADS, TEA domain family members; TGF-β, Transforming Growth Factor beta; WNT, (Wingless-type MMTV integration site); YAP, Yes-associated protein.

**Disclosures**

The authors declare that they have no disclosures.

**Acknowledgements**

We thank past and current members of our laboratories for discussions and contributions towards our understanding of signalling pathways. Work from the authors’ labs is supported by grants from the Canadian Institute for Health Research (CIHR), the Canadian Cancer Research Institute, the Terry Fox Research Institute and the Ontario government.

**References**

1. Anzano MA, Roberts AB, Meyers CA, Komoriya A, Lamb LC, Smith JM, Sporn MB: Synergistic interaction of two classes of transforming growth factors from murine sarcoma cells. Cancer Res 1982; 42:4776-8.

2. Massague J: Type beta transforming growth factor from feline sarcoma virus-transformed rat cells. Isolation and biological properties. J Biol Chem 1984; 259:9756-61.

3. Mustoe TA, Pierce GF, Thomason A, Gramates P, Sporn MB, Deuel TF: Accelerated healing of incisional wounds in rats induced by transforming growth factor-beta. Science 1987, 237:1333-6.

4. Tucker RF, Shipley GD, Moses HL, Holley RW: Growth inhibitor from BSC-1 cells closely related to platelet type beta transforming growth factor. Science 1984, 226:705-7.

5. Massague J: TGFbeta signalling in context. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol 2012, 13:616-30.

6. Weiss A, Attisano L: The TGFbeta Superfamily Signaling Pathway. WIREs Dev Biol 2013, 2:47-63.

7. Moustakas A, Heldin CH: The regulation of TGFbeta signal transduction. Development 2009, 136:3699-714.

8. Attisano L, Wrana JL: Signal transduction by the TGF-beta superfamily. Science 2002, 296:1646-7.

9. Bierie B, Moses HL: Tumour microenvironment: TGFbeta: the molecular Jekyll and Hyde of cancer. Nat Rev Cancer 2006, 6:506-20.

10. Feng XH, Derynck R: Specificity and versatility in tgf-beta signaling through Smads. Annu Rev Cell Dev Biol 2005, 21:659-93.

11. Schmierer B, Hill CS: TGFbeta-SMAD signal transduction: molecular specificity and functional flexibility. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol 2007, 8:970-82.

12. Bernabeu C, Lopez-Novoa JM, Quintanilla M: The emerging role of TGF-beta superfamily coreceptors in cancer. Biochim Biophys Acta 2009, 1792:954-73.

13. Ten Dijke P, Heldin C-H: Smad Signal Transduction. Smads in Proliferation, Differentiation and Disease. In Proteins and Cell Regulation. Volume 5. The Netherlands: Springer; 2006:472.

14. Mu Y, Gudey SK, Landstrom M: Non-Smad signaling pathways. Cell Tissue Res 2011, 347:11-20.

15. Nusse R, Varmus HE: Many tumors induced by the mouse mammary tumor virus contain a provirus integrated in the same region of the host genome. Cell 1982, 31:99-109.

