M.A. Hayat

Editor

Tumor Dormancy, Quiescence, and Senescence

Aging, Cancer, and Noncancer Pathologies

Volume 2

Springer

Tumor Dormancy, Quiescence,
and Senescence
Volume 2

Tumor Dormancy and Cellular Quiescence
and Senescence
Volume 2

Tumor Dormancy, Quiescence, and Senescence

Aging, Cancer, and Noncancer
Pathologies

Edited by

M.A. Hayat
Distinguished Professor
Department of Biological Sciences
Kean University, Union, NJ, USA

Springer

Editor
M.A. Hayat
Department of Biological Sciences
Kean University
Room 213, Library building
Morris Avenue 1000
Union, NJ 07083, USA

Although touched by technology, surgical pathology always has been, and remains, an art. Surgical pathologists, like all artists, depict in their artwork (surgical pathology reports) their interactions with nature: emotions, observations, and knowledge are all integrated. The resulting artwork is a poor record of complex phenomena.

Richard J. Reed, MD

One Point of View

All small tumors do not always keep growing, especially small breast tumors, testicular tumors, and prostate tumors. Some small tumors may even disappear without a treatment. Indeed, because prostate tumor grows slowly, it is not unusual that a patient may die at an advanced age of some other causes, but prostate tumor is discovered in an autopsy study. In some cases of prostate tumors, the patient should be offered the option of active surveillance followed by PSA test or biopsies. Similarly, every small kidney tumor may not change or may even regress. Another example of cancer or precancer reversal is cervical cancer. Precancerous cervical cells found with Pap test, may revert to normal cells. Tumor shrinkage, regression, dormancy, senescence, reversal, or stabilization is not impossible. Can prosenescence therapy be an efficient alternative strategy to standard therapies for cancer prevention and treatment?

Another known example of cancer regression is found in pediatric neuroblastoma patients. Neuroblastoma shows one of the highest rates of spontaneous regression among malignant tumors. In addition to the well-known spontaneous regression in stage 4S disease, the high incidence of neuroblastoma remnants found during autopsy of newborns suggest that localized lesions may undergo a similar regression (Guin et al. 1969). Later studies also indicate that spontaneous regression is regularly seen in infants with localized neuroblastoma and is not limited to the first year of life (Hero et al. 2008). These and other studies justify the "wait and see" strategy, avoiding chemotherapy and radiotherapy in infants with localized neuroblastoma, unless *MYCN* gene is amplified. Infants with nonamplified *MYCN* and hyper-diploidy can be effectively treated with less intensive therapy. Infants with disseminated disease without *MYCN* have excellent survival with minimal or no treatment. Another example of spontaneous shrinkage and loss of tumors without any treatment is an intradural lipoma (Endoh et al. 1998).

Although cancers grow progressively, various lesions such as cysts and thyroid adenomas show self-limiting growth. Probably, cellular senescence occurs in many organ types following initial mutations. Cellular senescence, the growth arrest seen in normal mammalian cells after a limited number of divisions, is controlled by tumor suppressors, including p53 and p16, and so this phenomenon is believed to be a crucial barrier to tumor development. It is well-established that cell proliferation and transformation induced by oncogene activation are restrained by cellular senescence.

Metastasis is the main cause of death from cancer. Fortunately, metastasis is an inefficient process. Only a few of the many cancer cells detached from the primary tumor succeed in forming secondary tumors. Metastatic inefficiency varies depending on the location within an organ, but the malignancy may continue to grow preferentially in a specific tissue environment. Some of the cancer cells shed from the primary tumor are lost in the circulation due to hemodynamic forces or the immune system, macrophages, and natural killer cells.

Periodic rejection of a drug by FDA, which was previously approved by the FDA, is not uncommon. Most recently, the FDA ruled that Avastin should not be used to treat advanced breast cancer, although it remains on the market to treat other cancers, including colon and lung malignancies. Side-effects of Avastin include high blood pressure, massive bleeding, heart attack, and damage to the stomach and intestines.

Unwanted side effects of some drug excipients (e.g., propylene glycol, menthol) may also pose safety concerns in some patients. Excipients are defined as the constituents of the pharmaceutical formulation used to guarantee stability, and physicochemical, organoleptic and biopharmaceutical properties. Excipients frequently make up the majority of the volume of oral and parenteral drugs. Not all excipients are inert from the biological point of view. Although adverse drug reactions caused by the excipients are a minority of all adverse effects of medicinal products, the lack of awareness of the possible risk from excipients should be a concern for regulatory agencies, physicians, and patients (Ursino et al. 2011). Knowledge of the potential side effects of excipients is important in clinical practice.

