SMO gene amplification and activation of the hedgehog pathway as novel mechanisms of resistance to anti-epidermal growth factor receptor drugs in human lung cancer
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Statement of translational relevance

The amplification of SMO in NSCLC resistant to EGFR TKIs opens new possibilities of treatment for those patients who failed first line EGFR-targeted therapies. The synergistic interaction of Hedgehog (Hh) and MET pathways further support the rationale for a combined therapy with specific inhibitors. In addition, Hh pathway activation is essential for the acquisition of mesenchymal properties and, as such, for the aggressiveness of the disease. Also in EGFR wild-type NSCLC models, inhibition of Hh, along with inhibition of EGFR, can revert the resistance to anti-EGFR targeted drugs. Additionally, inhibition of Hedgehog pathway sensitizes EGFR wild-type NSCLC to standard chemotherapy. These data encourage further evaluation of Hh inhibitors as novel therapeutic agents to overcome TKIs resistance and to revert EMT in NSCLC.
Abstract

Purpose: Resistance to tyrosine kinase inhibitors (TKIs) of epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR) is often related to activation of other signaling pathways and evolution through a mesenchymal phenotype.

Experimental Design: Since Hedgehog (Hh) pathway has emerged as an important mediator of epithelial-to-mesenchymal transition (EMT), we studied the activation of Hh signaling in models of EGFR TKIs intrinsic or acquired resistance from both EGFR mutated and wild-type (WT) non small cell lung cancer (NSCLC) cell lines.

Results: Activation of the Hh pathway was found in both models of EGFR-mutated and EGFR-WT NSCLC cell line resistant to EGFR-TKIs. In EGFR mutated HCC827-GR cells we found SMO (the Hh receptor) gene amplification, MET activation and the functional interaction of these two signaling pathways. In HCC827-GR cells inhibition of SMO or downregulation of GLI1 (the most important Hh-induced transcription factor) expression in combination with MET inhibition exerted significant antitumor activity.

In EGFR-WT NSCLC cell lines resistant to EGFR inhibitors, the combined inhibition of SMO and EGFR exerted a strong antiproliferative activity with a complete inhibition of PI3K/Akt and MAPK phosphorylation. Additionally, the inhibition of SMO by the use of LDE225 sensitizes EGFR WT NSCLC cells to standard chemotherapy.

Conclusions: This results support the role of Hh pathway in mediating resistance to anti-EGFR TKIs through the induction of EMT and suggests new opportunities to design new treatment strategies in lung cancer.
Introduction

TKIs against the EGFR represent the first example of molecularly targeted agents developed in the treatment of NSCLC and are, currently, useful treatments after failure of first line chemotherapy and, more importantly, for the first line treatment of patients whose tumors have EGFR-activating gene mutations (1). However, after an initial response, all patients experience disease progression as a result of resistance occurrence. Recognized mechanisms of acquired resistance to anti-EGFRTKIs in EGFR-mutated NSCLC are MET gene amplification or the acquisition of secondary mutations such as the substitution of a threonine with a methionine (T790M) in exon 20 of the EGFR gene itself (2). However, these molecular changes are able to identify only a portion of cancer patients defined as “non-responders” to EGFR-targeted agents. A number of molecular abnormalities in cancer cells may partly contribute to resistance to anti-EGFR agents (2, 3). Our group and others have shown that epithelial-to-mesenchymal transition (EMT) is a critical event in the metastatic switch and is generally associated with resistance to molecularly targeted agents in NSCLC models (4, 5). EMT is a process characterized by loss of polarity and dramatic remodeling of cell cytoskeleton through loss of epithelial cell junction proteins, such as E-cadherin, and gain of mesenchymal markers, such as vimentin (6). The clinical relevance of EMT and drug insensitivity comes from studies showing an association between epithelial markers and sensitivity to erlotinib in NSCLC cell lines, suggesting that EMT-type cells are resistant to erlotinib (7). In particular, recent data suggest that cancer cells with EMT phenotype demonstrate stem-cell-like features and strategies reverting EMT could enhance the therapeutic efficacy of EGFR inhibitors (4, 5).

The Hedgehog (Hh) signaling cascade has emerged as an important mediator of cancer development and metastatic progression. The Hh signaling pathway is comprised of the ligands sonic, indian and desert hedgehog (Shh, Ihh, Dhh, respectively), and the cell surface molecules Patched (PTCH) and
Smoothened (SMO). In the absence of Hh ligands, PTCH causes suppression of SMO; however, upon ligand binding to PTCH, SMO protein leads to activation of the transcription factor GLI1, which in turn translocates into the nucleus, leading to the expression of Hh induced genes (8). The Hh signaling pathway is normally active in human embryogenesis and in tissue repair, as well as in cancer stem cell renewal and survival. This pathway is critical for lung development and its aberrant re-activation has been implicated in cellular response to injury and cancer growth (9-11). Indeed, increased Hh signaling has been demonstrated in bronchial epithelial cells exposed to cigarette smoke extraction. In particular, the activation of this pathway happens at an early stage of carcinogenesis when cells acquire the ability to growth in soft-agar and as tumors when xenografted in immunocompromised mice. Treatment with Hh inhibitors at this stage can cause complete regression of tumors (12). Overexpression of Hh-signaling molecules has been demonstrated in NSCLC compared to adjacent normal lung parenchyma, suggesting an involvement in the pathogenesis of this tumor (13, 14).

Re-activation of the Hh pathway with induction of EMT has been implicated in the carcinogenesis of several cancer types (15). Inhibition of Hh pathway can reverse EMT and is associated with enhanced tumor sensitivity to cytotoxic agents (16). Recently, up-regulation of Hh pathway has been demonstrated in the NSCLC cell line A549, concomitantly with the acquisition of a TGF-β1-induced EMT phenotype with increased cell motility and invasion (17).

