Title

Cytoplasmic Expression of LMP1 and its Nuclear Translocation in Nasopharyngeal Carcinoma

Correlates with Epithelial-mesenchymal Transition

Running Head

Aberrant localization of LMP1 in NPC

Authors list

Weiren Luo¹

Affiliations list

1 Cancer Research Institute, The Second Affiliated Hospital of Southern University of Science and Technology, Shenzhen Third People's Hospital, National Clinical Research Center for Infectious Diseases, Shenzhen, China.

Contact details of corresponding author

* The Second Affiliated Hospital of Southern University of Science and Technology,
Shenzhen Third People's Hospital, Shenzhen, China. Tel: +86-755-61222333, Fax:
+86-755-61222333 Email: luoweiren@hotmail.com

NOTE: This preprint reports new research that has not been certified by peer review and should not be used to guide clinical practice.

Abstract

Up to now, the prognostic significance of latent membrane protein 1 (LMP1) in nasopharyngeal carcinoma (NPC) tissues still remains controversial. This study aims to investigate aberrant localization of LMP1 and its relationship with epithelial-mesenchymal transition (EMT) in NPC samples by immunohistochemistry and immunofluorescence. Both cytoplasmic and nuclear LMP1 expressions were observed in NPC tissues. In some tissues, nuclear LMP1 was frequently observed at tumor invasive front and tumor buddings. Nuclear LMP1 expression was significantly associated with lymph node metastasis (P=0.031), local recurrence (P=0.002), lymphatic invasion (P=0.004) and tumor budding (P=0.001). Furthermore, nuclear LMP1 showed significant correlations with EMT markers including E-cadherin (P=0.037), Vimentin (P < 0.001), N-cadherin (P=0.003), Snail (P=0.003) and Twist (P=0.002), but not significantly linked with Fibronectin (P=0.103) and Slug (P=0.503). According to cytoplasmic LMP1, it correlated strongly with lymphatic invasion (P=0.044), vascular invasion (P=0.003) and EMT proteins including E-cadherin (P=0.014), Vimentin (P=0.006), N-cadherin (P=0.003), Snail (P=0.008) and Slug (P=0.007), whereas not significantly associated with Fibronectin (P=0.221) and Twist (P=0.106). However, multivariate analysis showed that nuclear LMP1 (P=0.844) and cytoplasmic LMP1 (P=0.291) were not independent predictors for NPC. In conclusion, we demonstrate firstly that abnormal localization of LMP1 correlates with EMT properties and aggressiveness in NPC, respectively.

Keywords LMP1, Nasopharyngeal carcinoma, EMT, Nuclear translocation

Introduction

Nasopharyngeal carcinoma (NPC) is the most common type of the head and neck cancers in southern China and is strongly associated with Epstein-Barr virus (EBV) infection (Wong KCW et al. 2021; Luo et al. 2013). Latent membrane protein 1 (LMP1), is the major EBV-encoded protein essential for EBV-induced B cell transformation and immune surveillance (Yoshizaki et al. 2013). In vitro, LMP1 could promote cell invasion, and metastasis of NPC, indicating that interfering LMP1 pathways could be a promising anti-therapy strategy (Dawson et al. 2012). However, the prognostic significance of LMP1 in NPC tissues remains controversial. Several reports have showed that LMP-1 expression contributed to poor prognosis of patients (Hariwiyanto et al. 2010: Sarac et al. 2001: Taheri-Kadkhoda et al. 2009). In contrast, other studies showed the opposite conclusions (Plaza et al. 2003; Li et al. 2009; Chen et al. 2006). Generally, LMP1 protein is found in the cytoplasm (or membrane) of cancer cells. On the other side, several observations have also revealed that LMP1 was localized in the nucleus of human cells. For example, Xu J et al reported that the expression of LMP-1 protein was preferentially observed in the nucleus of human T cells and induced the malignant transformation of EBV genome-positive T-Cell (Xu et al. 2002). However, the localization of nuclear LMP1 and its prognostic significance in NPC remain largely unknown.

Epithelial-mesenchymal transition (EMT) is the key process for cancer invasion, metastasis in various types of human cancers (Brabletz *et al.* 2018; Zidar *et al.* 2018). It has also been reported that EMT contributed to tumor metastasis in NPC and was induced

3

by ectopic expression of LMP1 *in vitro* (Horikawa *et al.* 2007; Horikawa *et al.* 2011; Shair *et al.* 2009). Ten years ago, we demonstrated that neoplastic spindle cells possessing features of EMT should be considered as the more aggressive subtype in NPC, and EBER and LMP1 were highly expressed in these spindle cells (Luo *et al.* 2012a; Luo *et al.* 2013). However, as far as we know, the association between different localization of LMP1 protein and EMT in cancer tissues has not been fully described.

Therefore, the aim of this study was to clarify whether the different localization of LMP1 has clinicopathological impacts on NPC progression. In particular, the relationship between aberrant expression of LMP1 protein and EMT-related biomarkers such as E-cadherin, Vimentin, N-cadherin and Snail in NPC was also examined.

