Taxane-Induced Blockade to Nuclear Accumulation of the Androgen Receptor Predicts Clinical Responses in Metastatic Prostate Cancer
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Abstract
Prostate cancer progression requires active androgen receptor (AR) signaling which occurs following translocation of AR from the cytoplasm to the nucleus. Chemotherapy with taxanes improves survival in patients with castrate resistant prostate cancer (CRPC). Taxanes induce microtubule stabilization, mitotic arrest, and apoptotic cell death, but recent data suggest that taxanes can also affect AR signaling. Here, we report that taxanes inhibit ligand-induced AR nuclear translocation and downstream transcriptional activation of AR target genes such as prostate-specific antigen. AR nuclear translocation was not inhibited in cells with acquired β-tubulin mutations that prevent taxane-induced microtubule stabilization, confirming a role for microtubules in AR trafficking. Upon ligand activation, AR associated with the minus-end-microtubule motor dynein, thereby trafficking on microtubules to translocate to the nucleus. Analysis of circulating tumor cells (CTC) isolated from the peripheral blood of CRPC patients receiving taxane chemotherapy revealed a significant correlation between AR cytoplasmic sequestration and clinical response to therapy. These results indicate that taxanes act in CRPC patients at least in part by inhibiting AR nuclear transport and signaling. Further, they suggest that monitoring AR subcellular localization in the CTCs of CRPC patients might predict clinical responses to taxane chemotherapy.
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Introduction
Prostate cancer (PC) is the most commonly diagnosed cancer and the second leading cause of cancer-related death in men in the United States. In PC, growth and disease progression requires active androgen receptor (AR) signaling, which occurs following translocation of AR from the cytoplasm to the nucleus where AR, acting as a transcription factor, binds to and activates AR-target genes (1–3). Continued AR signaling remains essential to PC progression following androgen withdrawal (castration), with recent data suggesting that intratumoral androgen synthesis stimulates PC growth in patients with castrate resistant prostate cancer (CRPC; ref. 4). Agents that target the AR signaling axis in patients with CRPC have recently shown significant clinical activity in patients with CRPC (5), corroborating the importance of AR as a therapeutic target in CRPC patients.

Cytotoxic chemotherapy has been used to treat patients with advanced PC for more than 20 years (6). However, the taxanes represent the only class of chemotherapy agents showed to improve survival of patients with metastatic CRPC; docetaxel (DTX) and recently cabazitaxel are the standard for CRPC treatment (7–9). At the cellular level, taxanes bind β-tubulin and stabilize the microtubule cytoskeleton which, in actively dividing cells leads to mitotic arrest and apoptotic cell death (10). However, in contrast to cancer cells cultured in vitro, cancer cells in patients often display very slow doubling times (11, 12), suggesting that the clinical activity of taxanes cannot be attributed solely to their antimitotic effects and that it is important to understand the functional consequences of taxane-induced microtubule stabilization in cells during interphase (13). Accordingly, we have previously shown that dynamic interphase microtubules regulate the intracellular transport and activity of 2 other transcription factors, p53 and HIF-1α (14–17). A number of recent reports by us and others...
suggest that taxane chemotherapy can inhibit AR signaling in PC cells (18–20). Here, we define the mechanisms of taxane inhibition of AR and propose AR localization in PC circulating tumor cells (CTC) as a predictor of response/resistance to taxane chemotherapy in patients with CRPC.

Materials and Methods

Cell culture and antibodies

The PC cell lines LNCaP, PC3, and PC3/AR were derived and maintained as previously described (21–23). The PC3/mCherry-tubulin cell line was generated in our laboratory by stably transfecting PC3 PC cells with pcDNA3:mCherry-tubulin plasmid which was a generous gift from the laboratory of Dr. Tsien (UCSD, CA) and selecting transfected cells with 200 μg/mL neomycin (G418). The following antibodies were used for immunofluorescence staining and Western blotting: rabbit polyclonal anti-AR (N-20) and goat polyclonal anti-prostate–specific antigen (PSA; C-19) from Santa Cruz Biotechnology, Inc., mouse monoclonal anti-prostate–specific membrane antigen (PSMA) E91 (24, 25), rat monoclonal anti-α-tubulin was from Novus Biologicals, mouse monoclonal anti-c-myc was from Oncogene Research Products, mouse monoclonal antibody against dynein intermediate chain (IC74) was from Covance. All the Alexa-conjugated secondary antibodies were from Molecular Probes. NLP-005 Methyltrienolone (R1881) was purchased from Perkin-Elmer. Paclitaxel (PTX) and DTX were from Sigma.

