

Molecular mechanism of the TP53-MDM2-AR-AKT signalling network regulation by USP12

Urszula L. McClurg^{1,2,*}, Nay C.T.H. Chit¹, Mahsa Azizyan¹, Joanne Edwards³, Arash Nabbi⁴, Karl T. Riabowol⁴, Sirintra Nakjang^{1,5}, Stuart R. McCracken¹, Craig N. Robson^{1,*}

¹Newcastle Cancer Centre at the Northern Institute for Cancer Research, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4HH, UK.

²Institute of Cellular and Molecular Biomedicine, Medical School, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4HH, UK.

³Wolfson Wohl Cancer Research Centre, Institute of Cancer Sciences, College of Medical, Veterinary and Life Sciences, University of Glasgow, G61 1QH, Glasgow, Scotland, UK.

⁴Department of Oncology, Arnie Charbonneau Cancer Institute, Cumming School of Medicine, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, T2N 4N1 Canada.

⁵Bioinformatics Support Unit, Faculty of Medical Sciences, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4HH, UK.

* To whom correspondence should be addressed:

Urszula L. McClurg, Institute for Cellular and Molecular Biomedicine, Medical School, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4HH, UK. Tel: +44 (0) 191 208 3492, Fax: +44 (0) 191 208 7424
Email: Urszula.McClurg@ncl.ac.uk

Craig N. Robson, Northern Institute for Cancer Research, Medical School, Newcastle University, Newcastle upon Tyne, NE2 4HH, UK. Tel: +44 191 208 4426, Fax: +44 191 208 4301. Email: Craig.Robson@ncl.ac.uk

Keywords: prostate cancer, USP12, MDM2, TP53, AKT, castrate-resistance, deubiquitination, androgen receptor, UAF1, WDR20

Abstract

The TP53-MDM2-AR-AKT signalling network plays a critical role in the development and progression of prostate cancer. However, the molecular mechanisms regulating this signalling network are not fully defined. By conducting transcriptome analysis, denaturing immunoprecipitations and immunopathology, we demonstrate that the TP53-MDM2-AR-AKT cross-talk is regulated by the deubiquitinating enzyme USP12 in prostate cancer. Our findings explain why USP12 is one of twelve most commonly overexpressed cancer-associated genes located near an amplified super-enhancer. We find that USP12 deubiquitinates MDM2 and AR which in turn controls the levels of the TP53 tumour suppressor and AR oncogene in prostate cancer. Consequently, USP12 levels are predictive not only of cancer development but also of patient's therapy resistance, relapse and survival. Therefore, our findings suggest that USP12 could serve as a promising therapeutic target in currently incurable castrate resistant prostate cancer.

Introduction

TP53, the guardian of the genome, is a potent transcriptional regulator and a crucial tumour suppressor (1), (2). Following ubiquitination by MDM2, TP53 is targeted for proteosomal degradation resulting in increased proliferation and tumourigenesis (3). The ubiquitination event occurs within the nucleus. MDM2 can also directly ubiquitinate the androgen receptor (AR) leading to its degradation (4). AR is a transcription factor critical in prostate cancer development and progression, with increased AR activity promoting prostate cell proliferation and survival. Consequently, by targeting both TP53 and AR proteins, MDM2 acts to control the balance between pro- and anti- proliferative pathways in prostate cancer.

We have previously reported that AR can be directly deubiquitinated and stabilised by ubiquitin specific peptidase 12 (USP12) (5). USP12, when bound to its cofactors UAF1 and WDR20 (6, 7), can also deubiquitinate the AKT phosphatases PHLPP and PHLPL (8), (9). This activity controls the AR-AKT signalling network in which AKT can phosphorylate the AR at serines 213 and 791 which, in turn, targets it for ubiquitination by MDM2 and subsequent proteosomal degradation (4), (10). Additionally, AKT can also phosphorylate MDM2 at serines 166 and 188 which promotes MDM2 nuclear translocation (11) and inhibits its auto-ubiquitination and proteosomal degradation (12). Aberrant activity of AKT signalling is one of the most common features of the aggressive castrate resistant prostate cancer (CRPC) (13), (14, 15).

Understanding the wider network of prostate cancer regulators is now more important than ever before. Prostate cancer is one of the main causes of cancer associated deaths in males worldwide (www.wcrf.org). When localised, this disease can be managed with surgical or therapeutic intervention, however when patients develop metastatic castrate resistant prostate cancer there is no curative solution available (15). Additionally, we currently lack biomarkers that would indicate which patients are more likely to develop this aggressive form of the disease. Investigating master regulators and understanding the cellular biology of signalling networks in prostate cancer will allow us to identify novel biomarkers and therapeutic targets in CRPC. This study demonstrates the relevance of USP12 in the development of therapy resistance and uncovers how USP12 regulates the signalling axis between critical PC master regulators, TP53-MDM2-AR-AKT to control the balance between cellular proliferation and apoptosis. Multiple independent patient cohorts including those with end-stage prostate cancer have been assessed in this study. Our data raise the possibility that prudent combination of hormone therapy alongside inhibition of USP12 could provide a new treatment option for high-risk prostate cancer patients who can be selectively identified and targeted for early treatment using USP12 levels as a predictive biomarker.

Results

USP12 affects multiple cellular processes

We have previously reported that USP12 plays an important role in prostate cancer cells by controlling the protein levels of the AR (5) and the AKT phosphatases, PHLPP and PHLPL (8) to regulate the AR-AKT cross-talk. As USP12 has also been found to regulate transcription factors at the protein level we silenced USP12 expression in LNCaP prostate cancer cells and performed RNA sequencing to further investigate its role in cellular biology. A total of 2,355 genes were significantly dysregulated by USP12 silencing (Fig 1A). Genes most affected by USP12 silencing included many cancer related targets such as *HMGN2P46*, *FBN1*, *HES1* and *UGT2B* genes (Fig 1B, Sup Fig 1-2). Indeed, pathway analysis showed that USP12 depletion significantly affected the p53 pathway (Fig 1C). Additionally, USP12 was found to play a role in metabolic processes. The USP12 effect on gene expression profile was confirmed in multiple cell line models representing therapy sensitive (LNCaP), androgen independent (LNCaP-AI) and CRPC with constitutively active AR variants (CWR22Rv1). Additionally, silencing the USP12 cofactors required for its enzymatic activity, UAF-1 and WDR20 (7, 16), generally mirrored the effects of silencing USP12 confirming the role of USP12 enzymatic activity in the regulation of these transcripts (Figure 1D-G).

