Predictive value of protease-activated receptor-2 (PAR2) in cervical cancer metastasis
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Abstract
Metastasis is the primary cause of an unfavourable prognosis in patients with malignant cancer. Over the last decade, the role of proteinases in the tumour microenvironment has attracted increasing attention. As a sensor of proteinases, protease-activated receptor 2 (PAR2) plays crucial roles in the metastatic progression of cervical cancer. In the present study, the expression of PAR2 in multiple types of cancer was analysed by Gene Expression Profiling Interactive Analysis (GEPIA). Kaplan-Meier plotter was used to calculate the correlation between survival and the levels of PAR2, Grb-associated binding protein 2 (Gab2), and miR-125b. Immunohistochemistry (IHC) was performed to examine PAR2 expression in a tissue microarray (TMA) of CESC. Empower Stats was used to assess the predictive value of PAR2 in the metastatic potential of CESC. We found that PAR2 up-regulation was observed in multiple types of cancer. Moreover, PAR2 expression was positively correlated with the clinicopathologic characteristics of CESC. miR-125b and its target Gab2, which are strongly associated with PAR2-induced cell migration, are well-characterized as predictors of the prognostic value of CESC. Most importantly, the Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) data set analysis showed that the area under the curve (AUC) of the PAR2 model was significantly greater than that of the traditional model (0.833 vs 0.790, \( P < .05 \)), demonstrating the predictive value of PAR2 in CESC metastasis. Our results suggest that PAR2 may serve as a prognostic factor for metastasis in CESC patients.
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1 | INTRODUCTION

Metastasis is not only the main characteristic of malignancy but also the main factor that affects the therapeutic effect and prognosis of patients. In addition to the genetic background of cancer cells, alterations in the microenvironment have emerged as an important factor in regulating the metastatic progression of cancer. In the past, a great deal of research has focused on the microenvironment that surrounds cells and its role in tumour metastasis. The microenvironment of the tumour invasion front may enable the cancer cells to gain anomalously high motility and penetrate the surrounding stroma. It is worth noting that the invasion front of a tumour is particularly rich in a variety of proteinases, which facilitate cancer invasion and metastasis by remodelling the extracellular matrix and promote cell migration.

Protease-activated receptors (PARs) are a subgroup of G protein-coupled receptors (GPCRs). To date, four members of the PAR family have been discovered: PAR_1, PAR_2, and PAR_3, which are activated by thrombin, and PAR_4, which is activated by trypsin, tissue factor, neutrophil elastase and other factors. Previous evidence has shown that PAR_3 plays an important role in promoting the metastasis of colon cancer cells. As the sensor of protease, PAR_2 and its activating proteinases are typically observed in the invading frontier cells of cancer, and its expression level is tightly correlated with the switching of a primary tumour from local to metastatic spread.

Dysregulated microRNAs (miRNAs) are highly involved in the initiation and progression of multiple cancers. They function as either proto-oncogenes or tumour suppressors in vivo by repressing their target mRNAs or reducing their transcription. The dysregulation of miR-125b, which is regulated by PAR2, is expected to switch the tumour from local to metastatic spread.

In the present study, we used multiple online tools to analyse the association between PAR_2 levels and tumour prognosis in multiple cancer. Moreover, PAR_2 expression and the clinicopathologic stage of cervical squamous cell carcinoma endocervical adenocarcinoma (CESC) were assessed with a tissue microarray (TMA). miR-125b and its target Grb-associated binding protein 2 (Gab2), which are strongly linked to PAR_2-induced cell migration, are well-characterized predictors of metastasis in CESC. Most importantly, The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) data sets of CESC analysed by Empower Stats demonstrated the predictive accuracy of PAR_2 in CESC metastasis. Therefore, the PAR_2 expression pattern could serve as a risk factor that indicates a poor prognosis for patients with cervical cancer.

2 | MATERIAL AND METHODS

2.1 | Cell culture and cell lines

The human colonic epithelial cell line HT-29, and HCT116 as well as the lung adenocarcinoma cell line A549 were obtained from the American Type Culture Collection (Manassas, VA, USA). The cells were grown in Dulbecco's modified Eagle's medium/F12 supplemented with 10% FBS (Gibco, NY, USA). Stably transfected HT29 cells with PAR_2 knockdown were enriched with puromycin according to a previously described protocol.

