A novel gene, RSRC2, inhibits cell proliferation and affects survival in esophageal cancer patients

HIROKI KUREHARA, HIDEYUKI ISHIGURO, MASAHIRO KIMURA, AKIRA MITSUI, TAKUYA ANDO, NOBUYOSHI SUGITO, RYOTA MORI, NOBUHIRO TAKASHIMA, RYO OGAWA, YOSHITAKA FUJII and YOSHIYUKI KUWABARA

> Second Department of Surgery, Nagoya City University Medical School, Kawasumi 1, Mizuho-cho, Mizuho-ku, Nagoya 467-8601, Japan

> > Received August 18, 2006; Accepted October 23, 2006

Abstract. In Japan and China, esophageal cancer is common and more than 90% of esophageal cancers are squamous cell carcinoma. Esophageal squamous cell carcinoma (ESCC) shows a poor prognosis, but the mechanism of ESCC and target genes for treatment remains unclear. We searched for genes related to ESCC, and identified a novel gene, FLJ11021, which was designated arginine/serine-rich coiled-coil 2 (RSRC2). We sought to determine the role of RSRC2 in the proliferation of esophageal cell lines and to examine the relationship between RSRC2 and clinicopathologic factors and ESCC prognosis. Expression of RSRC2 was quantified by real-time reverse transcription polymerase chain reaction (RT-PCR) in 70 primary ESCCs and paired noncancerous esophageal mucosa. To determine the role of RSRC2 in ESCC cell proliferation, we used vector-based transfection and small interfering RNA methods. Our results show that RSRC2mRNA levels in all ESCC cell lines (TE1-15, excluding TE7) were lower than those in a human esophageal squamous epithelial cell line (Het-1A). Cell proliferation of an ESCC cell line was inhibited by overexpression of RSRC2, while reduced expression was accompanied by tumor progression. RSRC2 expression levels were significantly correlated with depth of invasion, lymph node metastasis, lymphatic invasion and vascular invasion. Moreover, ESCC patients with low RSRC2mRNA expression had significantly shorter post-operative survival time than those with high expression. In vitro study revealed that RSRC2 might play a role in cell proliferation. Our study demonstrated that RSRC2 expression may be a novel tumor

Correspondence to: Dr Hideyuki Ishiguro, Second Department of Surgery, Nagoya City Medical School, Kawasumi 1, Mizuho-cho, Mizuho-ku, Nagoya 467-8601, Japan E-mail: h-ishi@med.nagoya-cu.ac.jp

Key words: esophageal squamous cell carcinoma, *RSRC2* (*arginine/serine-rich coiled-coil 2*), quantitative reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction, post-operative survival

suppressor of esophageal cancer cell growth and a prognostic factor in ESCC.

Introduction

Esophageal squamous cell carcinoma (ESCC) is relatively common in Japan; worldwide, the disease is the ninth most frequent cancer, but it is the sixth most frequent cause of death from malignant tumors in Japan. ESCC exhibits poor prognosis as a result of early systemic metastasis, which occurs primarily via lymphatic vessels (1-6). Previous studies have identified prognostic factors for ESCC as tumor size, age at diagnosis, and primary site (5,6). Among these, depth of cancer invasion in the esophageal wall and lymph node metastasis are the main predictive factors for ESCC recurrence (5-7). These factors and the presence of distant metastasis are included in the pathological Tumor-Node-Metastasis (pTNM) staging for ESCC (8). The TNM classification of ESCC has been the only tool to predict recurrence and patient survival (5-7). However, the prognosis of individual ESCC, even at early stage (pT1), varies considerably, and a strategy to establish appropriate therapeutic modalities for each patient has yet to be formulated.

Molecular biologic studies have identified several genes that are involved in the carcinogenesis and/or progression of esophageal carcinoma: *TP53* (9), *CDKN2A* (10), *DEC1* (11), *DCC* (12), *DLC1* (13), *Fhit* (14), *Caveolin-1* (15), *COX-2* (16) and *MET* (17). However, the precise mechanisms that underlie the development and progression of ESCC remain unclear.

We searched for genes associated with ESCC among the Human esophageal carcinoma cDNA library (UniGene lib.6324, not available now) at the National Center for Biotechnology Information Home Page, and we obtained a list of genes associated with ESCC (Table I). Of these, we selected Hs.81648 (FLJ11021), a gene whose function was previously unknown. This gene was designated *arginine/serine-rich coiled-coil 2 (RSRC2)*. RSRC2 has arginine/serine-rich and coiled coil regions (Fig.1). *RSRC2* is predicted to act as a transcription factor, but the gene itself is poorly understood.

In this study, we analyzed the effects of *RSRC2* gene transfection and siRNA silencing of the gene on the proliferation of esophageal cancer cell lines. We also studied

Cluster ID	Cluster title
Hs.3463	Ribosomal protein S23 (RPS23)
Hs.81648	Hypothetical protein FLJ11021 similar to splicing factor, arginine/serine-rich4 (FLJ11021)
Hs.75789	N-myc downstream regulated (NDRG1)
Hs.65648	RNA binding motif protein 8A (RBM8A)
Hs.335928	<i>Homo sapiens</i> , similar to erythrocyte membrane protein band 4.1-like 3, clone MGC:12343 IMAGE:4044866, mRNA, complete cds
Hs.271916	ESTs, weakly similar to S41044 chromosomal protein
Hs.181304	Putative gene product (13CDNA73)
Hs.17585	KIAA0801 gene product (KIAA0801)

Table I. Esophageal cancer-related genes.

RSRC2mRNA expression in 70 patients with ESCC and evaluated its correlation with clinicopathologic features and postoperative survival.

Materials and methods

Cell lines and cell culture. A human esophageal squamous epithelial cell line (Het-1A) was obtained from the American Type Culture Collection (ATCC). Het-1A was maintained in serum-free medium (LHC-9; BioSource, USA) at 37°C in a humidified 5% CO₂ incubator.

ESCC cell lines (TE1-15, excluding TE7) were obtained from the Japanese Collection of Research Bioresources (JCRB). Cultures were maintained in RPMI-1640 (Sigma) medium supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS) (Gibco) at 37°C in a humidified 5% CO₂ incubator.

Tissue samples. Total RNA from normal human tissues (lung, kidney, small intestine, liver, stomach, heart and spleen) was obtained from Cell Applications, Inc. RNA concentration was adjusted to 500 ng/ μ l using a spectrophotometer.

