OPEN

SUBJECT AREAS:

UBIQUITYLATION
HORMONE RECEPTORS

Received
10 October 2014

Accepted
4 February 2015

Published
5 March 2015

Correspondence and
requests for materials
should be addressed to
H.W. (wuhj@dlut.edu.
cn)

* These authors
contributed equally to
this work.

FOXK2 Transcription Factor Suppresses ER α -positive Breast Cancer Cell Growth Through Down-Regulating the Stability of ER α via mechanism involving BRCA1/BARD1

Ying Liu^{1*}, Xiang Ao^{1*}, Zhaojun Jia¹, Xiao-Yan Bai¹, Zhaowei Xu¹, Gaolei Hu¹, Xiao Jiang¹, Min Chen¹ & Huijian Wu^{1,2}

¹School of Life Science and Biotechnology, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian 116024, Liaoning, China, ²School of Life Science and Medicine, Dalian University of Technology, Panjin 114221, Liaoning, China.

Estrogen receptors (ERs) are critical regulators of breast cancer development. Identification of molecules that regulate the function of ERs may facilitate the development of more effective breast cancer treatment strategies. In this study, we showed that the forkhead transcription factor FOXK2 interacted with ER α , and inhibited ER α -regulated transcriptional activities by enhancing the ubiquitin-mediated degradation of ER α . This process involved the interaction between FOXK2 and BRCA1/BARD1, the E3 ubiquitin ligase of ER α . FOXK2 interacted with BARD1 and acted as a scaffold protein for BRCA1/BARD1 and ER α , leading to enhanced degradation of ER α , which eventually accounted for its decreased transcriptional activity. Consistent with these observations, overexpression of FOXK2 inhibited the transcriptional activity of ER α , decreased the transcription of ER α target genes, and suppressed the proliferation of ER α -positive breast cancer cells. In contrast, knockdown of FOXK2 in MCF-7 cells promoted cell proliferation. However, when ER α was also knocked down, knockdown of FOXK2 had no effect on cell proliferation. These findings suggested that FOXK2 might act as a negative regulator of ER α , and its association with both ER α and BRCA1/BARD1 could lead to the down-regulation of ER α transcriptional activity, effectively regulating the function of ER α .

Breast cancer, the most common form of malignant disease among women, has become the second leading cause of cancer death¹. The common risk factors for breast cancer include family history, reproductive factors, dietary factors and estrogen². Among them, estrogen has been recognized as a key carcinogenic factor in the initiation and progression of breast cancer. Longer exposures to estrogen result in an increased risk of breast cancer³. Estrogen exerts its physiological function through binding with ERs, which then forms a dimer and binds to estrogen-responsive elements (EREs) in the promoters of the target genes to regulate their expressions. There are two isoforms of ERs, and these are ER α and ER β . ER α is closely associated with the development of ER-positive breast cancer⁴. Nearly 70% of breast cancer express ER α and are estrogen dependent⁵. Clinically, ER α is viewed as a valuable predictive and prognostic factor for breast cancer treatment. Consequently, inhibition of ER α has become one of the major strategies for the prevention and treatment of breast cancer. Currently, ER α is a major target for endocrine therapy⁶. Multiple cellular and molecular events can regulate ER α function, such as genic mutation, epigenetic modification, or direct interaction with corepressor proteins that repress ER- α -mediated transcriptional activity⁷. However, the detailed mechanism involved in the regulation of ER α function is still inconclusive, and this appears to restrict our understanding on the pathogenesis of ER α -positive breast cancer. Thus it is extremely important to gain further insight into how ER α function is regulated.

Numerous studies have shown that ER α is tightly regulated by post-translational modifications (PTMs), such as phosphorylation, methylation, acetylation, sumoylation and ubiquitination^{8–12}. In these PTMs, ubiquitination can down-regulate the protein level of ER α and suppress its transcriptional activity¹³. Ubiquitination involves several steps and three well-known enzymes called ubiquitin activating enzyme (E1), ubiquitin conjugating

enzyme (E2), and ubiquitin ligases (E3). Among the three enzymes, only E3 ubiquitin ligases physically interact with their substrates, and therefore confer some degree of specificity. Several E3 ubiquitin ligases are known to associate with the ubiquitination of ER α , include the C terminus of Hsc70-interacting protein (CHIP), Breast cancer type 1 susceptibility protein (BRCA1)/BRCA1-associated RING domain protein 1 (BARD1), murine double minute 2 (MDM2) and ring finger protein (RNF31)^{13–16}. Among them, BRCA1/BARD1 complex is a well-known E3 ubiquitin ligase, and it has been widely investigated. BRCA1/BARD1 plays important roles in DNA-damage response and tumor suppression through degrading a set of substrates such as RNA pol II and FANCD2 in addition to ER α ¹⁷.

Forkhead box K2 (FOXK2), also known as ILF or ILF1, is one of the forkhead transcription factors that contain a conserved forkhead winged helix-turn-helix DNA binding domain (FOX domain). It was first identified as a regulator of IL-2 transcription, where it acts as a transcriptional repressor¹⁸. In common with other forkhead transcription factors, FOXK2 contains a FOX domain in addition to a FHA domain that mediates its interaction with other proteins. The function of FOXK2 is regulated by the CDK1/Cyclin B kinase complex which modulates its stability and activity¹⁹. FOXK2 interacts with AP-1, and promotes the binding of AP-1 to chromatin, resulting in the up-regulation of AP-1-dependent gene expression²⁰. It can also bind to G/T-mismatch DNA and initiate the process of DNA mismatch repair²¹. FOXA1, another member of the forkhead transcription factors, has been shown to interact with ER α via its FOX domain, and mediates the recruitment of ER α to chromatin, leading to the up-regulation of ER α target genes²². Other members of this protein family, such as FOXO3a can also interact with ER α via its FOX domain, but its action inhibits ER α transcriptional activities, causing a down-regulation in the expression of ERs target genes, and suppression of the proliferation of ER α -positive breast cancer cells⁶. Both FOXA1 and FOXO3a can interact with ER α via their FOX domains, but they exert completely different effects on the regulation of ER α . This suggests that FOX domain just mediates the interaction of forkhead proteins with ER α , whereas other domains in their structures may affect ER α function. FOXK2 contains a conserved FOX domain, and our preliminary data have shown that FOXK2 can inhibit the transcriptional activity of ER α . We therefore wanted to know whether FOXK2 can interact with ER α and regulate its function.

In this report, we observed a negative correlation between ER α and FOXK2 in human breast cancer. We demonstrated that FOXK2 could interact with ER α via the region containing FOX domain (amino acids 128 to 353), leading to lower protein stability for ER α , and inhibition of its transcriptional activity. Such regulation of ER α by FOXK2 occurred via a mechanism that involved BRCA1/BARD1. We also showed that FOXK2 could suppress ER α -mediated proliferation of breast cancer cells. Taken together, our data suggested that FOXK2 might act as a negative regulator of ER α .

Results

FOXK2 is associated with ER α in human breast cancer. Aberrant ER α signaling is known to play an important role in the occurrence of ER α -positive breast cancer. However, little is known about the role of FOXK2 in tumorigenesis of breast cancer. In order to examine the relationship between FOXK2 and ER α in breast cancer, we compared the protein levels of FOXK2 and ER α in the breast cancer specimens (Fig. 1a). A total of 53 breast tumor specimens (27 ER α -positive and 26 ER α -negative) were analyzed by immunohistochemical assay. According to the comparison of H-score, seventeen of the ER α -positive samples (63%) showed low FOXK2 expression, whereas only eight of the ER α -negative samples (31%) showed low FOXK2 expression (Fig. 1b). We also examined the protein levels of endogenous ER α and FOXK2 in various breast cancer cell lines. As shown in Fig. 1c, the levels of FOXK2 expression in the ER α -positive

breast cancer cell lines (MCF-7, T47D, ZR-51-30 and BT474) were significantly lower than that in ER α -negative breast cancer cell lines (MDA-MB-231 and Bcap-37). Taken together, these results suggested that a negative correlation existed between ER α and FOXK2 in breast cancer.

