ERBB4 Drives the Proliferation of BRAF-WT Melanoma Cell Lines

L.M. Lucas[1], R.L. Cullum[1,2], V. Dwivedi[1], J.A. Markham[1], J.N. Woggerman[1,3], C.M. Kelley[1], E.L. Knerr[1,4], L.J. Cook[1,4], H.C. Lucas II[1], D.S. Waits[4], T.M. Ghosh[1], K.M. Halanych[4,5], R.B. Gupta[2,6], and D.J. Riese II[1,7#]

[1]Department of Drug Discovery and Development, Auburn University, Auburn, AL 36849 USA
[2]Department of Chemical Engineering, Auburn University, Auburn, AL 36849 USA
[3]Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, Auburn University, Auburn, AL 36849 USA
[4]Department of Biological Sciences, Auburn University, Auburn, AL 36849 USA
[5]Center for Marine Science, University of North Carolina-Wilmington, Wilmington, NC 28403 USA
[6]Department of Chemical and Life Science Engineering, Virginia Commonwealth University, Richmond, VA 23284
[7]O'Neal Comprehensive Cancer Center, The University of Alabama at Birmingham, Birmingham, AL 35233 USA

[#]Corresponding Author:
David J. Riese II
Department of Drug Discovery and Development
Harrison College of Pharmacy
Auburn University
Walker 3211g
Auburn, AL. 36849
driese@auburn.edu
334-844-8358

Abstract

Metastatic skin cutaneous melanomas remain a significant clinical problem. In particular, those melanomas that do not contain a gain-of-function *BRAF* allele remain challenging to treat because of the paucity of targets for therapeutic intervention. Thus, here we investigate the role of the ERBB4 receptor tyrosine kinase in skin cutaneous melanomas that contain wild-type *BRAF* alleles ("*BRAF* WT melanomas"). We have performed *in silico* analyses of a public repository (The Cancer Genome Atlas - TCGA) of skin cutaneous melanoma gene expression and mutation data (TCGA-SKCM data set). These analyses demonstrate that ERBB4 overexpression strongly correlates with *RAS* gene or *NF1* mutations that stimulate RAS signaling. Thus, these results have led us to hypothesize that elevated ERBB4 signaling promotes PI3K signaling, which cooperates with elevated RAS signaling to drive *BRAF* WT melanomas. We have tested this hypothesis using commercially available *BRAF* WT melanoma cell lines. Overexpression of wild-type ERBB4 stimulates clonogenic proliferation of the MEL-JUSO, MEWO, and IPC-298 BRAF WT melanoma cell lines. Moreover, overexpression of a dominant-negative ERBB4 (K751M) mutant inhibits clonogenic proliferation of the MEL-JUSO and MEWO cell lines. We discuss how these results may impact strategies for treating metastatic *BRAF* WT skin cutaneous melanomas.

Introduction

BRAF inhibitors, MEK inhibitors, and immune checkpoint inhibitors ("checkpoint inhibitors") are transforming the treatment of advanced skin cutaneous melanomas that possess oncogenic *BRAF* mutations ("*BRAF* mutant melanomas"). A recent clinical trial reports 34% five-year survival of patients with advanced *BRAF* mutant skin cutaneous melanomas treated with BRAF and MEK inhibitors [1, 2]. Another clinical trial reports 60% five-year survival of patients with advanced *BRAF* mutant skin cutaneous melanomas treated with a combination of immune checkpoint inhibitors [1, 3]. Finally, combining immune checkpoint inhibitors with BRAF and MEK inhibitors will likely lead to further improvements in survival [4].

Unfortunately, approximately 50% of advanced skin cutaneous melanomas possess wild-type *BRAF* alleles, and contemporary treatments of advanced skin cutaneous melanomas that contain wild-type *BRAF* ("*BRAF* WT melanomas") have yielded less impressive results. In part, these less impressive results are because of a paucity of actionable targets for the (targeted) treatment of these tumors [5]. Moreover, the five-year survival of patients with advanced *BRAF* WT skin cutaneous melanomas treated with immune checkpoint inhibitors is only 48%, less than the 60% experienced by patients with advanced *BRAF* mutant skin cutaneous melanomas in a parallel study [3]. Hence, we have attempted to address this gap in treatment efficacy by evaluating the ERBB4 receptor tyrosine kinase as a candidate target in *BRAF* WT skin cutaneous melanomas. Should ERBB4 prove to be a reasonable target in *BRAF* WT skin cutaneous melanomas, we anticipate that strategies that target ERBB4 signaling could be used in combination with immune checkpoint inhibitors to treat these tumors, analogous to what has been proposed for the treatment of *BRAF* mutant skin cutaneous melanomas.