USP12 regulates the expression of genes from the p53 pathway

Our pathway analysis indicated that over 40% of p53 KEGG pathway target genes were affected by USP12 depletion (Fig 1C). KEGG pathway analysis highlighted the importance of USP12 for p53 regulated cell cycle arrest, apoptosis, DNA repair and damage prevention and p53 negative feedback signalling (Fig 2A). Multiple p53 target genes including *BAX* were affected by USP12 silencing with 8 genes (12% of the p53 KEGG pathway) downregulated and 19 genes (28% of the p53 KEGG pathway) upregulated (Fig 2B). Results for 89% of the genes were in agreement with the expected result of USP12 silencing on p53 levels (17). Given the potential role of USP12 in the regulation of p53-dependent transcription, we also compared all known p53-responsive genes (18) to the list of genes identified in the USP12 regulated transcriptional network. Out of the 129 known p53-responsive genes (18), 50 (39%) were dysregulated by USP12 silencing. We have further confirmed the regulation of *BAX* by Real-Time qPCR in cell lines representing different stages of PC (Fig 2C; sup Fig 3). We have also determined that additional p53 target gene *FOXO3* was significantly upregulated even though it was not identified by the initial RNA sequencing (Fig 2C; sup Fig 3). As USP12 requires UAF1 and WDR20 complex members for its enzymatic activity, silencing any member of the USP12 complex should have comparable effects on the p53 target gene expression and this was the case in our study (Fig 2C). While silencing USP12, or its cofactors, had no effect on TP53 transcript levels confirming post-translational regulation by USP12 (Fig 2C; sup Fig 3). *BAX* and *FOXO3* were significantly upregulated by USP12 silencing in LNCaP cells representing early AR positive, castration sensitive disease and also in LNCaP-AI cells representing AR positive, androgen independent disease and CWR22Rv1 cells representing late AR and AR-variant positive castrate resistant PC.

USP12 regulates p53 protein levels by deubiquitinating and stabilising MDM2 protein

Our RNA sequencing analysis indicates that upon USP12 silencing, the p53 pathway was upregulated which implies that USP12 is a negative regulator of p53. As USP12 is a deubiquitinating enzyme that has been primarily reported to deubiquitinate K48 poly-ubiquitinated proteins leading to their stabilisation it was assumed that its effects on p53 must be indirect. We hypothesised that USP12 exerted its effect on p53 by targeting one of the negative regulators of p53 protein for deubiquitination. Consequently, we immunoprecipitated p53's E3 ligase MDM2 from cell lysate and

discovered that USP12 was in the same cellular complex with MDM2 and p53 in cancer cells (Fig 3A). To confirm that USP12 can interact with MDM2 in the absence of AR we overexpressed both proteins in COS-7 cells and confirmed their interaction (Fig 3B). Considering USP12 enzymatic activity as a deubiquitinase we then assessed MDM2 ubiquitination levels in PC cells following USP12 depletion. We found that USP12 silencing led to an increase in MDM2 ubiquitination which correlated with decreased MDM2 protein levels (Fig 3C). The proportion of ubiquitinated MDM2 increases due to the deubiquitinating enzyme USP12 being depleted which leads to more MDM2 being degraded decreasing the total protein amount (Fig 3C). In line with our previous data on USP12, regulation of AKT phosphatases silencing USP12 stimulated S166 phosphorylation of MDM2 (Fig 3D). This implies that USP12 could control MDM2 by both direct deubiquitination and additionally via the AKT pathway which regulates its auto-ubiquitinating ability. To further confirm that the effect of USP12 on MDM2 and consequently p53 protein levels was proteasome dependent, we silenced USP12 in the presence and absence of the MG132 proteasome inhibitor. We observed that similar to the effect on AR, USP12 could only regulate MDM2 and p53 protein levels in the presence of active proteasome (Fig 3E). Finally we confirmed the effect of USP12 silencing on p53 levels. P53 is a transcription factor which needs to translocate to the nucleus to interact with chromatin. Upon USP12 silencing we observed increased p53 levels in the nucleus and on the chromatin of PC cells (Fig 3F) explaining the increase in p53 target gene expression observed in RNA sequencing data (Fig 2A-C). Consequently, when we immunoprecipitated p53 associated chromatin we observed increased p53 binding to its target genes CDKN1A (Fig 3G) and CDC20 (Fig 3H) upon USP12 silencing.

USP12 plays a role in castration resistance

Currently, PC patients with non-curable disease are treated with anti-androgen based therapies, after which they invariably develop a castration resistant phenotype for which there is no available treatment beyond the minimal survival benefits seen with taxane chemotherapy (19). Consequently, there is a need for novel drug targets in CRPC and for novel biomarkers of castration resistance. We investigated the role of USP12 in CRPC and demonstrated that USP12 silencing sensitised both castrate sensitive LNCaP cells (Fig 4A) and androgen independent LNCaP-AI cells (Fig 4B) to casodex, as measured by both live cell imaging and cell counts. USP12 silencing also affected cellular proliferation of PC cells in the presence and absence of androgens to a degree comparable to silencing the AR itself (Fig 4C) highlighting the potential importance of USP12 as a PC drug target in all disease stages. This effect might be due to the regulation of p53 and MDM2 by USP12 and to the regulation of AR activity, since, in the absence of USP12, the binding of AR to chromatin is significantly decreased (Fig 4D).