2.2 | Gene Expression Profiling Interactive Analysis (GEPIA), Kaplan-Meier plotter and Gene Expression Display Server (GEDS) online database

Multiple tumour vs normal differential PAR_2 expression analysis was performed based on the GEPIA database (http://geopia.cancer-pku.cn), which is a newly developed web-based tool that provides key interactive and customizable functions based on TCGA and genotypetissue expression data.

The prognostic values of PAR_2, miR-125b and Gab2 in tumour patients were evaluated using Kaplan-Meier plotter (http://kmplot.com/analysis), an open online data set that can be used to assess the effects of 54 675 genes on survival in 21 cancer types.

The differential expression of miR-125b between tumours and corresponding non-tumour tissues was evaluated using the GEDS database (http://bioinfo.life.hust.edu.cn/web/GEDS/) that integrates multiscale gene, mRNA, miRNA and protein expression data from 23 315, 9009 and 9244 samples, respectively, from 40 tissues and 1594 cell lines.

2.3 | TMA and immunohistochemistry (IHC)

Immunohistochemistry studies of PAR_2 were performed on CESC samples from a TMA. The TMA was obtained from Outdo Biotech Co., Ltd. (Shanghai, China), including 119 CESC and 35 adjacent tissue specimens (Table S1). The patients undergoing surgery from January 2010 to October 2011 were classified based on the tumour node metastasis (TNM) classification system. All specimens were classified based on the tumour node metastasis (TNM) classification system. The primary antibody used for immunostaining was rabbit anti-human polyclonal antibody-PAR_2 (Abcam Co., Cambridge, MA, USA; 1:100 dilution). The secondary antibody used for immunostaining was two-step plus® Poly-HRP Anti-Mouse/Rabbit IgG Detection System (OriGene, Wuxi, China). The staining results were randomly selected and believed to be representative of the average results in the tumours by two independent experienced pathologists blinded to the clinical data.

2.4 | Real-time PCR

The total RNA was isolated from cells using TRIzol reagent (Invitrogen, Carlsbad, CA). After treatment with DNase I, RNA was reverse transcribed into cDNA with a Thermo Scientific Maxima First Strand cDNA Synthesis Kit for mRNA and analysed for miR-125b detection with a TaqMan™ microRNA Transcription Kit. Real-time quantitative PCR was carried out on an Applied Bio-Systems 7500 PCR instrument. PCR
data were normalized to those of GAPDH and U6 short hairpin RNA for mRNA and miRNA, respectively.

Primers for mature miRNA and U6 were obtained from GeneCopoeia (GuangZhou Ribobio Co. Ltd., China). Additional primers used in this study were as follows: PAR$_2^{21}$ sense, 5'-TGA AGA TTG CCT ATC ACA TAC-3'; and antisense (5'-TGC ATT ATT TTC TGA TTA AGA GCC-3'); and Gab2$^2$ sense (5'-CGC TGC T A5'-GAC AAC AGC CGA CTT CAC C-3') and antisense (5'-GCC CAC AAT CAT TTT CCC T-3').

2.5 | Statistical analysis

All statistical analyses were performed using GraphPad Prism 5.0, Empower Stats software (www.empowerstats.com, X&Y solutions, Inc Boston MA) and R (http://www.R-project.org). The data are presented as the mean ± SD, and a $P$ value less than .05 was considered statistically significant.