ERBB4 (HER4) is a member of the ERBB family of receptor tyrosine kinases (RTKs), which includes the epidermal growth factor receptor (EGFR), ERBB2 (HER2/Neu), and ERBB3 (HER3). ERBB4 possesses extracellular ligand-binding domains, a single-pass hydrophobic transmembrane domain, an intracellular tyrosine kinase domain, and intracellular tyrosine residues that function as phosphorylation sites. Ligand binding to EGFR, ERBB3, or ERBB4 stabilizes the receptor extracellular domains in an open conformation competent for symmetrical homodimerization and heterodimerization of the receptor extracellular domains. The dimerization of the extracellular domains enables asymmetrical dimerization of the receptor cytoplasmic domains. Phosphorylation of one receptor monomer on tyrosine residues by the tyrosine kinase domain of the other receptor monomer ("cross-phosphorylation") ensues. This tyrosine phosphorylation creates binding sites for effector proteins and activation of downstream signaling pathways [6].

Elevated signaling by an RTK is a hallmark of many types of cancer. Hence, RTK overexpression, ligand overexpression, and gain-of-function mutations in an RTK gene are all mechanisms for pathologic, elevated RTK signaling [7]. Indeed, EGFR and ERBB2 have been validated as targets for therapeutic intervention in numerous types of tumors; monoclonal antibodies and small molecular tyrosine kinase inhibitors have been approved to treat tumors dependent on these receptors [8-23]. It appears that ERBB3, particularly ERBB3-ERBB2 heterodimers, also drives various human tumors [24, 25].

In contrast, the role that ERBB4 plays in human tumors remains ambiguous. Part of the ambiguity reflects that an ERBB4 homodimer can function as a tumor suppressor, whereas an ERBB4-EGFR or ERBB4-ERBB2 heterodimer can drive tumor cell proliferation or aggressiveness [6]. Hence, in this work we attempt to resolve this ambiguity by testing the hypothesis that ERBB4 is sufficient and necessary for the proliferation of *BRAF* WT skin cutaneous melanoma cell lines.

Results

A. BRAF WT melanomas do not appear to be less aggressive than BRAF V600X melanomas. The Cancer Genome Atlas – Skin Cutaneous Melanoma (TCGA-SKCM) dataset contains outcome, gene expression, and mutation data for hundreds of skin cutaneous melanomas [26]. We analyzed the TCGA-SKCM dataset to look for meaningful differences between the group of skin cutaneous melanoma patients whose tumors possess *BRAF* WT alleles ("*BRAF* WT melanomas") and the group of melanoma patients whose tumors have a gain-of-function *BRAF* V600X allele ("*BRAF* V600X melanomas"). Descriptive data are shown in **Table 1a.**

BRAF WT melanomas account for a slightly greater percentage of cases in the TCGA-SKCM dataset than *BRAF* V600X melanomas, suggesting that treating *BRAF* WT melanomas is a significant clinical challenge. Furthermore, Chi-square analysis indicates that a slightly (P=0.1252) greater percentage of *BRAF* WT melanoma patients had died when the dataset was closed than *BRAF* V600X melanoma patients **(Table 1b)**. Moreover, Chi-square analysis indicates that the AJCC pathologic stage of the *BRAF* WT melanomas was not significantly different (P=0.6842) from the AJCC pathologic stage of the *BRAF* V600X melanomas **(Table 1c)**. Therefore, *BRAF* WT melanomas do not appear to be less aggressive than *BRAF* V600X melanomas. Hence, these *BRAF* WT melanomas pose a significant clinical problem, particularly because there is currently no targeted therapeutic strategy for these tumors.

B. Elevated ERBB4 expression is correlated with RAS or NF1 mutations. Gain-of-function *RAS* gene mutations occur in about 30% of skin cutaneous melanomas, and loss-of-function mutations in *NF1* occur in about 20% of skin cutaneous melanomas. Moreover, gain-of-function *BRAF* mutations, gain-of-function *RAS* gene mutations, and loss-of-function *NF1* mutations are largely mutually exclusive in skin cutaneous melanomas [27].

Receptor tyrosine kinases typically stimulate RAS pathway signaling [28-34]. Hence, we predicted that elevated ERBB4 expression (which is likely to cause elevated ERBB4 signaling) would be inversely correlated with gain-of-function *RAS* gene mutations or loss-of-function *NF1* mutations in *BRAF* WT melanomas of the TCGA-SKCM dataset. *ERBB4* transcription and *NF1*/*RAS* gene expression and mutation data were available for 178 *BRAF* WT melanomas. Surprisingly, Chi-square analysis indicates that elevated ERBB4 expression (22 melanomas – 12% of the total) is positively correlated (P=0.0057) with a gain-of-function *RAS* gene mutation or a loss-of-function *NF1* mutation in these *BRAF* WT melanomas **(Table 2)**. This correlation suggests that elevated ERBB4 signaling does not stimulate RAS pathway signaling; instead, this correlation suggests that ERBB4 signaling stimulates a pathway that cooperates with elevated RAS pathway signaling to drive *BRAF* WT melanomas.