FOXK2 interacts with ER α in breast cancer cells. In breast cancer cells, FOXA1 and FOXO3a can regulate the function of ER α via their FOX domains, and since FOXK2 also contains a conserved FOX domain, we speculated that it too may interact with ER α . In order to investigate this possibility, we performed co-immunoprecipitation experiments in two different cell lines (MCF-7 and T47D) using either anti-FOXK2 or anti-ER α antibody. A positive interaction between endogenous FOXK2 and ER α was evident in MCF-7 and T47D cells (Figs. 2a and 2b). Similar co-precipitation of FOXK2 and ER α were obtained when the same immunoprecipitation experiment was carried out in HEK 293T cells that were transfected with EGFP-FOXK2 and Flag-ER α (Fig. 2c). The interaction between FOXK2 and ER α was confirmed using mammalian two-hybrid system. Transactivation by pBIND-ER α was evident by co-expressing a pACT-FOXK2 fusion protein (Fig. 2d). Moreover, GST pull-down assay further confirmed the interaction between FOXK2 Δ 1 and ER α in vitro (Fig. 2e). Double-label fluorescence immunohistochemistry carried out in MCF-7 cells showed that both of FOXK2 and ER α were localized in the nucleus (Fig. 2f), further strengthening our speculation that FOXK2 may directly participate in the estrogen signaling pathway. To elucidate the region of FOXK2 that might mediate the interaction between FOXK2 and ER α , HEK 293T cells were transfected with EGFP-tagged ER α together with Flag-tagged full-length FOXK2 (FOXK2 FL) or mutant FOXK2 (FOXK2 Δ 1 contained FHA and FOX domains, FOXK2 Δ 2 contained FHA domain, FOXK2 Δ 3 contained FOX domain and FOXK2 Δ 4 contained C-terminal tail domain). The transfected cells were subjected to immunoprecipitation carried out with anti-GFP antibody, followed by Western blot with anti-Flag antibody. Positive interactions were obtained only between ER α and FOXK2 FL or Δ 1 or Δ 3, but not with ER α and FOXK2 Δ 2 or Δ 4 (Fig. 2g), indicating that the region containing the FOX domain (amino acids 128 to 353) mediated the interaction between FOXK2 and ER α , and probably exerted an important effect on the regulation of ER α .

FOXK2 decreases ER α protein level by promoting its ubiquitin-dependent degradation. Given that there was a negative correlation between ER α and FOXK2 in human breast cancer, we speculated that there may be a causal relationship between FOXK2 and ER α at the protein level. To investigate this possibility, MCF-7 cells were transfected with a control vector or His-Flag-FOXK2 and their endogenous levels of ER α were compared by Western blot. Overexpression of FOXK2 resulted in reduced ER α protein level (Fig. 3a). Considering that this could be also due to changes in level of ER α transcript, changes in ER α mRNA levels in MCF-7 cells were then examined. Real-time PCR analysis showed that overexpression of FOXK2 had no effect on the level of ER α mRNA (Fig. 3b). Furthermore, knockdown of FOXK2 by siRNA pool (with four individual siRNAs targeting FOXK2 gene) increased the endogenous ER α protein level (Fig. 3c) without changing the level of ER α mRNA in MCF-7 cells (Fig. 3d), suggesting that the reduced level of ER α protein caused by FOXK2 was due to the change in ER α protein stability. Considering the stability of ER α is known to be regulated by proteasome-mediated degradation^{23,24}, the effect of overexpression of FOXK2 on the stability of ER α was further examined in the absence and presence of MG132, a proteasome inhibitor. In the absence of MG132, the protein level of endogenous ER α decreased with increasing dosages of FOXK2, whereas in the presence of MG132, the levels were similar among regardless of the dosages of FOXK2 (Fig. 3e), suggesting that MG132 could inhibit the proteasome-dependent degradation of ER α .

Figure 1 | Correlation between ERα and FOXK2 in human breast cancer. (a) Representative results showing the immunohistochemical staining of ERα and FOXK2 in sections of the breast tumor tissues. Each sample was incubated with antibody against ERα or FOXK2. Positive staining and negative staining are indicated by brown and blue staining, respectively ($\times 200$ Magnification). (b) Correlation between ERα and FOXK2 expression suggested by the 53 breast cancer specimens. χ^2 test was used for statistical analysis. P values less than 0.05 were considered to indicate statistical significance. (c) Western blot analysis comparing the endogenous FOXK2 protein levels in several breast cancer cells. Experiments were repeated at least three times. The level of FOXK2 protein from MCF-7 cells was set to 1. Data shown in the graphs are the means $\pm$ SDs of three experiments. *, $P < 0.05$; **, $P < 0.01$. The full-length blot of Figure 1 is presented in Supplementary Figure 1.

promoted by FOXK2. The half-life of ERα in MCF-7 cells transfected with or without wild-type FOXK2 was determined after the cells were treated with cycloheximide, an inhibitor of protein biosynthesis. The results demonstrated that overexpression of FOXK2 shortened the half-life of ERα from 11 h to 5 h (Fig. 3f) and increased the ubiquitination of ERα (Fig. 3g). Taken together, these results suggested that FOXK2 could decrease the stability of ERα through promoting its ubiquitin-dependent degradation.

FOXK2 interacts with BARD1 and increases the ubiquitination of ERα. Protein sequence analysis showed that FOXK2 did not have the RING, U-box and HECT domains, which are catalytic domains of ubiquitin E3 ligase, and therefore FOXK2 may not function as an ubiquitin E3 ligase. So we speculated that FOXK2 may increase the ubiquitination of ERα through interaction with other E3 ligases. In

order to examine which ubiquitin E3 ligase is involved in FOXK2-promoted ubiquitination of ERα, we examined the interaction between FOXK2 and the ubiquitin E3 ligases of ERα. Co-immunoprecipitation experiments revealed a positive interaction between FOXK2 and BARD1 (Fig. 4a), whereas no interaction between FOXK2 and CHIP or FOXK2 and MDM2 was observed (Fig. 4b and 4c), suggesting that BRCA1/BARD1 might participate in FOXK2-mediated degradation of ERα. To further confirm the interaction of FOXK2 with BARD1, we performed co-immunoprecipitation experiment using MCF-7 cells and either anti-FOXK2 or anti-BARD1 antibody. A positive interaction between endogenous FOXK2 and BARD1 was observed (Fig. 4d). To map the region of FOXK2 that interacted with BARD1, we performed the same experiment for the different truncated FOXK2 mutants. Positive interaction was seen between BARD1 and FOXK2 FL or $\Delta 1$ or $\Delta 2$,