Determination of secreted PSA levels

LNCAp cells were cultured on 6-well plates and treated overnight with either DTX at the indicated concentrations or the di-hydroxytestosterone (DHT) analogue, R1881, at 10 nmol/L for 1 hour or the combination of R1881 treatment following incubation with DTX. Supernatant were diluted 1:10 with Abbott Laboratories free and total PSA specimen diluent. Secreted PSA level measurements were made on Abbott Diagnostics IxM MEIA system as previously described (18).

Measurement of PSA-luciferase activity

LNCAp cells were transiently cotransfected with a dual-luciferase reporter assay system in which luciferase is under the control of a promoter containing androgen-responsive elements (ARE-Luciferase) from the PSA gene (Promega Corp.; ref. 26) and pRL-TK-luc, Renilla luciferase reporter construct (kindly provided by P. Vertino, Emory University, Atlanta, GA), upon reaching 60% confluency on 6-well plates. Thirty hours posttransfection cells were incubated overnight with either dimethyl sulfoxide (DMSO; vehicle control) or taxanes (PTX or DTX) at the indicated concentrations followed by 1 hour treatment with R1881 at either 1 nmol/L or 10 nmol/L concentration. Cells were harvested and cell lysates were prepared for luciferase assays. Each transfection experiment was done in triplicate. Results represent an average of at least 3 independent biological repeats with data presented as relative PSA luciferase activity normalized to Renilla luciferase values.

Establishment of I1A9 cancer cell lines overexpressing AR

The parental ovarian cancer cells I1A9 and their derived β-tubulin mutant, PTX-insensitive clone PTX10 (27) were transfected with a pFLAG-hAR plasmid using lipofectamine (Invitrogen) following the manufacturer’s instructions. Cells were selected using G418 (300 μg/mL) and AR-expressing clones (as verified by Western blot analysis) were named I1A9/AR and PTX10/AR cells, respectively. To evaluate AR trafficking to the nucleus, I1A9/AR and PTX10/AR cells were plated on cell-tak-coated coverslips in RPMI 1640 containing 10% fetal calf serum and switched to medium containing 10% charcoal stripped serum (CS) for 72 hours. Following treatments without (control) or with (i) DHT (100 nmol/L) for 2 hours or (ii) PTX (100 nmol/L) for 2 hours, followed by DHT (100 nmol/L) for 2 hours, cells were fixed with PHEMO buffer (16) and immunostained using antibodies against AR (PG21, Millipore, 1:200) and α-tubulin (1:1000) followed by Alexa 647 (1:1000) and Alexa 568 (1:500) secondary antibodies, and DAPI staining.

Western blotting and immunoprecipitation

Control untreated and treated cells were lysed in TNES buffer containing 50 mmol/L Tris (pH 7.5) 100 mmol/L NaCl, 2 mmol/L EDTA, 1% Nonidet P-40, and a 1X protease inhibitor mixture (Roche Applied Science). For the immunoprecipitation experiments, 0.5 mg of soluble cell extract was immunoprecipitated with either a rat α-tubulin or a mouse antibody directed against dynein intermediate chain (IC74) and their respective IgG controls, using protein-G plus agarose (Calbiochem) as recommended by the manufacturer. Immunoprecipitated proteins and 50 μg of total cell extracts were resolved by 10% SDS-PAGE and immunoblotted for the indicated proteins. Immunoblots were analyzed with the Odyssey infrared imaging system (LI-COR).

Dynamin overexpression

For the dynamin overexpression experiments, LNCAp and PC3/AR cells were plated on 12 mm glass coverslips (Electron Microscopy Sciences) and transiently transfected with c-myc-tagged pCMV50m plasmid containing dynamin, a kind gift from R. Vallee (Columbia University, New York, NY; ref. 28). All transfections were done using FuGENE 6 transfection reagent (Roche Applied Science) according to the manufacturer’s recommendations. C-myc-dynamin transfected cells were processed for immunofluorescence labeling using the following primary antibodies: anti-AR rabbit polyclonal and an anti-c-Myc mouse monoclonal. The secondary antibodies used were Alexa 488-conjugated goat anti-rabbit immunoglobulin G (IgG; 1:500) and Alexa 568-conjugated goat anti-mouse IgG (1:500). Cells were then analyzed by confocal microscopy.