C. Commercially available BRAF WT melanoma cell lines appear to be appropriate for analyses of ERBB4 function. A prior report of ERBB4 function in human skin cutaneous melanomas primarily utilized proprietary human skin cutaneous melanoma cell lines [35]. This may have contributed to the failure of others to extend the findings of this work. Hence, we

have used the Broad Institute Cancer Cell Line Encyclopedia (CCLE) [36] to identify six commercially available *BRAF* WT melanoma cell lines **(Table 3a)**. RNAseq data from the Broad Institute CCLE indicate that these cell lines do not contain gain-of-function mutations in *BRAF* or *PIK3CA*, nor loss-of-function mutations in *PTEN*; however, they do contain mutations in *NRAS*, *HRAS*, or *NF1*. Hence, if the malignant phenotypes of these cell lines are dependent on elevated ERBB4 signaling, this elevated ERBB4 signaling may stimulate PI3K pathway signaling, which would cooperate with elevated RAS pathway signaling to drive the malignant phenotypes. This hypothesis is supported by our observation that the coupling of ligand-induced ERBB4 signaling to IL3-independent proliferation in BaF3 cell lines is dependent on ERBB4 coupling to the PI3K pathway [37].

RNAseq data from the Broad Institute CCLE **(Table 3b)** also indicate that these cell lines exhibit different patterns of *ERBB* gene transcription and ERBB4 ligand gene transcription. Furthermore, there does not appear to be any correlation between these patterns of gene expression and the absence or presence of an *ERBB4* mutation **(Table 3b)**.

D. ERBB4 is sufficient and necessary for clonogenic proliferation of MEL-JUSO, MEWO, and IPC298 human melanoma cell lines. We have previously used clonogenic proliferation assays to measure the effects of ERBB4 signaling on human prostate [38, 39], breast [39, 40], and pancreatic [41] tumor cell lines. Briefly, we infected MEL-JUSO, MEWO, and IPC-298 *BRAF* WT melanoma cells **(Table 3a)** with a recombinant amphotropic retrovirus that expresses wild-type *ERBB4* (LXSN-ERBB4-WT), a recombinant amphotropic retrovirus that expresses the *ERBB4* K751M dominant-negative mutant (LXSN-ERBB4-DN), the vector control amphotropic retrovirus (LXSN), or a mock virus preparation. Because the LXSN recombinant retroviral vector contains a neomycin resistance gene, we selected infected cells using G418. Infection of MEL-JUSO cells with LXSN-ERBB4-WT results in greater clonogenic proliferation than infection with the LXSN control retrovirus. Likewise, infection of MEL-JUSO cells with LXSN-ERBB4-DN results in less clonogenic proliferation than infection with the LXSN control retrovirus **(Figure 1)**. Similar results were observed when infecting MEWO and IPC-298 cells (data not shown).

To control for differences in viral titer and quantify these effects, in parallel we infected C127 mouse fibroblast cells, which do not endogenously express ERBB4 and do not respond to ERBB4 signaling (data not shown and [42]). We calculated the recombinant retroviral titer for each cell line and viral infection combination. To calculate the efficiency of clonogenic proliferation in the infected MEL-JUSO, MEWO, and IPC-298 cells, we divided the recombinant retroviral titer in each of these cell lines by the corresponding recombinant retroviral titer in the C127 cell line. We report the average efficiency of clonogenic proliferation over a minimum of five independent trials. ANOVA was used to determine whether the efficiency of clonogenic proliferation of the *BRAF* WT melanoma cell lines infected with the LXSN-ERBB4-WT or LXSN-ERBB4-DN viruses is significantly different from the efficiency of clonogenic proliferation of these cells infected with the control LXSN virus **(Table 4)**. The efficiency of clonogenic proliferation of MEL-JUSO, MEWO, and IPC-298 cells is significantly greater (approximately 4 to 12-fold greater) following infection with LXSN-ERBB4-WT than following infection with the control LXSN virus. Furthermore, the efficiency of clonogenic proliferation of MEL-JUSO and

MEWO cells is significantly lower (approximately 60 to 70% lower) following infection with LXSN-ERBB4-DN compared to infection with the control LXSN virus.

Thus, ectopic expression of wild-type *ERBB4* stimulates clonogenic proliferation, whereas ectopic expression of the *ERBB4* dominant-negative (K751M) mutant inhibits clonogenic proliferation. These results indicate that ERBB4 is sufficient and necessary for the clonogenic proliferation of at least some *BRAF*-WT melanoma cell lines. Hence, targeting ERBB4 or its signaling effectors may effectively treat *BRAF*-WT melanomas that exhibit elevated ERBB4 signaling due to elevated ERBB4 expression.

Materials and Methods

A. Analysis of the TCGA-SKCM dataset. Clinical and biospecimen data were downloaded for all 470 cases found in the TCGA-SKCM dataset [26]. All analyzed datasets are publicly available through the NIH/NCI Genomic Data Commons (GDC) portal [43]. The R statistical computing and graphics environment software [44] was used to reorganize the dataset. Statistical analyses were performed using GraphPad Prism [45].