It is known that chemotherapy can cause very serious side-effects. One most recent example of such side-effects was reported by Rubsam et al. (2011). Advanced hepatocellular carcinoma (HCC) induced by hepatitis C virus was treated with Sorafenib. It is an oral multikinase inhibitor that interferes with the serine/threonine kinases RAF-1 and B-Raf and the receptor tyrosine kinases of the vascular endothelial growth factor receptors and the platelet-derived growth factor receptor-beta. Although sorafenib is effective in regressing HCC, it shows serious side-effects including increasingly pruritic and painful skin changes (cutaneous eruption).

An example of unnecessary surgery is the removal of all the armpit lymph nodes after a biopsy when a sentinel node shows early stage breast cancer; removal of only the sentinel node may be needed. Limiting the surgery to the sentinel node avoids painful surgery of the armpit lymph nodes, which can have complications such as swelling and infection (such limited surgery is already being practiced at the Memorial Sloan-Kettering Cancer Research Center). Radiation-induced second cerebral tumors constitute a significant risk for persons undergoing radiotherapy for the management of cerebral neoplasms. High-grade gliomas are the most common radiation-induced tumors in children (Pettorini et al. 2008). The actual incidence of this complication is not known, although it is thought to be generally low.

Medical Radiation

Chromosome aberrations induced by ionizing radiation are well-known. Medical radiation-induced tumors are well-documented. For example, several types of tumors (sarcomas, meningiomas) can develop in the CNS after irradiation of the head and neck region (Parent 1990). Tumorigenic mechanisms underlying the radiation therapy of the CNS are discussed by Amirjamshidi and Abbassioun (2000) (see below).

Radiation therapy is commonly used to treat, for example, patients with primary and secondary brain tumors. Unfortunately, ionizing radiation has limited tissue specificity, and tends to damage both neoplastic and normal brain tissues. Radiation-induced brain injury, in fact, is a potential, insidious later cerebral side-effect of radiotherapy. Most commonly it consists of damage in small arteries and capillaries, resulting in secondary processes of ischemia.

After radiation therapy, imaging techniques (CT, MRI, SPECT) can be used to assess treatment response and detect radiation-induced lesions and recurrent tumors. Optical spectroscopy has also been used for detecting radiation damage (Lin et al. 2005). The F_{500} nm spectral peak allows accurate selection of tissues for biopsy in evaluating patients with new, contrast enhancing lesions in the setting of previous irradiation. This peak is highly correlated with a histological pattern of radiation injury. Deep lesions require a stereotactic biopsy to be conclusive. Also, much of the radiation effect is mediated by acute and chronic inflammatory cellular reactions. Biopsy samples supplement pathological differentiation of radiation effect from tumor progression. It should be noted that most of the biopsies show radionecrosis as well as scattered tumor cells.

Women treated with therapeutic chest radiation may develop cancer. This possibility becomes exceedingly serious considering that 50,000–55,000 women in the United States have been treated with moderate to high-dose chest radiation (~20 Gy). This possibility is much more serious for pediatric or young adult cancer patients, because these women are at a significantly increased risk of breast cancer and breast cancer mortality following cure of their primary malignancy (Martens et al. 2008). A recent study also indicates that such young women develop breast cancer at a young age, which does not appear to plateau (Henderson et al. 2010). In this high-risk population, ironically there is a benefit associated with early detection. In other words, young women with early stage breast cancer following chest radiation have a high likelihood for favorable outcome, although life-long surveillance is needed.

Presently, although approximately 80 % of the children with cancer are cured, the curative therapy could damage a child's developing organ system; for example, cognitive deficits following cranial radiotherapy are well known. Childhood survivors of malignant diseases are also at an increased risk of primary thyroid cancer (Sigurdson et al. 2005). The risk of this cancer increases with radiation doses up to 20–29 Gy. In fact, exposure to radiation therapy is the most important risk factor for the development of a new CNS tumor in survivors of childhood cancer, including leukemia and brain tumors. The higher risk of subsequent glioma in children subjected to medical

radiation at a very young age reflects greater susceptibility of the developing brain to radiation. The details of the dose-response relationships, the expression of excess risk over time, and the modifying effects of other host and treatment factors have not been well defined (Neglia et al. 2006).