USP12 is a novel biomarker of PC

As our results indicated that USP12 plays a role in PC and CRPC biology, we investigated if USP12 could be used as a biomarker of PC by assessing USP12 protein levels in clinical samples using immunohistochemistry. USP12 protein levels were significantly higher in both the cytoplasm and the nucleus of cells from patients with pre-neoplastic prostatic intraepithelial neoplasia (PIN). They were higher still in PC patients (Fig 5A). This indicates that USP12 may be involved in both early and late PC development and could potentially be used to identify patients at high risk for developing PC. There was also a strong correlation (Pearson $p < 0.0001$) between cytoplasmic and nuclear USP12 levels suggesting that USP12 might fulfil similar functions in both organelles (Fig 5B). We further investigated the protein levels of USP12 in a large cohort of patients with benign disease compared to patients with PC. USP12 levels were significantly increased when compared to samples with benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH) (Fig 5C). As USP12 regulates three most crucial pathways

responsible for cell death and survival; AKT, AR and p53, we investigated USP12's correlation with the well-established proliferation marker MCM2 (20). In our clinical cohort, the levels of USP12 and MCM2 were strongly correlated (p value of 0.03), supporting the idea that USP12 plays a significant role in prostate carcinogenesis (Fig 5D). Similarly, linear regression showed a significant relationship between nuclear USP12 and MCM2 (Fig 5E). A link between USP12 and cellular proliferation was further confirmed by a statistically significant correlation between USP12 and the Ki-67 proliferative index ($p=0.04$; $n=28$). We also analysed the relationship between USP12 and AR protein levels and target protein expression, in agreement with our cellular observations high USP12 levels, both cytoplasmic and nuclear, correlated with increased AR (Fig 5F-G) and PSA (Fig 5H) levels in patient samples. Furthermore confirming our cellular observations USP12 levels were positively associated with MDM2 protein in prostate cancer (Fig 5I).

High USP12 levels are seen in CRPC and correlate with poor prognosis in PC

Since we found that USP12 levels increase during the development of PC, we assessed USP12 as a prognostic biomarker. Patients with high USP12 levels had significantly shortened overall survival (Fig 6A) and their time to relapse was also significantly shorter, with an average of 14.7 months in the high USP12 expressing group versus 55.8 months in patients with low USP12 protein levels (Fig 6B). We confirmed this by analysing time to relapse in the TCGA cohort (<http://cancergenome.nih.gov/>), where high *USP12* transcript levels were also predictive of shorter relapse free survival (Fig 6C). Similarly when we divided patients based on their USP12 and TP53 expression patients with low TP53 and high USP12 had the most aggressive disease while patients with high TP53 experienced longest relapse free survival, this difference was not significant due to our small sample number but it showed a trend. Low TP53 and low USP12 expressing patients had medium survival (Fig 6D). Furthermore, patients with high USP12, both cytoplasmic (Fig 6E) and nuclear (Fig 6F), had higher PSA levels at relapse. Additionally, when we analysed the TCGA patient cohort PSA results based on their USP12 and TP53 levels we observed highest PSA in the group with high USP12 and low TP53 and lowest PSA in the group with low USP12 and high TP53 confirming the link between TP53 regulation by USP12 and PC (Fig 6G). Furthermore, when we compared USP12 levels between hormone sensitive and CRPC patients from our North of England, UK cohort, we found that they were significantly increased with disease progression (Fig 6H). Similarly, in patients from an independent cohort (21), CRPC patients had increased USP12 protein compared to treatment sensitive disease (Fig 6I). This was further confirmed in our cell line models. For example, our real-time qPCR analysis indicated that androgen independent LNCaP-AI cells had significantly increased USP12 transcript levels compared to their parental androgen sensitive line, indicating that USP12 might be involved in the CRPC biology in this model (Fig 6J). As we previously reported that silencing USP12 significantly decreases the ability of LNCaP-AI cells to grow in steroid deplete conditions (5, 8) we investigated if overexpression of USP12 could drive androgen independence. To answer this, we analysed colony formation in the absence of androgens in LNCaP cells overexpressing WT USP12 or enzymatically dead USP12 mutant. Cells overexpressing WT USP12 had significantly increased ability to form colonies in the absence of steroids compared to control or mutant USP12 overexpressing cells (Fig 6K).

Discussion

Progression to castrate resistant disease is a major challenge of translational PC research. Currently, the median time to progression is approximately 18 months and survival typically does not extend beyond 12 months after the development of metastatic CRPC (15), (22). Even the recent development of second and third line anti-androgens has only reinforced our understanding that resistance development is unavoidable and multifactorial with second and third line treatment only

offering short term survival advantage (23, 24). Hence, it is crucial for us to understand the mechanisms through which resistance develops and to identify signalling networks that control AR activity and CRPC development. Our study outlines USP12 as a novel master regulator of the critical signalling axis TP53-MDM2-AR-AKT, which plays a role in prostate cancer development and subsequently progression to CRPC.

Deubiquitinating enzymes have been at the forefront of research in recent years, with critical roles in cancer biology becoming evident (25). Here we report that USP12 plays a role as a master regulator in prostate cancer by controlling the TP53-MDM2-AR-AKT signalling network that is responsible for prostate tumour development and progression (Sup Fig 5). USP12 controls AKT by targeting PHLPPs (8), the most commonly mutated genes in early PC (26). USP12 also deubiquitinates both AR and MDM2, which in turn controls TP53 levels. We also demonstrate that USP12 is required for cell growth and AR activity at all stages of the disease, even in the castrate environment. This is a promising discovery as DUBs have recently been successfully explored as therapeutic targets. USP1, which similarly to USP12, depends on a WD40 protein binding for its enzymatic activity (27), was found to play a role in cisplatin resistance (28), (29). Inhibitors targeting the interaction between USP1 and its cofactor have been developed which have enabled high specificity. This approach has been very successful in treating cisplatin resistant lung cancer and is currently in clinical trials (30), (31), (32), (33). Similar observations have been made in osteosarcoma where USP1 was observed to be overexpressed and its subsequent depletion decreased proliferation and invasion (34). In glioblastoma, USP1 overexpression was found to promote therapy resistance (35). Targeting USP12 might be particularly beneficial in neuroendocrine prostate cancers where a recent tri-centre study (Trento, Cornell and Broad) accessible through TCGA (<http://cancergenome.nih.gov/>) reported that 17% of analysed tumours had USP12 amplification (13 of 77 samples) (36). USP12 targeting might also prove useful in other epithelial cancers as it has recently been identified to be one of 12 most commonly overexpressed cancer-associated genes located near an amplified super-enhancer (37). In this study we report that aside from targeting the AR, USP12 deubiquitinates both MDM2 and PHLPPs controlling the protein levels of p53 and pAKT, highlighting its potential utility in anti-cancer therapy design. Recent developments in targeting the USP1-UAF1 interaction for USP1 inhibition highlighted the importance of understanding the DUB-WD40 complex structure in specific therapeutics design (38). Recently the USP12-UAF1 structure has been solved allowing for similar approaches to be undertaken (39, 40).