Microtubule cosedimentation assay

LNCAp cells were lysed in low salt buffer (LSB; 20 mmol/L Tris, 1 mmol/L MgCl2, 2 mmol/L EGTA, 0.5% NP-40 and 1X cocktail protease inhibitors). Twenty microliter of MAP-rich bovine brain tubulin (5 mg/mL; Cytoskeleton) was supplemented with 1 mmol/L GTP and 2.5 μL cushion buffer consisting of PEM buffer (80 mmol/L PIPES, 1 mmol/L MgCl2, 1 mmol/L
EGTA) in 50% glycerol and allow to polymerized at 35°C for 20 minutes. Microtubules were diluted in 200 μL warm PEM plus 20 μmol/L PTX and kept at room temperature. Alternatively, MAP-rich tubulin was kept on ice and supplemented with PEM buffer plus 20 μmol/L colchicine to prevent microtubule polymerization. Twenty microliters of either microtubules or tubulin dimers were incubated with 50 μg of LNCaP total cell extract for 30 minutes at 35°C or 4°C, respectively. Samples were loaded into 100 μL cushion buffer and microtubules were pelleted by centrifugation at 100,000 g at room temperature in an airfuge (Beckman Coulter, Inc.). The warm supernatant (WS) or cold supernatant (CS) were separated and the warm (WP) or cold pellet (CP) were resuspended in an equal volume of PEM buffer. Thirty-five microliters from each fraction were loaded in a 10% SDS-PAGE and Western blotting was done with antibodies against AR (1:200 dilution) and α-tubulin (clone YL1/2, 1:5,000 dilution).

Live cell recording of AR nuclear translocation
For the analysis of GFP-AR trafficking in PC3-mCherry-tubulin cells, PC3-mCherry-tubulin cells were plated on 35 mm MatTek dishes and microinjected with full-length GFP-AR. The cells were grown in complete RPMI media and switched to phenol-red free media supplemented with 5% charcoal-stripped medium for up to 3 hours before imaging. Cells were transferred to a live-cell chamber and maintained at 37°C and 5% CO2 using the Tokai Hit Temperature control unit INUG2-20. The AR ligand R1881 was added to the cells using a 5% CO2 using the Tokai Hit Temperature control unit INUG2-20 minutes. Microtubules were diluted in 200 μL cushion buffer and microtubules were pelleted by centrifugation at 100,000 g at room temperature in an airfuge (Beckman Coulter, Inc.). The warm supernatant (WS) or cold supernatant (CS) were separated and the warm (WP) or cold pellet (CP) were resuspended in an equal volume of PEM buffer. Thirty-five microliters from each fraction were loaded in a 10% SDS-PAGE and Western blotting was done with antibodies against AR (1:200 dilution) and α-tubulin (clone YL1/2, 1:5,000 dilution).

Venous blood collection and isolation of CTCs
Following approval of the Weill Cornell Institutional Review Board (IRB), 10 mL of peripheral blood was collected, in sodium citrate tubes (BD), from CRPC patients at various time points during taxane chemotherapy. CTCs were then isolated using the epithelial cell adhesion molecule (EpCAM)-based immunomagnetic capture CellSearch system as per the manufacturer’s instructions (29). This enrichment step greatly facilitated our analysis as CTCs are very rare (1 in 10⁶ PBMCs) and require specialized technology for their detection. CellSearch has been the first and only FDA-approved CTC detection technology utilized for clinical prognosis. Following the isolation/enrichment step with the CellTracks AutoPrep System, captured CTCs were cytospun onto cell-tak (BD Biosciences)-coated coverslips and processed for immunofluorescence staining. For our analysis, we conducted only the first step of enrichment and omitted the second step of automated staining with cytokeratin, DAPI and CD45 which is used for CTC enumeration. In addition, to ensure analysis of PC CTCs among the leucocytes present in the EpCAM-enriched cell population, we stained for PSA (prostate specific marker) and CD45 (leucocyte specific marker) and analyzed the PSA+/CD45– cells for AR subcellular localization using multiplex confocal microscopy. Using this methodology, we monitored longitudinally CRPC patients receiving taxane-chemotherapy and investigated the association between AR subcellular localization in CTCs and patients’ clinical response to therapy.

In parallel, CTCs were also identified following Ficoll separation of blood collected in Vacutainer Cell Preparation Tube with Sodium Heparin (BD). The PBMC layer containing CTCs was collected and washed in 1X PBS. Hemolysis was done using ammonium chloride buffer (150 mmol/L NH₄Cl, 10 mmol/L NaHCO₃, 1 mmol/L Na₂EDTA, pH adjusted to 7.3). Cells were counted by Bright-Line hemacytometer (Hausser Scientific) and approximately 1 × 10⁶ cells were plated on cell-tak–coated 8-mm glass coverslips (Electron Microscopy Sciences) in 48-well plates, cytospun and allowed to attach. Subsequent to attachment, cells were fixed and processed for immunofluorescence and confocal microscopy as described below.