A recent study indicates that childhood brain tumor survivors are at an increased risk of late endocrine effects, particularly the patients treated with cranial radiation and diagnosed at a younger age (Shalitin et al. 2011). Among children with cancer, the application of radiotherapy, therefore, should not be taken lightly, and it should be administered only when absolutely necessary to successfully treat the primary tumor. When radiotherapy is administered, use of the minimum effective dose tends to minimize the risk of second CNS neoplasms (late effect). Prolonged follow-up of childhood cancer survivors (particularly those treated with radiation) is necessary because of the long period between treatment and the development of malignancy. This practice should be a part of the effective therapy of the primary disease.

It is well established that radiation doses are related to risk for subsequent malignant neoplasms in children with Hodgkin's disease. It has been reported that increasing radiation dose was associated with increasing standardized incidence ratio (p=0.0085) in survivors of childhood Hodgkin's disease (Constine et al. 2008). Approximately, 75 % of subsequent malignancies occurred within the radiation field. Although subsequent malignancies occur, for example, in breast cancer survivors in the absence of radiotherapy, the rise increases with radiation dose.

The pertinent question is: Is it always necessary to practice tumor surgery, radiotherapy, chemotherapy or hormonal therapy or a combination of these therapies? Although the conventional belief is that cancer represents an "arrow that advances unidirectionally", it is becoming clear that for cancer to progress, it requires cooperative microenvironment (niche), including immune system and hormone levels. However, it is emphasized that advanced (malignant) cancers do not show regression, and require therapy. In the light of the inadequacy of standard treatments of malignancy, clinical applications of the stem cell technology need to be expedited.

Prostate Cancer

There were an estimated 217,730 new cases of prostate cancer in the United States in 2010 with 32,050 deaths, making it the second leading cause of cancer deaths in men. Currently, there are more than 2,000,000 men in the United States who have had radical or partial prostate surgery performed. Considering this huge number of prostate surgeries and the absence of a cumulative outcome data, it seems appropriate to carefully examine the benefits of radical surgery, especially in younger men.

Clinical prostate cancer is very rare in men of the ages younger than 40 years. In this age group the frequency of prostate malignancy is 1 in 10,000 individuals. Unfortunately, the incidence of malignancy increases over the ensuing decades, that is, the chance of prostate malignancy may reach to one in seven in men between the ages of 60 and 79 years. Reactive

or aging-related alterations in the tumor microenvironment provide sufficient influence, promoting tumor cell invasion and metastasis. It has been shown that nontumorigenic prostate epithelial cells can become tumorigenic when cocultured with fibroblasts obtained from regions near tumors (Olumi et al. 1999).

Prostate cancer treatment is one of the worst examples of overtreatment. Serum prostate specific antigen (PSA) testing for the early detection of prostate cancer is in wide use. However, the benefit of this testing has become controversial. The normal cut-off for serum levels of PSA is 4 ng/ml, so a man presenting with a PSA above this level is likely to require a rectal biopsy, but only 25 % of men with serum levels of PSA between 4 ng and 10 ng/ml have cancer (Masters 2007). The PSA threshold currently being used for biopsy ranges between 2.5 and 3.4 ng/ml. Up to 50 % of men presenting with prostate cancer have PSA levels within the normal range. It is apparent that screening of prostate cancer using PSA has a low specificity, resulting in many unnecessary biopsies, particularly for gray zone values (4 ng–10 ng/ml). According to one point of view, the risks of prostate cancer overdetection are substantial. In this context, overdetection means treating a cancer that otherwise would not progress to clinically significant disease during the lifetime of the individual. Overdetection results in overtreatment. The advantages and limitations of PSA test in diagnosing prostate cancer were reviewed by Hayat (2005, 2008).

Androgen deprivation therapy (ADT) is an important treatment for patients with advanced stage prostate cancer. This therapy is carried out by blocking androgen receptor or medical or surgical castration. Although ADT is initially very effective, treated tumors inevitably progress to androgen-independent prostate cancer (AIPC), which is incurable. One possible mechanism responsible for the development of AIPC is modulation of the tissue microenvironment by neuroendocrine-like cancer cells, which emerge after ADT (Nelson et al. 2007).

