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SUMMARY

BRD4 belongs to the bromodomain and extraterminal (BET) family of chromatin reader proteins that bind acetylated histones and regulate gene expression. Pharmacological inhibition of BRD4 by BET inhibitors (BETi) has indicated antitumor activity against multiple cancer types. We show that BRD4 is essential for the repair of DNA double-strand breaks (DSBs) and mediates the formation of oncogenic gene rearrangements by engaging the non-homologous end joining (NHEJ) pathway. Mechanistically, genome-wide DNA breaks are associated with enhanced acetylation of histone H4, leading to BRD4 recruitment, and stable establishment of the DNA repair complex. In support of this, we also show that in clinical tumor samples, BRD4 protein levels are negatively associated with outcome after prostate cancer (PCa) radiation therapy. Thus, in addition to regulating gene expression, BRD4 is also a central player in the repair of DNA DSBs, with significant implications for cancer therapy.

INTRODUCTION

Perturbations in the repair of DNA double-strand breaks (DSBs) contribute to the development of multiple cancers through the formation of oncogenic genomic rearrangements and other DNA lesions (Fröhling and Döhner, 2008; Mani and Chinnaiyan, 2010). For example, genomic rearrangements involving erythroblast transformation-specific (ETS) transcription factor family genes are considered driver events in prostate cancer (PCa) development. These rearrangements typically involve the fusion of androgen-regulated transcriptionally active genes with the ETS genes, resulting in the overexpression of the latter (Tomlins et al., 2005). The most prevalent ETS gene rearrangement, which is observed in >50% of PCa, involves the fusion of androgen receptor (AR) target gene, TMPRSS2, with the ERG proto-oncogene, resulting in the formation of the TMPRSS2-ERG gene fusion. A combination of three-dimensional spatial proximity of the gene fusion partner loci and DNA breaks has been shown to promote the formation of gene fusions (Haffner et al., 2010; Lin et al., 2009; Mani et al., 2009, 2016). However, the DNA repair pathways and chromatin modifications underlying the formation of genomic rearrangements are far from clear.

BRD4 belongs to the bromodomain and extraterminal (BET) family of reader proteins that bind acetylated histones and regulate gene expression. Pharmacological inhibition of BRD4 by BET inhibitors (BETi) has indicated antitumor activity against multiple cancer types. We show that BRD4 is essential for the repair of DNA double-strand breaks (DSBs) and mediates the formation of oncogenic gene rearrangements by engaging the non-homologous end joining (NHEJ) pathway. Mechanistically, genome-wide DNA breaks are associated with enhanced acetylation of histone H4, leading to BRD4 recruitment, and stable establishment of the DNA repair complex. In support of this, we also show that in clinical tumor samples, BRD4 protein levels are negatively associated with outcome after prostate cancer (PCa) radiation therapy. Thus, in addition to regulating gene expression, BRD4 is also a central player in the repair of DNA DSBs, with significant implications for cancer therapy.
blocking castration-resistant PCa (CRPC) development in vivo (Asangani et al., 2014; Wyce et al., 2013). Thus, BETi mediate their phenotypic effects by blocking additional pathways that are essential for cancer cell survival. As histone acetylation is associated both with gene expression regulation and DNA repair (Lee and Workman, 2007), we explored the role of BRD4 in the repair of DNA DSBs. In this paper, we present experimental and clinical data to suggest that BRD4 is a key mediator of NHEJ DNA repair pathway, promotes the formation of oncogenic gene fusions, and, importantly, is associated with PCA radiation therapy outcomes.

RESULTS

BET Inhibition Regulates the Expression of DNA Repair Genes

We reasoned that histone acetylation-dependent, BRD4-mediated transcriptional regulation and DNA repair activity may be regulated the NHEJ pathway with near significance (p = 0.08). Consistent with the I-BET151 data, we observed that treatment with JQ1 (Filippakopoulos et al., 2010), the most commonly used BETi, also downregulated the expression of NHEJ DNA repair genes in two PCA cell lines (Figure S1B). We observed that small interfering RNA (siRNA)-based knockdown of BRD4, BRD2, or BRD3 resulted in the downregulation of many NHEJ repair genes in two PCA cell lines (Figure S1B). Given the observation that AR upregulates expression of I-BET151 (Figures 1A and 1B). The results of gene set enrichment analyses indicated that treatment with I-BET151

![Figure 1. Regulation of DNA Repair Genes and NHEJ DNA Repair by BET Inhibitors](image)

(A) Histogram representation of beta values indicating gene expression (from RNA-seq experiment) upon treatment of LNCaP cells with I-BET151 for 8 hr. Red colored bars represent 10 NHEJ genes.

