



RESEARCH HIGHLIGHT

Tamoxifen and ER α 36: Fertilizing the seeds of breast cancer metastasisMonika L. Burness¹ and Max S. Wicha¹*Cell Research* (2018) 28:391–392; <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41422-018-0028-4>

Hormonal therapies including tamoxifen have been a mainstay for the treatment of breast tumors that express the classical estrogen receptor ER α 66. Wang et al. now report that tamoxifen may paradoxically stimulate ALDH-expressing breast cancer stem cells via activation of the ER α 36 variant ER α 36.

One of the greatest advances in breast cancer therapy has been the stratification of tumors into subtypes based on expression of estrogen receptor (ER), progesterone receptor (PR), and HER2. Tumors that express ER, known as ER-positive breast cancers, are the most common subtype of breast cancer, accounting for ~70% of early-stage breast cancer diagnoses. They are highly curable, with 20-year disease-free survival rates approaching 80% for earliest stage tumors.

Estrogen signaling is mediated by binding of 17 β -estradiol (E2) to ER, which initiates a signaling cascade resulting in downstream activation of numerous transcription factors. Two estrogen receptors, ER α and ER β , have been described to signal via genomic and non-genomic pathways. These two receptors regulate unique genes, and in fact can serve opposing functions. Current clinically-utilized ER assays test for the primary alpha receptor, ER α 66. Several other ERs and related proteins have been described. For example, estrogen related receptor beta (ERR β) is found in embryonic stem cells, and is involved in cellular self-renewal. ER α 36, a truncated variant of ER α 66 without transcriptional activity, has been described and is thought to function via a non-genomic signaling pathway.¹ Interestingly, the expression of ER α 36 is independent of ER α 66, and thus it is expressed in a subset of cells in both ER-positive and ER-negative breast cancers.

The mainstay of therapy for ER-positive tumors is endocrine therapy, consisting of tamoxifen or aromatase inhibitors. Endocrine therapies work via preventing estrogen stimulation of the estrogen receptor and downstream signaling, although by different mechanisms. Aromatase inhibitors inhibit peripheral conversion of androgens into estrogen via the aromatase enzyme, thereby decreasing circulating levels of estradiol. Tamoxifen, a selective estrogen receptor modulator (SERM), acts as an estrogen antagonist in certain tissues, including breast tissue.

While endocrine therapy is highly effective, some tumors recur in spite of endocrine therapy. Cancer stem cells (CSCs) are postulated as a mechanism of tumor recurrence. These cells, which comprise a small portion of most ER-positive tumors, are thought to mediate tumor initiation, metastasis, and treatment resistance. Furthermore, the important clinical issue of dormancy in ER⁺ breast cancer has been attributed to this cell population. In ER-positive tumors, CSCs identified by the expression of aldehyde

dehydrogenase (ALDH1) are often found to be negative for ER α 66, and the mitogenic effects of estrogen on this cell population have been thought to be indirect involving paracrine effects.²

In a recent paper in *Cell Research*, Wang et al. add to the evolving story the importance of ER α 36 in breast cancer with a report that stimulation of ER α 36 promotes metastasis via promotion of ALDH1A1-positive CSCs.^{3, 4} This group has previously reported that expression of ER α 36 is related to resistance to tamoxifen, and that estrogen signaling via ER α 36 regulates the maintenance of breast CSCs.⁵ In the current study, they analyzed ER α 36 expression in 1677 breast cancer samples, and convincingly showed that ER α 36 expression was correlated with tumor size, grade, and lymph node involvement. They further found that ER α 36-positive tumors were more likely to recur as metastatic disease, regardless of ER α 66 status. In patients who received tamoxifen, those with ER α 36-positive tumors showed shorter metastasis-free survival than those with ER α 36-negative tumors, although this may in fact be due to ER α 36 itself, not a negative effect of tamoxifen therapy. In contrast to the effects of tamoxifen, they show that the clinical benefit of aromatase inhibitors is independent of ER α 36 expression. They conclude that these differential clinical outcomes are due to the stimulatory effect of tamoxifen on ER α 36-expressing cells, a finding consistent with but not proven by the clinical data.

They present compelling pre-clinical data linking ER α 36 and CSCs and demonstrate that tamoxifen stimulates ER α 36-expressing CSCs, increasing their capacity for migration, invasion, and tumor initiation. Furthermore, they show that this occurs via the regulation of ALDH expression. It has previously been demonstrated that ALDH is a marker of breast CSC and a predictor of poor clinical outcome.⁶ The current work adds increasing evidence for an important functional role of ALDH. It also suggests that estrogen may have a direct mitogenic effect on breast CSC which is mediated by ER α 36. In addition, this study suggests that tamoxifen resistance may in part be mediated by ER α 36, and that CSCs are responsible for the effect.

The authors propose that tumors could be screened for ER α 36 expression, and that tamoxifen should not be used for tumors that express ER α 36. However, this suggestion is counter to numerous clinical studies demonstrating the effectiveness of tamoxifen in both therapeutic and preventative settings. A meta-analysis published by the Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group (EBCTCG) in ER-positive breast cancer demonstrated ~30% reduction in breast cancer mortality with 5 years of tamoxifen therapy.⁷

¹University of Michigan Comprehensive Cancer Center, Michigan Medicine, Ann Arbor, MI, USA.
Correspondence: Max S. Wicha (mwicha@umich.edu)

Interestingly, however, there are some clinical data suggesting a paradoxical effect of tamoxifen consistent with the Wang et al. data. A meta-analysis of studies utilizing SERMs in prevention of breast cancer demonstrated a 38% reduction in breast cancer incidence.⁸ However, long-term results of one of the largest chemoprevention trials demonstrated a trend toward increased breast cancer deaths in the group treated with tamoxifen as compared to placebo.⁹ Furthermore, results of numerous studies reveal superior efficacy of aromatase inhibitors compared to tamoxifen.¹⁰ This may be in part due to mechanisms related to ER α 36 signaling as described.

A growing body of literature on ER α 36 suggests that expression of this ER variant may be of important clinical significance. In the absence of clinical trial data, it is premature to recommend a change in clinical practice based on ER α 36 expression. However, the data presented in this paper as well as previous studies provide a strong rationale for designing clinical trials to further elucidate the role of ER α 36 across the spectrum of breast cancer.

ADDITIONAL INFORMATION

Competing interests: MSW has financial holdings and is a scientific advisor for OncoMed Pharmaceuticals, Verastem, and MedImmune and receives research support from MedImmune.

REFERENCES

1. Wang, Z. et al. *Biochem. Biophys. Res. Commun.* **336**, 1023–1027 (2005).
2. Fillmore, C. M. et al. *Proc. Natl Acad. Sci.* **107**, 21737–21742 (2010).
3. Wang, Q. et al. *Cell Res.* **28**, 336–358 (2018).
4. Deng, H. et al. *PLoS ONE.* **9**, e88034 (2014).
5. Shi, L. et al. *J. Clin. Oncol.* **27**, 3423–3429 (2009).
6. Ginestier, C. et al. *Cell Stem Cell.* **1**, 555–567 (2007).
7. Early Breast Cancer Trialists' Collaborative Group. et al. *Lancet* **378**, 771–784 (2011).
8. Cuzick, J. et al. *Lancet* **381**, 1827–1834 (2013).
9. Cuzick, J. et al. *Lancet Oncol.* **16**, 67–75 (2015).
10. Dowsett, M. et al. *Lancet* **386**, 1341–1352 (2015).