We used multiple models to evaluate our observations using cell lines that represent distinct disease stages including androgen sensitive PC, androgen independent PC with full length AR and CRPC with full length AR and constitutively active AR variants. We also validated our results using patient samples from our in-house cohort containing end stage disease, an independent patient cohort and publically available large datasets. All of our sample sets confirmed that USP12 plays a critical role in early PC development and in the onset of incurable castrate-resistant disease. This, taken together with recent advances in DUB targeting therapeutics and the frequency of USP12 amplifications in PC, highlights the potential of USP12 as a novel therapeutic target.

Materials and Methods

Antibodies and plasmids - anti-AR (Santa Cruz Biotechnology; N20 clone), anti-H2A.Z (41), anti-MDM2 (Santa Cruz N20 and SMP14), anti-FLAG, anti-USP12 and anti- α -tubulin (Sigma), anti-p53 (Dako), and anti-ubiquitin (Santa Cruz Biotechnology) were included in this project. Plasmids used were pMYC-MDM2, pFLAG-USP12 (5).

Cell Culture, Transfections - LNCaP, CWR22Rv1 and COS-7 cells (all purchased from the ATCC) and LNCaP-AI variant cell line derived in-house (42) were cultured in RPMI 1640 medium with 2 mM L-glutamine (Invitrogen) supplemented with 10% (v/v) foetal calf serum (FCS) or steroid depleted serum (SDM) at 37 °C in 5% CO₂. Cell lines were never maintained for more than 30 passages or 2 months of continuous culturing. As per institutional policy, cell lines were authenticated and tested for mycoplasma on a tri-monthly basis. Transfections were performed using TransIT-LT1 reagent (MirusBio) following the manufacturer's instructions. The ViraPower Lentiviral Expression system (Life Sciences) was used to generate viral particles using pLenti-USP12 or enzymatically dead mutant C48A USP12 (5) expression vectors and control pLenti-LacZ vector (Life Sciences).

Immunoprecipitation (IP) - Cells were seeded at 10⁶ cells/90-mm dish, transfected with 1 µg of plasmid when indicated, incubated for 48 h, and lysed directly into lysis buffer (50 mM Tris, pH 7.5, 150 mM NaCl, 0.2 mM Na₃VO₄, 1% Nonidet P-40, 1mM PMSF, 1mM DTT, and 1x protease inhibitors (Roche Applied Science)). Lysates were incubated with 1 µg of antibodies for 16 h at 4°C, and antibodies were pulled down using protein G-Sepharose beads (Invitrogen). For denaturing IPs, cells were subjected to 20 µM MG132 proteasomal inhibitor treatment for the final 8 h followed by collection into lysis buffer supplemented with 2% SDS and subsequently denatured at 100°C for 10 min (5) prior to immunoprecipitation.

For chromatin isolation, cells were trypsinised and resuspended in 1ml of Buffer A (10 mM HEPES pH 7.9, 10 mM KCl, 1.5 mM MgCl₂, 0.34 M sucrose, 10% glycerol, 1 mM DTT and 1 x protease inhibitors cocktail) on ice for 10 min. Nuclei were collected by centrifugation at 1200g for 5 min at 4°C. Cytosolic fraction was cleared by centrifugation at 200g for 5 min at 4°C. Nuclei were washed in 1 ml of buffer A without glycerol and resuspended in 1ml of buffer B (3 mM EDTA, 0.2 mM EGTA, 1 mM DTT and 1 x protease inhibitor cocktail) on ice for 30 min. Finally, sample was centrifuged at 1500 g for 5 min at 4°C and the chromatin pellet was washed in buffer B seven times (43).

siRNA Gene Silencing and Gene Expression Analysis - Cells were reverse transfected with siRNA using RNAiMax (Invitrogen) according to the manufacturer's instructions and incubated in culture medium for 96 h prior to cell lysis. siRNA sequences were as follows SCR: UUCUCCGAACGUGUCACGU[dT][dT]; AR: CCAUCUUUCUGAAUGUCCU[dTdT]; USP12: CAGAUCUCUCCAAGCAU[dTdT], WDR20: CGAGAAAGAUCACAAGCGA[dTdT] and UAF1: CAAAUUGGUUCUCAGUAGA[dTdT] (7). Routinely, we achieved >60%, >65% and >80% knockdown for UAF1, WDR20 and USP12, respectively in qPCR validation (7) (Sup Fig 1). We also used additional USP12 targeting sequences USP12 A GAAACUCUGUGCAGUGAAU[dTdT] and USP12 C AUCAGUAUCUCAAGAA[dTdT] described previously (5). For RNA sequencing, RNA was extracted using the QIAGEN RNeasy Plus Mini Kit and all samples from three separate biological experiments were sequenced using Illumina's total stranded RNA prep kit with ribozero gold for library preparation with 100 bp paired end reads on the Illumina HiSeq 2500 platform, performed by AROS.

Reads were mapped to the reference human genome hg19 using STAR2-pass allowing up to two mismatches (44). Per gene raw read counts for each sample were obtained using HTseq and Gencode version 19 (45). Gene-level differential expression analysis was performed using DEseq2 (46). P values were adjusted to control for the false discovery rate (FDR) using the Benjamini-Hochberg method. Differentially expressed genes from each comparison were tested for functionally enriched pathways and gene ontology terms using Goseq (47) with a gene length bias correction on pathways annotated in KEGG database. Gene expression fold changes within KEGG pathways were visualised using the R package pathview (48).

Proliferation analysis - For proliferation analysis, IncuCyte measurements of cellular occupation of the wells were taken every 6 hours and additionally in a separate set of experiments cell numbers were counted at 96h to assess cellular proliferation (8).