B. Cell lines and cell culture. Mouse C127 fibroblasts and the ψ2 and PA317 recombinant retrovirus packaging cell lines are generous gifts of Daniel DiMaio (Yale University). These cells were cultured essentially as described previously [46]. The MEL-JUSO [47] and IPC-298 [48] human melanoma cell lines were obtained from DSMZ [49] (Braunschweig, Germany) and were cultured as recommended. The MeWo [50] human melanoma cell line was obtained from the American Type Culture Collection [51] (ATCC - Manassas, VA) and was cultured as recommended. Cell culture media, serum, and supplements were obtained from Cytiva [52] (Marlborough, VA). G418 was obtained from Corning [53] (Corning, NY). Genetic and mRNA expression data for the cell lines were obtained from the Broad Institute Cancer Cell Line Encyclopedia (CCLE) ß[36].

C. Recombinant retroviruses. Briefly, the recombinant amphotropic retroviruses LXSN, LXSN-ERBB4 (ERBB4 WT), and LXSN-ERBB4 K751M (ERBB4 DN) were packaged using the ψ2 ecotropic retrovirus packaging cell line, and the PA317 amphotropic retrovirus packaging cell line as previously described [38].

D. Clonogenic proliferation assays. C127, MEL-JUSO, MeWo, and IPC-298 cells were infected with 500, 3000, 3000, and 20000 amphotropic retroviral infectious units (respectively), essentially as described earlier. After incubation with the viruses, infected cells were selected using G418 at a concentration of 800 ug/mL. The resulting colonies of G418-resistant cells were stained using Giemsa 8, 13, 14, and 11 days later (respectively), and colonies were counted. C127 infections served as a control for viral titer. Tissue culture plates were digitized, and clonogenic proliferation efficiency was calculated as previously described [38]. The statistical significance of differences in clonogenic proliferation was calculated using ANOVA with a p-value threshold of <0.05 (1-tailed).

E. Immunoprecipitation and immunoblotting. Stably infected MEL-JUSO cells were grown to confluence, then serum-starved for 6 hours. Cells were lysed using an isotonic buffer that contains a nonionic detergent. Their protein content was quantified using a Bradford Assay. Protein concentrators were purchased from Cytiva and used according to the manufacturer's instructions. Samples of concentrated lysate containing equal total protein were then immunoprecipitated using specific antibodies. The immunoprecipitants were resolved by SDS-PAGE on a 7.5% acrylamide gel and electro-transferred to 0.2um PVDF. The blots were probed with the anti-phosphotyrosine mouse antibody and visualized using a goat anti-mouse horseradish peroxidase coupled antibody and enhanced chemiluminescence (ECL). The blots were then stripped and probed with the anti-ERBB4 (111B2) rabbit monoclonal antibody (Cell Signaling) and visualized using a goat anti-rabbit horseradish peroxidase coupled antibody and ECL. ECL was obtained from Cytiva, and secondary antibodies were obtained from Thermo Fisher Scientific.

F. Small molecular inhibitors and proliferation assays. Stably infected MEL-JUSO cells were plated in a 96-well plate (Corning) at $1x10^4$ cells/well. The next day they were treated with a drug and after five days of incubation were subjected to an MTT assay as previously described [54]. The PI3K inhibitor LY294002 was obtained from Tocris Bioscience.

Discussion

A. Elevated ERBB4 signaling appears to drive BRAF WT melanomas. Our data suggest that approximately 12% of *BRAF* WT melanomas exhibit elevated endogenous ERBB4 expression, which presumably results in elevated ERBB4 signaling. Elevated endogenous ERBB4 expression is significantly correlated with *NF1*/*RAS* gene mutations. Consequently, we postulated that elevated ERBB4 signaling cooperates with elevated RAS signaling to drive *BRAF* WT melanomas. We tested this hypothesis by measuring the effects of exogenous expression of *ERBB4* WT or an *ERBB4* DN mutant on the clonogenic proliferation of BRAF-WT melanoma cell lines.

WT *ERBB4* stimulates clonogenic proliferation of MEL-JUSO, MEWO, and IPC-298 *BRAF* WT melanoma cells. In contrast, the *ERBB4* DN (K751M) mutant inhibits clonogenic proliferation of MEL-JUSO, MEWO, and IPC-298 *BRAF* WT melanoma cells. These results indicate that ERBB4 is sufficient and necessary for the clonogenic proliferation of these *BRAF* WT melanoma cell lines.

Future experiments will determine whether ERBB4 signaling has similar effects on the proliferation of HMCB, SK-MEL-2, and COLO 792 *BRAF* WT melanoma cell lines. If ERBB4 signaling does not have similar effects in these cells, we will compare the cells that do not respond to ERBB4 signaling to those that do respond to ERBB4 signaling to identify the determinants of responsiveness to ERBB4 signaling.

Numerous *ERBB4* mutants have been found in melanomas and other human tumor samples [6]. The data presented here suggest that some of these mutants exhibit a gain-of-function phenotype that enables them to serve as tumor drivers. We will test that hypothesis.

