HDAC8 Inhibition Blocks SMC3 Deacetylation and Delays Cell Cycle Progression without Affecting Cohesin-dependent Transcription in MCF7 Cancer Cells*
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Cohesin, a multi-subunit protein complex involved in chromosomal organization, is frequently mutated or aberrantly expressed in cancer. Multiple functions of cohesin, including cell division and gene expression, highlight its potential as a novel therapeutic target. The SMC3 subunit of cohesin is acetylated (ac) during S phase to establish cohesion between replicated chromosomes. Following anaphase, ac-SMC3 is deacetylated by HDAC8. Reversal of SMC3 acetylation is imperative for recycling cohesin so that it can be reloaded in interphase for both non-mitotic and mitotic functions. We blocked deacetylation of ac-SMC3 using an HDAC8-specific inhibitor PCI-34051 in MCF7 breast cancer cells, and examined the effects on transcription of cohesin-dependent genes that respond to estrogen. HDAC8 inhibition led to accumulation of ac-SMC3 as expected, but surprisingly, had no influence on the transcription of estrogen-responsive genes that are altered by siRNA targeting of RAD21 or SMC3. Knockdown of RAD21 altered estrogen receptor (ER) recruitment to SOX4 and IL20, and affected transcription of these genes, while HDAC8 inhibition did not. Rather, inhibition of HDAC8 delayed cell cycle progression, suppressed proliferation and induced apoptosis in a concentration-dependent manner. We conclude that HDAC8 inhibition does not change the estrogen-specific transcriptional role of cohesin in MCF7 cells, but instead, compromises cell cycle progression and cell survival. Our results argue that candidate inhibitors of cohesin function may differ in their effects depending on the cellular genotype and should be thoroughly tested for predicted effects on cohesin’s mechanistic roles.

The cohesin complex is a chromatin-associated multi-subunit protein comprised of two SMC (structural maintenance of chromosomes, SMC1A and SMC3) and two non-SMC subunits (RAD21, STAG1/2). Cohesin’s canonical function establishes cohesion between replicated sister chromatids, thus ensuring their precise segregation at anaphase (1, 2). Research over the last one and a half decades has revealed that cohesin has additional cohesion-independent functions in interphase nuclei, such as chromatin organization and transcription regulation (3, 4).

Recently, cancer genome sequencing projects have revealed that genes encoding cohesin subunits are frequently mutated in several different types of cancer, with particularly high frequency in acute myeloid leukemia (AML) (5–9). Recent mouse models indicate that cohesin contributes to leukemia progression likely through controlling transcription and genome organization, rather than through chromosome separation (10–12). In breast cancer, the cohesin subunit RAD21 is overexpressed and confers poor prognosis (13, 14). We previously showed that cohesin mediates transcription of the MYC gene (15–17) and modulates the transcription of estrogen-dependent genes in MCF7 breast cancer cells (18). The emergence of cohesin as an important contributor to cancer has generated interest in the development of therapeutics that compromise cohesin function.

SMC3 acetylation and deacetylation is essential for cohesin function (19–22). The SMC3 subunit is acetylated on Lys-105 and Lys-106 by ESCO1/2 during S phase, and acetylation is reversed by the Class I HDAC, HDAC8, at telophase (22–25). Deacetylation of SMC3 is crucial for recycling of cohesin for use in subsequent cell cycles (22, 24, 26). Deardorff et al. (25) showed that mutation or depletion of HDAC8 led to the accumulation of ac-SMC3, reduced chromatin-bound cohesin, and resulted in genome-wide cohesin-mediated transcriptional dysregulation. Depletion of HDAC8 affected transcriptional regulation in HeLa cells without markedly disrupting cycling of these cells. Chemical inhibition of HDAC8 was deemed equivalent to blocking its expression using siRNA (25). In addition to ac-SMC3, acetylated p53 is a target of HDAC8. In inv(16)+AML, chemical inhibition of HDAC8 prevented p53 deacetylation, leading to restoration of p53-induced apoptosis of leukemia-initiating cells (28).