RNA extraction and cDNA synthesis. Total RNA was extracted from each cell line (HET-1A, TE series) using Absolutely RNATM Miniprep kits (Stratagene, La Jolla,CA) according to the manufacturer's instructions. The reverse transcriptase reaction was carried out at 42°C for 90 min and at 95°C for 5 min followed by incubation at 72°C for 15 min using 1 μ g of total RNA, 0.5 mg oligo (dT) primer, and Superscript II enzyme (Gibco BRL, Gaithersburg, MD). Synthesized cDNA was adjusted to 10 ng/ μ l.

Quantitative reverse transcription-polymerase chain reaction (*RT-PCR*). Quantitative RT-PCR was performed using a LightCycler (Roche Diagnostics, Mannheim, Germany).



Figure 1. Structure of RSRC2 protein. RSRC2 protein consists of 434 amino acids and has a coiled coil domain.

RSRC2mRNA was amplified and quantitatively analyzed using a LightCycler-Fast Start DNA Master SYBR-Green I kit (Roche Molecular Biochemicals, Mannheim, Germany). The primer sequences for the RSRC2 gene were as follows: forward primer, 5'-GGACAAATCCCAATCTGCTG-3'; reverse primer, 5'-GGGTTTGTGATCTTGCCATT-3' (product size: 209 base pairs). PCR protocol was as follows: initial denaturation at 95°C for 10 min was followed by 45 cycles at 95°C for 10 sec, annealing at 62°C for 5 sec, and extension at 72°C for 8 sec. PCR products were quantified based on SYBR-Green I intensity at 72°C. RNA extracted from TE10 was used as a standard. After reverse transcription, standard cDNA was serially diluted to obtain six standard solutions for use in PCR to generate the reference curve. The relative amount of cDNA in these cell lines and tissue samples was determined by interpolation using a standard curve, and then the relative ratio of RSRC2 to glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase (GAPDH) expression was calculated for each sample. The primer sequences for GAPDH were as follows: forward primer, 5'-GAAGGTGAAGGTCGGAGTC-3'; reverse primer, 5'-GAAGATGGTGATGGGGATTTC-3' (product size: 226 base pairs).

Expression vector construction. The full-length coding region of *RSRC2* was cloned into highly efficient eukaryotic expression vectors, pcDNA3.1 and pcDNA3.1/His (Invitrogen, USA). The constructed vectors (pcDNA3.1/RSRC2 and pcDNA3.1/His-RSRC2) were finally identified by restriction analysis and were verified by DNA sequencing.

Subcellular localization of RSRC2 protein by confocal microscopy. TE8 cells were transfected with pcDNA3.1/His-RSRC2 using nucleofection technology (10⁶ cells, 2 μ g pcDNA3.1/His-RSRC2, Nucleofector Program U-14, Amaxa Biosystems, Germany). Transfected cells were cultured on chambered coverglass in RPMI-1640 (SIGMA) medium supplemented with 10% FBS for 48 h. Cells remaining on the coverglass were washed once with PBS and fixed with 1% paraformaldehyde for 20 min at 4°C, and were then permeated with permeabilizing solution for 4 min. After gently washing once with PBS, cells were incubated with 0.1% Triton X-100 in PBS for 30 min on ice. Cells were incubated in 1% BSA and 4% powdered skim milk in TBS (50 mM Tris-Cl, pH 7.5, 150 mM NaCl) in order to block nonspecific antibody binding sites. Cells were then stained with primary antibody, mouse anti-His antibody (Invitrogen) (diluted 1:400 in 1% BSA in TBS), overnight at 4°C. After washing twice with TBS, the secondary antibody, anti-mouse Alexa Fluor 488-conjugated antibody (Molecular Probes Inc.), diluted at 1:300 in 1% BSA and 1% powdered skim milk in TBS, was added. The

Table II. Relationship between *RSRC2mRNA* and clinicopathologic factors in 70 patients with esophageal squamous cell carcinoma.