B. RAS pathway mutations and elevated ERBB4 signaling suggest strategies for treating BRAF WT melanomas. Our data suggest that elevated ERBB4 signaling causes increased PI3K signaling, which cooperates with elevated RAS signaling to drive the proliferation of *BRAF* WT melanomas (**Figure 2**). Thus, we predict that ERBB4-dependent, *BRAF* WT melanomas will respond to a combination of a PI3K inhibitor with a MEK inhibitor. It is commonly accepted that ERBB4 homodimers function as tumor suppressors, whereas ERBB4-EGFR or ERBB4-ERBB2 heterodimers possess oncogenic activities [6]. Therefore, given the toxicity of PI3K inhibitors [55, 56], combining a MEK inhibitor with an anti-EGFR or anti-ERBB2 agent may be a more effective treatment of ERBB4-dependent, *BRAF* WT melanomas than the combination of a MEK inhibitor with a PI3K inhibitor. We will test these predictions.

Tables

	Cases	% of Total Cases	*BRAF* V600 Mutant Cases	% of *BRAF* V600 Mutant Cases	*BRAF* WT Cases	% of *BRAF* WT Cases
Gender	470		210		227	
Male	290	61.70%	126	60.00%	141	62.11%
Female	180	38.30%	84	40.00%	86	37.89%
Race	470		210		227	
White	447	95.11%	203	96.67%	211	92.95%
Asian	12	2.55%	2	0.95%	10	4.41%
Black or African American	1	0.21%	0	0.00%	1	0.44%
Not Reported	10	2.13%	5	2.38%	5	2.20%
Ethnicity	470		210		227	
Hispanic or Latino	11	2.34%	6	2.86%	4	1.76%
Not Hispanic or Latino	446	94.89%	197	93.81%	217	95.59%
Not Reported	13	2.77%	7	3.33%	6	2.64%
Vital Status	470		210		227	
Alive	249	52.98%	119	56.67%	112	49.34%
Dead	221	47.02%	91	43.33%	115	50.66%
Not Reported	0	0.00%	0	0.00%	0	0.00%
Age at Diagnoses	470		210		227	
<30 (10950 days)	21	4.47%	19	9.05%	2	0.88%
30-49 (10951-17885 days)	106	22.55%	59	28.10%	46	20.26%
50-64 (17886-23360 days)	157	33.40%	80	38.10%	70	30.84%
65+ (>23360 days)	178	37.87%	48	22.86%	106	46.70%
Not Reported	8	1.70%	4	1.90%	3	1.32%
AJCC Pathologic Stage	470		210		227	
0	7	1.49%	2	0.95%	5	2.20%
I	30	6.38%	18	8.57%	12	5.29%
IA	18	3.83%	6	2.86%	10	4.41%
IB	29	6.17%	13	6.19%	14	6.17%
II	30	6.38%	14	6.67%	12	5.29%
IIA	18	3.83%	8	3.81%	8	3.52%
IIB	28	5.96%	5	2.38%	19	8.37%
IIC	64	13.62%	29	13.81%	32	14.10%
III	41	8.72%	22	10.48%	15	6.61%
IIIA	16	3.40%	8	3.81%	6	2.64%
IIIB	46	9.79%	20	9.52%	25	11.01%
IIIC	68	14.47%	25	11.90%	40	17.62%
IV	23	4.89%	12	5.71%	10	4.41%
Not Reported	52	11.06%	28	13.33%	19	8.37%
AJCC Pathologic Stage	390		182		208	
0	7	1.79%	2	1.10%	5	2.40%
I, IA, IB	77	19.74%	37	20.33%	36	17.31%
II, IIA, IIB, IIC	140	35.90%	56	30.77%	71	34.13%
III, IIIA, IIIB, IIIC	171	43.85%	75	41.21%	86	41.35%
IV	23	5.90%	12	6.59%	10	4.81%

Table 1a: Comparison of demographic and clinicopathologic characteristics of *BRAF* V600X and *BRAF* WT melanoma cases in the TCGA-SKCM dataset.

	BRAF V600X	BRAF WT	Total
Alive	119	112	231
Dead	91	115	206
Total	210	227	437

P = 0.1252

Table 1b: Comparison of survival among BRAF V600X and BRAF WT melanoma cases in the TCGA-SKCM dataset.

		BRAF V600X	BRAF WT	Total
AJCC Pathologic Stage at Diagnosis	**0**	2	5	7
	I, IA, IB	37	36	73
	II, IIA, IIB, IIC	56	71	127
	III, IIIA, IIIB, IIIC	75	86	161
	IV	12	10	22
Total		182	208	390

P = 0.6842

Table 1c: Comparison of AJCC pathological stage among BRAF V600X and BRAF WT melanoma cases in the TCGA-SKCM dataset.

	Elevated ERBB4 Expression	Not Elevated ERBB4 Expression	Total
RAS **or** ***NF1*** **Nonsynonymous Mutation**	21	104	125
RAS **and** ***NF1*** **WT**	1	52	53
Total	22	156	178

P = 0.0057

Table 2: Elevated ERBB4 expression is correlated with a gain-of-function RAS gene mutation or a loss-of-function *NF1* mutation in *BRAF* WT melanomas.