Recently, Pernicova et al. (2011) have further clarified the role of androgen deprivation in promoting the clonal expansion of androgen-independent prostate cancer. They reported a novel linkage between the inhibition of the androgen receptor activity, down-regulation of S-phase kinase-associated protein 2, and the formation of secretory, senescent cells in prostate tumor cells. It is known that several components of the SASP secretome, such as IL-6, IL-8, KGH, and epidermal growth factor, are capable of transactivating androgen receptor under androgen-depleted conditions (Seaton et al. 2008). It needs to be pointed out that androgen deprivation therapy, used in high-risk patients with prostate cancer, may cause reduced libido, erectile dysfunction, fatigue, and muscle loss; osteoporosis is also a late complication. Therefore, periodic bone density scanning needs to be considered.

Recently, the FDA cleared the use of NADiA (nucleic acid detection immunoassay) ProsVue prognostic cancer test. This proprietary nucleic acid detection immunoassay technology identifies extremely low concentrations of proteins that have not been routinely used as a diagnostic or prognostic aid. It is an in vitro diagnostic assay for determining the rate of change of serum total PSA over a period of time. The assay can quantitate PSA at levels <1 ng/ml.

This technique can be used as a prognostic marker, in conjunction with clinical evaluation, to help identify patients at reduced risk for recurrence of prostate cancer for years following prostatectomy. It targets the early detection of proteins associated with cancer and infectious diseases. This technique combines immunoassay and real-time PCR methodologies with the potential to detect proteins with femtogram/ml sensitivity (10–15 g/ml). Additional clinical information is needed regarding its usefulness in predicting the recurrence.

A significant decrease in the risk of prostate cancer-specific mortality is observed in men with few or no comorbidities. Indeed, active surveillance in lieu of immediate treatment (surgery or radiation, or both) is gaining acceptance. Most men with prostate cancer, even those with high-risk disease, ultimately die as a result of other causes (Lu-Yao et al. 2009). Debate on this controversy is welcome, but narrow opinions and facile guidelines will not lead to facts and new information; men worldwide deserve it (Carroll et al. 2011). Automatic linking positive diagnosis with treatment, unfortunately, is a common clinical practice. Unfortunately, even men who are excellent candidates for active surveillance in the United States often undergo some treatment. Deferment of treatment is advised in men with low-risk disease, especially of a younger age.

Active surveillance is proposed for patients with low-risk prostate cancer in order to reduce the undesirable effects of overdiagnosis. Prostate specific antigen serum level lower than 10 ng/L and Gleason score lower than 7 are the main criteria to select patients for active surveillance. The correct use of these two criteria is essential to differentiate between aggressive and non-aggressive prostate cancer. Autopsy studies indicate that approximately one out of three men older than 50 years show histological evidence of prostate cancer (Klotz 2008). Thus, a large proportion of prostate cancers are latent, never destined to progress, or affect the life of the patient. It is estimated that the percentage of low-risk prostate cancer is between 50 and 60 % of newly diagnosed cases. A large number of patients die having prostate cancer, but not because of this cancer (Filella et al. 2011).

First whole genome sequences of prostate tumors were recently published online in *Nature* journal (vol. 470: 214–220, 2011). This study revealed that rather than single spelling errors, the tumor has long "paragraphs" of DNA that seem to have broken off and moved to another part of the genome (rearrangement of genes), where they are most active. These portions of DNA contain genes that help drive cancer progression. The mutated genes involved include *PTEN*, *CADM2*, *MAG12*, *SPOP*, and *SPTA1*. This information may lead to the development of more efficient, less invasive ways to diagnose and treat this cancer. Such information, in addition, should lead to personalized therapeutics according to sequencing results of different gene mutations or chromosomal rearrangements. The urgent need of such studies becomes apparent considering the huge number of new cases of prostate problems reported every year.

In contrast to prostate cancer, cardiovascular disorders take the heavier toll of life. In other words, the risk of death for men in the United States between the ages of 55 and 74 years due to cardiovascular disease surpasses that of

prostate cancer. Cardiovascular disease is the most common of the chronic non-communicable diseases that impact global mortality. Approximately, 30 % of all deaths worldwide and 10 % of all healthy life lost to disease are accounted for by cardiovascular disease alone.

In conclusion, initial treatment with standard surgery, irradiation, chemotherapy, or hormonal therapy, or combination of these protocols can result in both local and systemic sequelae. Therefore, surveillance for late recurrence and secondary primary malignancies is recommended for most cancer patients. Patients with breast, lung, prostate, colorectal, and head and neck cancers constitute the largest groups requiring long-term monitoring and follow-up care.