(B) Heatmap representation of the expression of DNA repair genes (from RNA-seq experiment) upon treatment of LNCaP cells with the indicated doses of I-BET151.

(C) Gene set enrichment analysis (GSEA) of BRD4 expression level from castration-resistant PCA (CRPC) specimens (n = 122) against the 10 NHEJ DNA repair genes.

(D) Schematic of the NHEJ DNA repair assay.

(E) Representative flow cytometry profiles to describe the effects JQ1 on the repair of I-SceI-induced DNA DSBs by the NHEJ pathway.

(F and G) Quantitative analysis of the effects of JQ1 (F) or siRNA against BRD4 (G) on the repair of I-SceI-induced DNA DSBs by the NHEJ pathway (*p < 0.05; **p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001 by two-tailed Student’s t test; error bars, SD of 3 technical replicates).

(H) BRD4 RNA expression in normal prostate, ERG fusion positive and SPOP mutant primary prostate adenocarcinoma samples from TCGA dataset.

Complementary, thus, we conducted RNA sequencing (RNA-seq) experiments to study the gene expression changes in LNCaP cells upon BET inhibition with I-BET151. The downregulation of MYC expression in I-BET151-treated LNCaP cells served as a positive control for the experimental setup (Figure S1A). The expression levels of 7 out of 10 NHEJ pathway genes decreased upon treatment with I-BET151 (Figures 1A and 1B). The results of gene set enrichment analysis tests indicated that treatment with I-BET151
the clinical significance of this experimental approach, we conducted gene set enrichment analysis (GSEA) by mining BRD4 expression from RNA-seq datasets representing 122 CRPC patients from the SU2C cohort (Robinson et al., 2015). Remarkably, the 10 NHEJ pathway genes were significantly enriched and positively associated with BRD4 expression in clinical specimens (Figure 1C). Thus, we conclude that BRD4 regulates the expression of NHEJ DNA repair genes both in cell-based experimental models and CRPC clinical specimens.

The Role of BRD4 in NHEJ DNA Repair Pathway

As NHEJ DNA repair is the primary mediator of oncogenic genomic rearrangements, we explored the role of BRD4 in this pathway. We employed an engineered HEK293 cell line that expresses red fluorescent protein (RFP) only upon the repair of I-SceI endonuclease-induced DSBs by NHEJ (Mukherjee et al., 2012). The parental cells are GFP positive and RFP negative; transfection with an I-SceI expressing plasmid results in the formation of DSBs flanking the GFP gene (Figure 1D). The percentage of RFP positive cells following I-SceI transfection directly correlates with NHEJ activity in this assay. Treatment with JO1 reduced the percentage of RFP positive cells in a dose-dependent manner, demonstrating inhibition of NHEJ DNA repair (Figures 1E and 1F). Consistent with this observation, BRD4 knockdown using siRNA also resulted in impaired NHEJ DNA repair (Figures 1G and S3A). These results indicated that BRD4 has an essential role in the general repair of DNA DSBs by NHEJ.

Next, we queried BRD4 transcript expression in The Cancer Genome Atlas (TCGA) primary PCA dataset (Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network, 2015). BRD4 expression was not significantly altered in PCA specimens when compared to normal prostate (Figure S3B). As ERG fusion positive and SPOP mutation positive specimens represent the two major, but mutually exclusive molecular subtypes of PCA, we reasoned that BRD4 may be differentially expressed in these molecular subtypes. BRD4 expression was significantly elevated in ERG fusion positive PCA specimens in comparison to either normal prostate or SPOP-mutated PCA specimens (Figure 1H); no significant changes in BRD4 expression was noted upon comparison of normal prostate and SPOP-mutated PCAs. Thus, we conducted the next set of experiments to define the role of BRD4 in the formation of ERG gene rearrangements.