Immunofluorescence and confocal microscopy
Following treatment and attachment, the cells, including PBMCs were fixed and processed for immunofluorescence labeling (16). The following antibodies were used: rabbit polyclonal anti-AR, mouse monoclonal anti-PSMA (JS91) and rat monoclonal anti α-tubulin. The secondary antibodies used were Alexa 488-conjugated goat anti-rabbit immunoglobulin G (IgG; 1:500), Alexa 568-conjugated goat anti-mouse IgG (1:500) and Alexa 647-conjugated goat anti-rat IgG (1:500). DNA was stained with 1 μg mL⁻¹ 4′,6-diamidino-2-phenylindole (DAPI; Sigma). The cells were mounted using Mowiol (Calbiochem) and imaged using a Zeiss LSM 5 LIVE confocal microscope using 63×/1.4 Plan APOCHROMAT and 100×/1.4 Plan APOCHROMAT objectives. All images were acquired and analyzed using Zeiss LSM 5 LIVE software.

Quantitation of AR subcellular localization in CTCs
CTCs were obtained by CellSearch enrichment or Ficoll separation for each patient at each time point. CTCs were imaged with a Zeiss 5 LIVE confocal microscope using a 20× objective.
objective. A single plane image of each cell was taken and analyzed using the MetaMorph imaging software (Molecular Devices). The nuclear region of the CTC was identified by DAPI staining. Total cellular AR fluorescence intensity was measured and the amount of AR fluorescence inside the nuclear region was determined, allowing us to calculate the percentage of AR in the cytoplasm and the nucleus of each CTC. The total number of CTCs analyzed varied among patients, ranging from 3 to 27 CTCs per patient per time point. When possible we analyzed at least 10 CTCs per patient per time point.

**Statistical analysis**

For CTCs isolated from the 14 patients, we determined both the AR subcellular localization and total AR fluorescence intensity at each patient visit. AR localization was defined as follows: if greater than 50% of CTCs in a given sample have a meaningful percentage of AR in cytoplasm (>40%), we considered AR localization as cytoplasmic, otherwise, we considered AR localization as nuclear. Patients’ data with clear PSA outcomes (progressing or response/stable disease) was included in the analysis. Fisher’s exact test was used to correlate AR localization in the nucleus with the patients’ clinical response to treatment assessed using PSA working group 2 criteria. Considering the longitudinal nature of the data, the association between the AR measurements and the PSA outcome was more rigorously assessed using the generalized linear mixed effects models (30–32). Effects with $P < 0.05$ was considered statistically significant.

**Results**

**Taxanes inhibit AR nuclear accumulation and signaling**

Because microtubules are involved in transcription factor trafficking, we investigated the effects of taxane treatment on AR nuclear translocation in LNCaP PC cells. Cells were treated with PTX followed by the addition of the di-hydrotestosterone (DHT) analogue R1881 (Fig. 1A–C) and analyzed for evidence of PTX-induced microtubule bundling and R1881-induced AR sequestration and reduced nuclear accumulation. Arrowheads, microtubule bundles. B, quantitative analysis of number of cells with AR nuclear staining. C, quantitation of relative AR nuclear fluorescence intensity. D, dynamics and quantitation of AR nuclear accumulation using live cell imaging of PC3:mCherry-Tub cells microinjected with GFP-AR and treated with 1 nmol/L PTX. Top, time lapse images were obtained with a spinning disk confocal microscope by acquiring an entire Z-stack at 10 minute intervals for 2 hours. Shown are maximum intensity projections of representative PC3:mCherry-Tub cells expressing full-length GFP-AR at the indicated time points (for the full 2 hour recording, see Supplementary Movies S1 and S2). The integrity of the microtubule cytoskeleton from untreated PTX-treated cells was visualized with mCherry-tubulin at the end of the time lapse recording and is shown in the far right panels. Arrowhead points at microtubule bundles. Bottom, graphic representation of AR nuclear accumulation over time following R1881 treatment in control versus PTX-pretreated cells. Quantitative analysis of nuclear of GFP-AR was done on each focal plane (0.5 μm Z-sections through the entire cell depth) using integrated pixel intensity values from the sum projection and the percentage of nuclear AR was calculated using the following formula: % Nuclear AR = 100 × Nuclear AR/Total AR. This analysis was done on the following number of cells for each time point and treatment condition: Control 0 to 20 minutes: $n = 8$; 30 to 110 minutes: $n = 7$; 120 minutes: $n = 6$. PTX pretreated 0 to 80 minutes: $n = 12$; 90 minutes: $n = 8$; 100 to 120 minutes: $n = 3$. Statistical analysis was done using t test with equal variances (**, $P < 0.01$; ***, $P < 0.001$).