Age at surgery (years) <65 42 0.207±0.108 >65 28 0.193±0.133 NS Gender Male 55 0.204±0.113 Female 15 0.191±0.137 NS Normal or tumor Normal 70 0.313±0.246 Tumor 70 0.201±0.118 <0.01 Histologic differentiation Well 26 0.201±0.111 Moderate 33 0.190±0.135 Poor 11 0.234±0.072 NS Tumor status T1 8 0.303±0.172 T2 10 0.264±0.091 T3 31 0.170±0.090 T4 21 0.180±0.115 <0.01 T1 vs T2-4 8/62 <0.01 Virph nole <0.01 Virph nole.015 <0.01 T1 vs T2-4 8/62 <0.01 <0.05 N4 0.275±0.148 N0 <0.05 Lymph node status N0 14 0.275±0.148 <0.05 <0.01 Posit	Characteristic	No. of patients	<i>RSRC2mRNA</i> expression relative to GAPDH (mean ± SD)	P-value
$\begin{array}{l c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c$	Age at surgery			
$ \begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	(years)	10	0.005 0.100	
>6528 0.193 ± 0.133 NSGenderMale55 0.204 ± 0.113 NSMale55 0.204 ± 0.113 NSNormal or tumor 0.011 ± 0.137 NSNormal or tumor 0.011 ± 0.118 <0.01	<65	42	0.207 ± 0.108	NG
Gender Male 55 0.204 ± 0.113 Ns Male 15 0.191 ± 0.137 NS Normal or tumor Normal 70 0.313 ± 0.246 Tumor 70 0.201 ± 0.118 <0.01	>03	28	0.193 ± 0.133	NS
Male55 0.204 ± 0.113 0.191 ± 0.137 NSNormal or tumor 0.011 ± 0.137 NSNormal or tumor70 0.313 ± 0.246 Tumor 70 Normal or tumor 70 0.201 ± 0.118 <0.01 Histologicdifferentiation $Well$ 26 0.201 ± 0.111 Moderate 33 Poor 11 0.23 ± 0.072 NSTumor statusT1 8 0.303 ± 0.172 T2NSTumor statusT1 8 0.303 ± 0.172 T2NSTumor statusT1 8 0.303 ± 0.172 T2 <0.01 T4 21 0.180 ± 0.115 	Gender			
Female15 0.191 ± 0.137 NSNormal or tumorNormal 70 0.313 ± 0.246 Numor70 0.201 ± 0.118 <0.01	Male	55	0.204±0.113	
Normal or tumor 0.313 ± 0.246 Tumor 0.201 ± 0.118 <0.01 Histologic differentiation 0.201 ± 0.118 <0.01 Well26 0.201 ± 0.111 0.201 ± 0.135 Poor11 0.234 ± 0.072 NSTumor status $T1$ 8 0.303 ± 0.172 T210 0.264 ± 0.091 $T3$ T331 0.170 ± 0.090 $T4$ T1 vs T2-4 $8/62$ <0.01 T1 vs T2-4 $8/62$ <0.01 T1 vs T2-4 $8/62$ <0.01 Lymph node status <0.01 N014 0.275 ± 0.148 N111 0.203 ± 0.097 N224 0.156 ± 0.085 N310 0.216 ± 0.130 N411 0.191 ± 0.113 Ven invexision <0.01 Pathologic stage 0 03 0.299 ± 0.131 I10 0.247 ± 0.104 III23 0.161 ± 0.078 IV30 0.188 ± 0.114 Vein invasion $<0.027\pm0.154$ Negative10 0.327 ± 0.154 Positive46 0.172 ± 0.093 Vein invasion <0.01 Negative23 0.238 ± 0.148 Positive33 0.173 ± 0.090 Vein invasion <0.05	Female	15	0.191±0.137	NS
Normal70 0.313 ± 0.246 $1umor$ <0.01 Histologic differentiation $<0.201\pm0.118$ <0.01 Well26 0.201 ± 0.111 Moderate 33 0.190 ± 0.135 Poor 11 0.234 ± 0.072 NSTumor statusT1 8 0.303 ± 0.172 T2T2 10 0.264 ± 0.091 T3 31 0.170 ± 0.090 T4 21 0.180 ± 0.115 <0.01 T1 vs T2-4 <0.01 T1 vs T2-4 <0.01 Lymph node status $<0.275\pm0.148$ N1 <0.01 <0.01 Lymph node status $<0.216\pm0.130$ N4 $<0.275\pm0.148$ N1 <0.05 Na10 0.216 ± 0.130 N4 <0.05 Lymph node metastasis $<0.275\pm0.148$ N6 A1 <0.01 Pathologic stage 0 3 0.299 ± 0.131 I I <0.01 Lymph node metastasis <0.01 <0.01 Numph node metastasis $<0.161\pm0.078$ IV <0.01 Lymph node metastasis <0.01 <0.01 Lymphatic invasion Negative 0.327 ± 0.154 Positive <0.01 Lymphatic invasion Negative $<0.023\pm0.0148$ O.01 <0.01 Lymphatic invasion Negative $<0.23\pm0.148$ Positive <0.01 Vein invasion Negative $<0.23\pm0.148$ Positive <0.05 O.05Unknown14 <0.05	Normal or tumor			
Tumor70 0.201 ± 0.118 <0.01 Histologic differentiation	Normal	70	0.313±0.246	
Histologic differentiation26 0.201 ± 0.111 Moderate26 33 0.190 ± 0.135 Poor11 0.234 ± 0.072 NSTumor statusT1 T1 0.234 ± 0.072 0.264 ± 0.091 T3NSTumor statusT1 T2 0.264 ± 0.091 T3NST4 T1 vs T2-4 0.180 ± 0.115 0.01 T1-2 vs T3-4 0.180 ± 0.115 0.01 Lymph node status N0 14 0.275 ± 0.148 N1 0.275 ± 0.148 0.01 N1 N1 N1 N1 0.216 ± 0.085 0.33 10 0.216 ± 0.130 N4 0.275 ± 0.148 0.055 Lymph node metastasis 0 0.216 ± 0.130 0.44 0.275 ± 0.148 0.055 Lymph node metastasis 0.299 ± 0.131 1 1 0.05 Lymph node metastasis 0.13 ± 0.002 0.010 Pathologic stage 0 0 3 0.299 ± 0.131 1 1 0.0112 0.0112 Lymphatic invasion Negative 0.327 ± 0.154 0.012 0.0112 Vein invasion Negative 10 0.327 ± 0.154 0.0131 Vein invasion Negative 0.238 ± 0.148 0.012 Vein invasion Negative 23 0.238 ± 0.148 0.0132 Vein invasion Negative 33 0.173 ± 0.090 0.0512	Tumor	70	0.201±0.118	< 0.01
Well26 0.201 ± 0.111 Moderate33 0.190 ± 0.135 Poor11 0.234 ± 0.072 NSTumor statusT1 8 0.303 ± 0.172 T210 0.264 ± 0.091 T3T331 0.170 ± 0.090 T421 0.180 ± 0.115 Von T2-4 $8/62$ <0.01	Histologic differentiation	26	0.001 - 0.111	
Moderate33 0.190 ± 0.135 Poor11 0.234 ± 0.072 NSTumor statusT18 0.303 ± 0.172 T210 0.264 ± 0.091 T3T331 0.170 ± 0.090 T4T421 0.180 ± 0.115 < 0.01 T1 vs T2-4 $8/62$ < <0.01 T1-2 vs T3-4 $18/52$ < <0.01 Lymph node statusN014 0.275 ± 0.148 N014 0.275 ± 0.097 N2N224 0.156 ± 0.085 N3N310 0.216 ± 0.130 <0.05 Lymph nodemetastasis <0.05 Negative14 0.275 ± 0.148 Positive56 0.183 ± 0.102 o3 0.299 ± 0.131 I4 0.349 ± 0.213 II10 0.247 ± 0.104 III23 0.161 ± 0.078 IV30 0.188 ± 0.114 Vein invasionNegativeNegative10 0.327 ± 0.154 Positive46 0.172 ± 0.093 Vein invasionNegativeNegative230.238\pm 0.148 0.001 Unknown14	Well	26	0.201 ± 0.111	
Pool11 0.234 ± 0.072 NSTumor statusT18 0.303 ± 0.172 NST210 0.264 ± 0.091 T331 0.170 ± 0.090 T421 0.180 ± 0.115 <0.01 T1 vs T2-4 $8/62$ <0.01 T1-2 vs T3-4 $18/52$ <0.01 Lymph node statusN014 0.275 ± 0.148 N014 0.275 ± 0.148 0.01 N111 0.203 ± 0.097 $N2$ N224 0.156 ± 0.085 0.33 N310 0.216 ± 0.130 0.05 Lymph nodemetastasis 0.183 ± 0.102 <0.01 Pathologic stage03 0.299 ± 0.131 I4 0.349 ± 0.213 11 <0.01 II10 0.247 ± 0.104 111 <0.01 Lymphatic invasionNegative 10 0.327 ± 0.154 Positive46 0.172 ± 0.093 <0.01 Unknown14 $<0.238\pm0.148$ <0.01 Vein invasionNegative 33 0.173 ± 0.090 <0.05	Moderate	33 11	0.190 ± 0.135	NIC