The Role of BRD4 in the Formation of Oncogenic TMPRSS2-ERG Gene Fusions

We employed CRISPR-Cas9 technology to induce de novo TMPRSS2-ERG gene fusions in androgen-responsive LNCaP cells, which lack these gene fusions. We hypothesized that co-transfection of single-guide RNAs (sgRNAs) targeting intron 1 of TMPRSS2 and intron 3 of ERG would result in the simultaneous formation of Cas9-mediated DSBs in these two genes. While the cellular DNA repair machinery will fix most of these DNA DSBs, a subset of these breaks will inter-ligate to form TMPRSS2-ERG gene fusions (Figure 2A). We designed three different sgRNAs per gene and tested all the nine combinations for their ability to induce TMPRSS2-ERG gene fusions using TaqMan qRT-PCR assays. Seven of these nine sgRNA combinations induced the robust formation of TMPRSS2-ERG gene fusion RNA transcripts (Figure 2B). The T3 and E2 sgRNAs targeting TMPRSS2 and ERG, respectively, were the most effective combination in terms of gene fusion formation. Although all sgRNA combinations produced identical TMPRSS2-ERG fusion RNA transcript junctions, the genomic DNA junctions were unique for each sgRNA combination, as the DSBs are generated in different locations within the same introns. We developed a TaqMan qPCR assay to detect the predicted T3 and E2 sgRNA-induced TMPRSS2-ERG fusion genomic DNA junction. This assay was specific for the detection of fusions generated by the T3 and E2 sgRNA combination (Figure 2C). The CRISPR-Cas 9-induced genomic and transcript junctions were characterized by gel-based PCR, cloning, and sequencing (Figures 2D, 2E, S3C, and S3D). Importantly, the CRISPR-Cas9 system resulted in the formation of detectable levels of ERG protein in LNCaP cells. Moreover, consistent with the TMPRSS2-ERG fusion transcript data, the T3 and E2 sgRNA combination was associated with the maximal induction of ERG protein levels (Figure S3E). Thus, the CRISPR-Cas9 method allowed rapid, robust, and inducible...
formation of oncogenic gene fusions. Next, we employed the T3 and E2 sgRNA combination to identify mediators of gene fusion formation in subsequent experiments.

As the non-homologous end joining (NHEJ) DNA repair pathway is implicated in the formation of chromosomal translocations (Roukos and Misteli, 2014), we explored the role of this pathway in the formation of gene fusions. We studied the effect of knockdown of key NHEJ components such as PRKDC, PARP, Artemis, Ku70, Ku80, Xrcc4, Lig4, NHEJ1, Xpf, 53BP1, and WRN in CRISPR-Cas9-mediated TMPRSS2-ERG gene fusion formation. As hypothesized, knockdown of individual NHEJ components blocked CRISPR-Cas9-mediated TMPRSS2-ERG gene fusion formation both in terms of fusion genomic DNA and fusion RNA transcript (Figures S3F, S3G, and S4A). Consistent with this observation, treatment with NU7026, a PRKDC inhibitor, blocked the formation of TMPRSS2-ERG gene fusions in a dose-dependent manner (Figures S4D and S4E). By recapitulating the role of NHEJ components, we validated the potential of our CRISPR-Cas9 assay to identify mediators of genomic rearrangements. This set the stage to discover novel regulators of genomic rearrangements.

We next tested the role of BRD4 in CRISPR-Cas9-mediated TMPRSS2-ERG gene fusion formation. BRD4 knockdown using four different siRNAs either individually or pooled, resulted in a significant block in TMPRSS2-ERG gene fusion formation both in terms of fusion genomic DNA and fusion RNA transcript (Figures 2F, 2G, S4B, and S4C). Treatment with the BETi, JQ1, blocked the formation of TMPRSS2-ERG gene fusions in a dose-dependent manner (Figures 2H and 2I). Thus, BRD4 is necessary for the formation of oncogenic TMPRSS2-ERG gene fusions, and possibly other genomic rearrangements as well.

**BRD2 Promotes NHEJ DNA Repair and the Formation of Oncogenic TMPRSS2-ERG Gene Fusions**

Analysis of RNA-seq data from the SU2C cohort revealed that the expression of BRD4, BRD2, and BRD3 are correlated (Figure S5A). The endogenous expression of individual BET proteins was confirmed by immunoblot analysis in LNCaP cells (Figure S5B). BRD2 knockdown using siRNA also resulted in impaired NHEJ DNA repair (Figures 2J and S5C). These results indicated that BRD2 also promotes the repair of DNA DSBs by NHEJ. We tested the role of BRD2 in CRISPR-Cas9-mediated TMPRSS2-ERG gene fusion formation. BRD2 knockdown using multiple siRNAs either individually or pooled, resulted in a significant block in TMPRSS2-ERG gene fusion formation, both in terms of fusion genomic DNA and fusion RNA transcript (Figures 2K, 2L, and S5D). We conclude that BRD2 is also necessary for CRISPR-Cas9-induced TMPRSS2-ERG gene fusion formation.