Immunohistochemistry - Tissue microarrays (TMA) containing 0.6mm cores of benign prostatic hyperplasia (BPH), PIN, PC, and control tissues including breast, kidney, placenta, ovary, and liver were used of retrospective cohorts. Antigens were retrieved by pressure cooking in 10 mM citrate pH 6.0 (sup Fig 4). The TMAs were independently scored by 2 individuals using the 0-300 H-score method (49). Briefly, percentage and intensity of staining for positive cells was estimated (0, 1, 2, 3) using the following equation H-score = (% of cells with low level positivity) + 2*(% of cells with medium level positivity) + 3*(% of cells with high level positivity). All sections were scored blinded. For survival analysis high marker levels were defined as a value in the 3rd and 4th upper quarter of the population.

qPCR - For qPCR RNA was extracted using Trizol (Invitrogen) according to manufacturer's instruction, and quantified using Nanodrop. cDNA synthesis using the oligo dT primers and data analysis was performed as described previously (8). Briefly, 1µg of RNA was reverse transcribed with 1U of MMLV reverse transcriptase, 50 ng Oligo-dT and 630 µM dNTP (Promega). All qPCR was performed using the relative quantification method on three independent biological experiments and each sample was loaded in triplicate. qRT-PCR was conducted using SYBR®Green on 384-well optical reaction plates with the ABI 7900HT real-time PCR system. Results were normalised to *HPRT1* expression. Primers were *HPRT1* F: 5'-GAACGTCTTGCTCGAGAGATGTG-3', R: 5'-CCAGCAGGTCAGCAAAGAATTT-3'; *BAX* F: GCCCTTTGCTTCAGGGTTCA, R: TCAGCTTCTTGGTGGACGCA; *FOXO3* F: AACGTGGGAACCTTCACTGGT, R: TTTGAGGGTCTGCTTTGCCCA; *AGT* F: CCCAGTCTGAGATGGCTC, R: GACGAGGTGGAAGGGGTGTA; *TTR* F: TGGGAGCCATTTGCCTCTG, R: AGCCGTGGTGAATAGGAGTA; *SYT4* F: ATGGGATACCCTACACCCAAAT, R: TCCCGAGAGAGGAATTAGAACTT; *SLTRK6* F: TCCAGTGCTCTCATCCAGAGG, R: AGTTGAAAAGGTCGTGATGGT.

Colony formation - LNCaP cells carrying pLenti-LacZ, pLenti-WT USP12 or pLenti- C48A USP12. Cells were seeded in SDM at 2000 cells per well of a 6 well plate and allowed to form colonies. After 14 days cells were stained with crystal violet and colonies counted (7).

Chromatin immunoprecipitation (ChIP) - ChIPs were performed as described previously (7). LNCaP cells were transfected with siRNA for 96 h. Data are presented as percentage input using the following formula: % input = 100 × AE (amplification efficiency)*(CT adjusted input sample – CT immunoprecipitated sample). CT refers to cycle threshold. *CDKN1A* F: CTGTGGCTCTGATTGGCTTCT; R: GACAAAATAGCCACCAGCCTCT, *CDC20* F: CCGCTAGACTCTCGTGATAGC; R: TGGCTCCTTCAAAATCCAAC.

Statistics – data was tested for normal distribution and variance similarity and appropriate statistics were applied as detailed in figure legends.

Author contributions: ULM and CNR designed the study; ULM, NCTHC and MA performed the experiments; ULM and SRM scored and analysed all of the pathology data, ULM, AN and KTR analysed the TCGA dataset; SN and ULM analysed the RNA sequencing data; JE provided the Glasgow patient cohort; ULM prepared the manuscript with input from all authors.

Acknowledgments: ULM, SRM and CNR were funded by PC UK (PG09-23), JGWP Foundation (BH142412) and JRE Scientific Committee Charity, Newcastle Healthcare Charity (JG/ML/0414). CNR is supported by Cancer Research UK (C27826/A15994). NCTHC was funded by Newcastle University.

Conflict of interest:

The authors declare no conflict of interest.

References

1. Brown CJ, Lain S, Verma CS, Fersht AR, Lane DP. Awakening guardian angels: drugging the p53 pathway. *Nature reviews Cancer*. 2009;9(12):862-73.
2. Poletto M, Legrand AJ, Fletcher SC, Dianov GL. p53 coordinates base excision repair to prevent genomic instability. *Nucleic acids research*. 2016;44(7):3165-75.
3. Fuchs SY, Adler V, Buschmann T, Wu X, Ronai Z. Mdm2 association with p53 targets its ubiquitination. *Oncogene*. 1998;17(19):2543-7.
4. Lin HK, Wang L, Hu YC, Altuwajri S, Chang C. Phosphorylation-dependent ubiquitylation and degradation of androgen receptor by Akt require Mdm2 E3 ligase. *EMBO J*. 2002;21(15):4037-48.
5. Burska UL, Harle VJ, Coffey K, Darby S, Ramsey H, O'Neill D, et al. Deubiquitinating enzyme USP12 is a novel co-activator of the Androgen Receptor. *The Journal of biological chemistry*. 2013;288(45):32641-50.
6. Sowa ME, Bennett EJ, Gygi SP, Harper JW. Defining the Human Deubiquitinating Enzyme Interaction Landscape. *Cell*. 2009;138(2):389-403.
7. McClurg UL, Harle VJ, Nabbi A, Batalha-Pereira A, Walker S, Coffey K, et al. Ubiquitin-specific protease 12 interacting partners UAF-1 and WDR20 are potential therapeutic targets in prostate cancer. *Oncotarget*. 2015;6(35):37724-26.
8. McClurg UL, Summerscales EE, Harle VJ, Gaughan L, Robson CN. Deubiquitinating enzyme USP12 regulates the interaction between the androgen receptor and the AKT pathway. *Oncotarget*. 2014;5(16):7081-92.
9. Brognard J, Sierrecki E, Gao T, Newton AC. PHLPP and a second isoform, PHLPP2, differentially attenuate the amplitude of Akt signaling by regulating distinct Akt isoforms. *Molecular cell*. 2007;25(6):917-31.
10. Lin HK, Yeh S, Kang HY, Chang C. Akt suppresses androgen-induced apoptosis by phosphorylating and inhibiting androgen receptor. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2001;98(13):7200-5.
11. Mayo LD, Donner DB. A phosphatidylinositol 3-kinase/Akt pathway promotes translocation of Mdm2 from the cytoplasm to the nucleus. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America*. 2001;98(20):11598-603.
12. Feng J, Tamaskovic R, Yang Z, Brazil DP, Merlo A, Hess D, et al. Stabilization of Mdm2 via decreased ubiquitination is mediated by protein kinase B/Akt-dependent phosphorylation. *The Journal of biological chemistry*. 2004;279(34):35510-7.
13. Edwards J, Krishna NS, Witton CJ, Bartlett JM. Gene amplifications associated with the development of hormone-resistant prostate cancer. *Clinical cancer research : an official journal of the American Association for Cancer Research*. 2003;9(14):5271-81.
14. Marques RB, Aghai A, de Ridder CM, Stuurman D, Hoeben S, Boer A, et al. High Efficacy of Combination Therapy Using PI3K/AKT Inhibitors with Androgen Deprivation in Prostate Cancer Preclinical Models. *European urology*. 2014.
15. Feldman BJ, Feldman D. The development of androgen-independent prostate cancer. *Nature reviews Cancer*. 2001;1(1):34-45.

