

Nucleus-invadopodia duo during cancer invasion 1

Robin Ferrari, Elvira Infante, Philippe Chavrier

▶ To cite this version:

Robin Ferrari, Elvira Infante, Philippe Chavrier. Nucleus-invadopodia duo during cancer invasion 1. Trends in Cell Biology, 2019, 29 (2), pp.93-96. 10.1016/j.tcb.2018.11.006 . hal-02377256

HAL Id: hal-02377256 https://hal.science/hal-02377256

Submitted on 23 Nov 2019

HAL is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers. L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

<u>±</u>

1	Nucleus-invadopodia duo during cancer invasion
2	Robin Ferrari ¹ , Elvira Infante ^{1,‡} and Philippe Chavrier ^{1,*}
3	
4	¹ Institut Curie, PSL Research University, CNRS, UMR 144, 26 rue d'Ulm, F-75005,
5	Paris, France
6	[‡] present address: Department of Physics, King's College London, WC2R 2LS,
7	London, UK
8	*Correspondence: philippe.chavrier@curie.fr
9	
10	
11	Abstract (49 words)
12	Matrix proteolysis mediated by MT1-MMP facilitates the invasive migration of tumor
13	cells in dense tissues, which otherwise get trapped in the matrix because of limited
14	nuclear deformability. A digest-on-demand response has been identified, which
15	requires nucleus-microtubule linkage through the LINC complex and triggers MT1-
16	MMP surface-exposure to facilitate nucleus movement.
17	
18	
19	Keywords
20	Invadopodia; MT1-MMP; microtubule; LINC complex; tumor invasion; centrosome
21	
22	

23 Text (1449 words)

24

25 Introduction

26 During their metastatic journey, tumor cells migrate through dense and complex 3D 27 microenvironments within connective tissues. For carcinoma cells deriving from 28 epithelial tumors, dissemination starts by breaching the 0.1-1 µm thick basement 29 membrane (BM) made of laminins, cross-linked type IV collagen and proteoglycans 30 that surround epithelial tissues. BM transmigration signals the transition from in situ 31 to more aggressive infiltrating carcinomatous lesions; then invasive cells can 32 disseminate, mostly in cohorts, through interstitial tissues consisting of bundles of 33 type I collagen-rich fibrils interspaced with discontinuities. A salient feature of tumor 34 cell invasion in confining environments is that it requires extensive nuclear 35 deformation to squeeze the bulky and stiff nucleus through constricting pores within 36 the tissue matrix [1]. Recent studies, which are detailed in Box 1, revealed that 37 nuclear deformations during constricted migration can lead to nuclear envelope (NE) rupture with potential consequences for genome stability and tumor progression [2-38 39 5]. In addition, it has been shown that when the pore size of the matrix meshwork is below the deformability of nucleus, then cell movement stops [1]. It is also 40 41 established that surface-exposed membrane-type (*i.e.* trans-membrane) matrix 42 metalloproteinases (MT-MMPs) can enlarge the pores in the matrix [1, 6]. All 43 together, these findings have raised important guestions as to whether and how the matrix proteolysis machinery of cancer cells can scale with the level of confinement 44 45 by the matrix and what is the influence of nuclear deformation and mechanosensing to this response and to the invasive potential of tumor cells. 46

48 Nucleus pulling and pushing schemes generate nuclear deformation during 49 confined migration

50 Deformability and mechanical stability of the nucleus depends on nuclear lamina proteins lamin-A and B (LMNA, -B), which form a viscoelastic proteinaceous network 51 52 underneath the inner nuclear membrane. Nuclear stiffness scales with LMNA levels: 53 LMNA overexpression impedes transmigration by augmenting nuclear rigidity, while reducing LMNA levels increases invasion speed in 3D reconstituted matrix [1, 2, 7]. 54 55 Thus, nuclear stiffness and limited nuclear deformability have been identified as 56 restrictive factors that impede cell migration in confined environments [1, 2]. 57 Interestingly, a gradient of LMNA expression decreasing from the core to the invasive front of tumor xenografts has been reported and LMNA-deficient tumors have a 58 59 growth advantage [2, 5]. The downside is that nuclear resistance to mechanical 60 insults drops with LMNA deficiency and repeated passages across constrictions can lead to cell death as a failure to repair consequent NE rupture and DNA damage [2-5] 61 62 (see Box 1).