The aim of the present work was to study the role of the Hh signaling pathway as mechanism of resistance to EGFR TKIs in different models of NSCLC.

**Materials and methods**

**Cell lines, drugs and chemicals**
The human NSCLC HCC827, PC9, H322, H1299, H460 and Calu-3 cell lines were provided by American Type Culture Collection (ATCC, Manassas, VA, USA) between 2010 and 2012. The identity of all cell lines was confirmed by STR profiling (Promega) on an ad hoc basis prior to performing experiments, and repeated for all cell lines after a majority of the experiments were performed (November 2012). Cells were maintained in RPMI 1640 (Sigma-Aldrich) medium supplemented with 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS; Life Technologies, Gaithersburg, MD) in a 5% CO2 humidified atmosphere. HCC827-GR (Gefitinib Resistant) and Calu-3 ER (Erlotinib Resistant) cell lines were obtained in vitro, as previously described (4, 18). The established resistant cancer cell lines were then maintained in continuous culture with the maximally achieved dose of each TKI that allowed cellular proliferation.

Gefitinib, Erlotinib, LDE-225 (NVP-LDE225, Erimodegib), Vismodegib (GDC-0449), PHA665752 and cisplatin were purchased from Selleck Chemicals (Selleckchem, Houston, TX, USA).

Cell proliferation assays

Cell proliferation was measured with the 3-(4,5-dimethylthiazol-2-yl)-2,5-diphenyltetrazolium bromide (MTT) assay as previously described (4,18).

Protein expression analysis

We used the following primary antibodies from Cell Signaling (Beverly, MA): anti-EGFR, anti-phospho-EGFR (Tyr1068), anti-p44/42MAPK, anti-phospho-p44/42MAPK, anti-AKT, anti-phospho-AKT (Ser 473), anti-phospho-S6ribosomal protein (Ser235), anti-p70RSK, anti-phospho-p70RSK (Thr389), anti-Vimentin, anti-SLUG, anti-E-Cadherin, anti-Shh, anti-GLI1, anti-GLI2, anti-GLI3, anti-SMO, anti-PTCH, anti-MET, anti-phospho MET (Tyr1234/1235), anti-PARP, anti-HER3, anti-SUFU,
anti-NF-κBp65/RELA, anti-phospho-NF-κBp65(Ser536)/phospho-RELA, anti-Axl, anti-phospho-Axl (Tyr702) and anti β-actin. One mg protein lysates were immunoprecipitated with the required antibodies (anti-SMO, anti-MET, anti-SUFI, anti-GLI1 or healthy preimmune serum (PS) anti-mouse for the negative control); immunocomplexes were recovered with protein G Sepharose (GE Healthcare Life Science, UK) and detected by western blot (19). Each experiment was performed in triplicate.

For the siRNA transfection, cells in the logarithmic growth phase in 6-well plates (5x10^5 cells/well) were transfected with 100 nM of GLI1 siRNA (ON-target plus SMARTpool human: FE5L003896000005) or control-scrambled siRNA (Dharmacon Research) using Lipofectamine 2000 (Invitrogen), according to the protocol of the manufacturer. SMO DNA transfection (SMO (NM_005631) Human cDNA ORF Clone, Origene) was conducted according to manufacturer’s specifications.

**Tumor xenografts in nude mice**

Four- to 6-week old female balb/c athymic (nu/nu) mice were purchased from Charles River Laboratories. The research protocol was approved and mice were maintained in accordance with the Institutional Guidelines of the Second University of Naples Animal Care and Use Committee. Mice were acclimatized for 1 week before being injected subcutaneously with 10^7 HCC827-GR and Calu-3 ER cells. When established tumors reached the volume of approximately 75 mm^3, mice were randomized in different groups (8 mice/group) of treatments: HCC827-GR xenografted mice received only vehicle (control group), gefitinib (100 mg/kg daily orally by gavage), LDE225 (20 mg/kg intraperitoneally trice a week), PHA-665752 (25 mg/kg intraperitoneally twice a week), or their combination; CALU3-ER xenografted mice received only vehicle (control group), erlotinib (60 mg/kg daily orally by gavage) LDE225 (20 mg/kg intraperitoneally trice a week) or their combination. Body weight and tumor volume were monitored on alternate days. Tumor volume was measured using the
formula $\pi/6$ larger diameter (smaller diameter)$^2$. Tumor tissues were collected from the xenografts at the end of treatment period and analyzed by immunohistochemistry and by western blotting.

**Immunohistochemical analysis on tumor xenografts**

We used the following primary antibodies: from Millipore, Merck: MET monoclonal, clone: 4F8.2, dilution 1:500 (Millipore, Merck), PTCH Protein Patched Homolog 1, PPH1, polyclonal, dilution 1:300 (Millipore, Merck), Vimentin monoclonal, dilution 1:100 (Ventana, Roche). After heat-induced antigen retrieval, slides were processed by Benchmark Autostainer (Ventana, Roche) using the UltraView Polymer Detection kit. Negative controls were obtained by omitting the primary antibody.

Expression level of PTCH was scored on the basis of percentage-positive cells and intensity of the staining by two independent pathologists. Staining intensity were scored as follows: 0=negative, 1=weak, 2=moderate, 3=strong. Positive area percentages were graded as follows: grade 0 (<5%), 1 (6% to 15%), 3 (26% to 50%), 4 (51% to 75%) and 5 (>75%). In case of discrepancy, an independent reader was consulted and consensus was obtained. Positivity was determined using the following formula: IHC score= percentage score x staining intensity score. A score of 10 or more was considered positive.