Material and methods

Patients and samples

In total, 136 formalin-fixed paraffin-embedded tissues diagnosed with NPC during the period of 2003 to 2007 were obtained from the Department of Pathology, Guangdong Medical College, China. None of the patients had received therapy before. This protocol was approved by the Ethics Committee of Guangdong Medical College. Histopathologic classification of primary NPC samples was done according to "the Pathology and genetics of head and neck tumours" by the World Health Organization (WHO). All of the tumors were classified as non-keratinizing NPC. Among them, 26 samples were differentiated non-keratinizing carcinomas (DNKC) and 110 samples were undifferentiated carcinomas

(UDC). Clinical patients classified based the stage of these was on Tumor-Node-Metastasis (pTNM) system (AJCC/UICC). The clinicopathological characteristics of NPC patients were summarized in Supplemental Table 1. In the present study, the end date of the follow-up study was August 2012. The patients were followed-up from 8 to 106 months, with a mean period of 65.0 months. In addition, 45 non-tumoral pharynx tissues were obtained as normal controls.

Tissue microarray construction

After the cancerous and non-neoplastic pharynx epithelium areas of H&E-stained arrays were carefully reviewed and determined, tissue microarray (TMA) was built as described previously (Luo *et al.* 2013). In brief, representative areas of the paraffin 'donor' blocks were marked on the slide. Two tissue cylinders with a diameter of 1.5 mm were taken from 136 NPC tissues and 45 non-cancerous nasopharyngeal tissues and precisely arrayed into new paraffin blocks using a TMA workstation (Beecher Instruments, Silver Spring, MD, USA). All patients were represented by two cancer cores.

Immunohistochemistry and immunofluorescence

The sections were put into in citrate buffer (PH 6.0) for high-pressure antigenic retrieval and boiled for 2 minutes. The endogenous peroxidase activity and non-specific binding were eliminated by 3% hydrogen peroxide (H₂O₂) and 1% bovine serum albumin (BSA) at room temperature, respectively. The sections were incubated overnight at 4°C with the primary antibodies. The primary antibodies were listed as follows: LMP1 (Santa Cruz, clone CS1/2/3/4, dilution 1:25); E-cadherin (BD, clone 36/E, dilution 1:300); N-cadherin

(Abcam, clone 5D5, dilution 1:300); Vimentin (BD, clone RV202, dilution 1:200); Fibronectin (Abcam, clone IST-9, dilution 1:300); Snail (Cell Signaling, clone C15D3, dilution 1:100); Snail (Cell Signaling, clone C15D3, dilution 1:100); Slug (Cell Signaling, clone C19G7, dilution 1:50); Twist (Abcam, clone 3E10, dilution 1:400); D2-40 (Zymed, clone D2-40, dilution 1:200); CD31 (Zymed, clone JC70A, dilution 1:200); Pan-cytokeratin (Zymed, clone AE1/AE3, dilution 1:250). The slides were then washed with PBS for 2×5 min and incubated with the biotinylated secondary antibody (Zymed, San Francisco, CA) and streptavidin horseradish peroxidase complex for 15 min at room temperature, respectively. Subsequently, sections were reacted with 3,3'-diaminobenzidine (DAB) for 2 min for visualization, and counterstained with hematoxylin. PBS was used instead of the primary antibodies as negative controls.

The protocol of immunofluorescence labelling of formalin-fixed (FFPE) was equal to IHC procedure before sections of cancer tissues were incubated with primary antibodies over night at 4°C. After washing two times in PBS for 10 min, these sections were stained with Dylight594-conjugated goat anti-mouse antibody (Jackson, dilution 1:600) for 2 h at room temperature. At last, the slides were reacted with DAPI (Sigma) for 10 min and mounted in Antifade Medium (P0126, Beyotime).

Evaluation of immunostaining

Evaluation of the immunostaining expression was examined separately by two pathologists who were unaware of the clinical data. Four views were examined per case, and at least 400 cancer cells were counted per view at ×400 magnification. As described

6

previously, the immunohistochemical staining was graded on the basis of the intensity and percentage of positive cancer cells (Luo *et al.* 2013; Li *et al.* 2008). With regard to the scoring criteria for intensity, it was recorded on a scale of 0 to 4 as follows: 0 (absence of reactivity), 1 (weak reactivity), 2 (moderate reactivity), and 3 (strong reactivity). Relative to the percentage of positive tumor cells, it was reviewed as follows: 0 (no positive cells), 1 (<10% positive cells), 2 (10-50% positive cells), and 3 (>50% positive cells).

The expression patterns of proteins were calculated by multiplying the scores of staining intensity and the proportion of positive tumor cells. Taken together, a score of ≤ 4 was regarded as patients with low expression and ≥ 6 as those with high expression in tissue sections. In addition, D2-40 and CD31was used to confirmed tumor cells with lymphatic invasion or vascular invasion, respectively. The numbers of tumor budding cells was stained and mounted by Pan-cytokeratin (budding <5 and ≥ 5 was recognized as low and high grade, respectively) (Luo *et al.* 2012; Brown *et al.* 2010).

Statistical analysis

All statistical analyses were performed using the SPSS13.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL) statistical software package. Comparisons between LMP1/EMT proteins and clinicopathologic parameters were done with the χ^2 test. Spearman correlation coefficient was used to evaluate the relationships between variables. Survival curves were plotted by the Kaplan-Meier method and the log-rank test. A Cox regression (Proportional hazard model) was used for univariate and multivariate analysis. The "*" sign denotes P < 0.05 compared with control and the "**" sign denotes P < 0.01.