63 Nuclear deformation reflects the pulling and pushing schemes by tumor cells to move their nucleus across constrictions. As during cell migration in 2D, integrin-64 65 based adhesion to surrounding collagen fibers and actomyosin-based contractility 66 produce traction forces that can propel the nucleus forward through constraining 67 spaces ([8] and references herein). Additionally, pulling forces can result from dynein and kinesin molecular motors attached to the nuclear surface and moving the 68 69 nucleus along the microtubule network [9]. Proteins responsible for nucleo-70 cytoskeleton attachment and motor association to the surface of the nucleus belong 71 to the Linker of Nucleoskeleton and Cytoskeleton (LINC) complex. This complex 72 consists in SUN and nesprin proteins, which span the inner and outer nuclear

73 membrane, respectively, and interact through SUN domain and the carboxy-terminal 74 Klarsicht, ANC-1, Syne Homology (KASH) domain of nesprins in the intermembrane 75 space. Nesprin-2 was reported to be required for recruitment of LIS1, a regulatory 76 protein of dynein motor function, to the cytoplasmic face of the nucleus in invasive 77 MDA-MB-231 breast tumor cells [7]. In humans, LIS1 deficiency leads to 78 lissencephaly (smooth brain) due to severe cortical neuron migration and positioning 79 defects caused by impaired dynein-dependent nucleokinesis. It was recently found 80 that LINC complex and LIS1 mediate nucleo-centrosome linkage and centrosome 81 positioning ahead of the nucleus [7]. These observations suggest that Nesprin-2 and 82 LIS1 contribute to pulling forces exerted on the nucleus by dynein moving along 83 microtubules to support nucleus movement through confining environments 84 generating nuclear deformation (Figure 1).

85

86 Invadopodia mediate MT1-MMP-based matrix degradation by cancer cells

87 Membrane-anchored MT1-MMP (aka MMP14) is the sword arm of the collagenolytic 88 program of carcinoma cells. Using the intraductal mammary gland xenograft model, it 89 was reported that silencing of MT1-MMP impairs the ability of ductal carcinoma in 90 situ tumor xenografts to progress into infiltrating lesions, providing validation for the 91 prominence of MT1-MMP for BM transmigration by breast cancer cells in vivo [10]. 92 MT1-MMP has also been implicated in invasive migration of mesenchymal cells 93 through the fibrous interstitial type I collagen network, in the infiltration of vascular 94 and lymphatic compartments and in extravasation during metastasis. Inhibition of 95 MT1-MMP function can evoke protease-independent programs of cancer cells, which 96 can switch to contractility-driven ameboid movement or use the nucleus as a piston to propel the cell ahead [6, 8]. Moreover, in support of a major role during cancer 97

98 dissemination, MT1- MMP is linked to malignancy of multiple tumor types including 99 lung, gastric, colon, breast, and cervical carcinomas, gliomas, and melanomas. MT1-100 MMP is accumulated and spatially restricted to invadopodia that correspond to actin-101 based plasmalemmal subdomains, which combine membrane protrusive and matrix 102 proteolytic functions to promote cancer cell invasion and metastasis [11]. 103 Invadopodia form dynamically in association with constricting matrix fibers and can 104 vary in shape and possibly in composition depending on extracellular matrix topology 105 and components [12].

106

107 Nuclear Confinement triggers polarized MT1-MMP/invadopodia-based matrix 108 degradation ahead of the nucleus

109 Contrasting with gel-like pseudopodial protrusions that can squeeze through narrow 110 pores between matrix fibers, the nucleus has limited deformability (experimentally 111 estimated to be ~10% of original nuclear cross section) [1]. When nuclear 112 deformability limit is reached, cell migration physically stops as the nucleus becomes 113 entrapped in the fibrous matrix network [1, 7]. It is well established that pericellular 114 collagenolysis by matrix metalloproteinases (MMPs) can modulate restricting 115 environmental conditions by widening ECM pores [1]. Recent studies demonstrated 116 that MMP inhibition during confined migration of tumor cells in dense collagen 117 environment leads to increased nuclear deformation and mechanical rupture of the 118 NE [1, 3]. However, how mechanical input from the ECM microenvironment triggers 119 the invadopodial response is unknown and of paramount importance in light of data 120 showing that the biomechanical properties of the microenvironment have major 121 impact on cancer progression [13].