**Ionizing Radiation Induced DNA Damage-Dependent Genome-wide Acetylation of Histone H4**

As acetylated histone H4 is the classic recognition target for BRD4 (Chiang, 2009), we hypothesized a DNA damage-induced, acetylation-dependent mechanism for recruitment of BRD4 to damaged chromosomes. Chromatin immunoprecipitation sequencing (ChIP-seq) experiments in LNCaP cells revealed that ionizing radiation (IR) treatment induced a significant, genome-wide increase in acetylation of histone H4 (Figures 3A–3C). Although we observed an increase in histone H4 acetylation in transcription start sites (TSSs) (Figure 3D), mainly at +1 nucleosome where BRD4 typically binds, this did not fully account for the substantial increase in genome-wide histone H4 acetylation upon IR treatment (cf. Figures 3C and 3D). As the primary effect of IR on chromatin is DNA damage, we reasoned that the enhanced histone H4 acetylation is likely to be directed to sites of DNA damage. Dnase I hypersensitivity sites (DHSs) are hotspots for breaks; we have previously reported the involvement of DHSs in the formation of oxidative stress-induced de novo genomic rearrangements (Mani et al., 2016). Interestingly, we observed a significant increase in histone H4 acetylation in DHSs upon IR treatment (Figure 3E). The signature bi-modal peak is suggestive of nucleosome loss at the center of DHSs, which is associated with increased susceptibility to DNA breaks.

The prostate-specific transcriptionally active TMPRSS2 locus has high levels of acetyl histone H4 at the TSS (Figure 3F, top). The first intron of TMPRSS2, a hotspot for DNA breaks, is the most frequently rearranged intron in PCa genomes as it fuses multiple ETS family genes, including ERG, to form the ETS gene fusions. We observed DHSs in the first intron of TMPRSS2. IR treatment induced significant acetylation of histone H4 in the first intron of TMPRSS2. These results suggest that DNA damage is associated with enhanced histone acetylation.

Homozygous deletions spanning the PTEN locus are observed in about 15% of primary PCas (Barbieri et al., 2012; Cancer Genome Atlas Research Network, 2015). The TSS of PTEN is enriched for the acetyl histone H4 mark (Figure 3F, bottom). We observed two IR-induced histone H4 acetylation sites near the 5' and 3' ends of the PTEN genes. One of these two acetylated sites is also a DHS, suggesting that the induced acetylated sites are hotspots for DNA breaks. We speculate that mis-repair of simultaneous DSBs at these induced acetylation sites could contribute to PTEN loss in PCa.
primary recognition target for BRD4 was included as a positive control in these experiments; immunoglobulin G (IgG) was the negative control. The interaction of BRD4 with DNA repair proteins was further enhanced upon IR treatment. Thus, functional interactions between BRD4 and DNA repair proteins represent a potential mechanism for the role of BRD4 in NHEJ DNA repair.

We were intrigued by the interaction between the reader proteins BRD4 and 53BP1, which was significantly enhanced upon IR treatment. 53BP1 is a mediator of the DNA damage checkpoint (DiTullio et al., 2002; Fernandez-Capetillo et al., 2002; Wang et al., 2002), and, importantly, IR-induced 53BP1 foci formation is a hallmark of DNA damage response (DDR) signaling (Schultz et al., 2000). The BRD4-53BP1 interaction was confirmed by reverse co-immunoprecipitation experiments using both BRD4 and 53BP1 antibodies (Figure S6A). The results of proximity ligation assay (PLA) provided additional confirmation that IR treatment enhances the interaction between BRD4 and 53BP1 (Figures S6B and S6C).

