Original Article Association of PIN1 promoter polymorphisms with colorectal carcinoma risk and clinicopathological parameters

Liuyan Zeng^{1*}, Guoliang Huang^{1*}, Shengqun Luo¹, Xingxiang Pu², Dan Liao¹, Huahui Li¹, Tong Li¹, Yingqin Li³, Wenrui Jia³, Zhiwei He¹

¹China-American Cancer Research Institute, Dongguan Scientific Research Center, Guangdong Medical University, Dongguan, China; Key Laboratory for Epigenetics of Dongguan City; Key Laboratory for Medical Molecular Diagnostics of Guangdong Province, Dongguan, China; ²Department of Medical Oncology, Hunan Tumor Hospital, Changsha, China; ³School of Laboratory Medicine, Guangdong Medical University, Dongguan, China. ^{*}Equal contributors.

Received May 17, 2016; Accepted July 28, 2016; Epub September 1, 2016; Published September 15, 2016

Abstract: Studies have reported the associations between the two single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), -842G>C (rs2233678) and -667C>T (rs2233679), in the PIN1 promoter region and the risk of cancers. However, no studies have reported the association between the PIN1 polymorphisms and risk of colorectal carcinoma. In this study, we investigated the association between the two SNPs -842G>C and -667C>T in PIN1 promoter with risk of colorectal carcinoma (CRC) and clinicopathological parameter of CRC. The results indicated the frequencies of -842G>C and -667C>T genotypes and alleles were not significantly different between the colorectal cancer patients and controls. Interestingly, -667C>T SNP genotypes showed a significant association with clinical stage (P = 0.022). Compared to the -667CC genotype, the -667CT genotype was lower in the advance stage (rate in the advance stage, -667CC: 34/51, -667CT: 27/64). The -842G>C genotype was marginally associated with lymph node status (P = 0.099). In conclusion, our findings suggested that the polymorphic variants of -842G>C and -667C>T in PIN1 promoter were not associated with the risk of CRC but associated with the clinicopathological CRC.

Keywords: PIN1, colorectal carcinoma, polymorphism, risk

Introduction

PIN1 (peptidylprolyl cis/trans isomerase, NIMAinteracting 1), an approximate 18kDa protein consisting of a COOH-terminal catalytic domain and a WW amino-terminal protein-protein interaction domain, belongs to the evolutionarily conserved peptidy1-prolyl isomerase family of proteins [1] which can recognize and bind to specific phosphorylated Ser/Thr-Pro motifs and change conformation of phosphoproteins [2]. PIN1 plays a vital role in the development and progression of cancer by controlling the activity and/or stability of Pro-directed phosphoproteins [2]. PIN1 contributes to the development of cancer through various targets, such as β-catenin in prostate cancer [3], hepatitis B virus X-protein in liver cancer [4], estrogen receptor-alpha in breast cancer [5] and cyclin D1 in cervical cancer [6]. Overexpression of PIN1 has been reported in various types of human cancers [7]. Higher expression of PIN1 is associated with tumor progression and prognosis in several cancers, such as esophageal carcinoma [8], lung cancer [9], prostate cancer [10] and colorectal cancer [11].

Studies have reported the associations between the two single nucleotide polymorphisms (SNPs), -842G>C (rs2233678) and -667C>T (rs2233679), in the PIN1 promoter region and the risk of cancers [12-17]. Compared to -842GG homozygote, only -842GC heterozygote but not -842CC homozygote has reported to show a significantly decreased cancer risk in breast cancer [13], squamous cell carcinoma of head and neck [14], lung cancer [15] and nasopharyngeal carcinoma [17]. On the SNP

Characteristic	Patient	Control	P value
Age			
<40	34	40	0.052
≥40	121	84	
Gender			
Male	89	59	0.102
Female	66	65	
CEA			
<5 µg/L	100	-	
≥5 µg/L	43	-	
Primary tumor extension			
T1+T2	21	-	
T3+T4	113	-	
Lymph node status			
NO	55	-	
N1+N2+N3	71	-	
Metastasis			
NO	121	-	
YES	16	-	
Clinical stage			
+	60	-	
III+IV	72	-	

Table 1. Characteristics of colorectal carci-
noma patients and controls

-667C>T, the -667T allele is suggested to be increased in hepatitis B and C co-infected patients [12]. Studies indicate that the -667TT homozygote have a significantly increased risk of oral squamous cell carcinoma [18] and nasopharyngeal carcinoma [17]. However, no studies have reported the association between the PIN1 polymorphisms and risk of colorectal carcinoma.