122 Recent work in breast cancer cells revealed that surface exposure of MT1-MMP and 123 pericellular collagenolysis are adaptive responses, which are switched off under low 124 nucleus confinement, while decreased matrix pore size or increased nuclear stiffness 125 trigger the collagenolytic program [7]. MT1-MMP is known to recycle from 126 endolysosomal compartments to invadopodia in metastatic breast cancer cells [11]. It 127 was found that MT1-MMP-storage endolysosomal compartments distribute ahead of 128 the nucleus with a centrosome-centered polarization optimal to fuel MT1-MMP 129 delivery to invadopodia forming at the nuclear anterior zone (Figure 1, inset 2) [7]. 130 The polarization of MT1-MMP-secretory compartments and the assembly of 131 functional invadopodia require integrity of nucleo-microtubule linkage depending on 132 the LINC complex and LIS1 functionality (Figure 1, inset 1) [7]. Thus, a working 133 model is that tension generated by dynein motor along the microtubule network 134 through nuclear envelope and cell cortex anchoring, pulls the nucleus forward for 135 movement; extra tension on trapped nucleus through constricting ECM fibrils triggers 136 formation of proteolytically-active invadopodia and dissolution of the confining fibrils 137 to open the way for nucleus migration during confined invasion of tumor cells (Figure 138 1).

139 This model raises several questions. One question is how migrating cells 140 negotiating changing environments, recognize nucleus-constricting fibers and 141 degrade them, while ECM fibrils involved in integrin-based adhesion and cell 142 movement at the cell front are spared from degradation? One possible mechanism 143 for segregation of specialized degradation and adhesion contact zones is that distinct 144 collagenic receptors selectively trigger assembly of peripheral focal adhesions to 145 mediate traction force generation, and invadopodia, ahead of the nucleus. While 146 beta1 and -3 integrin receptors are classically involved in cell-collagen adhesion,

147 receptors mediating invadopodia formation in association with collagen fibers remain poorly defined and need to be identified. Another conundrum is how mechanical 148 149 constrains on the nucleus can trigger invadopodia formation and MT1-MMP delivery. 150 As tumor cells have constantly to adapt to changes in the matrix environment, these 151 responses have to happen on a fast time-scale, too fast for genetic regulation. 152 Several studies revealed the ability of the nucleus to sense and respond to forces 153 supporting the emerging concept of nuclear mechanotransduction [14]. Nuclear 154 mechanosignaling effectors have been recently identified including the nuclear 155 membrane protein emerin, which can contribute to nucleo-centrosome linkage and 156 mediates the response to tensional force applied to the nucleus in relation with LINC 157 complex and LMNA function [14]. Therefore, a possible mechanism to be further 158 explored is that nuclear tension and mechanosignaling can control the recycling 159 machinery ensuring MT1-MMP delivery to invadopodia. These observations also 160 highlight the possibility to target the machinery linking nuclear tension with MT1-MMP 161 surface delivery as a new therapeutic road to target cancer metastasis.

163 **References**

- 164 1. Wolf, K. et al. (2013) Physical limits of cell migration: control by ECM space and
- nuclear deformation and tuning by proteolysis and traction force. J Cell Biol 201 (7),

166 1069-84.

- 167 2. Harada, T. et al. (2014) Nuclear lamin stiffness is a barrier to 3D migration, but
- 168 softness can limit survival. J Cell Biol 204 (5), 669-82.
- 3. Denais, C.M. et al. (2016) Nuclear envelope rupture and repair during cancer cell
 migration. Science 352 (6283), 353-8.
- 4. Raab, M. et al. (2016) ESCRT III repairs nuclear envelope ruptures during cell
- migration to limit DNA damage and cell death. Science 352 (6283), 359-62.
- 173 5. Bell, E.S. and Lammerding, J. (2016) Causes and consequences of nuclear
- 174 envelope alterations in tumour progression. Eur J Cell Biol 95 (11), 449-464.
- 175 6. Wolf, K. and Friedl, P. (2011) Extracellular matrix determinants of proteolytic and
- non-proteolytic cell migration. Trends in cell biology 21 (12), 736-44.
- 177 7. Infante, E. et al. (2018) LINC complex-Lis1 interplay controls MT1-MMP matrix
- digest-on-demand response for confined tumor cell migration. Nat Commun 9 (1),

2443.