**Statistical analysis**

$p$-values lower or equal to 0.05 were considered as statistically significant. For defining the effect of the combined drug treatments, any potentiation was estimated by multiplying the percentage of cells remaining by each individual agent. The synergistic index was calculated as previously described (19). In the following equations, A and B are the effects of each individual agent, and AB is the effect of the
combination. Subadditivity was defined as $\%AB / (\%A \%B) < 0.9$; additivity was defined as $\%AB / (\%A \%B) = 0.9-1.0$; and supra-additivity was defined as $\%AB / (\%A \%B) > 1.0$.

**Results**

**Activation of Hedgehog signaling pathway in NSCLC cell lines with resistance to EGFR TKIs.**

We established an *in vitro* model of acquired resistance to the EGFR TKI gefitinib using the EGFR exon 19 deletion mutant (delE746-A750) HCC827 human NSCLC cell line by continuous culturing these cells in the presence of increasing doses of gefitinib. HCC827 cells, which were initially sensitive to gefitinib treatment (*in vitro* IC$_{50}$ ~ 80 nM), became resistant (HCC827-GR cells) after 12 months of continuous treatment with IC$_{50}$ > 20 μM. This cell line was also cross-resistant to erlotinib and to the irreversible EGFR kinase inhibitor BIBW2992 (afatinib) (data not shown). Sequencing of EGFR gene in gefitinib resistant HCC827-GR cells showed the absence of EGFR T790M mutation (data not shown). After the establishment of HCC827-GR cells, we characterized their resistant phenotype by protein expression analysis. While the activation of EGFR resulted efficiently inhibited by gefitinib treatment both in HCC827 and in HCC827-GR cells, phosphorylation of AKT and MAPK proteins persisted in HCC827-GR cells despite the inhibition of the upstream EGFR (Figure 1A).

HCC827-GR cells exhibited a mesenchymal phenotype with increased ability to invade, to migrate and to grow in an anchorage-independent manner (Figure 2A,B,C). Therefore, we next examined whether HCC827-GR cell line exhibits molecular changes known to occur during the EMT. Indeed, we found expression of vimentin and SLUG proteins and loss of E-cadherin protein expression in gefitinib-resistant cells as compared to gefitinib-sensitive cells (Figure 1B). Although activation of the AXL kinase and NF-kB (20, 21, 22) have been described as known mechanisms of EGFR TKI resistance, the
analysis of their activation status resulted not significantly different among the our cell lines. However, further studies are needed to explore a potential cooperation of AXL and NF-kB with Hh signaling.

Recently, expression of Shh and activation of the Hh pathway have been correlated to the TGF-β-induced EMT in A549 lung cancer cells (17). To investigate the expression profile of Hh signalling components in this in vitro model of acquired resistance to anti-EGFRTKIs, we performed western blot analysis for Shh, GLI1,-2,-3, SMO and PTCH in HCC827-GR cells. While Shh levels did not differ between HCC827 and HCC827-GR cells, a significantly increased expression of SMO and GLI1 was found in HCC827-GR cells as compared to parental cells (Figure 1B). No differences in the levels of GLI2 and 3 were observed (data not shown). Of interest, also PTCH protein levels resulted increased in HCC827-GR cells. This is of relevance since PTCH is a target gene of GLI1 transcriptional activity and increased PTCH levels indicate activation of Hh signalling. We further analyzed expression and activation of MET, as a known mechanism of acquired resistance to anti-EGFR drugs in NSCLC. Indeed, MET phosphorylation resulted strongly activated in HCC827-GR cells (Figure 1B). Analysis of the MET ligand levels, HGF, by ELISA assay, did not evidence any significant difference in conditioned media of our cells (data not shown). As previous studies have demonstrated MET gene amplification in NSCLC cell lines with acquired resistance to gefitinib (23), we evaluated MET gene copy number by FISH analysis and D-PCR in HCC827 and in HCC827-GR cell lines. The mean MET gene copy number was similar between gefitinib-sensitive and the gefitinib-resistant HCC827 cell line (Figure 1C).

Of interest, while we were working to these experiments, data on SMO gene amplification in EGFR mutated NSCLC patients with acquired resistance to anti-EGFR targeted drugs were reported on re-biopsies performed at progression, revealing SMO amplification in two of sixteen patients (12.5%) (24). For this reason, we evaluated by FISH SMO gene copy number in HCC827-GR cells, in which
the mean SMO gene copy number was 4-fold higher than that of parental HCC827 cells, indicating SMO gene amplification (Figure 1C).

We further analyzed the expression and the activation of these molecules on a larger panel of EGFR wild-type NSCLC cell lines, including NSCLC cells sensitive to EGFRTKIs, such as H322 and Calu-3 cells, NSCLC cell lines with intrinsic resistance to EGFRTKIs, such as H1299 and H460 cells, and Calu-3 ER (erlotinib-resistant) cells, which represents an in vitro model of acquired resistance to erlotinib obtained from Calu-3 cells (4, 18) (Supplemental table 1). As shown in Figure 1B, similarly to in HCC827-GR cells, Hh signalling pathway resulted activated in these NSCLC models of intrinsic or acquired resistance to EGFRTKI.

To further investigate the presence of specific mutations in the Hh pathway components, we sequenced DNA from our panel of NSCLC cell lines by Ion Torrent NGS; results indicated the absence of specific mutations in Hh related genes (data not shown).