3 | RESULTS

3.1 | PAR$_2$ is up-regulated in multiple types of tumours

We initially found that PAR$_2$ was expressed in nearly all human tissues after searching Gemini online tools (Figure S1). Moreover, we used the GEPIA online tool to further evaluate whether PAR$_2$ expression was different between non-tumour and tumour tissues in multiple human cancers. Notably, PAR$_2$ expression was markedly up-regulated in tumour tissue relative to control adjacent tissue. As shown in Figure 1, PAR$_2$ showed significantly strong up-regulation in teen types of cancer, including CESC, cholangio carcinoma (CHOL), colon adenocarcinoma (COAD), oesophageal carcinoma (ESCA), glioblastoma multiforme (GBM), acute myeloid leukaemia (LAML), lung adenocarcinoma (LUAD), lung squamous cell carcinoma (LUSC), ovarian serous cystadenocarcinoma (OV), pancreatic adenocarcinoma (PAAD), prostate adenocarcinoma (PRAD), rectal adenocarcinoma (READ), stomach adenocarcinoma (STAD), testicular germ cell tumours (TGCT), uterine corpus endometrial carcinoma (UCEC) and uterine carcinosarcoma (UCS). In contrast, PAR$_2$ expression was down-regulated in kidney chromophobe (KICH). Taken together, these results suggest that PAR$_2$ up-regulation is highly related to the progression of multiple tumours.

3.2 | PAR$_2$ correlates positively with poor survival in CESC, LUAD and PAAD

To identify whether the up-regulation of PAR$_2$ in multiple types of tumours should be employed as an important biomarker for clinical treatment, the impact of PAR$_2$ expression on the 5-year survival rate was evaluated with Kaplan-Meier plotter. The correlation

![FIGURE 1](image_url) The mRNA expression of PAR$_2$ in patients with multiple types of cancer. Differential expression of PAR$_2$ in 30 different cancer types. The fold change was calculated as the median expression of PAR$_2$ in tumour tissue divided by the median expression of PAR$_2$ in adjacent normal tissue. Box plots of PAR$_2$ mRNA expression based on GEPIA.
between PAR2 levels and the prognosis of different cancers demonstrated that patients categorized within the PAR2 high-score group had a significantly poor prognosis (Table 1 and Figure S2), especially those with CESC (overall survival (OS) HR = 1.66, 95% CI = 1.01-2.73, P = .0452; relapse-free survival (RFS) HR = 3.02, 95% CI = 1.26-7.25, P = .009), LUAD (OS HR = 1.87, 95% CI = 1.38-2.53, P = .0000; RFS HR = 1.89, 95% CI = 1.21-2.95, P = .0043), PAAD (OS HR = 2.11, 95% CI = 1.29-3.45, P = .0023; RFS HR = 6.28, 95% CI = 1.8-21.85, P = .0012) and READ (OS HR = 5.16, 95% CI = 1.30-22.0, P = .0112; RFS HR = 0.13, 95% CI = 0.01-1.10, P = .0271). These results confirmed that PAR2 expression had an impact on the prognosis (both OS and RFS) of the CESC, LUAD, PAAD and READ cohorts. In the present study, we performed an in-depth investigation on whether the activation of PAR2 was associated with a poor prognosis of CESC.

3.3 PAR2 expression is associated with tumour metastasis

Metastasis is a major cause of death for patients with malignant tumours. To better understand the relevance and fundamental mechanisms of PAR2 in tumours, the correlation between PAR2 expression and the metastasis characteristics of clinical CESC tumours was assessed.

PAR2 expression in 119 CESC patient samples and matched adjacent cervical mucosa samples was assessed with a TMA and IHC staining. The IHC results revealed that PAR2 was strongly expressed in CESC tissues, but weakly expressed in normal epithelial tissues of the cervical mucosa and in cervicitis tissues (Figure 2A). Moreover, PAR2 expression was more easily observed in poorly differentiated cervical tumours than in moderately or well-differentiated cervical tumours (Figure 2B). We experienced difficulty in detecting significant differences between tumour stages I and II, but PAR2 was up-regulated in the lymphatic metastasis relative to the local tissue in stage III tumours (Figure 2C). Notably, the PAR2-positive cells were typically stacked in advance of the invasive margin of the tumour tissue (Figure 2D). These results confirm that abnormal PAR2 expression is closely associated with the metastasis of CESC.