Eric Hayat

References

Amirjamshidi A, Abbassioun K (2000) Radiation-induced tumors of the central nervous system occurring in childhood and adolescence. Child's Nerv Syst 16:390–397

Carroll PR, Whitson JH, Cooperberg MR (2011) Serum prostate-specific antigen for the early detection of prostate cancer; always, never, or only sometimes? J Clin Oncol 29:345–346

Constine LS, Tarbell N, Hudson MM et al (2008) Subsequent malignancies in children treated for Hodgkin's disease; associations with gender and radiation dose. Int J Rad Oncol Biol Physol 72:24–33

Endoh M, Iwasaki Y, Koyanagi I, Hida K, Abe H (1998) Spontaneous shrinkage of lumbosacral lipoma in conjunction with a general decrease in body fat: case report. Neurosurgery 43(1):150–151, discussion 151–152

Filella X, Alcover J, Molina R (2011) Active surveillance in prostate cancer: the need to standardize. Tumor Biol 32:839–843

Guin P, Gilbert E, Jones B (1969) Incidental neuroblastoma in infants. Am J Clin Pathol 51:126–136

Hayat MA (2005) Prostate carcinoma: an introduction. In: Immunohistochemistry and in situ hybridization of human carcinomas, vol 2. Elsevier, San Francisco, pp 279–297

Hayat MA (2008) Prostate carcinoma. In: Methods of cancer diagnosis, therapy, and prognosis, vol 2. Springer, New York, pp 391–396

Henderson TO, Amsterdam A et al (2010) Surveillance for breast cancer in women treated with chest radiation for a childhood, adolescent or young adult cancer: a report from Children's Oncology Group. Ann Intern Med 152:1–22

Hero S, Simon T, Spitz R, Ernestus K, Gnekow A, Scheel-Walter H, Schwabe D, Schilling F, Benz-Bohm G, Berthold F (2008) Localized infant neuroblastomas often show spontaneous regression: results of the prospective trials NB95-S and NB 97. J Clin Oncol 26:1504–1510

Klotz L (2008) Low-risk prostate cancer can and should often be managed with active surveillance and selective delayed intervention. Nat Clin Pract Urol 5:2–3

Lin W-C, Mahadevan-Jansen A, Johnson MD, Weil R, Toms SA (2005) In vivo optical spectroscopy detects radiation damage in brain tissue. Neurosurgery 57:518–525

Lu-Yao GL, Albertsen PC, Moore DF et al (2009) Outcomes of localized prostate cancer following conservative management. JAMA 302:1202–1209

Masters JR (2007) Clinical applications of expression profiling and proteomics in prostate cancer. Anticancer Res 27:1273–1276

Mertens AC, Liu Q, Neglia JP et al (2008) Cause-specific late mortality among 5-year survivors of childhood cancer: the Childhood Cancer Survivor Study. J Natl Cancer Inst 100:1368–1379

Neglia JP, Robison LL, Stovall M, Liu Y, Packer RJ et al (2006) New primary neoplasms of the central nervous system in survivors of childhood cancer: a report from the childhood cancer survivor study. J Natl Cancer Inst 98:1528–1537

Nelson EC, Cambio AJ, Ok JH, Lara PN Jr, Evans CP (2007) Clinical implications of nueroendocrine differentiation in prostate cancer. Prostate Cancer Prostatic Dis 10:6–14

Olumi AF, Grossfeld GD, Hayward SW, Carroll PR, Tlsty TD, Cunha GR (1999) Carcinoma-associated fibroblasts direct tumor progression of initiated human prostatic epithelium. Cancer Res 59:5002–5011

Parent AD (1990) Late complications of radiation-induced neoplasms. Neurosurgery 26:1090–1091

Pernicova Z, Slabakova E, Kharaishvill G, Bouchal J, Kral M, Kunicka Z, Machalam M, Kozubik A, Soucek K (2011) Androgen depletion induces senescence in prostate cancer cells through down-regulation of SKp2. Neoplasia 13:526–536

Pettorini BL, Park Y-S, Caldarelli M, Massimi L, Tamburrini G, DiRocco C (2008) Radiation induced brain tumors after central nervous system irradiation in childhood: a review. Child's Nervous Syst 24:793–805

Rubsam K, Flaig MJ, Ruzicka T, Prinz JC (2011) Erythema marginatum hemorrhagicum: a unique cutaneous side effect of sorafenib. J Am Acad Dermatol 64:1194–1196

Seaton A, Scullin P, Maxwell PJ, Wilson C, Pettigrew J, Gallagher R, O'Sullivan JM, Johnston PG, Waugh DJ (2008) Interleukin-8 signaling promotes androgen-independent proliferation of prostate cancer cells via induction of androgen receptor expression and activation. Carcinogenesis 6:1148–1156