Colorectal cancer is the third most commonly diagnosed cancer in males and the second in females in the world. It is estimated that 1.4 million cases and 693,900 deaths occurred worldwide in 2012 [19]. Colorectal cancer is the 5 most commonly diagnosed cancers and the 5 leading causes of cancer death in China [20]. A few genes were reported to be associated with the risk of colorectal cancer [21, 22]. PIN1 is overexpressed in colorectal carcinoma and correlated with β -catenin expression [23]. Therefore, we speculated that there could be an association between PIN1 polymorphism and colorectal carcinoma risk. In this study, we genotyped the two common promoter SNPs -842G>C (rs2233678) and -667C>T (rs2233679) to test whether PIN1 polymorphisms were associated with risk of colorectal carcinoma. We also examined the associations between these polymorphisms and clinicopathological characteristics such as age, gender, serum carcinoembryonic antigen (CEA) level, primary tumor extension, nodal status, metastasis, and tumor stage.

Materials and methods

Study population

A total of 155 patients who were diagnosed with colorectal carcinoma and 124 cancer-free controls at Hunan Tumor Hospital, were enrolled in this study. The healthy individuals were matched for age with the colorectal cancer patients. The age range for colorectal cancer patients was 21-67 and for controls was 22-65. Tumor size and status of regional lymph node metastasis were examined by magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) or computed tomography (CT) scan. Clinical stages were graded according to the criteria of Union for International Cancer Control (UICC). All the patients were diagnosed either by histopathology or imageology and received no treatment before the blood drawing. Blood samples were collected after the informed consent was obtained from all participants. This study was approved by the institutional review board.

SNP selection and genotyping

The genomic DNA was extracted using TIANamp Genomic DNA kit (TIANGEN BIOTECH, Beijing, China) according to manufacturer's instruction. The two SNPs (-842G>C, rs223-3678 and -667C>T, rs2233679) genotypes were detected by polymerase chain reactionrestriction fragment length polymorphism (PCR-RFLP) method as described by Lambert JC [24]. We used forward primer (5'-CGG GCT CTG CAG ACT CTA TT-3') and reverse primer (5'-AAA TTT GGC TCC TCC ATC CT-3') to amplify the fragment. PCR amplification was performed in a 15 µl reaction mixture containing 100 ng genomic DNA, 0.5 µl of each primers and 1 X PCR master mix (Promega). For genotyping of -842G>C and -667C>T polymorphisms, 2 µl of the PCR products were digested for 4 h at 37°C with 1 µl of Banll (New England BioLabs) or 0.5 µl of Sacl (New England BioLabs) respectively in a total volume of 10 µl. Then the cleaved

	51101013				
Polymorphism	Patient	Control	P value	OR	95% CI
-667C>T					
Genotype					
CC	58 (37.4)	45 (36.3)	0.835		
СТ	70 (45.2)	60 (48.4)			
TT	27 (17.4)	19 (15.3)			
CT versus TT			0.611	1.207ª	0.585-2.491
CC versus TT			0.735	0.873ª	0.396-1.921
Allele					
С	186	150	0.908	0.980	0.697-1.379
Т	124	98			
-842G>C					
Genotype					
CC	0 (0)	0 (0)	0.069		
GC	15 (9.7)	5 (4.0)			
GG	140 (90.3)	119 (96.0)			
CG versus GG			0.160	0.448ª	0.146-1.373
Allele					
С	15	5	0.075	2.471	0.885-6.898
G	295	243			

 Table 2. Genotype and allele distribution of -667C>T and -842G>C

 in patients and controls

^aData were calculated by unconditional logistic regression with adjustment for age and gender.

products were separated on 3% agarose gel and identified by ethidium bromide staining. We confirmed the reproducibility of genotyping by direct sequencing using 10% of samples which were randomly selected.

Statistical analysis

Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium was analyzed using the Pearson's two-sided chi-square test in the cancer-free controls. The statistical difference of PIN1 genotype and allele frequencies between the colorectal cancer patients and controls was evaluated using the Pearson's two-sided chi-square test. The odds ratio (OR) and its 95% confidence interval (CI) was obtained by the logistic regression analysis to estimate the associations between PIN1 variants and colorectal cancer risk. The crude odds ratio was determined through univariate logistic regression with only the genotype or allele. The adjusted odds ratio was calculated using the multivariate logistic regression method with an adjustment for age and gender. Chisquare test or Fisher's exact test was performed to determine the association between the genotype frequencies and clinicopathological parameters such as age, gender, serum carcinoembryonic antigen (CEA), primary tumor extension, nodal status, metastasis, and tumor stage in patients. All statistical tests were two-sided, and P<0.05 was considered statistically significant using the SPSS 16.0 software.