Results

Cytoplasmic and nuclear LMP1 is overexpressed in NPC samples

Immunohistochemical results were summarized in **Supplemental Table 1**. LMP1 protein was weakly expressed in the non-cancerous nasopharyngeal epithelium (Fig. 1A, 1B), only 2 of 45 cases (4.4%) showed high expression. On the contrary, high expression of LMP1 was found in the cytoplasm and nucleus of tumor cells. Among 136 NPC biopsies, cytoplasmic and nuclear of LMP1 overexpression was detected in 30 cases (22.1%, Fig. 1D, 1E) and 51 cases (37.5%, Fig.1G, 1H), respectively. Furthermore, cytoplasmic (Fig. 1F) and nuclear localization of LMP1 (Fig. 1I) was confirmed by immunofluorescence labeling in NPC tissues.

Association of abnormal LMP1 with clinicopathological variables in NPC

The relationship of different localization of LMP1 expression and clinicopathological parameters was depicted in **Table 1** and Fig. 2. High expression of cytoplasmic LMP1 was positively associated with lymphatic invasion (P = 0.044) and vascular invasion (P = 0.003). However, no significant association was identified between cytoplasmic LMP1 and other variables including gender (P = 0.271), age (P = 0.215), histologic type (P=0.699), T classification (P=0.486), lymph node metastasis (P=0.266), distant metastasis (P=0.434), clinical stage (P = 0.272), local recurrence (P = 0.537) and tumor budding (P=0.489). As shown in Fig. 2G, the expression of nuclear LMP1 was significantly associated with lymph node metastasis (P=0.031), local recurrence (P=

0.002), lymphatic invasion (P= 0.004) and tumor budding (P= 0.001). High expression of total LMP1 correlated significantly with several clinicopathological variables including T classification (P= 0.037), lymphatic invasion (P = 0.001), lymph node metastasis (P= 0.039) and tumor budding (P = 0.001) in patients.

In some cases, high expression of nuclear LMP1 was more frequently observed at the invasive front of tumors (Fig. 2H, I), budding cells (Fig. 2J, K) disseminating from tumors, and cancer cells migrating into the stroma with spindle-shaped phenotype (Fig. 2L, M). Interestingly, a significant association was found between nuclear LMP1 expression in the invasive front with T classification (P= 0.019), lymph node metastasis (P= 0.001), local recurrence (P= 0.011), lymphatic invasion (P = 0.016) and tumor budding (P = 0.019) (Fig. 2N).

Spearman correlation analysis was further performed to confirm a significantly positive correlation between cytoplasmic LMP1 expression and lymphatic invasion (r = 0.172; P = 0.045) and vascular invasion (r = 0.255; P = 0.003). On other hand, there was a statistically significant correlation between nuclear expression of LMP1 and lymph node metastasis (r = 0.185; P = 0.031), local recurrence (r = 0.270; P = 0.001), lymphatic invasion (r = 0.248; P = 0.004) and tumor budding (r = 0.278; P = 0.001).

Relations between LMP1 expression and EMT-related markers in NPC

As shown in **Table 2**, cytoplasmic LMP1 expression was significantly associated with E-cadherin (P = 0.014), Vimentin (P = 0.006), N-cadherin (P = 0.003), Snail (P = 0.008) and Slug (P = 0.007) in NPC samples. On the other hand, in 136 samples with NPC, there

was a close linkage between the expression of nuclear LMP1 and E-cadherin (P = 0.037), Vimentin (P = 0.000), N-cadherin (P = 0.003), Snail (P = 0.003) and Twist (P = 0.002). As shown in Fig. 3, high expression of cytoplasmic and nuclear LMP1 was associated with low expression of E-cadherin, and high expression of N-cadherin, Vimentin and Snail in the same NPC biopsies, respectively. Taken together, we indicate that tumor cells with high cytoplasmic and nuclear LMP1 in NPC might strongly resemble cells that have undergone an EMT.

Association between LMP1 expression and survival

A multivariate Cox regression analysis was performed to determine whether LMP1 patterns have predictive impacts on patients' clinical outcome (**Table 3**). Distant metastasis (P= 0.000), local recurrence (P= 0.002) and tumor budding (P= 0.003) had independently prognostic values for patient outcome. However, nuclear LMP1 (P=0.844), cytoplasmic LMP1 (P= 0.291) and other clinicopathologic factors was found not to be independent predictors for NPC.

Discussion

With regard to the prognostic significance LMP1 in NPC, the issue is still controversial. For example, Hariwiyanto B et al. found that there was a significant association between LMP1 expression and overall survival of NPC patients (Hariwiyanto *et al.* 2010). In contrast, Chen CL et al. failed to find this link (Chen *et al.* 2006). In addition, some research groups described that it was not a valuable indicator of patients' outcome, but

linked significantly with clinicopathologic features including lymph node metastasis (Sarac *et al.* 2001; Ozyar *et al.* 2004). The discrepancy might be most likely due to tumor heterogeneity (including the different numbers and regions of samples) and protocol methods.