PCI-34051 was found to be a highly selective and potent inhibitor of HDAC8 in 2008, where it was shown to induce apoptosis in T cell-derived but not solid tumor cell lines (29). Since then, many studies have used PCI-34051 in various cell lines and tissues to functionally characterize the biological role of HDAC8 (30–33). Two recent studies showed that PCI-34051 is relatively specific for HDAC8’s SMC3 deacetylase activity...
Based on these findings, PCI-34051 has the potential to be a cohesin inhibitor.

Previously, we showed that cohesin is essential for normal transcription of a subset of estrogen-responsive genes in MCF7 breast cancer cells, via DNA looping and the recruitment of estrogen receptor α (ER) (15, 18). Here, we sought to determine if HDAC8 inhibition leading to accumulated ac-SMC3 blocks the estrogen-specific transcriptional role of cohesin in MCF7 breast cancer cells. We found that HDAC8 inhibition impedes cell growth, but is not functionally equivalent to RAD21 or SMC3 siRNA-based abrogation of cohesin. Our results suggest that the effectiveness of targeting cohesin’s transcription regulatory function via inhibition of HDAC8 might depend on cell type.

**Experimental Procedures**

**Cell Culture**—MCF7 cells (ATCC HTB-22) of low passage number (p9-p15) were cultured in Dulbecco’s Modified Eagle Medium (DMEM, Life Technologies or Sigma) supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS) in a humidified cell culture incubator at 37 °C and 5% CO₂. Hormone deprivation, 17-β-estradiol stimulation and RAD21 depletion using siRNA in MCF7 cells were carried as previously described (15, 18). To deplete SMC3 in MCF7 cells, we used the ON-TARGET plus siRNA smart pool LU-006834-00-0005 (GE Dharmacon). The non-targeting control siRNA smart pool D-001810-10-05 (GE Dharmacon) was used as a negative control. SMC3 and control siRNAs were used at final concentrations of 20 nM. Cells were reverse-transfected using Lipofectamine RNAiMAX (Life Technologies) following 24 h of hormone depletion. After transfection, cells were cultured in hormone-depleted conditions for a further 48 h prior to estradiol stimulation.

Estrogen deprivation for PCI-34051 experiments was carried out as for the siRNA transfections, except that the siRNA was replaced by 48 h PCI-34051 treatment (Cayman...
Chemical) and for controls we used dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO) solvent.

**RNA Isolation and Quantitative PCR**—Total RNA was isolated, reverse-transcribed into cDNA, and analyzed by quantitative PCR (qRT-PCR) as described previously (15, 18). Two reference genes, GAPDH and CYCLOPHILIN, were used for normalization of gene expression. Primer sequences for expression analysis have been described previously (15, 18).

**Cell Cycle Synchronization**—For G1-S phase cell synchronization experiments, MCF7 cells (3 × 10^5 cells per well of a 6-well plate) were cultured in full growth medium and allowed to grow to 25–30% confluence. Double thymidine block was carried out as follows: 18 h incubation with 2 mM thymidine, 9 h release and then 17 h of incubation with 2 mM thymidine. Following the second block, cells were released and treated with PCI-34051 as indicated.

**Ethanol Fixation for Cell Cycle Analysis**—Floating and adherent cells were harvested by adding phosphate-buffered saline (PBS), 0.1% EDTA solution, and centrifuged at 2000 rpm for 5 min at 4 °C. Cell pellets were washed in PBS, 1% FBS solution, resuspended in ice-cold PBS, and fixed in 96% ethanol overnight at 4 °C.

**Propidium Iodide Staining and Flow Cytometry**—Fixed cells were pelleted by centrifugation at 2000 rpm for 5 min at 4 °C and washed in PBS, 1% FBS solution. Cells were pelleted, resuspended in propidium iodide (10 μg/ml) with RNase A (250 μg/ml), and incubated at 37 °C for 30 min. Samples were analyzed on a Beckman Coulter Gallios Flow Cytometer (Beckman Coulter), and cell cycle profiles were generated using the acquisition interface software. Data were analyzed using the FlowJo software (version 9.7, Tree Star).