Tumor status T1 8 0.303 ± 0.172 T2 10 0.264 ± 0.091 T3 31 0.170 ± 0.090 T4 21 0.180 ± 0.115 <0.01 T1 vs T2-4 $8/62$ <0.01 T1-2 vs T3-4 $18/52$ <0.01 Lymph node status N0 14 0.275 ± 0.148 N1 11 0.203 ± 0.097 $N2$ N2 24 0.156 ± 0.085 $N3$ N3 10 0.216 ± 0.130 $N4$ N4 11 0.191 ± 0.113 <0.05 Lymph node $metastasis$ $Negative$ 14 0.275 ± 0.148 Positive 56 0.183 ± 0.102 <0.01 Pathologic stage 0 3 0.299 ± 0.131 1 I 4 0.349 ± 0.213 1 10 0.247 ± 0.104 III 10 0.247 ± 0.104 1 0.01 Lymphatic invasion $Negative$ 10 0.327 ± 0.154 <0.01 Vein invasion 14 0.238 ± 0.148	Poor	11	0.234 ± 0.072	112
T18 0.303 ± 0.172 T210 0.264 ± 0.091 T331 0.170 ± 0.090 T421 0.180 ± 0.115 T1 vs T2-4 $8/62$ <0.01	Tumor status			
T210 0.264 ± 0.091 T331 0.170 ± 0.090 T421 0.180 ± 0.115 T1 vs T2-4 $8/62$ <0.01	T1	8	0.303 ± 0.172	
T331 0.170 ± 0.090 T421 0.180 ± 0.115 <0.01	T2	10	0.264±0.091	
T421 0.180 ± 0.115 <0.01T1 vs T2-4 $8/62$ <0.01	13	31	0.170±0.090	0.01
11 VS 12-4 $8/62$ <0.01 T1-2 vs T3-4 $18/52$ <0.01 Lymph node status $N0$ 14 0.275 ± 0.148 N111 0.203 ± 0.097 N224 0.156 ± 0.085 N310 0.216 ± 0.130 N411 0.191 ± 0.113 Vegative14 0.275 ± 0.148 Positive56 0.183 ± 0.102 Positive56 0.183 ± 0.102 03 0.299 ± 0.131 I4 0.349 ± 0.213 II10 0.247 ± 0.104 III23 0.161 ± 0.078 IV30 0.188 ± 0.114 Vein invasion 0.327 ± 0.154 Negative10 0.327 ± 0.154 Positive46 0.172 ± 0.093 Vein invasion 14	T4	21	0.180 ± 0.115	<0.01
11-2 vs 13-418/32 $<$ (0.01Lymph node statusN014 0.275 ± 0.148 N111 0.203 ± 0.097 N224 0.156 ± 0.085 N310 0.216 ± 0.130 N411 0.191 ± 0.113 Value14 0.275 ± 0.148 Positive56 0.183 ± 0.102 Value56 0.183 ± 0.102 Pathologic stage0303 0.299 ± 0.131 I4 0.349 ± 0.213 II10 0.247 ± 0.104 III23 0.161 ± 0.078 IV30 0.188 ± 0.114 Voin invasionVegativeNegative10 0.327 ± 0.154 Positive46 0.172 ± 0.093 Vein invasionVegativeNegative23 0.238 ± 0.148 Positive33 0.173 ± 0.090 Vein invasion14	11 VS 12-4 T1 2 vo T2 4	8/62		<0.01
Lymph node statusN014 0.275 ± 0.148 N014 0.275 ± 0.148 N111 0.203 ± 0.097 N224 0.156 ± 0.085 N310 0.216 ± 0.130 N411 0.191 ± 0.113 <0.05	11-2 v8 13-4	10/32		<0.01
N014 0.275 ± 0.148 N111 0.203 ± 0.097 N224 0.156 ± 0.085 N310 0.216 ± 0.130 N411 0.191 ± 0.113 <0.05	Lymph node status		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
N111 0.203 ± 0.097 N224 0.156 ± 0.085 N310 0.216 ± 0.130 N411 0.191 ± 0.113 <0.05	N0	14	0.275±0.148	
N224 0.136 ± 0.085 N310 0.216 ± 0.130 N411 0.191 ± 0.113 vegative14 0.275 ± 0.148 Positive56 0.183 ± 0.102 Pathologic stage0303 0.299 ± 0.131 I4 0.349 ± 0.213 II10 0.247 ± 0.104 III23 0.161 ± 0.078 IV30 0.188 ± 0.114 Vein invasion46 0.172 ± 0.093 Negative10 0.327 ± 0.154 Positive46 0.172 ± 0.093 Vein invasionVein invasionNegative23 0.238 ± 0.148 Positive33 0.173 ± 0.090 Ven invasion14	NI NO	11	0.203 ± 0.097	
NS10 0.210 ± 0.130 N411 0.191 ± 0.113 <0.05	NZ 	24	0.136 ± 0.085	
N4II 0.191 ± 0.113 <0.03 Lymph node metastasisNegative14 0.275 ± 0.148 Positive <0.01 Positive56 0.183 ± 0.102 <0.01 Pathologic stage03 0.299 ± 0.131 I <1 I4 0.349 ± 0.213 	NJ NJ	10	0.210 ± 0.130 0.101 ±0.113	<0.05
Lymph node metastasis14 0.275 ± 0.148 Positive 0.275 ± 0.148 Positive 0.183 ± 0.102 <0.01 Pathologic stage 0 3 0.299 ± 0.131 I 1 4 0.349 ± 0.213 II 11 10 0.247 ± 0.104 III 111 23 0.161 ± 0.078 	114	11	0.191±0.115	NO.05
metastasis14 0.275 ± 0.148 Positive56 0.183 ± 0.102 <0.01	Lymph node			
Negative14 0.275 ± 0.148 Positive56 0.183 ± 0.102 <0.01	metastasıs	1.4	0.075.0.140	
Positive 36 0.183 ± 0.102 <0.01 Pathologic stage03 0.299 ± 0.131 I4 0.349 ± 0.213 II10 0.247 ± 0.104 III23 0.161 ± 0.078 IV30 0.188 ± 0.114 Voin invasion 0.327 ± 0.154 Vein invasion 46 Negative460.172\pm0.093 <0.01 Unknown14Vein invasion 0.238 ± 0.148 Positive330.173\pm0.090 <0.05 Unknown14	Negative	14 56	$0.2/5\pm0.148$	-0.01
Pathologic stage03 0.299 ± 0.131 I4 0.349 ± 0.213 II10 0.247 ± 0.104 III23 0.161 ± 0.078 IV30 0.188 ± 0.114 Voin invasion 0.327 ± 0.154 Positive46 0.172 ± 0.093 Unknown14Vein invasion 0.238 ± 0.148 Positive33 0.173 ± 0.090 Unknown14	Positive	30	0.185±0.102	<0.01
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Pathologic stage			
I4 0.349 ± 0.213 II10 0.247 ± 0.104 III23 0.161 ± 0.078 IV30 0.188 ± 0.114 V30 0.327 ± 0.154 Positive46 0.172 ± 0.093 Unknown14Vein invasionNegativeNegative23 0.238 ± 0.148 Positive33 0.173 ± 0.090 Venknown14	0	3	0.299 ± 0.131	
II10 0.247 ± 0.104 III23 0.161 ± 0.078 IV30 0.188 ± 0.114 V30 0.188 ± 0.114 Lymphatic invasion 0.327 ± 0.154 Positive46 0.172 ± 0.093 Unknown14Vein invasion 0.238 ± 0.148 Positive33 0.173 ± 0.090 Unknown14	I	4	0.349±0.213	
III 23 0.161±0.078 IV 30 0.188±0.114 <0.01		10	0.247 ± 0.104	
IV 30 0.188±0.114 <0.01		23	0.161 ± 0.078	0.01
Lymphatic invasion 0.327±0.154 Negative 10 0.327±0.154 Positive 46 0.172±0.093 <0.01	IV	30	0.188 ± 0.114	<0.01
Negative 10 0.327±0.154 Positive 46 0.172±0.093 <0.01	Lymphatic invasion	ı		
Positive 46 0.172±0.093 <0.01 Unknown 14 Vein invasion Vein inva	Negative	10	0.327±0.154	
Unknown14Vein invasion Negative230.238±0.148Positive330.173±0.090<0.05	Positive	46	0.172±0.093	< 0.01
Vein invasion 0.238±0.148 Negative 23 0.238±0.148 Positive 33 0.173±0.090 <0.05	Unknown	14		
Negative 23 0.238±0.148 Positive 33 0.173±0.090 <0.05	Vein invasion			
Positive 33 0.173±0.090 <0.05 Unknown 14	Negative	23	0.238±0.148	
Unknown 14	Positive	33	0.173±0.090	< 0.05
	Unknown	14		