Figure 2 | Interaction between FOXK2 and ERα. (a–b) MCF-7 and T47D cells were subjected to immunoprecipitation with anti-ERα antibody followed by Western blot with anti-FOXK2 antibody or vice versa. Immunoprecipitation carried out with anti-IgG antibody was used as control. (c) HEK 293T cells transfected with EGFP-tagged FOXK2 only, or with EGFP-tagged FOXK2 and Flag-tagged ERα were subjected to immunoprecipitation with anti-Flag antibody followed by Western blot with anti-GFP antibody or vice versa. (d) The interaction between FOXK2 and ERα was detected using a mammalian two hybrid system. FOXK2 and ERα were expressed from pBIND-ERα and pACT-FOXK2, respectively, whereas the empty vectors pACT and pBIND were expressed as controls, as indicated with the pG5-luc reporter in HEK 293T cells. Cells were transfected with pBIND-ID and pACT-MyoD as a positive control. Luciferase activity was measured 36 h after transfection. The luc activity level of cells transfected with pG5-luc, pACT and pBIND was set to 1. Data shown in the graphs are the means ± S.D.s of three experiments. **, $P < 0.01$ compared with cells transfected with pACT and pBIND. (e) Interaction of FOXK2 with ERα *in vitro*. Extract of MCF-7 cells were incubated with immobilized GST-FOXK2 Δ1 or GST alone. The bound proteins were subjected to Western blot assay. (f) Localization of ERα and FOXK2 in MCF-7. MCF-7 cells transfected with EGFP-FOXK2 and Flag-ERα were stained with rabbit anti-Flag antibody and tetraethyl rhodamine isothiocyanate (TRITC)-conjugated anti-rabbit IgG. EGFP-FOXK2 appeared as green signal when visualized by fluorescence microscopy. Nuclei were stained with 4,6-diamidino-2-phenylindole (DAPI). (g) HEK 293T cells were transfected with EGFP-tagged ERα and Flag-tagged full-length FOXK2 (FL), FOXK2 Δ1, FOXK2 Δ2, FOXK2 Δ3 or FOXK2 Δ4 and then treated with 10 μM MG132 for 8 h. The cells were subjected to immunoprecipitation with anti-IgG or anti-GFP antibody followed by Western blot with anti-Flag antibody. All experiments were repeated at least three times. The full-length blot of Figure 2 is presented in Supplementary Figure 2.

Figure 3 | Effect of FOXK2 on ubiquitin-dependent degradation of ERα. (a) HEK 293T cells transfected with Flag-ERα only or with Flag-ERα and His-Flag-FOXK2 were treated with or without 10 nM E2 for 16 h. The samples were subjected to Western blot analysis with the indicated antibodies. (b) MCF-7 cells transfected with empty vector or His-Flag-FOXK2 were treated with or without 10 nM E2 for 16 h. The samples were subjected to Realtime-PCR analysis. For comparison, the level of ERα mRNA for the control MCF-7 cells was set to 1. (c) MCF-7 cells transfected with siFOXK2 pool or siControl were treated with or without 10 nM E2 for 16 h. The samples were subjected to Western blot analysis with the indicated antibodies. (d) MCF-7 cells transfected with siFOXK2 pool or siControl were treated with or without 10 nM E2 for 16 h. The samples were subjected to Realtime-PCR analysis. For comparison, the level of ERα mRNA for the control MCF-7 cells was set to 1. (e) HEK 293T cells transfected with different doses of His-Flag-FOXK2 (0, 1, 2, 4 and 6 μg) were treated with or without 10 μM MG132 for 8 h. The samples were subjected to Western blot analysis with the indicated antibodies. (f) HEK 293T cells transfected with Flag-ERα only, or Flag-ERα and His-Flag-FOXK2 were treated with 10 μg/ml cycloheximide (CHX) for different periods of time (0, 3, 6, 9, 12 h) before being subjected to Western blot. The graph shows the relative intensity of the ERα band at different time points. The level of ERα protein for control HEK 293T cells was set to 1. (g) MCF-7 cells transfected with Myc-Ub only or with Myc-Ub and EGFP-FOXK2 were treated with 10 μM MG132 for 8 h. The samples were subjected to immunoprecipitation with anti-IgG or anti-ERα antibody followed by Western blot analysis with anti-Myc antibody. All experiments were repeated at least three times. Data shown in the graphs are the means ± SDs of three experiments. *, $P < 0.05$; ns, not significant. The full-length blot of Figure 3 is presented in Supplementary Figure 3.

whereas no interaction was detected between BARD1 and FOXK2 Δ3 or Δ4 (Fig. 4e), suggesting that the interaction of FOXK2 and BARD1 was mediated by the amino-terminal region containing FHA domain (amino acids 1 to 128) of FOXK2. Double-label fluorescence immunohistochemistry further revealed that both FOXK2 and

BARD1 were localized in the nucleus of the cell (Fig. 4f). Given that FOXK2 could interact with both ERα and BARD1, we speculated that an ERα-FOXK2-BARD1 complex might exist. To investigate this possibility, we performed re-immunoprecipitation and Western blot assay. A band was detected when extract of

Figure 4 | Effect of FOXK2 on the interaction between BARD1 and ERα. (a) HEK 293T cells transfected with HA-BARD1 only, or with HA-BARD1 and His-Flag-FOXK2 were subjected to immunoprecipitation with anti-Flag antibody followed by Western blot with anti-HA antibody or vice versa. (b) HEK 293T cells transfected with appropriate plasmids were subjected to immunoprecipitation and Western blot with specific antibodies as indicated or vice versa. (c) MCF-7 cells were subjected to immunoprecipitation with anti-MDM2 antibody followed by Western blot with anti-FOXK2 antibody or vice versa. (d) MCF-7 cells were subjected to immunoprecipitation with anti-BARD1 antibody followed by Western blot with anti-FOXK2 antibody or vice versa. (e) HEK 293T cells transfected with HA-BARD1 and different FOXK2 constructs as indicated were collected and then subjected to immunoprecipitation with anti-HA antibody, followed by Western blot analysis with anti-Flag antibody. (f) MCF-7 cells transfected with EGFP-FOXK2 and HA-BARD1 were stained with rabbit anti-HA antibody and TRITC-conjugated anti-rabbit IgG, and then counterstained with DAPI (blue) for nucleus detection. EGFP-FOXK2 appeared as green signal when visualized by fluorescence microscopy. (g) MCF-7 cells transfected with Flag-ERα and HA-BARD1 were subjected to immunoprecipitation with anti-Flag antibody and re-immunoprecipitation (RE) with anti-HA antibody followed by Western blot with anti-FOXK2 antibody, anti-Flag or anti-HA antibody. (h) HEK 293T cells transfected with appropriate plasmids as indicated, and then treated with 10 μM MG132 for 8 h. Cells were collected and then subjected to immunoprecipitation with anti-Flag antibody followed by Western blot with the indicated antibodies. (i) HEK 293T cells transfected with appropriate plasmids as indicated, and then treated with 10 μM MG132 for 8 h. Cells were collected and then subjected to immunoprecipitation with anti-Flag antibody followed by Western blot with the indicated antibodies. (j) HEK 293T cells transfected with various combinations of different constructs as indicated were treated with 10 μM MG132 for 8 h. The cells were collected and subjected to immunoprecipitation with anti-ERα antibody followed by Western blot analysis with anti-Myc antibody. All experiments were repeated at least three times. The full-length blot of Figure 4 is presented in Supplementary Figure 4.

Figure 5 | Effect of FOXK2 on the transcriptional activity of ER α and its downstream target genes. (a) MCF-7 and T47D cells were transfected with ERE-luciferase, Flag-ER α and His-Flag-FOXK2. Luciferase activity was measured either with or without pre-treatment of the cells with 10 nM E2 for 16 h. For comparison, the ERE-luc activity level of control cells was set to 1. (b) MCF-7 and T47D cells were transfected with Cyclin D1-luciferase with Flag-ER α and His-Flag-FOXK2. Luciferase activity was measured either with or without pre-treatment of the cells with 10 nM E2 for 16 h. For comparison, the Cyclin D1-luc activity level of control cells was set to 1. (c) MCF-7 and T47D cells were transfected with ERE-luciferase and different FOXK2 constructs. Luciferase activity was measured either with or without pre-treatment of the cells with 10 nM E2 for 16 h. For comparison, the ERE-luc activity level of control cells was set to 1. (d) MCF-7 and T47D cells were transfected with Cyclin D1-luciferase and different FOXK2 constructs. Luciferase activity was measured either with or without pre-treatment of the cells with 10 nM E2 for 16 h. For comparison, the Cyclin D1-luc activity level of control cells was set to 1. (e) MCF-7 cells were transfected with His-Flag-FOXK2. The cells pre-treated with or without 10 nM E2 for 16 h and then subjected to real-time PCR to measure the mRNA levels of Cyclin D1 and GREB1. For comparison, Cyclin D1 and GREB1 mRNA levels of control cells were set to 1. All experiments were repeated at least three times. Each bar represents the mean $\pm$ SDs of three independent experiments. *, $P < 0.05$; **, $P < 0.01$. The full-length blot of Figure 5 is presented in Supplementary Figure 5.