Since GLI1 is a transcription factor, we tested the functional significance of increased expression of this gene in the EGFR sensitive and resistant cell lines, using a GLI1-responsive promoter within a luciferase reporter expression vector (Figure 1D). Analysis of luciferase activity of HCC827-GR cells revealed a 6- to 7-fold increase in GLI-responsive promoter activity as compared with HCC827 cells (P < 0.001), suggesting that transcriptional activity of GLI1 is significantly higher in gefitinib-resistant HCC827-GR cells. Furthermore, depletion of GLI1 protein expression by transfection with a GLI1-specific siRNA expression vector led to approximately 65% decrease in GLI1-driven promoter activity in HCC827-GR (P < 0.01) (Figure 1D). To determine whether SMO expression may promote resistance to gefitinib, two cell lines harboring the mutated EGFR gene, HCC827 and PC9 cells, and the sensitive EGFR wild-type cell line Calu-3, were transiently transfected with an SMO expression plasmid. When treated with gefitinib, transfected cells exhibited a partial loss of sensitivity to the EGFR
inhibition (Figure 1E).

Activation of Hedgehog signaling pathway mediates resistance to EGFR TKIs in EGFR-dependent NSCLC cell lines.

As previously mentioned, HCC827-GR cells acquired expression of vimentin and SLUG and loss of E-cadherin when compared to gefitinib-sensitive HCC827 cancer cells along with an increased ability to invade, migrate and to form colonies in semisolid medium (Figure 2A,B,C). We next evaluated whether the Hh pathway activation was necessary for gefitinib acquired resistance by genetically or by pharmacologically inhibiting Hh components in the HCC827-GR cell line. Knockdown of GLI1 by a GLI1siRNA approach had a very little effect on HCC827-GR cells. However, when gefitinib treatment (1μM) was performed in HCC827-GR cells after GLI1 blockade, invasion, migration and colony forming capabilities were significantly inhibited (Figure 2A,B,C). Next, we evaluated the effects of two small molecule inhibitors of SMO, such as LDE225 and vismodegib. Treatment with LDE225 (1μM) (Fig 2A,B,C,D) or with vismodegib (1μM) (data not shown) alone did not significantly affect the viability and the invasion and migration abilities of HCC827-GR cells. Combined treatment with gefitinib and LDE225 (1μM) or vismodegib (1μM) caused inhibition of these parameters in HCC827-GR cells (Figure 2A,B,C).

Taken together, these data show that Hh activation is required for acquisition of gefitinib resistance in HCC827-GR cells.

As overexpression and activation of MET was found in HCC827-GR cells, we evaluated whether inhibition of MET phosphorylation by PHA-665752 could restore gefitinib sensitivity in this model. Although abrogation of MET signaling in combination with the inhibition of EGFR signaling...
marginally affected gefitinib sensitivity of HCC827-GR cells, surprisingly, inhibition of MET synergistically enhanced the effects of Hh inhibition in HCC827-GR cells (Figure 2A,B,C,D) in terms of invasion, migration, colony-forming and proliferation abilities, indicating a significant synergism between these two signaling pathways. The triple inhibition of EGFR, SMO and MET did not result in any additional antiproliferative effects (data not shown).

Cooperation between Hedgehog and MET signaling pathways in mediating resistance to EGFR TKI in EGFR-dependent NSCLC cell lines

To study the role of Hh pathway in the regulation of key signaling mediators downstream of the EGFR and to explore the interaction between Hh and MET pathways, we further characterized the effects of Hh inhibition alone and in combination with EGFR or MET inhibitor on the intracellular signalling by western blotting. As illustrated in Figure 3A, treatment of HCC827-GR cells with the SMO inhibitor LDE225, gefitinib or with the MET inhibitor PHA-665772, for 72 hours, did not affect total MAPK and AKT protein levels and activation. A marked decrease of the activated form of both proteins was observed only when LDE225 was combined with PHA-665772, at greater level than inhibition of EGFR and MET, suggesting that the Hh pathway cooperates with MET to the activation of both MAPK and AKT signaling pathways. In addition, vimentin expression, induced during the acquisition of gefitinib-resistance, was significantly decreased after Hh inhibition, suggesting that the Hh pathway represents a key mediator of EMT in this model. The combination of MET and Hh inhibitors strongly induced cleavage of the 113-kDa PARP to the 89-kDa fragment, indicating an enhanced programmed cell death.

Of interest, the inhibition of SMO by LDE225 also reduced the activated, phosphorylated form of MET
(Figure 3A), revealing an interaction between SMO and MET receptors. To address this issue, we hypothesized a direct interplay between both receptors. SMO immunoprecipitates from HCC827-GR cells showed greater MET binding compared with that from the parental HCC827 cells (Figure 3B). As MET has been demonstrated to interact with HER3 to mediate resistance to EGFR inhibitors (25), we explored the expression of HER3 in SMO immunoprecipitates. Protein expression analysis did not showed any association with HER3; similar results were obtained with EGFR protein expression analysis in the immunoprecipitates (data not shown).

The increased SMO/MET heterodimerization observed in HCC827-GR cells was partially reduced by the inhibition of SMO or MET with LDE225 or PHA-665752, respectively, and to a greater extent with the combined treatment (Figure 3B). These results support the hypothesis that Hh and MET pathways interplay at level of their receptors.