![Figure 1. Taxane treatment impairs AR nuclear accumulation. A, LNCaP cells were treated with DMSO (vehicle control) or PTX 100 nmol/L overnight followed by 1 hour treatment with the synthetic DHT analogue R1881 (1 nmol/L) to induce AR nuclear translocation. Cells were fixed and immunostained with antibodies against AR (green) and total tubulin (red) and imaged by confocal microscopy. Left, overlay of tubulin and AR; middle, AR alone; right, representative high magnification images of tubulin and AR. Solid arrows, AR nuclear localization in R1881 panel. Dashed arrow, AR cytoplasmic localization. B, quantitative analysis of number of cells with AR nuclear staining. C, quantitation of relative AR nuclear fluorescence intensity. D, dynamics and quantitation of AR nuclear accumulation using live cell imaging of PTX-pretreated LNCaP cells expressing full-length GFP-AR. Top, time lapse images were obtained with a spinning disk confocal microscope by acquiring an entire Z-stack at 10 minute intervals for 2 hours. Shown are maximum intensity projections of representative PTX-pretreated LNCaP cells expressing full-length GFP-AR at the indicated time points (for the full 2 hour recording, see Supplementary Movies S1 and S2). The integrity of the microtubule cytoskeleton from untreated PTX-pretreated cells was visualized with mCherry-tubulin at the end of the time lapse recording and is shown in the far right panels. Arrowhead points at microtubule bundles. Bottom, graphic representation of AR nuclear accumulation over time following R1881 treatment in control versus PTX-pretreated cells. Quantitative analysis of nuclear of GFP-AR was done on each focal plane (0.5 μm Z-sections through the entire cell depth) using integrated pixel intensity values from the sum projection and the percentage of nuclear AR was calculated using the following formula: % Nuclear AR = 100 × Nuclear AR/Total AR. This analysis was done on the following number of cells for each time point and treatment condition: Control 0 to 20 minutes: $n = 8$; 30 to 110 minutes: $n = 7$; 120 minutes: $n = 6$. PTX pretreated 0 to 80 minutes: $n = 12$; 90 minutes: $n = 8$; 100 to 120 minutes: $n = 3$. Statistical analysis was done using t test with equal variances (**, $P < 0.01$; ***, $P < 0.001$).
nuclear accumulation by confocal microscopy. Interestingly, PTX induced a significant decrease in AR nuclear accumulation, at both baseline and following R1881 treatment (Fig. 1A–C). Quantitation of the extent of PTX-induced AR nuclear exclusion revealed a significant decrease in the percentage of cells with nuclear AR, following R1881 treatment, from 70% to <30% (Fig. 1B; P < 0.001) and a concomitant 50% decrease in the total fluorescence intensity of nuclear AR staining (Fig. 1C; P < 0.001). The profound cytoplasmic sequestration of AR following PTX treatment implicated microtubules in the shuttling of the receptor from the cytoplasm to the nucleus. To explore the dynamics of ligand induced AR nuclear translocation, we introduced full-length GFP-AR into PC3 cells stably expressing mCherry tubulin (PC3mCherry-tub; Fig. 1D and time lapse confocal microscopy recordings available as Supplementary Movies S1 and S2). PTX treatment significantly reduced the extent and the rate of AR nuclear accumulation in cells with stabilized microtubules as early as 30 minutes post-R1881 addition (P < 0.01–0.001). Consistent with drug-induced AR nuclear exclusion, we also observed dose-dependent inhibition of AR transcriptional activity using a luciferase reporter assay in LNCaP cells expressing endogenous AR (Fig. 2A). Similarly, DTX treatment inhibited ligand-induced protein expression (Fig. 2B) and secretion of PSA (Fig. 2C), an AR target gene used clinically to monitor biochemical disease progression in men with PC (18, 33). Together, these results suggested that taxanes inhibit AR signaling by preventing AR nuclear accumulation.

Microtubule stabilization is a prerequisite for taxane-induced inhibition of AR signaling

To determine whether the taxane-induced cytoplasmic sequestration of AR required prior microtubule stabilization, we utilized an isogenic model of PTX-sensitive and -resistant human ovarian cancer cells, 1A9 and 1A9/PTX10, respectively, stably transfected with wild-type GFP-AR. Drug resistance in 1A9/PTX10 cells is conferred by an acquired tubulin mutation (F270V) at PTX's binding site (27). PTX treatment of taxane-resistant 1A9/PTX10 cells had no effect on GFP-AR subcellular localization (Fig. 3, right panel; consistent with the drug's inability to stabilize microtubules), whereas DHT-induced GFP-AR nuclear accumulation was robustly inhibited by PTX in parental drug-sensitive 1A9 cells (Fig. 3, left panel). These results showed that the microtubule stabilizing activity of taxanes is required to inhibit AR translocation and downstream signaling further implying that in cases where the drug-target interaction is impaired AR signaling will remain unaffected. To further characterize the interaction of AR with microtubules, we conducted high resolution multiplex confocal microscopy in PC3 cells stably expressing AR, and observed a clear colocalization of cytoplasmic AR with intact microtubules. Following taxane treatment AR remained associated with bundled microtubules in the perinuclear region (Fig. 4A). The tubulin-AR association was confirmed by coimmunoprecipitation of tubulin and AR in LNCaP cells (Fig. 4B) as well as by a microtubule cosedimentation assay (14) in which AR was found preferentially associated with the microtubule polymer fraction (WP) and not the fraction containing soluble tubulin dimers (WS), lending further support to the role of microtubules as tracks for AR transport toward the nucleus (Fig. 4C).