Firstly, we found that LMP1 protein was significantly elevated in 136 tumors compared with 45 non-neoplastic nasopharyngeal tissues, which is consistent with other previous observations (Hariwiyanto et al. 2010; Sarac et al. 2001; Taheri-Kadkhoda et al. 2009), indicating that EBV-relate proteins may play a critical role in the pathogenesis of NPC. Numerous studies have showed that LMP1 protein was detectable in the cytoplasm (or membrane) of cancer cells. In the present study, we observed that LMP1 was localized in both the cytoplasm and nucleus of tumor cells in NPC. Furthermore, a significant relationship was observed between cytoplasmic LMP1 and lymphatic invasion and vascular invasionin of NPC. On the other hand, high expression of nuclear LMP1 also linked tightly with aggressive aspects of tumors, including lymph node metastasis, local recurrence, lymphatic invasion. For example, 60.6% of patients with local recurrence displayed high levels of nuclear LMP1 in comparison with 30.1% of those without local recurrence, suggesting nuclear LMP1 overexpression might enhance the risk of tumor relapse, and might be a potent predictor of patient survival. As we know, local recurrence is the major cause of treatment failure and a worse prognosis in patients (Lee et al. 2012). Based on these findings, we suggest that aberrant expression of LMP1 might contribute to tumor aggressiveness and poor outcome of NPC. As anticipated, high nuclear LMP1

expression was significantly associated with shorter overall survival. However, similar to other research groups, no significant difference was found between increased expression of cytoplasmic LMP1 and patients' survival (Li *et al.* 2009; Chen *et al.* 2006). To our knowledge, it is the first time to divide aberrant localization of LMP1 expression into individual variables of patient outcome.

Epithelial-mesenchymal transition (EMT) is responsible for tumor immunosurveillance and invasion, and contributes to poor outcome of various cancer types (Zidar et al. 2018; Horikawa et al. 2007). Recently, we have also reported that EMT might occur in the progression of NPC, and EMT-related factors E-cadherin and Vimentin were unfavorable prognostic factors in patients outcome (Luo *et al.* 2012). LMP1, which is the major EBV oncoprotein, has been proved to be sufficient to induce EMT in NPC cell lines. For example, Horikawa T et al demonstrated that forced expression of LMP1 could enhance cell migration and invasiveness, and activate the EMT program in vitro (Horikawa et al. 2011). Similarly, Shair KH et al. described that up-regulation of LMP1 could greatly induce a cadherin switch from E- to N-cadherin in NPC C666-1 cell lines (Shair et al. 2009). In 1998, we have shown that transfecting LMP1 promoted the invasion and metastasis of NPC by inhibiting E-cadherin expression (Ou et al. 2008). As to the relationship between LMP1 and EMT in NPC tissues, Horikawa T also found that LMP1 correlated significantly with E-cadherin in NPC samples. In this study, we found that both cytoplasmic and nuclear of LMP1 correlated inversely with expression of E-cadherin, whereas linked positively with expression of Vimentin, N-cadherin and Snail. Based on

these observations, we conclude that EBV-encoded protein LMP1 might be crucial for the acquisition of aggressive and invasive properties in NPC.

The tumor invasive front was first discovered in colorectal cancer in the early 1980s, which is a prognostic area determining the aggressive behaviors and biological processes of cancers. Accumulating evidence has demonstrated that EMT is frequently present at the invasive front of tumors (Christofori . 2006; Liang. 2011). Of note, we have recently reported that aberrant expression of EMT-related molecules E-cadherin, Vimentin and Snail was predominantly observed at the invasive front of NPC (Luo *et al.* 2012b; Luo *et al.* 2012c). In this study, a preferential increase of nuclear LMP1 was also found in the tumor invasive front. We postulate that these tumor cells with high expression of nuclear LMP1 might be endowed with more invasive and aggressive potentials. As expected, we found that nuclear LMP1 overexpression in the invasive front correlated strongly with various aggressive features including T classification, lymph node metastasis, lymphatic invasion and local recurrence in NPC.

On the other hand, during the EMT process, single cells or small clusters of cancer cells along the invasive front of tumors, called "tumor budding", are fragile to escape from the primary tumor. Tumor budding is a histological feature and has been observed in various human cancers including colorectal cancer and pancreatic cancer (Betge *et al.* 2012; Karamitopoulou *et al.* 2013). More importantly, it is recognized as a valuable prognostic predictor by UICC. In NPC specimens, we have also described the presence of tumor budding and its associations with aggressive behaviors and poor survival of patients (Luo

et al. 2012d). Here, we show a distribution of nuclear LMP1 in tumor budding cells, and the protein patterns linked significantly with the degree of budding cells. Moreover, high expression of nuclear LMP1 was more frequently occurred in tumor cells invading into the surroundings, and these cells always exhibited a spindle-shaped morphology. Of note, our previous report had already found that malignant spindle cells correlated closely with EMT, and should be the more aggressive subtype in NPC (Luo *et al.* 2012a). Interesting, Ding RB et al has recently also showed that these sarcomatoid cells exhibited enriched EMT and invasion promoting genes (Ding *et al.* 2021). Taken together, our results imply that nuclear LMP1 may promote greatly the dynamic progression of NPC.