To study if the cooperation between these two pathways appears also at a downstream level, and considering that, as shown in Figure 3A, MET inhibition partially reduces the levels of GLI1 and PTCH proteins, we analysed luciferase expression of GLI1 reporter vector in HCC827-GR cells after treatment with LDE225, PHA-665752 or both. As shown in Figure 3C, transcriptional activity of GLI1 resulted strongly decreased by the combined treatment. In particular, treatment with single agent LDE225 did not abrogate the transcriptional activity of GLI1 suggesting a GLI1 non-canonical activation. In addition, single agent PHA-665752 reduced GLI1-dependent signal, suggesting a role for MET in GLI1 regulation. To better investigate these findings, we hypothesized that MET can regulate GLI1 activity through its nuclear traslocation. We, therefore, analyzed the binding ability of SUFU, a known cytoplasmic negative regulator of GLI1, following treatment of HCC827-GR cells with LDE225 and/or PHA-665752. Indeed, interaction between SUFU and GLI1 was markedly decreased in HCC827-GR cells as compared to HCC827 cells (Figure 3D), which further confirmed the role of the activation of
Hh pathway in this gefitinib-resistant NSCLC model. Furthermore, while combined treatment with LDE225 and PHA-665752 strongly increased the binding between GLI1 and SUFU, suggesting an inhibitory effect on GLI1 activity, also treatment with the MET inhibitor PHA-665752 alone favored the interaction of GLI1 with SUFU (Figure 3D), indicating a role of MET on the activation of GLI1. This phenomenon could be a consequence of the decreased interplay between SMO and MET receptors or the effect of a direct regulation of GLI1 by MET.

**Effects of the combined treatment with LDE225 and gefitinib or PHA-665752 on HCC827-GR tumor xenografts**

We finally investigated the in vivo antitumor activity of Hh inhibition by LDE225, alone and in combination with gefitinib or with the MET inhibitor in nude mice bearing HCC827-GR cells. Treatment with gefitinib, as single agent, did not cause any change in tumor size as compared to control untreated mice, confirming that the in vitro model of gefitinib-resistance is valid also in vivo. Treatment with LDE225 or with PHA-665752 as single agents caused a decrease in tumor size even stronger than that observed in vitro, suggesting a major role of these drugs on tumor microenvironment. However, combined treatments, such as LDE225 plus gefitinib or LDE225 plus PHA-665752, significantly suppressed HCC827-GR tumor growth with a major activity of LDE225 plus PHA-665752 combination. Indeed at 21 days from the starting of treatment, the mean tumor volumes in mice bearing HCC827-GR tumor xenografts and treated with LDE225 plus gefitinib or with LDE225 plus PHA-665752 were 24% and 2%, respectively, as compared to control untreated mice (Figure 4A). Figure 4B shows changes in tumor size from baseline in the six groups of treatment. A total of eight mice for each treatment group were considered. Combined treatment of LDE225 plus gefitinib caused objective responses in 5/8 mice (62.5%). Of interest, the most active treatment combination was
LDE225 plus PHA-665752 with complete responses in 8/8 mice (100%).

We then studied the effects of gefitinib, LDE225, PHA-665752 and their combinations on the expression of PTCH, MET and vimentin in tumor xenografts biopsies from mice of each group of treatment (Figure 4C, Supplemental Table 2). We measured PTCH expression since it represents a direct marker of Hh activation. While vimentin staining was particularly intense in control and gefitinib treated tumors, treatment with LDE225 alone and in combination with PHA-665752 significantly reduced the intensity of the staining further confirming the role of Hh inhibition on the reversal of mesenchymal phenotype. Of interest, MET immunostaining resulted in a consistent nuclear positivity: this particular localization has been described as a marker of poor outcome and tendency to a mesenchymal phenotype (26). Although the combination of LDE225 and gefitinib resulted in a significant reduction of tumor growth with a concomitant reduction in staining intensity of vimentin, the combination of LDE225 and PHA-665752 was the most effective treatment, with 8/8 (100%) mice having a complete response in their tumors. In fact, histological evaluations of these tumors found only fibrosis and no viable cancer cells. According to western blot analysis of protein extracts harvested from the HCC827-GR xenograft tumors, the levels of phospho-EGFR, phospho-MET and GLI1 resulted decreased after treatment with the respective inhibitor. Interestingly, the combined treatment with LDE225 and PHA-665752 resulted in a stronger inhibition of phospho-MAPK and phopsho-AKT (Supplemental Figure 1).

Role of Hedgehog pathway in mediating resistance to EGFR-inhibitors in EGFR wild-type non-small cell lung cancer.

As shown in Figure 1B, although H1299, H460 and Calu-3 ER lacked SMO amplification (data not shown), these cells displayed Hh pathway activation. We further conducted luciferase expression
analysis that showed a 8- to 9-fold increase in GLI1-dependent promoter activity in these lines as compared with EGFR-inhibitor sensitive H322 and Calu-3 cells, suggesting that transcriptional activity of GLI1 is higher in EGFR TKI-resistant EGFR wild-type NSCLC lines (Supplemental Figure 2A). Similarly to HCC827-GR cells, these cells showed also activation of MET. However, as reported in previous studies (4), MET inhibition alone or in combination with EGFR inhibition or with SMO inhibition resulted ineffective in inhibiting cancer cell proliferation and survival (data not shown).

We therefore tested the effects of Hh inhibition, by silencing GLI1 or by using LDE225, alone and/or in combination with erlotinib. Although knockdown of GLI1 or treatment with LDE225 (1 μM) did not significantly affect NSCLC cell viability, combined treatment with erlotinib restored sensitivity to erlotinib (Supplemental Figure 2B).

In addition, H1299, Calu-3 ER and H460 cells exhibited significantly higher invasive and migratory abilities as compared to H322 and Calu-3 cells, and inhibition of Hh pathway significantly reduced these abilities. Collectively, these results suggest that Hh pathway activation mediates the acquisition of mesenchymal properties in EGFR wild-type lung adenocarcinoma cells with erlotinib resistance (Supplemental Figure 2 B-D).