MCF-7 cells that overexpressed Flag-ER α and HA-BARD1 was probed with anti-FOXK2 antibody (Fig. 4g), indicating the existence of ER α -FOXK2-BARD1 complex. We further examined whether FOXK2 could affect the interaction of ER α with BARD1. The results showed that overexpression of FOXK2 enhanced the interaction between ER α and BARD1 (Fig. 4h), whereas knockdown of FOXK2 by siRNA decreased this interaction (Fig. 4i), indicating that FOXK2 probably acted as a scaffold protein to enhance the interaction of BRCA1/BARD1 with ER α . Next, we examined the effect of FOXK2 on BARD1-mediated ubiquitination of ER α . As shown in Fig. 4j, both FOXK2 and BARD1 enhanced the ubiquitination of ER α , with the extent of ubiquitination being enhanced when both FOXK2 and BARD1 were overexpressed. In contrast, knockdown of FOXK2 decreased the ubiquitination of ER α . Taken together, these results suggested that FOXK2 probably

facilitated the interaction of ER α with its ubiquitin E3 ligase BRCA1/BARD1 complex, therefore, promoting the ubiquitin-mediated degradation of ER α .

FOXK2 suppresses the transcriptional activity of ER α . FOXK2-promoted degradation of ER α was expected to have a negative effect on the transcriptional activity of ER α . Therefore, the effect of FOXK2 on the transcriptional activity of ER α was determined by using a reporter gene construct consisting of estrogen responsive element-luciferase (ERE-luc). MCF-7 and T47D cells were transfected with the ERE-luc construct and ER α only, or ERE-luc, ER α and FOXK2, and the level of reporter activity in these cells was measured following treatment with or without 17 β -estradiol (E2). As shown in Fig. 5a, in the presence of E2 treatment, ERE-luc activity was highest when the cells overexpressed ER α alone. However, when these cells also

overexpressed FOXK2, the level of ERE-luc activity was significantly reduced in a dose-dependent manner. Indeed, FOXK2 could both inhibit the transcriptional activity of ER α in the absence and presence of E2 treatment. These results corresponded to the reduction of ER α protein detected by Western blot (Fig. 3e). Cyclin D1 is a classical ER α -targeted gene and its promoter contains EREs. Similar results were obtained when the same experiment was carried out using MCF-7 and T47D cells that were transfected with Cyclin D1-luc, Flag-ER α and His-Flag-FOXK2 with or without E2 treatment (Fig. 5b). Next, we detected the effect of different FOXK2 constructs on the transcriptional activity of ER α using MCF-7 and T47D cells. Luciferase reporter assay showed that the transcriptional activity of ER α in cells transfected with FOXK2 FL significantly decreased compared to non-transfected cells; the transcriptional activity of ER α in cells transfected with FOXK2 Δ 1 was similar to that in cells transfected with FOXK2 FL, whereas the transcriptional activity of ER α in cells transfected with FOXK2 Δ 2 and Δ 3 increased significantly, compared with that in cells transfected with FOXK2 Δ 1 both in the cases of MCF-7 and T47D cells (Fig. 5c and 5d). Furthermore, we examined the ability of FOXK2 to regulate the expression of the well-established ER α -targeted genes (*Cyclin D1* and *GREB1*) in MCF-7 cells. Real-time PCR analysis showed that overexpression of FOXK2 reduced the mRNA levels of both *Cyclin D1* and *GREB1* (Fig. 5e). Taken together, these results showed that FOXK2 might suppress the transcriptional activity of ER α through promoting its degradation, and in doing so, it caused the down-regulation of the expression of ER α target genes.

FOXK2 suppresses ER α -mediated growth of breast cancer cell. As FOXK2 was able to interact with ER α , and regulate its function, it may in fact affect ER α -mediated proliferation of breast cancer cells, especially since ER α is known to play a major role in the proliferation of breast cancer. Crystal violet staining assay showed that MCF-7 cells transfected with Flag-ER α produced more colonies than cells that were transfected with an empty vector (control cells) or cells that were transfected with both Flag-ER α and His-Flag-FOXK2 (Fig. 6a). In contrast, knockdown of ER α decreased, whereas knockdown of FOXK2 increased the colony numbers of MCF-7 cells compared with the control groups, whereas knockdown of FOXK2 increased the colony numbers of MCF-7 cells compared with control group. However when ER α was also knocked down, knockdown of FOXK2 had no effect on cell proliferation (Fig. 6b). We also examined the effect of FOXK2 on cell viability. Growth of both MCF-7 and T47D cells was inhibited when these cells were transfected with FOXK2 and cultured either in the absence of E2 (Fig. 6c). The effect of FOXK2 on the cell-cycle was also investigated. MCF-7 cells transfected with either Flag-ER α or His-Flag-FOXK2 or both were subjected to flow cytometry analysis to evaluate the cell cycle profile of asynchronous cells. Cells transfected with ER α showed an overall increase in the percentage of cells in the S phase, with a corresponding reduction in the percentage of cells in G0/G1 phase compared with control cells (Fig. 6d). In contrast, the percentage of cells in the S phase decreased for cells transfected with FOXK2 decreased the percentage of S phase cells compared with control cells. When the cells were transfected with both ER α and FOXK2, the percentage of S phase cells decreased compared with cells only transfected with ER α . Taken together, these results suggested that FOXK2 could suppress the growth of breast cancer cells through its modulation of ER α .

Discussion

Growing evidence has shown that ER α plays a key role in the initiation and development of breast cancer, and this has made ER α a valuable predictive and prognostic biomarker for the treatment of breast cancer^{25–27}. However, much of the detailed mechanism

involved in the regulation of ER α function is still unclear, and this appears to restrict our understanding of the pathogenesis of ER α -positive breast cancer. Thus it is important to gain further insight into how ER α function is regulated. In this study, we focused on the role of FOXK2 in ER α -positive breast cancer cells as this would allow us to investigate the connection between FOXK2 and ER α in breast cancer and to interpret this connection in terms of its significance in biological function.

The forkhead transcription factors are an evolutionarily conserved family of proteins. In mammals, there are over 40 different forkhead transcription factors, and these proteins control several cellular processes, including growth, development, proliferation and cell cycle through regulating the expression of their target genes^{28–30}. Forkhead transcription factors also interact with other transcription factors, and regulate their functions, such as the co-association of FOXA1 with ER and AR^{22,31}, FOXO3a with ER α and ER β ⁷, FOXM1 with Sp1³² and p53³³, and FOXO1A with HoxA-11³⁴. The data from breast tumor specimens that we analyzed indicated a negative correlation between FOXK2 and ER α (Fig. 1). Furthermore, the data from coimmunoprecipitation, mammalian two hybrid system and GST pull-down assay clearly revealed that FOXK2 interacted with ER α (Figs. 2a–e), although we could not conclude from our data whether FOXK2 and ER α directly interact with each other or via some an accessory element. The interaction was obvious and real, and subsequent reporter gene assay showed that FOXK2 suppressed the transcriptional activity of ER α and it achieved this through affecting its protein stability rather than its gene expression (Figs. 5a–d). The mechanism may stem from FOXK2 playing a structural role, such as stabilizing the protein complex, thereby making ER α more readily for ubiquitination. In the case of FOXO3a, its interaction with ER α has been demonstrated to occur via its FOX domain, and this interaction also results in the inhibition of ER α transcriptional activity⁷. However, whether FOXO3a affects ER α at the level of protein or gene was not demonstrated. We not only identified the exact domain of FOXK2 that interacted with ER α , but also showed that such interaction led to enhanced the degradation of ER α via the proteasome, and hence, its loss of transcriptional activity.