### 3.4 The levels of miR-125b and its target Gab2 are closely correlated with a poor prognosis in CESC

Our previous study suggests that miR-125b mediates PAR2-induced cancer cell migration by regulating Gab2 expression. To better understand the roles of miR-125b and Gab2 in clinical CESC progression, the impacts of factors on cell migration were tested. We found that altering the miR-125b or Gab2 expression changed the cell migration abilities. Notably, the overexpression of miR-125b by the mimic-miR-125b or the knockdown of Gab2 by the siRNA significantly blocked the PAR2-induced cell migration (Figure S3).

Consistent with the findings in vitro, miR-125b was down-regulated in multiple types of cancer tissues (Table 2). Moreover, we found that miR-125b (HR = 1.82, 95% CI = 1.1-2.9, P = .012) expression was significantly associated with poor OS in patients with CESC (Figure 3A). Gab2 was also positively correlated with CESC progression (OS HR = 0.71, 95% CI = 0.43-1.17, P = .17; RFS HR = 3.00, 95% CI = 1.13-8.02, P = .021) (Figure 3B). In brief, we combined the Kaplan-Meier plotter pan-cancer database (including miRpower18 and mRNA) with clinical CESC patient sample data to demonstrate that the PAR2-miR-125b-Gab2 pattern serves as a predictive model for prognostic risk in cervical cancer.

### Table 1 The prognostic value of PAR2 in patients with multiple cancers

| Tumour abbr. | OS HR (95% CI) | P value | RFS HR (95% CI) | P value |
|--------------|----------------|---------|-----------------|---------|
| CESC         | 1.66 (1.01-2.73) | 0.0452  | 3.02 (1.26-7.25) | .0091   |
| ESCA         | 1.91 (0.75-4.83) | 0.1669  | 0.36 (0.13-0.99) | .0387   |
| LUAD         | 1.87 (1.38-2.53) | 0.0000  | 1.89 (1.21-2.95) | .0043   |
| LUSC         | 1.39 (1.02-1.90) | 0.0367  | 0.69 (0.40-1.19) | .1843   |
| OV           | 1.27 (0.94-1.70) | 0.1243  | 1.18 (0.83-1.70) | .3579   |
| PAAD         | 2.11 (1.29-3.45) | 0.0023  | 6.28 (1.8-21.85) | .0012   |
| READ         | 5.26 (1.30-22.0) | 0.0112  | 0.13 (0.01-1.10) | .0271   |
| STAD         | 1.38 (0.97-1.97) | 0.0732  | 1.55 (0.81-2.97) | .1835   |
| TGCT         | 3.85 (0.35-42.0) | 0.2385  | 2.78 (1.2-6.44) | .0127   |
| UCEC         | 1.51 (0.97-2.33) | 0.0635  | 0.84 (0.50-1.43) | .5261   |

Abbreviations: CESC, cervical squamous cell carcinoma and endocervical adenocarcinoma; ESCA, oesophageal carcinoma; LUAD, lung adenocarcinoma; LUSC, lung squamous cell carcinoma; OV, ovarian serous cystadenocarcinoma; PAAD, pancreatic adenocarcinoma; READ, rectal adenocarcinoma; STAD, stomach adenocarcinoma; TGCT, testicular germ cell tumours; UCEC, uterine corpus endometrial carcinoma.
To determine whether PAR$_2$ could serve as a prognostic factor for CESC metastasis, the TCGA data set of CESC was downloaded from cBioPortal (https://www.cbioportal.org/datasets, TCGA Pan-Cancer Atlas) and analysed by Empower Stats software. The data set contains detailed information on 255 patients (Table 3). Based on the 7th edition of the American Joint Committee on Cancer staging system, we collected recorded items ($N = 127$) and the risk factors ($P < .05$) that are closely related to tumour metastasis. Then, we formed two predictive models. Data in the CEA model included age at diagnosis, body mass index (BMI), total number of pregnancies, patient smoking history category, tumour type, primary lymph node presentation assessment, neoplasm cancer status and the expression level of CEACAM5, which represents a typical oncofetal antigen.$^{23-26}$ In the PAR$_2$ model, the expression level of PAR$_2$ was taken into consideration instead of CEACAM5 (used in the CEA model). Figure 4A shows that the area under the curve (AUC) for the CEA model was 0.790 (95% CI = 0.712-0.870), yielding a sensitivity of 55.0% and a specificity of 89.6% at the optimal cut-off value. However, in the PAR$_2$ model, the AUC was 0.833 (95% CI = 0.763-0.903), with a sensitivity of 70.0% and a specificity of 85.1% at the corresponding threshold ($P = .028$).