Shalitin S, Gal M, Goshen Y, Cohen I, Yaniv I, Philip M (2011) Endocrine outcome in long-term survivors of childhood brain tumors. Horm Res Paediatr 76:113–122

Sigurdson AJ, Ronckers CM, Mertens AC et al (2005) Primary thyroid cancer after a first tumor in childhood (the childhood cancer survivor study): a nested case–control study. Lancet 365:2014–2023

Ursino MG, Poluzzi E, Caramella C, DePonti F (2011) Excipients in medicinal products used in gastroenterology as a possible cause of side effects. Regul Toxicol 60:93–105

Preface

Little is known regarding the factors that regulate entry of residual cancer into a dormant state or the subsequent reinitation of growth. The prognostic factors present in the primary tumor are imprecise in predicting which patients will be cured by local treatment and which patients will have metastatic recurrence.

Although much progress has been made in identifying many of the genetic factors that contribute to cancer development, much remains to be learned about genetic and epigenetic factors that influence both tumor dormancy and the growth of metastasis. A majority of us have in situ tumors that may remain dormant or may progress into a lethal form of cancer; the former are prevented from recruiting their own blood supply.

This is volume 2 of the multivolume series discussing Tumor Dormancy, Quiescence, and Cellular Senescence. The role of tumor dormancy in a number of diseases, including breast cancer, melanoma, prostate cancer, liver cancer, and lung cancer is discussed. It is also pointed out that quiescent state regulates hematopoietic stem cells and muscle stem cells. The mediation of reversible quiescent state in a subset of ovarian, pancreatic, and colon cancers by the kinase is detailed. Molecular mechanisms underlying stress-induced cellular senescence and accumulation of reactive oxygen species and induction of premature senescence are presented. The importance of the role of microRNASE in oxidative stress-induced apoptosis and senescence and the effect of microRNA as a modulator of cell proliferation in lung cancer are detailed. Suppression of cellular senescence in glioblastoma brain tumor is also explained.

By bringing together a large number of experts (oncologists, neurosurgeons, physicians, research scientists, and pathologists) in various aspects of this medical field, it is my hope that substantial progress will be made against a terrible human disease and injury. It is difficult for a single author to discuss effectively the complexity of diagnosis, therapy, including tissue regeneration. Another advantage of involving more than one author is to present different points of view on a specific controversial aspect of cancer cure and tissue regeneration. I hope these goals will be fulfilled in this and other volumes of the series. This volume was written by 70 contributors representing 11 countries. I am grateful to them for their promptness in accepting my suggestions. Their practical experience highlights their writings, which should build and further the endeavors of the readers in these important areas of disease and injury. I respect and appreciate the hard work and exceptional insight into the role of

dormancy, quiescence, and cellular senescence in various diseases and stem cell functions provided by these contributors. The contents of the volume are divided into three parts: Dormancy, Quiescence, and Cellular Senescence for the convenience of the readers.

It is my hope that subsequent volumes of the series will join this volume in assisting in the more complete understanding of the major human diseases and their treatments. There exists a tremendous, urgent demand by the public and the scientific community to address to cancer diagnosis, treatment, cure and hopefully prevention. In the light of existing cancer calamity, government funding must give priority to eradicating deadly malignancies over military superiority.

I am thankful to Dr. Dawood Farahi and Mr. Phil Connelly for recognizing the importance of medical research and publishing through an institution of higher education.

Union, NJ, USA   M.A. Hayat
July, 2013

Contents

Contents of Volume 1

Contributors

Hussein A. Abbas Children's Cancer Center of Lebanon, American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon

Myriam Alcalay Department of Experimental Oncology, Istituto Europeo di Oncologia, Milan, Italy

Dalit Barkan Department of Biology, Faculty of Sciences, Haifa University, Haifa, Israel

Stefanie M. Bode-Böger Institute of Clinical Pharmacology, University Hospital, Otto-von-Guericke University, Magdeburg, Germany

Giovanni Camussi Molecular Biotechnology Center, Department of Medical Sciences, University of Turin, Turin, Italy

Vincenzo Cantaluppi Molecular Biotechnology Center, Department of Internal Medicine, University of Turin, Turin, Italy

Li Chen Department of Molecular and Cellular Oncology, MD Anderson Cancer Center, University of Texas, Houston, TX, USA

Jun Chen Department of Medicine, Renal Research Institute, New York Medical College, Valhalla, NY, USA