Ubiquitin-dependent protein degradation plays an important role in many basic cellular functions through regulating different cell regulators, such as tumor regulators, transcriptional factors and cell surface receptors^{35,36}. Before the target protein is degraded by 26S proteasome, it must be attached conjugated to ubiquitin, a process that is catalyzed by an E3 ubiquitin ligase^{37–40}. FOXK2 lacks the catalytic domains of ubiquitin E3 ligase, and does not have the function of ubiquitin E3 ligase. Thus we speculated that FOXK2 may increase the ubiquitination of ER α through regulating the interaction between ER α and its E3 ligases. Indeed, FOXK2 interacted with BARD1 and thus, the BRCA1/BARD1 complex could be responsible for the degradation of ER α . If so, then FOXK2 would appear to mediate the degradation of ER α via an accessory protein, BARD1. Furthermore, FOXK2 interacted with ER α and BARD1 at different domains (Figs. 2e and 4d), suggesting that the interaction was rather specific in each case. The involvement of BARD1 in FOXK2-regulated ER α activity was clearly supported by the data which showed that overexpression of FOXK2 promoted the interaction between BARD1 and ER α (Fig. 4h), whereas knockdown of FOXK2 weakened their interaction (Fig. 4i).

ER α is a member of the steroid hormone receptor superfamily of ligand-activated transcription factors. As a transcription factor, ER α plays a crucial role in regulating the normal function of reproductive tissues and proliferation of epithelial cells. It also plays an important role in the genesis and malignant progression of breast cancer. Aberrant activation of ER α contributes to tumorigenesis of the breast by up-regulating its target genes such as *TFF1*, *SDF-1*, *Cyclin D1* and *GREB1*^{41–45}. Among them, *Cyclin D1* is a major regulator that governs the entrance of a cell into the proliferative stage of the cell cycle,

Figure 6 | Effect of FOXK2 on ER α -mediated breast cancer cells proliferation. (a) MCF-7 Cells transfected with Flag-ER α , or with His-Flag-FOXK2, or with Flag-ER α and His-Flag-FOXK2 were stained with crystal violet after 8 days of growth (left panel). The right graph shows the relative cell density obtained from eight plates estimated by the software Imagepro-plus. For comparison, the number of control cells was set to 1. (b) MCF-7 Cells transfected with control siRNA (siControl), or with siER α , or with siFOXK2, or with siER α and siFOXK2 were stained with crystal violet after 8 days of growth (left panel). The right graph shows the relative cell density obtained from eight plates. The number of control cells was set to 1. (c) MCF-7 and T47D cells were transfected with His-Flag-FOXK2, and then treated without or with 10 nM E2 for the indicated times. The cells were then subjected to 3-(4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl)-2,5-diphenyltetrazolium bromide (MTT) assay performed according to the manufacturer's instructions (Key Gen). The absorption of control cells was set to 1. (d) MCF-7 cells were transfected with control vector, or with Flag-ER α , or with His-Flag-FOXK2, or with Flag-ER α and His-Flag-FOXK2. Flow cytometry analysis of cell-cycle distribution of MCF-7 cells after 36 h of growth in the presence of 10 nM E2. All experiments were repeated at least three times. Each bar represents the mean $\pm$ SDs of three plates *, $P < 0.05$; **, $P < 0.01$.

and its expression is regulated by ER α , which mediates its proliferative action on mammary cancer cells⁴⁴. Thus, there is a strong correlation between increased proliferative response and increased levels of *Cyclin D1* mRNA, and this could be seen from the increased levels of ER α in MCF-7 cells that stably expressed ER α compared to control cells (no overexpression of ER α)⁴⁶. Our

data here that the mRNA level of *Cyclin D1* was up-regulated in MCF-7 cells following treatment with E2, whereas this up-regulation was inhibited when the cells overexpressed FOXK2. The up-regulation of *GREB1* mRNA level was also inhibited by FOXK2 (Fig. 5e), and was consistent with the result obtained for *Cyclin D1*. This indicated that FOXK2 could suppress the transcriptional

activity of ER α , which would effectively down-regulate the expression of genes that are regulated by ER α .

Since FOXK2 could act as a negative regulator of ER α , we expected it to play a role in ER α -mediated cell proliferation. According to our data, either overexpression of ER α alone or knockdown of FOXK2 in MCF-7 cells could result in significant increases in cell number compared to control cells (no overexpression or knockdown of exogenous ER α or FOXK2) (Fig. 6a and 6b). This clearly showed that increase in the level of ER α activity resulting either from increased expression of the gene from exogenous source or from crippling FOXK2 (which had the effect of amplifying ER α activity) would ultimately lead to increased cell growth. A similar trend was observed in the cell viability assay (Fig. 6c). Furthermore, FOXK2 appeared to suppress ER α -mediated proliferation of breast cancer cells through inhibiting cell cycle progression (Fig. 6d).

In conclusion, we showed in this study that FOXK2 negatively regulated the function of ER α through enhancing its degradation via the proteasome, and identified the ubiquitin E3 ligase BRCA1/BARD1 complex as an important contributing factor. This negative regulation of ER α by FOXK2 would disrupt the ER α -mediated cell growth, and in the case of breast cancer cells, it would mean a reduction in cell proliferation and possibly, the spread of cancer cells. However, since ER α is also needed for the normal functioning of the cell, targeting it with a negative regulator gene that would result in its degradation is not an ideal strategy for combating breast cancer, even for ER α -positive breast cancer. Therefore, further work is desirable, such as more in depth investigation of the molecular interaction between FOXK2 and ER α and their effect on normal cells.

Methods

Ethics statement. The study involving human participants was approved by the institutional review board of Dalian University of Technology. Written consent was obtained from all the participants. The methods were carried out in accordance with the approved guidelines. All clinical research was performed on the basis of the principles expressed in the Declaration of Helsinki.

Plasmids and antibodies. His-Flag-tagged FOXK2 and EGFP-FOXK2 were gifts kindly provided by Dr. Andrew D. Sharrocks (University of Manchester). HA-BARD1 was a gift kindly provided by Tomohiko Ohta (St. Marianna University). Cyclin D1-luc was kindly provided by Dr. Robert Weinberg (Whitehead Institute for Biomedical Research). Flag-tagged full-length and truncated FOXK2 ($\Delta 1$, $\Delta 2$, $\Delta 3$ and $\Delta 4$) were constructed according to standard PCR-based cloning procedures using His-Flag-FOXK2 as templates. PCR fragments were inserted into pcDNA3.1-3 $\times$ Flag at the *Bam*HI and *Hind*III sites. Plasmid encoding GST-fusion protein was prepared by standard PCR methods using His-Flag-FOXK2 as templates, and the PCR fragment was cloned in frame into pGEX-4T3 (Amersham Pharmacia) at the *Bam*HI and *Sal*I sites. SMARTpool® siRNAs (Control, ER α and FOXK2) with four individual siRNAs targeting a single gene were obtained from Thermo (USA).