16. Kee Y, Yang K, Cohn MA, Haas W, Gygi SP, D'Andrea AD. WDR20 regulates activity of the USP12 x UAF1 deubiquitinating enzyme complex. *The Journal of biological chemistry*. 2010;285(15):11252-7.
17. Mirza A, Wu Q, Wang L, McClanahan T, Bishop WR, Gheyas F, et al. Global transcriptional program of p53 target genes during the process of apoptosis and cell cycle progression. *Oncogene*. 2003;22(23):3645-54.
18. Riley T, Sontag E, Chen P, Levine A. Transcriptional control of human p53-regulated genes. *Nature reviews Molecular cell biology*. 2008;9(5):402-12.
19. Tannock IF, de Wit R, Berry WR, Horti J, Pluzanska A, Chi KN, et al. Docetaxel plus Prednisone or Mitoxantrone plus Prednisone for Advanced Prostate Cancer. *New England Journal of Medicine*. 2004;351(15):1502-12.
20. Joshi S, Watkins J, Gazinska P, Brown JP, Gillett CE, Grigoriadis A, et al. Digital imaging in the immunohistochemical evaluation of the proliferation markers Ki67, MCM2 and Geminin, in early breast cancer, and their putative prognostic value. *BMC cancer*. 2015;15:546.
21. Willder JM, Heng SJ, McCall P, Adams CE, Tannahill C, Fyffe G, et al. Androgen receptor phosphorylation at serine 515 by Cdk1 predicts biochemical relapse in prostate cancer patients. *Br J Cancer*. 2013;108(1):139-48.
22. Lohiya V, Aragon-Ching JB, Sonpavde G. Role of Chemotherapy and Mechanisms of Resistance to Chemotherapy in Metastatic Castration-Resistant Prostate Cancer. *Clinical Medicine Insights Oncology*. 2016;10(Suppl 1):57-66.
23. Attard G, Antonarakis ES. Prostate cancer: AR aberrations and resistance to abiraterone or enzalutamide. *Nature reviews Urology*. 2016;13(12):697-8.
24. Antonarakis ES, Lu C, Wang H, Luber B, Nakazawa M, Roeser JC, et al. AR-V7 and resistance to enzalutamide and abiraterone in prostate cancer. *The New England journal of medicine*. 2014;371(11):1028-38.
25. McClurg UL, Robson CN. Deubiquitinating enzymes as oncotargets. *Oncotarget*. 2015;6(12):9657-68.
26. Xiong X, Li X, Wen YA, Gao T. Pleckstrin Homology (PH) Domain Leucine-rich Repeat Protein Phosphatase Controls Cell Polarity by Negatively Regulating the Activity of Atypical Protein Kinase C. *The Journal of biological chemistry*. 2016;291(48):25167-78.
27. Murai J, Yang K, Dejsuphong D, Hirota K, Takeda S, D'Andrea AD. The USP1/UAF1 complex promotes double-strand break repair through homologous recombination. *Molecular and cellular biology*. 2011;31(12):2462-9.
28. Sourisseau T, Helissey C, Lefebvre C, Ponsonnailles F, Malka-Mahieu H, Olausson KA, et al. Translational regulation of the mRNA encoding the ubiquitin peptidase USP1 involved in the DNA damage response as a determinant of Cisplatin resistance. *Cell cycle (Georgetown, Tex)*. 2016;15(2):295-302.
29. Zhiqiang Z, Qinghui Y, Yongqiang Z, Jian Z, Xin Z, Haiying M, et al. USP1 regulates AKT phosphorylation by modulating the stability of PHLPP1 in lung cancer cells. *Journal of cancer research and clinical oncology*. 2012;138(7):1231-8.
30. Chen J, Dexheimer TS, Ai Y, Liang Q, Villamil MA, Inglese J, et al. Selective and cell-active inhibitors of the USP1/ UAF1 deubiquitinase complex reverse cisplatin resistance in non-small cell lung cancer cells. *Chemistry & biology*. 2011;18(11):1390-400.
31. Dexheimer TS, Rosenthal AS, Liang Q, Chen J, Villamil MA, Kerns EH, et al. Discovery of ML323 as a Novel Inhibitor of the USP1/UAF1 Deubiquitinase Complex. *Probe Reports from the NIH Molecular Libraries Program*. Bethesda MD: NIH Molecular Libraries Programme; 2010.
32. Dexheimer TS, Rosenthal AS, Luci DK, Liang Q, Villamil MA, Chen J, et al. Synthesis and structure-activity relationship studies of N-benzyl-2-phenylpyrimidin-4-amine derivatives as potent USP1/UAF1 deubiquitinase inhibitors with anticancer activity against nonsmall cell lung cancer. *Journal of medicinal chemistry*. 2014;57(19):8099-110.