16. Clevers H, Nusse R: Wnt/beta-catenin signaling and disease. Cell 2012, 149:1192-205.

17. MacDonald BT, Tamai K, He X: Wnt/beta-catenin signaling: components, mechanisms, and diseases. Dev Cell 2009, 17:9-26.
18. Nusse R, Varmus H: Three decades of Wnts: a personal perspective on how a scientific field developed. EMBO J 2012, 31:2670-84.
19. Minoo P, Li C: Cross-talk between transforming growth factor-beta and Wingless/int pathways in lung development and disease. The international journal of biochemistry & cell biology 2010, 42:809-12.
20. Attisano L, Labbe E: TGFbeta and Wnt pathway cross-talk. Cancer Metastasis Rev 2004, 23:53-61.
21. Guo X, Wang XF: Signaling cross-talk between TGF-beta/BMP and other pathways. Cell Res 2009, 19:71-88.
22. Shu W, Guttentag S, Wang Z, Andl T, Ballard P, Lu MM, Piccolo S, Birchmeier W, Whitsett JA, Millar SE, Morrissey EE: Wnt/beta-catenin signaling acts upstream of N-myc, BMP4, and FGF signaling to regulate proximal-distal patterning in the lung. Dev Biol 2005, 283:226-39.
23. Hoppler S, Moon RT: BMP-2/4 and Wnt-8 cooperatively pattern the Xenopus mesoderm. Mech Dev 1998, 71:19-29.
24. Kamiya N, Ye L, Kobayashi T, Mochida Y, Yamauchi M, Moses HL, Attisano L: Association of Smads with lymphoid enhancer binding factor 1/T cell-specific factor co-activators functionally interact with lymphoid-enhancing factor to regulate graded expression of Mxe2. J Biol Chem 2003, 278:48805-14.
25. Crease DJ, Dyson S, Gurdon JB: Cooperation between the activin and Wnt pathways in the spatial control of organizer gene expression. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 1998, 95:4398-403.
26. Labbe E, Letamendia A, Attisano L: Association of Smads with transforming growth factor-beta and Wnt pathways. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2000, 97:8358-63.
27. Hussein SM, Duff EK, Sirard C: Smad4 and beta-catenin co-activators functionally interact with lymphoid-enhancing factor to regulate graded expression of Mxe2. J Biol Chem 2003, 278:48805-14.
28. Hu MC, Romashklo ND: Smad1, beta-catenin and Tcf4 associate in a molecular complex with the Myc promoter in dysplastic renal tissue and cooperate to control Myc transcription. Development 2005, 132:215-25.
29. Labbe E, Lock L, Letamendia A, Gorska AE, Gryfe R, Gallinger S, Moses HL, Attisano L: Transcriptional cooperation between the transforming growth factor-beta and Wnt pathways in mammary and intestinal tumorigenesis. Cancer Res 2007, 67:75-84.
30. Bayly R, Axelrod JD: Pointing in the right direction: new developments in the field of planar cell polarity. Nat Rev Genet 2011, 12:385-91.
31. Goodrich LV, Strutt D: Principles of planar polarity in animal development. Development 2011, 138:1877-92.
32. Simons M, Mlodzik M: Planar cell polarity signaling: from fly development to human disease. Annu Rev Genet 2008, 42:517-40.
33. Guo X, Ramirez A, Waddell DS, Li Z, Liu X, Wang XF: Axin and GSK3- control Smad3 protein stability and modulate TGF-signaling. Genes & development 2008, 22:106-20.
34. Liu W, Rui H, Wang J, Lin S, He Y, Chen M, Li Q, Ye Z, Zhang S, Chan SC, Chen YG, Han J, Lin SC: Axin is a scaffold protein in TGF-beta-signaling that promotes degradation of Smad7 by Arkadia. EMBO J 2006, 25:1646-58.
35. Orsulic S, Peifer M: An in vivo structure-function study of armadillo, the beta-catenin homologue, reveals both separate and overlapping regions of the protein required for cell adhesion and for wingless signaling. J Cell Biol 1996, 134:1283-300.
36. Cohen P, Frame S: The renaissance of GSK3. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol 2001, 2:769-76.