We next evaluated the effects of LDE225 alone and/or in combination with erlotinib on the activation of downstream pathways. Erlotinib treatment resulted unable to decrease the phosphorylation levels of AKT and MAPK in H1299 and Calu-3 ER cells (Figure 5A). However, when LDE225 was combined with erlotinib, a strong inhibition of AKT and MAPK activation was observed in these EGFR inhibitor-resistant cells (Figure 5A). Furthermore, flow cytometric analysis revealed that combined treatment with both erlotinib and LDE225 significantly enhanced the apoptotic cell percentage to 65% and 70% (P < 0.001) in H1299 and Calu-3 ER cells, respectively (Figure 5B) confirmed by the induction of PARP cleavage after the combined treatment (Figure 5A). These findings suggest that Hh pathway
drives proliferation and survival signals in NSCLC cancer cells in which EGFR is blocked by erlotinib, and only the inhibition of both pathways can induce strong anti-proliferative and pro-apoptotic effects. The in vitro synergism between EGFR and SMO was confirmed also in vivo. Combination of erlotinib and LDE225 significantly suppressed growth of Calu-3 ER xenografted tumors in nude mice (Supplemental Figure 1F).

**Hedgehog pathway inhibition sensitizes EGFR WT NSCLC cell lines to standard chemotherapy**

To extend our preclinical observations, we further investigated the effects of Hh pathway inhibition on sensitivity of EGFR WT NSCLC cells to standard chemotherapy used in this setting and mostly represented by cisplatin.

To investigate the role of Hh pathway in mediating resistance also to chemotherapy we evaluated the efficacy of cisplatin and Hh inhibition treatment alone or in combination on the colony forming ability in semisolid medium of H1299 and H460 cell lines (Figure 6). Treatment with cisplatin alone resulted in a dose-dependent inhibition of colony formation with an IC50 value of 13 and 11 μM for H1299 and H460 cells respectively. However, when combined to LDE225 the treatment resulted in a significant synergistic antiproliferative effect in both NSCLC cell lines (Figure 6). Together, these results indicate that treatment of EGFR WT NSCLC cells with Hh inhibitors could improve sensitivity of NSCLCs to standard chemotherapy.

**Discussion**
Resistance to currently available anti-cancer drugs represents a major clinical challenge for the treatment of advanced NSCLC patients. Our previous works (4, 18) reported that, whereas EGFR TKIs-sensitive NSCLC cell lines express the well-established epithelial markers, cancer cell lines with intrinsic or acquired resistance to anti-EGFR drugs express mesenchymal characteristics, including the expression of vimentin and a fibroblastic scattered morphology. This transition plays a critical role in tumor invasion, metastatic dissemination and the acquisition of resistance to therapies such as EGFR-inhibitors. Among the various molecular pathways, the Hh signaling cascade has emerged as an important mediator of cancer development and progression (8). The Hh signaling pathway is active in human embryogenesis and tissue repair, in cancer stem cell renewal and survival and is critical for lung development. Its aberrant re-activation has been implicated in cellular response to injury and cancer growth (9-11). Indeed, increased Hh signaling has been demonstrated by cigarette smoke extraction exposure in bronchial epithelial cells (12). In particular, the activation of this pathway correlated with the ability to growth in soft agar and in mice as xenograft, and treatment with Hh inhibitors showed regression of tumors at this stage (12). Overexpression of Hh-signaling molecules has been demonstrated in NSCLC compared to adjacent normal lung parenchyma, suggesting an involvement in the pathogenesis of this tumor (13, 14).

Recently, alterations of SMO gene (mutation, amplification, mRNA overexpression) were found in 12.2% of tumors of The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) lung adenocarcinomas by whole exome sequencing (27). The incidence of SMO mutations was 2.6% and SMO gene amplifications were found in 5% of cases. SMO mutations and amplification strongly correlated with sonic hedgehog gene dysregulation (p<0.0001). In a small case report series, three NSCLC patients with Hh pathway activation had been treated with the SMO inhibitor LDE225 with a significant reduction in tumor burden, suggesting that Hh pathway alterations occur in NSCLC and could be an actionable and valuable therapeutic target (27). Recently, up-regulation of Shh, both at the mRNA and at the protein
levels, was demonstrated in the A549 NSCLC cell line, concomitantly with the acquisition of a TGF-β1-induced EMT phenotype (17, 28, 29) and mediated increased cell motility, invasion, and tumor cell aggressiveness (30, 31).

In the present study, SMO gene amplification has been identified for the first time as a novel mechanism of acquired resistance to EGFR-TKI in EGFR-mutant HCC827-GR NSCLC cells. These data are in agreement with the results of a cohort of patients with EGFR-mutant NSCLC that were treated with EGFR-TKIs (24). Giannikopoulus et al. have demonstrated the presence of SMO gene amplification in tumor biopsies taken at occurrence of resistance to EGFR-TKIs in 2 out of 16 patients, (24). In both cases also the MET gene was also amplified. In this respect, although MET gene was not amplified in HCC827-GR cells, we found a significant functional and structural interaction between MET and Hh pathways in these cells. Infact, the combined inhibition of both SMO and MET exerted a significant anti-proliferative and pro-apoptotic effect in this model, demonstrated by tumor regressions with complete response in 100% of HCC827-GR tumors xenografted in nude mice.

Several MET inhibitors have been evaluated in phase II/III clinical studies in NSCLC patients, with controversial results. Most probably, blocking MET receptor alone is not enough to revert the resistant phenotype as it is implicated in several intracellular interactions, and the best way to overcome resistance to anti-EGFR-TKIs is a combined approach, with Hh pathway inhibitors.