33. Mistry H, Hsieh G, Buhrlage SJ, Huang M, Park E, Cuny GD, et al. Small-molecule inhibitors of USP1 target ID1 degradation in leukemic cells. *Molecular cancer therapeutics*. 2013;12(12):2651-62.
34. Liu J, Zhu H, Zhong N, Jiang Z, Xu L, Deng Y, et al. Gene silencing of USP1 by lentivirus effectively inhibits proliferation and invasion of human osteosarcoma cells. *International journal of oncology*. 2016;49(6):2549-57.
35. Lee JK, Chang N, Yoon Y, Yang H, Cho H, Kim E, et al. USP1 targeting impedes GBM growth by inhibiting stem cell maintenance and radioresistance. *Neuro-oncology*. 2016;18(1):37-47.
36. Beltran H, Prandi D, Mosquera JM, Benelli M, Puca L, Cyrta J, et al. Divergent clonal evolution of castration-resistant neuroendocrine prostate cancer. *Nat Med*. 2016;22(3):298-305.
37. Zhang X, Choi PS, Francis JM, Imielinski M, Watanabe H, Cherniack AD, et al. Identification of focally amplified lineage-specific super-enhancers in human epithelial cancers. *Nature genetics*. 2016;48(2):176-82.
38. Wahi D, Jamal S, Goyal S, Singh A, Jain R, Rana P, et al. Cheminformatics models based on machine learning approaches for design of USP1/UAF1 abrogators as anticancer agents. *Systems and synthetic biology*. 2015;9(1-2):33-43.
39. Dharadhar S, Clerici M, van Dijk WJ, Fish A, Sixma TK. A conserved two-step binding for the UAF1 regulator to the USP12 deubiquitinating enzyme. *Journal of structural biology*. 2016;196(3):437-47.
40. Li H, Lim KS, Kim H, Hinds TR, Jo U, Mao H, et al. Allosteric Activation of Ubiquitin-Specific Proteases by beta-Propeller Proteins UAF1 and WDR20. *Molecular cell*. 2016;63(2):249-60.
41. Binda O, Sevilla A, LeRoy G, Lemischka IR, Garcia BA, Richard S. SETD6 monomethylates H2AZ on lysine 7 and is required for the maintenance of embryonic stem cell self-renewal. *Epigenetics*. 2013;8(2):177-83.
42. Rigas AC, Robson CN, Curtin NJ. Therapeutic potential of CDK inhibitor NU2058 in androgen-independent prostate cancer. *Oncogene*. 2007;26(55):7611-9.
43. McClurg UL, Cork DM, Darby S, Ryan-Munden CA, Nakjang S, Mendes Cortes L, et al. Identification of a novel K311 ubiquitination site critical for androgen receptor transcriptional activity. *Nucleic acids research*. 2017;45(4):1793-804.
44. Dobin A, Davis CA, Schlesinger F, Drenkow J, Zaleski C, Jha S, et al. STAR: ultrafast universal RNA-seq aligner. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)*. 2013;29(1):15-21.
45. Anders S, Pyl PT, Huber W. HTSeq—a Python framework to work with high-throughput sequencing data. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)*. 2015;31(2):166-9.
46. Love MI, Huber W, Anders S. Moderated estimation of fold change and dispersion for RNA-seq data with DESeq2. *Genome biology*. 2014;15(12):550.
47. Young MD, Wakefield MJ, Smyth GK, Oshlack A. Gene ontology analysis for RNA-seq: accounting for selection bias. *Genome biology*. 2010;11(2):R14.
48. Luo W, Brouwer C. Pathview: an R/Bioconductor package for pathway-based data integration and visualization. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)*. 2013;29(14):1830-1.
49. Kirkegaard T, Edwards J, Tovey S, McGlynn LM, Krishna SN, Mukherjee R, et al. Observer variation in immunohistochemical analysis of protein expression, time for a change? *Histopathology*. 2006;48(7):787-94.
50. Pei H, Li L, Fridley BL, Jenkins GD, Kalari KR, Lingle W, et al. FKBP51 affects cancer cell response to chemotherapy by negatively regulating Akt. *Cancer cell*. 2009;16(3):259-66.
51. Chen M Fau - Pratt CP, Pratt Cp Fau - Zeeman ME, Zeeman Me Fau - Schultz N, Schultz N Fau - Taylor BS, Taylor Bs Fau - O'Neill A, O'Neill A Fau - Castillo-Martin M, et al. Identification of PHLPP1 as a tumor suppressor reveals the role of feedback activation in PTEN-mutant prostate cancer progression. *Cancer cell*. 2011;20(2):173-86.

Figure legends

Figure 1. USP12 controls multiple cellular processes. (A) LNCaP cells were treated with SCR or siUSP12 siRNA for 96h followed by RNA extraction and RNA sequencing. Transcript levels between USP12 knock-down and scrambled treated control (SCR) were compared: 2,355 genes are significantly differentially expressed in siUSP12 (adjusted p value < 0.05) and marked in red. (B) Most down (green) and up (red) regulated genes following USP12 silencing. (C) Top 5 pathways enriched with differentially regulated genes following USP12 silencing numDEInCat: number of differentially expressed genes in the pathway; numInCat: number of genes that are part of the pathway. (D-G) qPCR validation of most downregulated (D-E) and upregulated (F-G) genes following 96h USP12 silencing. LNCaP and CWR22Rv1 cells were treated with siRNA as indicated for 72h followed by 10 nM DHT stimulation for 24h. LNCaP-AI cells were cultured in SDM for 96h. Results were normalised to *HPRT1* gene expression and data is presented as mean of three independent experiments +/- SEM. * indicates p < 0.05; ** p < 0.01; *** p<0.005 when compared to SCR as tested with t-test.

Figure 2 USP12 controls the p53 KEGG pathway. (A) Genes from p53 KEGG pathway that were significantly altered by siUSP12 in RNA sequencing were highlighted with green to red boxes, depending on their log2FC intensities (see scale bar on the top right of the figure). (B) Histogram of differentially expressed p53 KEGG pathway genes from the RNA sequencing. (C) qPCR validation of most well known p53 pathway genes following USP12 silencing. LNCaP and CWR22Rv1 cells were treated with siRNA as indicated for 72h followed by 10nM DHT stimulation for 24h. LNCaP-AI cells were cultured in SDM for 96h. Results were normalised to *HPRT1* gene expression and data is presented as mean of three independent experiments +/- SEM. * indicates p < 0.05 when compared to SCR as tested with t-test.

Figure 3. USP12 controls p53 protein levels by deubiquitinating MDM2. (A) MDM2 was immunoprecipitated with interacting proteins from the LNCaP cells and immunoblotted as indicated. (B) MDM2 and USP12 were overexpressed in COS-7 cells for 72h and MDM2 was immunoprecipitated. (C) LNCaP cells were treated with siRNA for 96h as indicated following by denaturing immunoprecipitation for ubiquitinated MDM2 and immunoblotting. (D) LNCaP cells were treated with siRNA for 96h as indicated followed by immunoblotting. (E) LNCaP cells were treated with siRNA as indicated for 88h followed by 8h MG-132 treatment. (F) LNCaP cells were treated with siRNA for 96h as indicated followed by cellular fractionation and immunoblotting. (G-H) ChIP analysis of p53 recruitment to CDKN1A (G) and CDC20 (H) data is presented as mean of three independent experiments +/- SEM. * indicates p < 0.05 when compared to SCR as tested with ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple comparison.