**Antibodies**—Primary antibodies used are as follows: anti-RAD21 (Ab992, Abcam), ER (HC-20, sc-543, Santa Cruz Biotechnology), total-SMC3 (D47B5, Cell Signaling Technology), ac-SMC3 (Custom antibody kindly donated by Dr. Katsuhiko Shirahige, University of Tokyo, Japan), γ-tubulin (T5326, Sigma), and α-tubulin (T6199, Sigma).

**Quantitative Chromatin Immunoprecipitation (ChIP)**—ChIP for RAD21 and ER was performed as described previously (15, 18). Primer sequences were:

- SOX4 primer 1 forward: 5'-CGG-TAGGAAATGACCCGAGAGA-3';
- SOX4 primer 1 reverse: 5'-TTGTTTGGACCCTGAAACC-3';
- SOX4 primer 2 forward: 5'-ATTCCAATTTATTTTCTCCCTGT-3';
- SOX4 primer 2 reverse: 5'-GCTTAAGTCGCTAGGATT-3';
- SOX4 primer 2 reverse: 5'-GCTTAAGTCGCTAGGATT-3'
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FIGURE 3. Effects of cohesin depletion or HDAC8 inhibition on ER protein levels in MCF7 cells. Estrogen-starved MCF7 cells were transfected with control non-targeting or SMC3 or RAD21 siRNA, or were treated with 10 or 25 μM of PCI-34051 for 48 h, then treated with 100 nM estradiol for 6 and 24 h. A, SMC3 siRNA decreases SMC3 protein levels in MCF7 cells. B–D, ER protein levels following SMC3 siRNA (B), RAD21 siRNA (C), and PCI-34051 treatment (D) in MCF7 cells. Immunoblots showing total-SMC3 and ER were simultaneously probed for γ-tubulin, and detection was carried out using the two-color Odyssey® infrared system. Shown are representative blots of overlay of γ-tubulin (red) with either total-SMC3 or ER (green). Bar graphs represent levels of the indicated proteins normalized to γ-tubulin. Errors are the mean ± S.E. of 2–3 independent biological replicates. Significant difference for SMC3 levels was determined by paired ratio t test and for ER levels via two-way ANOVA. *, p ≤ 0.05; **, p ≤ 0.01.

3 forward: 5’-GGCTTGAATCCTGTGAATAG-3’; SOX4 primer 3 reverse: 5’-CCCCGTGTCAATTCAAGTT-3’ and IL20 primer 1 forward: 5’-CACCCAGAGTGCCTGACTA-3’; IL20 primer 1 reverse: 5’-GCAAGACGTGATGGGCAAT-3’.

Immunoblotting—Proteins were quantified using the Pierce™ BCA protein assay kit, and equal amounts of protein (20–60 μg) were loaded onto SDS-PAGE gels. Immunoblotting analyses were carried out as described previously using the LI-COR® infrared detection system and quantified using LI-COR Image Studio software (18). Primary antibodies used were: total-SMC3 (1:1000), ac-SMC3 (1:500), ER (1:1000), and γ-tubulin (1:5000).

Immunofluorescence and Confocal Microscopy—MCF7 cells were grown on sterile coverslips (6.25 × 10^4 cells per well of a 24-well plate). Cells were fixed in 4% paraformaldehyde (Fisher Chemical) solution for 10 min at room temperature and permeabilized with 0.3% (for α-tubulin) or 0.5% (for total and ac-SMC3) Triton X-100 (Sigma) for 10 min at room temperature. Cells were blocked in PBS containing 10% FBS for 1–1.5 h.

Primary antibodies were diluted in blocking buffer, and incubation was carried out at room temperature for 1.5 h (α-tubulin, 1:500) or overnight at 4 °C (total SMC3, 1:200 and ac-SMC3 1:100). Cells were washed with PBS and incubated with the secondary antibodies and 1 μg/ml of Hoechst 33342 at room temperature for 1 h. Cells were then washed and mounted onto microscope slides using ProLong Gold Antifade (Life Technology) mounting medium. Immunostained cells were visualized on a Nikon C2 confocal microscope; z-series images were taken using the NIS elements software, digitally zoomed, z-stacked, and processed using FIJI software. Secondary antibodies used were: anti-mouse Alexa Fluor 488 (1:2000, Life Technologies), anti-rabbit Alexa Fluor 568 (1:2000, Life Technologies).