37. Ng SS, Mahmoudi T, Danenberg E, Bejaoui I, de Lau W, Korswagen HC, Schutte M, Clevers H: Phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase signaling does not activate the wnt cascade. J Biol Chem 2009, 284:33508-13.
38. McManus EJ, Sakamoto K, Armit LJ, Ronaldson L, Shpiro N, Marquez R, Alessi DR: Role that phosphorylation of GSK3 plays in insulin and Wnt signalling defined by knockin analysis. EMBO J 2005, 24:1571-83.
39. Doble BW, Patel S, Wood GA, Kokeretz LK, Woodgett JR: Functional redundancy of GSK-3alpha and GSK-3beta in Wnt/beta-catenin signaling shown by using an allelic series of embryonic stem cell lines. Dev Cell 2007, 12:957-71.
40. Kaidanovich-Beilin O, Woodgett JR: GSK-3: Functional Insights from Cell Biology and Animal Models. Front Mol Neurosci 2011, 4:40.
41. Inoue Y, Imamura T: Regulation of TGF-beta family signaling by E3 ubiquitin ligases. Cancer science 2008, 99:2107-12.
42. Izzi L, Attisano L: Regulation of the TGFbeta signalling pathway by ubiquitin-mediated degradation. Oncogene 2004, 23:2071-8.
43. Zhu H, Kavak S, Abdullah S, Wrana J, Thomsen GH: A SMAD ubiquitin ligase targets the BMP pathway and affects embryonic pattern formation. Nature 1999, 400:687-93.
44. Fuentealba LC, Evers I, Ikeda A, Hurtado C, Kuroda H, Peros EM, De Robertis EM: Integrating patterning signals: Wnt/GSK3 regulates the duration of the BMP/Smad1 signal. Cell 2007, 131:980-93.
45. Sapkota G, Alarcon C, Spagnoli FM, Brivanlou AH, Massague J: Balancing BMP signaling through integrated inputs into the Smad1 linker. Molecular cell 2007, 25:441-54.
46. Ozdamar B, Bose R, Barrios-Rodiles M, Wang HR, Zhang Y, Wrana JL: Regulation of the polarity protein Par6 by TGFbeta receptors controls epithelial cell plasticity. Science 2005, 307:1603-9.
47. Narimatsu M, Bose R, Pye M, Zhang L, Miller B, Ching P, Sakuma R, Luga V, Roncarli L, Attisano L, Wrana JL: Regulation of planar cell polarity by Smurf ubiquitin ligases. Cell 2009, 137:295-307.
48. Boggiano JC, Feohon RG: Growth control by committee: intercellular junctions, cell polarity, and the cytoskeleton regulate Hippo signaling. Dev Cell 2012, 22:695-702.
49. Halder G, Johnson RL: Hippo signaling: growth control and beyond. Development 2011, 138:9-22.
50. Irvine KD: Integration of intercellular signaling through the Hippo pathway. Semin Cell Dev Biol 2012, 23:812-7.
51. Mauviel A, Nallet-Staub F, Varelas X: Integrating developmental signals: a Hippo in the (path)way. Oncogene 2012, 31:1743-56.
52. Pan D: The Hippo signaling pathway in development and cancer. Dev Cell 2010, 19:491-505.
53. Varelas X, Wrana JL: Coordinating developmental signaling: novel roles for the Hippo pathway. Trends Cell Biol 2012, 22:88-96.
54. Zhao B, Tumaneng K, Guan KL: The Hippo pathway in organ size control, tissue regeneration and stem cell self-renewal. Nat Cell Biol 2011, 13:877-83.
55. Nishioka N, Inoue K, Adachi K, Kiyonari H, Ota M, Ralston A, Yabuta N, Hirahara S, Stephenson RO, Ogonuki N, Makita R, Kurihara H, Morin-Kensicki EM, Nojima H, Rossant J, Nakao K, Niwa H, Sasaki H: The Hippo signaling pathway components Lats and Yap pattern Tead4 activity to distinguish mouse trophectoderm from inner cell mass. Dev Cell 2009, 16:398-410.
56. Hong JH, Hwang ES, McManus MT, Amsterrdam A, Tian Y, Kalmukova R, Mueller E, Benjamin T, Spiegelman BM, Sharp PA,
57. Lian I, Kim J, Okazawa H, Zhao J, Zhao B, Yu J, Chinnaiyan A, Israel MA, Goldstein LS, Abujour J, Ding S, Guan KL: The role of YAP transcriptional coactivator functions in balancing growth and differentiation in skin. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2011, 108:2270-5.