The microtubule-associated motor protein, dynein, mediates AR trafficking

To test this hypothesis, we investigated the involvement of the minus-end-directed microtubule-motor protein dynein, which transports cargo from the cytoplasm toward the nucleus, in AR trafficking (34). Coimmunoprecipitation experiments revealed that AR associated with dynein, and that this interaction was increased upon ligand (R1881) induced AR
nuclear translocation (Fig. 5A). In addition, dynein cofractionated with AR and microtubules in the cosedimentation assay (Supplementary Fig. S1A), suggesting that both dynein and AR associate preferentially with microtubule polymers. Cytoplasmic dynein, to drive subcellular motile functions, works in concert with several accessory proteins including dynactin, an adapter that mediates the binding of dynein to cargo structures enhancing the motor’s processivity. Overexpression of the dynactin associated protein dynamitin, which disrupts the dynein-cargo interaction (28), markedly reduced AR nuclear accumulation following R1881 induction (Fig. 5B and Supplementary Fig. S1B), suggesting that following ligand binding, AR is shuttled from the cytoplasm to the nucleus via microtubules and its associated motor complexes.
AR cytoplasmic localization in CTCs correlates with clinical response to taxane chemotherapy

To assess whether taxanes inhibit AR nuclear translocation in vivo, we isolated CTCs from the blood of CRPC patients and examined PSMA (24, 25, 35, 36) expressing CTCs by high resolution confocal microscopy. We first confirmed colocalization of AR with the microtubule cytoskeleton in patient samples (Fig. 6A). We next investigated whether perturbation of the microtubule-AR axis in CTCs identified in CRPC patients receiving taxane chemotherapy would correlate with clinical response. As shown in Figure 6B (top panel), CTCs from a patient who was refractory to PTX chemotherapy exhibited an unperturbed microtubule network with AR present in both the nucleus and cytoplasm. In contrast, in a second patient who was responding to DTX chemotherapy, CTCs showed bundled microtubules and AR was exclusively in the cytoplasm with intense AR perinuclear staining (Fig. 6B, bottom panel). These results in 2 patients suggested that taxane-induced microtubule bundling and AR cytoplasmic localization correlated with clinical response to chemotherapy. We therefore expanded our analysis to additional patients and used CTCs enriched from the blood of CRPC patients receiving EpCAM-based immunomagnetic capture (CellSearch; ref. 29). To identify PC CTCs among the leucocytes present in the EpCAM-enriched cell population, we stained for PSMA and CD45 (leucose specific marker) and analyzed the PSMA+/CD45− cells for AR subcellular localization using multiplex confocal microscopy (Fig. 6C). Using this methodology, we monitored longitudinally CRPC patients receiving taxane-chemotherapy and investigated the association between AR’s subcellular localization in CTCs and patients’ clinical response to therapy. Figure 6D shows a representative example of CTCs isolated from a metastatic CRPC patient in which AR was localized in the nucleus at baseline, consistent with this patient’s rising serum PSA (Fig. 6E, open symbols), but was consistently shifted to the cytoplasm during PSA decline following chemotherapy (Figs. 6D and E). In another patient (Fig. 6E, filled symbols), AR was detected in the cytoplasm as early as 1 hour following PTX administration which was followed by a significant decline in PSA. This result emphasizes fast and effective drug-target engagement in this patient’s sample.