The PAR$_2$ model showed a 27.3% (81.6%-67.3%) increase in sensitivity with comparable specificity at the optimal cut-off point. As shown in Figure 4B, bootstrap resampling (times $= 500$) yielded the same result (AUC of the CEA model = 0.792, 95% CI = 0.713-0.856; specificity = 0.896; sensitivity = 0.550; AUC of the PAR$_2$ model = 0.830, 95% CI = 0.765-0.893, specificity = 0.851, sensitivity = 0.700; $P = .045$). These data demonstrated that PAR$_2$ can serve for an important indicator to predict the potential for metastasis in CESC patients.

Machine learning methods were used to validate the importance of risk factors in the PAR$_2$ model. Figure 4C shows that the PAR$_2$ expression level, following the BMI, was the second most important predictor in the random forest model. The decision curve analysis evaluating the benefit and risks of the two models is presented in Figure 4D. The x-axis and y-axis show the risk threshold for cancer metastasis and the standardized net benefit using the model, respectively. For the AUC models, the treat all (grey line) and treat none (black line) represent the clinical value for each model. At a relatively large threshold value, the PAR$_2$ model was more cost effective than the CEA model. If a threshold of 80% was used as the prediction probability to treat CESC metastasis, then 21/100 patients would benefit from the PAR$_2$ model without harming others, compared with 4/100 patients who would benefit from the CEA model.

### FIGURE 2

Immunohistochemical staining of PAR$_2$ in cervical cancer. A, PAR$_2$ was highly expressed in tumour tissue and weakly expressed in normal cervical mucosa and cervicitis tissues (magnification × 200). B, PAR$_2$ was significantly up-regulated in poorly differentiated cervical tumours relative to well-differentiated or moderately differentiated cervical tumours (magnification × 200). C, PAR$_2$ was remarkably up-regulated in the lymph node metastasis group relative to the nonmetastasis group (magnification × 200). D, PAR$_2$-positive cells observed in front of the invasive margin of tumour tissue (left, magnification × 100; right, magnification × 400).

#### 3.5 | The prognostic value of PAR$_2$ in CESC metastasis

To determine whether PAR$_2$ could serve as a prognostic factor for CESC metastasis, the TCGA data set of CESC was downloaded from cBioPortal (https://www.cbioportal.org/datasets, TCGA Pan-Cancer Atlas) and analysed by Empower Stats software. The data set contains detailed information on 255 patients (Table 3). Based on the 7th edition of the American Joint Committee on Cancer staging system, we collected recorded items ($N = 127$) and the risk factors ($P < .05$) that are closely related to tumour metastasis. Then, we formed two predictive models. Data in the CEA model included age at diagnosis, body mass index (BMI), total number of pregnancies, patient smoking history category, tumour type, primary lymph node presentation assessment, neoplasm cancer status and the expression level of CEACAM5, which represents a typical oncofetal antigen.$^{23-26}$ In the PAR$_2$ model, the expression level of PAR$_2$ was taken into consideration instead of CEACAM5 (used in the CEA model). Figure 4A shows that the area under the curve (AUC) for the CEA model was 0.790 (95% CI = 0.712-0.870), yielding a sensitivity of 55.0% and a specificity of 89.6% at the optimal cut-off value. However, in the PAR$_2$ model, the AUC was 0.833 (95% CI = 0.763-0.903), with a sensitivity of 70.0% and a specificity of 85.1% at the corresponding threshold ($P = .028$).