Marcel Deckert C3M, Team Microenvironment, Signaling and Cancer, INSERM, Nice, France

Maria Chiara Deregibus Molecular Biotechnology Center, Department of Medical Sciences, University of Turin, Turin, Italy

Lara H. El Touny Laboratory of Cancer Biology and Genetics, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, MD, USA

Gerardo Ferbeyre Departmente de Biochimie, Universite de Montreal, Montreal, QC, Canada

Federico Figliolini Molecular Biotechnology Center, Department of Medical Sciences, University of Turin, Turin, Italy

Umberto Galderisi Department of Experimental Medicine, Section of Biotechnology and Molecular Biology, Second University of Naples, Naples, Italy

Yuan Gao Department of Molecular and Cellular Oncology, MD Anderson Cancer Center, University of Texas, Houston, TX, USA

Michael S. Goligorsky Department of Medicine, Pharmaclogy and Physiology, Renal Research Institute, New York Medical College, Valhalla, NY, USA

Jeffrey E. Green Laboratory of Cancer Biology and Genetics, National Cancer Institute, Bethesda, MD, USA

Toshiaki Inoue Division of Human Genome Science, Department of Molecular and Cellular Biology, School of Life Sciences, Faculty of Medicine, Tottori University, Yonago, Japan

Lijun Jia Cancer Institute, Fudan University Shanghai Cancer Center, Shanghai, China

Hirotada Kojima Department of Immunology, Graduate School of Medicine, Osaka City University, Osaka, Japan

Ana Krtolica Life Sciences Division, Lawrence Berkeley National Laboratory, Berkeley, CA, USA

Hiroyuki Kunimoto Department of Immunology, Graduate School of Medicine, Osaka City University, Osaka, Japan

Kung-Kai Kuo Division of Hepatobiliopancreatic Surgery, Department of Surgery, Kaohsiung Medical University Hospital, Kaohsiung, Taiwan

Athanassios Kyrgidis Department of Oral Maxillofacial Surgery, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, Thessaloniki, Greece

Jen-Marc Lemaitre Laboratory of Plasticity of the Genome and Aging, Institute of Functional Genomics, Montpellier Cedex 05, France

Guo Dong Li Research Center on Aging, Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Peking University Health Science Center, Beijing, People's Republic of China

Silvia Licciulli Kissil Lab, Department of Cancer Biology, The Scripps Research Institute, Jupiter, FL, USA

Hui-Kuan Lin Department of Molecular and Cellular Oncology, MD Anderson Cancer Center, The University of Texas, Houston, TX, USA

Graduate Institute of Basic Medical Science, China Medical University, Taichung, Taiwan

Department of Biotechnology, Asia University, Taichung, Taiwan

Shu Lin Department of Cellular and Structural Biology, University of Texas Health Science Center, San Antonio, TX, USA

Pengda Liu Department of Pathology, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

Li Wei Ma Research Center on Aging, Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Peking University Health Science Center, Beijing, People's Republic of China

Julien Maizel Department of Medicine, Renal Research Institute, New York Medical College, Valhalla, NY, USA

Ollivier Milhavet Laboratory of Plasticity of the Genome and Aging, Institute of Functional Genomics, Montpellier Cedex 05, France

Olga Moiseeva Departmente de Biochimie, Universite de Montreal, Montreal, QC, Canada

Koichi Nakajima Department of Immunology, Graduate School of Medicine, Osaka City University, Osaka, Japan

Yongfu Pan Cancer Institute, Fudan University Shanghai Cancer Center, Shanghai, China

Gianfranco Peluso Institute of Biochemistry of Proteins and Enzymology, C.N.R., Naples, Italy

Uma Rajarajacholan Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology and Oncology, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada

Vered Raz Department of Human Genetics, Leiden University Medical Center, Leiden, The Netherlands

Karl Riabowol Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology and Oncology, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada

Christiaan H. Righolt Department of Imaging Science and Technology, TU Delft, Delft, The Netherlands

Manitoba Institute of Cell Biology, University of Manitoba, Winnipeg, Canada

Neil P. Rodrigues National Institutes of Health, Center for Biomedical research Excellence in Stem Cell Biology, Roger Williams Medical Center, Boston University of Medicine, Providence, RI, USA

Department of Dermatology, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, MA, USA

Center for Regenerative Medicine, Boston University School of Medicine, Boston, MA, USA

Raya Saab Children's Cancer Center of Lebanon, American University of Beirut, Beirut, Lebanon