MTT Assay—Cells were seeded in quadruplet into 96-well plates at a density of 9900 cells for days 1 and 3, 6250 cells for day 5 and 4000 cells for day 7 incubation times. The next day, cells were treated with varying concentrations of PCI-34051. On the day of the assay, 0.25 mg/ml of MTT (3-(4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl)-2,5-diphenyltetrazolium) was added to each well, and plates were incubated at 37 °C for 3–4 h. Culture medium
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Depletion of SMC3 or RAD21 increased basal levels of ER, although not significantly, and level increase in ER protein levels upon SMC3 depletion was still apparent with estradiol stimulation but the change was not significant. Treatment with 10 and 25 μM PCI-34051 confirmed robust accumulation of ac-SMC3, while no changes were visible for total SMC3. The increase in acetylated SMC3 indicates that, consistent with previous observations in HeLa cells, PCI-34051 blocks HDAC8-mediated deacetylation of SMC3.

Depletion of SMC3 or RAD21 increased basal levels of ER protein (Fig. 3, B and C), however this was only significant in RAD21-depleted cells. Upon estradiol stimulation in RAD21 siRNA conditions, ER protein levels returned to control conditions and no significant differences were observed. The small increase in ER protein levels upon SMC3 depletion was still apparent with estradiol stimulation but the change was not significant. Treatment with 10 and 25 μM PCI-34051 also increased basal levels of ER, although not significantly, and levels returned to control conditions upon estradiol stimulation (Fig. 3D). Therefore, levels of ER are not rate-limiting for the transcription of estrogen responsive genes.

Previous microarray analysis identified MYC, IL20, SOX4, THBS1, IRS2, CXCL12, CCNG2, TFF2, PIM2, and BMPR2 as PCI-34051, and fluorescence was monitored in real time on the IncuCyte FLR and quantified using the IncuCyte software.

Statistical Analyses—GraphPad Prism (version 6, GraphPad software Inc.) was used to graph and analyze the data.

was then removed, and reaction was stopped with 100 μl of DMSO. Absorbance was read at 570 nm on a microtiter plate reader (BioRad).

IncuCyte and YOYO-1 Dye Assays—Cells were seeded and dosed as above. After PCI-34051 addition, plates were immediately placed in the IncuCyte FLR chamber. Using the IncuCyte FLR’s 10× objective, images were acquired every 3 h. At the end of each treatment period, kinetic growth curves were generated, and cell proliferation was quantified using IncuCyte’s confuence-based automated analysis software.

YOYO-1 dye assay (Life Technologies) was used to measure cell viability following PCI-34051 treatment. Cells were seeded as described above and the next day, YOYO-1 (1:10,000 dilution) was added to the culture medium, simultaneously with PCI-34051, and fluorescence was monitored in real time on the IncuCyte FLR and quantified using the IncuCyte software.

GraphPad Prism (version 6, GraphPad software Inc.) was used to graph and analyze the data.
Having altered expression in response to estrogen upon RAD21 depletion (18). We found that altered expression of these genes upon RAD21 knockdown was largely recapitulated by SMC3 knockdown in estradiol-stimulated MCF7 cells (Fig. 4, A and B). The results suggest that RAD21 or SMC3 depletion have similar effects on transcription, as might be expected if the cohesin complex as a whole is essential for transcription. In contrast, HDAC8 inhibition by PCI-34051 did not alter gene transcription in the presence of estradiol (Fig. 4 C) despite eliciting increased levels of ac-SMC3 (Fig. 2). Together, the results show that HDAC8 inhibition by PCI-34051 in MCF7 cells does not alter ER-associated transcription, unlike depletion of cohesin subunits.

**HDAC8 Inhibition Does Not Significantly Alter Chromatin-bound Cohesin or ER**—With the exception of CCNG2, the cohesin-regulated ER target genes identified above have cohesin and ER binding sites within 15 kb of the transcription start site (TSS) (15, 18), implying they can be regulated directly by cohesin and ER. We used quantitative chromatin immunoprecipitation (qChIP) to determine if HDAC8 inhibition alters chromatin. As expected, siRAD21 diminished RAD21 binding at cognate sites upstream of SOX4 and IL20 (Fig. 5 A) despite eliciting increased levels of ac-SMC3 (Fig. 2). Together, the results show that HDAC8 inhibition by PCI-34051 in MCF7 cells does not alter ER-associated transcription, unlike depletion of cohesin subunits.