Results

Characteristics of the study population

This study included 155 colorectal cancer cases and 124 cancer-free controls. Demographic variables and risk factors of the patients and controls are listed in **Table 1**. Lack of statistical differences were observed in the distributions of age (P = 0.052, **Table 1**) and gender (P = 0.102, **Table 1**) between patients and controls.

Distribution of PIN1 genotypes and their associations with risk of colorectal carcinoma

 Table 2 summarized the genotype and allele
 distributions of the PIN1 SNPs (-842G>C, rs2233678 and -667C>T, rs2233679) in patients and controls. The genotype frequency distributions of -667C>T and -842G>C both showed lack of statistical significance between study groups and controls (P = 0.835 and 0.069, respectively, Table 2). No significant difference was shown in the distribution of allele frequency of -667C>T between patients and controls (OR = 0.980, 95% CI = 0.697-1.379, P = 0.908, Table 2). Nevertheless, a marginally statistical difference was found in the allele distribution of -842G>C between patients and controls (OR = 2.479, 95% CI = 0.885-6.898, P = 0.075).

Association between PIN1 genotypes and clinicopathological parameter

Tables 3 and **4** summarized the relationship between -667C>T and -842G>C genotype and clinicopathological parameters, respectively. Genotype in the two SNPs showed no signifi-

patients				
Parameters	-667C>T			P value
	CC	СТ	TT	
Age				
<40	10	18	6	0.514
≥40	48	52	21	
Gender				
Male	36	34	19	0.100
Female	22	36	8	
CEA				
<5 µg/L	37	43	20	0.208
≥5 µg/L	15	24	4	
Primary tumor extension				
T1+T2	9	9	3	0.807
T3+T4	40	54	19	
Lymph node status				
NO	22	25	8	0.794
N1+N2+N3	25	33	13	
Metastasis				
NO	43	58	20	0.947
YES	6	7	3	
Clinical stage				
+	17	37	6	0.022
III+IV	34	27	11	

Table 3. Association between the genotype frequencies of -667C>T and clinicopathological characteristics of colorectal carcinoma

cant associations with parameters including age, gender, serum carcinoembryonic antigen (CEA), primary tumor extension, lymph node status, and metastasis in patients. Interestingly, -667C>T SNP genotype showed a significant association with clinical stage (P = 0.022). Compared to the -667CC genotype, the -667CT genotype was lower in the advance stage (rate in the advance stage, -667CC: 34/51, -667CT: 27/64). The -842G>C genotype was marginally associated with lymph node status (P = 0.099).

Discussion

Previous studies reported the association between PIN1 polymorphism and cancer risk [12-17], such as breast cancer [12], squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck [14], nasopharyngeal carcinoma [17] and lung cancer [15]. Our study investigated the association between PIN1 polymorphism and colorectal carcinoma risk. Our data indicated that the frequencies of -667C>T and -842G>C genotypes patients -842G>C Parameters P value GC GG Age <40 34 1 0.193 14 ≥40 106 Gender 7 Male 82 0.376 8 Female 58 CEA 90 10 0.771* <5 µg/L 38 5 ≥5 µg/L Primary tumor extension T1+T2 18 3 0.460* T3+T4 102 11 Lymph node status NO 46 9 0.099 N1+N2+N3 66 5 Metastasis NO 108 13 1.000* YES 15 1 Clinical stage

54

64

6

8

0.836

Table 4. Association between the genotype

cal characteristics of colorectal carcinoma

frequencies of -842G>C and clinicopathologi-

*Two-sided Fisher's exact test was used.

|+||

111+IV

and alleles were not significantly different between the colorectal cancer patients and controls. In the study of breast cancer [13], squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck [12] and lung cancer [15], -842GC heterozygote had a significantly decreased cancer risk comparing to -842GG homozygote. Yet, no significant difference on the frequency of -842G>C genotype was observed in a study of breast cancer [16] and a study of hepatocellular carcinoma [12]. Furthermore, there was no evidence that -667C>T polymorphism was significantly associated with cancer risk in the study of breast cancer [13, 16], squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck [14] and lung cancer [15]. However, decreased risk of cancer was found to be associated with the -842C variant allele in the study of breast cancer [13] and the study of squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck [14]. The SNP -667T allele increased in the patients group of hepatocellular carcinoma with HBV and HCV co-infection [12].