GAPDH, glyceraldehyde-3-phosphate dehydrogenase; SD, standard deviation; NS, not significant.

cells were incubated for 1 h at 37°C in a dark humidified atmosphere. After washing once with TBS, cells were stained with propidium iodide (PI), diluted at 1:10000 in TBS. Coverglasses were observed by confocal laser pascal scanning microscopy (Carl Zeiss Inc.).

Cell proliferation assay. TE8 (the lowest expressor of RSRC2mRNA among TE series) cells were transfected with 2 μ g of pcDNA3.1 or 2 μ g of pcDNA3.1/RSRC2 using nucleofection technology (10⁶ cells, Nucleofector Program U-14, Amaxa Biosystems, Germany) and were plated at 1x10⁶ cells/dish in 10-cm dishes under the culture conditions described above. After 24 h, positive clones were selected and harvested in medium containing G418 (400 μ g/ml). The medium was changed every 2-3 days and positive clones were detected by Giemsa staining on day 7 after G418 selection.

RNA interference (RNAi) and MTT assay. Twenty-one nucleotide siRNA duplexes with symmetric two nucleotide 3'-UU overhangs were obtained from Dharmacon. TE1 (the highest expressor of *RSRC2mRNA* among the TE series) cells were transiently transfected with 100 nM of non-target siRNA control or *RSRC2* siRNA duplexes using nucleo-fection technology (10⁶ cells, Nucleofector Program U-14) and were seeded in 96-well plates at a density of 1x10⁵ cells/100 μ l. Cell proliferation was measured by the MTT method. After 3 days, 20 μ l of 5 mg/ml MTT solution was added to each well and plates were incubated for 2 h at 37°C.

Absorbance at 490 nm was determined using a SPECTRAmax 340 (Molecular Devices Corporation). Six wells were assayed for each set of conditions, and SDs were determined.

Patients and surgical specimens. For the present study, samples were obtained from 70 patients with ESCC without preoperative chemotherapy or radiation. All patients underwent radical esophagectomy with three-field lymph node dissection for ESCC at Nagoya City University Hospital between January 1996 and December 2001.

There were 55 males and 15 females and the mean age was 61.8 years (range: 43-80 years). Endoscopic examination of esophageal lesions was performed, and a histologic diagnosis of ESCC was made based on biopsy specimens obtained before surgery. Preoperative diagnostic examination, including esophagography, computed tomography, and ultrasound, were performed for the purpose of clinical staging.

The resected esophagus and lymph node were examined histologically. All samples for RT-PCR analysis were immediately frozen in liquid nitrogen and were stored at -80°C until use. Samples were used with written consent from patients. The details of the 70 patients with ESCC are shown in Table II.

After surgery, all patients underwent laboratory examinations, such as routine peripheral blood cell counts and measurement of serum squamous cell carcinoma antigen levels every 1-6 months, and chest roentgenography, ultrasonography of the liver, computed tomography of the thorax and abdomen, and endoscopic examination of the remaining esophagus at intervals of 6-12 months.