In conclusion, our work demonstrates the existence of nuclear LMP1 in NPC tissues. However, the functions of nuclear LMP1 in relation to NPC initiation and progression remain unknown. In addition, the molecular mechanisms regulating nuclear translocation of LMP1 also need to be clarified. LMP1 has been proved to play an important role in NPC pathogenesis, and we believe that elucidating these above issues might definitely provide novel therapeutic strategies of patients.

Abbreviations

Latent membrane protein-1, LMP1; nasopharyngeal carcinoma, NPC; epithelial-mesenchymal transition, EMT; tissue microarray, TMA; immunohistochemistry, IHC; immunofluorescence labelling of formalin-fixed, FFPE; differentiated nonkeratinizing carcinoma, DNKC; undifferentiated carcinoma, UDC; tumor size, T; hazard ratio, HR; confidence interval, CI

Disclosure Statement

No potential conflicts of interest were disclosed

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 81202125, 81872202); Natural Science Foundation of Guangdong Province of China (Grant No. 2018A030313778), Natural Science Foundation of Shenzhen (Grant No. JCYJ20190809154603583, JCYJ20210324131210030, JCYJ20200109115420720).

References

- Betge J, Kornprat P, Pollheimer MJ, Lindtner RA, Schlemmer A, Rehak P, et al. (2012). Tumor budding is an independent predictor of outcome in AJCC/UICC stage II colorectal cancer. Ann Surg Oncol 19,3.
- Brabletz T, Kalluri R, Nieto MA, Weinberg RA (2018). EMT in cancer. Nat Rev Cancer 18,128-134.
- Brown M, Sillah K, Griffiths EA, Swindell R, West CM, Page RD, et al. (2010). Tumour budding and a low host inflammatory response are associated with a poor prognosis in oesophageal and gastro-oesophageal junction cancers. Histopathology 56,893-9.
- Chen CL, Ou DL (2006). Expression of syndecan-1 (CD138) in nasopharyngeal carcinoma is correlated with advanced stage and poor prognosis. Hum Pathol 37,1279-85.
- Christofori G (2006). New signals from the invasive front. Nature 441,444-50.
- Dawson CW, Port RJ, Young LS (2012). The role of the EBV-encoded latent membrane proteins LMP1 and LMP2 in the pathogenesis of nasopharyngeal carcinoma (NPC). Semin Cancer Biol 22,144-53.
- Ding RB, Chen P, Rajendran BK, Lyu X, Wang H, et al. (2021). Molecular landscape and subtype-specific therapeutic response of nasopharyngeal carcinoma revealed by integrative pharmacogenomics. Nat Commun 12:3046.
- Hariwiyanto B, Sastrowiyoto S, Mubarika S, Salugu M (2010). LMP1 and LMP2 may

be prognostic factors for outcome of therapy in nasopharyngeal cancers in Indonesia. Asian Pac J Cancer Prev 11,763-6.

- Horikawa T, Yang J, Kondo S, Yoshizaki T, Joab I, Furukawa M, et al. (2007). Twist and epithelial-mesenchymal transition are induced by the EBV oncoprotein latent membrane protein 1 and are associated with metastatic nasopharyngeal carcinoma. Cancer Res 67,1970-8.
- Horikawa T, Yoshizaki T, Kondo S, Furukawa M, Kaizaki Y, Pagano JS (2011). Epstein-Barr Virus latent membrane protein 1 induces Snail and epithelial-mesenchymal transition in metastatic nasopharyngeal carcinoma. Br J Cancer 104,1160-7.
- Karamitopoulou E, Zlobec I, Born D, Kondi-Pafiti A, Lykoudis P, Mellou A, et al. (2013). Tumour budding is a strong and independent prognostic factor in pancreatic cancer. Eur J Cancer 49,1032-9.
- Lee AW, Fee WE Jr, Ng WT, Chan LK (2012). Nasopharyngeal carcinoma: salvage of local recurrence. Oral Oncol 48,768-74.
- Li J, Guan HY, Gong LY, Song LB, Zhang N, Wu J, et al. (2008). Clinical significance of sphingosine kinase-1 expression in human astrocytomas progression and overall patient survival. Clin Cancer Res 14,6996-7003.
- Li Z, Bian LJ, Li Y, Liang YJ, Liang HZ (2009). Expression of protease-activated receptor-2 (PAR-2) in patients with nasopharyngeal carcinoma: correlation with clinicopathological features and prognosis. Pathol Res Pract 205,542-50.