The PAR$_2$ model showed a 27.3% (81.6%-67.3%) increase in sensitivity with comparable specificity at the optimal cut-off point. As shown in Figure 4B, bootstrap resampling (times $= 500$) yielded the same result (AUC of the CEA model = 0.792, 95% CI = 0.713-0.856; specificity = 0.896; sensitivity = 0.550; AUC of the PAR$_2$ model = 0.830, 95% CI = 0.765-0.893, specificity = 0.851, sensitivity = 0.700; $P = .045$). These data demonstrated that PAR$_2$ can serve for an important indicator to predict the potential for metastasis in CESC patients.

Machine learning methods were used to validate the importance of risk factors in the PAR$_2$ model. Figure 4C shows that the PAR$_2$ expression level, following the BMI, was the second most important predictor in the random forest model. The decision curve analysis evaluating the benefit and risks of the two models is presented in Figure 4D. The x-axis and y-axis show the risk threshold for cancer metastasis and the standardized net benefit using the model, respectively. For the AUC models, the treat all (grey line) and treat none (black line) represent the clinical value for each model. At a relatively large threshold value, the PAR$_2$ model was more cost effective than the CEA model. If a threshold of 80% was used as the prediction probability to treat CESC metastasis, then 21/100 patients would benefit from the PAR$_2$ model without harming others, compared with 4/100 patients who would benefit from the CEA model.
Cervical cancer ranked fourth in incidence and mortality rates globally among all cancers in women in 2018 (WHO, http://gco.iarc.fr/today/home). Recently, the inspection methods and effective treatment of surgery have continuously improved, which improved the prognosis of CESC. The 5-year survival rate of CESC patients in the early stage is now over 80.0%, but the appearance of lymphatic metastasis is still one of the main reasons for the difficulty in curing CESC. 

Proteases play important roles in the pathological processes of HPV infection, chronic cervicitis and tumorigenesis. In addition to the proteases produced by inflammatory cells, numerous proteases derived from host cells, and HPV or bacteria are enriched in the uterine cavity. The excessive release of proteases has been reported to be involved in the function and disease states of the cervix. Importantly, some proteases can selectively cleave and activate PAR signalling. 

Previous reports have directly shown that PAR signalling is essentially related to the migration of cancer cells.
PAR2 expression is significantly correlated with lymphatic metastasis according to previous reports, but the predictive value of PAR2 in tumour metastasis was unrecognized in the past. In the present study, we observed that PAR2 expression may be selectively enriched in cancer cells, increasing from the primary local tumour to the corresponding metastatic lymph node lesion and resulting in a poor clinical prognosis.