Table 1 summarizes the results from our CTC analyses done on sequential blood samples obtained from 14 patients receiving taxane chemotherapy and followed longitudinally. PSA outcomes were assigned by clinicians independent of CTC enumeration using modified Prostate Cancer Working Group 2 criteria (33). Responders were defined as having at least a 30% reduction in PSA (33, 37, 38); responders had more than 25% increase in PSA with a minimum absolute increase of 2 ng/mL and those meeting neither criteria were considered stable. Among 18 samples obtained during clinical progression, 13 (72%) showed nuclear AR localization; while among 17 responding/stable samples, 12 (70.6%) showed cytoplasmic AR localization (P = 0.02; Table 1). We also examined the association between longitudinal quantitative AR measurements (either in terms of the percentage of AR in cytoplasm or the total AR intensity) and the PSA outcome using a generalized linear mixed-effects model that accounts for possible clustering of data among cells from the same sample and among samples from the same subject. This analysis revealed that the odds of responding for those with AR completely in cytoplasm was estimated to be increased by 30% compared with patients with no AR in the cytoplasm (OR = exp(0.26) = 1.30, P < 0.001). Similarly, using log transformed total AR intensity as the predictor, we found that increased total AR intensity is associated with decreased odds of responding. With each unit increase in the log AR intensity, the odds of responding is 24% lower (OR = exp(−0.28) = 0.76, P < 0.001). Interestingly, we observed AR nuclear localization in all 4 baseline patient samples indicative of active AR signaling. In contrast, AR cytoplasmic localization was detected as early as 1 hour following the first dose of PTX administration (patient 4) showcasing rapid and effective perturbation of the microtubule-AR axis. Altogether, these results show that AR subcellular localization can be resolved in CTCs and can serve as a biomarker to monitor clinical response to chemotherapy.
Discussion

PC remains a major cause of cancer-related morbidity in the United States with the majority of PC-related deaths resulting from metastatic, castrate-resistant disease. Widely thought to be chemotherapy resistant (6), androgen withdrawal was considered the only effective therapy for patients who developed metastases. Although numerous clinical studies using taxane-based regimens had shown antitumor activity and clinical benefit in patients with CRPC, it was only in 2004 that the taxane DTX was proven to significantly improve overall survival (8, 9). In 2010, the taxane cabazitaxel was shown to improve overall survival in CRPC patients who had received prior DTX chemotherapy (7). These studies have proven the clinical utility of taxanes in PC.

Historically, the antitumor activity of taxanes has been attributed to inhibition of mitosis, as mitotic cell division requires the presence of highly dynamic microtubules and taxane treatment by suppressing microtubule dynamics leads to mitotic arrest in actively dividing cancer cells growing on 2-dimensional tissue culture (10). In addition to mitosis, microtubule dynamics are critically important for many interphase cellular functions such as intracellular transport and signaling, the disruption of which by taxanes has not been functionally implicated in their antitumor activity (39). Here, we provide evidence that taxanes clinical activity in PC can be attributed at least in part to the inhibition of AR activity via its effect on microtubules. Inhibition of AR signaling as effective therapy in the castrate state has similarly been observed with agents designed to specifically target the AR axis, including the androgen synthesis inhibitor abiraterone and the novel AR antagonist MDV3100 (5). The observation that DTX may also act by inhibiting AR through microtubule stabilization may explain why taxanes are the only class of active chemotherapy.

Figure 6. Clinical response to taxane-based chemotherapy correlates with AR cytoplasmic sequestration in CTCs. A and B, PBMCs obtained from the blood of a metastatic CRPC patient following Ficoll separation were fixed and stained for DNA (DAPI), AR, and tubulin. CTCs were defined as large (>10 μm diameter), nucleated, round to oval cells, expressing AR. A, high magnification of a CTC showing that the cytoplasmic portion of AR colocalizes with MTs (dashed arrows). B, microtubule integrity and subcellular localization of AR in CTCs isolated from CRPC patients receiving chemotherapy. Top, CTCs identified from a metastatic DTX-resistant CRPC patient treated with PTX (and carboplatin). CTCs analyzed 7 days following 2nd cycle of chemotherapy. Patient did not respond with rising PSA and increased sclerotic bone metastases on bone scan. Dashed arrows point to intense AR nuclear accumulation, indicative of active AR signaling. Bottom, CTCs identified from previously untreated metastatic CRPC patient receiving DTX chemotherapy. CTCs analyzed 7 days posttreatment following 10th cycle of chemotherapy. Patient responding to chemotherapy by PSA decrease. E, PSA trends over time for 2 representative CRPC patients. Ovals and diamonds on the graph represent the AR nuclear localization (cytoplasmic and nuclear, respectively) determined in CTCs isolated at these precise time points. For patient 11, evaluation of CTCs at baseline showed the presence of AR in the nucleus. Following treatment, CTC analysis revealed a shift of AR to the cytoplasm, consistent with the decrease in PSA. CTCs from patient 4 showed cytoplasmic AR during PSA response to taxane. However, CTCs subsequently showed AR nuclear localization before PSA progression was apparent.
in CRPC, and conversely why other chemotherapeutic agents have been largely ineffective.