Postoperative chemotherapy and radiotherapy were performed on 12 patients. The types of adjuvant therapies



Figure 2. The expression of *RSRC2*. (A) Relative ratio of *RSRC2* to *GAPDH* expression in cell lines. *RSRC2/GAPDHmRNA* expression levels were decreased in all esophageal cancer cell lines when compared with Het-1A. Data represent the average of three independent experiments \pm SD. (B) Expression of *RSRC2/GAPDHmRNA* in normal human tissues. *RSRC2* was ubiquitously expressed in several organs. Data represent the average of three independent experiments \pm SD.

were as follows: postoperative chemotherapy in 1 case, radiotherapy in 8 cases, and combined chemo- and radiotherapy in 3 cases. Radiation doses ranged from 40 to 60 Gy. The chemotherapeutic agents used were 5-fluorouracil and cisplatinum. The follow-up period for survivors ranged from 1 to 55 months (median, 17.4 months). Total RNA was extracted from each sample of ESCC and its corresponding noncancerous esophageal mucosa using Absolutely RNATM Miniprep kit, as described above. Noncancerous esophageal mucosa was taken from apparently nontumorous mucosa from a site as distant as possible from the tumor (at least 5 cm). RNA concentration was adjusted to 200 $ng/\mu l$ using a spectrophotometer. cDNA synthesis and quantitative RT-PCR were performed as described above. RNA extracted from Het-1A was used as a standard. After reverse transcription, standard cDNA was serially diluted to give six standard solutions in order to generate a reference curve for PCR. The relative amounts of cDNA in these cell lines and tissue samples were measured by interpolation using the standard curve, and the relative ratio of RSRC2 to GAPDH expression was

calculated for each sample. All of the procedures in the present study were approved by the Ethics Committee, Nagoya City University Graduate School of Medicine.

Statistical analysis. Data are expressed as means \pm standard deviation. Statistical analyses were carried out using Stat-View software (Abacus Concepts, Berkeley, CA). The significance of differences in the expression of *RSRC2mRNA* was evaluated by t-test and one-way ANOVA. The overall survival characteristics were compared using the log-rank test. Differences were considered significant at p<0.05.

Results

RSRC2mRNA expression in Het-1A and ESCC cell lines. In order to confirm that *RSRC2* is related to ESCC, RT-PCR was performed using ESCC cell lines. *RSRC2mRNA* expression in a human esophageal squamous epithelial cell line, Het-1A, and 14 esophageal cancer cell lines (TE1-15, excluding TE7) was examined by quantitative RT-PCR. *RSRC2mRNA* was detectable in all cell lines. *RSRC2mRNA* levels in ESCC cell lines varied; levels of *RSRC2mRNA* in all 14 cell lines were lower than those in Het-1A (Fig. 2A). *RSRC2mRNA* expression in TE4, TE8 and TE9 was particularly low.

RSRC2mRNA expression in normal human organs. We then performed quantitative RT-PCR using cDNA from various human organs. *RSRC2mRNA* was ubiquitously expressed in multiple organs and was expressed at higher levels in the lung than in the kidney, small intestine, liver, stomach, heart or spleen (Fig. 2B).

Subcellular localization of RSRC2 protein. In order to investigate the intracellular localization of RSRC2 protein, we transiently transfected a plasmid expressing His-tagged *RSRC2* (pcDNA3.1/His-RSRC2) into TE8 cells and observed the tagged protein by immunocytochemical staining. Cells transfected with pcDNA3.1/His-RSRC2 were stained with anti-His antibody and were visualized using anti-mouse secondary antibody conjugated with Alexa Fluor 488. RSRC2 protein was observed in the nuclei of TE8 cells (Fig. 3).

Overexpression of RSRC2 inhibited TE8 cell proliferation. The effects of *RSRC2* on the proliferation of esophageal cancer cells were investigated by transfecting pcDNA3.1 (empty vector) or pcDNA3.1/RSRC2 into TE8 (the lowest expressor of *RSRC2mRNA* among the TE series). The effects of the *RSRC2* expression vector were examined by quantitative RT-PCR after 3 days of G418 selection. *RSRC2mRNA* in *RSRC2*-transfected TE8 cells was overexpressed at much higher levels than in empty vector-transfected TE8 cells (Fig. 4A). Macroscopically, there were fewer colonies of the *RSRC2*-transfected TE8 cell line when compared with pcDNA3.1-transfected TE8 cells (Fig. 4B). These results indicate that overexpression of *RSRC2* inhibits the proliferation of esophageal cancer cells.

RNA interference (RNAi) and MTT assay. RNA interference was then investigated as a method to reduce *RSRC2* expression in an ESCC cell line (TE1; the highest expressor of *RSRC2*)



Figure 3. Subcellular localization of RSRC2 protein (x630). (A) Cells transfected with pcDNA3.1/His-RSRC2 were stained with anti-His antibody and were visualized by secondary anti-mouse antibody conjugated with Alexa Fluor 488. Green color indicates RSRC2 protein. (B) Nuclei of TE8 cells were stained with propidium iodide (PI). Nucleus were observed by the red color. (C) RSRC2 protein was found in the nuclei of TE8 cells, as revealed in merged images.



Figure 4. Overexpression of *RSRC2* inhibited TE8 cell proliferation. (A) TE8 cells were transiently transfected with pcDNA3.1 (empty vector) or pcDNA3.1/RSRC2 and were subsequently subcultured in the presence of 400 μ g/ml G418. Relative expression levels of *RSRC2* were determined by quantitative RT-PCR on day 3 of G418 selection. (B) TE8 cells were transfected with pcDNA3.1 (empty vector) or pcDNA3.1/RSRC2 and were subcultured in the presence of 400 μ g/ml G418. On day 7 of G418 selection, cells were stained with Giemsa and photographs of plates containing colonies were taken.

and to examine its effects on cell proliferation. On day 3 after the transfection of small interfering RNA for *RSRC2*, the expression levels of *RSRC2mRNA* were down-regulated by 90% (Fig. 5A). MTT assay confirmed that proliferation of *RSRC2* siRNA-transfected TE1 cells was mildly but significantly higher when compared with irrelevant siRNAtransfected cells (control) on day 3 (Fig. 5B).