**HDAC8 Inhibition Delays Cell Cycle Progression and Compromises Viability of MCF7 Cells**—Despite the lack of effects on cohesin-mediated transcription, growth of MCF7 cells was sensitive to HDAC8 inhibition. To better understand the effects of HDAC8 inhibition on cell cycle progression, we conducted flow cytometry on synchronized cells (Fig. 6 A). Control cells entered early S phase 2 h after release of the thymidine block, and tra-
versed S phase, G2, and mitosis at 12 h as a synchronous cohort (Fig. 6B). By 24 h, cells began to re-enter the next cell cycle. At 10 μM PCI-34051, the transit time through S and G2/M was similar to the control, but there was a notable delay at 24 h as fewer cells re-entered the next cycle. This delay was marked at 25 μM PCI-34051. At higher doses cells barely made it into S phase. PCI-34051 treatment caused a similar cell cycle delay in non-cancerous breast epithelial MCF10A cells and in T47D ER-positive breast cancer cells, with delay being more profound in T47D (data not shown). Thus, the main effect of PCI-34051 is to slow progression through the G1 phase of the cell cycle, with potency dependent on cell type. Mitosis was not compromised, as mitotic figures were normal as revealed by α-tubulin and DAPI staining (Fig. 7A), even at the 50 μM dose of PCI-34051.

A sub-G1 population, indicative of apoptotic cell death, was observed after 24 h with the 50 and 100 μM PCI-34051 (Fig. 6B). Morphological examination showed that PCI-34051 doses of 50 μM and above resulted in alteration of the characteristic MCF7 cell shape (Fig. 7B). HDAC8 inhibition with PCI-34051 led to a dose-dependent decrease in cell confluence (Fig. 7C) and cellular metabolism as measured by MTT assay (Fig. 7D). Cells lost viability after 48 h of drug treatment (Fig. 7, E and F).

Our results show that HDAC8 inhibition compromises growth and survival of MCF7 breast cancer cells.

**Discussion**

Cohesin shows promise as therapeutic target in cancers where it has a known role in tumor biology, such as AML (8–12). The lack of chromosome abnormalities in many cancers with cohesin alterations raises the intriguing possibility that cohesin contributes to cancer through its role in transcription (3, 6, 7). In MCF7 breast cancer cells, cohesin binds throughout the genome in combination with ER, leading to the idea that cohesin is essential for estrogen-dependent transcription (15, 18, 36, 37). In a previous study, we found that cohesin is an important transcriptional modulator of a subset of estrogen-dependent genes (18). Therefore, inhibition of cohe-
Sin in ER-positive breast cancer could have therapeutic potential through blockade of transcriptional response to estrogen.

HDAC8 was previously shown to be the specific deacetylase for SMC3 and therefore important for SMC3 recycling, which is assumed to be essential for all cohesin functions. Indeed, humans with mutations in HDAC8 fall within the spectrum of the human developmental disorder, Cornelia de Lange Syndrome (CdLS) (25). CdLS is caused by mutations in the cohesin loader NIPBL (around 50–60%) with a subset having lesions in cohesin subunits or HDAC8 (38, 39). The consensus is that developmental anomalies in CdLS are due to global problems with gene transcription (25, 40–42). Therefore, HDAC8 likely has a role in gene transcription, in a developmental context, through its role in deacetylation of SMC3.