Figure 4. USP12 controls cell growth in the presence and absence of androgens and in CRPC. (A-B) LNCaP (A) and LNCaP-AI (B) cells were treated with siRNA as indicated for 96h with and without the

addition of Casodex (Cas). Cell growth was measured with live cell imaging every 6h using the Incucyte (left side panel) and by cell counts at 96h (right panel). * indicates $p < 0.05$ as tested with t-test. (C) LNCaP cells were treated with siRNA for 96h as indicated in the presence (black bars) and absence (white bars) of DHT followed by cell counting data is presented as mean of three independent experiments +/- SEM. * indicates $p < 0.05$ as tested with t-test. (D) LNCaP cells were treated with siRNA as indicated for 96h followed by cytoplasmic and chromatin extraction and immunoblotting.

Figure 5. USP12 is increased in PC and its levels correlate with proliferation. (A) USP12 cytoplasm and nuclear levels were assessed using histoscore in a tissue microarray (TMA) consisting of 54 benign samples (BPH), 19 preneoplastic samples (PIN) and 44 PC samples. * indicates $p < 0.05$ as tested with t-test. (B) Linear regression between cytoplasmic and nuclear USP12 levels in 254 patient cores. (C) USP12 protein levels compared between BPH (n=124) and PC patient samples (n=251). *** indicates $p < 0.005$ as tested with t-test. (D) Correlation between USP12 and MCM2 histoscores in PC samples (n=41). (F-G) Linear regression between nuclear (F) and cytoplasmic (G) USP12 and AR levels in 254 prostate cancer tissue samples. (H) Linear regression between USP12 and PSA levels in 192 prostate cancer tissue samples. (I) Linear regression between USP12 and MDM2 levels in 138 prostate cancer tissue samples.

Figure 6. USP12 is a marker of poor prognosis in PC. (A) PC patient overall survival based on USP12 protein levels (n=128). (B) PC relapse free survival based on USP12 protein levels (n=99). (C) PC relapse free survival based on USP12 gene expression (TCGA) (n=38). (D) PC relapse free survival based on USP12 and TP53 gene expression (TCGA) (n=142). *Italicised number of subjects still at risk* (N) indicates patients still remaining in the study and is deducted by both patients who died/relapsed and patients who were censored after withdrawing from the study. (E-F) Patients PSA at relapse based on USP12 cytoplasm (n=13) (E); and nuclear (n=13) (F) levels. (G) PSA levels of TCGA patient cohort were divided based on their USP12 and TP53 levels. (H-I) USP12 histoscore comparison between hormone sensitive and CRPC patients in Newcastle (n=33) (H) and Glasgow (n=61) (I) cohort. Samples were independently assessed for nuclear and cytoplasmic staining on a 0-300 scale and combined cellular histoscore of 0-600 was created. * indicates $p < 0.05$; ** $p < 0.01$ as tested with t-test. (J) Comparison of USP12 transcript levels between cell lines representing different stages of PC. (K) LNCaP cells lentivirally transduced with either LacZ control, C48A enzymatically dead USP12 or WT USP12 were cultured in SDM media for 14 days followed by crystal violet staining and colony formation count data is presented as mean of three independent experiments +/- SEM. *** indicates $p < 0.005$ as tested with ANOVA with Dunnett's multiple comparison.




Supplementary Figure 1. qRT-PCR following 96h siRNA silencing as indicated. LNCaP and CWR22Rv1 cells were treated with siRNA as indicated for 72h followed by 10 nM DHT stimulation for 24h. LNCaP-AI cells were cultured in SDM for 96h. Results were normalised to *HPRT1* gene expression and data is presented as mean of three independent experiments +/- SEM.

Supplementary Figure 2-3. qRT-PCR following 96h siRNA silencing as indicated. Results were normalised to *HPRT1* gene expression and data is presented as mean of three independent experiments +/- SEM.

Supplementary Figure 4. Examples of immunohistopathological staining of prostate tissue.

Supplementary Figure 5. Model of the USP12 activity in PC. USP12 can directly deubiquitinate AR (5), PHLPPs (8) (PHLPP and PHLPL) and MDM2 causing an increase in their protein levels. Active AR bound to testosterone translocates to the nucleus where it stimulates transcription of its target

genes including FKBP5 which stabilises PHLPP AKT phosphatases (9, 50, 51). When AKT is not dephosphorylated it is active and phosphorylates AR leading to its inhibition and ubiquitination by MDM2 and degradation (4, 10). Active pAKT can also phosphorylate MDM2 (12) which leads to its nuclear translocation (11) stimulating its E3 activity towards p53 leading to its proteosomal degradation (3, 11).




C

Pathway	over represented p value	under represented p value	numDEInCat	numInCat	adj p value
p53 signalling pathway	4.50E-07	0.99999	27	67	0.0001
metabolic pathways	6.09E-04	0.99956	189	1043	0.0697
Adherens junctions	1.13E-03	0.99955	23	72	0.0864
Lysosome	3.92E-03	0.99805	30	117	0.2244
Protein export	7.59E-03	0.99815	8	23	0.3476


A

P53 SIGNALING PATHWAY




Data on KEGG graph
Rendered by Pathview

B



C



Gene	Response
14-3-3-σ	NC
APAF1	NC
ATM	0.15
ATR	-0.27
B99	NC
BAI1	-0.13
BAX	0.56
BID	NC
CASP3	NC
CASP8	0.30
CASP9	NC
CDC2	0.18
CDK2	0.26
CDK4/6	NC
CHK1	-0.13
CHK2	0.24
COP1	0.22
CYCLIN B	NC
CYCLIN D	-0.32
CYCLIN E	0.31
CYCLIN G	0.38
CYT C	NC
dNp73	0.18
DR5	0.31
FAS	0.59
GADD45	NC
GD-AIF	NC
IGF-BP3	0.58
KAI	-0.49
MASPIN	0.31
MDM2	0.55
MDMX	-0.44
NOXA	0.18
P14ARF	-0.12
P21	0.21
P48	0.31
P53	0.20
P53AIP	NC
P53R2	0.48
PAG608	0.86
PAI	NC
PERP	0.97
PIDD	0.20
PIGs	-0.32
PIRH2	NC
PTEN	0.19
PUMA	0.49
REPRIMO	NC
SCOTIN	0.19
SESTRINS	NC
SIAH1	NC
TSC2	-0.33
TSP1	0.28
WIP1	0.33
IGF	-1.88
TSAP6	-0.13
USP12	NC