58. Schlegelmilch K, Mohseni M, Kirak O, Pruszak J, Rodriguez JR, Zhou D, Kreger BT, Vasioukhin V, Avruch J, Brunemmelkamp TR, Camargo FD: Yap1 acts downstream of alpha-catenin to control epidermal proliferation. Cell 2011, 144:782-95.

60. Lee JH, Kim TS, Yang TH, Koo BK, Oh SP, Lee KP, Oh HJ, Lee SH, Kong YY, Kim JM, Lim DS: A crucial role of WW45 in developing epithelial tissues in the mouse. EMBO J 2008, 27:1231-42.

61. Camargo FD, Gokhale S, Johnnides JB, Fu D, Bell GW, Jaenisch R, Brunemmelkamp TR: YAP1 increases organ size and expands undifferentiated progenitor cells. Curr Biol 2007, 17:2054-60.

62. Ren F, Wang B, Yue T, Yun EY, Ip YT, Jiang J: Hippo signaling regulates Drosophila intestine stem cell proliferation through multiple pathways. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2010, 107:2064-9.

63. Karpowicz P, Perez J, Perrimon N: The Hippo tumor suppressor pathway regulates intestinal stem cell regeneration. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2009, 106:18486-91.

64. Shaw RL, Kohlmaier A, Polesello C, Veelken C, Edgar BA, Tapon N: The Hippo pathway regulates intestinal stem cell proliferation during Drosophila adult midgut regeneration. Development 2010, 137:4147-58.

65. Staley BK, Irvine KD: Warts and Yorkie mediate intestinal regeneration by influencing stem cell proliferation. Curr Biol 2010, 20:1580-7.

66. Reddy BV, Rajendran C, Irvine KD: Influence of fat-hippo and notch signaling on the proliferation and differentiation of Drosophila optic neuropilithia. Development 2010, 137:2397-408.

67. Baena-Lopez LA, Nojima H, Vincent JP: Integration of morphogen signalling within the growth regulatory network. Curr Opin Cell Biol 2012, 24:166-72.

68. McNeill H, Woodgett JR: When pathways collide: collaboration and conivance among signalling proteins in development. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol 2010, 11:404-13.

69. Varelas X, Sakumoro Y, Kasamatsuri T, Peurna R, Rao BM, Dembowy J, Yaffe MB, Zandstra PW, Wrana JL: TAZ controls Smad nucleocytoplasmic shuttling and regulates human embryonic stem cell self-renewal. Nat Cell Biol 2008, 10:837-48.

70. Martin-Belmonte F, Perez-Moreno M: Epithelial cell polarity, stem cells and cancer. Nat Rev Cancer 2012, 12:23-38.

71. Genevet A, Polesello C, Blight K, Robertson F, Collinson LM, Pichaud F, Tapon N: The Hippo pathway regulates apical-domain size independently of its growth-control function. Journal of cell science 2009, 122:2360-70.

72. Hamaratoglou F, Gajewski K, Sansores-Garcia L, Morrison C, Tao C, Halder G: The Hippo tumor-suppressor pathway regulates apical-domain size in parallel to tissue growth. Journal of cell science 2009, 122:2351-9.

73. Varelas X, Samavarchi-Tehrani P, Narimatsu M, Weiss A, Cockburn K, Larsen BG, Rossant J, Wrana JL: The Crumbs complex couples cell density sensing to Hippo-dependent control of the TGF-beta-SMAD pathway. Dev Cell 2010, 19:831-44.

74. Paramasivam M, Sarkeshik A, Yates JR, 3rd, Fernandes MJ, McCollum D: Angiomotin family proteins are novel activators of the LATS2 kinase tumor suppressor. Molecular biology of the cell 2011, 22:3725-33.