In the present study, we tested the idea that HDAC8 inhibition could cause similar transcriptional changes to cohesin subunit knockdown in MCF7 cells. Surprisingly, we found that although MCF7 cells accumulated ac-SMC3 following HDAC8 inhibition, transcription in response to estrogen was unaffected. Chromatin-associated cohesin (RAD21) was only slightly reduced at two candidate gene loci, SOX4 and IL20 on a background of increased ac-SMC3. This minor decrease is con-

**FIGURE 7.** PCI-34051 reduces MCF7 cell growth and viability. A, confocal immunofluorescence analysis showing nuclear morphology and tubulin organization of PCI-34051-treated MCF7 cells. G1-S synchronized MCF7 cells were treated with 50 μM PCI-34051 for 24 h. Cells were then fixed, permeabilized, and stained with Hoechst H33342 (for DNA, blue) and for anti-α-tubulin (red). Arrows point to a metaphase cell with tubulin staining showing the mitotic spindle. B, images showing phenotype of PCI-34051-treated MCF7 cells. MCF7 cells were treated with varying concentrations of PCI-34051 (as indicated) for 3 days and visualized on an IX71 Olympus inverted microscope at 20× magnification. Images were taken using the Olympus DP71 camera and DC software, digitally zoomed and processed using ImageJ. C, confience-based IncuCyte assessment of cell growth in MCF7 cells treated with varying concentrations of PCI-34051. Percentage of cell confluence is plotted on the y axis with treatment times on the x axis. Error bars are ± S.E. of two independent experiments. D, MTT assessment of proliferation of MCF7 cells treated with different concentration of PCI-34051 for various time periods. Bar graphs represent absorbance readings ± S.E. of two independent experiments. Significance was determined using two-way ANOVA. *, p ≤ 0.05; **, p ≤ 0.01; ***, p ≤ 0.001; ****, p ≤ 0.0001. E, phase contrast images of YOYO-1 fluorescent dye (green) staining in MCF7 cells 3 and 4 days post-treatment with different concentrations of PCI-34051. Images were taken on the IncuCyte FLR at ×10 magnification in real time. F, graph showing assessment of cell viability using YOYO-1 fluorescent nucleic acid dye in MCF7 treated with varying concentrations of PCI-34051. Non-viability was quantified by plotting fluorescence confluence versus time using the IncuCyte FLR object counting algorithm. Error bars represent ± S.E. of two independent experiments.
sistent with the global 17% decrease in RAD21 binding in HeLa cells that have reduced HDAC8 activity (25). Furthermore, recruitment of ER remained unaltered, which contrasts with its altered binding in RAD21-depleted cells. Instead, HDAC8 inhibition delayed transit through the G1 phase of the cell cycle, consistent with a predicted defect in cohesin reloading because of accumulation of ac-SMC3.

We observed a cytostatic effect of HDAC8 inhibition, particularly at higher concentrations of PCI-34051, which eventually compromised survival of MCF7 cells. A recent study showed that HDAC8 is also responsible for the deacetylation of p53. In inv(16) + leukemia cells, inhibition of p53 deacetylation reactivated p53, and induced apoptosis (28). It is possible that the cell cycle delay and growth arrest we observed in MCF7 cells is also mediated by altered p53 acetylation rather than solely from accumulated ac-SMC3.

It is possible that cell type may be important for HDAC8 inhibition to have appreciable effects on cohesin and its transcription function. In T47D ER-positive breast cancer cells with mutant p53, we observed minor changes in expression of a small number of genes following PCI-34051 treatment that reflected RAD21 or SMC3 knockdown. However, T47D cells also exhibited severe cell cycle delay following PCI-34051 treatment such that we could not exclude indirect effects of cell cycle arrest on transcription (data not shown). Differences in transcriptional responses between cell types could also be cohesin dose-dependent (12).

Mutations in genes of the cohesin subunits have been identified in a range of cancers (7), and are not generally associated with aneuploidy (43). Evidence suggests that cohesin functions to establish chromatin interactions that influence contact between gene promoters and regulatory elements (18, 27, 44–47). In hematopoietic stem cells, haploinsufficiency of cohesin alters transcription and induces leukemia (10–12), suggesting that in cancers, the primary role of cohesin might be transcriptional. Our findings in this study call for caution in the development of drug design strategies for therapeutic targeting of cohesin, since not all tumor types may respond in the same way, and targeting cohesin transcriptional function may not have the anticipated outcome. Future screening strategies for cohesin-inhibitory candidates may require the inclusion of multiple platforms and robust biochemical testing for predicted function.
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