RSRC2mRNA expression in 70 patients with ESCC. We then examined *RSRC2* expression in resected esophageal cancer tissues. Seventy primary ESCC samples and paired non-

cancerous esophageal tissues were examined. RSRC2mRNAexpression was detectable in all ESCC samples and noncancerous mucosa. RSRC2mRNA expression in ESCC tissue was significantly lower than that in the corresponding normal esophageal tissue (p<0.01, Fig. 6A). We examined the relationship between RSRC2mRNA expression in ESCC samples and patient clinicopathologic factors (Table II). Of the 70 ESCC samples, there were no differences in RSRC2mRNA levels based on age, gender or histological differentiation of ESCC. RSRC2mRNA expression levels in patients with ESCC varied significantly according to the



Figure 5. Effects of siRNA on *RSRC2* in TE1 cells. (A) TE1 cells were transiently transfected with 100 nM non-target siRNA control or *RSRC2* siRNA duplexes using oligofectamine (Invitrogen). The siRNA knockdown effect was examined by quantitative RT-PCR on day 3. (B) Cell proliferation of non-target siRNA- or *RSRC2* siRNA-transfected TE1 cells. TE1 cell proliferation rates were determined by MTT assay on day 3 and absorbance values were determined on a SPECTRAmax 340 (Molecular Devices Corporation) at 490 nm. Data represent the average of six independent experiments ± SD.

local tumor aggressiveness (T-status, p<0.01): RSRC2mRNA expression levels in locally invasive ESCC (T2-4) were significantly lower when compared to those in less invasive ESCC (T1) (p<0.01, Fig. 6B); *RSRC2mRNA* expression levels in ESCC tumors with lymph node metastasis were significantly lower when compared to those in ESCC without lymph node metastasis (p<0.01, Fig. 6C); RSRC2mRNA expression levels in tumors with lymphatic invasion were significantly lower when compared with those in tumors without lymphatic invasion (p<0.01); and RSRC2mRNA expression levels tumors with vascular invasion were significantly lower when compared to tumors without vascular invasion (p<0.05). Moreover, RSRC2mRNA expression levels [indicated by the ratio of RSRC2mRNA expression in the tumor to that in corresponding normal esophageal mucosa (T/N ratio)] in patients with ESCC varied significantly with tumor T status (p<0.01) and pathological stage (p<0.01).

Finally, we investigated the correlation between *RSRC2mRNA* expression levels and survival in patients with ESCC after tumor resection (median follow up, 17.4 months). Patients with low *RSRC2mRNA* expression levels (T/N ratio <0.6) had significantly shorter survival (14.5 \pm 1.4 months) after surgery when compared to patients with high *RSRC2mRNA* expression levels (T/N ratio >0.6) (25.1 \pm 2.5 months, p<0.05; log-rank test, Fig. 6D).

Discussion

We have demonstrated that *RSRC2* expression may serve as an additional tool to predict the malignant potential of ESCC. This newly identified gene is located at 12q24 and the gene product has 434 amino acids. However, the function of the gene product has yet to be identified. It was recently reported that FLJ11021 (*RSRC2*) might be associated with 5-fluorouracil sensitivity in gastric cancer cell lines (18); *RSRC2*-high cell lines were more sensitive to 5-fluorouracil when compared with low expression cell lines.

In this study, we found that RSRC2 is ubiquitously expressed and that *RSRC2* protein is localized in the nucleus. RSRC2mRNA expression levels were decreased in many esophageal cancer cell lines and resected tumor tissues when compared with normal esophageal mucosa. In addition, cell proliferation of an esophageal cancer cell line was inhibited by overexpression of RSRC2. Although the mechanism of RSRC2 downregulation is unclear, the inhibition of cell proliferation by RSRC2 overexpression strongly suggests that RSRC2 is related to esophageal cancer cell proliferation. Potential RSRC2 downregulation mechanisms include LOH and hypermethylation. Surprisingly, downregulation of RSRC2mRNA using siRNA increased the proliferation of an esophageal cancer cell line when compared with non-target siRNA-transfected cells (control); however, the level of cell proliferation was not marked. Although the reason is not clear, this may indicate that cell growth cannot be controlled by suppressing only one gene, and it will be necessary to analyze proteins related to RSRC2.

Among the clinicopathologic factors examined, we observed a significant correlation between *RSRC2* expression and degree of local invasion, lymph node metastasis, lymphatic and vascular invasion, and survival of patients with ESCC. In addition to the reported correlations with clinical data, the present study suggests *RSRC2* as a candidate target gene for esophageal cancer treatment. The precise physiological function of *RSRC2* is unknown. We have previously reported



Figure 6. (A) Comparison of *RSRC2mRNA* expression between noncancerous mucosa and cancer tissue. Cancer tissue expressed lower levels of *RSRC2mRNA* than the corresponding noncancerous mucosa (n=70, p<0.01). Data represent mean \pm 2SD (bars). (B) Comparison of *RSRC2mRNA* expression between early ESCC (T1) and advanced ESCC (T2-4). RSRC2mRNA expression levels in patients with advanced ESCC (T2-4) were significantly lower when compared with expression levels in patients with early ESCC (T1) (p<0.01). Data represent mean \pm 2SD (bars). (C) Comparison of *RSRC2mRNA* expression between lymph node metastasis-negative and -positive ESCC. *RSRC2mRNA* expression levels in ESCC patients with lymph node metastasis were significantly lower when compared with expression levels in ESCC patients without lymph node metastasis (p<0.01). Data represent mean \pm 2SD (bars). (D) Survival of patients with esophageal squamous cell carcinoma. Patients with high *RSRC2mRNA* expression [indicated by ratio of *RSRC2mRNA* expression in tumor to *RSRC2mRNA* expression had significantly shorter survival when compared to patients with high *RSRC2mRNA* expression (p<0.05; log-rank test).

genes that are related to prognosis in esophageal cancer; these include survivin (19), PTTG1 (20), PPAR- γ (21), DFF45 (22), ERCC3 (23) and PABPC1 (24). The finding that *RSRC2* is also correlated with clinical data suggests that it may be a target gene for the treatment of esophageal cancer.

In conclusion, the present study suggests that the expression of a newly identified gene, *RSRC2*, may play a significant role in esophageal cancer.

Acknowledgments

The authors thank Ms. Shinobu Makino for technical assistance.

References

1. Dawsey SM, Wang GQ, Weinstein WM, Lewin KJ, Liu FS, Wiggett S, Nieberg RK, Li JY and Taylor PR: Squamous dysplasia and early esophageal cancer in the Linxian region of China: distinctive endoscopic lesions. Gastroenterology 105: 1333-1340, 1993.