75. Chan SW, Lim CJ, Chong YF, Pobalti AV, Huang C, Hong W: Hippo pathway-independent restriction of TAZ and YAP by angiomotin. J Biol Chem 2011, 286:18-26.

76. Zhao B, Li L, Lu Q, Wang LH, Liu CY, Lei Q, Guan KL: Angiomotin is a novel Hippo pathway component that inhibits YAP oncoprotein. Genes & development 2011, 25:51-63.

77. Cordenonsi M, Zanconato F, Azzolin L, Forcato M, Rosato A, Frasson C, Inui M, Montagner M, Parenti AR, Poletti A, Daidone MG, Dupont S, Basso G, Bicciato S, Piccolo S, The Hippo transducer TAZ confers cancer stem cell-related traits on breast cancer cells. Cell 2011, 147:759-72.

78. Kim NG, Koh E, Chen X, Gumberlin BM: E-cadherin mediates contact inhibition of proliferation through Hippo signaling-pathway components. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2011, 108:930-5.
87. Zhou D, Zhang Y, Wu H, Barry E, Yin Y, Lawrence E, Dawson D, Willis JE, Markowitz SD, Camargo FD, Avruch J: Mst1 and Mst2 protein kinases restrain intestinal stem cell proliferation and colonic tumorigenesis by inhibition of Yes-associated protein (Yap) overabundance. Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A 2011, 108:E1312-20.

88. Barry ER, Morikawa T, Butler BL, Shrestha K, de la Rosa R, Yan KS, Fuchs CS, Magness ST, Smits R, Ogino S, Kuo CJ, Camargo FD: Restriction of intestinal stem cell expansion and the regenerative response by YAP. Nature 2013, 493:106-10.

89. Zecca M, Struhl G: A feed-forward circuit linking wingless, fat-dachsous signaling, and the warts-hippo pathway to Drosophila wing growth. PloS Biol 2010, 8:e1000386.

90. Rosenbluh J, Nijhawan D, Cox AG, Li X, Neal JT, Schafer Ej, Zack TI, Wang X, Tsherniak A, Schinzel AC, Shao DD, Schumacher SE, Weir BA, Vazquez F, Cowley GS, Root DE, Mesirov JP, Beroukhim R, Kuo CJ, Goessling W, Hahn WC, beta-Catenin-Driven Cancers Require a YAP1 Transcriptional Complex for Survival and Tumorigenesis. Cell 2012, 151:1457-73.

91. Wielenga VJ, Smits R, Korinek V, Smits L, Kielman M, Fodde R, Clevers H, Pals ST: Expression of CD44 in Apc and Tcf mutant mice implies regulation by the WNT pathway. Am J Pathol 1999, 154:513-23.

92. Morrison H, Sherman LS, Legg J, Banine F, Isacke C, Haipck CA, Gutmann DH, Ponta H, Herrlich P: The NF2 tumor suppressor gene product, merlin, mediates contact inhibition of growth through interactions with CD44. Genes Dev 2001, 15:968-80.

93. Konsavage WM, Jr., Kyler SL, Rennoll SA, Jin G, Yochum GS: Wnt/beta-catenin signaling regulates Yes-associated protein (YAP) gene expression in colorectal carcinoma cells. J Biol Chem 2012, 287:11730-9.

94. Azzolin L, Zanconato F, Bresolin S, Forcato M, Basso G, Bicciato S, Cordenonsi M, Piccolo S: Role of TAZ as Mediator of Wnt Signaling. Cell 2012, 151:443-56.

95. Liu CY, Zha ZY, Zhou X, Zhang H, Huang W, Zhao D, Li T, Chan SW, Lim CJ, Hong W, Zhao S, Xiong Y, Lei QY, Guan KL: The hippo tumor pathway promotes TAZ degradation by phosphorylating a phosphodegron and recruiting the SCF(beta)-TrCP E3 ligase. J Biol Chem 2010, 285:37159-69.