Rabbit polyclonal anti-Flag, anti-HA, anti-ER α , anti-GFP, anti-IgG and mouse monoclonal anti-Actin antibodies were obtained from Santa Cruz Biotechnology (Santa Cruz, CA). Mouse monoclonal anti-ER α and anti-GST antibodies were obtained from Millipore. Mouse monoclonal anti-HA and anti-GFP antibodies were obtained from GeneTex. Rabbit polyclonal anti-c-Myc and mouse monoclonal anti-Flag (M2) antibodies were purchased from Sigma. Goat polyclonal anti-FOXK2 (ILF1, ab5298) and rabbit polyclonal anti-FOXK2 (ILF1, ab84761) antibodies were obtained from Abcam. Rabbit polyclonal anti-BARD1 antibody was obtained from BIOSS (Beijing, China). Rabbit polyclonal anti-MDM2 antibodies were obtained from Sangon (Shanghai, China). Cycloheximide was obtained from Sigma, and MG132 was obtained from Merck.

Cell culture and transfection. HEK 293T, MCF-7, Bcap-37, MDA-MB-231 and T47D cells had been used in our previous study^{47,48}. ZR-51-30 and BT474 cells were obtained from the cell bank of the Shanghai branch of Chinese Academy of Sciences. Unless other stated, all cell cultures were incubated at 37°C in the presence of 5% CO₂. HEK 293T, MCF-7, Bcap-37, MDA-MB-231 cells were cultured in Dulbecco's modified Eagle's medium (DMEM, Invitrogen) containing 10% fetal bovine serum (Hyclone) and penicillin-streptomycin (100 U/ml penicillin and 0.1 mg/ml streptomycin). ZR-51-30 and BT474 cells were maintained in Roswell Park Memorial Institute (RPMI) 1640 medium supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum, penicillin-streptomycin. T47D cells were maintained in Roswell Park Memorial Institute (RPMI) 1640 medium supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum, penicillin-streptomycin and insulin (5 g/ml). For E2 stimulation experiments, MCF-7 and T47D cells were subjected to serum starvation for 24 h in 2% charcoal-stripped fetal bovine serum (Gibco) and phenol red free medium, and then treated with or without 10 nM E2 for 16 h. Lipofectamine 2000 (Invitrogen) was used for cell

transfection. Corresponding empty vectors were used in each transfection experiment to guarantee the same amount of plasmids for all parallel groups. All transfection experiments were transient transfection.

Immunoprecipitation and Western blot. Cells were harvested and then lysed in a cold hypotonic buffer containing 50 mM Tris-HCl (pH 8.0), 150 mM NaCl, 0.1% SDS, 1% NP-40, 0.5% sodium deoxycholate and a mixture of protease inhibitors. After centrifugation at 10000 $\times$ g/4°C for 10 min, the supernatant was incubated with the desired antibody or with control IgG and protein A-Sepharose (Amersham Biosciences) or protein G-Sepharose (Santa Cruz, CA) at 4°C for overnight. After that, the sample was centrifuged at 5000 $\times$ g/4°C for 10 min and the pellet was washed twice with Washing Buffer I (50 mM Tris-HCl [pH 7.5], 150 mM sodium chloride, 1% NP-40 and 0.05% sodium deoxycholate) and once with Washing Buffer II (50 mM Tris-HCl [pH 7.5], 500 mM sodium chloride, 0.1% NP-40, and 0.05% sodium deoxycholate), and then subjected to SDS-PAGE. After electrophoresis, protein bands in the gel were transferred to PVDF membrane (Millipore), and probed with the specified primary antibody, followed by the appropriate secondary antibody, and then visualized using the enhanced chemiluminescence detection reagents (Thermo). Immunoblot data were quantified by scanning the appropriate bands of interest and plotted as relative density of gray scale. Re-immunoprecipitation was conducted as previously described⁴⁹.

Immunofluorescence staining. MCF-7 cells were cultured for overnight on cover slips. After 24 h, the cells were fixed in 1% paraformaldehyde for 15 min at room temperature, permeabilized with methanol for 40 min at -20°C and then blocked with 0.8% BSA for 1 h at 4°C. The cells were then incubated with appropriate antibodies at 4°C for overnight, followed by further incubation with TRITC-conjugated anti-rabbit IgG for 1 h. The cover slips were then mounted on glass slides with mounting medium containing 49, 6-diamidino-2-phenylindole (DAPI). Images were taken with a confocal fluorescence microscope (Olympus FV1000-IX81, Tokyo, Japan).

Immunohistochemical assay. A total of 53 breast cancer specimens were obtained from female patients of Han Chinese descent, with a median age of 59.1 years, ranging from 39 to 78 years. Out of 53 specimens, 27 were ER α -positive, and 26 were ER α -negative as determined by clinical diagnosis performed by Qiqihar Medical University. Sections (4 micrometers thickness) of the obtained specimens were cut out and used for immunohistochemical analysis. The immunohistochemical assay kit was obtained from Maixin Bio. Immunohistochemical assay was conducted as previously described⁵⁰. The primary antibodies used in immunohistochemical assay were rabbit anti-human FOXK2 and mouse anti-human ER α . The levels of FOXK2 and ER α expression were quantified according to their H-scores⁵¹. ER α was considered positive if the H-score was more than 1^{52,53}. The median H-score of all samples was used as a cutoff for grouping the samples into high or low FOXK2 expression category⁵⁴.

Luciferase reporter assay. Cells were cultured in a 24-well plate for 24 h. The cells were then transfected with the appropriate plasmid construct using Lipofectamine 2000 (Invitrogen). Eighteen hours after transfection, the medium was replaced with phenol red-free medium containing 2% charcoal-stripped fetal bovine serum for 24 h, followed by treatment with or without 10 nM E2 for 16 h. The cells were harvested and Luc reporter assay was performed in accordance to the manufacturer's instructions (Promega, Madison, WI, USA).

Mammalian two hybrid assay. The checkmate TM mammalian two-hybrid system was obtained from Promega. ER α and FOXK2 were subcloned into *Bam*HI-*Sal*I cut pACT and pBIND, respectively.

GST pull-down assay. The GST alone and GST fusion protein were expressed in *E. coli* BL21 (Takara), and purified by Pierce GST Spin Purification Kit (Thermo scientific). GST pull-down assay was performed using a Pierce GST Protein Interaction Pull-Down Kit (Thermo scientific). The purified GST-tagged fusion protein (BAIT) was immobilized on the Pierce Spin Column. MCF-7 cells were lysed in pull-down lysis buffer containing DNase (Takara). The supernatant was loaded onto the Pierce Spin Column, and then incubated at 4°C for 2 hour with gentle agitation. The column was centrifuged at 1250 $\times$ g for 1 minute and the flow through was discarded. Then the column was washed five times using wash solution. Elution buffer was added to the column followed by 5-min incubation with gentle agitation. After that, the column was centrifuged at 1250 $\times$ g for 1 minute, and the eluent was subjected to Western blot assay.

Cell growth assays. MTT and Flow Cytometry assays were performed as previously described^{47,54}. For Flow Cytometry assay, MCF-7 cells transfected with different plasmids were stained with propidium iodide (PI) (BD Pharmingen, CA). Experimental data were collected by FACScalibur (BD Biosciences, San Jose, CA, USA). Cell cycle profiles were determined using ModFit LT (BD Biosciences). For crystal violet staining assay, MCF-7 cells transfected with the appropriate plasmids were transferred to 35 mm plate, and were cultured until the recognizable clones appeared. Then, the cells were stained with crystal violet for 30 min at room temperature.