Previous reports have shown that taxanes can inhibit PSA expression (18–20). Gan and colleagues reported that PTX inhibition of AR-transactivated genes is mediated by FOXO1 (19), whereas Zhu and colleagues similarly suggested that taxanes effect on microtubules inhibits AR nuclear localization (20). These results together with the data presented here

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Patient no. (age)</th>
<th>Sample no.</th>
<th>Number of taxane cycle</th>
<th>AR localization</th>
<th>Total AR fluorescence intensity (RU)a</th>
<th>Clinical response (PSAWG2)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 (66)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>Responder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 (59)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>177</td>
<td>Progressor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 (62)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>Cytoplasmic</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>Progressor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 (70)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 h post</td>
<td>Cytoplasmic</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>Baseline (1 h post)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cytoplasmic</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>Responder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>Progressor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Cytoplasmic</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>Progressor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>82</td>
<td>Progressor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>274</td>
<td>Progressor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 (78)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>Progressor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>Progressor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 (86)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cytoplasmic</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>Responder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>Progressor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 (69)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cytoplasmic</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA–Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cytoplasmic</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>Progressor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>Progressor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 (88)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>Progressor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 (77)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>Progressor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 (61)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Progressor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>Progressor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>NA–Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Responder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 (69)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cytoplasmic</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>Responder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cytoplasmic</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>Responder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cytoplasmic</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>Responder</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Cytoplasmic</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>Progressor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 (88)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cytoplasmic</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA–Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 (86)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>153</td>
<td>Progressor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA–Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA–Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cytoplasmic</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA–Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cytoplasmic</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA–Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Cytoplasmic</td>
<td>798</td>
<td>Progressor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 (68)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>baseline</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>Baseline</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 h post</td>
<td>Nuclear</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>Baseline (1 h post)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cytoplasmic</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA–Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Cytoplasmic</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA–Stable</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>Cytoplasmic</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA–Stable</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NOTE: AR subcellular localization and total fluorescence intensity were determined in CTCs isolated from the blood of 14 patients at different time points during the course of their taxane-based chemotherapy. Results were then correlated to the patients’ PSA outcome at the time that the CTCs were evaluated. PSA clinical response (responder vs. progressor) was defined using established Prostate Cancer Working Group 2 (PSAWG2) criteria.

a1 Relative Unit (RU) = 10,000 pixel intensity.
strongly suggest that interphase microtubule functions coupled with the trafficking and signaling pathways they regulate are indeed the effective targets of taxane treatment. In the current study, we show that in cells with tubulin mutation at the PTX-binding site treatment with PTX does not prevent AR nuclear localization suggesting that tubulin mutations at the taxane-binding site may account for clinical taxane resistance. This mechanism could also explain the lack of clinical cross-resistance between the different taxanes as we have previously reported that cancer cell lines that are resistant to PTX due to acquired β-tubulin mutations at the taxane-binding site retain sensitivity to DTX or other microtubule-stabilizing drugs that bind tubulin at the same site, such as the epothilones (27, 40, 41). This is attributed to the distinct-binding modes of PTX, DTX, or the epothilones in the same-binding site in β-tubulin so that single point mutations may affect one taxane but not the other even though the binding site is shared (42). Alternatively, AR gene alterations rendering AR trafficking independent of microtubule control could also lead to taxane resistance.

The lack of readily biopsied tumor material from metastatic CRPC patients represents an additional challenge to the understanding of clinical drug resistance. Circulating tumor cells isolated from the blood of metastatic cancer patients provide a noninvasive source of tumor material that can enable molecular characterization of disease progression. Previous studies have identified PC-specific molecular alterations in CTCs such as AR gene amplification, PTEN loss and TMPRSS2:ERG fusion confirming the malignant origin of CTCs (43–45). However, no studies have directly monitored CTCs for drug-induced dynamic changes in molecular pathways in individual patients over time. Using isolated CTCs from CRPC patients followed longitudinally over the course of taxane chemotherapy, we found a significant correlation between AR cytoplasmic localization and clinical response, suggesting that the changes in AR subcellular localization can be used as a predictive biomarker of response. We also detected a decrease in AR intensity. The correlation between the decrease in total AR intensity and clinical response to taxanes is consistent with AR transcriptional autoregulation (46) and our results showing that taxane treatment leads to AR cytoplasmic sequestration and subsequent inhibition of transcriptional activity (Fig. 1). These results showing that disruption of the microtubule-AR axis contributes to taxane antitumor activity also suggest that combining a taxane with other therapies targeting AR signaling at the level of ligand synthesis (47) or ligand-receptor interaction or DNA transactivation (48) may be synergistic.

Whether studying the effect of a taxane on AR localization in CTCs can be used as predictor of clinical response to therapy requires further study. To this end, we have begun a prospective clinical trial of CRPC patients receiving DTX chemotherapy to determine if AR localization following chemotherapy correlates with response, and whether tubulin and/or AR mutations correlate with DTX resistance. The ability to monitor these events in CTCs over the course of a patient’s treatment will enable early therapeutic interventions and help elucidate the mechanisms of drug resistance in CRPC patients.
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