We conducted the next set of experiments to explore the functional consequence of the interaction between BRD4 and 53BP1. Treatment with the BETi, JQ1, blocked the recruitment of 53BP1 to chromatin upon IR-induced DNA damage in LNCaP cells (Figure 4D). Similar results were obtained with siRNA-based BRD4 knockdown experiments (Figure S7A). Knockdown of
53BP1 did not block the recruitment of BRD4 to chromatin upon IR-induced DNA damage, suggesting BRD4 functions upstream of 53BP1 in the cascade of DNA repair events (Figure S7B). Given that both BRD4 and 53BP1 are reader proteins, we propose that BRD4 functions upstream in hierarchy and thus serves as a chromatin bookmark to guide the 53BP1 reader. Moreover, treatment with JQ1 blocked the recruitment of additional DNA repair proteins like Artemis and KU80 to the chromatin upon IR-induced DNA damage (Figure 4D). IR treatment did not affect the steady-state expression of BET proteins or DNA repair proteins in LNCaP and 22Rv1 cells (Figure S7C). These results indicate that BRD4 is critical for stable formation of DNA repair complexes.

We extended our studies to dBET1, a next-generation BETi, synthesized by the conjugation of JQ1 with phthalimide moiety (Winter et al., 2015). dBET1 induces selective degradation of BET proteins. We observed that treatment with dBET1 blocked the IR-induced recruitment of BRD4, 53BP1, Artemis, KU80 and XRCC4 to the chromatin in two different cell line models—LNCaP and 22Rv1 (Figures 4E and 4F). Overall, therefore these results indicate that BRD4 participates in NHEJ DNA repair by (1) regulating the expression of NHEJ DNA repair genes, and (2) physically and functionally interacting with NHEJ DNA repair proteins, thereby contributing to the formation of stable DNA repair complexes, and resulting in efficient DNA repair.

Loss of BRD4 Function Enhances IR-Induced γ-H2AX Foci Formation
We next evaluated the effect of JQ1 and siRNA-based knockdown of BRD4 on IR-induced γ-H2AX foci formation in LNCaP cells. Treatment with JQ1 enhanced IR-induced γ-H2AX foci formation (Figures 5A and 5B). Consistent with this observation, BRD4 knockdown significantly enhanced IR-induced γ-H2AX foci formation (Figures 5C and 5D). Treatment with JQ1 or BRD4 knockdown in the absence of IR did not result in γ-H2AX foci formation. Interestingly, a high-throughput RNAi study has also identified BRD4 as a significant effector.
of IR-induced γ-H2AX foci formation (Floyd et al., 2013). Overall, these results indicate that absence of BRD4 results in defective repair of IR-induced DNA breaks.

**BETi Synergizes with Enzalutamide to Enhance IR-Induced DNA Damage**

We conducted comet assays to study the role of BRD4 in the restoration of genome integrity upon IR-induced DNA damage. IR treatment resulted in a dose-dependent increase in comet tail moment in LNCaP cells, indicating an increase in the proportion of unrepaired DNA breaks. BRD4 knockdown significantly enhanced IR-induced comet tail moment (Figures 6A and 6B). BRD4 knockdown in the absence of IR treatment did not increase comet tail moment, indicating that BRD4 loss does not contribute to the formation of DNA breaks per se, rather it modulates the downstream DNA repair events. Furthermore, these findings with BRD4 knockdown were recapitulated with pharmacological BETi by JQ1. The effects with JQ1 were more pronounced especially at low doses of IR treatment (Figure 6C and 6D). Since JQ1 targets multiple members of the BET family proteins, when compared to the siRNA, which only targets BRD4, it is reasonable to observe enhanced effects with JQ1.

We also conducted rescue experiments by overexpressing FLAG-tagged BRD4 in LNCaP cells. Treatment of LNCaP cells with IR resulted in enhanced recruitment of ectopically expressed FLAG-BRD4 to the chromatin fraction (Figure S7D). Remarkably, BRD4 overexpression led to a reduction in comet tail moment upon IR treatment, indicating a decrease in the proportion of unrepaired DNA breaks (Figure S7E). The results of these experiments clearly demonstrate an important role for BRD4 in the repair of DNA breaks.