Although the sample size is small, our results suggest that -842G>C and -667C>T polymorphic variants might not have an influence on colorectal cancer risk.

It was interesting that -667C>T genotype showed significant association with clinical stage and -842G>C genotype was marginally associated with lymph node status in colorectal cancer. These data suggested that the two genotypes might be involved in the progression of colorectal cancer, but not in the initiation of cancer. Tumor stage and lymph node status were predictors of survival in colorectal carcinoma patients [25]. We infer that PIN1 genotype might be a predictor of survival in colorectal carcinoma patients. The probable reason for why the previous studies did not show an association between PIN1 genotype and clinicopathological parameter was that these associations were not examined in most of the studies [12-17].

In conclusion, our study suggest that the polymorphic variants of -842G>C and -667C>T in PIN1 promoter were not significantly associated with the risk of colorectal carcinoma. However, -667C>T genotype was associated with clinical stage and -842G>C genotype was marginally associated with lymph node status in colorectal cancer. These data suggested that the two genotypes might be involved in the progression of colorectal cancer and be a predictor of clinicopathological parameter of colorectal cancer. Further validation of our finding in larger population-based studies in diverse ethnic groups is needed.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China [No: 81372137 and No: 30973374 to Z H], Science and Technology Planning Project of Guangdong Province (No: 2013B021800070 to G-L H) and Training Plan for Outstanding Young Teachers in Higher Education Institutions of Guangdong Province [No: YQ201403/YQ2014086 to G-L H].

Disclosure of conflict of interest

None.

Address correspondence to: Zhiwei He, China-American Cancer Research Institute, Guangdong Medical University, 1 Xincheng Road, Dongguan 523808, China. Tel: 86-769-22896219; E-mail: zhi-weihe688@yahoo.com

References

- [1] Galat A. Peptidylprolyl cis/trans isomerases (immunophilins): biological diversity-targetsfunctions. Curr Top Med Chem 2003; 3: 1315-1347.
- [2] Lu KP and Zhou XZ. The prolyl isomerase PIN1: a pivotal new twist in phosphorylation signalling and disease. Nat Rev Mol Cell Biol 2007; 8: 904-916.
- [3] Chen SY, Wulf G, Zhou XZ, Rubin MA, Lu KP and Balk SP. Activation of beta-catenin signaling in prostate cancer by peptidyl-prolyl isomerase Pin1-mediated abrogation of the androgen receptor-beta-catenin interaction. Mol Cell Biol 2006; 26: 929-939.
- [4] Pang R, Lee TK, Poon RT, Fan ST, Wong KB, Kwong YL and Tse E. Pin1 interacts with a specific serine-proline motif of hepatitis B virus X-protein to enhance hepatocarcinogenesis. Gastroenterology 2007; 132: 1088-1103.
- [5] Rajbhandari P, Schalper KA, Solodin NM, Ellison-Zelski SJ, Ping Lu K, Rimm DL and Alarid ET. Pin1 modulates $ER\alpha$ levels in breast cancer through inhibition of phosphorylationdependent ubiquitination and degradation. Oncogene 2013; 33: 1438-1447.
- [6] Li H, Wang S, Zhu T, Zhou J, Xu Q, Lu Y and Ma D. Pin1 contributes to cervical tumorigenesis by regulating cyclin D1 expression. Oncol Rep 2006; 16: 491-496.
- [7] Bao L, Kimzey A, Sauter G, Sowadski JM, Lu KP and Wang DG. Prevalent Overexpression of Prolyl Isomerase Pin1 in Human Cancers. Am J Pathol 2004; 164: 1727-1737.
- [8] Fukuchi M, Fukai Y, Kimura H, Sohda M, Miyazaki T, Nakajima M, Masuda N, Tsukada K, Kato H and Kuwano H. Prolyl isomerase Pin1 expression predicts prognosis in patients with esophageal squamous cell carcinoma and correlates with cyclin D1 expression. Int J Oncol 2006; 29: 329-334.
- [9] He J, Zhou F, Shao K, Hang J, Wang H, Rayburn E, Xiao ZX, Lee SW, Xue Q, Feng XL, Shi SS, Zhang CY and Zhang S. Overexpression of Pin1 in non-small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) and its correlation with lymph node metastases. Lung Cancer 2007; 56: 51-58.
- [10] Ayala G, Wang D, Wulf G, Frolov A, Li R, Sowadski J, Wheeler TM, Lu KP and Bao L. The prolyl isomerase Pin1 is a novel prognostic marker in human prostate cancer. Cancer Res 2003; 63: 6244-6251.
- [11] Kuramochi J, Arai T, Ikeda S, Kumagai J, Uetake H and Sugihara K. High Pin1 expression is as-