Cell Line	*ERBB4* Mutation 1	*ERBB4* Mutation 2	*ERBB4* Mutation 3	*PIK3CA* Mutation	*PTEN* Mutation	*BRAF* Mutation	*NRAS* Mutation	*HRAS* Mutation	*NF1* Mutation 1	*NF1* Mutation 2
IPC-298							Q61L			
MEL-JUSO							Q61L	G13D	L1779P	
MeWo	M766I	R488R	S449F			L255L			Q1336*	R2053R
HMCB									Q535H	
SK-MEL-2	R50C						Q61R			
COLO 792	G730K	G730R	M313I						W1236R	Splice Site

Table 3a Commercially available *BRAF* WT melanoma cell lines do not possess *BRAF*, *PIK3CA*, or *PTEN* mutations, but do possess *NRAS*, *HRAS*, and/or *NF1* mutations.

Cell Line	EGFR mRNA Expression	ErbB2 mRNA Expression	ErbB3 mRNA Expression	ErbB4 mRNA Expression	NRG1 mRNA Expression	NRG2 mRNA Expression	NRG3 mRNA Expression	NRG4 mRNA Expression	HBEGF mRNA Expression	BTC mRNA Expression	EREG mRNA Expression
IPC-298	0.07	3.58	6.18	0.00	0.03	1.36	1.04	0.33	1.76	0.00	0.01
MEL-JUSO	0.97	3.87	5.95	0.12	3.67	2.02	0.10	1.02	6.42	0.26	0.04
MeWo	1.43	4.74	6.59	0.69	1.01	0.28	0.07	0.58	2.05	0.46	0.03
HMCB	0.00	6.12	8.12	0.93	6.00	0.11	0.23	0.58	3.49	0.89	0.45
SK-MEL-2	0.06	3.18	6.74	0.01	0.77	0.73	2.13	0.81	4.49	0.00	0.00
COLO 792	0.15	5.28	6.70	0.01	0.45	1.16	0.68	0.08	2.49	0.07	0.08

Table 3b: Commercially available *BRAF* WT melanoma cell lines exhibit different patterns of *ERBB* receptor gene transcription and ERBB4 ligand gene transcription.

Cell Line	MEL-JUSO		MeWo		IPC-298	
Retrovirus	Efficiency of Clonogenic Proliferation	1 Tailed Paired T-test (P)	Efficiency of Clonogenic Proliferation	1 Tailed Paired T-test (P)	Efficiency of Clonogenic Proliferation	1 Tailed Paired T-test (P)
Vector Control	8.87%		3.26%		0.36%	
ERBB4 WT	35.00%	0.0004	16.43%	0.0064	4.25%	0.0205
ERBB4 K751M (DN)	3.59%	0.0076	0.84%	0.0052	0.19%	0.0645
N	7		5		5	

Table 4: In the MEL-JUSO, MEWO, and IPC-298 cell lines, stable infection with LXSN-ERBB4-WT causes a statistically significant increase in the efficiency of clonogenic proliferation, whereas stable infection with LXSN-ERBB4-DN causes a statistically significant decrease in the efficiency of clonogenic proliferation.

Figures



Figure 1: In the MEL-JUSO cell line, stable infection with LXSN-ERBB4-WT causes increased clonogenic proliferation, whereas stable infection with LXSN-ERBB4-DN causes decreased clonogenic proliferation.



Figure 2: ERBB4 signaling can be stimulated by ERBB4 ligands, ERBB4 overexpression, or ERBB4 mutations. We postulate that elevated signaling by ERBB4-EGFR or ERBB4-ERBB2 heterodimers stimulates signaling by the PI3K pathway, which cooperates with elevated RAS/MAPK pathway signaling to drive the proliferation of *BRAF* WT melanomas.