In the context of EMT, Zhang et al. demonstrated that AXL activation drives resistance in erlotinib resistant subclones derived from HCC827, independently from MET activation in the same subclone, and that its inhibition is sufficient to restore erlotinib sensitivity by inhibiting downstream signal MAPK, AKT and NF-κB (21). In addition, Bivona et al. described in three HCC827 erlotinib resistant subclones increased RELA phosphorylation, a marker of NF-κB activation, in the absence of MET upregulation, and demonstrated that NF-κB inhibition enhanced erlotinib sensitivity, independently
from AKT or MAPK inhibition (22). Differently, we detected Hh and MET hyperactivation in our resistance model HCC827-GR without a clear increase in AXL and NF-kB activation.

Although the level of activation of AXL and NF-kB did not result to contribute to resistance in our model, further studies are needed to explore a potential cooperation of AXL and NF-kB with Hh signaling.

In a preclinical model, the evolution of resistance can depend strictly from the selective activation of specific pathways, whereas different mechanisms can occur simultaneously in NSCLC patients, due to tumor heterogeneity. Thus, all data regarding EGFGR-TKIs resistance have to be considered equally valid.

We further extended the evaluation of Hh pathway to NSCLC cell lines harboring the wild-type EGFR gene and demonstrated that Hh is selectively activated in NSCLC cells with intrinsic or acquired resistance to EGFR inhibition, and occurred in the context of EMT.

To further validate these data, we blocked SMO or downregulated GLI1 RNA expression in NSCLC cells that had undergone EMT, and this resulted in re-sensitization of NSCLC cells to erlotinib and loss of vimentin expression, indicating an mesenchymal-to-epithelial transition promoted by the combined inhibition of EGFR and Hh. Inhibition of Hh pathway alone was not sufficient to reverse drug resistance but required concomitant EGFR inhibition to block AKT and MAPK activation and to restore apoptosis, indicating that the pro-survival PI3K/AKT pathway and the mitogenic RAS/RAF/MEK/MAPK pathways likely represent the level of interaction of EGFR and Hh signals.

In EGFR wild-type NSCLC models, the role of MET amplification/activation is less clear, and in our experience its inhibition did not increased the antitumor activity of SMO inhibitors.

In addition, Hh inhibition contributed to increase the response to cisplatin treatment which is the standard chemotherapic option used in EGFR-WT NSCLC patients and in EGFR-mutated patients after progression on first line EGFR-TKI thus representing a valid contribute to achieve a better disease
control in those patients without oncogenic activation or after progression on molecular targeted agents.

Collectively the results of the present study provide experimental evidence that activation of Hh pathway, through SMO amplification, is a potential novel mechanism of acquired resistance in EGFR-mutated NSCLC patients which occurs concomitantly with MET activation, and the combined inhibition of these two pathways exert a significant antitumor activity. In light of these results, screening of SMO alteration is strongly recommended in EGFR-mutated NSCLC patients with acquired resistance to EGFR TKIs at first progression.
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Figure legends

Figure 1. Activation of Hedgehog signaling pathway in NSCLC cell lines resistant to EGFR TKIs

(A) Western blotting analysis of EGFR and of down-stream signalling pathways in parental EGFR-mutated human lung adenocarcinoma HCC827 cells and in their gefitinib-resistant derivative (HCC827-GR). β-Actin was included as a loading control. (B) Western blotting analysis of Hedgehog pathway, MET and selected epithelial- and mesenchymal-related proteins in a panel of EGFR TKI-sensitive (HCC827, H322 and Calu-3) and -resistant (HCC827-GR, H1299, Calu-3-ER, H460) NSCLC cell lines. β-Actin was included as a loading control. (C) FISH analysis of gain in MET and SMO gene copy number in HCC827 and HCC827-GR. (D) upper: GLI-driven luciferase expression in HCC827 and HCC827-GR cells before and after depletion of GLI1 in both cell lines; bottom: evidence of GLI1 mRNA downregulation by Silencing-RNA. β-Actin was included as a loading control. (E) MTT cell proliferation assays in HCC827-GR and PC9 cancer cell transfected with an empty vector or SMO expression plasmid with the indicated concentrations of gefitinib for 3 days. Bottom, Western blotting for evaluation of SMO after transfection.

Figure 2. Activation of Hedgehog signaling pathway mediates resistance to EGFR TKIs in EGFR-dependent NSCLC cell lines.

(A) Invasion assay; (B) migration assay; (C) anchorage-independent colony formation in soft-agar; (D) cell proliferation measured with the MTT assay in parental human lung adenocarcinoma HCC827 cells and in HCC827-GR derivative. The results are the average±s.d. of three independent experiments, each done in triplicate.
Figure 3. Cooperation between Hedgehog and MET signaling pathways in mediating resistance to EGFR TKIs in HCC827-GR cells

(A) Western blotting analysis of Hh, MET and EGFR receptors activation and their downstream pathways activation following treatment with the indicated concentration LDE225 and PHA-556752 on HCC827-GR NSCLC cell line. β-Actin was included as a loading control. (B) Co-immunoprecipitation for the interaction between MET and SMO. Whole-cell extracts from HCC827 and HCC827-GR cells untreated or treated with LDE225 or/and PHA556752, were immunoprecipitated (IP) with anti-SMO (upper) or anti-MET (bottom). The immunoprecipitates were subjected to Western blot analysis (WB) with indicated antibodies. Control immunoprecipitation was done using control mouse preimmune serum (PS). (C) GLI-driven luciferase expression in HCC827-GR cells during treatment with gefitinib, LDE225, PHA-556752 or their combinations. (D) Co-immunoprecipitation for the interaction between SUFU and GLI1. Whole-cell extracts from HCC827 and HCC827-GR cells untreated or treated with LDE225 or/and PHA556752, were immunoprecipitated (IP) with anti-GLI1 (upper) or anti-SUFU (bottom) antibodies. The immunoprecipitates were subjected to Western blot analysis (WB) with indicated antibodies. Control immunoprecipitation was done using control mouse PS.