sociated with tumor progression in colorectal cancer. J Surg Oncol 2006; 94: 155-160.

- [12] Segat L, Milanese M and Crovella S. Pin1 promoter polymorphisms in hepatocellular carcinoma patients. Gastroenterology 2007; 132: 2618-2619; author reply 2619-2620.
- [13] Han CH, Lu J, Wei Q, Bondy ML, Brewster AM, Yu TK, Buchholz TA, Arun BK and Wang LE. The functional promoter polymorphism (-842G>C) in the PIN1 gene is associated with decreased risk of breast cancer in non-Hispanic white women 55 years and younger. Breast Cancer Res Treat 2010; 122: 243-249.
- [14] Lu J, Hu Z, Wei S, Wang LE, Liu Z, El-Naggar AK, Sturgis EM and Wei Q. A novel functional variant (-842G>C) in the PIN1 promoter contributes to decreased risk of squamous cell carcinoma of the head and neck by diminishing the promoter activity. Carcinogenesis 2009; 30: 1717-1721.
- [15] Lu J, Yang L, Zhao H, Liu B, Li Y, Wu H, Li Q, Zeng B, Wang Y, Ji W and Zhou Y. The polymorphism and haplotypes of PIN1 gene are associated with the risk of lung cancer in Southern and Eastern Chinese populations. Hum Mutat 2011; 32: 1299-1308.
- [16] Naidu R, Har YC and Taib NA. Analysis of peptidyl-propyl-cis/trans isomerase 1 (PIN1) gene -842(G>C) and -667(T>C) polymorphic variants in relation to breast cancer risk and clinico-pathological parameters. Scand J Clin Lab Invest 2011; 71: 500-506.
- [17] Lu Y, Huang GL, Pu XX, He YX, Li BB, Liu XY, Dong Z and He Z. Association between PIN1 promoter polymorphisms and risk of nasopharyngeal carcinoma. Mol Biol Rep 2013; 40: 3777-3782.

- [18] Yao J, Wang JM, Wang ZL and Wu YN. The Pin1 gene polymorphism and the susceptibility of oral squamous cell carcinoma in East China. Cancer Biomark 2014; 14: 441-447.
- [19] Torre LA, Bray F, Siegel RL, Ferlay J, Lortet-Tieulent J and Jemal A. Global cancer statistics, 2012. CA Cancer J Clin 2015; 65: 87-108.
- [20] Chen W, Zheng R, Baade PD, Zhang S, Zeng H, Bray F, Jemal A, Yu XQ and He J. Cancer statistics in China, 2015. CA Cancer J Clin 2016; 66: 115-132.
- [21] Gansmo LB, Romundstad P, Birkeland E, Hveem K, Vatten L, Knappskog S and Lonning PE. MDM4 SNP34091 (rs4245739) and its effect on breast-, colon-, lung-, and prostate cancer risk. Cancer Med 2015; 4: 1901-1907.
- [22] Yao L, Hu Y, Deng Z and Li J. Survivin -31 G/C polymorphism might contribute to colorectal cancer (CRC) risk: a meta-analysis. Int J Clin Exp Med 2015; 8: 15857-15861.
- [23] Kim CJ, Cho YG, Park YG, Nam SW, Kim SY, Lee SH, Yoo NJ, Lee JY and Park WS. Pin1 overexpression in colorectal cancer and its correlation with aberrant beta-catenin expression. World J Gastroenterol 2005; 11: 5006-5009.
- [24] Lambert JC, Bensemain F, Chapuis J, Cottel D and Amouyel P. Association study of the PIN1 gene with Alzheimer's disease. Neurosci Lett 2006; 402: 259-261.
- [25] Wang G, Huang J, Zhu H, Ju S, Wang H and Wang X. Overexpression of GRO-beta is associated with an unfavorable outcome in colorectal cancer. Oncol Lett 2016; 11: 2391-2397.