References

1. Schummer, P., B. Schilling, and A. Gesierich, *Long-Term Outcomes in BRAF-Mutated Melanoma Treated with Combined Targeted Therapy or Immune Checkpoint Blockade: Are We Approaching a True Cure?* Am J Clin Dermatol, 2020. **21**(4): p. 493-504.
2. Robert, C., et al., *Five-Year Outcomes with Dabrafenib plus Trametinib in Metastatic Melanoma.* N Engl J Med, 2019. **381**(7): p. 626-636.
3. Larkin, J., et al., *Five-Year Survival with Combined Nivolumab and Ipilimumab in Advanced Melanoma.* N Engl J Med, 2019. **381**(16): p. 1535-1546.
4. Dummer, R., et al., *Rationale for Immune Checkpoint Inhibitors Plus Targeted Therapy in Metastatic Melanoma: A Review.* JAMA Oncol, 2020. **6**(12): p. 1957-1966.
5. Swetter, S.M., et al., *NCCN Guidelines(R) Insights: Melanoma: Cutaneous, Version 2.2021.* J Natl Compr Canc Netw, 2021. **19**(4): p. 364-376.
6. Lucas, L.M., et al., *The Yin and Yang of ERBB4: Tumor Suppressor and Oncoprotein.* Pharmacol Rev, 2022. **74**(1): p. 18-47.
7. Saraon, P., et al., *Receptor tyrosine kinases and cancer: oncogenic mechanisms and therapeutic approaches.* Oncogene, 2021. **40**(24): p. 4079-4093.
8. Tian, X., et al., *Challenge and countermeasures for EGFR targeted therapy in non-small cell lung cancer.* Biochim Biophys Acta Rev Cancer, 2022. **1877**(1): p. 188645.
9. Reita, D., et al., *Molecular Mechanism of EGFR-TKI Resistance in EGFR-Mutated Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer: Application to Biological Diagnostic and Monitoring.* Cancers (Basel), 2021. **13**(19).
10. Tsubata, Y., R. Tanino, and T. Isobe, *Current Therapeutic Strategies and Prospects for EGFR Mutation-Positive Lung Cancer Based on the Mechanisms Underlying Drug Resistance.* Cells, 2021. **10**(11).
11. Di Noia, V., et al., *Treating disease progression with osimertinib in EGFR-mutated non-small-cell lung cancer: novel targeted agents and combination strategies.* ESMO Open, 2021. **6**(6): p. 100280.
12. Zhou, J., Q. Ji, and Q. Li, *Resistance to anti-EGFR therapies in metastatic colorectal cancer: underlying mechanisms and reversal strategies.* J Exp Clin Cancer Res, 2021. **40**(1): p. 328.
13. Melosky, B., et al., *The dawn of a new era, adjuvant EGFR inhibition in resected non-small cell lung cancer.* Ther Adv Med Oncol, 2021. **13**: p. 17588359211056306.
14. Chen, J., M. Colosimo, and E. Lim, *The management of HER2-positive early breast cancer: Current and future therapies.* Asia Pac J Clin Oncol, 2021. **17 Suppl 6**: p. 3-12.
15. Wu, H.X., K.Q. Zhuo, and K. Wang, *Efficacy of targeted therapy in patients with HER2-positive non-small cell lung cancer: A systematic review and meta-analysis.* Br J Clin Pharmacol, 2022. **88**(5): p. 2019-2034.
16. Salkeni, M.A., et al., *Neu Perspectives, Therapies, and Challenges for Metastatic HER2-Positive Breast Cancer.* Breast Cancer (Dove Med Press), 2021. **13**: p. 539-557.
17. You, Z., et al., *Application of HER2 peptide vaccines in patients with breast cancer: a systematic review and meta-analysis.* Cancer Cell Int, 2021. **21**(1): p. 489.
18. Pupa, S.M., et al., *HER2 Signaling and Breast Cancer Stem Cells: The Bridge behind HER2-Positive Breast Cancer Aggressiveness and Therapy Refractoriness.* Cancers (Basel), 2021. **13**(19).

19. Li, L., et al., *Antibody-drug conjugates in HER2-positive breast cancer.* Chin Med J (Engl), 2021. **135**(3): p. 261-267.
20. Hrynchak, I., et al., *Nanobody-Based Theranostic Agents for HER2-Positive Breast Cancer: Radiolabeling Strategies.* Int J Mol Sci, 2021. **22**(19).
21. Fatima, I., et al., *Quantum Dots: Synthesis, Antibody Conjugation, and HER2-Receptor Targeting for Breast Cancer Therapy.* J Funct Biomater, 2021. **12**(4).
22. Azar, I., et al., *Spotlight on Trastuzumab Deruxtecan (DS-8201,T-DXd) for HER2 Mutation Positive Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer.* Lung Cancer (Auckl), 2021. **12**: p. 103-114.
23. Vathiotis, I.A., et al., *HER2 Aberrations in Non-Small Cell Lung Cancer: From Pathophysiology to Targeted Therapy.* Pharmaceuticals (Basel), 2021. **14**(12).
24. Hafeez, U., et al., *New insights into ErbB3 function and therapeutic targeting in cancer.* Expert Rev Anticancer Ther, 2020. **20**(12): p. 1057-1074.
25. Kiavue, N., et al., *ERBB3 mutations in cancer: biological aspects, prevalence and therapeutics.* Oncogene, 2020. **39**(3): p. 487-502.
26. *NCI GDC Data Portal: TCGA-SKCM Skin Cutaneous Melanoma Data Set*. [Accessed June 15, 2022]; Available from: https://portal.gdc.cancer.gov/projects/TCGA-SKCM.
27. Al Mahi, A. and J. Ablain, *RAS pathway regulation in melanoma.* Dis Model Mech, 2022. **15**(2).
28. Liu, C.Y., et al., *Molecular target therapeutics of EGF-TKI and downstream signaling pathways in non-small cell lung cancers.* J Chin Med Assoc, 2022. **85**(4): p. 409-413.
29. Smith, C.I.E. and J.A. Burger, *Resistance Mutations to BTK Inhibitors Originate From the NF-kappaB but Not From the PI3K-RAS-MAPK Arm of the B Cell Receptor Signaling Pathway.* Front Immunol, 2021. **12**: p. 689472.
30. Huang, X.L., et al., *Role of receptor tyrosine kinases mediated signal transduction pathways in tumor growth and angiogenesis-New insight and futuristic vision.* Int J Biol Macromol, 2021. **180**: p. 739-752.
31. Oliveres, H., D. Pesantez, and J. Maurel, *Lessons to Learn for Adequate Targeted Therapy Development in Metastatic Colorectal Cancer Patients.* Int J Mol Sci, 2021. **22**(9).
32. Santos, E.D.S., et al., *EGFR targeting for cancer therapy: Pharmacology and immunoconjugates with drugs and nanoparticles.* Int J Pharm, 2021. **592**: p. 120082.
33. Zhao, Y., H. Wang, and C. He, *Drug resistance of targeted therapy for advanced non-small cell lung cancer harbored EGFR mutation: from mechanism analysis to clinical strategy.* J Cancer Res Clin Oncol, 2021. **147**(12): p. 3653-3664.
34. Barbosa, R., L.A. Acevedo, and R. Marmorstein, *The MEK/ERK Network as a Therapeutic Target in Human Cancer.* Mol Cancer Res, 2021. **19**(3): p. 361-374.
35. Prickett, T.D., et al., *Analysis of the tyrosine kinome in melanoma reveals recurrent mutations in ERBB4.* Nat Genet, 2009. **41**(10): p. 1127-32.
36. *Broad Institute Cancer Cell Line Encyclopedia*. [Accessed June 15, 2022]; Available from: https://sites.broadinstitute.org/ccle/.
37. Wilson, K.J., et al., *The Q43L mutant of neuregulin 2beta is a pan-ErbB receptor antagonist.* Biochem J, 2012. **443**(1): p. 133-44.
38. Williams, E.E., et al., *A constitutively active ErbB4 mutant inhibits drug-resistant colony formation by the DU-145 and PC-3 human prostate tumor cell lines.* Cancer Lett, 2003. **192**(1): p. 67-74.