Figure 4. Effects of the combined treatment with LDE225 and gefitinib or PHA-665752 on HCC827-GR tumor xenografts

(A) Athymic nude mice were injected subcutaneously into the dorsal flank with $10^7$ HCC827-GR cancer cells. After 7 to 10 days (average tumor size, 75 mm$^3$), mice were treated as indicated in Materials and Methods for 3 weeks. HCC827-GR xenografted mice received only vehicle (control group), gefitinib (100 mg/kg daily orally by gavage), LDE225 (20 mg/kg intraperitoneally thrice a week), PHA-665752 (25 mg/kg intraperitoneally twice a week), or their combination. Data represent
the average (SD). Student t test was used to compare tumor sizes among different treatment groups at day 21 following the start of treatment. **(B)** Waterfall plot representing the change in tumor size from baseline in the six groups of treatment. A total of eight mice for each treatment group were evaluated. **(C)** Effects of combined LDE225 and PHA-665752 on expression of MET, PTCH and vimentin. Tissues were stained with H&E. Representative section from each condition.

**Figure 5. Activation of Hedgehog signaling pathway mediates resistance to EGFR TKI in EGFR-wild-type NSCLC cell lines.**

**(A)** Western blotting analysis of EGFR receptor and its downstream pathways activation, including PARP cleaved form, following treatment with the indicated concentration LDE225 and erlotinib on Calu-3, Calu-3 ER and H1299 NSCLC cell line. β-Actin was included as a loading control. **(B)** apoptosis was evaluated as described in Supplementary Materials and Methods with Annexin V staining in Calu-3, Calu-3 GEF-R, and H1299 cancer cells, which were treated with the indicated concentration LDE225 and erlotinib. Columns, mean of 3 identical wells of a single representative experiment; bars, top 95% confidence interval; ***, P < 0.001 for comparisons between cells treated with drug combination and cells treated with single agent.

**Figure 6. Hedgehog pathway inhibition sensitizes EGFR WT NSCLC cell lines to standard chemotherapy**

Anchorage-independent colony formation in soft-agar in human lung adenocarcinoma H1299 and H460. The results are the average±s.d. of three independent experiments, each done in triplicate. For defining the effect of the combined drug treatments, any potentiation was estimated by multiplying the
percentage of cells remaining by each individual agent. The synergistic index was calculated as previously described (19). In the following equations, A and B are the effects of each individual agent, and AB is the effect of the combination. Subadditivity was defined as \( \frac{\%AB}{\%A \%B} < 0.9 \); additivity was defined as \( \frac{\%AB}{\%A \%B} = 0.9-1.0 \); and supra-additivity was defined as \( \frac{\%AB}{\%A \%B} > 1.0 \).
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Scr</th>
<th>Si-Gli1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gefitinib (1µM)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDE225 (1µM)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHA-665752 (0.5 µM)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
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<th>Scr</th>
<th>Si-Gli1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gefitinib (1µM)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDE225 (1µM)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHA-665752 (0.5 µM)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Scr</th>
<th>Si-Gli1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Gefitinib (1µM)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LDE225 (1µM)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PHA-665752 (0.5 µM)</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

D

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>0.05</th>
<th>0.5</th>
<th>1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>gefitinib (1µM)</td>
<td>Scr</td>
<td>Si-Gli1</td>
<td>LDE225 (1µM)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Treatment</th>
<th>Gefitinib (1μM)</th>
<th>LDE225 (1μM)</th>
<th>PHA-556752 (0.5μM)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCC827</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HCC827-GR</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

B

1. IP: SMO
   - LDE225 (1μM)
   - PHA-556752 (0.5μM)

2. WB: MET

3. WB: SMO

C

D

1. IP: GLI1

2. WB: SUFU

3. WB: GLI1

4. WB: SUFU
Figure 4

(A) Mean tumor volume (mm³) over days of treatment for different treatments: CONTROL, GEFITINIB, LDE225, MET-I, LDE+GEF, LDE+MET-I.

(B) Objective response (%).

(C) Immunohistochemical staining for E&EE, Vimentin, MET, and PTCH across different treatment groups: Ctr, GEF, LDE225, PHA-665752, LDE225 + GEF, LDE225 + PHA-665752.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Calu-3</th>
<th>Calu-3 ER</th>
<th>H1299</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>-</td>
<td>- + - +</td>
<td>- + - +</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- -</td>
<td>+ +</td>
<td>- + +</td>
<td>+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **Erlotinib (1μM)**
- **LDE225 (1μM)**
- **EGFR**
- **Phospho-EGFR**
- **GLI1**
- **AKT**
- **Phospho-AKT**
- **MAPK**
- **Phospho-MAPK**
- **P70S6K**
- **Phospho-P70S6K**
- **S6**
- **Phospho-S6**
- **Vimentin**
- **PARP**
- **Cleaved-PARP**
- **β actin**

B

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Calu-3</th>
<th>Calu-3 ER</th>
<th>H1299</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Apoptosis (%)</td>
<td>Apoptosis (%)</td>
<td>Apoptosis (%)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>40 ± 5</td>
<td>80 ± 4</td>
<td>80 ± 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **ERLOTINIB**
- **LDE225**
- **ERLOTINIB + LDE225**
Figure 6

The graphs illustrate the anchorage-independent colony forming ability (%) of H1299 and H460 cells treated with different concentrations of Cisplatin and LDE225 alone or in combination. The x-axis represents the concentration of Cisplatin (µM) and LDE225 (µM), while the y-axis shows the percentage of anchorage-independent colony forming ability. The data points are shown with error bars indicating the variability of the measurements.
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