Real-time PCR. MCF-7 cells were transfected with appropriate plasmids. Twenty four hours after transfection, the cells were replaced with phenol red-free medium containing 2% charcoal-stripped fetal bovine serum for 24 h, then treated with or without 10 nM E2 for 16 h. Total RNA was isolated from the cells using TRIzol reagent (Takara), and then subjected to reverse transcription with oligo(dT)15. The mRNA levels of ER α , Cyclin D1, GREB1 and GAPDH (as an internal control) were quantitated by real-time PCR using Corbett Research RG 3000 analyzer (Australia), Maxima SYBR Green/ROX qPCR (Thermo Scientific). The following primer sequences were used: ER α : 5'-ACTCGCTACTGTGCAGTGTGCAAT (forward) and 5'-CCTCTTCGGTCTTTTCGTATCCCA (reverse); *Cyclin D1*: 5'-GCTGCTCCTGGTGAACAAGC (forward) and 5'-AAGTGTTCATGAAATCGTGCG (reverse); *GREB1*: 5'-CAGGCTTTTGACCGAATCT (forward) and 5'-CAAAGCGTGTCTCTTCAGCT (reverse); *GAPDH*: 5'-GGGTGAACCATGAGAAGT (forward) and 5'-GACTGTGGTCATGAGTCCT (reverse). The mRNA levels of ER α , *Cyclin D1* and *GREB1* were normalized against *GAPDH*, which served as an endogenous control. Each gene was measured in triplicate.

Statistical analysis. A Chi-square (χ^2) test was used to examine the correlation between FOXK2 and ER α gene expression in breast cancer tissues from 53 patients. All statistical analyses of other data were performed with ANOVA, followed by the Bonferroni test for pairwise comparisons^{25,56}. Data were given as means $\pm$ SDs, and significance was considered at the P value < 0.05 level.

- Wang, M. *et al.* AIB1 cooperates with ER α to promote epithelial mesenchymal transition in breast cancer through SNAIL1 activation. *PLoS One* **8**, e65556 (2012).
- Asif, H. M. *et al.* Prevalence, risk factors and disease knowledge of breast cancer in Pakistan. *Asian Pac J Cancer Prev* **15**, 4411–4416 (2014).
- Platet, N., Cathiard, A. M., Gleizes, M. & Garcia, M. Estrogens and their receptors in breast cancer progression: a dual role in cancer proliferation and invasion. *Crit. Rev. Oncol. Hematol* **51**, 55–67 (2004).
- Li, S. *et al.* CLOCK is a substrate of SUMO and sumoylation of CLOCK upregulates the transcriptional activity of estrogen receptor- α . *Oncogene* **32**, 4883–4891 (2013).
- Panno, M. L. *et al.* Bergapten induces ER depletion in breast cancer cells through SMAD4-mediated ubiquitination. *Breast Cancer Res Treat* **136**, 443–455 (2012).
- Keen, J. C. & Davidson, N. E. The biology of breast carcinoma. *Cancer* **97**, 825–833 (2003).
- Zou, Y. *et al.* Forkhead box transcription factor FOXO3a suppresses estrogen-dependent breast cancer cell proliferation and tumorigenesis. *Breast Cancer Research* **10**, R21 (2008).
- Grabinski, N. *et al.* AKT3 regulates ErbB2, ErbB3 and estrogen receptor α expression and contributes to endocrine therapy resistance of ErbB2(+) breast tumor cells from Balb-neuT mice. *Cell Signal* **26**, 1021–1029 (2014).
- Poulard, C. *et al.* JMJD6 regulates ER α methylation on arginine. *PLoS One* **9**, e87982 (2014).
- Kim, S. H., Kang, H. J., Na, H. & Lee, M. O. Trichostatin A enhances acetylation as well as protein stability of ER α through induction of p300 protein. *Breast Cancer Res* **12**, R22 (2010).
- Nait-Achour, T. *et al.* Transcriptional repression of estrogen receptor α signaling by SENP2 in breast cancer cells. *Mol Endocrinol* **28**, 183–196 (2014).
- Iizuka, M. *et al.* Histone acetyltransferase Hbo1 destabilizes estrogen receptor α by ubiquitination and modulates proliferation of breast cancers. *Cancer Sci* **104**, 1647–1655 (2013).
- Fan, M., Park, A. & Nephew, K. P. CHIP (carboxyl terminus of Hsc70-interacting protein) promotes basal and geldanamycin-induced degradation of estrogen receptor- α . *Mol Endocrinol* **19**, 2901–2914 (2005).
- Eakin, C. M., Maccoss, M. J., Finney, G. L. & Klevit, R. E. Estrogen receptor α is a putative substrate for the BRCA1 ubiquitin ligase. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **104**, 5794–5799 (2007).
- Kim, K. *et al.* MDM2 regulates estrogen receptor α and estrogen responsiveness in breast cancer cells. *J Mol Endocrinol* **46**, 67–79 (2011).
- Zhu, J. *et al.* The atypical ubiquitin ligase RNF31 stabilizes estrogen receptor α and modulates estrogen-stimulated breast cancer cell proliferation. *Oncogene* **33**, 4340–4351 (2014).
- Baer, R. & Ludwicz, T. The BRCA1/BARD1 heterodimer, a tumor suppressor complex with ubiquitin E3 ligase activity. *Curr Opin Genet Dev* **12**, 86–91 (2002).
- Li, C., Lai, C. F., Sigman, D. S. & Gaynor, R. B. Cloning of a cellular factor, interleukin binding factor, that binds to NFAT-like motifs in the human immunodeficiency virus long terminal repeat. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A* **88**, 7739–7743 (1991).
- Marais, A. *et al.* Cell cycle-dependent regulation of the forkhead transcription factor FOXK2 by CDK-cyclin complexes. *J Biol Chem* **285**, 35728–35739 (2010).
- Ji, Z. *et al.* The forkhead transcription factor FOXK2 promotes AP-1-mediated transcriptional regulation. *Mol Cell Biol* **34**, 1892 (2014).
- Fujii, Y. & Nakamura, M. FOXK2 transcription factor is a novel G/T-mismatch DNA binding protein. *J. Biochem* **147**, 705–709 (2010).
- Carroll, J. S. *et al.* Chromosome-wide mapping of estrogen receptor binding reveals long-range regulation requiring the forkhead protein FoxA1. *Cell* **122**, 33–43 (2005).
- Calligé, M., Kieffer, I. & Richard-Foy, H. CSN5/Jab1 is involved in ligand-dependent degradation of estrogen receptor α by the proteasome. *Mol Cell Biol* **25**, 4349–4358 (2005).
- Jeong, K. W. Flightless I (Drosophila) homolog facilitates chromatin accessibility of the estrogen receptor α target genes in MCF-7 breast cancer cells. *Biochem Biophys Res Commun* **446**, 608–613 (2014).
- Shrivastava, A. *et al.* The mechanistic target for rapamycin pathway is related to the phosphorylation score for estrogen receptor- α in human breast tumors in vivo. *Breast Cancer Res* **16**, R49 (2014).
- Wang, B. *et al.* Expression of NgBR is highly associated with estrogen receptor α and survivin in breast cancer. *PLoS One* **8**, e78083 (2013).
- Zhang, Y., Cheng, J. C., Huang, H. F. & Leung, P. C. Homeobox A7 stimulates breast cancer cell proliferation by up-regulating estrogen receptor- α . *Biochem Biophys Res Commun* **440**, 652–657 (2013).
- Hannenhalli, S. & Kaestner, K. H. The evolution of Fox genes and their role in development and disease. *Nat. Rev. Genet* **10**, 233–240 (2009).
- Myatt, S. S. & Lam, E. W. The emerging roles of forkhead box (Fox) proteins in cancer. *Nat. Rev. Cancer* **7**, 847–859 (2007).
- Carlsson, P. & Mahlapuu, M. Forkhead transcription factors: key players in development and metabolism. *Dev. Biol* **250**, 1–23 (2002).
- Gao, N. *et al.* The role of hepatocyte nuclear factor-3 α (Forkhead Box A1) and androgen receptor in transcriptional regulation of prostatic genes. *Mol Endocrinol* **17**, 1484–1507 (2003).
- Xu, K. & Shu, H. K. The FOXM1 transcription factor interacts with Sp1 to mediate EGF-dependent COX-2 expression in human glioma cells. *Mol Cancer Res* **11**, 875–886 (2013).
- Wang, F. *et al.* Biochemical and structural characterization of an intramolecular interaction in FOXO3a and its binding with p53. *J Mol Biol* **384**, 590–603 (2008).
- Lynch, V. J., Brayer, K., Gellersen, B. & Wagner, G. P. HoxA-11 and FOXO1A cooperate to regulate decidual prolactin expression: towards inferring the core transcriptional regulators of decidual genes. *PLoS One* **4**, e6845 (2009).
- Ciechanover, A., Orian, A. & Schwartz, A. L. Ubiquitin-mediated proteolysis: biological regulation via destruction. *Bioessays* **22**, 442–451 (2000).
- Hershko, A. & Ciechanover, A. The ubiquitin system. *Annu Rev Biochem* **67**, 425–479 (1998).
- Ardley, H. C. & Robinson, P. A. Robinson. E3 ubiquitin ligases. *Essays Biochem* **41**, 15–30 (2005).
- Cheng, J. & Guggino, W. Ubiquitination and degradation of CFTR by the E3 ubiquitin ligase MARCH2 through its association with adaptor proteins CAL and STX6. *PLoS One* **8**, e68001 (2013).
- Samant, R. S., Clarke, P. A. & Workman, P. E3 ubiquitin ligase Cullin-5 modulates multiple molecular and cellular responses to heat shock protein 90 inhibition in human cancer cells. *Proc Natl Acad Sci U S A* **111**, 6834–6839 (2014).
- Kane, L. A. *et al.* PINK1 phosphorylates ubiquitin to activate Parkin E3 ubiquitin ligase activity. *J Cell Biol* **205**, 143–153 (2014).
- Li, Y. *et al.* The histone modifications governing TFF1 transcription mediated by estrogen receptor. *J Biol Chem* **286**, 13925–13936 (2011).
- Zhang, Y. *et al.* CCCTC-binding factor acts upstream of FOXA1 and demarcates the genomic response to estrogen. *J Biol Chem* **285**, 28604–28613 (2010).
- Hall, J. M. & Korach, K. S. Stromal cell-derived factor 1, a novel target of estrogen receptor action, mediates the mitogenic effects of estradiol in ovarian and breast cancer cells. *Mol Endocrinol* **17**, 792–803 (2003).
- Prall, O. W., Rogan, E. M. & Sutherland, R. L. Estrogen regulation of cell cycle progression in breast cancer cells. *J. Steroid Biochem. Mol. Biol* **65**, 169–174 (1998).
- Ghosh, M. G., Thompson, D. A. & Weigel, R. J. PDZK1 and GREB1 are estrogen-regulated genes expressed in hormone-responsive breast cancer. *Cancer Res* **60**, 6367–6375 (2000).
- Wilcken, N. R., Prall, O. W., Musgrove, E. A. & Sutherland, R. L. Inducible overexpression of cyclin D1 in breast cancer cells reverses the growth-inhibitory effects of antiestrogens. *Clin. Cancer Res* **3**, 849–854 (1997).
- Yang, C. *et al.* PTEN suppresses the oncogenic function of AIB1 through decreasing its protein stability via mechanism involving Fbw7 α . *Molecular Cancer* **12**, 21 (2013).
- Bi, H. *et al.* SUMOylation of GPS2 protein regulates its transcription-suppressing function. *Mol Biol Cell* **25**, 2499–2508 (2014).
- Li, S. *et al.* The transcriptional activity of co-activator AIB1 is regulated by the SUMO E3 ligase PIAS1. *Biol Cell* **104**, 287–296 (2012).
- Xiao, L. *et al.* Induction of the CLOCK Gene by E2-ER α Signaling Promotes the Proliferation of Breast Cancer Cells. *PLoS One* **9**, e95878 (2014).
- Budwit-Novotny, D. A. *et al.* Immunohistochemical analyses of estrogen receptor in endometrial adenocarcinoma using a monoclonal antibody. *Cancer Res* **46**, 5419–5425 (1986).
- Dowsett, M. *et al.* Relationship between quantitative estrogen and progesterone receptor expression and human epidermal growth factor receptor 2 (HER-2) statuses with recurrence in the Arimidex, Tamoxifen, Alone or in Combination trial. *J Clin Oncol* **26**, 1059–1065 (2008).
- Ellis, M. J. *et al.* Outcome prediction for estrogen receptor-positive breast cancer based on postneoadjuvant endocrine therapy tumor characteristics. *J Natl Cancer Inst* **100**, 1380–1388 (2008).
- Chen, C. *et al.* High cytoplasmic FOXO1 and pFOXO1 expression in astrocytomas are associated with worse surgical outcome. *PLoS One* **8**, e69260 (2013).