- ▶ Liang X (2011). EMT: new signals from the invasive front. Oral Oncol 47,686-7.
- Luo WR, Chen XY, Li SY, Yao KT (2012a). Neoplastic spindle cells in nasopharyngeal carcinoma show features of epithelial-mesenchymal transition. Histopathology 61,113-22.
- Luo W, Fang W, Li S, Yao K (2012b). Aberrant expression of nuclear vimentin and related epithelial-mesenchymal transition markers in nasopharyngeal carcinoma. Int J Cancer 131,1863-73.
- Luo WR, Li SY, Cai LM, Yao KT (2012c). High expression of nuclear Snail, but not cytoplasmic staining, predicts poor survival in nasopharyngeal carcinoma. Ann Surg Oncol 19,2971-9.
- Luo WR, Gao F, Li SY, Yao KT (2012d). Tumour budding and the expression of cancer stem cell marker aldehyde dehydrogenase 1 in nasopharyngeal carcinoma. Histopathology 61,1072-81.
- Luo W, Yao K (2013). Molecular characterization and clinical implications of spindle cells in nasopharyngeal carcinoma: a novel molecule-morphology model of tumor progression proposed. PLoS One 8:e83135.
- Ou XB, Chen XY, Wu MH, Luo WR (2008). Effects of Epstein-Barr virus latent membrane protein 1 on metastasis of human nasopharyngeal carcinoma cell lines. Ai Zheng 27,803-8.
- Ozyar E, Ayhan A, Korcum AF, Atahan IL (2004). Prognostic role of Ebstein-Barr virus latent membrane protein-1 and interleukin-10 expression in patients with

nasopharyngeal carcinoma. Cancer Invest 22,483-91.

- Plaza G, Santón A, Vidal AM, Bellas C (2003). Latent membrane protein-1 oncogene deletions in nasopharyngeal carcinoma in Caucasian patients. Acta Otolaryngol 123,664-8.
- Sarac S, Akyol MU, Kanbur B, Poyraz A, Akyol G, Yilmaz T, et al. (2001). Bcl-2 and LMP1 expression in nasopharyngeal carcinomas. Am J Otolaryngol 22,377-82.
- Shair KH, Schnegg CI, Raab-Traub N (2009). Epstein-Barr virus latent membrane protein-1 effects on junctional plakoglobin and induction of a cadherin switch. Cancer Res 69,5734-42.
- Taheri-Kadkhoda Z, Magnusson B, Svensson M, Mercke C, Björk-Eriksson T (2009). Expression modes and clinical manifestations of latent membrane protein 1, Ki-67, cyclin-B1, and epidermal growth factor receptor in nonendemic nasopharyngeal carcinoma. Head Neck **31**,482-92.
- Wong KCW, Hui EP, Lo KW, Lam WKJ, Johnson D, Li L, Tao Q, Chan KCA, To KF, King AD, Ma BBY, Chan ATC (2021). Nasopharyngeal carcinoma: an evolving paradigm. Nat Rev Clin Oncol. 2021 18:679-695.
- Xu J, Ahmad A, Menezes J (2002). Preferential localization of the Epstein-Barr virus (EBV) oncoprotein LMP-1 to nuclei in human T cells: implications for its role in the development of EBV genome-positive T-cell lymphomas. J Virol 76,4080-6.
- Yoshizaki T, Kondo S, Wakisaka N, Murono S, Endo K, Sugimoto H, et al. (2013).
 Pathogenic role of Epstein-Barr virus latent membrane protein-1 in the development

of nasopharyngeal carcinoma. Cancer Lett 337, 1-7.

Zidar N, Boštjančič E, Malgaj M, Gale N, Dovšak T, Didanovič V (2018). The role of epithelial-mesenchymal transition in squamous cell carcinoma of the oral cavity.

Virchows Arch **472**,237-245.

Figures



FIG. 1. The expression and localization of LMP1 in paraffin-embedded nasopharyngeal carcinoma (NPC) tissues. LMP1 was weakly expressed in non-tumoral epithelium (**A**, **B**). Immunofluorescence showed that LMP1 was negative in normal epithelium (**C**). High expression of cytoplasmic LMP1 (**D**, **E**) were observed in NPC. Immunofluorescent labeling of LMP1 showed cytoplasmic localization (red) of tumor cells (**F**). DAPI (blue). High nuclear expression of LMP1 was detected in NPC (**G**, **H**). Immunofluorescent labeling of nuclear localization of LMP1 (red) in tumor cells (**I**).



FIG. 2. Relationship between nuclear LMP1 expression and clincalpathological features in NPC biopsies. Representative images of high expression of nuclear LMP1 was observed in the N3 (A, B), lymphatic invasion (C, D), recurrence (E, F) stages of NPC biopsies. The percentages of high and low expression of nuclear LMP1 according to different clinicopathological features (G). High expression of nuclear LMP1 was prominently found at tumor invasive front (H, I), budding cells (J, K) and cancer spindle cells migrating into the surroundings (L, M). High expression of nuclear LMP1 significatly correlated with different clinicopathological features (N).



FIG. 3. Cytoplasmic and nuclear localization of LMP1 staining correlates strongly with epithelial-mesenchymal transition (EMT) characteristics. Representative images show that high cytoplasmic (A) or nuclear expression (B) of LMP1 linked negatively with low expression of E-cadherin, whereas positively with high expression of N-cadherin, Vimentin and Snail.