39. Gallo, R.M., et al., *Multiple Functional Motifs Are Required for the Tumor Suppressor Activity of a Constitutively-Active ErbB4 Mutant.* J Cancer Res Ther Oncol, 2013. **1**(1): p. 10.
40. Pitfield, S.E., et al., *Phosphorylation of ErbB4 on tyrosine 1056 is critical for ErbB4 coupling to inhibition of colony formation by human mammary cell lines.* Oncol Res, 2006. **16**(4): p. 179-93.
41. Mill, C.P., K.L. Gettinger, and D.J. Riese, 2nd, *Ligand stimulation of ErbB4 and a constitutively-active ErbB4 mutant result in different biological responses in human pancreatic tumor cell lines.* Exp Cell Res, 2011. **317**(4): p. 392-404.
42. Penington, D.J., I. Bryant, and D.J. Riese, 2nd, *Constitutively active ErbB4 and ErbB2 mutants exhibit distinct biological activities.* Cell Growth Differ, 2002. **13**(6): p. 247-56.
43. *NCI Genomic Data Commons (GDC) Portal*. [Accessed June 15, 2022]; Available from: https://portal.gdc.cancer.gov/.
44. *The R Project for Statistical Computing*. [Accessed June 15, 2022]; Available from: https://www.r-project.org.
45. *GraphPad Prism*. [Accessed June 15, 2022]; Available from: https://www.graphpad.com.
46. Riese, D.J., 2nd and D. DiMaio, *An intact PDGF signaling pathway is required for efficient growth transformation of mouse C127 cells by the bovine papillomavirus E5 protein.* Oncogene, 1995. **10**(7): p. 1431-9.
47. *MEL-JUSO - DSMZ # ACC 74*. [Accessed June 15, 2022]; Available from: https://www.dsmz.de/collection/catalogue/details/culture/ACC-74.
48. *IPC-298 - DSMZ # ACC 251*. [Accessed June 15, 2022]; Available from: https://www.dsmz.de/collection/catalogue/details/culture/ACC-251.
49. *DSMZ*. [Accessed June 15, 2022]; Available from: https://www.dsmz.de.
50. *MeWo - ATCC # HTB-65*. [Accessed June 15, 2022]; Available from: https://www.atcc.org/products/htb-65.
51. *American Type Culture Collection*. [Accessed June 15, 2022]; Available from: https://www.atcc.org.
52. *Cytiva*. [Accessed June 15, 2022]; Available from: https://www.cytivalifesciences.com/en/us/shop.
53. *Corning*. [Accessed June 15, 2022]; Available from: https://www.corning.com/worldwide/en/products/life-sciences.html.
54. Cullum, R.L., et al., *Development and application of high-throughput screens for the discovery of compounds that disrupt ErbB4 signaling: Candidate cancer therapeutics.* PLoS One, 2020. **15**(12): p. e0243901.
55. Nunnery, S.E. and I.A. Mayer, *Management of toxicity to isoform alpha-specific PI3K inhibitors.* Ann Oncol, 2019. **30**(Suppl_10): p. x21-x26.
56. Greenwell, I.B., A. Ip, and J.B. Cohen, *PI3K Inhibitors: Understanding Toxicity Mechanisms and Management.* Oncology (Williston Park), 2017. **31**(11): p. 821-8.