| TABLE 3 Basic characteristics of CESC patients with or without metastasis |
|---------------------------------------------------------------|
| American Joint Committee on Cancer metastasis stage code     |
| mean ± SD                                                     |
| Without metastasis (N = 114)                                  |
| With metastasis (N = 141)                                    |
| p value                                                      |
| Age at diagnosis (years)                                     | 47.8 ± 12.3 | 48.0 ± 13.7 | 0.897 |
| BMI (kg/m²)                                                  | 27.6 ± 7.9  | 27.6 ± 6.6  | .971  |
| CEACAM5 mRNA expression level                                 | 12 969.53 ± 29 976.7 | 14 249.3 ± 34 548.7 | .756  |
| PAR2 mRNA expression level                                   | 863.0 ± 685.5 | 927.6 ± 868.8 | .518  |
| Total number of pregnancies                                  |              |              |
| N (%)                                                        |              |              |
| 0                                                            | 6 (5.9)      | 7 (5.6)      |
| 1                                                            | 14 (13.7)    | 11 (8.8)     |
| 2                                                            | 17 (16.7)    | 25 (20)      |
| 3                                                            | 22 (21.6)    | 23 (18.4)    |
| 4                                                            | 16 (15.7)    | 23 (18.4)    |
| 5                                                            | 11 (10.8)    | 15 (12.0)    |
| 6                                                            | 7 (6.9)      | 9 (7.2)      |
| 7                                                            | 3 (2.9)      | 4 (3.2)      |
| 8                                                            | 1 (1)        | 1 (0.8)      |
| 9                                                            | 1 (1)        | 1 (0.8)      |
| 10                                                           | 1 (1)        | 1 (0.8)      |
| 11                                                           | 1 (1)        | 3 (2.4)      |
| 12                                                           | 1 (1)        | 1 (0.8)      |
| 14                                                           | 0 (0)        | 1 (0.8)      |
| 15                                                           | 1 (1)        | 0            |
| Patient smoking history category                              |              |              |
| N (%)                                                        |              |              |
| 1                                                            | 64 (63.4)    | 73 (57.5)    |
| 2                                                            | 19 (18.8)    | 32 (25.2)    |
| 3                                                            | 2 (2.0)      | 5 (3.9)      |
| 4                                                            | 15 (14.9)    | 15 (11.8)    |
| 5                                                            | 1 (1.0)      | 2 (1.6)      |
| Tumour type                                                  |              |              |
| Adenosquamous                                                | 2 (1.8)      | 4 (2.9)      |
| Cervical squamous cell carcinoma                              | 95 (87.2)    | 103 (75.2)   |
| Endocervical adenocarcinoma                                  | 5 (4.6)      | 13 (9.5)     |
| Mucinous adenocarcinoma, Endocervical type                   | 2 (1.8)      | 14 (10.2)    |
| Endometrioid endometrial adenocarcinoma                      | 2 (1.8)      | 1 (0.7)      |
| Usual type                                                   | 3 (2.8)      | 2 (1.5)      |
| Primary lymph node presentation assessment                    |              |              |
| N (%)                                                        |              |              |
| Yes                                                          | 83 (87.4)    | 80 (77.7)    |
| No                                                           | 12 (12.6)    | 23 (22.3)    |
| Person neoplasm cancer status                                |              |              |
| N (%)                                                        |              |              |
| Tumour free                                                  | 81 (89.0)    | 81 (67.5)    | <.001 |
| With tumour                                                  | 10 (11.0)    | 39 (32.5)    |      |
The EGF receptor (EGFR) has a necessary role in the process of carcinogenesis and is of prognostic and therapeutic relevance in cancer. Some evidence indicates that COX-2 up-regulation is dependent on EGFR in cervical cancer, but activated PAR2 can promote EGFR transactivation. PAR2-induced EGFR activation also up-regulates tissue factor (TF), which subsequently activates PAR2 to form a feedback loop.

In the recent years, miRNAs have emerged as pivotal regulators in multiple types of cancers. The deregulation of miR-125b is commonly observed in breast, ovarian and liver cancers. In the cervix, miR-125b is up-regulated in the normal cervical cells infected with HPV, whereas its relative expression becomes down-regulated as lesions progress. In our previous report, we confirmed that miR-125b mediates PAR2-signalling induced cell migration and is closely associated with lymph node metastasis in the colon. Currently, we showed that OS is short for CESC patients with low miR-125b expression. Notably, miR-125b expression is closely regulated by the PAR2 status. The continuous activation of PAR2 signalling represses the level of miR-125b, which affects Gab2 expression.

Gab2 is a scaffolding protein that plays an important role in signal integration and amplification. Gab2 has the ability to interact with Src homology 2 domain-containing molecules, thereby regulating many biological processes, which provides the basis for the synergistic action of PAR2 signalling. For example, Gab2 acts downstream of EGFR, which is transactivated by PAR2. However, further studies are needed to determine whether Gab2-mediated EGFR transactivation occurs through the activation of PAR2. Importantly, Gab2 is considered to be a crucial element in the crosstalk and integration of these pathways.
of PAR$_2$ signalling. Furthermore, in addition to mediating these signalling pathways, Gab2 is also involved in cell migration and tumour progression. Thus, we believe that the importance of Gab2 in tumour progression should also be considered in future investigations.

In summary, we demonstrated that PAR$_2$ expression was higher in cervical cancer tissues than in normal tissues and correlated with advanced cancer metastasis and short survival. PAR$_2$ activation regulates miR-125b repression, which may result in its migration-promoting effect on cancer cells. In addition, our multivariable analysis indicated that PAR$_2$ could increase the predictive accuracy of the metastatic prognosis of CESC. We believe that PAR$_2$ is an important factor for predicting CESC metastasis, and the change in its expression level should be emphasized in the treatment process of CESC.
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