¥7 · 11	G	Cytopla	Cytoplasmic LMP1 (n, %) Nuclear LMP1 (n		ar LMP1 (n,	%) Invasive front nuclear LMP		1 (n, %)		
Variables	Cases	Low	High	P^*	Low	High	P^*	Low	High	P^*
Gender										
Women	33	28 (84.8)	5 (15.2)	0.071	22 (66.7)	11 (33.3)	0.570	29 (82.5)	4 (17.5)	0.467
Men	103	78 (75.7)	25 (24.3)	0.271	63 (61.2)	40 (38.3)	0.570	85 (87.9)	18 (12.1)	0.46/
Age (y)										
<48	68	56 (82.4)	12 (17.6)	0.015	47 (69.1)	21 (30.9)	0 1 1 1	59 (86.8)	9 (13.2)	0.050
<u>≥</u> 48	68	50 (73.5)	18 (26.5)	0.215	38 (55.9)	30 (44.1)	0.111	55 (80.9)	13 (19.1)	0.352
Histologic type										
DNKC	26	21 (80.8)	5 (19.2)	0.000	17 (65.4)	9 (34.6)	0.505	19 (73.1)	7 (26.9)	0.000
UDC	110	85 (77.3)	25 (22.7)	0.699	68 (61.8)	42 (38.2)	0.735	95 (86.4)	15 (13.6)	0.098
T classification										
T1-T2	62	50 (80.6)	12 (19.4)	0.406	44 (71.0)	18 (29.0)	0.063	57 (91.9)	5 (8.1)	0.010
T3-T4	74	56 (75.7)	18 (24.3)	0.486	41 (55.4)	33 (44.6)	0.062	57 (77.0)	17 (23.0)	0.019
Lymph node metastasis										

Table 1. Relationship between aberrant	expression levels of LMP1	protein and clinicopathological	variables in 136 NPC patients
--	---------------------------	---------------------------------	-------------------------------

N0-N1	80	65 (81.3)	15 (18.7)	0.266	56 (70.0)	24 (30.0)	0.021	74 (92.5)	6 (7.5)	0.001
N2-N3	56	41 (73.2)	15 (26.8)	0.200	29 (51.8)	27 (48.2)	0.031	40(71.4)	16 (28.6)	0.001
Distant metastasis										
No	115	91 (79.1)	24 (20.9)	0.424	75 (65.2)	40 (34.8)	0.126	98 (85.2)	17 (14.8)	0 202
Yes	21	15 (71.4)	6 (28.6)	0.434	10 (47.6)	11 (52.4)	0.120	16 (76.2)	5 (23.8)	0.302
Clinical stage										
I - II	38	32 (84.2)	6 (15.8)	0.272	28 (73.7)	10 (26.3)	0.002	35 (92.1)	3 (7.9)	0.102
III-IV	98	74 (75.5)	24 (24.5)	0.272	57 (58.2)	41 (41.8)	0.093	79 (80.6)	19 (19.4)	0.102
Local recurrence										
No	103	79 (76.7)	24 (23.3)	0.527	72 (69.9)	31 (30.1)	0.002	91 (88.3)	12 (11.7)	0.011
Yes	33	27 (81.8)	6 (18.2)	0.537	13 (39.4)	20 (60.6)	0.002	23 (69.7)	10 (30.3)	0.011
Lymphatic invasion										
Negative	97	80 (82.5)	17 (17.5)	0.044	68 (70.1)	29 (29.9)	0.004	86 (88.7)	11 (11.3)	0.016
Positive	39	26 (66.7)	13 (33.3)	0.044	17 (43.6)	22 (56.4)	0.004	28 (71.8)	11 (28.2)	0.016
Vascular invasion										
Negative	108	90 (83.3)	18 (16.7)	0.002	65 (60.2)	43 (39.8)	0 272	90 (83.3)	18 (16.7)	0.760
Positive	28	16 (57.1)	12 (42.9)	0.003	20 (71.4)	8 (28.6)	0.273	24 (85.7)	4 (14.3)	0.760
Tumor budding										
<5	80	64 (80.0)	16 (20.0)	0.490	59 (73.8)	21 (26.3)	0.001	72 (90.0)	8 (10.0)	0.010
≥ 5	56	42 (75.0)	14 (25.0)	0.469	26 (46.4)	30 (53.6)	0.001	42 (75.0)	14 (25.0)	0.019

Cytoplasmic LMP1 (n, %) Nuclear LMP1 (n, %) Variables Cases P^* Low Low P^* High High E-cadherin Low expression 104 76 (73.1) 28 (26.9) 60 (57.7) 44 (42.3) 0.014 0.037 High expression 32 30 (93.8) 25 (78.1) 2 (6.3) 7 (21.9) Vimentin Low expression 71 62 (87.3) 56 (78.9) 9 (12.7) 15 (21.1) 0.000 0.006 High expression 65 44 (67.7) 29 (44.6) 36 (55.4) 21 (32.3) N-cadherin Low expression 73 64 (87.7) 9 (12.3) 54 (74.0) 19 (26.0) 0.003 0.003 High expression 63 42 (66.7) 21 (33.3) 31 (49.2) 32 (50.8) Fibronectin 94 Low expression 76 (80.9) 18 (19.1) 63 (67.0) 31 (33.0) 0.221 0.103 High expression 42 30 (71.4) 12 (28.6) 22 (52.4) 20 (47.6) Snail Low expression 70 61 (87.1) 9 (12.9) 52 (74.3) 18 (25.7) 0.008 0.003 High expression 66 45 (68.2) 21 (31.8) 33 (50.0) 33 (50.0) Slug Low expression 77 66 (85.7) 11 (14.3) 50 (64.9) 27 (35.1) 0.007 0.503 35 High expression 59 39 (66.1) 20 (33.9) 24 (40.7) (59.3)Twist Low expression 63 53 (84.1) 10 (15.9) 48 (76.2) 15 (23.8) 0.002 0.106 High expression 73 53 (72.6) 20 (27.4) 37 (50.7) 36 (49.3)

Table 2. Associations between LMP1 expression and EMT-related proteins in 136 patients with NPC

* *P*< 0.05 as statistically significant.