- 180 8. Petrie, R.J. et al. (2017) Activating the nuclear piston mechanism of 3D migration
- 181 in tumor cells. J Cell Biol 216 (1), 93-100.
- 182 9. Bone, C.R. and Starr, D.A. (2016) Nuclear migration events throughout
- 183 development. J Cell Sci 129 (10), 1951-61.
- 184 10. Lodillinsky, C. et al. (2016) p63/MT1-MMP axis is required for in situ to invasive
- transition in basal-like breast cancer. Oncogene 35 (3), 344-57.
- 186 11. Castro-Castro, A. et al. (2016) Cellular and Molecular Mechanisms of MT1-MMP-
- 187 Dependent Cancer Cell Invasion. Annu Rev Cell Dev Biol 32, 555-576.

- 188 12. Artym, V.V. et al. (2015) Dense fibrillar collagen is a potent inducer of
- invadopodia via a specific signaling network. J Cell Biol 208 (3), 331-50.
- 190 13. Kai, F. et al. (2016) Force Matters: Biomechanical Regulation of Cell Invasion
- and Migration in Disease. Trends Cell Biol 26 (7), 486-97.
- 192 14. Aureille, J. et al. (2017) Mechanotransduction via the nuclear envelope: a distant
- reflection of the cell surface. Curr Opin Cell Biol 44, 59-67.
- 194 15. Irianto, J. et al. (2017) DNA Damage Follows Repair Factor Depletion and
- 195 Portends Genome Variation in Cancer Cells after Pore Migration. Curr Biol 27 (2),
- 196 **210-223**.
- 197

198 Acknowledgements

The authors thank Alessia Castagnino and Pedro Monteiro for helpful discussion and Agnieszka Kawska (http://www.IlluScientia.com) for artwork. The authors apologize to all investigators whose work could not be cited due to space constraints. This work was supported by grants from Fondation ARC (PGA1-RF20170205408) and Worldwide Cancer Research (Grant 16-1235) to P.C. and by institutional support from Institut Curie and Centre National pour la Recherche Scientifique (CNRS).

206 BOX 1: Mechanical stress on the nucleus in cancer (200 words max/206 words) 207 Cells are submitted to compressive forces during physiological and disease 208 conditions. Tumor growth can generate compressive forces due to overgrowth and 209 confinement by the tissue environment. In addition, cancer cells are submitted to 210 elastic deformations of the cell body and bulky nucleus as they invade across 211 interstitial spaces during metastatic spread [6]. Recent studies reported that 212 extensive nuclear deformation could result in local NE rupture, which can be rapidly 213 repaired [3, 4]. Leakage of nuclear DNA repair factors as well as transient exposure 214 of nuclear DNA to cytoplasmic nucleases such as three-prime repair exonuclease 215 (TREX)1 can lead to DNA damage and double-strand breaks (DSB) as indicated by 216 appearance of foci of DNA damage repair marker y-H2AX [3, 4, 15]. Sensitivity of 217 tumor cells to mechanical nuclear stress somehow scales with LMNA levels. 218 Genomic analysis of cancer cell lines following repeated cycles of migration through 219 small microfabricated rigid pores revealed that NE rupture can lead to genomic 220 alterations and chromosomal copy-number changes [15]. All together, repetitive 221 nuclear rupture could contribute to cancer progression by favoring genomic instability 222 and chromosomal rearrangements, an idea that remains to be experimentally tested. 223

224 Legend Figure 1: Model of invadopodia-, MT1-MMP-based matrix digest-on-225 demand response triggered upon nucleus confinement during cancer invasion 226 Confined migration of tumor cells through dense 3D collagen network results in 227 nucleus confinement by constricting collagen fibrils. Nucleus-microtubule/centrosome 228 linkage and nucleus pulling is mediated by LINC complex interacting with dynein-Lis1 229 molecular motor (see inset 1). Cortical anchoring of microtubules is required for 230 centrosome and MT1-MMP-positive endosome positioning and for targeted delivery 231 of MT1-MMP to invadopodia. Nucleus movement is facilitated by localized 232 invadopodia-based pericellular proteolysis of confining fibrils ahead of the nucleus 233 (right inset). Left inset, scheme of nucleus-cytoskeletal linkage through LINC complex 234 components nesprin and SUN in association with lamins. Lis1 in complex with dynein 235 associates to the NE depending on Nesprin-2 and is involved in nucleus-microtubule 236 linkage and nucleus pulling (adapted from [7]). Inset 2, model of polarized surface-237 delivery of MT1-MMP from recycling endolysosomes (adapted from [11]).



MT = microtubule NE = nuclear envelope

ECM = extracellular matrix