Drugs targeting DNA repair including poly-(ADP)-ribose polymerase (PARP) inhibitors have been associated with anti-tumor activity in PCa subsets (Mateo et al., 2015). We next explored the utility of targeting DNA repair with BETi. The combination of androgen deprivation therapy (ADT) and radiation therapy (RT) is commonly used in the treatment of PCa. In patients with clinically lymph-node-positive PCa, compared with ADT alone, ADT+RT was associated with a decreased risk of 5-year all cause mortality (Lin et al., 2015). Likewise, compared to RT alone, RT + short-term ADT was associated with decreased PCa-specific mortality and increased overall survival (Jones et al., 2011). Mechanistically, ADT blocks AR-mediated DNA repair and thus improves the efficacy of RT (Goodwin et al., 2013; Polkinghorn et al., 2013; Spratt et al., 2015). Thus, we tested the effect of JQ1 and the AR antagonist, enzalutamide (as single agents or in combination) in IR-induced DNA damage (Figure 6E). Similar to our earlier result, JQ1 significantly increased IR-induced comet tail moment in LNCaP cells that endogenously express wild-type AR. Treatment of LNCaP cells with enzalutamide showed a small, but statistically non-significant increase of IR-induced comet tail moment. The combination of JQ1 and enzalutamide synergistically increased IR-induced comet tail moment in LNCaP cells (Figure 6E, left). We conducted this experiment in 22Rv1 cells that endogenously express both wild-type AR and a splice variant of AR that does not bind enzalutamide. Treatment with JQ1, but not enzalutamide, increased IR-induced comet tail moment in 22Rv1 cells. However, JQ1 did not synergize with enzalutamide to increase comet tail moment in 22Rv1 cells (Figure 6E, right). These results indicate that BETi can radiosensitize cells expressing AR splice variants that escape enzalutamide blockade.
Figure 6. BRD4 Inhibition Synergizes with IR to Promote DNA Damage

(A) Alkaline comet assay of LNCaP cells with non-targeting siRNA or BRD4 siRNA, followed by treatment with the indicated doses of IR. Cells were irradiated 72-hr post-siRNA treatment, followed by recovery after 30 min.

(B) Quantification of alkaline comet assay Olive tail moment (top) and validation of BRD4 knockdown by immunoblotting (bottom).

(C) Alkaline comet assay of LNCaP cells treated with 1 μM JQ1 for 24 hr, followed by IR treatment, and recovery after 30 min.

(D) Quantification of alkaline comet assay Olive tail moment.

(E) Alkaline comet assay quantification of single-agent or combination treatment of LNCaP (left) and 22Rv1 cells (right) with 1 μM JQ1 and/or 1 μM enzalutamide for 24 hr followed by IR treatment and recovery after 30 min (**p < 0.01; ***p < 0.001; ****p < 0.0001 by unpaired Student’s t test; error bars, SD of n > 50 cells from each sample).
Association of Nuclear BRD4 Protein Expression with the Development of CRPC after RT

To extend our discoveries to the clinical context, we optimized BRD4 protein immunohistochemistry (IHC) staining in formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded (FFPE) PCa sections (Figure 7A). We next investigated the expression of BRD4 in prostate carcinogenesis and its association with primary treatment response. H-scores (HS) were determined by IHC and BRD4 antibody specificity was confirmed using BRD4 siRNA in LNCaP95 cells (Figure S7F). LNCaP95 is an androgen-independent and enzalutamide-resistant cell line derived from the parental LNCaP cells (Hu et al., 2012). We noticed higher BRD4 levels in LNCaP95 cells as compared to parental LNCaP cells (data not shown). We then compared BRD4 expression in clinical specimens representing normal prostate, prostatic intraepithelial neoplasia (PIN), and adenocarcinoma (Figure 7B). Although variability in BRD4 protein expression was noted, we did not observe a statistically significant increase in BRD4 levels as patients developed prostate adenocarcinoma. This could be perhaps due to differential BRD4 expression in the various molecular subtypes of PCa (e.g., ERG fusion positive PCa versus SPOP mutation positive PCa) as suggested by our analysis of TCGA primary PCa dataset (Figures 1H and S3B).

As BETi have shown therapeutic activity in multiple pre-clinical models of cancer, we hypothesized that the inherent levels of variability in BRD4 levels may influence the outcome of treatments that primarily target genomic integrity (e.g., RT). Thus, we analyzed the expression of BRD4 in pre-treatment PCa biopsies of men who underwent primary therapy that included radical radiotherapy as part of their treatment paradigm. Higher nuclear BRD4 expression (continuous variable, per 100 HS) at diagnosis was significantly associated with shorter time to CRPC development after primary therapy (HR 6.7; 95% CI 1.5–31.0; p = 0.01). We divided the patient cohort by median nuclear BRD4 expression (BRD4 low, HS <100, 11 patients) and BRD4 high, HS ≥100, 17 patients). Patients in the high BRD4 group had significantly shorter median time to the development of CRPC compared to those in the low BRD4 group (2.8 [IQR 1.9–7.7] versus 9.1 [IQR 2.7–10.1] years, HR 3.9 [95% CI 1.4–10.9], p = 0.01; Figure 7C). There were no significant differences in the baseline characteristics between these patient groups (Table S1). Finally, we determined whether nuclear BRD4 expression was associated with overall survival in our patient cohort. Consistent with time to CRPC, higher nuclear BRD4 expression (continuous variable, per 100 HS) at diagnosis was associated with shorter overall survival (HR 5.5; 95% CI 1.0–29.7; p = 0.05). Although those patients in the high BRD4 group had a worse outcome compared to those in the low BRD4 group, this did not reach statistical significance (median 8.0 [IQR 5.1–13.5] versus 13.3 [IQR 7.9–13.8] years, HR 2.1 [0.8–5.5], p = 0.11; Figure 7D). Thus, pre-treatment nuclear BRD4 levels are associated with outcome from radical local RT for PCa.