- Kakizoe T, Yamaguchi N and Mitsuhashi F: Cancer incidence in Japan, 2001. The editorial board of Cancer Statistics in Japan. Tokyo: Foundation for Promotion of Cancer Research, 2001.
- 3. Shiozaki H, Doki Y, Kawanishi K, Shamma A, Yano M, Inoue M and Monden M: Clinical application of malignancy potential grading as a prognostic factor of human esophageal cancers. Surgery 127: 552-561, 2000.
- 4. Faivre J, Forman D, Esteve J and Gatta G: Survival of patients with esophageal and gastric cancers in Europe. Eur J Cancer 34: 2167-2175, 1998.
- 5. Eloubeidi MA, Desmond R, Arguedas MR, Reed CE and Wilcox CM: Prognostic factors for the survival of patients with esophageal carcinoma in the U.S.: the importance of tumor length and lymph node status. Cancer 95: 1434-1443, 2002.
- Greenlee RT, Hill-Harmon MB, Murray T and Thun M: Cancer statistics, 2001. CA Cancer J Clin 51: 15-36, 2001.
- Lightdale CJ: Esophageal cancer. American College of Gastroenterology. Am J Gastroenterol 94: 20-29, 1999.
 Sobin L and Wittekind C (eds): TNM Classification of Malignant
- Sobin L and Wittekind C (eds): TNM Classification of Malignant Tumors. 6th edition. Wiley-Liss, New York, pp60-64, 2002.
- Robert V, Michel P, Flaman JM, Chiron A, Martin C, Charbonnier F, Paillot B and Frebourg T: High frequency in esophageal cancers of p53 alterations inactivating the regulation of genes involved in cell cycle and apoptosis. Carcinogenesis 21: 563-565, 2000.

- Suzuki H, Zhou X, Yin J, Lei J, Jiang HY, Suzuki Y, Chan T, Hannon GJ, Mergner WJ and Abraham JM: Intragenic mutations of CDKN2B and CDKN2A in primary human esophageal cancers. Hum Mol Genet 4: 1883-1887, 1995.
- 11. Nishiwaki T, Daigo Y, Kawasoe T and Nakamura Y: Isolation and mutational analysis of a novel human cDNA, DEC1 (deleted in esophageal cancer 1), derived from the tumor suppressor locus in 9q32. Genes Chromosomes Cancer 27: 169-176, 2000.
- 12. Miyake S, Nagai K, Yoshino K, Oto M, Endo M and Yuasa Y: Point mutations and allelic deletion of tumor suppressor gene DCC in human esophageal squamous cell carcinomas and their relation to metastasis. Cancer Res 54: 3007-3010, 1994.
- Daigo Y, Nishiwaki T, Kawasoe T, Tamari M, Tsuchiya E and Nakamura Y: Molecular cloning of a candidate tumor suppressor gene DLC1, from chromosome 3p21.3. Cancer Res 59: 1966-1972, 1999.
- 14. Kitamura A, Yashima K, Okamoto E, Andachi H, Hosoda A, Kishimoto Y, Shiota G, Ito H, Kaibara N and Kawasaki H: Reduced Fhit expression occurs in the early stage of esophageal tumorigenesis: no correlation with p53 expression and apoptosis. Oncology 61: 205-211, 2001.
- 15. Kato K, Hida Y, Miyamoto M, Hashida H, Shinohara T, Itoh T, Okushiba S, Kondo S and Katoh H: Overexpression of caveolin-1 in esophageal squamous cell carcinoma correlates with lymph node metastasis and pathologic stage. Cancer 94: 929-933, 2002.
- 16. Kawabe A, Shimada Y, Uchida S, Maeda M, Sato F, Itami A and Imamura M: Expression of cyclooxygenase-2 is associated with carcinogenesis of the lower part of thoracic esophageal squamous cell carcinoma and p53 expression. Oncology 62: 46-54, 2002.
- 17. Hu YC, Lam KY, Law S, Wong J and Srivastava G: Profiling of differentially expressed cancer-related genes in esophageal squamous cell carcinoma (ESCC) using human cancer cDNA arrays: overexpression of oncogene MET correlates with tumor differentiation in ESCC. Clin Cancer Res 7: 3519-3525, 2001.

- 18. Park JS, Young Yoon S, Kim JM, Yeom YI, Kim YS and Kim NS: Identification of novel genes associated with the response to 5-FU treatment in gastric cancer cell lines using a cDNA microarray. Cancer Lett 214: 19-33, 2004.
- 19. Kato J, Kuwabara Y, Mitani M, Shinoda N, Sato A, Toyama T, Mitsui A, Nishiwaki T, Moriyama S, Kudo J and Fujii Y: Expression of surviving in esophageal cancer: correlation with the prognosis and response to chemotherapy. Int J Cancer 95: 92-95, 2001.
- 20. Shibata Y, Haruki N, Kuwabara Y, Nishiwaki T, Kato J, Shinoda N, Sato A, Kimura M, Koyama H, Toyama T, Ishiguro H, Kudo J, Terashita Y, Konishi S and Fujii Y: Expression of PTTG (Pituitary Tumor Transforming Gene) in esophageal cancer. Jpn J Clin Oncol 32: 233-237, 2002.
- 21. Terashita Y, Sasaki H, Haruki N, Nishiwaki T, Ishiguro H, Shibata Y, Kudo J, Konishi S, Kato J, Koyama H, Kimura M, Sato A, Shinoda N, Kuwabara Y and Fujii Y: Decreased Peroxisome Proliferator-activated Receptor Gamma Gene expression is correlated with poor prognosis in patients with esophageal cancer. Jpn J Clin Oncol 32: 238-243, 2002.
- Konishi S, Ishiguro H, Shibata Y, Kudo J, Terashita Y, Sugiura H, Koyama H, Kimura M, Sato A, Shinoda N, Kuwabara Y and Fujii Y: Decreased expression of DFF45/ICAD is correlated with a poor prognosis in patients with esophageal carcinoma. Cancer 95: 2473-2478, 2002.
 Terashita Y, Ishiguro H, Haruki N, Sugiura H, Tanaka T,
- 23. Terashita Y, Ishiguro H, Haruki N, Sugiura H, Tanaka T, Kimura M, Shinoda N, Kuwabara Y and Fujii Y: Excision repair cross complementing 3 expression is involved in patient prognosis and tumor progression in esophageal cancer. Oncol Rep 12: 827-831, 2004.
- 24. Takashima N, Ishiguro H, Kuwabara Y, Kimura M, Haruki N, Ando T, Kurehara H, Sugito N, Mori R and Fujii Y: Expression and prognostic roles of PABPC1 in esophageal cancer: Correlation with tumor progression and postoperative survival. Oncol Rep 15: 667-671, 2006.