Fotunato Scalera Institute of Clinical Pharmacology, University Hospital, Otto-von-Guericke University, Magdeburg, Germany

Shavali Shaik Department of Pathology, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

Sambad Sharma Cancer Institute, University of Mississippi Medical Center, Jackson, MS, USA

Naoko Shimada Department of Biology, The City College of New York, New York, NY, USA

Lu-Zhe Sun Department of Cellular and Structural Biology, University of Texas Health Science Center, San Antonio, TX, USA

Yi Sun Division of Radiation and Cancer Biology, Department of Radiation Oncology, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MN, USA

Sophie Tartare-Deckert C3M, Team Microenvironment, Signaling and Cancer, INSERM, Nice, France

Alex J. Tipping University College London (UCL) Cancer Institute, London, UK

Tan Jun Tong Research Center on Aging, Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology, Peking University Health Science Center, Beijing, People's Republic of China

Uyen M. Tran Department of Biochemistry and Molecular Biology and Oncology, University of Calgary, Calgary, AB, Canada

Dimitrios N. Vatakis Division of Hematology-Oncology, Department of Medicine, David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA, Los Angeles, CA, USA

Mark E. Venable Biology Department, Appalachian State University, Boone, NC, USA

Guocan Wang Department of Genomic Medicine, MD Anderson Cancer Center, University of Texas, Houston, TX, USA

Xusheng Wang Life Science Division, Tsinghua University Graduate School at Shenzhun, Shenzhen, China

Ying-Jan Wang Department of Molecular and Cellular Oncology, MD Anderson Cancer Center, The University of Texas, Houston, TX, USA

Department of Environmental and Occupational Health, National Cheng Kung University, Medical College, Tainan, Taiwan

Zhiwei Wang Department of Pathology, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

Kounosuke Watabe Cancer Institute, University of Mississippi Medical Center, Jackson, MS, USA

Wenyi Wei Department of Pathology, Beth Israel Deaconess Medical Center, Harvard Medical School, Boston, MA, USA

Stefan Werner Center of Experimental Medicine, Department of Tumor Biology, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany

Harriet Wikman Center of Experimental Medicine, Department of Tumor Biology, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany

Michaela Wrage Center of Experimental Medicine, Department of Tumor Biology, University Medical Center Hamburg-Eppendorf, Hamburg, Germany

Yaojiong Wu Life Science Division, Tsinghua University Graduate School at Shenzhun, Shenzhen, China

Fei Xing Cancer Institute, University of Mississippi Medical Center, Jackson, MS, USA

Kazunari K. Yokoyama Graduate Institute of Medicine, Kaohsiung Medical University, Kaohsiung, Taiwan

Jerome A. Zack Division of Hematology-Oncology, David Geffen School of Medicine at UCLA, Los Angeles, CA, USA

UCLA, AIDS Institute, Los Angeles, CA, USA

Samira Ziaei Department of Biology, The City College of New York, New York, NY, USA

Part I

Molecular Mechanisms

Asymmetric Dimethylarginine Accelerates Cellular Senescence

Fotunato Scalera and Stefanie M. Bode-Böger

Contents

F. Scalera (✉) • S.M. Bode-Böger
Institute of Clinical Pharmacology, University
Hospital, Otto-von-Guericke University, Magdeburg,
Germany
e-mail: fortunato.scalera@med.ovgu.de;
stefanie.bode-boeger@med.ovgu.de

Abstract

Cellular senescence, a physiological state of irreversible growth arrest, might contribute to cardiovascular diseases in the elderly. Cellular senescence can be modulated by several different endogenous and exogenous factors that contribute to delay or accelerate the process of senescence. Nitric oxide (NO), formed from L-arginine by nitric oxide synthase (NOS), has antiatherogenic properties and is one of endogenous factors leading to delayed cellular senescence. Intracellular factors that decrease NO synthesis may therefore represent important targets in the accelerated cellular senescence and consequently in the development of cardiovascular diseases. Long-term treatment of human endothelial cells with asymmetric dimethylarginine (ADMA), an endogenous competitive inhibitor of NOS and regarded as a novel cardiovascular risk factor, accelerates the process of cellular senescence by inhibiting NO synthesis. Additionally, ADMA accelerates the shortening of telomere length in a dose-dependent manner and inhibits the telomerase activity. Our results suggest a new mechanism through which elevated ADMA levels observed in the elderly might accelerate endothelial senescence and consequently might promote atherogenesis.