DISCUSSION

We demonstrate a novel role for BRD4 in the formation of oncogenic TMPRSS2-ERG fusions via its involvement in the NHEJ DNA repair pathway. Mechanistically, BRD4 is recruited to DNA DBSs by its interaction with acetylated histone H4, and perhaps other acetylated proteins. BRD4 also interacts with several DNA repair proteins; these interactions are further enhanced upon IR treatment. Given the role of BRD4 in gene regulation, it is not surprising that several DNA repair genes are mis-regulated upon treatment with BETi. We suggest that both the direct effects of BRD4 in orchestrating the response to IR or CRISPR-Cas9-induced DNA breaks, and these indirect
effects by regulating the expression of DNA repair genes, are likely to be complementary.

We suggest that oncogenic gene fusions mirror many features of normal cellular processes like antibody gene rearrangements. BRD4 has been shown to promote class switch recombination (CSR) in B cells by facilitating the recruitment of 53BP1 to the switch regions (Stanlie et al., 2014). 53BP1 is essential for CSR in B lymphocytes (Manis et al., 2004; Ward et al., 2004). We suggest that DNA damage-induced cooperative interaction between BRD4 and 53BP1 promotes the formation of TP53RS2-ERG gene fusions, presumably by (1) blocking DNA end resection (Bothmer et al., 2010), (2) promoting/maintaining synopsis of distal DNA elements (Difilippantonio et al., 2006), and (3) increasing chromatin mobility (Dimitrova et al., 2008). 53BP1 exhibits structural plasticity and can recognize at least two different histone marks: the dimethylated histone H4 lysine 20 (H4K20me2) (Botuyan et al., 2006; Sanders et al., 2004), and the histone H2A ubiquitinated on Lys 15 (H2AK15ub) (Fradet-Turcotte et al., 2013; Wilson et al., 2016). We speculate that BRD4 may guide 53BP1 to the damaged chromatin and thus serve as a reader’s reader. Future studies should further refine our understanding of the nature, hierarchy, and origins of chromatin codes that are read by these reader proteins. BRD4 may also stabilize 53BP1 and the other DNA repair proteins at DSBs, leading to the formation of functional DNA repair complexes.

High-resolution mass spectrometry studies have identified lysine acetylation sites in several DNA repair proteins, including KU70 and KU80 (Choudhary et al., 2009). Thus, it is conceivable that the presence of two bromodomains help BRD4 and possibly other BET proteins to serve as adaptors to connect chromatin with acetylated DNA repair proteins. BRD4 may also promote acetylation-dependent cooperative interactions between DNA repair proteins leading to the establishment of multi-protein DNA repair complexes and liquid-liquid phase separation (Banani et al., 2017; Shin and Brangwynne, 2017). Such a model has been proposed for transcriptional regulation by super-enhancers (Hnisz et al., 2017). As BRD4 is a key component of super-enhancers, our study highlights common themes underlying the organization/regulation of super-enhancers and DNA repair complexes, and their vulnerability to BETi.

Our results also indicate that BET inhibition impairs the recruitment of 53BP1, Artemis, KU80, and potentially other DNA repair proteins to damaged chromatin. We also show that treatment with JQ1 enhanced IR-induced DNA damage and synergized with enzalutamide in cells expressing wild-type AR. Mechanistically, we show that these effects are due to targeting DNA repair. Since we also show that in clinical PCa samples, BRD4 protein expression is associated with outcome following radiotherapy, we now hypothesize that BETi can potentially be employed as a radiosensitizer in the radical treatment of higher risk localized PCas, especially in cancers with higher BRD4 expression.