EMT, epithelial-mesenchymal transition

Univariate analysis Multivariate analysis Variables P^* P^* HR (95% CI) HR (95% CI) Gender Women vs. Men 0.399 1.265 (0.732-2.184) 0.369 1.313 (0.725-2.377) Age (y) < 48 vs. > 480.859 1.045 (0.642-1.700) 0.542 0.847 (0.497-1.445) Histologic type DNKC vs. UDC 0.613 1.176 (0.628-2.201) 0.889 1.049 (0.537-2.051) T classification T1-T2 vs. T3-T4 0.006 2.055 (1.228-3.439) 0.666 0.849 (0.404-1.785) Lymph node metastasis N0-N1 vs. N2-N3 0.031 1.711 (1.050-2.788) 0.526 1.244 (0.634-2.440) Distant metastasis No vs. Yes 0.000 0.000 4.846 (2.803-8.379) 5.090 (2.626-9.866) Clinical stage I - II vs. III-IV 0.002 2.936 (1.494-5.768) 0.098 2.620 (0.836-8.210) Local recurrence No vs. Yes 0.000 0.002 2.655 (1.597-4.414) 2.536 (1.407-4.571) Lymphatic invasion Negative vs. Positive 0.189 1.410 (0.845-2.355) 0.121 0.608 (0.325-1.140) Vascular invasion Negative vs. Positive 0.462 0.420 1.242 (0.697-2.215) 1.319 (0.673-2.587) Tumor budding <5 vs. > 50.005 2.029 (1.244-3.319) 0.003 2.374 (1.338-4.212) Cytoplasmic LMP1 Low vs. High 0.092 1.596 (0.927-2.750) 0.291 1.382 (0.758-2.519) Nuclear LMP1 Low vs. High 0.030 0.844 1.720 (1.054-2.807) 0.941 (0.513-1.724)

Table 3. Cox proportional hazard models on overall survival of patients with NPC

* P < 0.05 as statistically significant.

DNKC, differentiated nonkeratinizing carcinoma; UDC, undifferentiatied carcinoma;

T, tumor size; N, lymph node; HR, hazard ratio; 95%CI, 95% confidence interval.

ICMJE DISCLOSURE FORM

Date:	2/10/2022
Your Name:	Weiren Luo
Manuscript Title:	Nuclear and Cytoplasmic Expression of LMP1 Correlates with Epithelial- mesenchymal Transition in Nasopharyngeal Carcinoma
Manuscript Number (if known):	Click or tap here to enter text.

In the interest of transparency, we ask you to disclose all relationships/activities/interests listed below that are related to the content of your manuscript. "Related" means any relation with for-profit or not-for-profit third parties whose interests may be affected by the content of the manuscript. Disclosure represents a commitment to transparency and does not necessarily indicate a bias. If you are in doubt about whether to list a relationship/activity/interest, it is preferable that you do so.

The author's relationships/activities/interests should be defined broadly. For example, if your manuscript pertains to the epidemiology of hypertension, you should declare all relationships with manufacturers of antihypertensive medication, even if that medication is not mentioned in the manuscript.

In item #1 below, report all support for the work reported in this manuscript without time limit. For all other items, the time frame for disclosure is the past 36 months.

		Nam relat	e all entities with whom you have this ionship or indicate none (add rows as needed)	Specifications/Comments (e.g., if payments were made to you or to your institution)	
			Time frame: Since the initial planning	of the work	
1	All support for the present manuscript (e.g., funding, provision of study materials, medical writing, article processing charges, etc.) No time limit for this item.		None	Click the tab key to add additional rows.	
			Lime frame: past 36 month	IS	
2	Grants or contracts from any entity (if not indicated in item #1 above).		None		
3	Royalties or licenses		None		

		Name all entities with whom you have thisSpecifications/Comments (e.g., if payments wererelationship or indicate none (add rows as needed)made to you or to your institution)
4	Consulting fees	⊠ None
5	Payment or honoraria for lectures, presentations, speakers bureaus, manuscript writing or educational events	None
6	Payment for expert testimony	None
7	Support for attending meetings and/or travel	None
8	Patents planned, issued or pending	None
9	Participation on a Data Safety Monitoring Board or Advisory Board	☑ None □ □ □ □ □ □ □ □
10	Leadership or fiduciary role in other board, society, committee or advocacy group, paid or unpaid	None

		Nam relat	e all entities with whom you have this ionship or indicate none (add rows as needed)	Specifications/Comments (e.g., if payments were made to you or to your institution)
11	Stock or stock options		None	
12	Receipt of equipment, materials, drugs, medical writing, gifts or other services		None	
13	Other financial or non-financial interests		None	
Plea 🖂	ise place an "X" next I certify that I have	t to th e	e following statement to indicate your agreemer ered every question and have not altered the wor	it: ding of any of the questions on this form.