55. Hong, Y. *et al.* SUMOylation of DEC1 protein regulates its transcriptional activity and enhances its stability. *PLoS One* **6**, e23046 (2011).
56. Xing, X. *et al.* SUMOylation of AhR modulates its activity and stability through inhibiting its ubiquitination. *J Cell Physiol* **227**, 3812–3819 (2012).

Acknowledgments

We are grateful to Dr. Alan K. Chang for his valuable contribution in the preparation of this manuscript. We thank Dr. Andrew D. Sharrocks (University of Manchester) for the present of His-Flag-FOXK2 and EGFP-FOXK2 constructs. We thank Dr. Tomohiko Ohta (St. Marianna University) for the present of HA-BARD1 construct. We thank Dr. Robert Weinberg (Whitehead Institute for Biomedical Research) for the present of Cyclin D1-luc. We also thank Hongming Pan (Qiqihar Medical University) for providing the breast tumor specimens. This work was supported by grants (31171353, 31271500 to H.W.) from the National Nature Science Foundation of China and grants (973 Program 2011CB504201 to H.W.) from the Ministry of Science and Technology of China. The funders had no role in study design, data collection and analysis, decision to publish, or preparation of the manuscript.

Author contributions

Y.L., X.A. and H.W. conceived and designed the experiments. Y.L., X.A., Z.J., X.B., Z.X., G.H., X.J. and M.C. performed the experiments. Y.L., X.A. and H.W. analyzed the data. Y.L., X.A., Z.J., X.B., Z.X., G.H., X.J. and M.C. contributed reagents/materials/analysis tools. Y.L., X.A. and H.W. wrote the paper. All authors have read and approved the final manuscript.

Additional information

Supplementary information accompanies this paper at <http://www.nature.com/scientificreports>

Competing financial interests: The authors declare no competing financial interests.

How to cite this article: Liu, Y. *et al.* FOXK2 Transcription Factor Suppresses ER α -positive Breast Cancer Cell Growth Through Down-Regulating the Stability of ER α via mechanism involving BRCA1/BARD1. *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 8796; DOI:10.1038/srep08796 (2015).

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution 4.0 International License. The images or other third party material in this article are included in the article's Creative Commons license, unless indicated otherwise in the credit line; if the material is not included under the Creative Commons license, users will need to obtain permission from the license holder in order to reproduce the material. To view a copy of this license, visit <http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>