Finally, our study demonstrates a new function for BRD4, a molecule that is widely implicated in the regulation of gene expression. Our results reposition BRD4 to the epicenter of DNA repair. These results are likely to enhance our understanding of cellular response to DNA damage and acquired resistance to cancer therapies that target DNA integrity, including RT and DNA-damaging anticancer drugs.

**Experimental Procedures**

**Cell Culture and Transfection**

LNCaP and 22Rv1 cells were obtained from American Type Culture Collection (ATCC) and cultured in RPMI 1640 medium containing 10% fetal bovine serum (FBS) in a 5% CO₂ humidified incubator. HEK293 cells were cultured in Eagle’s Minimum Essential Medium containing 10% FBS. LNCaP-95 cells were obtained from Alan K Meeker and Jun Luo (Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, MD, USA). LNCaP-95 cells were cultured in phenol red free RPMI 1640 medium supplemented with 10% charcoal-stripped FBS. All cell lines were verified by genotyping. Plasmid transfection was done using Lipofectamine® 3000 (Thermo Fisher Scientific, #L3000015) according to manufacturer’s protocol. The pFLAG-CMV-BRD4 expression plasmid was a gift from Eric Verdin (Addgene plasmid #22304) (Bisgrove et al., 2007). Patients were identified from a population of men treated at the Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust who received radical treatment for their PCa and went on to develop castration-resistant PCa (CRPC). Patients with a diagnosis of prostate adenocarcinoma with sufficient formalin-fixed, paraffin-embedded archival (diagnostic) tissue for BRD4 IHC were selected. Archival tissue was obtained from prostate needle biopsy (18), transurethral resection of the prostate (TURP, 2), or prostatectomy procedures (8). All tissue blocks were freshly sectioned and only considered for IHC analyses if adequate material was present (≥50 tumor cells; reviewed by D.N.R.). All patients had given written informed consent and were enrolled in institutional protocols approved by the Royal Marsden NHS Foundation Trust Hospital (London, UK) ethics review committee (reference no. 04/Q0801/60). A total of 28 patients had archival tissue sufficient for testing. Demographic and clinical data for each patient were retrospectively collected from the hospital electronic patient record system.

**Tissue Analysis**

IHC was performed using the rabbit anti-BRD4 antibody (Abcam; ab128874). Antigen retrieval was performed on slides in citrate buffer (pH 6.0) using a Menarini automated pressure cooker Menapath Antigen Access Unit. Anti-BRD4 antibody was diluted at 1:500 in Dako diluent and tissue was incubated for 1 hr. The reaction was visualized using the EnVision system. Cases were scored by a pathologist (D.N.R.) blinded to clinical data using the modified H score (HS) method; a semiquantitative assessment of staining intensity that reflects antigen concentration. HS was determined according to the formula: [% of weak staining] × 1 + [% of moderate staining] × 2 + [% of strong staining] × 3, yielding a range from 0 to 300. Rabbit IgGs were used as a negative control. Cell pellets from LNCaP-95 cells treated with BRD4 siRNA were used to confirm specificity of the antibody for BRD4.

**Statistical Analysis**

Time to CRPC was defined as the time from diagnosis (date of diagnostic biopsy unless clinical diagnosis was recorded as >1 month prior to biopsy) to documented progression (radiological, prostate-specific antigen [PSA], or change of treatment) on luteinizing hormone-releasing hormone (LHRH) agonist alone or with anti-androgen if started before/or with LHRH agonist. Overall survival was defined as time from diagnosis to date of death (21 patients) or last follow-up/contact (7 patients). Time-to-event end points (overall survival and time to CRPC) were assessed by means of Kaplan-Meier methods. Association with Nuclear BRD4 expression level was tested, as a continuous variable and dichotomized at the median HS of 100, using univariate Cox proportional hazards models. The proportional-hazards assumption was tested with the use of Schoenfeld residuals. Association between patient characteristics at diagnosis
(age, PSA, Gleason score, and previous treatment) and nuclear BRD4 levels were tested using two-sample t test, Mann-Whitney U test, chi-square, and Fisher’s exact test. Differences in nuclear BRD4 HS by cancer progression stage (normal, PIN, and adenocarcinoma) were assessed using the Kruskal-Wallis equality-of-populations rank test. All analyses were conducted using Stata v.13.1 and graphs were generated using GraphPad Prism v.6.
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